

lume à l'autre, chose à tout instant nécessaire. Pour fidèle en effet que soit la transcription typographique, elle ne suffit pas: elle ne peut par exemple rendre compte des variations d'écriture ou des encres différentes; et ces changements peuvent renseigner le chercheur. L'éditeur fournit également à celui-ci, avec les photographies, le moyen de tenter à son tour de déchiffrer les passages illisibles ou douteux. La valeur de l'édition est accrue en outre par les Notes en fin de volume, qui expliquent en particulier la plupart des allusions ou des citations. On devine quel secours apportent ces renseignements difficiles à trouver aujourd'hui. Comme je travaille depuis déjà des années les manuscrits de Solomos sur des photographies que M. le professeur Merlier avait eu la bonté de mettre à ma disposition, je crois être bien placé pour apprécier l'aide immense que les Oeuvres Autographes apportent à l'étude du poète national. Je sais quel secours j'y ai personnellement trouvé. Remercions de ce beau travail l'Université de Thessaloniki et le professeur Politis.

On attend maintenant la publication d'un troisième volume, qui offrira sans en changer l'ordre toutes les ébauches de chaque poème, mais où les ratures seront supprimées ainsi que les hésitations de la pensée, où les textes italiens seront traduits en grec, les différentes pièces présentées séparément, l'orthographe normalisée. Après le travail pour ainsi dire paléographique des deux premiers tomes, qui constituent l'édition "diplomatique," ce troisième tome constituera l'édition proprement dite. Il s'adressera à un public cultivé plus vaste: celui qui, sans vouloir se livrer à des recherches scientifiques, souhaite cependant satisfaire une curiosité éveillée plutôt que satisfaite par les éditions courantes. Ce volume sera bientôt indispensable à tous les amoureux des lettres grecques.

Attaché de Recherche au S.N.R.S.

LOUIS COUTELLE

Theodore Saloutos, *The Greeks in the United States*. Harvard University Press, 1964. Pp. XI+445.

Theodore Saloutos has written what undoubtedly will be the standard work on the history of the Greeks in the United States for a long time. It is an important study. Any further work on the subject, and we hope that this is but the start of systematic research and publication covering the immigration of Greeks to the United States, must necessarily start with Saloutos' pioneering study. There have been other attempts to write the history of the Greeks in the United States, but none is so com-

plete, so wide in scope or so objective as the work at hand. It is pioneering in many respects, not the least of which is the extensive bibliography which is included (pp. 389-400), and the copious notes (pp. 401-436).

There are many details with which one can find fault, and I shall do so below, but the reader should begin with the premise that he has before him the most complete study available on the subject.

Saloutos begins with a very important chapter on "The Hellas of the Immigrant," in which is contained a very good analysis of the social and economic conditions existing in Greece during the later part of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, conditions which in part brought about the widespread emigration from Greece. (It might be well to point out at the start that the author confuses *emigrant* and *immigrant* at times. The title of this first chapter is a case in point. It seems to me that it should be "The Hellas of the Emigrant." On p. 35 we find reference to "Patras, the ranking *immigration* port of the country. Such inaccurate uses of the two words abound throughout the work). It is a good summary of "a land of poverty, restlessness, unstable rule and passionate Panhellenic aspirations." There are some oversimplifications, which like all such statements can be misleading, incorrect, or both. The statement (pp. 18-19), "In Macedonia the portion of the population that recognized the Patriarch of Constantinople was considered Greek, while another group adhering to the Bulgarian Exarchate was branded schismatic, even though both were in agreement on matters of doctrine," is oversimplified. A more accurate oversimplification, if one were necessary, would be to say that the Bulgarian church was declared schismatic for rebelling and proclaiming its independence of the Patriarchate. But this is a problem which is complex and demands more than simple definitions.

"Preparing for the Unknown," covers 19th century United States Greek immigration, conditions which brought about emigration from Greece, means of transportation, statistics, and the problems involved in immigrating to a foreign land. There is a good summary of life in America in the early years after arrival, and Saloutos makes some interesting observations on the economic effect of emigration on Greece, mainly due to the remittances sent back to Greece by American immigrants.

In "The Early Years," the author describes conditions in the United States, occupations of the immigrants and isolated incidents of strife with Americans. As Saloutos points out, one of the interesting facts in the history of Greeks in the United States is that while the vast majori-

ty of them were peasants, whose sole experience was in agriculture, few undertook such ventures in the United States. He describes their first occupations, the conditions of labor, etc.

