

Oehrl admits himself, the following interpretation remains subjective despite the methodological approach, and it must also be considered that picture stones were used as ‘open media’ by being modified over the course of time (pp. 289–290), and as a consequence, this might complicate the interpretation of their original meaning.

‘Die Bildsteine Gotlands’ offers new inputs and especially new techniques and methodologies for the reading, documentation, and interpretation of the famous Gotlandic picture stones and updates central aspects of the previous research. Furthermore, Oehrl highlights the reciprocal relations between picture stones and literarily transmitted Old Norse mythology important for our understanding of Viking Age mentality and beliefs, thus helping to contextualise the picture stones in their original function as monuments for the cult of the dead and memento. His approach will hopefully lead to new and important results in combination with archaeological investigations.

DE-72070 Tübingen
Schloss Hohentübingen
Gartenstraße 29
E-mail: matthias-simon.toplak@uni-tuebingen.de

Matthias S. Toplak
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte
und Archäologie des Mittelalters
Abteilung Archäologie des Mittelalters
SFB 1070 RessourcenKulturen
Teilprojekt B06

EGON WAMERS (ed.), Der Tassilo-Liutpiric-Kelch im Stift Kremsmünster. Geschichte – Archäologie – Kunst. Schriften des archäologischen Museums Frankfurt Band 32. Schnell und Steiner, Regensburg 2019. € 50.00. ISBN 978-3-7954-3187-7. 496 pages with 381 colour illustrations, 90 b/w illustrations, and 2 foldouts.

The title itself already announces one of the many noteworthy results published in this volume: the so-called “Tassilo chalice” from the Upper Austrian Benedictine abbey of Kremsmünster (AT), studied in the last century first and foremost by Günter Haseloff and Victor H. Elbern, was actually a “Tassilo-Liutpiric chalice”. While both donors are clearly mentioned in the inscription surrounding the foot of the chalice, this realisation is not banal – it is not just a result of our current attitudes to gender but based on the insight that Liutpiric, a daughter of the last Langobard rulers Desiderius and Ansa, was in many ways actively involved in the way her husband Tassilo III exercised his power. Tassilo, himself of the house of the Agilolfings, was tried in AD 788 at the Ingelheim kings’ court (*Pfalz*). On spurious charges he was found guilty of disloyalty and an alleged “desertion” several decades before and condemned to death – a judgment later converted to confinement in a monastery. Liutpiric, their sons and daughters, *familia* and *thesauri* had also been brought to Ingelheim (DE). Much like Tassilo himself, after the trial his wife and children vanished in Rhenish or West Frankish abbeys. Most likely, it was the Frankish king’s wish that they should be the victims of a *damnatio memoriae*. In AD 794, however, Charlemagne had the Agilolfing noble brought to a synod then sitting in Frankfurt (DE), where the prisoner once again had to renounce all claims to power in Bavaria in favour of the king. For Egon Wamers, the volume should thus be seen as a “counterbalance to the humiliating show trial” to which the Bavarian prince was subjected in *locus celeberrimus franconofurd* (“als Ausgleich für den schmachvollen Schauprozess”; *Einleitung*, p. 11). The book contains papers presented at a conference held in Frankfurt from the 21st–23rd of February 2018, themselves the result of a joint research project of the *Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz* (RGZM) and the *Archäologisches Museum Frankfurt*, begun in 2014.

