

aber nicht fachkundige Öffentlichkeit von «Laien» wendet und dieser Band nicht zu deren genauer Unterrichtung beiträgt, sondern eher verwirrt.

Was wäre zu tun? Sollte irgendwann eine Neuauflage nötig sein, müßte ihre Herausgabe einem Sachkenner mit dem klaren Auftrag übertragen werden, unter Beseitigung entstellender Fehler und vorsichtiger Umordnung des Stoffes bei weitestgehender Bewahrung des Originals das nachzuholen, was durch G.s Tod und die falsche Pietät der Editoren unterblieb. Unter G.s jüngeren Schülern wäre, falls sich kein älterer Fachgenosse findet, sicherlich mancher, der das hervorragend könnte und als Dankestat für den Lehrer auch täte. Dann würde aus diesem opus postumum ein wirkliches Vermächtnis. Der positive Gehalt des Buches wäre das wert.

Klaus Wessel

Reallexikon zur Byzantinischen Kunst. Herausgegeben von K. Wessel unter Mitwirkung von M. Restle. Lief. 1 : Abendmahl — Ani; Lief. 2; Ani-Armenien; Stuttgart, A. Hiersemann, 1963, in- 4^o, je Lief. DM. 30.

It is to the credit of K. Wessel and M. Restle to have inaugurated the edition of the long desired «Dictionary» of Byzantine Art which is planned in four volumes, each containing eight fascicles totaling 640 pages. Each volume will appear in two to three year intervals.

From the first fascicle it appears that RBK. will allot considerable space to provinces and countries on the peripheries of the Eastern Roman empire subjected to its political-cultural influence in various degrees (e.g. Armenia).

Among the major articles contributed by the German and foreign scholars are *Egypt, Alexandria* (by M. Krause), *Abendmahl, Altar* (K. Wessel), *Apolonia* (J.B. Ward-Perkins), *Aquileia* (P.L. Zovatto), *Achtamar, Ani*, and *Armenia* (A. Katchatrian). It is fortunate to see that short-lived Antioch, which in «Encyclopedies» and «Dictionaries» did not enjoy the attention it deserves among the Metropoles of Antiquities, this time found honorable place in RBK, due to G. Downey's excellent article (178-209). This very informative article is based on the findings of the Princeton Expedition (from 1932 to 1939) of which Professor Downey has unique, first hand knowledge. It contains a brief historical and topographical account of the city and a concise description of the early Christian sacral architecture in the Metropole and its vicinities; the Constantinian «Domus Aurea», the Church of the St. Babylas in Kaoussié (379-380), and the Martyrium in Seleucia Pieria (479-491). However, the largest space is given to profane structures and floor mosaics. The overwhelming majority of the illustrations (plans, diagrams and topographic maps) employed in this article are of good quality (which is not consistently carried in BRK) and derive from Princeton Publications. This carefully prepared study does not neglect the silver work nor early Christian architectural sculpture. It is only regrettable that the scope of the discussed material does not go beyond 542. Despite the fatal material and political calamities in Antioch (525 to 542) after this date numerous significant churches were built, which should have been included in the study. For instance, in 541-551 on the Miraculous (Wondrous) Mountain, was built a large portion of St. Symeons (Stylites the Younger) Monastery. It is known through literary sources (Van der Ven, *La Vie Ancienne de St. Symeon Stylite le Jeune* (1962); *Acta SS. Maii*. V. 403-431), as well as through archaeological inquiries (CRAc Inscr. [1933] 343-348; *Ist. Mitt.* 15 (1965) 228 ff.). The Monastery of St. Barlaam on Mt. Kasios built in the late Justinian period (*Ist. Mitt.* 15 (1965) 218 ff.). The church, St. George, north of Seleucia Pieria, or those built after the conquest of Antioch by Byzantines (969) e.g. near Suruthme built in the second quarter of the eleventh century (*Ist. Mitt.* 15 (1965) 238 ff.).

The late fifth or early sixth century as a date for the Chalice of Antioch seems to me more reasonable than proposed fourth to fifth century (202).

