

use of the logical prologue, and his reasonable explanations of the divine by means of the *deus ex machina* destroyed the Dionysian aspect of tragedy. Socrates, with his "moral quotient" and his optimism, was also alien to the spirit of tragedy.

In Greek tragedy at its finest, man understood the cruelty and destruction of life. He was not disgusted by life's tragic forces; in fact, tragedy helped him justify his existence. In modern fiction, Zorba is its most "amoral, non-egoistic character because he wills his life in terms of values that promote his life. He dances after his child's death to relieve his pain. He laughs at death and resists him when he arrives. He is the modern tragic Dionysian artist.

The Boss, Zorba's employer, is the modern Socratic thinker suffering from Nietzsche's concept of *ressentiment*, a victory of the Judaeo-Christian view of sin over innocence with its need to punish the spirit because of the healthy desire of the body. Through Zorba, he learns how self-denial and introspection have desensitized his ability to participate in life.

The widow in *Zorba the Greek* (McDonough's discussion of her role is particularly accurate) symbolizes the way *ressentiment* reveals itself in the righteous morality of the men and women in her village. Her sexuality enhances her strength, and like Zorba, everything about her is primitively affirmative. But her very energy makes those who are weak experience guilt. They will make her suffer for her healthy effrontery.

It is significant that the widow is one of Kazantzakis' powerful characters. When he hoists his own *ressentiment* upon other female portraits, he is not so successful. Katerina in *The Greek Passion* seems contradictory and even stereotypical in her development. Mary Magdalen in *The Last Temptation of Christ* also puzzles the reader because the ideas of her creator hinder the free exercise of her personality.

Indeed, *Zorba the Greek* may be Kazantzakis' most powerful work precisely because Zorba is free of Kazantzakis' own concerns about sexual morality. As Yeats suggests, when the writer adopts a mask, a self that is most unlike his own, he frees himself from the egoism of the personal. Zorba and the widow are such driving mythical forces that all guilt and regret fade in their presence. Kazantzakis' own troubled views about sex are absent (his Christ figures have to deny their sexuality to become saintly). For McDonough, Zorba like the Olympian gods, provides the reader a sense of physical release from guilt by joyfully affirming the glory of the body in spite of life's tragic dissonance.

The author also traces four Nietzschean archetypes in *Zorba the Greek* and concludes with an analysis of the Overman and eternal recurrence themes as exemplified in Zorba. He has made an important contribution to Kazantzakian and Nietzschean scholarship with this valuable study.

Salem State College
Salem, Massachusetts

MICHAEL ANTONAKES

B. L. Fonkich, *Grechesko-Russkie Kul'turnye Sviazi v XV-XVII vv.* (Greco-Russian Cultural Ties in the Fifteenth-Seventeenth Centuries). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1977, 245 pp.

Recently several works have appeared in Russian analyzing Greco-Russian political relations in the eighteenth and especially nineteenth centuries. Works by G. L. Arsh and A. M. Stanislavskaiia immediately come to mind. Earlier cultural contacts lately have been less well studied. Under these circumstances this volume by B. L. Fonkich is an especially welcome

addition to our knowledge of Greco-Russian cultural relations in the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries.

The work is dedicated to the study of Greek manuscripts brought to or copied in Russia in the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries. Fonkich studies these manuscripts trying to make them an independent source for the reconstruction of the source of Greek writing in Russia with the aid of an analysis of handwriting, signatures, library marks and incidental notes.

Fonkich in four chapters focuses his attention on 1. observations on Greco-Russian cultural relations in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries deduced from a detailed and fascinating study of Greek manuscripts made in Russia in their writing characteristics, 2. Arsenii Sukhanov and aspects of the manuscript collection he brought from Mt. Athos, 3. Greek manuscripts in the *Pechatnyi Dvor* in the second half of the seventeenth century and deductions from them on Patriarch Nikon's reforms of Russian liturgical books, and 4. the composition and pattern of usage in Russia of two Greek manuscript libraries of Archimandrite Dionysius of Janina and Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem which arrived in Russia in 1689 and 1692 respectively.

Fonkich confines his work to analyzing only the four preceding questions. Similarly, he concentrates on gathering evidence to be found in the manuscripts themselves and not on a rehash of other information about Greek culture in Russia. As a consequence of this rigorous narrowing of view, Fonkich hesitates to make overriding generalizations about the nature of the Greek cultural presence in Russia before 1700, but his conclusions about Greek writing based on the manuscripts studied are well-founded and important, and they must be considered in any further study of Greek culture in pre-Petrine Russia.

On the basis of twenty-two fifteenth and sixteenth century Greek manuscripts copied in or delivered to Russia, Fonkich concludes that those Greek manuscripts were read not only for religious edification but for knowledge of Greek grammar as well. He adds, though, that with their study the copyists around Archbishop Gennadii of Novgorod were not able to raise their knowledge above a learner's level. In his study of the manuscripts brought to Russia by Arsenii Sukhanov in 1655, Fonkich adds significant information to our knowledge of the quantity of manuscripts brought and the conditions of work on Mt. Athos. Fonkich is impressed with the range of literature brought by Sukhanov to Russia and he deduces after retracing the history of the collection's life in Russia, that the works were intended as guides to many concerns beyond simply liturgical ones. Chapter III, the longest in the volume, is devoted to the Greek books of the Moscow *Pechatnyi Dvor* used by the reformers under Patriarch Nikon. Fonkich is able to fill in details of the lives of the Greek copyists working in the *Pechatnyi Dvor*, especially Arsenios the Greek, and with the aid of an opus to the *Pechatnyi Dvor* of 1658, Fonkich suggests that Arsenii Sukhanov's choice of manuscripts for Russia at Mt. Athos was not accidental but according to a plan perhaps laid out by Arsenios the Greek and Patriarch Nikon. The last chapter, devoted to the history of the collections of Dionysius of Janina and Dositheos of Jerusalem, adds many details to the life of Dionysius, an important Greek educator in seventeenth-century Russia, and to the relations among Dositheos, Greek teachers at Moscow's Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy and the Russian government.

Any further study of Greco-Russian cultural relations before 1700 will have to come to grips with this excellent volume. Far more than a study of the collection of Greek manuscripts in Russia, the book provides basic information for our understanding of the scope of the Greek cultural presence as a whole in Russia before the eighteenth century.

Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

PETER WEISENSEL