

Abstracts

PETER CHARANIS

THE SLAVS, BYZANTIUM, AND THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIRST BULGARIAN KINGDOM

The author of this paper makes a number of points: that Slavic settlements in Greece proper, including the Peloponnesus, and the inner coastal regions of the northern Aegean, were established in the last two decades of the sixth century; that the Slavs involved were numerous, but probably not as numerous as is generally believed; that despite their proneness to violence, they adjusted early to their new environment, gave themselves to the arts of peace, and began to succumb to the cultural influences of the Greeks; that in the penetration of this influence among them, the milieu, i.e. the native population which had survived the invasions, played an important role; that this penetration was accelerated by the more effective administrative system introduced by Byzantium and by the conversion of the Slavs to Christianity; and that finally the regions involved became again Greek in character, however that character might have been affected by the invasions late in the sixth century. This point has also been made, that the creation of the Bulgar state in the interior of the Balkan peninsula in the seventh century, its expansion westward to include the Slavs of upper Macedonia and beyond, the fusion between Bulgars and Slavs, and the development of a national tradition among the Slavs of these regions rendered these regions definitely Slavic. The failure of Byzantium to impose its authority on the Slavs of the interior of the Balkan peninsula and little by little bring about their Byzantinization as it did with the Slavs of the coastal regions is to be attributed in the final analysis to the persistent opposition of the First Bulgarian Kingdom and the role which that kingdom played in the formation of these Slavs into a people. Herein lies its historical significance.

ZACHARIAS N. TSIRPANLIS

GEORGES KRIŽANIĆ ET SES RELATIONS AVEC LE MONDE GREC

The object of this study is to ascertain whether the father of panslavism, the well-known Croatian cleric and scholar, was acquainted with the Greek language and culture and how much this knowledge influenced his writing.

Combining new facts from the archives of the Curia Provinciale della Compagnia di Gesù (Roma) and the Greek College of Rome with evidence collected from other sources, the writer is led to the following conclusions:

a) G. Križanić was a student of the Greek College of Saint Athanasios in Rome for 17 months, from May 1641 to September 1642.

b) During his studies he worked together with over 15 Greek students, coming from Chios, Cyprus, Crete, Macedonia and Thessaly. There were P. Ligaridis, Dem. Papanos, John and Hieronymos-Illarion Kigalas, Nicholaos Logothetis, David Papadimos, Basil Tzagarolos and others.

c) He managed to obtain permission to hold masses according to the Orthodox-Byzantine ritual, as was the custom of the church of the College.

d) He had quite satisfactorily familiarized himself both with the Greek patristic texts and the antipontifical works of the Greek theologians, and with the Greek language spoken at that time.

The education which he acquired within the Greek environment helped him to utilize later sources written in Greek; some of them he tried to translate as well.

Specifically, while it is doubtful whether Križanić directly utilized texts by Byzantine writers, it is also true that he translated works by mainly post-Byzantine Greek theologians.

This conviction has been secured by the study of an unpublished large volume of his, entitled *Bibliotheca Schismaticorum Universa*. In it Križanić has inserted translations he had made from Greek texts written by the following writers: Meletios Pigas the protosyncellus, afterwards Patriarch of Alexandria (16th cent.); the theologian from Chios, George Coressios (17th cent.); Gabriel Seviros (16th-17th cent.), the Bishop of Philadelphia; Maximos Margounios (16th cent.); Nilos Kavassilas (14th cent.), the Archbishop of Thessaloniki; the monk Varlaam Calavros (14th cent.); the Athenian scholar Nathanael Chika

(early 17th cent.); and the Patriarch Fotios (9th cent.).

It can be proved moreover that the Croatian scholar was acquainted with the works of Gregory Palamas and George Gennadios Scholarios, which he had planned to translate.

Also he had a knowledge and utilized the works of the contemporary latinist Greeks Peter Arkudios, John-Matthew Karyophilis and Leon Allatios.

In conclusion, the education of Križanić owes much to the deep study of the Greek texts of the late Byzantine, and especially the post-Byzantine age and, moreover, thanks to his personal friendships and ties with many Greeks he managed to get well acquainted with the contemporary Greek world.