The first of the three articles, dealing with Armenian art (all entrusted to A. Katchatrian), *Achtamar* (28-40) is exclusively devoted to the Church of the Holy Cross (built 915-921). The second article deals with *Ani* (158-170) which was brought to light by sixteen archaeological campaigns carried out by N. Marr. K.s. Chronological enumeration of architectural structures is not sufficient for the proper understanding of the complex image of *Ani*. Much would have been gained if K. had stressed the three clearly detectable diverging periods, which are distinguishable from each other by an almost peculiar clarity (style, form, building-technique, purpose). Marr, time and again distinguished in *Ani* three distinctly divided cultures, each of them unrelated to the previous culture, developing anew and demonstrating a new cultural, economical and political background unrelated to the preceding culture (*Ani* [1934] 5). For this very reason the secular and utilitarian architecture of the city (Caravansarays, baths, cisterns, hospices) wall paintings and pottery, neglected by K. are of great significance. On the other hand despite the extensive labor of Marr (Excavations of 1892, 1893, 1904-1916) numerous key problems of *Ani* (recognized by Marr, himself) remain still unsolved, which hampers the exhaustive evaluation of this site. Nevertheless, some mistakes could have been avoided, for instance, the Palast Church on the Citadel in *Ani* was not built in 622 as stated (163) but between the tenth and eleventh century (I. Orbeli, in *Khristianskij Vostok* I-1 p. 81 ff.; Jacobson, *Očerki po istorii Arm. Zōdčestva* (1950) 63); furthermore, it was not planned originally as a church but reconstructed from one of the main halls of the Camsaracan Palace (Jacobson, 63). The Cathedral of *Ani*, built during the epoch of the Kings (989-1001) cannot be dismissed with one short sentence (168), because this cruciform domed church with four free standing piers, with its overwhelming masses, imposing appearance of forms, huge blind arcades and paired triangular recesses is of singular significance and almost without analogy in Armenian architecture. Likewise it is essential to mention repairs, alterations, additions and the collapse of the dome in 1319, which considerably changed the original appearance of the cathedral (Marr., *Ani* 118-119). K.s. article abruptly ends with the mention of the Apostle Church, built 1215 by the merchant, Tigran Honenz (169). Had he mentioned the events of 1319 the decoration of the Church of the Saviour in 1432 (Marr, *Ani* 117) the mint and the production of artifacts which display a strong Islamic, especially Seljuk taste (Marr, *op. cit.*, 11, 35, 44; Orbeli, *Putevoditel* 45; Strzygowsky I 298) he could have placed the entire picture of *Ani* into sharper focus.

Some of K.s statements in regard to Armenian architecture (S.v. *Armenien*) are essentially untrue: On p. 316, one reads, «Während der arabischen Herrschaft von 654 bis 861 ruhte die Bautätigkeit in A. Aber im 9. Jh. wurden in den westlichen Gebieten A.s wichtige Kirchen gebaut, in denen byzantinische u. georgische Elemente, die die Traditionen des 7. Jh.s fortsetzten u. ihrerseits die Baukunst sowohl A.s als auch Georgiens beeinflussten, sich mischten. Hierzu gehören in der Provinz Taiq die Kirche von Bana (881-923) im Typus von Zwartnotz u. die Kirche von Oschque (958-61) im Typus der Kuppelbasilica mit zwei seitlichen, dreigeteilten Apsiden u. im Nordwesten von Erzerum die oktagonale Kirche von Warzahan (Abb. 16, 10. Jh.)».

First of all, the assumption that during the Arabic domination in Armenia architectural activities «ruhte» does not seem to coincide with reality; for instance, according to the Historian, Kirakoz Gandzakeci, in 717-728 Catholicos John Odzunceci (surnamed the Philosopher) built a large church in Odzun (now Uzunlar near Sanain) (*Deux Historiens Arméniens: Kiracos de Ganzac et Oukhtanes d'Oukha*, M.F. Brosset, 1-re livr. SPbg (1870) 36; G. Tschubinaschwili in *Encyclopedia of World Art* I (1959) 718, further abbreviated EWA). Bishop John (ninth-century) mentions the Aramus Church (of Djvari type) built by the Bishop David in 728-741 (D. Lisitsian in *Bull. Kavk. Ist. Arch. Instituta* No. 5 (1929) 11f.; Tschubinaschwili in EWA I. 721) and the small domed church (of Croix libre type) of the Virgin in Talin built

