
The long and exhaustive struggle by the Greeks for independence ended with the creation of a small state under the aegis of the Protecting Powers, England, Russia and France. Once this had been accomplished an equally important era began. The newly independent nation now faced the task of maintaining a workable national government, putting its internal affairs in order and sustaining harmonious relations with the Great Powers. As might be expected a good deal of attention by Greek and foreign scholars has been paid to the revolution itself. Yet the decade following independence is crucial in its own right, and a study of this period can throw a great deal of light on Greek history for the remainder of the century.

Petropulos has chosen to concentrate on the workings of the political parties in Greece during the years 1833-1843. The work, however, encompasses more than the affairs of the parties during this decade which represents the first era of Otho's rule. In Part One, consisting of approximately 150 pages, Petropulos discusses the conditions before 1833 which led to the rise of political parties. The core of the work follows in a section of about 300 pages. Here the decade of royal absolutism and the activities of the parties are examined at great length. A final section of sixty pages delves into the role of the parties in the making of the constitution of 1844.

To understand the make up and functioning of the parties in Greece one must analyze their origins and the conditions involved in their rise. Were they of foreign descent as their names ("French", "English" and "Russian") might imply? What share did conditions, in Greece during Turkish rule have in the shaping of the parties? This is what Petropulos seeks to answer in Part One of his study. In the process he provides, in this reviewer's opinion, a sound introduction to modern Greek history during the first decades of the nineteenth century. Ottoman society, and the subject peoples within it, constituted a complex pattern of relations not only between the rulers and the ruled but among the subject peoples themselves. Petropulos locates the sources of power held by the Greeks, which already had been established during the centuries of Ottoman rule. These interrelations between such elites as the captains (military) and the primates (administrative) provide the fundamental base for the power structure within Greek society before inde-
pendence. The author carefully delineates these factors and stresses their importance in the rise of political parties in Greece.

Of equal importance for Greek history is the cleavage manifesting itself in the cultural, economic, and political sectors between the westernizing, European oriented Greeks and those attuned to the life of Ottoman society. Certain numbers of Greeks had maintained ties with the West for centuries before Greek independence. The role of these Western ideas in Greece is placed in proper perspective by Petropulos, while he shows that cleavage along political lines did not necessarily follow an “East-West” pattern.

The war for independence gave various Greek elite groups the opportunity to make themselves felt on a wider scale than the arena around which they had revolved during Ottoman rule. These were by no means political parties, as Petropulos shows, but rather factions grouped about a leader or one particular elite. Without compartmentalizing these groups into any artificial pattern the author shows how these varied sources provided the elements that later came more or less together to form the parties under Otho’s reign.

The presidency of Kapodistrias, though not within the real scope of Petropulos’ book, is important not just for the growth of the parties. The problems and conditions facing Kapodistrias did not change markedly by the time Otho came to Greece as king. While these men differed in abilities and character they faced similar problems to some degree. From Petropulos’ book the reader can gain insight into the methods each used and how they compare as modern Greece’s first two rulers. The author is sympathetic in his treatment of Kapodistrias and judicious in examining the Bavarian monarch.

Otho’s reign has been the subject of much heated debate in Greece. Many Greek authors by the late nineteenth century pictured him as a foreign autocrat bent on visiting the evils of “Bavarianism” upon an untried and inexperienced nation. The folklore surrounding the activities of the parties during this period has also grown and become well established. Few Greek scholars have attempted any real analysis of this crucial era, and the works of Karolides, Aspreas and Kyriakides are not adequate accounts of the period.

Petropulos undertakes to give an account of the monarchy’s policies, first under the regents, then when Otho assumed personal control, a careful analysis of the make up and workings of each of the three parties, and finally the interaction between these two major forces. When
the difficulty and the complexity of the subject matter is taken into consideration he accomplishes his task with a high level of scholarship. The result is a valuable account of a complex mosaic of clashing personalities, the formation of national issues which each party sought to handle in its own way, the constant presence and frequent intervention of the Great Powers, and a vigorous struggle between the monarchy and the parties for the prize of political power in Greece.

The author carefully builds a solid case for his thesis that the parties did influence the shaping of the state institutions that developed and therefore the structure of the state. While these parties and the principles they espoused changed after the middle of the nineteenth century, some of the institutions which were established continue to have an influence in Greece even today.

Finally, a fully annotated bibliography as well as a list of the important politicians with relevant data provide valuable tools for the student interested in delving further into the complexities of the period. The work in toto makes a first-rate contribution to modern Greek historical studies.
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"Heaven protect us from people who profess to be nothing but folklorists," wrote prophetically in 1902 Albrecht Dieterich, one of the first scholars to study European folklore comprehensively. For if only to set the limits between folklore and the other disciplines in the vast field of the humanities, a scholar should be well versed in a considerable number of related subjects. He should be able to distinguish between folklore and ethnography-ethnology, folklore and history-archaeology and the classics, finally folklore and sociology. At the same time he should be able to use the methods and findings of these disciplines to the benefit of what has been agreed upon to be the purpose of folklore.

This ambitious standpoint could not, of course, have been taken by G.F. Abbott, when he wrote his *Macedonian Folklore* in 1903. It is