

nisme" et les "Sources" se complètera – ce que nous souhaitons et attendons – le grand public, les étudiants, les enseignants et même les spécialistes, tous les néo-grecs, pourront connaître mieux et plus profondément le passé récent de leur Nation, ses racines même.

Avant de terminer ces notes, nous jugeons nécessaire de souligner la signification que peut avoir ce livre pour les étrangers eux-mêmes. A une époque, où l'enseignement des études néo-helléniques en général gagne du terrain dans les universités d'Europe et des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, les "Sources de l'Histoire du Néo-Hellénisme" du professeur Vacalopoulos, avec les deux volumes déjà parus de son "Histoire," constituent une étude de base pour chaque spécialiste étranger des études néo-helléniques qui voudrait connaître ou enseigner d'une manière plus systématique l'histoire récente de l'Hellénisme.

Institute for Balkan Studies

S. I. PAPADOPOULOS

Silviu Dragomir, *Avram Iancu*. Bucuresti, Editura științifică, 1965. Pp. 304.

The present work is much more than the biography of a national leader and military hero; it is the final synthesis of a life-long study of the struggle of the Rumanians of Transylvania for national self-determination.

Silviu Dragomir, professor of Southeastern European history at the University of Cluj from 1919 until 1947 and a member of the Rumanian Academy from 1928 until 1947, was the author of numerous fundamental studies concerning the Rumanian national movement in Transylvania between the beginning of the eighteenth century and the union of Transylvania with the Kingdom of Rumania in 1918. The center of his interests was the revolution of 1848, and the work which surpasses all other accounts by virtue of the richness of its documentation and the rigorousness of its scholarship is *Studii și documente privitoare la revoluția românilor din Transilvania în anii 1948-49* [Studies and Documents concerning the Revolution of the Rumanians of Transylvania in 1948-49], of which four volumes appeared between 1944 and 1946. The first volume contains unpublished documents from the Ministries of War, Justice, and the Interior in Vienna; the second, documents from the Rumanian Academy in Bucharest and the Transylvanian Museum in Cluj; and the third, documents from the Kossuth Archive of the National Archives in Budapest. The fourth volume, based partly

upon this material and his numerous shorter studies, is an ambitious re-interpretation of the revolution and the Rumanian role in it, which superseded everything which had been written on the subject up to that time. Part one, dealing with the events of 1848, was published in 1946; part two, which brought the narrative down to the fall of 1849, remained in manuscript. The present study, *Avram Iancu*, incorporates much of this earlier material. Before his death in 1962, at the age of 73, Professor Dragomir was actively engaged in a major project undertaken by the Institute of History in Cluj to publish a multi-volume corpus of documents dealing with the revolution of 1848 assembled from numerous Rumanian and foreign archives.

Of all the participants in the revolutions of 1848 probably none is more deserving of the epithet "tragic figure" than Avram Iancu. Twenty-four years old and newly embarked upon a career in the law in the spring of 1848, he rejoiced at the news of Metternich's fall and of the proclamation by the youth of Budapest of the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, for he believed that these events heralded a new era of well-being and progress for his people. He enthusiastically embraced the principles of political liberalism and social justice which his Magyar colleagues in Tirgu-Mures proclaimed, but at the same time was repelled by their intolerant nationalism which denied to the Rumanians the same rights to self-determination which they themselves demanded from Austria. The Magyar liberals in Budapest and Cluj did, indeed, offer the Rumanians individual liberty and equality, but refused them any semblance of national autonomy and insisted upon the union of Transylvania with Hungary. The majority of Rumanian leaders, including Iancu, welcomed the former, but flatly rejected the union as a sentence of death for their nationality. As the prospects of a compromise became increasingly remote owing to the repressive measures of Magyar authorities and to armed clashes between Magyar and Szekler soldiers and Rumanian peasants, Rumanian leaders of necessity allied themselves with Austria, which had its own account to settle with the Magyars. From the fall of 1848 until the final defeat of Magyar revolutionary armies in the summer of 1849, Iancu organized and led the resistance of Rumanian peasants of the Munții Apuseni (Western Mountains) against the Hungarian revolutionary armies. They sacrificed their lives and possessions to defend the cause of the Habsburgs in the hope that their aspirations for national self-determination would finally be satisfied. The Court and those who served it, however,

had little sympathy for nationalism, which they regarded as a grave danger to the centralized monarchy which they intended to force upon Magyar "rebel" and Rumanian and Slav "ally" alike.

