

ple (1453). This well-known Bulgarian Ottoman scholar has given us an excellent synthesis of the social, economic, political, and other developments that occurred during that century of strife. She discusses the protracted resistance of the Bulgarians and other Balkan peoples against the Ottomans, the part played in this struggle by individual Balkan powers and prominent personalities, the devastating consequences of the disunity among the Balkan Christians, and the results of the fall of Tirnovo (1393) and Nicopolis (1396). At the end of the fourteenth century the Christians were so divided that they were unable to take advantage of the civil war in the Ottoman state following Tamerlane's defeat of Sultan Bayezid at Ankara (1402). The author supplies interesting details in connection with the religiosocial movements led by Sheykh Bâdr al-Din and Bürklüje Mustafa at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the fall of Salonika (1430), the Greek revival in Morea, the splintering of the Serbs into a number of feuding political entities, the heroic deeds of Skanderbeg, the ordeals and aspirations of Manuel II (1391–1425), the activities of Ivan Shishman, Ivan Stratsimir, Prince Mircea, János Hunyadi, King Władisław, and a number of others.

The main attention in the book is given to the background, preparations, and execution of the crusade against the Ottomans in 1443–44 that led to the Christian defeat at Varna. The author concludes that the Battle of Varna (1444) marked the decisive point in the struggle of the Balkan peoples against the Ottoman conquerors. The Ottomans established themselves in the Balkans, but they were unable to overcome the resistance of the Balkan peoples. Writing with patriotic fervor, the author compares the historical role of Bulgaria to that of Russia. Just as Russia saved Europe from the Tatars, the Balkan peoples—"especially" the Bulgarians—saved Europe from the Ottomans (p. 265).

The author also explains the establishment of Ottoman rule in the Balkans—the formation of Ottoman institutions and the introduction of Ottoman feudalism. She examines various categories of land (*miri*, *mülk*, *waqf*) and feudal fiefs (*khass*, *ziamet*, *timar*), the Muslim and Christian *sipahis*, and the obligations of fiefholders and peasants to each other and to the state.

The book is well documented and has an extensive bibliography. Besides Western works the author has consulted many Byzantine, Turkish, and Bulgarian chronicles and other documentary materials which shed light on the developments of the day and depict the brutalities that accompanied the Ottoman conquest. The work includes a number of useful maps and an excellent collection of illustrations of battle scenes, prominent men, soldiers and their dress and equipment, fortresses, and art. It is a pity that there is no index and that the printing and binding of the book are not of better quality.

WAYNE S. VUCINICH  
Stanford University

IZSLEDVANIIA V CHEST NA AKADEMIK MIKHAIL ARNAUDOV:  
IUBILEEN SBORNIK. Edited by P. Zarev, G. Dimov, and I. Konev. Sofia:  
Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1970. 544 pp. 7.70 lv.

Professor Mikhail Arnaudov is one of Bulgaria's most distinguished and best-known scholars. In his long and varied career he has concerned himself chiefly with the study of the Bulgarian national renaissance and with the history and theory of literature and folklore. This massive Festschrift in recognition of

Arnaudov's ninetieth birthday—containing forty-three contributions by Bulgarian, Soviet, and French scholars—reflects in scope and substance the wide interests of the man to whom it is dedicated.

Three opening essays by P. Zarev, G. Karaslavov, and A. Iliev deal with Arnaudov's life and work as a teacher and scholar. The Festschrift has four parts. The first contains essays on problems of the psychology and art of literary creativity. A. Antonov, D. Osinin, and K. Gerov examine Arnaudov's well-known *Psychology of Literary Creativity*, the stages of lyrical creativity and creative practice, and literary scholarship. K. Gülübov and G. Tagamlitska consider the expository style of the feuilleton and some problems of speech and artistic images in dramaturgy.

The second part deals with literary theory and history. K. Kuev raises the question of the authorship of the old Slavic *Azbuchna molitva*, noting that not all copyists regard Constantine-Cyril as its author. I. Begunov and B. Angelov write on Sofronii Vrachansky's use of Kozma Prezviter's *Beseda* and the attitude of Bulgarian writers toward Vrachansky's work and activity. G. Dimov, S. Baeva, and D. Lekov discuss the need for a comparative study of Bulgarian literature and the translations of Slaveikov and Karavelov. An examination of the newspaper *Tüpan* by Ts. Undzhieva shows Khristo Botev's contribution to this paper to have been minimal. S. Vasiliev, R. Rusev, and M. Tsvetaeva write on Vazov's historical novels and recently discovered plays. The historical works of Konstantin Petkanov are considered by G. Tsanev, and M. Minkov, Zh. Gülübova, and D. Blagoy present some penetrating insights into Shakespeare, Schiller, and Pushkin. V. Velchev argues that in the last years of his life Turgenev not only drew closer to the revolutionaries but almost succeeded in creating a new literary hero—the worker. S. Rusakiev, A. Anchev, and K. Dudevsky discuss Bunin's realism, the relationship of Tolstoy's criticism of the state to his religious views, and the Bulgarian translations of the works of Leonov.

