
The late Russian-American Byzantinist, Prof. Alexander Kazhdan, died on May 29, 1997 in Dumbarton Oaks, a research center dedicated, among other subjects, to the Byzantine Studies. He was one of the most prolific and influential Byzantinists of his generation and his work is always relevant to all Byzantinists of our times. The work he produced in the period between 1979 and 1997 as a senior Research Associate at Dumbarton Oaks is easily accessible, having been published by all well-known journals and publishers in the field, both in Europe and in the United States. However, between 1952, when his dissertation on the agrarian history of Byzantium was published, and 1975, when he left the Soviet Republic, Kazhdan, as a Russian Medievalist, produced an enormous volume of work, the major part of which was written in Russian. The significance of this work was such that a number of Byzantinists still active today felt obliged to learn Russian in order to converse with this part of Kazhdan’s scholarship. Russian, however, remains one of the less studied languages among Western academics and much of the outstanding scholarship that is still produced in this language remains unknown to European and American scholars.

The volume under review is trying to cover in some part this deficiency. In 1959 Kazhdan published in Russian a translation with introduction and extensive commentary of a Byzantine text of the early tenth century, under the title *Chronicle of Psamatia.* The original text in question had a very interesting history and it is worth repeating its outline here. In 1874 the German archeologist Gustav Hirschfeld found in a monastery on the island of the lake Egerdits in Asia Minor and purchased a number of manuscripts, which he brought to Berlin. Among them the manuscript that was catalogued as Berolinensis gr. 55 contained a truncated text that constituted the biography of the Patriarch Euthymius of Constantinople (907-912). The text – an eyewitness account of many events of the otherwise poorly documented reign of Emperor Leo VI the Wise –, was subsequently edited in 1888 with a German translation and a long historical essay by the German scholar Carl de Boor. Based on the work of de Boor and the critical observations of the Greek Academic N. Vees who reviewed the manuscript in Berlin and published his comments and corrections (not always accurate) in the «Acta of the Academy of Athens», Kazhdan produced the *Chronicle of Psamatia.* Since then, another edition followed, carried out by Patricia Karlin-Hayter, with an even more extensive introduction, a translation in English, detailed commentary and a section on the grammar of the text. More recently a Greek translation based on the edition of Karlin-Hayter with a brief introduction and comments and detailed indexes, was produced by the reviewer.

3 C. de Boor, *Vita Euthymii, ein Anekdoton zur Geschichte Leo’s des Weisen*, Berlin 1888.
5 It seems that he also took into account an earlier publication of the edition by P. Karlin-Hayter.
Due to loss of folios from the beginning and the middle section of the manuscript one third of the text is missing together with the title page. Trying to compensate for this loss, C. de Boor arbitrarily titled the work *Vita Euthymii*. Kazhdan, in his effort to bypass the restrictions of Soviet censorship, which in the 1950s prohibited any use of religious terminology in state funded scholarship, opted for the secular sounding title *Chronicle of Psamathea*. Irrespective of its title, the work is historical in its nature and is one of the very few sources (another one is the *Vita Theophano*) that were written by authors who witnessed the events of the reign of Leo VI. As such its value is beyond doubt, as has been stressed by most scholars who wrote on this significant Byzantine ruler.

The present translation, apart from the fact that it faithfully follows the text and the comments of the original Russian work, takes also into account the translation of Karlin-Hayter. (ariello) has given in footnotes the passages in which the translation of Karlin-Hayter differs from that of Kazhdan.

A major issue that has to be made clear here is the fact that Kazhdan’s translation (and the Italian by C.) predominantly relies on the classical “normalization” C. de Boor has performed or suggested in the *apparatus criticus* of his edition. However, as Karlin-Hayter has suggested in the section bearing the title *Grammatical Notes* of her edition 8 a number of these «abnormalities» such as the use of dative and accusative are «remarkably unclassical». 9 Under the light of this remark, Kazhdan’s translation and the Italian translation by C. may be kept unchanged, but the footnotes that normalize the text could have been either omitted or augmented with Karlin-Hayter’s suggestions. 10

