

réalité que des traductions d'œuvres grecques ou des œuvres dont les auteurs sont fort imprégnés de culture néohellénique. Si les titres rassemblés par Mr. N. Gaidagis sont d'une importance certaine dans l'étude de l'évolution de la pensée, les listes des souscripteurs et abonnés, que l'auteur du livre établit, facilite la recherche biographique sur les lettrés. Ces éditeurs et tous ceux qui ont eu une part active dans l'expansion du livre grec lors de cette période critique.

Mr. N. Gaidagis suit dans son ouvrage le système de la *Bibliographie Hellénique 1800-1863*, vol. 1-3, Athènes 1939, 1957, rédigée par D. Ginis et V. Mexas.—Le livre de N. Gaidagis est un précieux outil pour tout chercheur désireux de se renseigner sur la diffusion du livre grec dans les principautés danubiennes et son influence sur la pensée néohellénique et roumaine; par ailleurs le catalogue de Mr. N. Gaidagis constitue un usuel de recherche pour l'étude d'Aufklärung Néohellénique.

Institut d'Etudes Balkaniques
Thessalonique

ATHANASSIS E. KARATHANASSIS

Association Internationale des Etudes du Sud-Est Européen - Comité National Grec des Etudes du Sud-Est Européen, Symposium Historique International, "La dernière phase de la crise orientale et l'Hellénisme (1878-1881)", Volos: 27-30 Septembre 1981. Actes, Athènes 1983.

The terms of the preliminary Treaty of San Stefano, having been widely condemned, were adjusted in such a way as to satisfy both Turkey and all the European Powers (with the exception of Russia) with the signing in the same year of the Treaty of Berlin.

The solutions that were found for the problems of the East scarcely took into account the needs and desires of the peoples they directly affected. The sole desire of the German representative, Bismarck, for instance, was to avoid a clash in Europe, which would give France the opportunity to seek to avenge its defeat of 1870.

The conference members attached minor importance to questions concerning the Greeks. Consequently, although the representatives of the Great Powers agreed that Thessaly and much of Epirus should be ceded to Greece, they did not specifically include this decision in the terms of the Treaty, being content, after persistent entreaties from the Turks, merely to include in Article 23 a provision referring to the thirteenth protocol, signed at the meeting of 5 July. This unfortunate formulation led to great problems, and it was only after three years of negotiations, meetings, and debate that the Great Powers' wishes were carried out in part and to the detriment of Greek interests. This was with the signing of the Greek-Turkish Treaty of 1881, by which Greece received Thessaly, but only the Arta region of Epirus.

The events which took place between 1878 and 1881 were of particular importance for the history of the Balkan peoples, and especially for the development of the Eastern Question. This three-year period consolidated in practice what the Treaty of Berlin had legislated for on paper.

To celebrate the centenary of Thessaly's and Arta's incorporation into Greece, an inter-

national historical conference was held in Volos between 27 and 30 September 1981, on the subject : *La dernière phase de la crise orientale et l'Hellénisme (1878-1881)*. The conference was organised by the Association Internationale des Études du Sud-est Européen and the Comité National Grec des Études du Sud-est Européen, under the aegis of Unesco. A large number of Greek and foreign historians participated, examining and analysing the complex aspects of this period, which was in fact a Greek-Turkish dispute that occupied the policy-makers of the Greek kingdom and European diplomacy for three whole years.

The conference opened with two introductory papers: E. Kofos' "Hellenism at the Crossroads (1878-1881): Reappraisal of Priorities in an Evolving Balkan Setting" and St. Papadopoulos' "L'Épire pendant la période du Congrès de Berlin". Evangelos Kofos conducted an exhaustive analysis of the manifold problems facing Hellenism at the time in the context of the Eastern Question and in relation to the part played by the Great Powers. The three-year delay in the settlement of the Epirus-Thessaly question had far-reaching effects on the fate of the other unredeemed regions and was also prejudicial to the satisfaction of the Greek demands.

Apart from the Greek frontier problem, however, immediately after the Berlin Conference, Ottoman diplomacy had more urgent matters to attend to, such as, inter alia, the removal of the Russian forces from Eastern Thrace, the agreement with Austria-Hungary for ceding the administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the defining of the borders of the Balkan states, and the settlement of the administrative or political status of various provinces.

Professor Stefanos Papadopoulos gave a general review of the situation in Epirus at the time of the Berlin Conference, touching particularly on the administrative, economic, social, and cultural aspects. Epirus, which had always fought alongside Thessaly, failed not only to become unified with free Greece, but even to reach as far as the bounds of the River Kalamas, as the Great Powers had approved. Only a small area of Epirus was annexed to Greece, and naturally this influenced the behaviour of the enslaved Greeks of Epirus. Nonetheless, as Professor Papadopoulos pointed out, during this period the Epirot Greeks made keen efforts to develop education.

