Eirene-Sophia Kiapidou: Byzantine Historiographical Prefaces (4th–15th Centuries). A Study on the Praxis and Culture of Writing History in Byzantium. Turnhout: Brepols 2025 (Byzantios 23). 268 pp., 6 tables. € 75.00. ISBN 978-2-503-61251-5. eISBN 978-2-503-61252-2.

Eirene-Sophia Kiapidou presents an analytical review of the prefatory material in 44 Byzantine historical texts ranging from Eusebius in the early fourth century to Laonikos Chalkokondyles in the late fifteenth with the intention of answering questions about the nature and purpose of Byzantine historiography: through examining the introductory roles of these historiographical prefaces, the book aims to identify generic features, for example whether there are differences between ecclesiastical and secular histories or between chronicles and other histories, and to assess the theoretical views of authors in different periods. The intended result is to establish the theory and culture of Byzantine historical writing. This is a very ambitious project, one that most have eschewed, perhaps wisely. In terms of content, the majority of space is devoted to the actual prefaces rather than generalisations, and here Kiapidou occasionally corrects and replaces Heinrich Lieberich's classic work that is now 125 years old.[1]

The "Introduction" (pp. 17–59) is divided into two parts, of which the first, "Preliminary Remarks", reviews Byzantine historiography and its prefaces with particular attention to how to approach these (pp. 17–32). Kiapidou notes that Byzantine historiography is a field of current academic debate with one, more traditional, camp regarding these texts as valuable sources of information on military and political events above all, works that recognised the distinction between myth and historical truth, and at the other end of the spectrum those who view them primarily as literature, narratives created in response to the interests and priorities of the context of composition. In the absence of any Byzantine text on historiography to match that of Lucian of Samosata from the second century AD, she focuses on the prefaces as the best way of gaining insights into what authors across the eleven centuries covered in the volume thought about their work (pp. 19–23). To this end

1 H. Lieberich: Studien zu den Proömien in der griechischen und byzantinischen Geschichtschreibung. II. Teil: Die byzantinischen Geschichtschreiber und Chronisten. München 1900.

she adapts the work of Gérard Genette on modern literature[2] in order to analyse these prefaces as a historiographical sub-genre that can shed light on the practices of writing history, while recognising that theoretical introductory statements may not always match an author's actual methods (pp. 29–31).

The second part of the Introduction surveys the prefaces in the Greek (pp. 33–51) and Latin (pp. 51–56) historiographical traditions, before summarising what these offered to later writers (pp. 56–59). Herodotus and Thucydides are naturally important, though the latter's attention to speeches is not picked up by subsequent writers, while Diodorus Siculus, less esteemed by modern scholars, was of equal importance in the later tradition. The introductions become more expansive from Polybius onwards, sometimes with criticism of previous writers, sometimes with autobiographical information that in combination assert the superiority of the particular author. What emerges is an evolving tradition, from which later authors could select what seemed most relevant to their own situation. One minor correction: although Cassius Dio's 80 books of *Roman History* did cover the period 180 to 229 (p. 50), that understates its account that stretches from Aeneas to Cassius' lifetime.

Kiapidou's first main chapter ("The Prefatory Communication Situation in Byzantine Historiography", pp. 61–122) combines a review of seven aspects of prefaces, namely Length, Location, Time of Composition, Addressee, Authorship, Form (pp. 61–76) and Writing Methods (pp. 117–122), between which is sandwiched a detailed study of twelve select prefaces (pp. 76–117). The section on Length makes the point that not all Byzantine works of history included a preface, a possibility that had been recognised by Lucian (pp. 61–63), and then presents a table of all the prefaces under discussion divided into short, medium, and long (pp. 64–65). With regard to Location, Kiapidou focuses on the texts that contain a secondary or subsidiary preface in addition to the main one at the start of the volume, a practice for which Thucydides, Polybius, and Diodorus provided good precedent; the overall length of a work is the main explanation, though in the case of Procopius his second preface (*Wars* 8.1.1–2) introduced what was a separate and supplementary book. Time of Composition acknowledges that prefaces were

2 G. Genette: Paratexts. Thresholds of Interpretation. Translated by J. E. Lewin. Foreword by R. Macksey. Cambridge 1997 (Literature, Culture, Theory 20), pp. 196–236.

created after the bulk of the historical account but has to confront the fact that narratives did not always exemplify an author's theoretical claims (pp. 72–74). The section on Form (pp. 75–76) addresses the issue that prefaces did not necessarily have specific titles, with those that have come down to us perhaps being generated during transmission or added by a modern editor; some prefaces may be marked off by authorial statements such as "Let us begin ...", though this is far from standard.