Some minor points may be warranted a brief note and are the following: p. 85 n. 130: The *scholium* on Theophano attributed to Arethas – see *Scholia in Lucianum* (schol. vetera et recentiora Arethae), in H. Rabe (ed.), *Scholia in Lucianum*, Leipzig 1906, p. 26: τούτο καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν γέγονε καὶ τὴν βασιλείας Θεοφανίων ἐξεμάνη πάς γυναικεία μανία ἀγαπητῶν etc.) is in fact an anonymous one, and the accusation that «Areta […] negli scoli a Luciano condanna il comportamento di Teofano, ritenendo che voleva presentarsi come una santa (ἀγαπητῶν)» has nothing to do with Theophano herself and her behavior. The *scholium* castigates the attitudes of the people of Constantinople after her death and it is they that proclaimed her a saint. — P. 147 n. 263: The translation of Karlin-Hayter ([Greek text: «ἐκείνος», ἔσθεν, «τὴν ἱδιωρρυθμία καὶ μονοτονία αὐτοῦ ὑπακοῆς ἢ ταῖς ἡμετέρας πεπιθρηχίας παραινέσεως etc.»] «He… rather carried away by his own willfulness and obstinacy than at our request», does not differ in meaning from that of Kazhdan-C. («[Egli, prepotente e ostinato, [non?] ha dato ascolto alle nostre esortazioni […]», but Karlin-Hayter is closer to the word for word rendering of this phrase. That «[non?]» in the Italian translation should be kept with no question mark. — P. 153 n. 274: The phrase «οὐκ ἔστιν… ἀμαρτία τῆς ἡμῶν φιλανθρωπίας νικῶσα, ὡς γέραςπασ» is correctly stated as non-existent in the Scripture. The author may have had in mind the following phrase from the Ps.-Athanasius *Quaestiones ad Antichorum ducem*, *PG* XXVIII, coll. 644,50-645 3: Ἄκουσον δὲ καὶ γραφικῆς μαρτυρίας, καὶ πείσθητι μὴ εἶναι τὴν οὖν δὴ ποτὲ ἀμαρτίαν νικῶσαν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν. Λέγει οὖν ὁ Θεός διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἡλεκτηῆ οὕτως: «Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος ὁτι, εάν τις [coll. 645] ποτήρι ἄνθρωπους πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ εὐρίω δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, οὐ μὴ μηνισθο πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν αὐτῶν».

To conclude, the present volume is an excellent translation of a work that appeared almost sixty years ago, but hasn’t lost its relevance to Byzantine studies after so much time. C. should be commended on his diligent and careful work, which offers to the scholarly community and the wider public one of the most significant works of Prof. Kazhdan. Of great help are also the two indexes of proper names and of dates included in the end of this book.

8 Karlin-Hayter, *Vita Euthymii*, cit., pp. 234-244.
9 Ibid. p. 234.
10 For example, p. 72 n. 104, τὰ χαρτόνα δικαιώματα, an unnecessary correction of the τῶν χαρτόνοις δικαιώματος of the original text for which see, ibid. p. 235.
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The reign of Leo VI was not documented by contemporary sources and there is no historian proper who wrote on him, while Leo was alive.\textsuperscript{11} What remains from this period that can be attributed to eyewitnesses of the events is indeed the present work, the \textit{Vita Theophano}, the account of the sack of Thessalonike by the Arabs in 904 by Kameniates (despite Kazhdan’s objections on this), the \textit{Homilies} and the poems of Leo VI himself and a few more texts. Given also the fact that for Leo VI recent scholarship is limited mainly to Sh. Tougher’s \textit{The Reign of Leo VI} (886-912). \textit{Politics and People}, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, the significance of the dissemination of such seminal works as the one translated by C. cannot be stressed enough. All in all, this is a volume that should adorn the libraries of all Byzantinists and informed readers who are interested in the period of Leo VI the Wise.

Alexander Alexakis


Pascal Boulhol’s book deals with “Hellenism”, narrowly defined as the «knowledge and study of the Greek language» (p. 6 n. 3), in «ancient France» (fourth century-1530), with a focus on the practice of studying Greek. It provides an update of his 2008 monograph entitled \textit{La connaissance de la langue grecque dans la France médiévale} IV\textsuperscript{e}-XV\textsuperscript{e} s. (Aix-en-Provence 2008 [Textes et documents de la Méditerranée antique et médiévale]). It is divided into 14 chapters (two more than the 2008 version), excluding the introduction and the epilogue. In the introduction (pp. 5-12), B. recognizes the shortcomings of the previous edition and states that the new edition corrects, updates, and extends the 2008 account. Only the last two chapters are fundamentally different. B. justifies his chronological limits by taking the figure of Ausonius as the beginning of his discussion and the foundation of the Collège de France (i.e. the start of a permanent public teaching of Greek in France) as his end point.

In chapter I (pp. 13-21), Hellenism in late antique Gaul is discussed. The Author stresses that Greek was a native language in Gaul, but that it was nevertheless mainly studied in schools. In the fifth century, Hellenism was lost, although there were pretenders. There was, however, a short revival under Emperor Anthemiou Procopius (the “Renaissance of 470”). Chapter II (pp. 23-29) describes the fate of Greek in the Merovingian period, when the language lost its political and cultural functions. As a matter of fact, it was first and foremost regarded as the language of paganism. B. goes on by discussing the Carolingian revival in chapter III (pp. 31-56), which began “timidly”, but resulted in a considerable flourishing in the ninth century. In the eighth century, there was a fascination for the Greek alphabet rather than for the actual language. Knowledge, if there was any at all, was generally limited to some words and numerals. The cult of Dionysius the Areopagite stimulated Hellenism in one particular place: the abbey of Saint-Denis. This Hellenism was, however, exclusive, as it was meticulously kept within the walls of the abbey. Chapter IV (pp. 57-72) outlines the quasi-total absence of Hellenism in the 10th and 11th century, with the exception of three abbeys. B. suggests a link between the 1054 East-West Schism and the suspicion against the Greek language. In the course of the 12th century, Hellenism gradually began to flourish again, as is described in chapter V (pp. 73-86). Yet, it

\textsuperscript{11} For this see W. Treadgold’s bibliographical survey on Leo VI’s reign in W. Treadgold, \textit{A History of the Byzantine State and Society}, Stanford 1997, pp. 909-910.