

THE NATIONAL REGENERATION OF THE GREEKS AS SEEN BY THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA

In this article I intend to examine not Tsarist Russia's attitude to the Greek War of Independence of 1821¹, but a phenomenon of rather greater historical moment and duration: the "national regeneration" of the Greeks, by which I mean the restoration of the Greek people's free political life, the establishment of a free state, and the development of a new cultural life within the framework of this state. Needless to say, this renaissance was a lengthy process, beginning in the middle of the eighteenth century or earlier and lasting almost until the final decades of the nineteenth century, by which time the life of the newly established state had stabilised both politically and culturally. Apart from the intentions and plans of Tsarist Russia's capital, St Petersburg, to rouse the Greeks to cast off the Turkish yoke, and apart from any coldly calculated ulterior imperialist motives on Russia's part, there were also the reactions of individuals or isolated groups in Russia, who, whether or not they had anything to do with their country's foreign policy, nonetheless exhibited that freedom of thought, action, and criticism which inward speculation and an endeavour to make a free and impartial assessment of the prevailing historical situation has always granted to intellectuals all over the world. I shall discuss a number of such cases, and the general title will embrace

1. There is a considerable body of literature relating to Russia's political connection with the Greek War of Independence, chiefly in the Russian language. One fundamental work is G. L. Arsh's, *Eteristskoe dvizhenie v Rossii: Osvoboditel'naja bor'ba grecheskogo naroda v nachale XIX v. i russko-grecheskie svyazi* (Moscow, 1970). More recent writings are mentioned in K. Papoulidis's article, «Ἡ Ρωσία καὶ ἡ ἑλληνικὴ Ἐπανάσταση τοῦ 1821-1822: Μὲ ἀφορμὴ τὴν πρόσφατη δημοσίευση ἐγγράφων ἀπὸ τὰ ἀρχεῖα τῆς ἐξωτερικῆς πολιτικῆς τῆς Ρωσίας», which was first published in *Βαλκανικά Σύμμεικτα*, 2 (1983), 185-203, and republished in the author's collected studies titled *Ἑλληνορωσικά: Συλλογὴ μελετῶν ἐλληνορωσικῶν θεμάτων παιδείας καὶ πολιτισμοῦ τῆς μεταβυζαντινῆς καὶ νεότερης ἐποχῆς* (Thessaloniki, 1988), pp. 79-91. Papoulidis lists all the known literature, including studies by Greek scholars and Greek translations of Russian works. Cf. also T. Prousis, "Russian Philorthodox Relief during the Greek War of Independence", *Modern Greek Studies Year-book*, 1 (1985), 31-63.

several individual subjects, which, though they may for the moment seem unconnected with each other, do in fact share a common aspect — the Russian intellectual's attitude towards the creation of a free Greek state.

First of all, we must clearly understand one fundamental point relating to the Russian world's attitude to the Greeks' political independence. Russia was a great power at the time, and linked to the unredeemed Greeks by one common factor. This was Orthodoxy. The Western world viewed the Fall of Constantinople and the end of the Byzantine Empire from the point of view of its own political and religious expediency. The Eastern empire had been alienated from it for centuries, and the theocratic Western societies regarded the Easterners as schismatics, cut off from Rome, the greatest religious centre of the West. As soon as the Turkish conquest in Asia Minor started to weaken the Byzantine Empire, the Western states returned with renewed vigour to their conquering policy, which had first seen the light ages before under the pretext of the Crusades. Thus, by the time the Turkish conquest was complete, much of Greek territory was already in Western hands. Each and every offer to help save Constantinople from the Turks was backed by an ulterior political or religious motive of the Western world, which for the most part was quite indifferent to whether or not the Orthodox Christian Greeks came under the Islamic yoke. After the Fall, the Western powers policy opposed any effort to re-establish the Byzantine Empire, for in Byzantium's resurrection they clearly foresaw a powerful economic and political rival in the East, and generally a restraining force upon their own political power in the East Mediterranean.

Russia, however, presented a rather different picture, though it was not without ulterior motives of its own. The Russians had received Christianity from the Byzantines and remained linked to them for centuries under the spiritual leadership of the Patriarch of Constantinople². From the beginning of the eleventh century onwards, all hostilities between Russians and Byzantines ceased. Until the eighteenth century, Russia showed no substantial interest in extending its influence to the Middle East. Byzantium, despite all the criticism voiced in Russia, remained its spiritual teacher. The Fall of Constantinople came at a time when the great Principality of Moscow was waxing strong. When news of the Fall reached Moscow, the Russians' com-

2. From its conversion to Christianity in 988 until 1433, Russia was a metropolitanate of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. See J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 73-95.

mon consciousness was well prepared to receive it in the context of a mystical interpretation and messianic revelation of history. The Westerners regarded the destruction of the Hellenic Empire as a consequence of the Greeks' refusal to unite with Rome and thereby ensure the military support of the West³. The Russians interpretation of the same event was exactly the opposite. According to the view which had been fostered in Russia, Constantinople had fallen precisely because the Greek Church had signed the union with Rome in 1439. Byzantium had thus fallen into heresy, and the Fall had come as divine retribution⁴. It was this conviction, together with other historical circumstances, which brought forth the theory of the Third Rome: namely that after ancient Rome had fallen into heresy, followed by the Second Rome, Constantinople, there was only Moscow left in the world to defend Orthodoxy and Eastern Christianity⁵.

During the sixteenth century, Russia evolved into a great political and military power, with a strong awareness of its own supremacy and authority. Nonetheless, the Greek world continued to occupy an important place in the Russian consciousness, and never more so than when, from the mid-sixteenth to almost the end of the seventeenth century, the by now independent Russian Orthodox Church endured considerable intervention by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other Eastern patriarchates⁶. Though its political force was spent, Byzantium was still a spiritual empire, at the very pinnacle of which sat the Patriarch of Constantinople, the only authority capable of being the

3. Cf. S. Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 160-80. How deeply rooted in the Western Roman Catholic consciousness is the conviction that the Orthodox Church's refusal to unite with Rome brought about the historical necessity of its subjugation by the Turks was made clear in 1956, when, after the Turkish atrocities against the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Greeks in Constantinople, Pope Pius XII made statements which clearly implied that the Greeks' fate would have been different had they remained united with Rome.

4. See E. E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoj Cerkvi*, vol. II, 1 (Moscow, 1900), pp. 508-13. Cf. G. Papamichael, *Μάξιμος ὁ Γραικός, ὁ πρῶτος φωτιστής τῶν Ρώσων* (Athens, 1950), pp. 273-86.

5. Concerning the theory of the Third Rome, see H. Schaeder's fundamental work, *Moskau das dritte Rom: Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorien in der slawischen Welt* (Darmstadt, 1956). Cf. W. K. Medlin, *Moscow and East Rome: A Political Study of the Relations of Church and State in Muscovite Russia* (Geneva, 1952); *Roma, Constantinopoli-Mosca*, Da Roma alla Terza Roma: Documenti e Studi, Studi I, Seminario 21 Aprile 1981 (Naples, 1983); Papamichael, *Μάξιμος ὁ Γραικός*, 286-301.

