

Dem ersten Band (vgl. OrChr 47 [1963] 146/8) ist der zweite (= Schluß-)Band rasch gefolgt. Er bringt die Angaben für den « beweglichen » Teil des byzantinischen Kirchenjahres. Dazu als Anhang Angaben für prokeimena; einen Ordo für die Feier des Anniversarium einer Kirchweihe; Angaben für verschiedene Lesungen. — Zur besseren Erläuterung der Neujahrsfeier des 1. September wird als Ergänzung (nach Dmitriewski I, 152) der einschlägige Abschnitt aus einer Hs. des Archäologischen Museums zu Kiew und als Muster einer pannychis die Beschreibung aus der heute verschwundenen Hs. Dresden 104 a angefügt.

Die Krone der Ausgabe bilden jedoch die nun folgenden 120 (!) Seiten Indices. Sie erschließen den reichen Stoff nach allen denkbaren Richtungen. Sie offenbaren aber auch, wie sehr der Vf. mit den einschlägigen Problemen vertraut ist.

H. Engberding

P. B o n i f a t i u s OSB, *Sprüche der Väter* (Apophthegmata patrum) im Auszug herausgegeben und übersetzt = Geist und Leben der Ostkirche 3. 8°. 258 S., 19 Zeichnungen, 9 Vignetten, 1 Kartenskizze. Verlag Styria, Köln-Graz-Wien. 19.80 DM.

Goldene Worte haben die Altväter der ägyptischen Wüste gefunden; goldene Worte, welche lautes Zeugnis ablegen von der Größe der Meisterschaft, mit der sie die Kunst des geistlichen Lebens pflegten. Die innere Leuchtkraft, die Tiefe der in ihnen verborgenen Weisheit, verbunden mit unnachahmlicher Treffsicherheit und Kürze sichern diesen goldenen Worten eine Gültigkeit ewiger Dauer. Wer immer sich mannhaft zu Christus bekennt, kann an diesen Worten nicht vorbeigehen.

Daher hat der Verfasser mit Recht diese Schätze von neuem ausgegraben; und mit Recht hat die Reihe « Geist und Leben der Ostkirche » diese Perlen in ihren Schutz genommen.

Die Übersetzung ist fließend, vornehm und doch zugleich schlicht. Sie dürfte als vorzüglich bezeichnet werden, wenn ihr nicht einige Schönheitsfehler anhafteten. Wir nennen ein paar Beispiele: S. 127, Z. 6 heißt es: « er stand von selbst auf ». Gemeint ist aber: er stand selbst auf; d.h. er ließ nicht andere die Arbeit tun! — S. 106: « Gewiß habe ich ihm nichts gesagt ». Der Sinn wird deutlicher, wenn man übersetzt: mit Absicht habe ich ihm nichts gesagt! — S. 115: « wegen mir » ist im Schriftdeutsch nicht erlaubt.

H. Engberding

Jean M é c é r i a n, *Expédition Archéologique dans l'Antiochène occidentale* (Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut de lettres de Beyrouth Tome XXVII) Imprimerie Catholique Beyrouth 1965, pp. 114, LXXXIV pls.

The far-reaching works of C. O. M u l l e r, those of R. F o r s t e r, G. D o w n e y, and above all the excellent results obtained by the Princeton University excavations from 1932-1939 at Antioch and its vicinity have immensely enlarged our knowledge of late Antique and early Christian monuments in this area.

On the other hand, our knowledge of the same region from 969 A.D., when Antioch was recaptured by Nicephorus II, until 1084, and the period of Latin domination (1098-1268), remains almost unexplored. Therefore, any illumination of this period in medieval history is welcome.

This task was assumed by the French « Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres », which more than 30 years ago entrusted P. M é c é r i a n with the exploration of the monastery of St.

Symeon the Younger and some other sanctuaries located in the western vicinity of Antioch¹. The results of P. Mécérian's archaeological studies, mainly on the excavation of the monastery of S. Symeon the Younger, conducted from 1932 to 1939 appeared periodically².

Now, however, after some thirty years, J. Mécérian has published one of his final reports which is the subject of this review.

In broad terms this book deals with some churches located west of Antioch, in particular a medieval church located on the southern slopes of the Black Mountains, which according to the author was dedicated to St. Thomas³.

In the very beginning of this book, in « Introduction Bibliographique » we read, « Les souvenirs chrétiens de l'Antiochène sont constitués avant tout par les monastères arméniens, géorgiens et même les abbayes latines du temps des Croisades... » (p. 9).

From this general description, it is not clear to which period of Antiochene history the author is referring, although one may assume from the content of the material discussed that he has the medieval period in mind. If this is true we are amazed to hear that the first place among Antiochene monasteries is allotted to the Armenians, while the Greek monasteries, which constituted the main bulk already in the Christian era of this region⁴, as well as Syrian monasteries, are omitted altogether.

Contrary to the opinion conveyed in the above mentioned quotation it will suffice to name the leading monastic center in the region of Antioch — the monastery of S. Symeon the Younger — which at least until the Latin domination remained essentially Greek. Even the colophon of an Armenian manuscript from 1179, quoted by Mécérian, states clearly that in Bitis (Betyas) a Greek monastery (p. 29) was located. Of the existence of Syrian monasteries (St. Elias, St. Barlaam) we know from such sources as the colophons of Syrian manuscripts published by Wright⁵. Mécérian not only neglects Greek and Syrian monasteries of Antioch and its western vicinity, but at the same time fails to give a clearly documented picture of Armenian and Latin monasteries which, according to the author, represent a dominant factor in this region. (p.9)

It is obvious that the misleading and spotty « Introduction Bibliographique » or the whole first chapter is mainly dedicated to recounting the opinions and theories, as well as the partly factual material, of the late P. Peeters, which are in general based on Georgian hagiographic sources or studies by Th. Žordania (Chronicles, I, 1893, Tiflis). Since Georgian hagiographic or historical sources were inaccessible to Mécérian, he was obliged to follow step by step P. Peeters, whose laconic quotations are not sufficient for an exhaustive evaluation of the problems which Mécérian intends to solve. For obvious reasons, he is unable to construct a large amount of Georgian original material, above all the numerous colophons of manuscripts copied in the vicinity of Antioch, which could have been very useful in reaching dependable conclusions.

