

The struggle for unification was long and hard; made even harder by the exchange of populations which took place after the Treaty of Lausanne. But for the first time, more Greeks were gathered inside than outside the modern Greek state, a phenomenon that has not been sufficiently appreciated by historians, as it has been by prose writers and poets such as George Seferis. The latter was fully aware of the human tragedy brought about by this population arrangement, himself being one of the uprooted, but he viewed the return of the Greeks to the «rock», as Greece is frequently called affectionately, as pregnant with a variety of creative possibilities. With the Dodecanese acquired after the Second World War, Greece once more established herself mistress of the Aegean. Cyprus was a totally different story and has remained so to our days with its explosive potential for Greece and its neighbours.

Professor Dakin tells the political and diplomatic story of this unification drama well, and students of modern Greek history should be grateful to him for a concise and lucid presentation of a most complicated story. But as is commonly acknowledged, this sort of political transformation is inconceivable without corresponding social, economic and cultural movements which are either the offspring of political realities or which frequently seek to determine new political realities. For this reason, the relation between social and cultural factors and foreign policy or foreign adventures has been receiving increasingly greater attention in the writing of diplomatic history in recent times. The failure to concentrate in greater detail on this relationship is probably the major weakness of this study. Occasionally, to be sure, Professor Dakin does endeavour to place the political and diplomatic narrative in its social and cultural context but not altogether satisfactorily. Maybe this was inevitable since he chose to treat separately, however schematically, «The Economic and Intellectual Life of Greece 1861-1923» in the last chapter.

Despite this observation and some minor inaccuracies which crept into the text, Professor Dakin's work is extremely valuable and the only one of its kind available in English. It could be read profitably by students and diplomats alike as they are watching the psychological and diplomatic orientations of Greece toward the Arab and Balkan worlds, orientations which have become strikingly evident since the end of the military regime in Greece and the difficulties with Turkey over Cyprus.

University of Minnesota

THEOFANIS G. STAVROU

Richard Clogg, editor, *The Struggle for Greek Independence. Essays to mark the 150th Anniversary of the Greek War of Independence*, Hamden, Conn., Shoe String Press, 1973.

Today, a little more than a century and a half after the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence, there are still large gaps in our knowledge of this significant event. This book brings together papers originally delivered at a conference held at the University of London marking the 150th anniversary of the revolution. It is often the case in such works that continuity and evenness of quality are not easily obtained. In this instance, however, both of these criteria have been to a large extent fulfilled.

The Greek revolt of 1821, though preceded by the Serbian uprising in 1804, and succeeded by a century of turmoil in the Balkans, was an event of the first importance as it marked the beginning of the break-up of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. The subject

peoples of the empire had begun their struggle for independence in earnest. Metternichian Europe was now faced with the spectacle of the imminent demise of what once had been the «terror of Europe». By revolting against the empire the Greeks had added another facet to that imponderable issue of the nineteenth century, the Eastern Question. Europeans responded not only to the political and military implications of the revolt, but to its human face also. The Greek cause touched the philanthropic, artistic and moral sensibilities of the West. Bursting forth at a time when revolts had already occurred in Spain and the Italian peninsula, the Greek uprising served as an even more compelling challenge to the stability and peace of post-Napoleonic Europe.

From the day that the Greeks rose up Westerners have tended to see them through the experience of their own civilization, harking back of course to the ancient Hellenes. The eastern traditions of the Greeks, religious and political, have been viewed as either unenlightened and backward, and therefore to be deprecated, or exotic, and consequently amusing and entertaining. The multifaceted world of the eastern empires (Byzantine and Ottoman) to which they belonged, has only recently come to be fully appreciated. In the first chapter the editor, Richard Clogg, provides an informative and sound overview of this complex world of which the Greeks were part. It provides a sympathetic understanding of the far from homogenous world of the Greeks and the footnotes are as interesting and informative as the text.

