The Hellenic Herald

A MONTHLY POLITICAL PERIODICAL

Vol. I., No. 6] APRIL 1907 [Price 10/- per Annum Post Free

CONTENTS

SOME CONSIDERATIONS, OR THE MEMORANDUM OF THE BALKAN COMMITTEE . . . .

MODERN GREECE, AS SHE IS AND AS SHE SHOULD BE By E. Théry

CONTEMPORARY HELLENISM IN EGYPT By Al. S. Kas

BULGARIAN POLITICS AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

ROUMANIAN PRETENSIONS . . . .

EMIGRATION OF GREEKS FROM BULGARIA .

LITERARY PAGE—

THE PLAYTIME OF A PROCONSUL: LORD CROMER'S TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK . A. Clark

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE MEMORANDUM OF THE BALKAN COMMITTEE.

WE published in our last issue the memorandum of the Balkan Committee to the Governments and people of Bulgaria, Greece, Servia and Roumania. In this appeal the Committee "urges the above peoples, in the strongest manner possible, to adjust their policies to one another, and to agree upon a common solution." We have not invariably found the Balkan Committee so entirely impartial: on the present occasion we welcome and perfectly agree with its wishes. But we think that, in view of the point which the strifes and animosities between the various Christian races of Macedonia have now attained, a simple appeal, even from so eminent a source as the Balkan Committee, is not sufficient. It cannot be expected to bring about a magic change in the perturbed minds of those concerned, so as to induce them to come to terms by themselves. Those friends of the Balkan peoples in Europe who take an active interest in the sufferings as well as in the welfare of the Christian populations of the Balkans [the Balkan Committee, for example, and the *Ligue Française pour la Défense des Droites de l'Hellénisme*] must pave the way for such an understanding. In our judgment the best plan would be to obtain the appointment of an official commission, representing the Great Powers, which, after examining on the spot the claims and rights of the interested nationalities, should delimit their respective spheres. The findings of such a commission would gain the respect of the peoples concerned, and, by impartially defining the aims of each, would put an end to their present struggles for supremacy, and would ensure their coming to the necessary understanding. But as there seems little ground for expecting such a commission to be appointed at present, an immediately practical step would be to hold, in Paris or London, a conference of distinguished members of the above-mentioned societies, to which should be invited representatives, unofficial but authoritative, of each of the Balkan nationalities, who should give their views and national aspirations regarding the fair solution of the Macedonian question. After hearing the pleadings of these national representatives, the members of the conference will be able, in the first case, to form a definite idea of the most satisfactory solution of this complicated problem. When the rights and aspirations of the various races have received thorough consideration it will be possible to indicate a just and equitable basis of settlement. This suggestion, coming from so eminent and disinterested a source, will not fail to have great weight in the counsels of the interested parties. This done, a formal approval of the *modus vivendi* will be asked from all the delegates of the Christian nationalities present at the conference, and this preliminary understanding will then be submitted to the Governments of the interested Balkan states. If this rough scheme is accepted in principle by the respective Governments, then a second, and this time an official, conference will be called, in which a more elaborate and definite scheme will be drawn up, delimiting the exact spheres of influence of each race. Thus the so-much-desired understanding between the different Governments would be brought about. We think it absolutely necessary that our friends in Europe should act as intermediaries, and should help to bring about such an understanding, if any practical step is to be taken, and if the beautiful appeals are to pass into reality.

We quite realise the great obstacles in the way of such an understanding. First, however, let it be clearly understood that this course is the only one to be followed, then surely a way can be found to overcome the difficulties. We say this is the *only* course, because any other solution of the Macedonian question, an autonomy, for example, imposed by the Great powers without consulting the surrounding Christian states, or an occupation by Austria, has been proved to be impossible.

In a subsequent issue we hope to publish a more elaborate scheme for the solution of the Macedonian question.

MODERN GREECE,

AS SHE IS AND AS SHE SHOULD BE.

Lecture by M. EDMOND THÉRY.

THE seventh of the lectures organised by the French Philhellenic League was delivered on March 24. The meeting was presided over by M. Homolle, President of the League, supported by MM. Desmons (Vice-President of the Senate), Th. Reinach (Deputy), P. Grimanelli, J. Psichari, A. Berl and G. Triantaphyllides. The lecture, on the economic state of Greece, was delivered by M. Edmond Théry, the eminent economist, who is also treasurer of the League. He spoke as follows:

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—Among the lectures organised by our League and so attentively followed by you, that of to-day must assuredly prove the least interesting. I shall be obliged to deal with subjects which, like all that pertains to political economy

are arid and uninteresting, so at the outset I must throw myself on your indulgence and implore your kind attention.

"Our eminent President, M. Homolle, has explained to you the affection with which we all regard Greece, and he has been followed by a brilliant series of lecturers, who have proved to you that our affection is well placed and that the Hellenic people merits the gratitude of the civilised world. My task is to explain to you why we wish to see Greece great and powerful. But before I speak of Greece as she is to-day, and especially of what we wish her to become, it is necessary to turn back to the origin of her freedom. With your permission, therefore, I will give you in brief space an account of the War of Independence, which will lead us to a consideration of the Constitution of 1832.

The Struggle for Greek Independence

"The general uprising of Greece towards her independence dates back to 1821, and it was not till 1829 that the Sultan Mahmoud was obliged to accept the principle of that independence. I will not waste time in reminding you of the details of that heroic period, for they are still present in every mind: I will only state that, at the beginning of the insurrection, the European powers desired to avoid complications in the Orient, and were unfavourably disposed to the Hellenic cause. France was indifferent, Britain frankly hostile; and as for Austria and Russia, they displayed the most vigorous opposition to the insurrection.

"In the end, however, the heroic conduct of the Christians began to attract sympathy. Admiration could not be withheld from the handful of patriots who were trying to wrest Hellas from the Ottoman domination, and whose success had only been delayed by the intervention of the Viceroy of Egypt in 1824; it was felt that they were serving the great cause of civilisation and humanity. Accordingly, after some years of hesitation, Britain, France and Russia joined hands and declared for the independence of Greece.

"The three powers signed a first treaty in London on July 6, 1827, and they addressed to the Sultan an ultimatum, demanding that he should at once cease from hostilities. No reply was given to this ultimatum, so on October 20 the allied fleet destroyed the Egyptian fleet in the Bay of Navarino. Immediately afterwards Russia declared war on Turkey, and a French army corps, under General Maison, landed in the Morea in August 1828 and forced the army of Ibrahim-Pacha to evacuate Greece. From that moment the cause of Hellenism was assured of success.

"The London Protocol, signed on March 22, 1829, by Britain, France and Russia, was, however, an incomplete work, for it decided that Greece should be bounded by a line drawn from the Gulf of Arta, on the Adriatic, to the Gulf of Volo; and the country was to be constituted as a vassal state under the suzerainty of the Porte. She was even to pay to the Sultan an annual tribute of 1,500,000 piastres, and to be governed by a Christian Prince chosen by the Commander of the Faithful.

"This, then, was the principle of the first Protocol, of March 22, 1829. From the political point of view it was a great mistake, for in leaving Greece nominally under the power of the Porte it condemned her to a state of perpetual agitation; and in depriving her of the great Ionian Isles, Corfu, Cephalonia, Zante, and of the peculiarly Greek Island of Crete, it took away from her every hope of becoming a powerful state and every chance of ever playing an active part in the Orient.

"The National Assembly, which sat at Argos from July 23 to August 18, 1829, rejected these terms. It demanded—and rightly—that Greece should be completely independent of the Porte, and that she should have her natural frontiers. If at that moment the three protecting powers had dealt justly with the rightful claims of the Hellenic patriots all the vicissitudes which have befallen Greece during the nineteenth century would never have arisen, and this valiant little country would have been able to become powerful and prosperous.

The Bavarian Régime

"I will pass over the troubled period between the London Protocol of 1829 and the treaty of March 17, 1832, in which the three powers constituted Greece an independent kingdom, under the sovereignty of Prince Otho of Bavaria. The Greek National Assembly, called together at Nauplia, unanimously ratified the choice of the three powers, who had also organised on behalf of Greece a loan of £2,500,000 without interest, destined to pay an indemnity of £500,000 to the Porte, and to provide the new nation with its first elements of political, economic, financial and judicial administration. This treaty of 1832 marks the birth of Modern Greece.

"The impartial historian is bound to state at once that the administrative system inaugurated by the Bavarian Regency—which governed Greece until King Otho attained his majority on June 1, 1835—had a disastrous effect on the financial future of the young nation. This unhappy country had just been brought almost to ruin by eight years of merciless war; her population had been reduced by massacre and Ottoman repression to less than three-quarters of a million; she possessed neither roads nor ships; the state of her people was so miserable that the use of money was almost unknown; four-fifths of the country was an untilled waste, for there were no longer men to cultivate it. Such being the state of the country, what was above all things necessary at the outset of its new career was a patriarchal administration which should have for its first aim the pacification of the country and a methodical organisation of the means of production.

"Instead of this the Bavarian Regents began by establishing a ceremonial court—decreeing, for example, that European attire must be worn in the presence of the King. This rule, even though it may not have entailed great expense, was at least troublesome to the Greeks, who up to this time were in the habit of wearing on all occasions the *fustanelle* or linen kilt. The Bavarian Regency also filled the new fiscal and judicial administration with highly-paid officials who, understanding neither the language nor the customs, nor the material condition of the country which they were administering, simply failed to achieve any practical result, and at the same time gave offence to every section of the nation.

"A national army was created in which were incorporated 3500 Bavarian soldiers furnished by King Otho's father. This gave rise to grave dissensions between the Regency and the native element, for promotion was given to the foreign officers in preference over the old warriors who had devoted their lives and poured out their blood for the cause of independence.

"In short, throughout the twenty years' reign of King Otho, from 1833 to 1862, Greece was in a constant state of revolt and agitation, and one may describe it as miraculous that the unhappy country was able to pass through that cruel period without losing its national sentiment and its hope in its future.

"Naturally but slight progress was made during this reign, and at the downfall of King Otho the population of Greece hardly reached 1,100,000 inhabitants, her finances presented a deficit, her agricultural and industrial production was almost *nil*, and her external commerce did not yet exist. But under the influence of liberty a Greek merchant marine was created, and had applied itself energetically to the conquest of the maritime commerce of the Levant. The blue and white pennon was soon known in all the ports of the Mediterranean, the Adriatic and the Black Sea: it was by her sailors and merchants that Modern Greece affirmed her vitality.

The Era of King George—Happier Auspices

"With the reign of the present King, George I., Greece entered upon a new era. In the first case, the new King was so fortunate as to bring in his handbag the Ionian Isles, a present graciously given by Britain to Greece. In 1867 the young King married Princess Olga, daughter of the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia; this was a veritable joy to the whole of Greece, for the young nation was attached to Russia by the double bond of patriotic gratitude and common religion.

The Expansion of Greece

"With the Ionian Isles the area of the Kingdom was increased by 880 square miles, and her population by 270,000 inhabitants. In 1864 the census indicated a population of 1,377,000, against 1,096,000 in 1862 and 853,000 in 1842.

"In 1881, the Berlin Congress having at last ceded Thessaly to Greece, the area of the kingdom was again increased, by 5000 square miles, and the population by about 335,000 inhabitants. The 1882 census indicated a total population of 2,035,000 inhabitants. The figure passed 2,504,000 in 1899, and must at present reach something like 2,700,000.

"Finally, since April 1, 1906, the King of Greece has had the right of proposing to the protecting powers the name of the High Commissioner of Crete, and one may practically state that this corner of the Hellenic world is virtually united to the mother country, and this new edition would bring the Greek population to a total of some three millions. That is good for a beginning, but it is not enough!

"It is not enough, because until Greece has obtained her natural frontiers in the north—Macedonia and Epirus—she will remain subject to agitation, to the patriotic fever which has tormented and enfeebled her for three-quarters of a century, and which by that very fact has delayed her national development.

"At present the foreign trade of Greece has the annual value of over ten million pounds sterling, against less than two millions in 1862; and the public revenue is over five millions sterling, against one and a half millions in 1862. There is an evident and considerable increase, which offers clear proof of the activity of the Hellenic people: nevertheless, it is not sufficient to sustain the weight of the crushing charges imposed by the inefficient *régime* of the 1832 Constitution.

The Troubles of Greece

"Without doubt the reign of George I. has been relatively happy for Greece, which has seen its territory enlarged and its economic position strengthened in a most noteworthy manner: but can we forget that the reign of George I. has also had its troubles—the unrest in Crete, and the unceasing efforts made by the scattered members of Hellas to come together and unite with the mother country? Is it known as well as it should be that practically a third of the Greek public debt (which, by its disproportioned increase, led to the collapse of 1893), is due to the £8,000,000 given to Crete and to the unhappy Cretan refugees in Greece? and is it counted as a crime against the Greeks that they come to the rescue of their oppressed brothers?

"If in 1832 the protecting powers had given to Greece the rational frontier which she ought to have—and which, in the interests of European peace, she will have to receive some day—there would have been no need of the extraordinary expenses which have figured in the budgets of 1867-1890: all these sacrifices of men and money would have been avoided, and the new Greece, united from her origin, would have been able to concentrate all her efforts on the development of her moral and material situation.

"Europe must therefore share the responsibility for the Greek failure of 1893, and one may maintain that if in 1881 the Constantinople Conference had settled the Cretan question on the same lines as it dealt with Thessaly, that is to say, if the Conference had handed over to the central Hellenic state that small territory of which the population (Greek in heart and, so far as nine-tenths of it is concerned, in blood also) had spent a whole century in fighting against the Ottoman domination. If this had been done the rising of 1888-89 would never have taken place, nor the sanguinary events of 1895-1896, which made the war of 1897 almost inevitable.

Economic Progress of Greece

"Must we say that Continental Greece is still the miserable country which George I. found when he mounted the throne in 1863? So her enemies say; but a sufficient answer will be found if we examine her economic and financial condition for a period of ten years. Let us consider the period from 1896, the year before the Greco-Turkish war, to 1905, the last year of which reports have yet been published.

"We may compare the two extreme years in tabular form:—

	1896	1905
Foreign Trade . . .	£7,600,000	£9,000,000
Budgetary Receipts . .	£3,900,000	£5,100,000
Merchant Marine—*		
Number of Steamships .	107	201
Gross Tonnage . .	145,000	347,000
Navigation returns of Greek Ports—		
Number of Ships entering and leaving . .	5,809	8,394
Tonnage of these Ships	5,437,000	9,437,400

* The returns for the merchant navy are from the "Veritas" Mercantile Bureau.

These figures prove that, despite the sufferings and political troubles of Greece during the period indicated, the nation has continued to work and to enlarge its economic development.

"The question of the exchange also demands our notice, for what has taken place during the last ten years shows more clearly than all the argument in the world the economic progress which has been made by this country. In 1896 the Greek exchange stood at

44.2, *i.e.*, £1 in English gold was worth 44.2 drachmæ. If we regard 25.4 drachmæ as the theoretical value of £1, we see that Greek money to the nominal value of 44.2 drachmæ would really fetch no more than 25.4 drachmæ—a loss of some 42 per cent. on the exchange. At present the Greek exchange has fallen to 27.3: to-day, therefore, the real value of 27.3 drachmæ equals the nominal value of 25.4 drachmæ, so the loss is no more than 7 per cent in changing from Greek money into English. In other words, Greek coinage is almost equal in repute to English—more nearly equal than is, for example, Spanish currency. This presents a singular example of economic and financial improvement.

"To finish the long array of figures let us pass on to the question of railways,—

	1896	1905
Length of railway in use	593 miles	750 miles
Receipts (total)	Dr. 8,091,000	Dr. 12,000,000
Receipts per mile of line	Dr. 15,348	Dr. 16,000

I have also calculated the monetary value of all the realisable property of Greece: the figures for the two years are—

1896 . . £16,080,000 1905 . . £33,320,000

These figures demonstrate that the Greek people merits a higher reputation than many have hitherto been willing to accord it.

Some Characteristics of the Greeks

"M. Gaston Deschamps wrote as follows in his interesting account of Modern Greece, *La Grèce d'aujourd'hui*, published in 1901:—

"'The Kingdom of Greece consists of one small town and a number of villages. But many people would barter all the buildings of all the capitals of Europe for one treasure possessed by this little town—the Acropolis. And the villages are inhabited by an ingenious and patient race, which has overcome by its tenacity the most violent tempests; which has arisen, more than ever alive, from the ruin of many centuries, whose lot has been made yet more grievous by hard years of servitude and misery, but which possesses the two qualities by which unhappy nations succeed in surviving through ill fortune—the capacity of never losing consciousness of itself and the gift of hope in spite of circumstances.'

"These are absolutely just observations. If the Greeks have some of the faults of an Oriental people—and what race has no national failings?—they have, under all conditions, numerous qualities of worth. They are active, intelligent, laborious, enterprising. One clear proof of this is seen in their ready capacity of penetrating into foreign countries to seek fortune far from home and the results they attain in the search, but they have the true feeling of patriotism, and no matter how lofty the position they attain they never forget their native land, they allow no break in their relations of interest and sentiment towards her.

"It is an economic fact of the highest importance that Athens, which was but a miserable village when Chateaubriand visited it, and which was only a country town in the time of Edmond About, has to-day become a true capital. Now her wonderful transformation during the last fifty years is due entirely to the efforts of Greeks settled abroad. The Hellenic colonies generally occupy a prominent place in the commerce, industry and finance of the countries in which they are settled, and during recent years they have veritably taken the preponderant place in Egypt and the Soudan. I have just had the good fortune to visit these two countries, and if you will permit it we will rapidly run over that same voyage together, for that will enable us to seize more vividly upon one of the most interesting aspects of the Greek character—I mean his business acumen, his practical spirit, and his capacity of assimilation."

The Greeks in Egypt

Here the lecturer exhibited a series of representations of views of Egypt—Alexandria and Cairo with their luxurious palaces, their spacious avenues, their Arab quarters, the Pyramids, the Sphinx. M. Théry illustrated a voyage on the Nile—Luxor, Karnak, Assouan, the Isle of Philae Wady-Halfa, Khartoum, etc. Also many portraits—Lord Cromer, Kitchener, the Khedive.

"It was Kitchener who reconquered the Soudan, after commencing his first expedition by the recovery of Dongola. Realising that the Nubian desert could only be traversed by rail he organised his expedition on Khartoum by the aid of a railway, which constantly kept pace with his army. It was during this advance that the Greeks of the Soudan rendered immense services to the Anglo-Egyptian army. Whenever this army established itself in a town it found Greeks already installed there. It was these Greeks who provisioned Kitchener's army, and the present Governor-General of the Soudan, Sir Reginald Wingate, has himself informed me that the British Government could never forget the immense services rendered by the Hellenes to the cause of civilisation during the reconquest of the Soudan. He added that it gave him pleasure to be able to pay a tribute to their perfect integrity, for during the expedition every contract placed with a Greek house had been carried out without a hitch; and he was the happier to be able to make that statement because untoward circumstances had not always permitted the British contractors to fulfil their engagements.

"'*In Khartoum*,' *said M. Théry*, '*the population is almost exclusively European and numbers about* 6000. *The Greek colony is the most numerous*.'

"It is the Greeks who at present control the commerce of the Soudan. The smallest business and the largest are alike in their hands, and I can testify, from personal experience, that to make oneself understood in Khartoum it is necessary to speak Greek or French.

"Sir Reginald Wingate, the successor to Lord Kitchener, is fully cognisant of the services rendered by the Greeks to Britain and to Egypt in the organisation of the Soudan, and he loses no opportunity of expressing to the Hellenes his gratitude and sympathy.

"Angelo Capatos is generally and reasonably considered the chief of the Hellenic community at Khartoum. He was a modest Greek citizen of Cephalonia, who accompanied the Anglo-Egyptian army in its advance. The circumstances enabled Capatos not only to render great services to the British, but also to acquire, by legitimate business, a considerable fortune. He enjoys a preponderant position in Khartoum, where he is regarded as a sort of Rothschild. But he has not forgotten his country, and whenever occasion presents itself he shows that he is attached to Greece not only in thought but also in action. During my visit to Khartoum I asked, 'Where is the Greek church?' Capatos replied, 'In Macedonia!' By which he

meant that the Hellenic colony had collected a large sum for the building of a church in Khartoum, but owing to the unhappy turn of affairs in Macedonia the sum was sent to Greece for the succour of the unfortunate Macedonians.

. . . . . .

THE GREEK COLONISTS AND THE MOTHER-COUNTRY

"The object of this digression on the affairs of Egypt and the Soudan is to exhibit the power of this little nation which has been able within a few years to assume the preponderant position in a country which they did not enter as conquerors, and of which the physical nature is not such as to attract them. The Greeks are not colonisers in the true sense of the word, but they are something better—they are the organisers of a country. They have just proved this in the Soudan, and that is why we have been considering that country.

"Viewed from certain financial aspects, it is of great advantage to Greece to have these rich colonies disseminated over the globe, but there are also some drawbacks, of which the chief is the inducement to emigration. These rich colonies exercise a powerful attraction over the population of the Peloponnese, of Attica, and of the great Ionian Islands, and the consequences of this are injurious to the Greek homeland.

"The Hellenes abroad are, however, able to diminish this injury by remaining always closely bound to the mother country, by sending their children thither, and by maintaining more and more intimate relations with her. And it is the duty of the Hellenic Government herself to facilitate these relations by developing the means of production in Greece, and by confining itself to a safe and wise policy which will assure the security of foreign capital invested in the country.

RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN TRAVEL—THE OPPORTUNITY OF GREECE

"But there is another and most practical method of producing a rapid improvement in the economic and financial situation. I have already indicated this method two years ago in my study of Modern Greece.* With your permission I will refer again to this question, which I consider as one of the most important for Greece from the moral and economic point of view. The suggestion was received with marked favour by the Greek colonies of Alexandria, Cairo and Khartoum, before whom I have recently lectured on the subject.

"It is well known that for half a century past public wealth has been increasing at an enormous rate, both in Europe and in America, and the reasons for this development are also well understood. The increase, from which the middle classes receive the chief benefits, is due to the rapid development of means of communication, and to the more and more complete knowledge of affairs outside one's own country. And in every part of the civilised world it has led to a taste for travelling which becomes more popular every day.

"Fifty years ago the number of people who had the courage to face the risks of travel, and the means to accomplish it with some degree of comfort, amounted perhaps to a few thousands each year. Nowadays we count them by hundreds of thousands—in some years by the million.

"These travellers, accustomed at home to a comfortable life, travel abroad for instruction combined with amusement. They begin with the countries nearest to their own; then, having been pleased with their first voyage, they wish to see other countries, and they go farther afield.

"Their accounts and descriptions induce their friends and relatives to follow their example; so that, whereas formerly it was rare and exceptional to travel for pleasure in foreign countries, these journeys tend now to become the ordinary rule for every well-to-do man.

EXAMPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

"Several European countries have already taken advantage of this tendency and have organised a new industry—the 'traffic in visitors' as we may call it. It is carried out on a large scale in France, Switzerland, Italy, the Austrian Tyrol, etc.

"It has been calculated that foreign visitors leave some eighty millions sterling on French territory; that Switzerland, were it not for her mountains and glaciers, which attract tourist gold to the extent of something like ten million pounds annually, would be one of the poorest countries in Europe; and that, thanks to the twenty-five millions sterling which Italy receives annually from the same source, she has been able to re-establish her commercial equilibrium and gradually to wipe off the greater part of her externally-held National Debt.

"Finally, a more recent example may be cited. For the last ten years the English have set about exploiting the Pyramids, the Cataracts of the Nile and the other remains of Egyptian civilisation. In 1904 there were more than 20,000 tourists in Egypt. Without fear of mistake we may attribute the present extraordinary prosperity of Cairo and Alexandria to the ever-increasing influence of foreign visitors.

GREAT ATTRACTIONS OF GREECE—HER FAILURE TO UTILISE THEM

"Now if there is one country of the world which can attract and retain visitors, assuredly Greece is that country, yet, if we exclude professed archæologists, Greece has hardly more visitors than Servia or Bulgaria; and, if we except Athens and the Piræus, we may say that Peloponnesia, Attica, Bœotia, Phocea, Eubœa, Acarnania, Ætolia, and even Thessaly with its railway, are all just as much *terrae incognitae* in our day as they were in the time of Chateaubriand and Edmond About. And yet there is no man, however little learned, who does not dream of treading the soil of Greece, the cradle of civilisation, the ancient hearth of all our light, the country of the great men of antiquity: there is no man who does not wish to admire, once at least, her incomparable monuments of past grandeur.

"Why does the dream not become a reality? Because Greece is isolated like a distant island; because, outside the capital and its environs, life is hard and means of travel often difficult.

"And therefore, in this beautiful land with the azure sky, we meet no one but archæologists and commercial travellers. The archæologists have evidently rendered great services to Greece in rescuing her from the tomb into which the fall of her gods and the dominion of the Turk had plunged her, in uncovering her temples and monuments, in writing her history better than her own great historians had done. But the archæologists live on stones and inscriptions, and if they have been able to resuscitate Ancient Greece it is out of their power to endow the modern state with life.

* *La Grèce actuelle au point de vue economique et financier*, Paris, 1905. Published at the offices of the *Économiste Européen*.

A Practical Suggestion

"Now two years' work, by extending the Piræus-Larissa line to the Turkish frontier, would unite Greece to the great European railway systems, and Athens would be brought within sixty or seventy hours of Paris, Brussels and London, three days of St. Petersburg, fifty hours of Berlin, forty-five hours of Munich, thirty-seven hours of Vienna, and thirty-one hours of Budapest.

"From that moment Greece would cease to be a far-away island, and the current of travellers, which enriches and transforms those fortunate countries to which it is directed, would turn itself in the direction of Greece. But there is an essential condition—her hotels would have to be improved, and her ruins, historical centres and places of interest would have to be rendered accessible.

"It must not be necessary for tourists who visit Greece to content themselves with visiting the marvels of Athens, Phalerum, the Piræus and Eleusis and with the ascent of Lycabettus—all this is an affair of three or four days only. It must be made worth their while to stay several weeks, to visit not only Corinth, Mycenae, Tiryns, Nauplia, Epidaurus, Tripolis, Sparta, Olympia; in addition they must have opportunities of seeing Calavryta, Mantinea, Thebes and Chilas, of ascending Parnassus, of sailing over the Gulf of Lepanto as one explores Lake Geneva; they must be invited to visit Thessaly and to salute Ossa and Pelion, to climb the sacred slope of Olympus, and to bring back lifelong memories of a short stay among the pinnacles of Meteora. But, before this is possible, means of rapid communication must be established, hotels must be built—not necessarily luxurious, but at least clean and reasonably comfortable: in a word, an easy and agreeable life must be assured to people who are in the habit of faring reasonably well, and who will freely return to Greece, bringing other visitors in their train, if they have not been forced to undergo too great material discomfort.

"The two questions of prime importance are that of communication and that of lodging-place. At present Athens and its environs, Olympia and Mycenae, are the only places which a tourist can visit with comfort: the other celebrated spots in Greece are forbidden fruit.

"For example, take Delphi. The exploration of the remains here is one of the glories of the French school at Athens. Delphi is only seventy-five miles from Athens as the crow flies, but this represents a four days' journey, and even then there is no regular service. On the other hand, Olympia is 214 miles from the capital, but the journey can be made in forty-eight hours. Moreover, there are two good hotels at Olympia, and in a few years there will be five or six; consequently the number of visitors to Olympia is continually increasing.

The Method—Private Initiative Sufficient

"The enterprise which I have suggested is of national importance, but it could be carried out perfectly well by private initiative. Its favourable development could be assured without there being any need for the State to contract onerous loans or to increase the burdens already borne by the Greek taxpayer.

"An Organising Committee ought to be established in Athens. This would contain authorised representatives of the Greek banking houses, railway and steamship companies, Chambers of Commerce, etc. The Committee could soon decide in outline upon its plan of operation, just as has been done by similar committees in Switzerland, Savoy, Dauphiny and elsewhere. Two or three years would see a satisfactory solution of the important problem of the organisation of Greece from the point of view of the foreign tourist—and this is an economic question of the first importance.

"When this is done a continually-increasing stream of wealthy visitors will reach Greece from all the countries of Europe and America, and, with them, millions and millions of money will enter the country in various ways. There will be banks, transport and commercial societies, hotels, manufactures, not to speak of openings for guides, coachmen and so forth.

"The public revenue will show a constant increase and there will be a natural solution of that economic and financial trouble which has pressed so heavily upon the destinies of Hellenism. The interior of Hellas will become rich and powerful, and will recover from the war of 1897 as France recovered from her disasters in 1870-1871.

Moral Importance of Proposed Development

"The problem which I have just dealt with is not only material, as might at first appear. It has a great moral importance, not only because the solution will bring greater wealth to the labouring classes of Greece—will therefore keep on the soil a greater or less number of the emigrants whose departure depeoples the country—but also because of the foreigners who will year by year visit this glorious country, and whose souls will be moved by the masterpieces of antiquity, whose minds will be uplifted by the aspects of the country's ideal beauty. These visitors will become firm friends of Greece, strong promoters of the rights of Hellenism, and thus inland Hellas will become 'the heart of Hellas,' and will no longer have anything to fear from its enemies.

"To resume, present-day Greece, despite her recent economic development, despite her rich and brilliant colonies in Turkey, in Syria, throughout Asia Minor, in Egypt, in the Soudan and in all the great cities of the world, is still a weak nation, powerless in politics and uncertain of her future, because she is geographically incomplete and ill-balanced.

"This will remain true until she has her natural frontiers, and we must spare no efforts to make Europe realise the error committed in 1832, to make her complete the reparation which she began in 1863 and continued in 1881 by the restitution of Thessaly, and in 1906 by recognising the principle of Hellenic sovereignty in Crete.

"Then we shall see Greece as she ought to be—a strong and prosperous nation, mistress of her destiny, able by her political action to serve the cause of civilisation in the East. We wish to see her preserve in the Balkan Peninsula that position to which she is entitled by her history, her language and her traditions. But in return we demand of her a policy of peace, and a respect for the rights of others, for we know that her cause is strong and that the hour of full and entire justice will soon sound for her."

M. Homolle warmly thanked M. Théry for his remarkable address. "*I am sure,*" he continued, "M. Théry *will not complain if I remind you that the scheme which he has just explained has long been advocated by* M. Tricoupis; *nor will he be sorry to find himself in unison with that man, one of the ablest and noblest men produced by Greece.*"

CONTEMPORARY HELLENISM IN EGYPT.

THAT the Greeks succeed and accomplish great things wherever they are able to establish themselves under equitable conditions is a fact which finds many proofs in the flourishing Greek colonies which have settled during the last century in different parts of Europe, but the most striking example of the wonderful achievements of the Greeks in foreign countries is furnished by the Greek colonies in Egypt.

The great work done by these colonies is not a result of mere chance or of a coincidence of favourable conditions; it is the outcome of the ever-prevailing principle which has been especially manifested and confirmed during recent decades, that every man succeeds much better by confining himself to the sphere proper to his capacity and instruction than by occupying himself with many matters of diverse character.

The establishment of the Greeks in Egypt dates from the very foundation of the present Khedival dynasty, the great founder of which, Mehomed Ali, discerned with wonderful foresight the commercial aptitude of the Greeks. The immigration of Greeks into Egypt began immediately after the great insurrection of 1821, for the ruin and devastation which followed this uprising, in Greece proper and in the irredeemed Greek lands which had more or less participated in the struggle, did not leave much opportunity for commercial developments in these countries.

While the first immigrants were settling in Egypt other colonies of Greek merchants were establishing themselves in the principal towns of Europe, and especially in England, gaining a welcome in all the civilised states of Europe, and attaining distinguished positions by their display of business aptitude, devotion to work and commercial integrity. On the other hand, those Greeks established in Egypt had to encounter innumerable difficulties and dangers, which they only succeeded in overcoming by long and painful endeavours. In the end, however, by these persevering efforts they not only secured their own welfare, but they also prepared the way for the present flourishing condition of the Greeks in Egypt. When one regards the miserable state of Alexandria, and the lamentable conditions which prevailed in the small commercial centres of Egypt before the British occupation, when one considers the unhealthy climate, the frequent dire epidemics and the wide-spread eye diseases, one cannot but admire the stubborn resistance of the Greek settlers, who not only endured these evils but also created for themselves so enviable a position. It is worthy of note that this gift of resistance has been transmitted to their descendants and successors. Among all the Europeans who have penetrated from Cairo and Alexandria into Southern Egypt and the Soudan, the Greeks have been the foremost and the most numerous. In every European colony, even in the smallest, which is formed in the interior of Egypt, the Greek is the first to establish himself, and he does not leave his station and return to the town before making his fortune—in many cases he does not even shrink from exposing his life to danger. When the notorious Mahdi was the master of Khartoum, 300 Greeks were killed before the entry of the British forces, but their compatriots did not leave the town, and were the first to welcome the British army of occupation. In the capital of the Soudan there is at the present day a large and flourishing Greek colony, which is continually and rapidly increasing. The importance of this colony is fully appreciated by the Head of the Greek Church in Egypt, who is about to promote the Vicarage of Khartoum into a Bishopric. One of the best characteristics of the Greek is his stubborn attachment to his national traditions and religious faith. The famous geographer, Schweinfust, when upon his first voyage of exploration he used to come across the Greek merchants, was wont to call them, most appropriately, the " pioneers of civilisation."

It may be observed that whereas in the European towns the wealth of the Greek colonies is concentrated into a few vast fortunes, in Egypt some of the larger merchants have indeed accumulated great possessions, but the major part of the wealth of the Greeks is divided amongst those thousands of them who, established along a line from Alexandria to the south of the Delta, and so through Egypt and beyond Khartoum, form a continual Hellenic chain—prosperous in itself and a source of prosperity to others. A full investigation of the elements and the causes which have contributed to this enormous progress and success of the Greeks in Egypt would not be confined to the British occupation, for, at least twenty-five years before this, great enterprises had been undertaken and great fortunes made by the Greeks. The commercial depression which followed the first decade of the British occupation, and the uncertainty which prevailed during this period, produced some anxiety and embarrassment in the hitherto flourishing Greek communities, though not to the extent of causing serious discouragement. Soon after the consolidation of British rule the whole country underwent a wonderful regeneration, from which the Greek colonies derived great benefit.

It is quite true that the maxim " man is a money-making animal " is true everywhere and always, but it would almost seem to have been specially invented for the Greeks in Egypt. The first Greek colonists in Egypt built one church for their worship and one school for the elementary education of their children. But they took full advantage of the beneficial influence of both these institutions without paying much attention to useless ceremonies, *fêtes*, party strife and communal animosities. In this they acted more wisely than many other Greek communities—those, for example, of Constantinople, Smyrna, etc. Unlike their kinsmen of the kingdom of Greece they did not mix themselves at all in politics, either local or general; they utilised all their time, all their energies and all their aptitudes for their business.

They sought such instruction as should fit them for business and money-making, but in spite of this limited education they never became servile-minded. Towards the rulers of the country, with whom their commercial relations brought them into constant contact, their attitude was invariably free and dignified. When difficulties arose between themselves and their rulers they defended their rights with energy, and did not hesitate to appeal to the courts. At the present time, as hitherto, H.H. the Khedive, together with his uncles, brothers and other relatives, transact most of their business with Greek firms. The orderly and straightforward relations which prevail at the present time in the commerce between the Greeks of Egypt and the

native and European traders are largely due to the correct attitude taken up by the Greeks ever since their first establishment here, more than sixty years ago. The early establishment of British banks in Alexandria taught those who came in contact with them an order and regularity unknown in the other markets of the Levant, though these are of older foundation. The credit acquired by the Greek merchants, owing to the high reputation already referred to, greatly helped in the increase of their wealth, and also in the tolerably equitable division of that wealth among themselves. If the basis of political economy is the division of the wealth of a community among the members, in as nearly as possible equal proportions, then the Greeks of Egypt, without any previous instruction, have carried out this sound principle in their own society. Thus the relations which exist between the large merchants of the towns and their customers, the smaller traders of the village, are equally favourable to both. The stubbornness with which the Greek maintains his independence and safeguards his self-preservation is well known. To secure his independence by the acquisition of wealth the Greek of Egypt shrinks from no trouble or sacrifice; and when he has acquired a sufficient competence he regards himself as materially, morally and politically free. But he seeks to acquire his wealth solely by continued and strenuous work, and without stooping to questionable or dishonest practices. It is noteworthy that though the Greeks in Egypt have come from all Hellenic lands, the most successful have been those coming from the Islands and from the less-famed parts of the mainland. Those who come from the self-styled centres of civilisation in Turkey and the Kingdom of Greece usually find, it is true, plenty of work to do, but they seldom join the ranks of those who have made great fortunes. Their condition is apt to remain stationary, for they are disinclined to hard work, and are disposed to seek the leisure which they have enjoyed in their native places. It is, in consequence, usual to find them engaged in easy but not very profitable business. They do not realise that from the moment when they put their foot in this country of business and of strenuous endeavour, they must conform to the conditions around them if they hope to achieve anything noteworthy.

Now that commerce has been reduced almost to an exact science, it is easy for the established merchant to maintain and improve his position, but difficult for a newcomer to gain a footing. And if new avenues of commerce were not continually being opened by the highly beneficial action of the British occupation, the struggle which a Greek newcomer has to carry on against the different elements, European and native, already settled in Egypt would be so much more acute as to render highly problematical his ultimate success. But, as was stated at the beginning of this article, the Greek in Egypt owes his position entirely to his own tenacity of purpose and to the free conditions which allow full play to his qualities. Their only obstacle lies in the bad faith of the native. But the Greek understanding of character and decision of purpose renders even this obstacle not insuperable. Now the Greeks are so firmly established in Egypt and the Soudan that it would be practically impossible to eliminate them from these countries; and every Greek, who is prepared to work hard and rely on his own efforts, will find there an ample field for the exercise of his activities.

As matters stand at present the newcomer into Egypt must not forget that this is no country of easy and assured good fortune. Whether he comes to occupy himself in commerce or in a profession he must arm himself with all the necessary weapons before entering upon a struggle in which success comes only to the able and strenuous man. No part of the Kingdom of Greece and none of the irredeemed Greek countries can show anything to compare with Egypt in this matter of hard and steadfast work. The keen, struggling Greek of Egypt and the Soudan can only be compared with the hard-fighting British colonist: and for this reason both leave all foreign competitors far in the rear.

So distinguished was the position held by the Greeks at the time of the British occupation of Egypt that they came in for many of the titles and decorations bestowed at that time by the British Government, and they were the only foreigners to be so honoured. Even at the present time, the important position held by the Greeks in the country is so highly esteemed that when the distinguished representative of the British Government, Lord Cromer, whose departure we deeply regret, heard of the erection, last month, of three magnificent Greek Benevolent Institutions in Alexandria, he addressed a most kind letter to the distinguished President of the Greek community, congratulating him on the high standing and public spirit of the Greek colonies in Egypt.

ALEXANDER S. KASDAGLIS.

ALEXANDRIA, *March* 1907.

ON the occasion of the retirement of Lord Cromer from his glorious career in Egypt the following messages have been exchanged between his Lordship, the Greek Community of Alexandria and the Greek Chamber of Commerce of the same city.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE GREEK COMMUNITY
to LORD CROMER.

"I have been charged by the Greek Community of Alexandria, which held a special meeting for the purpose, to express to your Lordship its great sorrow for your departure from Egypt—a sorrow which is deeper because this departure is due to reasons of health. Our Community renders due homage to the great work your Lordship has done in Egypt and will always gratefully recollect its most beneficial and fruitful results.

"E. BENAKIS,
"*President of the Greek Community.*"

LORD CROMER'S REPLY.

"I beg to ask you, Monsieur le President, to transmit to the members of the Greek Community of Alexandria my hearty thanks for their message. Leaving Egypt with a deep sorrow, I will always have the best recollections of my long personal relations with many members of the Greek Community and of the friendly relations which exist between our two nations.

"CROMER."

THE GREEK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
to LORD CROMER.

"The Greek Chamber of Commerce, in its special meeting held to-day, charged me to communicate to your Excellency its deep regret for the unexpected decision of your Lordship to retire. We will never forget the inestimable services your Lordship has rendered to the commerce of Egypt and the Soudan, which owe entirely to your Excellency the prosperity they enjoy at the present day."

REPLY OF LORD CROMER.

"I beg to ask you, Monsieur le President, to communicate to the members of the Greek Chamber of Commerce my sincere thanks for their kind words.

"I acknowledge with gratefulness and esteem the great services the Greek commerce and industry has rendered to this country, and I wish them happiness and prosperity.

"CROMER."

BULGARIAN POLITICS AND THE SOCIAL CRISIS

THE recent assassination of the Bulgarian Premier has once more directed the attention of the whole of Europe upon this corner of the Balkan Peninsula, which is, so to speak, the seismographic centre of the whole region. The uneasiness aroused by this event does not appear to be wholly without justification: it is not only the gravity of the act considered in itself that affords grounds for inquietude—there are conditions and there are countries in which even a political assassination, though certainly it would not pass unnoticed, would yet by no means excite the fears and the apprehension aroused by the attack to which M. Petkoff has fallen a victim. But what renders this last event particularly disquieting, is the fact that it is only one of many manifestations of the profound disturbance which at present permeates Bulgarian society, and of which the arbitrary and anarchist outbursts which break out from time to time are but the external indications.

With a view to clearly understanding and fairly judging this lack of equilibrium in mind and spirit—which is swaying the political conduct of the young Bulgarian nation, and which is so disquieting to the best friends of the nation—it would not be useless to look backwards some years, to the middle of last century, *i.e.*, to the moment when the Bulgarian people was called upon, by the more or less disinterested efforts of the great Orthodox Power, to become conscious of itself. After having enjoyed a period of force and prosperity, the Bulgarian nation, at the beginning of the eleventh century, had succumbed to the power of Byzantium, and later, after an ephemeral awakening, it had fallen once more beneath the oppressive yoke of the Ottomans.

When Muscovite ambition wished to galvanise into life this inert corpse which had been the Bulgarian nation, it was clearly understood in Russia that the first thing necessary was to provide the Bulgarians with an *élite*, a leading and educated class, and also to withdraw them from the hitherto preponderant Hellenic influence. Of the methods adopted with this end in view, the creation of a national church was one, but the most potent means was the diffusion of instruction. Not only were numerous schools opened in the country, but also many young Bulgarians were introduced into the scholastic establishments in Russia, where they were destined to receive the light of learning, and at the same time to assimilate the ideas and sentiments of the great Slavonic nation, of which they were chosen to be the apostles and pioneers in the Balkans. The Panslavist dreams, which were the guiding principle of Russian politics towards the close of last century, were not limited to the territory of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia. They extended over all those mingled populations, of undeterminate ethnic character, which are met with especially in the north of Macedonia; they even touched upon the shores of the Ægean, as we see from the provisions of the San Stefano Treaty, which marks the culmination of Panslavist policy. Throughout the entire area of the " Great Bulgaria " of the treaty no efforts have been spared to create a Slavonic *élite*. These efforts have not been without fruit in Macedonia, and in Bulgaria itself they have been crowned with success. They have called into being a Slavonic nation, full of the " will-to-live," with an acute national conscience, and with a directing class which thinks and acts as the centre of a nation. The results obtained have been sufficiently remarkable, but they have not been free from certain defects rendered inevitable by the hasty development. An intellectual aristocracy was indeed created, but it was based solely on instruction, and often on half instruction. This aristocracy, deficient in those moral qualities which are the only sound basis of character, did not present those elements of stability and solidity which generations of education and ancient traditions have assured to other nations. This class of educated Bulgarians, despite the remarkable intelligence of some of its members, has been and still is subject to returns of ancestral savagery, which from time to time break out in bloody and arbitrary explosions. For the rest, though the educators of the Bulgarian people have been proceeding at break-neck speed, their desire has been above all to develop the nation's intellectual capacities, and up to the present they have somewhat neglected the diffusion of practical instruction calculated to bring about an improvement in the material situation.

After the constitution of the autonomous state of Bulgaria, the Bulgarian youth, having tasted the fruits of occidental learning—at first in Russia and later in the universities of the West—returned to their own country more instructed but no more wealthy than they set out, and their country also they found as poor as they left it.

Agriculture and stock-raising, the two principal sources of the national wealth, have remained almost stationary, and the continual exodus of Turkish cultivators, unable to endure the vexations to which they were daily subjected, has not been calculated to improve the conditions. Industrial pursuits, other than the immediate transformation of agricultural products, do not flourish in the absence of the conditions which are fundamental to their development: and even where there remain some vestiges of industry inherited from the past, as in the textile factories of Sliven, these are doomed to perish under the pressure of outside competition. Commerce is entirely in the hands of non-Slavonic elements: and the emigration of the Greeks, which has followed recent events, will benefit no one but the Jewish traders, who have for some time been disputing the commercial supremacy of the Greeks. Under these conditions the young Bulgarians, who return from Moscow or Leipsic or Lausanne short of money and without practical education, find that no path to wealth and honour, no simple means of existence even, lies before them outside the civil service and what are known as the " liberal professions." So they all become doctors or lawyers or civil servants, or perhaps they follow two of these pursuits at once: in a little Eastern Roumelian village of at most 10,000 inhabitants you shall find, as we are informed, four public physicians—Municipal Medical Officer, District Medical Officer, Officer of Public Health, and Director of the Hospital—and in addition there are military doctors, doctors in private practice, and doctors of the Quarantine Service, maintained at great cost by the Ottoman authorities as symbols of the Sultan's sovereignty over his former province.

Despite the enormous development and overstaffing of the civil service, the contingents of young graduates of foreign universities (and, during recent years, of the University of Sofia) are far in excess of the needs of the community and of the governmental machine, and unsuccessful competitors, briefless

barristers, physicians without patients, all throw themselves into the fierce political strife. In order to succeed in their intrigues these men exploit the desires which their Panslavic schemes awaken in the hearts of the people, and the disillusion brought about by the outcome of these grandiose projects has not yet sufficed to destroy all popular credence. These hopes and desires, called into being by the ambitions of politicians, degenerate into a madness of patriotic megalomania, and this in turn drags the successive Governments themselves into a politic increasingly adventurous; one sad result of all this was seen in the horrors of the so-called Macedonian insurrection.

On the other hand, this violent external policy necessitates within the country sacrifices such as only an unbending rigour of government bordering on the most arbitrary tyranny is able to impose upon the nation: and under the iron hand of the arch-barbarian Stambouloff we saw a dictatorship arise: it was born in blood, and in blood it perished. After numerous unsuccessful attempts, the authors of which perished amid atrocious torture, after two of his most eminent coadjutors and partisans, Veltcheff and Voulkovitch, had fallen beneath the assassin's blow, the Bulgarian Dictator was killed in 1895 in the tragic manner which is familiar to all. But the fall of the tyrant did not end the tyranny. And on many occasions since this murder the Bulgarians have shown that their thin veneer of civilisation is not sufficient to modify those habits of thought and feeling which they have inherited from long centuries of barbarism.

Again, the policy of insatiable ambition in which Government after Government of the Principality has indulged has had the result of increasing the weight of taxation, which already presses heavily enough on the population—the budget of 1906 reached the figure of five millions sterling. That is a very considerable sum for a country which, despite its fertility, is yet a poor country. The agriculture of Bulgaria, the country's sole resource for revenue, is managed in a most primitive fashion, and consists only in the production of cereals. Now it is known that, even when the raising of cereal crops is most scientifically conducted, it is subject to numerous causes of loss and depreciation: much more is this the case where the methods are primitive and the organisation of transport and exchange is still defective. A bad harvest is a national calamity in Bulgaria, and when there is a series of bad years, as from 1896-1901, it means unmitigated ruin and darkest misery, for the production of cereals is the sole factor in the economic life of Bulgaria, and there is no other source of wealth which might balance the losses due to a bad harvest and so give more stability to both public and private finances. It would be possible to modify this state of affairs by improving the processes of agriculture, by introducing new crops, by assisting the development of all the resources of the country. This could be done by employing in a proper manner the revenues of the country; but the effects of the ambitious policy pursued by the Government are seen in the disproportionate growth of military expenditure, which absorbs a third of the budget. If to this expenditure we add the sum called for by the National Debt, we reach a total of two and a half millions sterling—one half of the whole Budget. There remains, therefore, only two and a half millions for the expenses of administration—and when one considers the plethora of functionaries in this country, the truly needful sources of expenditure seem likely enough to be left unsatisfied.

While the national wealth remains stationary, or even actually decreases, owing to the persecutions which are driving into exile the non-Slavonic elements which are among the most laborious sections of the community, the taxes continue to grow larger and larger, and to press every day more heavily on the sole wealth of the country, on the soil. The peasant and the small proprietor, sinking more and more into debt, begin to lend the ear to politicians of the instructed class, whose state of mind is sufficiently indicated to us by the recent incidents which were provoked by the University students in Sofia, and which led ultimately to the closing of the Bulgarian University. The doctrines of the necessity of a radical upheaval of the social order found a soil prepared by long misery, and there is so presented us the sufficiently strange spectacle of a country entirely agricultural, where industrial development is utterly unknown, and which is yet permeated by an intense feeling of Socialism. There are already many Socialist deputies in the Sobranie, and last autumn a Socialist Congress assembled in Sofia to put forth the demands of the people. It is true that the movement is Socialist in name only; most of its promoters have but the vaguest notion of the bearing of their theories; in general they content themselves —and, as it happens, they content also their electors —by preaching the spoliation of the wealthy, who, by the way, are not numerous in Bulgaria, and the division of their wealth among the needy. These ringleaders might with more justice be designated anarchists; they are meet to go arm-in-arm with those who, with loaded revolver or ready bomb, indulge their personal or social hatreds, or, it may be, drown in blood the quarrels of party.

A premature and often incomplete or ill-comprehended assimilation of modern ideas is exercising a disturbing influence on the social and economic organisation of the country; it produces these unending conflicts between anarchy and arbitrary rule; it is the cause of these agitations which bring to the surface the old strain of ancestral savagery, and which furnish civilised Europe with so many sources of uneasiness. Unhappily, it is to be feared that a long time must elapse before the conditions of social life in Bulgaria will display that improvement which is necessary before these chronic troubles can be ended, from which Bulgaria herself is indeed the first to suffer, but which are, moreover, a constant danger to all the nations around. S. S.

ROUMANIAN PRETENSIONS

From the Ecclisiastiki Alithia

WE read in the *Roumania*, the official journal of the Roumanian Conservative party:—

"*Up to the present* 500 *sons of Roumanians and more than* 400 *sons of Turks and Albanians have enrolled themselves in the Roumanian schools in Macedonia. Fifty pupils, forty-five of whom are Macedonians, are at this moment attending the courses of the commercial school in Salonica. These figures bear eloquent witness of the progress achieved by the Roumanian schools in Macedonia.*"

We are in perfect agreement with the *Roumania*. These figures are indeed eloquent as to the progress

made by the Roumanian schools in Macedonia. They prove, during the forty-five years which have elapsed since the Greek schoolmaster, A. Margariti, appeared in 1862 on the scene as the apostle of Roumanism in Macedonia, the results accomplished by the Roumanian propaganda have been absolutely insignificant and are not even worth discussing. And yet the Roumanians have put forth strenuous efforts, and have redoubled these efforts of late years; they have poured out a constant stream of gold for the purchase and the corrupting of consciences; they have made use of every means—promises, menaces, intrigues, secret information, persecution; they have waged a desperate struggle with the aid of a whole legion of Roumanian teachers, inspectors and other agents, seconded by the Roman clergy, and, finally, they have received vast assistance from the foreign policy of Roumania.

Here in truth is eloquent witness of the miserable failure of the high-flown schemes which have captivated the imaginations of the Bucharest politicians! These gentlemen have permitted themselves to believe that the cultivated and intelligent Koutzovlachs stood on no higher intellectual plane than that of the Moldovlach peasantry, and they have imagined that the alteration of the national sentiment of a whole race was simply a matter of a few pieces of gold scattered about—combined, perhaps, with a little moral and material pressure.

Supposing that the figures are correct, and that there are 500 pupils in the Roumanian schools in Macedonia, what do these figures prove? If we remember that in these regions the number of scholars is to the population as one to twelve, or, in other words, the pupils form some 8 per cent. of the population, we shall see that these 500 pupils represent a population of (in round numbers) 6000 Koutzovlachs. But, according to the estimate made by the *Roumania* itself, there are in all some 600,000 Koutzovlachs in Macedonia. That is to say, forty-five years of Roumanian propaganda have won over *one per cent.* of the population.

If certain unfortunate people, who belong to the poorest classes of the communities, have been induced to send their children to the Roumanian schools, that is due to the fact that the Roumanians not only receive the pupils gratuitously, but they also provide them in addition with books, clothing and food, to say nothing of the subsidies which they grant to the parents of these pupils. In this matter there is a great contrast with the Greek schools, which are so far from making supplies to their pupils that they insist upon the payment by parents of the cost of their children's education.

The same means whereby the Roumanian schools have got hold of these Greek scholars have also attracted the 400 Turks and Albanians of whom previous mention has been made; and, above all, it is in this way that the commercial school at Salonica has succeeded in gathering the vast total of forty-five Roumanian (!) pupils. The Roumanian National Budget is the fruitful source from which they all draw the cost of their education and support.

