

*țara capitalismului în agricultura României după reforma din 1864*, Bucharest, 2 vols., 1956, 1959) is only briefly discussed. Practically nothing is said about David Mitrany's classic, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* (London, 1930).

The authors' opinion that Rumanian agriculture during this period was still backward is paralleled by their assertion that industry was also still primitive. From this second point they have chosen to draw the important conclusion that during 1918–21 "the workers' movement was not able . . . to attract the peasant movement's support," just because the industrial workers were still such a relatively insignificant political force (p. 413). In contrast, earlier Marxist-Leninist views tended to blame the failure of a worker-peasant alliance during this period simply on the absence of a strong Communist party (see, for example, *Studii și materiale de istorie contemporană*, vol. 2, Bucharest, 1962, pp. 32–40).

The authors feel that real modernization in agriculture began only during the interwar period. In this respect they strongly praise the 1921 land reform as a step in the right direction, since it greatly reduced the large estates, which until then for the most part had opposed such modernization (pp. 595–96). Here too the book differs from earlier interpretations, which were distinctly less sympathetic to the reform (*Studii și materiale*, 2:463–74, and vol. 1, Bucharest, 1956, pp. 90–93), and which saw it only as an effort to *prevent* meaningful social and economic change.

But although the authors stress the benefits to agriculture which they feel the land reform of 1921 brought, they do not successfully deal with the more significant question whether or not it was ever meant to help the industrialization of the country. *Relații agrare* maintains that during the 1930s more and more land was falling into the hands of the bigger, wealthier peasants, at the expense of the less efficient small peasants—a sign of the capitalistic transformation of agriculture, suggesting that the reform indeed may have created conditions favorable to industrialization. Yet the authors' definition of "big peasant" applies to holders of properties of between ten and fifty hectares (p. 585); as they admit, such properties employed hired labor because they were too big to be cultivated simply by the owner and his family (p. 56).

Therefore, is it correct to call such landowners "big peasants"? They were much more like small landlords. Thus the authors have unintentionally revealed quite a different result of the 1921 reform from the one they claim. Instead of the development of a strong peasant middle class, the class that really profited was the small landlords, implying that most of the peasants were still not self-sufficient by the end of the interwar period. In any case, although the reform may have led to a certain increase in agricultural growth, it is doubtful that the prevalence of many small peasants was at all conducive to any meaningful industrial development. This is especially true inasmuch as there is no evidence that these landowners were organized in any form of cooperative association, but rather were still cultivating their land on an individual basis.

PHILIP EIDELBERG  
New York City

MODERN ROMANIAN. By James E. Augerot and Florin D. Popescu. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1971. xiii, 329 pp. \$12.00.

Until recently there was no truly up-to-date Rumanian textbook for English speakers. The publication of two excellent works, Cazacu et al. (1969) and Murrell and Ștefănescu-Drăgănești (1970), was therefore particularly welcome. Much

as I like those two books, my preference goes to the one under review. I think it has a slight edge over them, mainly because of its pervasive sprightliness.

The book is divided into two parts of sixteen lessons each. The typical lesson in part 1 includes "Pronunciation and Vocabulary Exercises" and "Common Expressions," followed by the "Text" (a dialogue of varying length based on the first two parts), "Observations and Grammar Notes," and the exercises ("Substitution and Transformation Exercises," "Question and Answer Exercises," and "Homework"). Some of the later lessons in part 1 conclude with anecdotes, which enliven even further this already lively book.

Most lessons in part 2 begin with two "Preparatory Readings," each followed by a glossary, grammatical notes, and a few exercises. The main "Text," generally taken from Rumanian newspapers or the writings of Rumanian authors, is accompanied by marginal glosses and followed by exercises. Both the preparatory readings and the texts contain a wealth of information about the Rumanians and their country, history, and language.

There is a useful appendix in two parts ("Pronunciation" and "Inflection") and a Rumanian-English glossary. The glossary is unfortunately not free of errors: for example, *corcitură* is listed after *curat* (as if it were the variant form *curcitură*); *dezvălui* is incorrectly stressed on the antepenult, instead of the ultima; a number of words have been omitted, such as *aviatic*, *halbă*, *harnic*, *moft*; several words have been glossed incorrectly or in ways unrelated to their meaning in the text: thus *consta* is glossed as "state" instead of "consist of" ("state" is *constata*), *de-a dreptul* is translated as "by right" (wrong also in the text, p. 249) instead of "simply, downright," *dezlega* is glossed only as "unbind, untie" and not also as "solve," which is the appropriate gloss in this context (*se va dezlega chestiunea evreilor* "the Jewish question will be solved," p. 260), and so forth.

The authors should be congratulated for adopting the excellent method whereby the main text of each lesson comes as a reward, after the material preceding it has sufficiently prepared the student to understand and enjoy it. Especially in the second part of the book this reward is a very real one, for some of the texts are true literary gems, such as Ion Creangă's "Povestea unui om leneș," Eminescu's inevitable but nonetheless beautiful poem "La steaua" (unfortunately marred by a mistake: the fifth line reads *Poate de multe s-a stins în drum*, instead of *de mult*), and I. L. Caragiale's "Bacalaureat," "Românii verzi," and his entire one-act play *Conul Leonida față cu reacțiunea*.

The text is varityped and is accompanied by numerous photographs and some sketches of Rumanian writers. Beginning on page 142, I found literally dozens of errors, some of slight importance, others more serious, but none that could not be caught by an attentive teacher.

My overall impression of the book is extremely favorable. It is written with a humor and an enthusiasm I found irresistible.

KOSTAS KAZAZIS  
University of Chicago

ROMANIAN ICONS PAINTED ON GLASS. By *Cornel Irimie* and *Marcela Focșa*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970. 35 pp. + 149 color plates. \$25.00.

The art of icon-painting on glass was probably introduced among the Rumanians in the second half of the seventeenth century from Bohemia. It flourished in northern Moldavia for a time, but its true center was Transylvania. There, in a number of