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

Γιατί το θεματικό του μετατρέπεται; Το «εξωτερικό» και το «εσωτερικό» είναι δύο παράλληλα διάστημα, όπου το ένα αποτελεί τον προηγούμενο του τελευταίου, και συνεπάγονται στον ένα άλλον. Το «εξωτερικό» είναι το περιβάλλον του άνθρωπου και το συναντά στα μέσα της ανθρώπινης επιστήμης, ενώ το «εσωτερικό» είναι το ανθρώπινο δικό του χώρο. Αυτό το θέμα έχει εξάνεση στην περιοχή της ιστορίας και της ελληνικής κοινωνίας.


* * *


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 Belgrad 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, Rinelhart 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. But the ambition of this work was so great that it made a failure of the last volumes. With the exception of Russia it tries to encompass the history of the whole Intermediary Region from prehistoric times to the present day. 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 Oecumenical 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 synthetic history of the Intermediary Region in modern times, including Rhomania, be written from the εἰσόδιον and not from the Western angle. The bibliography of both volumes is not satisfactory. The once more repeated, although very weak, argument that «for practical reasons» it was necessary to limit it to works available in English, does not save it from criticism as useful books in English are not mentioned while others of highly doubtful importance are brought in.

DIMITRI KITSIKIS, Ph. D.
Professeur agrégé d’Histoire à l’Université d’Ottawa.

* Aί περί ιδιόκτησεως άτομων εν τῇ έκκλησίᾳ κατά τοὺς τρεῖς πρῶτους αἰῶνας

Έκδοσις Πατριαρχικού Ιδρύματος Πατριαρχείου Μελέτων, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάναδ, 13, Θεσσαλονίκη 1972, σ. 201, ὑπὸ Ἀρχιμανδρίτου Νεαχαλίου Χριστιανιχμάλη.

Εἰς καλλιτεχνικά καὶ λίγα ἐπιμελημένα έκδοσιν εκκλησιολογίας τελευταίας ή διδακτορική διατριβή του Πανοσιολογίατος π.Ν. Χριστιανιχμάλη, διδακτόρου Κοινωνιολογίας του Πανεπιστημίου του Στρατούρους, ἔχουσα ὡς θέμα: Αἴ περί ιδιόκτησεως άτομων εν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ κατά τοὺς τρεῖς πρῶτους αἰῶνας. Ἡ διατριβή αὕτη ἐπέμβληθε εἰς τὴν Θεολογικὴν Σχολὴν του Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλικού καὶ ἐκεῖρθη διομή.

Ὑποκείμενοι λέξεις: «Ἡ ἐργασία περιέχει πρόλογον, εξαγωγήν καὶ τὸ κύριον μέρος, τὸ ὁποῖον εἶναι διηγημένον εἰς τέσσερα κεφάλαια. Τὸ πρῶτον κεφάλαιον ἔχει ὡς ἀντικείμενον μελέτης τὸ κοινωνικὸν περιγράμμα, ὡς δείκνυται τοῦτο κατόπιν τῆς ἀλληλεπιδράσεως τοῦ σημειωτικοῦ, ἑλληνιστικοῦ καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὸ ὁμοοιοκοινωνικὸν καὶ κοινωνικὸν πέπλον τῆς ὑπὸ ἐξαντλυτές περιόδου. Εἰς τὸ δεύτερον κεφάλαιον ὁ συγγραφέας ἐξετάζει τὴν προέλευσιν τῆς ιδιόκτησεως καὶ τοὺς τρόπους αὐτοποίησής της. Εἰς τὸ τρίτον κεφάλαιον γίνεται λόγος περὶ τῶν τρόπων χρήσεως τῆς ατομικῆς καὶ κοινωνικῆς φαινόμενῆς καὶ ἀναπτύσσομαι αὐτὴν χρησιμοποιώντας τοὺς συντομομικοὺς σκίτους τοῦ πανοσιολογικοῦ συγγραφέως, ἐπί τοῦ δημοσίου, ἀποτελεσμάτων καὶ συμβουλικοῦ σχεδίου μὲ τὴν κοινωνιολογίαν. Αἴ τις τῆς γεωδαίης ἱδέας καὶ συμβουλεπτικῆς διατριβῆς τῶν εἰς τὴν προέλευσιν τῆς ιδιόκτητος, ἐπικαλείται.»

Ἰ. Διαφθοράς ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος τῆς ἐξαρτησίας τῶν περί ιδιότητος ἀπόλυτων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἢ τῶν εἰς τὸν οἰκονομικό-κοινωνικὸν ἀντλῆσαν τῶν διαφορὰς τέξεως τῆς ἐλληνορωμαϊκῆς κοινωνίας, ἢ ἐπτέρω δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἑλληνικῆς κοινωνικῆς ψιλοσφαίρας.

II. Διὰ τῆς παρούσης μελέτης θεμέλιωται ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τῆς ἀρχαίας χρησιμοποιικῆς παραδόσεως νὰ κλιμακώσῃ κριτηρίων ἡθικῆς ἀξιολόγησης τῆς ιδιότητος. Τοποθέτεται π.χ. ὑπὸ τοῦ συγγραφέα (σ. 117, 118) ἐπὶ μίαν τῆς ἔρευνας τῆς Δυσικής καταναλωσίας καὶ συμβουλεπτικῆς ἐν τῇ περιοχῇ τῆς κοινωνικῆς ἐπιστήμης.

III. Ὁ συγγραφέας δέχεται ὅτι δὲν ἐγκατεστάθηκε ἐν τῷ ἔνδον οἴκου δυσικῆς τῆς ιδιοτήτος ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῶν τριῶν πρῶτων αἰῶνῶν. Η ἱδιοτήτα ἐξορθοδοξοδοξοῦ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίαςς ἢ τῶν ἑπτά διδακτορικῶν καὶ ιστορικῶν ορθοδοξωτάτων αὐτοκράτωρ叙述.