The interposed study of twelve prefaces looks at ones described as "more carefully composed [...] in terms of length and/or language" (p. 13). They are distinctive in being in verse (two), epistolary (five), or rhetorical (five), though the last group is then subdivided into speeches and dialogue through the placing of Theophylact Simocatta in the latter category; in each case there is a description of the preface's contents with some analysis of the aspects reviewed earlier in the chapter. With regard to the two verse examples, Genesius and Constantine Manasses, it is notable that the latter offers no comment on the distinctiveness of his work as being the only extant history composed in verse, a useful reminder that a preface may not cover all aspects that we now regard as significant. The epistolary prefaces (Theodore Lector, Nicephorus Bryennius, Michael Glykas, John VI Cantacuzenus, Michael Critobulus) are a mixed group. Theodore addressed an unidentified recipient and spoke positively about the sources on which he relied. The opening of Bryennius' text is lost, but the first surviving paragraphs summarise the work's contents before a single paragraph deals with the circumstances of composition; granted that Bryennius regarded his work as unfinished, 'Materials for History' rather than History itself, this is a case where the preface was created before the whole was complete. For Cantacuzenus the epistolary opening with its possibly fictive addressee serves to distance the former emperor from the information that he relates, and this stance is carried through into the main work which preserves the form of a letter. Critobulus used a double preface to address two distinct audiences, first the Turkish sultan, Mehmed the Conqueror, and second the educated elite of the defeated empire to whom he apologised for revisiting distressing events. In the rhetorical section the four authors (Sozomen, Theophanes Continuatus, Michael Attaleiates, Nicephorus Callistus) all start with an address to the current emperor, with Sozomen being an influence on the latter two authors, but their secondary prefaces then develop in different ways, for example an anticipation of possible criticisms from readers in Sozomen or critique of earlier authors

in Nicephorus Callistus. Finally, the complex introductory sequence in Theophylact is analysed as a contemporaneous unit, ignoring the theory of Tereza Olajos that the preliminary Dialogue between Philosophy and History was an independent tract composed over fifteen years before the main body of the *Historiae*;[3] although I believe Olajos to be misguided,[4] the possibility should have been noted.

The general conclusions to be drawn from this detailed investigation are that the verse and rhetorical prefaces usually form part of a doublet with the initial element presenting the work to an individual, often an emperor, or audience, to be followed by a main preface that introduces the work itself; in these double prefaces there is no indication that one element was composed later than the other (pp. 114–117). Kiapidou then returns to the last of her Aspects ("Writing Methods: Originality and Mimesis" pp. 117–122), without it being clear why this discussion of these important issues should have been separated from the preceding six. Byzantine historians drew on both the representatives of the classical tradition and their Byzantine predecessors, with the intertextual connections being presented in a helpful table (pp. 120–121). Such copying did not detract from the individuality of each new preface, with the exception of George Cedrenus who recycled the introduction of John Skylitzes. Kiapidou speculates that, even though none survives, there must have been a collection of historical prefaces to match those of rhetorical works; she also raises the interesting question of whether historians were influenced by texts from different genres, with the possible link between Genesius' secondary preface and the hagiographic *Life of Peter the Athonite* and the similarities between the openings of Anna Comnena's *Will* and her later *History* being noted as instances of genre-crossing. Sozomen's preface was surprisingly influential, as was that of Agathias, whereas no-one followed the idiosyncratic approach of Theophylact's dialogue. Middle Byzantine writers were open to the influence of classical models, but in their turn had little impact on Late Byzantine writers.

The long second chapter ("The Content of the Preserved Prefaces of Byzantine Historiography", pp. 123–210) consists of three unequal parts, a brief

3 T. Olajos: Contributions à une analyse de la genèse de l'Histoire Universelle de Théophylacte Simocatta. In: AAntHung 29, 1981, pp. 417–424, at pp. 417–418.