In his paper, "P. A. Sabouroff on his Mission in Greece during the Eastern Crisis of the 1870's". G. L. Ars described the constructive part P. A. Sabouroff played in the annexation of Thessaly and part of Epirus to Greece. This is a particularly interesting study, because it is based on the Russian diplomat's personal correspondence, which is preserved in the Central State Archive of the USSR.

G. Castelan's paper, entitled "Les Balkans et la Grèce au lendemain du Traité de Berlin, 13 juillet 1878", looked at the problem from a diplomatic point of view, and maintained that the Treaty of Berlin did not inaugurate a period of peace and concord for either the Greeks or the other Balkan peoples, because the Great Powers did not take into account the wishes of these peoples.

S. Damjanov "La France et la question grecque à la fin de la Crise d'Orient (1878-1881)" and A. E. Karathanassis "La diplomatie française et le problème thessaloépirote" gave an account of the part played by French diplomacy in this whole affair.

Being so tied up with the Epirus-Thessaly question, the Greek government paid scant attention to the developments taking place in the southern Balkans, particularly after the establishment of the Exarchate. As much as a year after the decisions made at the Berlin Conference, the nationalist rivalry in the Balkans (which neither the Great Powers nor the Ottoman government were able to subdue), allied with the Russo-Turkish War and the

prolonged Russian occupation, reduced the physical and economic strength of the once powerful Greek element. A number of speakers dealt with aspects of the internal situation in this region after the foundation of the Ottoman Empire's autonomous province of "Eastern Rumelia" following the Berlin Conference. E. Statelova "Parties politiques en Roumélie orientale (1879-1885)" pointed out that there was a lack of political parties in the region in the early years following the creation of Eastern Rumelia. It was only after 1881-3 that two parties came into being. In her detailed paper "Les écoles grecques de Thrace et de Roumélie orientale pendant les années 1878-1885", based on archival material, H. Bellia examined the state of education in connection with the political developments and the fortunes of the Greeks in Eastern Rumelia and Thrace. She placed particular emphasis on the great contribution made by the Church to the communities, and the associations to the furtherance of Greek education. K. Mamoni's interesting paper, "Les corporations de Thrace et de Roumélie orientale (1878-1885)", looked at the corporate activity of the Greeks of Thrace and Eastern Rumelia after 1875 and the effects upon it of the prevailing political circumstances.

Istvan Dioszegi used Hungarian archival sources as the basis for his paper, "Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie und die Organisierung Ost-Rumeliens 1878-1879", which analysed the diplomatic aspect of the question and stressed the Austro-Hungarian monarchy's interest in the eastern Balkans. Led by Andrassy, the Austrians attempted to limit the extension of Bulgaria's frontiers and to preserve the status quo, but to no avail.

The Albanian Question was not discussed at the Berlin Conference because the Great Powers did not recognise it as a diplomatic question. In his paper, "Le Congrès de Berlin et la Question albanaise", Arben Puto made the point that after the Eastern Crisis the Albanian Question was directly or indirectly present in almost all the accords internationaux relatifs aux Balkans, pour finir par devenir, en 1912-1913, le principal objet de la Conférence de Londres des six Grandes puissances.

The Albanian awakening, which took material form in the foundation of the Albanian League of Prizren in 1878, was more or less contemporary with the Berlin Conference. Kristo Frasheri's paper, "Les traits distinctifs de l'idéologie de la Ligue albanaise de Prizren (1878-1881)", pointed out that the Albanians loin d'espérer accéder à l'indépendance nationale étaient au contraire conscients que leur patrie se trouvait sur un lit de Procruste.

In his paper, "La Ligue de Prizren et le problème de l'autonomie de l'Albanie", Stefanaq Pollo discussed the Albanian people's resistance to the Turkish oppressor, their national consciousness, and their struggles for national independence.

Basil Kondis' paper, "The Albanian Nationalist Movement and the Epiro-Thessalian Boundary Problem", was most interesting. On the basis of material in the archives of the Great Powers and the Greek Foreign Ministry, the author maintained that it is very probable that the general Albanian revolt in the north, which challenged Turkish rule and created conditions for foreign intervention, coupled with the fear of a Greek offensive and the extension of the revolt in the south, which might have resulted in the loss of the whole of Epirus and Albania, forced the Porte to settle the frontier question with Greece.

Milorad Ekmečić's interesting paper, entitled "An Attempt to Revitalize the Eastern Question Through a Popular Uprising in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1878-1882", observed that: The Slavophile backing of the uprising in Herzegovina was at its highest in February 1882. It was a belated offshoot of the clandestine activity which had started in 1878. After March 1882 it gradually withered away and passed into oblivion.

Emil Palotas analysed the diplomatic aspect of the problem in his paper, "Die mon-

tenegriscie Grenzfrage und die österreichisch-ungarische Diplomatie", while Novak Ražnatić's "Le Traité de Berlin et la démarcation entre le Monténégro et la Turquie (1878-1880)" examined the results of the Montenegrins' struggle for liberation after the Berlin Treaty.