6. See N. Kapterev, *Xarakter otnoshenii Rossii k pravoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stoletijax* (Sergiev Posad, 1914). Cf. C. Papadopoulos, *Οἱ πατριάρχαι Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς πνευματικοὶ χειραγωγοὶ τῆς Ρωσίας κατὰ τὸν 15' αἰῶνα* (Jerusalem, 1907).

determining factor in the re-establishment of the subjugated Empire. This was because the Patriarch's extensive spiritual jurisdiction could, at a given moment in history, be transmuted into political jurisdiction and transferred to some other instrument of power. Empress Catherine II was intelligent enough to realise this, when, to further her plans to overthrow the Ottoman Empire, she began to make use of such eminent Greek clerics as Patriarch Seraphim II of Constantinople, Evgenios Voulgaris, and Nikiforos Theotokis⁷.

Catherine's interest and her plans for the Ottoman Empire fuelled the legends and prophecies in the Greek East about the Greeks' liberation at the hands of the "fair race", i.e. the Russians⁸. Needless to say, neither the Greek nor the Russian masses had a very clear idea about the more remote consequences of Russian intervention, nor yet whether Constantinople, which was the focus of all these dreams, would eventually come under Russian or Greek power. An ardent desire for deliverance, a lively enthusiasm, and an impatience for the moment of liberation left little room for considerations relating to the distant future. The essential thing was that the enslaved Nation should rise up. The eighteenth century ran red with the blood of Greek neomartyrs⁹, who laid down their lives in their refusal to accept Islam. But this

7. See A.E. Vacalopoulos, *Ίστορία τοῦ νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, vol. IV (Thessaloniki, 1973), pp. 457-64; S. T. Batalden, *Catherine II's Greek Prelate: Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia 1771-1806* (New York, 1982), incl. bibliography.

8. In the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century books of prophecies (χρησιμολόγια) the "fair race" seems to have been identified with the Latins, and only later come to designate the Russians. See M. Laskaris, *Τὸ Ἀνατολικὸν Ζήτημα. 1800-1923* (Thessaloniki, 1948), pp. 233-6. Cf. Vacalopoulos, *Ίστορία*, IV, 269-75. Concerning oracles and prophecies relating to the liberation of Constantinople and the re-establishment of Byzantium, see V. Corovich, "Eine Prophezeiung über den Untergang des türkischen Reiches aus dem XVIII Jahrhundert", *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XXX (1909), 312-13; G. I. Zaviras, *Νέα Ἑλλάς ἡ θέατρον πολιτικόν* (Athens, 1972), pp. 390-2; G. T. Zoras, «Δύο προφητεῖαι περὶ ἀπελευθέρωσης τοῦ Βυζαντίου», *Byzantion*, XXXIII (1963), 473-82; D. Doikos, «Ὁ Ἀγαθάγγελος ὡς προφητικὸν ἀποκαλυπτικὸν ἔργον καὶ τὸ μήνυμά του», *Μνήμη 1821: Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς τὴν ἔθνικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν ἐπὶ τῇ 150ῇ ἐπετείῳ*, University of Thessaloniki, *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἑπετηρὶς Θεολογικῆς Σχολῆς*, Appendix No 9 of vol. XVI (Thessaloniki, 1971), pp. 7-61, 93-126; V. Mutafchieva, "Predskazaniyata' za kraja na Osmanskata imperija (kām vāprosa za rusko-balkanskite kulturni vārzki prez XIX vek)", *Studia Balcanica*, 8 (1974), 109-16; and A. Argyriou's seminal work, *Les Exégèses grecques de l'Apocalypse à l'époque turque (1453-1821)* (Thessaloniki, 1981).

9. A great deal has been written about the neomartyrs, and in recent years scholars' interest in discovering and studying further neomartyrs has increased considerably. The basic source remains Nicodemus the Hagiorite's, *Νέον μαρτυρολόγιον, ἧτοι μαρτυρία τῶν νεοφανῶν μαρτύρων τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς καὶ τόπους μαρτυρησάντων*. The first edition was published in Venice in 1799; the

sacrificial attitude gradually began to give way to a more fighting spirit; no longer passive resistance to the tyrant's oppression, but a struggle for the resurrection of the Nation¹⁰.

This shift is evident in the little-known martyrdom of a young man named Anastasios from Delvino in northern Epirus¹¹, who was put to death in 1756 for his Christian faith. The account of his martyrdom is followed by that of a very interesting and touching vision. Regrettably, nothing at all has been written about this neomartyr (who must not be confused with Anastasios of Ioannina, who was martyred in 1743)¹²; an account of his martyrdom does exist in Greek Athonite manuscripts, but it has never been investigated nor has a critical study of it ever been undertaken¹³. The story goes as follows. The Turks of Delvino tried to convert the young Anastasios to Islam, but failed. They then carried lies about him to the Turkish official of the region, who ordered his execution. The official's son, a close friend of Anastasios, was present at the execution, which so stirred his soul that he repaired to the monastery where Anastasios had been buried and was baptised there, taking the name of Daniel. From the monastery, he then went to Corfu, intending to sail to Constantinople, present himself to the Grand Vizier, and announce his conversion, in the hope of being martyred himself, as his friend had been at the hands of his father. Once arrived in Constantinople, he met a spiritual elder, to whom he confessed his intentions. But instead of encouraging him, the elder counselled him to retire to a monastic cell and remain there at prayer

second in Athens in 1856; and the third, again in Athens, in 1961. A new, voluminous publication comprises the martyrologies of Nicodemus, Macarius Notaras, Nicephore of Chios, and Athanasius Parios: *Συναξαριστής νεομαρτύρων*, edited by A. Margaris, second edition (Thessaloniki, 1989). Cf. S. Solov'ev, *Xristianskie mucheniki, postradavshie na vostokey* (St Petersburg, 1862); I. I. Sokolov, *Konstantinopol'skaja Cerkov v XIX veke* (St Petersburg, 1904), pp. 48-56; I. Perantonis, *Λεξικὸν τῶν νεομαρτύρων*, 3 vols (Athens, 1972); I. Anastasiou, «Σχεδιάσμα περὶ τῶν νεομαρτύρων», *Μνήμη 1821*, 9-61 and *Πρακτικὰ Θεολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου εἰς τιμὴν καὶ μνήμην τῶν Νεομαρτύρων (17-19 Νοεμβρίου 1986)*, published by the Metropolis of Thessaloniki (Thessaloniki, 1988).

10. Cf. Vacalopoulos, *Ἱστορία*, IV, 734-43.

11. Concerning this small northern Epirot town, which was a flourishing spiritual centre during the period of Turkish domination, see V. Baras, *Τὸ Δέλβινο τῆς βορείου Ἠπείρου καὶ οἱ γειτονικὲς του περιοχὲς*, with a foreword by the book's editor, L. I. Vranousis (Athens, 1966). It is surprising that such an exhaustive study should completely ignore Anastasios the neomartyr.

