

GREECE AND THE EASTERN CRISIS, 1875–1878. By *Evangelos Kofos*. Foreword by *W. N. Medlicott*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1975. 283 pp.

The dilemmas confronting a small, militarily weak state without allies but with ambiguous foreign-policy goals in a period requiring decisive action is the subject of Dr. Kofos's latest book. A well-written and exhaustive study of the role and position of Greece during the Near East Crisis of 1875–78, it must be regarded as an invaluable contribution to the existing literature dealing with a crucial and dramatic period of modern Greek history. The two major themes—the relations of Greece with her Balkan neighbors and with the Great Powers, and the interaction between Greece and the “unredeemed” Greeks of the Ottoman Empire—are pursued with balanced judgment and great thoroughness. Kofos's meticulous study of the archives of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the numerous file reports of the Greek consuls in the Ottoman Empire, and other unpublished Greek sources and private papers furnish invaluable and previously unused data to help clarify the neglected role and importance of the “unredeemed” Greeks during the events of the period under review. His detailed use of the British, French, and Austrian archives underline the often erratic and unpredictable behavior of the various Great-Power actors during the Crisis. This material helps to explain the inability of the Greek state to exploit fully the rapidly changing developments in the Balkans.

Should Greece join the Russians and the other Balkan peoples in the hope of sharing in the spoils of a defeated Turkey; or should she side with Britain and the other opponents of Russia in order to preserve, for the time being, the status quo in the Balkans? To what extent would a Turkish defeat destroy the long-range objectives of Greek nationalism—the liberation and national emancipation of the “unredeemed” Greeks? This subject was the center of the spirited debate concerning Greece's role in the Near East Crisis, and it is the main focus of this study.

Greece was, of course, too weak to determine the final outcome of the contest in the Balkans, although Great-Power rivalry allowed her a measure of maneuverability. Unfortunately, the degree of influence Greece could exert in order to safeguard the interests of Hellenism was diminished by the lack of effective leadership, by insufficient knowledge of the views of the Great Powers, and by the erratic tactics of the Powers, particularly Austria and Germany. Kofos's conclusion is essentially a negative one—the results of the Congress of Berlin were a mixed blessing for Greece. They could have been worse.

Dr. Kofos has written an excellent book. It has laid some of the groundwork for those who would like to have a better understanding of the relations between Athens and the “unredeemed” Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, but the definitive study on these relations has yet to be written. Both in terms of sources and analysis, Kofos's study of the dilemmas confronting the Greek government throughout the period of the Crisis is the best available in any language.

HARRY J. PSOMIADES
Queens College, CUNY

RUSSISCHE ROMANTIK. By *Bodo Zelinsky*. *Slavistische Forschungen*, vol. 15. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1975. xviii, 522 pp. DM 94.

Although the author points out that his study is merely a presentation of *Russische Romantik* and not of *Die russische Romantik*, in some respects this book can be considered an encyclopedia of Romanticism in Russian literature. A brief review cannot do justice to this impressive opus, written by a scholar of striking erudition and under-

standing of the general concepts of poetry, or to many specific features of the work. Zelinsky's discussion centers on both the well-known issues essential for understanding Romanticism and on the less tangible philosophical and aesthetic tenets of the somewhat esoteric Russian theory and practice of this trend. Naturally, he starts with such general notions as the theory of poetry as prophecy and the role of inspiration. The discussion of religious and spiritual ecstasy, passion, suffering, and so forth takes us to the more specific situation of Russia and the individual Russian Romantics.

It is quite natural for the author to follow the German and Russian tradition in dealing with Romanticism. The absence of a discussion of *Evgenii Onegin*, for example, seems to indicate that Zelinsky follows the traditional view, taking for granted that *Onegin* has little to do with Romanticism. No mention is made of the view argued by Ettore Lo Gatto ("L'Onegin come diario lirico di Pushkin," in *Bruno Becker Festschrift*) that the lyrical stream in *Onegin*, representing the poet's individual comments and digressions, links the work with Romanticism in a very interesting way. Zelinsky occasionally refers to representatives of other schools, but mainly on matters of detail rather than on general approach. Thus, on the whole, the thematic aspect is given much more attention than the problem of the formal revolution initiated by the Romantic trend. Some of the formal achievements of individual writers are analyzed in fine detail, however.

One of the book's most serious methodological difficulties is caused by the rather anachronistic tendency to follow the Aristotelian tradition of dividing all literary creation into three categories: *Lyrik*, *Epik*, *Dramatik*. Applied mechanically to all trends of Romanticism, this formula is bound to lead to inconsistencies and compromises, for example, the analysis of lyric poems to illustrate problems, discussed for some reason in the chapter on *Epik*. (Lermontov's *Zvuki* and Tiutchev's and Mandelstam's *Silentium* are given as illustrations of such phenomena as *Sehnsucht nach dem schweigenden Urgrund* and *Rückwendung des Menschen in die Tiefe der eigenen Seele*, as if they were examples of the "epic" descriptive genre.) Nevertheless, the actual discussion of these and other problems is competent and objective, and is supported in places by appropriate extensions into the realm of modern poetry (Pasternak, Mandelstam, Vinokurov, and so forth).

This study is published in the prestigious series, *Slavistische Forschungen*, edited by Reinhold Olesch. It follows, of course, the old and useful tradition of supplying not only a name index but also separate subject and chronological indexes.

Z. FOLEJEWSKI
University of Ottawa

THE LITERARY BALLAD IN EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By *Michael R. Katz*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976. xiv, 248 pp. £10.00. \$22.00.

The title of this book does not do it justice; in addition to a thorough investigation of the Russian ballad in the early nineteenth century, the book contains an extensive survey of the history of the genre of the ballad in Western Europe (England, Germany, and France), as well as a short history of the Russian literary epithet in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The author also includes theoretical discussions dealing with the concepts of "ballad" and "epithet," and provides appendixes containing statistical data on the types and frequency of epithets in Russian and Western folk ballads and literary ballads. Because Zhukovskii is the major balladist in Russian literature, his work dominates the discussion. In addition, there are chapters dealing with Zhukovskii's "imitators," particularly Kozlov, Katenin, and Meshchevskii, two chapters on