

UDC 930.85(4-12)

ISSN 0350-7653

SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

BALCANICA

XLVI

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief

DUŠAN T. BATAKOVIĆ

Director of the Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

Editorial Board

JEAN-PAUL BLED (Paris), LJUBOMIR MAKSIMOVIĆ,
ZORAN MILUTINOVIĆ (London), DANICA POPOVIĆ, BILJANA SIKIMIĆ,
SPIRIDON SFETAS (Thessaloniki), GABRIELLA SCHUBERT (Jena),
NIKOLA TASIĆ, SVETLANA M. TOLSTAJA (Moscow)

BELGRADE
2015



tions were moulding a Slavomacedonian identity along with a sense of Yugoslav solidarity.

In his epilogue, Sfetas briefly describes the challenges which the new independent state has been facing after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and concludes that, despite the fact that Slavomacedonian identity has been called into question, it has proved that it is still an "identity in evolution".

Having a strong theoretical grounding on the phenomenon of nationalism

(Hobsbawm, Hroch, Gellner, Anderson) and taking into consideration the Balkan particularities, professor Sfetas composes with remarkable sobriety a complex study on an extraordinarily thorny question – which still preoccupies public discourse – based on indisputable primary sources from the archives in Sofia, Belgrade and Skopje as well as an extensive literature, both Balkan and European. Although Sfetas's book was written in 2003, it remains the most analytical and enlightening study on the matter.

HÉRITAGES DE BYZANCE EN EUROPE DU SUD-EST À L'ÉPOQUE MODERNE ET CONTEMPORAINE,
EDS. OLIVIER DELOUIS, ANNE COUDERC & PETRE GURAN. ATHENS:
ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'ATHÈNES, 2013, 522 p.

Reviewed by Miloš Živković*

In 2013 *Ecole française d'Athènes* published a collection of papers entitled *Héritages de Byzance en Europe du Sud-Est à l'époque moderne et contemporaine*, as the fourth publication in the series *Mondes méditerranéens et balkaniques*. All contributions except three are based on the papers submitted at the scholarly conference *La présence de Byzance dans l'Europe du Sud-Est aux époques moderne et contemporaine* held in Athens in September 2008.

Even a cursory look at the contents of the volume reveals a remarkably broad chronological range and multidisciplinary breadth. In addition to an *Introduction* by the editors, O. Delouis, A. Couderc and P. Guran, the book contains as many as thirty contributions, mainly in political and ecclesiastical history, the history of ideas and ideologies, the history of the cult of saints and the history of art and architecture.

The volume opens with the eminent byzantologist Hélène Ahrweiler's appropriate and inspired article *Conférence inaugurale – La présence de Byzance*, specifying many of the originally Byzantine

phenomena in the national cultures of South-East Europe. It is followed by Jack Fairey's study *Failed Nations and Usable Pasts: Byzantium as Transcendence in the Political Writings of Iakovos Pitzipos Bey*, devoted to Iakovos Pitzipos Bey (1802–1869), the leader of the organisation called *Byzantine Union*. As the ideologist of this initially secret society of rather modest capacities and influence, Pitzipos left behind several writings on problems in the Ottoman Empire of his time. Fairey thoroughly studies the biography of this ambitious European traveller originating from Chios, as well as his writings, unusual in their ideological dynamics and contradictions, and somewhat utopian political views. A useful historical overview of the study of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Ottoman Empire is given by Dan Ioan Mureşan. His *Revisiter la Grande Église: Gédéon, Iorga et Runciman sur le rôle du patriarcat œcuménique à l'époque ottoman* is devoted to three

