

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,

besides sources, all of the literature on Rumania. Part of Campbell's material became available later when he published his articles "The Influence of Western Political Thought in the Rumanian Principalities, 1821-1848: The Generation of 1848" and "Eighteen Forty-Eight in the Rumanian Principalities" (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, 4 [1944]: 262-73, and 8 [1948]: 181-90). But these articles could not substitute for those rich source materials in the thesis which give an exact account of the roots of Rumanian nationalism in the period between 1830 and 1857. Some of the rare materials used in this book are available only in the older Rumanian libraries and archives or to some extent in Paris, Rome, and Munich, but hardly elsewhere. Thus we must admire Campbell's thorough methods in collecting all available sources dealing with the two Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia in the years between the actual liberation from Phanariot rule and the eve of the "United Principalities" after the Paris Conference in 1856.

The general definition of nationalism as "the conscious participation of the masses of a nation in the national life," which "implies also the loyalty of the masses to the national state as above all other loyalties" (p. 2), is carefully reduced to the line of development in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century which usually shows the way from a cultural and literary movement to a "political program with complete national unification as the final goal" (p. 3).

As far as the cultural and literary movement is concerned the author has used the available materials and achieved his purpose. But he has somewhat neglected the economic factors, as have most studies on nationalism in the last fifty years. Nevertheless, the cultural and literary aspects are excellently handled—for example, in dealing with Transylvania. The relations between the Rumanians of Transylvania and the Principalities tempered the French influence, because the Transylvanians noticed very early that in the Principalities the subordination of the national language and culture—first to Greek and later to French—had not been the appropriate way to escape "orientalism" and still combine the necessary occidentalization with the original Rumanian culture and civilization. Even though since 1945 many new historical studies have appeared in Rumania dealing with nationalism in the period treated by Campbell, one can hardly find a better presentation for the Principalities covering the whole period 1830-48. (Other important recent publications include David Prodan's *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* [Bucharest, 1967], which is now available in English [Bucharest, 1971], and Vlad Georgescu's *Mémoires et projets de réforme dans les Principautés Roumaines, 1769-1830* [Bucharest, 1970].)

Along with the recent book by the well-known French historian Georges Castellan, *En Serbie au seuil de l'indépendance, 1815-1839* (Paris, 1967), Campbell's thesis belongs with the classic studies describing a limited period of decisive importance for the nation-building and the later formation of national states in Southeastern Europe.

EMANUEL TURCZYNSKI
Ruhr-Universität Bochum