

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

outset (6) the first personal pronoun is indeed Rinvolucris but immediately afterwards on the opposite page (7) it switches without warning to Hammond, who tells us "I wrote a book, originally entitled 'An Anatomy of a Church'." Notice also the many references to the Uniates (vide. Index *s. v.*). Nowhere however does the author make us aware of his own relation to them nor of theirs to the Vatican. He mentions "the two Churches" (33). But what is his own attitude towards Protestantism? He *seems* ecumenically-minded. And yet he writes of Haghiorite "obscurantism" (70) and of Protestant *sects* (53). What opinion has he himself of these "sects" in so far as church reunion is concerned? Small though they may be yet they have their worth in any scheme of reunion. When the time comes they too will utter their views on Orthodoxy. The author apparently wishes to dispel "suspicion, enmity, hate and fanaticism" between the various churches. The words used about "the centuries and their harsh happenings" could apply to many events in *English* history and the Reformed Anglican Church in relation to the Papists. More than that, it hardly becomes a Roman Catholic to write, as Rinvolucris does (101) about "the latent fanaticism of the Greeks." A Greek who picks up a book about his Church and sees for instance in Hammond's eulogy *inter alia*... "he does not overlook its weaknesses"... "where we have avoided Orthodox pitfalls"... may be forgiven for some dislike of what must seem to be a smug and "holier than thou" approach.

All the same, many good points are made. Thus it is true that confession in the Greek villages (28) is seldom carried out. The bishops have indeed been at loggerheads with Zoi (87). The contrast between the theological faculties at Athens and Thessaloniki (121-3) is not at all unfair (mention might here have been made of the then Archimandrite Jerome Cotsonis). The sundry references to *Sotir* have been checked by the present reviewer in a meeting with its present Director, Mr. Frangopoulos, who disputes however the figures given on p. 91—fifty nine (not fifty) walked out of the Zoi Brotherhood, and the magazine sells 75 not 70 thousand. The author was just in time to mention the situation which arose in November 1965, although of course he was not to know of the impending appointment of Prof. Cotsonis (nowhere named) as Archbishop of Athens and all Greece, a manifestly good outcome of the political change in April 1967. There is a real enough danger (71) that the Holy Mount may more and more become a centre of just culture and tourism. The horrifying account of the crucifixion of Papa Thanasis

(135) is a not unfitting beginning to Chapter 7, which deals with Faith and Nation.

Some statements are debatable, some need either amplification or even correction. The Patriarch; it could have been emphasised (158), is not the administrative Head of a Catholic Church, like the Pope. (The author does well to liken the Patriarch's status to that of the Secretary-General of the U.N. although the comparison must not be carried too far.) *Egoismos* (34) is misused: the word should be *φιλότιμο*. The terms Monsignor (abbreviated Mgr. 104) and Mass (repeatedly introduced) are inappropriate. Instead of Mass (with all its Western overtones) we should demand *λειτουργία* ("Liturgy" if need be) for the Romanist term cloaks the differences which anybody today can see for himself, for instance the role in Orthodox worship of the iconostasis. The generalisation (27) about "the low level" of village priests could be disputed, at least as regards "spirituality." The truth of the story about the porter at Dionysiou (not Dyonisiou) need not be challenged. But the reviewer would ask Rinvolucris to seek another voice as well. For instance, Hieronimos, the Hymnographer, although living ascetically enough at Karoulia might provide some less crude answers. Rather more could have been said about "the Association of Professional Men" ("Men" is the term used by this body as part of the English title), for its 1946 Declaration was endorsed by such famous personalities as C. S. Lewis and Eddington, Milligan and Planck, Claudel, Maurois and Rops, and its journal *Aktines* supported a *cultural* movement (initiated by Prof. Tsirintanis especially through his book *Towards a Christian Civilisation*) which was based on the principles of Orthodox Christianity. Not enough emphasis is laid by Rinvolucris either on the regenerating process during the first ten years after the War, nor on Christian post-war social work.

The language question is brought up (4). 'The beautiful 'pure' language of the intellectuals, we are informed, "to the people [in the Town Parish] is only half comprehensible." Not so! For all sermons tend to be preached in at least *καθομιλουμένη* and in any case whoever has had a secondary education should easily understand the language of the New Testament and of the Liturgy. It seems somewhat priggish for one writing from the Roman Catholic standpoint to declare (33) that Greek countryfolk "often cling to their simple fundamentalist faith." They may indeed pin their faith in the Serpent and the Apple, in Balaam's donkey, and in Jonah and the Whale. But is this so very unlike the cre-

dulous attitude of thousands of Roman Catholic peasants in the Mediterranean and elsewhere? The phrase "these middle-class terms" suggests a stratification of society which is, if anything, English but not Greek. Nearly everybody in Greece tends to be middle class, for there are the proletariats and "the others." (including a very few who are very rich) Rinvoluturi uses the words . . . "when you say 'reunion of the Churches' today." (54) This must be linked with what is printed elsewhere (163). In fact, "the average Greek" is far more keenly aware of *ἐνώσις* than *ἐνότης*. For every Sunday in church he can hear the age-old prayer *ὕπὲρ τῆς ἐνώσεως τῶν πάντων*. The gossip on p. 104 (*κουβά τὸ δάκτυλο*) could have been replaced with the down-to-earth statement that the Church needs the taxpayer's money.

I have noted as mis-spellings Antonopolou (40) and *Ecclesim* (190). There is a wrong page reference to Chrysostomos (not 112 but 113). The Select Bibliography might well have mentioned the good little monograph on Athos by Cavarinos.

London

REX WITT

Dorothy Salisbury Davis, *Enemy and Brother*, novel, Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1966. Pp. 280.

The reason for this novel according to the author was the murder of the reporter George L. Polk, C. B. S. correspondent during the Greek Guerilla War in 1948. This was the only medium, she states, through which she could convey her story although she had at first thought of telling it in non-fictional form. All names are fictitious except for "Markos." It is an excellent piece of work, exceedingly well planned and finely written. The Greece of the early post-war period is most graphically displayed. To the reviewer, with memories of a talk (during the first of many visits to Greece) with the head-man of Asprangeli near Yanina in 1950, the figure of the leader of the bandits Markos, indispensable for the tale here told seems an almost personal bogey. For the head-man pointed to the nearby Albanian frontier and said "Markos is over there and is ever crossing to and fro." The novel goes back to a time when Markos was in a stronger position than a runaway and was not always having to take to his heels. The author believes that "an earnest and open minded reporter died for reasons we are not to know."