* Institute for Byzantine Studies SASA

remarkable scholars – Manuel Gédéon (1851–1943), the official historian of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940), the one most deserving for bringing the so-called post-Byzantine epoch into historiographical sight, and Sir Steven Runciman (1903–2000), the author of a valuable synthetic overview of the history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate under the Ottomans. Petre Guran's *God Explains to Patriarch Athanasios the Fall of Constantinople: I. S. Peresvetov and the Impasse of Political Theology*, analyses several post-Byzantine writings in the light of their common elements, focusing primarily on the so-called *Tale of Constantinople* attributed to Nestor Iskander, and a version of this work by a Russian author, Ivan Peresvetov. Vera Tchentsova's article *Héritage de Constantinople ou héritage de Trébizonde? Quelques cas de translation d'objets sacrés à Moscou au XVII^e s.*, shows that the seventeenth-century Russian court, in collecting Byzantine precious objects, apart from Constantinopolitan, attached great significance to those from the former treasuries of the Empire of Trebizond. Relying on archival sources, many of which were previously unknown, she reveals and follows the significant circulation of illuminated manuscripts, saints' relics and icons whose origin should be traced back to Trebizond. The only work devoted to the Serbian reception of Byzantine heritage is the one by Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić, *Se souvenir de Byzance. Les reliques au service de la mémoire en Serbie (XV^e–XIX^e s.)*, which traces the history of the cult of relics in Serbian culture from the last decades of the independent medieval Serbian state to the age of national romanticism in the nineteenth century.

There follow three contributions devoted to Byzantine traditions in Wallachia and Moldavia. Andrei Pippidi's *Byzance des Phanariotes* reminds us of the great significance of the Byzantine written heritage for the culture of the Romanian

principalities in the eighteenth century. Andrei Timotin's *Prophéties byzantines et modernité roumaine (XVII^e–XIX^e s.)* looks at the rich tradition of Romanian apocalyptic literature, based on the translations of prophetic writings of different nature, contents and dates. Radu G. Păun's *Byzance d'empereur et Byzance d'Eglise. Sur le couronnement des princes "phanariotes" à Constantinople* seeks to clarify a very delicate question in a bid to reconstruct the structure and symbolic meaning of the rite of inauguration of the Wallachian and Moldavian Phanariote princes. The rite was performed in the patriarchal church in Constantinople, probably from the last decades of the seventeenth century onward. The author recognizes elements of Byzantine imperial ideology in the details of some, not too extensive, descriptions of the ceremony.

Several works that follow are devoted to Greek topics. Ioannis Kyriakantonakis's article *Between Dispute and Erudition. Conflicting Readings on Byzantine History in Early Modern Greek Historical Literature*, is focused on the writings of two Greek church historians from the seventeenth century – Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669–1707), and a Cypriote unionist, Aloysius Andruzzi. Differences between their views are detected and interpreted, especially regarding the relationship between church and state in Byzantium, with the focus on identifying several historiographical idioms in their works. These differences resulted, of course, from their conflicting polemical-apologetic positions: Dositheus's baroque theology used in defence of Orthodoxy on the one hand, and Andruzzi's promotion of the authority of the Pope on the other. Judith Soria's contribution *Les peintres du XVIII^e s. et la peinture paléologue: David Selenica et Denys de Fournas* presents the elements of the "neo-Byzantine" style in the work of the painter David, born in the village of Selenica, in

the south of present-day Albania. She uses the example of the frescoes painted in 1726 by David and his assistants Constantine and Christ in the Church of St. Nicholas in Moschopolis. Through comparing this fresco ensemble with the early fourteenth-century paintings in Protaton attributed to the legendary figure of Manuel Panselinos, Soria concludes that the younger wall painting is directly dependent on the older. Effie F. Athanassopoulos's extensive and richly documented contribution, *Byzantine Monuments and Architectural "Cleansing" in Nineteenth-Century Athens*, is devoted to the disappearance of rich architectural layers of the Byzantine, Frankish and Ottoman Athens during the process of urban remodeling of the capital of the modern Greek state, that is, in the period when appreciation was directed almost exclusively to its ancient heritage. In 1834, under the direction of Ludwig Ross, head of the Archaeological Service in Athens, there began an "architectural cleansing" of the city which stripped Athens of many religious and other medieval buildings, despite the attempts at administrative protection and personal interventions. The text by Marios Hatzopoulos, *Receiving Byzantium in Early Modern Greece (1820s–1840s)*, focuses on the reception of Byzantine heritage in the culture of modern Greece, showing that, until the second half of the nineteenth century, the Byzantine period was not considered as an integral part of the history of the Greek nation. Yet, as the author shows, apart from the generally negative perception of the Byzantine epoch, some of its segments reverberated positively in romantic national consciousness. Despina Christodoulou also writes about the reception of Byzantium in modern Greece in her *Making Byzantium a Greek Presence: Paparrigopoulos and Koumanoudes Review the Latest History Books*, focusing on the debate on Byzantium between nineteenth-century Greek histori-

