

varies not only among the communist states, but also within each country.

The details of these processes are systematically offered in each chapter (although they are somewhat of an uneven quality). Generally, the surveys and analyses are very satisfactory, supported by numerous references. In its wider implications, the study opens vistas not yet scanned.

City University of New York

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer (Eds.), *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, Washington D. C., University of Washington Press, 1969, pp. X + 465.

Despite many attempts of varied theoretical sophistication in the last few years to increase our understanding of the nature of nationalism as a crucial ingredient in the emergence of the modern world system, the subject still remains regrettably obscure and suprisingly devoid of significant contributions since the works of Kohn, Hayes, and Deutch appeared a number of years ago.

At the same time, while some more concerted efforts in that direction have been made with respect to defining the nature and content of nationalism in the emerging third world states, as well as, more recently, in western Europe (see the recent work edited by Charles Tilly), eastern Europe has received very little attention in this respect, other than the lip service paid to it in general treatments of the subject which view nationalism in that area as a mere reflection and mimesis of the same phenomenon in western Europe, in fact as simply the export of nationalism from western to eastern Europe in the age of «isms», after the French Revolution.

In this respect, the work under review which attempts to demonstrate the essential qualitative differences between these two kinds of nationalism constitutes a new and important contribution to our understanding of east European nationalism, and should definitely be welcomed.

The volume brings together the essays of a number of well-known and respected historians, most of whom are natives of the countries which they treat. Their command of the native languages of the countries surveyed and their knowledge of the cultures analyzed is an obvious strength of the book which, along with a rich bibliography, offers the western reader a wealth of material not otherwise easily accessible because of the language barrier. Although the book suffers, in parts, from the usual unevenness of collective works, the overall product is basically balanced and convincing in the points it treats. Of particular interest are Fischer-Galati's treatment of the antisemitic content of greater Romanian nationalism, and Lederer's analysis of the stresses and strains that went into the making of Yugoslav nationalism. Especially challenging, above all, is Sugar's introduction to the whole work which seeks to provide an overall statement on the nature of east European nationalism, to establish the essential differences which distinguish it from its western counterpart, to underline its historicist vein as a crucial ingredient that went into defining it, and, finally, to attempt to provide us with a typology of four distinct kinds of nationalism that should be seen as existing within the general phenomenon of east European nationalism. At the same time, one of the weaknesses of the volume is that the distinction between popular, bureaucratic, aristocratic and bourgeois nationalisms offered by Sugar is not pursued by the authors in their separate essays.

Ultimately, however, the greatest flaw of this volume arises precisely from its area of success: while asserting the distinctiveness of eastern European nationalism

as against that of western Europe, it does not attempt to establish the nature of the relationship between the two, a relationship, let it be said, which not only defines the differences between the two areas but also the differences between northern and southern east-European nationalism, or, in other words, the nationalisms which emerged in the Ottoman as opposed to the non-Ottoman territories of eastern Europe.

Crucial in the former distinction is the rise of capitalism in the West in what Fernand Braudel has called «the long 16th century». It was in the course of this period that the emergence of a powerful capitalist system in the states of north-western Europe brought about the gradual but unmistakable decline in the states of eastern Europe, transforming them, according to Immanuel Wallerstein, into a periphery of the emerging «European world-economy». This phenomenon of «second feudalism» which transformed north-eastern Europe into an essential colony of the rising West is of crucial significance, for example, in any attempt to understand what Sugar calls the aristocratic nature of Polish and Hungarian nationalisms when they eventually came about. At the same time, the nature of nationalism in the Balkans, which were for the most part Ottoman-held territories, should also be understood in the dual context of: a) the fact that the Ottoman empire remained for a while an economic system which lay outside the emerging «European world-economy», and thus was not from the outset transformed into a periphery of the new capitalist system; and b) the fact that, when the Empire was subjected to the penetrating impact of expansive western European commercial capitalism in the 17th and 18th centuries, by virtue of what Professor Inalcik has termed the Ottoman traditional disdain for commercial activities, nationalism became to a large extent identified with the activities of Orthodox and, very often, Greek Balkan merchants who, forming an inter-Balkan elite, served as a vehicle of national reawakening in these areas. Apart from Wallerstein's very recent statement, the works of Stoianovich and Svoronos on the Balkans have long treated the subject from this perspective.

Ultimately also it may be argued that the emphasis on the glories of the past — whether real or imaginary — which, as Sugar points out, constitutes a major distinctive characteristic of east European nationalism (or in other words, a mechanism of national integration) may be better understood in the light of an analysis which lays emphasis on the unequal but dialectic nature of the relationship between the two Europes than by merely asserting their undeniable qualitative differences. In this sense then the essays contained in this volume (which are more essays in political history than on nationalism) should be viewed as valuable material for a fresh reexamination of the whole phenomenon of eastern European nationalism within a more synthetic and comprehensive framework.

State University of New York
Orange Country Comm. College

NIKIFOROS P. DIAMANDOUROS

Aziz S. Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity*, Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press, 1968, pp. xiv + 486 + pl. 19.

Professor Atiya's book on the *History of Eastern Christianity* has long since established itself in the standard bibliographies on Eastern Christendom. Actually, it should not be called the *History of Eastern Christianity*, because it does not include the Greek Orthodox Church but rather is a history of the non-Chalcedonian or