

internal enemies, little is reported on the attitude of the local population during his expedition which is extensively analyzed by A. Andresakis.<sup>56</sup>

The last fifteen years of the Byzantine rule in Italy, ending in 1071, appear confusing and incoherent in our sources and are briefly reported by the author mainly through the eyes of the Byzantine sources (p. 444–451).

The book ends with an additional note by the author and coordinator of this collective work, T. LOUNGHIS, who reports on the reappearance of the Byzantine forces in Italy to fight against the new conquerors, the Normans: “Επίμετρο: η τελευταία βυζαντινή στρατιωτική απόπειρα στην Ιταλία” (“Επίμετρο: the Last Byzantine Military Attempt in Italy”, p. 453–467)]. In 1154, in the beginning of the reign of the Norman king of Sicily William I (1154–1166), the Byzantine emperor Manuel I sent a Byzantine expedition by sea to Italy under the generals Michael Palaeologus and Ioannes Dukas. A small Byzantine army, in which a number of local soldiers had enlisted, temporarily conquered Bari, Trani, Gionenezzo and Molfetto. This was the twilight of the Byzantines’ attempt to dominate Italy. The most conspicuous characteristic of this expedition, as Lounghis properly emphasizes, was the deterioration of the once glorious Byzantine navy.

#### General Conclusion

The above survey illustrates the main points of the four long essays on Byzantine Armies in the West (5<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> c.). Studies on the Operations on Land and at Sea: Composition and Mission of the Byzantine Task Forces in the West. Multi-faceted factors have contributed to the development of the above study. Undoubtedly the interplay of history and diplomacy with military activities has been successfully presented. Nevertheless, more emphasis should have been placed, according to the title, on military aspects of the Byzantine army and navy as well as on the capabilities and strategies of its rivals.

Kryoneri Attikis

*Vasileios Christides*

Alexei LIDOV, *Hierotopy: Spatial Icons and Images-Paradigms in Byzantine Culture*. In Russian. Summary in English. Moscow: Theoria, 2009. Cloth. Pp. 352; 176 color and 30 black-and-white figures and line drawings; list of terms; index; list of abbreviations. ISBN 978-5-91796-001-2.

After founding the Research Centre for Eastern Christian Culture in Moscow in 1991, the historian and theoretician of art Alexei Lidov has embarked vigorously into pioneering multidisciplinary and phenomenological research of relics and miraculous icons that are, arguably, the most fascinating and

<sup>56</sup> ANDRESAKIS, as before, 12. Andresakis’ view that there was only one expedition by Maniakis seems reasonable (p. 11).

controversial objects within Christianity. His formative work on relics and icons, stemming from his training as an art historian, follows his numerous scholarly and public lectures and more than 80 publications in Russian, English, French, Italian, Spanish, Greek and Japanese languages. Lidov has also organized international symposia that were followed by published compendia, among which are: *The Iconostasis. Origins Evolution Symbolism* (Moscow, 2000); *Eastern Christian Relics* (Moscow, 2003); *Hierotopy. The Creation of Sacred Spaces in Byzantium and Medieval Russia* (Moscow, 2006); *New Jerusalem. The Translation of Sacred Spaces in Christian Culture* (Moscow, 2006); and *Hierotopy. Comparative Studies of Sacred Spaces* (Moscow, 2009). Edited by Lidov and written by the most eminent world scholars trained in various disciplines, these volumes eventually sparked wide intellectual debate on the cultural history of the creation of sacred spaces as well as on innovative methodologies in the study of sacred space. Today, Alexei Lidov also acts as a ~~Deputy Director~~ of the Institute for World Culture at the Moscow State University and is best known to scholarly audience for introducing in 2001 the concept of *hierotopy*, a neologism combining the Greek words *hieros* (sacred) and *topos* (place, space, notion).

This book *Hierotopy: Spatial Icons and Images-Paradigms in Byzantine Culture* gathers ten of Lidov's *hierotopical* essays from the last decade focusing on the extremely complex subject of the creation of sacred spaces by the Byzantines and those who embraced their culture. The scope of the book is remarkable. Lidov takes into account various manifestations of the sacred as pivotal elements for the creation of sacred spaces (or spatial installations) in the vast territories from modern-day countries of Italy to Armenia along a west-east axis and from Russia to Ethiopia along a north-south axis.

