Korais, as was the enlightened teacher, K. Koumas. Finally, there follows an evaluation of Korais' endeavour and of its consequences, among which were the imposition of conservatism and the distortion of Korais' teaching by the scholars who followed him.

In the volume's penultimate study, Professor Dimaras examines the end of the Enlightenment and Konstandinos Paparrigopoulos (pp. 391-410), the historian who brought cohesion back to the historical development of our nation, after eminent scholars, both before him and contemporary with him, had denied Byzantium its place in Greek history in their attempts to turn anew to veneration of the ancients. But despite the violent controversies which surrounded him, Paparrigopoulos and his teaching deeply influenced the generation of 1880, who accepted the ideology of the western world. He advocated the study and the use of Demotic and "restored to a theoretical, but strong and effectual unity a certain spirit of Enlightenment and the imposition of Byzantium".

Finally, we have for the first time the publication of the satire, "Anonymous of 1789", pp. 411-428, which had hitherto caused Professor Dimaras uncertainty with regard not only to the identity of the writer, but also to the influences at work upon him, the people to whom he makes allusions and against whom he finally turns (Voulgaris, for example). However, Professor Dimaras considers this a significant text (despite its libellous character) which appeared at an effective moment for the development of the modern Greek spirit and for the country in which it was written (which was probably Moldavia).

It is, of course, superfluous to emphasise that this book of Professor Dimaras' opens up new roads to us, for the study not only of the modern Greek Enlightenment, but particularly of the European Enlightenment, to which we owe so much. Nor should we neglect the significance of all these personalities of Neohellenism, who associated themselves, positively or negatively, with the Enlightenment, for the history of culture in the Balkans: in Roumania, for instance, and in Bulgaria—the former in particular—where many of these Greek scholars found appropriate terrain in the Phanariot courts.

Institute for Balkan Studies
A. E. KARATHANASSIS


The presence of the Latin Church in Greece, the Near and the Middle East, and its political and economic extensions following the Crusades have been a particular subject of historical research. The notable studies which have been written on this topic in the past, by G. Golubovich, M. Le Quien, L. Santifaller, E. Gerland, R. Loenertz, have not covered all the complicated aspects of the problem. The motives, the factors and the conflict of the protagonists' interests have left wide margins unfilled, not only with regard to general authentications, but also with regard to specific interpretations of the facts and of the actions of political and ecclesiastical powers. For this reason any new work on the above subject constitutes a welcome contribution.

In particular, this three-volume work (vol. I, Verona 1973, pp. 526, vol. II, Verona 1976, pp. 282) by Professor Giorgio Fedalto of the University of Padua provides a rare opportunity for the historian of the late Middle Ages to approach and elucidate with certainty the ecclesiastical, economic, cultural and social institutions imported with a host of variations to the East from the Catholic West. The first volume refers to the historical fates of
the Latin Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople, to the Archbishops of Thebes and Patras, to the Latin Church of Crete, to the custom of the pontifical tithe and also to the propagandist work of missionaries in the various lands of the Balkans and in the Far East. With the second volume the writer reveals himself as an indefatigable researcher, methodically and minutely presenting the "Hierarchia Latina Orientis", a most useful work and vital for significant chapters in historical knowledge, such as ecclesiastical portraiture and geography, proven chronological tables and the acme and decline of episcopal sees and offices. With regard to these two noteworthy volumes, the second in particular, Professor N. B. Tomadakis has made interesting observations in an evaluation in *ΕΕΒΣ* 42 (1975-76) 457-463; cf. also in *ΕΕΒΣ* 43 (1977-78) 430-433 for the third vol., for which he makes some remarks.

The third volume, which most concerns us here, deals with one of the most characteristic cases of state intervention in Church affairs. To be precise, it examines Venice's ecclesiastical policy in the East during the XIVth and XVth centuries. This was the period when St. Mark's Republic was organising and stabilising its colonies to the detriment of the Byzantine Empire. The Venetians were to use the Latin prelature as their basic and surest instrument for conducting their commerce with the East. They had the most lively concern that the highest offices of the Church, both at home and in the colonies, should be occupied exclusively by their own people, citizens of their State. Political and commercial interests were of the highest importance. The Venetian Senate's 723 decisions, which appear in this book in full, in part or in summary and which cover the period of time between 1302 and 1503, demonstrate once again the famous principle: "prima siamo Veneziani e poi Cristiani".