at the end of the seventh century (V. Arutiunian, S. Safarian, Pamjatniki Armjanskogo Zodščestva (1951) 45) or early eighth century (G. Tschubinaschwili EWA I. 721; K. himself dates it 689 p. 315). To begin the postarabic period of A. architecture with the Churches of Bana and Oshki (K. = Oschque) is a serious mistake not only because for this period symptomatic architectural forms evolve in the *Kuppelhalle* (Strzygowsky I. 188 - V. Arutiunian, S. Safarian. *op. cit.*, 17) which is rapidly gaining ground and completely dominates as the final architectural form in the twelfth and thirteenth century. (Tschubinaschwili EWA I. 722), but because these churches are not Armenian but Georgian (on this account the main source remains E. Takaishvili MAK XII (1909) 88-117; *Ibid.*, Arkheologičeskaja Ekspeditsia 1917 go goda v iužnie provincii Gruzii (1952) 45-67, which to K. apparently is unknown). Besides the date of Oshki (958-961) which is based on Ktitors inscription (E. Takaishvili, *Ark. ekspeditsia*. 57 f.) should be interpreted only as early period of the construction, which was dragged possibly through the whole century. The church received the frescoes paintings in 1036 (fragments of which accompanied by beautiful Georgian inscriptions still remains). I examined this church in 1964 and found that some of the portions e.g. the domes cylinder have never been really completed.

It is regrettable that some significant articles, such as *Achteckbauten*, *Adrianople*, are omitted and cross-word reference is lacking. The material is not always distributed in accordance with the importance of the subject; for instance, to *Achtamar* (28-40) and *Alexandria* (99-111) the same amount of space is allotted. Inaccuracies in spelling and various minor shortcomings are frequent, such as : « *Mengalopsycheia* » (185) « *Voznesenija Gospodija* » (270). By the way, this church at *Zromi* (= *Tsromi*) is dedicated to « *Kovlademida* » (*Wakhushti Geography* (1941) 58), and its German equivalent is « *Allerheiligen* » (G. Tschubinaschwili, *Zromi Kirche* (1934) 5). The plan of the Cathedral at *Ani* is reproduced twice (163, 318), once upside down. The bibliography of the article on *Achtamar* is missing : I. Orbeli : *O pervonačalnoj forme Kupola Akhtamarskogo Khrama* in *Zap. Vost. Otd. Rus. Arkh. Obščestva XXV* (1921) 293-300; A. Sakisian in *AB XXV* (1934) 346-357; u. Ispiroglu « *Die Kirche von Akhtamar* » (1963) to which the excellent monograph of S. Der Nersessian « *Aght'amar* » (1965) should be added.

W. Djobadze

Johann Maier, *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum* = Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 93 (Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, Berlin 1965) X und 87 Seiten, Gzln., DM 21,-.

Der Verfasser, Ordinarius für Judaistik an der Universität Köln, hat mit dieser Studie ein vieldiskutiertes und umstrittenes Thema im Angriff genommen : Seit langem bemüht sich die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft um die Fragen der Entstehung, der Funktion und der Beschaffenheit der israelitischen Bundeslade.

Maier bietet eine Art von « Entmythologisierung » der Bundeslade, — dies nicht etwa leichtfertig und vorschnell, sondern auf Grund einer eingehenden kritischen Analyse der alttestamentlichen Quellen. Für die die Lade betreffenden Stellen im « *Hexateuch* » [Nm 10, 29-36; 14, 44; Ex 33, 1-17 (23); Jos 3 f.; 6] stellt der Verfasser fest, sie seien alle so spät, « daß sie weder für die Herkunft und das Alter noch für den Charakter des Ladeheiligtums der Frühzeit etwas besagen können » (39). Einen Quellenwert haben sie lediglich für die späte Königszeit, für die Intentionen der Jerusalemer Hof- und Tempeltheologie. Auch die Vorstellung der Priesterschrift, daß Lade und Zeltheiligtum zusammengehören, ist eine nach rückwärts gewandte Erklärung, die sich an dem Vorbild der Tempelsituation ausrichtet. Der Verfasser spricht sich für die Behälterhypothese aus, d.h. dafür, daß die Lade im Tempel zu Silo als Behälter