¹ J. Mécérian, « Monastère de Saint - Symeon - Stylite - le Jeune », in *CRAC Inscr.*, 1948, p. 323.

² Millet, G. in *CRAC Inscr.*, 1932 pp. 343-348; 1934 pp. 144-149; 1935 pp. 195-197; 1936 pp. 205-206. Mécérian J., *Ibid.*, 1948, pp. 322-328.

³ I neglect the sentimental portion of the book dealing with the unfortunate fate of Armenians in this region in modern times since it is out of scope, not contributing toward the understanding of Archaeological material.

⁴ The condensed summary of churches and monasteries in and near Antioch of this period are contained in G. Downey's monumental work : *A History of Antioch in Syria*, pp. 656-659; R. Devresse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche*, Paris, 1945, pp. 109-111. W. Eltester, « Die Kirchen Antiochias im IV. Jahrhundert », in *ZAW*, 1927, pp. 251-286 and A.J. Festugière, *Antioche païenne et chrétienne*, Paris, 1959.

⁵ Catalogue, pp. 194-200; P. Peeters, *Un témoignage*, p. 378.

The second chapter of the Book (17-39) deals with itinerary (west of Antioch), a subject matter which preoccupied many prominent scholars in the past (R. Dussaud, C. Cohen, E. Rey, recently G. Downey, and the popular, but very useful three volumes of P. Jacquot), who in their studies attempt to identify the remains of churches and monasteries that survived in this area.

Mécérian enumerates in the second chapter all the following churches: St. Spyridon (17), St. Meletios and St. John the Chrysostom (26), St. Panteleimon (28), St. Thomas (29), St. George and St. Thecla (31), and St. Michael (36). He mentions also the Grotto of Sourp Sarkis (33) and the Chapel of Sourp Mardiros (34).

The overwhelming majority of these monuments were known through various scholars dealing with north Syrian topography (R. Dussaud, E. Honigmann) and antiquities (P. Jacquot). Some of these churches are mentioned in colophons, part of which are collected by P. Peeters and quoted by Mécérian, but these do not solve the problem of identification and location of churches mentioned in manuscripts. Mécérian does not even attempt to solve this problem, which is a necessary prerequisite to achieving a satisfactory conclusion. For instance, how do we know that the two churches located in Bitias are dedicated to St. Meletion and St. John Chrysostom, as Mécérian assumes (p. 26)? These unrestrained assumptions in regard to the unjustified identification are apparent on pp. 29, 33, and 34. Mécérian does not offer any palpable documentary evidence that the monuments mentioned here were consecrated to St. Thomas (p. 29), Sourp Sarkis or Sourp Mardiros (pp. 33, 34). He cannot introduce documentary evidence because such evidence does not exist.

Instead of analysing the gathered archeological material which conceals the answer, Mécérian is carried away by wishful thinking and sentimental desires. For instance, for the identification of the above mentioned monuments, we possess reliable documentary evidence through epigraphic as well as archeological material found in the very same place, namely: 1. A fragmentary Georgian inscription (*Nushkuri*), in what Mécérian calls the Chapel of Sourp-Mardiros (pp. 34-35). 2. A Georgian inscription (*Mrgwlowani*) in form of a cross, an ornamented limestone, both found and copied by H. Seyrig in 1924. 3. The colophon of the MS A 845 (Gospels of Ruisi) copied in the second half of the XI Century in the same valley by a Georgian monk who calls himself «Black Sakaria». 4. Ornamented panels found in the so-called church of St. Michael (figs. 42-44) whose form and style is typically Georgian. The close prototypes for the geometric interlace of these panels as well as for the plant motifs could be found in numerous monuments of minor art in Georgia executed by Georgian craftsmen, as for example the altarpiece at Saphara⁶, at Khovale⁷, and at Shiomgwime⁸.

Furthermore, neither SS. Mardiros and Sarkis nor St. Thomas are worshipped in Georgia, and to my knowledge there is no sanctuary dedicated to them in Georgia. Moreover, there is no apparent reason for Georgian monks dwelling in this area to have dedicated their sanctuaries to the above mentioned Armenian saints. These names, as well as that of St. Thomas (p. 29) could have been introduced by Armenians, who settled in this area in the XVII century, rebuilt abandoned or devastated churches and rededicated them to their national saints. During the three centuries of Armenian domination the whole area was Armenianized, but this fact had nothing to do with the short-lived monastic life in this region, which had diminished since the very beginning of the XII century and had become extinct forever by 1268, when Antioch was taken by the Mameluks under Bibars. Through the centuries the frequent ethnical changes

⁶ Schmerling, R., «Minor forms in Georgian architecture», Tbilisi, 1962, pl. 37-38.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pl. 32.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pl. 45, 49. Very similar motifs I found during my excavation in 1964-65 in the monastery of St. Barlaam on Mount Kassios. It is not impossible that they were executed by the same artist as those discussed here.

in the Black Mountains resulted in the introduction of new names and a topographical confusion. The same happened in the beginning of our century, when Armenians left their settlements in this region, the Turkish element was introduced, and the names of the above mentioned sanctuaries were again changed. For instance, the sizable architectural monument on the steep mountain north of Yogun Oluk is not called by its Armenian name «vanque» but «Kale», the so-called «Sourp-Mardiros» is «Magara», and St. Michael is now known as «Kharaba Kilise».

