

murale présente une décadence irrémédiable, celle des icônes continue à donner des œuvres importantes dont plusieurs signés par des artistes locaux, alors que les plus belles demeurent anonymes. Le joug d'un peuple hétérodoxe ne pouvait porter atteinte à la création de ces objets de culte indispensables à la dévotion du peuple chypriote.

Telle se présente dans ses grandes lignes l'histoire de l'icône chypriote, difficile à retracer en raison des influences multiples qui ont agi sur elle, mais d'autant plus intéressante que ces influences déterminent une variété de styles qu'on ne trouve pas ailleurs. Chypre ayant été le lieu d'une confrontation prolongée de l'art de l'Occident avec celui de Byzance, on comprend l'importance, dans l'état actuel des études, d'un ouvrage qui montre à découvert les résultats de cette confrontation. Avouons que la tâche n'était point aisée. On doit savoir gré à M. Papa-georgiou de ce texte de haute qualité qui livre une sélection d'œuvres d'art byzantins à la réflexion des esthéticiens, des historiens aussi. Car ces icônes ne sont pas seulement des objets de délectation. Le chef de l'Église et de l'État chypriotes insiste dans la préface du livre: elles sont liées à des souvenirs de vie, à des visions d'âme. Le peuple de l'île soumis au cours des siècles à de dures épreuves a cherché dans la religion refuge et libération. C'est le message secret de ces insulaires courageux et tenaces que nous apportent ces magnifiques planches en couleurs. Nous sommes redevables à l'auteur d'avoir enregistré pour nous ce message, d'avoir capté ces «voix du silence» que nous parviennent d'un âge de foi. Si ce livre est un titre d'honneur pour son auteur il en est avant tout pour l'Archevêché de Chypre qui malgré ces temps difficiles sait trouver les loisirs nécessaires pour se consacrer à des œuvres pacifiques. C'est sous son initiative qu'on a entrepris de réunir, restaurer, faire connaître ce trésor du patrimoine national. Ces œuvres plaident pour la cause des droits chypriotes.

Athènes

MARIA S. THÉOCHARIS

C.W. Crawley: *John Capodistrias: Some Unpublished Documents* (Institute for Balkan Studies) Thessaloniki, 1970.

There are not many dark places left in the biography of Greece's first head of state, but among the most interesting of them is the period

of exile between the resignation from the post of Secretary of State to the Tsar in 1822 and his election as *Kyvernitis* of Greece in 1827. Mr. Crawley's researches in the archives of Corfu have enabled him to throw new light on two aspects of Capodistrias' activities during that period: his correspondence with the Tsar and with his former colleague and successor in St. Petersburg, Count Nesselrode; and his dealings with Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg over the throne of Greece. Earlier works on the same period include notably L. Oeconomos' *Essai sur la vie du Comte Capodistrias, 1822-1828* (Paris, 1926) and M. Lascaris' *Lettres inédites de Léopold Ier lors de sa candidature au trône de Grèce, 1825-1830* in *Le Flambeau*, nos 5-6 (Brussels, 1951). Mr. Crawley does not attempt to supersede their work but to supplement it, and incidentally in one or two points to correct it.

After an admirably concise and judicious introduction, Mr. Crawley leaves the documents to speak for themselves, supported with helpful footnotes. In the case of the correspondence concerned with Leopold's candidature, he prints the more important of the new letters in full, but summarizes in English the less substantial exchanges and those which had already been published in 1839 by Capodistrias' former secretary, E.-A. Bétant. A number of new points emerge from the series: for instance that, contrary to what has previously been asserted, Leopold and Capodistrias did not meet while they were both in England in August-September 1827. It appears that the suggesting a meeting and then evading it lay with Capodistrias; and this interpretation is consistent with the general view that Leopold was the more eager of the two to see a throne established for him in Greece. The new documents do not throw any fresh light on the circumstances of Leopold's eventual withdrawal in 1830. Indeed, the latest of the hitherto unpublished letters is dated 24 September 1827, all the later ones being summarized from Bétant.

