

A. M. Papadopoulos, D. Th., 'Ο Ἅγιος Δημήτριος εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν καὶ τὴν Βουλγαρικὴν Παράδοσιν (St. Demetrius in Greek and Bulgarian Tradition), Thessaloniki 1971, pp. 175 + 10 Tables (pp. 175-187).

In this study, A. M. Papadopoulos introduces us to an area of research concerning St. Demetrius which until now no-one had undertaken. It is an area of great importance, but a good deal of preparatory work was needed: the historico-philological researches and studies of the respected Byzantinologist Professor Sigala, who first drew attention to the necessity for a systematic edition of all the hierological texts (encomia, sermons, miracle-accounts etc.) relating to St. Demetrius<sup>1</sup>; the studies of the Academician A. Xyngopoulos<sup>2</sup>; and the late B. Laourdas' edition of several encomia of St. Demetrius. Capitalizing on these preliminary achievements, the author breaks new ground with an original and extremely interesting study devoted to St. Demetrius as he is encountered in the written and oral traditions of Greece and Bulgaria.

The problem as reflected in scholarship and popular tradition is set within its historical context in the Introduction (pp. 11-16), which allows the author to present his bibliography most effectively. The opening chapter is based on the encomia and the hymns to St. Demetrius, which have as their substrate his miracles and martyrdom; through these the author analyzes the Saint's role as a teacher of Orthodoxy, conquering with his instruction the theological and Christological heresies of the Greeks, the Jews, the Manichaeans and the Paulicians, the iconoclasts, and even the «filioque» of the Catholics! Papadopoulos takes an interesting and, I believe, original position on the question of how St. Demetrius, who was martyred in 306 A.D., is able to combat the heresies of later centuries. The matter is perfectly comprehensible, he points out, when viewed within the terms of the Orthodox Church's belief that the saints, as Christ's friends, are present at every event that concerns the Church.

Setting out next to explain how the cult of St. Demetrius was communicated to the Slavs and Bulgarians, the author speaks first of their raids against Thessaloniki. The chapter's title refers to barbarian invasions, the second subtitle to the Slav wars, and the text to invasions of Avaro-Slavs, Proto-bulgarians, Agareni and Bulgarians. In reality, however, it is a question not of wars but of invasions or population shifts, and not of Slavs but of barbarians, unknown tribes with some Slavs and Bulgarians amongst them. There is no detectable Slav initiative—at least in the sources that Papadopoulos uses—that would warrant the characterization of these invasions as Slav. The author has fallen in the same error that even specialists in this period of history fall into: every time there is a population shift in the Balkans (and naturally in Greece as well) involving any one of a number of barbarian tribes, they see it as a Slav invasion. The misinterpretation of the sources here is patent. A more careful re-examination of the Syrian chroniclers, of sixth- to tenth-century historians and of the relevant hagiological texts should disabuse the secondary sources of this fundamental misconception.

Thus the writer gets down to the key section (pp. 61-69) in his study of this period: how did the cult of St. Demetrius spread to the Slavs and Bulgarians? Handling his sources with

1. A. Sigalas, *Ἐκλαϊκευμένα Μελετήματα* (Popularized Studies) I, (Athens 1970), 1-2.

2. A. Xyngopoulos, 'Ο Ἅγιος Δημήτριος εἰς τὴν Βυζαντινὴν Ἀγιογραφίαν (St. Demetrius in Byzantine Hagiography), (Thessaloniki 1946); *Ibid.*, Panegyric Address at the University of Thessaloniki (with the same title), (Thessaloniki 1950); *Ibid.*, 'Ο Εἰκονογραφικὸς Κύκλος τῆς Ζωῆς τοῦ Ἀγίου Δημητρίου (The Iconographic Cycle of the Life of St. Demetrius), (Thessaloniki 1970).

facility, he follows the course of events with a critical mind. Nevertheless, one might have expected an account, in specific terms, of the factors that led to the Slav destruction of the Christian shrines, as well as a precise explanation of how the cult of St. Demetrius passed from Thessaloniki to the Slav countries. For this latter phenomenon presupposes that Christianity had already been conveyed to the countries in question, whereas we know that the first systematic efforts to achieve this did not take place until the reign of Basil I (867-886). I do not question that the contribution of Methodius, Clement and their disciples to the diffusion of the Saint's cult throughout the Slav nation was significant; but they themselves were principally concerned with spreading Christianity, and reverence for the saints was simply a natural corollary of this.

