

agree with his thesis (for example, on the "Fifty Points," pp. 335 and 360). Fine's main conclusions run contrary to the results of the most recent Yugoslav research, but there is nothing wrong with that. One only wishes that the author's approach to the sources had been less speculative and more even-handed.

On the whole, Fine's book is an interesting contribution to the study of a very intricate and arcane subject. Fine deserves much praise for his effort, even though his conclusions are as controversial as any previously expressed on the Bosnian Church.

BARIŠA KREKIĆ

*University of California, Los Angeles*

LJUDEVIT GAJ AND THE ILLYRIAN MOVEMENT. By *Elinor Murray Despalatović*. East European Monographs, 12. Boulder, Colo.: *East European Quarterly*, 1975. x, 271 pp. \$12.00. Dist. by Columbia University Press, New York.

Professor Despalatović's book is the twelfth in the series of monographs published under the auspices of the *East European Quarterly*. It is the first effort in English to deal with the political career of Ljudevit Gaj, the father of the Croatian national renaissance, in a comprehensive fashion. Despalatović has expanded her doctoral dissertation to cover the 1840s, when the Illyrian movement which Gaj founded moved from the cultural to the political arena. The volume concludes with a brief exposé of Gaj's activity during the opening months of the 1848 revolts and his rapid fall from grace because of a bribery scandal.

Despite painstaking research into all available Croatian and many foreign sources, the central figure of Despalatović's work remains as enigmatic in his character and motivations as ever. Gaj's own papers—extensively pruned during his later years—allow no firm conclusions on most of the more interesting questions of his political goals and methods. As the author states, in dealing with the years after 1838, it is difficult or impossible to detect for whom and for what the founder of Illyrianism conceived himself to be working. Spinning intrigues, now with the Petersburg court, now with Polish exiles, and protesting his *Habsburgtreue* to a skeptical Metternich while cultivating expansionist aspirations in Serbia, Gaj flits through the pages of the present work in a bewildering multitude of allegiances. Perhaps the only consistencies in this patchwork life were those which brought him low in 1848: financial insecurity, and a notable opportunism in attempting to remedy it.

The present work's careful factual narrative serves in the end to reinforce the prevailing judgment: after the initial linguistic reforms and the foundation of the *Novine* and the *Danica* in the mid-1830s, Gaj's significant contributions to his people's history were finished. What came after was, so far as is now visible, primarily the work of others. By the time the bell of revolution tolled in 1848, Gaj had become adept at factional politics but was no longer the standard-bearer of national aspirations. His weakness is best illustrated by the essential pettiness of the charges which brought him down at age thirty-nine. He did not rise again, and the monuments went up to the befuddled Jellacic *faut de mieux*.

It is a pity that a series distributed by Columbia University Press cannot, apparently, afford the services of a good editor. The typographical errors are numerous enough to become a nuisance, and the typesetting and layout in no way serve to make the work more attractive. A skilled editor might also have assisted the author in overcoming several obvious reminders of the work's origin as a dissertation.

PHILIP J. ADLER

*East Carolina University*