

The English version becomes by far the most useful and authoritative of the three previous editions.

Princeton's publication at this time of an English translation of Babinger's important biography provides a standard life-story of one of the greatest rulers of the Middle East and Balkan history. Along with Babinger's scholarship, now more than two decades old, the editor has offered an excellent selection of pictures and maps, a useful index, a glossary of Turkish terms, and numerous references to the most recent scholarship on the subject. Undergirded by these scholarly aids, Babinger's story of Mehmed the Conqueror acquaints the reader with the Islamic foundations of Balkan history in the modern world.

Colorado State University

WILLIAM J. GRISWOLD

Baker, Derek (ed.), *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1976, 336 p. / *Studies in Church History*, vol. 13/.

The twenty papers in this work are a selection from those read for two meetings of the Ecclesiastical History Society. The common thread, as the editor indicates, is the survival and the living continuity of the Orthodox tradition. Though the themes of the papers are all, at least tangentially, connected with the varied relationships between eastern and western Christianity, the papers are diverse both in their subjects and in their time frame. We see Orthodoxy not only in the Byzantine period but also in the twentieth century.

The Byzantines saw Orthodoxy and the Empire as being coterminous; a habit of thought which carried them through centuries of disorder and tribulation, particularly in the later stages of the Empire. However, the Orthodox church has persisted long after the fall of Constantinople. The myth of the union of Church and empire survived to the very end but was ultimately replaced in the fifteenth century when the Church was forced to learn to survive on its own. Approximately half of the papers explore the origins of this ability to survive; first in the Byzantine Orthodoxy's encounters with the West and second in the resistance of the Church during the XIIIth - XVth century to their emperors' efforts to secure western military aid by submitting to the claims of the papacy.

The problems of combining the teachings of Christ and with those of the Greek philosophers are examined by Dr. Amand de Mendieta who shows the differences between the official and private positions of Basil of Caesarea on the value of Greek philosophy and science to the Christians. This ambivalence was not unique to the Greeks and was in fact part of the Mediterranean Koine discussed by Peter Brown. Yet there were important differences. Professor Janet Nelson examines the distinctly divergent inauguration rituals in Byzantine and the West which emerged from the common framework of Christian theology. In saints, too, the western and eastern Christians had distinct tastes as Derek Baker shows in the life of Theodore of Sykeon. Theodore was an ascetic but no mystic. He was very much involved in the world and "epitomized the moral qualities so prized by the Byzantines in their saints as much as in their soldiers,...." The ecclesiastical and intellectual encounters with the West during the Byzantine period of the Orthodox Church served to sharpen the distinctions between the Latin and Greek branches of Christianity. However, as Professor Brown demonstrated there was a Mediterranean Koine, the common cultural background of East and West, which should cause us to hesitate in defining the early divergence between the west and east too starkly. Yet the difference existed and Professor Brown has brilliantly epitomized this in his study of the divergent attitudes in the two Churches toward the idea of the *holy*. The

comparative study sets the standard for the high level of scholarship which characterizes these selections.

All too often contacts between the two Churches were traumatized by schisms which successively emerged and were resolved until the Fourth Crusade. After which the differences were seen to be so acute that only capitulation by one side or the other could resolve the outstanding questions. The Greeks and the Latins were divided by language so that it is important to know whether a pope such as Gregory the Great knew Greek (Joan M. Peterson). Also of considerable interest is the extent and quality of Robert Grossteste's command of the Greek language (Kathryn Hill).

The difficulties of communication only compounded the doctrinal differences between the two Churches. That the Greeks knew very little Latin and the ignorance was reciprocated by the westerners increased the importance of the few bilingual individuals who did exist. Professor Geanakoplos has shown that a good part of the, admittedly ephemeral, success of the Council of Lyon was due not to Bonaventura but to two Franciscan friars John Parastron and Jerome Ascoli. The Cistercians on the other hand failed completely in their religious missions to the East; Dr. Bolton sees them as lacking the modernity of the Franciscans and in their missions to the Levant being too distant from Cîteaux, the spiritual heart of the order, which itself had lost its previous vigor.

In the same context, Grigori Tsamblak has traditionally appeared as a conciliator figure at the Council of Constance. He was neither the enlightened champion of reunion as appears in some traditions nor the betrayer of Orthodoxy, as in others. A comparison of Fillastre's diary, which established the conciliator tradition, with a Slavonic version of his planned but undelivered sermon before the Council shows him to have been an orthodox cleric with tradition attitudes on union.

