

LA ROMANITÉ DES ROUMAINS: HISTOIRE D'UNE IDÉE. By *Adolf Armbruster*. *Bibliotheca Historica Romaniae*, Monographies, 17. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1977. 279 pp. Lei 22.

The translation of the 1971 Rumanian edition of this work is another contribution to the extensive literature dealing with the continuity of Roman culture in Rumania—a most important historical question to modern Rumanians. The book is only an indirect attempt to prove continuity, however; for the most part, it is an account (with extensive excerpts in the original languages) of those Rumanian and foreign writers, who, from the tenth to the mid-eighteenth centuries, considered the question of Rumanian *romanité*—that is, the continuity of descent from the Roman colonists of Dacia and the Roman character of the modern Rumanian language and customs. The work is essentially Armbruster's doctoral dissertation, written under the direction of Andrei Oțetea, a noted Rumanian historian, who provides a short preface. As one would expect, the book is thorough and scholarly, with more than adequate documentation. The reader will be impressed by the author's mastery of "the impressive bulk of material collected," as was Oțetea (p. 7), and may also agree that Armbruster is a worthy successor of the Saxon historians of Transylvania. Unless he is one of the specialists to whom the question is of particular relevance, however, the reader is likely to tire of the lengthy catalog of writers who, through the centuries, have observed the *romanité* of the Rumanians. But, for the specialist, the point is well made; there simply is no serious tradition to contradict continuity. One may object that the Hungarian writers who made their appearance toward the end of the period, suggesting a later Rumanian migration into Transylvania, are not given a fair hearing, but that is hardly to be expected, and their witness does nothing to change the overall picture.

Although the theme of the book is narrow, there is some information for the scholar whose interests are broader than the history of Rumanian *romanité*. Many of the writers who march through Armbruster's pages are extremely interesting in themselves. Popes, humanists, Saxon chroniclers, Jesuit missionaries—all are worthy of further attention. For the historian who is particularly concerned with the inter-relationship between East and West, the book could well prove seminal.

RICHARD TODD
Wichita State University

BULGARIA PAST AND PRESENT: STUDIES IN HISTORY, LITERATURE, ECONOMICS, MUSIC, SOCIOLOGY, FOLKLORE AND LINGUISTICS. Edited by *Thomas Butler*. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bulgarian Studies Held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison—May 3–5, 1973. Columbus, Ohio: American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, 1976. xiv, 397 pp. Paper.

As Professor Robert Byrnes pointed out in this journal a short while ago (*Slavic Review*, 36, no. 2 [June 1977]: 286–91), there is good reason to fear for the health of the Slavic profession. The contraction of employment possibilities is enervating a generation of graduate students, universities are not replacing senior professors, and decreasing enrollments are discouraging even the most optimistic. But one sign of health is the proliferation of special interest groups for the study of East European problems. Whereas fifteen years ago the AAASS itself had yet to hold its first national convention, today a number of groups meet regularly to pursue special interests. There are groups for the study of Greece, Rumania, Slovenia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, and others, as well as the American Association for Southeast European Studies and the Association for the Study of the Nationalities in the Soviet Union.

One of the most successful of these groups has been the Bulgarian Studies Group. Founded in 1971 by a handful of interested scholars, it immediately began publishing

a meaty newsletter and arranging scholarly contacts among Bulgarianists in this country and in Bulgaria. The initial fruit of this effort was the first international conference on Bulgarian studies, held in Madison at the University of Wisconsin in May 1973. This has since been followed by a second international conference, held in Varna in June 1978.

It would be fruitless to review individually the thirty-seven contributions in five fields which were presented at Madison and published in this collection. Only a few of the presentations fall into the category of national glorification—for example, Emil Georgiev's parochial exaggeration of Bulgarian literary contributions—but these are balanced by contributions such as that of Riccardo Picchio, whose notion of fifteenth-century Italy and Russia as two extreme variants of the Byzantine diaspora places Bulgarian events in a broad European development. In the historical section, and presumably in the other sections, most of the articles cover ground the authors have covered elsewhere, although Philip Shashko's piece on Kishelski is new, and there are two excellent articles on historiography and the development of Bulgarian studies that should be read by all Balkanists. The historical articles are traditional methodologically. This is not entirely desirable, but perhaps it is to be expected at this stage of the development of Bulgarian studies. One other article that needs to be mentioned is the superbly clear and succinct discussion of Bulgarian demography by Anastas Iu. Totev.

One might have hoped for more daring and originality in these contributions, but this volume is evidence of considerable good will and hard work on the part of both Bulgarians and Americans. The Slavic profession may be facing serious problems as we approach the 1980s, but lethargy among the Bulgarianists is not one of them.

GALE STOKES
Rice University

GREECE AND ALBANIA, 1908–1914. By *Basil Kondis*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1976. 151 pp.

Basil Kondis's study is based principally on extensive work in the Athenian archival collections of the Greek Foreign Ministry, the Benaki Museum (Northern Epirus and Venizelos papers), and *Syllogos Parnassos* (Nicholas Levidas papers). He has also consulted British Foreign Office materials and a number of books and articles published in Albanian that have hitherto been overlooked by Western diplomatic historians. In his work, Kondis argues that Greece favored the creation of an autonomous Albania "except for Epirus" and "repeatedly tried to come to an understanding with the Albanians to avoid excessive interference by the Powers and her Slavic neighbors" (p. 13). The support that Greece then gave for the creation of an Albanian state was, in the author's opinion, of a more "upright" nature than that given by Albania and Italy, who "supported the creation of Albania to weaken both Greeks and Slavs and to ensure their continued control over the Otranto Straits and Albania" (pp. 13, 136–37).

Greeks and Albanians, to be sure, had lived together for generations in southern Albania. A considerable proportion of the Albanophones in this area were of the Orthodox faith, and were strongly influenced by the hierarchy and civilization of the Greek church. After 1908, the chaotic conditions in the Ottoman Empire and the threat of Bulgarian and Serbian expansion made the Albanians and Greeks natural allies. Even before 1908, the Albanian nationalist leader Ismail Kemal, who had once studied at the Greek gymnasium in Ioannina, visited Athens and concluded a secret agreement with Prime Minister George Theotokis on terms highly favorable to Greek aspirations in southern Albania (northern Epirus). In July 1910, a detailed program of cooperation between Greeks and Albanians was proposed by Kemal and accepted by the Greek government. By the beginning of 1913, however, the progress of the Albanian nationalist movement, growing unrest in Albania, and the interference of