

Dukas. *Chronographia*. Byzantiner und Osmanen im Kampf um die Macht und das Überleben (1341–1462). Griechisch / Deutsch. Eingeleitet, neu ediert, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von DIETHER RODERICH REINSCH. In Zusammenarbeit mit LJUBA H. REINSCH-WERNER (Sammlung Tusculum). Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter 2020. 800 S. – ISBN: 978-3-11-069764-3 (€ 79.95)

- FRANCESCO MONTICINI, Università Roma Tre
(francesco.monticini@uniroma3.it)

In this volume, DIETHER RODERICH REINSCH (= R.), professor emeritus of Byzantine studies at the Free University of Berlin, presents to the international scientific community a new version of the Greek text of Doukas' *Chronographia*, along with several chapters of *prolegomena*, a German translation and a commentary of the work. It is good news for all those who specialize in the late-Byzantine and early-Ottoman period, given that the previous critical edition of Doukas' *Chronographia*, edited by VASILE GRECU, dates back to more than half a century ago.¹

Although the introduction makes up only a quite small part of the volume (fifty-six pages out of eight-hundred), that section – as well as the methodological approach it outlines – is expected to have a great impact on the academic world, becoming the main point of reference for future generations of scholars dealing with Doukas' historical work.

There is very little to quibble about both the structure and the content of this introductory part of the book. In the first chapter, R. conveys some biographical information on Doukas to his readers. In particular, he focuses on the chronology of the author's life and his education. Doukas probably grew up in Nea Phokaia, on the Western coast of Anatolia, where he likely learnt – besides Greek – the Italian language spoken by the Genoese. This cultural background allowed him to become a diplomat of the Gattilusio family in Lesbos. As for the crucial historical event that happened during Doukas' life – the fall of Constantinople – R. confirms that the author was not an eyewitness of the Turkish siege, but instead “im Juni 1453 muss

1. Ducas *Istoria Turco-Bizantină* (1341–1462), ediție critică de VASILE GRECU. Bucharest 1958.

Dukas nach dessen Eroberung am 29. Mai in Konstantinopel gewesen sein” (p. 10).

The second chapter of the *prolegomena* is dedicated to a thorough analysis of the *Chronographia*. In one passage, Doukas calls his own activity “χρονογραφεῖν”, while elsewhere he defines the product of his writing as “ἱστορία” or “διήγημα”. Thus, R. properly concludes that “folgerichtig und auch was die konkrete Ausführung betrifft, könnte man daher sein Werk, einer früher in der Forschung üblichen Unterscheidung folgend, als „Chronik“ oder als „Geschichtswerk“ bezeichnen, wobei die chronikartigen Abschnitte nur einen kleinen Teil des Werkes ausmachen und Dukas daher zu Recht in der Fachliteratur allgemein unter den „Geschichtsschreibern“ fungiert” (p. 12). R. also provides a short summary of all sections of the work and states that “Dukas hat sein Geschichtswerk offenbar nach der Eroberung von Konstantinopel am 29. Mai 1453 in der vorliegenden Form konzipiert [...]” (p. 14), as we can infer from Doukas’ reference to the fall of the *Polis* in the sixth chapter.

In the third chapter of the *prolegomena*, R. analyzes Doukas’ concept of history. He correctly asserts that Doukas had the same traditional *Geschichtstheologie* as all Byzantine authors of chronicles, according to which the primary impetus that drives history is divine will. In this regard, I believe that R. is perfectly right to dedicate almost three pages (pp. 21–23) to the explication of the three sins of the Byzantine people that, according to Doukas, were the real cause of the fall of Byzantium. The passage is worth quoting, at least in part: “So sind es neben der allgemeinen Sündhaftigkeit der Byzantiner vor allem der Eidbruch gegenüber den Laskariden, die Missachtung des letzten Willens Andronikos’ III. und die Weigerung der Bevölkerung, die durch Eide bekräftigte Kirchenunion auch zu vollziehen, die dazu geführt haben, dass Gottes Zorn über sie kam und Mehmed II. als ein zweiter Nebukadnezar und Antichrist als Werkzeug Gottes das Ende Konstantinopels besiegelt hat” (p. 23).

The fourth chapter of the *prolegomena* is dedicated to the formal textual aspects of Doukas’ work. R. particularly focuses on Doukas’ literary use of speeches and dialogues, as well as metaphors. All this causes his style – according to R. – to be “plastisch, kraftvoll und anschaulich” (p. 27). Concerning Doukas’ language, R. overtly foregoes a thorough analysis of the issue – “hier kann keine umfassende und in die Tiefe gehende Analyse geleistet werden; daher nur einige kurze Hinweise auf Besonderheiten” (pp. 35–36) – but he still dedicates three subchapters to morphology, syn-

tax, and lexicon (in the latter, he particularly focuses on Doukas' use of non-Greek words). In the last passage of the chapter, R. deals with Doukas' contemporary readers. His convincing conclusion is that "Sprache und Stil deuten auf ein levantinisches griechischsprachiges Zielpublikum mittleren Bildungsstandes, wie es auf den Inseln der Ägäis und in Westkleinasien zu finden war" (p. 40).