KITSOS A. MAKRIS

CHALCOGRAPHIES GRECQUES AUX PAYS BALKANIQUES PENDANT LE XIX^e SIÈCLE

Copper-engraving was widely practiced by the Balkan peoples for the reproduction of a large number of copies of hagiographic compositions and Saints' portraits. Especially on Mt. Athos there arose considerable use of this popularized form of art. At first engraved copper plates were ordered from European artists, but by the end of the 18th century there appear many Greek engravers, who impart to their works a more popular character. Many of these engravings have bilingual inscriptions, in Greek and a Slavonic language, because they circulated throughout the Balkan Peninsula. This resulted in the spreading and copying of many hagiographic themes, not only traditional ones but more modern ones too, such as Neomartyrs' portraits. A typical example is St. George of Jannina, who was martyred in 1838. A few years after his martyrdom, copper engravings were in circulation representing him full-length in *foustanella* and fez. These engravings also gave rise to a wooden icon from the village of Kuklen, which is on display in the palace of the Metropolitan of Philippopolis. We are here dealing with an adaptation of an engraved model to painting techniques.

ATHANASIOS A. ANGELOPOULOS

DIMITRIOS TSAMIS KARATASOS

A SYMBOL OF GREEK, SERBIAN AND BULGARIAN FRIENDSHIP

Two Serbian texts extol the contribution of Dimitrios Tsamis Karatasos to the Balkan joint effort to throw off the Ottoman yoke. These texts are analysed by the author within the historical framework of their period, so that the man's personality and work may be accurately evaluated from a fresh viewpoint.

More specifically, the author conducts a research on the tombstone of Dimitrios Tsamis Karatasos, which he discovered himself at Naoussa, and the octet engraved on it, which is also published here. The work is illustrated by seven plates, of which four have not been published previously.

CONSTANTIN PAPOULIDIS

LE PATRIARCHE ŒCUMÉNIQUE SÉRAPHEIM II ET LES RUSSES

In the first part of his study the author presents, within a general framework, the external policies of Russia towards the Ottoman Empire and the fulfilment of the Greeks' desire for liberation from the Turkish yoke during the second half of the 18th century.

In the second part he studies the main points in the biography of the Ecumenical Patriarch Seraphim II (1757-1761) which are related to the external politics of Russia, in order to establish his reputation as a Russophile.

CHARALAMBOS K. PAPASTATHIS

ZUR VERBREITUNG DER «HEXABIBLOS» DES HARMENOPOULOS
IM SLAWISCHEN RAUM

Constantinos Armenopoulos' *Ἑξάβιβλος*, chronologically the last private Byzantine codification (Thessaloniki 1345) enjoyed widespread dissemination in the post-Byzantine period. It was employed by the

courts of the Ecumenical Patriarchate to resolve private differences among the multi-ethnic Orthodox flock of the Balkans. Given that the official language of the Patriarchate was Greek, it was not necessary to translate the *Ἑξάβιβλος* for the Serbs and Bulgars of the Ottoman Empire; but this necessity existed for the Serbs of Austro-Hungary. At the instigation of Stefan Stratimirović, Archbishop of Karlovci, Petar Vitković, the priest of Eger (in Hungary), accomplished the translation (1797-1798). Because of the Serbian rebellion (1804) and after other troubles, the translation remained unpublished. The *Ἑξάβιβλος* was translated into Russian by Spyridon Destounis and saw five editions (1831, 1850, 1854, 1904, and 1908); this was because it had authority as civil law in Bessarabia, which from 1812 to 1918 belonged to Russia. In the other parts of the Russian Empire, the *Ἑξάβιβλος* was used as an interpretative aid for certain chapters of the *Kormčaja kniga*.

IOANNIS A. PAPADRIANOS

DER GRIECHISCHE GELEHRTE GEORGIOS ZACHARIADIS UND SEIN BEITRAG ZUM SLAWISCHEN SCHRIFTTUM IM 19. JAHRHUNDERT

Among the Greek scholars who lived during the 19th century in the north-eastern Balkans, and also in Central Europe, and by their work contributed to the spiritual development of the Balkan Slavs, pride of place must be given to Georgios Zachariadis. Unfortunately, however, no detailed monograph on Zachariadis exists. On this account the problems that arise concerning the life and activities of this Greek scholar are still many and varied. In his study the author tries to fill one part of this lacuna.