Mécérian is very reluctant to offer the reader factual documentary material, but whenever he does, his plans and measurements are inaccurate and grossly misleading. This is applicable for instance to the above mentioned Grotto of Sourp Sarkis, which is not a grotto, as Mécérian asserts, but a hermitage erected on a rocky plateau nine meters above the ground. The plan of this hermitage, reproduced on fig. 48 (without scale) does not correspond to its real appearance which has a clearly perceptible rectangular shape. The measurements are not 12×7.5 m, but 4.90×4.72 m. It did not have a wall as indicated in the plan, but the remains of bannisters which along with the square dowels are still visible on the northern side. Equally inaccurate is the description of the cistern, which has not a rectangular, but circular opening (maximal width 0.83 m, depth 1.20 m).

Mécérian's observations in regard to the topography of the vicinity from the monastery of St. Symeon Stylite the Younger eastwards toward Daphne, and his attempt to identify and to locate some monuments (pp. 45-58) mentioned in hagiographic sources, particularly in the *Bios* of Saint Martha, are instructive. Yet it seems that the «lower monastery» (that of St. John, the teacher of St. Symeon the Younger) was not located at the foot of the mountain, where the great Kara Cai enters into the Orontes, as Mécérian asserts (p. 51), but closer to the monastery of St. Symeon the Stylite for the following reasons:

1. According to the *Bios* of St. Symeon the Younger, the monastery appears to be not in a lower location, but rather on the elevation. The *Bios* of St. Symeon tells that Symeon was led by the guidance of Divine Vision to a location called «Tibere» and from there he ascended the mountain upon which the monastery of John the Stylite⁹ was located.

Since the only mountain in this region (on the right of the Orontes) is located towards west, St. Symeon should have followed the path leading toward the «miraculous mountain», possibly through the present longitudinal town called *Nahirli Köy*. Since six years later St. Symeon had to ascend to the higher mountain where he finally established himself, the «lower monastery» (or that of St. John Stylite) should be sought between *Τιβεριανή χώρα* and the monastery of St. Symeon the Younger.

2. If the distance between *Τιβεριανή χώρα* and St. Symeon's monastery was three miles, which converted into the Roman or Greek millage system will measure 3 to 4 kilometers, then it seems to me that the lower monastery could have been located in the western outskirts of *Nahirli Köy* in the immediate western vicinity of the spring located there.

The partial support of my opinion is found in the *Bios* of St. Symeon's famous mother, St. Martha, who travelled from St. Symeon's monastery to Daphne in accordance to the following sequence: from the monastery of St. Symeon the Younger, the monastery of St. John, the church of St. John the Baptist, *Τιβεριανή χώρα* and Daphne¹⁰.

3. To buttress his opinion Mécérian mentions the ruins near the Orontes on the western side of *Buyuk Kara Cay* (p. 53, figs. 82, 83, the map on p. 15) which he identifies with the «lower monastery». However, before assuming this possibility we should take two obstacles into account: 1. The lack of direct evidence for such an assumption. and 2. the fact that the ruins of the

⁹ Van den Ven, P. *La vie ancienne de S. Symeon Stylite le Jeune*, Bruxelles, 1962, § 12, p. 11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, § 102, p. 80/22; also: *Life of St. Martha*, Iviron, MS 84, fol. 30 r.

structure indicated above are not contemporary with the activities of St. John (approximately first quarter of the VI century) but much later, possibly of the XI century.

For these reasons I think it is possible that we should look for the « lower monastery » in the immediate western vicinity of the spring located on the western end of the town *Nahirli Köy*, although the distance between this point and the monastery will be less than three Roman miles.

The second part of the book (pp. 73-126) is entirely dedicated to the so-called church of St. Thomas which I have identified as church of the « Livingfiller-Holy-Cross » or of Mary and the inscriptions found in two regions of the Black Mountain.

It is unfortunate that Mécérian does not give a precise account of the extent of his activities there, or an account of all the fragments that he excavated, some of which have since vanished forever. Mécérian also fails to give the description, measurements or diagrams of his findings, which relate only to those of an architectural nature; no glassware, coins, or pottery are included.

One of the main problems that Mécérian attempts to solve is the genesis of the plan of this church (p. 97). Mécérian quotes (p. 87 n. 78) G. Millet as believing that this church was a Georgian monument reminding him of the cathedral of Bagrat at Kutaisi (Western Georgia). Mécérian does not agree with Millet since in the church of Bagrat the southern and northern arms are projected beyond the rectangle. He suggests a similarity between the cathedral of Ani and the so-called Toroschurch at Anazarbe, because, as he states, he was not able to find a similar plan among Georgian churches (p. 87,88). But the Cathedral of Ani (which will be more applicable than the Toroschurch) is useless for an explanation of the characteristic features of the so-called St. Thomas church for a number of reasons: 1. The absence of a western narthex; 2. The absence of portico; 3. The tripartite division of the eastern facade.

Furthermore, it does not possess any architectural decorative fragments whose motifs or structural ideas coincide with the so-called St. Thomas church. On the other hand, the arrangement of the western facade with its tripartite portico and the deployment of sculptural elements in the Bagrat Cathedral offer very close prototypes for the understanding and reconstruction of the St. Thomas church, inasmuch as the western portico of the cathedral of Kutaisi was built (after the completion of the church 1003) in the first half of the eleventh century which coincides perfectly with the date of the church of St. Thomas.