His chapter, "Social and Community Life" is a bit superficial. It is based, I am afraid, on the author's own experiences in Milwaukee and Chicago. A thorough study will show that life for the immigrant varied widely (as it still does) in the United States. Many of the experiences he relates are not necessarily applicable to the rest of the country and for this reason it is dangerous to generalize. In many respects the development of social and community life in the Far West and the South is far different for the Greek-American than it is in the large industrial centers of the East and Middle West. In the South the immigrant is faced with a violent anti-foreign attitude not existing elsewhere. In the Far West assimilation into the American community is much more rapid due to the smallness of the Greek communities and the notable lack of other large groups of foreign nationals as existed in the East and Middle West. Another factor to consider is that in the East the immigrant was faced with established society and institutions, while in the growing West he became an actual part of that growth. The Greek communities of the western states never went through a ghetto phase as they did in the large cities east of the Mississippi. Social and Community life was also determined and affected by the customs which these immigrants brought with them to America. This varied widely, depending on the part of Greece that the particular groups came from. They tended to settle in pockets throughout the country. As a result, customs varied and continue to vary and generalizations must be made with great caution. An interesting phenomenon of the Greek communities of the West is that while they were assimilated earlier and easier than the similar groups in the eastern part of the country, this assimilation did not prevent them from maintaining their heritage of language, religion and customs. This fact seems to be as true today as it was fifty years ago. The statement, "The missionary zeal shown for the study of the parent language probably explains why so many children before the First World War learned to speak Greek before they learned English," (p. 71), is incorrect. It was a matter of communication. The parents spoke little or no English. That is why the children spoke Greek first. Saloutos gives a cursory analysis of a Greek community in those early days. (*Koinotitos*, p. 76, should be *koinotis*. The use of the genitive in this case is incorrect).

The author devotes a chapter to the part played by Greek immigrants in the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 and their intense interest in matters

affecting their native country. This is followed by a chapter on how the political upheavals of Greece affected the Greek in the United States, his social and community life. A chapter on the First World War touches upon the part played by these Greek immigrants and leads into Greek-American attempts to influence U.S. foreign policy where it concerns the "Great Idea."

Saloutos then devotes a long chapter, "Royalists versus Venizelists," in which he depicts the second phase of the royalist-liberal struggle in the United States.

In the chapter on the erosion of Hellenic sentiment, Saloutos traces the subtle change which gradually takes place in the Greek-American, from the ultra-nationalist of the early part of the century to the philhellene of today.

The chapter "The Greek Orthodox Church: The Beginnings," well describes this early period prior to 1918 as one of confusion, dissension, and the lack of a centralized authority. Saloutos puts in proper perspective the effect of the political problems in Greece on the Greek communities of the United States. (p. 119, the author omits the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Jerusalem when he lists the churches that comprise the Eastern Orthodox Church). Saloutos gives a good summary of the political and ecclesiastical problems both in Greece and in the United States. His summary survey of the various court trials, the problems of establishing communities which erected churches and schools and their affiliations with groups in the homeland is a rather good one.

When one comes to "old world politics," one treads on very tender ground. Saloutos walks the gangplank well. Nothing in the history of American Hellenism remains so much a blight on its development as does the emotional aspects that the Venizelos-Royalist controversy assumed in the United States among the immigrants. His account is well documented, and if his sympathies lie with the Venizelists, it does not affect his objectivity. The extent to which this old world political controversy affected American Hellenism is incomprehensible to many today. But it was deeply rooted, fanatic and ridiculous. Saloutos shows how both royalists and Venizelists attempted to influence American foreign policy toward Greece and how the Venizelists had more success than the royalists.

"The First World War" is an account of the part played by the newly arrived Greek-Americans in helping the American war effort in many ways. Enlisting in the American armed forces; selling and buying

liberty bonds, and leaving aside their differences to demonstrate in word and deed their loyalty to their adopted country.

Greek-Americans generally have always done everything they could to promote "The Great Idea." The author in this chapter details the part they played in trying to influence American foreign policy in supporting the claims of the Greeks during and following the First World War.

The second phase of the Venizelist-royalist struggle is accurately portrayed by Saloutos. This phase of the controversy was highlighted by a personal visit of Venizelos to the United States. Generally, the liberals in the United States were antimonarchical, and their experience in the great democracy led them to believe in and promote the establishment of a democratic republic in their homeland. The bitter disputes in the various Greek communities in the United States and how they affected the religious organization are given in great detail.

One of the thorns in the sides of Greek-Americans for many years was the question of military obligations. The author devotes a chapter to this problem and quite rightly describes the disillusionment that many Greek-Americans found when they returned to Greece. Whether or not this hastened the Americanization of these persons is conjectural, but it can be accurately stated that many Greek-Americans who returned to Greece were disillusioned.

