Russia, and Serbia—the author launches into a discussion of the Annexation Crisis of 1908. Nicholas did not receive the territorial compensation he sought, but this did not prevent him from entering upon a policy of détente with the Dual Monarchy in 1909. This did not last, and Russia, which had long been subsidizing Montenegro, maintained its ascendancy at Cetinje. In his narrative Treadway does not get bogged down in relating events which are not central to his account. His focus always remains centered on Montenegro and the actions of its Prince, after 1910, King Nicholas. The latter’s dislike of his son-in-law King Peter of Serbia and the rivalry of the two rulers for the leadership of the Serbian people is also brought out.

After making his way succinctly through the Albanian Uprisings of 1910-11, the author discusses Montenegro’s part in the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. Here he provides some new details on Montenegro’s relations with Bulgaria. The great powers in their Conference of Ambassadors in London had agreed that the city of Scutari should go to the newly created Albanian state. Montenegro, having finally captured this long-sought prize, defied the powers and for a time refused to withdraw. The Scutari Crisis of 1913 which led to an international naval demonstration is fully canvassed. It was again Austria-Hungary which led in curbing Montenegro’s territorial demands. Continuing border and other disputes between Austria and Montenegro flared up. The growing sentiment among the Montenegrin populace for union with Serbia went along with a desire for more political democracy and economic development. When World War I broke out, King Nicholas, although he first spoke of neutrality, had no alternative but to join with Serbia in resisting Austrian aggression.

Treadway has provided us with a well-written, objective account, and in a particularly successful concluding chapter he summarizes his findings. Here he notes that his study of Balkan policy indicates that “contrary to the assertion of some historians, including Fritz Fischer and Imanuel Geiss, Germany was not always waiting for a suitable opportunity to make war” (pp. 178, 210). The author shows conclusively that Montenegro “was often a bone of contention between Austria-Hungary and Russia, a source of discomfort for the Triple Entente, and a wedge that threatened to split the Triple Alliance” (p. 201). Beyond a doubt “in the decade before World War I Montenegro exercised political influence far out of proportion to her small size and meager resources” (p. 201).

Ernst C. Helmreich
Bowdoin College


The conclusions of Dr. Kunt’s study are clearly stated: central government officials came to take over provincial positions at higher ranks; the province replaced the district as the main administrative unit; and patronage relations and household affiliations became dominant factors in the polity. The author in his prelatory remarks under “method and sources” writes that the book “is intended for a wider audience ... including historians whose interests lie in other areas and periods.” (p. x) This is the standard by which the book will be measured.

The first problem is that the prelatory remarks are required reading since this short book of less than one hundred pages of text cannot be fully understood without the section on “methods and sources.” A second problem is that the book lacks a glossary. While the author usually gives a brief description of each term when it first appears, the reader is expected to remember them; and for a non-specialist that can create problems. Sometimes the differences between terms are not clear: e.g., zaim versus subase, while the key word ümera required a fuller definition.
A third problem is that this study, as carefully as it is executed and as convincing as are the author’s arguments, is only a single, relatively small section in a much larger picture. True, on a number of occasions the author refers to shifts in the use of capital accumulation, the impact of external economic changes, and general economic developments during the hundred years he covers. Further, Kunt states that the end of the sixteenth century was a major turning point, justifying a comparison of changes in provincial personnel for the eras preceding and following it. More evidence and an expanded argument, however, are needed to set properly the stage for this study.

Professor Kunt’s work reflects a mastery of very difficult sources, and a caution in using them one can only applaud, as well as a broad knowledge of Ottoman history. But, the focus is too narrow for that broader audience he seeks. It is to be hoped that future studies by this scholar will deal with some of those more general questions he only touched upon in this monograph.

Jere L. Bacharach

University of Washington