Now we have to turn to another problem. It is true that in Georgia no architectural monument exists which as Mécérian asserts (p. 87) displays the same structural symptoms as St. Thomas. The best example for a comparison (as far as planning is concerned) is offered in the main monastic church at Ikalto (not later than X century)¹¹. This is an inscribed cruciform domed church where the cross is inscribed in a rectangle and the dome in the center rests on four free standing piers. It is also equipped with narthex and portico. In addition to this the eastern facade is not divided by two triangular niches in three parts, but finished in a straight wall which encloses the main apsis and pastaphories arranged in one line.

Another church comparable to St. Thomas (especially in style and form of the architectural decoration) is that of Samtavisi (completed in 1030)¹². Yet I think that the particular characteristics of the St. Thomas church cannot be solved by comparisons, but mainly by the careful analysis of the church itself and its topographic position.

¹¹ Tshubinashvili, G., *Architecture of Kakhet'i*, I, Tbilisi, 1959, p. 348; the plan of the church on p. 340.

¹² Severov, N., *The Monuments of Georgian Architecture*, Moscow, 1947, pp. 178-179; *Ders. Ars Georgica VI*, figs. 79-85; Djobadze, W., *Vorläufiger Bericht über Grabungen und Untersuchungen in der Gegend von Antiochia am Orontes*, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, Vol. 15, 1965, pp. 241-242.

Above all, even those who examined this church as hurried visitors will notice that the eastern part of the church rests on an artificially created platform beneath which the mountain declines very sharply into a gorge from which an opposite mountain wall rises almost vertically. The same is also partially true for the southern and northern sides of the church, which are furnished with a narrow platform from which complete view of the monumental wall is impossible, while the eastern facade remains inaccessible to the eye. The nature of the topography obviously determined the plan. This phenomenon also explains the architectural gradation of the western facade and its decorative climax which is concentrated at the only spot from which the total complex may be seen.

The frequent inaccuracies and unsound generalizations are very disturbing to the reader. For instance, on page 83 Mécérian simply enumerates eleven architectural fragments without telling us the location where they were found, or their measurements, or their original place in the structure. Here are two examples of Mécérian's confusing statement: The first, fig. 126, is labeled as the frame of a window or lintel (p. 83). Yet the width of the windows, four in number, (whose sills are still *in situ* which Mécérian did not notice) is 1.15m, while the interior width of the so-called « cadre d'une fenêtre » (fig. 126) is only 0.60 m wide.

The most important fact is that the above mentioned fragment is not the frame of a window, but the fragment of a monolithic niche without an opening. The second fragment, according to Mécérian, is the cornice of the door (fig. 131) or the lintel (p. 73). If this is so, the door will not exceed 0.52 m in width, and cannot be functional for obvious reasons, inasmuch as the remaining walls of the church do not suggest the existence of such a door.

On pp. 94-95 photographs of carved architectural fragments are enumerated and reproduced from five Georgian churches (Savane, fig. 156; Nikorzinda, figs. 161, 162; Ertazinda, fig. 163; Ahtala, figs. 165 and 166; and Ikorta, figs. 167, 168), without any comment as to how they are related to the sculptured fragments from the church near Surutme.

However, an extensive analysis of the published material — especially concerning carved plant and geometric motifs — is necessary in order to reach a dependable date for the church under discussion.

The complex task of dating can hardly be accomplished by a mere occasional, superficial, or optical resemblance. Inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of ornaments from this church, for instance, the S-motif which originally was developed from a plant ornament (as for instance, the window frame ornament) on the western facade of the « Bagrat » cathedral at Kutaisi 1003, and later transformed into a geometric pattern which appears (slightly modified in style or form) in almost every church in Georgia, particularly since the very beginning of the XI to the XIII century.

In addition, the carved architectural examples introduced for comparison by Mécérian (p. 95) are not pertinent to the so-called St. Thomas' church, mainly because of stylistical or chronological reasons. For instance, the examples from the church at Ikorta (figs 167, 168) were executed almost 150 years later (1172) than those at the above mentioned St. Thomas' church. More typical fragments could be found for instance in the church at Samtavisi (1030), which is not only chronologically close to the above mentioned church, but could at the same time demonstrate close stylistic parentage and a common source of plan, design, and ornamental pattern. Some geometric and plant motifs applied on the neck of the drum, on cornices or on the decorative frame of the western window, reveal a most intimate relationship to the carved architectural fragments of the so-called St. Thomas church. The similarity is strongly revealed in common sources of patterns as well as in style and technique (use of the deep drill). The church of Samtavisi could have helped Mécérian to determine the place and function of three panels (figs. 199-201) which terminated in trefoil, within the architectural context of St. Thomas which he briefly mentions in one line as « bien spécifiquement géorgienne » (p. 97).

If Mécérian genuinely desired to trace the genesis of the so-called St. Thomas church and its architectural decoration, or strives to arrive at satisfactory results in regard to the date of the construction of the church, he should know that this task could best be accomplished by a careful stylistic analysis of the singularly rich and diversified architectural details; particularly the geometric and plant interlaces which are typical of Georgian medieval architecture.

From the XI-XIII centuries, in the wide use of stone carving we observe a trend from the naturalistic towards more flat, pictorial and rather schematic lifeless forms. Since this transition is detectable step by step, the closeness of chronological limits should be observed with extreme care, unless there is a compelling reason for broader interpretation.

