governmental relations improved. This trend appears to be leading to a "regional integration based on a community of East European national interests rather than on dogmatic rectitude." And, lastly, "If Soviet leaders must advocate worldwide communism and dream about its mythological comforts, the most they may realistically expect is that carefully cultivated relationships with their East European neighbors might brighten the prospects for Communism on a genuinely international, if disappointingly local, scale."

Jamgotch has carefully defined his subject-matter so as to leave his generalizations largely undisturbed by the Sino-Soviet "dialogue" of recent years. He has offered some very pointed ideas on the workings of Soviet relations with the communist regimes of East Europe, ideas that fully deserve the attention of Western observers. Whether the Soviet-Czechoslovak "dialogue" of 1968 and the Brezhnev "Doctrine" which accompanied it have refuted his findings remains to be seen.

Southern Connecticut State College

JOHN O. IATRIDES


Since this volume does not contain all of the papers presented at the 1966 Byzantine Congress in Oxford, it does not offer a full perspective on the current state and preoccupations of the field, insofar as the Congress offered one. Nevertheless, this is still an impressive collection of papers, demonstrating the flourishing health and the striking characteristics of diversity which are both features of Byzantine studies today.

Diversity is certainly apparent in the variety of approaches and disciplines brought together. Indeed, the one approach conspicuous by its relative absence is the once-conventional one of political history, barely one or two of the papers published here might liberally be classified under that heading. But there is almost everything else: church, cultural, art, social, and administrative history; musicology; ethnography; archaeology; numismatics; hagiography; and historical geography.
Diversity can be found in any healthy scholarly field today. But one kind of diversity is evident here that is specifically characteristic of Byzantine studies. This is the variety of national and regional interests that blend into the mainstream of Byzantine history. Thus, we find here as much attention devoted to the Byzantine impact upon, or dealings with, neighboring peoples—Turks, Serbians, Russians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Italians, Armenians—as is given to exclusively Byzantine subject matter. In this respect, few fields of Western history are so genuinely “international” in scope and attraction.

The bulk of the volume is made up of twenty-four “Main Papers” of about 15-20 pages in length, each followed by one or more “Supplementary Papers.” Generally speaking, the sets of papers may be divided into those dealing with essentially Byzantine material and those handling Byzantine relationships with neighboring peoples. Though they are not grouped according to such categories in the book, the following comments will follow this division.

In his Main Paper (VII: pp. 207-224), Kurt Weitzmann surveys a wide range of XIth-century miniature and icon paintings. He concludes that this epoch was the crucial one in the “fulfillment” and perfection of Byzantine style, in its harmonizing and balancing at last of previously contending currents. In their Supplementary Papers, Charles Delvoye (pp. 225-234) and A.V. Bank (pp. 235-241) find similarly pivotal developments respectively in the architecture and the minor arts of this same period.

A particularly helpful assessment of the state of progress in Byzantine musicology is provided by Oliver Strunk’s Main Paper (VIII: pp. 245-254). Following him, Giuseppe Schirò gives the philologist’s perspective on problems of editing the hymns of the Heirmologion (pp. 255-266), while Michel Hugo—moving this time into the category of relations with the non-Byzantine world—makes a contribution in his own right on the thorny question of Byzantine influence on Western music by classifying and grouping examples which reflect varying degrees of East-to-West musical transmission or adaptation. This, he rightly stresses, was a function of “l’unité culturelle et spirituelle dans laquelle fusionnaient l’Est et l’Ouest.”

E. Kriaras next (IX: pp. 238-300) explores the theme of “diglossie” in later Byzantine Greek—that is, the cleavage between the artificial literary language and the living, spoken language—picturing it as a function of a “néo-hellenique” outlook in the period after
the Xth century. Here in particular, a topic chosen seems too intricate, involving too much material still in need of digestion, for so cursory and selective a survey as this Main Paper. But it is a stimulating outline of the problem, which is no more than its author intended. The topics Kriaras discusses also anticipate significantly the question of modern Greek *diglossia*. While he makes note of the point, it is left to be developed further by Johannes Irmscher, as a departure-point for arguing social and class implications into its Byzantine manifestations (pp. 301-308); while André Mirambel explores more directly (pp. 309-313) the differences between Byzantine *diglossia* and the modern Greek "question de la langue." These three papers, in sum, while raising more problems than they settle, focus some valuable light on a subject that is familiar but as yet only scantily explored.