The authority for this assertion is the official statement of the Roumanian Government. From a report, dated November 5, 1901, addressed to King Charles by Mr. Haret, Minister of Public Instruction, we extract: "*We have many schools and many teachers, but few pupils; and in proportion as the number of pupils decreases we are increasing the number of teachers. The work of the propaganda is limited to certain sharply-defined districts, and is confined to the poorer classes, for the better classes will have nothing to do with it. And thus it results that our grammar schools, our colleges, our commercial academies, all contain no pupils except the bursars, and without the bursars they would remain empty. Our schools in Macedonia have no solid foundation, and they are kept up artificially by indiscriminately-granted bursaries.*"

Such are the actual words of a Roumanian minister. The conditions being as we have already set forth, one would not imagine it a very notable achievement if the Roumanians were to entice into their schools even ten times as many pupils as they have succeeded in gaining. The other propagandist schools in the Orient have succeeded in capturing a far more considerable number of pupils, though they do not offer anything like the same inducements as these Roumanian establishments. One cannot but admire the constancy and patriotism of the Koutzovlach population, which continues to reject the advances of the Roumanian propaganda with a disgust and contempt which have deprived it of all power.

Evidence of this attitude of the Koutzovlachs may be found in the report submitted (26th November 1901) by Mr. Lazaresco Lecanta, Director of the Roumanian School at Janina, to Mr. Haret, the Roumanian Minister of Public Instruction. From the report, which had been called for by the Ministry, we extract the following passages:—

"Before discussing the manner in which we must organise our national propaganda in Turkey, permit me to give a brief survey of the present state of our national problem and of the methods of our propaganda. It is evident that up to the present the propaganda has not borne the slightest fruit.

"It is, I believe, a matter of common knowledge that our national position in the Balkan Peninsula is on the wane. Great efforts have been made and are still being made: in spite of them all, the whole work is yet to be begun. After thirty years of struggle we cannot boast that we have advanced one single step.

"We began our endeavours to extend our national culture at the same time as the Bulgarians. To-day, while the progress of Bulgarism has become most formidable, the cause of Roumanism is still in its infancy: it is where it was on the day of our earliest efforts—if, indeed, it is not in a worse condition than then.

"We must not imagine that we are achieving anything: we must not suppose that we are of any help to the Roumanian peoples in the Peninsula. No! We have not helped them in the smallest degree. The results attained by our propaganda are quite factitious and have no real value. With all our schools, of which the number is respectable enough, with all our numerous array of teachers, we are and we shall continue altogether inferior to the other nationalities in the Peninsula. At the present time the Roumanian language is gaining no ground. The Roumanian population in the Peninsula is insignificant. You may readily satisfy yourself of this truth at what time and in what manner you may choose. The Bulgarians, on the other hand, have made considerable progress, and so have the Greeks.

"Do not imagine that my outlook is pessimistic, that my fancy paints all things black, that I have no hope of any improvement. On the contrary, I am most optimistic as to all that concerns the Roumanian element in the Peninsula. The vitality and

the activity of this element render it superior to all the races by which it is surrounded. But its future importance depends on one condition. The Roumanian national culture must be introduced among Roumanians of every class, so that it may establish itself on a firm basis and take root everywhere. If this cannot be brought about there will be an end of the Roumanian race in the Peninsula. It will disappear, or it will be absorbed, as has already happened in many places.

" For the introduction of that culture we have already a sufficient number of schools, of masters, professors, priests and so forth. But we have no population which can be considered as Roumanian in any proper sense of the word—any population, that is to say, which thinks and feels in unison with Roumania. At the present time there are many who are embracing the Roumanian cause and whom we credit with Roumanian sentiments, but their heart and soul is not in the matter; they are acting, not from conviction, but because they find the pretence is to their interest. As soon as they find this no longer serves their interests we shall very quickly see the superficiality of those Roumanian sentiments which they have exhibited for a time.

" With the Greeks, and also with the Bulgarians, affairs are in a much healthier condition than they are, unhappily, with us. Dr K. Istrioti declares that it is the sacred fire which is wanting in our efforts. So far as my observation goes it has always been absent: if it has at any time existed anywhere it is now quite extinguished. From its earliest days to the present time our national cause has been but a speculation or a means of livelihood. Self-interest alone has kept it alive.

" We must not condemn those Roumanians of the Balkan Peninsula who have refused to embrace or to defend our cause, preferring to attach themselves to the Greeks. Nor must we believe, as has formerly been believed, that they have been terrorised, or at least influenced, by the Greek element or by the emissaries of Hellenism. The root of the trouble must be sought elsewhere. The Bulgarians have been subjected to the same influences as our own people, and in a greater measure: nevertheless, they have freed themselves completely from Greek influence and have developed their national sentiment in a remarkable degree.

" Our failure is due to the ridiculous means which we have employed from the beginning, and which we are still employing. The result of these methods is that our efforts, far from meeting with any reward, have only involved us in quarrels and gained us enemies. We are ourselves the sole cause of this trouble. If we had known how to set about the task our adversaries would not have placed a single obstacle in our way. The Greeks are not our opponents, for in no single village do we find a Greek and a Vlach population side by side. But we have utterly estranged from us the whole Vlach population. We have thrown it into the arms of Hellenism, and now our prestige among the Vlachs is a thing of the past. Everywhere the Vlachs have renounced our cause, and they attach themselves with ever-increasing zeal to the Greek propaganda.

" One result of this is that, in villages where the population is purely Vlach, our schools lack pupils, while the Greek schools are filled to overflowing—notwithstanding the fact that in our schools the instruction is gratuitous, whereas the Greeks do not receive pupils without fees. This, surely, is a circumstance worthy of attention.

" If the Roumanian sends his children to the Roumanian school it is for the sake of receiving bursaries, subsidies, books and so forth; but he will send them to the Greek school without expecting anything of this sort. And if he thinks that the Greek school is in need he will open his purse-strings, or at his death he will bequeath his fortune for the propagation of Greek culture.

" From the first our opponents have not been foreigners or people to whom we were unknown; they have been Roumanians, our own compatriots, with whom we have entered into direct relations. But in whatever fashion we approach them, they are not only unwilling to receive us, they shun us as the plague.

" Sometimes, indeed, our agents have been received as friends in the Vlach villages, but that has been because the peasants were ignorant of their mission. But as soon as we declared ourselves as Roumanian schoolmasters they have scouted us and driven us out.

" Do not let it surprise you that our colleges have increased in number despite all this: that has resulted simply from the increase in the budget. Larger sums have been voted to the schools, so these have increased their staffs not because any increase was necessary but because the augmented vote had to be spent somehow.

" There is only one remedy for this state of affairs. The organisation of our propaganda must be completely changed."

At the request of the Ministry Mr. Lecanta sent in a second report on February 25, 1902. In this he recommended that friendly relations should be established between Greece and Roumania, which countries, he considered, should unite to resist their common enemy, Bulgaria. Owing, he stated, to the Greek sentiments of the greater part of the Koutzo-vlachs and to their attachment to the Orthodox communion, these would never be willing to learn Roumanian or to bring themselves into touch with Roumanism without the consent of the Œcumenical Patriarch. At the same time Lecanta advised that pressure should be put upon those Koutzovlachs who had settled in Roumania, for even those, he said, proclaimed themselves to be Greeks.

The foregoing unimpeachable testimony shows us by what means pupils are gathered into those Roumanian schools, of which the *Roumania* is so proud.

The same methods are applied in the great towns as in the villages. If anyone has doubts on this head a visit to the Roumanian school in Pera will be sufficient to convince him. In this institution the use of Greek is general. The directress, the teaching staff, the pupils, down to the very porter, everyone speaks Greek. The handful of day-pupils and boarders (all of pure Greek origin), who attend the school, will tell you that they are on its registers because they are orphans, or because of their parents' poverty, and because they are supplied with free instruction and maintenance, not without many promises of future help and protection.

These admissions of the official agents of Roumanism in Macedonia are valuable. They dissipate into thin air that elaborate structure, built up of calumnies and insults, which the Roumanians had raised to threaten the Church of Constantinople. When it was realised in Bucharest that the Koutzo-

vlachs were repelling all the attempts made to convert them to Roumanism, and that they were solemnly proclaiming the indissoluble union with the Greeks on the grounds of community of origin, of language, of thoughts, of traditions, of aspirations and of customs, then the Roumanians hit upon the ingenious idea of invoking the aid of the Œcumenical Patriarchate towards their enterprise of Roumanising the Koutzovlachs. But any design of using the Patriarchate as the knowing or unknowing tool of Roumanian megalomania could not but miscarry. So there was a change of tactics, and everywhere it was proclaimed that the Patriarchate was but an instrument of Hellenist intrigue, that it oppressed the Koutzovlachs in odious fashion, whom, by violence and by intimidation it kept them from realising their cherished desire of introducing into their schools and churches their mother-tongue—Roumanian.

No efforts have been spared which might influence public opinion. Representations have been made to the Imperial Ottoman Government and to the Cabinets of Europe. The most elementary principles of International Law and the canons of the Church have been ignored: Europe has been duped and its public opinion led astray by a campaign of calumny and defamation against the Œcumenical Patriarchate. And the justification for all this has been that the Patriarchate would not consent to force the Koutzovlachs to change their national sentiment, to banish from home and school and church the Greek tongue which they all spoke and wrote, and to replace this language by the Roumanian, of which they were all ignorant. The striking feature of this is that the tongue which the Roumanians wished to introduce into the Koutzovlach schools and churches was not the Koutzovlach dialect but the Roumanian—that is to say, a foreign language.

On this subject we may refer to the testimony of the Roumanian diplomats themselves. In January 1905 the editor of *The Temps*, M. G. Villier, had an interview with Mr. Lahovari, in which the latter admitted that there is as great a difference between Roumanian and Koutzovlach as between French and Provençal. Mr. Brun, in his propagandist work, *The Old Man of Pindus*, states that the condition of the Koutzovlachs who attend Roumanian schools is precisely analogous to that of Bretons in French schools [with which we may compare the condition of Welsh pupils in English schools]. In point of fact this is a great understatement of the case, for it is a matter of common knowledge that a Roumanian and a Koutzovlach can never understand one another or enter into a common conversation. Nevertheless, it is under these conditions that it has been proposed to drive out of the schools and churches the Greek language, with which all the Koutzovlachs are familiar, and to replace it by the Roumanian, which is far less nearly related than is Greek to the Koutzovlach.

But that which is amazing beyond all is the base purpose of this Roumanisation, with so much difficulty effected by bribes and coercion, of the Macedonian Koutzovlachs. It is well known in Bucharest that, owing to reasons of geography and statistic, there can be no possible hope of either autonomy or annexation of the Koutzovlachs. What, then, is the aim of the Roumanians? It is an aim which would not be believed possible, but with a surprising ingenuousness the Roumanians have revealed their most secret thoughts. We take the following extract from the *Renaissance Latine*, a Roumanian journal, published in Paris by the well known Roumanian, Prince C. Brancovan. "*The aim of the Roumanian Government is not so much to create a colony among the Koutzovlachs as to make certain of a pledge, of something which it can cede to Bulgaria in return for more important advantages—such as, for example, the rectification of the frontier of the Dobroutza. Mr. Take Joanesco has already suggested the Roustchouk-Varna line, which would leave to Roumania two fortresses and a good port. That is perhaps too much to ask, and one might be content with less if Bulgaria would agree to reasonable terms.*" Mr. Bourchier, in his book, *The Balkan Question*, explains that the Koutzovlachs could neither be united to Roumania nor be formed into a compact and autonomous element in Macedonia; he adds: "*Roumania is pursuing her propaganda on the understanding that she would have a claim to compensation elsewhere if demonstrably Rouman population in Macedonia eventually be adjudged to some other power. The Roumanian Government aids the movement in Macedonia with a considerable subsidy, but it seems doubtful whether any commensurate political advantage will repay the outlay.*" [No. of July 15, 1904, p. 614.]

Mr. E. Barbulesco, sub-director of the Roumanian archives, delivered (March 1905) a lecture at Bucharest on the Koutzovlach question. He emphasised the view that Roumania must not lose sight of the political aspect of this question, nor of its connection with the question of the Dobroutza frontier. And the Bulgarian semi-official, *Novi-Vek*, makes no secret of the fact that, when the time is ripe, Bulgaria is to enjoy the fruits of Roumanian enterprise in Macedonia. The journal speaks with entire truth. Out of their own mouths they stand convicted. *Hebemus reum confitentem.*

We may refer again to the testimony of the Roumanians themselves. They feel that their boundaries are too narrow. But they cannot fix their aim upon the millions of their brothers who inhabit Transylvania, Bukovina and Bessarabia, so they covet eagerly the quadrilateral of Silistria—Roustchouk—Choumla—Varna on the right bank (*i.e.*, the Bulgarian side) of the Danube. Unfortunately for them this territory is not a *res nullius*: it has already an owner. What steps can they take to induce this owner to consent to an exchange?

In the first case, it was necessary to have some object of exchange, something to bargain about. They have imagined that this object could be found in the unfortunate Koutzovlach population of Macedonia. By the means with which we are already familiar this people was to be metamorphosed into a Roumanian population, and afterwards it was to be handed over to the Bulgarians for a third (and this time a final) baptism.

Such, according to the testimony of the Roumanians themselves (and in this question the Roumanian evidence is clearly truthful), is the true purpose of this attempt to Roumanise the Koutzovlachs. This is the Utopia which, by fair means or foul, they are seeking to establish, in order that, when established, it may serve as a step towards another Utopia. This is what has inspired the diplomatic crusade and the newspaper campaign against the Œcumenical Patriarchate, which has committed the crime of refusing to use its prestige in the service of base compromises and immoral political designs.

THE EMIGRATION OF THE GREEKS FROM BULGARIA.

The Future of Thessaly—The Persecution in Bulgaria.

AMONG the proposed laws, for which the Greek Government is about to ask legislative sanction, none are more urgent or of greater importance to the country than those which relate to the repartition of Crown lands in Thessaly for the benefit of the peasants and refugees from Bulgaria, as well as for the Greek cultivators who are preparing to leave Roumania in consequence of the events of which that country has recently been the theatre. The refugees from Anchialos, and, in general, those from the Bulgarian littoral, have expressed a preference for lands on the sea-board, and the Government counts upon establishing them in the Plain of Almyros, on the Gulf of Volo. The refugees from Philippopolis and from other districts in the interior are to receive lands situated on the Thessalian Plain, and belonging in great part to the Stefanovik property, which the Government acquired some years ago, intending to divide it between the peasants, so as to create a population of small proprietors in this region, which had hitherto been in the hands of great land-owners.

The Greek agriculturalists, to the number of some 600 families, who are preparing to leave Roumania with a view to establishing themselves in Greece, form a special class of colonists. Possessed of some capital, and acquainted with the most scientific methods of culture, they will receive properties somewhat larger than usual—100 acres or more. The price of the plots sold to these immigrants will be paid by instalments extending over a number of years. The colonists from Bulgaria, being absolutely ruined, will receive both land and also money advances, calculated to sustain the preliminary costs of cultivation. A commission, appointed by the immigrants, desires to aid the Government in framing regulations concerning their establishment on Greek soil.

The new elements, brought into Thessaly by the immigration of Greeks from the Black Sea, will be most valuable for the development of the resources of the region, which the scanty population, and the out-of-date methods employed by the peasants, have left almost unexploited. This region is of remarkable fecundity, and could easily provide Greece with all the corn which she needs, so that she would no longer have to purchase foreign grain to the value of over £1,000,000 sterling per annum. On the contrary, if this land were carefully cultivated, it might easily provide for a valuable export of cereals, which might become an important source of national wealth.

It would, therefore, not be at all wonderful if this immigration of Hellenic peoples, driven from the littoral of the Black Sea, should mark the commencement of a new era in the economic progress of Greece.

The number of Greeks obliged to quit Bulgaria continues to increase. During the first half of March, 140 refugees landed at the Piræus; 600 others arrived during the third week of last month. The Bulgarian authorities, as is well known, place a thousand obstacles in the way of their departure, so the 600 already mentioned, prevented from escaping by boat, had been obliged to gain the frontier and make for Dede-Agatch, travelling on foot for twenty-four days during a season of exceptional rigour.

The latest arrivals so far are those from Stenimachos and Kavakli. These also were obliged to slip through the frontier and to come by way of Adrianople to the Turkish port of Dede-Agatch, where they were able to embark for Greece.

The steam-boat touched at Mitylene, where the exiles were the objects of the warmest reception on the part of their compatriots of the Isle, who distributed clothes and victuals among them.

Those Greeks who remain in Bulgaria are forced to endure the most violent attacks upon their liberty of conscience. Because they declared themselves Greeks and would not abjure Hellenism, they have been insulted, terrorised, threatened with death, subjected to countless indignities and to every sort of outrage. They have been deprived of the few churches which still remained to them. The Greeks of Kavarna, deprived of their church, sent for a Greek priest, who administered baptism and the sacraments in the houses of his followers. The Bulgarian press desires the Government to expel this priest, in whose presence at Kavarna they see an attack on the sovereignty of the Bulgarian people! At Bourgas, another Greek priest, Papa Stylianos, the only one of the clergy who was left, was about to pronounce his blessing on the marriage of a certain M. Nikos to one Paraskevi Nicolaou, when a band of 200 members, led by the churchwarden of the Bulgarian, accompanied by a journalist, threatened the priest with death if he continued the marriage service. The betrothed pair were at the same time summoned to celebrate their union in the Bulgarian church. The authorities, who had been forewarned of the event, refused to interfere.

The situation of the Greeks in Bulgaria is worse than ever—never a day passes without some new event of this nature being recorded.

In a letter from Philippopolis, to the *Bulletin d'Orient* of 16th March, we read:—

"I have more than once explained to you that the movement of last August was an affair of systematic organisation and not, as people here would have us believe, an explosion of Bulgarian patriotism excited by the non-success of the committees in Macedonia. One proof of this is the fact that, not only has war been declared against the Greeks in regions where there was no previous disturbance, but also this war has been continued even after the close of the Macedonian troubles. Further, the persecutions are spreading over the whole extent of the Principality. Here are some extracts from a letter concerning the Boyaliki district:—

"'*Ever since the beginning of the anti-Hellenic movement, a state of incredible anarchy has prevailed here. On every side we see persecutions, menaces, deeds of violence. Our schools have been seized, and attempts have been made to seize our churches also, and to force the inhabitants to renounce Orthodoxy in favour of the Exarchate. . . . Our life is as though we were imprisoned, and, in fact, we are in what is practically a state of siege. We know nothing of what is passing in the outside world; within our town walls, the supervision to which we are subjected is such as to render difficult and dangerous the most ordinary relations of life. Everyone is seeking to find some mode of escape.*'

"The Boyaliki district contains more than 3000 Greeks, divided between the townships of Megha-Boyaliki, Mikro Boyaliki, and Mouradakli. Situate to the East of Kavakli, it is some distance from our town, with which its communications are interrupted during winter. For all these reasons, I have rarely spoken to you of this region."

Despite the measures taken by the Bulgarian Government, 392 other Greeks from Eastern Roumelia have just reached the Piræus.

The latest arrivals, 252 in number, formed part of a convoy of 1000 persons, nearly all of whom were from the Kavakli district. The Bulgarian authorities

did not give them any passport, so that the exiles were debarred from the sea-route, and, consequently, they decided to travel by land. At the Turkish frontier, or, more precisely, at a post named Sakari, they were set upon by a Bulgarian detachment, which had received orders not to let them pass. The Greeks refused to obey their injunctions, so the Bulgarians opened fire upon them, wounding eight. Those who had already reached the frontier, the 252 mentioned above, continued on their way; the remainder were compelled to remain in Bulgaria, whence they hope to make their escape in small parties at some later period.

LITERARY PAGE.

THE PLAYTIME OF A PROCONSUL.

LORD CROMER'S TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK.

DURING the past month the Egyptian Government has lost the services of its most distinguished servant, and the cause of Hellenism in Egypt has been deprived of one of its warmest friends, by the resignation of Lord Cromer. This is not the place in which an estimate of Lord Cromer's career may fittingly be attempted—indeed, such has been the magnitude of his work that only from a distance can it be viewed in true perspective; it falls within the province of the future historian of modern Egypt. The pages of the *Hellenic Herald* might most properly contain a record of Lord Cromer's relations with the Greek people and the Hellenic cause in Egypt, and there can be no doubt that if such an account were written, it would disclose a state of affairs not less gratifying to the friends of Hellenism than interesting to the general reader. The present article, however, is of much narrower scope and less ambitious purpose: it deals only with a product* of Lord Cromer's leisure hours, in which he sought refreshment from the cares of state, in the study and translation of the lyrists of Ancient Greece.

Though we have disclaimed all intention of writing an account of Lord Cromer's political and administrative work, it may, notwithstanding, be well to give a brief summary of his toils in Egypt, before we touch upon his recreations.

When Lord Cromer, then Sir Evelyn Baring, returned in 1883 from India to Egypt, he had already occupied the positions of Commissioner of the Public Debt and Controller-General of Egypt. Nevertheless, he was still a young and comparatively unknown man, and the appointment was regarded as very much of an experiment—and never has there been a more difficult and bewildering subject of experiment than the Egypt of 1883. The country was almost bankrupt; the public services were in a state of chaos, consequent upon Arabi's wild career; the Egyptian army, suffering from its defeats at the hands of the British, and cowed by the Mahdists of the South, was a demoralised and spiritless rabble. Before the new Governor reached Egypt, the ill-fated expedition of Hicks Pacha had already set out, and the train of circumstances had begun, which culminated two years later in the fall of Khartoum and the death of Gordon. And while the jealousy of foreign powers was such that their intervention seemed by no means unlikely, the British Government looked on helplessly, and was for long unable to decide upon its own plan of action. It was clear that Egypt could be saved only by a ruler of clear sight, firm action and unhesitating decision: and Sir Evelyn Baring proved himself to be such a ruler.

At the outset he saw that his efforts must be concentrated on Egypt, and for a time the Soudan was left to its fate. The progress made under his wise rule was almost phenomenal. By close attention to finance, unwearied construction of public works, and truly Herculean labours on the Nile (to which is due all wealth and life itself in Egypt), he at length succeeded in restoring order and prosperity to Egypt. Within seven years of entering the country, he felt justified in undertaking the reconquest of the Soudan. In 1889 began the reorganisation of the Egyptian army for this purpose under General Kitchener, and ten years later, the victories of Atbara and Omdurman had placed the Soudan once more under Egyptian rule: and during the last eight years, the Soudan has shared in the orderly and prosperous development of Egypt.

Great as has been the material progress of Egypt under Lord Cromer, the improvement in national *morale* has been not less striking. The history of Egypt for 5000 years shows a national apathy almost without parallel, and never was the fellah more lifeless and abject than at the commencement of the British occupation. But now, for almost the first time in history, an Egyptian national spirit begins to manifest itself. This is due alike to the new prosperity of the country, to the Viceroy's identification of the aims of the Government with the welfare of the people, and to the equal and undeviating justice of his rule. Lord Cromer's wise administration has overcome all the obstacles which twenty-four years ago seemed insuperable: his resignation meets with universal regret in Egypt, in England and on the Continent.

One would imagine that a life so full and strenuous could leave scant leisure for wooing the Muse. But Lord Cromer is not the first English statesman whose literary amusements have been preserved to us. Mr Gladstone's multifarious labours, as Homeric student and translator of the classics, are too well known to require more than passing mention. And another great Viceroy, the Marquis of Wellesley, found time, during his tenure of office, to give us some graceful Latin and English verses. Mr Gladstone and Lord Wellesley were both educated at Eton, and Eton has never failed to teach her sons to love the ancient poets, and to dwell with fondness on their cadence when schooldays are long past. Lord Cromer had no such schoolboy memories of the Greek poets. As he tells us in the introduction to *Translations and Paraphrases*, he learnt no Greek at school, and might have never learned it but for the accident of his going to Corfu in 1858, as a subaltern in the British force which then garrisoned the Ionian Isles. With characteristic energy, he set to work upon the colloquial Modern Greek of the neighbourhood. He found himself attracted by the language and proceeded from Modern to Ancient Greek: we may imagine with what delight he entered upon this hitherto unknown domain,—

> ". . . like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes
> He stared at the Pacific."

In Egypt Lord Cromer was in continual contact with the Greeks, and we know from his own repeated public utterances how much he was helped by and

* *Paraphrases and Translations from the Greek.* By the Earl of Cromer. Macmillan & Co., 1903. 5s. nett.

how highly he esteemed this people. We may well suppose that his close friendship with the modern Greeks made him turn with greater zest to the poets who were their ancestors, and so furthered the production of the volume which lies before us. And it is a curious coincidence that Lord Cromer's taste sends him to those pastoral poets and anthologists who flourished in the Alexandran court of the Ptolemies.

As for the translations, almost all are good, and many are extremely good. The difficulty of adequately rendering these Greek lyrics and pastorals lies in their combination of the grace and polish of a courtly and over-civilised age, with much of the grand style, which seemed inseparable from Greek art, even when it dealt with light and trivial subjects. Even the most artificial epigram of the Anthology does not lack some distinction, and Theocritus certainly has a great measure of the "large, clear utterance" of the earlier poets. It is in translating the more elaborate poems that Lord Cromer seems to us to attain his highest level. The rendering of the second idyll of Theocritus contains some excellent verses—for example,—

"Hushed are the winds, silent the ocean's swell,
But peace is banished from my hapless life,
I long for Delphis, whom I loved too well,
No maiden, but, alas! no wedded wife.
My magic wheel, I bid thee move,
Draw home to me the man I love."

and also,—

"My hair fell off, and waxen grew my skin,
I sought each mumbling wizard's aid in vain,
Time passed, yet hotly burned the fire within,
And none but Delphis could assuage my pain.
Bethink thee of my love, and whence it came,
My Lady Moon."

The young subaltern in Corfu must have heard modern echoes of this poem, for to this day the deserted Greek maiden sings incantations to the moon in the hope of recovering her lover: the Modern Greek folk-poetry is full of this theme.

Another fine version is that of the "Lament for Bion, from Moschus,—

"Bion is dead, and song itself is spent,
Whilst stricken lies the tuneful Dorian Muse.
Begin Sicilian Muses, your lament.
And ye, Strymonian swans, the tidings bring,
To Thracian nymphs and to Œagrian maids,
Chant with such voice as he was wont to sing,
Say that a Dorian Orpheus joins the shades."

In the same version skilful use is made of the poetical effect of Greek proper names,—

Less keen a wail, beloved Anacreon,
Arose for thee along the Teian strand,
Not o'er Archilochus, but o'er thy grave,
Does sea-girt Paros chant a funeral strain,
While Mitylene, by the Ægean wave,
Forgets that Sappho ne'er will sing again.

In lighter vein is the amusing dialogue of Theocritus XV. This idyll is, perhaps, better adapted for prose than for verse translation, and Lord Cromer's version is less happy in places than Mr Andrew Lang's prose. "The crowd is really something awful, dear," lacks the conciseness of the original πολλῶ μὲν ὄχλω —and the rhyme of "Zeus" and "deuce" is perhaps rather audacious. As might be expected, the "Psalm of Adonis" is the best part of the version. "Love the Runaway" (Ἔρως δραπέτης) of Moschus is much better: the opening lines remind one of our own Cavalier poets, and might have been written by the author of "Cupid and my Campaspe,"—

"Fair Cypris seeks her truant boy, and cries:
'Can no one tell me where the child doth stray?
Who brings me news shall gain an ample prize—
A kiss for him who's seen my runaway.'"

Another verse recalling Lovelace or Suckling is XVI.—"The Scorned Lover" of Asclepiades,—

"She bade me come, the traitress fair,
O Night, and now she dares to flout me!
Some day she'll crave my love, I swear
That then she'll have to go without me."

Equally good in the same strain is III., from Nossis,—

"Pretty Nossis vows that she
Spurns the honey of the bee,
But that Cupid can distil
Sweets the cup of joy to fill.
Whom Venus hates can never know
What roses in her garden grow."

While XLVIII., on Anacreon's Grave, suggests Omar Khayyam rather than a Greek,—

"Pour a libation, stranger, as you pass,
It is Anacreon's tomb. He loved his glass."

There are one or two slight blemishes. In VI., the

"μοῦνος ἐὼν πρὸς ἕνα,
θνατὸς δ' ἀθανάτῳ συστήσομαι·"

of Rufinus is not adequately rendered by "I'll bid a single god defiance." In X., from Meleager, κηρύσσω τὸν Ἔρωτα is incorrectly translated "I *chase* wild love." The κήρυξ is, of course, the town crier, who "*cries* wild love": the poem gives the crier's description of Love. But these are minor blemishes, of which very few occur in the book. The mere translation is indeed so uniformly good and accurate that it was scarcely necessary to entitle the book "*Paraphrases* and Translations"—except that Lord Cromer does not shrink from anachronisms, as in the reference to champagne in II.

In conclusion, we cite in full two of the best versions—XXXIV, the "Pall of Leonides" from Philippus,—

"The Persian threw his mantle o'er the grave
Whereon his shame was writ.
Then did the hero turn,
And proudly cried, 'I spurn
Your Asian tribute. Let my shield and glaive,
Of which in sunlit earth you felt the might,
Be still my pall, in death's eternal night.
I lived a Spartan. In the realms beneath
I still am true to Sparta, e'en in death.'"

and the charming "Good-bye to Childhood," No. LXVI.,—

"Her tambourine and pretty ball,
Her dolls she left, with all their dresses,
Her playthings, whether great or small,
The net which held her golden tresses.
Sweet Chloe, on her marriage day,
Renounced her happy childhood's pleasures.
A maid should to a maiden pray,
The Limnian Queen received her treasures.
Daughter of Leto! listen as we pray,
Shield her, and keep her pure from day to day."

We lay down the book with regret. The illustrious career of its author would give an interest to anything which came from his pen: and no friend of the Hellenic cause, knowing how longstanding and intimate, and how mutually beneficial and pleasing have been Lord Cromer's relations with the Modern Greek, could fail to welcome this evidence of his love of Ancient Greece. But apart from these considerations, the book is, on its own merits, well worth reading (and possessing). It offers a proof, if proof were needed, that in Lord Cromer the official never overpowered the man: the stern demands and the dull routine of government could not suppress the human sentiment or the love of beauty.

A. Clark.

Published at Craven House, Kingsway, London, W.C.
Editor, Dr C. Poupris.

The Hellenic Herald

A MONTHLY POLITICAL PERIODICAL

Vol. I., No. 7] MAY 1907 [Price 10/- per Annum Post Free

CONTENTS

THE FALLING OF THE MASK . . . ——
THE HEROIC AGE OF MODERN GREECE . Henry Houssaye
THE MACEDONIAN COMMITTEE OF ATHENS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE BALKAN COMMITTEE . ——
FROM SOFIA . . . . . ——
FIAT LUX . . . . . ——
THE HELLENIC FINANCES . . . . ——
PRESS REVIEWS . . . . . ——
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . . ——
LITERARY PAGE—
THE TEACHING OF GREEK . . John C. Caldwell

THE FALLING OF THE MASK.

"THE iron must be tested in the fire," says a popular Greek proverb. So with the Bulgarian claims and their supporters in Europe. So long as the latter were guided by their undue enthusiasm for the "wonderful warlike qualities and admirable political sagacity" of the Bulgarians, and, not fully understanding the real situation which prevailed in Macedonia, were too readily supporting the most absurd Bulgarian pretensions, the Bulgarians posed as the most eager in desiring a fair and impartial solution of the Macedonian Question, which should satisfy the judgment of all liberal-minded men in Europe who are interested in this subject, and especially of the Balkan Committee, which has been regarded as the champion of the Bulgarian cause. A more thorough and impartial examination of the conflicting factors which constitute the Macedonian Question has finally led the Balkan Committee to a conviction of the impossibility of any solution to this question other than by an understanding between the different nationalities inhabiting Macedonia. In this conviction the Committee addressed its late appeal to the Governments of the Balkan States, calling their attention to the necessity of coming to some such understanding. The real projects and the hidden thoughts of the Bulgarians have been exposed by their reception of this unquestionably most reasonable proposal. They have manifested not only dissatisfaction and disappointment, but also the most virulent anger, as is shown by the most instructive report from Sofia, which we publish on page 102.

One illustration of the "political sagacity and self-restraint" of the Bulgarians was afforded by the senseless and barbarous way in which they have carried on their so-called struggle for liberty in Macedonia, in which they have shown more anxiety to exterminate their Christian rivals than to shake the power of the Turkish oppressors, thereby provoking alike the opposition of their brother Christians of other nationalities and the disgust of civilised Europe—the two factors which have brought about the failure of all efforts for the liberation of Macedonia. Another illustration of the same high qualities is given by the insolent repudiation of the late Appeal, which sketches out the necessary first steps towards the only just and equitable solution of the problem, and which, moreover, is put forth by that same Balkan Committee to the friendship of which the Bulgarians have been and still are so deeply indebted.

With the Greeks, matters have quite a different complexion. They have for years been persecuted by the Bulgarian bands, and have been represented by the Bulgarians as unwilling to co-operate in the cause of Macedonian liberation, if not, indeed, as traitors to that cause. Moreover, they have not the same cause as the Bulgarians for making a prompt and cheerful response to the overtures of the Balkan Committee, which has certainly never shown itself too favourably disposed towards the Greek claims. Notwithstanding this, they have readily responded to the Manifesto, thus showing a sincere desire for the amelioration of the unhappy condition of Macedonia, as is evidenced by articles which have appeared in the Greek press and in our own columns, and especially by the very moderate reply of the Macedonian Revolutionary Committee of Athens to the Balkan Committee, which we publish on page 102 of this number.

The ready response of the Greeks to the Appeal must not be attributed to any weakness on their part. The utter lack of success of the Bulgarian efforts in Macedonia, and the disorganisation and collapse of their bands in the presence of the Greeks, prove that the Bulgarians are not in so strong a position as they pretend, and that the Greek element is the predominant one—there is no other way of explaining the failure of the well-organised, and for ten years all-powerful, Bulgarian Committees.

The treacherous way in which the Bulgarians have behaved with respect to this appeal is no surprise to us, who know from long experience their unscrupulous, perfidious and ungrateful character. But the sacrifice of thousands of innocent and peaceful notables in Macedonia and the total annihilation of an important Greek population in eastern Roumelia [1] have been necessary to convince the European philobulgarian enthusiasts how little the Bulgarians had digested the principles of freedom which they professed, how false were the claims to Liberalism by which they sought the sympathies of Europe. They have hidden their face for long: at last the mask has fallen.

[1] We publish in another column an important extract from the *Tribune* of 17th May, 1907, on the subject of the expulsion of the Greeks from eastern Roumelia, which, though so late, comes in exact confirmation of facts which have been so frequently urged in our columns See p. 108, *Greek Grievances.*

THE HEROIC AGE OF MODERN GREECE.

(*Lecture delivered by* M. HENRY HOUSSAYE.)

THE eighth of the lectures organised by the French Philhellenic League was delivered on April 14, in the hall of the "Agricultures de France" in Paris. M. Henry Houssaye, the eminent Academician of France, and Vice-President of the League, lectured on "The Heroic Age of Modern Greece—1821-1829" to an audience composed of men prominent in the political and literary worlds, mingled with ladies of the aristocratic circles of Parisian Society and of the Greek colony. M. Houssaye was supported on the platform by MM. Th. Homolle, Theodore Reinach, Desmons, Jules Lemaitre, Edmond Théry, P. Grimanelli, G. Fougères, Emm. Rodocanachi, Gr. Triantaphyllides, and other officials of the League: among the audience were MM. N. Delyanni, the Greek Ambassador; S. Levides, First Secretary to the Legation; Mendel, Secretary to the President of the Cabinet; P. Delyanni, Greek Consul in Paris; Count de Mouy, formerly Plenipotentiary at Athens; and other distinguished persons.

The lecturer spoke as follows:—

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—For the first of our lectures, our honoured and esteemed President, M. Homolle, took the delightful subject: *Why we love Greece.* With his well-known eloquence, M. Homolle discoursed on the reasons for philhellenism—the word is perhaps a little out-of-date, but the thing lives always in our hearts and minds. He spoke of ancient Greece—of her art, poetry, philosophy; of those principles of political liberty which she was the first to discover, to investigate and to practise; of her enlightening influence on the destinies of humanity. He reminded us that the European Renaissance owed its birth to the treasure of Greek Literature, preserved by the Byzantines and by them transmitted to the Western nations. In conclusion he described to us the efforts made by the Hellenes last century to remake themselves into a nation, of their rapid and astonishing progress, of their flourishing commerce, their prosperous industries, their numerous and well-filled schools.

"There is another reason why we love Greece—the warlike valour of the Greeks in their struggle for independence. Modern Greece, like Ancient Greece, has passed through an heroic age. It is of this Heroic Age of Modern Greece that I wish to speak to-day.

"From the earliest days of the Turkish conquest, the Greeks of the extreme north and of the extreme south, of Epirus and of Maina in the Peloponnese, took up arms to defend the Hellenic soil and the standard of the Cross. Sometimes victorious, often defeated, decimated, driven to the mountain-tops or the deep ravines, but always exacting from the victors the full price of victory, they submitted only to break out in new revolt. The Ottomans could never firmly establish their domination in Greece: as they stamped out the national fire in one place, it broke out anew in another.

"When the Greeks were not fighting, they burst out in patriotic song: 'Never,' said one of their poets, 'never shall we rest, with sword and song inactive'—and by their songs new fighters were inspired. By ballads of battle and glorious death, of martyrdom or of warlike exploit, by songs of patriotism, by elegies chanted over the bodies of leaders slain by the enemy, the popular improvisations kept alive in the hearts of the Greeks the fire of patriotism and of religious faith.

"The chief Nicolas Tzouvaros raised the standard of revolt 'the blue and red standard with the silver cross.' Surrounded by a horde of Turks, he carved a bloody passage through their midst, and returned to Karpenisi 'to keep Easter, to celebrate the resurrection of Christ, to roast the lamb and break the Easter egg'—After twenty combats, the pallikars of Tzolkas, worn out with fatigue and dying of hunger, refuse to march against the enemy. They exclaim, 'How can you ask us to fight, captain, in the heat of July or under the scorching sun of August? Our burning muskets can no longer take the powder.' But Tzolkas draws his sword and answers: 'Unsheath your swords and march: let our towns and villages learn that the chief Tzolkas has fought against three thousand Turks in the heat of July and under the scorching sun of August.' They fought for three days and three nights, and in the end the chief led all his pallikars over the bodies of their foes 'like a hawk he makes his flight to the crest of the highest mountains.'

"Three heroes form the plan of surprising the town of Grabuze. The first, Buzo-Marco, climbs the rampart and with his single sword slays many—'Follow, my brave companions. I can no more advance, for my death has come.' The first slain was Buzo-Marco, but soon all three lay dead in the same place.

"Ali, Pacha of Janina, holds as hostage six Suliot children. Four he hangs, then sends word to the two leaders of the revolt, Tzavellas and Drakos, that he has not harmed their two children, but that if Suli does not surrender they will share the fate of the other four. At these words, grief seizes upon Tzavellas and Drakos. They assemble their soldiers and call the priest. 'Kneel in prayer,' they say, 'and do you, priest, chant the psalms of the dead for our six hostages, the six Suliot children whom the Pacha has put to death.'

"Like those ancient runners who passed the torch from hand to hand, in Greece as generation succeeded generation, the warrior's sword was passed down. 'I am too old,' said Zimotzios, 'to be a leader; the first place is no longer for me. But I have one son for the sword, another for the musket, and another, the youngest of all, to bear the standard.'

"A pallikar, treacherously slain, dies with the cry, 'I leave my children behind me; they will pay for my blood with heads of the Turks.' The chief, Lambros, mortally wounded, gives his sabre and musket to his son, saying, 'Now you are chief. Make my tomb wide and high, that I may stand upright therein. And leave a loophole in the side, that I may hear the sound of thy musket during the fight.'

"To these pallikars, the crown of life was death on the field of battle. As they finished each meal in bivouac they would offer one another the toast 'to a fortunate bullet.' And so the approach of death, instead of terrifying the Greek hero, uplifted and transported him. He would exult in his death. 'Devour my flesh,' cried a Klepht of Mount Olympus, 'devour my flesh, wild eagle, that thy wing-span may increase an ell, and the grip of thy claws a span.' 'Comrade,' said Ghipthakis, 'I am sore wounded. Give me my death-blow, cut off my head and hide it, lest the enemy should glory in my death.' 'What matters my death,' said Kitzos, 'the blood of heroes will make the ground put forth sword-blades thick as corn.'

"The sentiments uttered by some of these Hellenic mountaineers were worthy of Leonidas. When the chief Tzelios was summoned by a Turkish commander to surrender to the Pacha of the province, he replied, 'While Tzelios lives he never submits. He has no Pacha but his sword, no Vizir but his musket.' The

insurgent Kontoghianis inscribed on his sword-blade, 'The sword alone is liberty, honour and life.' Another Klepht chief stopped a troop of Turks on the march, and said to the Pacha in command, 'Pacha, here is no country submissive to the Osmanlis; this is not the Morea; here it is the muskets of the Klephts that rule.'

"The spirit of the women was no less steadfast than that of the men; some of their sayings have the accents of the Spartan mother, 'Fade, ye flowers, and cease to sing, nightingales of Olympus, defeat has overtaken us. And you, my children, may curses fall upon you and may earth reject your bodies if ever you submit to the foe.' At Cordyle, there fought another Jeanne Hachette. During the battle her corsage became loosened, disclosing a woman's breast beneath the linen. In surprise the Turk cried, 'We are fighting against a woman; it is the sword of a virgin that is slaying our janizzaries.'

"These were not only bootless feats of arms, acts of individual courage, vain lamentations. These desperate struggles stood out as examples and served as lessons; the tears formed a thunder-cloud, destined to break forth in lightning-flashes.

. . . . . .

"Historians have often attempted to discover the immediate causes of the Greek Revolution. They have recalled the foundation of the Hetairia at Odessa by the Greek Skouphas; they have followed the fortunes of that secret society, which gave as aim to its members 'the union in arms of all the Christians of the Ottoman Empire, towards the triumph of the Cross over the Crescent.' The historians have given clear and full exposition of the secret action of the Hetarists in Greece, from 1814 to 1820. They have drawn attention to the vague ideas, the vague projects and the vague promises of the Tsar Alexander I. They have described the partial insurrection, so quickly and so easily repressed, fomented by Alexander Ypsilanti in Moldo-Wallachia. They have also told of the rebellion of Pacha Ali of Janina against the Sublime Porte, a rebellion of which the immediate result was the return of the Suliotes to their mountains.

"We may grant that the Hetairists had spread over Greece and had spoken to certain notables of the clergy and of the municipal bodies of coming uprising. We may also recognise that the expeditions against Ypsilanti in the Danubian Provinces and against Ali-Pacha in Epirus, expeditions in which Turkey was obliged to employ the greater part of her available forces, were indirectly helpful to the success of the Greeks. But we must nevertheless guard against saying that these events caused the Great Revolution of April 1821. This revolution was already prepared in the hearts and minds of the people, though there was no preparation of means of action or of military dispositions. There was no arrangement between the captains of the bands, between the chiefs of the klephts, or between the municipalities as to the date for the taking up of arms, nor was there any plan of attack or even of mobilisation and concentration. Throughout Greece men were waiting for a signal: the signal did not come, so each man rose singly. The Greek Revolution arose spontaneously. Each canton took up arms impulsively for its liberty, without asking if the neighbouring canton would march by its side, and without considering the number of the enemy.

"At Patras, on April 4, the archbishop, Germanos, assembled the people, raised the standard of the Cross before the Church of St George, and made the assembled people swear that they would fight to the death for the deliverance of Greece. In Maina, on April 5, the two chiefs of clans, Kolokotronis and Petro-Bey, joined their bands and marched on Kalamata. In Laconia, a young girl, Constance Zacharias, called to arms five hundred peasants, drove the Turks from the villages, and forced them to seek refuge in the stronghold of Mistra [there, Ladies, is an instance of feminism before the name of feminism existed]. In Bœotia, the pallikar Diakos with three hundred men raised the standard of rebellion. In the Isles of the Ægean, the insurrection was proclaimed by the tetrarchs of Psara, the magistrates of Spetzai and the senators of Hydra. The Senate of Hydra, by unanimous vote, issued the noble declaration: 'The Greek nation, weary of the yoke which has borne it down for four centuries, rises and takes up arms to break its chains. The inhabitants of Hydra, eager to share the perils of Greece, have resolved to employ their resources, their private fortunes, and the strategic position of their Isle, in order to fight against the common foe.'

"This proclamation, acclaimed by the people of Hydra, was conveyed to Psara, Spetzai, throughout the Isles, to Tinos, Andros, Cos, Delos, Samos. In a few days the numerous trading vessels of the Isles were converted into ships of war. Everyone set his hand to the work of war and liberation. Cannon were taken from the arsenals to arm even the fishing-boats; barrels of powder, rifles, munitions of war, were carried on board the vessels, hitherto peaceful, which had served to enrich the islanders in their widespread trade. Subscriptions were opened to cover the expenses of the first campaign, and gifts came pouring in. Two Hydriotes, Lazare Coundouriotis and Orlandi, gave each 2000 guineas a month to maintain ten vessels. A rich widow of Spetzai, the famous Bobolina, equipped three brigs at her own expense. The beautiful Modena Mavrogeni arrayed a small flotilla, which landed a troop of volunteers in Eubœa, under the orders of Zorbas and Nikokles; as they set out, Modena Mavrogeni announced that she would bestow her fortune and her hand on whichever of the two chiefs should slay the greater number of Turks. The enthusiasm of patriotism inflamed the courage of all and opened their purses to such an extent that, at the end of April, the fleet of the Islands numbered 166 brigs, xebecks and polaces, bearing altogether more than 500 pieces of artillery.

"Within a month, the fire of insurrection covered the whole of Greece from Taygetus to Othrys, from the Ionian Sea to the Ægean. The entire Morea, Attica, Bœotia, the Phocid, Phthia, Eubœa, the Sporades and the Cyclic Isles, and many of the large islands of the Asiatic shore, were in full revolt. The Turkish garrisons sought refuge in the acropolis and in the strong forts, while they awaited help and left the Greeks in possession even of the towns—Sparta, Mistra, Patras, Argos, Nauplia, Corinth, Megara, Athens, Thebes, Andros, Tinos, Samos, Hydra.

. . . . . .

"After this brilliant prologue, the bloody and glorious drama continued for seven long years. You will readily understand that I cannot recount all the details of this drama; the events of seven years of war cannot be described in half an hour's lecture, if one wishes to give more than a table of dates and names. Of the events of the War of Independence, I propose only to relate certain famous feats of arms, certain bold and audacious strokes, which may suffice to justify my title:—*The Heroic Age of Modern Greece.*

"These feats of arms and valiant deeds are without number; the difficulty is to make the proper choice. I will pick out certain ones which I remember at hazard.

"The pallikar Diakos, with ten men, was surprised

by the advance guard of Omer Vrione in the defile of Thermopylæ. He resolved, and his companions with him, to court death. Refusing a horse offered him by his adopted son, he began to fire upon the Turks. He checked their march for an hour, while his companions fell one after the other. He himself, grievously wounded and no longer able to defend himself, was thrown down, bound, and carried off to Zitouni. The Greeks were not considered as belligerents, and the Turks treated all prisoners as rebels taken with arms in hand. To this rigorous law the military code of Islam offers one modification. The prisoner may save his life, his liberty and his possessions if he will consent to become a Moslem. Diakos was led to the place of execution, and implements of torture were prepared before his eyes. The Pacha approaches with the offer of pardon at the price of apostasy. 'No!' cries Diakos, 'kill me! My death matters little to Greece, for Greece has many a Diakos.'

"On June 18, 1825, rejoicings were being held on board the flagship of Kara Ali, in the roadstead of Chios. The French officer Baleste, who had been fighting in the Greek ranks, had been killed in Crete, and his head had been borne to the Admiral. As Baleste had been the object of great renown and fear, the staff of every ship in the fleet had come to congratulate Kara Ali, who entertained the principal officers in a banquet on his ship. They gave themselves up to rejoicings, for they had been victorious, and they could without fear pass a night of Ramazan on this vessel, which carried 2200 men and eighty guns, and was surrounded by more than fifty warships.

"Now that same day, two little Greeks boats had set out from Psara. One carried twenty sailors, the other fourteen. These thirty-four men, a party of incendiaries, with Constantine Canaris at their head, had formed the design of avenging Chios. They get past the Turkish watches at the entrance to the waterway, make their way through the midst of the anchored war-vessels and approach the flagship. Swift as an arrow, the fireship of Canaris comes alongside the man-of-war. Canaris seizes the prow, attains the bowsprit, climbs along it and heaves the grappling-irons into the cat's-head. Then he drops back into his fireship, sets it alight, jumps off into his boat and cuts its moorings with a blow of his sword. Then he is rejoined by his lieutenant, George Pepinos, who has just attacked the frigate Rialta-Bey, in the same manner and with equal success. They pass in their boats under the fire of the Turks, whom they salute with the shout of triumph, "Victory to the Cross!" These fearless sailors disdain to shun the view of the enemy—they have achieved their work, and in each of their boats is a barrel of powder, ready to blow them up if their retreat is cut off.

"But the Turks have few thoughts save for the fire which threatens to spread to all their ships. In one instant the flames have enveloped the flagship, and the wind, suddenly arising at that moment, renders fiercer the flames, which soon gain deck and spars and rigging. Everywhere is the crackle of burning wood, and the ship becomes a furnace. The heat causes the guns to explode and spread fear and destruction among the fleet. The Admiral, seeing the flames advance towards the powder-magazine, is escaping by a boat, when a burning mast falls and at once sinks the boat, and, striking the Admiral, breaks his back. Some of the sailors swim with him to shore, and death does not end his sufferings before he has seen his flagship blown up and many of his frigates burned.

"During the eight years of the war this terrible exploit was repeated a score of times by Canaris, both under shadow of the night and even in full day. On March 16, 1824, in the middle of the day, Canaris, with a single fireship, attacked and burned a frigate in the Straits of Samos. This struck such terror into the minds of the enemy, that their Admiral, with twenty-seven ships at his disposal, abandoned his design of forcing the Straits.

"At a later period than this, the French Colonel Voutier begged Canaris to tell him of his encounters with the Turks. 'I no longer remember them,' replied Canaris; 'last time, there were fifteen of us on board. Bring the others here, and they will tell you what happened.' An English captain asked the secret for preparing the fireships which achieved such terrible results. Canaris put his hand on his heart: 'There,' he cried, 'is the secret of success!'

"A sublime sentiment and one of eternal truth. It is well enough to multiply a hundredfold the power of gun or rifle, to invent new tactics, to convert fields of battle into moving fortresses; but the secret of victory will always be in the heart of the combatants.

"One word more of Canaris. He said he had no claim to be considered brave 'because the rifle bullets never came near him.'

"Behind rocks or walls the Greeks were invincible; at surprises, sudden assaults, forlorn hopes, they were altogether excellent; and often—but not always—they were victorious in pitched battles. On May 24, 1821, 4000 Greeks of Maina and Messenia, under Kolokotroni and Mavromichalis, maintained the Valtetzi-Derveni line for a whole day, against Mustapha-Bey's army, 12,000 Turks and Albanians with 1500 cavalry and excellent artillery. On the next day the Greeks, seeing that the previous day's assault had wearied their adversaries, took the offensive, charged the enemy, and drove them headlong into Tripolitza.

"After the whole army of Western Greece had been dispersed in the battle of Peta, Mavrocordato with thirty-five men, and Marco Botzaris with thirty-seven men, reached Missolonghi. That little town had no defence of the land-side except the remains of a rampart and a ditch half-filled with ruins. The sea was still open, and in the port were numerous vessels, but Mavrocordato obstinately refused to embark. "I wish to die in this place," he said. "And I also," replied Botzaris. This hardy resolution inspired the townsfolk with like courage. They sent away their women, children and old men, so that there remained 350 vigorous men. The army of Omer Vrione soon approached—11,000 men, with a powerful force of artillery. The Turks invested the city and began to bombard it. The townsfolk had no thought of saving life or property, so the Turkish bombs and bullets inspired no fear. Omer Vrione, in consequence, opened negotiations, which Mavrocordato made a pretence of entertaining, wishing to gain time by holding out to the Turk hopes of a surrender. Advantage was taken of the respite to strengthen the rampart and to fortify the houses behind the wall. Six weeks passed in this way, Omer Vrione continuing to bombard by night and to negotiate by day. Then Petro-Bey, Andreas Zaimis and Kenelos Delyanni arrived by sea with a reinforcement of 700 Peloponnesians, picked men, hardened to war during the long and bloody defence of the Acropolis of Argos. Soon other reinforcements raised the garrison of Missolonghi to 2,500 men. Then Mustapha sent his last summons. This time Mavrocordato no longer feared to disclose his intentions. "If you want our town," he wrote, "come and take it." But the besiegers had lost too much time, they were weakened by privations and decimated by disease. Mustapha

determined too late to make an assault upon the town. His soldiers advanced bravely to the charge, but the numbers of the Greeks were no longer contemptible: behind their earthworks and their loop-holed buildings they were invincible. The Turks left 800 dead bodies on the field of battle, and a week later, hearing of the approach of Mavromichalis and Odysseus, they hastily raised the siege, abandoning a great portion of their artillery and baggage.