The identification and treatment of the remaining fragments (figs. 169-201) is equally misleading and essentially faulty. For example, the figures 173-176 (p. 96) are incorrectly described, which leads to the obvious wrong conclusion that these three fragments were originally applied to the apse. There are other symptoms as well. 1. The apsis reveals the remains of the fresco painting which makes the use of stone carving superfluous. 2. The interiors of apses in Georgian churches are not equipped with carved friezes. 3. Since the apse space in the so-called St. Thomas church was separated from the rest by the iconostasis (remains of which I uncovered in 1963) and hidden from the eye, the need for the decoration of the apsis is limited. 4. The measurements of the above mentioned fragments, which I took at the church in the summer of 1962, show that the radius of the apse in this church is 2.40 m which requires a 0.018 m curve in 0.50 m length. On the other hand, the depth of the carved fragment (fig. 173) is 0.025 m, bowed requiring a 1.50 m radius, which is compatible with the base of the shallow dome on the western portico.

Consequently the fragment (according to my measurements: length 0.74 m; height 0.35 m, depth 0.36-0.38 m) reproduced by Mécérian (fig. 176) could have belonged only to the base of the shallow dome in the western portico.

5. This assumption is supported by the 2,5 cm (in diameter) iron (dowel pin) placed into the dowel hole (0.12-0.14 m in diameter) filled with lead. A similar dowel could have been on the opposite end of this fragment which is broken off.

6. Finally, a sondage which I conducted on the eastern side of the so-called St. Thomas church in June 1962 revealed five fragments of the cornice, all showing the same geometric ornament cardinally different from that discussed here.

The figs. 183 and 184 are not impost capitals (« chapiteau coussin ») as Mécérian assumes (p. 96), but bases of the composite engaged columns widely used in eleventh century Georgian architecture as for example the western portico in Nikorzmindā (1010-1014)¹³, the south-western annex of the church at Zemo Krikhi (first half of XI cent.)¹⁴, and the southern portal of the church at Savane (1046)¹⁵. In some cases the bases and capitals are of the same shape and decoration (e.g. Nikorzmindā), but in our case there were only two such fragments, which indicates the possibility that they should be regarded as bases which could have been terminated with fragments, reproduced up-side down by Mécérian (fig. 187). My studies and measurements in 1962 of the fragments discussed above show that they are organically related to each other.

Obviously misleading is the identification of fig. 185 as « un ornement de fenêtre de façade » (p. 96), because of the size (0.18 m in diam.) and protruding shape of the column which has

¹³ Severov, N., Tschubinaschwili G., *The Monuments of Georgian Architecture*, Moscow, 1947, pp. XIX; Baltrusaitis J., *Études sur l'Art Médiéval en Arménie et en Géorgie*, Paris, 1939, pp. 12-14, MAK IV pl. XLVIII.

¹⁴ Tsintsadze, W., *L'Église de Zemo Urikhi* in AG VI, pp. 105, paragraph 38.

¹⁵ Beridze, W., *Savane* in AG I, pp. 130, paragraph 23.

more than $2/3$ of its surface free standing. The relief of profiles and cornices of windows in Georgian churches are much lower, i.e. not exceeding one third of the height of its diameter. Furthermore, one fragment similar to that under discussion here (fig. 185) I found in the north-western section of the narthex in the immediate vicinity of the northern stairs of the western portico during my activities at the same church in 1962. This fact indicates that fig. 185 originally could have been attached to the portico or to the northwestern gate of the narthex.

Some factual inaccuracies should be mentioned here :

1. The fragments, figs. 194 to 197 do not have spheric surfaces similar to fig. 191 (p. 96), but have even surfaces. Their architectural function is also quite different and accordingly affects their size. Figs. 194 to 197 (according to my measurements 0.61 m in height, 0.70 m in width) could have been used as fillings between arches, while fig. 191 is undoubtedly a pendentive from the western portico (height 0.76 m; width 0.905 m).

2. Figure 198 does not include human or animal images as Mécérian suggests on p. 97. but are solely plant motifs. Typical of this church is the fact that among the rich and diversified carvings here is no trace of human or animal images. In the predominance of plant motifs, particularly in the frequent representation of the so-called « green crosses » or « living crosses », which are very common in Georgian art, I see one of the proofs that this church was dedicated not to St. Thomas, but to the « Pillar of Life », « Tree of life », or to the « Life spending Cross », as I indicated in my preliminary report¹⁶. This could be the church of the monastery (commissioned by D. Djibisdze) in which in 1035 MS A 135 was copied and which contains ornamental patterns similar to those from the church.

3. The assignment of fig. 206 to the main dome of the church (p. 98) is erroneous for the following reasons : a. The dome was covered with fresco paintings. b. At the height of ca. 37.00 m the fine ornamentation of the key stone, whose diameter is only 0.75 m, and the ornamental ribs including the frame and geometric interlace (width 0.15 m), would be almost invisible from the floor of the church. c. Another evidence against Mécérian's interpretation is the scale of the carvings executed on both lower and upper rings of the dome's cylinder, which is two to three times larger than that of the keystone. If fig. 206 were indeed the keystone of the central dome its ornamentation would undoubtedly have been much larger than that of the above mentioned rings. d. Mécérian's opinion is not supported by Georgian or Armenian architectural monuments, and his example from the Georgian church at Zougrugasheni is not from the dome of the church, but from the shallow dome of the portico. e. The ribs of the keystone found in the church or located by me in the neighboring town of *Hadji Hababli* are not curved, but straight.

These are some of the arguments which make it possible to assign fig. 206 to the shallow dome of the western portico. Such a solution is supported by the large number of examples from Georgian churches. I will enumerate some of them built in the first half of the XI century : Zemo Krikhi¹⁷, Cathedral of Kutaisi (1003),¹⁸ Cathedral of Nikorzinda (1010-1014)¹⁹.