The first part of the volume is devoted to archaeometry and to goldsmithing techniques. As a basis for all further analyses of this work of art, E. Wamers provides a “documentation of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice. Description, photography, drawing” (*Die Dokumentation des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches. Beschreibung, Fotografie, Zeichnung*, pp. 15–39). In the course of research, the chalice had been sent to the RGZM, where it was exposed to elaborate non-invasive scientific investigations. These are described and discussed by Anja Cramer and Guido Heinz (3D-digitalisation and development of an interactive 3D analytical tool / *3D-Digitalisierung und Erstellung eines interaktiven 3D-Analysewerkzeugs*, pp. 40–48), Susanne Greiff and Sonngard Hartmann (Fire gilding and niello on the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice. Composition and technology / *Feuervergoldung und Niello am Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelch. Zusammensetzung und Technik*, pp. 49–69) as well as Florian Ströbele, Sonngard Hartmann, and Susanne Greiff (An investigation of the silver inlays of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice / *Untersuchungen an den Silbereinlagen des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches*, pp. 70–100). Measurements carried out in 559 places using micro-X-ray fluorescence equipment could amongst others confirm that there are “two generations of gilding” on the chalice (“zwei Vergoldungsgenerationen”, pp. 50–52) and that for example the silver sheet of the Christ medallion has a higher gold content than the other medallions. In addition, the copper used to make the chalice is 99% pure and must hence be unalloyed, even though no definite source could be identified. Similarly, given that the geometry of the piece is not conducive to X-ray fluorescence, it was not possible to decide whether the green and blue glass cabochons on the knob (*nodus*) of the chalice were “recycled Roman glass, Carolingian glass, or a glass inlay replaced at a later date” (“recyceltes Glas der Römerzeit, karolingerzeitliches Glas oder um später ersetzte Glaseinlagen”, p. 68). On the basis of the various analyses, Stephan Patscher reconstructs the chalice’s production (The Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice. Structure, manufacture and later changes / *Der Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelch. Aufbau, Fertigung und spätere Veränderungen*, pp. 101–127), which combined a separately fashioned cup, the foot, and a conjoining pearl ring. After the first two components had been chased from a copper sheet and the third been cast, the chip carvings were carried out, the silver sheets added and, where needed, attached with silver rivets, and finally the niello and gilding completed. After the glass cabochons had been framed, the components of the chalice were joined with a central rivet, hidden by the moveable pearl ring which was now added. The production process was carried out on one occasion, and only few corrections were necessary, for instance, the position of the thumb on Christ’s left hand (p. 119). “Given its age, its constant use, and its changing fortunes, it is surprising how much of the original substance of the chalice is still present. This is of course down to luck but also illustrates the know-how of the craftsman who produced it” („Angesichts des Alters, der fortwährenden Nutzung und des wechselvollen Schicksals ist es erstaunlich, wie viel von der originalen Substanz des Kelches noch vorhanden ist. Das ist natürlich Glück, zeugt aber auch von dem Können des Handwerkers, der den Kelch geschaffen hat“, p. 123).

The contributions on materials and manufacture are followed by a section “On the history of Tassilo, his family, and the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice / *Zur Geschichte Tassilos, seiner Familie und des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches*”, collecting chapters with a historical angle on the donors, their children, and their fate. Matthias Becher once more reaffirms his analysis of the sources for Tassilo’s III deposition, first offered in 1993 (The overthrow of Tassilo III of Bavaria. A quarter century of research / *Der Sturz Tassilos III. von Baiern. Ein Vierteljahrhundert Forschungsgeschichte*, pp. 131–144). The reports on Pepin’s III royal assembly at Compiègne provided in the Royal Frankish Annals, according to which Tassilo became a vassal of the king, and those regarding the AD 763 *harisliz* in Aquitaine are invented passages, written after AD 788 in order to justify Tassilo’s deposition at Ingelheim. Research generally agrees on this, and M. Becher makes clear that the representation of Frankish court historiography was not a “manipulating procedure adequate to memory”, as argued by Johannes Fried (“gedächtnisadäquat manipulierende[s] Verfahren”, p. 140f.), but quite simply