Most stimulating is Philip Grierson's incisive essay, pointing up the less-than-fully appreciated subject of "Byzantine Coinage as Source Material" (X: pp. 317-333). Here, he takes the term "coinage" to mean "coins in bulk: where, when, and how coins were struck and in what quantity, over what area they circulated, the role which they played in economic life." Valuable also is his seven pages of bibliography. He is followed by Alfred R. Bellinger, who sketches the evolution of "Epigraphy of the Byzantine Coinage" (pp. 335-338): one wishes he could have been given the time and space to expand more fully on the details and insights of his interesting topic. After him, T. Bertelé comments briefly on the gold coinage of the Nicaean Emperors (pp. 339-341).

F. Halkin reflects on another body of source material ancillary to conventional Byzantinological resources in "L'hagiographie byzantine au service de l'histoire," (XI: pp. 345-354). He points out the specific details and the subtler insights into Byzantine mentality, spirituality, and life which Saints Lives afford, and he pleads for help in carrying out the current hagiographic programs. Here again, the Supplementary Papers draw the discussion into the sphere of Byzantine relations with other peoples: Enrica Follieri (pp. 355-362) points out the dimension of East-West relations reflected and—indeed, for editing purposes—inherent in hagiographic texts; while Ivan Dujčev (pp. 363-370) performs a parallel service for the less frequently considered Byzantine-Slavonic relationship in hagiography.

In what many Byzantinists should find the most valuable paper, and certainly one of the few deliberately contentious ones in the volume, N. Svoronos joins those currently re-assessing "la crise du XIe
siècle.” He argues (XII, pp. 373-389) that “la crise générale de cette époque a ses origines du Xe siècle,” and that, rather than being the consequence of a simple civil/military rivalry or of an abrupt abandonment of Macedonian governmental policies after Basil II, the disruption of the later XIth century resulted from a complex pattern of internal social and economic changes within the Empire’s structure. Supplemen­ting Svoronos, André Guillou discusses (pp. 391-396) some details of the Byzantine social and administrative order in XIth-century Byzantine Italy. Halina Evert-Kappesowa comments (pp. 397-400) on XIth-century society and urges that, more than simple feudalization and central weakness, it was the internal inability of the Empire after the XIth century to play the great-power role its positions demanded of it that helped precipitate Byzantium’s decline. And, in most stimulating fashion, Eugen Stanescu (pp. 401-408) analyzes the successive regimes of the period 1057-1081 in terms of successive cycles of “réformes” and “contre-réformes,” suggesting further that these cycles provide the key to understanding the subsequent government of Alexius I. Together with other recent publications, this set of papers suggests that the crucial XIth century is likely to become a particular battleground of “revisionism” among Byzantinists in the years ahead.

As the last of the Main Papers, Peter Charanis offers “Observations on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire” (XIV, pp. 445-463). He includes a thorough if concise assessment of recent writing in this area, especially estimates and analyses of Byzantine population, adding some pointed comments of his own on the components and character of that population as well. In terms of both the judgements and the up-to-date bibliography it provides, this incisive discussion represents the best starting-point for anyone seeking information on Byzantine population. Following this, Hélène Ahrweiler sketches “Les problèmes de la géographie historique byzantine” (pp. 465-473), outlining its nature and methodology; while Hans-Georg Beck adds (pp. 474-475) only a few detailed reactions to Charanis’ paper.

Turning to the discussions of Byzantine relations with the Empire’s neighbors, we find two discussions of essentially “Eastern” spheres. The initial Main Paper is Gyula Moravscik’s “Byzantinische Mission im Kreise der Türkvolker an der Nordküste des Schwarzen Meeres” (I, pp. 15-28), which sketches what the author points out is a relatively neglected aspect of Byzantine Christianization efforts: one which fell between, roughly, the 4th and the 8th centuries, and which was
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directed at various Hun and Chazar peoples of the Crimean area. Following which, Ludolf Mülller (pp. 29-38) re-assesses the subsequent missionary activities north of the Black Sea which were primarily focused on the conversion of Kievan Russia. Both of these papers, especially the latter, stress anew the interrelationships of such missions to Byzantium's diplomacy and foreign policy. Near the volume's end, Cyril Toumanoff's essay "The Background to Manzikert" (XIII, pp. 411-426) is, in effect, a sketch of the Empire's dealings with the peoples of the Caucasus (including the Armenians) during the 1st-11th centuries, to which dealings he sees the disaster of 1071 as but the outcome and final chapter. In the process, he provides useful perspective on the place of the Caucasus peoples in Byzantine history, both outside and within the Imperial borders. As foils, to this, Sirarpie Der Nersessian discusses (pp. 427-431) the circumstances of Armenian state and society that aided Byzantine annexation in the XIth century; while Robert W. Thomson presents (pp. 432-438) valuable insight into the effects of their diaspora on the attitudes and ideas of post-annexation Armenians, a neglected area of Armenian intellectual history; and Faruk Sümer adds a few comments (pp. 439-441) on XIth-century Asia Minor and the growth of the Seljuk power there, but viewed from the Turkish perspective.