At the upper end of the social and economic scale of the subject Greeks were the *Phanariots*, true representatives of the eastern tradition. An imperial elite, whose interests and success lay in serving the Ottoman state, the *Phanariots* gained wealth and power in Constantinople, and in the Rumanian Principalities, which they dominated politically and culturally for most of the eighteenth century. Cyril Mango's piece on the role of this elite is an exercise in debunking. He diligently works to lay bare whatever pretensions the *Phanariots* may have had regarding their claims to a Byzantine aristocratic lineage as well as any favorable views that historians may have voiced concerning their contribution to life in the Ottoman state, especially to their Greek compatriots. While their record in the Principalities is hardly a model of enlightened or even moderate rule, Professor Mango, in this reviewer's opinion, is too sweeping in this criticism and fails to give us a balanced picture of this important elite.

Theorists of modern nationalism have long emphasized the importance of intellectuals to the rise of this movement. Yet the nature and extent of their influence has been difficult to measure and assess. Catherine Koumariou addresses herself to this problem in a chapter on the role of the Greek intellectuals in preparing the way for the revolution. In a fine essay she makes her own «contribution» to this issue in a clear and sensitive manner. While Greek intellectuals, both inside and without the Ottoman Empire, differed greatly in their estimation of when and how their people would achieve their liberation, they all understood the importance of preparation through education and general enlightenment.

Matters came to a head in March, 1821, when the Greeks rose in the Peloponnesos and a conspiratorial group, the *Philiki Etairia*, attempted to create a general uprising in the Balkans by starting a revolt in the Principalities. George Frangos delineates the diversity among the men who joined this secret society while focusing on the largest group with regard to social background, the merchants. He offers a tempting hypothesis: that these were men between two worlds, the traditional one in the Ottoman Empire that they left, and the more «modern» one in southern Russia where they went to make good. Unfortunately for the interested reader, the supporting research for this is to be found in his doctoral manuscript

from which this short piece is drawn. That the leaders of the *Philiki Etairia* sought to involve the entire Balkan peninsula and all Greeks in their conspiracy is certain. That the hundreds who eventually joined the Society were united only by the basic desire to break free from Turkish rule also becomes apparent from Frangos' essay, even if one does not find his theoretical framework entirely convincing.

When the forces of the *Philiki Etairia* under the leadership of Alexander Ypsilantis crossed the Pruth into Moldavia on March 6, they carried with them, besides their arms, a far more potent «weapon». The *Etairists* spread the word that they had the support of Tsar Alexander in their endeavor to gain the support of the local population when they raised the standard of revolt. What gave this assertion credence was the fact that Ypsilantis had been in the service of the Tsar and that Russia's foreign minister, John Kapodistrias, was widely believed to be a sympathizer and member of the *Etairia*. The pros and cons of the latter assumption as well as the question of Kapodistrias' role in Ypsilantis' expedition into the Principalities are ably analyzed by C. M. Woodhouse. He persuasively argues that the Corfiot took a proper stand of non-involvement in the secret society during the first years of its existence as befitting a high government official of the Russian Empire. Yet his sympathies with the cause of the Greeks kept him from putting a stop to the plans that Ypsilantis set in motion for an uprising in the Principalities.

The Greeks struggled not only for independence during the 1820's but also for a viable state. When the new nation was launched with the arrival of its new king, Otho, in February, 1833, there were already contradictory forces in motion. Professor Douglas Dakin judiciously surveys the years of the revolution revealing the conflicting personal and regional divisions in Greek society and their impact on the emergent Greek state. Thus, when the young Otho came to Nauplion representing centralized and personal authority as the new monarch there already existed an established tradition of constituent power in Greece. That these two tendencies would clash was of course inevitable.

