

Revolutionary concept of "labor use," yet the Russian narodniks are not mentioned at all. What was Stamboliski's own influence on the theory and political action of other agrarian political movements in Europe? Did Stamboliski's program have any prospects for success? In keeping with his cautious and conservative approach, Bell ignores many questions about the character of Bulgarian society, such as those raised by Irwin Sanders in his *Balkan Village*, a study of Bulgarian rural life that does not appear in Bell's bibliography.

To conclude, Bell's book is now the definitive account of the Stamboliski era in English. Although interesting as it stands, one wishes that the author had been bold enough to place his subject in its European perspective.

GEORGE JACKSON  
Hofstra University

HISTORY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND MODERN TURKEY, VOLUME II: REFORM, REVOLUTION, AND REPUBLIC: THE RISE OF MODERN TURKEY, 1808–1975. By *Stanford J. Shaw* and *Ezel Kural Shaw*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. xxvi, 518 pp. Tables. Maps.

Since 1973 general works on the history of the Ottoman Empire have been published by Inalcik, Cook, Kinross, and the Shaws. The last is the broadest treatment both in time span and in topical coverage. It is based on considerable research in the Ottoman archives and on published documents, memoirs and monographs in Turkish, and Western monographs. This second volume, half again as long as the first (which covers 1280 to 1808), will for some time to come be a standard reference for the century of reform and Westernization that preceded the establishment of the Turkish Republic.

The volume begins with a chapter on the military and administrative reforms of Sultan Mahmud II (1803–39). It continues with two lengthy chapters on the administrative and financial organization of the Tanzimat ("reordering") period (1839–76), under a rising new bureaucracy, and on the era of Sultan Abdulhamit II (1876–1909). Abdulhamit is characterized as "the last man of the Tanzimat" and "one of the most eminent of all Ottoman sultans." This rehabilitation, perhaps a little too enthusiastic, of the oft-damned sultan, is one of the book's chief contributions to Turkish historiography. Next follows a chapter on the politics, reforms, and wars of the Young Turk period (1908–18). The final two chapters describe the Turkish war for independence (1918–23) and the evolution of the Republic thereafter. The last chapter is proportionally slighter than the others.

The core of the book is institutional history, principally the history of the administrative organs centered on Istanbul. But there is much more. The political context, both domestic and international, is set forth in each chapter. Minority problems and international complications and wars receive much attention. There is a fair amount of social and economic history, and somewhat less intellectual history. The sum is a well-rounded account.

The great virtue of the Shaws' book is that it is Turk-centered. The reader frequently gains a Turkish perception of important events of Turkey's history. He finds, for example, references seldom encountered in Western works to the recurrent streams of Muslim refugees from Russia, the Balkans, or eastern Anatolia. He also finds a vigorous reply to Armenian accusations of mistreatment. Readers of this journal may feel that Balkan Slavs are slighted—autonomous Serbia from 1829 to 1875 is covered in three pages—but the advantage of this is to place the question in Ottoman context. The authors felt that they could give the Arab provinces only occasional notice as well. There are naturally other omissions which one regrets. It would be appropriate, for example, to mention the American shipbuilders employed by Mahmud II, the deportations of leading Armenians from Istanbul in 1915, and the growth of right-wing (as well as left-wing) terrorism in the 1970s. But one cannot include everything.

Some of the most interesting sections of the book will occasion debate. How accurate, for instance, are Ottoman (or any Near Eastern) statistics? Can census figures be checked, somehow? Can one assume that, in 1895, 90 percent of all school-age boys in the empire actually were attending elementary school? The area of demographic research opened up here will certainly be further developed by scholars. In a book so crammed with factual detail there are also, inevitably, slips sprinkled here and there, sometimes simply of proper name or date. The next edition can correct these.

The work ends with seventy-eight pages of valuable bibliography and an index. The bibliography furnishes extensive references to Turkish and Western works, both old and new. The thorough index is at the same time a glossary and a biographical register. They are a fitting conclusion to a massive volume, packed with information, that every scholar concerned with the area will want.

RODERIC H. DAVISON  
*George Washington University*

THE POETICS OF PROSE. By *Tzvetan Todorov*. Translated from the French by *Richard Howard*. Foreword by *Jonathan Culler*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1977 [Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1971]. 272 pp. \$4.95, paper.

Tzvetan Todorov first translated the Russian Formalists into French in 1965, and has since developed and extended several strands of Formalist thought into French Structuralism. The present collection contains fifteen essays written between 1966 and 1969, with an appendix on the heritage of Russian Formalism, dated 1964. According to Jonathan Culler, the book aims "to understand literature as a human institution, a mode of signification," instead of interpreting individual works. Actually, Todorov's ideas represent what he calls a "reading"—a blend of general literary theory and structurally oriented analytical criticism.

Underlying much of Todorov's poetics is the proposition that the dynamics of narrative structures are analogous to those of natural language. Therefore, one may operate with grammatical concepts to construct a grammar of narrative which could itself contribute to the formulation of a universal grammar of all semiotic systems. Todorov develops his theoretical designs primarily by means of binary distinctions. Thus, the speech act divides into the levels of discourse (purporting a change) and of story (mere description) which can be related to Boris Tomashevskii's dynamic and static motifs, leading in turn to the establishment of a predicative typology based on static/dynamic and adjective/verb characteristics (p. 200). Applied to a literary text, this typology can be elaborated to produce the analytical category of narrative transformation which Todorov develops through extended analogies with grammatical relationships between predicates and verbs. He calls it an "intermediary" category between generalized narrative structures (such as Propp's classifications) and "the diversity of particular narratives" (p. 219).

A number of essays focus on specific texts: *The Odyssey*, *Arabian Nights*, *The Quest of the Holy Grail*, the stories of Henry James; and others relate theory to literary practice in a similar binary mode of argument. These are illuminating, highly imaginative readings, instinctively more complex and subtle than theory alone would expect, so that it is really unfair to say that structuralists (or semioticians) can be made by teaching a parrot to divide by two. It may happen, however, that through exclusive concern with linguistic textures some critics will deny the literary text any but self-contained purpose and thus find themselves in a cage of language, as Frederic Jameson once thought.

RIMVYDAS SILBAJORIS  
*Ohio State University*