The obvious doctrinal differences first systematically discussed by Photius already existed in the Acacian Schism where the western and eastern Churches demonstrated that they were thinking in different terms (Prof. Freud). The schism was ended by Justin I and Justinian, but Justin II was forced in his turn to demonstrate the continuing orthodoxy of the reigning emperor (Averil Cameron). It was only late in the vicissitudes of the relations of the two Churches that what Professor Nicol has called "the papal scandal" came to dominate efforts toward a healing of the schism. After 1204, the *filioque* question and other doctrinal controversies remained but the arrogant demands for papal supremacy by the Latins became for the Greeks the focus of their most vociferous refusals to capitulate to the westerners. The innovations which the popes wished to force upon the Greeks caused such a violent reaction that even the safety of the Empire could not bring a lessening of the objections to western novelties. The distaste for the other sides heresies were reciprocated by the Latins. Dr. Hill shows the anti-Greek attitudes in Fulcher of Chartres who seems to have accumulated a good portion of the Grecophobia of the first crusaders. The efforts at union caused a spirit of autonomy to develop within the Eastern Church so that after 1453 the Orthodox Church has survived under the Turks and under communism.

The talent for survival under Turkish domination over several centuries produced a significant anticlericism in Greece. This attitude is explored by Dr. Clogg in the period before independence. Intellectuals were the most obvious originators of anticlerical tendencies toward a Church which had become intellectual ossified under the Turks. But the popular saying among the Greeks that includes the priests at the head of the list of curses upon Greece in the 1820's is shown by Dr. Clogg to represent a deep-rooted anticlericalism among all strata of Greek society. The Orthodox Church protected the Orthodox Christians but in the process it became part of the apparatus of Turkish domination—perpetuating and profiting

from that domination, under the millet system. The Turkish conquest not only produced an eventually ambivalent attitude of the saved toward their saviors in Greece but also led to the further development of autonomous entities within Orthodoxy as seen in Dr. Topp's discussion of the Rumanian Church and the West. The view that the Orthodox Church was the pillar which enabled Christians to survive oppression is seriously questioned by Dr. Clogg but emotively postulated by Dr. Zernov in his discussion of the messianic mission of Orthodoxy to the West as a result of the triumph of communism in Russia.

In the modern period the Orthodox Church has received attention from a variety of *loci*. The spiritual attractions of Orthodoxy affected Frederick North, the fifth Earl of Guilford, who Dr. Ware demonstrates was a philhellene not only politically but also religiously through a secret conversion to Orthodoxy. Dr. Cuming explores the liturgical influence of the East on the Anglican divines of Reformation England. A knowledge of eastern liturgy could not only stimulate *Angelic* liturgists but could also produce disharmony as Professor Sefton shows in the vicissitudes of the negotiations of the Scottish bishops with archbishop Arsenius of Thebais in Egypt during the early 18th century.

Such dissension could occur not only between a bishop Campell and his peers but also among the Orthodox. In Dr. Stuart Mew's paper, the political and religious situation in Egypt under British domination made it possible for an overzealous bishop Gwynne to intervene in the election of the Greek Patriarch of Alexandria in 1926.

Finally a word must be said with regard to the quality of selection and editing in this volume. Professor Baker has done a remarkable job of presenting to the academic community a volume that is scholarly in its individual contributions and coherent in its attention to the general theme.

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.

FRANK E. WOZNIAK

John V. A. Fine, Jr., *The Bosnian Church: A New Interpretation*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1975, 447 p.

Within the scholarly community of medieval Balkanists, two distinct and alternate interpretations of the character of the Bosnian Church exist: one, that the church was dualist and second, that it was schismatic and autonomous but essentially orthodox in its doctrines. The daunting aspect which one confronts when discussing the Bosnian Church is that both sides are able to marshal considerable and even compelling evidence for their case but only at the expense of rejecting whole blocks of evidence which seem to substantiate the alternate interpretation. Instead of entering this arena of scholarly disputation on one side or the other, Professor Fine takes the refreshing and what seems to me correct direction of going back to the sources. He returns not just to some of the sources but to all of them in an effort to make sense of these materials without arbitrarily dismissing any relevant evidence. Very aptly, he recognizes that any single-explanation theory will probably not be sufficient to explain all aspects of the religious question in medieval Bosnia. Taking into account the work of 19th and 20th century scholars as Franja Racki, V. Vorović, A. Babić, D. Kniewald, A. Bolovjev, J. Šidak, L. P. Petrović and others, the author offers a significantly different solution to the problem of the nature of the Bosnian Church.

Though Professor Fine's study of the medieval Bosnian Church is less concerned with the theology than with the role of this church in Bosnian society and the Bosnian state, he, nonetheless, provides at every stage of his argument a thorough explication of the nature of