

Procopius' survey of Justinianic buildings is confined to sites on or close to the main strategic highway to the east - are confronted squarely and resolved judiciously (as, for example, in the excellent notice on Binbirkilise).

It is not and could not have been a compendium, so numerous and varied have been the archaeological investigations carried out in Anatolia over the last five or six generations. To have included more sites in the second part would have entailed squeezing the first thematic section, when, if anything, it should be expanded, with new sections on castles, roads and bridges, warehouses (*apothekai*), and surface reconnaissance. The only solution would have been to end each thematic entry with an inventory of relevant sites or material – but such inventories would have become outdated all too soon and would have required considerable labour. The task is, in any cases, largely performed by the bibliography which runs to 60 pages.

A final quibble: it would have been useful, both for non-archaeologist Byzantinists and for budding archaeologists, to have lists of archaeological projects currently under way in Anatolia and their websites.

James Howard-Johnston
Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Alexios G. C. Savvides, *The Beginnings and Foundation of Byzantine Studies: a Survey. With a bibliographical appendix*. Athens: H erodotos, 2018. Pp. 264
DOI:[10.1017/byz.2019.33](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.33)

This book appears at a very opportune moment when there is a lively debate about the right approach to Byzantine studies and about the national and cultural agendas that have driven perceptions in the past. There are even objections to the very name 'Byzantine', as an irrelevant neologism that should be replaced with 'Roman'. As the author of numerous authoritative publications on Byzantine history, Alexios Savvides is well qualified to offer this timely and informative guide to how we got to where we are today. He supplies helpful surveys of the careers of prominent pioneering Byzantinists such as Hieronymos Wolf and Charles du Cange, with abundant bibliographical references for further reading. Details are also given about Greek Byzantinists of the twentieth century whose work is still useful but about whom it is often quite hard to find any information (118-20).

Given that it is such a valuable resource, more could have been done to make the book easier to use. Of necessity, it includes a large number of names with some pages containing little more than a list of great Byzantinists of the past (43-4, 116-22). Yet there is no name index to enable readers to locate quickly the figures who interest them, only a separate list at the back, repeating all the individuals discussed in the book in broad chronological order, giving only their dates and no page references (253-6). Similarly, the text itself would have been more accessible if the author had observed the rule that, unlike Greek, English works better with short sentences. The format is somewhat unexpected as well.

Of the 264 pages, only 63 are dedicated to tracing the development of Byzantine studies. That is doubtless because, as the author tells us, the book is an expanded version of a journal article (46). The rest of the pages contain a foreword, introductory remarks, a list of abbreviated references and French and Greek translations of the publisher's blurb on the back. The largest section is occupied by the bibliographical appendix referred to in the title, which runs to 117 pages. At first sight, it is not immediately apparent what this appendix is for. It does not present a list of publications specifically relevant to the beginnings of Byzantine Studies: those come separately at the beginning of the book. Rather it is an attempt to list the most influential books and articles in the field of Byzantine studies, subject to a long list of exclusions (139-44).

It is in this appendix, rather than in the main text, that Savvides' main concern comes to the fore. He feels that previous bibliographies have been inadequate for one particular reason. 'Gone are the days', he laments in the introduction, 'when a noteworthy number of scholars in the western world could read and utilize bibliography in modern Greek'. He even singles out one scholar by name for his 'indifference' to material written in Modern Greek in the reading list for his recent book (137-8). While one could hardly disagree that due weight should be given to the work of Greek Byzantinists who choose to write in their own language, Savvides is being a little unfair here. Given the sheer number of books on the field, authors have to make a selection in order to keep within their publisher's word limit and it is hardly surprising that they restrict themselves to work that is accessible and available to their readers. The author whom he criticises chose a range of books appropriate to a general introduction for readers of English. After all, Savvides' bibliography is likewise his personal selection (223-8) and even he himself is guilty of some disrespect to the Greek language. Rather than giving Greek book and article titles in the original language and letters, he transliterates some into Latin characters and translates others into English. Perhaps this is because the bibliography is work in progress. We are assured that a sequel will provide a further, enhanced one (131).

It is not just the neglect of Greek scholarship that grieves Savvides but also an apparent hostility to it. He castigates another, named historian for labelling historiographical approaches to Byzantium in Orthodox countries as 'problematic' (45). Again, Savvides has a point here. The word was not well chosen as it could be interpreted as suggesting that work produced in western Europe or north America is somehow superior to that of Greek, Russian or Serbian historians. On the other hand, it is not to be expected that historians who are not of Orthodox heritage will necessarily share the priorities of those who are. Some of the views that Savvides expresses in this book are a case in point. We are told, for example, that 'Catholic historiography of the western world, living under constant fear of a pending condemnation by the all-powerful Holy Inquisition ... faced the interest towards an investigation into the Orthodox Byzantine world with bigotry and open hostility, characterising the latter as a "dark" creation of a protracted decline' (61). That is at best a sweeping generalization, and at worst a travesty, of the development of

Byzantine Studies in western Europe. It also contradicts the praise that Savvides later accords to Catholic scholars such as Du Cange and neglects the fact that many pioneering Byzantinists, such as Hieronymus Wolf, were Protestants. On the other hand, the comment seems to reflect Savvides' apparent view that Modern Greece, as the 'natural heir' of Byzantium (53), is somehow bound to produce the most authoritative Byzantine scholarship.

At the end of the day, Savvides has produced a helpful survey that fills a gap in the current literature. One would only ask that, while championing his own perfectly legitimate views and cultural origins, he should understand that other scholars might have different priorities, appropriate to their own background and readership.

Jonathan Harris
Royal Holloway, University of London

Konstantina Zanou, *Transnational Patriotism in the Mediterranean 1800-1850: Stammering the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. xx, 248.
DOI:[10.1017/byz.2019.34](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.34)

What did John Capodistria, Ugo Foscolo, Andrea Mustoxidi, Andreas Kalvos and Dionysios Solomos have in common? They were all born in the Ionian Islands and studied in Italy; they were all actively involved in national and international politics; and they were all 'transnational patriots' who had a sense of possessing two or more homelands.

All but Solomos were born as subjects of the Venetian republic, while Solomos entered the world as a subject of revolutionary France. Only three of the five ever visited the newly established Greek state, but two of them played leading roles in its administration. Two served in the short-lived government of the Septinsular Republic; two worked for a time as employees of the Russian government; three of them spent many years of their maturity in the British-protected United States of the Ionian Islands, and two of them died there, while two others died in England.

Zanou's remarkable and compelling book analyses the biographies of these and other intellectuals who experienced the afterlife of the Venetian empire. Nowadays those of us who work on modern Greek literature are more than ever aware of the multiple national identities of Kalvos and Solomos. Zanou provides not only additional insights into the lives of these two poets, but into those of many other intellectuals of their time from similar backgrounds who shared similar experiences. This period saw 'the dissolution of a common regional cultural space and [...] the shattering of its centuries-old cultural continuum' (p. 2). Multi-ethnic empires were beginning to seem outdated: the Venetian empire fell in 1797 and the Greek Revolution in the 1820s struck an unprecedented and debilitating blow at the Ottoman empire. The Greek nation-state was established, the first major efforts at the unification of Italy as a single kingdom were made, and yet another empire, the