

completely the attention of Nicholas I, who was concerned just as much with the maintainance of the status quo.

Despite the above criticism, Fadeev's work is a useful and comprehensive account of a significant period in nineteenth century diplomacy over the Eastern question. The major part of his narrative is divided into three periods. The first one covers the years 1821 - 1823 when the conflict was located in the Morea and the Principalities as a result of the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence. The second phase which also encompassed Egypt and Iran covers the years 1824 - 1827. Then he discusses the period 1828 - 1829 when the Russo - Turkish war and the intervention of the great powers made the entire Near and Middle East an area of contention. He concludes with a discussion on the treaty of Adrianople (1829) and its historical significance. Reading Fadeev's detail study of the Eastern crisis in the 20's, this reviewer became convinced that western scholars can benefit from the works of Soviet historians even though the former may reject the latter's Marxist interpretation of history.

Fadeev has utilized both primary and secondary sources. He consulted several standard western works on the subject, especially the ones he wanted to criticize. Yet one cannot help but notice serious omissions of works by western scholars. Concerned with socio economic developments in the Eastern question as Fadeev is, he should have consulted the admirable and instructive two-volume study of H.A.R. Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West* (London, 1950, 1957).

University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

THEOFANIS GEORGE STAVROU

Ἀντωνίου - Αἰμιλίου Ν. Ταχιάου, *Τὸ Γεωργιανικὸν Ζήτημα (1868 - 1918). Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς ρωσικῆς πολιτικῆς ἐν Ἀγίῳ Ὄρει.* [Antony - Emil N. Tachiaos, *The Georgian Question (1868 - 1918). A Contribution to the History of Russian Policy on Mount Athos*]. Publication No 54 of the Institute for Balkan Studies, Thessaloniki 1962, 124 pp. + 6 plates. German Summary, pp. 119 - 124.

As the subtitle suggests, the essay under review is a contribution to the study of Russian policy on Mount Athos. The author achieves his objective through a carefully documented account of the so-called Georgian question. Essentially, the Georgian question, which upset the relations of Greeks, Georgians and Russians for half a century (1868 - 1918), consisted of claims by Georgian monks on Mount Athos over the famous monastery of Iviron, and the resistance of the Greek monks to these claims. The monastery, which originally belonged to the Georgians, had gradually passed into the hands of the Greeks and by 1868 became Greek in character and orientation. On that same year, a delegation of twelve Georgians, headed by the monk Benedict, arrived at Mount Athos. Having purchased the kelli of St. John the Divine

from the Greek monks of Iviron, Benedict set out to make it a bastion of Georgian claims. He began a campaign invoking the help of the rulers of Georgia and Russia in order to revert the jurisdiction of the monastery of Iviron to the Georgians. Simultaneously, he was endeavoring to raise the status of his kelli to that of a skete. As could be expected, the Greeks opposed these schemes. They pointed out that since available documents did not clarify many aspects of the monastery's early history, the only criterion which should determine the jurisdiction of the monastery should be who was *de facto* in possession of the premises at the time. The Greeks readily argued that the situation at the monastery of Iviron was analogous to that at the Russian monastery of St. Panteleimon on Mount Athos. Just as the latter had been Russified by the gradual increase of the Russian element, so the monastery of Iviron was Hellenized by the predominance of the Greek element there. Systematically, therefore, the Greeks frustrated any attempts of the Georgians to either raise the status of their kelli or to reinforce their claims over the monastery.

What started as a seemingly common administrative quarrel among two Orthodox groups of monks soon became international in nature, involving the Russian Holy Synod, the Russian Foreign Office, the Russian Embassy in Constantinople, and the Russian Consulate in Thessaloniki, as well as the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. It was precisely this active participation of Russian representatives in the Near East, especially ambassadors Nelidov, Zinoviev, and Charikov, which made the Greeks adamant in their stand against the demands of the Georgian monks. The Greeks began to view the Georgian question as an attempt by Russian leaders to Russify the Holy Mountain — a continuation of the Pan Slavistic policy of N. P. Ignatiev.

The Russian authorities, championing the Georgian cause, exerted heavy pressure on the Greek monks in charge of the monastery of Iviron through traditional methods: they threatened to confiscate the income from the monastery's property in Georgia and in Russia; they made it difficult for the representative of the monastery of Iviron to visit Russia for the collection of funds; and finally, they put heavy pressure on the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople. Russian policy, to be sure, did not always respond with the same irresponsible impetuosity of the Georgian monks, but on the whole it rendered the Georgians moral and material support in their struggle against the Greeks. It was largely thanks to this Russian official intervention that the Greek monks gradually were forced to reconsider their position and contemplate making certain concessions to the Georgians. It looked as if their cherished dreams to take control of the monastery would finally materialize. But the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia effected, among other things, a reversal of tsarist policy in the Near East, thus abandoning the Georgian cause as well. Thereafter, the Greek element asserted itself with relative ease.