The remaining sets of papers deal with "foreign-relations" topics which will doubtless interest readers of this journal the most. All but one of them involve separate regional approaches.

In his Main Paper, "Problèmes des relations byzantino-serbes au XIVe siècle" (II, pp. 41-55), George Ostrogorsky assembles a somewhat disunified but stimulating series of remarks, addressed primarily to the character of Dušan's empire vis-à-vis Byzantium, to the Serbian Principality of Serres, and to the Serbian interests in Mt. Athos. The first Supplementary Paper (pp. 57-61), some remarks on Serbian retention and assimilation of Byzantine ideas, practices, and organization, is a posthumous contribution by the late George Soulis, whose death less than three months before the Congress remains a deeply-lamented loss to Byzantine and Balkan studies and to the fellowship of his associates. And Bariša Krekić briefly bids for some consideration of usually neglected Western contacts in "La Serbie entre Byzance et l'Occident au XIVe siècle" (pp. 62-65) though one wishes he had been able to develop something from the few mere hints he gives.

The third Main Paper is the longest in the volume, and the most complex of its multi-authored ones. Devoted to "Relations of Old Rus-
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sia and Byzantium from the Xlth to the first half of the XIIth century,” it is divided into two parts. The first, “Economic and Political Relations of Old Russia and Byzantium,” by G.G. Litavrin and A.P. Každan (pp. 69-81), outlines the pattern of contacts, of which the ecclesiastical ones are deliberately underplayed, while the frequently reciprocal elements are stressed. It is particularly valuable for bringing out some of the less familiar aspects of Xlth and XIIth-century contacts, with their increasingly complex multiplicity. The second part, “Russo-Byzantine Cultural Connections,” by Z. V. Udalcova (pp. 81-91), analyzes some of the diverse ways in which Byzantine influences did or did not affect Russian cultural development. Most of her space is devoted to areas of law, literature, music, and scholarship, in which she argues for strong currents of native individualism; more fleetingly, she concedes that painting, mosaic, and architecture sustained more extensive Byzantine permeation. Both parts, and especially the second, are flawed by elements of exaggerated nationalism, by insistence on the native Russian genius at every turn, and by reaction to any alien influence as some form of “aggression,” subtle or otherwise. Nevertheless, these are stimulating presentations, and it does seem unfortunate that they have to be in Russian, without even summaries in another language. Since these papers contain a good deal of information not conventionally accessible for those without Russian, they preserve an undesirable language barrier around this subject matter. The specific qualities and weaknesses of these papers are set in relation to general currents of Soviet and non-Soviet scholarship and are scrutinized at length in the first Supplemental Paper (pp. 93-104), by Ihor Ševčenko, who also offers some comments of his own on Russo-Byzantine relations from “the vantage point of Constantinople,” mainly those relations involving XIVth-century Lithuania. And Fairy von Lillienfeld analyzes shifting Russian ideological re-assessments and attitudes concerning the Empire during the latter’s last century of decline in his “Russland und Byzanz im XIV und XV Jahrhundert” (pp. 105-115) with critical scrutiny of the extent of “Byzantinism” in early Muscovite Russia.

