

factions in Yugoslavia; and, of course, there is not even a hint about the massacres carried out by Tito's Partisans, many of which have now been fully authenticated.

The most valuable contributions are those of Milorad Ekmečić, Bogdan Krizman, Dragan Živojinović, and Dragovan Šepić, all dealing with the internal and international factors and circumstances that led to the formation of the first Yugoslavia in 1918.

Pero Morača, a prominent Partisan commander in World War II, gives a perceptive analysis of the Communist political strategy and tactics that contributed to the triumph of the Partisans over the Chetniks during the war. The account of Morača, however, is flawed in other respects. He gives exclusive credit for everything to Tito's wisdom and foresight and says nothing about possible contributions of Tito's leading associates at the time—all of whom have been politically eliminated since then—such as Milovan Djilas, Andrija Hebrang, and others.

In sum, the volume bears witness both to the valuable research being done by Yugoslav historians in their attempt to understand the past (particularly the period of the formation of the first Yugoslavia), and to the strictures to which Yugoslav historiography is still subjected when dealing with politically sensitive topics. Perhaps the great interest of Yugoslav historians in the formation of the first Yugoslavia is in part attributable to the fact that many of the problems and issues of the past remain unresolved and current. For example, the force of clashing nationalisms, which disintegrated the Dual Monarchy in 1918, threatens Yugoslavia and some of the other successor states. Yugoslavia, which was established in accordance with the Wilsonian concept of national self-determination, on the erroneous assumption that the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were three tribes of one nation, has been no more successful than the Habsburg state in developing a constructive and harmonious relationship between its component nationalities.

MATTHEW MESTROVIC
Fairleigh Dickinson University

ORTHODOXY AND NATIONALITY: ANDREIU ŞAGUNA AND THE RUMANIANS OF TRANSYLVANIA, 1846-1873. By *Keith Hitchins*. Harvard Historical Studies, 94. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1977. x, 332 pp. \$14.00.

Andreiu Şaguna, bishop, later metropolitan, of the Greek Orthodox Rumanian Church of Hungary and Transylvania, was by any reckoning an important figure in many fields. The promotion of his church from a mere subsection of the Serbian-controlled Metropolitanate of Karlowitz, which was its status when he was ordained into it in 1833, to the independent rank in which he left it on his death was itself an outstanding achievement, and one which was due almost entirely to his personality and his skill. In the course of bringing it about he introduced much sorely-needed order into his church's organization, improved its financial position, expanded its cultural institutions, raised the standards—both moral and material—of its clergy, and in this and other ways also did much to improve the cultural standards and, indirectly, the material conditions of the Transylvanian Rumanians as a people. The national tradition which decreed that the two Rumanian bishops, the Uniate and the Orthodox, should act as spokesmen of their people vis-à-vis the outer world, also assigned to him a major role in the tangled political developments which filled the twenty years of his episcopate. All this makes the story of his life well worth telling, but the story is not easy to tell because of the enormous number of factors with which Şaguna found himself involved: the lay authorities, Austrian and Hungarian officials, the Serbian hierarchy, his Uniate colleague, and above all, the rivalry among the young "intellectuals," who

were his own countrymen but who were impatient and suspicious of ecclesiastical control.

Hitherto, Şaguna's story has, in fact, not been told satisfactorily. The fullest biographies of him, works of disciples, were overadulatory, while other works, especially those of the pseudohistorians of the first years after 1945, either presented a distorted picture of the man and his work, or passed it over too shortly. Professor Hitchins holds the balance very fairly. His analyses of Şaguna's outlook on the problems involved, political, social, cultural, and national, are, if somewhat repetitive, also thoughtful and often illuminating. The story of Şaguna's activities is necessarily closely interwoven with the general history of the period, toward our knowledge of which some of Professor Hitchins's pages make useful contributions: the present reviewer knows of no other verbatim translation into English of the "Sixteen Points" adopted by the famous mass meeting of May 16, 1848. It is the more regrettable that Professor Hitchins, for some inexplicable reason, consistently passes over in complete silence, or at best, with only a passing allusion, the larger events within the framework of which all this took place. The Sixteen Points were themselves drawn up in preparation for the forthcoming vote which the Transylvanian Diet was to take at the end of the month on the question of the union between Transylvania and Hungary; this in its turn was to constitute Transylvania's answer to the wish for the union expressed by the new, autonomous, Hungarian Diet. The very convocation of the Diet is left unmentioned, and even the fact that it met and voted *nem. con.* for the union is mentioned only retrospectively, and in a single line. This is only one of the very many omissions of facts vital to the understanding of the events which Professor Hitchins does record. It is greatly to be hoped that he will repair them in a later edition of his interesting essay, which a few hours' work spent in consulting any standard history book would make immeasurably more readable, and even for most readers, more intelligible. While performing this work he might check his pages on a few minor points. We are told, for example, that the Hungarian minister of education, Baron Eötvös, was Şaguna's "friend from university days": but there is no mention anywhere of Şaguna's having attended any university; certainly not Eötvös's of Pest.

The bibliography is long, but eclectic. Poor Jorga must have turned in his grave when he found his name omitted from it.

C. A. MACARTNEY
Oxford, England

HISTORY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE AND MODERN TURKEY, VOLUME I: EMPIRE OF THE GAZIS: THE RISE AND DECLINE OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, 1280-1808. By *Stanford Shaw*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. xvi, 351 pp. \$23.50, cloth. \$12.95, paper.

Stanford Shaw's new book will be welcomed by all who concern themselves with Ottoman history and the role the Turks played in Europe, Russia, North Africa, and the Near East. With the appearance of the second volume, it will be the first substantial English-language work to cover the complete course of Turkish history from the thirteenth-century Ottoman *beylik* up to and including the contemporary republic. Relying upon many years of experience as a particularly successful professor of Ottoman history, the author has prepared a text well suited to students and others seeking a clear, organized, and balanced introduction to a very broad and difficult topic. This new publication will certainly go a long way toward countering that stubborn anti-Turkish bias which has warped the Western view of the Ottomans and their achievements: