

works which fully deserve the attention of serious students of East European history.

FREDERICK KELLOGG
University of Arizona

ORIGINILE ROMANTISMULUI ROMĂNESC. By *Paul Cornea*. Bucharest: Editura Minerva, 1972. 759 pp.

Paul Cornea, professor of modern literature at the University of Bucharest, is the author of a number of studies on the origins of Rumanian Romanticism; and he has now given the topic monographic treatment in the present volume. It is not only the most thorough study of the topic but also the one which deals with it most comprehensively within its European framework. Methodologically the book follows the tradition of the history of ideas as represented in the works of Paul Hazard in comparative history, or of Daniel Mornet in his invaluable study of the intellectual origins of the French Revolution. It is a full and well-documented study which extends in important areas the work already done in the history of Rumanian literature by Dumitru Popovici in *Literatura Română in Secolul Luminilor (Rumanian Literature in the Age of the Enlightenment)* and his studies of the Romantic epoch. If the former book placed the Rumanian Enlightenment in its European, and especially French, context, the latter marked out lines of future research.

Paul Cornea is a multifaceted interpreter of the origins of Rumanian Romanticism, borrowing for his study of literary ideas the fertile suggestions of historians such as Lucien Febvre, Marc Bloch, and Robert Mandrou as they relate to a period in which the literary and cultural background of a civilization are inseparably interrelated.

The author begins with an indispensable introduction in which he examines the problems of methodology, including the structure of ideas: "The integration of foreign influences with the historical context and their subordination to the transformations of mentality involve not their denial but their affirmation." Through his knowledge of the theoretical framework of world literature the author provides a solid methodological base which guides the reader through the nearly eight hundred pages of the book.

The book is divided into three sections: "The Background, 1780–1821," "The Period of Transition, 1821–1830," and "The Emergence of Romanticism, 1830–1840." This compartmentalization corresponds to the development of Romanticism which traces its origins to the Age of the Enlightenment. It is obvious that in a book called *The Origins of Rumanian Romanticism* the author should devote particular attention to the background of the movement; and Professor Cornea examines diligently the earlier periods of the Enlightenment and the transitional era of 1821 to 1830. He is thus able to emphasize the course of Rumanian literature from Enlightenment to Romanticism, an evolution characterized by the tendency to integrate Rumanian culture with the system of European values. The discussion of the relation between Enlightenment and preromanticism, or classicism and preromanticism, offers a broader base for the understanding of Romanticism. Yet the author does not depart from his original topic. This is a study of the origins of Romanticism in Rumanian culture and not a history of the movement in full flower.

Paul Cornea's informative, erudite, and elegantly written book will remain a fundamental work for the student of the history of ideas, as well as for the student

of the history of literary movements and the interrelation of the historical and cultural spheres.

POMPILIU TEODOR
Urbana, Illinois

YUGOSLAV COMMUNISM AND THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION. By Stephen E. Palmer, Jr., and Robert R. King. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books (Shoe String Press), 1971. x, 247 pp. \$10.00.

This monograph is a study of the attitudes of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) and its supporters in Yugoslav Macedonia toward the Macedonian Question before, during, and after the Second World War. It is based on Communist sources interspersed with works by Western scholars and journalists. Most of the nameless Macedonians interviewed by the coauthors appear to belong to a group of pro-Bulgarian anti-Communist exiles associated with Ivan Mihailov. Palmer and King stress that the "crucial element of the CPY policy on Macedonia was its decision to recognize the existence of a Macedonian nationality." The stand the party adopted did not pay immediate dividends in Macedonia nor lead to more cordial relations with other Balkan Communist parties. The controversies that divided the Yugoslav and Bulgarian Communist leaders are discussed at some length, and force the authors to conclude that "without doubt, Macedonia will continue to be a complex focal point of conflict in Balkan politics."

The usefulness of this pioneering work is seriously reduced by three major weaknesses. No convincing evidence is provided to support the authors' contention that before the outbreak of the Second World War the "vast majority of the Slavo-Macedonians considered themselves" Bulgarians. The tribulations of the inhabitants of Macedonia and the blood feuds among them would have been far less widespread had they been quasi-unanimous about their national allegiance. Palmer's and King's espousal of what is essentially the Bulgarian thesis about the nationality of the Slavo-Macedonians makes them emphasize differences of opinion and clashes between Serbs and non-Serbs, while playing down those between Bulgarians and non-Bulgarians in Macedonia. Thus we read of the "Serbian terror" in Macedonia in 1912-14, but there is no mention of the brutal treatment by Bulgarians during 1915-18 of those they considered as Serbs in Macedonia.

Second, the authors ignore important source material, such as the seventh series of the *Zbornik dokumenata i podataka o narodno-oslobodilačkom ratu jugoslovenskih naroda* and the contributions to the leading Macedonian historical journal, *Glasnik na institutot za nacionalna istorija*. Third, there are many inaccurate statements, most of which could easily have been avoided if the authors had read more carefully the books listed in their bibliography. "All the Serbian parties" did not vote for the Yugoslav Constitution in 1921 (p. 19). Several, including the Agrarians, voted against it. The Yugoslav Communists were not the "first outside party" to join the Comintern (p. 20). The Yugoslav Communist leaders in 1919-20 did not take the position that Macedonians "were Serbs" (p. 21). They argued that no single nationality had an absolute majority in Macedonia. *Općinski* does not mean "county" (p. 21) but "municipal." A non-Communist opposition party, the Republicans, did contest the 1920 general elections in Macedonia (p. 23). The *Obznana* was decreed in December 1920 and not in August 1921 (p. 25). Sima Marković did not lead a delegation to Moscow in December 1920 (p. 24). He was