

on political coalitions. Riker, for instance, suggests that coalition partners will always act to pare down their membership to the minimum necessary to achieve essential goals. The Soviet Union does appear to have acted in accordance with this precept in the Rumanian and Albanian cases. If the Soviet Union could still retain effective control in Eastern Europe with core doctrinal values, particularly those regarding the socialist community remaining intact, its leaders eventually learned a «minimum winning coalition» was bound to be less troublesome than a larger one with uncertain loyalties at the margin. Leiserson offers a complementary theory in suggesting that coalition makers strike bargains with their adversaries as well as with their partners in order to secure mutual gains. This type of behavior is evident in Soviet attempts to freeze their reluctant East German partners out of the détente negotiations. It was clearly in the interest of the Soviet Union and Poland to co-operate with West Germany rather than with East Germany. Remington calls attention to the longstanding nature of Soviet-East German differences and the attempt of WTO members to use the Pact to enforce East German compliance with coalition aims in Europe (134). Temporary restraint of one member of the coalition in the interest of the others thus had the effect of strengthening the coalition vis-à-vis its adversaries at the same time that it was co-operating with them. Clearly the barbarians can reside within the walls as well as beyond them.

Another area to which Professor Remington alludes but does not treat in detail is the importance of the geographical factor in explaining different reactions to conflicts within the coalition. With the exception of the Polish events of December 1970, Soviet policy has always been to resolve conflicts in the northern tier of East European states by invasion; even in Poland, Remington notes, there was massive economic intervention (177). Troublemakers in the Balkans, on the other hand, have been the object of negotiation or exclusion. Remington relegates to a footnote the concept of a «second strategic echelon» (60), but one wonders whether there might not be more to the matter than she concedes. The Warsaw Treaty, after all, was executed only in Russian, Polish, Czech and German (Document, p. 204). The outright exclusion of all the Balkan languages implies a clear geographical hierarchy within the alliance which existed prior to the mitigating factor of Chinese interest in East Europe dissidents. Indeed, the Chinese protested the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia as well. The Soviet Union has generally sought to achieve its goals in the Balkans by indirect means. It will be remembered, for example, that Stalin told Djilas that Yugoslavia should go ahead and swallow up Albania.

A brief note on style is in order. Remington writes well and, as she promises in the introduction, without jargon. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the book was badly proofread before it went to the printer. The number of grammatical and typographical errors which remain are inexcusable in a work of the quality—and the cost—of this one. Even the documents suffer from careless editing.

*Center for International Studies  
Cornell University*

CYNTHIA W. FREY

Gunnar Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und europäische Politik 1620-1638*, pp. X + 340 + 100, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1968.

This voluminous book is the fruit of many years of research covering the relatively brief span of eighteen years of history of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The author very aptly describes this period as the «most interesting» since the fall of Constantinople and the «most decisive for the future of the Patriarchate» (p. 29). It is a period in which the historical stage

of Orthodoxy is completely dominated by the actions of that most extraordinary Cretan Cyril Lukaris (1572-1638), Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople.

The history is built round the personality and the manifold activities of this outstanding leader of the church. The very disturbed and unsettled period is explored in great depth by the author. The Ecumenical Patriarchate, as the recognized political and religious agency of the Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire had become literally the «apple of discord» between the clashing interests of the Powers of the West in the vitally important area of southeastern Europe.

The bibliography dealing with the character and the work of this heroic and tragic figure is very extensive indeed and one would think that the subject has been long exhausted. Nevertheless, the historian justifies his book in the opening pages of the preface on two important grounds: that «he for the first time had full access to the archives of those countries which played primary roles in the intrigues at Constantinople», and that scholars who had hitherto dealt with the subject, «if they were theologians treated Lukaris from the point of view of his dogma, ignoring the historical and political implications, and on the other hand, if they were historians, they tended to ignore the more general relationships and the problems associated with the story that emerged beyond the narrow confines of the history of each particular country involved».

In turning the pages of this book with the list of sources and bibliography amounting to some 100 pages, the reader immediately discerns that it is a work of an indefatigable and exacting scholar who, at the same time, manages to retain the composure and objectivity of the good historian, even when he discovers that his country of origin and his church are treated most favourably. Most impressive, indeed, to the attentive reader is the facility and the accuracy with which the author uses the modern Greek texts, a rare feat for contemporary Western scholars.

More especially, in evaluating the present work of G. Hering, one is immediately impressed by the brilliant presentation of the material at hand in seven chapter-headings by which the organic development of the relationships between State and Church is expounded within the limits of the time and the area covered by the book. Moreover, the author's historical curiosity helps him to unravel the particular problem wherein he reaches the conclusion that «surprisingly late has a clearer picture emerged of the role that the Christian population of southeastern Europe was to play in the fulfilment of its political ends» (p. 7).

Hering follows faithfully in the footsteps of his master Heinrich Felix Schmid and attempts to apply Schmid's very successful method of correlating the rules of law, social structure and political maturity, especially when he comes to describe the history of institutions as in this particular work.

