

are otherwise inexplicable. The authors could have enhanced the significance of what preoccupied Rumanian intellectuals if they had placed them in the broader context of the *European* generation of 1848. As it is, comparisons have been limited mainly to eighteenth-century Transylvania. These objections notwithstanding, the work remains a significant contribution to the elucidation of the revolution of 1848 in Central Europe.

KEITH HITCHINS

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

TWENTIETH CENTURY RUMANIA. By *Stephen Fischer-Galați*. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1970. x, 248 pp. \$7.95.

The author has chosen historical change and continuity as his main theme. His purpose is to examine the validity of the present regime's claim that the Socialist Republic of Rumania represents the fulfillment of the Rumanian people's age-old aspirations. Three chapters deal with the period before 1944 and six with the installation and evolution of the Communist system. Throughout, the author confines himself mainly to political history.

Perhaps the most important single ingredient in the Rumanian historical tradition is nationalism—specifically, the idea of the essential oneness of the Rumanian people. Although the author rightly criticizes the extreme nationalist interpretation of the Rumanians' struggle for political unity before 1918, he does not fully appreciate the mutual concern which Rumanians on both sides of the Carpathians had for one another. The newspapers and private correspondence of the time clearly reveal the strength of national feeling. It seems to me that the author misjudges the attitude of the Rumanians of Transylvania toward both the Habsburg emperor and the Old Kingdom. Contrary to his views, loyalty to the first was fragile after the Compromise of 1867, and it was not "opposition to socio-economic and political modernization" in Rumania that prevented the Transylvanian Rumanians from accepting the political leadership of Bucharest but rather their repugnance toward the political system there and its failure to bring about meaningful social reform.

As far as the interwar period is concerned, the author gives Ion I. C. Brătianu, King Carol II, and Marshal Antonescu their due. He is a little hard on Iuliu Maniu, who emerges as a prude and a shallow democrat. The Jewish question and the nationality problem, both continuing themes in late nineteenth and twentieth-century Rumanian history, are quickly passed over. The Iron Guard and fascism are treated at some length, but other ideologies and intellectual currents are largely ignored. The literature of the period is mentioned briefly in a later chapter. Its representatives are inaccurately characterized as "less distinguished" than the writers of the nineteenth century, and Victor Eftimiu and Cezar Petrescu are cited along with Mihail Sadoveanu as major figures. In fact, the twenties and thirties witnessed brilliant innovation and productivity and the maturing of modern Rumanian literature; and Eftimiu and Petrescu, though popular, belong to the second rank.

In describing Rumania's development under communism, the author gives particular attention to the national current in the Rumanian Communist movement and demonstrates that the policies pursued by Gheorghiu-Dej and Ceaușescu in the sixties had their origins in the preceding decade. The struggle between the "Muscovites" and the "Rumanians" within the Rumanian Communist Party and the con-

flict between it and the Soviet Communist Party are described in detail. Economic development, the status of the worker and peasant, public opinion, the nationality problem, and intellectual life are dealt with in more cursory fashion.

The author has put together a useful survey, but has not, in my opinion, gone deeply enough into the problem of continuity and change. Adequate treatment of it would require the study of intellectual and spiritual development and the evolution of institutions. The author has relied heavily upon secondary works in English; and the monographs, interpretive works, collections of sources, and newspapers in Rumanian have hardly been touched. Perhaps this is why the three introductory chapters are superficial and the remaining ones seldom take us beyond what is already known.

KEITH HITCHINS

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

THE MEMOIRS OF PROTA MATIJA NENADOVIĆ. Edited and translated from the Serbian by *Lovett F. Edwards*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969. 1, 227 pp. \$7.00.

Prota (Archpriest) Matija Nenadović is known mainly as the diplomat of the First Serb Revolt (1804–13); he visited Russia in 1804–5 and was a steadfast admirer of Russia during the rest of his long life. He has long deserved more than the bare mention he gets in the historical literature outside Yugoslavia.

Nenadović was a remarkable man. Although his education was surprisingly meager considering the means of his family and the schools available, he made an excellent impression in Russia at the relatively early age of thirty. He was a capable negotiator; he was always able to deal with the Turks in the midst of a revolt which he helped to start, made a valiant effort at the Congress of Vienna where he obtained an audience from Emperor Francis, and was often used by the princes of Serbia to settle complicated domestic and foreign issues.

He served Serbia as a statesman and administrator from 1807, when he became the first president of his country's first Legislative Council, until he retired from politics for the third and final time in 1852. He was an independent who was ready to disagree even with his own politically very important family, to oppose on a few key issues the leader of the revolt, Alexander Karageorge, and the first two princes of Serbia, Miloš and Michael Obrenović. As a result his life was often in danger, and once he knew prison and exile too, although only for a short period.

During the First Serb Revolt, Nenadović was one of his country's most important military field commanders, and during the second revolt (1813–14) he occupied himself with smuggling arms into his country before he returned to serve it again as a diplomat. It is not surprising that such an active, versatile man wrote memoirs; what is surprising is that in them he proved to be an excellent historian. Modern scholarship has found relatively few and minor errors in his work, which Vuk Stefan Karadžić, the poet-historian, used as one of the main sources for his history of the Serb Revolt and which also served Leopold von Ranke in writing his famous *History of Serbia*. This good history is superbly written. Edwards is absolutely correct when he states that "the opening pages of the Memoirs are among the most beautiful in the Serbian language."

Edwards has translated these memoirs and also some shorter historical