

## ***Book Reviews***

Ekkehard Kraft, *Moskaus griechisches Jahrhundert, Griechisch-russische Beziehungen und metabyzantinischer Einfluss 1619-1694*, Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart 1995.

The first part of the book describes the conditions of life experienced by the Orthodox, and particularly the Greek Orthodox, population of the Ottoman Empire. It presents the system of millets as it evolved on the initiative of the sultan Mehmet II after the fall of Constantinople, a system which enabled the Orthodox Church to preserve in part the imperial idea of Byzantium and which safeguarded for the Orthodox their autonomy in the field of so-called psychica, that is to say in that part of the law which today we call civil. The internal situation of the Orthodox Church was influenced by the general condition of the Ottoman state; thus from the end of the 16th century throughout the 17th the Empire's steep decline and the frequent replacement of its civil functionaries were reflected in the frequent changes of leadership of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and of the different dioceses. The continuous financial needs of the Ottoman state and its officials, and the custom of bribery for the securing of office, created in the bosom of the church also a constant need for money which could only be supplied by travelling to the few independent Orthodox countries of that era—to the principalities of the Danube, to Georgia, and especially to Russia—to seek and collect charitable donations. Significantly greater stability prevailed in the other eastern Patriarchates, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, than in Constantinople. For this reason the Patriarchs of Jerusalem particularly, who spent most of their prelacy not in the holy city but in Constantinople, played an important role during the 17th century in the history of the Greek people.

As for Greek education at this period, the Greek College of Rome from its establishment in 1577 constituted an important centre of education for Greek intellectuals. Many of the graduates of this college later continued their studies at the University of Padua, the pre-eminent Greek university of the day. In Constantinople the patriarchal school functioned with occasional interruptions, as did also, from 1663, the so-called school of Manolakis, with teachers such as Theophilos Korydaleas, Ioannis Karyophilis, Germanos Lokros, Alexandros Mavrokordatos and Sevastos Kyminitis; in addition, the many libraries in monasteries and in private hands created excellent conditions for self-education. Nowhere in the Christian east did better educational opportu-

nities exist than in the Greek part.

The next chapter deals with the meetings of Greeks and Russians in the 17th century and presents an analysis of the types of contact between them: the nature of the contact (requests for charity, Greek clerics and laymen acting as agents supplying information to Moscow) and the social group of those taking part (monks, bishops, merchants), the route travelled (generally through Vlachia, Moldavia and the Ukraine, more rarely via the Caucasus, the Caspian Sea, the Baltic countries or the North Sea), their arrival in Moscow, their reception by the Tsar's officials and their sojourn there; he describes abuses on the part of the Greeks but also of the Russians. Moscow was also a place of exile for many Greek clerics and intellectuals who for political or financial reasons settled in Moscow or elsewhere in Russia. As for the stereotypical preconception each race had of the other, the Russians from the 15th century entertained a certain mistrust of the Greeks. Because the Greeks and the other Orthodox nations of the south had entered into a union, though briefly, with the Roman Catholics. Florence, the Russians felt themselves superior in matters of religion and considered themselves purer and more faithful members of the Orthodox faith. For their own part, the Greeks never forgot that they themselves gave Orthodoxy to the Russians and in matters of faith they always felt themselves superior.

In the fourth chapter Dr Kraft deals with the political aspect of Greek-Russian relations. Almost immediately after the shock of the Fall of Constantinople, hope had begun to spring up of deliverance from Ottoman rule. Certain pro-European intellectuals saw western Europe as the source of that deliverance, while the majority of the people and of the clergy had reservations about such a possibility. With the increased contacts between Greeks and Russians and continuously circulating prophecies of a "blond race" that would liberate and regenerate the Roman Empire, hopes turned more and more towards the great power of the north. The famous scholar-monk Maximos the Greek and the Patriarch of Alexandria Joachim were the first to remind the Russian Tsar of his duty. During the prelacy of the Ecumenical Patriarch Cyrillos of Loukaris, the first phase of political collaboration between Greeks and Russians took place, in the form of efforts to establish a Russian-Ottoman alliance, that also included the Protestant countries, against the Catholic powers of Europe. After the violent death of the Patriarch, the Greek side reverted to its traditional anti-Ottoman attitude. Greek prelates made great efforts to promote the union of the Ukraine with Moscow. The Patriarch of Jerusalem took important initiatives in this direction, as did the Metropolitans of Corinth, Ioasaf, of Thessaloniki, Galaction, and of Nazareth,