I shall not dwell on the problems associated with the Iconostasis (pp. 99-104). It will suffice to mention that the questions emerging from the above mentioned pages could barely be solved by quoting S. Filimonow, or other authors whose works were written a century ago and who did not have a firsthand knowledge of Georgian iconostasis. Since the knowledge of this field, as well as the number of monuments found, has considerably increased. Important in this

¹⁶ Djobadze, W., *Op. cit.* p. 242.

¹⁷ *Ars Georgica*, VI, fig. 34.

¹⁸ *Ars Georgica*, V, figs. 74, 81.

¹⁹ Severov, N., Tshubinashwili, G., *The Monuments of Georgian Architecture*, Moscow, 1947, pl. 28b.

regard is the work of R. Schmerling (The Minor forms in Georgian Medieval Architecture, Tbilisi, 1962) based on immediate knowledge of analyzed monuments.

Originally the iconostasis incorporated not two plates (p. 103) as reproduced by Mécérian, but four. An additional two plates were revealed by my sondage in 1963.

On page 132 Mécérian offers the « Liste des principaux sanctuaires Transcauciens du X^e au XII^e siècle » which according to him display the highest degree of resemblance with that of St. Thomas. This list includes fifteen churches out of which five churches (at *Ateni*, VII cent.; at *Akhtala* XIII cent.; at *Geghard*, 1215; at *Pitaretî*, second half of XIII cent.; and at *Ertatsminda*, XIII cent.) are out of the chronological scope indicated above. Furthermore, out of the fifteen churches enumerated on p. 132 all but one are not precisely or correctly dated. For instance, *Achtala* was built not between the XI-XII cent. as Mécérian puts it, but in the second decade of the XIII century²⁰; the church at *Ertatsminda*, not in the XI-XII cent., but in the XIII century²¹. If under *Gelati* Mécérian means the main church, it was not built from 1089-1125, but from 1106-1125²², and *Haghbat* was built from 967-991²³. The date for *Ikorta*, 1172 is correct²⁴. *Katskhi* was not completed during the reign of Bagrat IV (1027-1072), but during that of Bagrat III in 1010-1014²⁵. *Geghard* (keghart) was completed in 1215²⁶ and the cathedral at *Kutaisi* in 1003²⁷. The cathedral of *Mtzheta* was completed in 1029²⁸, *Nikorzminda* in 1010-1014²⁹, *Pitaretî* (Phitoretî by Mécérian) not at the beginning of the XIV century, but in the first half (possibly the second decade) of the XIII century³⁰. *Samtavro* was not built between the XII-XIV century, but in the first half of the XI century³¹ and *Samtavisi* in 1030³².

Mécérian's argument in regard to the Georgian architectural monuments located in the province *Tao-Klardjeti* is essentially based on the tendentious work of Tokarskij³³ whose theory in regard to the churches of *Tao-Klardjeti* was sharply denounced by scholars of Armenian³⁴ as well as Georgian³⁵ art (which to Mécérian were unknown) which makes additional comments superfluous. Mécérian also briefly mentions the second edition of Tokarskij's above mentioned book commenting that it is written on better paper (p. 121, n. 104), a worthwhile observation but inconclusive. In this second edition Tokarskij renounced his own theory by omitting the whole fourth chapter from his first book, that deals with the monuments of *Tao-Klardjeti*. The most fundamental work of E. Takaishvili (Archaeological Expedition of 1917 to the Southern provinces of Georgia, Tbilisi 1952) dealing with the churches of *Tao-Klardjeti* is not known to Mécérian.

²⁰ Tshubinashvili, G., in *Encyclopedia of World Art* (forwith EWA) VI, p. 146; Amiranashvili, Sh., *History of Georgian Art*, Moscow, 1950. p. 183.

²¹ Amiranashvili, Sh., *op. cit.*, p. 174.

²² Tshubinashvili, G., in EWA VI, p. 146; Amiranashvili, Sh., *op. cit.*, p. 173, 224.

²³ Arutjunian, V., Safarian, S., *Monuments of Armenian Architecture*, Moscow, 1951, p. 56.

²⁴ Tshubinashvili, G., in EWA VI p. 146; Severov, N., *Monuments of Georgian Architecture*, p. 180; Amiranashvili, Sh., *op. cit.*, pp. 174, 240.

²⁵ Beridze, W., The church at Katskhi in *Ars Georgia* III, pp. 93, 94.

²⁶ Arutjunian, V., Safarian, S. *op. cit.*, p. 58.

²⁷ Tshubinashvili, G., in EWA IV p. 145; Severov, N., *op. cit.*, p. 195.

²⁸ *Ars Georgica*, I, p. 133 ff.

²⁹ EWA IV, p. 146; Severov, N. *op. cit.*, p. 198.

³⁰ EWA VI, p. 146; Amiranashvili, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

³¹ *Ars Georgica*, I. p. 75.

³² EWA IV, p. 146; *Ars Georgica* VI, p. 199.

³³ *Architecture of Ancient Armenia*, Erevan, 1946, pp. 200-214.

³⁴ Jacobson, A., in *Viz. Vrem.* III, 1950, pp. 257-267.

³⁵ Djanashia, S., in *Voprosi Istorii*, V, 1947, pp. 71-89.

I shall comment on some inscriptions which form part of the fourth chapter (pp. 106-113). These inscriptions, mainly epigraphic material published here, derive from two locations of the region of the Black Mountains, namely: from the valley north of Seleucia Pieria and the so-called church of St. Thomas. The first place revealed two inscriptions discovered before Mécérian in the summer of 1924 by Henri Seyrig, who sent me copies of these in 1959. Although these inscriptions along with other epigraphic material, collected by me in 1962-1965, have been published or prepared for a publication in the final report, some short comments here will not be out of place.

