

AZ ELLENFORRADALOM NEMZETISÉGI POLITIKÁJÁNAK KIALAKULÁSA. By *Béla Bellér*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1975. 290 pp. 60 Ft.

Bellér has compiled an impressive array of information on early interwar Hungarian nationality policy. The narrative covers the rise and fall of Christian petite bourgeoisie hegemony (1919–21), when the ultra-conservative counterrevolution feigned a “new course” in minority policy. In fact, it furthered revisionism. The second phase was dominated by the aristocratic István Bethlen, a nationalist equally dedicated to Magyar supremacy. Bethlen sought to pacify the nationalities with illusory gains.

Bellér correctly states that the government’s duplicity was an attempt to cashier Swabian (German) aspirations. After Trianon, Swabian autonomy was quietly dropped and the Ministry of Nationalities phased out. Even moderate Swabians, led by the controversial Jakob Bleyer, soon despaired. To mollify them, Bethlen instituted what promised to be a new, liberal course. But chauvinistic administrators, subtly encouraged from Budapest, sabotaged minority education and the Swabian cultural association, the U.D.V. In 1924, the minority problem was not yet acute; but as Germany gathered strength, the Swabians gained importance. Bellér suggests that ill-treatment undermined Swabian loyalty and encouraged future conflict involving the revitalized German Reich. This is debatable. The post-war nationalistic hysteria would have undoubtedly claimed the Swabians in any event.

This is a praiseworthy, meticulously researched monograph. Bellér has re-examined such half-forgotten episodes as Bethlen’s abortive plans for Slovakia’s subversion in league with Poland, and the machinations of the Ministry of Nationalities, mainly in the Successor States—especially its sinister plottings involving Slovak, Carpatho-Ukrainian, and Burgenland separatism. Bellér has consulted nearly all Hungarian primary and secondary sources and a respectable number of Western authors, but he has, unfortunately, ignored G. C. Paikert’s contributions, and the copious archival repositories in Vienna, Bonn, and Koblenz. Aside from his questionable use of the term “fascist,” and frequent allusions to class struggle, Bellér has provided a balanced and fair treatment of an important and neglected chapter in Central European history.

THOMAS SPIRA

University of Prince Edward Island

COMMUNAL FAMILIES IN THE BALKANS: THE ZADRUGA. ESSAYS BY PHILIP E. MOSELY AND ESSAYS IN HIS HONOR. Edited by *Robert F. Byrnes*. Introduction by *Margaret Mead*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976. xxxii, 285 pp. \$14.95.

This volume is a fitting tribute to Philip Mosely. It represents a genuine contribution to knowledge in an area which deeply interested Mosely at an early stage in his career: the changing socioeconomic structure of the peasant household; more precisely, the extended family commune, or *zadruga*, in southeastern Europe. Unfortunately, his untimely death in 1972 did not permit him to return to this topic upon retirement, as he had long planned to do. But, from his articles reprinted here, it is clear that he had already made a major contribution to the study of the *zadruga* on the basis of extensive field work in the Balkans in the late 1930s.

Of particular note here is his pioneering in-depth study of the Slavonian Varžić *zadruga*, whose survival demonstrated to Mosely that the institution continued to manifest considerable viability in modern times under appropriate conditions. Among his most enduring findings was the absence among the peasants of any perceived dichotomy between the nuclear family household and the *zadruga*. Over time, a given family line might alternate between the two, as *zadrugas* eventually split and nuclear families expanded into new *zadrugas* by encompassing succeeding generations.

Another of Mosely's contributions was his threefold delineation of geographical zones of survival or disappearance of the *zadruga* as a dominant mode of peasant life-activity. From this scheme he attempted to hypothesize political, social, and economic causes for the *zadruga's* continuation or decline. His conclusion that the *zadruga* was most viable in a pioneer setting where new lands were to be cleared was not entirely borne out by subsequent studies.

Thus, Daniel Chiroț's article on the Rumanian communal village shows quite convincingly why the *zadruga* did not develop in that country despite the presence of conditions very similar to those Mosely described. In Rumania, the communal village provided a "functional alternative" not based on the extended family. Eugene Hammel offers some interesting historical evidence of the development of the *zadruga* in medieval Serbia, emphasizing the flexibility of structure then as in later periods. He points out that similar arrangements existed outside of the Balkans, although the *zadruga* format was especially common there. This is a point mentioned by other contributors, most notably by Emile Sicard, who perhaps glosses over too many distinctive elements in arguing that the extended family commune is a "natural stage" in the evolution of property and family relationships in an agrarian milieu.

The book contains three interesting accounts of personal family experiences in *zadrugas* by Wayne Vucinich, Jozo Tomasevich, and Ante Kadić. There are also very valuable treatments of vital existing *zadrugas* in Macedonia (by David Rheubottom) and Kosovo (by C. J. Grossmith), both based on recent field research. Space limitations prohibit further discussion of these and other extremely worthwhile contributions. In short, this is a meaty compendium indeed. Philip Mosely's memory is well served by it.

ROBERT F. MILLER

The Australian National University, Canberra

KRAJ SRPSKOG CARSTVA. By *Rade Mihaljčić*. Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1975. 325 pp.

It has usually been accepted that the disintegration of the Serbian empire of the Nemanjići began immediately after the death of its founder, Tsar Dušan, in 1355. The causes were inherent in the empire's organization. By conquering Byzantine provinces, Dušan brought in all the weaknesses of the Byzantine feudal system, and by rapid territorial expansion, the Nemanjići exceeded their power to govern. They had no time to assimilate the different territorial acquisitions into the stronger and healthier administrative organism of their "Serbian lands." The Church was granted large privileges, and the *pronoia* system was gradually abandoned. All these and other developments undermined the central authority, reduced the military capacity of the state, and favored the emergence of separate feudal entities.