

anything for Yugoslavia and for the Serbs. Churchill reportedly replied that everything was lost and that there was nothing he could do. Canonic Douglas allegedly reminded Churchill that there was one very important thing he could still do: state publicly that he had erred in his wartime policies with regard to Yugoslavia and the Serbs... Yovanovich concludes that the cause of Serbia was lost because too many forces—the Croats, Tito, the Russians—conspired against it and because Britain, deprived of the powerful partnership and influence of a strong France, would not support Mihailovich, the London-based Serbs, and their plans for a democratic Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

As in the case of all diaries and personal narratives of this type, the reader must constantly bear in mind that the writing of history represents a synthesis of conflicting accounts. This small book offers valuable insight into the thoughts and aspirations of an often neglected aspect of Yugoslavia's wartime political world. It will thus be welcomed by students of allied policies regarding Yugoslavia and the Balkans generally. On the other hand, the absence of any explanatory notes and cross-references, and the non-discursive nature of the author's style make this diary meaningful only for those who are quite familiar with Yugoslav affairs before and during the War. And, of course, the fact that it has not as yet been translated from the Serbo-Croat drastically reduces its usefulness. Such a translation, together with extensive explanatory annotations, would be highly desirable. Furthermore, since the author of the diary remained in close association with Yovanovich until the latter's death in London in 1958, it is to be hoped that another volume, covering their conversations after 1945 would soon follow.

Southern Connecticut State College  
New Haven, Connecticut

JOHN O. IATRIDES

Ferenc A. Vali, *Bridge Across the Bosphorus: The Foreign Policy of Turkey*.  
Baltimore, Maryland, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.  
Pp. 410.

Professor Vali has assayed the task of writing a comprehensive history of Turkish foreign policy under the Republic, essentially from the period of Atatürk to the present. In his writing, he goes back to the beginnings and traces the emergence of Turkey as a nation-state from the matrix of

the Ottoman Empire, in order to get at the foundations of Turkey's foreign policy—the geopolitical, ethnic and ideological foundations of foreign policy under the Turkish Republic. In doing so, Dr. Vali makes the basic point that, whether under the Ottoman Empire or the Republic, essentially, foreign policy and interest have been Western in orientation, whatever the appearances to the contrary. Following these introductory chapters is a detailed discussion of political parties, public opinion and foreign policy, in which the author observes that, with the exception of the Turkish Labor Party and certain elements of the "New Left," there is a basic unity as to Turkish foreign policy.

Several chapters deal separately with specific aspects of Turkish foreign policy. For example, Chapter IV treats of Turkey, the United States, and NATO, and it provides useful detail on Turkey's relationships with the United States within the NATO framework. It also raises the essential questions as to the American presence in Turkey and the problem of whether Turkey should remain a member of the "grand alliance." Mr. Vali holds that Turkey is unlikely radically to change its moorings. Chapter V treats of the USSR, the Turkish Straits, and the Balkan area. The essence of the Soviet-Turkish relationship is well characterized, centering as it does, in many ways, around the Turkish Straits, in which the Soviet Union has maintained the old Russian interest and policy. The Cyprus problem, involving Greece and Turkey and the Cypriot Greek and Turkish communities, is treated more or less from a Turkish point-of-view and should be compared with the works of Stephen G. Xydis, for example. Finally, Chapter VI deals with Turkey and the Middle East with relations with Iran and the Arab world. Due note is made of the Baghdad Pact (CENTO) with Iran and Pakistan, and particularly of the technical and economic significance of CENTO. But special point is made of Turkey's recent attempts, especially since 1967, to improve relations with the Arab States (Syria and Iraq).

The concluding chapters treat of Development as a foreign policy goal and of ambitions and realities in Turkish foreign policy. The author observes that Turkey, in addition to its Westward orientation, is a developing society in need of both economic and technical assistance—hence the general direction of its foreign policy, whatever the manoeuvres on the diplomatic *tapis* from time to time. Like other observers, Professor Vali holds that a sense of realism in Turkey will hold policy on a course which has been set in years past.

This is a very useful book and is very readable. At times the style

is repetitive and somewhat pedantic, and there are a few errors of fact and date, but these do not mar the good qualities of the book. There is an excellent selected bibliography. The book should take its place on the shelves of all students of modern Turkey, the eastern Mediterranean area, and of international politics.

•The American University  
Washington, D.C.

HARRY N. HOWARD

George Galavaris, *Bread and the Liturgy: The Symbolism of Early Christian and Byzantine Bread Stamps*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1970. Pp. 235.

Everything which in the past has been associated with and is still relevant to the liturgical life and experience of the Church is always interesting and provocative, not only for the theologian or the Church historian but for scholars who look at history as an integral part of the human experience. Professor Galavaris' contribution lies precisely in his effort to enrich our knowledge of the past by studying all the converging disciplines, cultures and literary information he had at his disposal. Thus the author successfully and with a deep sense of scholarly responsibility presents in his book the story of the eucharistic bread in the life of the Early Church and in the Byzantine liturgy more particularly. He openly acknowledges his debt to the brilliant work in this field by Professor Franz Joseph Dölger and discusses the nature of the Last Supper. He seems to accept the *Sabbath-Kiddûsh* or *Chabûrah* nature of the Lord's Last Supper, a thesis entertained by various scholars (Gregory Dix, Trempelas and others), without however mentioning the work of Annie Jaubert, who in her work *La date de la Cène* brought forth new material, especially from the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, regarding the nature of the Last Supper.

Professor Galavaris is right in declaring that many problems concerning Christian worship have been solved as a result of archaeological investigations and the bread stamps and moulds offer indisputable proof of this fact. Of course stamps and moulds were used by the ancient Greeks and Romans, and the Christians continued this custom. However, the author points out the problem of determining the stamps which were used for bread and more specifically the stamps which were used not