The major scholarly contribution of the book is its outstanding attempt to study sacred space comprehensively by using an innovative *hierotopical* approach, which transcends the methodological and terminological limitations imposed by traditional humanistic disciplines. The introduction and the opening essay, "Hierotopy. The creation of sacred spaces as a form of creativity and subject of cultural history" (11–37, English summary 307–311), make an important contribution in the definition and justification of *hierotopy* as a methodological approach within historical studies. The focus is on the making of sacred space as a specific form of creativity and an investigation of identifiable examples of that creativity. *Hierotopy* is, by its definition, a broad methodological approach for studying the historical creation of sacred space. Lidov defines sacred as the divine presence, which is inseparable from the miraculous (not created by human will), and explains the need for addressing the phenomenon of the creation of sacred space (actually made by human intellect and human hands, 10) as a whole. Though *hierotopy* resonates and occasionally employs *hierophany* as defined by the anthropologist Mircea Eliade ("Every sacred spaces implies a *hierophany*, an irruption of the sacred that results in detaching a territory from the surrounding cosmic milieu and making it qualitatively different" citation on 11, English summary 307), the focus of these two disciplines is different because *hierotopy* "focuses on

creativity intended to actualize the memory of a *hierophany*” (12, summary 308). Lidov addresses constructively the drawbacks of traditional disciplines such as art and architectural history, archaeology, anthropology, and religious and theological studies by emphasizing only selected aspects of the creation of sacred space. Although *hierotopy* uses some of these traditional approaches, it does not coincide with any nor is it a simple combination of all. *Hierotopical* studies combine various humanistic disciplines that deal with sacred space but go beyond positivist, object-oriented studies that gave preeminence to closely tied text-illustration or image-beholder relations at the expense of understudied aspects of dynamics, *performativity* and creativity in the creation of sacred spaces. Arguably, as a very young (only a decade old) concept, *hierotopy* still lacks wide academic approbation and established terminology. Time will show to what extent scholars in medieval and humanistic studies will embrace Lidov’s vision. Lidov himself discusses the controversial comments about *hierotopy*, yet rightly remarks that no scholarly work offering arguments against the *hierotopical* approach has appeared thus far (p. 9). Moreover, we are reminded that both *iconography* (slightly more than a century old) and *hierophany* (only some 50 years old) are also relatively young methods in historical and cultural studies. However, today both are widely used in the disciplines of art history, anthropology, semiotics, and media and religious studies. Furthermore, in this book, for the first time Lidov provides a theoretical discussion of the terminology of *spatial icons* – “iconic imagery presented as spatial visions” (7, English summary 304) and proposes the concept of *icon-paradigms* as a study tool – *instrumentum studiorum* (25–26, 304) for analyzing this specific category of images, which he terms “spatial icons”. In this context, Lidov boldly proposes *hierotopy* as a new research discipline, whose task is to study various *hierotopical* phenomena.

Subsequent essays examine thematically specific spatial icons by using the tool of icon-paradigms that, through typological links successfully unify an impressive number of chronologically and geographically unrelated examples from Constantinople, Rome, Jerusalem, Edessa, Thessaloniki, Ohrid, Ravenna, Venice, Bari, Cyprus, Naxos, Mt. Sinai, Cappadocia, Coptic Egypt, medieval Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russia, and Serbia. The essay topics are exemplary in scope and in treatment of available primary and secondary sources, developing a theoretical basis for *hierotopical* studies: “Spatial Icons. The Miraculous Performance with the Hodegetria of Constantinople”; (39–69, summary 311–316) “The Church of the Theotokos of the Pharos. The Imperial Church-Reliquary as the Constantinopolitan Holy Sepulchre”; (71–109, summary 316–317) “The Mandyllion and Keramion. An Iconic Image of the Sacred Space”; (111–135, summary 317–319) “Holy Face – Holy Script – Holy Gate. An Image-Paradigm of the ‘Blessed City’ in Christian Hierotopy”; (137–161, summary 320–321) “Miraculous Icons of Hagia Sophia. The Emperor as Creator of Sacred Space”; (163–209, summary 321–327) “The Catapetasma of Hagia Sophia. Byzantine Installations and the Image-Paradigm of the Temple Veil”; (211–225, summary 328–331) “The Priesthood of the Virgin. An Image-Paradigm of Byzantine Iconography”; (227–259, summary 331–333) and “The

Holy Fire. Hierotopical and Art-Historical Aspects of the Creation of ‘New Jerusalem’” (261–291, summary 333–335).