ans. Ioannis Koubourlis's *Augustin Thierry et l'"héliénisation" de l'Empire byzantine jusqu'à 1853: les dettes des historiographes de la Grèce médiévale et moderne à l'école libérale française* clearly demonstrates the influence of French historians, especially Augustine Thierry and François Guizot, on the pioneers of Greek national historiography Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos and Spyridon Zambelios. These authors found some typically Greek features in Byzantium, along with those inherited from the ancient Roman Empire (monarchy, aristocracy) – the ideas of free spirit and democracy, detected even in institutions such as church councils.

Nicolae Șerban Tanașoca contributes the paper *L'image de Byzance dans la conscience historique des Roumains*. Using the most eloquent written sources, primarily those of historiographical character, the author reconstructs specific ideological dynamics in the development of the Romanian relation to the Byzantine legacy. He takes into account the writings of Romanian seventeenth-century humanists strongly marked by a "Byzantinophile" sentiment; eighteenth-century historical works by Greek-Catholic authors in Transylvania and, in the nineteenth century, by Romanian Enlightenment intellectuals whose work is characterized by sharp criticism of Byzantium; as well as the definitive formulation of Romanian byzantology as a discipline of critical historiography through the substantial work of Nicolae Iorga and his numerous disciples. A similar topic attracts the attention of Gabriel Leanca, but his *"Byzance" et la modernité roumaine: de la négation à la patrimonialisation sous l'influence française* covers a shorter chronological span and provides the picture of Byzantium in modern Romanian history. He first studies the period of the birth of the Romanian national idea, marked by romantic sentiment and a one-dimensional vision of the national past, which was typical of

all nineteenth-century European national ideologies, and then points to a turn caused by the emergence of critical historiography, with the decisive contribution made by Iorga.

Nadia Danova's article *L'image de Byzance dans l'historiographie et dans les lettres bulgares du XVIII^e au XX^e s.* analyses the image of the Byzantines in early modern Bulgarian historiography. She points to the predominance of negative perceptions of Byzantium and the Greeks in Bulgarian historical conscience from the end of the eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, followed by a kind of usurpation of Byzantine historical figures in a typically romantic and, of course, pseudo-historical manner. With the emergence of Bulgarian historians who had university degrees (S. Palauzov, M. Drinov), this dilettante approach to Byzantine history and Byzantine-Bulgarian relations was gradually abandoned. Dessislava Lilova's *L'héritage partagé? Byzance, Fallmerayer et la formation de l'historiographie bulgare au XIX^e s.* also contributes to the understanding of the specifically Bulgarian relation to the Byzantine heritage.

The collection of papers also includes works devoted to some aspects of the Russian reception of Byzantine tradition. Dimitrios Stamatopoulos's *From the Byzantism of K. Leont'ev to the Vyzantism of I. I. Sokolov: The Byzantine Orthodox East as a Motif of Russian Orientalism* makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of the specifically Russian view of Byzantine civilisation from the 1870s until the beginning of the twentieth century. He thoroughly analyses the image of Byzantium in the works Konstantin Nikolaievich Leontiev, the author of the influential essay *Vyzantinism and Slavism*, who considered the Empire on the Bosphorus as an ideal historical church-political entity. Furthermore, he shows that the historian Ivan Sokolov favoured Byzan-

tine civilisation over others, primarily on the basis of his own understanding of the relationship between state and church, in which he recognised balance and coordination, that is, a sort of organic unity. In his article *Byzantine Culture in Russia: Doesn't it Lose Something in Translation*, George P. Majeska reminds us of the traces of formulation of specific Russian reception of Byzantine traditions, using the example of the ruler's ideology and "political theology". The author explains Russia's way from the period of Christianisation under Prince Vladimir until the time of a truly imperial ideology under Ivan IV "the Terrible" (1547–1584).

Adriana Șotropa's *L'héritage byzantin dans la pensée artistique et l'art roumains au tournant du XX^e s.* looks at the creative interpretation of the medieval heritage in Romanian modern art. In this respect, the painting of Apar Baltazar, Octavian Smigelschi and Ștefan Popescu is very significant. They produced a "Byzantine-Romanian style" by combining a recognisable past iconography and an unequivocally modern visual language. In sculpture, on the other hand, some works were almost replicas of medieval pieces, such as Dimitrie Paciurea's *Dormition of the Virgin* from 1912.

Dimitrios Antoniu's *Le choix d'une résurrection partielle: l'introduction du droit civil byzantin dans le nouvel État hellénique au XIX^e s.* explains the process of introducing Byzantine civil law into the legal system of modern Greece, starting from 1835, when Constantine Arsenopoulos's *Hexabiblos* was published. Anne Couderc's *Byzance à la Conférence de la Paix (1919): Vénizélos, les revendications de la Grèce et l'idée d'Empire*, reassesses the significance of Byzantine tradition for the Greek demands at the Conference at Versailles, which also included territorial claims to Constantinople and parts of Asia Minor. She analyses the nature of these demands, focusing on the

Greek understanding of their own ethnogenesis and continuity, that is, the theory of the survival of Hellenism through the centuries of Byzantine history and Ottoman period. Tonia Kiossopoulou looks at the participation of the Greek delegation at the Second International Congress of Byzantine Studies held in Belgrade in 1927: *La délégation grecque au II^e Congrès international des études byzantines (Belgrade 1927)*, noticing that the rise in the number of Greek participants – twelve compared to only two at the first congress, held in Bucharest in 1924 – demonstrated growing awareness of the importance of Byzantine heritage both for modern national identity and for scientific and cultural policies. Maria Kambouri-Vamvoukou looks at Byzantine tradition in the architecture of Greece between the two world wars, *L'héritage byzantine dans l'architecture de l'entre-deux-guerres en Grèce*. A second wave of “neo-Byzantinism” was different in a way from the previous one that took place in the second half of the nineteenth century. Greek interwar architecture reflected a better understanding of Byzantine architecture.

In his exhaustive study *Théodore Stoudite, figure de l'Union des Églises? Autour de la renaissance d'un monachisme stoudite en Galicie (Ukraine) au XX^e s.*, Olivier Delouis thoroughly explores the character of the so-called neo-Studite monastic movement of the Greek-Catholic church in Galicia in the first half of the nineteenth century. The establishment of monasteries in which monastic life was regulated by the Typikon of the Constantinopolitan monastery of Studios, under the auspices of Andrei Szeptyckyj, Metropolitan of Lviv (1900–1944), is analysed in the light of the church policy of unionists in Galicia. Delouis convincingly shows that the choice of Theodor the Studite as an ideal monastic model was by no means accidental, but rather that it

was based on the opinions on this Byzantine saint in Catholic proselytic historiography, especially under Pope Leon XIII (1878–1903).