In the case of the Bulgarians in particular, it was through their commercial intercourse with Thessaloniki that they received the cult of St. Demetrius. It caught on to such an extent that they regarded Thessaloniki as their holy city. We do not know when or under what circumstances the Bulgarians were officially confirmed in his cult; we can only accept that this came about with the passing of time, as the rhythm of these exchanges increased and the Bulgarians learned more about the Saint's miracles. Also instrumental were three classes of «forced» migrant: slaves carried from Slav countries to Greece by Byzantine feudal lords, to work their estates and tend their herds; Slav and Bulgarian prisoners of war who later returned to their homelands; and Greek prisoners carried off during the raids against Thessaloniki<sup>1</sup>.

In the third chapter (pp. 70-89) the author discusses the cult of St. Demetrius in the second Bulgarian State (1186-1393), which raised him as a symbol of political and religious independence. When the Normans took Thessaloniki in 1186, the brothers Petris and Asan? (Bulgarians of Vlach extract who had led the Bulgarian uprising against the Greeks earlier in the same year) propagated as the reason for their success the story that the city's patron St. Demetrius had abandoned her because of the citizens' sins. The Bulgarians exploited this rumour, making St. Demetrius a symbol of their kingdom and even issuing coinage that bore his image, as the Byzantines had done. They already had the same reverence for him as the Thessalonians, being orthodox, and they gave out that he was born and bred a Bulgarian.

In time, St. Demetrius rose from defender of Thessaloniki to defender of the Empire. This extension of his sway to the whole empire, such that the Byzantine emperors held him in reverence as the leading patron of the realm, is examined in the fourth chapter (pp. 90-109). The author develops his subject with poise and persuasiveness. He is not quite so convincing, however, in dealing with the theme indicated by the subtitle «St. Demetrius in the formation of Neo-hellenism» (pp. 100-109). The factors that produce a given set of historical conditions are, as we know, objective in character, and St. Demetrius is of no relevance to issues of this nature. The people's reverence for St. Demetrius has been quite unaffected by all this sort of thing. Their faith in him has not varied from the era of his martyrdom until the present day; the form of his cult may have changed—should have changed—but the essence persists unaltered. Hence it is pointless to look for connections between St. Demetrius and neohellenism; the Saint and hellenism were both there from its very beginnings, though they altered in response to the different conditions that characterized each age. Only the laography of neohellenism will show us how St. Demetrius is related to it.

In Chapter Five (pp. 110-131) the author devotes his attention to those outstanding qualities associated with the Saint's personality for which he was also regarded as an example for Orthodox monks. With masterful clarity he analyzes the topic «vision/knowledge of God»

1. Cf. *Patrologia Graeca* CXVI, 1363b-1364a; and the relevant bibliography in Note 91, p. 62 of the present study.

(pp. 114-116), notions that are comprehensible only to an acute and cultivated mind. Keeping only to the main points that he develops in this chapter, the same can be said with regard to his interpretation of the Saint's myrrh (pp. 116-118). These were the characteristics that raised him to the rank of protagonist of Greek Orthodoxy.

Papadopoulos treats in Chapter Six (pp. 132-144) of St. Demetrius in his role as defender of all Greeks from the year 1353, when the Turks first set foot in Europe. And when Turkish rule extended throughout all of Greece, St. Demetrius' participation in the struggle against it found new forms of expression: his encomiasts and hymnographers of this period assure us that with his teachings (p. 135) and miracles (p. 136) he instilled courage into the people. Papadopoulos next looks for signs of St. Demetrius' presence in the life of the Greek people, and the laographical evidence he works from shows how closely the Saint was associated with its every aspect.

In the seventh and final chapter (pp. 146-160) we move on to the Bulgarian traditions regarding St. Demetrius. The author traces them first in Bulgarian literary texts written during the period of Turkish domination. While it is a fact that the Bulgarians based their literary compositions on Byzantine ecclesiastical originals, adapting them to their own circumstances, they nevertheless added many features from the traditions of their race which they had either brought with them from the regions they left or found in their new homelands. Regardless of their intellectual level, it is perfectly natural that this was the only way that they could come to love them and believe them to be their own.

A parallel study of this area of Greek and Bulgarian literature should throw light on many other problems as well. But this can be undertaken only by Greek and Bulgarian specialists in literature, working in amicable co-operation. On the other hand, the first national Bulgarian history written by Paisios Helandarios cannot be regarded as a political history; it is rather a collection based on tribal narratives which Paisios unified into a single corpus under the influence of the Greek enlightenment (1750-1821) —at the time when Eugenius Voulgaris became director of the Athonite Academy (1753-1759), the Greek enlightenment was exerting a productive influence throughout the whole of the Holy Mountain (Mt. Athos), where Paisios lived and wrote his history. For historical reasons, the Bulgarians' national consciousness had not yet been formed and Paisios' history expresses only their racial pride. His call to his compatriots was for an uprising on a racial basis; it constituted the first heraldings of a national alert similar to those being proclaimed at about the same time in other Balkan countries. If Russian panslavic propaganda later travestied Paisios' history (1829), that is quite a separate matter.

