

of the Yugoslav theory of nonalignment, Nord derives "general" and "socialist" goals against which Yugoslav foreign policy is evaluated. Content analyses of the final documents emanating from the first three Conferences of Nonaligned States (Belgrade, Cairo, and Lusaka) are utilized as an indicator of the success of nonalignment under normal diplomatic conditions, while Yugoslav actions during four international conflicts (the Middle East wars of 1956 and 1967 and the Soviet invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia) provide examples of how nonalignment fares under crisis conditions.

Nord makes several valuable contributions to the analysis of Yugoslav foreign policy. The rigorous comparative treatment of these diplomatic events forms an important supplement to traditional descriptions of nonalignment. The explicit differentiation of several facets of Yugoslav foreign policy provides the first step toward an assessment of this important question. Nord's quantification techniques should also be of interest to all students of Communist foreign policy.

On the other hand, more attention might have been paid to temporal shifts in Yugoslav foreign policy orientations. The specific distinction between "general" and "socialist" goals is not altogether convincing, and too little emphasis is given to the much noted "pragmatic" and "stimulative" bents of Yugoslav diplomacy. Also, a ranking of the relative importance of goals in specific situations (for example, security interests during the 1956 Middle East and Czechoslovak crises) might have furthered the analysis. Overall, though, the data developed by Nord are an interesting and significant contribution to the literature on nonalignment.

CAL CLARK

*New Mexico State University*

INCURSIUNI ÎN ISTORIOGRAFIA VIETȚII SOCIALE. By *Aurel Răduțiu*.

Cluj: Editura Dacia, 1973. 202 pp. Lei 7.25, paper.

The intention of this work is to provide an investigation into the historiography of Rumanian social history from the early chroniclers to the late nineteenth century. The period under consideration is seen by the author as significant both because it was the era during which social history first became a preoccupation of Rumanian historians and because it provides much of the data and direction for subsequent efforts. Especially crucial have been the twin problems of the origins of land proprietorship and the evolution of agrarian relationships. By focusing on these two questions, the author seeks to illuminate both controversies and proposed interpretations.

Given the scope of the study and the impressive amount of work invested in it, the author is to be commended for achieving both succinctness and comprehensiveness. His overview of the place of social history and social historical data in the writings of the chroniclers, Dimitrie Cantemir, and the scholars of the Rumanian enlightenment is informative. The bulk of the work is devoted, however, to a treatment of the nineteenth-century Rumanian writers M. Kogălniceanu, N. Bălcescu, A. P. Ilarian, G. Barițiu, I. Pușcariu, N. Densușianu, and B. P. Hasdeu. The author compactly characterizes the historical milieu of each and analyzes the place of social aspects in their works. Undoubtedly, the book will prove very helpful to those concerned with either Rumanian social history or Rumanian historiography.

The study concludes with the onset of historical positivism as a primary trend in late nineteenth-century Rumanian historiography; the author has projected a

second volume along the same lines to cover subsequent work. In light of the need for careful and methodical treatment of Rumanian social history, this unpretentious book provides both necessary groundwork and a welcome impetus to further investigations. There is also a useful bibliography.

PAUL E. MICHELSON  
*Huntington College*

THE DACIAN STONES SPEAK. By *Paul MacKendrick*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975. xxii, 248 pp. Illus. \$12.95.

MacKendrick has now written six books surveying parts of the Roman Empire in which he sketches the archaeological evidence bearing on cultural development. The present work covers most of Rumania (for example, ancient lower Moesia and Dacia) from the Neolithic era to the Slavic conquest of Histria in the seventh century after Christ. Initially his treatment is chronological, but in the Roman era chapters are topographical or topical (as on religion and the arts).

The author writes in a lively, personal style which sometimes produces exaggerated appreciations; where evidence is abundant, as in the Roman period, his account becomes almost a list of sites and emperors. He has traveled recently in Rumania, where he had good guides, and is at home in the literature cited in the bibliography; technical terms are duly explained. The lay reader will not be led seriously astray, but a serious student should not expect to gain any deep insight into the many ancient peculiarities of a land which still today differs markedly from its neighbors. Almost half the pages are given over to illustrations and plans, not all of them as sharply reproduced as might be wished; but, as a whole, the work is a pleasant perambulation over ground not often trodden by classical scholars.

CHESTER G. STARR  
*University of Michigan*

N. M. KARAMZIN'S PROSE: THE TELLER IN THE TALE. By *Roger B. Anderson*. Houston: Cordovan Press, 1974. 238 pp. \$8.95.

Mr. Anderson's is the third English-language doctoral dissertation on Karamzin to be published over the past decade. The other two are by Henry M. Nebel, Jr., *N. M. Karamzin: A Russian Sentimentalist* (1967) and by A. G. Cross, *N. M. Karamzin: A Study of His Literary Career (1783-1803)*, which appeared in 1971. In addition, Hans Rothe published a major study in 1968, *N. M. Karamzins europäische Reise: Der Beginn des russischen Romans*, and, following the pioneering work of Iurii Lotman, a host of articles on Karamzin's prose tales have appeared in Soviet journals and *sborniki*, as well as F. Z. Kanunova's monograph, *Iz istorii russkoi povesti (Istoriko-literaturnoe znachenie povestei N. M. Karamzina)*, published in 1967.

Mr. Anderson adds nothing to this considerable body of recent scholarship. His book manages to be both derivative and inadequately researched; it is also poorly organized and written in a bizarre, jargon-ridden style. His argument, that Karamzin's tales can be broken into three separate groups according to Karamzin's psychological mood at the time of composition and the point of view from which they are narrated, is contradicted by the facts he himself adduces. His criteria,