

inspire the present. The author's discussion of the problem and his selection of sources are excellent. He points out how the historians of this school further refined the critical techniques of their craft and how they developed and employed the auxiliary sciences.

But it is only with the antiromantic and positivist currents of the end of the nineteenth century that we come to modern critical history. The works of Xenopol, Iorga, Bogdan, Dimitrie Onciul, and Vasile Pârvan raised Rumanian historiography to a European level, and their preoccupations with the scientific and philosophical nature of history reveal both the sophistication which Rumanian historiography had attained and the debt which they themselves owed to their German and French masters. Teodor has included in his anthology some of the great theoretical writings of these men: Xenopol's "Opening Lecture" in his course at the University of Iași in 1883 and his "Short Exposition of the Fundamental Principles of History" (1899), Bogdan's "Rumanian Historiography and Its Problems" (1905), Onciul's "The Epochs of Rumanian History and Their Division" (1906), and Iorga's "Two Historical Concepts" (1911). One wishes that this important phase could have been examined in more detail. The volume closes with a brief commentary on the rise of historical materialism and a selection from a work of one of its leading representatives, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu.

Professor Teodor has given us an enlightened overview of his subject. Western scholars, in particular, will find the introduction, the prefaces to each author's works, and the comprehensive bibliographies a valuable introduction to Rumanian historiography.

KEITH HITCHINS

*University of Illinois, Urbana*

#### RELAȚII AGRARE ȘI MIȘCĂRI ȚĂRĂNEȘTI ÎN ROMÂNIA, 1908–1921.

By *Vasile Liveanu et al.* Bucharest: Editura Politică, 1967. 629 pp. Lei 23.

Previously there has been considerable study of the agrarian history of Rumania preceding the 1907 uprising and during the 1918–21 reforms, but *Relații agrare* breaks new ground in providing a detailed account of the 1908–18 interval as well as of the postwar reform period. It provides a valuable guide to the source material and presents much information, including helpful statistical data.

Unfortunately the apparatus has some defects. There is no bibliography, as in the case of other recent studies published in Rumania, so that one must look up sources in the scattered footnotes. There is no index of subjects or of persons, but only one focusing on place names—mainly some five thousand Rumanian communes. The text would have been improved by further division into subsections; for example, the 100 pages of part 3, chapter 1, bear only the general title "The Agrarian Problem and the Peasant Situation Between 1919 and 1921."

Of particular interest is this book's position in contemporary Rumanian historiography. As already pointed out in a review by C. Murgescu (*Studii*, 1969, pp. 1001–3), *Relații agrare* departs from the earlier Marxist-Leninist position that pre-1918 Rumanian agriculture was already well on its way to modernization. The authors stress that, on the contrary, agriculture was still extremely backward—a much more realistic view. It is a pity that a work of such importance does not devote more than the briefest attention to contrasting its position with that of earlier works. The pioneer work by I. Adam and N. Marcu (*Studii despre dezvolt-*

*țarea capitalismului în agricultura României după reforma din 1864*, Bucharest, 2 vols., 1956, 1959) is only briefly discussed. Practically nothing is said about David Mitrany's classic, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* (London, 1930).

The authors' opinion that Rumanian agriculture during this period was still backward is paralleled by their assertion that industry was also still primitive. From this second point they have chosen to draw the important conclusion that during 1918–21 "the workers' movement was not able . . . to attract the peasant movement's support," just because the industrial workers were still such a relatively insignificant political force (p. 413). In contrast, earlier Marxist-Leninist views tended to blame the failure of a worker-peasant alliance during this period simply on the absence of a strong Communist party (see, for example, *Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană*, vol. 2, Bucharest, 1962, pp. 32–40).

The authors feel that real modernization in agriculture began only during the interwar period. In this respect they strongly praise the 1921 land reform as a step in the right direction, since it greatly reduced the large estates, which until then for the most part had opposed such modernization (pp. 595–96). Here too the book differs from earlier interpretations, which were distinctly less sympathetic to the reform (*Studii și materiale*, 2:463–74, and vol. 1, Bucharest, 1956, pp. 90–93), and which saw it only as an effort to *prevent* meaningful social and economic change.

But although the authors stress the benefits to agriculture which they feel the land reform of 1921 brought, they do not successfully deal with the more significant question whether or not it was ever meant to help the industrialization of the country. *Relații agrare* maintains that during the 1930s more and more land was falling into the hands of the bigger, wealthier peasants, at the expense of the less efficient small peasants—a sign of the capitalistic transformation of agriculture, suggesting that the reform indeed may have created conditions favorable to industrialization. Yet the authors' definition of "big peasant" applies to holders of properties of between ten and fifty hectares (p. 585); as they admit, such properties employed hired labor because they were too big to be cultivated simply by the owner and his family (p. 56).

Therefore, is it correct to call such landowners "big peasants"? They were much more like small landlords. Thus the authors have unintentionally revealed quite a different result of the 1921 reform from the one they claim. Instead of the development of a strong peasant middle class, the class that really profited was the small landlords, implying that most of the peasants were still not self-sufficient by the end of the interwar period. In any case, although the reform may have led to a certain increase in agricultural growth, it is doubtful that the prevalence of many small peasants was at all conducive to any meaningful industrial development. This is especially true inasmuch as there is no evidence that these landowners were organized in any form of cooperative association, but rather were still cultivating their land on an individual basis.

PHILIP EIDELBERG  
New York City

MODERN ROMANIAN. By James E. Augerot and Florin D. Popescu. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1971. xiii, 329 pp. \$12.00.

Until recently there was no truly up-to-date Rumanian textbook for English speakers. The publication of two excellent works, Cazacu et al. (1969) and Murrell and Ștefănescu-Drăgănești (1970), was therefore particularly welcome. Much