

documented in *The War Against the Jews, 1933–1945*. The effectiveness of the resistance was determined, however, by extrinsic considerations.

Gilles Lambert, a *Le Figaro* correspondent, has written a gripping and fascinating narrative which draws largely upon interviews with survivors of the Holocaust. It is by no means a systematic and scholarly work. Documentation is absent and the various statistics he provides are questionable. Nonetheless, the work is a valuable addition to the literature of the Holocaust.

WILLIAM KOREY
B'nai B'rith

HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE *GEISTESGESCHICHTE* SCHOOL. By *Steven Bela Vardy*. Studies by Members of the Arpad Academy. Cleveland: Arpad Academy, 1974. 96 pp. \$4.00, paper.

This pamphlet contains the original text of a lecture given in Hungarian by the author to a Hungarian audience in Cleveland. An English summary is also included.

Várdy's account of Hungarian historiography is well balanced, objective, and concise, as is his definition of the *Geistesgeschichte* school. The latter, he says, "regards all social evolution as being the product of manifestations of the 'creative spirit.' It rejects the notion of the existence of 'laws and objective reality in the history of human society' and believes that 'history is the totality of single and unique phenomena.'"

In objecting to the insensitivity of the *Geistesgeschichte* school to Hungarian popular culture and mentality, Várdy is echoing most of its critics, especially those of Elemér Mályusz's ethnohistory school. Yet, in spite of its critics, the *Geistesgeschichte* school dominated the writing of Hungarian history between the two world wars, partly because of its sophistication and scholarship and partly because of its influence on those who controlled educational and cultural life. This domination continued until both the school's practitioners and all its non-Marxist critics were swept away by Hungary's postwar regime.

Várdy anticipates the publication soon of his major work on the history of Hungarian historiography. On the basis of the present foretaste, we can look forward to the appearance of a significant and interesting contribution to the literature.

BÉLA K. KIRÁLY
Brooklyn College, CUNY

THE BALKANS IN OUR TIME. By *Robert Lee Wolff*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974. xxii, 647 pp. \$15.00.

The Harvard University Press has reprinted Robert Wolff's standard history of the Balkans during and after World War II without changing a single comma, even in the bibliography. They call it a revised edition, however, because the author has added a twenty-six-page afterword in which he gives a thumbnail sketch of the last twenty years of Balkan developments. The book remains the same solid, detailed discussion of Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, and Yugoslavia that has become familiar to students of the period and of the Balkans over the

past two decades. Almost every teacher in the area probably has used it, at one time or another, as a text or as a source for his own lectures, so that *The Balkans in Our Time* is, along with Stavrianos, one of the best known modern books on the Balkans.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that Professor Wolff did not actually revise this edition, since the original weaknesses of the book remain, and the passage of time inevitably has added others. The first third of the book, which is based in some places on sources that are no longer adequate, is a tour de force of compression, but this makes it sketchy for the student new to the area. The final quarter of the book goes to the opposite extreme, especially from the vantage point of twenty years, by jamming too much partially digested economic and political data into the postwar Stalinist period. No one today would complain about an overemphasis on economic subjects, as the reviewer of the first edition did in this journal (*Slavic Review*, April 1957, pp. 214–16), but ephemeral data sorely need to be weeded out and an interpretive analysis grounded in economic or developmental theory added. In the political sphere, revisions, taking into account recent studies of Allied policies in Eastern Europe during the war and of the Cold War period, would make the book less dated.

One solution might have been to make the book explicitly a history of the Balkans from 1939 to Stalin's death, instead of keeping the theme of "our time." While some reorganization and considerable pruning would have been necessary, a more comprehensible unit would have resulted. Instead, Professor Wolff has simply added his afterword, which is a disappointment. Rather than ruminating on the significance of the events his book covers, he skims over two decades of development in his four countries, and closes with a series of questions that he suggests are provocative, but which are in fact didactic and unconvincing.

Wolff's nonrevision may be flawed, but the book remains one of the great achievements of Balkan studies in this country nonetheless. It still is a standard interpretation of the events it discusses, and an unusual number of its facts and interpretations remain unchallenged. If it is no longer quite the living text it was in the fifties, it is at least still alive, inching its way toward eventual status as a classic.

GALE STOKES
Rice University

TURSKA I DUBROVNIK U XVI VEKU. By *Toma Popović*. Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1973. 506 pp.

The sixteenth century marked the peak of the economic and cultural growth of Dubrovnik and of the military power and political influence of the Ottoman Empire. Mr. Popović traces the parallel course of the two developments, never forgetting to put them within the larger framework of Mediterranean and European history. He offers a chronological sequence of events in the relations between Dubrovnik and Turkey, centered mainly around the major wars in which Turkey was involved at the time and which very much affected Dubrovnik's precarious position on the edge of two worlds—the Ottoman in the East, the Christian in the West. The author, however, did not neglect the intervening periods of peace and their significance for Dubrovnik's relationship with the Ottomans.