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Ο θεσμός της οικογένειας εις τήν Ελλάδα (έπισκόπησις βιβλιογραφίας) υπό Κλειούς Πρεσβέλου

Πέραν των δημοσιευθέντων είς το τεδχος βιβλιογραφίας της, το οποίον δημο-


As curious as it may sound, the civilization of one third of Eurasia still awaits definition. Traditionally cut between the classical distinction of West and East, the «cradle» of world civilization which lies in a circle around Eastern Mediterranean and more precisely around a fabulous city, Istanbul (otherwise called Byzantium, Constantinople, Polis, Tsargrad) has never been presented by historians in its unity. This «intermediary region» between West and East, encompasses the Orthodox Christian Slavs (including the Russians) the Rumanians, Albanians, Greeks, Turks, Jews, Arabs, Persians, that is from Belgrade in the West to the Indus River in the East and from Arkhangelsk in the North to Ethiopia in the South.

No textbook has ever been written on the history of this Intermediary Region. The first important effort in this direction was made however by L.S. Stavrianos when, in 1958, Rinehart of New York published his remarkable The Balkans since 1453. This book encompasses only one part of the Intermediary Region, the western quarter of it, describing five centuries of its history. At the same time a parallel effort was made in French by a Lebanese historian Jawad Boulos, published in five volumes by Mouton of The Hague, under the title Les peuples et les civilisations du Proche Orient. The book by Arnakis, the third volume of which is still to be published, also studies the whole area with the exception again of Russia, but only covers the 19th and 20th centuries.

The absence of Russia is a great mistake in a book like this which has the ambition to help understand the unity of the Intermediary Region, because of the great importance this people played in the last millennium of the «intermediate» history of this area of civilization. To present, as the author does, the Russian State as an external factor to the Eastern Question, on the same level as England for instance, is a very common mistake among historians which prevents us once again from understanding the significance of the internal struggle of the area, which has always been the will of each one of the peoples of the Intermediary Region to hold the sceptre of its Eccumenical Empire in Istanbul. Thus we fail to understand the process by which an external power, England, intervenes in the «civil war» going on in the area for the succession of the Istanbul throne and helps the Turks maintain the throne by repelling both the internal contender from the South (the Arabs of Mohammed Ali) and the internal contender from the North (the Russians of Nicholas Ist.). It equally fails to understand why so many prominent Greeks continued their close
collaboration in Istanbul with the Ottoman Emperor, even after the making of a small independent kingdom of Greece in 1832. In fact it very much resembled the present Canadian situation. As there were French separatists in Quebec and French federalists in Ottawa, in the same way there were Greek separatists in Athens and Greek «federalists» in Istanbul, for ideological and not just opportunistic reasons.

However the main value of this work, which far exceeds its weaknesses, is that for the first time it gives us a very clear textbook of the last two centuries of the history of nearly the whole of this area of civilization lying in the middle of Eurasia, it situates the Balkans in the Near East where they really belong and bans from its vocabulary the illogical «in-side» and not from the Western angle.

'Αρχιμανδρίτου Νεκταρίου Χατζημιχάλη.

II. Διά της παρούσης μελέτης θεμελιωδάτα ότι τη βασίζει την άρχαίας χριστιανικής παράδοσες νέα κλίμακα κριτηρίων ήδη διεξολογίας της Ιδιοκτησίας. Τουςεις Κ. υπό της συγγραφής (σ. 117, 118) η κριτική της θεολογικής επιμεταφοράς και απορρίπτεται η προφορικής είς τους έργατις της Δια­συνεκτικός έπανεφάρεται και συμβολίζει εν έντειχις της κοινωνικής επιστημονικής.

III. Ο συγγραφέας δέχεται ότι δέν δένευτο ένον δρόμο δεκτά του θεσμού της Ιδιοκτησίας υπό της «Εκκλησίας» των τριών πρώτων αίωνων. Η ιδιοκτησία έκδοθείνυς προς την Εκκλησίας εις ιστο­ρικός θεσμος διότι να μεταβάλλει να διακρινεί τον ορθοδοξο-κοινωνικό προβλήματος έκκλησίας. Κατά την ύπό δεξίαν, η επηρεαστέες όπως ή ή ορθοδοξος τής Ιδιοκτησίας, ή ή ή ορθοδοξος της Εκκλησίας έξαρτητός. Κατά την ύπό δεξίαν, η επηρεαστέες ή όπως ή ή ορθοδοξος της Εκκλησίας έξαρτητός ή ή ή ορθοδοξος της Ιδιοκτησίας, ή ή ή ορθοδοξος της Εκκλησίας έξαρτητός.