The correspondence with the Tsar and Nesselrode contains more interesting and novel revelations. The series begins in 1820, two years before Capodistrias' resignation, and thus throws light on the gradual deterioration of his intimate relationship with Alexander I. In August 1820, the date of the first letter in the Tsar's own hand, there was no sign of any cloud on the horizon. By the end of 1821, nine months after the outbreak of the Greek revolution, Capodistrias' tone has become hurt and querulous. To his accusation that Nesselrode was deliberately by-passing him in the transaction of business, both Alexander and Nessel-

rode himself returned soft answers, pointing out that Capodistrias himself had been unwell and that no secret discussions had taken place in his absence. Other correspondence of the same period, not contained in Mr. Crawley's collection, shows nevertheless that by the early weeks of 1822 Capodistrias was convinced that his days as Secretary of State were numbered: and so it proved.

The series continues from his exile in Switzerland. In writing both to Alexander and Nesselrode, and after December 1825 to Alexander's successor, Nicholas I, Capodistrias made it very plain that he did not consider himself as having finally left the Russian service. He was in fact always expecting to be recalled, and some of his letters plainly caused embarrassment in St. Petersburg. Sometimes he would talk of returning to Russia, sometimes of settling in Corfu; but whenever he planned to go even to Paris for medical advice he would always go through the formality of seeking his sovereign's permission. The implication that he was only on leave from his post was all the more awkward because Nesselrode and the Tsar must have known of his numerous contacts at the same time with the leaders of the Greek revolution and also with other nationalist leaders — the German Baron Stein, the Polish Prince Czartoryski and the Italian Henry Misley. To appreciate the full significance of this correspondence, it is necessary to read it in conjunction with other contemporary material on Capodistrias' activity in Switzerland.

Mr. Crawley's collection contains also some particularly interesting indications of Capodistrias' relations with the English. He could never forgive them for Maitland's treatment of the Ionian Islands, and he wrote two extremely bitter commentaries on England in 1820 and 1827, which are reproduced here. (Admittedly neither is certainly by Capodistrias, but the internal evidence is strong). He also had several close friends in England, however; and Stratford Canning was to prove a real friend in need in 1828, even though their earlier relations were tense. One of the most important documents in Mr. Crawley's collection is Capodistrias' account, written for Nesselrode, of a meeting with Stratford Canning at Geneva in October 1825, of which there is no other record. Capodistrias derived from this conversation the striking but incorrect conclusion that Canning had instructions to negotiate with the Turks for the purchase of sovereignty over Greece by Great Britain for "a sum of money", to be eventually repaid by the Greeks in exchange for their full independence.

A number of other interesting documents are here published for the first time, all of which fit neatly into the existing material on Capodistrias' life between 1820 and 1830. In the interests of fitting the material together, a small correction may be offered to Mr. Crawley's statement (p. 78), that the reply of Tsar Nicholas I to Capodistrias' first letter of homage on his accession was "not found". The reply was in fact published by Mr. D. Gatopoulos in his excellent biographical work on Capodistrias as long ago as 1932. For the rest, it would be hard to find any point of factual criticism to make of Mr. Crawley's patient and scholarly work, which has added much to our knowledge of a crucial phase in Capodistrias' career.

C. M. WOODHOUSE

Stephen Fischer-Galati, *The Socialist Republic of Romania. Integration and Community Building in Eastern Europe*. Edited by Jan F. Triska. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1969. Pp. XIV + 113.

The present monograph is the last in a lengthy series concerned with the unity of the Socialist camp, its extent and prospects. The series was begun by the Hoover Institution, under whose aegis volumes dealing with North Korea, Outer Mongolia, the Soviet Union and Communist China appeared, and has been continued under the editorship of Professor Triska of Stanford University, whose authors are covering the Communist states of Eastern Europe. The work on Romania is the most recent to appear, presumably to be followed by studies dealing with Hungary and Bulgaria, so that the series may be complete.

Professor Fischer-Galati was evidently provided with a schematic outline, so that his treatment would parallel those of his fellow authors. Consequently his paragraphs are grouped under such heading as "Compatibility of Demands Relevant to Integration" and "Rumania as a Self-Fulfilling Unit." This does not prevent him from presenting his case, though at times it contributes to some confusion in the argument, as when the increase of assimilative pressure against the Magyar minority appears in the last chapter on "The Present Stage", although this pressure was a phenomenon of the late 1950's and early 1960's primarily, essential to understanding the shift in popular attitudes toward the Dej leader-