“fake news” (p. 141). In a witty contribution with much noteworthy detail, Herwig Wolfram describes the importance of the Agilolfing dynasty for the ecclesiastical, cultural, and administrative development of Bavaria (The church politics of the Bavarian Agilolfings in the 8th century / *Die Kirchenpolitik der baierischen Agilolfinger im 8. Jahrhundert*, pp. 145–163). Martina Hartmann reminds us of Tassilo’s Langobard wife and of their children Cotani and Rotrud (Liutpirc and her daughters. The information from written sources / *Liutpirc und ihre Töchter. Der Befund der schriftlichen Quellen*, pp. 164–171), mentioning the sons only in passing. While the location of Liutpirc’s monastic confinement in the West Frankish area can no longer be reconstructed, her daughters were brought to Chelles and Laon (both FR), although it is unknown which lived where. Martina Hartmann would like to connect the Mondsee psalter, now kept at Montpellier (FR), with Rotrud, as she believes the volume to have been among Tassilo’s treasures. A few pages, perhaps those connected to Tassilo, were removed from the manuscript, and instead *Laudes regiae* with reference to the Carolingians were added, alongside a prayer for a *soror Rotrud*, which could, however, also refer to Charlemagne’s daughter of that name, who died in AD 810 in Chelles (p. 169). Finally, Wilfried Hartmann asks whether “Tassilo III can be compared to Charlemagne” (“ob Tassilo III. mit Karl dem Großen zu vergleichen sei”, p. 172) (Thoughts on the importance of the prince Tassilo / *Überlegungen zur Bedeutung des Fürsten Tassilo*, pp. 172–183). He points to the king-like position of Tassilo in the synodal records and describes his striving for independence from the Frankish realm, which became increasingly hard to realise after AD 781. One difference to Charlemagne is that the Agilolfing ruler was an important founder of abbeys, but in spite of his important victory over the Carinthians in AD 772 he was not a military man. In contrast to the Frankish king Charles, “Tassilo was undoubtedly a peaceful ruler” (“Tassilo [war] zweifellos ein Friedensfürst”, p. 181). To conclude the section on the interpretation of written sources, P. Altman Pötsch OSB summarises “Written and pictorial sources on the history of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice in Kremsmünster abbey” (*Schrift- und Bildzeugnisse zur Geschichte des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches im Stift Kremsmünster*, pp. 185–208). There, the chalice is first attested in AD 1325 but is missing in the AD 1013 inventory of abbot Sigmar, perhaps because in contrast to other golden altar fittings, it was made from copper and only gilded (p. 186). In the Early Modern Period, the chalice saw use as a profane drinking vessel on the abbey’s foundation anniversary, the 11th of December, and was illustrated on a copper engraving in AD 1777. In AD 1795, it was comprehensively restored, and its first scholarly study was carried out in AD 1857 by Franz Bock. A series of reprinted papers and personal declarations show the special treatment of the chalice, which the conservator Franz von Juraschek finally returned to the abbey from the safe storage tunnels in Altaussee and Lauffen (both AT) even before the official end of the war on the 18th April 1945 (p. 200–206).

The central part of the book contains two asides on the results of research in comparative treasury art. First, Reinhard Gratz (The Rupertus cross from Bischofshofen. A research and restoration project / *Das Rupertuskreuz von Bischofshofen. Ein Forschungs- und Restaurierungsprojekt*, pp. 211–221), Elisabeth Krebs (The Rupertus cross from Bischofshofen. Investigations and analyses / *Das Rupertuskreuz von Bischofshofen. Untersuchungen und Analysen*, pp. 222–232), and Anton Scharer (The Rupertus cross and “courtly culture” under Tassilo III / *Das Rupertuskreuz und die “Hofkultur” unter Tassilo III.*, pp. 233–244) tackle the *crux gemmata* which in the Middle Ages was housed in the church standing in the location of the *Cella Maximiliana* in Bischofshofen (AT). Today, it is kept in the *Domuseum* in Salzburg (AT). The Greek cross still sports 41 fire gilded copper sheets over poplar wood as well as plant and animal ornamentation. Most of the settings for the 38 gemstones are today empty, but a peg was added later. Both Northumbrian and Mediterranean connections can be traced, and the piece is connected to the insular artistic centre of Salzburg under Bishop Virgil. A copper sheet found in the crossing of the late Carolingian church in Bischofshofen in the course of archaeological excavations in 1998 has the same high copper content as the sheets on the cross.

This shows that the cross was not only brought there from Salzburg in AD 1167, as supposed by Heinz Dopsch, but was already in place in the Early Middle Ages (Gratz, p. 219; Krebs p. 226). The contributions are at times a little redundant in their description of the cross but eloquently show the piece's deplorable state of preservation (Gratz p. 211; Krebs p. 228). Based on a controversial prayer for Tassilo by the Irishman Clemens Peregrinus, probably penned in Freising (W. Hartmann, p. 176), a text which connects Tassilo to Constantine the Great, Anton Scharer interprets the cross as a "triumphal cross for Duke Tassilo" ("ein Triumphkreuz Herzog Tassilos", p. 238) and "a cross promising victory in the tradition of Constantine, ... a sign of Tassilo's quasi-royal authority and power" ("das Sieg verheißende Kreuz in der Tradition Konstantins, ... ein Zeichen von Tassilos quasi königlicher Autorität und Herrschaft", p. 241).