12. Concerning the neomartyr Anastasios of Ioannina, see Nicodemus the Hagiorite, *Νέον μαρτυρολόγιον* (1961 ed.), 131-2.

13. In the manuscripts, which are listed in the next note, Daniel's vision precedes Anastasios's martyrdom.

until God showed him what he should do. Daniel followed this advice, and three days later was vouchsafed a vision, which he recounts himself¹⁴. In the vision, his martyred friend Anastasios appeared to him, took him by the hand, and led him to a Turkish mosque, saying: "Do you see this mosque? Here once stood the Church of All Saints"¹⁵. The two friends entered the church, where they found the saints foregathered; and all went forth together in an unending procession to the Church of the Twelve Apostles¹⁶. Awaiting them there were the Twelve Apostles and Saints Constantine and Helen, holding the Cross in their hands. The procession went from there to the Fanar, where

14. The oldest known manuscript to preserve the vision seems to be MS No 5 in the private collection of the family of Georgios and Alexandros Grammatikos in Thessaloniki: it is a copy of an Athonite manuscript and is dated to 1821, the year the Greek War of Independence broke out. The title of the text is as follows: «Ὁπτασία τινὸς Δανιὴλ μοναχοῦ, ὁποῦ εἶδεν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐν ἔτει σωτηρίῳ 1764: νοεμβρίῳ 18» (The Vision of one Daniel, a monk, which he saw in Constantinople on 18 November in the year of Our Lord 1764); *incipit*: «Ἐγὼ ὁ ἐν μοναχοῖς ἐλάχιστος Δανιὴλ ἐνδιατρίβων εἰς τοὺς Κορφοὺς χάριν τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ Σπυρίδωνος...» (I, the least of monks, Daniel, sojourning at Corfu, by the grace of the wonder-working Spyridon...); *desinit*: «...ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκον τὸ ψαλτήριον» (...they departed for the church and read aloud the Psalter). See also A. Sigalas, *Ἀπὸ τὴν πνευματικὴν ζωὴν τῶν ἐλληνικῶν κοινοτήτων τῆς Μακεδονίας*, vol. I. *Ἀρχεῖα καὶ βιβλιοθήκαι δυτικῆς Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki, 1939), p. 154; and p. 21 for a description of MS No 34 of the Municipal Library of Kozani, a miscellany, fols 1092-1102 of which contain precisely the same text. This codex is a compilation of a number of separate MSS, and unfortunately Sigalas does not date the part which contains the Vision. Indirect evidence suggests that this MS is later than the one belonging to the Grammatikos family. The Vision of Daniel is also preserved in the following Athonite MSS: i) No 115 (694) of Koutloumousiou Monastery, dated to the beginning of the nineteenth century (L. Politis, *Συμπληρωματικοὶ κατάλογοι χειρογράφων τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους* (Thessaloniki, 1973), p. 64); ii) No 85-4 of the year 1844 of the kyriakon of the Skete of St Anne (Gerasimos Mikragiannanitis, monk, *Κατάλογος χειρογράφων κωδίκων τῆς βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Κυριακοῦ τῆς κατὰ τὸ Ἁγιώννυμον Ὁρος τοῦ Ἁθῶ καὶ Μεγαλονύμιον Σκήτης τῆς Ἀγ. Θεομήτορος Ἀννης* (Athens, 1961), p. 220); iii) No 335 of Zografou Monastery, 18th c.; iv) No 581 of Grigoriou Monastery, 18th c.; containing only texts relating to the restoration of Byzantium; v) Nos 161, 204, and 281 of Panteleimon Monastery, all dating from the 19th c. The last of these MSS gives Daniel's previous name as Mousas, and says that he was a Pasha's son. See S. P. Lambros, *Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς βιβλιοθήκαις τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὁρους ἐλληνικῶν κωδίκων* (Cambridge, 1885), vol. I, pp. 32, 49; vol. II, pp. 308, 328, 349. A version of the account of Anastasios's martyrdom, based on the MS of the Skete of St Anne, has been published in the *Συναξαριστὴς νεομαρτύρων*, pp. 158-63, but it completely omits the vision.

15. Concerning this church, see R. Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, part 1. *Le Siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*, vol. III. *Les Eglises et les Monastères* (Paris, 1953), pp. 403-4.

16. Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique*, III, 45-6.

it was joined by the Teacher of the Nation, Chrysanthos¹⁷.

At this point, the Great Martyr St George appeared and invited them all to come to his own church; so the procession began to move in the direction of the Church of St George. He, however, went ahead on his white steed and, before the procession arrived, seized a cudgel and drove out the Turks who were praying inside. The Turks gazed in terror upon the great martyr and the saintly procession with the Cross, and cried out: "Woe to us! The Greeks are come upon us, fly!" Oddly enough, the next place to be occupied by that heavenly host was not a Christian church, but the celebrated Yeni Cami¹⁸. And while they were inside the mosque, singing "Glory be to God in the highest", the voice of the muezzin was heard from the minaret, calling the faithful to prayer. St Constantine raised the Cross and down came the minaret, bringing the muezzin with it. The procession came eventually to the one place where one would naturally expect it to go, the Church of Hagia Sophia; and we now have the culmination of the Nation's dream. The church is bathed in a dazzling, celestial light, all the heavenly host are holding lighted white candles, the gold and the silver glitter, the holy icons rejoice, and in the place of the icon of the Blessed Virgin there stands a bright throne with the Mother of God herself seated upon it. All around the chancel screen are rows of empty thrones. Wondering what their purpose might be, Daniel asks his friend Anastasios, who replies: "Upon those thrones sat the Emperors and the Prelates of the great Councils. And they shall sit upon them again and there shall be more Councils". St Marcian then collects all the candles and places them around the Cross, which has been set up in the centre of the church. Suddenly the sanctuary doors open to reveal Christ himself clad in pontifical robes, and he approaches the pontifical throne accompanied by battalions of angels. The Divine Liturgy begins, conducted by James, the brother of Christ. The Epistle is read by the archdeacon Laurence and the Gospel by the proto-martyr Stephen. As soon as the Liturgy is over, the Blessed Virgin addresses

17. It is difficult to identify this "teacher of the Nation" with any of the known contemporary figures of this name. The eminent Patriarch of Alexandria, Chrysanthos Notaras, who was known to all the Greeks and a distinguished writer as well, died in 1731. It is unlikely that the vision would have referred to a figure from the past. There was a teacher named Chrysanthos in Constantinople in the first decades of the nineteenth century, but this was long after the vision.

18. This is the splendid mosque which stands in Eminonu Square in Constantinople. Its construction was begun in 1597 by the Sultana Sefiye and finished in 1660 by the Sultana Valide, mother of Mehmet IV. Here too was Mehmet IV's luxurious pavilion, in which, after his prayers, he would receive eminent figures of the day.

