interwar period constituted literacy, educational and professional opportunities, maternity care, daycare, and a decrease in infant mortality—all achievements that Bohachevsky-Chomiak claims for the Soviet state. Yet she still insists that "the opportunities were never real" and the Party did not "respond to the needs of women."

Bohachevsky-Chomiak's focus on the relationship between feminism and nationalism is laudable. Unfortunately, she never engages the larger theoretical questions, and like the subjects of her own research, concentrates on practical activities. She has collected a vast amount of material, but is unable to fit it into an analytical framework. Those interested in the relationship between feminism and nationalism must devise their own conclusions from her work.

Wendy Goldman

Carnegie Mellon University


The work under review comprises fourteen studies in English, French, and Italian by the able Bulgarian historian and archaeologist Vassil Gjuzelev. Though all of the articles deal with some aspect of Bulgarian history, they make up a varied collection dealing with matters from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries. Moreover, the studies range from scholarly-popular to highly academic works. Of particular interest to the more general reader are his two long studies, "The Protobulgarians—a Pre-history of the Asparouhian Bulgaria" (pp. 11-80) and "The Adoption of Christianity in Bulgaria" (pp. 115-203). The former is, to the best of my knowledge, the only serious work in English detailing the history of the Bulgars (Proto-Bulgars) prior to their crossing the Danube into what is now Bulgaria in the seventh century. The latter, after a brief but flawed and somewhat inaccurate history of Christianity in the Balkans prior to the arrival of the Slavs, turns into a stimulating study of the Christianization of Bulgaria in the ninth century. It is aimed at the general reader but should also be of interest to scholars for its various new insights, something that should be of no surprise, for Gjuzelev is the author of Knjaz Boris P"rui, the best biography of Prince Boris.

The most interesting studies for the scholar will probably be found in the last section, five articles on Bulgarian Black Sea trade with Venice and Genoa in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (pp. 263-363). Particularly important is "Les relations Bulgare-Venétienes durant la première moitié du XIVe siècle" (pp. 289-326) in which Gjuzelev corrects LJubi’s 1352 dating of John Alexander’s trade treaty with Venice, persuasively placing it in the second half of 1347, and then goes on to detail the terms of the treaty and their general place in Bulgarian policy toward the Italian merchants; he also provides a valuable discussion of the values of the various currencies of the middle of the fourteenth century.

Of greatest interest to this reviewer is the study in French of the contribution of the Bulgars in breaking the Arab siege of Constantinople in 717-18 (pp. 91-113). Normally historians, following Theophanes and
Nicephorus, present this event straightforwardly as if there were no problems: the Bulgarians of Tervel in 718 responded to the call of Byzantine Emperor Leo III and sent troops which caught the Arabs between themselves and the city's walls, wiping out between twenty and thirty thousand Arabs. The Bulgarians thus have traditionally been given a major role in breaking the siege. Gjuzelev does not question the clear-cut Bulgarian contribution but shows the complexity of the issue. He presents a study of all sources on the siege: the Byzantine (with two different traditions), the Arabic, the Western, and the later Bulgarian sources. Then he notes that were possibly two "Bulgarias" involved—besides Tervel's state in Bulgaria there was also the remnants of Kuver's settlement in Macedonia north of Thessaloniki. The earliest Byzantine tradition (represented by the Akatist hymn and the Synaharium of the Church of Constantinople) suggests that upon their arrival one contingent of Arabs went off into Thrace to secure their positions for the siege, provoking a conflict with Bulgarians—possibly the Macedonian ones—which resulted in these Bulgarians wiping out twenty thousand Arabs. Other sources, Arabic ones, ignore this foray and have Arabs concentrating from the start on effectively setting up their siege. This tradition then has Tervel's Bulgarians launching an attack at the besieging Arabs—who, according to Gjuzelev, may never have struck out into Thrace/Macedonia at all—as early as 717 and effectively bottling them up for the difficult winter of 717-18. Emperor Leo, according to Nicephorus, called in the midst of the siege for help from some Bulgarians—usually thought to be Tervel's. But if Tervel was already there, this would make no sense. But were his Bulgarians really there so early? Or had this call been sent much earlier in 717? Or if Tervel was present, was the call sent to "Kuver's" group? One current of Arabic sources, ignoring Tervel entirely, supports the last possibility and has this second group arriving in 718 to destroy many Arabs. It also adds further complications. For Leo's deposed predecessor, Anastasius II, had been exiled to a monastery north of Thessaloniki, and Anastasius, then, if we can believe this Arabic version, led these rescue forces. And Gjuzelev believes these Bulgarian would-be rescuers were Macedonians, but he doubts they showed up when the siege was in progress. Instead, following Theophanes, Gjuzelev believes Anastasius in fact used these troops to revolt against Leo, a revolt that failed. Indeed, it was doomed to fail, since Anastasius' Bulgarian allies (wherever they came from, for it is not certain they were from Macedonia) almost certainly, as Theophanes reports, appeared on the scene after the Arabs had withdrawn, so Leo had no trouble putting the rebellion down.

Gjuzelev concludes that the sequence of events went: 1) July-15 August 717, treaty between Bulgaria [Tervel] and Byzantium to fight the Arabs; 2) [After the Arabs arrived], first half of August 717, the Bulgarians [Tervel] attacked the [Arab] detachment of Maslama and routed them; 3) 15 August 717 to 15 August 718, commanded by [General] Kormesii the Bulgarians [of Tervel] warred without cease against the Arabs before the walls; 4) in the spring of 718 [Tervel's] Bulgarians wiped out an Arab detachment of about 22,000; 5) the Bulgars and Slavs of Macedonia, possibly summoned by Leo and mobilized under Anastasius II, sought to overthrow Leo only to be defeated after the retreat of the Arabs (second half of