By applying such an historical method of approach, the author has succeeded in shedding light, using the criteria of the objective historian and the orderly sequence of events as a basis, on the concrete formulation of the primary forces that created the conditions to be found in that very troubled period. In such manner the author is able to evaluate the various forces at play most accurately.

Especially typical is a similar objectivity shown by the author in delineating the character of his central hero Cyril Lukaris, about whom judgments by other historians vary from the extremes of the Roman Catholic fanatic Peter Arcudius, who describes the Patriarch as «a bad egg from a bad crow», to the opposite end of the pole where his ardent admirer Nicholas Jorga considers Lukaris to be one of the greatest figures in world history.

Despite his scrupulous judgments regarding the character and the work of the Patriarch, it is my feeling that Hering has actually missed the mark when he comes to deal with the religious convictions of Lukaris whom he considers a man of indubitable Calvinistic leanings. It makes little difference that, as he notes in his preface, by the terms «Calvinism» and «Calvinist» he means «in a more general sense». The argument in its entirety supporting such a delicate point betrays the fact that Hering is manifestly lacking in theological training which would account for his missing the mark in this instance. But this would not have been necessarily a serious failing on the part of the author if he had at least as a historian maintained certain reservations when it comes to passing judgment on matters of a purely theological nature. And yet he not only unreservedly and dogmatically and arrogantly maintains as much but ridicules those who dare argue the «Orthodoxy» of the Patriarch, stating that such scholars are totally devoid of objective thought (cf. p. 198). Under the circumstances, for the sake of the facts and because of the provocative attitude of the author, I feel I must give some reply in greater depth to this vital point of the study.

Although the author admits that the veracity of the famous *Confessio Fidei* attributed to Lukaris «is even to this day strongly doubted» (p.191), he nevertheless does not believe it essential that this be taken as the unique or the prime revelation with which to support his contention, even though throughout his study he appears to be convinced that the *Confessio* had in fact issued from the Patriarch's pen. On the contrary, he believes that even had such a document not been drafted by Lukaris, one can conclude from other similar documents that the great churchman was a convinced Calvinist long before he occupied the patriarchal throne.

I will not touch upon the *Confessio* here since it is in one way or another still doubted and since Hering himself treats it as of little import. But I have many doubts concerning the other evidence which the author has in fact so diligently assembled.

This evidence is primarily taken from the very lengthy correspondence of the Patriarch with numerous distinguished Protestant theologians of his time, and from the comments that Lukaris had made in his own hand when reading through the *Catechism* of Bellarmine.

From all this evidence one can actually infer that on many points of the Orthodox faith the views of the Patriarch were not strictly Orthodox or were wavering and dubious, but this does not in the least mean that one can describe him as a Calvinist, for throughout his entire life and until his appalling death he strove always to support and to shield the purity of the Orthodox faith. This charge Lukaris expresses succinctly when he says, «God wishes the faith to be simple and pure, as it is taught by the Scriptures and by the Apostles». Hering (p. 194) also quotes this in an excerpt from a sermon by Lukaris but unfortunately without perceiving that by the single word «Apostles» the great Patriarch had clearly and exultantly supported the tradition and had associated the Scriptures directly with this tradition, a remark he would never have conceivably uttered had he been a Calvinist. Otherwise he would have contented himself with that fundamental *Sola Scriptura* of Protestantism.

That on some points Lukaris appears quite bluntly to support the views of Calvin whom he praises by name may be easily accounted for by the fact that Calvinism was an avowed enemy of the disreputable extremities and practices of the Roman Catholic Church which had for long been outraging the Christian conscience generally, and by the fact that the Reformation movement was yet in its infant stages and had not yet assumed its final form, and its own extremities and errors had not been realized in depth.

Regarding especially the comments of the Patriarch, which he records in his own hand, on the contents of the Catechism of Bellarmine, I would point out that these should be treated as an expression of his own doubts on the more difficult articles of the dogma, and not as a confession of faith intended for the enlightenment of others. But the personal nature of these scholia which were the subject of the special study by K. Rozemund who had edited these comments, cites these to support a contrary argument that they express the deep faith of the Patriarch. How can one possibly consider such scholia as a serious confession of faith on the part of Lukaris when they are but his personal reactions to the contents of a book propounding dogmas that were anathema to him? Hering himself admits (p. 179) that the Protestant theologians of Berne «in their reformationary zeal wrongly interpreted» even those purely Orthodox proposals sent by Critoboulos to them for their enlightenment. I greatly fear that Hering overcome by his historical zeal, has similarly fallen into error by assuming that Lukaris was a Calvinist. The unsuitability of a historian to pass judgment on such theological niceties becomes even more obvious by Hering's slips in the use of the most elementary theological terminology. He writes, for example, that «Lukaris had by the autumn of 1618 definitely rejected the most important articles of faith of traditional Orthodox teaching» (p. 21), yet a few lines later observes that «apparently Lukaris still adhered faithfully to the Orthodox doctrines which he abandoned only after the publication of his *Confessio Fidei* in 1629». If in fact after 1618 Hering believes him to have definitely rejected the basic articles of faith of the traditional Orthodox credo, how can this be possibly consistent with the statement that he had until 1629 adhered faithfully to the Orthodox doctrines? If in fact the historian realizes that by saying doctrine one means the most fundamental body of the entire dogmatic teaching of the Christian church generally, he would never have fallen into such crass contradictions. More specifically, in the chapter on the saints and their place in the church, Hering regards these as the touchstone of Lukaris' Orthodoxy, and indeed they play a very basic part in the doctrine, but this makes Hering's contradictory statement even more glaring, for it would have been absolutely incomprehensible that the Patriarch should have strayed from this basic issue of the doctrine, yet nevertheless, as Hering claims, adhered faithfully to the Orthodox doctrine.