4 Mi. Whitby: Two Notes on Theophylact Simocatta's *Universal History*: his Patron and the Table of Contents. In: Byzantion 94, 2024, pp. 57–83, at pp. 59–60.

opening ("A Few Introductory Remarks", pp. 123–125) and longer summation ("The Conventionally Functional Prefaces of Byzantine Historiography: An Overview", pp. 197–210), which are separated by another close look at individual prefaces, namely those of the 32 works not treated in chapter 1. The lessons from the previous chapter to be applied here are that there was very considerable variety in the tradition of historiography in Byzantium, with no fixed rules or precepts, so that individuals could select what elements they wished from the *smorgasbord* of earlier examples. With this very general preliminary, Kiapidou turns initially to assess longer and more carefully elaborated prefaces, setting aside those already treated in the first chapter, since these are more likely to offer clear evidence on the purpose of the prefaces in terms of the author's personal or literary agenda as well as on more theoretical views on the genre of historiography (p. 124). These prefaces are treated in chronological order, with those covered in chapter 1 being noted at the appropriate place, before attention is turned to a minority of brief prefaces that are termed purely functional. I will not comment on every entry, but pick out points of interest.

The Early Byzantine section (pp. 125–142) opens with Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, a work whose novelty left Eusebius lacking confidence in his ability to create this new form of historical narrative even though he could draw on material from his earlier *Chronicle*. Livy offered a possible precedent for diffidence, though of equal interest is that expressions of doubt about personal competence become a staple in hagiography.[5] Socrates in his preface to Book 6 of his *Ecclesiastical History* defended both his use of plain language, which was designed to ensure his text was comprehensible to as many in his audience as possible, and his refusal to lavish complimentary epithets on contemporary figures since that would breach the laws of history that expect a truthful narrative. With regard to Procopius, Kiapidou suggests that his apparent exaltation of contemporary events may conceal critical references to Justinian (p. 133). I am not convinced by the argument, since the reference to those who might give precedence to the actions of antiquity (*Wars* 1.1.7) is immediately countered by the comparison of ancient and contemporary archery (1.1.8–16). On Agathias, whose long preface merits particular attention (pp. 136–141) and might well have belonged in chapter 1, Kiapidou (pp.

5 Examples from early Byzantine texts: *Life of Daniel* 1; *Life of Euthymius* preface, p. 6.17–18 (ed. Schwartz); *Life of Sabas* preface, p. 86.12 (ed. Schwartz); *Life of Theodore of Sykeon* 2.18–27; 49.37 (ed. Festugière).

140–141) plausibly develops the approach of Marek Jankowiak[6] to identify a latent critique of Procopius' tendency to praise holders of high office, presumably Belisarius above all. Agathias asserted that history must offer judgements, and in line with that is the fact that οἶμαι, 'I think' occurs over seventy times in his work.

The Middle Byzantine section (pp. 142–177) opens with Theophanes' *Chronographia*, whose preface has attracted significant attention because of its comments about his relationship with, or dependence on, George Syncellus. Kiapidou identifies intertextual references to the prefaces of both Theodore Lector and Theophylact Simocatta, authors whom Theophanes used as sources, and sees these as evidence for his self-awareness of both his status as the author of a chronicle and his need to gain the approval of a learned audience in Constantinople (pp. 145–147). Less convincingly, she accepts Jesse Torgerson's translation as 'impetus' of the crucial word ἀφορμὰς, rather than 'materials' or 'starting-point',[7] which would change the nature of George's influence on Theophanes. George the Monk is presented as a more ambitious author than he is often seen, with his critique of secular literature for its ostentatious learning and affected style serving to promote his own innovative approach to combining historiography with Christian edification (pp. 148–150). With regard to Skylitzes, Kiapidou urges that his critique of fourteen recent historians should be taken seriously as an attempt to reposition historiography on a proper theoretical basis with attention to accuracy and the presentation of a simple text in the manner of George Syncellus and Theophanes, the only two writers to receive praise from him (pp. 154–158). There are summaries of the discussion of the much-studied prefaces of Anna Comnena (pp. 158–163) and John Zonaras (pp. 164–168), though in the former Kiapidou overlooks the fact that Anna made use of John of Epipha-

6 M. Jankowiak: Procopius of Caesarea and his Byzantine Successors. In: M. Meier/F. Montinaro. A Companion to Procopius of Caesarea. Leiden/Boston 2021 (Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 11), pp. 231–251, at pp. 232–236.

