

besser in der Lage, die Geschehnisse in diesem Lande zu beobachten und die Gefahr zu sehen...».¹⁶ Bekanntlich lehnte Atatürk, genau so wie Gökalp, Klassenkampf und Kommunismus bereits in den 20er Jahren ab, ohne daß er dadurch seine guten Beziehungen zur SU belastete. Seine politische Utopie von einer Klassenunion und einem Staate, der jedem Bürger volle Entfaltungsmöglichkeiten bot, ohne daß die Grundlagen der herrschenden Kreise angetastet wurden, brachte ihn zur SU, die sich zunehmend konsolidierte, in Opposition. Er fürchtete einen Export der sozialistischen Revolution, weshalb er sich in seinen letzten Jahren wieder stärker an die Westmächte anlehnte. Diese Hintergründe sollte man bei einer Einschätzung seiner Haltung zum Wiederaufleben des extremen Nationalismus nicht übersehen.

Die von mir vorgetragenen einschränkenden Bemerkungen mindern nicht den wissenschaftlichen Wert der Dissertation. Ich kenne kein Werk zur gleichen Thematik, das mit so viel Präzision und Akribie Inhalt und Form des türkischen Nationalismus zwischen Revolution und 1. Weltkrieg analysiert und systematisiert. Es wäre nur zu wünschen, daß die Verf. ihre Untersuchungen fortsetzt und der Entwicklung der bürgerlichen Ideen in der kemalistischen Ära weiter nachspürt.

Universität Leipzig

ERNST WERNER

Pictorial History of Greece by Thomas Spelios. Consultant for the Ancient and Byzantine Periods John E. Rexine, Text for Ottoman and modern Periods Harry I. Psomiades. Crown Publishers Inc. New York, 1967. Pp. 326.

To bring out a pictorial history of Greece covering 4000 years in some 300 pages of letter-press and illustrations is a fantastically hard undertaking. This volume is the product of twenty years research. Spelios has obviously thought it out with great patience and skill. He has been helped by Professor Rexine as Consultant for the Ancient and Byzantine history and by Professor Psomiades with the text for the Ottoman-Turkish and modern periods. The team have carried out their stupendous task – a task never undertaken before – with admi-

16. J. Jäschke: Eine Unterredung Mc Arthurs mit Mustafa Kemal von 1932. *Die Welt des Islam* X, 1965, S. 67.

erable success. The book can therefore be warmly recommended to any one with an interest in Greece. You may dip into it wherever you like. The Greek with no English may look simply at the photography—doubtless with rather more attention to the last hundred pages than to what English readers may enjoy most, all that goes before.

As the author points out "the heritage of the modern Greek is the heritage of the Western world." He takes no half measures but sweeps us along from the Minoan Age right down to the Council of Europe in 1966. Long ago Samuel Johnson defined a lexicographer as "a harmless drudge." In the present encyclopaedic work's compilation there must have been plenty of drudgery. One may wonder whether some of it could not have been avoided.

What is important in such a work is to maintain throughout just proportion and balance, for the parts will else be out of scale. Without any doubt *Greece* for the educated man wherever he lives implies first and foremost the Glory of the 5th Century B. C. We might therefore reasonably expect that this period should receive greater prominence than all others. In the present work it gets some 16 pages (43-58), only a little more room than Greece since 1945 (285-97). Nor is this all. The author's intention is to show Greek influence at work wherever he can. Nobody could find fault with him for some allusion to Graeco-Buddhism Sculpture (with a list of Far Eastern Countries) (89). The view of the Khyber Pass may be judged relevant as Alexander went that way. The British reader will like to know that Greek coins have been discovered "in distant Scotland" (27). But is it really necessary in even a popular book about *Greece* to bring the living (including President Johnson, who whatever else is certainly not a Greek!) so conspicuously before our eyes? Three pages (and rather more) are allotted to Hagia Sophia, two and a half to El Greco and eight to Prominent Modern Greeks (mostly in America). One ought always to bear in mind the wise old Greek saying: *μηδὲν ἄγαν*.

The reviewer with scissors and paste at hand might have a gay time in rearranging the various celebrities and in producing strange and somewhat revolutionary scenic effects. Pericles (1) and Grivas (289) are surely a typical pair of Panhellenists! The Palace of Cnossus (12-3) is so to speak a forerunner of the Monasteries of Athos and Meteora (201). The killers are there: Harmodius and Aristogeiton (35.34) to slay Hipparchus, and Basil the Bulgarians (154). The plutocrats make their bow: Attalus of Pergamum (84), Herodes Atticus(1) and

Aristotle Onassis (299). Naturally we greet Homer on p.1 (and again on p. 18). Three hundred pages later (309) we meet his modern successor Kazantzakis and "his long poem of 33,333 lines, *The Odyssey—A Modern Sequel*."

