

Charles A. Frazee, *The Orthodox Church and Independent Greece 1821-1852*, Cambridge University Press, 1969. Pp. viii+220.

This work is a welcome addition to the many books on modern Greek history that have recently appeared in English. In it Professor Frazee has made available to the general public outside Greece the findings of the many Greek historians who have written on the Greek Church of modern times. He was not, unfortunately, able to use the monumental volume of Varnavas Tsortzatos, the Metropolitan Bishop of Kitros, on the statutory legislation of the Church of Greece, which work appeared only two years ago. But he had at his disposal most of the sources on which that work is based. To all this he has added a few details taken from the archives of London, Munich, Rome and Paris, though it is doubtful whether these add anything of importance to what is already known. Indeed, the principle value of this work is that it gives in a relatively small compass a scholarly account of the relation of Church and State in Greece from 1821 to 1852. This account is given a fairly wide general historical setting. To do this is not, from the point of view of arriving at a correct balance, an easy task; and, although it be said that more attention might have been paid to the inner life of the Church, on the whole the author has surmounted most difficulties of arrangement and proportion. His narrative and commentary flow easily, and he packs his text neatly with salient information, much of which he expands in his footnotes, which contain moreover lively comment on his sources. His approach is factual; he ties his story closely to his authorities; and these he quotes from time with much skill and to good effect.

He begins his story with the fall of Constantinople in May 1453 and then goes on to describe the Church under Ottoman rule. He examines its status, its ecumenical character, its clergy, its schools and its conservatism—a conservatism which like that of many conservative institutions may well contain within itself both revolutionary and counterrevolutionary tendencies. Professor Frazee does not bring out this last point in so many words; perhaps even he might not agree with the construction here placed upon the story he had to tell; but in his second chapter on the prelude to the Greek revolt, and in his third chapter on the year of revolution, 1821, he says enough to show clearly the twofold, paradoxical, character of the Holy Church—its hostility, on the one hand, to the kind of nationalism that derived from the Enlighten-

ment and the French Revolution, and, on the other, its love for the nation, the *millet*, as it existed in the Ottoman Empire, a form of nationalism which was probably wider spread and deeper rooted than that which derived from Western thought. Here indeed was the great dilemma of the Patriarchate and its clergy in 1821. The Patriarch Gregorios V (who for the third time was holding the Patriarchate) had certainly shown some sympathy for the *Etairists*, among whom were many priests and monks, and outstanding bishops like Germanos; but yet he felt obliged to issue on April 4, in what he honestly considered to be the larger interests of Hellenism, a letter excommunicating those who had rebelled against the Sultan. This he did in good faith and with sorrow in his heart. But his action, although from the Patriarchal point of view correct, failed to satisfy Sultan Mahmoud, who was not convinced that Gregorios was above suspicion. The tragic result is well known. On 10 April Gregorios was seized after the divine Liturgy at Agios Georgios, and was hanged in his robes before a multitude of his sorrowing people.

His place was taken by the timid Eugenios II, who sent out to the Greek people in all parts of the Empire a letter calling on them to lay down their arms and "to return to that pristine state of perfect and loyal subjection." This letter was rejected in the Morea by twenty-eight bishops and by a thousand clergy, who anathematised the Patriarch as a Judas. The Church, as a political organisation, was therefore split. As a doctrinal establishment, however, it preserved its unity. In resurgent Greece it retained its great spiritual force and, equally important, its democratic tradition. Hence, although Greek political society has taken different forms and although it had attempted to emulate the liberalism of the west, its basic democratic character is firmly rooted in the Church. As in the period of the revolution in France, so in revolutionary Greece, the Church survived. In France it was the Concordat which first of all saved and later defeated Bonaparte. In Greece, and in the Greek lands outside the nascent state, it was the Church, which, despite the schism, maintained the fundamental unity of Hellenism.

