

ordinary number of provocative ideas, which should stimulate both Byzantinists and nonspecialists.

The least satisfactory feature of this work is its format. Praeger has published the book in a large edition with numerous plates, to which the author appends explanatory notes. But there are no footnotes, and the bibliography is very inadequate. Even the plates are hard to use, for the frequent discussions of individual works of art in the text are not accompanied by references to the illustrations. Although this work does include some discussion of the influence of Byzantium on Slavic culture, the author's main interest outside the empire is obviously Western Europe. As an interpretation of Byzantine culture, however, this study will be valuable for Slavic scholars as well as for Byzantinists.

DOROTHY DEF. ABRAHAMSE
California State College, Long Beach

THE GREAT CHURCH IN CAPTIVITY: A STUDY OF THE PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE FROM THE EVE OF THE TURKISH CONQUEST TO THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.
By *Steven Runciman*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1968. x, 455 pp. \$9.50.

The title of this interesting work is decidedly, though perhaps forgivably, misleading. Almost the first half of it deals with the Byzantine background of Near Eastern Orthodoxy in general and the Ecumenical Patriarchate in particular—concentrating successfully on such important issues as the structure of the church, church-state relations, Orthodoxy's dealings with the Latin West, and Eastern learning and piety. This is useful background, especially since the author's objective is "to examine the effects of the Ottoman conquest upon Greek ecclesiastical history and religious life" (p. 9). Consequently, it becomes effortlessly comprehensible how "in theory, at least, the Orthodox Church of Constantinople survived the shock of the Ottoman conquest better than might have been expected" (p. 179), since the Conqueror, despite some modifications, chose to follow some of the practices established by his Byzantine predecessors as far as church-state relations went. Furthermore, the millet system enabled the Greeks of the Ottoman Empire to establish themselves conspicuously as businessmen, interpreters, or administrators—the best-known group of such individuals being the Phanariots, who also served as hospodars of the Danubian Principalities. But Sir Steven Runciman is quick to point out that the church's position as well as that of the Greek millet as a whole was, after all, one of servility to "infidel" sultans, many of whom were not as enlightened toward their Christian subjects as Mohammed the Conqueror had been.

What emerges, then, is an extremely sympathetic account of the Great Church (as the Constantinople patriarchate was frequently called) in captivity, explaining how in fact the privileged status which the patriarchate enjoyed burdened it with secular concerns which inevitably led to a decline of spirituality and theological learning. For it must be remembered that besides the exodus of Greek intellectuals to the West ("we know of not a single Greek of intellectual distinction living within the bounds of the Ottoman Empire during the later fifteenth century and the first years of the sixteenth," p. 209), the task of maintaining adequate Greek educational facilities within the empire was nearly impossible. The Patriarchal Academy in

Constantinople and a similar one on Mount Athos provided a semblance of “learning” for a few ecclesiastics until some of them began to study in Western universities, but the impact of this educational crisis on the Greek flock was disastrous. Had it not been for the vivacious intellectual activity of the Greek colonies outside the Ottoman Empire, such as the one in Venice, the consequences to Greek education would have been even graver.

