

before the First World War, Macartney stood up for the losers of the post-1918 peace settlements. He regarded the Treaty of Trianon, which had handed over nearly one-third of the Hungarians to the Successor States, as particularly unjust, and he championed Hungary's aspirations to border revision in her favor. But he did not lose sight of the overriding interest of European security—the focal point of his *Problems of the Danube Basin* (1942)—even though the political solutions he offered were not realistic. Nor did his Hungarophile attitude cause him to lose his critical stance. *Hungary* (1934, Modern World Series, edited by H. R. L. Fisher) is a brilliant survey of Hungarian society and its “oligarchic” political system which received praise from Social Democrats and Populists rather than the establishment. *October Fifteenth* (2 vols., 1957; 2nd ed., 1961) is a piece of meticulous scholarship: a one thousand-page account of Hungarian politics and of German-Hungarian relations between 1929 and 1944 which culminated in the regents' foiled attempt to break the alliance with Hitler (hence the title). The portraits of personalities in the book are outstanding. *Hungary* (1962) is by far the best short history of Hungary that has ever been written. *The Habsburg Empire 1790–1918* (1968), Macartney's magnum opus (an abridged version of which was published in 1978 and entitled *The House of Austria*), is a general and comprehensive narrative of the empire's domestic history into which the diverse components of the Danubian Lands were properly welded. As such the book is a unique achievement in any language, even though the Slavs (in contrast to the Germans and Hungarians) receive insufficient attention.

Macartney wrote history in a somewhat old-fashioned erudite narrative form into which a wealth of detail on social and political institutions was compressed, and he presented it with great clarity and in beautiful prose. He was a kind, unassuming man with strong sympathies for the underdog and with insight into men and situations. He held deep convictions. Even the errors of some of his judgments underline his intellectual integrity and independence. Ever since his Winchester days Macartney had believed, with humility, that a scholar had an obligation not only to find out the truth but to tell all that he held to be important, withholding nothing. During his life, the recognition his work was accorded may not have been commensurate with what it merited. His friends, and there are many, will miss his company. Posterity will remember Dr. Macartney as a scholar who found out much about the Danubian Lands and, by his skillful presentation, illuminated an area of Europe that might otherwise have remained obscure.

LÁSZLÓ PÉTER
University of London

ALEKSANDR ALEKSANDROVICH ZIMIN, 1920–1980

Alexander Zimin died in Moscow in February just three days after his sixtieth birthday. His last years, plagued by ill health, forced him to spend long winter sojourns in the Crimea, yet he continued to write almost to the very end. The two volumes being prepared in his honor, of which he was aware—one in the Soviet Union by his students and friends, and the other by his Western colleagues—will now be offered in tribute to his memory.

In a publishing career that spanned more than three decades (1946–78), he established himself as his generation's most important historian of medieval Muscovy, and he undoubtedly belongs among the four or five greatest Russian specialists in this century who concerned themselves with that period. His productivity was enormous: six books, over one hundred and seventy articles, chapters, or parts of books, and at least sixteen editions of texts with commentaries (either alone or in collaboration with

others). This tally does not include the large number of encyclopedia articles or his edition of Kliuchevskii's works. His output spanned the entire field of early Russian history, from the beginnings of Kiev to 1700, though the bulk of his research dealt with the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His range was enormous, touching upon virtually every aspect of society, from peasants and slaves to the aristocracy and the crown. He concerned himself with problems of political authority, landholding patterns of clerical and lay lords, regional history, and foreign policy. His lists of boyars, *namestniki*, and *d'iaki* for the middle Muscovite period are fundamental for anyone interested in the development of central authority. Inevitably, he had to deal with methodology, textology, and the redating of documents. In his later years his interests spanned literature and linguistics. For all his scholarly preoccupations, he found time to teach a succession of students in the Historical Archival Institute, a number of whom have embarked upon distinguished careers.

Zimin was a complex human being. Driven by an ambition to excel, he spent most of his waking hours in his living room, which served as a study by day and bedroom by night, as he hunched over an ancient typewriter positioned at knee level and pecked out page after page. His private library lined the walls of the hallway of his four-room apartment. His only recreation was the cinema, which he called the only new art form of the twentieth century, and he devoured books on the subject provided him by friends abroad. In his last years he doted on his grandchild.

Zimin never received the honors and rewards his society reserves for outstanding scholars. In 1963 he completed a major manuscript questioning the twelfth-century origin of *The Song of Igor's Campaign* and arguing for its formulation in the eighteenth century. Zimin presented his case in a two-day session in 1964 at the Institute of History in the Academy of Sciences, but to no avail. He could not receive permission to publish. Numerous articles began to appear attacking his thesis and its premises, and his position earned him a number of important enemies. His conviction that he deserved the right to publish in his own country and to present his evidence affected his later career and complicated his relations with his colleagues. Yet his scholarly focus remained clear, for some of his best contributions appeared in the last fifteen years of his life.

No one concerned with a study of Muscovite history can avoid taking Zimin's work into account. Beyond the sense of loss felt by his family, friends, and admirers, his legacy will remain fresh.

GUSTAVE ALEF
University of Oregon