"The Erosion of Hellenic Sentiment" is a melancholy but true account of the assimilation of the Greek-American into the American community, the decline of his Greek identity in terms of language and customs and his preoccupation with being a good American. This is a chapter where Saloutos is at his best. His summary of AHEPA and GAPA, their aims, their membership, their achievements and their decline is excellent. (One should only point out that GAPA was the first Greek-American organization to have a national youth order, and even in the 1950's its Junior Order could hold a national convention in Saloutos' own Milwaukee with hundreds of young delegates from throughout the United States in attendance as delegates. This reviewer once heard the late Archbishop Michael once state when talking about GOYA that to GAPA goes the credit for organizing the Greek-American youth of America first, her example to be followed later by AHEPA and much later, the church.).

"Greeks in Business" describes the main occupations of the Greek immigrants, the rule and the exception.

"The Civil War Within The Greek Church," which in reality is the history of American Hellenism is carefully and fully documented. The

author's mistakes are in details. In general his facts and conclusions are correct. He was fortunate to be able to discuss the subject with the late Demetrios Callimachos who personally played such an important part in this complicated controversy yet retained his complete objectivity. Callimachos also made available to the author his files. From the arrival of Meletios Metaxakis to the election of Athenagoras (now Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople) as Archbishop a decade later, in 1930, American Hellenism underwent its most turbulent period. Bishops and Archbishops were to arrive from abroad and declare themselves independent and establish their own sees. The resulting confusion and chaos is still remembered by many who shudder at the havoc that was wreaked upon them in the process. With the arrival of Athenagoras and the departure of all the other hierarchs, relative peace and calm descended upon the land. It is to Athenagoras' eternal credit that through his diplomacy, his patience and his ability, American Hellenism is united today.

"The Second Generation." This is a chapter which is difficult to summarize, both for the author and the reviewer. He does well, because he clings to generalities. I believe, though, that he overstates the case of AHEPA and understates the influence of both the church and GAPA. While it might be true that in the large cities where the Greek communities were widespread and the influence of the Greek community was not strong, in many of the smaller communities of the United States assimilation took quite a different form than he describes. It is true that to the average second generation Greek-American, America was his country, but to say they did not care about Greek culture in any of its forms is not an accurate statement.

Leading into the thirties, Saloutos continues his account, and I must continue to differ with his conclusions. Generally speaking, where Saloutos lacks documentary evidence, he bases his conclusions on personal observations and experiences which do not seem to be either broad or deep enough, or on fragmentary evidence. It is surprising that he does not account for the great number of Greek school students in the thirties. It stems primarily from his experience in a large industrial city, where the Greek community is composed of thousands. In that context a single Greek school means little. But in a city where Greek families number less than a hundred, a Greek school with a hundred pupils is an imposing accomplishment. There were many such schools.

In overemphasizing AHEPA the result is that for this period the evolution of the Greek immigrant to America is a rather one-sided picture. According to the bibliography, he has not consulted the publi-

cations of other fraternal organizations for the period. (This is surprising. Because of his contact with Callimachos, one would have expected him to use the complete files of the *Tribune* of GAPA; and for the earlier period the publication of the *Pan Hellenic Union*, which is available in Widener Library, Harvard University). The author also seems to over-emphasize the clannish nature of provincial societies.

Continuing into the Second World War, the part played by Greek-Americans is somewhat colored. Naturally they were all loyal Americans and thousands of young men joined the armed forces, and the communities took part in every form of patriotic endeavor to help the war effort, from the Red Cross, to selling and buying bonds. The organization and effective work of the Greek War Relief is quite accurately described. But was it all done through the AHEPA? While it is true that AHEPA would like to speak and represent American Hellenism, the fact that it contains on its rolls less than 10% of Greek-Americans and neither speaks nor represents them all is a fact. AHEPA finds it difficult to understand and accept that the only organization in the United States to which all of Greek descent belong is the Greek Orthodox Church.

