

“proof of the fact that Vlad Țepeș was determined to act firmly in order to contribute to the economic progress of his country” (p. 76). And in the same vein, the extreme excesses inflicted by Vlad upon his Christian Orthodox coreligionists in the course of military expeditions against his Turkish and Transylvanian enemies (while treated with discretion) are explained in terms of his ingenious military and psychological strategies of warfare. All this leads up to the book’s conclusion that “any method is good if its aim is the strengthening of the country and the defense of its liberty, the two ideals of Vlad Țepeș’s policy” (p. 226).

The retrospective ascription to Vlad the Impaler of political objectives interpreted in terms of state interest and historical progress remains somewhat speculative in relation to the sources, relying as it does to a significant degree on hypothesis and contemporary analogies. Moreover, by taking a consistently one-sided approach to such delicately balanced dilemmas—peculiarly inherent in its reinterpretive effort—as the relation between ends and means in the exercise of statesmanship, the place of ethical and religious restraints in the politics of *raison d’état*, or the legitimation of autocratic rule in terms of superior state goals, the book reflects the normative pressures of the cultural and political environment of which it is a product.

VLADIMIR SOCOR
Columbia University

POLITIKA, PARTII, PECHAT NA BŪLGARSKATA BURZHOAZIIA 1909–1912. By *Elena Statelova*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1973. 0.65 lv.

This book delivers much less than its title promises. Far from being a comprehensive treatment of politics and political parties at a critical moment in Bulgaria’s history, it deals almost exclusively with Bulgaria’s two major independent newspapers and with the newspapers of six “bourgeois” political parties. Statelova defends this narrow focus by stating that “the history of the Bulgarian bourgeois press represents to a great extent the political history of the Bulgarian bourgeois state,” an assertion with which it is impossible to agree, and which seems intended largely to excuse her failure to make much use of any sources, archival or published, except the newspapers themselves.

When the author does attempt to deal with larger questions, her judgments are frequently wrong or superficial. She argues that Bulgaria’s six “bourgeois” parties—the Agrarian Union, Broad Socialist, and Radical Democratic parties are labeled “petit bourgeois” and ignored—may be defined by their class constituencies. For example, the Progressive Liberal Party represented the rising middle commercial and banking interests, the Democratic Party represented the manufacturers, and so on. But to view these parties as the vehicles of distinct groups within the Bulgarian bourgeoisie is to impose a framework that is simply not applicable. Politics itself was Bulgaria’s largest and most lucrative industry, and the parties existed to gain patronage and access to the state treasury for the “chiefs” and their followers. The parties were, in Dimo Kazasov’s words, “corporations formed for the exploitation of power.” Nor does Statelova succeed in demonstrating any correlations between the parties’ constituencies and their positions on domestic or foreign affairs.

The bulk of the book consists of a survey, and it is no more than that, of editorial opinion on the major diplomatic events from Bulgaria’s declaration of *de jure* independence from the Ottoman Empire to the outbreak of the First Balkan War. Statelova believes that the period may be divided into two stages: the first, from 1909 to 1911, in which the question of Bulgaria’s acquisition of Macedonia and Thrace was discussed in a relatively calm and abstract way; and the second, marked by the outbreak

of the Tripolitan War and by Turkish atrocities against Bulgarians in Macedonia, which saw the bourgeois press succumb to war fever and open a campaign to mobilize public opinion for an attack on Turkey. This conclusion is true, but hardly original.

Beyond presenting a limited amount of information on the technical side of Bulgarian publishing, the financing of newspapers, the composition of editorial and reporter staffs, and newspaper circulation, this book contributes little to our knowledge of Bulgaria's political history.

JOHN D. BELL

University of Maryland Baltimore County

DECLINE AND FALL OF BYZANTIUM TO THE OTTOMAN TURKS. By *Doukas*. An annotated translation of "Historia Turco-Byzantina" by *Harry J. Magoulias*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975. 346 pp. Illus. \$18.50.

A valuable Byzantine source concerning Constantinople's fall to the Turks in 1453, and the complex events before and for some years after it, has now been made available in English translation by Professor Harry Magoulias. Descriptions of these events by three other contemporary Byzantine historians, Chalcondyles, Critoboulos, and Sphrantzes, are available, and another, a brief Venetian account, has recently been discovered, but Doukas's account is in certain respects unique. He was not only an eyewitness but, as an administrative employee serving the Latin Gattilusi family of Lesbos, he was also a participant in certain events. No less important, by virtue of his connections with Byzantines, Latins, and even Turks, he was frequently able to secure firsthand reports on events from other persons.

Doukas provides concrete evidence to support the oft-made generalization that a large-scale conversion of Christians to Islam occurred as a result of the opening of key posts in the Turkish government to educated Christians and of the formation of the elite Janissary corps drawn from the sons of Christian peasants. He also gives valuable information on the use of alum (important for dyemaking) in technical processes, on the technique then used to prevent the shattering of cannons at the time of discharge, and, not least interesting, on the sexual depravity of the Turkish leaders. Doukas, a Byzantine aristocrat, is far from impartial toward the Turks but in some ways he is no less biased toward some of his fellow Greeks. As a supporter of religious union with Rome, the overriding political and religious question of the age for the Byzantines, Doukas feels little compassion for the antiunionist mass of the Greek people who clung so tenaciously to their religious practices.

This English translation, which is based on the definitive Greek text established by Greco in 1958, seems to be carefully and faithfully done. Notes are provided to explain any ambiguous passages or incorrect statements of Doukas and any unusual words in the text. As the editor points out in his introduction, Doukas's style, though typically Attic, often incorporates neologisms, words drawn from the demotic Greek of the period. Besides serving Byzantinists, this smooth readable English version should interest the student of affairs in the eastern Mediterranean world during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

DENO J. GEANAKOPLIS

Yale University