A very interesting note from the contemporary history of the Orthodox Church is given by Isabelle Dépret. In her *L'Église orthodoxe de Grèce et la condamnation de l'icônoclisme en 1987–1988: fidélité à la tradition byzantine, relectures, mobilisation*, she reflects on the conflict between the socialist government of Andreas Papandreou and the Archbishopric of Athens in 1987/8, at the time of the celebration of 1200 years since the ecumenical Council of Nicaea (787), which was caused by the government's plans for the nationalisation of church property. In its resolute and successful action, which ended in reconciliation between state and church, the Archbishopric resisted the state by using old Byzantine patterns, which aroused a considerable public response.

The book ends with a very interesting case study. Through analysing the view on Byzantine traditions in the Roman Catholic communities on the islands of Syros and Tinos, in a broad historical perspective, Katerina Seraïdari's *Byzance dans le discours d'un minorité religieuse: les catholiques de Tinos et Syros*, shows that the Latin occupation in 1204 was seen as a natural continuation of Byzantine government and as a basis for a new cultural identity.

The volume *Héritages de Byzance en Europe du Sud-Est à l'époque moderne et contemporaine* bears out once again not only the significance of “post-Byzantine” and “neo-Byzantine” phenomena in South-East European cultures but also the need for their further study. The precious heritage is approached in a remarkably comprehensive, thorough and provocative way, and from different disciplinary, theoretical and methodological positions, with all limitations result-

ing from the nature of an edited volume. However, along with all praises, there is a reason for some critical remarks. Thus, for example, a Serbian reader, especially the one interested in art history, might object to the poor presence of Serbian history topics, especially those concerning the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century. Even though such an objection might be described away as sentimental, it seems that it should be expressed nonetheless, along with drawing the attention to a number of studies by Serbian scholars that demonstrate the considerable importance of the “Serbian-Byzantine” and “neo-Byzantine” styles in the Serbian art and architecture of the late modern

and more recent periods.¹ The intention of this criticism, to be sure, is not to devalue an impressive scholarly endeavour, the contents of which we have sought to review in a general manner.

¹ For this particular occasion, one should mention only the most recent books which include relevant bibliographies: M. Jovanović, *Srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo i slikarstvo novijeg doba* (Belgrade 2007²); A. Kadijević, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi (sredina XIX – sredina XX veka)* (Belgrade 2007²); N. Makuljević, *Crkvena umetnost u Kraljevini Srbiji (1882–1914)* (Belgrade 2007).

STEFAN ROHDEWALD, *GÖTTER DER NATIONEN: RELIGIÖSE ERINNERUNGSFIGUREN IN SERBIEN, BULGARIEN UND MAKEDONIEN BIS 1944*. COLOGNE – WEIMAR – VIENNA: BÖHLAU VERLAG, 2014, 905 p.

Reviewed by Dušan Fundić* and Marija Vasiljević**

Stefan Rohdewald, Professor of Southeast European History at the University of Giessen, Germany, has since 2013 been co-editor of several publications that deal with various aspects of Eastern and Southeast European history: *Das osmanische Europa. Methoden und Perspektiven der Frühneuezeitforschung zu Südosteuropa*, eds. A. Helmedach et al. (Leipzig: Eudora-Verlag, 2014); *Religiöse Erinnerungsorte in Ostmitteleuropa. Konstitution und Konkurrenz im nationen- und epochenübergreifenden Zugriff*, eds. J. Bahlcke, S. and T. Wünsch (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013); *Litauen und Ruthenien. Studien zu einer transkulturellen Kommunikationsregion (15.-18. Jahrhundert)/Lithuania and Ruthenia. Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)*, eds. S. Rohdewald, D. Frick and S. Wiederkehr (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007).

His main areas of interest are discourses of remembrance, relations between European East and West in technology, science and sports, transculturality and transconfessionality.

The subject of the book reviewed here is the role of religious figures in the consolidation, transformation and restoration of collective identities from the middle ages to the middle of the twentieth century. Yet, the study is especially focused on the remembrance of particular figures during the formation of the independent states of Serbia and

* Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

** Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia doctoral research scholarship holder (project no. 177029, Institute of History, Belgrade)