7 J. W. Torgerson: The *Chronographia* of George the Synkellos and Theophanes. The Ends of Time in Ninth-Century Constantinople. Leiden/Boston 2022 (Brill's Series on the Early Middle Ages 28), p. 154; for the prominence of 'impetus' in Torgerson's analysis, see the review by Roger Scott in Plekos 27, 2025, pp. 197–209 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2025/r-torgerson.pdf), at pp. 199–201, who points out that the singular abstract noun 'impetus' is unlikely to be the meaning of the plural ἀφορμὰς.

nia's preface, a work that was probably not widely known.[8] Eustathius of Thessalonica (pp. 169–172) is of interest since, in contrast to most Byzantine authors who treat ἱστορία and συγγραφή (and cognates) as synonyms, he returns to a distinction evident in the prefaces to Herodotus and Thucydides, in which the former, as the narrator of events that he has not personally experience, engaged in ἱστορία, 'investigation', whereas the latter, as a participant, produced a συγγραφή, 'composition', as did Eustathius, a direct witness of the Norman capture of Thessalonica in 1185. Kiapidou also elaborates the thesis of two-stage composition by Eustathius, the first for a Lenten recital in the year after the sack, and the second for a subsequent presentation in Constantinople. Nicetas Choniates is another author of an account of a major disaster, in his case the capture of Constantinople by the fourth crusaders, and Kiapidou (pp. 172–177) uses this calamity to explain the well-known paradox of his preface, that, while it proclaims the importance of simple language and avoidance of rhetoric, the final version of his narrative could only be presented in a more elevated style.

In the Late Byzantine section (pp. 177–193), Kiapidou suggests that George Acropolites' reference to the different starting-points of historical works and its relevance to contemporary historiography deserve further attention (p. 179), but does not pursue this line of enquiry. Theodore Scutariotes is of interest as a writer who explicitly declined to claim 'paternity' for his text on the basis that it was entirely based on earlier sources, perhaps as a means of deflecting criticism for errors but also as a response to the preface of Zonaras (pp. 182–183). Kiapidou proposes, plausibly, that Nicephorus Gregoras composed his preface to accompany publication of the first tranche of his *Roman History*, namely books 1 to 11 (pp. 183–188). The same was most probably true of other historians, for example Agathias who clearly expected to continue his narrative beyond 559 but in the end never managed to bring that to completion. Gregoras' preface is also significant for including a speech attributed to emperor Andronicus II on the subject of history, espe-

8 For comprehensive discussion, see P. Rance: Anna Komnene and John of Epiphania's *Histories*: Quotation, Allusivity or Plagiarism? In: Parekbolai 15, 2025, pp. 139–158 (https://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/parekbolai/article/view/10581/9780). Rance points out (p. 145, n. 24) that, al-though the connection is overlooked in much recent scholarship, it was noted among others by Lieberich (see note 1); Kiapidou should have been aware of this.

cially on the fair presentation of leading figures such as emperors and patriarchs.

To conclude this very long presentation of what Kiapidou regards as the more interesting individual prefaces, she proposes two classifications that also embrace the works discussed in chapter 1, prefaces written for fellow scholars and those that additionally addressed contemporary political powers, with the results being presented in two tables (pp. 193–195). She also identifies the Middle Byzantine period as the time when the most elaborated and interesting prefaces were composed. The chapter ends with a short review of prefaces categorised as 'functional' and of little interest in theoretical terms (pp. 196–210). Of these less fortunate texts, only John Malalas receives significant comment (pp. 199–204), in part because of the possible links between his preface and that to Eusebius' *Chronici Canones*, which survives primarily in Latin translation, and partly for Malalas' invitation to successors to complete his account, an accurate anticipation of how his work was extended. John of Epiphaneia is, obviously, not credited with influencing Anna Comnena.

