death up until the arrival of King Otto I, a period marked by a relative absence of laws, culminating in the Ordinance of October 8/20, 1832 which abolished courts altogether. This was the state of affairs when Otto I arrived in Greece.

At this point, Geib interrupts his narration. He had just started his work in the Greek Ministry of Justice (this book—translated and annotated successfully by Mrs. Kalkani—being the product of that work).

A young German jurist showed the way modern Greek jurisprudence should have taken, which turned herself instead not to the study and establishment of a purely national law, but to foreign models.

Institut for Balkan Studies ATHANASSIOS E. KARATHANASSIS

Spiridon Kontogiannis, *The Sinai Question, 16th-19th Century,* Jerusalem, Nea Sion, vol. 79, 1987, pp. 422.

The monastery of Sinai, a center of spiritual asceticism during the Byzantine and post-Byzantine era, has experienced, through the ages, a series of fierce confrontations with other Orthodox patriarchates, in what is known as the Sinai Question, an open wound in the history of Orthodox Christianity for over three centuries (16th-19th). This is the subject of Mr. S. Kontogiannis' doctoral dissertation, who based his research on the rich archive material of the Monastery of Sinai, the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Patriarchate of Antioch. The author studies how the question first emerged, focusing on the acts of Laurentius, Archbishop of Sinai (1592-1617), who, because of his desire to render the Archbishopric autocephalous, openly confronted the Patriarches of Jerusalem and Antioch. At the root of the matter were the privileges granted by the Byzantine emperors to the Monastery. The privileges guaranteed the bishop's and the bishopric's independence and autonomy, and were further strengthened by the capacity of the bishop of Mount Sinai as father superior of the said Monastery. This situation later caused problems of Canon law and gave rise to ecclesiastic disputes, also attributed to the Monastery's policy of establishing dependencies throughout the territory. The dependencies extolled the ecclesiastic authority of Sinai's bishop and father superior in violation of the Church hierarchy. One such incident of insubordination was the refusal of the fathers of Sinai to fall under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, under the authority of which they had always been, or the irregular demand they made to be granted a status of an autocephalous bishopric. This inevitably led to an open confrontation with the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Patriarch of Alexandria, since the Monastery of Sinai operated a dependency in Cairo which did not fall, as it ought to have, under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Soon, in the argument between the Monastery of Sinai and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem became involved the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Patriarchate of Antioch and the Catholic Church. Laurentius and the fathers of Sinai had requested the assistance of the Catholic Church, which, through Pope Paul V (1605-1621), saw therein an opportunity to become involved in the internal affairs of the Orthodox Church. The policies drawn by Laurentius remained unchanged under his successor, Joasaf (1617-1661), who not only stood

up to the Patriarches of Alexandria, but kept the communication lines with the Vatican open. Moreover, he was successful in gaining the support of the Moldavian ruler Ioannis Vasilios (1643-1653), who pressingly intervened in the Patriarchate of Constantinople in favor of the demands posed by the Monastery of Sinai. Joasaf's unyielding position led to his dethronement on December 1646 and January 1648 on the initiative of Ioannikios II, Patriarch of Constantinople, Ioannikios, Patriarch of Alexandria, Efthimios III, Patriarch of Antioch and Paisios, Patriarch of Jerusalem. The order was ostentatiously ignored by Joasaf, with the support of the Moldavian voevod and the Vatican. His successor, Ananias (1661-1671), followed the policies of his predecessors Laurentius and Joasaf, despite the fact that this assured the continued hostility of the Patriarchates of the Orthodox East and the Russian Czar, Alexios Michailovich (1645-1675). He enjoyed, however, the support of the princes of Wallachia, whom Ioannis Kariofillis, the High Official title-holder of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, could influence. On December 1670, the Permament Synod of Constantinople, headed by Patriarches Methodius III of Constantinople and Dositheos of Jerusalem, deposed Ananias. Ananias subsequently turned to Czar Alexios, offering him the protection of the Monastery of Sinai, a request Alexios fortunately turned down, out of fear perhaps of provoking the wrath of the Patriarchates of the Orthodox East. In 1691, a new Permanent Synod in Constantinople reached a decision to depose Ananias again, but did little to resolve the Sinai question, i.e. the Archbishopric's demand for an autocephalous status. In 1671, Ananias had resigned his post and his post was assumed by Ioannikios (1671-1702). He did not cease, however, to behave in a thoroughly irregular manner, claiming titles to which he had no right to or wearing vestments of the Archbishops of Cyprus and Achrid. A new decision to dethrone him was carried out in 1691, over the objections of the voevods of Moldovia and Wallachia (Constantine Bessarab and Constantine Cantemir), the French Ambassador to Constantinople and the Turkish authorities.