The present study is the result of systematic research in the

archives of the Monastery of Iviron which included a wealth of documents dealing with the Georgian question. The author also utilized the correspondence of the Georgian kelli of St. John the Divine. In this respect, the author explored sources unknown to previous scholars who occupied themselves with the same question, such as the general study of the famous professor of the Kiev Theological Academy, A. Dmitrievskii, *Russkie na Afone* (St. Petersburg, 1895), and the more specialized work of A. Natroev, *Iverskii monastyr na Afone v Turtsii, na odnom iz vystupov Khalkidonskago poluostrova* (Tiflis 1909). This is also true of the Greek standard works on Mount Athos, such as Γ. Συμυρνάκη, *Tò "Άγιον Όρος* (Athens, 1903), which Mr. Tachiaos uses judiciously.

In his use of primary sources, the author is meticulous. The chronological list of documents replacing a conventional bibliography, the photographs of some documents, as well as the supplements he attached to the narrative, all add to the scholarly value of the book, which illuminates successfully a relatively little known problem of the history of Mount Athos.

There is an area in which the essay can stand criticism. In his introduction, the author justified his project to write a monograph on the Georgian question on the grounds that the latter formed part of the general Pan Slavistic policy pursued by Russia in the Balkan peninsula and for all practical purposes in the Orthodox Near East. Yet he fails to relate the Georgian question to other similar contemporary movements in the Balkans and the East Mediterranean. He makes no mention at all of the Slavonic Benevolent Societies, or the activities of the Russian Imperial Orthodox Palestine Society, the latter flourishing between 1882 and 1914, the years when the Georgian question assumed ugly proportions. In fact Russian policy in Palestine during this time offers numerous examples of Russian expansionist proclivities at the expense of the Greek hierarchy in the Eastern Patriarchates. Only few incidental allusions (pp. 24, 84n, 107) identify the Georgian with the Palestine problem. It is this reviewer's opinion, that had the author devoted more attention to this problem of setting the Georgian question in the context of Russian ecclesiastical policy in the Near East, the wider implications of his study would be much more discernible. In this respect, the author could have made better use of Charles Jelavich's *Tsarist Russia and Balkan Nationalism* (Berkeley, 1958), instead of simply using it to establish the appointments of Russian ministers in European capitals. As the author must know, Mr. Jelavich's work is an excellent account of Russian attempts to influence Balkan politics through the Orthodox Church.

On the whole *The Georgian Question (1868-1918)* is competently done, and a welcome addition to Athonian historical literature. As the author points out in his introduction, most works dealing with Mount Athos about this period are either national journalistic accounts or almost beyond the reach of most scholars. In this respect, he has ren-

dered a useful service to scholars through the present study. It is hoped that other individuals will follow suite and investigate other questions or write new histories of the leading monasteries on Mount Athos. In most cases, archival materials abound, and the 1000 year anniversary of the Holy Mountain may serve to stimulate this sort of historical research.

University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

THEOFANIS G. STAVROU

*Codul Calimach*. Editie critică. [Das Gesetzbuch des Calimach. Kritische Ausgabe]. Bukarest, Akademie der Rumänischen Volksrepublik, 1958, 1009 S., 9 Tafeln mit einer kurzen Zusammenfassung in russischer (S. 995-1002) und französischer Sprache (S. 1003-1009) = *Adunarea izvoarelor vechiului drept românesc scris*. III. [Sammlung schriftlicher Quellen des alten rumänischen Rechts. III].

Die geografische Lage der Donaufürstentümer und die sich seit dem neunten Jahrhundert immer stärker herausbildende Gemeinsamkeit der Völker Südosteuropas sowie schliesslich die Zugehörigkeit zur oströmischen Kirche haben an den Höfen der walachischen und moldauischen Fürsten auch die Kenntnis und Bewunderung der byzantinischen Kulturformen gefördert. So haben die mannigfaltigen griechischen Kultureinflüsse in Südosteuropa dazu geführt, dass bereits in der Frühzeit der rumänischen Fürstentümer Moldau und Walachei das römisch-byzantinische Recht dort rezipiert wurde und zusammen mit dem älteren, ungeschriebenen Gewohnheitsrecht, das seinerseits auch auf römischrechtlichen Normen aufgebaut war, durch Jahrhunderte in Geltung blieb. Wahrscheinlich war es der Nomokanon in südslawischer Übersetzung, der den Fürsten und Bischöfen als erste geschriebene Rechtsgrundlage in ihren Herrschaftsbereichen diente. Aus dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert sind bisher drei Handschriften des berühmten alphabetischen Syntagma (Σύνταγμα κατὰ στοιχείον) des Mönches Matthias Blastares bekannt, der im Jahre 1335 in Thessaloniki den ganzen Stoff des Nomokanon mit den wichtigsten Gesetzen des Procheiron und der Basiliken zusammenstellte.

Auf Veranlassung des Fürsten Vasile Lupu (1634-1653) wurde ein rumänisches Gesetzeswerk verfasst und in Jassy gedruckt, das zum Teil auf griechischen Vorlagen — vor allem aus dem Syntagma und der Hexabiblos —, aber auch auf römischem Recht der «Praxis et theoria criminalis» des Prosper Farinacci, genannt Farinescu, beruht. Diese wiederum enthält das römisch-germanische Recht der bekannten «Constitutio Criminalis Carolina». Es sollte nicht die einzige Verschmelzung römisch-byzantinischen Rechts mit deutschen Rechtsnormen in diesem Raum bleiben. Da sich die geltenden Rechtsbestimmungen in den folgenden hundert Jahren nicht weiterentwickelten, wurde die Neufassung der bestehenden Gesetze eine dringende Aufgabe.