Most chapters deal with a major theme in Byzantine studies and Eastern Christian Culture – the icon. Lidov examines lucidly various miraculous icons within church and urban space and their role within rituals as aiding liturgical and iconic re-enactment of biblical, human and universal history as the Byzantines understood them. For example, according to medieval sources the double-sided icon of *Hodegetria*, showing the Mother of God pointing to Christ (*Hodegos* via Greek term “the Way”) on one side and the Crucifixion on its other side, had miraculous powers. Every Tuesday the icon performed “flying” in the air and lifting an icon-bearer within the public square in front of the monastery *Hodegon* in Constantinople. Public healing, collective supplication, penitence and liturgical acclamations were reported. Lidov suggests that the “Tuesday” miracle comprised a spatial iconic reenactment of the Crucifixion of Christ, but also of the historical event of the unsuccessful siege of Constantinople in 626 when, on Tuesday, the icon of the Mother of God was carried around city walls. The “Mandyllion-Karami(di)on paradigm” relates to the miraculous reproduction of the images of Christ on cloth and brick as well as to the reduplication of these images above the major passages within the church and city, thus becoming an icon-paradigm made of sacred space. The essay about the *katapesmata* (the curtain over the altar table) of Hagia Sophia examines its *hierotopical* aspects in relation to the temple veil, their iconic repetition in Russian **iconcurtains**, and its relation to church space as a whole. Similarly, the image-paradigms of the holy cities of Edessa and Jerusalem, the imperial chapel-reliquary of the Theotokos of the Pharos and the spatial setting of the miraculous icons and relics of Hagia Sophia, are considered as *performative* installations and as spatial icon-paradigms repeated and reproduced in various forms in a Byzantine church. Lidov contributes to an innovative understanding of the analyzed miraculous icons we often recognize as meditative depictions on wooden panels, various clothes and textiles, but also of “non-traditional” icons that have escaped scholarly attention due to their elusive occurrence, such as the miraculous “Holy Fire” or “Holy Light” as it is rendered in the Eastern Orthodox Church. Recorded since the ninth century, every Great Saturday before Easter the Holy Fire descends at the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. This is historically one of the greatest miracles, signifying the Resurrection and the promise of the Second Coming and eternal life in a Heavenly Jerusalem. Lidov examines the keeping and transferring of the lamps kindled by the Holy Fire and suggests how, in new settings, the icon-paradigm of the “Holy Fire-Jerusalem” recreated the sacred space of the “New Jerusalem”. Furthermore, he suggests the importance of this paradigm for the creation of funerary lanterns in territories of modern-day France, Spain and Austria as well as for the creation of Russian “onion” domes.

The chapter “The Priesthood of the Virgin, An Image-Paradigm of Byzantine Iconography” addresses especially a groundbreaking topic in Medieval and particularly in Byzantine studies. While we still have to understand fully the relations between religious texts and images of Christ

the High Priest, the priesthood of the Mother of God has never been discussed in Byzantine studies, to the best of our knowledge, until this essay by Lidov. Lidov introduces this highly controversial topic by connecting hymnography and homiletic to visual metaphors of the Virgin's priesthood. Lidov revisits portable icons, frescoes and mosaics with images of the Virgin from the 5<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries in Byzantine Greece, Italy, Egypt, Russia, and Serbia. He analyses the scenes such as those depicting *Deesis* (a big prayer scene showing Christ flanked by the Virgin and John the Baptist), and suggests that the Virgin is a metaphor for the New Testament Priesthood. He suggests that the Virgin's vestments, such as veils over the traditional *maphorion* or the fringed edges of the Virgin's garments, echo priestly garments. By focusing on the handkerchief often held by the Mother of God in her visual representations (which is in iconographic studies often understood as a cloth that reflects Mary's nobility), Lidov convincingly proposes that we are looking at a liturgical napkin deeply related to the Eucharistic sacrifice. Lidov's interpretation of the metaphorical nature of the priesthood of the Virgin opens yet another image-paradigm that connects visions, hymnography and rituals into one inseparable entity which cannot be fully understood if we focus only on one aspect of the paradigm – either pictorial representations or hymns. The great significance of this ingenious conclusion is not so much for the study of the literal existence of a female priesthood (we are reminded that deaconesses did exist) as for the study of the liturgical and symbolical role of Mary within Christian understanding of the „living spatial icon“ as a concept of salvation.

