

that the ideological sections have been reduced, but the complete lack of references and an index is a serious deficiency.

The authors cover the traditional areas of international law. The analysis of international treaties is thorough and perhaps the best part of the book. The discussion of international organizations (chap. 9) is considerably longer than in the earlier text. The presentation of Western theories and the views of non-Soviet writers, who are referred to only in a critical way, is painfully inadequate. In general there is no important difference between Hungarian and Soviet theory. Although the dependence on Soviet doctrine is frequently so overwhelming that it raises the question of originality, the sources are not cited. But readers familiar with the Soviet literature will easily recognize that the main theoretical influence is the work of the most influential writer in the Soviet Union, Grigorii I. Tunkin, *Voprosy teorii mezhdunarodnogo prava (A nemzetközi jog elméletének kérdései, Budapest, 1963)*.

The book does not include even the most outstanding cases in international law. However, the amount of political propaganda has been significantly reduced, which is a great improvement. For example, the entire section dealing with the question of just and unjust war is completely omitted, although the problems of national self-determination and liberation movements are still covered, though more briefly.

In the Hungarian literature on international law a wider and more diversified selection of topics has led to a greater number of publications and some valuable contributions in recent years. This book is an expression of that new vitality. The authors have made a belated attempt to implement the de-Stalinization of international law, and their efforts demonstrate that the discipline shows some scholarly growth but there is still no meaningful separation from Soviet influence.

BARNABAS A. RACZ  
Eastern Michigan University

DIVANUL. By *Dimitrie Cantemir*. Edited with an introductory study by *Virgil Cândeia*. Bucharest: Editura pentru literatură, 1969. cx, 566 pp. Lei 26.

This edition of Dimitrie Cantemir's bilingual work *Divanul sau Gîlceava Înțeleptului cu Lumea sau Giudețul Sufletului cu Trupul* is the first to appear since 1878, when G. Sion published an unreliable Latinized text. Consequently, Virgil Cândeia has taken pains to ensure that the transliteration of the Rumanian version (originally printed in the Cyrillic alphabet) is both accurate and consistent. He also includes a modern Rumanian translation of the Greek version (which he ascribes to Ieremia Cacavela), and this should prove of considerable help to readers unaccustomed to Cantemir's ornate baroque style. Clearly, such an arrangement is hardly designed to appeal to the specialist, who must still consult existing copies of the 1698 Jassy edition for research purposes; but the assumption that few present-day students of Rumanian literature possess sufficient linguistic preparation to read with any ease the original Rumanian text—let alone the Greek version—is probably correct.

A man of many accomplishments—aptly compared by the critic George Călinescu to Lorenzo de' Medici—Dimitrie Cantemir is the most representative figure of a late-flowering Renaissance in Rumania. His first work, the tripartite

*Divanul*, written in exile at Constantinople, is widely regarded as the first piece of philosophical writing in the Rumanian language. Book 1, the substance of the work, takes the form of an acrimonious debate between the Sage and the World (or Soul and Body), in which the former insists on the veracity of Christian doctrine, while the latter upholds the skeptical viewpoint of the European Enlightenment. Book 2 (based, Căndeia believes, on an undiscovered foreign model) is an amplification of this dialogue. Book 3 is a translation of a work (*Stimuli virtutum ac fraena peccatorum*, Amsterdam, 1682) by the Polish Unitarian Andreas Wissowatius.

Belying the work's outward appearance, Căndeia asserts in his introduction, *Divanul* is not "an outburst of militant mysticism," but "an exercise in political advancement," created with a view to impressing "those members of the ruling classes [in Moldavia] still accustomed to works of ethical outlook and Christian didacticism." Căndeia effectively refutes the idea of religious orthodoxy advanced by numerous critics, by pointing out that Cantemir himself evidently believed in the compatibility of Christian doctrine and non-Christian philosophical beliefs. He is probably right to stress the logical, rational character of the disputation; but in his desire to emphasize the originality of Cantemir's secular thinking, he disregards the expressive value of the Sage's many adroit ripostes.

Căndeia hardly sheds much light on a complex situation, moreover, by referring successively to Cantemir as a humanist, Renaissance man, and man of the Enlightenment. Categories such as these are particularly confusing for the Western reader in this context, since the secularization of religious thought—a process which took several centuries in Western Europe—has no exact parallel in Rumanian history. Though it may be true that Cantemir articulates a vision acceptable to modern man, it is also a vision steeped in Byzantine deviousness, relying in great part on medieval theories on the human condition that had long been discarded by Western writers.

Căndeia has most impressively established the authenticity of the Rumanian version, reconstructed the various stages of the work's elaboration, and stressed the importance of Cantemir's creation of a Rumanian philosophical language. The scholarly significance of his copious introduction to this exemplary edition is, therefore, beyond all doubt; but his claim that *Divanul* is "one of the great works of Rumanian thought and of Southeast European thinking in general" remains inconclusive, since evidence of the book's divulgation in other Orthodox countries is at present scanty. Rather, *Divanul* should be regarded as one of those rare hybrids, *un fructo tardio* (to use Ramón Menéndez Pidal's celebrated phrase), in which an astonishingly wide range of philosophical systems and epochs is reflected, as a measure of Rumania's tardy emergence from intellectual isolation.

MICHAEL H. IMPEY  
University of Kentucky

FRENCH INFLUENCE AND THE RISE OF ROUMANIAN NATIONALISM. By John C. Campbell. The Eastern Europe Collection. New York: Arno Press and the *New York Times*, 1971 (photo-reprint of the author's Harvard University Ph.D. thesis, April 1, 1940). vi, 463 pp. \$19.00.

This book is a reprint of a Ph.D. thesis submitted at Harvard University in 1940, which was known until now only to a small group of historians who investigate,