At the beginning of the work the following are examined, on the basis of new historical evidence: the date and place of Georgios Zachariadis' birth, his studies and tenure as teacher in the Greek school at Zemun, the Serbian school at Šabac, and the Greek school in Vienna. The author continues his study by analyzing the various works of Zachariadis, which are written on Old Church Slavonic, and the translations this Greek scholar made from Greek into Old Church Slavonic. Finally, the extent of Georgios Zachariadis' contribution to Slavonic letters is made clear.

SOTIRIOS KISSAS

ICONS OF A KOZANI MENOLOGION

In this study are presented four small double-faced icons from the collection in the Public Library of Kozani, which are decorated with thirty-two scenes from the *Menologion*. After a description of the icons, there follows a study of the subjects which are of particular iconographic interest. Then are given some observations on technique. On the basis of their Slavonic inscriptions and details of artistic method, the icons are ascribed to Christophe Žefarović, one of the greatest artists in the Balkans in the first half of the 18th century.

There follows a general review of Žefarović's artistic output, concerning the artist's relations with the Metropolis of Sremski Karlovci and also with the Greeks of the Diaspora; finally his relations with the Greeks from Kozani who lived abroad are examined, the problem of his influence on the artists of northern Greece is posed, and the Balkan character of his work is emphasized.

The Kozani icons, painted about 1730, constitute Žefarović's earliest work.

JEAN TARNANIDÈS

ÉTUDE COMPARÉE DES JOURNAUX *EPHÉMÉRIS* ET *SERBSKIJA*
NOVINi, ÉDITÉS À VIENNE PAR LES FRÈRES GRECS
 MARCIDÈS POULIOU, PENDANT LES ANNÉES 1791-1792

The brothers Markidis Pouliou managed to bring into circulation a Greek newspaper, from 31st December 1791, and a Serbian newspaper, from 14th March 1792. A comparison between these two newspapers is of great interest, since they were published at the same time and by the same editors and directed at two groups of people of different origin and national consciousness who nonetheless lived in the same political and cultural environment, and who in many circumstances had the same problems, yet in others found their interests clashing. Especially interesting, of course, are the articles which concerned some of their common struggles or, conversely, some point of difference between them.

With the above observations as motive, but also as a measure for

this short study, we may draw up several principles which seem to have been accepted in the relations between the two papers:

1. In general, the Serbian paper was dependent upon the Greek one.
2. Articles taken from the general European press were translated by a group of polyglots into Greek and from Greek were rendered into Serbian. This is why these articles, like others of more general interest were as a rule printed first in the *Ephimeris* and only three days later in the *Serbskija Novini*.

3. For local news, coming from a particular area in the Balkans or concerning only one of the communities, each paper was largely independent of the other: thus there were articles printed only by the Greek or only by the Serbian paper.

4. Articles which concerned the relations of the two communities were printed with slight variations so as not to offend the national pride or prestige of the readers.

The conclusion of this parallel study is that these papers, which sprang from a certain intellectual presence of the two peoples in Austria, exerted an important influence on their readers and helped to make them conscious of their power and to further their intellectual development.

CHRISTINA BOULAKI-ZISSI

ILARION OF TÄRNOVO AND THE RENAISSANCE IN BULGARIA DURING THE FIRST DECADES OF THE 19th CENTURY

One of the main characteristics of the Bulgarian renaissance was the attempt to create a national Church. In order to justify this, a host of accusations were fabricated against the clergy of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Not even Ilarion, Metropolitan of Tärnovó was exempt from these accusations. However, slandering Ilarion was no easy matter. There is a great body of historical information and evidence which has obliged conscientious Bulgarian historians to recognize Ilarion as one of the prime movers of the Bulgarian renaissance.

This evidence is, briefly, as follows: the most important pioneer of the renaissance, Aprilóv, knowing of the favourable disposition of the metropolitan towards the Bulgarian enlightenment, entrusted to him

the choice of a suitable person to direct the first Bulgarian school at Gabrovo. Ilarion chose the highly capable monk Neophytos of Rila. He personally interested himself in the organization of the school, whose operation he followed closely. He directed Neophytos to draw up teaching manuals in Bulgarian as well as a Bulgarian grammar. He also assigned to him the translation of the New Testament into Bulgarian, and went on to provide financial support for the work. Both Aprilov and Neophytos expressed themselves eulogistically concerning the metropolitan. He also provided for the construction and operation of a Bulgarian school in Tărnovo, as well as a Bulgarian church, in which services were enacted in Old Church Slavonic. He himself donated two icons to this church. He supported Pavel Vaskinović while the latter translated the New Testament, and bought Bulgarian teaching manuals from Christakis Pavlović in order to distribute them to poor Bulgarian children. He chose as his colleagues Bulgarian clerics, who lived with him in the metropolitanate building and directed from it the work of the enlightenment of the Bulgarians.