The political and administrative schism in the Church was unavoidable. Successive Patriarchs, Eugenios, Anthimos, Chrysanthos, Agathangelos, Konstantinos, were under the control of a hostile government. The clergy who remained in what was to become the Greek kingdom (their losses were heavy) regarded the Patriarchate as vacant

and omitted the name of the Patriarch from the Liturgy. They had perforce transferred their allegiance to the new authorities, unsettled though these were. They took their place in the Peloponnesian Senate in 1821, in Mavrokordatos's Assembly in Western Greece, and in the Areopagus of Eastern Greece. They were to be found again in the National Assembly of Epidavros, which decreed that the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ was the established religion of the new Greek State. It was that body which set up a Ministry of Religion as one of the eight departments of government, and if, as was decreed on paper, the ninth-century *Basilika* had been enforced, the Church would have been deprived of the independence it had enjoyed in Turkish times. But in practice (in spite of this and subsequent attempts to subordinate the Church to the State) the Church, amid all the confusion of the war of Independence, carried on as best it could, filling higher vacancies (there was no Holy Chrism available in Greece), transferring clergy from parish to parish, finding places for refugee Greek clergy, providing for the continuation of the schools, attempting (but without much success) to provide training for the priesthood, and arranging (where possible) for the maintenance and repair of ecclesiastical buildings. In all this work the Ministry of Religion had some share, but in the main the Church, as formerly, looked after itself.

After the war, during the Regency of king Otho, a commission, under Tricoupis, was set up to enquire into the problems of the Church. Among its members was Th. Pharmakidis, who like Koraïs favoured an autonomous Church in Greece. He had been recommended by the scholar Georgios Gennadios to the Regent, Maurer, who, knowing nothing about the Orthodox Church, thought in terms of the ecclesiastical regime in Bavaria and who therefore found the schemes of Pharmakidis much to his liking. These schemes were presented to a synod at Nafplion in July 1833. There were present at the beginning some twenty-two prelates (nine were native bishops and thirteen were refugees) and later a further fourteen who arrived late upon the scene. These prelates (whose careers were at stake) displayed no unified opposition. They agreed to the Constitution of July 23, 1833. This stated that the Orthodox Eastern Apostolic Church of the Kingdom of Greece recognised, in spiritual matters, no head other than the founder of the Christian faith; that, while preserving doctrinal unity with other Orthodox Eastern Churches, it was autocephalous, and independent of all other authority; that the highest ecclesiastical authority was the king, who would

exercise that authority through a Holy Synod, whose membership would be determined by the king and whose proceedings would be scrutinised by a royal procurator; that the bishops were subject to the Synod, forbidden to correspond with any civil or ecclesiastical foreign power, and, in case of crime, subject to the secular courts.

This regime the Patriarch Konstantinos refused to ratify, and, but for the counsels of the Russians, would have anathematized the Church in Greece. The Russians, in advising moderation, hoped that the Bavarian Regents, in view of the unpopularity of the new regime, would change their policy. Through Katakazis, their representative in Athens, they attempted to exert pressure on Otho, his advisers and his minister. The result was that the Church question became caught up in the complicated politics of the Regency—struggles which from time to time manifested themselves in plots and violence. When in 1835 Otho came of age, these same struggles continued. At length in 1839 Pharmakidis was dismissed from his influential post as secretary of the Synod. His fall had been brought about chiefly by the activities of Oikonomos, a former adviser to the Tsar and a pensioner of Russia, who had returned in 1834 to Greece where he carried on literary polemics with Pharmakidis and plotted to bring about his downfall. When the plot succeeded the Synod passed into the hands of bishops opposed to the constitution of 1833. But this situation did not last long. In the summer of 1840 appointments to the Synod restored its old complexion.

Throughout the period 1833 to 1840 the Synod, which was chiefly a department of the royal administration, had reorganised the Church in Greece. Its work—the dissolution of more than 400 smaller monasteries and convents, the fixing of the boundaries of the bishoprics to coincide with secular administrative divisions, the imposition of episcopal control over the remaining monasteries, the issue of regulations concerning ordination, parish records, and marriage, the attempts to root out simony—all this is described in some detail by Professor Frazee. So too are the religious disputes over the activities of the British Foreign Bible Society and of the Protestant missionaries, over proposed translations of the Holy Scriptures, and over the question of the succession (Otho was a Roman Catholic and was loath to agree that any children he might have would be brought up in the Greek Orthodox faith).