According to Mécérian, the first cruciform inscription (p. 109) was read by the late R. Blake as « Kriste J (ua)risi ». Both the editing and reading are incorrect. In this inscription, consisting of two abbreviated words are not eleven, but only seven letters. The inscription reads vertically from top to bottom, and horizontally from left to right (from us) as follows: « J (ua)ri K (rist) esi ». The second inscription, (p. 109) read by G. Garitte in September of 1964 is the most difficult of all inscriptions, due to its fragmentary condition as well as its calligraphic particularities. Despite this G. Garitte's reading of the three words is correct. Yet it seems to me that the second word in the second line was preceded by a word which could be read *as*.

From the second location (St. Thomas' church) Mécérian introduced three inscriptions (pp. 110-113). All of these were published by me along with numerous graffiti which I excavated in the southern section of the same church in 1962-1963³⁶. From these three inscriptions one (§ III p. 110) which I published twice is correct. The remaining two fragments (§ IV-V, pp. 110-112) are superficially treated and erroneous.

It is regrettable that Mécérian does not give the precise description, identification, location and above all the measurements of the architectural material, inasmuch as some of the architectural fragments and epigraphic material disappeared meanwhile.

The photographs are not consistent in quality (figs. 36, 37, 44, 92, 170, 183, 189, 198, 207), repeated (figs. 221-223, 172, 173, 164-236) and upside down (figs. 220, 222, 197, 123). In his book Mécérian incorporated some fragments which I uncovered in summer of 1963 (photogr. 143, 123, 219).

I would like to indicate some factual errors which show Mécérian's superficiality toward the discussed epigraphic material, for instance, part of which I published in *Or Chr* vol. 49 (1965).

1. In the inscription § IV (p. 110-11) *da dzqro* is not *Les deux derniers mots* « », because between these two words are the clearly visible remains of two letters; the first I reconstruct as *r*, the second is undoubtedly *a*, which suggests abbreviated *r(ath)a*.

Before *da* there are traces of at least four easily detectable letters, not even mentioned by Mécérian.

The last word consists of four, not five, letters, in which the fourth letter is not *o* but *th*. Furthermore on top of and between the last two letters *r-th* there is an abbreviation sign detectable which makes it possible to read the last word as *tsqr(omi)th[a]*. From two fragments with Georgian inscriptions which are omitted by Mécérian (p. 111), the first, (fig. 241) could be reconstructed as *[sa]kh(el)sa*. Of the second I can distinguish only two letters *pa*.

2. The last inscription (§ V, pp. 111-112) is executed on the flat upper surface of a monolithic pendentive and appears to be of historical importance for Mécérian as well as for the distinguished scholar of Georgian patrology, P. Peeters, because both regard the incorrectly read inscription as palpable evidence of N. Marrs theory, first formulated in his Magister's thesis and later reiterated in his various publications. Mécérian does not quote P. Peeters as the first publisher of this inscription without photographs. On the other hand the reading of Peeters

³⁶ *Oriens Christianus*, vol. 49, pp. 116-130.

and his interpretation of the inscription is of great interest not only because of Peeters' high reputation in this matter, but also because he was the co-discoverer³⁷ of the inscription (not mentioned by Mécérian) and had the singular opportunity to study the inscription in the original. Instead Mécérian offers the reading of R. Blake, who was less fortunate than Peeters, because he had to work with inadequate photographic reproductions (figs. 244, 245).

Mécérian gives R. Blake's reading as follows: « *eklesiay ars somekht'oy* » and its French translation *l'église est aux Arméniens* (p. 111). For some unexplicable reason Mécérian adds in the next sentence (p. 112) that the last word of the same inscription was read by P. Peeters (without quoting Peeters' work) as *Somkht'ay*, which is an incorrect copy of the erroneous reading, for Peeters reads the last word not as *Somkht'ay*, but as *Somkthurth*³⁸.

If Mécérian's intention was the comparison of Blake's readings with that of Peeters, then he should have introduced the complete sentence consisting of three words: *ekeleci ars s[ojm]kh[u]rth*³⁹. In this case it would become obvious that the difference consists not only in the reading of the last, but also the first word, which Peeters reads as « *ekeleci* ». Before reaching a hasty conclusion based on two incorrect and contradictory readings (not mentioned by Mécérian) and stating that the church was Armenian, Mécérian should have answered some unavoidable questions. For instance, if the author of this inscription was really Armenian then why did he resort to the Georgian alphabet and not to his native Armenian? Or if Armenians were eager to make known that the church was Armenian, why did they hide this valuable document? If this document was meant for the defense against confiscation of the church, as Peeters assumed (Le Tréfonds p. 162), who could have remembered after a few generations where it had been buried? And how could they have shown this document against any possible opponents without destroying the church?

This unusual inscription attracted my attention in 1959 when I addressed a letter to Mécérian asking him to clarify some grammatical shortcomings of the inscription and for a dependable photograph of it. I never received Mécérian's response, but in the summer of 1962, when I began to work in the same church and found the inscription, it became clear that the confusion had been caused by the faulty reading. As I have stated already, it is a mason's mark indicating the position of the pendentive in the church. Thus, the inscription should be read as follows: *ekles[(ia)sa] [š(in)]a s(a)mkhrith*.

As I have shown before, the plan of the church, its decorative program and its details, are unmistakably Georgian, built by a Georgian architect, as are the inscriptions found in the western vicinity of Antioch before the final collapse of Antiochene monachism in 1268.

In the early period of this area a large amount of Georgian, but never Armenian, inscriptions were found. This is the place where a large number of Georgian monastic centers were established, such as at *Castana*, *Tzkarotha*, *St. Menas at Calipos*, *Lertzmis Khevi*, *Father Ezdra's*, *Romana*, *Holy Moda*, *St. Symeon's the Younger*, *Procop*, *St. Barlaam*, and the monastery of the *Holy Cross*.