The third and last chapter in the volume ("Theoretical Aspects of Byzantine Historiography: the Evidence of the Prefaces", pp. 211–229) has the daunting task of extracting generalisations from the preceding extensive descriptions; it approaches this through four categories, Profile of the Author, Value of History, Historiographical Practices, and Profile of the Reader/Listener. With regard to authors, assuming the presence of a sufficient level of education, the expected qualifications primarily relate to moral qualities, for example commitment to the task and lack of bias, rather than the status and practical experience that are celebrated in the prefaces to classical Latin histories. Although writers proclaim that the value of history lies in its ability to record the truth, this ideal may clash with the other frequent objective that the narrative should deliver moral lessons, for which purpose the truth might have to be massaged into an appropriate shape. For Practices, Kiapidou divides her analysis into six sub-sections. (1) Content (pp. 215–217): apart from the obvious fact of the importance and interest of the material being related, the issue of variety now enters the equation, something that is present in most authors but only infrequently acknowledged in prefaces, while the need to assess the character of the leading participants, in particular emperors from the Middle Byzantine period onwards; historical calamity is

identified as a particular sub-category with regard to the captures of Thessalonica and Constantinople, though it might have been observed that both Procopius (on the plague) and Agathias (on earthquakes) had included disaster as an element in their works. (2) Start points (p. 217) vary according to the type of historical work, with universal histories and chronicles usually running from the Creation, whereas more focused narratives begin from where a predecessor left off or from a specific event. End points may be expressed as 'up to our time', but to my mind authors rarely brought matters right up-to-date: this is certainly true for the fifth-century church historians, who avoided the Christological controversies of the 440s, as well as for Agathias and Theophylact, whose works ended a couple of decades or more before the time of composition. (3) With regard to length and structure (p. 218), most Byzantine texts are long, whatever might be said in prefaces about the virtues of being concise, while authors very rarely offer any comment on how their material is organised. (4) On language and style (pp. 219–220), the question of Greek as the proper language for writing history is only raised after the Ottoman conquest, when it becomes an element of national identity, whereas the preference for a clear style is repeatedly expressed as the best means to convey unadorned truths; that said, simplicity of language might occasion apologies, including from Theophylact Simocatta whose elaborate style attracted unsurprising criticism from Photius. (5) For sources of information (pp. 220–223) only a few authors could claim personal experience, for example Procopius, John of Epiphaneia, and John Cantacuzenus, whereas most relied on earlier texts that they reworked in different ways, sometimes through adjusting the stylistic level, sometimes through combining distinct sources, and occasionally through correcting errors. To me it seems significant that this is an aspect that is not really analysed in prefaces. (6) With regard to Generic Differences (pp. 223–224), historiography defined itself as separated from rhetoric with its aim of praising or blaming without full regard to the truth, and for most, but not Agathias, was distinct from poetry as well as from rhetoric. Other genres might, however, be incorporated, with hagiography and other forms of biography becoming part of historiography; this happened early, unsurprisingly in the sub-genre of ecclesiastical history where Sozomen replaced the martyrs in Eusebius with the exploits of famous ascetics, but also in classicising history where Menander went so far as to compose an epigram on the Persian martyr Yazdbozed and Theophylact had information about the life of another Persian, Golin-

duch.[9] The final element of the chapter turns to Readers and Listeners (pp. 224–225); granted that texts were often read aloud, it is not particularly profitable to draw a distinction between these categories, though individual patrons or friends who may be addressed in a preface, for example Theodore in Socrates or Eutychianus in Agathias, can be considered as readers.

Following these four categories, and their subdivisions, Kiapidou closes the work with a few "Final Remarks and Answers to Current Research Questions" (pp. 225–229) in which she reiterates the variety of both histories and their prefaces, as well as the role of the latter in demonstrating that a particular author was aware of their place in a generic tradition. The two questions that she addresses are, first, whether it is possible to detect an evolution in Byzantine perceptions of historiography, to which the answer is essentially negative although Middle Byzantine writers did devote more thought to historiography than their predecessors or successors; and, second, the old chestnut of the distinction between history and chronicle, where on the one hand prefaces describe the processes, techniques, and objective of composition in fairly similar terms, but on the other historians refer more often to first-hand experience while chroniclers uphold the virtues of brevity, and it is only in the prefaces to chronicles that the term 'chronicle' occurs. Thus the book concludes by sitting on the fence with both the similarities and differences of histories and chronicles being acknowledged.

This might seem like a damp squib at the end of a long and detailed analysis, but it prompts a fundamental question as to whether, regardless of how important it is to unpick the meanings of these introductions and to identify their interconnections, the study of prefaces is in itself sufficient to reveal the nature of Late Roman and Byzantine historiography. These prefaces say nothing, for example, about authors' attitudes to compositional elements such as speeches or digressions, parts of a work that individual writers chose to contribute as embellishments to the material they were recording and hence, perhaps, revealing some of the attitudes and priorities of both themselves and their audiences. Editorial comments embedded in narratives are another source of information: thus there is nothing in the preface to Procopius' *Wars* to hint at his reaction to the fall of Antioch in 540 (*Wars* 2.10.4–

9 Menander fr. 13.3 (Blockley), and see P. Rance: In the Margins of Strabo: Menander Protector on Persian Religion and the *Passio S. Izbozetae*. In: JÖByz73, 2023, pp. 125–150; Theophylact 5.12.

