

dence. Mrs. Grimsted excels at uncovering and unraveling some of the complexities of Alexander's character and policies, and professes to find a certain consistency in his "real devotion both to the encouragement of enlightened reform and to the maintenance of social order," however inconsistent his actions often appeared. Foreign policy decisions were determined not by domestic public pressures nor even by narrowly framed considerations of "national interest," but by Alexander's rather broad understanding of the concept of balance of power and by various "theoretical objectives" (chiefly his commitment to the ideas of progressive reform and political stability).

Richly detailed on the actions and thoughts of Alexander I's foreign ministers, the book is somewhat disappointing in its failure to consider the role of the emperor's other advisers in the determination of foreign policy. Having emphasized the personal element in Alexander's choice of advisers, Mrs. Grimsted leaves one wondering about the relations between the foreign ministers on the one hand and various ministers and key advisers on the other. The influential Speransky and Novosiltsev, for example, are mentioned but briefly, Golitsyn not at all. (Curiously, in briefly noting the noninvolvement of Arakcheev in diplomatic affairs, the author contrasts his apathy with the concern of "earlier key domestic advisers"—unnamed—"who were usually involved in foreign affairs.") It is also somewhat bewildering, after having been shown that Alexander was "his own foreign minister" and "kept the reins of diplomacy in his own hands," to find the author asserting that "the office of foreign minister was one of the most important in the Russian government in the first quarter of the nineteenth century" (compared with which other offices, one may ask).

These minor flaws notwithstanding, Mrs. Grimsted's study of Alexander I's foreign ministers is thoroughly researched, well documented, and soberly thought out. It is a distinguished contribution to our understanding of both the Alexandrian age and the workings of imperial Russian diplomacy.

JUDITH COHEN ZACEK
Albany, New York

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND INDEPENDENT GREECE, 1821–1852.

By *Charles A. Frazee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. viii, 220 pp. \$10.00.

Through the centuries the Orthodox Church in the Balkans has played an important and controversial role. Byzantinists have studied the patriarchate of Constantinople from different angles, but it has been only very recently that historians have dealt with the Orthodox Church in the post-1453 period. Steven Runciman in *The Great Church in Captivity* (1968) recounts for the first time at any length the record of the Constantinople patriarchate under Ottoman rule up to 1821. Now Charles Frazee in a creditable manner offers the first analytic account of the Orthodox Church in Greece from 1821 to 1852.

Under the millet set up by the sultans, the patriarch was the religious leader of the several Orthodox nationalities and the head of the nation, the person responsible for the Orthodox minorities before the sultan. Traditionally opposed to ideological currents coming from Western Europe and committed to the status quo, the patriarchate spoke out against the pleas for Greek national revival during the French Revolution. This conservatism, combined with heavy pressure from the Turks, led Patriarch Gregorios V to denounce the outbreak of the Greek War of

Independence in 1821. The rebellious Greeks, fighting for national dreams, severed ties with their former religious leader. The earlier overriding influence of the church upon the Greeks waned during the war years. With independence the young monarch of Greece, Prince Otho of Bavaria, and his German advisers legalized in 1833 the ruptured relations: the church of Greece became autocephalous and separated from the patriarchate, which ruled from the enemy's capital. The Holy Synod, established to govern church affairs, soon fell under the domination of the civil authority. As the years passed, the Greek leaders recognized that the existing state of tension between the Greek church and its traditional seat of leadership satisfied few people. To complicate matters, England, Russia, and France exerted varying degrees of influence in internal Greek politics. It was not until 1852, with both parties in a compromising spirit, that the autocephalous Greek church resumed formal relations with the patriarchate.

Although Frazee's use of diplomatic correspondence, contemporary newspapers and government publications, and published works is extensive, there is a noticeable absence of any material from patriarchal sources in Istanbul. Furthermore, the author fails to mention, as A. J. Toynbee and George Finlay do, the hopes for a reincarnated Byzantine Empire under Greek leadership, which many Phanariots and patriarchs supported. For the purpose of clarifying a pattern of nineteenth-century Balkan history, the author might have commented on the declarations for an autocephalous church made by Serbia, Rumania, and Bulgaria shortly after they achieved their national independence. There are some interesting comparisons and contrasts with the Greek experience.

S. VICTOR PAPACOSMA
Kent State University

THE RUSSIAN LANDED GENTRY AND THE PEASANT EMANCIPATION OF 1861. By *Terence Emmons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968. xi, 484 pp. \$13.50.

Emmons's book was and is a very good doctoral dissertation, and it is as good a book on the Emancipation as there is in English. Aside from being informative and useful for students in Russian history courses, it contains an insight that is well worth a book: to wit, that in the late 1850s and early 1860s the Russian gentry developed corporate consciousness, pretensions to a glorious past, and a liberal program all at once, primarily in response to pressures being exerted upon them by the central government. Emmons gives almost all his attention to the liberal program, leaving corporate consciousness and heritage to the side, but he notes the close connection between all three phenomena and thereby makes his work a perceptive case study in the development of public opinion as well as a historical monograph.

Unfortunately, the book is not well organized. A diligent reader can find a historical account of how liberal sentiment sprang into an organizing principle among the gentry, but he has to search through a mass of material which, though sometimes interesting, does not relate to the subject. It is my impression that Emmons wrote the book with two purposes confused in his mind: to show how liberal opinion emerged among the gentry and to describe the enactment of the Emancipation Statute of 1861 from a liberal point of view. He studies liberal opinion as a historical phenomenon, but often slips into using it as a basis for historical interpretation, and this does not make for clarity. Nor does it make for