The author provides us no guide as to what he is doing in the matter of transliterating Greek into English. Generally speaking, scholars follow either a determined orthographical or phonetic system of transliteration. Where one is involved in both classical and modern Greek, the orthographical would seem to be the preferred one. But in this case there seems to be no system, and the author has transliterated to his own fancy. In many cases he gives different spellings for the same words. I have mentioned above the incorrect *koinotitos* for *koinotis*, which also appears on p. 127, here as an English word, since it is not italicized. Another example of the use of the genitive instead of the nominative (for some unexplained reason) is *Artis* for the city of *Arta*. Why *Zakynthos* on p. 29 and *Zante* on p. 32? Why *Thessaloniki* on p. 112 and *Salonica* on p. 143? Why *Gortinian*, p. 125, instead of *Gortynian*? *Aeon*, p. 25 for Αἰών is neither an orthographic or a phonetic transliteration. *Benaki* on p. 121 and *Benachi* on p. 23. *Boetia* on p. 31 for *Boeotia*. Why *nomarchia*, p. 31? It doesn't mean anything in English, and such terms should be given in their English equivalent or translation. Also quite strange is *Tripolitsotas*, pp. 50 and 124, while throughout the book immigrants from other cities are given as Athenians, Spartans, etc. *Fiampoulis* p. 125, should be *Fiampolis* or *Fiambolis*. *Dilbaes*, p. 123, should be *Dilveis* or *Dilbeis*. *Spiridon* p. 146 should be *Spyridon*. *Theoclitus* p. 145, should be *Theoclitos*. *Mandilaris*, not *Mandeleris*, p. 90. *Photios*

*Kyritsis*, not *Kyrisis*, p. 400. There is no consistency in using the letter "H" to denote an aspirate in transliteration. (*Ai Ellinikai Parikoiai ana ton kosmon*, p. 394; *E Helliniki Katagogi tou Christoforou Kolombou*, p. 395 —? *Ethniki Odeporia eis tin Amerikin*, p. 395; *Peri tou en Ameriki Ellinismou*. 395, and on the same page, *O en Ameriki Hellinismos*.). But grammatical mistakes also: *E Phone tou ipodoulon* p. 399 and *Hamos ti Heroikes Pheelis* p. 379). Since the author translated all the transliterated titles in his bibliography, it seems that it might have been better to give them in the original Greek with a translation, rather than the transliteration and translation. The problem with transliterating without a predefined system makes it difficult to find the titles the author lists in his bibliography in any library catalogue. The Library of Congress, for instance, uses an "H," to denote all aspirates.

While generally the author's summaries are excellent and penetrating, there are throughout his work statements which are rather vague. When it comes to historical facts, these can be dangerous, and one would have expected more precision for the sake of historical accuracy. In describing the first exile of King Constantine in 1917, Saloutos says, p. 154... "the crown passed to twenty-four year old Prince Alexander, a *Venizelist and pro-Entente in sentiments*." Describing Alexander as a Venizelist is not accurate. In describing the excommunication of Venizelos, Saloutos places all the blame on Archbishop Theoclitos of Athens, as if the Archbishop took it upon himself to perform this rite, ignoring the political position of a state church as existed at that time; p. 145.. "Theoclitus, the Metropolitan of Athens and president of the Holy Synod of Greece, *resolved to punish Venizelos* for his revolutionary activities by performing the medieval rite." These two examples merely serve as illustrations of many statements that appear throughout the book.

The author concludes his work with a chapter titled "The Era of Respectability," and there are a number of things with which I must differ. On the matter of the Truman Doctrine and aid to Greece he states that it did not become an issue with Greek-Americans and finds this hard to understand in view of their usual concern with the affairs of Greece. This is a rather strange remark. The reason it did not become an issue was because most Greek-Americans were in support of the Truman Doctrine. Opposition to the Truman Doctrine came only from extremely liberal and Front organizations of inconsequential importance.

On the election of Athenagoras to be Ecumenical Patriarch, Saloutos does not even hint at the behind the scenes role played by the U.S. government and the Greek government in his selection. It was a substantial role.

Where Saloutos is to be disputed is in his general conclusions as to the conditions of American Hellenism today. He states that the fact the church was becoming the most influential Greek institution in the United States was a general cause for alarm to many. It must be understood that the reason the church has become the most influential institution is because it is the only all embracing "organization" in the U.S. There are many organizations to which the author has devoted a considerable amount of space, such as AHEPA, GAPA, the various provincial federations such as Pan-Arcadian, Pan-Messinian, etc., but these really have a membership which is a mere fraction of the Greek-American population of the United States. The centralization of authority in the archdiocese with which the author obviously is not in sympathy, was not first invoked by Archbishop Athenagoras. The Tome setting out the reorganization of the Archdiocese of North and South America was issued by the Patriarchate in 1931, abolishing the up to then existing synodical system. The centralization program is responsible for bringing order out of chaos. To say that the followers of the Rev. Christopher Kontogeorge resented the centralization program is an unimportant detail, for they comprised less than 1% of the communicants in the United States. Saloutos is not in sympathy with the decline of the role of the layman in church affairs. The lay tradition which he claims was being supplanted by clerical authority is not a tradition of orthodox countries, as he claims. The tradition of the layman being active in church affairs grew out of the particular conditions arising from the establishment of the communities in the United States and the founding of churches by these communities. The same has happened throughout the world, wherever Greeks have "colonized."

