

The volume is, nevertheless, a valuable contribution to the scholarly literature on the Paris Peace Conference, and adds another fragment to our knowledge of the political and territorial decisions by which the former Austro-Hungarian Empire was reorganized. The dominant impression gained from this account is of a lonely state, fighting its diplomatic battle without reliable friends. At the Conference, each of the so-called Successor States fought alone, without giving or receiving support from the other heirs of the Empire. The enmity of their neighbors and the lack of consistent support for the new states by France and England, and the tragic collapse of American influence after President Wilson's departure from the Conference foreshadowed danger for the future of these states. In fact, their isolation from any friends and their dependence on the interests and good will of the distant Western Powers was to remain their tragic weakness until the issue was "solved" by their absorption into the Russian sphere of interest.

Washington D. C.

DAGMAR H. PERMAN

Richard and Eva Blum, assisted by Anna Amera and Sophie Kallifaidou, *Health and Healing in Rural Greece: A Study of Three Communities*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press 1965. Pp. 269.

To the expanding list of anthropological studies in English about rural and little communities, we may now add Richard and Eva Blum's *Health and Healing in Rural Greece*. The authors are respectively a social psychologist with sociological, anthropological, and archaeological interests, and a clinical psychologist with training in the classics and experience in anthropology; both are scholars at the Institute for the Study of Human Problems at Stanford University. With the aid of two Greek social workers and two public-health teams provided by the Greek Ministry of Health, they carried out a morbidity study of three rural communities in Greece during 1962. Their conclusions are based upon informal contacts with various members of the three communities, upon observations of Greeks during medical examination, upon answers to standardized questionnaires, and upon a knowledge of classical and especially preclassical Greek history.

Under the influence of Robert Redfield's *Little Community*, the authors have sought to "understand the life of people in little communities—those camps, villages, and small towns that are distinct, relatively

homogeneous and self-sufficient, and in which over one-half of mankind lives." (p. 4). The three communities of their choice were all situated near Doxario, in Attica, approximately one and one-half hours from Athens by bus: Dhadhi, located in a fertile plain, formerly a swamp, with a population of 200 persons of diverse geographic origins, including a large number of Asia Minor refugees and their descendants; Panorio, a settlement of 126 persons of Albanian origin; and an encampment of Saracatzan (Greek-speaking) shepherds totaling 42 persons.

By examining these little communities, the authors also seek to improve their (and our) understanding of the Great Greek Community. In this respect, their contribution duplicates the goal of other studies of little communities, notably Irwin T. Sanders' *Balkan Village* (Lexington, Ky., 1949), which describes a village in the Šop country of Bulgaria with the object, in part, of generalizing about the Great Bulgarian Community; Joel M. Halpern's *A Serbian Village* (New York, 1958), which looks into the society, economy, and values of a Šumadija village with the object of extending some of his generalizations to the Larger Serbian Community; Ernestine Friedl's *Vasilika* (New York, 1962), which describes a village in the Boeotian plain with the aim of extending some of her generalizations to the Great Greek Community; and J. K. Campbell's *Honour, Family and Patronage* (London, 1964), which directly or inferentially, raises questions concerning the relationships between the cultural values and social organization of the Saracatzan shepherds of the Zagori district of the Pindus, and the values and society of the Larger Greek Community.

The Blums' second chapter, "Themes in Community Life: Parallels, Past and Present," embodies an attempt to give the study a historical framework. Their bibliography and the content of their work indicates that they have made use of several important interpretative studies, including F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, Frederick Thomas Elworthy, *The Evil Eye*, Jane E. Harrison, *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion and Themis* and *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, J. C. Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, M. P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion*, and E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*. The authors thus establish a fairly satisfactory relationship between the society and values of Homeric and Hesiodic Greece and those of the little communities which they subjected to scrutiny in 1962, but their book still lacks historical depth. They point to parallels between Greek society as it existed in the eighth century B.C. and "little community" life as it existed in 1962

but they leave unaccounted for more than twenty-five hundred years of Greek history.

Apart from a few questionable historical statements, such as their contention that the Dorians are "closely related to the native Pelasgians"—whatever that means—and their assignment of the Achaean invasions to the third millenium B. C. (p. 24), their general observations are acceptable, if one forgives them their omissions. We may thus readily concur with their view that "polarity, the oscillation between two extremes—excess and moderation, chaos and order,...distrust and sociability,...despair and fantastic hope" (p. 25)—is one of the most pervasive features of past and present Greek life.

But the polarity that they actually describe is, on the one hand, a polarity between Reason or Moderation (Sophrosyne) and Chaos, Excess, Disorder, or Unreason (Hubris), and, on the other, between opposite forms of Unreason. Failing to note that both types of polarity characterize Greek culture, with different amalgams in different Greek communities, the Blums establish a parallel between the culture of the so-called "Dinaric warriors," who inhabit a stretch of area from Switzerland, across Yugoslavia and Albania, to northern Greece, and the culture of their own "little communities." Drawing upon the views of the Croatian-American sociologist, Dinko Tomasić, they give the following description of Dinaric culture: "The father is king; he is seen by the children as a god. The children are alternately spoiled and commanded; the results of such upbringing are submission mixed with defiance and intense love mixed with intense hate..." (p. 24). We shall not go into the question of the validity of Tomasić's views and will similarly refrain from criticizing the Blum study for the attention it devotes to the conflict between polar forms of Unreason. This conflict is indeed very real, and the authors are to be commended for their observation of it. What we shall criticize, however, is their relatively muted treatment of the conflict between Sophrosyne and Hubris.