Christ, beseeching him to deliver the Nation. And Christ compassionately replies: "Since you intercede and pray so much for these ingrates, for the sake of your love and the prayers of my faithful servants I shall soon liberate them from their suffering under the Turks". After this Daniel approaches the Virgin and asks her blessing for his martyrdom for Christ. But she urges him to keep Christ's commandments and thus be sure that he will eventually receive the same victor's crown as if he had been martyred. And when he asks her permission to remain inside Hagia Sophia for the rest of his life to keep the oil-lamp burning, the Virgin again dissuades him, telling him that the lamp has been burning there for more than three hundred years. She does, however, urge him to go to the Metropolitan of Ptolemais, Dionysios¹⁹, tell him what he has seen and heard, and exhort him to proclaim it to Christians everywhere, that the people may hear and believe.

There are two points which particularly deserve our attention in this account: firstly, the proximity of the Nation's deliverance and the re-establishment of the Empire, with Constantinople as its centre and the Emperors restored there; secondly, a turning away from martyrdom in favour of an active struggle against the Turkish overlord. The story very soon came to the attention of Russian circles. A Russian manuscript from Simonov Monastery near Moscow²⁰ tells us who translated it into Russian and disseminated it in the Russian world. He was a most distinguished Russian monastic figure,

19. MS No 85-4 of the kyriakon of the Skete of St Anne contains the following note: «Περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Σωφρονίου, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Πτολεμαῖδος περὶ οὗ ἡ Θεοτόκος εἶπε τῷ Δανιὴλ ἐξ Ἰσραηλιτῶν, ὅτι ἦν πιστὸς δοῦλος τοῦ Υἱοῦ μου» (Concerning Patriarch Sophronius, he is the [Metropolitan] of Ptolemais of whom the Blessed Virgin told Daniel of the Ismaelites that he is the faithful servant of my son): Gerasimos Mikragiannanitis, *Κατάλογος χειρογράφων*, 220. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Sophronius II (1774-80) had indeed formerly been Metropolitan of Ptolemais (M. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί πίνακες* (Constantinople, 1890), pp. 664-6), but the name Dionysios complicates the identification.

20. See N. P. Popov, *Rukopisi Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj (Patriarshej) Biblioteki*, 2. *Sobranie rukopisej Moskovskogo Simonova monastyrja*, Chtenija v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix pri Moskovskom Universitete, 1910, No 2 (Moscow, 1910), pp. 80-4. Popov confuses this Anastasios with his namesake from Ioannina, who was martyred in Constantinople in 1743. The account of the martyrdom of St Anastasios of Delvino and the vision of Daniel is also to be found in the Slavonic MS No 292 of Hilandar Monastery, which was copied in 1816 by hieromonk Daniel of this Monastery. It is also found in an abridged form in MS No 719 of the same monastery: D. Bogdanović, *Katalog ćirilskix rukopisa Manastira Hilandara* (Belgrade, 1978), pp. 127, 240. The martyrology of St Anastasios in Hilandar MS No 292 has been published by M. Matejić, "Hilandar Codex 292 (360): An Unusual Martyrology", *Palaeobulgarica*, II/4 (1978), 24-47, though without sufficient historical commentary.

Paisy Velichkovskii²¹. Born in Poltava in 1722, Velichkovskii went at an early age to Wallachia, where he became a monk. He then spent eighteen years on Mount Athos. An ardent Philhellene, Velichkovskii conceived the ambitious plan of reviving Byzantine mysticism among the Slavs and the Romanians by translating anew the Byzantine mystic and ascetic writers. This he achieved to a large extent, at least as far as Russia and Romania were concerned; and left Mount Athos for Romania in 1764. During his years on the Holy Mountain, a close friendship had developed between Velichkovskii and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Seraphim II²², who had lost his throne in 1761 after the Turks had accused him of engaging in political relations with Russia. It is very likely that the former Patriarch himself passed on the story of Anastasios's martyrdom and Daniel's vision to Velichkovskii, for, like the neomartyr, Seraphim was a native of Delvino²³. Furthermore, he does indeed appear to have had connections with Russia, for he eventually escaped from Mount Athos on a ship in Orlov's fleet, which had sailed into the Aegean in 1772²⁴.

Velichkovskii himself translated the Greek text and handed it on to the Russian world²⁵. The dissemination of this text among the Russians was an event of particular importance. The prestige of Greek Orthodoxy had declined in Russian eyes after the Fall of Constantinople for two fundamental reasons: firstly, because Byzantium had agreed to sign the union with Rome in 1439; and secondly, because, as the Russians saw it, the centre of Orthodoxy, Con-

21. The Slavonic biographical sources for Velichkovskii have been published by A.-E. Tachiaos, *The Revival of Byzantine Mysticism among Slavs and Romanians in the XVIIIth Century: Texts Relating to the Life and Activity of Paisy Velichkovsky (1722-1794)* (Thessaloniki, 1986). The two basic biographical texts relating to Paisy have already been translated into English by J. M. E. Featherstone, *The Life of Paisij Velyckov'skyj*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, vol. IV, with an introduction by Anthony-Emil N. Tachiaos (Harvard University Press, 1989). Cf. A.-E. N. Tachiaos, *Ὁ Παῖσιος Βελιτσκόφσκι (1722-1794) καὶ ἡ ἀσκητικοφιλογολογικὴ σχολή του* (Thessaloniki, 1964), and a photocopy reprint done in 1984 by the Institute for Balkan Studies, No. 73, the introduction to which contains an updated bibliography.

22. Concerning Velichkovskii's relations with Patriarch Seraphim, see Tachiaos, *The Revival of Byzantine Mysticism*, 104, 106, 201, 203, 205-6.

23. Baras, *Τὸ Δέλβινο*, 49.

24. Gedeon, *Πατριαρχικοί πίνακες*, 649-53; C. Tzogas, «Νικόλαος Ζαρζούλης ὁ ἐκ Μετσόβου», *Μνήμη 1821*, 129-42; C. Papoulidis, "Le patriarche œcuménique Serapheim II et les Russes", *Balkan Studies*, 15 (1974), 288-97, incl. bibliography; S. Batalden, "A Further Note on Patriarch Serapheim II's Sojourn to Russia", *Balkan Studies*, 18 (1977), 409-11.

25. This is attested by the codex of Simonov Monastery, which states that it is a copy of an autograph by Velichkovskii; Popov, *Rukopisi*, 83.

stantinople, and more specifically Hagia Sophia, had been irrevocably defiled and desecrated when the Turks seized it²⁶. Daniel's vision, in which Christ appeared and forgave the Greeks and Himself officiated in Hagia Sophia, now fully restored in Russian eyes the authority and prestige of Greek Orthodoxy. Furthermore, the very fact of undergoing martyrdom for the Christian faith — an unknown phenomenon in eighteenth-century Russia — was a sign of Greek atonement and expiation. There is another point in this story which must not be missed, however. The intervention of the "fair race", the Russians — a very common motif in other prophecies of this time — plays no part whatsoever in the vision: the Greeks are left to struggle alone for the liberation of the Empire. And one final point: the neomartyr Anastasios declares that a Greek emperor will come and sit once more on the empty royal throne of Constantinople.