While the Rupertus cross survived over the centuries, albeit in a worrying state of preservation, the so-called Eligius chalice once kept in Chelles abbey was melted down during the French Revolution. However, a very precise copper engraving, which also took account of the original colour scheme, had already been produced in 1653 and now forms the basis of various investigations. Renate Prochno-Schinkel (*The Chelles chalice. Questions of materials and possibilities for interpretation / Der Kelch von Chelles. Materialfragen und Deutungsmöglichkeiten*, pp. 246–276) points out that the chalice was "apparently mounted with almandines, 24 lightly polished and light-coloured stones – probably rock crystals – gold beads, and inlays probably made from white glass paste and green glass" ("offenbar mit Almandinen, 24 gemugelten hellen Steinen – vermutlich Bergkristallen – Goldperlen und Einlagen vermutlich aus weißer Glaspaste und grünem Glas besetzt", p. 264). "Based on the proportions of its shape and the numerical relations between its different mounted elements, it represents a visualisation of Solomon's temple, with references to Ezechiel's vision of the temple, and simultaneously also the Heavenly Jerusalem" ("Der Kelch stellt sich aufgrund der Proportionen seiner Form und in den Zahlenverhältnissen seiner Besatzelemente als Verbildlichung des Salomonischen Tempels mit Verweisen auf die Tempelvision des Ezechiel und zugleich als Himmlisches Jerusalem dar", p. 273). With a signpost to further research to come, Stephan Patscher (*On the manufacturing technique of the Chelles chalice / Zur Herstellungstechnik des Kelches von Chelles*, pp. 277–279) briefly describes the production steps of this "consummate work" ("vollkommenes Werk", p. 273), which was finally recreated in a virtual version, presented by Egon Wamers (*The 3D-reconstruction of the Eligius chalice / Zur 3D-Rekonstruktion des Eligiuskelches*, pp. 280–283). "The subtle elegance (*artis subtilitate*) attributed to Master Eligius is thereby resuscitated" ("Die Meister Eligius zugeschriebene subtile Eleganz [*artis subtilitate*] ist hiermit wieder zum Leben erweckt worden", p. 281).

The final part of the book is devoted to "Archaeology, Art History, Iconography / *Archäologie, Kunstgeschichte, Ikonografie*". Michael Ryan begins by outlining the insular connections of the chalice (Insular chalices and the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice, pp. 286–296). The contribution is somewhat confusingly structured and the illustrations badly referenced, but it does present and compare numerous chalices. In contrast to the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice, however, the other pieces have not been so well looked after over time; all other known examples have been deposited in hoards during one crisis or another (p. 288 f.). Katrin Roth-Rubi considers liturgical objects (Early Medieval sculpture in Raetia and in the Chiemsee abbeys. Historical aspects / *Frühmittelalterliche Skulptur in Rätien und den Chiemsee-Klöstern. Bemerkungen zu historischen Aspekten*, pp. 297–315), particularly those made from Vinschgau marble. The ornamentation in Münstair abbey (CH) seems particularly close to the Kremsmünster chalice, but the abbey's founder is difficult to identify (p. 312 f.). Rüdiger Fuchs studies the writing (Insular influences in the inscriptions of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice. A preliminary palaeographic study / *Insulare Einflüsse in den Inschriften des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches. Eine vorläufige paläografische Studie*, pp. 316–320) and Alexandra Pesch the animal art on the chalice (The animal figures on the chalice. Tassilo's glass bead game / *Die Tierfiguren auf dem Kelch*.

