The novel is full of good things. How terribly moving is the picture of Stephanou's weeping (161): "In the instant before he concealed them I saw the tears ooze beneath the shiveled eyelids." Finely drawn are the Sunday Liturgy (95), the picture of Greek politics (106), the procession (66), the walls of Preveza (158), the dancing (129), and the allegory of the wart (127).

The epigrams can be pitiless as well as biting, and the reader must try to hear the overtones: "A Greek makes an unhappy Communist. Even if he is an unhappy Greek." (156) Stephanou having regained his balance was "standing in white nakedness like Christ at the pillar." (77) "His head was as bald as the rock of starvation." (56) Archeologists—"proving that the future of Greece lies in her past." (83) "When I wrote about Pericles they thought I meant Metaxas." (89) "He could have gone to Egypt with the government — the flight into Egypt." And so it goes on.

The writer hopes she has afforded entertainment. She has done this and more. She has thrown a flood of light on what was (in more than one sense) a dark period of Greek history. (How little news seeped through into the English papers during the "emergency"!) Her character drawing is magnificent. Above all else she has cast over her readers the spell of what she calls "Greekness." The tale throbs with it. The novel deserves to become an English classic.

An intimate acquaintance with the Modern Greek language is evident. The plural on p. 69 must be Klephtika. On p. 106 the word should be "plebeian."

London
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Nineteenth-century Russian foreign policy has traditionally interested students of Russian history as much as the domestic developments of the tsarist regime. This interest emanated, and still does, partly from the international concern which Russian expansion during the last century caused as the empire of the tsars gradually transformed itself from European to world power and partly from the close connections between domestic and foreign policy. This can be especially true in an
autocratic situation as in the case of imperial Russia, where essentially the tsar made foreign policy and the foreign minister executed it. This is the story which Mrs. Jelavich set out to tell, emphasizing the fact that "despite internal weakness the Russian government in foreign affairs usually demonstrated an instinctive understanding and a remarkably consistent recognition of the Russian diplomatic situation."

The story told by Mrs. Jelavich is a common one and the approach rather conventional. There is practically no information which could not be found either in textbooks of Russian or Balkan history or in the monographs produced previously by the author on Russia's interests and policy in the Balkans. The latter may in fact account for the obvious imbalance of the work which treats in far greater detail Russia's Balkan policy as contrasted with her Asiatic policy. But even in the case of the Ottoman Empire to which the author devotes a great portion of her book, the reader expecting fresh insights on such significant topics as the "Eastern Question" will be disappointed. But then, the author clearly states that she intended A Century of Russian Foreign Policy as a survey for the non-specialist interested in Eastern Europe or in diplomatic history. As such, the volume is the only one of its kind available and one to be welcomed by students as well as teachers of courses in modern European history, diplomatic history, and Russian history.

After an introductory chapter dealing with the eighteenth-century background when through war and war alliances Russia for all practical purposes had accomplished her territorial expansion in the West, the author divides the rest of the book in five chronological chapters under titles of the tsars' names and elaborates on her thesis how through rather simple and logical designs the tsars managed to preserve their acquisitions in the West in addition to acquiring new territory in Asia. This accomplishment was by no means an easy task for the tsars. Neither was the description of it for Mrs. Jelavich who had to develop her theme through the labyrinth of nineteenth-century European diplomacy. Occasionally in fact, the author fails to present in the clarity which she had set out to do the main issues of Russian foreign policy and the narrative becomes laborious reading indeed.

The most useful and indeed the only interpretive chapter is the concluding one where the author rightly reminds the reader that the ultimate failure of the tsarist regime should not obscure the fact that Russian diplomacy in the nineteenth century was "remarkably successful." This success is the more remarkable when one bears in mind the
economic weakness of Russia which determined and indeed "limited Russian commitments in foreign policy." This weakness also explains Russia's successes for it forced the tsars to rely largely on their ability to maintain unusual flexibility, divide their potential enemies and effect alliance with the leading diplomatic capitals of Europe, Berlin and Vienna.

Omissions are usually the easiest and most observable shortcomings in any scholarly work and the author often has good reasons for his or her chosen emphasis. Yet one cannot help but wish that Mrs. Jelavich had paid slightly more attention to the impact of the rapid industrialization in Russia during the reign of Nicolas II. As is known, Russian industrialization was heavily financed with European capital. Also, industrialization and especially the rail-road building unavoidably pushed Russia into Far Eastern adventures which ultimately led to the Russo-Japanese War. Similarly, the author paid practically no attention to the various cultural channels in the Balkans and the Middle East which despite the suspicion with which they were frequently viewed by the Foreign Office, on numerous occasions nevertheless supplemented the efforts of Russian diplomacy in the region.

Despite the above comments and until a more ambitious work on the subject appears, Barbara Jelavich's book will remain a useful guide and reference work to an exciting phase of Russian history.
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Yugoslav literature is becoming better and better known to the English language public.

Not long ago the Yugoslavs were known abroad almost exclusively for their folk poems and tales; the amount of translation and discussion of Serbo-Croatian folklore was enormous.

But since the 1950's several years before Andrić received the Nobel prize, more and more Yugoslav writers, particularly novelists and poets, have been translated into English. Lincolns-Prager (London) has published some significant Yugoslav novels, such as *The Return of Philip Latinovicz* by Miroslav Krleža, *Bosnian Story* by Ivo Andrić, *The Poem*