"On the night of August 19, 1823, Botzaris and 400 Suliotes penetrated to the very heart of the camp of Carpennissi, which they threw into confusion. At the sound of his horn, familiar to the Hellenes as the cry of St. George to the mediæval English soldier, three columns attacked the camp from different quarters. There was a fierce struggle. Botzaris, wounded by a bayonet-thrust in the thigh, continued to lay about him with the sword till he fell, mortally wounded by a rifle-bullet. His pallikars surrounded him, with lamentations. 'Brothers in arms,' he said, 'I entrust my wife and children to you and to the nation. Work together, be faithful to Greece and humble before God . . . march fearlessly against the foe, and continue the work which I have begun . . . For myself, I am content: I have paid my debt to my country.'

"After the fall of Psara, in July 1824, 200 Magnesians held the citadel for eight days against all assaults. At length food and water failed. The men determined to die, and they prepared for themselves a glorious funeral display. When the Turkish columns were pressing on the walls in a new assault, and were already placing scaling-ladders in position, the defenders hurled torches into the powder-magazines. Instantly the citadel blew up, and the gallant defenders were buried beneath its ruins, with more than a thousand of the enemy.

"After the siege of Missolonghi, so gloriously sustained by the Greeks in 1822, the fortifications of the little town were repaired and enlarged. Several bastions and a tenaille were constructed; the ditch was deepened and provided with a glacis and a covered way. Sixty pieces of artillery were provided, including both guns and mortars. Thanks to these means of defence, and, especially, thanks to the intrepidity of the defenders, a garrison of 3000 soldiers and 1000 townsmen was able to hold out against the army of Rechid Pacha for seven months, from April to October 1825. They offered so vigorous a resistance that the Turks, without precisely raising the siege, withdrew to the shelter of their entrenched camp, and there rested three months without making any attempt at attack.

"The following winter, Ibrahim Pacha, with the Egyptian army, joined his forces to those of Rechid, and at the same time the Ottoman fleet anchored in front of Missolonghi. This time the town was assailed both by land and by sea, and the defenders, now reduced to 2,500, find ten times that number opposed to them. Nevertheless they continued to offer a successful resistance, answering the fire of the enemy, beating off all attacks, and making daring sallies to destroy the approach works. But after February 15, the daily ration of bread had to be reduced to six ounces for each man, and on March 1, the supply of flour gave out. During six weeks the garrison maintained itself on some rice which still remained, eked out with the flesh of dogs and rats and with algæ and polyps from the sea. Cold was added to famine, and there was no wood for fires; finally a violent epidemic of dysentery broke out. Ibrahim offered to accept a capitulation on the terms:—'The inhabitants to remain in the town, their lives and property being guaranteed; the soldiers to march out and to be free to depart, after first laying down their arms.' Kitzo Tzavellas replied to this offer that 'the Greeks could not be expected to lay down their swords, covered with Turkish blood.'

"To escape death from hunger, the garrison determined to sally forth *en masse*, and to cut a way through the Turkish lines and make for the mountains. The sortie was made on the night of April 22, and the morning of April 23. The garrison was divided into three columns, commanded by Kitzo Tzavellas, Makris and the aged Notis Botzaris. In each column the soldiers marched first, then the women and children and the old men who were able to make the attempt, and in the rear a detachment of armed men. The sick, the wounded and the infirm took refuge in the old windmill which served as powder-magazine, where they blew themselves up three days later.

"The enemy's watch was vigilant. Hardly had the Greeks issued from the sally-ports before they were attacked. Nevertheless, they carved for themselves a bloody passage, but half their number were left dead on the field of battle. Some women, pursued by Albanian soldiers as far as the first escarpments of Mount Zygos, could only escape outrage by hurling themselves over a precipice, thus repeating the sublime heroism of the Suliot women in 1803. The story of these is well-known, but it will bear repetition. Sixty women of Suli were at the crest of a mountain-spur, with no means of escape other than a narrow path, along which they saw the soldiers of Ali-Pacha mounting to pursue them. Offering up a prayer, the unhappy women first hurled their children over the precipice. Then joining hands, they chanted a funeral hymn, and made a sort of funeral dance, every step of which brought them nearer the side of the peak. When the first woman reached the edge, she precipitated herself into the abyss, and, still holding hand-in-hand, each of the others followed her into the gulf.

"The war was ended by the armed intervention of Europe, the battle of Navarino, the landing in the Morea of the army under the French General Maison, and especially by the passage of the Balkans by the Russian troops under Diebitsch. But it would not be just to say that in 1827 the Greeks were crushed and unable to offer further resistance. The truth is that at that time the Turks and the Greeks were equally exhausted. We may believe that, with her greater wealth and resources, her better military organisation, her numbers of brave and redoubtable warriors, Turkey would ultimately have achieved the victory; but the victory must yet have cost her many years of painful effort.

"Despite the decisive action of Britain, France and Russia on behalf of Greece, the Greeks are still entitled to all honour for their conquered liberty. It was their daring feats of arms, their heroic deeds, their prolonged resistance, that gained them the admiration and the ardent sympathies of Europe, and that in the end brought about the intervention of Governments which had at first been frankly hostile to their cause. The power of the Greeks was that defeat and victory alike inspired them, that they fought without cease, that continued defeat and disaster could never make them despair. 'God has given his signature to Greek liberty,' said Kolokotronis; 'He will never withdraw it.' All the insurgent chiefs thought and acted like Kolokotronis. They were always eager to fire that last cannon-ball, 'which may kill the enemy,' as the Bailiff of Suffren has it.

"The last cannon shot from the crumbling ramparts of Missolonghi did not kill the enemy, but it made such a report, it had so prolonged and so resounding

an echo, that it called armies and fleets to the aid of Hellas.

"And thus the hazardous appeal to arms of the Greeks, their unshaken firmness and their heroic efforts during eight years of war, achieved the grand end of all their dreams—the independence of Greece.

"The glory and brilliance of nations is in their letters, their science and their arts: it is the military qualities that make nations. It may be that the power of arms is not the most praiseworthy, but there can be no doubt that it is the most efficacious. If so much blood had not been shed between Matapan and Olympus, we should still have read and admired Homer, Sophocles and Plato. But without the muskets borne by the rude mountaineers of Maina and Acharnania, of whom few could read or write, there would to-day have been no Greek nation."

M. Homolle, in thanking the lecturer for his brilliant oration, remarked that when one hears of the valour of the Greeks, one need not think only of past history. "We need only turn our eyes towards Macedonia," he added, "where the valiant Melas and other chiefs have given us recent evidence that the Greece of to-day has not lost the power to produce examples of courage and patriotism worthy to rank with the heroes of the Independence."

THE MACEDONIAN COMMITTEE OF ATHENS.

To the President of the
Balkan Committee of London.

SIR,—Having learned through the press the terms of the Appeal, recently addressed by the Balkan Committee of London to the Cabinets of Athens, Bucharest, Belgrade and Sofia, we feel bound to lay before you the views of the Macedonian Committee of Athens on this subject.

It is not necessary to remind you of the many occasions on which Greece has given evidence of her desire for an understanding among the Balkan States. Up to the present, however, all hopes of such an understanding have been destroyed by misrepresentations and acts of violence on the part of the enemies of Hellenism.

Nevertheless, despite the discouraging nature of past experience, we should be far from hostile to any understanding from which we might hope to see calm and tranquillity arise once more in the Macedonian Provinces. But if such an understanding is to bring about a durable peace, its basis must consist in a respect for the freely-expressed national conscience of the interested peoples, and for the ethnic rights of the different countries, manifested by the continuity of the historic action of homogeneous populations in the regions which they have never ceased to occupy.

The Macedonian Committee is grateful for the efforts of the Balkan Committee to ameliorate the lot of the Christian peoples of the Orient, and it will therefore be most happy to respond to the Appeal, as soon as ever the necessary guarantees for a general pacification, on the basis explained in the preceding paragraph, have been offered to the inhabitants of these countries, who have undergone such sufferings in consequence of their unshaken attachment to their national and religious faith.

We seize the present opportunity to protest against certain allegations concerning the task of defence, to which Macedonian Hellenism has been obliged to apply itself, for the safeguarding of its national existence. A series of crimes and atrocities, perpetrated during the last twelve years upon the Hellenes, has shown the existence of a premeditated and systematic scheme to weaken the cause of Hellenism by an armed Propaganda. A vain attempt has been made to establish a fiction, of which, it was hoped, advantage could easily be taken: those who made the attempt did not realise that the Macedonians, oppressed beyond endurance, would never cease to oppose a firm and resolute defence to all aggression, and would fight for their traditional faith, their households and their nationality.

The Macedonian Committee has the honour, Sir, to assure you of its distinguished consideration.

ATHENS, 1*st May* 1907.

FROM SOFIA.

BULGARIAN OPINION AND THE APPEAL OF THE BALKAN COMMITTEE.

SOFIA, 12*th April*, 1907.

THE Balkan Committee's recent Memorandum has produced here a sense of bitter disillusion and a very evident irritation. For some time past the Bulgarians have seen that European opinion was ceasing to look upon the Macedonian Question from the point of view of Sofia, but they never expected the Balkan Committee to go to the length of renouncing the principle of Macedonian autonomy, so eagerly defended by the Bulgarians. The Appeal of the Balkan Committee is very significant, for it indicates a great change in British public opinion as regards the true character of the Macedonian Question. This change of face ought not to come as a great surprise: many of us have never despaired of some day witnessing it; sooner or later truth must prevail.

But the Bulgarians have no thought of reciprocating the conciliatory proposals of their adversaries, though, as we now see, these same proposals are also put forth to-day by the Balkan Committee, and they must appear reasonable to anyone who approaches the question with an unbiassed mind and who obtains a clear view of the state of affairs in Macedonia. The following extracts from Bulgarian journals will show what impression has been produced in Sofia by the Appeal:—

The *Den*, of March 29, 1907, devotes a leading article to the Memorandum. The *Den* recognises that the appeal is inspired by "the sincere desire of the Balkan Committee to help the Macedonian population and the Balkan States."

But, on the other hand, it declares "categorically" "that *it is immoral and criminal to think of coming to any arrangement* which will involve the division of the regions in question between the different competitors."

The *Den* continues—"The interested parties have already made known their views on this subject. In Bulgaria there is only one opinion; the Bulgarian people desire to see an autonomous Macedonia, whose frontiers shall coincide with the limit of the movement of reform. The Greeks and Servians demand a partition. Can the Bulgarian nation accept a settlement which has for basis the division of its culture and nationality, a division which others have sought to enforce *by methods of murder and persecution?*" (*sic.*). Further on the *Den* declares that "not only will the Bulgarian people refuse ever to adopt a proposal which can only lead to a parcelling out of Bulgarians under different nations, but they will resist it with all their might."

The Bulgarian official organ, the *Courier of Sofia*, reproduces this article in its issue of March 31.

The *Mir* of April 2 also comments on the Memorandum, and states that the Bulgarians, "wishing to see the triumph of justice and a solution with no

ulterior partitions," have never desired to bring about any hasty settlement of the question. It adds that "every Bulgarian citizen or statesman, who consented to make concessions on the subject, would be acting as a traitor to his country," for the Balkan Committee's suggestions contain no hint of Macedonian autonomy. The *Mir* goes on to remark that "the Memorandum of the Balkan Committee comes to emphasise the declarations of Tittoni, the proposals of the *Temps*, and the personal assertions of some of the members of the Balkan Committee." It exclaims bitterly, "Is Europe again going to be generous at our expense, *as formerly in the Berlin Treaty?*"

The Liberal Party's organ, the *Narodin Prava*, says, in its issue of April 6, that "The Balkan Committee, in its Memorandum of March 18, implores the Balkan States to come to an arrangement as to their line of political action towards a satisfactory solution, but this idea will probably prove to be an unrealisable dream."

The *Drevnik*, for April 2, says that, immediately after its foundation in 1903, the Balkan Committee "developed a feverish activity on behalf of the Bulgarians." After citing several passages of the Memorandum, the *Drevnik* goes on to say that, "The Appeal of the Balkan Committee is as remarkable as it is unacceptable. It is not a momentary hatred which separates the populations of the Balkan States, but a racial hatred which has endured for ages. Between Greeks and Bulgarians, between Roumanians and Greeks, the hatred is so deep-rooted that no diplomatic agreement can bring about a fraternal accord." Further on, "the Macedonian movement (!) is not an attempt at Bulgarian expansion; it is a movement arising from the Macedonian populations themselves, who are in every way prepared for self-government." The hypocrisy, deceit and impudence of Sofia are truly unlimited.

The *Balkanska Tribuna* (April 1) writes: "This is a hard Memorandum to accept, especially for us Bulgarians, for the Balkan Committee is the only public society which has protected the interests of our cause, and which has hitherto defended before the world the legitimate claims of the Macedonians (for which read, the covetous desires of Bulgaria).

"Now the Balkan Committee is seeking a solution which will mean ruin to our ideal." The *Tribuna* goes on to give a warning which implies an unusually frank admission—"we shall know how to make menacing demonstrations with a view to preventing the partition of our country."

So that Macedonia is a portion of the patrimony of Bulgaria! But in that case, what becomes of the motto, "Macedonia for the Macedonians?" The Bulgarian organ attacks the comitadjis which, "far from serving great principles, have their origin in the middle of intrigues, conspiracies and personal ambitions," and which in consequence create a great prejudice against the national cause.

A previous account has been given of the campaign of the *Makedo-Odrinski Plegled*, the journal of the Interior Organisation, against any movement towards a solution which would not be exclusively in favour of Bulgarian claims. In its issue of March 31 this journal shows itself equally hostile to the present Memorandum, which it stigmatises as "monstrous," for this Memorandum, says the *Plegled*, "appears under a form which exposes most clearly the true character of the already too notorious Balkan Committee." What ingratitude! But all this is rendered clear by one phrase, "not a single word of autonomy!" And referring to the action of the Balkan Committee, the *Plegled* exclaims, "This advice, coming after so many declarations and promises, is even *insulting*. Insulting, because it recommends an agreement with States for which the idea of autonomy has no meaning; insulting, because it puts us in the same rank with States which have no rights which entitle them to a say in the solution of the Macedonian Question." This is an allusion to Servia, and especially to Roumania, towards which countries the *Plegled* is peculiarly hostile. And this journal, which announces the views of the comitadjis, concludes with the bitter reflection: "So the Balkan Committee has abandoned the idea of autonomy," and, "at present all illusions are vanishing." Let us hope so.

The *Changova Vetcherna Pochta* (March 30) says that "the Bulgarian people will not allow itself to be deceived by all the appeals of the Balkan Committee." If it is necessary, adds this journal, "Bulgaria will impose her will by force!" This braggadocio will frighten no one. The Bulgarians are past masters in the art of "bluff," but their game goes no further, and they must be very simple people who are deceived by such rhodomontades.

The official *Vetcherna Pochta* (April 4) advises the Bulgarian patriots not to be discouraged. Rather than trust to foreign aid, says this journal, the Bulgarians should rely on their own efforts—"no sooner do we cease to wage our journalistic campaign in the Western countries, than rumours, menacing the future of our race, begin to reach Sofia."

The preceding extracts suffice to show us to what lengths insolent and intransigent folly have gone among the Bulgarians. And we see how they reject the wise and moderate counsels of their best friends, the Balkan Committee, who stand before the British public as the accredited champions of the Bulgarian cause. The cause of their exasperation is that they are no longer recognised as the sole people which has rights in Macedonia. Hitherto, the very utmost they have been willing to allow was the existence of a Greek factor. Even this they regarded as feeble and insignificant to the vanishing point, and any other claim they have simply ignored. They, the Bulgarians, were the only people who counted in Macedonia; to them alone belonged the reversion of Turkish rule.

FIAT LUX

III

[Parts I and II of this paper on the Rumanist propaganda among the Koutzovlachs of Macedonia appeared in the *Hellenic Herald*, No. 5, March 1907, p. 71.]

BEFORE proceeding further from this point, let us recall the conclusions pointed out by the most convincing sources of evidence—the witness of the Koutzovlachs and the admissions of the Roumanians. These conclusions are:—

A. The aim of the Rumanist propaganda is to compel the Koutzovlachs to learn and make use of the Roumanian language.

B. Despite the utmost efforts, this propaganda has failed entirely, on account of the frankly hostile attitude of the Koutzovlachs, who see in the propaganda nothing but an attempt to sow dissension between the Greeks and the Koutzovlachs.

C. In order to defeat the Roumanian schemes, the vast majority of the Koutzovlachs denounce them to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, from which they claim assistance and support.

We may now examine a little more closely the bases on which the Roumanians found their pretensions.

Can they prove an incontestable identity of race, a common historical evolution, a similarity of manners, usages and traditions? Or in the absence of these considerations, can they point to any extraordinary circumstance, such as sometimes arises to bind together nations for ever by indissoluble bonds?

The Roumanians can point to nothing of this sort.

As for the rights which they pretend to possess over the Koutzovlachs, they try to establish them by the following claim:—

The Koutzovlachs are descended from Roman colonists, the Roumanians are descended from Roman colonists, *therefore* the Koutzovlachs are Roumanians.

For the sake of argument, let us admit the reality of this common Roman origin, though no historical evidence of it is forthcoming. Let us admit that after the final conquest of Macedonia by Metellus in B.C. 148, some veterans of the Fifth Legion, which occupied the country, remained there, and that some Roman colonies were formed in the country.

What does all that prove?

These rude and uncivilised Roman soldiers, lost in the mass of the Greek inhabitants—*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*—could not possibly escape the lot which awaited them from the first moment when they settled down in contact with a people of vastly superior civilisation and culture. The Greek atmosphere in which they found themselves exercised its inevitable action over them; they allowed themselves insensibly to be absorbed; and in the end they became completely Hellenised. That would clearly account for the sentiments which their descendants have preserved towards the Greeks.

This fusion of the Greek and Roman elements in Macedonia can be exactly paralleled elsewhere.

In Italy, the Greeks of Sicily and Magna Graecia, the Latins and Italiots of the centre, the Gauls, Ostrogoths and Lombards of the North, have blended together and have finished by giving rise to one race, the Italian race.

In France, the Celts, Gauls, Kymri, Romans, Normans and Franks have formed the French nation.

In England, the amalgamation of Britons, Romans, Anglo-Saxons and Normans has produced the English people.

In Spain, the Celts, Iberians, Romans, Vandals and Visigoths have united to form the Spanish nation.

And in America, in our own day, from the medley of the diverse peoples whom a century's emigration has sent into the United States, has sprung the young American nation.

And since for many centuries the Koutzovlachs have blended with the Greeks, can any serious person maintain that there is a community of race between them and the descendants of the other Roman colonists settled in Dacia? Can anyone pretend that these latter have any right to claim authority over the former? The Romans of those colonies which the Emperor Trajan was impelled to place for military reasons on the Dacian frontier began by mingling with the seventeen Scythian tribes which were permanently settled in that land. The region which they occupied was afterwards submerged by successive inundations of Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Alains, Slavs, Avars, Mongols, Hungarians, Poles. Each of these peoples has left its peculiar imprint on the original inhabitants, so that, after so many cataclysms, these have retained but the most superficial traces of their Roman origin.

Still, the Roumanians object, the relationship of the Roumanian and Koutzovlach languages ought to count for something, ought to give us certain privileges. Is it necessary to repeat that this relationship is of the slightest? The Latin element constitutes no more than twenty per cent. or twenty-five per cent. of the Koutzovlach dialect, which, as a whole, differs widely from the Roumanian. But let us grant that the presence of even this small proportion of Latin words suffices to mark Koutzovlach as a Romance language. Has it been considered what disastrous consequences would affect the Roumanians themselves, if any practical sanction is given to this idea of basing political claims on the affinities of languages? The number of Slavonic words in Roumanian is so large that for long this was regarded as a Slavonic language: it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that the Roumanians assumed an alphabet of their own in place of the Cyrilic alphabet, which they had always used until then. Will the Roumanians, therefore, allow the Slavonic peoples, who press upon them from all sides, to take advantage of these facts and to impose their language and their influence on Wallachia and Moldavia? It would be hoisting the engineer with his own petard.

The Roumanian tendency to base a claim upon these considerations is not new. It is said that at the Berlin Congress a memoir was read in which, among other things, was a reference to the Koutzovlachs and the pretended claims of Roumania. At this point Prince Bismarck with a movement of impatience exclaimed, "Pooh! this is going too far!" and with his pencil he struck out all that part of the memoir. The Chancellor was right: one trembles to think of the topsy-turveydom which might result from the application of these theories. The British might say that the Breton tongue had much in common with Gaelic and none with French: straightway they might call upon their neighbours to suppress the use of French in Brittany; and, ignoring the protests of the Bretons themselves, they might demand that these should no more be treated as French. They would have no difficulty in buying over some wretched pamphleteers, to put forth "patriotic" demands for the British to support. The French might reply by laying claim to the whole of England. Did not William the Conquerer come from Normandy? has not the English vocabulary been enriched by many French words? do not the Court and the Legislative Chambers make use of many formulas of French origin? Next would come the turn of Germany: what fine claims she could bring forward upon the Dutch, Flemish and Scandinavians! And on the same principle, the Americans, Belgians and Swiss, who have no language of their own, would be wiped out of the list of nations.

Such are the monstrous positions into which we are led by even a slight departure from logic and equity. Two nations may have a common origin and languages which do not sensibly differ, and yet they may have no sympathies towards one another, they may have totally different aspirations and national ideals. To say that two such peoples ought to form one common nation is to propound a thesis which simply supports the interests of the stronger of the two. It is merely a dissimulation of projects of conquest. Are there any greater racial affinities between Koutzovlachs and Roumanians than between Norwegians and Swedes? With these last-named two nations everything—race, language, legend, history, even the nature of their two countries—all seemed to make for an indefinite continuance of the union, which nevertheless we have just seen dissolved. On the other hand, no consideration of race and language can account for the alliance so close and so sincere which has ended by uniting the Flemings and the Walloons into one distinct nationality. All such

matters depend on the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned, and on nothing but that will. There can be no marriage, says the Code, without consent, and it has never been said that consanguinity can take the place of this consent to legitimatise an enforced union.

Nevertheless, let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that in this matter we are mistaken. Let us suppose that simply in virtue of the principle of common origin, a Latin people has the right to force the Koutzovlachs into a union which they detest. In that case, by what authority does the Roumanian nation arrogate to itself the position of sole heir of Roman greatness—the Roumanian nation, which was born but yesterday and in which the Roman characteristics are so slight? Has the Roman family no other more ancient and more powerful representatives? Are there no more direct and more legitimate descendants of the Quirites?

At the rate at which the Roumanians are advancing, if they never pause on the downward slope, along which their irresponsible Chauvinism is hurrying them, there is grave reason to fear lest, before long, they should be raising claims upon the inhabitants of the Southern Alps, upon the Provençals, and upon the Catalans, whose dialects are so closely related to their own. And, once they have entered upon this path, why not lay claim to the cradle of the Latin races, the Eternal City herself! At least, in so acting, they would as grateful colonists give evidence of their sentiments towards their mother city. However absurd such an attempt might seem, it would be at least as sensible as that by which they are seeking to attach to themselves this little Koutzovlach branch, which, grafted more than 2000 years ago on the robust tree of Hellenism, has never ceased to share in the life of Greece.

IV

WHAT does the Rumanist propaganda itself think of the legitimacy of its claims in Macedonia? Let us leave Mr Max Nordau to answer the question. "The mere question would move them to laughter. They know better than any foreigner what is the value of their Macedonian pretensions. No intelligent Roumanian dreams that they will ever succeed in converting the Koutzovlachs into a living, fruitful, useful member of the Roumanian family. Not even the most fanciful of Roumanian dreamers has ever imagined the possibility of a territorial union between the ethnic group of Pindus and the Romano-Dacian realm.

"No, the Roumanians are not serious when they talk in this lofty strain about the Koutzovlachs. They are far too cunning to entangle themselves in political absurdities or to indulge in a dangerous Quixotism. With a cynical frankness they admit that they are creating the Koutzovlach question by violent intervention on behalf of a people which ignores or repudiates them, and by raising claims which are monstrous from every point of view—historical, geographical, linguistic, ethnic, and diplomatic. They admit that their real object is vastly different from the pretence which they advance. They wish to create a claim in Macedonia and at a later period to bargain this claim against another thing which they really do want. One hardly knows whether to admire the more their lack of scruples or the *naïveté* which betrays an equal cynicism. How beautiful and touching is this love for the Koutzovlachs! To prevent the Koutzovlachs from being or becoming Hellenes, so that they may become Bulgarians—such is the plan of the Bucharest statesmen who speak so nobly of national rights, of persecuted brothers and of necessary emancipation. What inconceivable aberration has led the Latins of Bucharest to join themselves to the Slavs, who are no less hostile to them than to Hellenism? What has led them to make common cause with these Slavs against the Hellenes, who are brothers of the Latin races, if not by blood, at least by tradition and civilisation, who are their natural allies and on whom alone they may count for help in the supreme struggle against those exterminators who will sooner or later seize them by the throat? It is impossible that the Roumanians can persist for ever in their sinister mistake. Never has a conflict more frivolous or more artificial saddened the friends of peace and goodwill among nations, than has this strife between Roumania and the Greeks. May the appeal to the conscience of the Roumanians open their eyes! May it make them measure the depth of the abyss into which their insincere policy is plunging them headlong, to the ruin of their own interests and the disturbance of European peace."

An important Roumanian journal, the *Destœpterea* (the Awakening), admits that so far as the Roumanians are concerned, there are neither serious convictions nor plausible complaints to justify the Graeco-Roumanian conflict. This journal asserts that the attitude of a certain press has contributed not a little to envenom the quarrel. "The Roumanian Government itself, ill-informed as to what has taken place, has answered this factitious agitation and the demands of this press, behind which was and still is a committee of patriots denuded of all patriotic sentiment, by ordering the expulsion of the most honourable and wealthy of the Greeks."

Further on, in order to prove that no grave enmity ought to separate the Greeks and the Roumanians the *Destœpterea* adds:

"Roumania can only find brothers and friends in the ranks of that people which has given our nation such illustrious patriots and statesmen as the historian Dionysios Fotino, as Gregory Voda Ghica (who, when Prince of Moldavia, faced decapitation rather than consent to the seizure of Bucovina by the Austrians), as Costache Aristia (the friend and coadjutor of Heliad in the foundation of the national theatre), as Asaki, Iatropoulo, Barbu, Gatarzi, Lascar Gatarzi, Aristarchos, Polychroniad, Eugene Statesco, Alexander Lahovari, Michael Pascali, Constantine Dimitriad, Vangheli and Constantine Zappa, Take Anastasiu, Kyriazi and Serfioti."

Here the *Destœpterea* gives a long list of distinguished Roumanians of Greek origin, for which the reader is referred to the *Hellenic Herald's* quotation from that journal in our issue, No. 3, January 1907, pp. 47 and 48. The Roumanian journal continues:

"To deny the patriotism of the Greeks in this country would be to deny the obvious truth. They are men devoid of all political wisdom and of all national sentiment, who, with no tittle of cause, have driven from our country the wealthiest of the Greeks, who have expelled Greeks united by the closest bonds of family to many Roumanians, Christians like ourselves, and, moreover, members of the same Pelasgic race as ourselves, so that after two generations passed among us, the Greek mingles *in toto* with our great and respected Roumanian family."

The late Roumanian diplomat Obedenare is entirely at one with these opinions. In his work, *The Economics of Roumania*, he states that, in this country, nearly all the aristocracy and statesmen are sons or grandsons of Greeks.

We have no reproaches to utter against these Rumanised Greeks. We leave them to Roumania, though the Roumanian theories would give us far stronger claims over them than the Roumanians can ever have over the Koutzovlachs. We do not demand the return to Hellenism of all those who have been transformed into Roumanians (beginning with Cantacuzene, Lahovari, and Dissesco). But we are bound to observe that Roumanian sentiments cannot in so short a time have taken so firm a hold upon the hearts of these men whose fathers (or, at the very least, whose grandfathers) were Greeks. The few drops of Roumanian blood recently infused into their veins cannot be the cause of the ardour with which these men are driven to so violent methods in Macedonia. The true motives of this aggressive policy have been revealed to us by Mr. Panon. This publicist, though himself a declared partisan of the propaganda, has no hesitation in recognising that the causes of the conflict are to be sought in "the entanglement of the Government which, while it was in Opposition, had exploited all national questions, and on its coming to power, found all its plans crumbling to ruin. In consequence, the Cabinet looked out for some question of international import and tries to hide its domestic policy behind the Macedonian Question."

In a more recent article Mr. Panon criticises a speech of Professor Dissesco:

"This wonderful(!) lecture was announced as an expression of the ideas of the Government. Read it calmly, and you will be astounded at its barefaced demagogy and its empty violence. . . .

"Our national question has been a speculation, a means of livelihood from its initiation down to the present," says Mr Lecanta. "The work of a patriotic committee devoid of all patriotism, and of men denuded of all political wisdom and national feeling," according to the Roumanian journal *Destœpterea*. "The brazen demagogy of a Cabinet, obscuring its domestic policy, behind the Macedonian question," according to the ex-Minister, Mr Haret.

These declarations tell us dearly enough what the Roumanians themselves think of the Koutzovlach business.

It is with a feeling of profound sadness that we have insisted upon these truths. They sound hard indeed, but for this who is to blame? We may recall to the Roumanians Schiller's saying: "If you had always loved truth and justice we should not have come to this pass; events would have turned out otherwise." And if we have thought it needful to expose in some detail the real nature of this problem, it is because we count on the diffusion of sounder opinions to take away some of the bitterness of the strife which has been forced upon us.

It was the Church of Constantinople which announced to the Roumanians, and to all the Orthodox peoples of the North, the message of truth and grace. It is this Church which has nourished them on the vivifying Heavenly bread, which has instructed them in a doctrine, subject to no alteration, which has made of them "perfected men," able to fight the good fight in the path of civilisation and progress. And the Church of Constantinople will never cease to pray for all her sons without distinction, and she is expectant for the day when mutual confidence and respect for the rights of one another will rekindle in the hearts of the Greeks and Roumanians the surpassing light of brotherhood.

Then "may the peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in Jesus Christ."

The words are Saint Paul's.

THE HELLENIC FINANCES.

THE International Commission of Finance has just published its ninth annual report, for the year 1906. We extract the following particulars:—

"The receipts from the revenues destined for the Public Debt, after the conversion into paper drachmæ of the £95,640 taken in gold at the Piræus Custom House, and the £32,334 resulting from the sale of the emery of Naxos, amounts to the total of Dr.59,861,917, made up as follows:—

Revenues subjected to the surcharge .	. Dr.33,429,150
Revenues of the Piræus Custom House	. Dr.26,432,767

Comparing these figures with those for 1905, we note an increase in both totals:—

	1905 totals.	Increase in 1906.
Revenues subjected to the surcharge .	Dr.33,248,298	Dr.180,852
Revenues of the Piræus Custom House . .	Dr.21,892,607	Dr.4,540,160

The profit on exchange reaches in 1906 the sum of Dr.4,967,910. This is distributed as follows, in according with Article 5 of the Instrument:—

	Dr.
To the State, 40 per cent. . .	1,987,164
To paying off Interest, 30 per cent.	1,490,373
To Sinking Fund, 30 per cent. .	1,490,373
Total .	4,967,910

The amount devoted from this source to the service of the Public Debt shows an increase upon the 1905 total:—

	1905.	1906.	Increase.
Portion of Profit on exchange devoted to Public Debt	Dr.2,238,300	2,980,746	742,446

The following Table gives the amounts (expressed in English gold) devoted to the paying off of interest and to the sinking fund, for each year since the establishment of the International Commission of Finance:

Year	Sources of Amounts devoted to payment of Interest and increase of Sinking Fund			Destination of these Amounts	
	Portion of Surcharge devoted to Service of Debt	Profit of Exchange and Portion devoted to Service of Debt	Interest on Redeemed Stock	Payment of Interest	Sinking Fund
	£	£	£	£	£
1898	41,855	20,933	211	24,397	24,412
1899	41,442	11,323	1,398	34,740	29,921
1900	40,019	2,926	2,946	24,196	24,724
1901	55,333	—	4,331	29,509	24,411
1902	43,436	2,235	5,705	28,864	19,764
1903	77,402	10,434	7,225	53,419	49,686
1904	80,405	38,383	9,705	62,074	59,293
1905	73,371	74,678	12,201	90,659	79,057
1906	81,738	106,570	15,231	108,400	88,664
Total	535,001	267,482	58,953	456,258	399,932
	Grand total, £861,436			Grand Total, £856,190	
				Balance still in hand	£5,246
					£861,436

From the chapter devoted to the exchange we extract the following particulars:—

The improvement of the exchange, indicated in our report for the year 1905, has continued progressively

during the 1906 period. The subjoined gives the value of the exchange [number of Greek drachmæ which will fetch 1 franc; to which the drachma is nominally equivalent], for each year since the inauguration of the Financial control in Greece:—

Year	Highest Value	Lowest Value	Difference	Average of the Year
1898	1·565	1·40	·01650	1·47410
1899	1·6825	1·49	·01925	1·56057
1900	1·730	1·495	·23500	1·64302
1901	1·720	1·570	·15000	1·65770
1902	1·675	1·575	·10000	1·62560
1903	1·6325	1·405	·22750	1·56450
1904	1·490	1·295	·19500	1·37930
1905	1·3275	1·1475	·18000	1·23100
1906	1·1675	1·0675	·10000	1·10030

We are pleased to observe the constant lowering of the exchange, which is one of the most certain indications of the economic improvement of a country. Even more pleasing is the fact that this lowering has been brought about without any violent fluctuations, which are perhaps even more prejudicial to commerce and industry than is an inflated rate of exchange.

We have already seen that this improvement in the exchange has produced a greater sum for the service of the Public Debt in 1906 than in 1905, to the extent of Dr.742,446.

In accordance with Act 30 of the Law of Control, a sum of Dr.2,000,000 in bank-notes was withdrawn from circulation in 1906, for the liquidation of the Currency Debt. This is thus reduced to Dr.79,775,975, of which sum Dr.14,000,000 is in bonds of 1 and 2 Dr.

The particulars of bank-notes in circulation are as follows:—

	Maximum permitted	Value actually in circulation on Dec. 31, 1906
	Dr.	Dr.
Notes of the National Bank of Greece . . .	65,000,000	54,457,866
Notes of the Ionian Bank .	7,000,000	6,518,727

It will be observed that both the National banks are restraining the issue of paper money below that to which the control of the Public Debt would give sanction. The total value of bank-notes, notes of the Ionian Bank, and 1 and 2 Dr. bonds on the Currency Debt, is thus reduced from the permitted maximum of Dr.165,775,975 to the amount of Dr.137,640,239, actually in circulation at the end of 1906.

Progress of the Town and Port of Piræus.

Our Piræus contemporary the *Sphaira* publishes two articles with full details as to the progress made by the town and port of Piræus. We summarise the statistics:—

Year	Number of Ships Entering the Port	Tonnage
1902	1,597	1,968,000
1903	1,770	2,197,000
1905	2,348	2,950,000
1906	2,898	3,116,378

The statistics of last year, classified according to nationality, are:—

Flag	Number of Ships	Tonnage
Greek	1,194	983,000
Austrian	339	487,000
Italian	239	403,000
British	234	361,000
French	148	287,000
German	163	252,000
Russian	132	231,000
Ottoman	11	4,000

Side by side with the daily increasing commerce of the port of Piræus must be noted the continuous growth of the population. This is due to the excess of births over deaths as much as to the immigration of new inhabitants into the Piræus. We give particulars of the population returns:—

Census	Number of Houses		Population
1896	4,000		48,000
1896-97	new-built, 976 repaired, 755	no official figures	
1907	taxed, 7270 free from tax, 800	=8000	80,000

In the eleven years the population has increased by over 32,000. This gives an annual increase of over 2500 inhabitants (5 per cent).

PRESS REVIEWS

(*Written from Constantinople to the* Bulletin d'Orient *of April* 6.)

GREEK AND BULGARIAN BANDS

The Bulgarians never cease to maintain that the Bulgarian bands have suspended all action in Macedonia, and that order is no longer troubled in that province except by the Greco-Macedonian bands. I have already sent you official figures (cf. *Bulletin d'Orient*, No. 154), according to which there were:

	Bulgarian Bands	Greco-Macedonian Bands
In the Vilayet of Monastir .	23	10
In the Vilayet of Salonica .	38	12

More recent official figures are as foliows:—

	Bulgarian Bands		*Greco-Macedonian Bands*	
	Number of Encounters	Number of Killed and Losses	Number of Encounters	Number of Killed and Losses
March . . .	7	57	4	28
April . . .	8	73	5	34
May . . .	3	29	2	52
June . . .	5	17	6	13
July . . .	4	5	4	27
August . .	2	3	2	8
September . .	4	8	3	2
October . .	3	8	1	11
November . .	3	6	4	2
December . .	7	13	1	0
January . .	6	17	1	0
February . .	4	6	1	4
Total	56	242	34	181

The above Table shows that not only are the Bulgarian bands the more numerous, but also the more active; and that the Greco-Macedonian bands have during recent months preserved a purely passive attitude—otherwise the Turks would not have failed to pursue them with the same activity as in the first half-year.

BULGARIAN OFFICERS IN THE REVOLUTIONARY BANDS.

Our distinguished contemporary, *The Patris* of Athens, publishes a detailed list of twenty-seven Bulgarian army officers (whose ranks are specified) who have served in the revolutionary bands from the beginning of the Macedonian agitation; they are:

Eight Captains of Infantry: Alex. N. Protogerof, Jean K. Taroufalof, Nic. Tsoutsef, Dim. Yankof Bergof, Jean P. Pozarletef, Basile Spasof, Dim. Belikof Stoikof, Lisumpomer Stoensef.

Three Captains of Cavalry: Giordan Timotief Venedikof, Dim. Athanasof, Pierre Georgief Darvinkof.

Three Captains of Artillery: George Grenof, Dim. Tsokof Jordanof, Nic. Georieo Vinarof.

Captain Dim. Antonof Ziostof, reporter to the Military Tribunal of Roustchouk, and the military doctor, Vladimir Ivanof Roumenof. Further:

Six Lieutenants of Infantry: Stephan Giorghief, Dim. Andreef Zografof, Boris Strezof, Vladimir N. Kanaziref, Elie Boltof, Antoine Zienef.

One Sub-lieutenant of Infantry: Const. Natsef.

Two Lieutenants of Artillery: Stoyan Jordanof Naoumof and Sotir Voulkof Atanasof.

Two Lieutenants of Engineers: Christo P. Sarakinof and Chr. Tanousef.

To this list *The Patris*, in a leading article, adds the names of Theodore Markof, Commandant of the General Staff, who was in Macedonia in 1905 and 1906, and of Captain George Koutzmanoff, both of whom acted as secretaries to the Bulgarian Agencies; of Captain Lefterof, of the Staff, and Captain Piteff, of the Third Cavalry regiment, who are still in these Agencies as secretaries.

(*From an article by M. Adossides in the* Journal de Genève, *April* 23.)

GREECE AND ITALY.

HAPPILY, these recriminations will not interfere with the conciliatory attitude which will in the end prevail, both in Rome and in Athens. On both sides an understanding is desired. From the Greek point of view, this desire is especially natural at a moment when Greece has need of all the friendly sympathy she can obtain from the great Liberal Powers. Italy also has everything to gain by cultivating the friendship of her smaller neighbour. The Greek kingdom may have little material power, but the Hellenic ideal plays a large and active part in the Orient. And it is not surprising that Italy, seeking to rival Germany and to extend her influence in the Levant, should have sought, if not an ally, at least a friend in Greece. The moment was favourable. Greece having for the last eight years been feeling herself in too isolated a position, had allowed herself to be attracted for a time to Austria. But in the end she had gradually moved away from Austria, after that country's intrigues in Macedonia began to assume disquieting proportions. This detachment of Greece from Austria has been completed by the Greco-Italian understanding. It is easy to understand why the Vienna press, in its account of the visit of the King of Italy to Athens, gave evidence of the keen dissatisfaction produced in the Ballplatz by that event.

Such seems to have been the significance of the meeting at Athens, in which, as the official *Tribuna* said the other day, "The most *blasé* international scepticism cannot fail to recognise some political importance." And though the comments of the Greek press on the visit of Victor Emmanuel are in the spirit of the royal toasts from which were banished all political allusions, the Athenian journals lay great emphasis on the interviews of Signor Tittoni with Messrs Theotokis and Skouzes. They insist also on the fact that in the great discussion which has been opened on the subject of the Balkans, Greece makes no claim to specially favourable treatment. What the Hellenes demand from the Great Powers is simply that in their Oriental policy the Powers may not sacrifice the interests of one people to those of others. For ourselves, as for our opponents, we ask simply that the settlement shall be just, and shall in consequence lead to peace. And it was therefore with a lively satisfaction that we heard Signor Tittoni's recent declaration in the Italian Chamber, that the basis of settlement in the Macedonian problem ought to be the *principle of nationalities*.

(*From* The Temps *of April* 11.)

THE KING OF ITALY IN ATHENS.

THE Italian king's visit to Athens has proved in every way most happy, and the meeting of the kings of the two re-born nations of antiquity has been followed by the friendly interest of Europe. But this interest has another motive besides the sentimental one. The question propounds itself: to what extent does any political signification attach to the voyage of King Victor Emmanuel III., and what is that political significance?

When the high officials of the two countries have been questioned on this point by the Greek and Italian press, they have replied that the visit was of entirely private character. King George went to Rome last year; it was natural that King Victor Emmanuel III. should wish to return his visit. We have made recent allusion to the ties which unite Greece to Italy—ancient ties which date back to that remarkable union which produced the Greco-Latin culture, ties made yet closer in 1821 during the War of Greek Independence, and in 1897 during the Greco-Turkish war. In all this is more than sufficient to justify the recent movements of the two kings. Nevertheless, it is impossible not to observe that the present visit has been invested with a character of special solemnity. Last year the King of Greece visited Rome without a single Minister of State. At Athens, the King of Italy is accompanied by Signor Tittoni and Admiral Mirabello. It is true that, by the Italian Constitution, the king must not leave the kingdom without the attendance of either the President of the Chamber or the Minister of Foreign Affairs. But Signor Tittoni is not alone. The Minister of the Marine, with a powerful squadron, is escorting the royal yacht. We may be permitted to believe that all this does not happen by chance.

It is necessary to observe, at the same time, that this exchange of cordialities is in contrast to the mutual relations of the two countries during the last few years. The King of Greece has many times passed through Italy without making an official pause in Rome to salute King Victor Emmanuel. Last autumn was the first occasion on which the two sovereigns met officially. A consideration of the political situation of Greece and Italy will easily account for this reserve. The King of Italy is son-in-law to the Prince of Montenegro; he is united by family to the Servian Royal House; he is on cordial terms with the Prince of Bulgaria. In the present troubled state of the Balkans he frequently appears, therefore, as a denizen of the Slavonic camp. It follows that Greece has not generally been able to regard the Italian Government as sympathetic towards her aspirations. On the other hand, she has looked for support in Vienna. Now, there have been times when, for a Balkan State, too great intimacy with the court of Vienna was far from implying cordial relations with Rome. Many Athenian publicists, in agreement with an important section of Austrian opinion, have feared an Italian intervention in Albania. Finally, the presence of Italian carabineers in Crete has given rise to continual tension which has at times led to active irritation on both sides, and to a dangerous strain in the mutual relations. Without entering into details, we may certainly consider that there was room for an improvement in the relations between Greece and Italy.

Both in Athens and in Rome there has been an evident desire for such an improvement. Athenian

public opinion, if not the Greek Government, has begun to regard Austria much more coldly since the directions of Vienna have led to the tardiness in carrying out the Muersteg programme. Italy, faithful to that policy in the Mediterranean which has led to the two "*ententes cordiales*"—first with France and afterwards with Britain—has sought the friendship of Greece also. Her withdrawal of the Italian carabineers from Crete was a proof of confidence in Hellenic policy, and as such it has been warmly appreciated in Greece. On the other hand, the Italian Chamber has taken pains to assure the Balkan States that the Eastern policy of Italy is a policy of *statu quo*, and that the Government does not approve of the popular aspirations towards a "Greater Italy" on the other side of the Adriatic. It did not of course escape notice that by making this *status quo* the basis of its agreement with Austria, the Italian Government has bound down its partner as well as itself. All this has been a matter of interest to Greece—the more so, as her relations with Roumania had been broken off, and she was on stormy terms with Bulgaria. Greece felt very decidedly that the friendship of another nation would be very precious to herself. This friendship was offered by Italy, and Greece has accepted the offer with fervour.

That there is more than this in the matter—that, for example, there is the formal treaty which some have suggested—we do not believe, for the present, at all events. It does not follow that, sooner or later, Italy will not judge it expedient to assure herself in the Mediterranean by the support of the Greek navy, the only one which counts in the Levant, for the Turkish navy is a myth. But up to the present we have no grounds for supposing that anything has taken place more than a simple development of friendship. That will be sufficient to enable Italy to consolidate the position of friendly arbiter, which she seems to be aiming at in the Balkan Peninsula, and to which we at least raise no objections. As resolute supporters of the scheme of a reconciliation among the Balkan States, we welcome anything which may some day render this hope more easy of attainment. The friendly relations between Italy and the various Balkan States are such as to favour this desirable consummation.

From The Tribune *Correspondent.*

ATHENS, *May 10th.*

GREEK GRIEVANCES.

THE anti-Greek campaign in Bulgaria continues unabated, though no longer conducted so openly as formerly; the Bulgarian Press is almost entirely controlled by the patriotic committees, and continues to feed the popular racial hatred against the Greek inhabitants. It is, therefore, not surprising that, in spite of the stringent measures adopted by the Bulgarian Government to prevent the Greeks from emigrating, the stream of refugees from Eastern Roumelia to Greece shows no signs of abating. During February, March, and April 5,374 such refugees landed at Piraeus, and 1,520 more since May 1st, thus bringing up the total already in Greece to 18,000. These thousands are, of course, almost entirely destitute, having either lost their worldly belongings by fire or pillage, or been forced to sell out at nominal prices, in order to get away from their persecutors.

It can readily be imagined that this mass of refugees, thrown entirely upon public support, constitutes a heavy burden upon the Greek public treasury, although Athenian society has responded generously to the appeals for relief ever since the first victims of Anchialos and Stenimachos arrived here last summer. The Greek Chamber has just voted a grant of £400,000 for the settlement of these Greek exiles, authorising the Government to settle them in Thessaly upon public lands or private estates, purchased *ad hoc* by the State. A new Anchialos is to be founded near Almyros, in the Gulf of Volo, comprising the sea-faring refugees from Anchialos, Sozopolis, Mesembria, Pyrgos, and Varna, while the agriculturist refugees are to be settled in the interior of Thessaly. Each family is to receive eight hectares of land in the province of Trikkala (or fifteen in the less fertile province of Larissa), and 3000 drachmae (£120) in cash for housebuilding, live stock, seed, tools, and immediate living expenses.

If Governments are more intent upon the success of their political schemes than upon justice and fair play, it is for the public conscience in England to demand that justice should be done—even to the Greeks; that the Greek schools and churches in Bulgaria be restored to their rightful owners, that the losses of individuals at the hands of Bulgarian mobs be made good by the responsible government of the country, and that the rights, solemnly assured to the Greeks of Bulgaria by Great Britain conjointly with the other Powers, be respected in future—even by the Bulgarians.

It is quite irrelevant to drag the Macedonian imbroglio into this question—the Greeks of Bulgaria are entirely innocent of the slightest participation in Macedonian affairs, whereas their persecutors are the very conspirators who have terrorised Macedonia for the past decade or more. Nor can these Greek communities be held in any way responsible for what the Greek bands may do or have done in Macedonia, nor for the existence of those bands. The responsibility for all this rests entirely with the Sofia patriotic committees, who first organised and have since perfected by ten years' practice in Macedonia a system of racial propaganda by means of fire, rope, and dagger, of which the Greek bands are at best a more or less faithful imitation.

From the Bulletin d'Orient.

THE BULGARIANS AND EUROPEAN OPINION.

A CORRESPONDENT WRITES FROM ROME.

THE *Italia all'Estero*, the organ of the Bulgarian propaganda in Italy, displays some uneasiness on the subject of King Victor Emmanuel's visit to Athens. Contrary to the opinion of the Italian journalists who were present at the fêtes, Mr. Radolphe Foa considers that the Greek people have distorted the meaning of this visit, and have thus raised up dangerous illusions in their country. He makes a further attempt to discredit the Greeks in the eyes of the Italian public by offering a re-taste of the "Greco-Turkish co-operation" myth. This accusation, first made four years ago by Berard, was based upon certain Turkish newspaper reports, fabricated in Constantinople with a purpose which can easily be understood. The statements were refuted in the first number of the *Bulletin d'Orient*, and since then, recent events have completely proved the falsity of the charges. Mr. Foa, though he has lived in Macedonia, seems to be ignorant of all this, and contents himself with reproducing the extracts from the *Stamboul* and the *Iskdam* of the spring of 1903.

Now, without speaking of the long list of

encounters between the troops and the Greco-Macedonian bands, we give some figures which show clearly enough the attitude of the Turks towards the Greeks.

The extraordinary tribunal of Salonica has tried, up to the present, 557 Greeks, of whom 312 were acquitted and 245 condemned. Dividing its activity into two parts we have—

	Greeks acquitted.	Greeks condemned.
Before January 1907 .	174	211
Since	138	34
	312	245

Grand total, 557.

Until February 1906 this court only tried those Greeks who were taken armed; since that date, its jurisdiction has been extended to cover all Greeks accused of political crime. These words have been interpreted in their widest sense; many arrests have been made on charges of contraband of arms, correspondence or understanding with the bands, etc.

The above figures give only a partial idea of the facility with which the authorities undertake arrests of this nature, for they refer not to the whole of Macedonia, but only to the single court of Salonica. They suffice, however, to do justice to the accusation of a pretended Greco-Turkish *entente*.

FROM A SOFIA CORRESPONDENT.

Mr. Gennadief, Director of the Publication Department to the Bulgarian Foreign Office, has prepared a scheme for the reorganisation of the Department, calculated to bring the European public into closer touch with interesting Bulgarian news.

The journals are advising the Government to distribute in Britain and America several thousand copies of the book published by the correspondent Moch on *The Bulgarian Exarchate—its extent and jurisdiction in Turkey*. It will be remembered that the Sobranië recently voted a pension for this ex-German officer, whose statistics have been singularly influenced by the generosity displayed towards him by the Bulgarian deputies. He computes 1,458,902 Bulgarians in Macedonia against 265,304 Greeks.

BULGARIAN ADMISSIONS.

THE *Balkanska Tribuna* (April 30), devotes a leading article to the emigration of Greeks. It lays the blame on the Bulgarian Government, which has tolerated the anti-Hellenic movement, and which still deals so kindly with the agitators who blackmail Greeks in the Principality. In support of its statements, the *Balkanska Tribuna* cites the recent cases of Apostolos Arghyriou of Daoutli, from whom the committees extorted £200, and of twenty Greek merchants of the Pyrgos district, from whom they extorted £1000 to £1500. The Bulgarian journal argues that this justifies the Greeks in saying that they are insufficiently protected. In connection with this article we may quote the following letter, recently sent to the Bulgarophil *Independence Roumaine* by its Sofia correspondent:—

Since the anti-Hellenic movement of the spring of 1906, the Greeks living in Bulgaria have been deprived of all their churches, so that they cannot perform their Easter devotions. The Bulgarian Government has therefore decided to restore to the Greek community of Philippopoli two of the churches which were seized and have been retained by the Bulgarians since the said movement. The other Greek communities in the province will, however, continue to have no churches. Moreover, the new Public Instruction Law renders impossible the continuance of the Greek schools in the Principality.

These two circumstances are the main causes of the continued exodus of Greeks from Bulgaria. Almost every week, hundreds of families embark at the ports of Bourgas and Varna for Greece or Turkey: it would appear that after a few more months the number of Greeks throughout the entire Principality will have dwindled down to ten or twelve thousand. The fact that the greater number of the Greek emigrants are selling their goods and properties to Jews begins to disquiet those who are able to read the signs of the times. They foresee that, far from the aim of the anti-Hellenic movement being attained, a national danger is being created. Instead of Bulgarising the Greek towns and villages, the agitators are simply creating colonies of Jews.

(*From the* Ecclissiastiki Alithia.)

THE PERSECUTION OF GREEKS IN BULGARIA.

WHEN Mr. Natchevitch, ex-diplomatic-agent representing Bulgaria in Constantinople, resigned his post and returned to Bulgaria shortly after the first crimes committed against the Greeks in that county and in Eastern Roumelia, he denounced the criminal conduct of the Government in the following words which we take from his interview with the Editor of a Bulgarian journal:—

"It was impossible for me to meet my colleagues of the diplomatic body without blushing at the thought of the opprobrium with which the present Government has covered our country."