The volume proceeds to a survey of the manuscript tradition of Doukas' *Chronographia*, which consists of a *codex unicus*, Par. gr. 1310 (Diktyon 50919), fols. 288^r–391^r + 248^r–249^v (henceforth P) – although an anonymous fifteenth-century Italian translation, transmitted to us by a Venetian manuscript (Marc. it. VI 83, fols. 1^r–133^r), is essential to reconstruct some ambiguous passages, as well as the final part of the work (cf. pp. 600–602). R. offers a list of all previous editions and translations of the whole text of Doukas' *Chronographia*. He also adds two short chapters dealing with his own published Greek version of the text and his German translation. In this section, we find a list of abbreviations and a select bibliography, divided into primary and secondary sources. As stated (p. 51), the secondary sources are followed by a partial list of the countless publications addressing the fall of Constantinople.

Doukas' original text is published by R. with his German translation as parallel text. Since the new edition of the work that will appear in the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* series is not available yet,² the Greek text published in this volume is the result of R.'s critical reading of P. While some emendations are tacitly made – as stated at pp. 48–49 – the most relevant are explained and discussed in a specific apparatus that is found at the end of Doukas' text (pp. 607–631). After a careful reading, it can be affirmed that R.'s edition of *Chronographia* marks a considerable improvement over the previous ones. I support this statement by giving three examples, which I consider as particularly relevant because they entail both textual and exegetical issues.

1) At II 4,1–4³ (p. 62), R. maintains the text as it has been conveyed by P, although it contains two evident historical mistakes: "μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ἀνδρό-

2. As R. asserts, "Als Textgrundlage für die Übersetzung sollte eigentlich in Absprache mit der künftigen Herausgeberin eine seit 2001 offiziell als „in Vorbereitung“ für das *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Series Berolinensis angekündigte neue kritische Edition fungieren, die aber bis jetzt nicht erschienen ist" (p. 48).

3. R. has maintained the same numeration of chapters and paragraphs as GRECU. The capital letters written in red ink in P have been replicated by R. in bold.

νικον ἐβασίλευσεν Μιχαήλ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔτη [...]. μετὰ δὲ τὸν Μιχαήλ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ ἐπονομαζόμενος⁴ Γέρων, ἔτη ιγ”.⁵ Here, R. rightly does not accept the emendations proposed by FRANÇOIS POUQUEVILLE⁶ – and adopted by GRECU in his own edition – which improperly altered Doukas’ original text: “σὺν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ Ἀνδρονίκῳ ἐβασίλευσε Μιχαήλ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. μετὰ δὲ τὸν Μιχαήλ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ ἐπονομαζόμενος νεώτερος ἔτη ιγ”” (cf. p. 608).

2) At XXIII, whereas P conveys the incomprehensible version “ῥή δειγματο” (p. 616), R. resolves the issue by recovering the correction proposed by ISMAËL BULLIALDUS⁷ (“ῥήματα δῆγματα”; cf. XXIII 5,3; p. 250). In this passage, GRECU rather limited himself to inserting a crux philologica and to providing only a partial integration in his *apparatus criticus* (“ῥήματα/ῥητά δειγματα”; cf. p. 616).

3) At XLIII 8, P conveys the following text: “καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ζητήσαντες τὸ πολίχνιον καὶ ὄρκους τοῦ μὴ αἰχμαλωτεῦσαι”. BULLIALDUS and IMMANUEL BEKKER⁸ accepted this passage as it was. In order to make it more comprehensible, GRECU proposed to correct the second clause, by substituting “καὶ” with “ἔδωκεν”. R. not only validates GRECU’s intervention through the comparison of this passage with the corresponding one that is found in the Italian translation of Doukas’ work, but he also improves GRECU’s text: “καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ζητήσαντες τὸ πολίχνιον καὶ <δου> ὄρκους τοῦ μὴ αἰχμαλωτεῦσαι” (XLIII 8,10–12; p. 564). In his *textkritische Bemerkungen*, R. presents a convincing explanation of his choice to the readers: “Diese Lösung [the one of GRECU] wurde modifiziert, das überlieferte καὶ im Text belassen und danach das Partizip δους eingefügt. Dukas bevorzugt diese Satzkonstruktionen mit participium pendens” (p. 631).

As far as R.’s German translation is concerned, it is impeccably in line with the Greek text. There is a passage that is quite significant in this regard. At XXXII, P conveys a clearly defective version of Doukas’ text: “καὶ στρατεύσας καὶ θεῖς χάρακα ἐν τῷ Ἐξαμιλίῳ, ἦν γὰρ πρὸ τεσσάρων

4. P conveys the version “ἐπονομαζόμενος”.

5. As is well known, Michael IX Palaiologos only reigned as a co-emperor (1294–1320), along with his father Andronikos II (1282–1328). It was rather Andronikos the Younger (= Andronikos III, 1328–1341) as a sole emperor.