Tassilos Glasperlenspiel, pp. 321–335). Compared to the main motifs, the figurative human representations, the animals are optically pushed into the background. In contrast to Volker Bierbrauer and Egon Wamers, who did not want to assume that the animals on the chalice were derived from animal style II, Alexandra Pesch points out that such animals already existed in the earlier art styles. “In time-honoured tradition, works such as the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice provide a synthesis of the symbolic vocabulary drawn from diverse schools, regions, and times. It is almost a glass bead game as that by Hermann Hesse in which an entirely new style is created through combining and contrasting different artistic currents on the same object” (“Werke wie der Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelch bilden in guter alter Tradition eine Synthese aus den Symbolsprachen unterschiedlicher Schulen, Regionen und Zeiten. Es ist quasi ein Glasperlenspiel frei nach Hermann Hesse, bei dem durch die Zusammenführung und Gegenüberstellung unterschiedlicher Kunstströmungen auf demselben Objekt eine ganz neue Stilform hervorgebracht wird”, p. 331). The animals carried messages of salvation, and in spite of their ancestry in the “northern animal style” (“Tierstil des Nordens”) there is no question that the creatures on the chalice belong to the Christian sphere. “Chronologically as well as iconographically”, the chalice is “a pictorial witness to a purely Christian culture” (“der Kelch ist zeitlich wie ikonografisch ein Bildzeugnis rein christlicher Kultur”, p. 332). This assessment seems all the more justified after reading the contribution by A. Pötsch (*Rota in medio rotae*. On the theology of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice / *Rota in medio rotae. Zur Theologie des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches*, pp. 336–376), which provides an in-depth analysis of the geometry and numerical symbolism of the piece, rooted in the Old and New Testaments. The author aims to illustrate that “the main theological message of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice [...] is] the New Covenant in Christ; the Lord himself is shown as a high priest on the cup” (“Die theologische Hauptaussage des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches ist der Neue Bund in Christus; der Herr selbst ist auf der Cuppa als Hoherpriester dargestellt”, p. 341). By reconstructing a subtext from the inscription and a chronogram from its letters, A. Pötsch wants to show that the chalice of Tassilo and Liutpirc was made in AD 781 for the Rupertus cathedral in Salzburg (p. 346f.); according to A. Pötsch, it was made there by north Italian craftsmen, who, however, shifted all the medallions on the cup one position to the left compared with the object’s original design (p. 342f.; 372). E. Wamers argues against this reading (*Urbs caelestis*. The iconographic structure of the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice / *Urbs caelestis. Die Bildstruktur des Tassilo-Liutpirc-Kelches*, pp. 450–490) and assumes that the final execution of the chalice corresponds to the original design (p. 454). Instead, his aim is to place the piece “as holistically as possible into the context of early Christian art” (“möglichst ganzheitlich in den Kontext der frühchristlichen Kunst [zu] stellen”, p. 452). His comparative analysis shows that the details and positioning of the animals do not have any iconographic significance, they “merely illustrate the bustle of creation” (“das Gewimmel der Schöpfungstiere”, p. 458f.). Most likely, the chalice “indicates a probably two-storeyed round building of heavenly character, the heavenly city built from a ‘paradisiacal material’, the environment – animal – plant – ornament of insular origin” (“dürfte ... einen vermutlich zweigeschossigen Rundbau himmlischen Charakters indizieren, die Himmelsstadt, die aus „paradiesischem Baustoff“, dem Lebensraum-Tier-Pflanzen-Ornament insularer Herkunft, errichtet ist”, p. 472). In the windows of the structure, the viewer can see Christ, the four Evangelists, and four saints in a paradisiacal architecture sporting the roofscapes of the Heavenly Jerusalem (p. 484–486). In this way, the donors’ names are transported to a celestial sphere, “the ducal donation hence promising the attainment of paradise” (“die herzogliche Stiftung stellt somit die Erlangung des Himmelreiches in Aussicht”, p. 481).

