

Keith Hitchens, *Orthodoxy and Nationality: Andreiu Şaguna and the Rumanians of Transylvania, 1846-1873*, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1977, pp. ix + 332.

The book is the ninety-fourth monograph of the "Harvard Historical Studies" published under the direction of the Department of History of Harvard University.

It is divided into ten chapters of which the most important are rather the last four entitled: "Orthodoxy, Serbes, and Uniates", "Secularism", "Church and State", "Social Activism".

The book's main objective is to describe "the political and cultural development of the Rumanians of Transylvania during the two crucial decades that preceded the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867" and the role of the Rumanian Orthodox Church, and especially the contribution of the metropolitan Andreiu Şaguna and the Rumanian intellectuals to the national survival of Rumania. Rightly it is emphasized that Şaguna and the intellectuals provided the motive force of Rumanian national development by the tension they created until the union of Transylvania with the kingdom of Rumania in 1918.

Mr. Hitchens' research elucidates and reevaluates many obscure and long overlooked though extremely important aspects of Şaguna's political and ecclesiastical activities. It is the first complete, factual, and well-documented account of the significant role played by Şaguna and the Orthodox Church in the Rumanians' struggle for national rights in the Habsburg Monarchy and their contribution to the creation of the modern Rumanian state. The sympathetic treatment given Şaguna by Ojetea, the Giurescus, and especially by Hitchens suggests that the dogmatism of the 1950s and early 1960s has moderated sufficiently to allow judgments of historical figures to be made within the context of their own times.

He somewhat idealizes Şaguna's christian and political convictions, educational reform, and unselfish motivation (pp. 46, 51-52, 56-57, 87, 88, 89, 93, 122, 174, 175, 190, 197, 249, 276, 283-4). Undoubtedly, Şaguna was a controversial figure in his times and country. He was accused by some as too conciliatory to the old regime and not nationalistic enough and by others as too nationalistic (pp. 161, 163, 175, 214, 218, 250-1). His political philosophy, however, was peace with and obedience to law and to a higher morality operating in politics (pp. 87-89, 117, 122, 227). Şaguna is more or less designated and accepted by the author as a political realist and social activist, prudent, cunning, courageous, foresighted and wise ethnarch, despite his occasional servile loyalty to the imperial house and his stubborn and autocratic attitude (cp. pp. 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 100, 118, 119, 136, 143, 161-2, 231, 245, 257). His political program can be summarized in his dictum that the most effective way to defend and achieve the autonomy of Transylvania, was to participate fully in the political life of the state (p. 156). And I think Mr. Hitchens is right in stating that "during his long episcopate the (Rumanian) Orthodox Church became a far more active social force than it had been at any time in the preceding century and a half" (p. 174). However, Şaguna as pictured by Mr. Hitchens appears to be too autocratic and hierocratic distorting rather the church organization of early Christianity (p. 245-6, 247, 265) in his effort to eliminate lay participation in the administration and activities of his bishopric.

As a result of his effort to idealize Şaguna's character, the author tends to believe, in agreement with hero's concept, that the Orthodox Church is a national institution and that its national claims and features can be supported by the decisions and opinions of the Ecumenical Councils! (p. 176, 215). Such a generalizing view of the Orthodox Church is diametrically opposite to the international and ecumenical activities and history of the Byzantine Church, as well as of the post-Byzantine Patriarchate of Constantinople. Furthermore it is not clear in the author's mind and treatment whether Şaguna was an ecclesiastical re-

former thoroughly motivated by denominational fanaticism or a national leader (pp. 197, 198, 213, 214, 215, 217, 220, 261, 272, 277, 278). The author, as a result, justifies Şaguna's bitter opposition to the Uniates (p. 254, 260), as well as to the leader of the Rumanian intellectuals, Simion Bărnuţiu (pp. 205, 206, 208, 209-218, 279). Moreover, Şaguna's views on ecclesiastical autonomy and nationality as presented by the author, are not free of contradiction and ambivalence (pp. 253-4, 245-6, 257, 262, 263-4, 272, 278).

Mr. Hitchins seems to have made a conscientious and critical use of the sources, the archives of the metropolis of Sibiu and Karlovci, the Austrian State Archives in Vienna, the pastoral letters of Şaguna and other correspondence of the period, the archives of Budapest and Bucharest, as well as of the newspapers *Gazeta de Transilvania* (1838-1873), *Telegraful Român* (1853-1873), *Foaia pentu minte, inimă şi literatură* (1838-1865), and modern bibliography.

*Suny, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.*

CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS

Mihail Lazarov, *Bălgarija na Balkanite, 1944-1974, Bibliografija* [Bulgaria in the Balkans, 1944-1974, Bibliography], Sofia, BAN [Institut za balkanistika], 1975, pp. 372.

The study of Balkan problems in all branches of scholarship and politics as well is impossible without the systematic classification of the publications relating to these problems, especially at a time when the difficulties of up-to-date bibliographical knowledge are continually growing. Consequently, every bibliographical work which contributes to this classification constitutes a considerable scholarly contribution to Balkan studies. I note here the importance of the "Bibliographie d'Etudes Balkaniques" (1966, and following) published by the Bibliographical Centre of the Balkan Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia and of the "Βαλκανική Βιβλιογραφία" [Balkan Bibliography] (1973, and following) published by the Institute for Balkan Studies in Thessaloniki. The above bibliographies fill a gap since the publication of "Südost-europa-Bibliographie" occurs with great delay.

One of the recent publications of the Bibliographical Centre of the Balkan Institute of Sofia, a contribution to the study of contemporary Balkan problems, is the work of Mihail Lazarov, "Bulgaria in the Balkans, 1944-1974, a Bibliography". He records the publications of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in the period from the end of the second world war until 1974 which concern the development of the Balkan countries during the last thirty years and which were written by Bulgarian and foreign writers. More especially, apart from books and chapters of books, a classification is made of articles from 142 periodicals and 52 series of editions (Year Books, Bulletins etc), reports of congresses, symposia and also doctoral treatises by Bulgarian or foreign researchers defended in Bulgaria.

The rich material (2,560 entries) is classified systematically first according to subject and then, within the subjects, where necessary, by country (the Balkans generally, Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Rumania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia) and in alphabetical order of entries, in accordance with the Cyrillic alphabet. Then follow the publications in the latin alphabet. The themes in which the entries are classified cover all the aspects of life and science in the last thirty years in the Balkan area: Politics, Economy, Philosophy, Law, Political History, Military History, Cultural History, Geography, Philology, Education, Medicine, Art, the Press, Communications, Sport, and so on. After every title there is recorded, when they exist,