The mystical aspect of Daniel's vision was clearly accompanied by an element of realism, which was also a spur to dynamic action. The Russian public's interest in the Crescent's collapse was now well and truly aroused. In 1789, a prophecy by an Arab astrologer, Musta Ed'din, concerning the fall of the Turkish Empire was published in St Petersburg. The Greek War of Independence rekindled interest in prophecies of this sort. Soon they were being read not only by the common people but also by the better educated, for by 1828-9 they were being printed by the printing houses of the Imperial Theatre, the Imperial Medical and Surgical Association, and the University of Moscow²⁷. But, more than anyone else, it was the celebrated poet Alexandr Sergeevich Pushkin who conveyed the triumph of the Greek Uprising to the Russian people. The Greeks' uprising affected Pushkin profoundly. As soon as it was declared, he contacted Ypsilantis and asked to be allowed to enlist in the "Friendly Society" (Φιλική Ἑταιρεία) but unfortunately he was being watched by the Tsarist police and never managed to realise his dream of hastening to the aid of the rebelling Greeks of the Danube Principalities. Nothing daunted, Pushkin, now began to wonder anxiously what Russia, under Tsar Alexander I, intended to do for the unfortunate Greeks, as, poor and naked, they struggled against the powerful Turkish oppressor. His answer came in the form of Alexander's announcement to the Sublime Porte that Russia was maintaining a neutral stance²⁸. Censuring the Tsar's policy,

26. See Papamichael, *Μάξιμος ὁ Γραικός*, 273f.

27. *Svodnyj katalog russkoj knigi grazhdanskoj pechati XVIII veka 1725-1800*, vol. II (Moscow, 1954), p. 469, No 5630.

28. See Vacalopoulos, *Ἱστορία τοῦ νέου Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, vol. V (Thessaloniki, 1980), pp. 220f.

Pushkin wrote scores of letters on behalf of the rebelling Greeks. In 1821, he also wrote his splendid poem dedicated to the Greek mother who loses her son in the struggle for freedom; the heroic lad is likened to the ancient Aristogeiton, who killed the tyrant Hipparchus and was subsequently put to death by Hipparchus's brother, Hippias²⁹.

Living in exile in Kishinëv, Bessarabia, in 1821 Pushkin was able to observe the uprising of the Greeks in the Principalities from very close quarters. He spent the evening of 2 April 1821 at the house of Greek friends in Kishinëv, and wrote in his diary: "We spoke about Ypsilantis. Amongst five Greeks, I was the only one who spoke like a Greek. They are all disheartened by the failure of the *Etaireia*'s work. I am certain that Greece will triumph"³⁰. Pushkin believed that the Greeks' Uprising would pave the way to the overthrow of all tyranny and that it would be the spark that would light the great blaze which would devour the great edifice of the Holy Alliance. He wrote: "This uprising may have significant consequences not only for our own region here but for the whole of Europe"³¹. For him it was not fortuitous that the revolutionary movement against Turkish tyranny, and indeed against all tyranny, had started off amongst the Greeks, the descendants, that is, of those who had taught humankind the ideals of democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. The splendour of ancient Greece sprang to life once more within him; and he conveyed the experience to the whole of Russian society through his poems, his letters, and his articles. In 1827, the Russian poet Gnedich published the whole of the *Iliad* in Russian translation. Pushkin read it hungrily, and in his exhilaration wrote this couplet about Homer:

Hearing the faded sound of the divine Hellenic word,
My soul is hattered by the touch of that venerable shade³².

The failure of the Uprising in the Principalities immeasurably saddened this greatest of Russian poets, and he was shaken to the core by the death of Georgakis Olympios. Believing that a great hero of Greek history had been lost in vain, Pushkin decided to write a long epic poem recounting the story of the Greek struggle in the Principalities. In the spring of 1823, while he was

29. O. B. Shparo, *Osvobozhdenie Grecii i Rossija (1821-1829)* (Moscow, 1965), pp. 108-9. Cf. S. M. Petrov, *A. S. Pushkin: Ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* (Moscow, 1973), p. 81.

30. H. Tryat, *Pouchkine*, vol. I (Paris, 1946), p. 276.

31. Tryat, *Pouchkine*, 275.

32. Petrov, *A. S. Pushkin*, 83.

at work on his epic, he invited his friend, Prince P. A. Vjazamskii, to Kishinēv: "I shall introduce you to the heroes of Sculeni and Secu, the warrior Georgakis, and the Greek woman who kissed Byron"³³. Unfortunately, he never finished the epic. The following year, 1824, he wrote his short story "Kirdzhali", which concerns one of the heroes of Sculeni. In it he re-assesses the events and unhesitatingly places the blame for the failure fairly and squarely upon the shoulders of his friend Ypsilantis: "Alexandros Ypsilantis was a courageous man, but he did not have the necessary abilities for the part he so passionately, yet so carelessly, decided to play. He had not the facility to get along with the men he was compelled to guide. They in their turn had for him neither respect nor trust. After the luckless battle in which the flower of Greek youth was cut down, Georgakis Olympios counselled him to withdraw and himself undertook to defend the country. Away galloped Ypsilantis towards the Austrian frontier, whence he cast imprecations upon his men, calling them undisciplined cowards and scoundrels. But it was the greater part of those selfsame cowards and scoundrels who fell within the walls of Secu Monastery or upon the banks of the Pruth, fighting an enemy who was ten times stronger"³⁴.

The news of the uprising of the Greeks in the Danube Principalities reached St Petersburg very quickly, where it came to the ears of, amongst others, Prince Sergii Aleksandrovich Shirinskii-Shixmatov³⁵. The scion of a powerful family and a man of great learning, in 1821 Prince Shixmatov held the rank of Captain and was a teacher at the Naval Cadets' School in St Petersburg. Thanks to his profound classical education, the celebrated Imperial Academy of Sciences opened its portals to him at the tender age of just twenty-

33. Petrov, A. S. *Pushkin*, 82.

34. Petrov, A. S. *Pushkin*, 82.

35. The very interesting, anonymous biography of Prince Shirinskii-Shixmatov was first published in the periodical *Odesskii Vestnik*, No 65 (1837); after it had been read at sessions of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, the printing-house of the Cadets' School produced it as a book in its own right on 29 October 1838. The author's data come from the second, likewise very rare, edition: *O zhizni i trudax Ieromonaxa Anikity, v mire knjazja Sergija Aleksandrovicha Shixmatova* (St Petersburg, 1853). Cf. A. Kovalevskii, "Iz vospominanii o prisnopamjatnyx starcax: ierosximonaxe Serafime Sarovskom, ieromonaxe Anikite (knjaze Shirinskom Shixmatove) i drugix", *Dushepoleznoe chtenie* (April, 1869), 111-14. Between 1834 and 1836, Anikita Shirinskii-Shixmatov travelled around the holy places of the Middle East, including Mount Athos. His travel journal was published by V. Zhmakin, "Puteshestvie ieromonaxa Anikity (v mire knjazja S. A. Shirinskago-Shixmatova) po Svjatym mestam Vostoka v 1834-1836 godax", *Xristianskoe chtenie* (1891), I. 69-117, 526-57, II. 187-98, 317-36, 447-69. Cf. T. G. Stavrou and P. R. Weisensel, *Russian Travellers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century* (Columbus, Ohio 1986), pp. 222-3.