In contrast to the literary compositions of the Turkish period, the oral traditions and legends of the Bulgarian people contain frequent references to their relations with the Byzantines, which date from the time of Basil II's subjugation of Bulgaria (976-1025). A proud and insubmissive people, it was natural that they engaged in ceaseless conflict with Byzantine domination; and their struggles gave rise, on another level, to a series of traditions which Paisios was later to incorporate into his history. From the middle of the last century until the Second World War Bulgarian chauvinism brandished these traditions like a red flag in order to incite a national hatred against Greece.

For all that, the Bulgarians did not cease to revere St. Demetrius and to look to him as their protector in difficult hours, in the same way as the Thessalonians and all other Greeks. Moreover, the fact that the Bulgarians regard St. Demetrius as their own indicates how deeply rooted his cult has become in the Bulgarian popular soul; so ingrained is their faith in him that he has left a clear impression on numerous aspects of their popular culture, and they entertain not the slightest suspicion that he is a saint imported from a foreign country.

I feel that the author ought to have traced the traditions and legends around St. Demetrius from the time when the Bulgarians officially adopted him and raised him as their standard during the Asenobite revolution (1014-1188), since his intimate association with their everyday Christian lives dates from that period. Just as the Greek people's mythologizing imagination and deep-seated belief in St. Demetrius prompted them to attribute visions and happenings of all kinds to him, weaving a whole cycle of legends and stories around his life, so we ought to accept that the Bulgarians did the same. From the moment when Greeks and Bulgarians found themselves in the same historical situation during the years of Turkish rule, with the patriarchate of Constantinople as head of their ecclesiastical administration and Orthodoxy the essential link between them, both peoples revered the Saint in roughly the same way. It was this consideration that led me, when speaking earlier of Bulgarian literature in the Turkish period, to give voice to the need for a comparative study of Greek and Bulgarian popular cultures which would show how much each people took and how much each gave, and thus deliver us from quite a few historical illusions. Only a joint attempt by Greek and Bulgarian specialists could tackle such a project, and the time for such a joint undertaking has not yet come.

For all the objections that we have raised, and for all the reservations we might still entertain, Papadopoulos' work is unquestionably creditable from every aspect. His handling of sources shows that he is capable of both clear thinking and critical reflexion. It is also to his credit that this study is based in part upon archive research; he has gone to Bulgaria, dusted libraries and archives, and mingled with the Bulgarian people. Many of his observations are important for precisely this reason, and they often contain implications—not to say obligations—which should be noted by both Greek and Bulgarian specialists. To Mr. Papadopoulos belongs the honour of having posed the problem of St. Demetrius in Greek and Bulgarian oral and written tradition. And as some ancient said, «the biggest part of every job is the start».

*Thessaloniki*

YANNIS TSARAS

Ioannis A. Papadrianos, *Ένας Μεγάλος Κοζανίτης Ἀπόδημος: Εὐφρόνιος Ραφαήλ Παπαγιαννούσης-Πόποβιτς* (A Great Emigré from Kozani: Euphronios Raphael Papayannousis-Popovich), Publications of the «Letters and Arts Society» of the Nomos of Kozani, No. 9, Thessaloniki 1973, pp. 37.

The Macedonian scholar Euphronios Raphael Papayannousis-Popovich (1772-1853) spent most of his active life in central Europe and the northern states of the then Turkish Balkan Peninsula, and his contribution to the emigré Hellenism of these regions was considerable. This study of his life and work, by the noted Balkanologist and Fellow of Thessaloniki's Institute for Balkan Studies Ioannis Papadrianos, is of particular significance in that its author has researched the archives of Kozani and Belgrade and presents a wealth of new data drawn from unpublished sources.

Directing his attention at the start to the Macedonian emigré's family background, Papadrianos maintains that Euphronios' father Demetrius Papayannousis was born at Servia in Western Macedonia in the year 1750, and not 1736 as has been believed hitherto. Demetrius left Servia in his youth, going to Kozani where he was ordained a priest and where his only son was born—Chariton or Charisios, a name he was later to change to Euphronios Raphael. Going over the sources carefully, the author of the present study proves that Euphro-