

not secretary-general of the CPY in 1923–25 (p. 28). It is misleading to associate him with “Greater Serbian leanings in the Party” (p. 46), since he advocated autonomy for Macedonia, and vigorously opposed in and out of Parliament his compatriots’ policies in that province. The “rash of assassinations” that the IMRO organized in Bulgaria did not begin in 1924 (p. 38) but, as many an Agrarian and Communist discovered to his cost, in 1923.

IVAN AVAKUMOVIC
University of British Columbia

STRANI KAPITAL U RUDARSTVU SRBIJE DO 1918. By *Danica Milić*. Istorijski institut u Beogradu. Jugoslovenske zemlje u XX veku, vol. 4. Belgrade: Izdanje istorijskog instituta, 1970. 579 pp.

Dr. Milić’s book is the latest in a series of well-documented if mapless works published by her own Historical Institute of the Serbian Academy on independent Serbia’s relations with the Great Powers early in the twentieth century. Dimitrije Djordjević, now professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, set a high standard in the first of these volumes, his *Carinski rat Austro-Ugarske i Srbije, 1906–1911* (Belgrade, 1962, 733 pp.). In her study of foreign capital in Serbian mining, principally French and Belgian investment after 1900 in copper and coal, Dr. Milić pays the same thorough attention to all relevant European archives as Professor Djordjević did. Useful insights into the economic history of Great Power penetration of the Balkans therefore emerge from an apparently narrow topic.

Dr. Milić conducts her investigation from Marxist first principles. But like a number of postwar Yugoslav scholars, she is careful to avoid dogmatic conclusions. She identifies doubtful or scanty data as such, rather than relying on it. Private European investors emerge as cautious types. Their profits in Serbia are not puffed up to explain the survival of European capitalism or the limitations of native industry. Their activities are described by quantities of capital committed and copper or coal exported, not by quotations from their promotional polemics in the fashion of some current revisionist writers of American economic history. Dr. Milić acknowledges benefits as well as costs to Serbia from an increasing but still limited amount of European mining investment after 1900. There is valuable experience in playing off the interests of one Great Power against another. Most important, she argues, is the access to European technology and training that Serbian merchants and bankers would not have financed. It is this gain that made foreign mining investment a “necessary evil,” in Dr. Milić’s phrase, during these last prewar decades.

The principal shortcomings of the book are omissions for which the author cannot be blamed. If the chapter on working conditions in these mines is regrettably brief, it is because most material on wages and prices was lost in the two world wars. Dr. Milić can collect a representative sample of consumer prices only for Belgrade. The cost of living at mining sites was probably much higher. This constituted a special burden for the large number of foreign workers, mainly Czechs, who had no recourse to their native villages in hard times, as Serbian labor did. The author admits a relative lack of records from the private mines that were the center of increasing foreign investment after 1900. She apologizes for her greater reference to state mines and refuses to exaggerate their importance.

One final regret is Dr. Milić’s failure to carry the account into the interwar

period. European investment in Serbian mines increased sharply in the 1920s, especially in the copper complex at Bor. Yet the neglect of a united Yugoslavia's difficult, early years continues to be the most striking omission chargeable generally to the country's academic community.

JOHN R. LAMPE
University of Maryland

ISTOKI RUSSKOI BELLETRISTIKI: VOZNIKNOVENIE ZHANROV
SIUZHETNOGO POVESTVOVANIIA V DREVNERUSSKOI LITERA-
TURE. Edited by Ia. S. Lur'e. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi litera-
ture (Pushkinskii Dom). Leningrad: "Nauka," 1970. 595 pp. 2.90 rubles.

Istoki russkoi belletristiki, one of the most important books to come out of the Pushkinskii Dom to date, is a collective work with an exclusively literary focus in which eight scholars of the Sektor Drevnerusskoi Literatry participated (Ia. S. Lurie, O. V. Tvorogov, L. A. Dmitriev, A. M. Panchenko, D. S. Likhachev, V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, N. S. Demkova, and O. A. Belobrova in descending order of the size of their contributions). The word *belletristika* is used here not simply to denote imaginative prose (*khudozhestvennaia proza*) or prose fiction in its widest sense, but rather to indicate structured plot narrative (*siuzhetnoe povestvovanie*) in particular, and to stand collectively for all the genres of plot narrative (*povest'*, *rasskaz*, *novella*, *roman*). The book surveys the origins and gradual development of plot narrative in its various forms (both translated and original) from the eleventh to the end of the seventeenth century, dealing not only with works of plot narrative proper but also with numerous works (for example, lives, annals, historical tales) which cannot be considered "belles-lettres" in the fullest sense but which clearly possess certain traits characteristic of true plot narrative (such as peripatetic construction, individuated speech, and *sil'naia detal'*).

In his informative introduction, Lurie, lest there be any later misunderstanding, wisely defines the elusive and often ambiguous word *siuzhet*, linking it with the system of events, the plot, and the narrative structure as opposed to the *fabula*, which designates the mere totality of events or the temporal sequence of the story. A *fabula* is the raw material which will be worked and organized into a *siuzhet* (epic, teleological, or ambivalent) by an author, operating from his own particular idea of life and "reality."

In chapter 1 Tvorogov studies the methods (such as direct speech and artistic detail) through which mere information is changed into *description* of events in the eleventh- to thirteenth-century annals. In the first and most successful part of chapter 2 Adrianova-Peretts illustrates how translated Byzantine hagiography (lives, martyrdoms, patericons) broadened the artistic possibilities of the Old Russian writer by providing him with clear examples of the artistic devices typical of the Byzantine secular romances of love and adventure. In part 2 she deals with Slavic hagiography, and though she makes some insightful comments, she nonetheless overstates the role and artistic value of details of realia as such. In the third chapter, which treats belletristic elements in eleventh- to thirteenth-century translated historical narrative, Tvorogov, drawing on a remarkably careful reading of all the texts in their entirety, characterizes the works well but unfortunately says little about the actual influence that these works (especially the *History of the Jewish War*) had on Old Russian literature. Tvorogov discusses translated