At the same time the Bulgarian journal, *The Mir*, published an equally bitter denunciation of the Bulgarian Government's conduct. *The Mir* made no secret of the Bulgarian Government's complicity, and stated that its action, unparalleled in the history of civilised peoples, had alienated from the Government (and at the same time from the people) of Bulgaria the entire favour and sympathies of Europe. A former number of *The Mir* had informed us of the unjustifiable methods whereby the governing circles of Sofia had hoped to deceive European public opinion. They fabricated at Sofia, as we were informed, pretended telegrams from Constantinople to the journals of Europe, and, above all, to those of Vienna, concerning the situation in Macedonia: then a Bulgarian agent residing in Vienna would collect these same telegrams and send them to the Bulgarian journal through the medium of the "Bulgarian Telegraphic Agency." This "Agency," which has no connection with any foreign agency, is under the direct control of the Bulgarian Minister for Foreign Affairs. By this double game (our authority is still *The Mir*) the Bulgarian Government makes a direct effort to deceive public opinion, both in Europe and in Bulgaria.

Despite these denunciations and exposures, the authorities of Sofia continue, without ceasing to pursue the diabolical plan which the official *Vetcherna Pochta* suggested, with cynical effrontery, in December 1905:—

"There is one race which alone ought to be dominant over the Balkan Peninsula; and that race is the Bulgarian. Consequently, an end must be put to all Hellenism in Eastern Roumelia and in Macedonia. . . . The destruction of Hellenism ought to be regarded as an article of faith for the Bulgarians. The fight against Hellenism ought to be commenced in the very cradle. . . . Bulgarians! Be mindful of your duty!"

Such is the appeal which was made to the Bulgarian people, and the authentic letters from different parts of Eastern Roumelia, which were published in the last number of the *Ecclissiastiki Alithia*, are of such a character as to convince all readers that the Bulgarians are mindful of their "duty," and that they continue the work of the destruction of Hellenism, not without the open co-operation of the Bulgarian Government.

To the information contained in these letters we might easily add more of the same nature. We might, for example, point out that at Anchialos, where the worst elements of the comitadjis have established their headquarters. These last tried on January 6 to prevent those Greeks who still remained in the city from the customary ceremony of the blessing of the waters. It is only owing to the strong representations of the Orthodox Greeks that the local authorities prevented further conflicts by interfering and putting a bridle on the Bulgarians. At Philippopoli, to name this city only, the police have forbidden the Greeks to celebrate any marriages without the authorisation of the Bulgarian Exarchate authorities, on the pretext that, as the Greeks have no longer a church of their own, they have no right to celebrate any marriages unless the Exarchate authorises them to do so!!! And when a Greek merchant of Philippopoli celebrated his marriage to a Greek girl in the village of Vodena, he was subjected on his return to a police examination, and since then, a systematic persecution has been organised of which he is the victim; every day vexations are put upon him with pressure to leave Bulgaria.

But the prolonged impunity enjoyed by these descendants of Krum and Skyloyan that, posing as Bulgarian refugees from Macedonia, they have recently dared to address a memoir to the Prime Minister of Britain and to the Russian Duma, in which, after lamenting the non-success of the reforms inaugurated in the vilayets of Roumelia and deploring the sufferings of their compatriots, they demand that these vilayets shall be constituted into an autonomous province on the model of Eastern Roumelia.

Why not? The more one has, the more one wants. The Bulgarians have found Eastern Roumelia a pleasant morsel, much to their liking. And now that since last July, their "civilising mission" is completed in that province, they are eager with desire to repeat their exploits in a second Eastern Roumelia.

What is astonishing in the matter, and what calls forth our bitter complaints is not the conduct of the Bulgarian people—we know this people from long experience, and we have never expected anything better of them—it is the passive attitude of civilised Europe.

Europe seems to have forgotten that the domination of the Bulgarians over the Greeks is due neither to right of conquest nor to the consent of the Greeks themselves. Europe seems to have forgotten that shortly after the conclusion of the treaty of San Stefano, the British Foreign Secretary, in his Circular Note of April 1, 1878, attacked the treaty, on the grounds that "the new Principality (of Bulgaria) has been created in such a manner as to include, within a dominant Slavonic majority, a considerable population of Greek origin and tendencies, which Greek population foresees with horror its absorption by a society which is foreign to it, in respect not only of nationality but also of political tendencies and religious convictions."

Europe seems to forget that it was precisely in order to safeguard the rights of this minority that the Berlin Congress was called. In this congress the Marquess of Salisbury, doubtless foreseeing what the treaty would lead to, brought forward [in the session of June 17, Protocol 2] a motion, in which it was said:

"*The Christians of these regions are divided into two parties, whose interests are not identical and whose sympathies are not in harmony. The congress is well aware that, during recent years, those bonds of friendship have been broken which formerly linked together the Greek and Slavonic subjects of the Porte. . . . The Greeks fear (and with reason) the subjugation of their church, the suppression of their language, and the absorption and the progressive disappearance of their race. . . . Her Britannic Majesty's Government is of opinion that the proposed decisions would not be acceptable to the Greek people, and would, in consequence, be favourable neither to the tranquillity of the Ottoman Empire nor to the peace of Europe. It is to be feared that new agitations would arise among this people, which is so deeply attached to its faith and its nationality, and which will have the conviction that Europe has abandoned it to the domination of a race from which its sympathies are far removed.*"

Prince Bismarck immediately expressed himself in the same sense on behalf of the German Government. These declarations led to two consequences. One was the reduction of the boundaries of the Bulgarian Principality; the other was the introduction, in the Berlin Treaty, of the well-known clauses which safeguard the rights of the Greek and Turkish populations.

And to-day? To-day these clauses of the Berlin Treaty which safeguard the rights of the Greeks have been trodden underfoot by the Bulgarians, and Europe stands by, a passive witness of all that has taken place, of events which inflict an indelible stain on modern civilisation. And the Bulgarians are encouraged and fortified in their acts and intentions by the benevolent tolerance of those very people who ought to be the champions of Lord Salisbury's declarations in the Berlin Congress, and of the consequences of these declarations, the clauses in the Berlin Treaty which are to safeguard the rights of the Greeks.

Doubtless these friends of the Bulgarians do not know the extent of cunning, dissimulation and ingratitude which is concealed in the depths of the Bulgarian spirit. They do not realise or suspect that the Bulgarians, once their projects are realised, will, without a moment's hesitation, turn the back on their protectors of to-day, to throw themselves once more into the arms of those towards whom they are impelled by natural tendencies. These present protectors ought not to forget that "blood is thicker than water."

Are we then to abandon all hope? Are we to witness the realisation of Lord Salisbury's apprehensions? Is the Greek population to continue to believe that Europe has abandoned and delivered it to the domination of an abhorred race? Despite the at present discouraging attitude of official Europe, we cannot believe that a people, whose first appearance on the political horizon is a matter of yesterday, a people which owes its separate existence entirely to the action of other races, will ever be permitted to re-establish in Europe the brutal barbarism of the dark ages of the past. We cannot believe that Europe will ever permit such a collapse of the moral principles on which are based the progress and civilisation of modern societies.

LITERARY PAGE.

THE TEACHING OF GREEK

By JOHN C. CALDWELL, M.A., Madras College, St. Andrews

LIKE most students who have passed through Scottish or English preparatory schools and have subsequently spent a few terms at the University, I was initiated into the Greek language after the usual method in vogue in Europe generally. That is to say, I was taught to pronounce Greek by the rules which govern the pronunciation of Latin. By pronunciation I here mean simply the stressing of a particular syllable of a word, as I have no intention of entering into the vexed question of the vocalisation of the various vowels, etc., of Ancient Greek. This subject has been ably dealt with by Mr Gennadius in the *Contemporary Review* of 1895, and his two articles may be warmly recommended to all interested in this part of the subject.

It is my desire to say a few words on the accent in Greek, treating the subject from a scholastic point of view. During my own preliminary studies of the Greek tongue, I could not help being struck by the fact that though certain marks were printed above the words in the Greek text, absolutely no use seemed to be made of the same; in fact they seemed to be of no practical utility. Rules might be given and multiplied, and exceptions "crammed" *ad nauseam*, but still the question "why?" remained unanswered; while the pupil's ability to accentuate correctly progressed but slowly, if indeed it progressed at all. Surely there must be something radically wrong with the present system, when the greater part of the students in University Honours Classes still continue to adopt the "pepper-box" system of accentuation, as it has been facetiously termed.

My contention is that if the pupils in our large public schools were taught their Greek on the stress-accent principle, they would in the course of a very few months be able to accentuate correctly and without effort any ordinary extract of Greek prose or poetry, and of course their own Greek versions.

The advantages of this method of instruction are obvious. Instead of the pupil's being asked to acquire laboriously a host of rules and exceptions, he learns the elementary principles of accentuation, *i.e.*, the position of the acute and the circumflex, and the changes of position caused by the lengthening of final syllables, etc.

Then he pronounces every word which he meets in his reading with the stress of the voice on the accented syllable, and in declining nouns and adjectives, and in conjugating verbs, he is forced at once to observe the variation in the position of the accent. This knowledge he applies by analogy to other words accentuated similarly. Thus in a very short time, instead of laboriously searching in a dictionary for the accentuation of words in use in everyday reading, he can say promptly and confidently where the accent falls in every case, without reference to a lexicon.

Another advantage is, that should the pupil at any time take up the modern language—and I hope that a great many will do so—he will have nothing to unlearn except the pronunciation proper. He has simply to forget the Erasmian, and adopt the modern method of vocalisation; whereas the pupil instructed under the usual régime has the double task of learning both the stress-accentuation and the vocalisation.

It may be argued against the stress-system, that it has one great disadvantage, viz., that it destroys a proper perception of quantity. I am of opinion, however, that if due care is exercised from the very outset, and a slight pause made after the stressed syllable, *e.g.*, in a word like ἄνθρωπος this difficulty will vanish.

I once had the good fortune to discuss this matter briefly with one of H.M.I. of schools, himself a supporter of the old method. He informed me, however, that he himself had been taught his Greek according to the stress-accent system, and concluded by admitting that, even if it did cause a slight loss of quantitative perception, it was the only sensible and practical method of teaching accentuation.

Just a few words in conclusion. I have made it a practice to bring under my pupils' notice various Greek magazines, newspapers, art-journals, etc., written in the modern tongue, and to make a few observations occasionally on the chief differences between ancient and modern Greek. I find that as soon as pupils learn that there is still a modern language which they can read and understand with a very little trouble after they have made some progress in their studies, their interest is immediately quickened, and what till then has seemed part of the dead and gone past appears to them in quite a different and more human aspect.

CORRESPONDENCE

[The Editor of the *Hellenic Herald* does not hold himself in any way responsible for the views of correspondents.]

GREECE AND ALBANIA

To the EDITOR *of* THE HELLENIC HERALD.

"SIR,—It is only to-day that I have perused the article in your January number on the Albanian Question by a Greco-Albanian. The article is excellent, but there is a flaw in it. It speaks of Greek aspirations for expansion in Albania. It seems to me that Greek aspirations, so far as Albania is concerned, should be those of the Albanian people. The only statesmanlike attitude on the part of the Greeks is to carefully watch the feelings and wishes of the Albanians, and to further and support them to the very utmost of their modest means. It is only by such a policy that we may hope to secure the affections of our Albanian brethren, and to effect a confederation or even a union of the two people to the benefit of both.—I am, etc., LEKAS AVVANITIS."

We quite agree with our correspondent. The Greeks have never sought for any conquest in Albania. Setting aside the question of Epirus, which admits of no discussion, the Greeks have always regarded the Albanians as friends and brethren, to whom they are ready to accord cordial support and sympathy.—Ed. *Hellenic Herald.*

To the EDITOR, HELLENIC HERALD.

"DEAR SIR,—Your interesting journal is doing such good service in the cause of truth and justice that I am sure it is read with pleasure by many Englishmen who, like myself, have deplored the fact that Hellenism should have been in need of championship in the land of Byron. However, the pro-Bulgarian feeling is far less strong in England than it was two or three years ago. Sympathy with the persecuted Greeks of Macedonia is making rapid headway. The Bulgarians have been found out, and the pity of it is that their lies were ever given credence in this country. This much the Greeks have gained by the delay in the settlement of the Macedonian Question—but at what a terrible cost! They have now British public opinion with them, instead of against them. Bulgaria, by a contemptible policy of misrepresentation, had this advantage for a time. She has overreached herself and lost it.—Yours truly, H. C. J., Broadstairs."

We welcome our correspondent's sympathy, and wish we could believe that he is not premature in his opinion that the Greeks have already British public opinion on their side.—Ed. *H. H.*

Published at Craven House, Kingsway, London, W.C.
Editor, Dr C. POUPTIS.

The Hellenic Herald

A MONTHLY POLITICAL PERIODICAL.

Vol. I., Nos. 8—9. JUNE—JULY, 1907. [Price 10/- per Annum, Post Free.

CONTENTS.

MACEDONIA AND BRITISH POLICY ... ... ——

THE MACEDONIAN DEPUTATION AND SIR ED. GREY ... ——

FROM SOFIA ... ... ——

EPIRUS ... ... English Traveller.

THE BISHOP OF KASTORIA AND THE ACCUSATIONS AGAINST HIM ... ... ——

MISCELLANEOUS—

A BULGARIAN MARES-NEST—NEW YORK AND MACEDONIAN HELLENISM—THE DEFENCE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN—THE REFUGEES IN THESSALY—THE LAUNCHING OF GREEK WARSHIPS ON THE THAMES—THE FOREIGN TRADE OF GREECE—THE COMMERCE OF SALONICA IN 1906.

DIPLOMATIC CONFLICTS IN THE NEAR EAST, Theodore P. Ion, D.C.M.

THE PERSECUTION OF THE GREEKS IN BULGARIA ... ——

PRESS REVIEW—

THE UNREST IN THE BALKANS: THE CASE FOR THE GREEKS ... ... "Westminster Gazette."

THE "INDIAN TIMES" AND GREEK POLICY.

LITERARY PAGE—

THE EXCAVATIONS IN CRETE.

MEDEA AT THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

THE TASK OF HELLENISM AND ITS EFFORTS.

MACEDONIA AND BRITISH POLICY.

On July 9th a very important event took place regarding the Macedonian question, when Sir Edward Grey received a large and influential deputation composed of eminent political and religious personages of all sections, and headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The deputation having urged that Great Britain should adopt more drastic measures for the improvement of the intolerable condition of Macedonia, Sir Edward, in a long and lucid reply, declared that the only means of bringing about the desired improvement lay in the continuance of the programme of reforms drawn up some years ago by Austria and Russia, and approved by the other Great Powers, and in the continued close co-operation of Britain with the concert of Europe, without any attempt to take separate action, or to hurry on any drastic measures. Such drastic measures, Sir Edward Grey declared, are impracticable at the present moment, not only owing to the conflicting elements which constitute the problem but also owing to the opposition which they would find from other Powers more concerned in Balkan affairs, and "having special local interests in Macedonia." The complications arising from such opposition might give rise to responsibilities which the position and interests of Great Britain would not allow this country to undertake. Sir Edward Grey, speaking of the causes to which the present troubles are due and of the measures which can and must be taken for their alleviation, attached the chief responsibility to the "extravagant pretensions" of the neighbouring Balkan States, and to the armed bands which have been formed to support these pretensions. In these States, Sir Edward considered, the intervention of the Great Powers four years ago has given rise to the idea that it would ultimately secure Macedonian autonomy, and the dismemberment of a part of the Turkish dominions; and this, in his opinion, has led to the persecution of one nationality by another, and to their "pegging out claims" for themselves in case any division took place. He further stated that the only measures which the British Government thought it advisable to take at the present moment, in concert with the other Powers, consisted in first pressing the Turkish Government for a better distribution of its troops in Macedonia, and secondly in bringing about an increase of the gendarmerie, in order to make a more thorough and effective pursuit of the different bands which terrorise the country, and thirdly, in urging the neighbouring Balkan states to prevent by every means the formation of these bands in their respective territories. Further, the British Government sought to obtain a reorganization of the judicial institutions of Macedonia, the defective and inefficient character of which are largely responsible for the lawlessness of the country. This reorganization was not possible before the fiscal reforms marked by the introduction last year of the Financial Commission. This, we are assured by Sir Edward Grey, has already produced satisfactory results, and by providing the necessary funds, will facilitate the introduction of judicial and other reforms.

We share in some degree the disappointment which all the members of the deputation felt after hearing Sir Edward Grey's declaration of *non possumus* on the part of Britain towards anything more substantial than the continuance of the present meagre reforms. But we know from personal experience the great difficulties which present themselves on all hands to any who would attempt to solve the Macedonian question, and we realise the risks to which Britain would expose herself by any hasty and ostentatious intervention in the affairs of Macedonia, and we therefore feel quite grateful to the British Government for the relatively good results which it assures us it has already obtained, and for the better results which it promises us for the future.

But we cannot refrain from expressing our fears that the expectations of the British Government and the other Powers, very modest as they assuredly are, may yet not be realised, so long as those principal factors, in our judgment the chief cause of the present troubles, are ignored or are not taken into due consideration. These factors are, on the one hand, the true *motifs* of the racial struggles which persist with such obstinacy and fury in Macedonia, and on the other hand, the absolute necessity for some kind of control over the entire Turkish administration. Without this control, despite Sir Edward Grey's hopeful assurances, and the marked decrease in the familiar Turkish atrocities during the last two years, any schemes, even though they may achieve some temporary success, are in the end bound to fail.

The origin of the racial struggles and animosities dates not from the time of the recent intervention of the Powers in Macedonia as Sir Edward Grey suggests, but goes back to the middle of the 19th century, and especially to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8. At different times this antagonism has taken different forms. Its most violent manifestation has been the latest, that of the last ten years. But it is a mere coincidence, and in no sense a consequence, that this manifestation of violence has been contemporaneous with the application of the " reforms."

We will not deal with the earlier stages of this racial struggle, which assumed for the most part a religious form, and which did not attract a great deal of attention in Europe. The acute stage began just after the separation of the Bulgarian Church from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the foundation of the Exarchate. This separation might have come sooner or later as a natural development of Bulgarian ambitions, but there is no question that it was greatly fostered, warmly supported and hastened by Russia, with a view to weakening the powerful Greek element in the Peninsula. This element was the chief obstacle to the Slavonisation of the country, and to the Muscovite ambition of a Panslavonic Empire, extending from the Behring Straits to the Mediterranean. One result of Russia's pursuance of this ambition was the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8, and as an issue of that war, the creation of a Greater Bulgaria, comprising the whole of Macedonia and a large part of Thrace. The arbitrary subjugation of the large and influential Greek population of Macedonia, to a race which had no predominant rights in that country, and no common traditions and affinities with the Greek race, and which moreover was inferior in civilization to the latter, aroused indignation and vehement protests among the Greeks. These protests were fortunately recognized and supported by the British Government of 1878, and in consequence the Treaty of San Stefano was annulled and Macedonia and part of Thrace were restored to Turkey—with the formal stipulation, however, that wide reforms should be introduced in these provinces, calculated to secure the tranquillity and prosperity of the provinces, and the free development of the different nationalities according to their aspirations.

The Bulgarians were unable to forget the dream of a Greater Bulgaria which Russia, for reasons already explained, had fostered in their imaginations. Immediately after the annullation of the treaty of San Stefano, they started a systematic campaign of Slavonisation by more peaceful methods—*i.e.*, by creating Bulgarian churches and schools and by organising a Bulgarian propaganda in every part of Macedonia. In this process they never failed to enjoy the support of the Russian representatives in Turkey and of the Panslavistic Societies in Russia. After twenty years of this propaganda, the results were exceedingly unsatisfactory to the Bulgarians. The reason of this is not far to seek. The greater part of the Christian population in Macedonia proper (*i.e.*, in the two villayets of Salonica and Monastir) is Greek, its aspirations are fervently Hellenic, and its educational institutions much in advance of anything the Bulgarians have ever been able to offer. The Bulgarians, seeing the failure of their propaganda, and also encouraged by the unfortunate issue of the Greco-Turkish war of 1897, began to resort to those violent methods which are familiar to all, and owing to which the Greeks also, who for long endured in patience and contented themselves with vain appeals for protection to the Powers, have ultimately been dragged into the present patricidal struggle.

In view of the deep-rooted antagonism between the Christian races of Macedonia, which, supplemented by Turkish misrule and intrigue, has led to the present violent struggles, what hope is there that the situation would be improved by any meagre reforms of the Turkish administration-reforms which leave untouched the racial question, the principal cause of agitation and unrest? In our opinion it is little short of futile to rely upon any measures which do not put an end to the racial animosities. It has been consistently maintained in these columns not only that there is this racial question, but also that there is a clear solution of the problem. But the racial animosities cannot be quieted by merely urging the Governments of Athens and Sofia to prevent the formation of the bands—the bands have deep roots in Macedonia itself, and it would be outside the power of the Governments to suppress them. Nor is it sufficient to urge Turkey to take more stringent measures against the bands—she always does her best in the way of " stringent measures " ! There is one way to solve the question. The position of each nationality in Macedonia must be delimited by a free census made under the control of an

official and impartial European Commission. The Commission will not only put a stop to the confusion which now prevails in Europe as to the strength and rights of each Christian population in Macedonia, it will also dispose of the present extravagant claims of the Nationalities and will compel them to restrain their aspirations within reasonable limits. It will assist also in the interchange and the more homogeneous distribution of the different nationalities.

The importance of the racial problem has been recognised ever since the late reforms were inaugurated. The Mürsteg programme itself contains a clause providing for something like what we have suggested. This clause has never been put into execution, in spite of the paramount importance of the question, and in spite of the abundant proofs given every day to the candid observer that the racial trouble is crying out for settlement. The solution of the racial problem is a necessary prelude to any real pacification of the country. The bringing of it forward at present could not even temporarily disturb the reforms already entered upon, for such a stipulation already occupies a principal place in the Mürsteg programme. The carrying out of the clause mentioned could not, therefore, be seriously resisted, either by the Great Powers which have drawn up the stipulation or by Turkey, who has given her consent to it.

If this measure is carried out, it will calm the exasperated and bewildered Christian populations, and will contribute to the pacification of Macedonia more than all the other measures together. It will not in the slightest degree endanger the pacific programme of the Powers, it will not lead to any further exaggeration of the nationalist pretentions of the Macedonian populations. On the contrary it will facilitate the work of reform and it will contribute much to the reconciliation and eventual confederation of the Balkan peoples—a reconciliation which would avert great trouble and risk from the Powers if the time should come one day for an alteration in the *status quo* of Turkey.

The Macedonian Deputation and Sir Edward Grey.

Sir E. Grey, accompanied by Lord Fitzmaurice, received at the Foreign Office on the 9th inst., an influential deputation who desired to urge the necessity for European control in Macedonia in consequence of the failure of the Mürsteg scheme of reform introduced in 1903 to check the terrible massacres in that country. The deputation was headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and included the Rev. R. F. Horton, D.D., Sir John Kennaway, M.P., Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, M.P., Mr. D. J. Shackleton, M.P., Professor Westlake, K.C., (President of the Balkan Committee), the Bishops of Birmingham, Southwark, and Hereford, the Earl of Stamford, Lord Haversham, Lord Stanmore, Lady Frederick Cavendish, Canon Barnet, the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, the Rev. Stephen Gladstone, the Rev. Thomas Law, Sir T. Fowell Buxton, Sir Henry Lawrence, Sir G. Kekewich, M.P., Mr. Noel Buxton (Chairman of the Balkan Committee), and Mr. Alfred Booth (Liverpool).

The Primate, in introducing the deputation, said he was anxious, puzzled, and bewildered as he read through successive Blue-books and reports about the situation, which one might almost say would be humorous if it were possible to connect humour with so terrific a series of tragical events as darkened that bit of Europe. England was largely responsible for the rule over Macedonia being in the hands it was in now. Nothing had been gained by what took place in 1903-4. Great and sensational massacres were certainly less, but there was permanent and systematic misrule. They did not underrate the enormous difficulties with which the question was beset, but they wanted some assurance that things were going forward, and not, as they sometimes said, backwards; that the Powers were not being simply mocked by words and nothing more.

Mr. D. J. Shackleton, Sir J. Kennaway, M.P., Dr. Horton, Sir W. Brampton Gurdon, M.P., and Professor Westlake also spoke.

Sir Edward Grey, in reply, said he recognised most fully the importance of the deputation, and he did not at all differ from the opinion that the deputation was also opportune. The Archbishop had said that in all the history of this question in the past few years nothing had been gained, and things remained as bad as they were. In one sense at any rate he did not intend to qualify that statement as to the actual condition of affairs at the present moment, but he should like to look a little further into the situation and see what was now the evil with which they had to deal.

Financial Reforms.

Practically the whole of the past year has been taken up with the negotiations for the increase of the Customs dues. In 1905 Lord Lansdowne made his consent to that increase dependent upon the reforms in Macedonia. The effect of those reforms had not yet been felt because the actual increase of Customs dues had not come into force, although it was expected to do so in a few days. Some good however, must be the outcome. In the first place the whole revenue which the Turkish Government received from the increase of the Customs dues was to be set apart for the Macedonian Budget. That was a most important matter. Lord Lansdowne had said that financial reform was at the root of all reform in Macedonia, and one of the first things he (Sir Edward) became aware of when he took office was the truth of that statement. By the increase of the Customs dues they had secured not only that the increase should be available for the Macedonian Budget, but that there should be, he trusted, a sufficiency of money so that the reforms now in existence should not fail for want of means. In the next place a Financial Commission had been formed which would have full control of the Macedonian Budget, and would be able to see that proper provision was made in that Budget for the improvement of the country. In the third place no increase of expenditure which caused a deficiency in the Macedonian Budget could take place without the consent of the Financial Commission. That meant that it would not be possible for the Turkish Government, by increasing military expenditure, to starve the civil side, because the Turkish Government was precluded from creating a deficit by armaments unless it provided the necessary additional funds itself. In the fourth place the powers of the Gendarmerie had been increased, and in the fifth place a supply of recruits for the Gendarmerie had been guaranteed. When it was suggested that England should take the lead and show that she had a spirited sense of her responsibility, he was entitled to reply that as regards last year at any rate England did take the lead. Without the persistence and insistence of the British Government the conditions in Macedonia would not have been so satisfactory as they were. Lord Lansdowne stated that the Financial Commission should be given administrative and executive powers and be instructed in the first instance to frame without delay schemes for effective con-

trol of the administration of finance and justice. Justice has not yet been dealt with, but the commission had acquired power in the matter of finance. There had been a slight remission of taxes in Macedonia, which had been accompanied by an increase in revenue, and there had been improvements in the honest collection of the taxes. He would sum up the result of all that by saying that Mr. Hardy, the British representative on the Financial Commission, gave it as his opinion in his latest despatch that on the whole the Turkish administration had been greatly improved, and taken by itself would not give cause for serious disaffection on the part of the population. Why was it then that things remained as bad as they were as regarded security for life ? The fact that the particular forms of outrage due to Turkish troops and gendarmerie had disappeared was more than outweighed by the fact that crimes of violence still remained as great as they were.

Rival Christians.

The discouraging fact when they came to analyse the crimes of violence, which they had to set against the improvement in administration was that those crimes were committed by rival Christian nationalities upon each other. In the six months beginning December, 1906, there were 422 persons killed by violence in Macedonia. Of that number 105 were armed insurgents killed by Turkish troops. Of the remainder there were only 69 cases in which people were killed by Moslems and there were 248 in which people were killed by Christians of different nationalities. This internecine rivalry did not exist before the intervention of the Powers, and it was a most discouraging outcome of that intervention. He thought the intervention of the Powers had given rise without justification to the idea that it was going to lead to Macedonian autonomy and dismemberment of part of the Turkish dominions. Consequently the different nationalities who had interests in that region seemed to think themselves justified in persecuting or even attempting to exterminate villages which did not belong to their own race or their own Church, in order to peg out claims for themselves in case any division took place. On the other hand this activity of the bands had undoubtedly tended to make the Turks more and more suspicious and more reluctant to accept suggestions from the Powers for reforms. But further reforms there must be if things were not to get worse. (Cheers.) He knew it was pressed on the attention of the British Government from some quarters that nothing would do much good short of complete European control in Macedonia. By that he understood the appointment of a Governor-General of Macedonia appointed with the consent of the Powers, irremovable without their consent, and therefore responsible to the Powers. That was a wide and sweeping proposal, and one which Great Britain could not make alone. It could only be made with the consent and co-operation of all the Powers, and it was not one which could be put forward by any one Power unless that Power had reason to think that it would be accepted in principle by the others, and that the others having accepted it in principle would be prepared to join in taking whatever measures might be required to ensure its application. To put forward a proposal of a far-reaching character which met with a negative, might be a cheap and easy way of meeting criticism at home, but it would not improve the situation. It would weaken our position abroad, offend some Powers and embarrass others, and do nothing to further the matter in hand. Great Britain had certainly not lagged behind. We took the lead last year ; Lord Lansdowne had previously more than once taken the lead in his proposals for reform, and we had been from time to time more active than any other Power.

Proposals for the Future.

While at home it was complained that the British Government had done too little, they were reproached in other quarters abroad for having displayed activity which was importunate and embarrassing. He did not complain of that double line of criticism, but it must be borne in mind that we were not the whole conscience of Europe. It was our duty as part of that conscience to make our voice heard, but the final action and the amount of results which we would obtain must depend upon the consent of the whole. There were two points on which he hoped to concentrate his efforts and on which he hoped other Powers would concentrate their efforts. One had reference to the mischief which was being done by the activity of the rival bands in Macedonia. The British Government had lately pressed that at Constantinople, and not entirely without result. There were signs that the disposition of the Turkish troops was being changed and that they were being sent to places where they could better guard the frontiers against incursions by bands. But besides that he thought much could be done by making a larger use of the gendarmerie. By securing larger executive power for the gendarmerie and getting the co-operation of the Turkish officials in making fuller use of them a good deal might be done to repress the bands. The outrages committed by the bands were for the moment the pressing evil, and if by the use of the Turkish troops and gendarmerie or by more energetic action on the part of those powers whose nationalities were responsible for the bands, improvement could be made in the course of the next few months in stamping out the bands and driving them out of Macedonia, nothing could have a more beneficial effect on the country and nothing could produce a better impression on those who wished to see reforms in Macedonia. The other point on which to concentrate attention was that of judicial reform. Last year was so occupied with the negotiations in reference to the increase of the Customs dues that it was impossible to approach the other Powers with regard to further reforms. Now that matter was settled, however, progress should be made with judicial reforms, and they should be on the lines for which Lord Lansdowne always contended, namely, reforms to which all the Powers would be a party. The Government had heard within the last few days that Austria and Russia expected to make proposals in the course of the present summer. He understood those proposals would be on a basis similar to that of the Financial Commission, and the Government would do their utmost to secure agreement with the other Powers that these reforms should be as effective as possible. The influence of the Government would be used as constantly, as regularly, and as energetically as it had ever been to ensure that the question should not lapse, and that neither Great Britain nor the other Powers should become callous to the state of affairs. They would do their utmost to press for further measures of improvement in Macedonia. (Cheers.)

The deputation thanked Sir Edward Grey and withdrew.

From Sofia.

THE *Balkanska Tribuna* speaking of the emigration of the Greeks and of the causes to which it is due, says :—

"At the present the Greeks are emigrating *en masse* from Stenimachos, Cavakly, Sozoupolis, Messimvria, Anchialos and the neighbouring Greek villages. The greater part of the goods belonging to the emigrants are bought up by Bulgarians, but the Greeks from Stenimachos and the surrounding region, which is somewhat unproductive, are abandoning all their property for the sake of getting away. The beautiful and fertile district of Anchialos has been repeopled by Bulgarians from the Stara Zagora district, so that the Bulgarisation of this region proceeds rapidly. If one asks the Greeks, 'Why are you emigrating?' they reply, 'Because it is not possible to live where

we are deprived of our schools and churches, and because we are menaced and persecuted by the *Meetingadjis*—that is the name given to the extreme elements, which the authorities have allowed to commit with perfect impunity every sort of excess, violence and pillage, and which continue the same courses even now, in places where the authorities allow them. On April 9/22, the house of Apostolos Arghyri at Daoutli (Anchialos) was attacked by these ruffians, who demanded payment of a sum of £160. Then there was the business of the Mitre belonging to the Greek bishop of Anchialos*. The *Meetingadjis* have also sent out scores of threatening letters to rich Bulgarians (?) and Greeks, from whom they have tried to extort from £1000 to £2000."

In another article in the same number of the same journal we read :—

"Quite recently, at Philippopoli and at Bourgas, anonymous letters have been sent to rich citizens, demanding money in the name of certain committees. The French Consul at Bourgas received one, on the subject of which we published yesterday an exculpatory communication from the *Bulgarian Telegraphic Agency*."

Now this agency, which is a manufactory of doctored news, directed by one Ghennadief, has tried to turn aside the attack by insinuating that the letter addressed to the French Consul emanated from a Greek source. It is a grotesque and stupid attempt, worthy of Bulgarians. But their barefaced pretence has deceived no one, and those Sofia journals which are not in the pay of the present Cabinet, are the first to declare against the deception.

The state of lawlessness which rages at present in Bulgaria, and which results in acts of increasing criminality perpetrated upon the Hellenes, is due to a party of demoniac agitators, who rely on the goodwill of the Government, and who are affiliated to the committees which direct the Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia The Greeks in Macedonia know how to keep these gentry in order, but what effective resistance can the outnumbered Greeks offer in Bulgaria ?

In truth, there is no limit to the presumption of the Bulgarians. It is known that the Œcumenical Patriach recently addressed a letter to the Czar, praying him to intervene on behalf of the Greeks in Bulgaria, whose rights had been so shamefully trampled underfoot. Now observe in what terms Daskaloff, the editor of *Vetcherna Pochta*, comments on this fact in his issue of May 29/June 12 :—

"Eastern Roumelia and the *Statut Organique* no longer exist, since 1885 (!). The Patriarch's endeavours to meddle with our affairs (*sic*) through the intermediary of the Czar of Russia need inquiet nobody. Where we have defended our real rights against the imaginary or illegitimately acquired (?) claims of others, our resolve must be firm and our action decisive (!). We remember that in 1900, when the Bulgarians of Stenimachos had . . . . . taken one of the Greek Churches, the Greek Patriarch demanded the intervention of the Czar. The Russian Government did actually make representations to ours on behalf of the Patriarchate. Nevertheless, the Church was not restored to the Greeks."

Further on, the editor of the Bulgarian journal contradicts the rumour that the Bulgarian Government had decided on a restitution of the usurped Churches :—

"The resolution passed by the authorities of Phillippopoli to return to the Greeks two confiscated churches, is in no sense a general measure—it is simply an evidence of the justice of that city towards the Greeks—Bulgaria is a country ruled by justice (!), and she will settle the matter in accordance with right and with the laws, and not according to the desires of the Patriarch of Constantinople, whom we do not recognise."

The *Dnevnik* publishes correspondence from Vienna, over the signature W.Z., pointing out the change which has come over the Balkan policy of Austria since Baron Aerenthal has come into power. It is well known that this minister has Bulgarophil leanings, to which the Austro-Servian customs dispute has contributed no little, for apparently Austria means to favour Bulgaria at the expense of Servia, which country shows itself more and more desirous of escaping from the political and economical leadership of Austria. Apart from this, says the *Dnevnik*, Baron von Aerenthal is personally favourable to Bulgaria. Finally, the visit of King Victor Emmanuel to Athens, and the Greco-Italian *rapprochement*, which was at once the motive and the result of that visit, have accentuated these tendencies of Austro-Hungarian diplomacy, owing to the rivalry of Austria and Italy in the Balkans. According to the correspondent of the *Dnevnik*, a "Viennese diplomatist" had made the following statement to him :—

"It is time that Bulgaria ceased to accuse Austria-Hungary of designs on Salonica and on Macedonia generally. Any such designs would be absurd. We have but one interest in Macedonia ; we do not wish to see Salonica in the hands of one of the Great Powers. We are perfectly well aware that we personally have the power neither to capture Salonica, nor to maintain and defend it. To realise any such ambition, Austria would need two fleets, one operating in the Aegean, the other in the Adriatic, whereas, in point of fact, the Austrian fleet is insufficient even for the Adriatic. And if the question were raised of creating an Austrian fleet in the Archipelago, neither the Reichstag

*This Mitre, of a value of £3,200, was stolen by Bulgarian marauders, with the knowledge or connivance of the police, and was sold to a Jew for £160. But the miscreants discovered how ill they had bargained, and were going to try to force the Jew to disgorge his prize. He, however, had prudently made his way to Constantinople.

nor, still less, the Hungarian Parliament, would entertain the idea for a moment."

The diplomat in question seems to have added that he did not see much likelihood that Salonica would ever change hands, but that if such a thing took place, "Salonica would be an object of strife between Greeks and Bulgarians, but could never become Servian."

Here follows some pretty direct encouragement given by the "Viennese Diplomat" to the Bulgarians—always supposing that the verity of the *Dnevnik's* correspondent is not open to question:

"It would be a very desirable consummation if a Great Bulgaria came into existence at the extremity of Central Europe, towards the Archipelago. If Bulgaria will pay attention to the new spirit which inspires Austrian politics, if the Bulgarians will take advantage of it, and will, especially, put a complete end to that unjustifiable suspicion of Austria which one meets with here and there (especially among the Opposition), then Bulgaria will not be slow to reap the benefit of this new policy."

The same correspondent writes to the *Dnevnik* of May 22/June 5.

"Almost the whole of the Viennese press has adopted a Bulgarophil attitude, thanks doubtless to the influence exercised by the official circles of Vienna which, as is well-known, displays an increasing sympathy with the Bulgarians. The Emperor himself gave an example of this last week, when he decorated several Bulgarian officers. And the Bulgarophil tendencies of Baron von Aerenthal's foreign policy, dating from last summer, offer an equally striking proof of that minister's just and sane attitude towards Bulgaria. Shortly after the anti-Greek excesses committed in Bulgaria, the Greek Government tried to induce the Great Powers to use their influence at Sofia to bring about the restitution of Greek churches and schools. They had on their side the Clemenceau Cabinet, which was willing to make friendly representations at Sofia if the Austrian Cabinet would back it up.* Naturally, the Greeks tried to obtain Austrian support also. But Vienna, while evincing perfect friendliness, refused to make any intervention. This policy of Baron von Aerenthal's has been even more beneficial to Bulgaria than was the abolition of the capitulations."

This policy of Baron von Aerenthal's has encouraged the Bulgarians to pillage Greek churches, to confiscate Greek schools, to pursue a steady course of robbery and oppression, against the Greeks settled among them. It is little surprising that the Bulgarians should recognise the value of Baron von Aerenthal's policy.

*The *Dnevnik's* correspondent is misinformed. The French Government charged its representative at Sofia to make strong representations on the subject of the treatment of Greeks in Bulgaria. In this the French Government did not exceed its rights as a Power Signatory to the International Treaties guaranteeing the rights of the Greeks in Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia.

EPIRUS:

HER PAST, HER PRESENT, AND HER FUTURE.

By an English Traveller.

The name of Epirus conjures up to the imagination no visions of ancient splendour and fame, such as are associated with the history of Athens or Sparta, no reminiscences of deeds rendered familiar by the words of classic history or poetry. It forms no tangible part of that Greek world which is for ever associated with marble temples, exquisite statuary and open-air theatres, though what its people lacked in culture, perhaps they made up for in manliness. But no famous episode recorded in the pages of Thucydides or Herodotus has helped us to give lasting renown to any of its cities. Two names alone stand out in antiquity as connected with Epirus, Dodona and Pyrrhus. But the great oracle of the North is little but a shadowy name, and no important ruins are left to testify to its exact site and attract the pilgrimage of classical enthusiasts, while Pyrrhus is bound up with the history of Rome and Southern Italy, and has reflected but a small part of his celebrity on the home of his birth.

Nor yet in later times has Epirus loomed large on the page of history. It is one of those marches or borderlands which, though continually the scene of stirring and romantic events, are not the central theatre of action. Such lands often send out invaders to subdue other countries or form a stage in the advance of conquering hordes heading for fairer goals. Thus historically Epirus holds a position not unlike that occupied by Calabria in its relation to Sicily or by the Asturias and mountainous marches of Northern Spain in their relation to the fairer provinces of the South. The floods of contending nations which broke over Macedonia and Greece, often overflowed into Epirus and left their refuse-water there. But the main-stream of events poured through other channels. Thessaly, lying east of the Pindus range, was always a more tempting prize for the invader. The lack of ports on the Epirote coast also caused the tide of over-sea immigration from Italy to pass north through Dyrrhachium (Durazzo) and so on into the heart of the Balkans by the Egnatian Road. In the tumultuous period which followed the conquest of Constantinople by the Frank Crusaders, Epirus was a kind of "no man's land," the scene of constant warfare and invasion. There then arose that Despotate of Epirus, which was the first Greek principality to emerge from the wreck of the Frankish conquest. At that time the centre of the principality was the present Greek town of Arta whose territory belongs geographically to Epirus, though now politically separated from it. Those were stirring days, though obscure in history, when the Greeks of

Epirus, the Frankish Knights, and the Turkish and Bulgarian mercenaries of the Eastern Empire made this country their battlefield.

Then follows the long gloom of Ottoman rule, broken at the beginning of the 19th century by a brief period of light. For a short time Epirus even manages to attract the gaze of Europe, and one of England's greatest poets could proclaim with truth to the world that—

> "On Suli's rock and Parga's shore
> Exists the remnant of a line
> Such as the Doric mothers bore."

What is more, thence comes inspiration to a new literature—the ballad-poetry of Modern Greece. For throughout the years of foreign rule, when the Angevins, the Orsini of Cephalonia, the Albanian princes, the Tocco of Leucadia, and finally the Turks successively held sway in the country, the people remained Greek, and cherished the traditions of the race in their heart. Thus at the beginning of the 19th century the city of Jannina was only second to Constantinople as a centre of Greek culture, and its schools helped to keep alive that national spirit which was soon to show itself in the Greek War of Independence. The first productions of Valaoritis, perhaps the greatest poet of Modern Greece, have their heart in Epirus, and sing of the wild days of Ali Pasha.

Ali of Tepelen—this single name dominates all others, and has practically effaced all the memories of former history. The castles and historic sites, which the traveller may visit, are all associated with his name; even the mournful ballads, with which the *Kiradjee* or carrier whiles away the hours of a long ride, tell of Ali and his deeds of terror. Here are history and romance enough to attract those in search of lands of fresh interest and unhackneyed traditions. Yet who visits Epirus now? The tourist whose interest in the Greek East is confined within the limits of Baedeker and Smith's Ancient History of Greece, does not venture so far from the beaten track. In fact, tourists of any kind are still scarce enough to secure their being stared out of countenance and almost mobbed in the streets of Jannina. The only regular visitors are a few sportsmen who have learnt that the mountain glades and swampy valleys conceal every kind of game from snipe and wild-duck to deer, wild-boar and even, in some places, wolf and bear.

In spite of its considerable sea-board, there are but few convenient points at which the ordinary traveller can penetrate into the interior. By sea one can go to Santa Quaranta and Prevesa, both of which have direct steamship communication with Brindisi, Piraeus and Corfu. By land a road leads up from Arta, in Greece, and joins the Prevesa road half-way to Jannina. Since the establishment of a regular Austrian steamship service between Santa Quaranta and Constantinople the overland routes to the interior of Turkey have fallen into disuse, and the natives, who continually leave the country to find work in the capital, are only too glad to avail themselves of the ridiculously low fares offered by the Austrian line instead of having to face the toils and difficulties of a long overland journey.

The only carriage-roads marked on the maps are the three leading from Santa Quaranta, Prevesa, and Arta, but even here a caution must be given, for the experienced person knows that in Turkey the fact of a carriage-road being indicated on the map is no sufficient guarantee of its real existence. No objection can be brought against the road from Prevesa which is as good as a road can be, but this is probably the exception that proves the rule. The unwary traveller who enters Epirus by way of Santa Quaranta, and has calculated that he ought to be able to cover the distance to Jannina in about a day, will find himself rather disappointed, at least for the present. There are, indeed, indications of awakening energy on the part of the authorities in the piles of stones which cumber the side of the road, but then it is always a doubtful matter how long they may not continue to lie there. At the present moment it requires some stretch of imagination to realize that a carriage can pass certain parts of the road without shaking itself and its occupants to pieces; natives, however, assure one that the feat is frequently accomplished. Truly Turkey is a land of wonders!

Epirus does not present her most attractive face to the outside world, and nothing can be more forbidding than the stony tree-less mountains which meet the traveller's eye on every side as he lands at Santa Quaranta. And what a place for the terminus of a high-road! It is impossible to call it a harbour, for it is merely a shore, and, when there is a high sea, getting ashore is not unlike landing in a surf-boat at Madras. And yet in spite of such obvious disadvantages as a port, Santa Quaranta seems always to have been a place of some importance. The ancient Onchesmus, which is located here, was the regular point of departure even in the days of Cicero. Numerous ruins also attest the former existence of a considerable town under the Lower Empire, when Anchiasmus, as it was then called, was important enough to be the seat of a bishop. A fortified camp close to the shore probably belongs to this period, as also the monastery on a neighbouring hill, which has given the place its modern name. Venice and Charles of Anjou may also have had a hand here, while the ruined castle on the hill facing the monastery dates from the time of Ali Pasha. These various ruins give one a peep into the historical past, while the present is represented by a single street of squalid and tumbledown houses. The whole place has a forlorn look, as if it was only undertaking to play the part of a port under protest.

No wonder that the traveller is anxious to quit this dreary wilderness at the earliest oppor-

tunity, and push on, mounted on a sturdy mountain-pony which will carry him safely over the rocks and through the quagmires and torrents diversifying the (officially termed) road. In half-an-hour the ridge is surmounted, and then what a change of scenery! Green trees, flowing waters and grass-covered hills on every side seem to show that those barren mountains which frown forbiddingly on Corfu are but a stratagem to repel the invader. Were it not for the distant vista of mountains and the absence of hedges, this might almost be English scenery with its streams and green meadow-land. For perfection of scenery and general picturesqueness it would be hard to rival Delvino, which is the only town on the road to Jannina. A torrent coloured by the red soil divides the valley, the slopes are covered with pretty houses, not too crowded as is so often the case in the East, while an old stone minaret rises here and there from among the almond and other fruit-trees. A rocky height blocks the gorge, and the ruins on its summit recall the "Terror" of Ali Pasha, who also planted the fine old plane-trees in the square of the town. Cleanliness is the peculiar feature which distinguishes Delvino from other Turkish towns and shows one that dirt and picturesqueness are not inseparable in the East, as is commonly supposed. The inhabitants themselves are clean and smart in their attire. What a change from the rags of Brindisi or Corfu! Gleaming white *fustanellas* (Kilts), silky black or blue *vrakes* (flowing breeches), the white goats-hair garments of the shepherd and kiradjee, and the black sheep-skin cloaks of the Albanian peasant are seen here on every side. The study of these costumes gives one an insight into ethnology and history. The *fustanella* worn by Greek and Albanian alike is Albanian in origin, and its adoption throughout Greece points to the days when the Sultan used to pour hordes of Albanians into the devastated valleys of the South. As for the *vrakes*, they are most likely of Slavonic origin. One meets them anywhere from Dalmatia to the Peloponnesus, dark blue in Greece, oftener black in Turkey. In Dalmatia, perhaps their original home, the well-to-do peasants are said to combine them with a modern top-hat, suggesting a comic resemblance to the old Dutch costume. Though the Slav has long ago vanished from Albania, Epirus and Greece, this costume is doubtless a survival of the days when the Slavs swept over the western part of the Greek empire and settled in various districts of Northern Greece and the Peloponnesus. The ubiquitous fez, worn by Christian and Mohammedan alike, is here the symbol of Turkish rule, though it also survives in countries from which the tide of Ottoman conquest has long ago rolled back. After Delvino the road passes through a variety of scenery ranging from thickly-wooded slopes to bare ridges, revealing a most peculiar geological formation, as one descends to the valley of Dropoli. The *khans*, stationed at regular intervals along the route, may not quite come up to all the requirements of modern civilisation, but at any rate they do not allow the traveller to starve, and if taken in the proper spirit, their novelty is a pleasant relief from the conventionalities of ordinary European lodgings.

Jannina, the capital of the vilayet, is perhaps not such a gem as Delvino, but it is a town rich in history and that of the most stirring, for here was Ali Pasha's capital and both city and lake have many a tale to tell of him. All its romance centres round the citadel and the island with its four or five monasteries. The citadel is an ancient stronghold dating back from Byzantine and Frankish times, when Comneni, Orsini and Tocco all in turn held the sceptre of Jannina. To-day it has no strategical importance and it is hard to see for what reason special leave must be obtained to visit it. Within its walls there lives, besides the garrison and prisoners, a Jewish population of some 3,000 souls. There one may see the Jew such as Shakespeare pictured him, the Jew of the Middle Ages marked out from other men by his distinctive dress, the true "Jewish gaberdine," and with features which agree too well with the traditional character of oriental Judaism.

But though Jewry is not the least interesting part of this old fortress, the supreme interest lies in the fact that here was the seat of Ali Tepeleni's power, within these walls Ali, who aspired to become the ally of the great Napoleon, who sent his own representative to the imperial conference at Tilsit, who fomented the Greek revolution, and defied Sultan Mahmoud and all his power, evolved his deep-laid schemes and dreamed to become independent ruler of Albania. Here, too, are darker memories of Suliotes massacred and Christians tortured, of Greek maidens taken and drowned in the blue waters of the lake to spite his faithless sons, Muchtar, Suleiman, and Veli.

The Greek Claims.

The citadel of Jannina recalls Ali in the days of his glory and strength, the island opposite enshrines the story of his downfall. There, in the little monastery of St. Panteleon, is the fatal room, just as it was in those days with a low wooden divan running round it, where Ali lay, disgraced but spared, and by his side the fair Vasiliki who had betrayed him and Jannina to the Turks. The room is built against the rock and communicates with a small cave into which Vasiliki fled, when the soldiers sent by Kurshid Pasha came and treacherously killed him. Such was the end of the "Lion of Jannina," betrayed by the only creature he had ever loved in this world. One more melancholy monument of Ali remains, his tomb in a corner of the citadel. There his headless body is buried, for his head was sent by Kurshid Pasha to Constantinople, and stared for many a day from the Seraglio gate.

In the days of Ali Jannina was a popular and thriving city, which strangers, including Byron, came from afar to see. All the trade of Thessaly poured through its gates, thence to be forwarded to the outside world. But now Thessaly is free and the Greek port of Volo has taken all its trade away. Without manufactures or industry of any kind, Jannina has waned both in wealth and population and is now a city of past glories.

As to its national character, Jannina is essentially a Greek city, and, if we except the Mosques, the Turkish flags and uniforms are the only indications of Turkish rule. Greek is the language universally spoken, even by the Turkish officers. There are Greek inscriptions over every shop, and even some of the government buildings. In fact, one hears only two tongues spoken in Epirus, namely, Greek and Albanian, the latter being more common in the North. As for Turkish, it is practically confined to the walls of the government buildings. At Delvino one is already on the border-land of Greece and Albania; Greek is indeed generally spoken, but Albanian appears to be the medium of ordinary conversation. But this is not so in the greater part of Epirus. There is, indeed, throughout the province an admixture of Albanian population, but this has been largely hellenized both in language and customs. What is more surprising is to go to a military cafe at Jannina and hear nearly all the officers talking Greek. In fact, a person who crosses the frontier from Greece into Turkey will notice no difference either of language or costume. In Epirus the difference between Greeks and Turks is not so much one of race or language, as of religion. These officers and *beys* who speak Greek so perfectly are all Mohammedans many of them descendants of the original Christian land-owners who changed their faith to preserve their lives and their lands, as they did in so many other places, Bosnia, for instance, and Crete. The latter bears a striking resemblance to Epirus in having a large population of these sham Turks and thinly disguised Greeks. It may even be doubted whether their Mohammedanism is more than skin deep. It is a fact that when the autonomy of Crete was proclaimed a large part of the Greek-speaking Mohammedan Cretans emigrated to Smyrna, where the Mohammedans are noted for the strict observances of their religion. The Cretans being hopelessly ignorant of the correct ritual and observances of Mohammedanism, found themselves so exposed to the ridicule of their co-religionists at Smyrna that they were compelled to return to their own country.

Under the circumstances there is reason to expect that, if Greece should ever make good her claims to Epirus and Crete, she will have no difficulty in assimilating populations so near to her both in race and language. The free Greeks of the kingdom of Greece may have many faults, but no one has even taxed them with religious or even racial intolerance. In this respect they certainly set an example not only to great nations, like Russia and Prussia, but also to their Balkan competitors, as for instance Roumania whose scandalous treatment of the Jews in spite of the most solemn pledges given to the Powers has aroused the indignation both of Europe and America. We have a proof of Greek toleration in the fact that one of the first deputies to be returned to Parliament for Thessaly after the Greek annexation was a Mahommedan landowner and that the Albanian language may still be heard spoken in many places both in Greece Proper and in the Greek isles.