Following a productive series of essays that investigate various icon-paradigms (Heavenly Jerusalem, the Priesthood of the Virgin, or the paradigm of icon-curtain) and their role in the creation of sacred space and which are predominantly based on studies of iconic (meditative) images that open visions beyond the realm of figurative, two-dimensional images, the concluding chapter, „Image-Paradigms as a New Notion of Visual Culture, A Hierotopic Approach to Art History“, (293–305, summary 335–337) discusses in detail the potential of the *hierotopic* approach in cultural studies and humanistic disciplines with a special emphasis on its application in art history. Lidov's own work focuses on the medieval realm and on our understanding of the medieval way of thinking. However, Lidov reminds us that the approach may be of particular interest to students of theological interpretations of Jewish, Christian and Islamic cultures and to those who study Mediterranean and Russian cultures. Lidov also emphasizes that because of the shared dynamic perception of images, *hierotopy* may be of interest to those who study art and ritual as well as to those involved in contemporary, *performative* arts and multimedia installations, despite all differences in their contents, technologies and aesthetics and the fact that these contemporary artistic practices do not have historical or symbolical links with Byzantine tradition.

One of the major positive surprises is also the book production. The book employs both Russian and English languages thus becoming in a sense a scholarly „ambassador“ book. The main text is in Russian with a lengthy summary in English, and all the captions for images are in both Russian and

English. Though some may comment on the quality of English, we should only commend Lidov's attempt to write in his non-native English. Unlike most scholarly books published in Russia or states of the former Soviet Union, this book is lavishly illustrated with more than 150 high-quality color images and numerous explanatory line-drawings and details. The carefully selected images themselves are extremely informative and complementary to the text, to the extent that occasionally they form a peculiar self-explanatory "still film." Hopefully, publishers will be also alerted to possibilities for additional editions of the book with complete translations of the manuscript into other languages, making the material available to an even larger audience. Indeed, *Hierotopy: Spatial Icons and Images-Paradigms in Byzantine Culture* is an impressive, intelligently written and highly motivating book of great interest to art historians and theoreticians, scholars in medieval and interdisciplinary studies, and everyone interested in intellectual thought about the spiritual realm.

Greenville, NC

Jelena Bogdanović

Edward N. LUTTWAK, *The Grand Strategy of the Byzantine Empire*. Harvard, Harvard University Press 2009. 512 p. 13 maps. ISBN 978-0-674-03519-5.

It is impossible to approach this book without reference to the same author's *The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire* (Baltimore 1976) and the controversy it aroused. Luttwak (L.) himself draws attention to his earlier work, which 'continues to attract inordinate praise and strenuous criticism' (ix; 421). Prefaced as an outsider's foray into Roman history – L. is, *inter multa alia*, a strategic defence expert – the book divided critics. Many Roman specialists faulted L. for anachronism, reliance on secondary literature and overly schematic models of 'Grand Strategy'. Some saw nonetheless a value in posing new questions, presenting novel perspectives and challenging received opinions on the basis of analytical methodologies and terms of reference imported from another discipline (Defence Studies). Whatever its shortcomings, *The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire* was a provocative contribution to an ongoing scholarly debate.

Despite the similarity of title, *The Grand Strategy of the Byzantine Empire* is an altogether different work, in part of necessity. Byzantine military archaeology and epigraphy are a slim volume compared to the vast library that informs our understanding of Roman defensive strategies, while Byzantine 'Frontier Studies' has yet to emerge as a distinctive field of enquiry comparable to 60 years of triennial Roman *Limeskongreßen*. Conversely, L.'s discovery that Byzantium offers a 'richer body of strategy than the earlier Romans ever possessed' required him to modify his original plan simply to write a sequel to his study of Rome (ix–x). L. describes himself as 'more student than scholar in this field' and the book as 'intended for non-specialists as well', implying that it is also meant for specialists. He is again mostly reliant on secondary literature,