After the war Iancu refused the decorations which were offered him and insisted instead upon the "decoration of his people by the satisfaction of the promises made to them." His continued "agitation" led to his arrest and brief imprisonment. With his hopes for the future of his people shattered and convinced of the futility of his own efforts on their behalf, he suffered a mental and physical breakdown. He spent the last twenty years of his life in near poverty wandering from place to place in the Munții Apuseni, and never again participated actively in the political life of his nation. He died in 1872 on a straw mat in the house of a baker friend.

In describing Iancu's defense of the Munții Apuseni, Professor Dragomir treats in some detail two matters which were of fundamental importance to the future of the Rumanian national movement in Transylvania: Magyar-Rumanian and Austro-Rumanian relations.

He regards the inability of the Magyars and the Rumanians to resolve their differences as a catastrophe for both peoples, in that it facilitated the victory of conservatism and thereby frustrated their own national and liberal aspirations. Although he can explain why Magyar leader refused to grant the Rumanians autonomy, he cannot excuse them, and, rightly, it seems to this reviewer, ascribes to them the chief responsibility for the animosity and bloodshed which divided two peoples with similar aspirations. It is significant for what might have been that, at the beginning of August 1849, after the cruel battles of the winter and spring and as Austrian and Russian armies were about to complete the destruction of the Hungarian independence movement, Iancu could promise Louis Kossuth, as a demonstration of "our brotherly feelings toward . . . the Hungarian people," that in the decisive battle at hand his forces would remain.

It was, Professor Dragomir argues, the impasse with the Magyars and the threat to their national existence which the union of Transylvania with Hungary posed which caused the Rumanians to turn in self-defense to the Austrians. Rumanian leaders, including Iancu, had no illusion about the anti-liberal and anti-national character of the pre-1848 Habsburg regime, but hoped that out of the present struggles a new Monarchy would arise based upon more enlightened principles than those of centralization and absolutism. Until the spring of 1849,

Austrian leaders encouraged the Rumanians in their delusion with half-promises about self-determination and the "satisfaction of their just grievances." However, when the Rumanian peasant soldiers were no longer necessary for the defense of the Monarchy, even the half-promises were forgotten. Iancu, from his contact with Austrian military commanders, perceived early the duplicity of his "allies." They never genuinely co-operated with Iancu and other Rumanian prefects because they regarded the Rumanian peasant with disdain and distrust and were, consequently, little inclined to supply him with provisions and weapons.

Around the figure of Avram Iancu Professor Dragomir has woven an engaging narrative of the revolution of 1848 in Transylvania. He has made wide use of both Rumanian and Hungarian sources and has preserved an admirable objectivity. *Avram Iancu* is a major contribution to the interpretative literature on the revolution of 1848 and deserves the attention of every scholar who wishes to understand its course in Eastern Europe.

University of Illinois

KEITH HITCHINS

Pandelis Prevelakis, *The Sun of Death*, translated by Philip Sherrard.
London: John Murray, 1965. 206 pp.

This is a translation, praiseworthy for the naturalness of its style, of a novel about life in Crete during the first world war. In 1960 it was awarded the prize in Athens as the best novel of the year. The story is relatively short. Yet it compellingly grips the reader's mind and heart with its scenes of life —and death— on the island which as one of western civilisation's cradles is a very fit setting for events which have "the timelessness of any classic." As in an ancient Greek tragedy, the plot moves inexorably onwards to the murder of Aunt Rousaki in the novel's last two paragraphs just as she said "I heard there's no killing in holy week." It would be hard to find a tale in world literature that could more deeply sear the feelings.

The claims made (on the dust-jacket) for the greatness of Yorgaki's Aunt are fully justified. She is the novel's heroine, the "one unique sun" around whom the local life revolves—"a character worthy to rank with the greatest in her completeness and in the lasting impression she makes." She shows the penetrative imagination of poetic genius as when she tells of how the South Wind was sent by God against the North: "Blowing gently it melted the palace and only the tears of the North Wind were