

the *Geschichte der K. u. K. Kriegsmarine* published by the Kriegsarchiv, Vienna (1882–1966). The beautiful maps are inadequate and imprecise: Serbia and Transylvania are shown in the wrong place in the map on page 5; on page 72 Dalmatia appears to have become part of Hungary.

With a splendid sense of national pride, Sokol asserts that the German-speaking Austrians were “the most advanced . . . of the Empire’s nationalities” (p. 17). He assumes that most of the Slavs were still busy with their cultural revival in 1848 “rather than in pursuit of political goals,” as though Palacký, General Jelačić, Patriarch Rajačić, not to mention the traditionally politically minded Polish gentry, simply did not exist. In short, Sokol’s excursion into general history is none too happy.

When it comes to naval strategy, Sokol deplores the parsimony of the empire’s financial authorities. Because of it, he says, Mahan’s doctrine was neglected and the navy never became more than a coastal defense force. He seems to fail to appreciate that the Habsburg Empire had to struggle for survival in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and had neither interests nor influence beyond the Strait of Otranto, so it had no need for a blue-water navy. As it was, in 1914 the fleet was oversized and simply rotted away in the harbors where it was bottled up, just as the Imperial German Navy did throughout World War I. The Battles of Otranto and Jutland were too insignificant to justify the tremendous investments the two empires had put into their navies.

The book’s chief merit lies in its statistical and technical data, which, alas, it presents without documentation. All in all, the volume is a sentimental and romantic paean to the Habsburg navy, a commemorative album rather than a work of professional history.

BÉLA K. KIRÁLY
Brooklyn College

IZVESTIIA NA BULGARSKOTO ISTORICHESKO DRUZHESTVO, vol. 25.
Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1967. 497 pp.

The twenty-fifth volume of *Izvestiia* of the Bulgarian Historical Society is a welcome revival of a most valuable series which the society occasionally published from 1905 to 1948. The series lapsed in the Stalin era, when the society, in existence since 1901, came to be viewed with the suspicion Stalinists had developed toward the Society of Marxist Historians in the USSR (1925–34) and other general associations of intellectuals. The de facto dissolution of the Bulgarian society in 1951 was termed a “mistake” in the era since the death of Stalin and rectified by the society’s revival in 1964. With the new emphasis on continuity in national life, the new society is described as a restoration of the old and its *Izvestiia* as a continuation of the old series.

Like its predecessors, volume 25 contains a wealth of information for a variety of readers. There are five articles on national history, eight on local history, four notes on sources and two on historiography, two discussions of the nature of Bulgarian fascism and organization of archives in Bulgaria, numerous reviews of historical works published in 1964 and 1965, an index to the contents of volumes 1–24, a list of the contents of Bulgarian historical periodicals for 1964 and 1965, a text of the statute of the society and other materials on its organization and activities, and a prefatory note by the society’s president and principal editor of *Izvestiia*, Professor Dimitur Kosev. There is no doubt that if one needs a single mirror reflecting

the life of the historical profession in Bulgaria, the *Izvestiia* of the Bulgarian Historical Society would serve the purpose better than any of the regular historical periodicals published in Bulgaria.

At the same time, it should be pointed out that this volume does not contain the bibliography of works by Bulgarian and foreign historians on the history of Bulgaria and the Bulgarian lands that was a distinguishing feature of earlier volumes. The need for such a bibliography is acute, since no periodical, in Bulgaria or elsewhere, at present provides this information in a systematic and comprehensive manner, and there is no current bibliography of Bulgarian history. The technical and ideological difficulties of compiling the bibliography are understandable, but the Bulgarian colleagues are still in a better position than anyone else to produce it. It may also be wished that future volumes would carry, as in the past, lists of the members of the society in order to facilitate scholarly contacts.

MARIN PUNDEFF

San Fernando Valley State College

BULGARIA'S SHARE IN HUMAN CULTURE. By *Emil Georgiev, Dimiter Angelov, Kiril Krustev, and Zhivka Todorova*. Sofia: Sofia Press, 1968. 129 pp. 10 color plates.

A common theme pervades the four articles of this book: the rationalizing, democratizing, humanizing, and revitalizing effect of the contact between Byzantine civilization and the South Slavic barbarians. More specifically, Emil Georgiev discusses the role of the Bulgarian Slavs in furthering the "democratic" notion that every people should have its own script. Emphasizing the social aspects of the dualistic Bogomil heresy, Dimiter Angelov represents Bogomilism as a popular movement with a "rational world outlook." In Angelov's eyes, heresy was an ideological superstructure through which the people expressed their opposition to feudal power. They doubtless accepted some of the teachings of their heretical leaders, but they deviated from them in continuing to favor family life and in welcoming rebellion against constituted authority. In a third article, Kiril Krustev discusses the appearance of a new orientation in Bulgarian art during the thirteenth century. Characteristic of the new vision, as illustrated by the church of Boyana (near Sofia), was a decline in fresco and mosaic styles and a growing preference for more individualistic panel painting and icons; also typical was a retreat from ideational art in favor of an art with psychological content, a synthesis of classical realism, Byzantine spiritualism, and populist Bogomilism (the author omits Hesychasm from his list of influences). Finally, Zhivka Todorova writes about Yoan Koukouzel, whom she identifies—erroneously perhaps—as a Bulgarian composer who, in an imprecise period of the later Middle Ages, increased the range of tone in church composition, used melodies which had previously been considered too secular, and introduced "barbarous" (Bulgarian?) and "alien" (Persian) intonations into Byzantine chant. Though it does not embrace all the previous premises and conclusions, Ivan Dujčev's preface may help readers see how the four articles constitute a whole.

The book thus emerges as a study of the results of contact between peoples of different cultures or at different levels of cultural development (Byzantine and Bulgarian). Though marred by an excessive Bulgarian nationalism and by misplaced ideological assertions, it offers an interesting insight both into Bulgarian