Later that same year a Synod of bishops was called by the Greek government to deal with the question of the church in the new state. The Synod took the momentous step of voting to separate itself from the jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarchate and to become an autocephalous church. The revolution was a traumatic experience for the Orthodox Church. When the Ottoman Turks conquered the lands of Byzantium the Sultan had allowed the patriarchate in Constantinople to continue. It retained not only its ecclesiastical functions, but was given temporal powers over the Orthodox subjects of the empire as well. When the Greek revolt began the church, as an imperial institution, faced the dilemma of affirming its loyalty to the Ottoman state or declaring for the revolution. In a way the hierarchy of the church had almost no choice, for to side with the insurrection would have meant the loss of all its spiritual and temporal privileges. Philip Sherrard has long been concerned with the impact of the modern world on the Orthodox Church (see his *The Greek East and Latin West*) and he addresses himself to this theme once again in a chapter on the Church and the war of independence. In this instance he takes us all the way back to Constantine the Great, and on to the West and the Roman papacy, in order to elucidate what he feels have been greatly contrasting conceptions of church-state relations. These sweeping excursions into the past are then related in a somewhat tenuous manner to the problem of the relationship between church and state in modern Greece. While the issue was indicative of a clash of traditions—modern and Western versus traditional and Eastern—one does not need to go back five or ten centuries to find an explanation. The essay fails to examine the all-important attitude of the new leaders of Greece who felt that the patriarchate was

too closely indentified with the Turks and instead sends us on an intellectual trek into the middle ages.

Chapters by Robin Fletcher on «Byron in Nineteenth Century Greek Literature», Alexis Dimaras on the non-military British philhellenes and E. D. Tappe on the revolution in the Principalities round out the essays. It ought to be noted that in a book on the «struggle for Greek independence» there is almost nothing concerning the actual military conduct of the war. Despite this omission several significant topics are covered. Though these essays raised as many questions as they answered, this should be construed as a recommendation that the book be read by anyone interested in the Greek revolution.

University of South Carolina  
Department of History

GERASIMOS AUGUSTINOS

N. Todorov - V. Trajkov, *Bŭlgari učasnici v borbite za osvobodnieto na Gŭrcija 1821-1828*, Sofia, BAN (Institut za balkanistika), 1971, pp. 1017.

The 19th Century was a turning point in the history of the Balkan peoples. It began with the eruption of the national liberation movements in the nations of Southeastern Europe, and ended with the formation of nearly all the national states in that region. Yet the friction and rivalry between the newly independent countries grew as the irredentist movements increased in intensity, the aim of these movements being the fulfilment of each young nation's «Great Idea». At the same time, however, the irredentist movements united the Balkan nations even more in their common struggle against the Ottomans. The groundwork for these movements had been laid in the previous centuries by a process of gradual enlightenment and the growth of a national consciousness which was further nurtured by the spread and absorption of the ideals of the French revolution in the Balkan area.

The earliest national liberation movement in the Balkans to culminate in the establishment of an independent and sovereign State after an eight-year struggle was the Greek War of Independence of 1821. The outbreak of the revolt in areas outside Greece proper such as in Moldavia and Wallachia, and the fact that flourishing Greek communities existed in most parts of the Balkans side by side with other national groups, not to mention the Greek outbreak against the common foe, made a deep impression on the Balkan peoples in general, many of whom took an active part in the rebellion.

Several works have appeared in the recent past dealing with the influence of the Greek War of Independence in the Balkans and the participation of the Balkan peoples in that rebellion [see the recent article by N. Todorov, «Novi dannii za dobrovolcite ot grăckoto văstanie prez 1821 g. v dunavskite knjažestva» (New evidence concerning volunteers in the Greek revolution of 1821 in the Danubian principalities), *Balkani* 3, Sofia 1973, 7-30, with significant bibliography. See also Sp. Loukatos, *Σχέσεις Ἑλλήνων μετὰ Σέρβων καὶ Μανροβουνίων κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἐπανάστασιν 1823-1826*, Thessaloniki, Institute for Balkan Studies, 1970, and his «Τουρκοαλβανικοῦ φιλελληνισμοῦ ἐράνισμα κατὰ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν ἐθνεγερσίαν», in *Ἀθηνᾶ* 73-74 (1973), 43-63].

Nevertheless, the problem has not yet been thoroughly studied. Now, the work by N. Todorov - V. Trajkov dealing with Bulgarians who took part in the struggle for the independence of Greece constitutes a welcome addition that fills a great gap in the story of the Bulgarian patriots who participated in the War of Independence in the Greek peninsula,