Saloutos is overly harsh on the hierarchy. He claims they assumed unparalleled power over lay matters and he calls most of them "trained authoritarians." The judgement,... "by encroaching upon the lay tradition the hierarchy was supplanting authoritarianism for democracy and losing sight of the spiritual values it was supposed to be fostering" is a bit unfair. Neither can the \$10.00 membership fee of the archdiocese be considered a "tax" as the author would like us to believe. The "deka-dollarion" was instituted to systematize support of the archdiocese and its institutions. This replaces repeated collections in the various churches often during the year for support of the Theological School, St. Basil's Academy, and other archdiocesan functions.

The real reason for the success of centralization in the archdiocese has been due to a recognition by the layman of the benefits that would

accrue from a centralized, orderly organization. In addition it reflects the growing assimilation of the church's communicants within the American community. The church is developing into a purely religious organization and shedding the ethnic and social tasks it once performed. The average layman today is concerned with his own life in the community and seeks only religious ministrations from his church. This was not true a generation ago.

The author does not pay due attention to the institutions of the archdiocese, namely the Seminary of the Holy Cross and St. Basil's Academy. All we find is criticism of the Seminary. I am afraid that he has been influenced by a small group of dissidents who have published scurrilous attacks on the hierarchy and the seminary over the years. Neither does the author give the merited attention to GOYA. In its short life, no Greek-American youth organisation can match its accomplishments or its size. The miniscule, by comparison with GOYA, Sons of Pericles receives a great deal of space.

The church today stands as never before, well organized, respected, and in rather good financial condition. It seems that the author has disagreed with its evolution as an American institution and finds it difficult to accept that it is becoming more and more merely a church and nothing else.

It is unfortunate that the archives of the archdiocese were not made available to Saloutos. We might have had a more balanced account of the situation.

The undermining of the "secular tradition" has not caused many to lose confidence in the church leadership and has not driven many from the Orthodox faith as Saloutos claims. Those who have left the church have left for other reasons and they may use this as an excuse. The suggestion that a well coordinated association of groups of laymen and the revival of major fraternal organizations offer the best hope of stopping "a steady encroachment of the hierarchy into lay affairs" (the author seems obsessed with this subject!) will fall on infertile soil. Few laymen are interested in devoting their time to running churches and a history of the major fraternal organizations composed of immigrants has been one of decline. This decline has nothing to do with the church but is due mainly to the assimilation of its members into the American community who no longer find the need for social intercourse with people of common ethnic background.

The vast majority of priests serving the communities of the United States today are American born, and this also has led to the pro-

gress which the church has made. A much better understanding of their communicants, a personal knowledge of their problems, not to mention the common language situation, has led these second generation priests to be far more effective as religious leaders than the pioneering priests of a generation or two ago. To the immigrant priests everyone will always be grateful for their work in establishing churches and schools and operating them under difficult circumstances in a foreign atmosphere. This is no longer true. Orthodoxy has taken its place among the major faiths of the United States, is recognized and respected as such. Whatever the layman accomplished on behalf of the Orthodox church he did as an Orthodox Christian, not as an Ahepan, a Gapan or whatever. Neither can Archbishop Iakovos be placed in the same category as former Archbishops Athenagoras and Michael. The latter came to this country as Archbishops without ever having been here. Iakovos had served here as a priest for many years before he was elected Archbishop so for the first time the church in the United States had as its leader one who had worked on the community level and knew the problems of the parish priest and the communities.

One of the astounding statements of the author is to state that were it not for the post World War II immigration to the United States from Greece, Hellenism in America might have become extinct! Of course such matters are conjectural, but I doubt that American Hellenism as we know it today, a sort of strong Philhellenism, would have been affected without the relatively small numbers of immigrants who have arrived in the post war period. The churches would still be standing, the institutions flourishing, and the various fraternal organizations about in the condition that they are. The author also fails to give any attention to the fact that thousands of Greek-Americans and their offspring have visited Greece in the post war period, and this probably more than anything else has given American Hellenism its strongest infusion to retain some kind of identity with the religion, the language and the culture of the land of their fathers.

As I said at the start, this is a valuable study, and we are grateful to Prof. Saloutos for the many years he must have devoted to preparing it. It was not an easy task, for the sources are scanty and scattered. But it is an excellent start toward a systematic historiography on the subject of American Hellenism. It will always be the starting point.

Berkeley, California

PAUL G. MANOLIS