Professor Roderick H. Davison's paper, "The Ottoman-Greek Frontier Question 1876-1882, from Ottoman Records", was extremely interesting. He pointed out that my investigation is intended to show that the question looked like to the Ottoman Foreign Ministry, if possible. But there are without doubt errors in it. It is also incomplete, does not cover the whole frontier question, but stops in 1880. The incompleteness also arises from the fact that in this period Sultan Abdul-hamid II was beginning to take a much more active role in the conduct of affairs, including foreign affairs, than his predecessors'.

In his interesting study, "Gladstone and the Hellenic Factor in the Eastern Question", Richard Shannon examined the British Prime Minister Gladstone's part in the Eastern Crisis.

Another interesting topic was Nadia Danova's "L'incorporation de la Thessalie à la Grèce et l'opinion publique bulgare". The Bulgarian historians are investigating this subject for the first time, and are bringing to light new data which will help to create new perspectives in Greek-Bulgarian relations.

Romania was one of the independent states created by the Berlin Conference. Making extensive use of published sources and unpublished Romanian archival material, Nicolae Ciachir spoke about "La diplomatie roumaine dans les Balkans durant la période 1878-1881". The burden of his paper was that during this period, Romanian diplomacy endeavoured to establish diplomatic relations and to maintain perfect good-neighbourly relations with all the Balkan nations.

Prince Couza recognised the Greek communities of Romania in 1860. The fact that the majority of the Greeks in Romania were of Macedonian or Epirot origin explains why the Greek press in Romania took such an interest in the events connected with the Eastern Crisis. Olga Cicanci's paper, "La presse grecque de Roumanie et la Question orientale", was most interesting in its discussion of the wealth of subjects which engaged the attention of the Greek press in Romania from the midnineteenth century up until the Balkan Wars. The first Greek newspaper, *O Zephyros tou Istrou* (The Zephyr of the Istrus), came out in 1841-2, and was followed by many others.

"The Impact of 1878 on Romania" was the title of Radu Florescu's paper, in which he pointed out that the wartime publicity served to bring the national ideal to the attention of the masses, not only in Romania proper, but also in those provinces still under foreign occupation. His conclusion was that 1878 deepened the national consciousness in all Romanian lands.

With reference to the internal situation in Thessaly, E. Allamani's paper, "La Thessalie au lendemain de la libération: Une tentative d'analyse de ses structures politiques, économiques et sociales", was interesting. She approached the subject solely on the basis of the Greek consular reports in the region, and discussed the problems of the development of economic and social structures in Thessaly during the critical five-year period.

Georgia Ioannidou-Bitsiadou's paper, "La structure économique de la Thessalie à la veille de l'annexion (1878-1881)", discussed the economic situation in Thessaly on the basis of the reports of the French and British consuls.

T. Tsiovaridou broached the enormous problem of the ownership of the so-called "national lands" in her paper, "Le changement de la structure de l'agriculture grecque après l'annexion de la Thessalie en 1881", and concluded that the change in the structure of Greek

agriculture after the annexation of Thessaly was due to three main factors: a) historical factors; b) Koumoundouros's and Trikoupis's different agricultural policy; and c) the international situation.

The paper presented by D. Vayakakos, "Le problème démographique et toponymique d'Arta et de Thessalie lors de leur annexion à l'Etat grec", was particularly interesting. He discussed the demographic and toponymic situation in Thessaly and Arta with reference to the general census of September 1881 and other documents.

The part played by the great landowner Konstantinos Karapanos in the drawing of the new Greek boundaries was the subject of C. Cardika-Alexandropoulou's well-researched paper, "La participation de Constantin Karapanos aux négociations pour les nouvelles frontières grecques".

H. Koukou's study, "Documents inédits du mouvement de libération de la Thessalie en 1875", was also based on unpublished archival material, and Rita Tolomeo discussed the political and religious situation in Epirus and Thessaly in her paper, "La situazione politico-religiosa in Epiro e Tessaglia vista da propaganda fide (1878-1881)".

On the basis of the French archival sources, Dimitris Michalopoulos paper, "Le sentiment favorable à l'union avec la Grèce des habitants de Thessalie pendant les années 1878-1880 et la réaction des autorités ottomanes", dealt with the mood of the Thessalian people and the attitude of the Turkish State in the critical period when the Berlin Conference's decisions were not being implemented.

"L'Hellénisme de la dispersion et la crise de la Question d'Orient (1875-1881)" was the title of S. Loukatos' paper, which discussed the collaboration between the Greeks of the Diaspora and the other Greeks, both free and enslaved, during the Eastern Crisis. His information was drawn from the Greek emigrant press, and particularly the Trieste newspaper *Κλειώ* (Kleio).

The Volos Conference was an enormous success. This was due in large part to the fact that many scholars, both Greek and foreign, took part in it and investigated and discussed not only how the Berlin Conference left the question of Greece's borders unresolved — a matter which was of decisive importance for Greece, of course — but also various other issues involved in the Eastern Question.

*Institute for Balkan Studies
Thessaloniki*

GEORGIA IOANNIDOU-BITSIADOU