

breaks a lance or two with A. J. P. Taylor; in a footnote in Schroeder's last chapter Taylor is neatly hoist by one of his own aphorisms.

Because Schroeder stays close to his subject, some scholars will be disappointed. He does not investigate thoroughly the origins of the Crimean War, which was in its beginnings a Russo-Turkish war. Tsar Nicholas's diplomatic and military aggression is acknowledged, but seems to be peripheral, while the Ottoman reactions and maneuvers are given short shrift. By contrast, Schroeder shows carefully how Britain, France, and especially Austria became enmeshed in the Russo-Turkish war. The war itself is barely mentioned; the silence of the guns is eerie. By contrast, the Austrian quest for a negotiated peace is better told than ever before. The Paris peace congress, at the end, is again slighted, with vital aspects of its arguments and decisions largely ignored. Fortunately Winfried Baumgart, as Schroeder himself notes, has just published a good study of the peacemaking. All these omissions are evidently intentional, given the Austrian focus.

The book has a thesis, as well as a focus. Schroeder argues that Austria sought peace within the Concert, and aided the Western powers to curb Russia while trying to moderate demands by the West. He argues further that Britain wanted the prestige of victorious war, blocked any negotiated peace till the end, and so disrupted the Concert. He piles up evidence that Palmerston, Clarendon, and Russell in the ministry and Cowley, ambassador to Napoleon III, worked hard for war. Clarendon, often devious, emerges smelling like a skunk. Buol smells like a rose.

Some of the book is hard slogging. The author follows negotiations in detail, but sometimes omits the terms of crucial documents: thus the Vienna Note, the Turkish amendments to it, Russia's "violent interpretation," and others are not adequately set forth. Sometimes there are not enough dates in the text, so that the exact time sequence eludes the reader. There are dates in many notes, but this involves flipping to the back. The writing is clear, sometimes good, but relentlessly the same. Great concentration is needed to absorb name-packed sentences. There are two helpful maps, one marred by the mislocation of Besika Bay.

The concluding chapter is a ringing condemnation of British policy because it destroyed the Concert, and a powerful sermon defending Concert rules, the Metternichian ideal, the settling of crises among the Pentarchy before they became confrontations—the apotheosis of the Austrian viewpoint. Schroeder has poured his soul into this, he expresses himself well, and he says many wise things (along with some quite debatable ones). He asks "iffy" questions, poses hypotheses, projects consequences, sets standards. And so, after careful research, should a good historian do. Amen.

RODERIC H. DAVISON
George Washington University

OTTOMAN DIPLOMACY IN HUNGARY: LETTERS FROM THE PASHAS OF BUDA, 1590–1593. By *Gustav Bayerle*. Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 101. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, 1972. vii, 204 pp. \$6.00, paper.

The military and civil administrator of the parts of Hungary under Turkish occupation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the pasha of Buda. The pashas maintained a frequent correspondence with the Viennese organs of government of the Habsburg monarchy, with the military commandants of the fortresses

opposing them on the other side of the frontier, and, on the other hand, with the princes of Transylvania. This correspondence constitutes first-rate source material concerning not only the everyday problems of the province under occupation, as well as of the frontier territory (military conflicts even in times of peace, taxation, transit commerce, and so forth), but also the political relations of the two great powers.

The letters of the pashas of Buda, written mostly in Hungarian (even if addressed to one of the Viennese officials), are to be found in great numbers in the Austrian and Hungarian archives. Their publication started about half a century ago, when 451 letters written between 1553 and 1589 appeared in the volume compiled by Sándor Takáts, Ferenc Eckhart, and Gyula Szekfű: *A budai basák magyar nyelvű levelezése* (Budapest, 1915). The venture, however, was not continued. The fact that Takáts quoted many passages from later letters as well, in his numerous books dealing with this period, could not fill the gap. It is the continuation of this initiative that Gustav Bayerle has now undertaken. His present volume contains 107 letters written by the pashas of Buda in the years 1590–93. The letters are published in their original Hungarian text, but with English summaries. The reader finds himself in a period when the relations between the Habsburg and Turkish empires, previously more or less consolidated in spite of recurrent disputes, are becoming gradually more tense. The dark shadow of the long Fifteen Years' War (1593–1606), which was to ruin Hungary in unprecedented measure, can be seen approaching. The correspondence is less frequent. The letters contain more self-justification, more threats. They try to conceal the military preparations.

The publication is exemplary. The texts are faultless. The introduction, though short, gives all the essential information. For the sake of completeness we should like to mention that two further unpublished letters of Sinan Pasha to Chief Commander Miklós Pálffy (1591) are to be found in the manuscript department of the National Széchényi Library, Budapest (Fol. Hung. 431).

F. SZAKÁLY
Budapest

HUNGARY IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: THE DECLINE OF ENLIGHTENED DESPOTISM. By Béla K. Király. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1969. xi, 295 pp. \$9.75.

The frustrated teacher of East European history, struggling with the limitations imposed by the scarcity of English-language literature in his field and the poor quality of much of it, is apt to welcome new works with gratitude. In his introduction Király rightly notes that Henrik Marczali's *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (1910) is now out of date as well as difficult to obtain. Király's book therefore fills a definite need.

It is disappointing to have to point out a number of puzzling shortcomings. Although the bibliography is excellent and up to date, in the text the author apparently eschewed much of the recent literature on the East European Enlightenment, electing to base most of his work on a handful of outdated if often excellent secondary works in Hungarian. Sources most frequently referred to are such standard works as Hóman-Szekfű's history of Hungary (1935–36), Béla Grünwald's *A régi Magyarország, 1711–1825* (1888), and Marczali himself. Király fails to explain