The penultimate contribution to the volume, temporarily skipped due to the tight thematic links of the other two contributions, has also been penned by E. Wamers (*Cum thesauris ac familia*. Treasure art and court school of Tassilo III / *Cum thesauris ac familia. Zur Schatzkunst und Hofschule Tassilos III.*, pp. 377–449). In this central essay, the volume’s editor attempts to reconstruct

Tassilo's treasury, brought to Ingelheim in AD 788 (p. 381), thereby putting his life's work as an archaeologist in the balance: as it turns out, almost everything Egon Wamers has ever studied during his life now is also part of the riches of the great Agilolfing. Alongside the Mondsee psalter, declared to be Tassilo's and Liutpirc's prayer book (p. 383), the treasure also contained the cover of the older Lindau gospel, as already suspected by Victor H. Elbern (p. 388), but the majority of the material, we are told, probably ended up "in the furnaces of the royal gold smithies" ("in den Schmelzöfen der königlichen Goldschmiedewerkstätten", p. 382), was reused as spoils, or passed on as gifts to churches and abbeys. In this way, "Tassilo's court school" ("Tassilos Hofschule") becomes the connecting element for all works of art E. Wamers would like to link to the treasure. This style expresses itself in the "insular artistic province of Salzburg" ("der insularen Kunstprovinz in Salzburg", p. 388), in which the "inhabited vine-scroll" was a "very characteristic stylistic hallmark" ("sehr charakteristisches Motiv-Kennzeichen", p. 391) for a creative practice we should no longer describe as "Tassilo chalice style" ("Tassilokelchstil", p. 388). Neither – and quite in contrast to the view long held by E. Wamers himself – was this "the art style of the Carolingian-Frankish upper classes" ("der Kunststil der karolingisch-fränkischen Oberschicht"), in which Charlemagne himself also participated (p. 405 f.). In this way, Wamers succeeds in associating all sorts of objects with Tassilo's treasure: the silver pyxides from Fejø (DK) and Pettstadt (DE), the Enger reliquary, and various strap ends, e.g. from Ingelheim, as well as the liturgical cingulum fitting from Gornji Vrbljani (BA), the censer from the source of the Cetina (HR), and the Petőháza chalice (HU). As if that weren't enough, Wamers uses the fact that the sword from the Hedeby boat burial (DE) has this style of decoration on its pommel and crossguard to turn the piece into the weapon of a follower, disarmed alongside Tassilo at Ingelheim (p. 427 f.). From Charlemagne's treasury or the Ingelheim armouries, the sword would then have passed as inheritance to Louis the Pious, who might have given these "old witnesses of the Bavarian dukedom" ("die alten Zeugnisse des bairischen Fürstentums") to Harald Klak, the King of the Borders ("den König im Grenzland"), as Wamers once called him in 1994 (not quoted in the bibliography). All this is a "chain of speculations" ("eine Kette von Spekulationen", p. 428), yet nevertheless "the renewed attempt presented here [is...] brave but internally consistent" ("Der hier erneut vorgelegte Versuch ist kühn, aber in sich schlüssig", p. 429).

Egon Wamers' remaining "difficult, partly speculative attempt at identifying further works and spoilia and in tracing their routes from Bavaria into the diaspora" ("der schwierige, zum Teil spekulative Versuch, weitere Werke und Spolien zu identifizieren und ihre Wege von Baiern in die Diaspora nachzuzeichnen", p. 444) cannot be discussed further here. All this is very stimulating, but what will Wamers do should finds of a quality and standard of manufacture that are truly worthy of a Tassilo one day really come to light? What can be said about Tassilo's treasure without falling prey to speculation has been collected by the reviewer (M. HARDT, Schatz Herzog Tassilos III. In: Historisches Lexikon Bayerns. https://www.historisches-lexikon-bayerns.de/Lexikon/Schatz_Tassilos_III. [letzter Zugriff: 25.02.2021]).

In spite of the criticism it has been necessary to voice in the last paragraphs, Egon Wamers has produced a wonderful book on the Kremsmünster chalice and its donors which will have a decisive influence on research into the Tassilo-Liutpirc chalice and the Agilolfing dynasty for a long time to come. May the editor's enthusiasm for this great prince of the Bavarians prove contagious and help Tassilo and his artistic legacy to overcome the undeserved *damnatio memoriae*.

Translated by Daniela Hofmann

DE-04109 Leipzig
Reichsstraße 4-6
E-mail: Matthias.hardt@leibniz-gwzo.de

Matthias Hardt
Leibniz-Institut für Geschichte und Kultur
des östlichen Europa (GWZO)