

scholars from other countries (eg. Rilski's own relationship with E. Tandalidis, see p. 155, no. 136). There is a fairly large number of lexicons (22 in all) which, it seems, are positively tattooed with Rilski's notes. For years he himself was preparing the publication of a large Bulgarian-Greek lexicon and had collected thousands of words towards this end. He read, pencil in hand, consulting all the Greek dictionaries he knew of (Gazis', Vyzandios' etc.). He added words, noted errors, made comments. Rilski's lexicological observations are of great interest, and specialists in particular should pay attention to the Greek words he amasses.

He is characterised by the quite spontaneous and cutting way he frequently reacts as he reads. A characteristic example: in T. Hrlev's lexicon, "A Short Lexicon of the Foreign Words in the Bulgarian Language", Braila, 1863, beside the words *kivot* and *kimval*, which are noted as being Hebrew, Rilski has written in Bulgarian: "They'll be gypsy next. They're both Greek, idiot!".

He comments on opinions he considers exaggerated or inappropriate, makes sarcastic remarks, shows approval or makes comparisons (for instance, he compares Darvaris' and Kalavakidis' arithmetic, p. 161, no. 142).

It is unfortunate that there are so many more than the average number of printing errors, in the Greek texts particularly, which often make it difficult to understand certain words. These errors detract from the results of Afrodita Aleksieva's labour, the patient and painstaking deciphering of Rilski's Greek notes.

Through an oversight no doubt, the New Testament in Roumanian and in Cyrillic script has been inserted in the second part of the book (p. 209, no. 116) amongst the books in Greek and Latin script; it belongs in the first part.

In his hitherto unsurpassed study of Neofit Rilski, in the section devoted to the scholar's library ("Novi studii iz oblasti na bălgarskoto vāzraždane. Biblioteka na Neofita Rilski (=New studies concerning the Bulgarian Renaissance. The library of Neofit Rilski,) Sbornik BAN, 21 (1926) 461), Iv. Šišmanov notes: "If it were possible for us to know what any particular well-known writer had read during his lifetime, or at least during the most significant periods of his intellectual and moral development, this would throw light on certain aspects of his work and activity". Regarding the XIXth century in particular, the library of a great scholar such as Rilski can be an indication and a measure of more general observations concerning the movement of books and ideas within Bulgaria during the second and third quarters of the XIXth century. Afrodita Aleksieva's and Dočo Lekov's work of compiling the notes Rilski made in his books is consequently a contribution to the cultural history of this country during the XIXth century.

*Institute for Balkan Studies*

DESPINA LOUKIDOU-MAVRIDOU

Taki Theodorakopoulos, *The Greek Upheaval-Kings, Demagogues and Bayonets*, New Rochelle, N. Y.: Caratzas Bros., 1978, 257 pp. + index.

The decade of the 1970s has witnessed a revival of interest in modern Greek politics. This particular book is presented by the publishers as "different... controversial and revisionist in tone... giving stimulus for a reassessment of modern Greek history...". The publishers are

certainly correct in their first three characterizations of this book, but one wonders what kind of reassessment of modern Greek history they and the author had in mind. Further, the author tells us (pp. 131-2) that the essence of this book is to give "objective answers" to questions about the causes of the death of the democratic process in Greece in 1967 by examining the Papandreu era and showing that the dictatorship was "almost inevitable". However, this noble goal of objectivity is lost in his passionate attack on the Papandreous and his attempt to rationalize, if not also to defend and apologize for the actions of the King, the junta and those participants of the Greek political scene that the author likes.

Indicative of the character of this book is the following brief summary of the key points raised by its author. We are told that Greece is more "Middle Eastern than European"; that Greek politics follow the vicious circle of "freedom-anarchy and repression"; and that there is a tradition of military meddling in politics. Greece is also a country dominated by a yellow press, lacking a tradition of constitutional government, with a turbulent, if not demagogic, parliamentary life and a history of rigged elections. As for the Greek public, it is described as immature, volatile, unruly, individualistic, prone to cheating and corruption in politics, showing preference to retribution than compromise and forgiveness, and being ungrateful to those that help it. The author attributes the problems of Greek politics to "age old characteristics and idiosyncrasies" of the Greek mind and the Greek people in general. Consequently, democracy in Greece has been only a figment of Western romanticism and imagination rather than a fact of Greek political life.