There are a great many points brought out by Hering in his treatment of the subject but he does not appear to realize that none of these by any manner of means can be used to support his arguments regarding the Calvinistic leanings of the Patriarch's faith.

This is not the place to enumerate in detail and examine a plethora of such historical points. I would limit myself only to pointing out the following very typical example. Although, as we have seen above, Hering considers Lukaris to have abandoned after 1618 the basic attitudes of the traditional Orthodox teaching, on p. 33 he writes that in 1620 Lukaris, while still Patriarch of Alexandria, «had sent his protosyncellus Joseph to the Ukraine with instructions to travel up and down the country from village to village to guard the faithful from the dangers of the Uniates, of the Lutherans and the Romans, by preaching and spreading the good word».

The question again naturally arises as to why, since Hering wants to believe that Lukaris was at heart a Calvinist, he gave such instructions to his protosyncellus Joseph to undertake an implacable war against the Lutherans in the Ukraine and thus to help preserve the Orthodox beliefs of the faithful residing in that area. How possibly could Lukaris' protosyncellus, under official instructions from his Patriarch, have treated as equally hateful Lutheranism and the Uniate dogma and the Roman dogma if in fact Lukaris was a Calvinist.

Could it be that Hering is unaware of the fact that Lutheranism is as much a Protestant sect as is Calvinism?

One could point out many major contradictions in Hering's history concerning the disputed subject of the deeper beliefs of the Patriarch, but the limited space of this review does not allow me. Such shortcomings nevertheless do detract from the importance and the value of the entire work. On the other hand, it further confirms the fact that even the most diligent and gifted scholar can draw erroneous conclusions when trespassing outside the boundaries of his own field.

After all is said and done, the author has shed much light on the numerous and important problems in that dark period, one which was in fact so vital for the fortunes of Orthodoxy and the Greeks. And it would be most unfair not to express one's admiration and gratitude for Hering's tremendous scholarship, only because he could not draw a different conclusion more objectively from the sources at hand.

*Archbishop of Australia*

STYLIANOS HARKIANAKIS

Douglas Dakin, *The Unification of Greece 1770-1923*, London, Ernest Benn Limited, 1972, pp. 344, £ 3.75.

This review, which should have been written two years ago, is in a way much more timely now than it could have been then, for events in Greece and Cyprus since the summer of 1974 have indeed enhanced the value of the volume under consideration. Professor Dakin's study presents clearly a major phenomenon in modern Greek political history, a phenomenon oftentimes ignored by western observers: that it took a whole century and «Four Wars of Independence» before Greece acquired its political and geographic physiognomy by 1923, the year chosen for the termination of this study. In other words, following the example of historians who treated the unification of Italy, Professor Dakin sought to demonstrate how Greek unification was achieved.

Professor Dakin's work is valuable for another significant reason. In it one can trace themes and forces which continue to have great impact on modern Greek society and the relations of the Greeks with their neighbours, Slavs and Turks, especially the latter. And this is not to suggest by any means that the *Megali Idea*, that unfortunate and much misunderstood as well as abused concept, is a major factor in the formulation or execution of Greek foreign policy in our day. If anything, this year has demonstrated that empty slogans do not move either Greek politicians or the Greek population irresponsibly. But more to the point is the fact that «The First War of Independence» which led to the establishment of a tiny and restricted Greek kingdom was the beginning of the geographic decline of the Ottoman Empire. With the exception of the Ionian Islands ceded to Greece by the British in 1864, the gradual acquisition and reincorporation of Greek lands into the young Greek state was the result of either insurrection or war. «The Second War of Independence» over Crete in the 1860's and 1890's, and the third such war, which Dakin subtitles the «Macedonian Struggle», during the first decade of our century and spilling into the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 completed the end of Turkey's rule in Europe. «The Fourth War of Independence», concentrating on Thrace and Asia Minor, threatened for a while the very existence of the already reduced Turkish state. The transformation of the Greek invasion of Anatolia into a Greek disaster is common knowledge, as is the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923 which sought to regulate Greco-Turkish relations on a number of vital issues.