5), or in Agathias' long opening to anticipate his reflections on the death of Anatolius in the 557 earthquake (*Histories* 5.4.3–6). Another problem with prefaces is the contradictions between their principled general statements and the actual practice of authors: Kiapidou flags the issue with regard to some authors, for example Nicetas Choniates, but it is more pervasive: for example, Agathias criticises authors who indulge in unjustified praise and blame (*Histories* preface 16–20), but his own presentation of Belisarius's actions in 559 is no less adulatory than Procopius' treatment of him in the first six books of the *Wars*, while criticism of Justinian's handling of the military reflects the tendency in the 570s to shift the blame for current problems onto an imperial predecessor.

Kiapidou laments the lack of studies of the prefaces of other literary genres since these could have enriched her own study (p. 12). I would have found it particularly interesting if she had attempted even a preliminary assessment of prefaces in hagiography, since she does note the relevance of a saint's life to Genesius (p. 120). A brief survey of prefaces in some early Byzantine hagiography throws up parallels for an epistolary preliminary to a more traditional introduction, and for double prefaces where the second element is located later in the text.[10] Hagiographers expressed doubts about their ability to cope with their material, bemoaned their lack of education, and stressed the benefits that a narrative of the ascetic achievements of their honorand would bring to readers and listeners. There is also scope for individuality: the *Life of Marcellus the Sleepless* opens with a display of abstruse Homeric knowledge about the Iliadic catalogue of ships and chariot race that would enhance the most literary of secular texts, even if it is then followed by a narrative whose style and language do not live up to this opening promise.

The book is not always easy to use. As indicated in the survey above, the historical works are discussed in three separate sequences, so that the chronological list of prefaces with page references for subsequent discussions (pp. 15–16) is a vital resource. Although the modern division of works into book, chapters, and paragraphs results from editorial intervention, Kiapidou's citation by the page and line of the editions listed in the bibliography is unhelpful, since readers may not have access to a library with the specified text (e.g. for Procopius they might use the Loeb rather than the Teubner), and

10 Epistolary preliminary: *Life of Hypatius*; double prefaces: the second, or Leipzig, version of the *Life of Daniel the Stylite* 12; *Life of Theodore of Sykeon* 22.

less than perfect in the case of classical texts that are all cited from the Loeb series even when more reliable editions are standard. Greek quotations within the text are usually provided with a translation, though not when passages are compared in parallel (e.g. pp. 145–146), but are left untranslated in footnotes even though Latin quotations in the notes are translated. All this seems bizarre. There are a few glitches in the English: 'on' is repeatedly used in references where 'for' would be preferable (e.g. pp. 43, n. 57; 45, n. 70; 48, n. 79); 'of' is used for 'in/on' (p. 153, n. 129), but 'on' for 'of' (p. 246, line 6); words appear to be missing at pp. 133, n. 36 and 135, n. 55, as if a correction has not been incorporated, while at p. 141, n. 76 'thought' should be read for 'though'. The list of Abbreviations (p. 9) does not include *MEG* or *EEBΣ*.

In terms of its main focus, the prefaces of extant histories between the fourth and fifteenth centuries, this book offers a valuable survey of this varied material, with the salient points of each preface highlighted and intertextual connections noted. With regard to its wider goal of establishing a Byzantine theory of historiography and hence elucidating the praxis and culture of historiography (p. 12), it is, inevitably less successful since this could only be attempted on the basis of a more comprehensive study of all these texts – and even then might fail to produce clear results.

Michael Whitby, University of Birmingham
Professor emeritus
m.whitby@bham.ac.uk

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Michael Whitby: Rezension zu: Eirene-Sophia Kiapidou: The Byzantine Historiographical Prefaces (4th–15th Centuries). A Study on Praxis and Culture of Writing History in Byzantium. Turnhout: Brepols 2025. In: Plekos 27, 2025, S. 579–590 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2025/r-kiapidou.pdf).