About the junta we are told that its poor, religious, hard working, nationalistic leaders really wanted to save Greece from corruption, communism and the Papandreous. This is why they were welcomed by the Greeks at home and abroad. Any resistance to the junta was mostly outside Greece and even this has been exaggerated by few foreign dreamers and Greek radicals. Although Ioannides' rule is condemned, that of Papadopoulos is presented in superlatives in terms of its economic performance, its dedication to returning Greece to a "guided democracy" and for following for the first time an "independent foreign policy". This the author attributes to the fact that Papadopoulos did not have politicians willing to embarrass him. The 1973 referendum is described as one of the most free ever to be held in Greece, opening the way to the historic but lost opportunity of the Markezinis experiment.

The stories of nepotism and corruption of the junta are waved off as myths circulated by disgruntled army officers and opponents of the regime. As for torture, it was neither an established policy nor in accordance with the colonels' thinking. Actually, both the issue of torture and of the events at the Polytechnic—where the junta is said to have acted with patience—are described as myths created by a non-existent resistance in order to rewrite history. Had Papadopoulos held elections in 1970, he would have won by a landslide thanks to the "political peace", "social harmony", and "economic progress he had brought to Greece. But Papadopoulos failed because he was not able to gain the support of the intellectuals and the Greek establishment in building a new Greece; refused to dismantle the old power structures, and, like the king, lost touch with the people. The author concludes that the fall of the junta was a voluntary act on the part of its leaders done for the "good of the country". This is why they stepped down without seeking any guarantees for themselves. But the ungrateful and revengeful Greek public subjected them to what amounted an unfair trial and unjust punishment.

Similarly distorted is Theodoracopoulos' account of political developments in Cyprus. The problems of the island are attributed to the romantic and megalomaniac Makarios. He

is accused of having acted under Russian influence; maintaining a repressive government at home; spreading anti-Greek propaganda; and, along with Andreas Papandreou, discrediting the U.S., Britain, and NATO. In contrast, the author praises the "moderation" of the colonels in their dealings with Turkey over Cyprus and the other Greco-Turkish problems, and this moderation is seen as one reason for the U. S. support of the junta. The author clears the U. S. of any complicity in the events in Cyprus, and considers the 1974 coup as a natural reaction to the persecution the coupists had suffered under Makarios. The accounts of violence by the coupists are seen as exaggerations of the press, and those committed by the Turks during the invasion are indirectly equated to atrocities allegedly committed by the Greek Cypriots.

Theodoracopoulos attributes the current wave of anti-Americanism in Greece to Andreas Papandreou who exploits the Greek humiliation over Cyprus, and the belief that the U. S. helped the colonels, in order to polarize Greek politics and undermine the West. He is therefore accused of having done irreparable damage to the relations of Greece with the West. Clearly, Andreas Papandreou is the *bête noire* of this book and this "objective" account of Greek politics spares no words in presenting him as the "most divisive factor" in Greek politics since the schism of the 1920s.

Much like David Holden's *Greece Without Columns* (Lippincott, 1972), which Theodoracopoulos admires, this book is simplistic and inaccurate in its explanations of events in Greece and Cyprus. While totally neglecting available documentary evidence, the author over-powers the reader by his ideological bias and personal antipathies blatantly contradicting his own goal of an objective account of Greek politics. This book is one of the worst to be written about Greece in recent years. And while Greeks should familiarize themselves with the distortions that are being circulated abroad about their country's politics and society, this reviewer would recommend to the non-Greek reader, who is unfamiliar with Greece and wishes to learn about Greece, *not* to read this book.

Indiana University-Fort Wayne

VAN COUFOUDAKIS

Dimitri Kitsikis, *Συγκριτική Ιστορία 'Ελλάδος και Τουρκίας στον 20' αιώνα* (translated from the French ed.), Athens, Estia: 1978, pp. 269.

The author, well known from his earlier work, utilizes a comparative approach to present an "objective study" of Greco-Turkish history. This book, which has been translated ed. from the French, concludes rather abruptly around 1930 with a brief but significant discussion of the Kurdish problem. The author plans to continue this comparative study through 1967 in another volume.

Two controversial concepts are presented in this book. The first is that of the "intermediary region", one developed earlier by Spyros Vryonis and others. Kitsikis defines this region as the space between the East and the West, encompassing areas as the USSR (except the Baltic states), the Balkans (except Croatia), the Arab States (from Morocco to the Arabian peninsula), Ethiopia, Iran, Afghanistan and portions of Pakistan and Turkestan. According to the author, each of the peoples that dominated this region attempted to unify it into one ecumenical empire. These internal conflicts brought interventions by the Western powers, creating what is often called the "Eastern Question". The prologue contains a chart