

of the European powers, and the regulations governing the Straits have from time to time been revised according to the power or lack of power of the Ottoman government to resist demands, and according to the general diplomatic situation. In the critical period surveyed in the present study the Ottoman state sank further and further into impotence, but the hostility of Great Britain to Russia made impossible the Muscovite dream of controlling the Straits and even securing possession of Constantinople. On the one hand the Russians, fearful of attack on their southern front, aimed at opening the Bosphorus and Dardanelles to Russian warships, while the British advocated complete opening to all nations or at least closure with provision for the sultan to call up the forces of friendly powers if he felt threatened by Russia.

This knotty problem has frequently been studied in the context of European diplomatic history, but Professor Jelavich is the first scholar to be able to utilize the now-published records of various foreign offices and of late the recently opened archives of Istanbul, Vienna, and London. Though for Russian policy she has had to rely, like her predecessors, on the fragmentary and not always reliable account of S. M. Goriainov, the vast diplomatic correspondence now available throws adequate light on Russian aims and policies. In a lucid, compact, and fully documented study she traces the evolution of the Straits problem from the London Conference of 1871, through the eclipse of Ottoman power in 1878 and the acute Central Asian crisis of 1885, to the Balkan imbroglio of 1887. During this entire period the Ottoman government was at the mercy of Britain and Russia, without whose acute antagonism the empire would certainly have disintegrated.

The author handles this problem in masterly fashion, as befits an expert on Russian foreign policy and European diplomatic history in general. Her essay is a definitive treatment that leaves little if anything to be desired. However, one might question her purpose in writing a supplementary chapter on the Bosnian crisis of 1908, which, though important, provides little opportunity for any novel contributions. It would have been more useful if she had analyzed the acute international crisis of 1895–97, in which the Straits question was of crucial importance and on which there is much that is obscure. One can only hope that she will continue her studies of this explosive issue, carrying the analysis at least to 1914 and if possible to 1923.

WILLIAM L. LANGER
Harvard University

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE
UNITED KINGDOM AND GREEK EXPERIENCE. By *B. S. Markesinis*.
Foreword by *C. J. Hamson*. Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative
Law, 9. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1972. xvi,
283 pp. \$19.50.

This doctoral dissertation by Basil Markesinis, whose father, Spyros Markesinis, was to serve as the first prime minister of the second Greek Republic for a few weeks during October and November 1973, deals with the subject of the dissolution of parliament in terms of legal theory as well as in British, Greek, and Belgian practice. It is excellent from the legal-theoretical viewpoint but less so as a study in comparative politics. From the author's intentions as indicated in his introduction,

one expects the book to be politically value-free. However, in discussing the Greek practice of the dissolution of parliaments, Markesinis tends to treat British practice as a norm from which Greek practice deviated, instead of trying simply to explain why the two practices differed. Of course, this would have meant examining the topic in terms of politics, political science, and political culture, especially since the dissolution of a parliament is a political act par excellence within rather vague constitutional parameters. Such further inquiry would have suggested, first, that the two-party system in England by contrast to the multiparty system in Greece was one of the main reasons why the two practices differed; and, second, that kings of Greece, despite their Danish origin, were likely to behave differently in Greece from the way they would have behaved in Denmark or England, simply because they found themselves in a Greek, not a Danish or English, political setting. Greek political parties were not durable or cohesive. They were personality-based and extremely fragile. Their leaders and would-be leaders were likely to behave in political ways that would be unthinkable to any of their colleagues in the British Conservative, Liberal, or Labour parties in response to the king's political maneuvers, which were often engaged in with the advice of Greek politicians themselves or other advisers.

Besides containing certain minor errors in Greek names (such as Constantine instead of Panayotis Pipinelis, p. 251), Markesinis's account of what transpired when King Paul I commissioned Constantine Karamanlis to form a government after the death of Premier Alexander Papagos on October 6, 1955 (pp. 209–10) omits the fact that Karamanlis refused to accept the leadership of Papagos's Greek Rally Party until and unless Parliament gave him a vote of confidence. Meanwhile a five-member committee of that party, consisting of Karamanlis, E. J. Tsouderos, P. Kanellopoulos, S. Stefanopoulos, and C. Rodopoulos, assumed the leadership. This suggests that both the beneficiary of the king's commission and the other Greek Rally Party leaders were agreed that if the monarch had intended to appoint Karamanlis as head of the party as well, he was acting improperly. The unimplemented constitutions of 1968 and 1973, incidentally, were to make it clear that the head of state would be acting also unlawfully if he ever tried again to act in the same way.

STEPHEN G. XYDIS
Hunter College, CUNY

PROBLEMY SLAVIANSKOGO FOL'KLORA. By *N. I. Kravtsov*. Moscow: "Nauka," 1972. 360 pp. 1.63 rubles.

This volume is a collection of the author's articles, published separately over the years. Kravtsov is one of the very few folklorists able to survey the whole range of Slavic folklores and make a comparative study of them, and the present volume is therefore a valuable one. The articles include: "A Work of Folklore as an Artistic Whole," "The Art of Psychological Portrayal in Russian Folklore," "The System of Genres of Russian Folklore," "Text and Melody in Folk Songs," "Folklore and Mythology," "The Serb Epos and History," "The Slavic Folk Ballad," "Bulgarian Folk Proverbs," "Harvest Songs in Bulgarian Nineteenth-Century Folklore," "Romanticism in the Slavic Literatures and Folklore," and "The Study of Slavic Folklore." The articles are uneven, but the best of them, such as the first one (actually a detailed analysis of the Russian ballad "Muzh-soldat v gost'iakh u