So far from being intolerant towards other nationalities, the Greeks rather lay themselves open to the charge of showing an unnecessary contempt, not to say indifference, towards those nations which rightly or wrongly they regard as their inferiors in civilisation and culture. This fault is accountable for their failure to establish a rapprochement with the Albanians to whom they are bound by so many ties both of interest and blood. When one remembers that there are large Albanian communities in Greece itself and that a considerable proportion of the Albanians in Turkey are half-hellenized, when further, both Albanian and Greek are fighting a struggle for existence against a common enemy, the Slav, common-sense seems to prompt the establishment of an understanding between the first two races. Greece, both as a free country and as being the most enlightened of the two, ought naturally to take the first step. Not only should Greeks make themselves generally acquainted with the Albanian language, a thing which for the present they refuse to do, but also they should establish Albanian schools or universities which should offer the Albanians educational facilities in their own language. In view of the fact that the Turkish government prohibits the use of the Albanian language in schools in Turkey, such a measure not only would flatter the national pride of the Albanians, a factor by no means to be neglected, but would also prove of the greatest practical benefit to them. The wise suggestion that an Albanian college should be established at Corfu, the position of which is peculiarly favourable for communication with Epirus and Albania, has as yet not born fruit in the public mind. There can be no doubt that the Greeks of Epirus strongly favour the idea, and particularly the establishment of an industrial college. The Albanians, who are no fools, would be sure to avail themselves of the great advantage thus held out to them. Of the few steps which have been taken in that direction, the publication of the Albanian dictionary of Christophorides at the expense of the Greek government, deserves notice. The manuscript of this work was originally purchased from the compiler's son by the Greek consul at Durazzo, and a recent book ("The Burthen of the

Balkans," by Miss M. E. Durham), suggests that the consul destroyed it. This insinuation, which is based on absolutely groundless conjecture, has, fortunately, been effectively contradicted by the publication of the dictionary.

The political questions which arise in connection with Epirus are neither so complicated nor so difficult to comprehend as those which confront one in other Turkish provinces, and especially East of the Pindus. There is not that clash of rival races and propaganda which fill other districts with a continual ferment of intrigue. As far as races are concerned, there are but two important factors to deal with, the Greek and the Greco-Albanian, as the Greek-speaking Albanians of Epirus may be termed in contra-distinction to the Northern Albanians. There are no genuine Turks, if one except a few officials who have no permanent stake in the country, and so can hardly be taken into account; even of the officials a large part is composed of Greeks and Greek-speaking Albanians. As for Serb and Bulgar, there is not so much as a consul for either at Jannina. Roumania was unrepresented only up to the other day, but lately she has taken it into her head to start a propaganda, and, consequently, has established a consulate. But her attempts to arouse a feeling of Roumanian nationality in the small and scattered Kutzo-Vlach communities has not been crowned with much success, for the Kutzo-Vlachs are generally indifferent to Roumania, and prefer to maintain their present status, which is that of Greek Patriarchists. The school established by the Roumanian government at Jannina to train up Roumanian patriots is filled with Greek pupils, whose parents have been induced by the offer of free education to send their children to the school; even some of the teaching staff are Greeks. The varnish of Roumanian patriotism thus acquired will soon wear off, when the interested motives which originally induced the parents to send their children have ceased to operate. It is, indeed, generally agreed that the Roumanian movement, not only in Epirus, but in Macedonia as well, is purely artificial, being fostered by the Roumanian government instead of arising out of the national consciousness of the Kutzo-Vlachs themselves. Nor can it lead to any tangible political results in favour of Roumania, seeing that these Vlach communities are completely cut off from their mother-country. Various diplomatic incidents between Roumania and Turkey merely show that Roumania wishes to use her schools in Turkey as instruments for political intrigue to create difficulties for the Greeks, a fact which Osman Pasha, formerly Vali of Jannina, seems to have given as the justification for his action in imprisoning some Roumanian school-inspectors at Jannina. We may sympathise with Osman Pasha for looking askance at agitators who wished to stir up bad blood between the Christians of his usually peaceful province. It is only to be hoped that this fresh danger to the peace of the Balkans may soon be removed, and that the Roumanian and Greek nations may renew those friendly relations which alone can preserve them against the common danger of the Slav.

No Christian province of the Turkish empire has had to suffer such bitter disappointments as Epirus. Long one of the chief centres of Greek culture in the Turkish empire, the birth-place of some of modern Greece's greatest patriots and benefactors, she has yet been doomed not to enjoy that liberty for which she has made so many sacrifices. Before the Greek war of Independence broke out in 1821, Suli and other bold towns of Epirus had made a bid for liberty against the tyranny of Ali Pasha and Europe had rung with their gallant deeds and glorius fate. The men who had fought Ali Pasha to the death contributed with equal vigour to the great struggle of Liberation against the Turks. Some of the noblest heroes of that war were Epirotes, including Marcos Bozzaris the Suliote, the gallant victim of Karpenissi. These men fought for the freedom of all Greece, yet, when Europe made the kingdom of Greece, she did not include in it Epirus whose sons had bled for the common cause. A more cruel disappointment was in store for Epirus in 1881. In that year the Berlin Treaty gave to Greece the whole of Epirus as far as the river Kalamas; but Turkey, refused to fulfil this article of the Treaty and so, like so many others which Europe has not cared to enforce, it has remained in abeyance. Only the little province of Arta was freed and now it gazes across the Aracthus towards the still enslaved sister-province much as free Roumania looks longingly across the Pruth to Bessarabia, the child torn from her bosom by her perfidious Russian ally. In 1897 there was a fresh gleam of hope, doomed to the same darkness as before. The Greek army advanced to within a short distance of Jannina. On that occasion such was the terror of the Mohammedans that enormous prices were offered for carriages to take them away from the town, and many Mohammedan families took refuge in Christian houses, crying, "Aman (mercy)! we are your brethren." Then came the Greek reverse at the Five Springs, the Greek army fell back and Epirus was broken-hearted once more.

In dealing with Epirus, it is impossible to omit all mention of those powers who cherish ulterior schemes of aggrandizement in the Western part of the Ottoman empire, and whose unjust pretentions clash with the legitimate ambitions of the smaller Balkan nations. In these regions European diplomacy still adheres largely to the traditions of the age of Kaunitz and Catherine the Great, which have become obsolete in other parts of the world. Ministers still talk of partitions, and weave far-reaching schemes which would have won the applause of the veteran Chancellor of Vienna and the "Semiramis of the North." Through-

out Albania and Epirus the protagonists are Austria and Italy. One scents these two Powers everywhere along the coast, and in the chief inland towns. They both have their post-offices, their subsidised lines of steamers, and their consulates. Both seek to coax and win over the Albanians, for neither has anything to expect from the Greeks. One does not require to remain long in the country to see which way the Albanians incline. Italy is anathema to them, and they will have none of her; they can see for themselves that she is poor, and that Italian occupation or protection is not likely to bring them any material gain. Italian Jingoes may talk as they please of brotherhood based on Albanian colonies in Apulia, they may patronize imaginary pretenders to the shadowy crown of Scanderbey, and assert Italy's "ancient rights"—to use a favourite phrase of Kaunitz—to the Venetian patrimony from San Giovanni di Medua to Prevesa. The Albanians will not have Italy at any price. Not that they cherish any special affection for Austria. But they know that Austria will benefit them materially, as she has done Bosnia and Herzegovina, that she will build railways and roads, and so promote trade. Yet woe to the country where the Habsburg eagles have once been planted, for they have rarely been known to recede. No European Power, not excepting Russia, has advanced so insidiously in the Balkans, has clutched so greedily and held so firmly. In her the smaller nationalities have found their bitterest and most selfish enemy. Her south-eastern frontier is composed of mangled fragments of the Balkan nations which she has severed from the parent body with the most heartless indifference to national feelings and aspirations. Roumania laments the irrevocable annexation of her kindred in the Bukovina, Servia sees her dream of a greater Servia frustrated by the permanent occupation of Bosnia, Montenegro still broods over the bitter wrong she has suffered by Austria's appropriation of the fair harbour of Cattaro. With these examples before them it is not likely that the Albanians, with their strong sense of independence and nationality, will be in any hurry to welcome the Austrians into their country.

As has been already pointed out, common interests, as well as geography, tend to throw Albania and Greece together, and it is well-known that a large number of Albanians incline towards that country not so much from affection for the Greeks as because they think their nationality will be less seriously threatened by union with Greece. In Epirus, one sees the problem of the union of the two races already partly solved in the Greco-Albanians of that province. Epirus may yet prove the golden link which shall unite the two ends of the chain and by creating a united Greco-Albanian kingdom thus add a strong element of stability to the politics of the Balkan peninsula.

The Bishop of Kastoria and the accusations against him.

THE *Ecclissiastiki Alithia* publishes a long report, in which the Bishop of Kastoria reviews the various events of which that diocese has been the scene since 1903. He gives a long list of crimes committed against the Greeks by the committees, and he describes also the methods of terrorisation employed by the committees. He also gives an account of the methods whereby the Bulgarian propaganda has attempted, and has to some extent succeeded, in misleading the public opinion of Europe. Their most usual weapon has been calumny. None of the Greek prelates has suffered more from these calumnies than Mgr. Caravanghelis, who has been represented as having accompanied the Turkish troops in the events of 1903, and as having incited them to burn the Bulgarian villages. The subjoined account will shew in what manner he did actually behave towards the schismatics.

In August, 1903, when the troops had scattered the Bulgarian bands, more than 3,000 schismatic peasants, among whom were the priests of Zagoritsani and Tsiresnitsa, took refuge in the Greek convent of the Holy Anarghyres, whence they wrote to the Bishop to implore assistance. At the same time Mgr. Caravanghelis received other petitions from Bulgarians who had sought refuge in the Greek village of Clissoura. These petitions, like the former ones, came from declared enemies of the Orthodox Church, but the Bishop did not on that account refuse to succour them. He at once sent to the convent, under the convoy of Vanghelis and other young Greeks of Kastoria, a supply of provisions sufficient to maintain the refugees until the re-establishment of peace. Those of the Bulgarians who were most deeply implicated were brought, safeguarded by Vanghelis, to Clissoura, where the Bishop had already arrived, and where he had found concealed in the cellars, the priest Zlatko (formerly representative of the Exarchate at Kastoria) and several other Bulgarian ecclesiastics and chiefs of bands. He furnished them with over £100 ready money, and provided for their escape into Bulgaria.

During this time the committees had put to death Papa-Christos, priest of Precopana, with his nephew John, under the orders and in the presence of the schismatic priest Papa-Gherman. They had also murdered Lagos of Bapsori; the moukhtar Christ of Hodjivista, Zaïkos of Preznitsa and his son, and ten old men of Tiholista. Shortly after this, Vanghelis was ambushed and slain by Bulgarians, and the convent of the Holy Anarghyres became the object of the attacks of the committees. The last attack was made so recently as last March, when the Superior of the convent was murdered

with his companions (for particulars of this murder, see the *Bulletin d'Orient*, Nos. 168 & 172).

The perpetration of these crimes did not prevent the Bulgarians from addressing fresh entreaties to the Bishop, praying him to use his position as member of the Provincial Council and to intervene on behalf of the Comitadjis Kyriagos, Draskas, Mamboulis and others, who were accused under martial law. Caravanghelis extricated these men from their predicament: he also rescued one Nako, of the Chroupista committee, whom he sheltered in the diocesan palace.

The rising broke out anew, and once more the bands were crushed. Hundreds of Bulgarian women and children, from Aposkepo, Costenetsi, Zombanigta and other villages, fled to the shores of Lake Kastoria. The Bishop sent boats to convey them across to the city, and extended to them the hospitality of his palace. For three months the Cathedral close and the Bishop's garden were turned into a camp; more than three hundred persons—old men, women, children—were maintained at the expense of the Bishop. To face this heavy expense, he was obliged not only to restrict the ordinary episcopal expenditure but also to incur large debts, many of which he has not yet been able to clear off.

The report goes on to discuss many of the false charges made by the Bulgarians. Some of these would be sufficiently absurd if they did not wear an appearance of truth. For example, the Bishop one day received a letter from the well-known English traveller, Lady Thompson, who said that she had learned with pain that he had imprisoned a Bulgarian Priest in the convent of the Holy Anarghyres; she called upon him instantly to abandon these methods of medieval barbarism. Now the truth is that the prisoner was not a Bulgarian priest; he was a Greek (one Theophanis), a violent lunatic. In the absence of any proper asylum, this man was confined within a convent, after the universal custom of the Orient. On another occasion Mgr. Caravanghelis was present at a review held in honour of the Sultan's birthday; a photograph of the scene has been spread abroad, as evidence of an imaginary Greco-Turkish co-operation. The photograph will be found, with misleading letterpress, in Mr. H. N. Brailsford's book on "Macedonia."

Touching this last calumny, that there is a connivance between the Turkish authorities and the Greek episcopacy, one might ask how it comes about that the five Orthodox Greek bishops of Pelagonia, Drama, Corydja, Cozani and Kastoria have been deprived by the Porte of the right to stay within their dioceses and to take part in the Provincial Councils, whereas Bulgarian bishops, as deeply implicated as those of Stromnitsa and of Ochrida, have never been subjected to the slightest vexation.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A BULGARIAN MARÈS-NEST.

From a Sofia Correspondent.

The *Sofia Courier*, which is inspired by the Bulgarian Foreign Office, publishes the following document, as emanating from the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and purporting to be addressed to the President of a Macedonian Committee at Athens:

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
First Division.
Registration No. 3,539.

Athens, December 28, 1906.

Sir,

In the name of the Nation, I beg that you will reimburse the Chief K. Goudas the arrears of pay due to 25 *men of his band.*

We take the liberty of respectfully recommending that such a thing may not occur again.

The Minister.
(Signed) Alex. Scouzes.

Although this letter bears a wholly fictitious registration number, and although a mere perusal of the text is sufficient to expose the thing as a forgery, the Bulgarian official journal publishes it and pretends to believe in it, and denounces Mr. Scouzes as the "Grand Master of the "Greek Committees, which flood Macedonia with mer-"cenary bands who slay the inoffensive Bulgarians." The Bulgarian newspapers are finding in this letter a new pretext for their attacks upon Greece; they are using it as a means of stirring up hatred against the Greeks, and we may expect them to offer the same perverted reason as a justification for the murder of unhappy Greek emigrants by the Bulgarian soldiery.

It is superfluous to add that, whatever the uneducated part of the Bulgarian public may believe, and whatever the Bulgarian journals may wish and pretend to believe, no one competent to form an opinion, even in Sofia itself, is deceived by this ridiculous piece of foolery, which has not even the merit of looking as though it could possibly be true. In Ministerial Offices it is customary to employ a somewhat more concise mode of speech, and in Greece, at all events, even if by any chance a Minister should require to address the members of a Committee, he would display a slightly less exaggerated degree of respect.

From a Paris Correspondent.

The Sofia correspondent of the *Temps* telegraphs (June 12):—"The journals here are publishing what "purports to be an official document proving the com-"plicity of the Government of Athens with the Greek "bands in Macedonia. The signature given is that of "Mr. Scouzes, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the "document is addressed to the President of the Helleno-"Macedonian Committee. The text is:—'*Sir, in the name* "'*of the people, I pray you to pay the chief Gouda the pay* "'*overdue to the* 25 *men of his band, and to guard against a* "'*recurrence of the event.*' We suppose that the Bulgarian "diplomats will use this document to back up fresh anti-"Greek representations to the Great Powers."

Our readers will observe divergencies between the text communicated by the *Temps* correspondent and that published by the *Sofia Courier*. We may remark that it is usual, when laying claim to the possession of an official document, to publish it as it stands. The Bulgarians, however, are careful not to publish in any European journal so ridiculously manifest a falsification; they have contented themselves with telegraphing abroad the general sense of the letter, hoping thereby to give an appearance of truth to a forgery which, if published in full, could only provoke the laughter of an intelligent public.

On June 13, the day following its publication of the above, the *Temps* published the following telegram from Athens:—"It is officially declared that the letter pub-"lished by the Bulgarian journals as having been sent by "Mr. Scouzes, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Presi-"dent of the Macedonian Committee, is a pure invention. "The letter itself bears manifest evidence of being a

"forgery. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whether "during Mr. Scouzes' tenure of office or under his prede- "cessors, has never entered into any relations with the "Macedonian Committee."

NEW YORK AND MACEDONIAN HELLENISM.

Archbishop Potter of New York presided over a grand meeting held at Palm Garden on May 5 to protest against the deeds of violence to which the Bulgarians have subjected the Macedonian Hellenists.

The Archbishop described the conditions under which the Hellenes of Macedonia have suffered from the attacks of the Bulgarian bands; he pictured, also, the lot measured out by the Sofia government to the Greeks of the Principality. He gave an impartial summary of the state of affairs, and insisted upon the moral responsibility which Europe is incurring owing to their continuance. In conclusion, the Primate expressed the hope that if resolutions relative to an appeal for aid were laid before the United States Government, this might contribute towards restraining the unbridling of bloodthirsty angers.

Mr. Denis O'Sullivan, the well-known New York lawyer, spoke to the same effect. He proposed that lectures should be arranged with a view to enlightening the American public on the subject of Bulgarian aims and methods. The audience adopted this speaker's proposal that a permanent association should be formed with the object of defending the cause of Hellenism, and that it should act in concert with the Macedo-Thracian Committee of New York. Mr. Brittman, a former magistrate, and Mr. Panopoulos, a Greek, also spoke.

According to the *New York Times*, a series of lectures and meetings will be organised by the New York League for the Defence of the Rights of Macedonian Hellenism, and will shortly commence.

THE DEFENCE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN.

Mgr. A. Colocci, formerly a deputy in the Italian chamber, has just published, in the *Revue Diplomatique* of Paris, an interesting article on "La protection de la Méditerranée," from which we extract the following passages:—

Imperious considerations of defence would explain and justify the coalition of Mediterranean Powers. So far as union between Greece and Italy is concerned, however, there is a more potent cause than even reasons of policy; there is the very logic of history. The need of defence against Austrian aggression is forced upon the notice of both powers. If Austria could gain possession of Valona, which is within 50 miles of Otranto, she would be able to close the gates of the Adriatic upon Italy. In the same way, if Austria could use Salonica as the *point d'appui* for her maritime forces, there would be an end to all Greek influence in the Archipelago.

A second common menace to Greece and Italy is found in the pressure which is leading the Slavonic peoples of the Balkans to try to burst out from their inland territories and to gain a footing on the two sea-boards.

For centuries the coast-lands and the Isles of Istria and Dalmatia have been inhabited by Italian races, just as the coast of Macedonia, of Athos, and of the Chalcidean peninsulas have been occupied by Greeks, while the interior regions have been settled by Slavonic peoples—Slovenes and Croats on the Italian sides, Bulgarians towards the Greek regions.

It is clear that if the Slavonic races of the interior succeed in making their way to the two seas, this would mean the obliteration of the ethnic character of the littoral populations, which are mainly Italian on the Adriatic, Greek on the Ægean, Greco-Italian on the Ionian Sea.

If we consider in addition the sympathy manifested in Italy towards the Greeks in respect of the Cretan question, and the endeavours of the Crown to withdraw itself from family interests, we shall see that the Greco-Italian *rapprochement* is not merely Platonic, but that it rests on a secure foundation of earnests already given.

When Italy brought Greece into the Mediterranean Concert, the force which introduced into the League (if we may so call it), was by no means negligible. It would be a mistake to regard the population of the Kingdom of Greece as an adequate criterion of her political importance. Union with Greece implies the friendship of ten millions of Levantine Greeks, who are spread over the entire Orient, and in whose hands are the bulk of the banks, the commerce, the industry of Egypt, Syria, the coasts of the Black Sea, and down to the mouth of the Red Sea.

Hellenism, moreover, is a pledge of solid and settled policy. The Greece of to-day does not imitate the turbulence and disorder of certain petty Balkan States. Her attitude to Turkey since the last war indicates a renunciation of all policy of adventure, and she has given many proofs of an orderly spirit which has gained her the confidence of the Great Powers.

It must not be overlooked that Greece is to-day the most civilised state of the Orient. The University of Athens is the beacon which illuminates with the light of learning the progress (still, unhappily, too slow), of the European Orient.

THE REFUGEES IN THESSALY.

Mr. Aster Alexandre, of the Almyros (Thessaly) branch of the "Hellenismos" Society, writes:—

A large number of Greeks from Bulgaria, whose flight from that inhospitable country had led them to Athens, have been conducted to Almyros, which is among the chief of the centres in which the solicitude of the Government is establishing them. Each time that a fresh body of our unhappy kinsmen arrives among us affords opportunity for new demonstrations of warm sympathy, demonstrations which are often of touching character. As they arrive, they are overcome with emotion as they set foot on the Greek soil on which they are henceforth to live in peace among the brothers of their race. In every case they are received with warm and universal welcome.

The population of Almyros has set itself to make these unfortunate settlers forget the unhappy turn of events which has torn them from their homes and their property, from the land which holds the ashes of their fathers. They try to efface the memory of the unspeakable sufferings to which the refugees have been subjected, and to the exile which they were finally forced to impose upon themselves, as their only means of escape from oppression.

A committee, consisting of the leading men of Almyros, assisted by several ladies, has been appointed to superintend the settlement of the refugees; within the last few days, the numbers of the committee have been greatly increased, so as to facilitate the settlement, and more certainly to ensure the satisfaction of everyone concerned. But quite apart from this official work, a large number of the residents have taken upon themselves the pleasant duty of alleviating the sufferings of their compatriots.

The Easter festival has afforded our townspeople an opportunity of giving an auspicious character to the inauguration of the new colony in our midst. Everyone has played his part according to his means; the merchants of Almyros have furnished garments and woollen goods; the farmers have sent eggs and farm produce; the shepherds have provided lambs. Thus the refugees have not lacked the Paschal lamb and the red Easter egg, the traditional Easter fare of the Greeks. Finally, the physicians and apothecaries of the town have also placed their gratuitous services at the disposition of all Greeks emigrant from Bulgaria. The Government has undertaken the maintenance of the exiles, but the goodwill and assistance of private individuals is not out of place when there is so much suffering calling for relief.

Until the refugees have been definitely installed in the property which the Government has set apart for their use, they are, in a sense, our guests, and the precarious condition to which they have been reduced has evoked the warmest sympathy on all sides. Numerous instances of generosity and liberality might be recounted, but I will content myself with a reference to the magnificent gift of Mr. K. Charokopos. This gentleman, with enlightened patriotism, has placed his domain of "Kalogriana" in Thessaly at the disposal of the refugees.

THE LAUNCHING OF GREEK WARSHIPS ON THE THAMES.

On July 10th there was a beautiful ceremony in Messrs. Yarrow's shipyards at Poplar, where two more Greek destroyers were launched in the presence of the official representatives of Greece, His Excellency Mr. D. Metaxas, the Minister, Mr. L. Caftanzoglou, First Secretary to the Legation, Mr. T. Joannides, Acting Consul, the Archimandrites, of the Greek Church, the Rev. Mr. Pagonis and Rev. Mr. Moschovakis, the officers of the ships, and those charged with the supervision of the construction, and a large number of the Greek community in London, officially represented by Mr. P. Ralli.

After the ceremony of consecration and christening had been performed by the Archimandrites, His Excellency Mr. D. Metaxas delivered a stirring address. He praised the Greek statesmen for the care they take in strengthening the national forces; the national benefactors, whose generous contributions have provided for the building of these two vessels. He referred to the prominent place occupied among the national benefactors by the Greek community in London, which is always to the front in helping on valuable national works. Then His Excellency turned in conclusion to the officers present, whom he exhorted to continue in the glorious traditions of the Greek Navy, and to imitate their brave ancestors, whose marvellous achievements on sea and on land during the War of Independence laid the foundations of our free Fatherland, whom destiny has called to unite in freedom all the yet unredeemed sons of Hellas, and to prove worthy of the glorious past. "In the name of our august sovereign, King George I.," he concluded, "I give these ships the names of the SPEAR and the SLING."

After the Minister's speech, the newly-appointed Archimandrite of the Bayswater Greek Church, the Rev. Mr. Pagonis spoke a few words full of ardent patriotism and religious devotion. He emphasised the fact that the Greek nation has passed through her vicissitudes and glories always supported by her religion and her patriotism, and whatever the future might have in store for her, religion and patriotism would ever enable her worthily to play her part.

THE FOREIGN TRADE OF GREECE.

We have often referred to the development of the foreign trade of Greece during 1906. We give subjoined a comparison of statistics for 1906 and 1905:—

	1906	1905
Total commerce	£10,460,343	£8,985,748
Imports	£5,738,056	£5,631,322
Exports	£4,722,287	£3,354,426
Excess of Imports ...	£1,015,769	£2,276,896
Customs receipts ...	£1,565,303	£1,345,763

It will be observed that the disproportion between imports and exports has been reduced by something like one and a quarter millions sterling. If we consider that the remittances sent home by emigrants must alone exceed the £1,015,769 of the above table, and that Greece also profits largely from her merchant marine and from the tourists who visit her, it will be seen that the present balance is very favourable to Greece.

From the commercial point of view, 1906 was not only a better year than 1905: it was, in fact, a record year. The fact is brought out by the subjoined table, which gives the values of imports and exports for the last 14 years:—

Year.	Imports. (£ sterling.)	Exports. (£ sterling.)
1893	3·66	3·20
1894	4·40	2·97
1895	4·38	2·89
1896	4·65	2·90
1897	4·66	3·27
1898	5·53	3·53
1899	5·25	3·76
1900	5·26	4·10
1901	5·62	2·96
1902	5·49	3·19
1903	5.46	3·37
1904	5·13	3·65
1905	5·63	3·31
1906	5·74	4·72

The increase of £1,367,861 in the exports of 1906 over those of 1905 is due mainly to an increased export of agricultural produce—oil, olives, figs, vegetables, wines, and, above all, tobacco and currants. The price of currants has reached a figure much higher than in previous years.

The export of minerals also marks an increase of more than a third of a million sterling—£973,069 in 1906, against £608,760 in 1905.

THE COMMERCE OF SALONICA IN 1906.

A Salonica correspondent of the *Bulletin d'Orient* sends the following details of the trade of that port in 1906:—

I.—IMPORTS.

Character of Goods.	Countries from which they come.	Value. £ sterling.
Stuffs of various kinds—Silk, Woollen Goods, &c.	England, Germany Switzerland, Italy, United States	1,020,000
Manufactured Goods ...	England, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Austria	110,000
Sugar	Austria, Russia	96,000
Empty Sacks, Cloth ...	India, France, Italy, Austria, Germany	15,200
Coffee	Brazil	140,000
Petroleum	Russia, Italy, Hungary, Roumania	126,000
Soap	Greece, Crete, Mitylene, France	40,000
Oils	Italy, Greece, Crete, France...	80,000
Rice...	India, Italy, Holland, Austria	40,000
Metals	England, Belgium, France, Sweden, Italy	160,000
Candles	Holland, Belgium, France ...	5,200
Paper	Austria, France, Italy	30,000
Hardware	Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Italy, England	100,000
Leathers...	India, France, Africa, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Austria	160,000
Chemicals	India, France, Austria, Italy, England	20,000
Matches	Austria, Italy	6,000
Glass, Porcelain, &c. ...	Belgium, Austria, Italy, Germany, England	28,000
Spirits	Russia, Austria, Hungary, Italy	28,000
Furniture, Clothing, &c.	Austria, Italy, France, &c. ...	200,000
Coal...	England, Turkey	12,480
Flour	France, Roumania, Russia, Bulgaria, Servia	51,600
Corn	Turkey, Bulgaria, Russia, Servia	120,000
		£2,588,480

Diplomatic Conflicts in the Near East.

BY

THEODORE P. ION, D.C.M.

Professor of International Law at Boston University Law School.

PRINCE BÜLOW, the German Chancellor, using one of his happy expressions—in which he seems to be prolific—said once in the Reichstag that the Eastern Question was like a sea serpent, which never appears above the waves all at once, but in sections (See *Times*, December 13th, 1898). One might even say that, it is more like that monster "Hydra," whose heads were doubled when cut off; the City of the Golden Horn representing in some way its central and immortal head.

Leaving to a future Hercules the task of delivering again the world from such an evil, let us now examine some of the present difficulties which seem to perplex European diplomacy.

The object of the present article is not so much to state the facts of some of these troubles, as to deal with the point of view of International law with which they are connected. But as it would be impossible to dissociate entirely the facts from the *law*, a summary statement of the causes which gave rise to these events is deemed to be indispensable.

* * * * * * * * * *

EVER since the conclusion of the famous treaty of Berlin, of 1878, by which the Ottoman Government pledged itself to introduce "reforms" in its European and Asiatic possessions, the signatory Powers to that instrument have been occupied with endless negotiations between themselves, and made countless suggestions, recommendations, and threats to the Sublime Porte for the carrying out of the projected "reforms"; but we all know the result of all these exertions; a considerable increase of lawlessness and plunder, of murders and assassinations, and of periodical massacres, were the reward received from Turkey by Western Europe for having saved again the tottering empire from the clutches of Russia.

In Asiatic Turkey, the massacres having been carried to perfection, the question of reforms—much to the relief of the Sultan—has been relegated to the Greek Kalends. But in the European possessions of the Empire—besides the perennial misgovernment—the "Reforming" Powers have encountered with another not less formidable difficulty—namely, the racial hatred and the political antagonism of its heterogeneous inhabitants, which, being inflamed by the exhortations and intrigues of the people of the so-called Balkan States—the would-be heirs of the estate of the Sick Man of the East—brought the matter to a real *impasse*.

We will, therefore, here deal with some of the questions which have arisen between these States, who, in their eagerness to demonstrate or vindicate their so-called rights, in the future "inheritance," have not only overstepped the limits of international courtesy, but also violated some of the fundamental principles of the law of nations; trampling upon the very treaties which admitted them into the family of civilized nations.

The differences which have caused the comission of these unlawful acts, arose between Roumania and Greece and the Greek Church on one hand and between Bulgaria and the same Church, and incidentally again with Greece, on the other hand.

Each case shall be dealt with separately, according to the chronological order of the events.

First, then, of the diplomatic conflict between Roumania and the Hellenic Kingdom.

In the heterogeneous country known by the classical name of Macedonia and in some other parts of European Turkey, there exists a population, known by the name of Koutzo-Vlachs or Helleno-Vlachs. The remote origin of these people is unknown, but their speech denotes a Latin connection with a tincture of Greek. Leaving to ethnologists the task of tracing the true ancestry of these interesting people and of discovering whether they descend from Latin colonists or are mere remnants of a Greco-Pelasgic race, let us see what are their natural aspirations; the only safe criterion for the settlement of the question of a people's nationality.

For centuries, the Koutzo-Vlachs have cast their lot with the Hellenic nation, not only in words but also in deeds. They took a leading part in the war of Greek Independence and after the establishment of the Hellenic Kingdom contributed to the regeneration of the new state in various ways; the city of Athens being the principal recipient of their munificence.

Now, the Latin origin of the speech of the Koutzo-Vlachs has appealed to the imagination of some Roumanian statesmen, who took it for granted that these people were nothing but Roumanians and that it was their duty to bring them under their political sphere of influence, in order to make the best bargain of it in the eventual partition of the Macedonian provinces.

Consequently, during nearly 40 years, every sort of artifice has been employed in order to allure the Koutzo-Vlachs, so that they may be induced to espouse the Roumanian cause. A host of emissaries has been sent to all parts of European Turkey where such people were to be found; schools have been founded by the Roumanian Government, with free tuition and even free board, and numerous scholarships have been created; generous rewards in money being given to parents who sent their children to the Roumanian and not to the Greek schools, as they had hitherto done. But unfortunately for Roumania, all these efforts were frustrated by

the refusal of the bulk of the population to detach themselves from Hellenism, with which they had for centuries identified themselves.

This failure was admitted some years ago, as it is evident from the official correspondence passed between the Roumanian Inspector of Schools in European Turkey and the Minister of Education at Bucharest. (See Revue de Droit International et de la legislation comparée, deuxième série, vol. vii., p. 679; also deuxième série, vol. viii., p. 309. Article by Prof. M. Kebedgy.)

"Greece," wrote this Roumanian Inspector of Schools, "has undergone in these recent years two great crises, which shook her from her very foundation, namely, bankruptcy and war. These reverses should have stopped or weakened the progress and the development of the Greek schools in Turkey, still they have not in the least suffered; everywhere they maintain a high position, as if nothing had happened; the reason of it is, that the Greek proselytism is not founded on interest, but relies on the people who are totally devoted to them" (The Hellenes). Ibid. R. D. I. (1)

The despondency of the Roumanian official is emphasized by the following remarks: "Our Schools," he wrote, "are in want of pupils in villages which are inhabited purely by Vlachs, whilst those of the Greeks are full of them, although in these schools they pay tuition fees, whilst in our own they are exempted from such payment." And he further added that "the Vlach sends his children to the Roumanian school, in order that we may make him presents." . . . "It is not," he continued, "the foreigners that have fought us from the very beginning, but the Roumanians (the Koutzo-Vlachs) our own compatriots." (??) . . . in whatever manner we appear before them not only they refuse to receive us, but avoid us as if we were infected." (2).

In vain the various Koutzo-Vlach communities told the Roumanian agents that they wished to be Greeks and not Roumanians; in vain they warned them that it was purely a loss both of time and money to try to Roumanize the people, who were already Hellenized; and that consequently their sympathies and aspirations were on the Greek side. Nothing availed to discourage the Roumanian statesmen; they wished at any price to have some people on their side, so that they might, at a future date, barter their claims with some compensation in different direction.

See views of Roumanian statesmen on the question of compensation in the *Monthly Review*, April, 1903, and in *La terre et la race Roumaine* by Al. Stourdza, ed. 7904 p. 147, note. (3)

Notwithstanding all these failures, the Roumanian Government, after an interruption of a few years, recommenced its efforts, and in May 23rd, 1905, succeeded in obtaining from the Sultan an edict recognizing the Koutzo-Vlachs as "distinct communities" with the right of having a separate representative in the administrative councils. (See *the Times*, May 23rd, 1905).

After this success the minister of Roumania at Constantinople renewed his efforts with the Greek Patriarch, under whose ecclesiastical authority the Vlachs are, in order that he might recognize them as such, and that Roumanian priests might be permitted to officiate in the Roumanian language in the churches of the Vlach communities. It should, however, be noticed that this question of the introduction of the so-called national language in churches, has been misrepresented to the outside world. In a semi-official declaration of the Roumanian foreign office it was said that; "The sole aspirations of the Roumanians (the Vlachs) of the Pindus, is to pray to God in their language and to bring their children in the Roumanian schools." (See *Times*, September 14th, 1905).

Now, as a matter of fact, that statement is entirely erroneous and misleading, because it was in the Roumanian language that the religious services were to be conducted, and not in the Vlach dialect, which is a separate idiom, Roumanians and Vlachs being unable to understand each other by using their respective languages. That these are not the same is not denied even by Roumanians themselves. (See statement of the late Mr. Lahovary, Minister of that country at Constantinople in *Temps*, of January 19th, 1905). (4)

NOTE. (1)—This fact is admitted also by one of the leading statesmen of Roumania, who referring to the people of Macedonia wrote that the towns and boroughs "contain a Macedo-Roumanian majority, at least as far as race is concerned, or rather a Greek one, when we consider the wishes of the inhabitants; for a considerable section of the Turkish Roumanians betray Hellenistic rather than Roumanophil tendencies." Take Jonescu, Monthly Review April, 1903.

NOTE. (2)—The Roumanian official on account of his outspoken opinion on this question was subsequently murdered at Bucharest, the culprit being acquitted by the jury with the applause of the public, and treated as a real national hero.

NOTE.—(3) This view was also expressed to me during my recent visit to the Balkan States, by some of the leading statesmen of Servia, amongst them, Mr. Patshitcsh, now Premier of that country, and Mr. Novakovitz, also a former Premier and minister at Constantinople. The concensus of the opinions of the statesmen at Belgrade is that Roumania agitates in Macedonia about the Koutzo-Vlachs, not because she has any hope of acquiring any territory there, but in order to claim compensation from Bulgaria, as a reward for her agitation against the Greeks in Macedonia.

NOTE. (4)—A Vlach priest during his visit in Bucharest having been introduced to the Minister of Public Instruction in that city, after vainly trying to make themselves understood in their respective languages, they resorted at last to the medium of an interpreter, through whom the conversation was carried, it is said, in Turkish, both of them abstaining obstinately to converse in Greek, with which language they were familiar. (See "Atlantis," March, 1907).

In short, the object of the Roumanian government was to substitute the Roumanian for the Greek, which latter tongue is not foreign to the Vlachs, who having no written language of their own, and considering themselves as Greeks, use Greek as their written tongue. In plain words, Roumania desired that the Spiritual Authorities of the Greek Church should help her to obtain a political end, to the detriment both of the Greek Church and the interests of Hellenism.

The " Holy Synod " of Constantinople having refused to accede to these demands as being entirely incompatible with the tenets of the church, Roumania now turned to Greece with the request that the government of that country should use its influence with the Patriarchate at Constantinople for the acceptance of the Roumanian demands. In the meantime, as the Greek bands in the Macedonian provinces had murdered some Vlachs who were accused by the Greeks as co-operating with the Bulgarian bands to commit murders against the Hellenic populations, the people in Roumania retaliated against the Greeks residing in that country, and plundered and pillaged some of their shops in Bucharest (see *Times*, July 31st, 1905) and burned in the streets of Geourgevo a Greek flag (see *Times*, September 10th, 1905) without the Roumanian authorities making any effort to prevent such disorders.

The last incident created immediately a diplomatic conflict: Greece now demanding the punishment of the Roumanian official responsible for the maintenance of order and also an indemnity for the injury sustained by her subjects on account of the disorder. As Roumania refused to give any such satisfaction, Greece, as a mark of displeasure, granted an indefinite leave of absence to her diplomatic agent at Bucharest, it being followed by a similar action on the part of the Roumanian government with her minister at Athens, the legations of both countries being left at the time in charge of their respective secretaries. Still, up to that time, there was not yet, properly speaking, diplomatic rupture between the two countries.

The Roumanian government, subsequently made the following peremptory demands upon Greece :

First. That the Hellenic government should use its influence with the Patriarch at Constantinople, in order that the latter might recognize officially the creation of the projected Vlach communities in European Turkey, and that Roumanian priests might be permitted to officiate in the churches of these communities in the Roumanian language.

Secondly. That the Hellenic government should prevent the Greek bands from entering the Turkish provinces and maltreating the Vlachs.

The reply of Greece to the first request was that the Hellenic Kingdom had no right to interfere in the ecclesiastical matters of a Spiritual Chief, *i.e.*, the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and that, besides, the latter was beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the Greek State. To the second, it was pointed out that the government of King George could not be responsible for acts committed in the territory of the Sultan of Turkey, and that besides, the Vlachs were Turkish, and not Roumanian subjects, and that consequently it was for Turkey and not for Roumania to make any complaints, if there were any.

This peremptory demand on the part of Roumania, coupled with her refusal to grant any satisfaction to Greece for the insult done to her flag, and the ill-treatment of her subjects in Roumania, compelled the Hellenic government to break officially its diplomatic relations with the government of King Charles, and to entrust to Russia the protection of her interests in the Roumanian Kingdom, those of the latter in Greece being likewise given to the charge of Italy.

In consequence of this rupture, Roumania denounced her commercial treaty with Greece, to take effect after its expiration, namely on June, 1906, and also the protocol attached to that instrument, which recognized *permanently* the judicial *status* of the Greek churches and schools in Roumania ; the denunciation in regard to the protocol taking effect immediately. (See *Times*, October 9th, 1905.)

On February 12th, 1906, Greece proposed that both States should resort to the mediation of a third Power, namely, to that of Russia, for the adjustment, in general, of their differences ; or at least to refer to the Court of Arbitration at the Hague, the adjudication of the question of the alleged right of Roumania to denounce the protocol, recognizing *permanently* the judicial *status* of the Greek schools and churches. But Roumania refused to consider both solutions. (See *Times*, October 12th, 1906.)

Now, as the feasibility of war between the two States is precluded on account of the geographical situations of both countries, any attempt on the part of Roumania—which is a stronger military Power than her antagonist—to invade the territory of the latter being impossible, and equally Greece, though strong at sea in comparison to Roumania—the latter having practically no navy—being unable to send her fleet to the Roumanian coast on the Black Sea on account of the International prohibition of the passage of men-of-war through the straits of the Dardanelles, the " hostilities" have been fortunately limited to " commercial war " and " newspaper vituperation." As a matter of fact no attempt was ever made by the Greek fleet to capture any Roumanian boat in the Mediterranean, nor by the Roumanian cruisers to capture any Greek boats in the Black Sea.

It is, therefore, evident that no state of war exists between the two countries, but a mere severance of diplomatic relations, not unusual in the history of diplomacy.

The first question to be here examined, is as to how far the demands made by Roumania upon Greece were justified, in accordance with the accepted rules and usages of International law.

As to the first, namely, that Greece should use her influence with the Greek Patriarchate at Constantinople for the furtherance of the political interests of Roumania, it is beyond question that a State is not under any obligation to second the policy of a foreign country by using her influence with a Spiritual authority, especially when that happens to be both independent and out of her territorial jurisdiction. The expression "to use her influence," corresponds to the "use of the good offices or mediation" which a friendly state might be requested from another to offer in a diplomatic conflict. But neither good offices nor mediation have any obligatory force upon States, at least, as long as they have not taken a special engagement to that effect by treaty. (See Treaty of 1858 between Japan and the United States, and also Treaty of Paris in 1856). It is purely discretionary for a State to mediate or intercede in favour of another in order to adjust a difference. It might be an act of politeness and international courtesy not to refuse such a favour, if it does not conflict with the interests of such State; but between an act of politeness and an obligation there is a great difference. It is even questionable, whether the refusal of a favour of such a character, may be considered as an infringement of the rules of the "comity of nations," justifying the other party to resort to Retortion.

Therefore, it is quite evident that Greece was not under any obligation towards Roumania, to use her influence with the Greek Patriarch at Constantinople, in order to induce the latter to accede to the Roumanian demands, especially when such acts are directed against her own interests, namely, to detach the Vlachs from Hellenic influence. In plain words, Roumania asked Greece to commit suicide and the latter refused to do so.

That there does not exist any such obligation is beyond any doubt, and the injustice of the Roumanian claim may be seen at a mere glance. To illustrate the case, let us suppose a foreign power, say, England, requesting Spain, to use her influence with the Pope for certain ecclesiastical concessions, which she might have wished to secure for some people residing, say, in France, and citizens of that country, who, might happen to have an affinity with the Anglo-Saxon race, or speak a language which might have some kind of connection with the English, (like the Vlach with the Roumanian) and upon the refusal of Spain to use such influence with the Pope, England should retaliate upon Spanish subjects residing in England, and denounce her commercial and other treaties with that power. Could such conduct be justified amongst civilized nations?

But the second demand is not less untenable than the first. The Roumanian government held Greece responsible for the acts of the Greek bands in Turkish territory, and, what is more strange, upon Turkish subjects, namely the Vlachs. That the Roumanian government should make friendly representations to Turkey for the ill-treatment of the so-called Roumanians (the Vlachs) though Turkish subjects, and residing in Turkish territory, may be conceded as a consecration of the principle of nationalities carried to its extreme limit, but instead of that, to make a peremptory demand upon a foreign government for these acts, is beyond the conception not only of International law, but also of the rules of the comity of nations, as accepted in modern times.

That Turkey has a perfect right to make representations to Greece—as she did on various occasions—and to ask the Government of that country to prevent the Greek bands from entering the Turkish territory, is beyond question, but for Roumania to hold Greece responsible for acts committed against Turkish subjects, is incomprehensible. It is entirely a novel theory without any precedent in the diplomatic history of the civilised world.

The policy of the United States Government in regards to the kidnapping of Miss Stone by members of the Bulgarian revolutionary committees, who had come from that principality to carry out their misdeeds on Turkish territory, is well-known, as being comparatively of recent date. In that case, although there was not any shadow of doubt—as it was subsequently admitted by Saravoff, the principal leader of these committees—that the kidnapping was the work of the Bulgarian revolutionaries, (See Washburn's memo. Foreign Relations 1902, p. 1017), no serious step was taken by the State department to hold Bulgaria responsible for that act, and no demand was ever made upon that principality to pay to the United States the $75,000 subscribed by the people of the United States and paid for the ransom of Miss Stone. It should not be forgotten that the United States had a stronger claim than Roumania, because Miss Stone was an American citizen, whilst the Vlachs are Turkish subjects. It is therefore Turkey, on whose territory the act was committed and not Bulgaria that was held liable for the payment of the ransom money, but the claim was never pressed. (5.)

Another question connected with International law, in this controversy, is whether

NOTE (5.)—In the interview between the American chargé d'affaires and the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Turkish government was informed that "Whatever sum was ultimately agreed upon to be paid to the brigands, it would have to be paid by the Turkish government, and that the Turkish Minister agreed that precedence warranted the demand of the money from the Porte." See Foreign Relations, October 2nd, 1902, p. 4006.

Roumania was justified in nullifying the effects of the protocol annexed to the Commercial Convention, in regards to the recognition of the Juridicial capacity of the churches and schools of the Greek communities in Roumania, with all the privileges and rights attached thereto, such as the right of holding real property, that of teaching and the like. According to the terms of that instrument "The Hellenic churches—which actually exist in Roumania—shall be definitely considered as moral persons and shall continue to exist as such, as well as the schools depending thereof, by conforming to the laws and regulations of the Kingdom."

The Roumanian government contends that these privileges are mere grants and may, consequently, be withdrawn at any time and for any reason, independently of the Commercial Convention, of which they may or may not be part, notwithstanding the wording of the protocol as to their permanency. (See article written on this point by Prof. Streit in *Revue de Droit International Privé*, of March and April, 1906).

Now the recognition of the *status* of the Greek churches and schools in Roumania, in an International compact, was attained after good many years negotiation between the two countries, and the settlement of the question was considered at that time by the governments of both States, as ending definitely a controversy of long standing, which was a source of trouble both to Greece and Roumania. It should be besides observed that these Greek communities were established in Roumania long before the recognition of the latter as an independent State.

The question, therefore, may be asked as to whether a State, whilst at peace with another, is justified in denouncing an International compact by which the citizens of one have acquired certain rights of a permanent character in the territory of another, thus setting at naught all such rights and privileges. That war generally puts an end to treaties between belligerents,—except transitory treaties,—i.e., those of a permanent character, such as the delimitation of boundaries, the acquisition of territory and certain others of a different nature,—every one will concede ; though it is questionable whether a State even in such a case can nullify rights acquired by individuals and subjects of the other belligerent. At least from the adjudication of both English and American cases, one may draw the conclusion, that where treaties contemplate permanent arrangement of certain national rights, it would be against every principle of just interpretation to hold them extinguished by war. (See the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel v. New Haven, 8 Wheaton, 464. Also Sutton v. Sutton, 1 Russel & Milne, 663.)

But to resort to such a measure, in time of peace, by withdrawing certain rights acquired by aliens, in a permanent manner does not seem to be in consonance with justice and equity, upon which the principles of law of nations are mostly founded.

(To be continued.)

The Persecution of the Greeks in Bulgaria.

During the nights of June 1 and 2 there was enacted near Cavakli, on the Turko-Bulgarian frontier a horrible tragedy which adds a lurid page to the long catalogue of the sufferings of the unfortunate Greek population of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, while at the same time it leaves a new and shameful blot on the record of the criminal persecutors.

A detachment of Bulgarian troops (which the telegrams published in certain journals have tried to pass off for a Turkish detachment) descried, on the boundary line, an unarmed group of Greeks—men, women and children—who were leaving the country of their ancestors, in order to escape being forced to deny their nationality and the faith of their fathers. The sergeant in charge of the Bulgarians saw the chance of some fine sport. "Why, go for them!" he cried, and straightway the carnage began. Six were killed and thirteen wounded, among whom was a woman, Anastasia Pascoudi, who expected shortly to become a mother—a glorious exploit of the Bulgarians! After this misdeed, the soldiers bore off the survivors to their guard house, and there despoiled them of their money, their valuables and their animals, and afterwards drove them towards the direction of Cavakli.

This "Bulgarian atrocity," perpetrated openly by Bulgarian troops upon unarmed citizens whom they had caught in a premeditated ambush, must surely excite the horror and indignation of the entire civilised world.

* * * * * *

The reasons for the clandestine emigration of Greeks from Bulgaria are as follows: No emigrant can obtain his passport until he has satisfied a number of arbitrary regulations imposed by the Bulgarian authorities. We give a few of these regulations :—

1st. Twelve certificates must be presented from the prefecture, the sub-prefecture, the mayor, the police, the gendarmerie officials, the military authority, the tax-gatherer, etc.—despite the fact that the law on the granting of passports makes no mention of any of these certificates. The would-be emigrant can only get these certificates after running about for a month and disbursing at least 40 shillings.

2nd. If the emigrant wishes to sell any real property, and has any male children who have not yet undergone their military service, he must pay an indemnity of £81 to the authorities. It is on account of this clause that the Bulgarian authorities have prevented many inhabitants of Couclaina from proceeding with the sale of their property.

3rd. For the inhabitants of Couclaina there is a special regulation: the authorities demand a further certificate, signed by a commission of which no one knows anything, stating that the emigrant has the right to change his nationality. This stipulation is quite outside the laws, and it is this regulation more than anything else which forces the Greeks of Cavakli to try to escape during the night through the mountain passes, in the face of a thousand difficulties, of which the fatal events of the night of May 19-20 was the culmination.

* * * * * *

In some parts of Eastern Roumelia, more particularly at Sozoupolis, the Bulgarian authorities have invented a new and unheard-of method of preventing the exodus. The communal authorities have hit upon the plan of demanding, from those Greeks who are disposed to

emigrate, all arrears of taxes from the time of the Turkish administration, *i.e.*, from before 1878. They try even to hold the emigrant responsible for all the arrears of his relatives and connections, living or dead. By means of these imaginary estimates they establish a demand for £10 or £15 or £20; but they are careful to insinuate that, if the emigrant abandons his project, no more will be heard of these charges.

* * * * * *

The Bulgarian journal *Mir* gives what it says is the main reason why the Bulgarians seek to prevent the exodus of Greeks. The emigrants, says the *Mir*, make for Constantinople or Athens, and there they are seen by numbers of European tourists, who would otherwise be ignorant for the most part of the very existence of a Greek element in Bulgaria, not to speak of the sufferings endured by this element.

This, the *Mir* informs us, is harmful to the Bulgarian cause, and thus the Bulgarians themselves demonstrate (of course, inadvertently) that their cause is based on falsehood and on the distortion of real facts.

PRESS REVIEW.

From the Westminster Gazette."

———: o :———

THE UNREST IN THE BALKANS.

THE CASE FOR THE GREEKS.

The condition of affairs in Macedonia is once again occasioning anxiety. While, as Sir Edward Grey was able to tell a recent deputation, considerable reforms have been effected, disorders of the gravest kind still continue, though they are to some extent of a different character from those which formerly prevailed. Whereas then it was the misrule of the Turk which was responsible, to-day it is the conflicts between the Greeks and Bulgarians which are the main source of anxiety. And, by the irony of circumstances, it is, according to Sir Edward Grey, the intervention of the Powers which has been largely responsible for this deplorable condition of affairs. For that intervention, he tells us, has stimulated the belief that Macedonia may eventually be freed entirely from Turkish rule, and this in turn has led to one nationality persecuting the other, and to their pegging-out claims for themselves in case any division should take place.

Already hundreds of deaths have occurred, and sanguinary conflicts are of constant occurrence. Armed bands rove about, attacking, pillaging, and destroying. According to some, the Greeks are the aggressors; according to others, the Bulgarians. So far as the attitude of the Greeks is concerned, there is in London just now a gentleman exceptionally well qualified to speak on the subject, in the person of Mr. André Andréadès, Professor of Public Finance at the University of Athens and Editor of the *Bulletin d'Orient*, and the following brief notes of a recent chat with him on the subject may be read, therefore, with interest.

The Greek case overlooked.

Professor Andréadès expressed the opinion at the outset that hitherto the Greek case had been to some extent obscured and overlooked. Thus it had been contended by some that the Greeks in this matter were working with the Turks, and endeavouring to play them off against the Bulgarians. Such a charge was, however, utterly disproved by the facts: (1) that conflicts were constant between the Turks themselves and Greeks, and (2) that any number of Greeks in Macedonia had been imprisoned, and were still imprisoned, by the Turkish authorities. The notion of co-operation and collusion between the Greek inhabitants and the Turkish authorities in this matter was, therefore, absurd. The armed Greek bands, Professor Andréadès went on to say, had come into existence solely on account of the total incapacity of the existing authorities to protect the Greek population against the Bulgarians, whose bands were even more numerous, and, as it was perfectly certain, were organised and officered from Sofia by the Bulgarian Government. In proof of this last statement, Professor Andréadès "put in" an interesting document. This was a tabular statement of all the Bulgarian officers engaged not long since on this work in Macedonia, which had been obtained from the archives of the Bulgarian Committees and published in a Greek newspaper. Names, regiments, and all other particulars of the various officers were given in this table, which thus proved conclusively the complicity of the Bulgarian Government in the disturbances.

A referendum under European Control.

