

Although not intended to be a history of eighteenth-century Rumania, the book provides a wealth of information on many other subjects (e.g., social classes in Rumania, inter-Balkan cooperation). One must add that it suffers from certain infelicities of translation and would have benefited from a more rigorous copy-editing. On the whole, however, the book's comprehensive analysis of the political ideas of the Phanariot era is both much needed and usefully done.

PAUL E. MICHELSON
Indiana University

LIMBA DOCUMENTELOR SLAVO-ROMĂNE EMISE ÎN ȚARA ROMĂNEASCĂ ÎN SEC. XIV ȘI XV. By *Lucia Djamo-Diaconișă*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1971. 397 pp. Lei 25.

Rumanians, Russians, Bulgars, and Serbs have written about the Rumanian Church Slavonic recension. In determining its place in the general scheme of Church Slavonic and analyzing it as a system, they have demonstrated how its study has helped Slavists. They have indicated its three subtypes: Wallachian, Moldavian, and Transylvanian. The author belongs to this tradition and has contributed much. In the present work she has made the first full study of the language of the oldest group of Wallachian documents (those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) and has also provided a picture of the gradual growth of Rumanian national awareness which these texts reflect. She answers an important question: Were the writers of Rumanian Slavonic texts mostly Rumanians or Slavs? If they were Rumanians, then Rumanian Slavonic was primarily the written language of a non-Slavic people; if they were Slavs, then Rumanian Slavonic reflected a living Slavic dialect. The author proves they were Rumanians.

The author classifies the documents as either official acts of state characterized by conservative style or personal correspondence characterized by innovations. In describing their language she devotes chapters to orthography, phonetics, morphology, and lexicon. There is no special part for syntax or phraseology. Rumanian influence is discussed both in a section on Rumanian elements and elsewhere. The influences of Slavonic orthographic traditions and Slavic spoken languages are mentioned throughout the book, while Hungarian, German, Italian, Greek, and Turkish influences are indicated in the chapter on lexicon.

Although her approach is fundamentally philological, the author effectively uses linguistic data to prove her points. Aside from misprints and other minor errors, I find one major shortcoming. The book often lacks the linguist's systematic approach, particularly in the chapter on phonetics, where the sounds of the language are not presented as parts of a system of oppositions. Still, I recommend this book as highly interesting to Slavists and students of Rumanian.

HARVEY E. MAYER
California State University at Fullerton