

tives for survival in a changing world system generate pressures for this in any event. Instead, they are efforts of the peasant periphery or the middle-class semiperiphery, respectively, to find original paths out of dependency.

One advantage of this approach is that it provides an explanation of right-wing movements that are otherwise apt to be dismissed as transient irrationalities. Indeed, it is a strength of this collection that all the authors, even those who do not use dependency theory, clarify issues that are broader than the Rumanian particulars they discuss. For this reason, I have the feeling that some of the ideas Jowitt and his collaborators bring forward will have considerable impact on the direction of East European studies over the next few years.

GALE STOKES
Rice University

CLASH OVER ROMANIA: BRITISH AND AMERICAN POLICIES TOWARD ROMANIA, 1938–1947. By *Paul D. Quinlan*. Los Angeles: American Romanian Academy, 1977. 173 pp. Paper.

Although not identified as such, this monograph probably began as a dissertation. The author's adviser should have restrained his candidate from the herculean effort of researching the overwhelming amount of materials for the period and the topics under study. Dr. Quinlan waded into a tidal wave in a vain effort to produce a study of diplomatic, military, economic, and social history of the period preceding, during, and following the Second World War. In so doing, he could not investigate all relevant archival materials in Britain and the United States, so essential for understanding Anglo-American actions regarding the Balkan states. For example, Quinlan devotes about one page to the Churchill-Stalin agreement on the Balkans reached in Moscow on October 9, 1944, whereas Albert Resis, in "The Churchill-Stalin Secret Percentages Agreement on the Balkans" (*American Historical Review*, 83, no. 2 [April 1978]: 368–87), refers to more sources on that event alone than on all the sources cited by Quinlan put together!

When such unwittingly bold studies appear in print, one wonders what motivates a young scholar to attempt the impossible. Is this study a polemic? Is it intended to postulate some thesis? If, as Dr. Quinlan asserts, "by the summer of 1943 it had become evident that most of the Balkans would fall within the military sphere of the Red Army" (p. 159), why does he fail to follow up this view with some analysis of Roosevelt's and Churchill's efforts at Teheran and Yalta to mitigate this apparently inevitable development? It is precisely Quinlan's selective, and not inclusive, outline which gives this reviewer the impression that this is an undertaking which requires infinitely more research and analysis. One outstanding virtue of historical research in the West is that it has the right to produce works of this kind. But academic freedom also requires examination of *all* available evidence, not merely those items which can substantiate some vague thesis.

SHERMAN D. SPECTOR
Russell Sage College

KARA MUSTAFA POD WIEDNIEM: ŹRÓDŁA MUZUŁMAŃSKIE DO DZIEJÓW WYPRAWY WIEDEŃSKIEJ 1683 ROKU. By *Zygmunt Abrahamowicz*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo literackie, 1973. 410 pp. Illus. 75 zł.

This is a timely publication of Turkish sources concerning the Vienna campaign of 1683. Dr. Abrahamowicz has translated a selection of Ottoman chronicles and letters pertaining to the campaign of Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa (1638–83), which cover

the period from January 21, 1681 to the end of February 1684. He also includes selections which provide religious, cultural, economic, and military background to that campaign.

The book is divided into six parts. The introduction, which contains a critical analysis of Ottoman and Crimean sources and their historiography, should be most useful to specialists. Part 1 contains excerpts from the chronicle of Silahdar Mehmed Aga (1658–1723), published in Istanbul in 1928 by Ahmed Refik under the title *Silahdar tarichi (Silahdar's Chronicle)*. Part 2 contains a selection from the memoirs of Dzhebedzhi Hasan Esiri, written in 1725 under the title "The Criterion of States and the Judgment of Nations," only part of which was published in 1912 by M. Arif. Part 3 presents the "History of the Vienna Campaign" by Husein Hezarfenn (1611–91). In 1685, one of the two existing "Vienna Campaign" manuscripts was translated into French by F. de la Croix and utilized in his book, *Guerres des Turcs avec la Pologne, la Moscovie et la Hongrie* (1689). An Italian translation of the manuscript by J. M. Talman, entitled "Breve storia . . .," appeared in 1709. Part 4 consists of the author's translation of the "Chronicle of Events" written by Defterdar Sary Mahmed (1656[?]-1717), which is published here for the first time. Part 5 deals with the "Chronicle of Mahmed Gerej" and presents information about the Vienna campaign from the Crimean Tatars' point of view. The final part contains four letters written by Kara Mustafa at the time of the campaign.

The translations are well done and retain the flavor of the originals, but too many Turkic terms are used. Even though they are explained in the text, they could have been replaced by corresponding Polish terms. This would have contributed to the clarity of the text and to the flow of the narration. In addition, a good index would have made the book more useful to researchers.

An important contribution, *Kara Mustafa pod Wiedniem* will have to be consulted by all serious students of Ottoman history and the history of the Vienna campaign. Those interested in Polish history might note that some of the direct references to Polish forces made by the Turkish authors support historians' earlier conclusion that the Polish forces under King Jan III Sobieski played a central and positive role in the delivery of Vienna and the recapture of conquered territories.

C. M. NOWAK
Bridgewater State College

CHEKHOV: A STUDY OF THE MAJOR STORIES AND PLAYS. By *Beverly Hahn*. Major European Authors series. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1977. xiv, 351 pp. \$19.95.

How many studies on Chekhov have appeared since his death? After World War II? Within the last year? An innumerable amount, and their number continues to grow. Cambridge University Press alone has, within a few years, published three works on this writer. The reader may wonder if Beverly Hahn's book is necessary. The first reaction is to answer in the negative, because the book repeats a great deal of facts and views that interested readers know only too well. The book inevitably includes the same letter from Grigorovich to Chekhov of March 1886 and Chekhov's reply, and the one Chekhov wrote to Pleshcheev in October 1889 ("I am not a liberal, not a conservative . . ."), as well as short analyses of stories that have been studied countless times (for example, "Misery," "The Huntsman," "Enemies"). Chapters are devoted to plays that have been commented upon at length and in depth. The author even had the audacity to include a chapter on "Chekhov and Tolstoy" (juxtaposing, of course, "A Dreary Story" and "The Death of Ivan Ilyich"), a theme that is too hackneyed even for student papers. This is one of those books on Chekhov in which he is presented as a superb, impeccable writer, without critical indications of his