As to the possibility of a settlement of this deplorable racial conflict, Professor Andréadès was more hopeful than might have been anticipated. "At first sight," he observed, "the situation seems a very difficult one, but I am inclined to agree with M. Engelhardt, the well known French diplomatist and writer on international affairs, that its solution should not be impossible. For, as M. Engelhardt has pointed out, the amount of what may be called debatable territory in Macedonia is comparatively limited. That is to say, while the Bulgarians are overwhelmingly predominant in the North, the Greeks are equally so in the South. So far as these districts are concerned, the partition presents no difficulty. The difficulties are undoubtedly much greater in Central Macedonia, but even here they can be solved with the aid of the referendum. Referendum is the only way to know what is the real national feeling of the contested population. And it will offer every guarantee of sincerity if, as M. Engelhardt proposes, it takes place under the supervision of a European international commission. There need be no formal partition, and the Turks could still retain their nominal sovereignty. At the same time, to those who look to the eventual dislodgment of the Turk from Macedonia I would point out that this can only be accomplished by agreement between the two Christian populations. So long as they remain disunited, it is certain that they can never hope to get rid of the Turk."

"And you do not altogether despair of such an entente being arranged?"

"No, I do not; though I should be much more hopeful but for the monstrous treatment of the Greeks by the Bulgarians in Bulgaria itself and in Eastern Roumelia, which, of course, forms virtually a part of that Principality. If the condition of affairs is deplorable in Macedonia, it is infinitely more so here, where the Greeks are being subjected to the most ruthless persecution, recalling the worst horrors of the Jews in Russia and the Armenians under the Turks. Unfortunately, the English public has been to a large extent kept in ignorance of the facts hitherto. Otherwise, I cannot doubt that much more public indignation and sympathy would have been aroused. What makes the matter the more regrettable, too, is that under the Treaty of Berlin the Powers are fully authorised to intervene. Under that Treaty the utmost pains were taken to safeguard the rights of the Greek minority, which at present are being so ruthlessly violated. It was of the essence of the arrangement come to that they should preserve their own Church, schools, hospitals, and so forth, and continue to enjoy all their rights as a separate and distinctive nationality.

Enormities Committed by Bulgarians.

"Unfortunately the Bulgarians have never reconciled themselves to this, and a policy of Bulgarisation has been pursued, stopping little short of actual extermination. At first, the thing was done more or less tentatively. By such means as taxes on their advertisements, the attempted suppression of their schools, the jerrymandering of the electoral divisions, and so on, the Greeks were

harassed in every way. Of late years, however, more violent measures have been resorted to, and the grossest enormities have been perpetrated, chiefly by means of deliberately organised riots, after the manner of the Russian pogroms, connived at, and in many cases directly instigated by the Government. The authorities, it is true, disclaim responsibility for these excesses, and profess regret for them; but there can be no question whatever as to their actual sympathy and complicity. Not only do they do nothing to prevent them, but they take no steps to punish the offenders, and, what is more conclusive still, appropriate wholesale the pillaged property of the Greek communities (churches, schools, lands, and buildings) by the specious process of handing it over to so-called commissions, the character of which may be gathered from the fact that the head of one of them recently appointed was a creature of the authorities who has just served five years' imprisonment for blackmailing.

"Those who would learn more as to the abominations which have been perpetrated should procure the striking pamphlet published by M. Athos Romanos, formerly Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs. At Varna, Philippopolis, Stenimachos, Burgas, Anchialos, and elsewhere, the most abominable deeds of pillage and violence have been perpetrated at the expense of the hapless Greek minority, entailing serious loss of life and frightful destruction of property. In the case of Anchialos the whole town was virtually wiped out, the Greek quarters having been burned to the ground. As a consequence of this terrible condition of affairs, the Greeks are leaving the country in a steady stream, and often under the most pitiable conditions, as many as 28,000 having fled since the burning of Anchialos. They fly to Greece, where they have to be fed, housed, and cared for. And those treated in this cruel fashion are a people whose rights are carefully guarded under the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin.

Is it matter for wonder that, in the circumstances, they look to the great Powers to take action? Can the nations of Europe stand by and see their intentions set at naught in this fashion? As to the facts there is no room for doubt. At the beginning of the year, M. Pichon, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, replying to a question of M. Denys Cochin, a Deputy for Paris, admitted as much in the most unqualified language. Meanwhile the dastardly process of extermination continues, and nothing is done. The interests involved are no doubt immense, and the difficulty of securing joint action, as Sir Edward Grey reminded us the other day, is doubtless great; but it is the business of diplomacy at times to face trouble and overcome difficulties."

The "Times of India" and Greek Policy.

The *Times of India* (Bombay), in its issue of June 3rd, publishes an article on Macedonian affairs from a Constantinople correspondent, in which that gentleman speaks of the factors connected with the Macedonian question, in a way excusable only to an amateur writer who collects his information from the chatter of the streets. Fortunately the Editor of the *Indian Times*, in a short notice preceding this correspondence, disclaims all responsibility for the writer's opinions on the subject, and thus he relieves us from any need of attaching serious importance to the article. But we cannot refrain from answering some of the most striking and amusing stories told by this correspondent to the *Indian Times*. He speaks of His Holiness the Patriarch as the leader of the Greek revolutionary movement in Turkey, and of the Patriarch's organ the *Ecclissiastiki Alitheia* he says that "far from attempting to pour oil on the troubled waters it devotes the major part of its volumes to fulminations against the Heretical Bulgars and their ridiculous pretensions." He also refers to the "Hetairia Hellenismos" as a "revolutionary society most dangerous to the peace of Europe." Furthermore he pretends to have heard from prominent Greek politicians, from the Patriarch himself, and from many other influential persons, bankers, tradesmen, soldiers as well as from men of the people and "the waiters of the Jannis restaurant in the Grande Rue de Pera."

What has he heard? Some truly wonderful schemes—"Our aim is to provoke the Bulgarians to invade Turkey . . .—We shall convert Macedonia into a Bulgarian shambles. Then when war breaks out we shall aid Turkey with 30,000 guerilla warriors . . . and allow the Turks . . . to dictate their terms of Peace in Prince Ferdinand's Palace in Sofia. Then we shall claim our reward. Eastern Roumelia will be retroceded to Turkey as was intended by the treaty of Berlin; a Christian Governor will be appointed and we shall stipulate that this Governor shall be a Greek. One other stipulation will be that the Bulgarian Exarch shall be removed from Constantinople and that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarch shall remain unchallenged throughout the Ottoman Empire."

Now His Holiness the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joachim III., is well-known for the strict observance of his sacred duties towards the Orthodox Christians and for always doing his best to bring peace and concord into the disturbed and exasperated minds of his flock. He is one of the most prudent and wide-minded prelates who have ever held the Patriarchate, and while he defends his just rights with vigour and courage, he has never resorted to any disloyal and turbulent methods for which indeed he has a profound abhorrence—this is admitted by all who know His Holiness, and in fact is even recognised by his most ardent opponents. Therefore, to call him "the head of the revolutionary movement" is simply to convict oneself of gross ignorance.

As for the organ of the Patriarchate, the *Ecclisiastiki Alitheia*, the object of this journal is to defend the right of the Orthodox Church and to enlighten public opinion about the calumnies which are every day spread against the Patriarchate by its numerous enemies. Now when we consider that the Bulgarian people and government have pursued during the past year and still pursue a deliberate and systematic plan for the extermination of Greek Orthodoxy, when too we consider that in Macedonia and Thrace as well as in their own country, the Bulgarians appear as the most unscrupulous calumniators and the most ferocious persecutors of everything Greek and everything Orthodox — does the correspondent of the *Times of India* expect that the *Ecclissiastiki Alitheia* will smile tenderly upon these gentry? But we will point out (and our copious quotations almost every month from the *Ecclissiastiki Alitheia* will support the statement) that the organ of the Patriarchate has simply and consistently demanded that Greek Churches and schools, built and maintained with Greek money by Greek people for Greek people, and unlawfully confiscated by the Bulgarians, should be restored to their rightful owners. Furthermore, the *Ecclissiastiki Alitheia* has never advocated any other than strictly lawful methods of bringing this about; it has never, on any single occasion, advocated that the violence of the Bulgarians should be met by any reprisals in kind. And certainly, it has never advocated the retrocession of Eastern Roumelia to Turkey.

As for the "Hetairia Hellenismos," this is a purely patriotic association. So far from being a "revolutionary organisation," it is well-known for its entirely pacific tendencies, which indeed have caused its relations with the Macedonian Committees in Athens to be very strained.

As for the long passage quoted above, about a Greco-Turkish co-operation in Macedonia a Greek policy of retrocession of Eastern Roumelia, it is pretty certain that the correspondent obtained the whole of his information from "the waiters of the Jannis restaurant in the Grand Rue de Pera." But the facts of every day prove that the Greco-Turkish co-operation is a myth, and of course no responsible Greek statesman or writer has ever advocated the retrocession of Eastern Roumelia.

Literary Page.

Pre-historic Crete.*

Since Schliemann created pre-historic Greek archæology by proving that the Homeric poems were the product, not of the infancy of classical Greece, but of a splendid pre-Hellenic civilization, there has been nothing more startling and perhaps nothing more interesting in archæology than Mr. A. J. Evans's discoveries, which shew that Crete was the pioneer and centre of that great civilization of which Tiryns and Mycenæ knew little more than the after-glow. Mr. Evans's excavations are still far from complete, and we may have to wait some years for the appearance of the big book which is to embody the results of his researches. But it is already possible to formulate an account which shall bring together what is scattered through the various archæological periodicals (chiefly, of course, the Annual of the British School at Athens) for the past half-dozen years. This is what is done in the book under notice, and though Professor Burrows has valuable opinions to offer on such questions as, for example, Minoan chronology and the significance of the double-axe, he confines himself in general to an exposition of Evans's results and a justification of his methods.

The importance of the discoveries it would be quite impossible to estimate too highly, and it would be almost equally difficult to overrate what Professor Burrows calls Mr. Evans's "geological method." There is so great a tendency to refuse to admit that high art can belong to a period hitherto regarded as barbaric, that without Evans's exact registration of each find in its proper place among the successive deposits, there is no saying what chaos the "old-fashioned Mycenæan archæologist," as Professor Burrows terms him, might not have introduced by an attempt to fix Minoan chronology on a basis of purely stylistic criticism. As regards Mr. Evans, "there is no danger that he has confused the renascent or derived with the original, the archaistic with the archaic; and he is free from the not infrequent fallacy of thinking that all equally good art must belong to the same period . . . . What profit is it to shake one's head over the marvellous classical masonry of the Northern Bath, when above it, separated from it by three feet of deposit, which could itself only have accumulated after the destruction and complete filling-up of the bath, is found the cement pavement of a later chamber, the spiral decoration of whose wall stucco would, if found elsewhere, be unhesitatingly classed as 'good Mycenæan'?"

The earliest deposits unearthed carry us far back to the Stone Age. Above some seven or eight yards of Stone Age deposit we find still 17 feet below the level of the soil earliest relics of the Bronze Period. Mr. Evans produces evidence that this period was contemporary with the first Four Dynasties of Egypt—we may say that Bronze Civilization in Crete began about 4,000 B.C. Applying the "geological method" to the lower deposits "we need not shrink from the date of 10,000 or 12,000 B.C. which are thus given to the first settlement of man upon the hill at Knossos."

The time between the first appearance of bronze, and the decay of Knossos at the beginning of the Iron Age, is what Mr. Evans calls the "Minoan Age," within which he thinks he can see nine well marked "Minoan Periods" of Bronze Civilization. During the first eight of these nine periods—from perhaps 4,000 B.C. to perhaps 1,500 or even 1,200 B.C.—we see the development of the civilization known as Minoan, and a marvellous picture it is which is unfolded. The "cup-bearer" wall-painting reproduced on the cover of Professor Burrows' book and the miniature frescoes shew us what manner of men these Minoans were in their prime; from the remains of the Palace at Knossos we can learn much of their life, and the boxing and bull-fighting scenes on the vases from Hagia Triade shew us their amusements. We see a handsome and athletic race, with the fine features and intellectual brow which result from centuries of civilisation, while the studied artifice of feminine *toilette* and *coiffure* bespeak the courtly and elaborate life of the Palace. Their art had developed along lines for which nothing hitherto known in the Ægean world had prepared us: vases there are in profusion, fine metal work and beautiful ivory carving, and (this is what surprises us) delicate porcelain work in many colours—"Some plaques formed part of a mosaic that covered human life with its varied scenes of peace and war. Here we have warriors, the Cretan erect, and his darker skinned enemy prostrate and suppliant. Here is the Cretan wild goat or *Agrimi*, the vine too, and the willow, and curving horizontal bands for running water; there a whole city, with towers and three-storied houses, in whose windows oiled red-tinted parchment seems to have anticipated the use of glass . . . We are nearer the shield of Achilles than we have ever been before."

On the walls of the Palace the frescoes shew the court of King Minos, "his minions and his dames in garden or balcony viewing the games, the men close-shaven and with flowing hair, the women with puffed sleeves and flounced skirts, *frisées et décolletées*, altogether ladies of fashion and the Court of whom the French savant might well exclaim '*Mais ce sont des Parisiennes*!'" We see larger paintings too, men from the Ægean Isles bearing tribute to their overlord in Crete, and so showing us whence the Minoan kings and nobles derived the wealth necessary for the maintenance of the vast Palace at Knossos and for the luxurious life of its court. The story of the human tribute to King Minos testifies to the sea-power of Knossos, and it may be that some of the dungeons found at Knossos were built to hold the human tribute from Athens and the Island cities, until their turn should come to enter the boxing arena or the bull-ring on some Minoan holiday. The plan of the Palace alone is sufficient to shew us the maritime character of the Minoans. For the palace at Knossos exceeded in size and far more in wealth those of the Mycenæan princes, but if we look at Knossos for the enormous fortified walls so characteristic of Tiryns and Mycenæ, we find no more than a paltry guard-house, just strong enough to prevent the sudden descent of a handful of marauding pirates. Knossos was the centre of a commercial race, whose fleets plied the Ægean and the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, carrying the goods of other people and exporting their own wares to Egypt and Italy and the Asiatic Isles and coast-lands: their 'first line' was the navy, and the "blue-water school" was paramount in their councils of defence.

We might expect that the material civilization of such a people would be at least on a level with its artistic development, but the reality far exceeds all expectation. It is not merely that we find fine and regular masonry, magnificent and skilfully engineered balustrade staircases, weights and measures and coinage and records written with pen and ink, all as early as the Second Millenium before our era. The startling thing is the elaborate drainage and lavatory system. The scientific completeness of this system is not only far in advance of anything found in classic antiquity, it is without parallel in any save the most modern time in Western Europe—it is aptly described by the Italian excavators as drainage "*all' Inglese*."

When we ask who these Cretan people were we are baffled before many vague suggestions and no clear indications. That they were not Greek in any full sense of the word is certain enough, but we are quite ignorant as to whether they were of the same stock as the earlier Greek races. Apparently they had some kinship with the Egyptians on one hand, and on the other there are clear signs to connect them with the Etruscans—but that does not greatly enlighten us. They have left behind them no lack of pictographic and linear script: if we could learn to decipher this it might yield a clue to their racial affinities, but we may have to wait long before any key is found to the writings. Later "Eteocretan"

*"The discoveries in Crete." By RONALD M. BURROWS, Professor of Greek in the University College, Cardiff, London: John Murray (5/- net).

inscriptions have been found which use the Ionian alphabet. Professor Conway thinks he has found evidence to connect the Eteocretan language with the Indo-European group. But this is by no means certain, and in any case we do not know that Eteocretan is necessarily identical with or nearly akin to Minoan. It is true enough that we must see in the Snake Goddess a forerunner of the Chthonic deities of classic Greece, and in Evans's "Images of the Fetish Shrine" we may have something like Rhea and the Dictean Zeus, but this proves nothing as to racial continuity. The barbarian Greeks who overthrew the Minoan race would hardly dare to neglect the gods of the earlier civilization.

Professor Burrows seems inclined to regard the Minoans as belonging mainly to the long-headed Mediterranean stock which he thinks may in early times have possessed the whole of Greece, and which in historic times may have persisted chiefly in Attica and the Isles. On this hypothesis he would interpret the Attic Renascence of the fifth century B.C. as a working out of the old Mediterranean character. The skill of the Minoan artist must doubtless have leavened the classic race, and accords well enough with Professor Burrows' theory, but the character of Minoan art surely lends it a little countenance. For the "Hellenic" character which marks off Attic art from Modern European is precisely what distinguishes it from the Cretan. The "Morris" wall-paper designs and Paris fashions and *art nouveau* of Knossos have so much in common with modern art and so little likeness to anything Attic, that we can hardly believe Minoan and Attic to be manifestations of a pre-Aryan genius represented little or not at all in modern Europe.

Whoever the Minoans were, they provide a fascinating study, and in Professor Burrow's book we see a sketch of their development from Neolithic times to the full bloom of a high civilization. We see a growth, but no "decline and fall," for there was no decline. The end came suddenly, in the midst of highest prosperity, Side by side with the latest Minoan city had been growing up Achæan settlements in the Isles, profiting by the trade of Crete, crudely imitating the art of Crete, paying tribute to Minos and learning their first laws from Rhadomanthos. The wealth of Knossos aroused their cupidity and the sway of its rulers proved irksome, and in time arose some Theseus, half patriot and half pirate, to lead on the barbarian hordes to the sack of Knossos; fire and sword and pillage ended a history whose beginnings are lost in the mist of far remote antiquity. And as the invaders seeking spoil wandered through gloomy corridors and stately halls and colonnades oppressive with splendour, strange faces peered and grimaced upon them from the walls, strange forms of unknown gods frowned upon them as they groped among dark recesses; what wonder if their disordered imaginations pictured the mazy intricacies of the Palace as the abode of some strange monster half-god and half-demon, as the Labyrinth of the Minotaur?

For a time the Minoan race dragged on, the shadow of its former self, but the centre of power was no longer in Crete. The robber-chiefs of Tiryns and Mycenæ had become wealthy and powerful and cultured: Minos was gone, and Agamemnon was King of Men. But soon the Achæans too must meet the fate which they had dealt out to the Minoans, and must yield before barbarian conquerors, the sterner, ruder Dorians of the North. Knossos is no more, Troy has followed it, a common ruin has overwhelmed Tiryns and Mycenæ and darkness has settled on the Grecian countries. For a half or it may be a whole Millenium the lands of Hellas are in travail, till in the fulness of time is born the child of the stern Dorian, the genial large-souled Achœan and the skilful Minoan—that glorious age of Athens which has been and will be to the end of time the inspiration of all free and noble races.

We have passed over many things which are to be sought in Prof. Burrows' pages—his chapters on the Double Axe Symbol, the chronological question, the Labyrinth, the Homeric poems (in which chapter the Professor has no difficulty in shewing the influence of the Cretan civilisation upon the poems, though for the rest he is perhaps more successful in scoring neatly off the present Poet Laureate than in proving his point against Mr. Andrew Lang). The one fault which we find with the book is the almost complete absence of illustrations. This Professor Burrows justifies on the ground of keeping down the price of the book; but we are not converted as to the advisability of publishing an archæological work of this nature without copious illustration. However, Prof. Burrows does the next best thing in telling us exactly where to find all published illustrations—indeed, the copiousness of reference renders the book valuable as an excellent guide and bibliography for the professed student. Its interesting style and "untechnical language, which does not expect its readers to know by instinct what is meant by a *Schnabelkanne* or a *Vase a étrier*" render the book equally suitable for the general reader. We should add that the publisher is to be congratulated on issuing a book of such excellent appearance at so low a price.

The "Medea" at University College.

A very interesting performance of the *Medea* of Euripides was given on June 11th, 12th and 13th by students of University and Bedford Colleges. The *Medea* is one of the best known of Euripedes' plays, but it is practically never put on the modern stage (though we understand that a representation of Dr. Gilbert Murray's English version will shortly be given in London). So far as Oxford and Cambridge and our Public Schools are concerned, the difficulty of finding an adequate *Medea* is sufficient to explain why this play is so seldom represented. No male actor could easily do justice to the many essentially feminine touches in this character. The Committee responsible for the present representation was exceptionally fortunate in having at hand so remarkably capable a *Medea* as Miss Ethel Abrahams, to whose fine acting the success of the performance was very largely due.

The *Medea* is in many ways among the most interesting of Greek plays, and it has the curiously modern note which is so characteristic of Euripides. For if Euripides has borrowed his names from the old heroic story, the play is invested with none of the glamour of Argonautic romance. Iason is no old-time hero, but a very everyday sort of man who wants to "get on," and who is seeking to rid himself of an inconvenient youthful entanglement The scene of the play may be heroic Corinth, but the atmosphere is that of Athens in the second half of the fifth century, B.C., and the romantic interest of the story is subordinated to a psychological analysis which brings the *Medea* into line with such modern productions as the Ibsen drama.

The chief interest of the play is of course in the character of *Medea* herself. The proud and passionate barbarian, torn between maternal affection and the mad lust for revenge, was admirably represented by Miss Abrahams. Her rendering of the famous passage in which *Medea's* resolution breaks down at the sight of her children, will not readily be forgotten by those who saw it. Among the other actors we must single out for special praise Mr. R. B. Solomon, who gave a very dramatic presentment of the Messenger; and also Miss Calkin as the Nurse, and Miss MacDowell as leader of the Chorus.

Under the stage management of Professor E. A. Gardner, the scenic conditions of the Attic drama were reproduced as nearly as is possible in a covered hall. The Botanical Theatre at University College resembles a Greek Theatre in its general shape, and the absence of footlights, raised platform, curtain, and the other accessories of a modern theatre made it possible to reproduce the actual conditions of the ancient drama more exactly than was feasible, for example, in the performances of Euripides recently given at the Court Theatre. The scene represented was the front of a Doric palace, (as was fitting, in a play of old Corinth), the action taking place in the propylœum, and two side doors serving for entrances and exits, while the orchestra was a horse-shoe shaped space on the same level as the stage—this representing the most probable arrange-

ment of the fifth century Attic Theatre. The altar was in the place of the only Greek theatrical altar yet discovered (the one at Priene)—at the extreme boundary of the orchestra, facing the stage. The beautiful appearance of the Doric architecture calls for praise, alike to Professor Simpson who designed it and to his students who made it in the architectural workshops of University College. The Doric costumes of the chorus, the barbaric dress of *Medea* and her winged snake-chariot, both copied from well-known Attic vases, all helped to make the performance a valuable illustration of archæology. This, of course, is an important function of such academic representations as the present one.

The Task of Hellenism and its Efforts.

A correspondent of the *Gazette de Lausanne* expresses his amazement that Europe, not content with the *role* of unconcerned spectator of the extermination of Greeks in Bulgaria and of the Bulgarian misdeeds in Macedonia, should even extend indulgence and partiality to the machinations of Sofia. This indifference and this partiality he imputes to the alleged fact that "Greece has badly administered her patrimony," whereas, so say the Bulgarophils of the Occident, "What gigantic strides Bulgaria has made in thirty years!" Our contemporary's correspondent institutes a comparison of the parallel development of the two countries.

Greece began her career of renewed independence with 500,000 inhabitants, whose psychological and economic condition was lamentable. Everything had to be made or re-made after 1829, for the insurrection had left nothing but ruins. The State had to succour invalids, widows and orphans, although the public revenues were in a more ruinous condition than those of any private citizen. In 1832 the Protecting Powers estimated the possible receipts at £33,000: in 1843, they had barely touched £400,000. At the very moment when Greece was recognised as an independent State, she had already an external Public Debt of nearly 3 millions sterling, borrowed in 1824 and 1825 for the needs of the insurrection. In 1832 the Exterior Public Debt had increased to 5¼ millions sterling, thirteen times the Public Revenue—The Debt amounted to over £9 per head of population, a figure not exceeded to-day among many of the most prosperous States.

Bulgaria, on the other hand, began with 3,000,000 inhabitants, set free in a single campaign waged by Russia and Roumania—for the Bulgarians themselves had no part in their own liberation. Bulgaria in consequence had never suffered any economic exhaustion, and as she was endowed with a sufficient patrimony, she has from the first enjoyed an excellent financial position, which has enabled her to avoid troubling the world with financial questions, and so to escape much criticism.

To-day, Greece has 2,500,000 inhabitants in 25,000 square miles. Bulgaria, 3,700,000 inhabitants on an area of 37,000 square miles. Both have consequently the same density of population, 100 per square mile. But whereas the Bulgarian population is enclosed within a compact rectangle, the Greek population is spread over an area which is intersected with arms of the sea: and the whole Greek area, including land and water, amounts to 77,000 square miles, and on this computation the real density of Greek population becomes not more than 31 per square mile. The territory of Greece is intersected and subdivided by the sea to such an extent that the most neighbouring regions are often entirely shut off from economic and intellectual communication with one another. There are places distant from one another more than 400 miles as the crow flies—practically the same distance as that between London and Aberdeen. In winter, several of the Isles are for weeks cut off from all means of communication with the rest of the country. Geographical conditions such as these are far from favouring the action of a central Government: they are more likely to develop a local spirit which is opposed to the general interests of the country.

To satisfy the requirements of 3,700,000 inhabitants the Bulgarian Government has to provide public services for an area of 37,000 square miles. The Greek government has to perform the same duties towards a population of 2,500,000, scattered over an area of 77,000 square miles. We must take into account the marine services which the State has to provide, such as the maintenance of ports, channels of navigation, lighthouses, cables, marine police, subventions for transport carried on at a loss, etc. We shall have to consider: first, the expenditure (both in gross, and also per head of population concerned) on the development and maintenance of public services, both in Greece and in Bulgaria; secondly, the relative utility of these services in Greece and in Bulgaria. In respect of the latter point, since the utility of a public service is proportional to the population which profits by it, it must be proportional to the density of the population. It will therefore be about three times as great in Bulgaria (100) as in Greece (31). It follows that the same enterprise may wear a very different complexion in Greece and in Bulgaria. What is urgent or simply necessary in Bulgaria may amount in Greece to a costly luxury.

Moreover, certain of the public services in Bulgaria (telegraphs and railways in particular) are provided in part at the cost of foreigners, thanks to the situation of Bulgaria on the great international highway from Western Europe, Hungary, Russia and Roumania to Constantinople, and thence to the East. Greece, on the other hand, actually bears the cost of much international trade, for her ports and lighthouses are *gratuitously* at the service of foreign vessels which ply in Greek waters towards Turkey and the Black Sea. Of these foreign vessels, even those which put in at Greek ports for stores, coal and repairs are not charged dues unless they stay more than 72 hours in port. And it will readily be believed that they generally contrive to get their business finished within the three days. In spite of the fact that Greece is thus handicapped, in spite too of the fact that much of her transport is by sea and not by rail; nevertheless, in proportion to her continental area, Greece has a greater development of railway than Bulgaria, in the ratio of 4 to 3.

Now let us turn to the industrial development of the two countries. As Bulgaria can, by legal methods of protection, assure her industry 3,700,000 customers, while Greece has only a population of 2,500,000 to draw upon, it follows that the first-named country has a 50 per cent. greater opportunity of industrial development. Moreover Greece is on some of the main ocean highways, and her coasts are indented to an extraordinary degree, so that all points of the country are as accessible to importation from London, Hamburg, Antwerp, Marseilles, Genoa, Trieste etc., as to the enterprise of native manufacturers. But the greater part of Bulgaria is far from the seaboard and the maritime routes, so that native industry is little threatened by foreign competition. This double handicap of Greece does not prevent her industrial development from greatly exceeding that of Bulgaria.

Agriculture is unquestionably one of the most important economic factors of the prosperity of a country. In respect of agricultural possibilities Greece, as is well-known, is naturally at a great disadvantage as compared with Bulgaria. We may quote Brockhaus on this point:

"The agriculture of Bulgaria is at a very low level. The agricultural implements are most primitive. But the soil is generally of exceeding richness, and yields crops almost without tillage or manure."

Whereas in Greece—"The soil is for the most part unfertile; the mountains are generally naked rock, devoid of humus; 59 per cent. of the surface of the country is unproductive, fit at best to serve as pasture for sheep and goats."

The Greek revenue service suffers greatly from natural disadvantages. The coastline is of so enormous an extent (it is greater than that of France), and the Turkish coast is so near that every facility is offered for the development of contraband trade, and in point of fact, the smugglers defraud the customs of some £160,000.

Published at Craven House, Kingsway, London, W.C.
Editor, Dr. C. Pouptis.

The Hellenic Herald

A MONTHLY POLITICAL PERIODICAL.

Vol. I., Nos. 10—11. AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1907. [Price 10/- per Annum, Post Free.

CONTENTS.

AN UNWISE POLICY ... ... ——

A DECLARATION OF THE *Greco-Albanian Union* ... ——

A MANIFESTO OF THE HELLENO-VLACH INHABITANTS OF MONASTIR ... ... ——

THE KIDNAPPING OF COLONEL ELLIOT: *A Lesson to Bulgarophils* ... ... ——

GREEKS AND BULGARIANS IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES: *An open Letter to Sir C. Dilke* ... ... N. Kasasis

LETTER FROM SOFIA... ... ... ——

MODERN GREECE: HER RÔLE IN EASTERN EUROPE ... M. A. Berl

THE SITUATION IN CRETE ... ... ——

THE BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT AND THE MACEDONIAN COMMITTEES ... ... ——

A LIST OF BULGARIAN CRIMES IN MACEDONIA .... ——

MISCELLANEOUS—

THE ABBOTT AFFAIR—TURKS AND GRECO-MACEDONIANS—THE DEATH OF AGRA—TURKISH OPPRESSION—AN INFAMOUS FALSEHOOD—GREECE AND ROUMANIA—A VALUABLE ADMISSION—THRACE—THE COMMERCE OF SALONICA IN 1906—THE GREEK COMMERCIAL MOVEMENT IN ALEXANDRIA—THE BETROTHAL OF PRINCE GEORGE.

PRESS REVIEW—

THE SITUATION IN MACEDONIA *(a Letter of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., to the "Times")*—GREEK REPLY TO THE TURKISH NOTE—THE ACTIVITY OF BULGARIAN BANDS.

LITERARY PAGE—

THE RENAISSANCE OF GREEK LITERATURE ... A. Clark.

TWO GREEK BOOKS ON ASIA MINOR AND THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF ALBANIA.

The Summer holiday season being now at an end, the Hellenic Herald will resume its ordinary course of publication. Beginning with the October issue, the Herald will appear, as ordinarily, in a monthly number of 16 pages.

AN UNWISE POLICY.

The general approval by the Great Powers of the arrogant note recently addressed by the Turkish Government to the Cabinet of Athens on the subject of the Greek bands in Macedonia, and the additional remonstrances addressed to the Greek Government by the representatives of the Powers in Athens (and especially by the British representative) in support of the unjust Turkish note, prove that the diplomatic mind is not always so subtle or so far-seeing as it would have us suppose. It is clear that diplomacy, like the veriest political amateurism, is capable of failing to make any thorough and impartial examination of the real factors underlying a knotty problem. The diplomat can apparently rival the arm-chair critic in his incapacity duly to appreciate the elements of a complicated question; and like the armchair critic he is ready to deceive himself by proposing mere temporary palliative measures, instead of boldly facing a painful operation which shall cut away the evil at its root. He is even ready to plume himself on his ready alertness, thinking he has promptly understood and grappled with the difficulty, when he has merely snatched at some facile half-measure.

The truth of the matter is, as we have repeatedly maintained in these columns, that the action of the Greek bands is purely defensive. It has been called forth by long years of wanton persecution, suffered by the Greek population in Macedonia at the hands of the Bulgarian bands. The aim and purpose of the Greek bands is to defend the Greek population from Bulgarian aggression, and from the exactions of the Turks; the cessation of these troubles would bring about a prompt and speedy disappearance of the Greek bands. And yet we have repeatedly been informed, during the last few months, that diplomacy considers the Greek bands as the only source of trouble in Macedonia! The Bulgarian bands, we are told, either do not exist or are only in small numbers, and in any case, they behave—"like angels!!" while as for the Turks, they have transformed themselves into docile pupils, and are most eager to listen and submit to the counsels of their teachers—the Great Powers. The picture of Turk and Bulgarian in the new *rôle* of "angels" is idyllic; but a snake is lurking in this blissful Eden. Everything is upset by the "selfish and aggressive policy of the Greeks!"

How far this assertion is correct the reader can judge from the official list (published in our present issue), which shew that during the last three months 91 innocent Greeks have been murdered, 58 in the vilayet of Salonica and 33 in the vilayet of Monastir, by the "non-existent or peacefully-disposed" Bulgarian bands. In confirmation of the "non-existence" of Bulgarian bands comes a report transmitted by the Vienna correspondent of the *Morning Post* informing us that the number of Bulgarian comitadjis killed by Turkish troops during the month of July amounted to 143, against 45 Greeks. If the Bulgarian bands no longer exist or at any rate refrain from action, how does it happen that they have lost so many men in these encounters? If these figures—

143 Bulgarians, 45 Greeks—had been published some time ago, the old absurd story of Greco-Turkish co-operation would have been revived *ad nauseam;* but the tone of the Turkish note, to which we have referred above, is sufficient to refute any such monstrous theory. The note is an official admission of Turkish bitterness towards the Greeks.

The impartial observer cannot fail to have noticed with sadness, that on many occasions and in fact almost consistently the action and attitude of diplomacy have been most unjust to Greece. So impartial and well-informed an authority as Mr. T. P. O'Connor has recently found it necessary to protest in the *Times*, against the fact that "it has become popular for "some time in England, to say that the chief rea- "son for the continued unrest . . . in Macedonia "is the incursion of Greek bands." Mr. O'Connor, after referring to certain crimes committed by Bulgarians, concludes [letter to the *Times*, Aug. 10th, 1907]: "I fervently pray that all bands "will soon disappear from Macedonia—Greek, "Bulgarian, and Servian; but until the Greek "population gets adequate protection from the "Powers of Europe, until these Powers suppress "the incursions of Bulgarian bands into "Macedonia for the persecution of everything "Greek, how can we expect the Greeks to abstain "from giving to their compatriots and co- "religionists the only protection at their "disposal?"

Another witness to the same effect is the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*—a journal which cannot be regarded as favourable or even fair towards the Greeks. The correspondent writes [*Times*, August 1st, 1907]: "It would "be easier for both the Greek Government and "the Patriarchate to yield if the Powers would "to some extent admit the Greek contention that "they are acting on the defensive, and that it is "necessary to maintain the Greek bands so long "as the interests of Hellenism are in danger "from the activity of the Bulgarian bands, and "that if the Powers intervene to prevent the "extermination of Bulgarians by Greeks they "ought at the same time to intervene to prevent "the extermination of Greeks by Bulgarians. "Most European observers are of opinion that "the first duty of the Powers in the Macedonian "question is to put an end to the prevailing "system of political propaganda by murder and "violence, and that they can only effect this "object by impartial pressure on the Govern- "ments of Constantinople, Athens, Sofia and "Belgrade."

We are far from approving the excesses which have sometimes been committed by Greek bands in their defensive work in Macedonia. Yet the Greeks have repeatedly given ample proof of their conciliatory and law-abiding disposition; they constitute the principal factor in the Near East; they have the strongest right to claim the fair and just consideration of the Great Powers. They have been provoked and persecuted for years by savage and unscrupulous rivals, whom Europe has encouraged in their criminal work and and favoured in their absurd pretensions, although their conduct has rather merited banishment from the European family of nations.

Owing to the action of these men anarchy has reigned in Macedonia, life has become a continual struggle for survival and escape; and the Greeks in self protection have had to join issue in the guerilla warfare. And though their occasional excesses are to be deplored and condemned, it is a different and a totally unjust thing to proclaim a sort of Holy War against the whole of Greek policy and Greek aspirations.

There can be no doubt that the Great Powers, and especially Britain, have manifested towards the Bulgarians an undue partiality, which, in our judgment, is a very mistaken policy for any Power which has at heart the settlement of the Nearer Eastern question. We do not profess to account for the motives of this preference, or for the childish schemes based upon hopes of the young and utterly unreliable Volgarian nation, which as yet is hardly touched by civilisation. We do not ask for any concessions owing to our own historical position and brilliant past, but we are justified in asking for a fair and impartial treatment which has not hitherto been accorded to us. The Powers have systematically thwarted the aspirations of Greece. They have sought to impose upon the Hellenic Government the entire responsibility for a state of affairs which has not been created or promoted by that Government. They have multiplied enormously the already sufficiently grave difficulties which impede the work of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who is not only the Primate of a large and venerable church, but also the head and representative of five million Greeks living in the Turkish dominions. The Powers have continually exasperated the element which, apart from its preponderance in numbers and still more in *morale*, offers the main hope of order, progress and civilisation in the Near East; while they have manifested a continuous and incomprehensible indulgence towards those whose abominable crimes, both in Macedonia and in their own "constitutional (!!)" country, have given rise to the present anarchy. This policy of the Powers is as unwise as it is unjust. It amounts to nothing less than rejecting the one element capable of affording a foundation for that edifice of a "lasting peace in the Balkans" which the Powers declare is so dear to their hearts. They reject the firm foundation, and seek to build on a shifting sand. Instead of peace, they are preparing a widespread calamity, a conflagration before which the present localised disorders will pale.

We have received from the Committee of the GRECO-ALBANIAN UNION, *recently established in Athens, the following*

DECLARATION.

During the last thirty years events have taken place in the East, and especially in the Balkan Peninsula, which have tended to the decomposition of the Ottoman Empire and the historic and imprescriptible rights of the indigenous peoples, so that it is high time for the Greek and Albanian peoples to awake to the urgent necessity of renewing the bonds which unite them, thanks to their common origin and traditions, and to their joint interests and dangers.

It is well known that the treaty of San Stefano, sapping the foundations of the political edifice of the Turkish Empire, created a "Great Bulgaria," comprising almost the whole of Macedonia amd the greater part of Thrace: it divided the Hellenic peoples and made inroads upon Albania, to the profit of the Slavonic races; it left Hellenism a dismembered ethnic mass, deprived of form and strength.

Happily, some of the Great Powers, guided by their interests and urged on by free nations whose conscience revolted from the injustice, intervened and prevented the realisation of this atrocious scheme, which would have imposed a fresh slavery on the noblest race and most heroic people of human kind.

The Berlin treaty replaced that of San Stefano, and confined Bulgaria within the limits of its national sphere. It guaranteed the existence of Turkey, designated her natural boundaries and recognised the right of the Sultan to occupy the Balkan passes with his military forces. This reassured the other peoples of the Peninsula, and encouraged them to hope for a future national development and for the amelioration of their lot.

The Great Powers Signatory to the Berlin Treaty, by their common and reciprocal pledges, solemnly engaged themselves to introduce new institutions into European Turkey, and to bring about the application of radical reforms.

Unfortunately, we Greeks and Albanians, forgetting the nightmare of Bulgarian domination, disregarded the necessity of a firm alliance to defend ourselves against the future agression of the Bulgarian and other Slavonic races. We gave ourselves up to the sweet dream of a reorganisation of the Orient by the inauguration of a political system which should guarantee justice and equal rights to all nations. It has proved to be nothing but a dream. And sometimes in our heedlessness we have listened to the perfidious insinuations of those whose interests are served by dividing us and we have held aloof from one another, engaging in worthless local discussions and quarrels; and in this way we have left the field open to our enemies. We have allowed them to renew and to continue the work of reconstituting the "Great Bulgaria," and of extending their influence over purely Greek and Albanian regions.

While we have not sufficiently enforced our rights, established and recognised by the whole of Europe, while we have fallen into this perilous state of indifference, the Bulgarians have been adroitly shaking off their duties and responsibilities. The international agreement as to their vassalage they have turned into a dead letter, they have not paid their suzerain the tribute fixed by Europe, they have succeeded in not allowing the passes of the Balkans to be occupied by the Turkish garrisons, and finally they have laid violent hands on Eastern Roumelia, the privileged province which was created to be a model of political system and administrative autonomy.

Henceforth there were no bounds to the cupidity of the Bulgarians. They set to work to spread Bulgarisation by trampling underfoot the most sacred rights, and by violating the most precious international engagements. Their attacks upon the liberty of conscience, their illegal confiscation of private and communal property and their profanation of sacred foundations, guaranteed by international decrees and by unalterable natural and moral law, constitute crimes such as humanity has not known in all previous history. All the non-Slavonic peoples of the Principality and of the autonomous Province have been subject to their aggression and their criminal persecution. Mosques and other Moslem religious establishments, churches, schools and other Greek institutions—all have been violently plundered.

The Greek and Turkish populations, harassed and oppressed in every fashion, seeing their cities and houses burned and pillaged by ferocious mobs before the eyes and under the protection of the civil and military authorities, have been reduced to the last extremity of fleeing their country to save their lives and to avoid the most terrible of ignominies, enforced abjuration.

Since Europe, viewing unmoved the deeds of crime and violence perpetrated by the Bulgarians, has allowed them to violate with impunity the principal clauses and the most important enactments of International treaties, and since Turkey has taken no steps to strengthen the position of the other nationalities by means of wide and practical reforms, it was natural that the Bulgarians should seek by every means to achieve the realisation of their aims.

In the eyes of the Turkish authorities the Bulgarians pass for peaceful subjects; in their relation with the liberal thought of Europe they pose as "liberators." Thus they have been able to exploit the carelessness of the first and the credulity of the second; they have succeeded in extending the jurisdiction of the Exarchate (and consequently their political power) in Macedonia, where for the last five years they have openly pursued by every possible means their plans of undermining the Turkish authority, destroying the Greek and Albanian elements, and even falsifying the records of history.

In the face of this state of affairs in the Orient, of the attitude maintained by the Great Powers in whose hands rests the moral and military force of the civilised world, the time has come when the Greeks and Albanians, representing the two strongest and most intimately related races in the Balkan Peninsula, being threatened in their national existence, should take means to defend our common rights and interests.

AND THEREFORE WE DECLARE:

(1). We will not threaten the general peace by opposing ourselves to any policy or action of which the aim is to maintain the *status quo* in the Orient, in accordance with international agreements; but we demand that this *status quo* shall be made into a true guarantee of the peace of the world and a means of justice and equality for all the peoples of the Orient.

(2). We do not reject the European schemes of reform, but we demand that the reforms provided for shall be radical, and shall benefit equally all the Balkan peoples.

(3). We do not and will not oppose the legitimate rights and aspirations of any nation whatsoever; but we demand that our legitimate rights and aspirations shall also be respected. We reject all propaganda, religious or political, and all intrigue, no matter whence it may come; and we declare that we regard as our common enemy any one who shall seek to injure us or to encroach upon our common or private rights.

(4). Greeks and Albanians, without distinction of religion, we are friends and brothers, our interests and our dangers are shared in common. Our joint programme consists in the national development of each race within its historic limits so long as the present state shall continue: and if a time should ever come for the disappearance of the existing political *régime*, we aim at a free and independent Albania, and a re-establishment of the Greek countries.

(5). Greek and Albanian alike, we reject the oppression and denationalising methods of other races. The basis of our national programme and the scope of our secret desires is: religious liberty, social unity, political autonomy, and the co-operation of all the peoples inhabiting our land.

We pray all, who share these thoughts and sentiments, to accept this declaration. We appeal for their assistance in the work of re-establishing justice, liberty, fraternity and equality in the land of our ancestors, who from the earliest times made such vast contributions to human progress.

The Greco-Albanian Union, making the above Declaration, addresses all those friends and defenders of liberty and justice who live in foreign lands, and prays for their aid and sympathy.

The Committee of the Greco-Albanian Union.

Athens, March 22, 1907.

A MANIFESTO

From the Helleno-Vlach Inhabitants of Monastir to the Consuls of the Great Powers in that City.

To the Consul of.....,

Sir,

We are the people known as Koutzovlachs. We are the people about whom rages a fierce conflict, concerning whom many write and talk without understanding anything about us. For some time the world has been pleased to manifest a great interest in our fate, but it has not troubled to examine who we are or to ask what we think on subjects which concern only us. We have been looked upon as orphans or abandoned foundlings, and the world has undertaken to bring us up in its own way. We have been regarded as an estate in Chancery, the rightful owners of which have at last been discovered, after years of search.

It would have been a miracle if this solicitude for us, so passionate and of such recent growth, had been disinterested; and all this farce played at our expense would have been worthy of nothing but contempt, but for the fact that it has caused much unhappiness among us—it has given rise to internal strife among brothers, who for thousands of years have lived the same national life.

And now, for the first time after all these centuries, the Roumanians—who are divided from us by Servia and Bulgaria—have suddenly discovered themselves to be closely akin to us, have suddenly manifested a great love for us. And in order to conceal their mazy political aims and to deceive Europe as to the purpose of their propaganda, they pretend that it is the cause of civilisation which is pushing them irresistibly towards us. So they come to us, scatter gold among us, and wish to teach us their language, which resembles ours as much as French or Italian. But—we do not want their civilisation. Our own is superior. When they were still obscure and uncivilised, we were already developing our civilisation and cultivating the riches of our country. We were distinguishing ourselves in the sciences and in in the arts, as they have never distinguished themselves. For evidence of this, look at those from among us who have established themselves in the various countries of Europe; look at those who have settled in Roumania itself without becoming Roumanised; or ask those Europeans who have come among us and who can estimate the value of the Hellenovlach schools and charitable organisations, which were established, and have for centuries been maintained, solely by our own efforts, and not by foreign gold.

While we were organising and maintaining these institutions, the Roumanians were sleeping the profound sleep of ignorance. They still made use of the Cyrillian alphabet. Moreover, our manners and customs suffice to distinguish us from them. We have a conception of the family hearth and of family honour, which is quite foreign to their ideas. We are not Slavo-Latins as they are; we are Helleno-Latins, neither more nor less. Believe us, there is a vast difference.

For reasons easy to comprehend, the Roumanian politicians proclaim that there are in Macedonia near a million of their brothers, who only need learn the rules of Roumanian grammar before being convinced of their relationship to these people. We do not know on what the Roumanian politicians base their arguments. It is a pity they do not come here to open their eyes. But we ask any foreigner who has seen us, to say whether it considers it humane or just, that a whole people should be oppressed by the action of a foreign propaganda to satisfy a linguistic pedantry, and that their most cherished sentiments should be violated with such callous disregard.

For the matter does touch our cherished sentiments. All the lucubrations concerning the inalienable rights of linguistic, or the politics of the Patriarchate, cannot destroy a national conscience which has endured for thousands of years. They say our Church has been guilty of errors. So be it; She is none the less our Church. If these faults have been committed, we bear our share of them—they pertain to our national history. They do not concern the Roumanians one way or the other. We desire one thing only of the Roumanians: that they leave us alone and do not meddle with our affairs. They have no right to speak in our name, to decide upon our language or upon our destiny: they have no right to send out paid emissaries in order to create a Roumanian coterie.

We are not Roumanians. We proclaim the fact openly and fearlessly. And though the Roumanians increase a hundredfold their bribes, we shall still never become Roumanians. Towards them we have no feelings other than

a profound contempt and distrust, engendered by the audacity of their attempt to pose as our protectors. The gold which they scatter so profusely may purchase some corrupt individuals, some social flotsam, but it will never be able to silence the just indignation of a whole people against the band of Roumanian politicians who, desiring to inspire their countrymen with what they are pleased to call a national aim, are subjecting us to varied and increasing annoyance, and are inflicting pressure in indescribable ways upon the simplest and poorest among us.

We have on many occasions protested to the Imperial government against this state of affairs, but we must also address our representations to the nations of Europe. We think it necessary to do this because we regret to observe that not only does almost the whole of Europe abet the Roumanians in their ungrateful design, but also certain of the European representatives, who have perhaps made a superficial study of things, have encouraged our detractors and so have contributed to the perpetuation of our miseries.

We have the honour to be, etc.,

The Koutzovlachs of the City of Monastir.

[Here follow the duly legalised signatures of 2062 Hellenovlach heads of families.]

The Kidnapping of Colonel Elliot:

A LESSON FOR BULGAROPHILS.

What reward British Bulgarophils may expect from the objects of their regard is admirably shewn by the attack upon Colonel Elliot near Drama. This officer was in a sense the representative of his country in this part of Macedonia. He was in charge of a body of gendarmerie, whose work was to protect the Christian peasants from Turkish exactions. Apparently, too, Colonel Elliot himself, was, as we learn from several sources, particularly favourably disposed towards the Bulgarian part of the peasantry. Notwithstanding his general mission of protection and his special pro-Bulgarian sympathies, he was treacherously set upon by a Bulgarian band, and but for the plucky behaviour of the gendarmes of his escort, the Colonel must inevitably have been carried into captivity.

We wish we might hope that this outrage would open the eyes of British Bulgarophils and teach them how the Bulgarians express their gratitude for moral sympathy and practical benefits. But we fear pro-Bulgarism is as immutable as it is inexplicable, and we regret to observe that most of the British journals dealt very lightly with the affair. The *Times*, in a leading article on the outrage, even contrived to adapt its usual anti-Greek sermon to the new text, passing over the kidnapping in the first few lines, and devoting the rest of its long article to a rambling invective against the Greeks.

Somewhat conflicting accounts come from various sources as to the precise details of the event, and we may have to return to the subject in a subsequent issue. Meanwhile we reprint the following account from Salonica, which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of August 12, 1907:

Salonika, August 6.

The following are some additional details of the recent attempt by a Bulgarian band to kidnap Colonel Elliot, the British staff officer in charge of the work of gendarmerie re-organisation in the Drama district of Macedonia.

In the course of a tour in his district Colonel Elliot arrived on the afternoon of Tuesday, July 30, at the Bulgarian village of Gyuredjik, situated about seven hours from Drama, on the road to Nevrokop. It seems clear that it has been planned to carry him off from the house in which he passed the night, and that this project was frustrated only by the vigilance of his escort in guarding the house.

About seven o'clock the following morning Colonel Elliot went out to take a stroll round the village. Turning into a side street he had gone only about forty yards when he suddenly found himself seized by four men in khaki uniforms, armed with Mannlicher carbines and bayonets, wearing bandoliers, and carrying bombs in small sacks attached to their belts. They tried to hurry their prisoner away towards the hills, explaining that they intended to do him no harm but merely to make the Turkish Government pay a ransom for him. He resisted with all his might, his jacket getting torn to pieces in the struggle, but when they tied a rope round his left arm he relaxed his efforts, fearing that he might be secured in such a way as to leave no hope of escape. He continued, however, to make the pace as slow as possible. Strange to say, his captors did not search him for arms ; they were probably in too great a hurry.

While the prisoner was being carried off parties of the band were posted to fire down the streets by way of intimidating possible pursuers, and these parties afterwards formed themselves into a long line of skirmishers to cover the withdrawal of the party who were in charge of the prisoner. Two of the gendarmes composing Colonel Elliot's escort started pluckily in pursuit, and soldiers from an adjoining blockhouse began to fire across a ravine on the retiring Bulgarians.

Meanwhile Colonel Elliot had been hurried some distance upwards towards the forest, and his party reached an open meadow, where, finding themselves under fire, one of the party lay down and began to return the fire of the two gendarmes, who were only about seventy yards off, while the other three tried to force their prisoner to lie down. At this moment the colonel succeeded in drawing his Browning pistol, and immediately shot through the body the three men who were struggling with him. As they fell away from him he started running down the slope, dragging after him the cord that was knotted to his left arm. A few steps down he saw the fourth of his captors, whom he supposed to be Daieff, chief of the band, taking aim at the gendarmerie sergeant Ferhad. This man (Daieff) swung round his rifle to bear on Colonel Elliot, who instantly shot him.

Still further down the colonel saw a fifth Bulgarian lying on the ground with a rifle and shot him through the head. Not till afterwards did it occur to the colonel that this man might already have been wounded.

It was at this point that the colonel was wounded in the thigh and understood from the bullets splashing in the mud in front of him that he was being fired upon from behind; but in few more steps he gained cover and was out of danger. He called off the two gendarmes, who, however, continued to fight, in the hope, as they afterwards said, of capturing some of the wounded Bulgarians. He then proceeded to the house where he had spent the night, and had his wound dressed.

The two gendarmes returned some time after, the elder, Ferhad, a man sixty years of age, having been seriously wounded, and the younger, Mehmed, having exhausted his ammunition and having had the mud splashed in his face by the explosion of a bomb, after which he thought it was time to bring his wounded companion out of danger.

The same evening Colonel Elliot returned to Drama, and on Sunday, the 4th inst., he arrived in Salonika and was received in the Turkish Civil Hospital. His wound is progressing favourably.

The conduct of the two gendarmes was beyond all praise; and the sargeant in charge of the military detachment also behaved creditably, throwing out his men as skirmishers, and helping by their fire to cover the successful advance of the two gendarmes which enabled, Colonel Elliot to effect his escape. No blame is attached to him for not coming to close quarters with a large and well-appointed band numbering probably between forty and fifty men. The firing lasted about one hour.

Greeks and Bulgarians in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.

Prof. N. Kasasis, the well-known author of several books on the affairs of the Near East, and distinguished President of the Patriotic Society "Hellenismos," has just published a most enlightening little book entitled "Greeks and Bulgarians."