In his introduction the author rightly perceives the governmental role of the Venetian Senate, which, thanks to its spheres of jurisdiction, kept a watchful eye on the life and conduct of every kind of cleric in the eastern colonies, whether Orthodox or Latin, bishop, priest or monk; it also proposed new people to the Papal Court for the occupation of episcopal sees, ratified, to a certain extent, the formal papal decisions, imposed sanctions or confiscated Church property and removed incompetent or uncooperative prelates. Without any "dispute concerning the dress of the bishops" and long before the famous opinions on ecclesiastical matters of her cleric, Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623), Venice decisively settled her relations with Rome and made the Church's fate subject to political expediency. The documents in this volume give a vivid and minutely detailed picture of the State Church, which does not seem to have differed from many churches of our own time.

In particular, through this interesting collection one can follow over two centuries the sagacious activities of the Venetian nobles with regard to ecclesiastical matters concerning Crete, Euboia, Koroni, Methoni, the Argos and Nafplion, Monemvasia, Patras, Corfu, Zakynthos and Cephalonia, Tinos and Mykonos, Karpathos, Limnos, Rhodes, Cyprus, Thessaloniki, Constantinople, Dyrrahion, Athens, the distant commercial stations of the Crimea and many other places. The chronological limits (1302-1503) are justified because the Senate's first decisions on this matter are indicated at the beginning of the XIVth century, in the "Misti" series, while with the ending of the second Turko-Venetian war (1499-1503) Venice lost Dyrrahion, Nafpaktos, Methoni, Koroni and the Gulf of Pylos and embarked upon her final decline.

Of course, the evidence could be extended with the citing of documents published by the Venetian local authorities, such as the Authority of Crete or the various châtelains. Many such documents certainly exist in the Venetian archives and indeed in the famous "Duke of Crete's Archives". However, such research would lead too far, as the author ad-
mits (p. 6). His aim is to define the main course of Venice’s religious policy, based on the decisions of the most fundamental administrative organ of the State, i.e. the Senate. And so this collection of documents essentially comprises the nucleus from which future supplementary works or works of topical interest may depart. It is in this point, I think, that Fedalto’s notable contribution lies.

The following observations aim at a better understanding of the documents and emphasise their importance with regard to Greece and the Balkans in general; also, they may prove useful in a future re-publication of the work.

First of all, a general observation: the documents are not edited in strict accordance with the diplomatic method; neither change of line nor change of page is indicated, nor indeed are the well-known technical rules of publication applied (as regards editorial insertions, omissions made by the scribe, or lacunae due to damage of the document). The writer has followed the method used in similar publications produced in Italy, such as those of the “Monumenti storici pubblicati dalla Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Venezie” or of the “Comitato per la Pubblicazione delle Fonti relative alla Storia di Venezia”. Scholars would appear to have difficulty in agreeing on a uniform method of editing documents, although the diplomatic method has become widely accepted.