Perhaps the author’s professional awareness of the significance of these intellectual contacts between the patriarchate and the non-Ottoman world compelled him, unfortunately, to reduce the second half of his study to a sort of religious “Eastern Question” as he traces in some detail the relations of the Great Church with the Church of Rome, the leaders of the Reformation, the Anglican Church, and to a certain degree with Moscow. Such an approach is, of course, permissible and corresponds to the interest in the ecumenical movement in our day. But it reminds this reviewer, at least, of the standard diplomatic accounts about the perennial Eastern Question, all of them Europocentric and all of them based on the reports of European diplomatic representatives or travelers in the Levant. The author, in fact, justifiably reminds us that without such accounts we would be ignorant about whole periods of the Orthodox experience under the Turks. Precisely because of this realization, Sir Steven’s rather “apophatic” (to borrow one of his frequently used terms in a different context) attitude toward Russian sources is regrettable. For it is quite clear by now that the history of Eastern Orthodoxy, not just Russian Orthodoxy, will have to be written after extensive research in Soviet libraries and archives which have rich repositories of Greek as well as Russian Orthodox materials—such as reports and correspondence between the Orthodox leaders of the East and their Russian coreligionists. To be sure, Sir Steven used some published Russian sources, such as the works of N. Kapterev, which, in keeping with the emphasis of his study, illuminate the “diplomatic” aspects of the relations between Orthodox Russia and the Orthodox East. On the other hand, it is unfortunate that he did not consult the accounts of Russian scholars, travelers, and pilgrims to the Near East, such as the most informative multivolume one by V. G. Barsky, who traveled extensively to the Holy Places of the East from 1723 to 1747, or the numerous scholarly works of Porfirii Uspensky on Mount Athos and the Meteora monasteries. These and many other similar accounts written by Orthodox scholars and hierarchs who were vitally interested in the fate of Eastern Orthodoxy abound in details of the internal conditions of the Eastern churches—details which could enhance the usefulness of the work under review. Sir Steven redeemed himself partly by having used the works of Greek Orthodox historians such as the late Chrysostomos Papadopoulos and G. Papamichael and our contemporary Theodore Papadopoulos, on whose *Studies and Documents Relating to the History of the Greek Church and People Under Turkish Domination* (Brussels, 1952) he draws extensively, and by having consulted the recent Western scholarship on the subject. But in vain did I search to find traces of any references to the classic study by the nineteenth-century professor of Moscow University, A. P. Lebedev, *Istoriia Grekovostochnoi tserkvi pod vlastiü turok ot padeniia Konstantinopolia (v 1453 godu) do nastoiashchago vremeni* (2nd ed., St. Petersburg, 1903), a translation of which would readily fulfill the reader’s expectations aroused from an encounter with Sir Steven’s work.

Until such translations become available, however, this book will be of great service, especially to undergraduates and nonspecialists, while simultaneously sug-

gesting topics on which much work remains to be done by specialists in this most significant area of Near Eastern and Russian history.

THEOFANIS G. STAVROU
University of Minnesota

DIE NESTOR-CHRONIK. Introduced and annotated by *Dmitrij Tschizewskij*. Slavistische Studienbücher, vol. 6. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1969. xix, 325 pp. DM 38, paper.

Among other important texts made available to scholars in this series, the Russian Primary Chronicle is presented to us in an excellent reprint preceded by Professor Dmitrij Tschizewskij's introduction (pp. vii-ix) and followed by his notes, a bibliography up to 1968, and two genealogical tables concerning the Russian princes mentioned in the Chronicle (pp. 297-325).

The reprint itself reproduces the "Chronicle according to monk Laurentius' copy," which contains the oldest preserved manuscript of the Primary Chronicle, often referred to as Nestor's Chronicle, a title adhered to also by Tschizewskij, although in his introduction he correctly states that the whole text of the Primary Chronicle could not have been written by Nestor, who joined the Kiev Monastery of the Crypt (*Pecherskii monastery'*) only after 1073. The Laurentian Chronicle, on the other hand, went far beyond 1110, the date on which the Primary Chronicle ends in this copy, for it was continued up to 1377 as the Suzdal Chronicle. Tschizewskij's reprint does not go beyond 1110—reproducing, this reviewer surmises, the 1910 edition of the *Povest' vremennykh let* by the Archaeographical Commission, including the two indexes (personal names and geographical terms). This 1910 edition follows in everything (except the indexes, obviously) the complete edition of 1897 of the Laurentian Chronicle by the same Archaeographical Commission, the so-called third edition, and by far the best. Only the preface (pp. xi-xix) was taken by Tschizewskij from the complete 1897 edition, but he introduces important corrections by E. F. Karsky, who in 1926 reworked this preface for his own edition of the Laurentian Chronicle, lately reprinted in 1962. One does not get the impression that anything more was borrowed by Tschizewskij from the Karsky edition, for neither the variants nor the notes at the bottom of the reprinted text nor, especially, the text itself shows such borrowings. One is thus surprised to read on the verso of the title page that the 1926 edition was the basis of this reprint. Aside from the preface the book is rather the edition of 1910 (1897), a much better one. (For criticism of the Karsky edition see D. S. Likhachev, "Arkheograficheskii obzor spiskov 'Povesti vremennykh let,'" *Povest' vremennykh let*, vol. 2, Moscow and Leningrad, 1950, p. 152.)

Professor Tschizewskij's scholarly notes are a notable contribution to the understanding of the Chronicle.

MARC SZEFTTEL
University of Washington

STUDIES IN MUSCOVY: WESTERN INFLUENCE AND BYZANTINE INHERITANCE. By *Nikolay Andreyev*. Preface by *Elizabeth Hill*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1970.

This volume is a collection of fourteen articles (406 pages including the 28-page index), thirteen of which deal with the cultural history of Muscovy, predominantly