

Allies controlled the air and the sea, the Germans still succeeded in removing most of their garrisons from Greece and the Mediterranean islands without undue losses. Hnilicka's account of the retreat is both exhaustive and exhausting. Most of the hundred and fifty pages of narrative read like daily position reports prepared by a staff officer. The only respite from the bone-dry quality of the writing is an occasional excerpt from an eyewitness account. The most interesting as well as the most useful part of the book is the document appendix. Included in the documents is a clear, concise account of the retreat, written in January 1945 by the commander of the German forces in the Balkans, Field Marshal von Weichs. It is unfortunate that Weichs never expanded this brief account into a full study.

Though Hnilicka's narrative is in general lifeless, one should not infer from this that he does not have strong prejudices. He fervently defends the collaborators; he gives lurid accounts of the atrocities committed by the Partisans (including a description of a "death march" during which thousands of German prisoners of war died); and he pays a stirring tribute to the German soldiers who fought in the Balkans, saying that they "helped spare Germany and Austria from Communist occupation." He seems to imply that if the Balkan states had rallied to Hitler in August 1944 when the Red Army first penetrated the area, they too might have been spared.

Hnilicka has not written a history of the epic German retreat; rather he has collected the material from which a history could be written. He has interviewed all the important survivors; he has surveyed all the relevant literature; and he has used all the documents that he could get his hands on. The result is a competent but dull account. Perhaps that is all Hnilicka intended to write. If so, then more is the pity, because warfare in the Balkans has provided a rich mine of information upon which a case study could be written that examines the problems and frustrations of an occupying power faced with a guerrilla war.

JON M. BRIDGMAN
University of Washington

TRAGEDIJA HRVATSKE HISTORIOGRAFIJE: O FALSIFIKATORIMA, BIROKRATIMA, NEGATORIMA, ITD . . . ITD . . . HRVATSKE POVIJESTI. 2nd, revised and expanded edition. By *Zvonimir Kulundžić*. Zagreb: Nezavisno Autorsko Izdanje, 1970. 526 pp. 60 new dinars, paper.

Zvonimir Kulundžić's book about the "tragedy" of Croatian historiography was an instant best seller in Croatia when it appeared in 1970. So far it has gone through two editions despite its seemingly esoteric subject matter and the fact that it was published by the author at his own expense. This is not so surprising, however, when one notes that Kulundžić is a popular and prolific writer of best sellers dealing with political history, such as *Atentat na Stjepana Radića* and *Politika i korupcija*. The book under review is no dispassionate scholarly study of the shortcomings of Croatian historiography. Rather it is a violent attack on many of Croatia's foremost historians and Slavists (Professors Šidak, Štefanić, Anica Nazor, Nada Klaić, and others), as well as prominent institutions and scholarly journals, for deliberately and systematically distorting, negating, and disparaging Croatian history, and doing so for reasons of careerism, political cowardice, or professional incompetence.

These are grave charges to level at those who teach Croatian history at Zagreb University and against the Staroslavenski Institute and the Yugoslav Academy.

In the opinion of this reviewer the substance of Kulundžić's charges cannot be wholly dismissed. Like so many hallowed institutions, the Yugoslav Academy in Zagreb, for instance, has been relatively inactive and conservative, partly because its leadership is monopolized by scholars—many in their seventies and even eighties—who are often jealous of their positions and prerogatives. It is also true that little that is original has been published in the areas of medieval and early modern Croatian history. But the reasons for this are far more complex than Kulundžić is ready to admit. For years Croatian as well as other Yugoslav scholarship and historiography were under the ideological control of the political establishment. It is only recently that scholarship has been freed from inhibiting ideological pressures.

From the context of Kulundžić's book it is obvious that his ire against Professors Šidak, Štefanić, and others is personal. It is related to his endeavors to prove that the first Croatian printing establishment was in Kolin, in the region of Lika, where it flourished in the late fifteenth century until the coming of the Turks. Kulundžić's thesis about Kolin and his claim, for example, that an extant missal published in 1483 and a breviary published in 1491 were printed in Kolin and not Venice (as Šidak and others have maintained) were resisted by the experts in the field. Kulundžić evidently feels that opposition to his thesis about Kolin is part of an organized and systematic denigration of Croatian history by the professionals.

Kulundžić weakens his substantive charges against the historians and Slavists by his polemical, political, and often outright demagogic attacks against opponents. Thus he seeks to discredit Šidak by charging him with wartime collaboration with the Ustaša regime and postwar subservience to the Communists. Despite the regrettable excesses of the book, it may have served the useful purposes of creating broad public interest in historiography and of placing the professionals on notice to improve their creative contributions.

MATTHEW M. MEŠTROVIĆ
Fairleigh Dickinson University

ROMAN MILOŠA CRNJANSKOG: PROBLEM UNIVERZALNOG ISKAZA.

By *Nikola Milošević*. Belgrade: Srpska književna zadruga, 1970. 261 pp.

In this book the author attempts to solve some intricate problems of the theory of literature and epistemology. The problem of the place and function of the universal statement in a literary work is his main concern, but he also discusses the monistic and pluralistic interpretations of literature, the cognitive value of literary creation, and the problem of the "organic" unity of the heterogeneous elements constituting the oneness of a literary work.

The first part of Milošević's book, some sixty-two pages, is taken up by a critical survey of the views concerning these problems. The author observes that the presence of universal statements in literary works is an undisputed fact and that the disagreement among theoreticians is over the artistic—not the ideological—relevancy of such statements. He notes that some theoreticians overemphasize the importance of universal statements and others consider them totally irrelevant to the aesthetic value of a literary work; or if they concede that the ideological content has some aesthetic value, they consider it a "violation against the inner coherence of the literary work" (p. 21) and an "intellectual sediment that muddies the pure currents of literary narration" (p. 21). Milošević concludes that the