The Sinai question flared anew in the mid-19th century, with the election of Cyril Byzantius (January 7, 1859) to the post of the Archbishop of Sinai. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Cyril II, refused to ordain him, as he ought to have, having been instructed so by his predecessor, the late Patriarch of Constantinople Constantios (1830-1834, †1859). The fathers of Sinai sought the help of Constantios' successor Cyril VII (1855-1860), who, at the intervention of Count N. Ignatiev (friend of Cyril) ordained him on November 25, 1854. The move was interpreted as an unauthorized intervention of the Patriarch of Constantinople into the affairs of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The fathers in Sinai were now allied, in a sense, to the Patriarch of Constantinople, as far as their argument with the Patriarch of Jerusalem was concerned. This led to a new series of problems of Canon law of a more general nature, with wider political ramifications, involving the Russian church and its effort to play a more active role in the region. Finally, the matter was brought before the Permanent Synod of Constantinople (1859), who called on the Patriarch of Jerusalem to end his irregular refusal to ordain Cyril Byzantius. The Ecumenical Patriarch Cyril himself was the one who finally ordained the Archbishop of Sinai in the Monastery's dependency of the Holy Cross in Constantinople. Cyril's authoritative manners and nepotism, his abuses and collaboration with the Turks and Count Ignatiev ultimately led the fathers of Sinai to ask for the intervention of Cyril, Patriarch of Jerusalem and others. The fathers at Sinai elected Cyril Rokidis in the post of father supreme and, On August 24, 1867, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in the presence of the exarchs of the Congregation of Sinai, dethroned Cyril. The dethronement was carried out over the objections of the Ecumenical Patriarch Grigorius VI, a friend and supporter of Cyril's, who claimed that the matter had to be decided together with the Church

Seat. Cyril Rokidis (later named Kallistratos) worked hard during 1867-1868 for an acceptable solution on the Sinai Question and in order to restore the normal relations between the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Monastery. Kallistratos Rokidis had to overcome, at the same time, other difficulties, such as the anti-Greek policy of Ignatiev, the theft of the famous Code of Sinai by Tischendorf and the abuses of father Serafim in one of the Monastery's dependencies, all issues that deeply divided the fraternity. By August 1873, most of the issues had been resolved and relations between the Monastery and the Patriarchate of Jerusalem became normal again. However, the Monastery of Sinai entered a period of rapid decline, for reasons attributed both to a Panslavic propaganda and the uprising of the Arab-speaking populations of Egypt and the Middle East. Porfirios (1885-1904), who succeeded Kallistratos, tried to put a hold on this decline. He administrated the financial affairs of the Monastery with great care, thereby managing to repay all debts, found a School in Rethos, establish dependencies and generally build up momentum for the Monastery; this, despite the obstacles raised by the Patriarch of Alexandria, who objected to the re-establishment of the Monastery's dependency in Cairo and disagreed over the Ambetios School, the Greek Orthodox Community School in Cairo. Porfirios kept his title as President of the Ambetios School and reaffirmed its Greek character by appointing likelyminded teachers and professors.

At the end of his research Mr. Kontogiannis looks at a number of problems: he searches for the reasons behind the emergence of the Sinai Question, which he attributes to the ambition for greater authority which the post of the Archbishop of Sinai seemed to carry. He also discusses the Archbishops' clash with the Patriarches of Jerusalem and Alexandria; the assumption of the post of the archbishop of Sinai and the post of father superior of the Monastery by one and the same person and the conflict of jurisdictions that entailed; the lack of coordination that would have prevented the overlapping of jurisdictions between the father superior of Sinai and the Patriarchical throne, for the countries concerned; the intervention of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Eastern Patriarchates; and, the role played by Russia and the princes of Moldavia and Wallachia, with its grave effect to the ecclesiastic order.

Mr. Kontogiannis has done a superb job in bringing to light important elements which enrich our knowledge of an old ecclesiastic matter. He comments on the political implications of the question for that period and discusses the involvement of the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, in a situation that bears some resemblance to the present one. The author has used unpublished sources and has successfully combined it with what is already published. Overall, the book is an important work, rich in information about the history of Hellenism and the Orthodox Church in the Middle East and the Greek East.

Institut for Balkan Studies ATHANASSIOS E. KARATHANASSIS

Augustinos Gerasimos, ed., *Diverse Paths to Modernity in Southeastern Europe: Essays in National Development*, New York, Greenwood Press, 1991, 176 pages.

This compilation of scholarly contributions provides an historical examination of the