This evidence is unshakeable and indisputable; and since on the basis of it Ilarion appears as a true Christian shepherd, who cared for the spiritual enlightenment of his flock without taking into consideration national or racial distinctions, the attempt by certain historians to present Ilarion's interest as hypocritical is destroyed. It is shown up as being without foundation and in bad faith by the publication, by V.Sphyroeras, of two letters of Ilarion to the Patriarch and the Synod. In these letters Ilarion placed the work of the enlightenment of the people on a wider foundation. He believed that the Eastern Orthodox Church always cared for the cultural advance of the people, and on that account permitted the translation of the Scriptures into their language, in contrast to the Western Church which forbade translations. Ilarion himself translated the New Testament into modern Greek. This shows that he was by conviction in favour of the spiritual enlightenment of Christians, beyond all national or racial discrimination.

The epitaph on the marble slab which covers the tomb of the metropolitan in Tărnovo, written in Greek and Old Church Slavonic, best expresses the views and feelings of the Bulgarians of the time. There it says that it is in vain that the stone covers the metropolitan's corpse, for his soul is among the choirs of the just.

G R. T H. S T A T H I S

IOASAPH RILIOTES ET SES «EXÉGÉSEIS»
A CERTAINES COMPOSITIOS BYZANTINES

The manuscript codices Nos. 132 and 145 of Byzantine music in the Monastery of Xenophon, on Mt. Athos, contain, among others, compositions of «Ioasaph, Proigoumenos of Rila». These compositions in fact make up Ioasaph's «exegeses» of older Byzantine chants with more detailed notation. These two codices also contain a few chants in Slavonic. This fact, and the testimony «from the work of Isaiah Philippidis, 1817 at Rila», which is written on two other musical codices from the Monastery of Xenophon, Nos. 142 and 152, fixes the provenance of these codices in the famous Bulgarian monastery of Rila. These four codices are similar in their outward appearance, their handwriting and their content; they were written we may say, by the same copyist in about 1800. It is clear from the writing that this man was a Greek who knew Slavonic, rather than a Slav or a Bulgar who knew Greek; and in all probability, since the codices contain the exegeses of Ioasaph Riliotis, which I have yet to meet in other musical codices, the writer must himself be the martyred «Ioasaph Proigoumenos of Rila» (Xenophon 132, 19b, 145, 7b and 62a-b) or «Ioasaph Riliotis» (Xenophon 132, 32b).

Of the life and musical work of Ioasaph, it is known only that he remained for some time on Mt. Athos and that he had a wide knowledge of Byzantine notation, which he taught his pupils in Rila. In 1816 he was for six months a pupil of Chourmouzos Chartophylax, one of the three inventors of the New Method of analytic notation (Constantinople, 1814). After learning the New Method and obtaining suitable manuscripts, he returned to Rila and taught his pupils the New Method of writing and intoning Byzantine chants. Thus Ioasaph led the way towards Bulgarian acceptance of the New Method of Byzantine notation.

Ioasaph's exegetic work concerns Byzantine chants of which, both before and after him, other music teachers in various places gave exegeses. A comparative study of these exegeses demonstrates the evolutionary course followed by Byzantine notation until its reform in the New Method of 1814, but also the stereotype of the Byzantine chant, which was preserved intact in form through all the attempts at exegesis of the old Byzantine notation.

What is both obvious and important is that Byzantine notation before 1814 was summary, and that Byzantine chant consisted in much

more than the phonetic signs alone show; it was this that was recorded in detailed form but in similar form by the «exegetes» and finally by the three teachers of the New Method in 1814. Apart from this, the exegesis, as also the intonation, of the Byzantine chant (as the exegesises make clear) was the same everywhere that Byzantine worship existed, and not just a practice of music teachers of Constantinople, especially Peter Peloponnesios, as is erroneously believed. Ioasaph Riliotis and his «exegesises» are witness to this, at least as far as Bulgaria is concerned.