The many disputes of Otho's reign, the religious no less than the purely secular conflicts, led in September 1843 to an (almost) bloodless

revolution which secured for Greece a new constitution and parliamentary government. Many hoped on this occasion to free the Church from state control, to reduce the king to the status of a mere "protector" and to restore relations with Constantinople. But when the new constitution of March 1844 was drawn up the hopes of Oikonomos and his supporters were not fulfilled. Moreover nothing came of the proposed 27 articles which Kolettis sponsored in May 1845—articles which were designed to give the Synod a greater control over Church administration; and nothing came of similar proposals made by Schinas in January 1847. By 1849, however, a somewhat new approach to the problem developed both within and outside Greece. The Patriarch, Anthimos IV, adopted a conciliatory attitude and Athens responded by rewarding him with the decoration of the Order of Saviour of Greece. The next year saw (largely as a result of Otho's reaction to the British blockade of Piraeus) a great improvement in Greek-Russian relations. Protracted negotiations followed and the outcome was a request to the Patriarch from the Government and Synod at Athens for the recognition of the Church in Greece and the restoration of full communion.

Professor Frazee ends his story at the compromise of 1852 and gives in a brief conclusion a rapid survey of the ground he has covered. He ends by saying: One could still find extreme devotion to Orthodoxy in 1852, but it could not compare to the enthusiasm engendered by "The Great Idea" of Greek expansion against the Turks. Secular nationalism had begun to replace religious fervour. Great fury could be raised by the fact that king Otho was not Orthodox, but it was anger born of political as much as religious motivation." In this there is undoubtedly an element of truth but perhaps also a degree of exaggeration. In any event, the conflict between political and ecclesiastic hellenism did not end with the compromise of 1852. One great problem always remained—whether it was in the ultimate interests of Hellenism to increase the size of the national state or whether it were better to leave the unredeemed Greeks as a theocracy in what remained of the Ottoman Empire. Theoretically there was much to be said on either side, but until the Smyrna disaster of 1922 the secular nationalists tended to play the dominating role. We must always remember, however, that Ion Dragoumis and others who took part in the Macedonian struggle thought more in terms of stemming the advance of the Exarchists than of extending the northern frontier of Greece. In

other words they attached more importance to the Patriarchate than to the Government of Athens.

Birkbeck College

DOUGLAS DAKIN

Mihailo Lalić, *Lelejska gora* (The Wailing Mountain). Belgrade, Prosveta, 1965; Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., Trans. from the Serbo-Croatian by Drenka Willen

*The Wailing Mountain* is the story of a man who is alone. It is the story of a man constantly pursued, a man who knows neither peace nor tranquility. His moments of happiness and satisfaction are only fleeting, and his relationships with other people are only superficial. Through the character of Lado Tajović the author vividly portrays the struggle of man to sever the bonds of loneliness and to find a path which will lead him out of the darkness.

Lado Tajović is a young Partisan in wartime Montenegro. He is separated from the main group of his companions and wanders through regions controlled by Chetniks and inhabited by people whom he cannot trust. His life is constantly in danger, and therefore he is always alert and always on the run. Lalić realistically depicts his hero's experiences and aspirations, his encounters with the families in the villages, his love for Nada, his hallucinations, dreams, and reminiscences. Lado soon becomes oblivious to all comforts of life as the desire to survive drives him onward in search of food and shelter.

The author chooses to present the novel from the standpoint of the main character. It is narrated in the first person because the thoughts within Lado's mind are more significant than the actual development of the plot or the other characters, who are important primarily not as individuals, but as a means of further revealing Lado's estrangement from society. The use of the first person enables the reader to identify more closely with Lado Tajović and to perceive more acutely the hardships which he endures. The dreams and visions within Lado's mind are the motivating factors in the novel.

Lado Tajović is a man who is fleeing not only from his political enemies, but also from the devastating loneliness within his own mind. Even when he is traveling with his companions, he is alone and is tor-