

The description of each *fond* includes the name of the *fond* and its year span; a detailed breakdown of the content of mixed *fonds*; the number of documents and books involved, with indication of date and type; organization, basic characteristics, and language(s) of the material; a history of the *fond* and its founder(s); and indication of the state of preservation of the material. The compilers of this series have rendered commendable service to the researcher and historian interested in this part of Yugoslavia. The description and historical background of the *fonds* are quite sufficient for determining their research potential.

The collections described in the three volumes span the years 1225 to 1971 and reflect in content and the language of the documents, the political history and cultural heritage of the Vojvodina—the old Slavic and Hungarian traditions, the eighteenth-century Austrian and Hungarian influences, the nineteenth-century Hungarian dominance with resurgence of the Slavic heritage, and finally the political incorporation of the Vojvodina into Yugoslavia and the reoccupation of Senta and Subotica by Hungary during World War II. The Turkish period is represented only obliquely in terminology. The type of material contained in each of the three archives is basically similar. Family records, papers of prominent persons, church records, and the records of local offices and institutions, often with long runs, dominate the pre-World War I period. Holdings for the interwar period are rather thin, and the post-World War II period is characterized by a large number of relatively small collections of records of public offices, committees, enterprises, schools, and associations. Perhaps the most interesting *fond* described is that of the Vojnić family of Baša (1235–1943), listed in the Subotica volume, whose documents in Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian, German, Latin, and Italian provide a kind of capsule history of the Vojvodina.

Although there are few unusual holdings among the *fonds* included in these three volumes, the series, taken as a whole, offers the scholar and researcher a unique and valuable tool for reference and the planning of research.

DAVID H. KRAUS  
*Library of Congress*

PLAN AND MARKET IN YUGOSLAV ECONOMIC THOUGHT. By *Deborah D. Milenkovitch*. Yale Russian and East European Studies, 9. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1971. x, 323 pp. \$10.00.

Dr. Milenkovitch's study ably traces the intellectual debate conducted mainly, but not exclusively, inside Yugoslavia on the respective roles of plan and market in the postwar Yugoslav economy. Although her analysis tells us much about Yugoslav economic organization, the author places her study in a wider setting describing it as "only one part of an inquiry into a larger topic, the economic organization of socialism." She eschews, therefore, detailed consideration of other forces, such as political, economic, and social interests and pressures, except where it is necessary to demonstrate their relative weight in bringing about organizational change. For example, it is impossible to measure the contribution of the theoretical debate over economic reform in the early 1960s without paying some attention to interregional and interparty conflicts. Thus, those seeking a comprehensive economic history of postwar Yugoslavia will look here in vain. The volume is, however, a history and a critique of ideas and attitudes. Indeed, an elaborate factual

counterpart would have interrupted the sense of intellectual continuity that the writing conveys and thereby obscured the main purpose of the study.

In the short space which is allotted it is impossible to do justice to the author's thorough and balanced analysis of Yugoslav literature on the central theoretical themes of enterprise behavior, price formation and factor distribution. Before the reforms of the 1960s the debate on enterprise behavior was of little practical importance since enterprise investment programs and pricing policies were determined by the planning system and enforced through the budget. As a result of the 1965 reform the enterprise has replaced the plan as "entrepreneur," and, consequently, the debate is of central significance. Dr. Milenkovitch undertakes a detailed exposition of short-run theories, devoting particular attention to the contributions of Ward, Domar, and Horvat. She also discusses the early attempts of Furotbin and Pejovitch at long-run analysis, although their more recent articles, developing and refining their ideas, appeared after publication of her study.

The pre-reform debate on price theory also receives careful consideration. But Dr. Milenkovitch sees the outcome of the more recent controversies between the ruling establishment and other groups—such as the so-called socialist humanists—over income distribution and the related topic of property rights as carrying the greatest significance for the future direction of Yugoslav economic institutions. To operate the system effectively, authorities are already accepting the idea that a decentralized market for investment funds cannot function properly without at least some concessions to the individual ownership of capital. The question is, therefore, whether market socialism can be made to work without breaching the most fundamental socialist notions about what constitutes a just distribution of income. Since publication of this volume, the conflict between efficiency and equality has, as the author rightly suspected, become more acute. Without further clues as to its likely resolution, no confident prediction about the future course of Yugoslav economic institutions can be made.

CHRISTOPHER PROUT  
*University of Sussex*

CONTINUITATEA POPULAȚIEI AUTOHTONE ÎN TRANSILVANIA ÎN SECOLELE IV-V (CIMITIRUL 1 DE LA BRATEI). By *Ligia Bârzu*.

Academia de științe sociale și politice a Republicii Socialiste România. Institutul de Arheologie. Biblioteca de Arheologie, vol. 21. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1973. 308 pp. + 7 pp. plates. Fold-out map. Lei 32.

Only the very fine print of the subtitle identifies this work as an excavation report rather than a general treatise on the continuity of the post-Roman population in Transylvania, such as D. Protase's *Problema continuității în Dacia în lumina arheologiei și numismaticii* (Bucharest, 1966). The title does state the theme of the work, however, while reflecting the continuing controversy over Transylvania that threatens to turn every excavation report in this field into an archaeological apologetic. Rumanian scholars have understandably favored continuity but, whatever their bias, they have, in this reviewer's opinion, shown very good evidence for continuity of life in Dacia after Aurelian's withdrawal in A.D. 271.