six years. Both Sergii and his brothers Plato and Alexii had firm religious principles and were inspired by democratic and philanthropic ideas; all three had devoted both themselves and their fortune to the founding of a school for the peasants of their own district. Owing to his status, Prince Sergii Shixmatov was amongst the first to learn the details of the Greeks' uprising. Writing to his brothers on 29 March 1821, he was careful to inform them that though news of the Greeks' rebellion had reached St Petersburg by official channels, the Tsar had not yet authorised the publication of any details whatsoever: "Greece, our Mother in terms of our Faith, and for long centuries weighed down by the barbarians' heavy yoke, has finally decided to seek dynamic revenge, throwing off that ignoble yoke which has been inflicted upon her. Greece has taken up arms to demand her freedom. The flag of liberty is flying throughout the land and all, from the youngest to the most aged, with all the strength at their command, have hurled themselves against the oppressor. Under the leadership of Ypsilantis, who has issued a proclamation, an army of some 15,000 men has been formed, a number which is constantly being swelled by the voluntary enlistment of the sons of the Motherland, each of whom is determined either to die or to resurrect beloved Greece". He concluded: "We can only wish our brothers success"³⁶. In another letter to his brothers on 19 August 1821, the Prince tells them about the Greeks' successes and adds that the Greeks have issued a proclamation to the European Powers, which the Admiral has already translated into Russian; it is doubtful, however, that the Tsar's censors will allow it to be published in the Russian newspapers. "It is very likely that our own time will see the achievement of that great cause, the re-establishment of the Greek Empire and the triumph of our Orthodox faith"³⁷. It is indeed noteworthy that aristocrats serving the Tsar of the mighty Russian Empire retained the unswerving conviction that Byzantium must be reborn as a Greek empire and that it was to Byzantium that the sceptre of the Orthodox world naturally belonged.

Liberal circles in St Petersburg, as also Russian public opinion, were anxiously waiting for the Tsar's policy towards struggling Greece to change. Their concern reached a peak in the autumn of 1822, when the Holy Alliance met in Verona³⁸. In a letter dated 13 December 1822, the Prince wrote: "There is a rumour that our Orthodox Tsar, having been patient enough, is finally

36. V. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity o polozhenii cerkvi grecheskago korolevstva (v 1837 godu)", *Khristianskoe chtenie* (1891), I. 458.

37. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity", 459.

38. See Laskaris, *Tò 'Anatolikòn Zήτημα*, 55.

to come out in support of our fellow Orthodox Christians who are being persecuted and tormented by the barbarian"³⁹. But events were to show just how vain these hopes were, for Russia did not begin to show any interest in the fate of the Greeks until after 1825, when Tsar Nicholas I ascended the throne⁴⁰.

In 1828, at the age of only forty, a member of the Academy with years of experience and naval successes behind him, Prince Sergii Shirinskii-Shixmatov submitted to the Tsar his resignation from the Navy and became a monk⁴¹. During a journey to the Middle East, he received orders from the Russian Holy Synod to lead a spiritual mission to Athens and take up the position of vicar of the Tsarist embassy's chapel there. The Tsar's first ambassador to the Greek capital was Grigorii Katakazi, a Russian of Greek descent, who quickly embarked upon far-reaching diplomatic activity⁴². The former naval officer and Prince, now a hieromonk named Anikita, arrived in Athens in April 1836. But he was to occupy his new post for only a year; for on 7 June 1837, he died in the capital of the tiny Greek kingdom⁴³. During his time in Athens, he wrote a long report, dated 26 April 1837, which was sent to his brother Plato, now Minister for Education in St Petersburg. The report concerned political and ecclesiastical affairs in the new kingdom⁴⁴, and painted a discouraging picture, for Anikita had formed a most disagreeable impression of the Greek people's morale. Whereas, until a few years before, they had all been united like brothers, fighting the common oppressor together, now these selfsame people were divided and destroying each other. The government was alien, completely out of touch with the people, and worst of all showed no respect for their traditions, the very traditions which had

39. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity", 459.

40. Laskaris, *Tò 'Ανατολικὸν Ζήτημα*, 59-66.

41. See *O zhizni i trudax ieromonaxa Anikity*, 30-3.

42. Concerning Katakazi's diplomatic activity, literature about him, and the Russophiles in Athens, see B. Jelavich, *Russia and Greece during the Regency of King Otto 1832-1835* (Thessaloniki 1962). Cf. C. Papoulidis, «Ρωσικὸ ἐνδιαφέρον γιὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησία τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν ἐποχὴ τοῦ Ὁθωνα μὲ βάση ἔγγραφα τοῦ Ἀρχιεῖου Ἐξωτερικῆς Πολιτικῆς τῆς Ρωσίας», *Θεολογία*, 58 (1987), 144-51.

43. Hieromonk Anikita Shirinskii-Shixmatov was well loved by the Athenians, who refused to allow his remains to be taken either to Russia or to Mount Athos; he was therefore eventually buried at Petraki Monastery. See *O zhizni i trudax ieromonaxa Anikity*, 66-9. Cf. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity", 467-9; I. Apostolidis, *Παναγία Λυκοδήμου* (Athens, 1959), 36-7. Though short, this latter work contains much interesting information about the royal hieromonk's activity in Athens.

44. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity", 460-6.

kept them Greek and Orthodox for centuries. After Capodistrias, education in the schools had also lost touch with tradition⁴⁵. American missionaries were blithely engaged in religious activity which went quite against the principles of Greek Orthodoxy and, having plenty of money, had opened, alongside the thirty existing primary schools, a number of mutually instructive schools in which they were teaching their own doctrines quite unhampered by any checks or control. This cutting-off from tradition, however, culminated in the arbitrary creation of the autocephalous Church of Greece, a move which was made at the Bavarians' suggestion in order to alienate the free Greeks once and for all from their spiritual centre, the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Shixmatov's report came into the hands of the Metropolitan of Moscow, Filaret Drozdov, an eminent figure who influenced not only ecclesiastical but also political affairs in Russia for forty-five years. After reading the report, Filaret noted in his diary: "The description of the deplorable state of the Church in the Greek kingdom — if, indeed, in its present condition it may be termed a church — is the second testimony relating to it which has reached me from a member of the Orthodox prelacy. I have also seen a little book, in Greek, which the American Methodists have published in Greece, and in which they brazenly oppose the traditions and principles of the Orthodox Church. They call publicly upon the Greeks to reform it, or in other words to destroy it, within Greece itself. What an unlooked-for muddle! A government of German nationality and Latin faith, in this land of the Greeks, showing favour to the American Methodists"⁴⁶.

