

What emerges from this volume is a mosaic of events and ups and downs in Ottoman-Ragusan contacts, from which certain conclusions can be drawn: there was a constant strain in these relations, generated mostly at the lower, local level of the Ottoman administration, but sometimes present also in Ragusan dealings with the Porte itself. The impression is that Dubrovnik was continuously on the verge of being swallowed up by the Ottomans, but just as consistently managed to preserve its independence. This was due largely to the consummate skill of the Ragusan diplomats—their excellent intelligence services and their ability to foresee and to forestall adverse developments. The Ottomans, themselves, had a great interest in Ragusan survival. As Mr. Popović states: “On the edge of two worlds, Dubrovnik survived as a necessity for both, because it was the only one, among small states . . . able to play the role of intermediary between them through a highly developed network of colonies in the Balkans and in the West, all the way to England, and through the strength of its merchant fleet” (p. 383).

The value of this book is in what it allows us to see of the functioning of the Ottoman state, especially of the relationship between the central and provincial administrations, and the changes they underwent as the century advanced and “the discrepancy between the new economic phenomena and the old political forms became increasingly obvious” (p. 386). In the end, Dubrovnik’s fate was linked to that of the Ottoman state, because “by the strength of its economic relations Dubrovnik was vitally tied to Turkey” (p. 391). This is why the initial decay of the Ottoman Empire in the closing decades of the sixteenth century marked the beginning of Dubrovnik’s troubles too.

The book has some minor flaws: the text is at times less than clear because of obvious restructuring and a too sparing use of dates, some themes are left unfinished, and a brief dictionary of Turkic idioms and a map would have been helpful. Nevertheless, this is a volume well balanced in its judgments. Based on a vast amount of source material from the archives of Dubrovnik, Venice, and so forth, and on many Ottoman and other texts, it is a major contribution to our knowledge of the Balkans, as well as of the Ottoman Empire and the Eastern Mediterranean, at a crucial time in their history.

BARIŠA KREKIĆ

*University of California, Los Angeles*

DALMACIJA 1870: RADOVI SA ZNANSTVENOG SKUPA U POVODU STOGODIŠNJICE POBJEDE NARODNE STRANKE NA IZBORIMA ZA SABOR DALMACIJE. Edited by *Dinko Foretić*. Zadar: Matica hrvatska, 1972. 298 pp. Paper.

Over the past decade several useful studies have appeared on the national revival in Dalmatia in the nineteenth century (for example, Jakša Ravlić, ed., *Hrvatski narodni preporod u Dalmaciji i Istri*, Zagreb, 1969). The present volume is a Festschrift containing sixteen papers that were delivered at a symposium commemorating the centenary of the victory of the Nationalists in the 1870 elections for the Provincial Diet of Dalmatia. Although a mere 10 percent of the population had the vote under the existing Austrian electoral structure, the Nationalists’ victory was a boost to the morale of the Habsburg Croats and other Slavs after

the *Ausgleich*. It enabled the Dalmatian Nationalists to begin implementing changes in the administration, schools, and language regulations that allowed the South Slavic majority to reassert itself in Dalmatia after centuries of Italian domination. This rather traditional interpretation pervades most of the articles included in the volume.

Only one selection deals directly with the election of 1870. The others discuss the economic, social, cultural, and political conditions in Dalmatia in the nineteenth century. The papers vary considerably in quality—including a keen analysis of the Croatian ideology of Mihovil Pavlinović as well as elaborations of well-known events of Croatian political history. In one essay, Foretić carefully examines the census statistics for the Italian minority (which never exceeded 28,000), although he probably goes too far in characterizing it as “an artificial creation, the result of definite political events.” Foretić points out elsewhere that the proper focus of this volume is on the *Croatian* national revival, because the Serbs of southern Dalmatia never had to face the same problems of cultural identity as the Croats. They also supported wholeheartedly the Nationalists’ goals of union with Croatia and the replacement of Italian with the Serbo-Croatian language in public life. As the contents of this volume demonstrate, however, more research is needed on the awakening of Serb national consciousness in Dalmatia.

JAMES BUKOWSKI  
*Augustana College*

RATNI CILJEVI SRBIJE 1914. By *Milorad Ekmečić*. Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1973. 550 pp.

SRBIJA I JUGOSLOVENSKO PITANJE 1914–1915. GODINE. By *Dragoslav Janković*. Belgrade: Institut za savremenu istoriju i “Eksport-pres,” 1973. 574 pp.

Milorad Ekmečić, professor of history at Sarajevo University, has written an important book on how Serbia developed her war aims in World War I. To persons not specifically interested in Serbia and the Yugoslav question, the most intriguing portion of his book will be those few pages where he uses suspected but previously unknown telegrams to the Serbian government from its ambassador in St. Petersburg, Miroslav Spalajković, in the critical days preceding the Austrian declaration of war in July 1914. Spalajković’s report of his discussion with Russian Foreign Minister Sazonov on July 24, and his telegram of the next day forwarding the results of the meeting of the Russian Council of Ministers, add substance to Albertini’s argument that Sazonov was trying to hint that the Serbs should not accept the Austrian ultimatum. The Russians did not give Serbia unconditional support, but Spalajković’s enthusiastic and positive assessment of the mood in Russian military and court circles, evident in the telegrams Ekmečić reveals, was an important ingredient in both the Serbian answer to the Austrian ultimatum and in her intransigent attitude in the days that immediately followed.

But Ekmečić’s study is more than an exposé of these details. It is a superbly researched book, written in a rich style appropriate to the complexity and passion of Serbia’s dark but glorious year of 1914. Dragoslav Janković’s excellent book on almost the same question, although it is complete and able, is pale by comparison. Janković, professor of legal history at Belgrade University, pre-