

Turkish conquest to 1945. The result is a compilation that includes entries on "generalities," religion, book publishing, geography, and biography, and in its section on history (by far the largest, pp. 141-266) covers Greece, the Balkans, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Turkey, and Cyprus, in that order.

The shortcomings of the first volume are many. The confusion in coverage of subject matter can be avoided, or at least minimized, if a system of classification is devised to reflect the field rather than fit the field into a preconceived scheme. Ideological and national bias also has intruded; for example, there are only eleven entries under "Religion" for the entire peninsula, and most of the entries on Macedonia are under "Bulgaria." If certain segments of the subject matter are to be omitted, the bibliographies covering them should be prominently listed and explained. Since this tool is for the specialist, the need to translate into French all entries in the Balkan languages is questionable; it would be more helpful to have good annotations. For a bibliography compiled in Bulgaria, the fact that materials in the Slavic languages are better represented than those in Greek and Turkish is understandable but not excusable, especially since the coverage of Rumanian and Albanian publications is quite good. Finally, errors in citations indicate that not all entries were handled *de visu*.

Under pressure to produce the first volume, the Bulgarian compilers have put forward a rather raw mimeographed product which will need rethinking in organization, a better effort in collection of material from neighboring countries and beyond, and a better technical execution if it is to become a tool of the order of Leon Savadjan's *Bibliographie balkanique* and *Südosteuropa-Bibliographie* of the Südost-Institut in Munich.

MARIN PUNDEFF

San Fernando Valley State College

SÜDOSTEUROPA-BIBLIOGRAPHIE, vol. 3: 1956-1960. Part 2: ALBANIEN, BULGARIEN, JUGOSLAWIEN, SÜDOSTEUROPA UND GRÖSSERE TEILRÄUME. Südost-Institut München. Edited by *Gertrud Krallert-Sattler*. Munich: R. Oldenburg, 1968. 634 pp. DM 42, paper.

This volume is the latest addition to the bibliography the Südost-Institut in Munich has been publishing since 1956 to cover in five-year segments the postwar publications on Southeast Europe. The scope of the bibliography has made it a fundamental tool for scholars concerned with the part of Europe that includes Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania. The hefty volumes cover books, articles, and dissertations in all relevant languages. The only regrettable feature of this worthwhile effort, perhaps because it is so painstaking and thorough, is that the volumes are appearing with a lengthening time lag. The institute may be well advised to deal with periods of less than five years in subsequent volumes.

Part 2 of the 1956-60 volume contains 559 entries for Albania, 2,477 for Bulgaria, 5,086 for Yugoslavia, and 901 for the area as a whole. The majority of entries represent, of course, publications from within the countries concerned, and herein lies the special value of the bibliography. In the West only the *Revue des études slaves* (Paris) and *Canadian Slavic Studies* provide coverage of such publications, but the philological and literary orientation of *RES* limits the scope of its annual bibliographic surveys and the coverage of the bibliographic supplement that *CSS* began in 1967 has so far been spotty. This reviewer shall avail himself of the opportunity to renew a plea of long standing that such coverage be provided on a

quarterly or annual basis by one of the appropriate American periodicals or the newly established Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center in Washington, D.C.

MARIN PUNDEFF
San Fernando Valley State College

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

I have every reason to be pleased with Professor Fisher-Galati's kind remarks concerning my study, *Double Eagle and Crescent: Vienna's Second Turkish Siege and Its Historical Setting*, reviewed in the September 1969 issue of your journal. However, I should like to take mild exception to one of his criticisms. If, as he notes, the external and internal motives for Kara Mustafa's actions remain unclear in the book, this is precisely because of the Turkish sources, which are of little help in this respect. While the volume is not based upon personal research in the Turkish archives, it does draw quite extensively upon the published German version of the two contemporary Ottoman accounts of the siege. The reader is referred to my discussion of them in footnote 88, chapter 5. The translator, Dr. Richard Kreutel, who has done much work in Istanbul and who placed certain nonpublished portions of his material at my disposal, is skeptical about the chances of new sources being discovered. To be sure, part of the problem is due to the organizational status of the Turkish archives, and so the possibility of fresh revelations cannot be excluded.

THOMAS M. BARKER
State University of New York at Albany

TO THE EDITOR:

Professor John H. Hodgson's review of my book *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: The Petsamo Dispute* (December 1969, pp. 652-53) leaves me no substantive grounds for complaint. It was a generous review, which is always welcome.

I was rather unhappy, however, to learn that my discussion of a particular point "degenerates into petty polemics" against the British historian Anthony F. Upton, allegedly one of my *bêtes noires*. Mr. Upton, whom I know and respect, will be as surprised as I am by this charge. In a review of his book *Finland in Crisis, 1940-1941* (*American Historical Review*, January 1966), I referred to it as "the first objective scholarly study to appear in any major language of how Finland in June 1941 became a cobelligerent of Germany against the Soviet Union." I called it "well balanced, lucidly written, and factually reliable." I gave his book equally high marks in another review (*American-Scandinavian Review*, December 1966). But I also registered my disagreement with a couple of his major conclusions, for which I found no solid evidence.

Because these conclusions were accepted completely by a number of scholars,