As we know, the Greeks' struggle was lost in the Danube Principalities; but it flourished in the Peloponnese, the islands, and mainland Greece. Only a small section of the Greeks, who were spread over three continents, had gained freedom and formed a kingdom. For the time being, the dream of liberating the capital city of all the Greeks, Constantinople, had to take second place. The establishment of an autocephalous church in the new state was a decisive stage in the severing of its bonds with the Greeks' age-old centre, the quondam "ruling city". The Bavarians in Athens had already gone a long way towards furthering the aims of the Great Powers, who were anxious that the Greeks should never regain all their former greatness. The Bavarians

45. A. Geromichalos, «Ἡ περὶ παιδείας καὶ Ἐκκλησίας φροντίς τοῦ κυβερνήτου Ἰωάννου Καποδιστρίου», *Μνήμη* 1821, 207-20. Cf. N. Pantazopoulos, «Georg Ludwig von Maurer: «Ἡ πρὸς εὐρωπαϊκὰ πρότυπα ὁλοκληρωτικὴ στρόφη τῆς ἑλληνικῆς νομοθεσίας», Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Σχολῆς Νομικῶν καὶ Οἰκονομικῶν Ἐπιστημῶν», 13 (1968), 1385-1405.

46. Zhmakin, "Pis'mo ieromonaxa Anikity", 466.

found ready collaborators in certain Greeks, who laboured zealously to snuff out dreams and visions. Russian public opinion was now faced with the image of a divided Greek reality: on the one hand, a small state under Bavarian leadership; and on the other, the vast number of Greeks still in bondage, under the spiritual protection of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which had already received the first stab in the back from its own people. The spread of the ideas of the European Enlightenment amongst Russian intellectual circles brought with it an interest in ancient Greek. Classical literature flourished in Russia during the nineteenth century and classical Greek antiquity was the focus of every educated Russian's interest. However, people immediately began to compare modern with ancient Greece and, needless to say, as had already happened with the Europeans, the comparison was not favourable to modern Greece⁴⁷. At the same time, the proponents of the Enlightenment were opposed to church tradition, which was another factor in the lessening of their interest in the majority of the Greeks, who were living under the shadow of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Having no particular enthusiasm for Orthodoxy, they ceased to regard it as something which linked them with the Greeks, whether in bondage or in freedom. The conservatives, on the other hand, who believed in the principles and traditions of Orthodox Christianity, were for the most part supporters of the Slavophile movement, which was gradually moving towards Pan Slavism⁴⁸.

The Slavophiles did, it is true, have profound religious convictions, but these drew their strength to a great extent from Russian Messianic and national concepts. In 1860, a select group of Slavophiles, led by the philosopher A. S. Xomiakov⁴⁹, issued a declaration to the people of Serbia⁵⁰, in which they

47. In this connection, it is interesting to look at Russian diplomatic reactions to the Greeks' revolt against the king in 1843. See B. Jelavich, *Russia and the Greek Revolution of 1843* (Munich, 1966).

48. M. B. Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Pan Slavism, 1856-1870* (New York, 1958), Cf. A. Gleason, *European and Muscovite: Ivan Kireevsky and the Origins of Slavophilism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972).

49. Xomjakov was one of the most distinguished Slavophiles of the nineteenth century and wielded great influence in conservative circles. His theological views are particularly interesting and carried much weight with the Russian theological circles of the Diaspora. Fundamental works concerning his life, his work, and the circles in which he moved are: A. Gratieux, *A. S. Khomiakov et le mouvement slavophile*, vol. I. *Les Hommes*, vol. II. *Les Doctrines* (Paris, 1939); and idem, *Le Mouvement slavophile à la veille de la Révolution: Dimitri A. Khomiakov* (Paris, 1953).

50. The Russian text of the declaration was last published in Xomjakov's collected works: A. Xomjakov, *Izbrannye sochinenija*, edited by Prof. N. S. Arsenjev (New York, 1955), pp. 172-206.

accused the Greeks of spiritual pride and arrogance. However, the declaration was itself so supercilious in tone that it quite failed to rouse the Serbs⁵¹. The Panslavists envisaged a union of all the Slavonic peoples under the sceptre of the Russian Tsar; and within this great east European family a place was also to be reserved for the Greeks and the Romanians, since they too shared the same religious and spiritual foundation. In 1869, one of the leaders of the Russian Panslavist movement, N. I. Danilevskii, published the much-acclaimed *Russia and Europe*⁵², in which was clearly set forth the political manifesto of Panslavism. The great Panslavonic confederation would also include the Kingdom of Greece, as also Thessaly, Epirus, south-western Macedonia, all the Aegean Islands, Rhodes, Crete, Cyprus, and the islands along the Asia Minor littoral. Most of Rumelia and Macedonia would belong to Bulgaria, and the department of Constantinople would include the rest of Rumelia, Asia Minor, the Sea of Marmara, the Dardanelles, Gallipoli, and the island of Tenedos. Danilevskii did not regard the Greeks either as farmers or as industrialists, but simply as merchants and mariners: "When", he wondered, "will Greece be able to acquire a merchant marine powerful enough to enable her to trade on an international scale"⁵³? He believed that only a Greek-Slav union could make Greece a maritime power. The following year, in 1870, another Panslavist, P. A. Fadeev, published in St Petersburg his work *Opinions on the Eastern Question*⁵⁴, in which he categorically stated that the Greeks' Great Idea was a foolish chimaera, a figment of the Greek intellectuals' antiquity-fixated imagination which Russia would never permit to become a reality.

This was the sort of thing which was being said and written by the intellectual Russian Panslavists; and their views coincided absolutely with the

51. The title given to the letter is: "To the Serbs. Letter from Moscow". Concerning its contents and the Serbs' negative attitude to it, see Gratieux, *A. S. Khomiakov*, II, 200-6. Cf. Petrovich, *The Emergence*, 96-102. Cf. A. Tambrorra, "A. S. Chomiakov, il suo messaggio *K Serbam* del 1860 ed il suo significato", *Europa Orientalis*, VIII (1989), 117-20.

52. N. J. Danilevskii, *Rossija i Evropa: vzgljad na kul'turnyja i politicheskija otnoshenija slavjanskogo mira k germano-romanskomu*, 5th edition (St Petersburg, 1895). This work has also been translated into German by Karl Notzel: *Russland und Europa: eine Untersuchung über die kulturellen und politischen Beziehungen der slawischen zur germanisch-romanischen Welt* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1920).

53. Petrovich, *The Emergence*, 205.

54. R. A. Fadeev, *Mnenie o vostochnom voprose* (St Petersburg, 1870). This work has also been translated into Serbian: *O Istochnom pitanju* (Belgrade, 1870); and English: *Opinion on the Eastern Question*, trans. T. Mitchell (London, 1871).

policy of the Foreign Ministry in St Petersburg towards Greece and the Eastern Question.