Gabriel, who acted as mediators between the Ukrainian Cossacks and their leader Bogdan Chmel'nickij and Tsar Alexei Mikailovich. A striking record of this time is the "Encouraging Word" of the former Ecumenical Patriarch Athanasios Patellaros, who originated in Crete, in which he deploys all his scholarship, with references to the Old Testament, to the Iliad, and to history, to show that the Tsar was the sovereign chosen by God to liberate the Orthodox from the Ottoman yoke. Another substantial Greek argument was the various prophecies that circulated at that time. In the end Moscow accepted the Greek overtures. At a reception for Greek merchants on Easter Sunday, 1656 the Tsar emphasised that he considered it his duty to deliver their country from the Turks. However, the situation in the Ottoman Empire just at that time had stabilised and Moscow lost its opportunity. Alexei Mikailovich after his second marriage showed an increasing interest in western Europe and its culture, and so the Byzantine phase of his life passed without anything more significant happening in terms of foreign policy; Greek-Russian relations were slackened for a time. The first Russo-Turkish war broke out in 1677 when Alexei's son Fedor Alexeevich was Tsar.

An important person generally, and in particular to Greek-Russian relationships at that time, was the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos Notaras. Having understood that the time was not yet ripe for the realisation of great plans, he determined that the best policy for future success was unconditional support for Russia. He followed this policy throughout his very long tenure of office (1669-1707), becoming probably Moscow's most important agent in the Ottoman Empire. The ecclesiastical problems of the Patriarchate, such as the dispute about jurisdiction with the monastery of Ag. Aikaterini on Mount Sinai, in which Moscow became involved, did not significantly affect Dositheos' long-term policy. He was however, in spite of all his efforts, unable to prevent a fundamental change in Russian policy during the reign of Peter the Great, who nevertheless drew on the Greek Century for many of the elements of his foreign policy.

There were also ideological consequences of those close Greek-Russian contacts. In the eyes of the Greeks the Russian Tsar took the place of the Byzantine Emperor as supreme ruler, and this is reflected in the clearly Byzantine titles by which the Greek prelates addressed the Russian Tsar, such as Invincible, Most Serene, Sent By God, Most Christian, and so on. Thus the Tsar seemed to be a new Constantine and Moscow a new Constantinople, but temporarily, however, because they awaited the conquest of Constantinople by the Russians and the re-establishment and regeneration of the Roman Empire. Thus their stubborn adherence to the ecclesiastical primacy of Constantinople

is not in doubt. A final sign of post-Byzantine influence belongs to the decade following 1680: the plan of a register of marks based on Byzantine models such as the Pseudo-Kodinos and others.

The final large chapter of Dr Kraft's book is devoted to the ecclesiastical and cultural aspect of Greek-Orthodox influence in Russia. A characteristic of the 17th century in comparison with the preceding two was an appreciable Greekness in the Russian church. This was due in large measure to the necessity to revise the ecclesiastical books. The question was, however, on which models, Greek or ancient Slav, the revisions should be based. In this the case of Archimandrite Dionysios was significant. He was one of the few philhellenes in Moscow at the beginning of the 17th century and he paid for his daring in revising liturgical books according to the Greek model with several years' confinement in a monastery. The efforts of the Patriarch of Jerusalem Theophanis and his influence on the new Patriarch of Moscow Philaretos (who was also the father of Tsar Mikail Fedorovich) gained Dionysios his freedom. Thus it was Theophanis who inaugurated Moscow's "Greek Century".

During the period when Philaretos was Patriarch (1619-1633) we can distinguish a cautious opening towards Greek authority. This opening widened further in the decade from 1640 with what the Russian historian Kapterev called the "circle of zealots for godliness" to which belonged the confessor of the Tsar, Stefan Vonifat'ev, and various eminent aristocrats. They had forsaken the old prejudices against the books which originated in the Ukraine and in Greek territory. When the Patriarch Moschas Iosif died, the Metropolitan of Novgorod, Nikon, with the support of the Tsar and of the Circle, became his successor. Nikon was a very authoritative prelate and a highly committed philhellene even in his eating-habits. Almost immediately after his enthronement he began the work of reforming the Russian Church along Greek lines. The most disputed element of this reform was the change in the sign of the cross, which in Russia had customarily been made with two fingers to symbolise the dual nature of Christ; Nikon now compulsorily introduced the use of three fingers, symbolising the Holy Trinity, in accordance with the custom of the Greeks and the other Orthodox in the Balkans and the Middle East. His closest associates were Arsenios the Greek (a native of Trikala in Thessaly who had an adventurous past) and the Ukrainian Hellenist scholar Epifanij Slavineckij. The reforms once established led the traditional part of the Russian Orthodox Church that had anti-Greek feelings into the schism of the so-called Old Believers, a schism which continues to this day.