Particular observations: on p. 22, note 51, the reference made to document n° 520 (p. 198) is incorrect, because the document does not refer to the relations between Venice and Thessaloniki, but to the defence of Constantinople.~On the same page the ‘island’ Strophalia, near Zakynthos, on which is the monastery of the Holy Virgin, should read Strophades or Strophadia (two small islands); in the relative document n° 723 (p. 290), which is given in summary form (published by C. Sathas, Μνημεία [Monuments], v. 5, p. 78-79), we read the incorrect “di Stampalia”, which leads us naturally to the well-known Dodecanesian island Astypalaia. A clarification is therefore necessary, either on the same page or in the index (p. 301) where the monastery is referred to as S. Maria, mon. de Strophalia.~On the same page (22) and in note 53, the reference to document n° 720 (p. 289), which contains a summary of Sathas’ edition (Monuments, vol. 5, p. 80-81), cannot be said to be pertinent, because the contents of this document mention no concession on the part of Venice towards her Orthodox subjects on Zakynthos and Cephallonia. On the contrary, according to the summary given, the Venetian admiral was to ensure that the official residence of the Orthodox archbishops of Zakynthos remained in the possession of the Latin bishop of the two islands.~Document n° 123 (p. 58-59) has already been published by S. M. Theotokis, Μνημεία τής Ελληνικής Ιστορίας [Monuments of Greek History], vol. 2, part 1, Athens 1936, p.272, n° 20. There is also an analysis of the document in Z. N. Tsirpanlis, Τὸ κληροδότημα τοῦ καρδιναλίου Βησσαρίωνος γιὰ τοὺς φιλενωτικοὺς τῆς βενετοκρατούμενης Κρή­της (1439-17ος αί.) [Cardinal Bessarion’s Legacy to the Unionists of Venetian-occupied Crete (1439-XVIth cent.)], Thessaloniki 1967, p. 221-223.~In document n° 187 (p. 85) Μαλφατανόρου should correctly read Μαλφατανορος (see Tsirpanlis, “Cardinal Bessarion’s Legacy”, p. 62).~In the inscription of document n° 195 (p. 90), for Monte Sion read Monte Sinai.~Document n° 227 (p. 102) has already been published by Flaminius Cornelius in “Creta Sacra”, vol. 2, Venetiis 1755, p. 161.~Document n° 246 (p. 108) has also been published (with variations in the text) by Cornelius, ibid., p. 128.~Document n° 293 (p. 123-124) has been published by M. I. Manousakas in Βενετικά έγγραφα άναφερόμενα είς τήν έκκλη­σιαστικήν ιστορίαν τῆς Κρήτης τοῦ 14ου-16ου αἰώνος [Venetian Documents regarding the ecclesiastical history of Crete from the XIVth to the XVIth cent.], ΔΙΕΕ 15 (1961) 154-156, with a detailed commentary. The differences in the reading of words in the two
editions are significant. It should be noted in particular that the word *anconam* in Fedalto's edition should read *sintonam*, according to Manousakas' edition. Otherwise I am unable to grasp the meaning of the relative passage.~Document no 306 (p. 127) has already been published by Cornelius, *ibid.*, p. 56-57, but with a different date (8.7.1383).~Document no 331 (p. 135) has also been published by Cornelius, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 56 (dated 14.7.1388 and with a different reading of certain words).~Document no 363 (p. 146-147) has been published (with significant differences in the reading of many words) by Manousakas in "Venetian Documents", *ibid.*, p. 156-160.~In the summary of document no 453 (p. 177) "Apano e cha to Trifana" should correctly read "Apano e Chato Trifona".~In the summary of document no 461 (p. 180)—published in Sathas' "Monuments", vol. 3, p. 30—reference is made to the Church of the Holy Virgin "de Casopo" on Corfu. This is the same church which is incorrectly referred to in the summary of document no 527 (p. 200-201)—published in Sathas' "Monuments", vol. 3, p. 263—as the Church of the Holy Virgin "de Calapo". The analogy should also be made in the index (p. 301) where they are referred to as two separate churches on Corfu. This is, of course, the famous Church of the Panayia Kassopitira (see K. Ch. M. Kyriakis, *'Οδηγός τής νήσου Κέρκυρας* [Guide to the Island of Corfu], Athens 1902, p. 75, 85). Sathas, in both documents (*ibid.*, p. 30, 263) transcribes the church's name as "Sancta Maria de Casopo".~Document no 475 (p. 183-184) has already been published by Cornelius, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 371, with a different date (6.6.1417) and with many differences (correct, I think) in the reading of various words.~In document no 488 (p. 186-187) reference is made to the castle of Sancti Petri, for which cypress timber was transported from Crete to Rhodes. In the index (p. 303) it is referred to as *Sanctus Petrus castrum Rhodi*. It should be clarified that this is not a castle on Rhodes, but the famous castle of Petroumi (in ancient times Halicarnassus, now Bodrum in Turkish Asia Minor), which belonged to the Knights of St. John of Rhodes.~Document no 538 (p. 206) has been published (in a Greek translation) in K. D. Mertzios, *Μνημεία μακεδονικής ιστορίας* [Monuments of Macedonian History], Thessaloniki 1947, p. 61.~Document no 554 (p. 212-213), published here in fragmentary form, has also already been published by Mertzios, *ibid.*, p. 76-78, 83, 84, 84-85, 87 (in corresponding fragments) both in the Venetian original and in a Greek translation.~Document no 541 (p. 207) was first published by Cornelius, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 73, with a slightly different date (14.5.1426).~In document no 580 (p. 223) the word *salinas* should read *Salinas*, because it is a place-name (*Salina = Αλυκές = Σκάλα Λάρνακος* in Cyprus), and it should also be included in the index. In the same document, the printed *Simisso* should be corrected (and in the index too, p. 304) to *Limisso*.~In the summary of document no 584 (p. 225), from Sathas' edition in "Monuments", vol. 3, p. 431-432, reference is made to the "First Priest" of Corfu, Leo Rapochiefali. The correct rendition of his surname is Rokokephalos (see A. Ch. Tsitsas, *'Η Εκκλησία της Κερκύρας κατά την Λατινοκρατίαν. 1267-1797* [The Corfiot Church under Latin Domination. 1267-1797], Corfu 1969, p. 167). It should indeed be noted that Leo had been hitherto known to hold the title of "First Priest" from 1480 onwards. Whether it is the same man or a related namesake, the name should be added to the chronological list of First Priests.~Document no 598 (p. 232) has already been published by Tsirpanlis in "Cardinal Bessarion's Legacy", p. 244-245 (with difference in the reading of some words); see also p. 215-216 for an analysis of the document.~Document no 600 (p. 233) has also been published by Cornelius in "Creta Sacra", vol. 2, p. 106; see also Tsirpanlis, "Cardinal Bessarion's Legacy", p. 210, for a bibliography relating to the publication of the document.~Document no 603 (p. 234) has already been
published (with slight differences in the reading) by Cornelius, ibid., p. 13. Document no 604 (p. 234-235) has also been published by Cornelius, ibid., p. 113-114 (with many differences in the reading of words). In document no 651 (p. 255-256), also known to us from H. Noiret's edition (“Documents inédits”, Paris 1892, p. 462), the words “comino Sancti Johannis Palmoye” should correctly read “iconomo Sancti Johannis Palmose”; see also the correction in Tsirpanlis' “Cardinal Bessarion’s Legacy”, p. 73. It should be noted that document no 676 (p. 266) has already been published by Noiret, ibid., p. 533; see also Tsirpanlis, ibid., p. 118. It should be added that “cetera eius Turchus occupat. Cardinalis...” should correctly read (according to Noiret) “cetera enim Turchus occupat, Cardinalis...” Document no 708 (p. 284) has already been published by M. I. Manousakas in ‘Αρχιερείς Μεθόνης, Κορώνης και Μονεμβασίας γύρω στα 1500 [Prelates of Methoni, Koroni and Monemvasia circa 1500], Peloponnesiaka 3-4 (1958-1959), p. 136; see also M. Manousakas, Recherches sur la vie de Jean Plousiadénos (Joseph de Méthone) (1429-1500), Revue des Études Byzantines 17 (1959), p. 47. The differences in the script between the two editions (of Manousakas and Fedalto) are significant. I note only that “...venerabilis vir dominus Ioannes Phisindino” (ed. Fedalto) should read “...Venetiarum vir chir Joannes Plusiadino” (ed. Manousakas). The incorrect reading of the surname also creates two different individuals; therefore in the index (p. 299) Johannes Phisindino should be identified as Ioannes Plagudino (Plusiadeno).