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, there appeared on the scene an individual with a more profound understanding of Greek affairs: the distinguished thinker and writer, K. P. Leont'ev⁵⁵. A man with a liberal and critical mind and an uncompromising intellect, Leont'ev was a genuine esthète. He had served as a Russian diplomat in Chania, Ioannina, and Adrianople, and ended his diplomatic career in 1871 as Russia's Consul General in Thessaloniki. In addition to four short stories relating to the Cretan Revolution of 1866, his extensive œuvre includes a number of notable political essays on the Eastern Question. Leont'ev did not share the views of the Panslavists. He had a profound belief in the virtues of the Balkan peoples, and unreservedly acknowledged the supremacy of the Greeks. Though not always entirely correct, his judgements demonstrated a truly rare acumen and perspicacity. He was sharply critical of the mentality that was developing among the up-and-coming bourgeoisie in the Balkan countries, and at the same time emphasised the vast gulf it created between the bourgeois mind and the popular spirit. Above all, he was offended by the superficial, shallow mimicry of the Western way of life and thinking which was appearing in the new bourgeoisie in the Greek kingdom. In one of his studies he wrote: "The Greek bourgeoisie is very different from the Bulgarian. The discriminating, prudent, thoughtful Phanariot is much more patrician in appearance, much more apt for serious politics, with a much better social upbringing than the Athenian politician. What, by the way, is an educated Athenian? Something of an ancient orator,

55. Leont'ev's works have been published in nine volumes: *Sobranie sochinenij K. Leont'eva* (Moscow, 1912-13). The fifth and sixth volumes contain his articles, studies, and essays on the Eastern Question which had previously been published under the title *Vostok, Rossija i slavjanstvo*, 2 vols (Moscow, 1885-6). Long after his death an autobiography was discovered, and first published in the periodical *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 22-24 (1935), 427-96; the more recent edition is K. Leont'ev, *Moja literaturnaja sud'ba: Avtobiografija*, The Slavic Series, 1 (New York and London, 1965). The most important studies of Leont'ev are by N. Berdjajev, *Konstantin Leont'ev: Očerki iz istorii russkoj religioznoj mysli* (Paris, 1926), and G. Kologrivov, *Constantino Leontjev: La sua vita ed il suo pensiero (1831-1891)* (Bergamo, 1949). Unfortunately, neither of these excellent works contains any extensive discussion of Leont'ev's opinions on the very interesting issues connected with Greek and Slav relations. On the Greek side, only K. Lassithiotakis has so far dealt with this eminent Russian intellectual in an article published in the periodical *Ελληνική Δημοκρατία*, 153 (1954). Lassithiotakis has also published one of Leont'ev's short stories in Greek translation with an introduction and notes, *Χρυσή: Διήγημα από την κρητική ζωή 1868* (Thessaloniki, 1966).

something of a Parisian demagogue, something of an *affairiste*, something of a tawdry gentleman when flirting with the ladies. He still blindly believes that the Greek is the wisest man in the world, that the Greek nation is the only phœnix in history and, before the end of the world, will be reborn a few times more to sprinkle the human race with flowers and nourish it with the fruits of its genius"⁵⁶. According to Leont'ev, it was this bourgeoisie with its slavish imitation of all things Western which had destroyed the tradition of the dashing gallantry (*levendia*) of the Cretan in his *vraki*, the Peloponnesian, the Mainlander, and the Epirot in their *foustanella*, and the Macedonian Greek in his *salavari*. Leont'ev debunked the views of the Panslavists and opposed Danilevskii's manifesto: "Mr Danilevskii has great faith in the Slavs and in a very exclusive manner places all his hopes in them. I too had such faith when I was living in Constantinople; I had high hopes of their independence of mind. I very soon realised, however, that, from precisely this point of view of cultural originality (to which I attach such importance), all the Slavs, whether in the South or in the West, are no more than an unavoidable political evil for us Russians; for thus far, they have nothing to offer the world in terms of an intelligentsia but a pedestrian and stereotyped bourgeoisie"⁵⁷. The literature which was being produced in the Greek kingdom was a literature of the new bourgeois lifestyle, far removed from the soul of the people and the traditional folksong, and to Leont'ev it was devoid of any content, shallow, unconnected with the real existential struggles and the profounder speculations of the individual. Though he did not regard Achilleas Paraschos's poetry as being of exceptional interest, he nonetheless considered that his love poems presented certain interesting and original dimensions⁵⁸.

Leont'ev could see before him two Greek domains: the tiny free kingdom, and the vast domain of the unredeemed Greeks with Constantinople still as its centre and capital. But despite his wholehearted admiration for the unredeemed Greeks, he categorically rejected the notion of a Greek empire. In a number of political articles on Constantinople's future, he acknowledged the Greeks and the Bulgarians as the only natural contenders for the Bosphorus, but regarded neither of them as worthy of possessing this "pearl", as he called Constantinople. "The Greeks' childish dreams of the Great Idea", he wrote, "that is, the re-establishment of Greek Byzantium as far as the Balkans

56. In his article "Russkie, Greki i Jugo-Slavjane: Opyt nacional'noj psixologii", *Vostok, Rossija i slavyanstvo* (Moscow, 1912), p. 271.

57. "Dopolnenie k dvum statjam o panslavisme", *Vostok, Rossija i slavyanstvo*, 108.

58. "Russkie, Greki i Jugo-Slavjane", 293-6.

and beyond, and the cheap patriotism of the Bulgarians, who, being unable to attain the level of the universal Slavonic vision, are constantly ready to disorganise and destroy the Orthodox Church with their intolerable wrangling, make these two peoples equally unworthy of possessing the Bosphorus"⁵⁹. Thus, possibly the keenest Philhellene among the Russian intellectuals and publicists of the nineteenth century was opposed to the re-establishment of the Greek Empire. The Russians continued to nurture an absolute respect for the Ecumenical Patriarchate; but the new angle from which they now viewed things placed it on a different footing. This is clear from the policy of the eminent Russian diplomat, Count N. P. Ignat'ev, during the first phase of the Bulgarian Question⁶⁰. Albeit a Panslavist himself, Ignat'ev believed that Russia ought to support the Patriarchate against the southern Slavs and use it as an instrument in its plans for extending its own influence; for, owing to its powerful spiritual authority and influence, the Greek Patriarchate could remain an allied spiritual empire for Russia in the Near East. Later, of course, after his plan had fallen through, he took up the cudgels in unconditional defence of Bulgarian political interests.

All that has been said so far is but a page in the yet unwritten book about the Russian intelligentsia's attitude to the question of the renaissance of the Greek nation. It could also serve as a brief introduction and jumping-off point for an investigation of a very interesting subject, which, however, is still awaiting the scholar or specialist who will research it more thoroughly. It is to be expected that the aspects which will come to light will reveal facts that will give us a much more complete picture of the position the Greeks occupied in the Russian intelligentsia's outlook in the nineteenth century.

59. "Pis'ma o vostochnix delax", *Vostok, Rossija i slavjanstvo*, 447-8.

60. Concerning Count Ignat'ev's attitude to the Bulgarian Ecclesiastical Question, see the excellent work by the Patriarch of Bulgaria, Kiril: Kiril Patriarh Bălgarski, *Graf N. P. Ignatiev i bălgarskijat carkoven vāpros: Izsledvane i dokumenti*, vol. I (Sofia, 1958). Cf. A.-E. Tachiaos, *Ἱστορία τῶν Σλαβικῶν Ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησιῶν: Πανεπιστημιακαὶ παραδόσεις* (Thessaloniki, 1970), pp. 116-36.