This book, which is written in the form of an open letter to Sir Charles Dilke, appears opportunely on the anniversary of last year's Bulgarian atrocities in Eastern Roumelia, of which public opinion in this country has unfortunately been little informed. After an introductory chapter, of which we quote the greater part, Prof. Kasasis gives a brief sketch of the development of Bulgarian aims and ambitions, from the time of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 down to our own days, supplementing his remarks by a citation of many important official documents, including those articles of the *San Stefano* and *Berlin Treaties*, in which was laid down the boundaries of the new State. A short chapter on the Bulgarian character, in which Prof. Kasasis quotes from eminent Bulgarian and other authorities, prepares us for the main narrative, which deals with the aims of Bulgarism and with the means by which it has sought to realise these aims, and especially with its relations to Hellenism. The attitude of Bulgarism towards Hellenism, and the character of Bulgarian methods, are unhappily only too well known to our readers; and we need only say that Prof. Kasasis deals in the clearest and most lucid and withal most impartial manner with the sorry and disgraceful theme. His conclusion is noteworthy, and we quote it in full.

Introduction.

TO THE RT. HON. SIR CHARLES DILKE, BART.

SIR,—It was during my absence from Athens that, with the connivance of the Bulgarian authorities, the mob in certain districts of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, and especially at Varna, Philippopolis, and Anchialos, perpetrated the most terrible outrages on the Greek population of these towns, who were forced to abandon their ruined homes and seek an asylum elsewhere, the majority taking refuge at Athens.

These unprovoked crimes filled with horror and indignation a great portion of the civilised world.

But, on the other hand, both in Europe and America, amongst those who were either ignorant of the true facts of the case, or were influenced by Bulgarian propaganda, these same outrages were either defended by some who justified them on the ground that the activity of Greek bands in Macedonia demanded some kind of retaliation, or made light of by others who declared that they were purely imaginary and had never taken place at all; while in England especially public opinion, misled by the information of Bulgarian agents, sympathised rather with the perpetrators of these outrages than with their unfortunate victims.

Practically the whole of the English Press, with *The Times* at its head, published articles attributing to the Greeks themselves the responsibility for the outrages committed. Other organs of public opinion, both in England and on the Continent, were silent.

Has the standard of public morality indeed fallen so low? It is not for me to say, but rather simply to state the facts, and describe a condition of affairs which can but bring pain to every friend of civilisation and humanity.

The Society over which I have the honour to preside considered it a duty, at this latest outbreak of Bulgarian violence, to appeal to the friends of the Greek nation in England, France, and Italy, with whom during the last period of national activity it had had such pleasant relations. Among the first, it appealed to you, for many years an eminent and proved friend of our nation—to you, Sir, who have so often expressed your affection and solicitude for Hellenism. Our Society could by no means ignore the kindness which you have shown towards the writer during his visit to London, and your intense interest in the cause which he has so much at heart. In you our Society justly recognised the most illustrious of all the English Philhellenes and one of the ablest and most cultured minds of the Anglo-Saxon race.

On my return to Athens, a few days after these lamentable events, I found your reply to our appeal, which I now have the honour to reproduce:

"DOCKETT EDDY, SHEPPERTON, MIDDLESEX,
"*August* 19, 1906.

"DEAR SIR,—I have your telegram. I had of course already seen with horror the telegrams relating the dreadful deeds you name. I shall at all times associate myself with those of every country who may join in the expression of the wish for the success of Greece and the extension of Hellenic civilisation. It would, I fear, be difficult to induce them to deal in detail with the various outrages which mark the struggle between the races and the Churches who are thrown together in South-East Europe.

"Sincerely,

"(Signed) CHARLES W. DILKE."

At the same time as our Society appealed to you, the Metropolitan of Athens, who is also president of the committee for the aid of the refugees, wrote in the following moving terms to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

"*To* HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

"The Church of Greece entreats your Grace's sympathetic aid with regard to the unparalleled and entirely unprovoked outrages committed against the law-abiding Greeks of Bulgaria, and against the churches, monasteries, and church dignitaries, notwithstanding the protection to which all are entitled from the Great Powers, in virtue of the Berlin Treaty.

"The Church of Greece entreats, through your Grace, the fraternal intervention of the English Church with the British Government, so that an end may be put to further murders and rapine, which leave a stain on the age in which we live.

"(Signed) The Metropolitan of Athens,

"THEOCLITUS."

To this entreaty the Archbishop of Canterbury replied as follows through the medium of the Bishop of Gibraltar:

"You are requested to inform the Metropolitan of Athens that the Archbishop of Canterbury has instructed me to make the following communication:

"That the telegram of his Holiness the Metropolitan of Athens arrived in England during his absence on the Continent, and was handed to him a few days ago, on his return.

"That the Archbishop, as well as the English Church in general, never interferes in questions of a political nature, and that it is impossible for the

Archbishop to take any action which might be interpreted as a justification of the entry of bands from Greece into Turkish territory.

"The Archbishop therefore considered that it was not possible for him to send a telegraphic or an official reply, but he instructs me to assure his Holiness that the English Church learns with great sorrow of the strife between the Christians of the East; and he sends his brotherly greetings to his Holiness.

"The Bishop of Gibraltar also desires to offer his brotherly greetings and respect to the Head of the Greek Church."

I do not desire, Sir, to express my own opinion of these two letters; let the reader judge. I will only comment briefly on that part of the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury in which he says that "the English Church learns with great sorrow of the strife between the Christians of the East," and that "it is impossible for the Archbishop to take any action which might be interpreted as a justification of the entry of bands from Greece into Turkish territory."

You, Sir, also, taking into consideration the erroneous opinion obtaining in England as to the character and motives of the conflicts between the different races in Macedonia, confessed with regret, in the letter which you addressed to the Board of our Society, that "It would be difficult to induce them to deal in detail with the various outrages which mark the struggle between the races and the Churches who are thrown together in South-East Europe."

You will allow me, Sir, to differ from you, as well as from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury and from all those who hold such ideas as to the activity in Macedonia and the conflicts between the different peoples inhabiting that country. I assert that these conflicts are not in the least due to religious or sectarian influences. The reason for the anarchy which has become a scourge to that country must be sought elsewhere.

Those who have thoroughly investigated the Macedonian question, and have based their study on mere facts; those who have visited this part of the Balkan Peninsula, and have examined the conditions without any racial, political, or sectarian prejudice, must confess that the present conflict in Macedonia is not due to religious antipathy or to differences of dogma; nor is it a struggle of races—of Greeks and Bulgarians, or even of Slavs and Greeks. The Greeks, it is true, are fighting in self-defence in one place against Bulgarians, in another against Turks; but in other parts Servians are opposing Bulgarians, and Rumanophiles contend against Greeks—indeed, the condition of Macedonia may be truly defined as *Bellum omnium contra omnes.*

What, then, are the real causes of these bloody conflicts carried on in full view of the nations of Europe, whose Governments have even on occasion fomented the quarrel for their own ends?

I will advance nothing *à priori* with regard to the present crisis in the Balkan Peninsula, which has resulted to a great extent from the selfish policy of some of the European Powers, who merely seek their own political interests. I could adduce many facts, which are confirmed by official Europe itself, clearly showing that the state of anarchy now prevailing in Macedonia is due, partly to the insincere policy of official Europe, and partly to the greedy and criminal activity of the Bulgarian committees, encouraged by several European Powers who have an interest in the continuance of this anarchy in the Balkan Peninsula.

It is hardly necessary to repeat that the causes of the conflict between the Christian peoples of Macedonia are neither religious, doctrinal, nor ecclesiastical.

I have already shown, and shall soon again prove, that the Greeks of Macedonia have for some time past been defending their homes against the Bulgarian bands which are encouraged by the Government of the principality and even commended by a considerable portion of the public opinion of Europe. The Bulgarian Government has taken advantage of this strife between Greeks and Bulgarians to perpetrate by means of the mob the recent abominable outrages on the unfortunate Greeks residing in that country. Of these crimes I have authentic accounts, not only from Greek and other sources, but even from Bulgarian eye-witnesses, whose better feelings revolted at the sight of such atrocities.

I have been hindered by indifferent health from undertaking sooner the cheerless task of attempting to enlighten public opinion in England as to the facts which I have just mentioned. But I now entreat your aid, Sir, in the hope of overcoming the indifference which has been shown in both official and unofficial circles in England to the sufferings of the Greek population under Bulgarian rule.

If the official reports are examined, it will soon appear that it is the duty of Europe to apply pressure in certain quarters with regard to the excesses now being committed in Macedonia. But will it be the agitators in Sofia, or those who are defending their own lives in Macedonia, who will in the end suffer for these atrocities? It is the duty of Europe to consider whether the commission of such crimes is creditable to or permissible by the civilisation which is the white man's burden and pride; crimes which, if committed by yellow, black, or red races, would have called forth the prompt intervention of an international crusade.

The prime object of the Berlin Conference was, first, to emancipate the Christian peoples suffering under the Turkish yoke, and, secondly, to guarantee the personal freedom of all those populations. Above all, liberty of conscience in religion and education as well as in political and social relations was to be assured to all. In order to attain this end, the necessary measures were taken at the Conference; and the representatives of the European Powers there assembled showed every desire to respect and protect all the rights of the populations whose conditions were to be ameliorated under the new order. Thus new Bulgaria was created with the obligation to respect the religious and social rights of the different nationalities included in the principality.

The Conference was fully conscious that the old racial and religious differences of the Greeks and Bulgarians would not be terminated by the new order of things. They could not hope that a national hatred whose origin was considerably older than its latest manifestation would be easily forgotten under the pressure of a policy of forcible assimilation—*per fas et nefas.*

As I have already pointed out, the late Lord Salisbury, when attacking the Treaty of San Stefano, based his chief argument on the fate awaiting the Greek inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula if they were left to the mercy of the insatiable Slavs; and at Berlin he consistently declared the danger to which the Greek race would be exposed in the newly established principality if its religious and other liberties were not assured.

The words of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs were in every respect prophetic. Notwithstanding the measures adopted by the Conference for their protection, these unfortunate subjects of the Bulgarian Government, who were relieved from the oppression of one tyranny in order to be placed under another, have suffered and are still suffering greater hardships than those which they endured under the domination of the Turks.

This I will proceed to prove, setting down the actual facts in defence of justice and truth.

AN HISTORICAL PARALLEL.

May I be permitted to make an historical incursion into the past and recall some events of thirty years ago?

No one is ignorant of the massacres of Batak and Cavarna in Bulgaria, then a Turkish province. The Bashi-Bozouks committed every species of atrocity on the Bulgarian inhabitants of certain districts who had risen against the Turkish rule during the insurrection of Herzegovina.

Official Europe remained apathetic. "Ein Bischen Erzegovine," exclaimed the Mephistopheles of the German Empire, at a political soirée given at his palace, and he turned his attention to the domestic affairs of Germany, declaring that the Eastern question was not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier.

What did the British Government do at this moment?

England remained indifferent, as did the whole of Europe, with Germany at its head, to the events taking place in the Balkan Peninsula.

In fact, I may add that the policy of the United Kingdom showed the greatest sympathy for the Turkish Government, and evinced no desire to accept as true the accusations brought against the organs of that Government of criminal conduct against the revolted peasantry of Bulgaria.

The British Government concealed these events from the British public, either out of indifference or from incorrigibility, as Gladstone said at the time.

Fortunately, the manager of a Liberal journal, the *Daily News*, assigned to one of its correspondents the duty of verifying the events of that fearful affair. Indignation seized the public opinion of England on account of the occurrences. At the same time (June 26, 1876) the Duke of Argyll in the House of Lords and Mr. Forster in the House of Commons addressed impatient questions with regard to the report of the correspondent of the *Daily News*. After the commotion caused in England and on the Continent, detailed reports were published with regard to the Balkan and Danubian provinces, and the truth of the ravages of the Kurds and Bashi-Bozouks therein was laid bare.

At that critical moment Gladstone shot his political bolt in connection with the occurrences. This was the publication of his pamphlet, *Bulgarian Atrocities*.

I may here be allowed to observe, Sir, that the crimes committed in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, during the last few months, from July until the present time (December, 1906), against the Greek population, do not differ in the least degree from those which took place exactly thirty years ago and in that very country.

The only difference is that then the chief actors were Mussulman, whereas they are now Christian Bashi-Bozouks—Bulgarians.

But, as then the Turkish, so now the Bulgarian Government is no stranger to the events.

I must nevertheless observe, in addressing an English gentleman, that the British Government has lately taken a one-sided view of the events of the Balkan Peninsula; nor is it out of place for me to repeat to-day the words of Mr. W. H. Smith in the House of Commons in 1878, that it "followed the merciless policy of excessive egotism."

British diplomacy has especially caused harm to poor Greece. I am seized with grief on reading in both unofficial and official English publications inaccuracies concerning the crimes perpetrated in Bulgaria and Macedonia on the innocent Christian population, crimes which have been more than once acknowledged, not only by foreigners, but by the very Bulgarians themselves.

A few days since, the *Bulgaria*, organ of the Bulgarian Premier, M. Daneff, wrote as follows:

"The acts of violence of every description committed and continuing to be committed in our country; the acts of brigandage, the incendiarism, the daily encounters, the thefts, and to sum up, the crimes against the person, property, and honour of the citizens of every race, tend to a great extent to show that the country has become an important factor of anarchy. In addition, the attitude of the Great Powers and of the European Press clearly shows that as such is Bulgaria looked upon abroad."

And yet there are people, more especially in England, who cast the responsibility for these crimes upon the Greeks of Macedonia and of Bulgaria! According to publications which we have seen, the work of credible witnesses, and official documents, certified not only by Europe but by Bulgaria herself, the authorities of that country themselves took part in the destruction of Anchialos, the outrages at Philippopolis, and in other Bulgarian towns.

Nobody any more disputes the truth of these facts.

A portion only of the English Press passes them over in silence, or denies them, or, worse, justifies them.

Is not an examination on the spot imposed on Europe, and especially on English public opinion, in the name of philanthropy and of civilisation, in order that it may be persuaded that it has a duty to perform in deliberating more seriously with regard to the fate of populations which it has handed over with a light conscience to a political status little differing from the most savage and tyrannical which history has to show?

I consider that I have sufficiently described in the foregoing pages the national and political character of the people, to whom from time to time congratulations are addressed on its action, and wishes expressed for the continuance of this action, in the Balkan Peninsula.

I invoke the verdict of the civilised world.

CONCLUSION.

In the first page of a book published some twenty years ago, full of life and truth, which you, Sir, above all others, have felt and considered, I read the following:

"Never since the fall of Napoleon has brutal force held so considerable a place in Europe as to-day. . . . It is not certainly from to-day only that nations are tempted to seize by violence the property

of others, but at least in other days they tried to save appearances." *

I call for the aid of him who wrote these words to protest against the *brutal force* which, as a political discoverer, he stigmatised in a special publication, but which he may also stigmatise as a practical statesman. With regard to the real *Bulgarian Atrocities* committed a few months ago in the Bulgarian principality, in which the organs of that Government took part with impunity, he can do, with the same right, what thirty years ago was done by his magnanimous countryman, William Gladstone, in a similar case, when he launched at the British public and the civilised world that famous book in which he stigmatised so unmercifully but justly the outrages of the Bashi-Bozouks of the Ottoman Power on the Christians of the Balkan countries.

Believe me that the authors of both these atrocities, those of 1876 and those of 1906, do not differ in the least degree.

Both peoples came from the same land, both have made a name for their criminal conception of life, with the sole difference that the Turks represent Islam, and the Bulgarians, assimilated to the Slav peoples, adopted Christianity without, however, their original character being in the least changed. Facts speak for themselves. Concerning both, may one repeat Gladstone's phrase: "They were, upon the whole, from the black day when they first entered Europe, the one great anti-human specimen of humanity."

I address myself in the name of the Hellenic race, that race which is so much undervalued and persecuted by political speculation, to him who has so often protested against the *brutal force* which prevails in Europe, and before which justice and truth are compelled to give way.

He is one of the strongest and most intellectual spirits of Great Britain—strong in the face of falsehood and hypocrisy, unbending and invincible in the support of truth.

The Greek nation calls with confidence upon him to support their rights, and that nation has no doubt that it will find in that man a most powerful and just advocate of their trampled and neglected rights.

Letter from Sofia.

THE ORGANISATION OF BANDS: GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION: FORMAL ADMISSIONS.

I have often explained how careful the authorities here are to explain that they do not tolerate the organisation in Bulgarian territory of bands to invade Macedonia.

In spite, however, of the silence imposed on the Bulgarian press as to the movements of the "bands of liberation," some journals occasionally forget themselves, and allow compromising indiscretions to escape them. These revelations go to the extent of shewing that Prince Ferdinand's Government not only tolerates and encourages the formation of bands, but also that it is closely concerned in their workings, and is, in fact, the supreme (though hidden) mainspring of the bands.

First we may touch upon the question of the famous £20,000 voted by the Sobranie in support of the Bulgarian propaganda of the Macedonian Committees. We now learn that this sum has been placed at the exclusive disposition of that faction of the comitadjis which is favoured by the Stamboulovist cabinet—it must not be forgotten that there are two opposing factions of the comitadjis who dispute with one another the honour of "liberating" Macedonia. On this subject, let us refer to the *Den* of June 26 and 28:

"A revolutionary chief has sent us the following "information, which we print, without for the moment "commenting upon it.

"A telegram from Sofia to the *Frankfurter Zeitung* "states that six bands set out from here some time ago. "It is said that the telegram was sent by M. Kozak, who "is connected with the Government.

"The other day the *voevode* (*i.e.*, chief of a band) "Kristio of Cotcham, was brought here without escort, "together with his nine partisans, who had been arrested "at Kustendil by a company of soldiers. Many of the "*voevodes* and partisans mentioned by the *Frankfurter* "*Zeitung* are at large unchallenged in Kustendil.* Before "Kristio's band was arrested, it was currently rumoured "that the bands referred to in the above-mentioned "despatch, having penetrated into the Strouma region, "had been completely destroyed by Tchernopeeff, a friend "and follower of Kristio.

"On account of that rumour, Kristio's band was "arrested and imprisoned, while *the frontier guards received* "*order to keep a close watch, and to fire without warning on* "ANY BAND WHICH APPEARED WITHOUT THE AUTHORISATION "OF THE GOVERNMENT. The Prefect Ladjene has been "imprisoned, though the Prefect of Kustendil is allowed "to go free. The Sofia police have been instructed to "arrest certain *voevodes* and their bands, and to let others "go free. . . .

"Moreover, for some time there have been operating "in Sofia two sections of the "Interior Organisation," "which do not recognise one another. *Is it some personal* "*or party interest of the Government* which leads to these "bloody conflicts between different sections of the Or-"ganisation? We see no other explanation.

"Finally: is it not the duty of the press to throw "some light on these dreadful events?"

So much for the *Den*. Its Bulgarian contemporaries, as we shall shortly see, confirm these statements. Meanwhile, I may state, in agreement with the *Den*, that:

1. The Bulgarian bands, operating in Macedonia, are without question formed on the territory of the Principality.

2. They are formed with the knowledge and with the aid of the Government.

The Cabinet, however, only supports one section of the self-styled "Interior" Organisation, which has quite recently "despatched six bands from here," of which some "have already penetrated into the Strouma region," while others "are still at large in Kustendil"—ready, no doubt, to join the others across the frontier. The other section of the "Interior" Organisation does not enjoy Government support, but is on the contrary subjected to rigorous treatment, as may be seen from the arrest and imprisonment of Kristio, the friend of Tchernopeeff, who belongs to this adverse camp. A further proof is seen in the order given to the frontier guards, to "fire on every band which crosses into Turkey *without authorisation from the Government*"—every band, that is to say, which is not in the good graces of the present ministers.

In view of these facts, will any Bulgarian deny that their country is implicated in the organisation of bands in Macedonia? Moreover, the *Den's* revelations are so far from being contradicted that they find confirmation in the columns of other Bulgarian journals. First the *Gradjanin* of May 31/June 13 gives us more accounts of the brigands; then comes the *Balkanska Tribuna* which grieves over the quarrels, and addresses an appeal to the Government, which it exhorts to abandon "this policy of favouritism," and to support all the comitadjis without exception. If this is not done, the *Tribuna* threatens, it will lay bare to

* "Jamais, depuis la chute de Napoléon, la force brutale n'a tenu en Europe une place aussi considérable qu' à l'époque actuelle . . Ce n'est pas d'aujourd'hui, sans doute, que les nations sont tentées de saisir par violence le bien d'autrui; mais, du moins, s'efforçait-on autrefois de sauver les apparences."—CHARLES DILKE, "L'Europe en 1887." Paris.

* Kustendil is a Bulgarian town near the Turkish frontier. It is one of the headquarters of the Bulgarian bands operating in Macedonia.

the public certain facts discreditable to the Stamboulovists. We read in a leading article of this same journal's issue of June 2/13 :

" It would be a grave mistake to suppose that the " facts revealed by the revolutionary chief† date from " yesterday. They have long caused anxiety in Bulgaria : " they unsettle the mind of the nation and dishonour its " name. Thanks to the presence in Macedonia of European " officers in the gendarmerie, and of European civil agents " and financial representatives, Europe is in full posses- " sion of facts which have been carefully concealed from " our own people. . . ."

The Bulgarian journal goes on to accuse the Government of fomenting " bloody dissentions in the midst of the *Interior* Organisation."‡ Since the organisation is *Interior*, we may ask in passing how it comes about that the Bulgarian Government can affect it one way or the other. We need not waste time by dwelling on this point.

The *Mir* also, in its issue of May 30/June 12 comments on the letter published in the *Den.* " We must " admit, then," says the *Mir*. " that there are certain " bands which are organised by the Government itself, " and which are sent into Macedonia, there to carry out " the policy of Ghennadief;§ for it is Ghennadief who, " thanks to his completely possessing the confidence of " H.R.H., holds in his hands all the strings of Bulgarian " politics. Apart from these bodies, there are other " *independent* bands, which the Government represses, " and of which the chiefs are arrested and imprisoned by " the military authorities."

The *Mir* prints in italics that passage from the above quoted letter, in which it is demanded that the press shall " throw some light on these dreadful events " It adds :

We also are among those who demand more light, but it is not from us that the enlightenment is to be expected. " That must come from those who are in the " actual working of things. Let the chiefs themselves be " more frank ; let them raise the veil : the present state " of Macedonia no longer renders secrecy justifiable. " . . . ."

But the *Mir*, doubtless seeing that it has gone rather too far, at once makes haste to moderate its counsels :

" But if it is not desirable to wash our dirty linen in " public, in the organs of the press, and *under the eyes of* " *foreigners*, is it not possible to arrange private confer- " ences, in the presence of official representatives of our " political parties, and of the Society ? . . ."

It goes on to propose that the meetings shall take place in the Palace of the Holy Bulgarian Synod, " the " organ of which has shed many bitter tears, and has " urged us to act in unison and to make a common effort " towards settling the Macedonian question. Under the " auspices of that authority, light could be thrown upon " these dreadful events."

The Government does not recruit its emissaries in Macedonia entirely from among the professional comitadjis, whose sole business is in the campaigns of the bands : it draws also upon the army. No one who has followed, however slightly, the course of events in Macedonia, can fail to have observed, on many occasions when the Bulgarian bands have come into conflict with Turkish troops, that among the dead left on the field have been many who wore the uniform of Bulgarian army officers. Does the Minister of War for the Principality pretend ignorance of these facts ? Is it not, on the contrary, with his approbation that these members of the army—whether officers or simple soldiers—leave their post and abandon the barracks, in order to terrorise and massacre or hold to ransom those Macedonians who do not busy themselves in support of the Bulgarian propaganda ?

† In the previously quoted article from the *Den.*

‡ As is well known, the " Interior " Organisation purports to be a purely Macedonian body—" Interior," and not formed or controlled in any exterior country (*i.e.*, in Bulgaria). In this way the Bulgarians try to palm off the criminal organisation of their bands as a Macedonian movement.

§ The Minister—established beyond question as the chief of the Bulgarian comitadjis operating in Macedonia.

MODERN GREECE:

HER ROLE IN EASTERN EUROPE.

A LECTURE DELIVERED BY M. A. BERL, BEFORE THE FRENCH PHILHELLENIC LEAGUE.

M. Homolle, in inaugurating this series of lectures, gave a happy description of the aims of the League—to make Modern Greece known and loved as Ancient Greece is known and loved.

It did not escape his notice that for many years past, the enthusiasm of former days with regard to the Greek people had been replaced, not only by more or less fair criticism, but also by unfriendly prejudice and systematic calumny. This current of thought had been reflected in literature, the dithyramb had been succeeded by the pamphlet, the poetical exaltation of *Les Orientales* by the caricature of *Le Roi des Montagnes*. Former philhellenes had been discouraged and carried away in the general injustice, partly owing to political and financial mistakes made by Greece, but chiefly on account of the country's misfortunes.

Some people affected to find admiration of Ancient Greece a shield behind which to hide their enmity to Modern Greece. The memory of one served to blot out the other, and the stones of the Propylæa became no more a pedestal but a tombstone, under which, as they pretended, was the grave of Greece. " Modern " Hellas is but the degenerate daughter of the " antique race, or rather she lays claim to a " false affiliation: the race of authentic Hellenes " has long ago vanished. Civil war, foreign " invasion, servile admixture, Asiatic and " Slavonic infiltrations, all these had tainted " the last drop of the illustrious classic blood, " or had completely absorbed it. There rests " no trace of the 40,000 Athenian citizens or of " the 7,000 Spartans of the great age, no " vestige of all those races whence were recruited " the armies of Alexander ! The Modern " Greeks are no true heirs of the Hellenic " name ; they are but usurpers." So their enemies have maintained : and they made just as short work of the personal quality of the Modern Greeks as of their claim to ancient descent. They were denied the possession of every virtue which had been ascribed to them ; they were declared incapable of governing or of submitting to government. Open preference was accorded to the other Balkan States, the progress made by Greece was treated with scorn, her most legitimate aspirations and her most indisputable rights were sacrificed to her rivals. And, therefore, the efforts of the Philhellenic League were not superfluous, nor the endeavours of our lecturers without use.

M. Thery has recently demonstrated[1] that the financial errors of Greece were due less to

[1] E. Thery, *Modern Greece, as she is and as she should be*, HELLENIC HERALD, No. 6, April, 1907.

bad administration than to the vicissitudes of the Cretan question and to the onerous duties devolving upon the mother-country in consequence of that question. He pointed out also the difficulties of the general position, and the narrowness of the economic and territorial resources with which Europe has endowed Greece.

M. Houssaye[2] has recounted the heroism of the Greeks, to which Greece owes her independence, and has recalled the eight years of war which were necessary before the indifference of Europe could be overcome and her conscience awakened.

We may hope that the friends of Hellenism will do much to reawaken this conscience if they can dissipate the errors and calumnies spread abroad by her enemies. It is in the hope of helping to bring about this return to justice, that I am putting forward the results of researches, which I have had the opportunity of making during the course of a long mission, which kept me for several years in the Balkan Peninsula. In this brief sketch of political and ethnographical psychology, I will try to lay clear before you the dominant characteristics of the Greek people, which distinguish them from all the other races of Oriental Europe and which constitute that which is essentially Greek—the virtues and vices of the race, its connection with its forerunners, that which explains its mistakes and its progress, and on which must depend its future.

There is no departure from impartiality in maintaining the superiority of Greek civilisation among the nations of the Balkans. In antiquity, Hellenism was educator of the European and Asiatic world, and it played the same part down to the end of the Byzantine period. For the Hellenic world the middle ages were not, as they were in the West, a period of ignorance and darkness, and in those ages also Hellenism stood forth as the centre of light. And in the beginning of Modern European culture and civilisation, Greece still played a prominent part, thanks to her share in the Italian Renaissance. Down to our days even, under the Turkish domination, Greece was still the illuminator of the Christian races which had been overcome by the Turkish arms, then governed by the administration of Turkey, and finally united to one another by a common religion. At the fall of Constantinople, the various Slavonic, Finnish, and Moldovlach populations had not yet attained to any autonomous and complete civilisation. Their development was still in the most primitive stage, and under the Turkish rule they continued to look to the Greek educators and the Phanariot magistracy for their moral and religious guidance. In particular, the civilisation of the Danubian Principalities was so purely the work of the Phanariots, that the greater part of the Roumanian towns were created by them, and were organised by Phanariot governors, whose descendants, while adopting Roumanian nationality, yet retain such purely Greek names as Ghika, Morouzi, Mavrocordato, Soutzo, and Cantacuzene.

Previous lecturers have described[3] the role of the Phanar, the Greek Church, and the great professors or *didascaloi*, who, from the XVIth to the XIXth century, have prevented the suppression of learning in all the countries which had belonged to the Greek Empire. They have shewn how the Œcumenical Patriarch became tutor, protector, and legal representative of all the Orthodox Christians under the Turkish authorities.

It was their fund of learning and their advanced civilisation which enabled the Greeks to survive, even politically, after their defeats. Just as, 2,000 years ago, conquered Greece led captive conquering Rome, so, and to an even greater extent, after the conquest by Mahomed II, the Greeks were able to render themselves necessary to their new masters; and the Phanar, whence had been recruited the Civil Service and the higher clergy nnder the Byzantine *regime*, continued to furnish the Turks with the agents and functionaries required by the moral needs of their Christian subjects.

Thus it happened that the national tradition of the Greeks was never broken. They preserved their ancestral culture, and with it their ethnic consciousness and personality. They continued to play an active part in the government of the country, for the Turks did not trouble to assimilate the conquered elements, but were satisfied to leave them a certain measure of autonomy. The learned treatise of Mr. Sathas has demonstrated the activity of administrative life in the provinces, both in the towns and also in the villages under the Empire; and he has also shewn us the important part played by the "Demogerontia," *i.e.*, the Council of Old Men, elected by all the Christian inhabitants of a city or a borough.

These Demogerontiæ, which were perhaps a survival of the ancient liberties of the Greek city, were respected under the Byzantine Empire, and continued to exercise power under the Ottoman domination. In that way was continued a habit of self-government, scarcely known at that time among the other races. On the other hand, the intellectual superiority of the Greek community forced the Turks to look to it for their diplomatic representatives. As soon as the wane of Turkish power began, all these causes conspired to make the Greeks more ripe than the other subject races for revolt and independence and liberty.

And so when one travels through the Balkan Peninsula, and stays long enough in each country to observe its customs and its political life, when one penetrates through the constitu-

[2] H. Houssaye, *The Heroic Age of Modern Greece*, HELLENIC HERALD, No. 7, May, 1907.

[3] Ch. Diehl, *The Greek Church and Hellenism*, HELLENIC HERALD, No. 4, Feb., 1907.

tional forms of their almost identically similar political organisations, one notes that at the bottom are certain remarkable differences. The only one among them which seems to be a free nation is Greece. There alone the parliamentary and representative system has any real force: elsewhere it is a pretence. In the other Balkan States, set free in the course of the XIXth century, the real if not the written constitution is one of submission to the will of the sovereign. Liberation from the Turkish yoke has not destroyed their habit of blind obedience. All of them, before the conquest, were ruled over by national chiefs, Tsars or Voevodes, or by a native feudal nobility. After the emancipation, they have been ruled over by foreign princes whom Europe has bestowed upon them. Nothing, except the example of the Greeks, had familiarised them with the conception of a free government, for they could not discover the principle either in their history or in their national aptitudes.

The Greeks on the other hand had retained the tradition of free government, thanks to the demogerontiæ which we have recalled, and thanks especially to their peculiar characteristics—to that Greek spirit which finds expression in the love of conversation and public deliberation, in the taste for dialectic and political or religious discussion, in a word, in the *Logos*, which in the Agora, the soul of the ancient city, was at once the cause of its glory and its troubles, and which was at a later period the cause of religious schism, for the foundation of the Oriental Church was a triumph of individualism in religious matters, since the *Logos* would not permit the Greeks to submit to the dogmas of Rome, to a foreign doctrine which was to be accepted without criticism or examination.

Whatever the cause may have been, this individualism of the Greeks has been manifested ever since the reawakening of independence. It was manifested in the matter of the great Hellene Capo d'Istria, who loved his country better than he understood his countrymen, and who paid with his life for his attempt to implant a Russian autocracy in Greece. It was manifested against King Otho, who wished to apply the methods of a German drill sergeant in governing his Greek subjects, as indocile as they were intelligent, and who lost his crown in attempting the task. King George was the first ruler to understand the people over whom he was called to reign. He governed them in Greek fashion: that is to say, like a sovereign who respects the constitution of his country—like a British King, in fact.

It is not to be denied that this spirit of extreme liberty and democracy has at times had untoward consequences; that for a nation yet young or newly awakened to independence after a long servitude, absolute liberty may be dangerous, and that it were better to advance by stages; and finally that the fruits of universal suffrage are sometimes bitter and unwholesome. We cannot deny that there is much room for criticism on all these subjects. But if we cannot extend full approbation to all which has taken place, it is at least impossible for us, members of a free nation, to withhold our sympathy and respect. The Greek nation is a nation, fallible assuredly, but master of and responsible for its actions. It is a moral being which lives, works, governs itself in accordance with its own sentiments and its own ideas. It is a European nation; it is not, like its neighbours, a gregarious mass, a soulless herd which moves on at the bidding of its shepherd, or rather under the club of its master, an Asiatic population which may possess in theory the right of voting but which in fact never dare refuse its suffrages to whatever Ministry is in power, and which knows no means of ridding itself of abuse or despotism other than by conspiracy and assassination.

Another consideration must be added to the honour of the Greeks: political life has never been for their statesmen a means of enriching themselves. If the modern like the ancient Greek has let his taste for politics become a passion, it has at least been a disinterested passion.

There is no need to remind you of the Greeks who sacrificed their fortunes, considerable though these often were, in the struggle for national independence—Coundouriotis, Apostolis, Zaimis, Mavromichalis, Boudouris, Kanellos and many others. But all those who have governed Greece since her freedom was regained have either died poor or impoverished themselves while in power. Colettis, Metaxas, Boulgaris, Grivas, Deligeorgis, Coumoundouros, Tricoupis, Delliyannis, all left their families in actual want and at the charge of the citizens. It is also well known that Theotokis and Rhallis have not augmented their wealth while controlling public affairs; and the same disinterestedness is found in the ranks of the elective hierarchy. The members of the Demogerontia always gave their services without payment, and so the Greek of to-day is proud of directing public affairs—is it the influence of example, or is it due to ancestral blood? What is certain, is that on this subject the modern Greek has the sentiment of the Athenians of the Periclean age; that politics is the sole occupation worthy the occupation of a free man. And if too many of the citizens live for politics, it would be untrue to say that they live on it. On this subject, we may note in passing, many exaggerations have found acceptance on the assurance of ill-informed writers. When we look closely into the statistics, the multiplicity of professions with which the Greeks occupy themselves proves how varied are their aptitudes. During the last 20 years, once the free state has got into a steady and proper

working order, every branch of human activity, not only the liberal professions and the administrative functions, has found its place, in an increasingly stable equilibrium, in commerce, agriculture and the professions.

This then is the first characteristic of Greek civilisation, the fruit of its traditions for thousands of years: political liberty with its resources and its perils, its nobility and its pitfalls.

Another characteristic is necessarily allied to the first one, and contributes no less to differentiate the Hellenes from among the other peoples of the Orient: that is the nature of their patriotism. All the peoples of the Orient profess an accentuated patriotism, natural enough perhaps among races which were yesterday freed from an odious yoke, and which have not yet attained to their proper territorial development, which are ignorant and avid, surrounded by neighbours as ignorant and ambitious as themselves: a fierce and narrow patriotism, based on the selfish instincts of human nature, on the physical accidents of blood and race over which the individual has no control. It is a patriotism like that of the primitive races, discontented with the present and fearful for the future, and especially "xenophobe"—hating all that is foreign. Bulgarian and Roumanian are alike xenophobe, seeing in every foreigner an enemy for whom the gates of the country must never open. They do not scruple to violate all the tenets of international law and hospitality which might serve to protect peaceful and hardworking men, who may have been born on their soil, even established there for generations, or who perhaps have entered the country, there to work loyally for its enrichment and prosperity. Distrustful and exclusive like Thoas, the Scythian King of Tauris, these peoples are always ready, in their nationalist fury, to proscribe and to exterminate, but never to welcome or to assimilate. Greek patriotism is of quite a different nature, and in the Orient it is an unique phenomenon. It is like the patriotism of the most advanced countries of the West. It rests on the wholly modern principle, first put forward in 1789, of free choice and voluntary consent. Each people is independent and sovereign; just as it chooses its representatives to govern it, so it is free to join this or that ethnic group which may attract it, and to detach itself from the body with which it feels neither affinity nor moral community. It is conscience which is the base of nationality, and not conquest or blood or religion. The Greek is Greek because he thinks and feels Greek, not because it comes of the Hellenic stock. It matters nothing that his name may indicate Slavonic or Koutzovlach origin, so long as he has freely chosen to adhere to Hellenism, so long as he is attached by his sentiments to and does not wish to be torn away from the Greek civilisation. This patriotism is rather an ideal than a material fact. Hence its power and its grandeur, hence the reasons why it has gained for Hellenism the Vlach and Slavophone populations of Macedonia which, weapon in hand, scornfully reject the claim of common origin, the nationality of Bulgar or Roumanian, and who face ruin and torture and death rather than abjure the cause of Hellenism.

Among the Koutzovlachs were recruited many of the champions of Independence in 1821—Botzaris and Tzavella, for example: among them also have been found many of the nation's benefactors—the Evergetes; Averof, who left a quarter of a million sterling for the foundation of schools and the building of ships; Baron Sina, whose foundations were as generous as they were numerous; Rizzaris and Zossimadis, Zographos the Epirot; Zappas, who founded the magnificent school at Constantinople, to which the only parallel is found in the work of Arsaki, another Koutzovlach; Hadjicosta, Tossizza, Stournara, Pangas, and a host of others.

(To be continued).

The Situation in Crete.

A new cabinet has come into power in Crete, under the leadership of Mr. Logiades, one of the most distinguished men of the Island. A very favourable impression has been produced by the nomination to office of two Mussulmans—Ali Bey Zadi as Minister of Public Education, and Ali Bey Tablot as Prefect of the Canea. This step is looked upon as removing the last cause of enmity between the Christian majority of the Island and the Moslems.

Credit for the settlement of the crisis is mainly due to Mr. Zaimis, the High Commissioner, who has prevented a new dissolution of the Chamber by calling eight prominent Mussulmans to join the Administration, and consequently to support the present state of affairs. There still remain among the Moslems certain discontented and irreconcilable fanatics, who cannot bring themselves to accept the idea of the emancipation of Crete. These form, however, but an insignificant minority, whom the greater number of the Moslems tend more and more to abandon. The new Cabinet has the support of 41 out of the 67 deputies. Mr. Zaimis' wise and tactful administration, and his evident regard for the interests of all subjects, of whatever creed, have already led to much more peaceful relations. There is every ground for the hope that the Island, left free to devote itself henceforward to the development of its resources and of its institutions, will travel uninterruptedly in the path of progress, until one day shall see the fulfilment of its hopes and the formal union of Crete to Greece.

Before leaving Athens on his return to Canea, Mr. Zaimis had an interview with Mr. Theotokis as to the choice of the 28 Greek officers who are to organise the native Cretan militia, which is destined ultimately to replace the International troops in the Island. The High Commissioner has also talked with the Governor of the National Bank of Greece on the subject of a proposed loan of £400,000.

The High Commissioner has addressed a memoir to the Powers, informing them of these projects.

The legislative session has just been opened by the High Commissioner. The Chamber, immediately after

being sworn in, passed with great enthusiasm and acclamation the following resolution, which was at once communicated to the representatives of the Protecting Powers:—

"Representing the free sentiment of the people—that "national sentiment which with unanimous enthusiasm "has been manifested in peace and in war—and feeling "more keenly with the course of years the need for the "immediate accomplishment of that passionate aspiration "for union, feeling also the solidarity of the moral and "racial bonds which unite the Cretan people to Hellenism "as represented by the Kingdom of Greece:—The Cretan "Assembly is convinced that the Powers, in their so "well-known favourable disposition towards the people "of Crete, will deign to consent to the speedy accomplish-"ment of the legitimate and unanimous aspirations of "the people, by the union of Crete and Greece."

Mr. Michelidakis, chief of the Conservative party, has been elected President of the Chamber.

* * * * * *

The *Nea Ereyna* of the Canea contains an account of an interview between Dr. Mantonakis, a Cretan notable of Colymbari, and Lord Francelston, who with Lady Francelston has recently visited the Island. The visitor repeatedly expressed his admiration of the work accomplished by the officers of the Hellenic Gendarmerie in settling and pacifying the country. He informed Dr. Mantonakis (whose guest he was in Colymbari) that he appreciated their work all the more highly as a result of being in Crete during the elections, which he had been told would give rise to serious troubles which might call for the intervention of the Powers.

"It is with much satisfaction," concluded Lord Francelston, "that I can testify to the absence of any "such troubles, and I cannot refrain from expressing my "admiration of the Greek *régime* and its success. The "impression is forced upon me that not only Crete but "also Macedonia and the Orient generally can only "prosper under a Greek *régime*.

"In Macedonia we are witnesses of a frightful "situation. We have not failed to deplore the non-"success of the joint intervention of the Powers; but "diplomacy refuses to move, favouring the Bulgarians, "despising the Turks, and persecuting the Greeks, who "are the sole factor making for the progress and develop-"ment of the country."

Lord Francelston afterwards spoke of the importance of the Greek nation in the Orient, and insisted on the fact that without them no solution of the Eastern Question is possible.

The Bulgarian Government and the Macedonian Committees.

From a Sofia Correspondent.

The Bulgarian official journal, the *Sofia Courier*, seeks to attract public opinion and to withdraw its attention from the fact that thirty soldiers of the Philippopolis garrison have penetrated into Macedonia. With this end in view, the journal recently published a pretended letter from Mr. Skouzes to the President of the Macedonian Committee. The mere tone in which this letter was couched was sufficient to prove it a fabrication.—Ministers of State are not in the habit of writing, *I take the liberty* of *respectfully* praying you . . . . etc. The Bulgarian journals do not shew their wonted adroitness this time; and in any case the Government of the Principality is not absolved from its responsibility for the wholesale desertions from the colours, and especially for the above-mentioned action taken by 30 soldiers belonging to the regiment of artillery commanded by the Crown Prince Boris. Recent information serves to establish beyond doubt the incursion made by these 30 soldiers.

The *Interior Organisation* has refused to exert itself in order that the Bulgarian Government may be able to boast of diplomatic successes, and has refused to continue the struggle in Macedonia unless the Government will declare war on Turkey. This refusal has deprived the Government of the services of the best bands, and has forced it to recruit the bands from the barracks, and to employ the pressgang upon both the civil and the military population. Observers in Philippopoli have long known of the manœuvres practiced by Captain Stoikof, Lieutenant Raskof (of the Divisional General Staff), and of Sub-Lieutenant Stefof. And since the Government is eternally boasting of the discipline of its troops, people have asked how the authorities contrived to be ignorant of what was going on. They were not ignorant: They not only knew of these things, but encouraged them.

There are other circumstances which prove beyond doubt the direct complicity of the Government in the actions of the Macedonian Committees. I give below extracts from certain letters which have been sent by subordinates of the Committees to the centres of action in Macedonia, and which prove that in reality the committees are directed by Prince Ferdinand's Ministers.

FROM A LETTER DATED AUGUST 12TH, 1906:

"*Since last autumn Mr. Petroff, the President of the Chamber, has himself declared to several members of the Committee that the Government wished the following to be placed at the head of affairs: Ivan Garvanoff, Damien Grouef and Boris Sarafoff.*

The desire of the Government has been carried out. By the **moral and pecuniary support** *which it has accorded to Garvanoff, Grouef, and especially Sarafoff, it has proved to all chiefs of bands that only those which enjoy the approval of the Government can rely on having* **money and arms** *at their disposal. I write at some length on this subject, in order that you may clearly understand that* **the Bulgarian Ministers are the directing force in the Macedonian business,** *and that the various voevodes and chiefs of bands are merely tools in their hands.*

"*The present anti-Greek movement is organised by the Bulgarian Government and seeks a twofold end—*

1.—*To make it clear to the Prince that the Stamboulovist party has control of all the extreme elements, with the aid of which it would be able to foment a national insurrection, if the Prince should endeavour to make a change in the Government.*

2.—*To establish throughout Bulgaria societies which, under cover of continuing the struggle against the Greeks, shall collect supplies in order to maintain the revolutionary movement in Macedonia, seeing that* **the secret supplies voted last session** *are insufficient for the purpose.*

"*I think it indispensable that you should know that the anti-Greek meetings throughout Bulgaria have been arranged by members of the Government. Those in Philippopolis are due to our friend Tsakalarof, who is at present in the employ of the Ministry of Commerce. On the day of the first demonstrations, when great damage was inflicted upon the Greeks, he entered Philippopolis at the head of thirty comitadjis,* **having first received instructions from the Minister Ghennadieff.**

"*For the future,* **the Mannlicher rifles supplied by the Government to the bands** *will not bear the official stamp, so that the Turkish authorities will have no proof that Bulgarian officials bear any part in the action of the committees.*"

Comment is needless. I will simply add that Tsakalarof, who carried out the instructions of the Minister Ghennadieff and pillaged the Greek houses in Philippopoli, was in 1903 and 1904, the chief of a band in the neighbourhood of Castoria.

A LIST of crimes committed by the Bulgarian propaganda war against the Orthodox Greeks of the Vilayets of Salonica and Monastir, during May, June and July, 1907.

A.—VILAYET OF SALONICA.

	Victim's Name.	Birthplace or Domicile.	Date, Place and Nature of Crime.
1	Nicholas Stergiou	Dely-Hassan	Assassinated on May 2nd, by a Bulgarian band, which also burned two Greek houses in the Village.
2	An Unknown Greek	Stromnitza	Assassinated on May 17th, by Bulgarians in the Papatasco quarter of Stromnitza.
3—6	Four Peasants	Velkameni	Assassinated, as they were going to a mill, by a Bulgarian band, on May 21st. The same band burned the Greek school and two Greek houses at Ellovon.
7, 8	John & George	Alistrati	Assassinated on May 21st.
9, 10	Kolias, Elias	Ernikiori	do. do. May 25th.
11	Dimitri	Kato-Vrontou	do. do. May 25th.
12	A Servant of the Perifanos ...	Epamomie	Dangerously wounded by unknown Bulgarians, May 24th.
13	A Servant of Theodoros Moschos Boghiantyi	do.	do. do. do. May 25th.
14—17	The Monk John	Convent of Analypsis (Perlepe)	Murdered, May 30th.
	Christos Dimitrios and two Companions	Klissovali (Demir Hissar)	Ambushed and murdered, May 30th.
18—21	Geo. Nicolas, G. Ketses, Geo. Takos, Ant. Lagaron,	Startsista ... ... (Serres)	Invited on May 31st by Petro Cafandarsti of Melenikon into the house of the priest Antony, and there slain with a hatchet.
22	Geo. Papazachariou	Salonica	Severely Wounded on May 21st in the city of Salonica itself. Taken to the hospital, and thence to his home, where he died on June 6th.
23—25	Two Men and a Woman ...	Livaditsa	Murdered on June 11th, while returning from the market at Drama to their own village.
26, 27	Two Peasants	Petalino	Murdered on June 12th, in the Forest of Tsegani by followers of the Committees.
28—30	Misco Petkon, Mitros Iovan, Christos Tsepon ... ... (14 years)	Rahovo	Members of a convoy of Peasants, attacked on May 29th as they were returning from the fields. Murdered. Their companions escaped.
32, 33	Dem. Nathaniel and his Uncle	Startsista ... ... (Nevrokop)	Murdered on June 18th by Comitadjis, who had first set fire to the tobacco plantations owned by the Greeks.
34—36	Three Patriarchist Peasants...	Eleoussa ... ... (Stromnitsa)	Carried away on June 18th, by a Bulgarian band into the Mountains. Presumably murdered.
37	Petro Evanghelou ... ... (aged 15 years)	Spatovo	Murdered by Bulgarians on May 17th.
38	Nicholas	Klepousna	Murdered June 7th, for being a Patriarchist.
39	Christos Martsios	Koula	The Bulgarian priest of the village and some Bulgarians tried to murder him on June 7th.
40—42	Thomas, his Wife, and a Companion	Mandili	Killed on July 12th by a band from Skrytzovo, who also set fire to the village and burned several houses.
43—47	Four Peasants and a woman...	Do.	Dangerously wounded by the same band during the same attack.
48	Dom Constantimore	Zimbovo...	Carried off on July 16th by a band of 20 men. Doubtless murdered.
49	A Greek	Nouska	Murdered, June 24th.
50, 51	Rizoya Emmanuel Tovantyes, Evanghelia, his wife	Leska, (Anô-Tjoumaya)	Murdered on July 8th by a Bulgarian band of 30 men, who set fire also to the houses of Tovantyes' brother and his neighbours.
52	The Priest, Papa Dimitri ...	Ravna	Wounded on July 9th by the Bulgarian, Zapra Mitye.
53—56	Four Peasants	Rapesh (Morichovo)	Murdered, July 6th.
57	Stavros Papastavrou	Galatista	Murdered, July 10th.
58	Athanasios Nicholas or Tzifkas	Konlakia	Murdered, July 12th, by a Bulgarian, who, like the victim, belonged to the household of the Turk. Kehaya.

B.—VILAYET OF MONASTIR.

	Victim's Name.	Birthplace or Domicile.	Date, Place and Nature of Crime.
1—2	Two Peasants	Sijetsi	Murdered on May 24th by a Bulgarian band, which also burned 3 houses.
3	A Peasant...	Sopatnitsa	Burned alive on May 27th by a Bulgarian band on account of his Greek sentiments,
4—7	Four Peasants	Nospal	Murdered on May 30th by a band under the chief Dimko, on account of their Greek sentiments.
8	Peo Nedelko	Polsk	Murderously attacked on May 30th by the chief Natso and his band.
9—12	Four Peasants	Verniki	Murdered end of May.
13	A Shepherd	Pissoderi	Murdered early in June by a band which also set fire to the huts of the Sarakatzans. The women and children escaped.
14—16	Neilos and two Monks	Demir-Hissar	Burned alive in the Convent, which was burned by a Bulgarian band on June 29th.
17—20	Four Peasants	Gradesnitza	Murdered by a Bulgarian band July 18th as they were returning from Movihovo.
21—23	Two Peasants and a woman...	Korvinovo	Murdered June 8th, by a band, which also wounded five invalids in the Greek hospital.
24	The Priest, Papagheorghiou...	Nivitza	Murdered June 16th, by Bulgarians. His body bore 30 wounds.
25, 26	Two Charcoal Burners	Megarovo	Found murdered near Gopessi, June 26th.
27	Milossis	Novaki	Murdered June 15th, near Monastir, by two Bulgarian foresters.
28, 29	Two Peasants	Nevoliani	Murdered on July 14th. One was found hung from a tree.
30—32	Three Men	Nizopolis	Murdered by a Bulgarian band, July 17th.
33	A Man	Megarovo	Murdered by the same band in the same place. The four victims were buried together in Monastir.

We add statistics of crimes committed by the Bulgarian Propagandists during preceding years.

ORTHODOX GREEKS KILLED BY BULGARIANS.

1897—February 1903	Vilayet of Salonica	94	... ...	Vilayet of Monastir	134
February 1903—November 1904 ...	,, ,,	157	... ...	,, ,,	133
November 1904—October 1905 ...	,, ,,	139	... ...	,, ,,	127
Rest of 1905	,, ,,	141	... ...	,, ,,	150
1906	,, ,,	208	... ...	,, ,,	157
		739			701

GRAND TOTAL of Orthodox Greeks killed by Bulgarian Propagandists in the Vilayets of Salonica and Monastir, from 1897 to 1906 1440

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE ABBOTT AFFAIR.

Our readers cannot have failed to observe the attempts made in certain quarters to fasten upon a Greek band the responsibility for the kidnapping of the unfortunate Mr. Abbott. One writer, Mr. H. N. Brailsford, has even had the temerity to publish a signed article in a leading London journal, in which, on absolutely not the slightest foundation, he assumes it as a well-known and well-established fact that the miscreants were members of a Greek band—he goes to the extent of suggesting that the Abbott affair was but one of many such perpetrated by Greek bands. We have much pleasure in publishing the following account of an interview with Mr. Abbott senior, on the subject of the outrage. It will be seen that Mr. Abbott himself scouts the suggestion that the kidnapping was the work of a nationalist band—he concludes, as is indeed sufficiently evident to any unbiassed person, that the whole affair was a piece of brigandage. The present deplorable state of affairs in Macedonia, and the inefficiency of the Turkish police, offer only too much encouragement to brigandage.

The Anglo-Greek family Abbott, of Salonica, has recently been much before the public, owing to the capture of young Mr. Abbott by brigands. The family has just come to Athens, where an interview has been held with Mr. Abbott *père*, in the presence of the son who was captured. The details of the capture of young Abbott are too well known to need repetition. The sum agreed upon between Mr. Abbott and the brigands as the ransom for his son was £12,500 sterling. This sum was paid by a representative of the British consulate at Salonica, and the British Embassy in Constantinople has been charged to demand from the Porte a reimbursement of the sum.