Greek polarity is, we think, very different from Russian polarity at least as the latter appears in Dostoevsky or in Paul Miliukov's or Nicolas Berdyaev's descriptions of Russian "national character." But, without intending to, the Blums mislead the reader on the exact nature of Greek polarity by allowing him almost, if he chooses to make comparisons, to conclude that there may be no difference, for example, between the polarity of the Greeks and the polarity of the fifth-century Slavs, as pictured by Jordanes (presumably on the basis of the observations

of Priscus), during their funeral rites: *contraria inuicem sibi copulentes, luctum funereum mixto gaudio celebrant...*

Folk cultures tend to resemble each other and Greek and Slavic folk cultures are very similar, but the elitist influences were much greater in Greek than in Slavic cultures until several centuries ago. By neglecting to undertake a systematic comparison of polarities among peoples of neighboring cultures and in differing historical situations, the Blum study cannot but fail to indicate how Greek polarity is and has been different from the polarities of other Balkan peoples.

Among the other subjects that the Blums discuss are birth, abortion, and death; medical and hygienic practices and illness interpretations; folkhealers, doctors, and priests; "shameful" diseases — tuberculosis, venereal disease, epilepsy, cancer, and mental disorders; value patterns of shame and honor (*philotimo*); folk conceptions of the "evil eye" and of the "bad hour" (especially noontime); the relations between men and women and the belief in women's possession of dangerous psychological powers; the relations between children and adults; patterns of nutrition; and patterns of reaction to pain.

The Blums rightly observe that many Greeks are outwardly indifferent toward pain of mechanical origin, such as a fracture, but "intensely anxious, hypochondriacal, and disorganized in the face of a minor discomfort of unknown origin." (p. 199). Such Greeks closely conform to Lawrence Durrell's conceptions of how Greeks react to pain, as described in *Prospero's Cell*. But the Blums also encountered Greeks who react noisily to pain, of whatever origin. Unfortunately, the authors make no allusions to the fact that the first form of reaction likewise occurs among the highlanders of Montenegro and Hercegovina and of the adjacent Slavic and Albanian lands, where the art of setting bones was often skillfully practiced long before the introduction of modern medicine during the latter part of the nineteenth century. A silent reaction may be the specific form of reaction to pain of herdsmen accustomed to caring for their hurt animals, whereas the noisy reaction is perhaps more widespread among the plainsmen and settled folk of the Mediterranean. The two groups may have a common tendency, however, to use a medicine that has proved effective against one malady to cure other illnesses. On the other hand, they tend to distrust medicine in general, as may be inferred from the use of the same Greek term — *pharmaki* — to refer to poison and medicine alike. They thus express an ambivalence or polarity toward medicine as they do toward life in general.

Our criticisms notwithstanding, *Health and Healing in Rural Greece* is a useful and valuable addition to the repertory of studies of local cultures or little communities.

Rutgers University

TRAIAN STOIANOVICH

Aziz S. Atiya, *Crusade, Commerce and Culture*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1962. Pp. 280.

Aziz S. Atiya, *The Crusade: Historiography and Bibliography*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1962. Pp. 170.

Professor A. S. Atiya, an Egyptian scholar who has been director of the Middle Eastern Studies Program at the University of Utah since 1962, has taught and written widely during the past thirty years on various themes connected with the history of the Crusades. The first of the two books under review here is an expanded version of a series of lectures given on the Patten Foundation at Indiana University in 1957. The second volume is a bibliographical companion to the first.

In *Crusade, Commerce and Culture*, Professor Atiya defines his subject in very broad terms indeed, for the Crusades, he believes, must be understood as an episode in the long and bitter history of conflict between East and West in the Mediterranean basin. The Crusades, he maintains, are simply one attempt among many to deal with the Eastern Question and he would trace the roots of the Crusades back to the conflicts between the Greeks and the Persian Empire in the fifth century B.C., which some may think is carrying the whole matter rather far. In Atiya's scheme, however, he would distinguish between the Greek and Roman solutions to the Eastern Question, the Byzantine solution, the Carolingian solution, and the Crusades, which he calls the "Frankish solution." There seems, incidentally, to be some terminological confusion inherent in these last two labels, for if one speaks of a "Frankish solution" to the Eastern Question, the phrase would seem to be quite broad enough to include the Near Eastern policy of Charlemagne, to mention nothing else, in addition to the Crusades properly speaking. Furthermore, it is surely debatable, to say the least, whether either Charlemagne or Pope Urban II would have recognized the existence of an "Eastern Question" to which a solution was required.

A more serious and fundamental objection to Professor Atiya's schematic approach to the Crusades lies in the fact that he gives unduly short shrift to the really distinctive and authentic characteristics of the