It seems to me that it would have been useful for this collection to include, together with the decisions of the Venetian Senate, the documents (or their summaries) published by the Venetian senator Flaminius Cornelius in 1755. These decisions, of course, relate to ecclesiastical problems on Crete, as do the documents of 16.7.1334 (“Creta Sacra”, vol. 2, p. 11), circa 1366 (ibid., p. 345-347), 15.2.1367 (ibid., p. 52), 22.3.1368 (ibid., p. 53-54), 10.5.1411 (ibid., p. 63-64), 15.9.1415 (ibid., p. 369-370), 2.1.1448 (ibid., p. 81-82).

The additions or corrections mentioned above are mere trifles when set against the impressive contribution made by this three-volume work, and more generally against Fedalto’s contribution to studies in the field of Greek-Venetian relations during the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

University of Ioannina

Z. N. TSIRPANLIS


Richard Clogg’s A Short History of Modern Greece is probably the best book of its kind, with the possible exception of Nikos Svoronos’ Review of Modern Greek History. Designed for a general but an educated audience, this volume digests nearly 800 years of Greek history in less than 250 pages. The end result is an eminently readable summary skillfully synthesizing the insights of a large body of in-depth scholarship, including Clogg’s own works, into a well-ballanced, thoughtful, and informative essay on modern Greece.

Richard Clogg systematically employs in this volume an empiricist orientation with standard historical interpretative techniques. In recounting the turbulent history of Modern Greece, he quietly suggests that political developments are the product of a multiplicity of “causes” that can be traced in the domestic arena and in the foreign environment of Greece.

In telling his story, the author emphasizes political developments and is quite conscious