In these monasteries numerous Georgian manuscripts were translated or copied, part of which have reached us, such as: A 484, A 845, H 2211, A 135, N 76, Q 37, S 384, and H 1791 which appears to be one of the last manuscripts copied (in 1213-16) by Georgian monks in this region; P 3 in Leningrad, and Nos. 45 and 84 at Athos in the monastery of Iviron.

Historical and hagiographic sources tell us that these monasteries were financed, maintained, and encouraged by Georgian kings. We know a large number of names of monks (in XI-XIII cent.) who were active in these monastic centers, particularly during the eleventh century.

³⁷ Peeters, P., Un témoignage autographe sur le siège d'Antioche par les Croisés en 1098 (*Miscellanea Historica A. de Meyer*), p. 389 note 3.

³⁸ Peeters, P., *Le Tréfonds Orientale de l'Hagiographie Byzantine*, Bruxelles, 1950, pp. 162.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 162.

Some of them were: The superior of the monastery at *Calipos*: *Basil*, Monk *Kiril*, *Saba Tukhareli*, *Arsen of Ikaltho*, *Ephrem Oškeli*, Monk *Saba*, *Ioanne Pharnakeli*, *Anton Tbeli*, *David* and *John Djibisdze*, *Black Sakharia*, *Anton the Cross-bearer*, *Theophile* who became the *metropolit* at Tarsus, and above all *Ephrem Mcire* and *George Hagiorite*.

In this review I have enumerated only some of Mécérian's inaccuracies and misrepresentations which are climaxed in the very last absurd sentence «*Eklesiy ar somekht'ay*» (*L'église est aux Arméniens*) of his book.

W. Djobadze

Gerhard Gruber, *ZOH. Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes* = Münchener Theologische Studien II. 23. München 1962. Max Hueber Verlag. XXIII + 342 S.

Man kann kaum sagen, das Schrifttum zu Origenes, zu seiner Person wie zu seinem Werk, sei so gering und unzulänglich, daß es nottäte, diesem großen Theologen endlich gebührende Beachtung zu schenken. Und doch erweist sich Origenes immer wieder als einer der selten Großen der Theologie, die nicht nur nicht «*endgültig*» dargestellt werden können, die vielmehr immer aufs neue die Forschung, ja sogar die jeweils moderne Theologie anzuregen und zu befruchten vermögen. Gemäß seiner Einleitung möchte G. Gruber mit dem hier zu besprechenden Buch die Reihe der Untersuchungen fortsetzen, die für ein besseres und gerechteres Urteil über Origenes und für eine vollere Auswertung seiner Theologie notwendig sind (vgl. 3). Er wählt einen biblisch-neutestamentlichen, vorab johanneischen Grundbegriff, nämlich *ζωή*, um ihn zum Gegenstand einer Monographie zu machen, die mittels der umfassenden Darstellung der Aussagen des Origenes zu *ζωή* «*Origenes eigene Theologie besser zu verstehen*» gestatte (5). Gr. will «*sehen, welche Probleme ihn selbst (d.i. Origenes) bewegen, wenn er über die ζωή spricht und die entsprechenden Schriftstellen erklärt. Diese Probleme sollen also aus Origenes selbst entwickelt und dargestellt werden*» (5).

Der *erste Teil* der Arbeit behandelt «*Begriff und Stufen der ZOH*». Es wird der Grundunterschied zwischen «*gewöhnlichem Leben*» und «*wahrem Leben*» herausgearbeitet. Jenes ist das «*sinnliche*» (*αισθητή*), dazu indifferente, mittlere Leben, das als «*scheinbares Leben*» doch auch als Bild des wahren Lebens zu verstehen ist. Es heißt «*mittleres, indifferentes Leben*», da es sowohl mit dem wahren Leben zusammenstimmen kann, wie auch mit dem «*wahren Tod*», der Sünde. Das wird aus der Erklärung des «*wahren Lebens*» verständlich: Dieses ist das Leben der Seele aus und in Christus. Es kann hier auf Erden nicht seine Vollendung erfahren, da es noch an den Leib gebunden ist. Als Leben der Sündelosigkeit und Heiligkeit, als Licht der Tugend und der Erkenntnis weist es auf die Quelle und Fülle des wahren Lebens hin, das Gott, und zwar Gott Vater ist. Die Schwierigkeiten der verschiedenen Aufteilungen und Zuweisungen der Lebens-«*Formen*» nach Origenes behebt Gr. durch klare Zuordnungen (soweit das möglich ist) in einem das erste Kapitel abschließenden Nachwort (120-127). Besonders zu beachten für den Fortgang der Untersuchung sind die vier Stufen der *ζωή*: *θάνατος* (Sünder) — *μετέχων ζωής* (Heiliger) — *αυτοζωή* (Christus) — *πηγή ζωής* (Vater), ein «*Schema, das sich harmonisch in den Zusammenhang von Seelenlehre, Teilhabetheorie und Trinitätslehre einfügt*» (328).

Das *zweite Kapitel* behandelt, durch die die vielschichtigen Aussagen Origenes zu ordnen suchende Darstellung des ersten unabdingbar gefordert, den «*Empfang des wahren Lebens in Christus*» durch den Menschen. «*Es soll gezeigt werden, wie der Sünder zum heiligen Leben gelangen, dadurch an Christi eigenem Leben teilnehmen und, wie Christus, αὐτόπτης des Vaters werden kann*» (131). Die betreffenden Abschnitte sind folgendermaßen überschrieben: «*Die metaphysische Struktur der ZOH — Das wahre Leben als Geistverbindung — Das*