In the third part, problems of folklore and ethnography are considered. P. Dinekov claims that the Bulgarian revolutionary poetry owes much to the *haiduk* folk songs, while N. Shumada shows the relationship between Ukrainian and Bulgarian folklore. E. Georgiev asserts that Vuk Karadžić should be considered the father of the study of Bulgarian folklore. I. Konev's essay on Karadžić and the Bulgarians fully supports this view. S. Stoikova and the late Ts. Romanska discuss rhymes, alliterations, and repetitions in epic folklore and a cycle of songs about the hero Momchil. An article by E. Ognianova deals with images of the battle of Kosovo in late nineteenth-century Bulgarian folk songs. V. Vülchev argues that Bulgarian symbolist poets did not break with the folk tradition. U. Georgieva, R. Katsarova, and D. Marinov examine the origins of St. George's holiday, the *kukeri* (mummers), and the ethnographic characteristics of the yoke in Bulgaria.

Part 4 treats historicocultural problems. V. Georgiev distinguishes three historical phases in the development of Slavic mythology; R. Bernard writes on the *karakondzho* or bugbear and its relation to the Turkish *karakoncolos*; T. Tomov examines the spread and influence of the ideas of the Bogomils in the West; N. Todorov's essay deals with the Bulgarians and the Greek revolution of 1821; and V. Paskaleva traces the way in which Russian consuls in the Ottoman Empire developed a better understanding of the Bulgarian national movement in the years prior to the Crimean War.

Although most of the essays deal with narrow topics and there is a general

lack of unity, together they constitute a significant contribution to scholarship. With few exceptions the essays are factual and scholarly. Where they fail to add new evidence, they suggest viable new approaches. In short, this book presents a series of essays which should prove especially valuable to those interested in Bulgarian culture and Bulgaria's relations with her neighbors.

PHILIP SHASHKO

*University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

MAGYARORSZÁG KÜLPOLITIKÁJA, 1938–1939. Edited by *Magda Adám*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970. 809 pp. 140 Ft.

This documentary collection is the third volume in the series of publications from the Hungarian Foreign Ministry archives, *Diplomáciai iratok Magyarország külpolitikájához, 1936–1945*. The series is being published under the auspices of the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Of the planned six volumes, the first, second, and fourth have been published previously. This volume covers the period from the First Vienna Award on November 2, 1938, to the Hungarian annexation of Subcarpathian Ruthenia in conjunction with Hitler's occupation of Bohemia and Moravia in March 1939. The focus is on Hungarian efforts to annex that part of Ruthenia which Hungary failed to obtain from Czechoslovakia by German-Italian arbitration in the First Vienna Award. There is considerable information regarding Polish-Hungarian plans to precipitate an uprising among pro-Hungarian factions in Ruthenia, and then jointly to move in and "restore order" on November 20, 1938. These schemes were connected with the Hungarian desire to maintain a foreign policy independent of Germany. Warsaw and Budapest hoped that the establishment of a common border through Hungarian annexation of the rest of Ruthenia would make possible the formation of a neutral bloc of states in East Central Europe supported by Italy—the so-called Third Europe. After vehement German opposition forced Hungary to cancel plans for the invasion of Ruthenia, however, Budapest changed its tactics. The documents clearly show that both the Hungarian signature of the Anticomintern Pact in February 1939 and the withdrawal from the League of Nations in April were directly related to this shift in policy after the November fiasco. It was hoped that what could not be obtained independently might be obtained by closer cooperation with the Reich. Vindication of this view seemed to come in March 1939 when Hitler finally allowed the annexation.

The collection is also relevant to a study of the relations between Germany and the Soviet Union. There is evidence here, as well as in other sources, that Hitler toyed with the notion of making Ruthenia into a kind of Ukrainian Piedmont which would attract to it the Soviet Ukraine. The fact that Hitler allowed the Hungarians to occupy the area in March appears to indicate that by this time he was already beginning to consider the possibility of a German-Soviet alliance at Polish expense.

The appendixes contain a summary in German of each document, the organization of the Hungarian Foreign Ministry, a list of foreign diplomats accredited to Hungary, and the names of Hungarian representatives abroad. Identification of persons is generally adequate, although there are a few instances in which names are spelled incorrectly.

Considering the emphasis on the problem of Subcarpathian Ruthenia, it is