As the reforms were completed, little by little a dispute began to develop between the Patriarch Nikon and Tsar Alexei. The autocratic behaviour of the

Patriarch provoked a negative reaction in the Tsar, who was by then older and more independent. After one minor incident, Nikon resigned his office, a move obviously designed to induce remorse in the Tsar and ensure his triumphant return. The Tsar however reacted otherwise. The arrival soon afterwards of the Chiote scholar Paΐsios Leigarides provided Alexei Mikailovich with the expert required to settle the dispute. Leigarides was a dubious character, a graduate of the Greek College of Rome whom the Propaganda fide later sent as a Catholic missionary to the east. There, however, he supposedly converted to Orthodoxy and the Patriarch of Jerusalem Paΐsios ordained him Metropolitan of Gaza. He soon abandoned his diocese for other places and for that reason Paΐsios finally deprived him of office.

Given the handling of the dispute in Moscow, Leigarides exacerbated the situation. He proposed the setting up of an ecumenical synod that required the presence of the Patriarchs of the east. The Patriarchs Paΐsios of Alexandria and the Arab Makarios of Antioch answered the Tsar's invitation in the affirmative and made the journey to Moscow, but the Ecumenical Patriarch Dionysios III and Nectarios the Patriarch of Jerusalem did not participate. Nikon's arrogant behaviour and the canons of ecclesiastical law left them, notwithstanding their sympathies with the philhellene Patriarch, no margin for leniency. Thus the synod of 1666/67, in which nine Greek bishops took part along with the two Patriarchs, sentenced Nikon to be disordained. It also regulated the internal problems of the Russian church. After the synod Leigarides ceased to play a significant role in Moscow.

The so-called Greek faction was then at the height of its influence. Its protector was the Patriarch of Moscow Joachim. After the second marriage of Tsar Alexei, however, western influences appeared in the form of the so-called Latin faction in which the leading figure was the White Russian scholar-monk Simeon Polockij, while the central personality in the Greek faction was Epiphaniј Slavneckij. For all their conflicting views, the two intellectuals always maintained cordial relations, something that changed drastically after their deaths when their pupils the monk Evfimij and Sil'vestr Medvedev took charge of the controversies. Medvedev also had political ambitions and in the struggle for power in Russia he allied himself with the Miloslavskij faction, that is to say with the family of Tsar Alexei's first wife. A significant aggravation of the discord resulted from a theological dispute provoked by Evfimij in opposing the Latin faction's views on the moment of transubstantiation of the holy gifts in the liturgy. In this dispute he found allies in two fellow scholar-monks from Kephallonia, Sophronios and Ioannikios Leichoudes who had received an official Russian invitation to Moscow to establish and

direct a high school there, the famous Greek-Slavic-Latin academy, in accordance with a plan that had existed in Moscow from the beginning of the 16th century. As soon as the Naryškin, the family of Alexei Mikailovich's second wife who was the mother of Peter the Great, had triumphed over the Miloslavskij, political developments brought a parallel defeat of Medvedev as scheming politician and representative of the Latin faction. This victory of the Greek party, though, was to be short-lived. The interest of the new Tsar had already turned towards the west; and Ioannikios Leichoudes' son's love affair with a young Russian woman resulted in the closing of the academy and the expulsion of its founders. Thus Moscow's Greek century came to an end in 1694.

To conclude, Dr E. Kraft's book is a useful one, showing as it does the full extent of Greek-Russian relationships during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The author has used his material methodically to give a clear picture of the Greek presence in Russia at this critical time.

*University of Thessaloniki*

ATHANASSIOS E. KARATHANASSIS

Meropi Anastassiadou, *Salonique, 1830-1912. Une ville ottomane à l'âge des Réformes*, Leiden - New York - Köln (Brill) 1997, pp. 465.

Le livre en question s'occupe d'un sujet intéressant. Mais notons tout d'abord que son contenu il paraît qu'il n'approche pas le sujet des Réformes ottomanes (Tanzimat). Il n'y a pas de références à la législation des Réformes qui a été rédigée de 1839 jusqu'à 1876 et qui constitue la source fondamentale de l'approche du sujet. Il paraît encore que l'auteur n'a pas en vue la plus grande partie des informations de l'archive britannique (Public Record Office Foreign Office Archives) et de l'archive française (Archives du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères: Correspondance consulaire et commerciale, Correspondance politique). La majorité des informations provient surtout de la bibliographie mais puisqu'elles ne sont pas confrontées à la législation des Réformes et aux informations des archives elles ne sont pas persuasives. De plus, le sujet n'est pas situé correctement en ce qui concerne les dates. Comme il résulte de la législation des Réformes celles-ci ont duré de 1839 jusqu'à 1876 et pas jusqu'à 1912. A cause de ce remuement chronologique jusqu'à 1912 presque tout le contenu de ce livre concerne la fin du 19e siècle et pas les Réformes. Les Réformes ottomanes sont présentées comme un effort qui avait pour but la réalisation "de la cohabitation fraternelle" des divers peuples qui vivaient à