6. FRANÇOIS C.H.L. POUQUEVILLE, *Voyage dans la Grèce*, V. Paris 1821.

7. Ducae Michaelis Ducae nepotis Historia Byzantina. Studio et opera ISMAELIS BULLIALDI. Paris 1649.

8. Ducae Michaelis Ducae nepotis Historia Byzantina. Recognovit et interprete Italo addito supplevit IMMANUEL BEKKERUS. Bonn 1834.

χρόνων οικοδομήσας αὐτὸ ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος, σὺν ἐξήκοντα χιλιάσιν ὧν ἐντὸς αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθε” (p. 623). While R.’s emendation of the Greek text is perhaps a little audacious here – indeed, he does not hesitate to alter the order of the words considerably⁹ – he still avoids correcting a faulty text through a free translation, as GRECU did: “și Murad pornind cu război și-a așezat tabăra la Examilion, căci Constantin îl construise înainte de patru ani; și fiind cu șaizeci de mii, Murad a intrat înăuntru” (cf. p. 623).

A good example of the high quality of R.’s translation is also his own version of the passage in which Doukas describes Giovanni Giustiniani Longo’s mortal wounding: “ἐπλήγη γὰρ διὰ μολυβδοβόλου ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ὀπισθεν τοῦ βραχίονος· ἔτι σκοτίας οὔσης” (XXXIX 10,4–5; p. 496). While these lines posed some interpretative issues for AGOSTINO PERTUSI (“Infatti, quando era ancor buio, fu colpito da una palla di piombo alla mano del braccio che impugnava lo scudo (?)”¹⁰), R.’s translation is perfectly clear: “Er wurde nämlich von einer Bleikugel am Arm hinten am Ellenbogen getroffen, als es noch dunkel war” (p. 497).

All notes to the German translation of Doukas’ work can be found in the specific apparatus located after the commentary of the Greek text (pp. 633–710). Through these meticulous *Anmerkungen* (they are more than one thousand as a whole), R. provides his readers with further information about the historical context of the events reported by Doukas. In several cases, he also offers some bibliographical references, which can be particularly valuable for scholars wishing to conduct more in-depth investigations. There is very little to criticize here. For example, at p. 679, n. 609, where R. deals with the Βασιλικὴ Πύλη and its problematic location, he only refers to the classic monograph by RAYMOND JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine*.² Paris 1964. Although someone could object that other studies on this topic could be cited here,¹¹ we must take into account that this kind of apparatus is not designed to offer a long list of bibliographical references. Therefore, this section of the book is also well-documented and exhaustive.

An index of names and places is found at the end of the volume (pp. 711–

9. XXXII 7,8–10; p. 396: “καὶ στρατεύσας καὶ θεῖς χάρακα ἐν τῷ Ἐξαμιλίῳ, ὁ δὲ Κωνσταντῖνος ὧν ἐντὸς (ἦν γὰρ πρὸ τεσσάρων χρόνων οικοδομήσας αὐτὸ), σὺν ἐξήκοντα χιλιάσιν αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθε”.

10. AGOSTINO PERTUSI, *La caduta di Costantinopoli*, II. Milan 1976, p. 173.

11. For instance, WOLFGANG MÜLLER-WIENER, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls. Byzantion, Konstantinupolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen 1977, p. 57.

800). As explained by R. (p. 51), it is something more than a simple index, given that it also contains short notes on the context of each term cited by Doukas. It is undoubtedly a useful tool for any reader who is not perfectly acquainted with all historical and geographical details of the fifteenth-century Eastern Mediterranean region. Toponyms mentioned by Doukas appear in their Greek and Turkish form (e.g., Arsingan/Erzincan, p. 718; Behramkale/Assos, p. 723). If they have changed over the centuries, the old one is always accompanied by the current toponym (e.g. Kaffa/Feodosia, p. 748; Sebasteia/Sivas, p. 784).

In conclusion, this is a high quality volume – albeit with minimal typographical errors, e.g. “Pkokaiia” (p. 9), “expressiv verbis” (p. 21); one would expect nothing less from R. His remarkable mastery of the Byzantine historiographic *corpus* has allowed him to take a great step forward compared to GRECU’s edition of *Chronographia*. As a result, all scholars dealing with this historical work now have at their disposal a new and reliable version of Doukas’ original text, as well as an extensive apparatus of exegetical notes. In addition, this book will reach a broader audience, as the first ever German translation of an important Greek source shedding light on the fall of Constantinople.¹²

Keywords

Byzantine history; Dukas; fall of Constantinople; historiography

12. The editor of *The Byzantine Review* thanks Vasileios Marinis for revising the English text.