The interviewer asked Mr. Abbott: "It is said that the Macedonian bands had demanded money from you, and that upon your refusal they determined to carry off your son. If this is true, perhaps you can also give us some information as to the nationality of the brigands?"

"It is untrue," replied Mr. Abbott, "that I refused to contribute to the funds of any Macedonian bands, for no such request was ever made to me. As for the nationality of the brigands, I know nothing. On the evening of the capture an Albanian belt was found in the garden of my house, and my son informs me that the brigands wore the baggy trousers of the Albanians. The letter which I received from the brigands was written in Greek, but that language is current in Salonica and in the region generally. All the time my son was with the brigands they wore false beards. They exchanged some words of Greek when in his presence. We are firmly convinced that the affair was not the work of a nationalist band, but of mere brigands, who planned and carried out a lucrative project with rare audacity and ability."

"The most complete anarchy," continued Mr. Abbott "reigns at present in Macedonia. The recrudescence of the activities of the nationalist bands has a natural consequence in the increase of brigandage. All the details of the capture of my son and of his captivity among these malefactors go to prove clearly that the matter was one of an international band of brigands, acting solely on its own initiative, and simply for the interest of its own members."

As for the reforms and the general state of affairs in Macedonia, Mr. Abbott declares that never has insecurity been so rife in that province as at present. No one is sure of his life or of his property. Despite the official optimism, Mr. Tittoni was recently obliged to admit that the reforms have produced the most meagre good result. It is time for the Powers to understand that half-measures must be abandoned, and that they must take upon themselves a complete and efficient control of the police in Macedonia. It is thus and thus only that a renewal of confidence can be brought about, that the bands can be caused to disappear, and that the ground can be prepared for the success of the judicial and administrative reforms, so that Macedonia may once more enter upon an era of peace and civilisation.

NOTE.—Since the above was written, the kidnappers of young Mr. Abbott have themselves been captured by the Turkish authorities. They prove, as we surmised, to be merely a mixed body of common brigands. They hail from a village near the scene of the capture, and are of various nationalities, having no connection whatever with any Greek or other nationalist band. A large part—more than £10,000—of the ransom has been recovered from the brigands, which again proves that they were common thieves, and not nationalist agents.

TURKS AND GRECO-MACEDONIANS.

We receive from Salonica the following details of the conflict at Goumentza of the Turkish troops with a band under the Greek chief Nikephoros:

The band was near Goumentza when it was perceived by four Bulgarians, who hastened to signalise its presence to the authorities. A small detachment was sent against the little Macedonian band, but met with a very hot reception, and its leader was killed by Nikephoros in personal combat. The Turks were driven back, but returned in greater numbers and attempted to surround the band, which began to retreat towards the south. A desperate struggle began and lasted from dawn to sunset. Six of the Greeks had been killed, and Nikephoros himself was wounded and disabled. He prayed his followers to kill him and so save him from falling alive into the hands of the Turks: when they refused, he blew out his brains. The three survivors were able to escape and gain the mountains. The Turks suffered heavy losses.

* * * * * *

A telegram from Athens to the *Temps*, July 10, states:

Information has come from Salonica that a combat has just taken place between a Greco-Macedonian band of ten men and some Turkish troops, to whom their presence had been betrayed.

The Turks attacked the band near Goumentza. The band offered a stubborn resistance, holding its own almost the whole day. Ultimately, however, it was cornered and almost wiped out. Seven men were killed, and the remaining three grievously wounded. The chief of the band, Nikephoros, fought with surpassing bravery. He was disabled by the bursting of a bomb, and put himself to death to avoid falling into the hands of the Turks. The three wounded men, despite the gravity of their injuries, were able to make good their escape. The losses of the Turks are unknown.

* * * * * *

Another communication from Salonica states that a fierce engagement has just taken place to the north of Lehovo, between Turkish troops and a strong Greco-Macedonian band. The band lost six men killed and five wounded, and the Turks also seem to have lost heavily. The chief Varda was not present at this engagement.

A detachment of Turkish troops attacked a small Greco-Macedonian band near the village of Stoina, in the Caza of Monastir. The band and the troops each lost two men killed, and several troops were wounded. The village priest and several peasants were wounded in the course of the fight.

* * * * * *

We are informed from Salonica that Hilmi Pacha has warned the Greek Bishop of Moglena that he will not be permitted to be present at the sittings of the Provincial Administrative Council. The reason for this prohibition is the Bishop's refusal to give the Bulgarian peasants of Sbortsko a letter, which would have enabled them to enter into communications with and to betray a Greco-Macedonian band. The Bishop also tells us that the authorities have forbidden him to visit the villages of his diocese.

The Ottoman authorities of Verria have had an order published and also cried in the streets, that without distinction of race or religion all who refused to enter

into commercial relations with the pretended Roumanian community would be obliged to close their shops. This decree is aimed at the Greeks who have refused to deal with certain Vlachs who have sold themselves to the Roumanist propaganda.

THE DEATH OF AGRA.

The Athens correspondent of the *Figaro* sends the following account of the death of the brave Macedonian chief Agra:

The death of the young Macedonian chief Tello Agra has awakened a profound emotion throughout the whole of Greece, on account of the dead chief's personality no less than of the circumstances under which he met his death. Tello Agra was a young man, barely 26 years of age, with the beauty of a young Apollo and the courage of a veteran warrior. He had gone into Macedonia to try to effect an arrangement with the Bulgarian chiefs, and so to put an end to that terrible racial war, which drenches with blood the soil of that unhappy province, and which renders more and more remote the prospects of a settlement of the Macedonian question. This man had a particular horror of the repeated murders of Christians by Christians, and of the constant battles between bands of diverse nationalities.

He had brought about a cessation from arms and a sort of truce in the district where he was himself in command of a strong band, and where he had already fought valiantly against the Turkish troops. Agra hoped to be able to spread this peace over the whole of Macedonia, and he thought that in the well-known Bulgarian chief Zlatan he had found a supporter of his humane and Christian sentiments. An interview was arranged near Niaousta. Tello Agra left his band and, accompanied by one supporter only, went to meet Zlatan, who received him with every appearance of amity. A banquet was held in honour of the rival chief; there were gaieties, merry makings, talk of fraternisation, dreams of a confederation between the Christian peoples of the Balkans.

But when Zlatan had made certain that Tello Agra had really come, like a confiding dreamer, unarmed and unprotected, he gave a sign to his followers, who straightway threw themselves upon Agra, bound him, bore him off to the mountain, and there put him and his companion to death. Next day some peasants discovered the two bodies hanging from trees, hacked and butchered—Agra's body bore more than a hundred wounds. The peasants buried the bodies.

Legends have already grown up around the name of Tello Agra, which is widely celebrated in Macedonia and in Greece: it is the subject of songs and pæans and dirges. An Athenian journal recalls a striking parallel to his case. Nearly twenty-five years ago the Greek statesman Tricoupis, carried away by the same dream of a Balkan Confederation, and believing it to be possible, made his way to Sofia, there to seek a statesman as eminent in the Balkans as himself—Stambouloff. To him he proposed, frankly and without diplomatic ambiguity, a solution of that Macedonian question which was to become, not many years afterwards, a cause of horrors and massacres. Stambouloff listened, entered into a feigned discussion, and gained the confidence of Tricoupis, who thereupon revealed his plan in full.

Within two days every detail of Tricoupis' project was in the hands of the Porte. Stambouloff obtained certain slight concessions in Macedonia—certain Bulgarian schools were founded, three new bishoprics were instituted, etc.—and the Greeks in Turkey were subjected to new persecutions. Tricoupis, like Tello Agra, had been too confiding.

TURKISH OPPRESSION.

A Monastir correspondent writes that the Ottoman authorities are displaying themselves increasingly hostile towards the Greek population. The bishops are excluded from the provincial councils, and are prevented from fulfilling the duties of their office; suspected persons are dealt with in most rigorous fashion, Greek peasants are not protected, Macedonian bands are vigorously attacked, communications with the Kingdom of Greece are watched by the military, and in fact the Turks have apparently allied themselves with the Roumanians and Bulgarians, in their endeavour to weaken in every possible way the Greek element.

The death of the Greco-Macedonian chief Foufas, at Palaiochori, shews how close is the union between Turks and Bulgarians against the Greeks. The Turks had been informed by some Exarchate spies that Foufas would pass through Palaiochori, so they concealed themselves in the house of the Bulgarian schoolmaster, and opened fire on the Macedonian chief. A violent combat ensued and raged for an hour around the house. Foufas however was slain, and his followers could do nothing beyond avenging his death.

* * * * * *

A letter has been intercepted in Constantinople from the Central Bulgarian Macedonian Committee of Sofia to one of the sub-committees. The letter revealed a plan to assassinate all the Greek consuls in Macedonia, beginning with the Consul-General at Salonica.

AN INFAMOUS FALSEHOOD.

A Salonica correspondent writes to the *Bulletin d'Orient*:

The Bulgarians of Salonica have just presented to the Chief of Police a list containing names of Bulgarians who were said to have been marked out for assassination by the Greeks. When this list is closely examined, it is found to contain just the names of those persons whom the Bulgarian committees have proscribed on account of their opposition to the projects and commands of the committees. One name, for example, is that of Damian Petrof, who has subsequently been murdered by two emissaries of the Bulgarian committees. If the schemes and fictions of the committees and their followers had not been exposed in this way, we may be certain that, after each assassination of a Bulgarian in Salonica, the official press of Sofia and the Bulgarian Telegraphic Agency would take pains to impress upon us that here was another crime committed by the Greeks.

GREECE AND ROUMANIA.

The *Official Gazette* of the Hellenic Government has recently [June 30/July 12, 1907] published a decree rescinding that of July 11/24, 1906, which imposed extra customs charges on goods of Roumanian origin and extra dock charges on vessels flying the Roumanian flag. Roumanian goods and merchandise will henceforth be admitted on the ordinary terms of the general tariff.

On the same day, the Roumanian Government published in the *Official Journal of Bucharest* a decree rescinding that of July 8, 1906, which had imposed prohibitive duties on all goods of Greek origin.

The change in Roumanian policy is due to the advent to power of the Roumanian liberal cabinet led by Mr. Stourdja. The systematic persecutions to which the Greeks in Roumania have been subjected have been suspended, and the Bucharest Cabinet has shewn itself disposed to favour a renewal of diplomatic relations. Thanks to Russian mediation, pourparlers have been entered upon. They have already resulted in the suspension of the above-mentioned decrees, but diplomatic relations have not yet been re-established, and the situation with respect to the two countries is still far from normal. On both sides there is evidence of good-will, which, however, will accomplish nothing if it is not accompanied by good sense. The Cantacuzene cabinet certainly shewed very little of this commodity, and it is to be hoped that the Stourdja Ministry will do much better, and that there will be no repetition of General Lahovary's demand that Greece shall help the Roumanians to manufacture a Roumanian population in Macedonia.

A VALUABLE ADMISSION.

Truth will out! Human passions and interests may obscure her for the moment, but sooner or later she will reappear, to the confusion of those who seek to rely on falsehood, slander, and deceit.

For long years Europe has turned a deaf ear to the cries uttered by the victims of Bulgarian oppression, and has lent a benevolent attention to the lies of the oppressor. Observers from the West have been voluntarily or involuntarily blind, so that nothing could have opened their eyes to the truth, had not deeds of horrible cruelty been perpetrated in Eastern Roumelia—deeds which have left an indelible stain on the fair fame of the twentieth century. If there be any who still remain blind, we present to them the following document, an authentic and official pronouncement which affords a most absolute and unqualified proof of all our statements about and condemnation of the self-styled "liberators" of Macedonia. The document in question, which is extracted from a letter from Constantinople to the "Narodni-Prava," or official organ of the Radoslavists, contains an official report which the (Bulgarian) Archbishop Synesios of Uskub has submitted to the Bulgarian Exarchate, on the situation of the Bulgarians in his diocese. The report states:

"The members of the Bulgarian Committees have "exacted forced contributions from the Bulgarians, and "have committed various excesses and acts of injustice, "thereby causing incalculable loss. This behaviour of "the committees has spread terror among our people. "And the consequence is that a large number of Bul-"garian villages, and many notables, have sought and "continue to seek relief from the forced contributions "and excesses, and acts of terrorism, by fleeing to the "Œcumenical Patriarchate."

This valuable admission, *made by a Bulgarian Bishop*, presents the Macedonian situation under its true form, and any comment would be superfluous. Those civilised people who have defended and championed the barbarities and monstrous doings of the Bulgarians, need but peruse this edifying report.

THRACE.

The journal *Thraki* (Thrace), which is the official organ of the Thracian Society at Athens, publishes an analysis of the recent official census of the Greek Educational bodies in Thrace:

	Vilayet of Constantinople.	Vilayet of Andrinople.
Boys' High Schools ...	... 6 ...	... 2
with Masters ...	... 90 ...	... 12
and Pupils	... 1,050 ...	... 158
Girls' High Schools ...	... 73 ...	... 124
with Mistresses ...	... 231 ...	... 231
and Pupils	... 9,185 ...	... 11,257
Primary Schools ...	... 68 ...	... 112
with Teachers ...	... 256 ...	... 231
and Pupils	... 7,160 ...	... 13,745
Rural Schools	... 43 ...	... 182
with Teachers ...	... 43 ...	... 182
and Scholars ...	... 1,715 ...	... 6,305

We have, therefore, in sum for the part of Thrace still under Turkish dominion:

	V. of Constantinople.	V. of Andrinople.	Whole of Turkish Thrace.
Schools	190 ...	420 ...	610
with Masters (and Mistresses),	620 ...	656 ...	1,276
and Pupils	19,110 ...	31,465 ...	50,915
Annual cost ...	£35,710 ...	£13,928 ...	£49,638

THE COMMERCE OF SALONICA IN 1906.

Continued from p. 126 *of our last issue* (*Nos.* 8-9, *June-July*, 1907).

II.—EXPORTS.

It is not possible to give such exact and official statistics of the exports as of the imports, since customs returns only refer to goods imported. The following figures, however, have been collected with great care, and are probably fairly approximate.

1. CEREALS. Export in 1906: 80,681 T., value ... £397,680
   [Of this, 10,350 T., representing £57,680, was from Servia, having been sent across for export from Salonica.]
   These cereals were exported to England, France, Germany, Italy, etc. Much wheat was sent to Greece and also to other Turkish ports; and buckwheat to the extent of 21,801T. to Italy, Austria, France, Belgium and Egypt.
2. LEATHER: Approximate value of export £188,000
3. OPIUM: (chiefly exported to Britain & U.S.A.), value £70,800
4. OPIUM SEED: (exported to France and Germany)... £41,000
5. SILK COCOONS: 4,500 tons, representing £200,000
   Chiefly exported to Milan; a small quantity to Marseilles.
6. FENNEL SEED: 6,500 tons, representing £28,600
   The export of this article, which is sent exclusively to Marseilles, shews a decline of 20% upon the 1905 amount.
7. DRIED BEANS, &c.: 8,000 tons (4,000 for Marseilles).
8. WOOL: 2,000 tons (chiefly to England and U.S.A.)
9. RED PEPPER: 9,000 tons, imported chiefly to Bulgaria, Turkey, and Roumania.
10. WOOD FUEL: 2,000 tons, representing £2,640
11. WOOD CHARCOAL: 13,350 tons, representing ... £3,000
    Exported to Turkey and Egypt.
12. EGGS: 11,600,000, to the value of £22,000
    3,600,000 by sea to Greece, Italy and France.
    8,000,000 by rail to Germany, Austria and France.
13. FLOUR AND BRAN: 180,000 tons, representing ... £156,000
14. METALS: Magnesia ... 3,600 tons £8,800
    Chrome ... 5,600 tons £18,000
    These have been exported to Liverpool, Marseilles and Rotterdam. Besides the above, the Chalcidean Company of Stratonia has exported:
    Manganese ... 16,300 tons £32,000
    Iron Pyrites .. 350 tons £22,400
15. TOBACCO: 20,000 tons, of a value of £180,000
    This small amount of low quality tobacco was sent to Austro-Hungary, Italy, America, Germany, Egypt and Cyprus.
16. CATTLE AND LIVE ANIMALS.

We may draw up the following table. The figures give the number of *cages* of poultry, *cwt.* of game, and in all other cases *head* of cattle, horses, &c.:

Description.	No. of Turkish origin.	In transit from Servia and Hungary.		Destination.
Horses and Mules	168...	517 (Hungary)...		Greece.
Oxen, Calves, &c.	10,920...	1,643 (Servia)		Greece, Crete, Egypt, Italy, Malta.
Sheep ...	...128,075...	900	„	Greece 20%, Constantinople 80%.
Goats	2,150...	——		...Greece.
Swine	450...	52	„	...Italy.
Poultry	2,628...	16	„	Greece, Egypt, Malta.
Game	67...	——		...France.

It will be remarked that sesame and cotton do not figure among the goods exported, although the country produces both in large quantities. The reason is that the quantities produced barely satisfy the local demand—in fact, Salonica is obliged to import sesame from Syria for her own consumption.

It will be seen that the total value of the exports exceeds a million and a half sterling. The value of the imports, as set forth in our last issue, was a little over two and a half millions sterling. The total commerce of Salonica for the year 1906 was, therefore, more than £4,000,000 sterling.

THE GREEK COMMERCIAL MOVEMENT IN ALEXANDRIA.

From the *Pharos tis Alexandrias:*

The Greek Consul-General at Alexandria has recently sent to the Hellenic Government an important and interesting report on the movements of Greek shipping in the port of Alexandria. The report shews that there has been a considerable development of commercial relations between Greece and Egypt during the last two years, and permits us to look forward to a continued and rapid increase. We need only cite a few figures in justification of this satisfaction with the past and hope for the future:

	1905.	1906.	Increase.
Greek steamships entering the Port ...	184...	246...	+62
tonnage ...	...158,868...	224,459...	+65,591
Greek sailing ships entering the Port...	113...	96...	—17
tonnage ...	... 18,193...	18,336...	+143
Greek steamships leaving the Port ...	189...	228...	+39
tonnage ...	...154,734...	192,172...	+37,438
Greek sailing ships leaving the Port ...	111...	79...	—32
tonnage ...	... 18,603...	15,575...	—328
Total of ships entering Port—			
number	297...	342...	+45
tonnage ...	...177,061...	242,795...	+65,734
Total of ships leaving Port—			
number	300...	307...	+7
tonnage ...	...173,337...	207,747...	+34,410
Total movement —ships	597...	649...	+52
tonnage ...	...350,398...	450,542...	+100,144

The Betrothal of Prince George.

We have pleasure in announcing the betrothal of Prince George, the second son of the King of Greece and the most popular of Greek Princes, to Princess Marie Bonaparte. Princess Marie is the daughter of Prince Roland Bonaparte, who, apart from his connection with the ex-Imperial family, is a well known member of the French Academy of Sciences. As befits a *savant*, the Prince himself took a great part in the education of his daughter, who, in addition to being an expert linguist, has also shared her father's scientific studies and researches. She is also an enthusiastic sportswoman, and has even a wide acquaintance with military affairs. The Princess, who is in her twenty-fifth year, is well known and highly popular in Paris, where the marriage is to take place.

PRESS REVIEW.

—:o:—

THE SITUATION IN MACEDONIA.

To the Editor of the Times.

Sir,—Your issue of last Saturday contained the information that six Greeks have been found murdered, who were travelling from Neveska to Florina last week; the corpses were found hanging. These murders were committed by some Bulgarian band. I ask your journal and the English public to take note of this occurence. It has become popular for some time in England to say that the chief reason of the continued unrest and frequent crimes in Macedonia is the incursion of Greek bands; and you yourself, in a recent leading article, otherwise distinguished for its judicial tone, seemed to indicate that the Government of Greece had some responsibility for the state of Macedonia. Some of your correspondents have expressed similar opinions, and I have heard these opinions also suggested in speeches in the House of Commons.

Is it not the real truth that the Greek bands have been called into existence by such unprovoked and horrible murders of Greeks as those reported last week?

I fervently pray that all bands will soon disappear from Macedonia—Greek, Bulgarian, and Servian; but until the Greek population gets adequate protection from the Powers of Europe, until these Powers suppress the incursions of Bulgarian Bands into Macedonia for the persecution of everything Greek, how can we expect the Greeks to abstain from giving to their compatriots and co-religionists the only protection at their disposal?

Your obedient servant,

T. P. O'CONNOR.

House of Commons, Aug. 6.

THE MACEDONIAN BANDS.

GREEK REPLY TO THE TURKISH NOTE.

Constantinople, Aug. 3.

According to an official despatch from Athens M. Skouzes, the Premier, on receiving representations from the Ottoman Minister regarding the activity of Greek bands in Macedonia, declared that the Hellenic Government was doing its utmost to prevent bands or suspected persons from crossing the frontier, and added that any officers of the Greek army who were found abusing their leave in order to proceed to Macedonia to join such bands would be severely dealt with.

While, however, anxious for the cessation of the present state of things in the interest of good relations between Greece and Turkey, the Greek Government could not help recalling that the presence of Greek bands was the outcome of the misdeeds of Bulgarians against the Greek population, and pointed to the recent desertions of officers and men of the Bulgarian army who joined Bulgarian bands. In conclusion, M. Skouzes referred to the list prepared by Greek Consular officials showing that 60 murders of Greeks by Bulgarians had been committed in the course of the month of May in the vilayets of Salonika and Monastir. The Hellenic Government, therefore, hoped that the Porte would not confine its representations to Athens, but would address similar remonstrances to Sofia. The above reply may be embodied in a Note to the Porte. *Reuter.*

ACTIVITY OF BULGARIAN BANDS.

Athens, August 14.

The following semi-official Note is issued here to-day:

"Despatches from Salonika state that a Bulgarian band attacked several Greek peasants at Kolsino and Makrynovon, near Strumnitza. An aged Greek notable was killed, another was severely wounded, while two other men disappeared. The remaining Greeks escaped. Bulgarian bands are terrorising the district of Strumnitza. Other crimes committed against Greeks are also reported. Thus, at Menelik, a Bulgarian band wounded a Greek; another band murdered three Greek peasants at Gorgopi; outside Ossiani, a Kutzo-Vlach professing friendship for the Greeks was also murdered. It is considered here that all these fresh crimes show how hazardous it is to make isolated complaints in Athens on the subject of bands when it is asserted that the Bulgarian bands have never been so active as now. The report that Turkey had made fresh representations in Athens on the subject of the bands is not correct." *Reuter.*

Literary Page.

The Renaissance of Greek Literature.

The Greek nation has been compared by a recent historian to "some perennial plant, whose buds are destroyed by the storms of each revolving winter, but whose hardy stem needs but a few genial hours of sunshine to throw out fresh shoots of lovelier flowers;" and the comparison may aptly be applied to the Greek language, for it would be difficult to find another example of a language which, passing through such vicissitudes as have befallen Hellenism during twenty centuries, has yet emerged with undestroyed vitality, once more to be the medium of a great literature.

Assuredly the changing fortunes of the Hellenic peoples have not been without a profound influence on the language and literature. The ancient literature of Greece was the exuberant expression of a free and vigorous people, and the decay of Greek literature went hand in hand with the decline of Greek freedom. The Macedonian conquest may be regarded as the first milestone in the downward course of Greek freedom, and it marks also the end of the great creative age. Not the end of everything, for the voice of Ancient Hellas was not stilled in a day. The Hellenistic age was one of great intellectual activity, or at least of extreme mental busyness: Alexandria could still give the world a notable literature, but a literature of learning rather than of power, of fancy rather than imagination. The Roman conquest marked a further stage in the decline. It would not be fair to take the *Graeculus esuriens* of the Roman satires as a representative of his race. "For educated "men (in Greece) it was a time of quiet looking-back on "the great past. . . . Athens was still a home of "letters and art, and of much else that Roman swords "could not destroy, nor Roman money buy. Lucian, "three generations after Plutarch, can still contrast the "tranquil elegance of Athenian life with the extravagant "luxury of Rome."[1] But neither from the needy adventurer in Rome, nor from the cultured gentleman who in his tranquil Athenian home held aloof from the life of the great world, came any impulse to keep literature still a living force.

The transference of the Imperial Throne from Rome to Constantinople simply brought the Greek people more directly under the observation of their Roman masters. The Roman yoke became heavier, the Greek towns were deprived of much of the local self-government which they had never yet lost: and in the sixth century of our era, Justinian suppressed the Athenian academies. It looked as though the end of Greek intellectual life had come: and soon it appeared as though everything Greek was about to perish. Great hordes of barbarians came pouring down from the North: Goths and Slavs, and Huns and savage Volgarians from the Asiatic Steppes. The Barbarians repeatedly threatened the walls of Constantinople itself, and the Slavonic tribes wrested a permanent home in Greece. For two centuries this continued, and then a more dangerous foe appeared from the South. The warlike Saracens, flushed with unbroken victory, inspired with the fierce ardours of a Holy War, easily tore Syria and the African provinces from the feebler Roman grasp: it looked as though Saracen and Bulgarian would shortly dispute the possession of Constantinople, and the Greek race and culture would be crushed between the upper and the nether millstone.

But the Empire was not yet to fall. A great leader appeared, Leo the Isaurian. The Empire roused itself with a new vigour, broke and scattered the Bulgarians, hurled back the Saracen invaders. And now, in the eighth century, a change came over the character of the Eastern Empire. Hitherto it had been a Roman Empire with its seat of government in a Greek country. The governing body had been surrounded by all the powerful and subtle influences of Greek intellect and civilisation; the Roman character could no longer resist the solvent, and the Eastern Empire had gradually become Greek. Moreover, the barbarians had torn away the Northern and the Saracens the Southern provinces; in what was left of the Empire the population was mainly Greek. Leo recognised the change, and reorganised his government. Greek became the official language, the tone of the court was Greek, the Orthodox Church became the recognised Church of Emperor and people. The Roman chapter is ended, and the Byzantine chapter entered upon.

During four centuries the Byzantine Empire was flourishing and prosperous. Greece became the foremost of European nations in commerce and manufacture, in arms and learning. Her ships filled every harbour, her wares were sold in every market. Her army and navy were the most powerful in the world, and were long the sole bulwark of Europe against the Saracens and, later, the Turks; and her missionaries converted the pagan Russians and Bulgarians. Learning was revived, and if the literature of the great ages was not rivalled by the ponderous Byzantine tomes, at least the ancient manuscripts became once more an object of study.

At length the Byzantine Empire fell. In 1204 there occurred perhaps the greatest crime recorded in history—the marauding expedition known as the Fourth Crusade. The resistance on the part of the Orthodox Church to Roman claims of supremacy had caused a complete rupture between the Eastern and Western churches, and other factors had been at work to revive the old animosity and mutual contempt between Roman and Greek. In 1204 the army of "crusading" Frankish free lances was let loose upon the Eastern Empire, which crumbled before the shock, and the Greek cities now became centres of Frankish Principalities and Dukedoms. From time to time Greek leaders captured pieces of the Frankish domains to set up Greek Kingdoms—Michael Palæologus reconquered Constantinople in 1261, and set up what is sometimes called the "Greek Empire" of 1261—1453. But the disunited Empire was no longer able to resist the Moslems, who gained step by step, till in 1453 Constantinople fell, and soon the Greek race entered upon the period of its deepest degradation, the 370 years of Ottoman rule.

And what effect had all these changes upon the Greek language? We know how Latin was modified in contact with Gauls and Iberians and the barbarian conquerors of Italy: surely the successive influence of Roman and Slav and Frank and Turk must have profoundly altered the aspect of the Greek tongue? We cannot do better than quote Professor Jebb on this subject: "Greek was for centuries rude and ungrammatical, but "it was always itself and itself alone. Many foreign "words thrust themselves into its vocabulary—most of "which have now been thrust out: but in the organic "matters of structure and syntax Greek has never made a "compromise with any foreign language. Briefly its "story has been this. About 300 A.D. the spoken Greek "language began to diverge from the literary language. "But until 750 A.D. Old Greek was generally understood "by the people. Then came the great breach of Hellenic "tradition, due chiefly to the Slavonians, and by 900 A.D. "classical Greek had probably ceased to be generally "understood by the people. Presently, between 1100 "and 1200, the people's spoken Greek began to have a "popular literature of its own. By the thirteenth "century this popular dialect had made such way that it "was beginning to be used in polite society and in literature. This popular Greek of the thirteenth century "differed little from that which was in use at the beginning of the present century." (*This was written in* 1880). "During the last 80 years, however, the Greek language "has been returning more and more to the classical type. "The vocabulary has been purged. . . . The chief "difference between Old and Modern Greek is one which "exists between old and modern languages generally: "the old is synthetic, the modern is analytic. Thus it

1 Jebb, *Modern Greece*, pp. 6—7.

" has been the unique destiny of the Greek language " to have had, from pre-historic times down to our own, " an unbroken life. Not one link is wanting in the chain " which binds the Old Greek to the New." (*Modern Greece*, pp. 51 and 52).

If we can trace a continuity in the language of the Greek people, the same is not true of their literature. We have seen already that Greek letters waned with Greek liberties under the Macedonian rule, and in the earliest days of the Roman domination, Greek literature was in a very moribund state.

From time to time various influences galvanised Greek letters into some sort of temporary activity. Thus contact with the East gave birth to the prose romances, a few of which were charming productions and became widely known in the West, where their influence can be seen on the infant literatures of Italy, France, and England. " Heliodorus, that good Bishop of Tricca, loved rather to lose the dignity, profit and devotion of so venerable a Prelateship, than to forego his daughter, a young woman to this day commended for her beauty, but haply somewhat more curiously and wantonly pranked-up than beseemed the daughter of a churchman and a Bishop, and of over-amorous behaviour," says Montaigne;[2] and the adventures of *Theagenes and Chariclea*, with the far finer *Daphnis and Chloe* of Longus, continued to inspire Italian, French, and German romancers, from Tasso to Saint-Pierre. Our own Elizabethans, who gathered honey from every flower, did not fail to draw fully upon so excellent a source; and that Shakespeare was one of those by whom the *Æthiopica* [doubtless " pranked-out " —and, we will add, much improved—in the Elizabethan dress of Underdowne] was commended for her beauty, we know from the reference in Twelfth Night (Act V., Scene i.), to the story of Theagenes:

Orsino.—Why should I not, had I the heart to do it,
Like to the Egyptian thief, at point of death,
Kill what I love?

In the time of the Crusades, Western Europe first paid back some part of its debt to Greek literature. The Greek romance writers began to be imbued with the spirit of Frankish chivalry, and the rhymed romance appears in Greece. In these poems there is no attempt at classical diction, but they are written in the popular dialect, which may now definitely be called Modern Greek. Among the best known are the lays of the monk Prodromo, which, however, possess no great poetical merit. A much more interesting poem is the romance of *Belthandros and Chrysantza.*

But after all, these romances were trivial playthings, promising nothing for the future. The Greeks had lost their hold on the graver issues of life; they could amuse a Frankish noble with a story of adventure, but they had nothing to say which it is essential or important for us to hear. They were not masters of their own destiny, and they had nothing which could affect the destinies of mankind. And when the dead weight of Turkish oppression fell upon them, it seemed as though at last had come the end of all Greek life. The hand of the conqueror lay heavy upon the subject population, and every sign of national life was crushed out. The force of Hellenism, the spirit of the Hellenes were dead; in their place was the utter stagnation of apathy and despair. So at least thought Europe: so thought Byron when he wrote in *Childe Harold:*

Hereditary bondsmen! know ye not
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow?

* * *

But ne'er will freedom seek this fated soil,
But slave succeed to slave through years of endless toil.

And, in *The Isles of Greece*, he thinks that literature is as dead as all else:

The Scian and Teian muse,
The Hero's harp, the lover's lute,
Have found the fame your shores refuse,
Their place of birth alone is mute.

And yet under its stagnant surface the whole of the Greek world was alive with a fierce determination to throw off the Turkish yoke. The " hereditary bondsman " was ready to strike the blow, and that right soon. Indeed the Ottoman dominion had been a fire in which the spirit of the nation was tried and tempered; and the time was at hand to put the temper to the test. Many causes had united to give the nation a sense of one-ness which it had never before possessed. In the first case, the Turk classified his subjects according to religion. All the Christians were one body, under one Head—the Patriarch of Constantinople; and the organisation which Mahomet II. had sanctioned, that he might have a definite centralised body with easily located responsibility, had served as a continual reminder to the Christians that their cause was one. And the Greek church, with its uncontaminated Greek liturgy, and the Greek education which it so freely extended, never left room for doubt that this one cause was the cause of Greece. Moreover, the Turk was a soldier and nothing more; his civil and diplomatic services, many of his governorships, all positions for which education and culture were requisite, could only be filled by Greek graduates of the Phanariot School. And so the Greeks began to feel not only that they were one nation, but also that the time might again come for that one nation to play a great part.

There was yet another reason. It might have been possible to sit down in resignation under a more lenient rule, but the very harshness of the Turkish yoke made an unresisting acquiescence impossible. It was thus that the klephts came into being—bolder spirits who fled to the mountains, repudiating all allegiance to the conqueror, and descending in bands to despoil and slay the Turk. Their exploits and their misfortunes were celebrated in songs and elegies, which were chanted everywhere by the peasants, inspiring their hearts for the coming struggle, and at the same time sowing the seeds of a new literature, to blossom forth in the appointed season. " Oppression had impaired the character the " klepht, but the Hellenic vein was in him all the same. " Hence his imagination, his lyrism, and his pathetic " delight in the desolate beauty of his native scenery, all " of which are sung by him in well-nigh Homeric " directness and simplicity. He improvises on all " occasions of daily life. All those events which call " forth the deepest emotions of the human heart—love " and marriage festivals, funerals, the death scene, the " sorrow of absent love—find corresponding expression in " his song . . . Equally is the klephtic muse stirred " by the joys of victory and revenge, by the fortitude " which braves torture, and the courage which " encounters the enemy."[3]

The klephtic poems were not written but transmitted orally. They are consequently not very accessible, though collections have been made and in time we may hope to see a large number of the poems in print. The following fine lament of a mother whose child has borne off to be pressed into the Janizzaries, is a charming example of the klephtic elegial strain.

Ξενητεμένο μου πουλὶ καὶ παραπονεμένο,
Ἡ ξενιτειὰ σὲ χαίρεται καιγὼ 'χω τὸν καϋμό σου,
Νὰ στείλω γράμμα χάνεται, δὲν βρίσκει τὸ παιδί μου,
Νὰ στείλω μῆλο σήπεται, λουλούδι μαραγγιάζει,

[2] " *Heliodorus, ce bon evesque de Tricca, ayma mieulx perdre la dignité, le profit, la devotion, d'une prelature si venerable, que de perdre sa fille, fille qui dure encore bien gentille, mais, à l' aventure pourtant un peu trop curieusement et mollement goderonnée, pour fille ecclesiastique et sacerdotal, et de trop amoureuse façon.*"—Essais de Montaigne, II., viii."

It is of little moment that the Heliodorus of the *Æthiopica* was not a bishop, or even, for that matter, a Christian, and that a modern reader does not find his " daughter of over-amorous behaviour."

[3] *Neo-hellenic Language and Literature* (p. 25), by Plato E. Drakoules. This little book, published by Messrs. Simpkin and Marshall, gives the substance of three lectures delivered by Mr. Drakoules at Oxford, and contains much that is interesting, including brief accounts of the pioneers of Modern Greek poetry.

Νὰ στείλω καὶ τὸ δάκρυ μου σ' ἕνα ψιλὸ μαντύλι,
Τὸ δάκρυ μου εἶνε καυτερὸ καὶ καίει στὸ μαντύλι.
Φεγγάρι μου λαμπρό, λαμπρὸ καὶ κυκλογυρισμένο
Αὐτοῦ ψηλὰ ποῦ πρεβατεῖς καὶ χαμηλὰ μᾶς βλέπεις,
Δὲν εἶδες ποῦ τὸ γιόκα μου τὸν πολυαγαπημένο ;
Τίνος ματάκια βλέπουν τον καὶ τὰ δικά μου κλαίουν ;
Τίνος τὰ χείλη τοῦ μιλοῦν καὶ τὰ δικά μ' στενάζουν ;
Τίνος καρδιὰ τὸν χαίρεται καὶ ἡ δική μου σκάζει ;
Τίνος χεράκια τὸν κιρνοῦν καὶ τὰ δικά μου τρέμουν ;
Ἀνάθεμά σε ξενιτειὰ γιὰ τὸ κακὸ ποῦ κάνεις.

This poem is well translated in Miss Macpherson's *Modern Greek Literature.*

My exiled bird, so far away, from whom I mourning go,
The stranger's land has joy of thee and I have nought but woe;
Fruits if I send they wither up, if blooming flowers they fade,
I fain would send one tear of mine in a fair napkin laid.
But ah! my tears are glowing fire, the napkin they would burn.
Oh shining moon that beamest bright and round the world dost turn,
That wand'rest through the heavens high, beholding men below,
Where dwells my darling son, my well beloved? dost thou know
What other eyes behold him now and mine are dim with crying?
What other lips with him may speak and mine are always sighing?
What other heart him gladly greets the while my heart is breaking?
What other hand his goblet fills and mine with grief are shaking?
Woe worth to thee! Oh exile drear, for all thy evil works!
My husband thou hast ta'en away, left me a widow lone;
My bird, my child, thou too hast ta'en, these twelve years is he gone.
Woe worth to thee! Oh exile drear, and woe betide the Turks!
My home have they left desolate, and black weeds made me don.

From the pathos of the people's lot, the klepht turns aside to admire the unchanging calm of the mountains and the sea. Byron felt of the majesty of these eternal witnesses of the great past:

The mountains look on Marathon—
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And, musing there an hour alone,
I dream'd that Greece might yet be free.

And the klepht sings:

Ἤσυχα ποῦναι τὰ βουνά, ἥσυχοι ποῦναι οἱ κάμποι,
Δὲν καρτεροῦνε θάνατο, γεράματα δὲν ἔχουν.

Calm the mountains, tranquil the fields;
Death they await not, nor the tooth of age.

Olympus is fittingly their chosen abode, and may well scorn less favoured hills:

Once discord fell between Mounts Ossa and Olympus;
Thus in disdain Olympus turned to Ossa:
"Reproach me not, thou wretched one, O Ossa, slave
of the Turk,
Am I not Old Olympus, whose fame all nations know?
My summits are two and forty, from my flanks spring
three-score streams,
From each tree-top on my side floats a standard,
beneath each branch stands a klepht.

And when the klepht falls in battle, he but goes to wed his loved mountain:

These tidings to my mother bear, my mother sorrowing sore;
Bid her not hope for my return, nor e'er await me more.
But tell her not that I am slain, say not that I am dead:
Say, far amid the forest lone, a wife I've wooed and wed.
The hard rock my new mother is, the black earth is my bride,
My kin by marriage are the dust and pebbles at my side.
Weep for me, mother, weep for me, when shines the moon by night;
And in the dewy hour of dawn when day is growing light,
When fair maids bathe, when nightingales back to their nests return,
My love will go and sit alone, at thought of me to mourn.

(*Miss Macpherson's translation*).

From the klephts to the immediate forerunners of the Revolution is no far cry. The songs of the klephts had long been a principal factor in rousing and sustaining the courage of the Greeks, and to the end the revolutionary impulse was kept alive by literary influences—which explains why the war broke out in spontaneous but unconnected uprisings over a wide area, instead of being a centralised and directed movement. It is pleasing to reflect that the watchword of the revolution was supplied by Milton who, nearly two centuries before, had written to the Athenian Filaras:

Οὐδὲν ἀνδρικώτερον, οὐδὲν εὐγενέστερον ἢ ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους τοὺς Ἕλληνας ποιεῖσθαι.

(Nothing manlier and nothing nobler than to make Greeks free and independent).

In every part of the Greek world gifted men were lecturing and teaching the old national literature and the newer literature of freedom from the West, and in all the great cities people were aroused by representations of the classic drama and Greek translations of the great plays of England, France, and Germany. It was from the Greek theatre of Odessa that the signal came in 1821 for the national uprising, and it was a band of literary men who first took up arms in the same year and began the war at Dragatsani in Roumania. "In these men "was combined a love for letters with a love for country, "and joining these two aspirations in all their teaching, "they kept alive the national hopes. The lives of these "men would be the secret inner history of the Greek "people during the years of slavery, at a period when to "the casual observation of strangers it seemed only a "question of time before they would be merged into the "race of the conqueror and all individuality wiped out." [E. M. Edmonds, *Life of Regas*].

In the work of blending the revived classic spirit and the nationalist aspirations of klephtic literature with the teaching of that great European movement which culminated in the French Revolution, two men stand out before all others—Regas and Korais. Regas, the earlier of the two, was the first national poet. He wrote with the definite and conscious aim of awakening the spirit of his countrymen. "Who is inspired to resist tyranny," he said, "and is moved with the desire to set free any of "God's creatures—lo! God is with him; then, what "need to fear?" The songs of Regas produced a tremendous influence, and he was about to put himself at the head of a revolutionary movement when he fell into the hands of the Austrians. He was handed over to the Turks, and executed in 1798. "I have sown the "needful seed," were his last words, "the day of fruition "is not distant."

Korais, or Coray as he is more generally called in this country, was the greatest of Modern Greek scholars. He "took all knowledge for his province"—philology, ethics, science, were all enriched by his pen. He spread in Greece the knowledge of the great European revolutionary movements. But above all, he took upon himself the linguistic reform of his country. He set to work to purify the various Greek dialects, retaining to the full the modernity of analytical structure, but seeking to replace all importations of foreign words by others of Greek origin. His followers may have carried things to excess, but it is owing to Coray that the whole of Greece now possesses one recognised tongue; and, without doubt, the unity of language helped the ideal of national unity. "It is due to his efforts that the Greeks were "sufficiently equipped intellectually to withstand the "opposition of the ruling classes of Europe, who thought "that the Greek revolutionary movement was identical "with the great outburst of the French nation." (Drakoules).

While Coray was still at work the War of Independence broke out in 1821, and seven years later Greece entered upon her new era of freedom. The soil had been abundantly prepared for a literary harvest, and the first fruits were not long in appearing. It is impossible to do more than mention by name a few of the more important poets of the new nation. The first was Alexander Rangaves, who wrote idylls and patriotic lyrics, and introduced what he calls "metrical narratives," little tales in verse. Andreas Regopoulos, the friend of John Bright and Mazzini, wrote political satires; Athanasius Christopoulos wrote charming lyrics, Tantalides was a poet of nature. The writings of these and many of their successors cannot perhaps be placed in the highest class of poetry; yet they constitute a body of national poetry which shews that the old Hellenic spirit is not dead. What the future may bring forth one cannot say, but we may surely look upon it with hope.

It remains only to refer to the greatest of Modern

Greek poets, Dionysios Solomos. Solomos was born in Zante in 1798, and educated in Italy. He returned to Greece in 1819, and threw himself with ardour into the revolutionary movement. His patriotic songs are widely known. The "Ode to Liberty," from which the Greek national anthem has been taken, has been translated into most languages. One famous stanza is thus rendered in Miss Macpherson's English version:

From the sacred ashes rising
Of the Hellenes great and free,
Valiant as in olden ages;
Hail! all hail! O Liberty!

From pæans of victory he turns to lament the fallen:

O liberty, peace one moment!
Put up thy reeking blade!
And come with me to weep
O'er the grave where Byron lies.

But his muse does not always breathe the clash of arms or the silence of the grave. With the new order came the power to linger on scenes of pure beauty and the leisure to indulge in fantasy and reverie. During the British occupation of the Ionian Isles, there was a young Englishwoman, the daughter of the Governor of Corfu, whose beauty Solomos greatly admired. This girl was fond of sallying forth in the early dawn, arrayed in white, to gather flowers. Solomos had often observed this, and thus fancifully expressed his feelings in verse:

What fair vision comes toward me, gliding down the mountain side?
'Tis a maiden: where her feet touch blossoms burst forth on the sward,
And before her radiant beauty fairest flowers bow the head:
"Pass not by me, unknown goddess, pick and twine me in thy hair."
Dark blue eyes, now grave, now smiling, and mysterious like the skies;
Hair unbound falls o'er her shoulders like a stream of living gold;
Sweet her lips like dewy rose-bud, opening at first blush of dawn.
What fair vision comes toward me, gliding down the mountain side?

* * * * * *

Here we leave the story of Greek renaissance. With Solomos, Greek poetry is born anew: after him have come a galaxy of young writers,[4] and especially poets, and it should seem that time will soon bring forth the complete fulfilment of Shelley's prophecy:

The world's great age begins anew,
The golden years return,
The earth doth like a snake renew
Her winter weeds outworn;
Heaven smiles, and faiths and empires gleam
Like wrecks of a dissolving dream.
A brighter Hellas rears its mountains
From waves serener far,
A newer Peneus rolls his fountains
Against the morning star.
Where fairer temples bloom, there sleep
Young Cyclads on a sunnier deep.

* * * * * *

Another Athens shall arise,
And to remoter time
Bequeath, like sunset to the skies,
The splendour of its prime;
And leave, if naught so bright may live,
All earth can take or heaven can give.

A. Clark.

4 It is intended that in subsequent numbers of the HELLENIC HERALD, articles shall appear dealing with some of the more notable of these writers.

TWO GREEK WRITERS ON THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE.

ASIA MINOR

BY STAMATIOS ANTONOPOULOS (Athens).

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF ALBANIA

BY EPAMINONDAS MAVROMMATIS (Athens).

Mr. Antonopoulos who has travelled widely in Asia Minor and made a thorough study of the region, has given us a volume full of valuable information concerning this portion of Asia. He treats of the statistics of population, of the state of agriculture and the industries, of the ethnographic and religious distribution of the inhabitants, of their moral and intellectual development and of the organisation of the different communities—dealing particularly with the Greek communities, and laying great stress on the intellectual activity of these communities, and on their attachment to the national traditions. The author's impartial handling of the subject is highly praiseworthy, and will make his little book a real help to those who wish to study these countries, geographically so near to Europe, and yet so little known by Europeans. Some of its passages recall the mediæval wars of religion. Such, for example, is the chapter on the Stavriots, as those of Christian descent were called who sought to escape the persecutions of the Osmanlis by a feigned conversion to Islam, while still preserving in their houses and secretly transmitting the faith of the cross (*σταυρός*). According to the ancient law of the Moslems, any Christian or Jew who, after conversion to Islam, reverted to his former creed was punished with death. The application of this law in 1843 to an Armenian named Ovanghim, led the British ambassador, Lord Stratford of Redcliffe, to demand and obtain the abolition of the law. At a later period came the Crimean War and the *Hatt-Houmayoum*, and Fuad Pacha sent to the representatives of the Great Powers a circular proclaiming the principles of religious toleration and the liberty of conscience. The *Stavriots* of the Ak-Dag took advantage of this to declare their faith, and after some difficulty they were able to obtain the inscription of their names as Christians in the official lists. But there were some who, on account of the difficulties of travel and communication, were behind the appointed time in making their declaration. For these *Hatt-Houmayoum* and the Turkish circular remained dead letters. The authorities refused to recognise them as Christians; the repeated protests of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople produced no effect; and some of the more obstinate *Stavriots* have even been arrested and imprisoned. It is true that there are no longer ambassadors of the calibre of Lord Stratford of Redcliffe.

* * * * * *

Mr. Mavrommatis, like Mr. Antonopoulos, speaks to us of a country of which he has gained a wide knowledge, in the course of many years' experience in the consular service. His account of Albania is full and impartial, and free from any bias of national or political aspiration. Albania, which descends from Montenegro along the Adriatic to the confines of Epirus, is still less known to us than is Asia Minor. Much however has been written of the population of this country, which is doubtless aboriginal, and scholars have talked, not without much reason, of the Pelasgians. The learned priest Kamarda (an Albanian of Sicily) was enthusiastic of the future of his race, and ably demonstrated the close affinities of race and language between the Albanians and the Greeks. But the Albanians are divided into clans—the Tosques and the Guegues; and they are not less divided by opposing religious dogmas—Orthodox, Roman, and Moslem. Between the various sections there is never cohesion, and often hostility. As regards language, the state of affairs is no better: there is one Albanian language, but no written literature (there is not even a true alphabet, for most of the Albanians use Greek characters), and thus it results that the single Albanian

language is represented in different parts by a multitude of dialects, and the man of one district cannot understand the slightly differing dialect of another region. As Mr. Mavrommatis observes, it is not on such a foundation that an enduring State can be built. The writer deals with the unconcealed rivalries of the neighbouring Powers, Austria and Italy. He remarks also on the modern tendency of peoples to collect together in great political organisations. How are the million Albanians to maintain their independence amid the envious nations which encircle them? Mr. Mavrommatis examines also the situation of the Greeks who, though far more numerous, are not sufficiently compact to form a powerful State, and he advises the two countries to enter into a federal union, thus forming one strong people. He cites the example of Switzerland, and draws attention also to the affinity of the two peoples. He points out also that the Albanians within the Kingdom of Greece have played a large part in the government and have often controlled the destinies of the Kingdom. He believes that the solution he suggests would not find Austria and Italy hostile, since it would afford them a means of escape from their dangerous rivalry in Albania.

We reprint from our bright and enterprising contemporary, "**The Cosmopolitan Financier**" (No. 2, Aug. 1, 1907), the following extracts from an article on :—

THE FINANCES OF GREECE.

Encouraging Outlook for Bond-holders.

The Currant Trust.

The Report of the Greek International Financial Commission for 1906, which was recently issued, gave an encouraging account of the finances of Greece from the point of view of the bondholders. Mr. Charles Alban Young, who is the First Secretary of the British Legation at Athens, and served as the British delegate on the International Commission, has now issued a very welcome supplement to the Report. Without needless repetition of what may be found in the Report, Mr. Young has included one table showing the status of the various Greek bonds in the London market, and necessarily refers to the amendment of the stamp laws, but deals with it from the social point of view, unlike the Commission who regarded it in the much narrower light of its effect on a source of revenue which has not expanded as it ought to have done in the nine years of international supervision.

Reduction of Stamp Duty.

True, even the Commission noted that thrift would be encouraged by the reduction from 50 to 10 lepta (approximately a penny) of the stamp duty on bank deposits receiving no interest and on all deposits under 10 Drachmai. The Commission had repeatedly asked for revision of the stamp laws, but Mr. Young clearly shows that the assistance of the Government in this sphere of reform was only enlisted when its measures for military reorganisation were checked by lack of ways and means.

Progressive Spirit.

The Government is showing a more Progressive spirit in other directions, and is already giving effect to many recommendations towards reform urged by the International Commission. The Customs staff at the Piræus is being strengthened, and the equipment overhauled so as to keep pace with the growth of trade.

Development of Forests.

The question of the national forests is engaging the attention of the Prime Minister, and he is endeavouring to develop and protect them by employing the services of foreign experts and organising a corps of forest guards. It is in the reform of the Civil Service that Mr. Young anticipates the greatest difficulty, and significantly—almost sarcastically—remarks that "the International Financial Commission finds it often difficult to convince itself that the changes submitted for its concurrence in the staff employed in the establishments connected with the assigned revenues are based solely on considerations of merit and character." It is to be hoped that the necessity for such criticism will soon have passed away, for no genuine progress can be registered in any country where promotion in the country's service is not the reward of merit.

The Evil of Emigration.

Greece, like Ireland, is suffering severely owing to the large number of its people who emigrate to the United States. This has resulted in a considerable shortage of labour, and has at the same time given cause for alarm to the Government on account of the consequent shrinkage of the able-bodied population liable to military service. Mr. Young hints at the probability of legislation to stop the emigration of young men who have not fulfilled their military obligations.

The Currant Trust.

The currant problem also receives attention in the Report; and Mr. Young subjects to some adverse criticism the efforts of the privileged company to handle it.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

ΗΡΩΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΝ ΑΙΜΑ

Ὑπὸ ΙΔΑ.

This little book gives a vivid and picturesque description of the struggle in Macedonia. The book is written in the form of a novel, its hero being a young Macedonian Greek, who strives to rouse his countrymen from the torpor into which they had fallen after the misfortunes of the Greco-Turkish war. He urges the Macedonian Greeks no longer to turn the other cheek to the smiter, but to become once more strong and self-reliant, able and willing to work out their own fate. The writer has evidently based his descriptions on personal observation. There is a keen sense of local scenery, and the pictures of the Turk, the Macedonian Greek, and the Bulgar are very true to life; while the writer's faith in the courage and ability of his countrymen is cheerful and inspiring. The book is written in the popular Greek tongue, which suits well the subject. In a future issue we may give quotations from this very interesting work.

Our Athens contemporary *Le Monde Hellenique* is issuing an interesting series of French translations of Modern Greek literature. We have received the first of the series, which is just issued, "*La Mort du Pallikar*," by Mr. C. Palamas. In a subsequent issue we may refer more fully to the books of this series.

We have also received a very interesting Modern Greek translation of Oscar Wilde's play *Salome*, by Mr. Poriotis.

The Editor will always be pleased to acknowledge in these columns the receipt of books on matters within the scope of this journal.

Copies of the book "*Greeks and Bulgarians*" by Prof. N. Kasasis, noticed in our columns, may be obtained at the offices of the **Hellenic Herald**, price two shillings.

Published at Craven House, Kingsway, London, W.C.
Editor, Dr. C. Pouptis.