If any one fact is indisputable it is that the land to which we now apply the name Greece has stayed throughout the centuries one of mountains, sea and island. (The land itself by common consent in ancient times was a good deal less bare than it has become through deforestation and for other reasons, a point which Spelios would have done well to stress.) The *Hellas* where *Hellenes* at the present time speak their own immemorially old language (and alas, these *Hellenic* names are not selected for special mention, nor indeed is any word to be found in the text which is printed in the alphabet on p.26) is a comparatively small part of the Balkan Peninsula. It we turn p. 158 of the book we can see an Empire spreading over the entire Balkans and ranging as far East over Asia Minor as Armenia. The fluidity of the geographical concept "Greece" is one of the most significant lessons of its long history. It was in Crete, not on the mainland, that Minoan civilisation flourished. It was at Alexandria in Egypt that the greatest Greek of all times, a Macedonian, founded his eponymous city and capital of his Empire. It was at Ravenna that the Greek Exarch for a century had his seat (as Spelios shows on pp. 138-9) although he does not call attention to ecclesiastical links with Thessaloniki. Spelios ought to have plainly said on p. 27 that for a long time before Rome became a dominant power (his own phrase what "was to become the Roman state" is badly chosen) a "Great Greece" (cf. "Great Britain") existed in Sicily and along the western shore of Italy. (Admittedly, *Magna Graecia* is named on p. 106, but its birth and growth cannot be gathered from the text). He could also have made the point that Pythagoras, even though Ionian born (31 and 37) was the reputed founder of a philosophical religion which like Orphism was rooted in Italy. And what a chance to throw in a few pithy words on p. 3, (where we have not much help from the camera in drawing a contrast) to supplement the somewhat tame descriptions "Doric severity of the Parthenon" and "magnificent opulence of the Hagia Sophia." The international ramifications of Greek history may be pursued in terms of leaders. Flaminius (105) appears as a liberator centuries before Churchill (284). Alexander from Macedonia (71) has a long start over President Johnson from the U.S.A.(306).

Spelios remarks (5) that Greece has "a singularly dry climate" which

is "conducive to clear seeing." Clear *seeing* in the physical world surely helps clear *thinking*, a point which might well have been made on p. 31 in the treatment of Greek philosophers, scientists and mathematicians. Incidentally, what we in our modern jargon call "technology" can be traced throughout the course of Greek history—the storerooms at Knossos (12), the machines invented by Greeks at Alexandria in Egypt (102-3), the "Greek fire" of "Byzantium," and the power plants at Ptolemais (300).

Some further comments. On p. 189 Ficino is named, but not Erasmus. On p. 82 "statues of the Greek gods" must be related to the Egyptian setting. Syncretisation was at Alexandria the order of the day. The Index (which is not very thorough) omits all reference to Egypt—a serious gap. It would have preceded "Eisenhower, Dwight D." and "El Greco" and would have comprised at least the following pages: 14, 27, 34, 72, 81, 104, 107, 109, 128, and 141. The *Demeter* on p. 16 is a well-known exhibit at the British Museum (unnamed). The mural on p. 62 is Hellenistic (with Isiac connotations) from Pompeii. Hellenic though she may seem to be on p. 107, Cleopatra liked to dress up (in Shakespeare's phrase) "in the habiliments of Isis." A howler is to be seen on p. 115: "the *New* and Old Testaments were translated into Greek." (On the same page "Neoplatonism" is incorrectly substituted for "Middle Platonism" as beginning "to spread throughout the Greek world" at "about this time" i. e. the first century A. D.) The tale (122) that St. Paul "gained a valuable convert in Dionysius the Areopagite, a Stoic philosopher" is wholly apocryphal. The ascription of the *Akathist Hymn* (143) to the Patriarch Sergius surely needs proof. Porphyry categorically tells us that Plotinus refused to have any likeness made of himself by artists (herein he was almost the prototype of the Christian iconoclasts so that the sculpture on p. 114 is at once suspect.) Somewhere on pp. 119-20 the name of Galerius needs mention, for he was the last really important pagan emperor (if we except Julian) and this fact is borne out at Thessaloniki not only by his Arch but by excavations which are still in progress. Certain stylistic oddities could have been avoided: "located above Thessaly" (69) instead of "north of," and "millions of dollars" (133) instead of "vast sums."

The photography is undistinguished. How much better if some at least of the illustrations could have been in colour, in order to repro-

duce e. g. the bright sunlight on p. 3, and the magnificence of Constantinople on p. 160 ("wealthiest city in the world").

London

REX WITT

Mario Rinvoluceri, *Anatomy of a Church. Greek Orthodoxy Today*. London, Burns and Oats, 1966. Pp. 192.

For Christians who are thinking in these days about Church Reunion (and their number may well run into millions) a book written from the Roman Catholic standpoint about the Greek Orthodox Church must be regarded as very important, whatever its conclusions. The little primer now under review can be recommended for careful reading as being on the whole a successful and objective presentation of the facts, especially when the Eastern and above all the Greek part of Christendom is set beside the Church of Rome. We may search in vain for the author's own views, which are nowhere made clear. At any rate the ground is well covered and the declared aim (which Peter Hammond is somewhat strangely made to state in a foreword) is completely fulfilled, namely to analyse "the state of the Greek Church in the mid-sixties" and to provide "the general reader with an inside picture" of the Orthodox Church in Greece today. The extent of the author's debt to the *pappas* George of Hypsilanti is nowhere clearly shown, though it is he who is pictured (somewhat darkly!) on the front cover of the book beneath the names Rinvoluceri-Hammond.

We start from the village and go to the town. We see monasticism old and new (the dialogue with the monk on Athos has the ring of truth and is very telling) before we meet bishops and lay theologians (what a lot of squabbling there is among them!) and learning about the crucial problem of Church and State in Greece. Next we are introduced to the Ecumenical Patriarch himself and are told about the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church (obviously the writer's) towards Orthodoxy. All this within less than 200 pages of a paper-back! It is an excellent achievement in handing out potted knowledge. So a reviewer must guard against niggling criticisms.

The most serious weakness is surely the author's failure to come clean out as a Roman Catholic. Indeed, he might seem to some to be wearing a Papal mask! Apart from the portrait on the outside, at the