

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

the doctrines of the Bosnian church. His methodologically convincing use of an anthropological hypothesis on the nature of peasant societies provides a satisfactory framework for the discussion of religious syncretism and the weak hold of Christianity upon Bosnia's uneducated rural society. Thus, the peasant looked at religion from a rural, concrete, worldly and unlettered point of view which took preeminence over any formal connection with any particular religious confession. For the peasant and even to a great extent the nobility in medieval Bosnia, formal religion had little influence and even less of a hold in this overwhelmingly peasant society. In such a society new ideas spread with excruciating slowness which should make us wary of the alarmist discussion in papal letters of the rapid spread of heresy.

Throughout the study but particularly in his chapter on sources, Professor Fine judiciously apprizes us of the nature of the available evidence; an impression reinforced by his exhaustive bibliography of primary and secondary sources. There are no contemporary, native chronicles of events in medieval Bosnia nor do there exist any archives in Bosnia containing any documents for the period before the Turkish conquest. We do have three early 17th century chronicles written by foreigners, charters and records from the Dubrovnik archives, papal letters about heresy, accounts of Franciscan missionary efforts in the Balkans, documents in archives outside of Bosnia but related to Bosnian affairs and archeological evidence; but we do not have a single work written by any Bosnian churchman. On the basis of the hypothesis concerning the place of religion in medieval Bosnian society and a thorough reexamination of the sources, the author pursues a chronological development of his subject. Though such an approach to the subject might initially appear to be antiquated, the first chapter quite clearly demonstrates the usefulness and even necessity of this framework for analysis.

Not until the reign of Ban Kulin in the late 12th century and early 13th century do we acquire much substantial information on religious affairs in medieval Bosnia. Before this, the situation is hazy, but a nominal Catholicism seems to have been the norm in this rural society. With the onset of Hungarian intrigues and invasions, charges of heresy begin to be levied at the Bosnians with unrelenting vigor. The existence of an unreformed Benedictine monasticism, which had through ignorance and isolation fallen into abuses of church practices, Papal misconceptions and misinformation, along with Hungarian efforts to justify their reassertion of authority in Bosnia served to superficially substantiate the picture of an heretical Bosnian Church in the late 12th and early 13th century. While never really heretical, save maybe through ignorance, the Bosnian monks did come eventually to break away from Rome and form their own independent Bosnian Church. Driven by foreign persecution and Papal ignorance, these misguided but well-intentioned Bosnian monks who formed the mainstream of formal religion in Bosnia established an autonomous church between 1234 and 1252. The hierarchy of the Bosnian Church was the administrative personnel of the existing monastic order. In utilizing the unreformed monastic order as the foundation of the church, the monks preserved the beliefs and practices of the order until that time. At first simply schismatic, the ignorance of the monks served also to insure the gradual intrusion of a variety of deviations in belief and practice. The formation of the Bosnian Church was thus part of a nativistic response to the Hungarian threat to the position and authority of the political leadership in Bosnia and to the potential consequences of a Hungarian domination of the Christian church in Bosnia.

Founded on a fear of outside influences among the monkish order in Bosnia, the Bosnian church based its doctrines on its own brand of Catholicism which because of its deviations into prescribed practices seemed to the Papal hierarchy to have earned the label of heretical. This essentially schismatic church was largely limited to the monastic order in Bosnia and

found little root in the peasant population because of the unconfessional nature of peasant religious practices and the incipient monkish abjuring of secular and social religious responsibilities. The Bosnian Church served the monastic community and varying parts of the aristocratic elite for nearly two centuries with an indifferent degree of success. Most medieval Bosnian kings after the mid-13th century seem to have been initially members of the Bosnian Church but the religious indifference of the Bosnian nobility and the vicissitudes of power caused most of the political leadership to flirt with Catholicism and even to convert when such a move seemed expedient. Consequently, the Bosnian Church never received any widescale commitment, except on occasion from the nobility, and never seems to have had a significant following among the unlettered peasants.

All evidence seems to indicate that the schismatic monkish church of Bosnia was, at least initially, nominally Catholic in its theology. The charges of dualism, which began only in the 15th century and which have thoroughly complicated previous studies, are founded on the probable existence of a small but distinct dualist movement in Bosnia and upon the possible acquisition of practices or attitudes which seemed to the foreign writers of inquisitional and polemical literature to be dualist in character. The substantially non-heretical but schismatic character of the Bosnian Church is further emphasized by the amazing paucity of references to dualists, Patarins or other heterodox Christians in sources related to Bosnia after the Turkish conquest when the only references are to the Orthodox, Catholics and Muslims.

Only a very small part of the Bosnian population had ever been full members of the Bosnian Church. When King Stefan Tomas forced the conversion to the Roman Church of the monastic kernal of the Bosnian Church, the church for all intents and purposes disappeared within a very short time after 1459. Further, this church which was largely restricted to a self-perpetuating monastic community with few roots in the general population was not a member of the Orthodox community. Several denunciations by the Serbian Church and the rivalry of Catholic and Orthodox missionaries for the religious adherence of the Bosnian population in the last years of the Bosnian state serve to confirm this conclusion. In addition the gradualness with which Orthodoxy appeared in Bosnia after 1463 seems to substantiate Professor Fine's conclusion that prior to the Turkish conquest Orthodoxy was weak in Bosnia and that the Bosnian Church was not a part of Orthodox Church.

While the chronological arrangement of this study might have some apparent deficiencies, the nature of the sources and the logic of the author's presentation quickly allay any reservations. Although the reader is left to make his own final summation of the author's conclusions, the author's exhaustive and analytical study leaves one convinced that Professor Fine has unraveled the major questions surrounding the Bosnian Church. In the end, however, what Professor Fine has produced in this extremely convincing analysis of the Bosnian Church is more than a new interpretation of the intricate religious problems of Bosnia in the later Middle Ages. He has given us a thorough discussion of the political history of medieval Bosnia and Hercegovina, a political history which is intricate in itself but the explanation of which serves as a further important contribution of this work.

*University of New Mexico*

FRANK E. WOZNIAK

Nondas Stamatopoulos, *Old Corfu, History and Culture*, Corfu 1978. Second edition revised and completed. Pp. 300, with 24 Plates and two Maps.

"Old Corfu" — what more enchanting title than this for Greek and philhellenic rea-