In “Die bulgarische Länder und das bulgarische Volk in den Grenzen des byzantinischen Reiches im XI-XII Jahrhundert (1018-1185) (sozial-ökonomische Verhältnisse)” (V, pp. 151-166) D. Angelov investigates that obscure phase of Bulgaria’s history, when it was under Byzantine rule after Basil II’s annexation of it. His primary focus is on the organization of landholding, the introduction of Byzantine forms
of "feudalism," the status of the peasantry, and, more cursorily, the state of the economy. He concludes "dass in dieser Periode das bulgarische Volk und die bulgarischen Länder in das sozial-ökonomische System des byzantinischen Reiches fest eingegliedert waren" but he does not lose sight of his topic's relevance to religion, politics, and movements of national independence. Supplementing him neatly is Antonin Dostal, whose consideration of "Les relations entre Byzance et les Slaves (en particulier les Bulgares) aux XIe et XIIe siècles du point de vue culturel" (pp. 167-175) is regrettably brief. But it points out the important bases afforded by IXth-century Byzantine missionary work, as filtered through Ochrid, to the subsequent Bulgarian cultural development in the period stipulated. Taken together, these two papers are particularly useful contributions on the Balkan historical literature.

The Rumanian sector is represented in terms of Byzantine frontier organization there, as studied mainly through recent archaeological work. In "Nouvelles recherches sur le Limes byzantin du Bas-Danube aux Xe - XIe siècles (VI, pp. 179-203), E. Condurachi, Ion Barnea, and Petre Diaconnu sort out the sources and the remains for the imperial fortifications in the Dobrudja. They find that "Les découvertes archéologiques confirment à leur tour les données fournies par les sources littéraires" and they suggest that "L'ensemble de ses découvertes témoigne de la fermeté avec laquelle s'était consolidé le pouvoir politique et administratif de Byzance au Bas-Danube." Moving to the XIVth and XVth centuries, Aleksander Elian discusses "Byzance et les Roumains à la fin du Moyen Age" (pp. 195-203), giving a concise sketch of political and cultural contacts.

Finally, in a comprehensive (rather than a regionally restrictive) approach, Milos Velimirović extends his own previous work with his Main Paper, "The Influence of the Byzantine Chant on the Music of the Slavic Countries" (IV, pp. 119-140). Synthesizing, and going beyond his earlier study of Byzantine elements in the early Slavonic heirmologion, he not only provides a valuable summary of the current state of research in this area and a concise presentation useful to musicologists alone, but he also presents a fascinating picture of the working-out of Byzantine influence in one area of Slavonic culture (both Balkan and Russian) that merits the study of any Central European historian. Since Velimirović's focus comprehends the Russian absorption of Byzantine influence, the supplementary comments of Dimitrije Stefanović (pp. 141-157) consider the Bulgarian and Serbian literature.
more closely; though, as he admits, he can only point the way to future work needed in establishing that durability of Byzantine influence was perhaps even greater there by comparison with the Russian case.

As the foregoing comments may have suggested, these are qualities common to at least some of the papers in this volume. A good many of them are built around the crucial period of the XIth century, consequently adding an ensemble of valuable new discussions to the literature on that epoch. Also, several of these papers provide, either in the main or in passing, useful analytic and bibliographical surveys of the state of current research in given topics or fields. This latter element is perhaps less frequent than one might wish, but it appears more consistently in these papers than in those of most previous Byzantine Congress Proceedings, therefore making this volume a particularly valuable reference-point and landmark for Byzantine scholarship.

The volume is prefaced by various addresses and business reports of the Congress’ opening and closing sessions. It ends with five *Instrumenta studiorum*: by H. Hunger on the projects and work of the University of Vienna’s Institut für Byzantinistik; by Paul Lemerle on Byzantine epigraphy; by P. Périchon on the Byzantine titles in the *Sources chrétiennes* series; by N. Oikonomides on the Mt. Athos archives inventory and publication; and by B. Lavagnini on the work of the Istituto Siciliano di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici. Plates accompany several of the papers. Regrettably, if perhaps understandably, the volume has no index.

University of Wisconsin, Madison

JOHN W. BARKER

*A Land Called Crete. A Symposium in Memory of Harriet Boyd Hawes.*


These are the four lectures given at the symposium. An excellent introductory account of Mrs. Hawes’ life and work is provided by Phyllis Williams Lehmann, but it is too brief for the importance of what Mrs. Hawes accomplished in Greek archaeology, and only gives a sketch of the other contributions she made to scholarship and to social justice.

J. Walter Graham lectured on “The Cretan Palace: Sixty-seven Years of Exploration.” While he concludes with pointing out some of the