

In August of 1943 that center disappeared with Boris's sudden death (Miller agrees with Frederick Chary that he died of natural causes), and the leadership vacuum became acute. The sole source of recognized authority became the three regents, for Boris's son Simeon was still a child. After Stalingrad, it was obvious to most government officials that Hitler would eventually lose the war, and if Bulgaria were to salvage anything from the wreckage she would have to take decisive action. But the new prime minister was Dobri Bozhilov—Miller rightly characterizes him as “not qualified for higher office”—who installed a “colorless” cabinet which proved quite incapable, during 1944, of taking the initiatives necessary to end Bulgaria's participation in the war. As the situation worsened, Bozhilov yielded place to Ivan Bagrianov, who likewise proved unable to lead the country out of its impasse. Finally, the last cabinet to hold power—for only a few desperate days before the coup of September 9, 1944—was headed by three “Vrabcha 1” Agrarians, of whom the least competent, Konstantin Muraviev, became prime minister. In any case, by then it was too late. The failure of leadership at the top had been decisive.

Miller frequently speaks of such “opposition leaders” as Nikola Mushanov and Dimitur Gichev, head of the Vrabcha 1 Agrarians. But these men were “opposition leaders” only in a very restricted sense: they did not derive their authority from the people through the parliament (indeed Gichev had failed of election to parliament in 1940), but rather anticipated coming to power by the authority of the king, or, later, by authority of the regents. Mushanov and Gichev accepted the established source of authority, even if they opposed some of its policies. The genuine and fundamental opposition to King Boris came from the “Pladne” Agrarians, under the leadership of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, who fled the country in early 1941, and Nikola Petkov. The open opposition of the Pladne Agrarians to the king's pro-German policies substantially antedated that of the Bulgarian Communist Party, which went into open opposition only after the German attack on the Soviet Union. In July 1944, the Pladne Agrarians summoned Bulgaria to declare war on Germany as the only conceivable means of saving the situation. But the Pladne Agrarian leadership could not prevail over the inertia of the Bulgarian government until the upheaval of September 9 swept away all the established leaders, both “government” and “opposition.” Miller pays insufficient attention to this aspect of the political struggle in Bulgaria over the war years.

On the whole, however, *Bulgaria During the Second World War* is a very worthwhile contribution to American scholarship on Bulgaria.

CHARLES A. MOSER
George Washington University

POVIJEST KATOLIČKE CRKVE MEĐU HRVATIMA. By *Josip Buturac* and *Antun Ivandića*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko književno društvo sv. Ćirila i Metoda, 1973. 372 pp. Illus. Maps.

Church history is one of the more neglected fields of modern Yugoslav historiography. While several recent studies have appeared on the history of the Serbian Orthodox church (see the review by Wayne Vucinich in *Slavic Review*, 34, no. 1 [March 1975]), a comprehensive history of the Catholic church in the Yugoslav lands is still lacking. This book provides a succinct but reliable survey of the

Catholic church in the Croatian lands (including Bosnia) from Roman times to the twentieth century. The authors are professors at the theological seminary in Zagreb, who bring to their subject a thorough familiarity with the archival sources for Croatian church history. They confine their survey to the development of religious institutions among the Croats, with just passing mention of the neighboring peoples. Their intention is to show that the Catholic church has always played a positive role in the cultural life and national struggles of the Croatian people.

The emphasis of the book is on the institutional rather than the social history of Catholicism. Thus, meticulous attention is paid to diocesan jurisdictions, religious orders, liturgical usages, Church schools and seminaries, and the careers of individual bishops and clergymen. The authors do include some sections, however, on demographic, cultural, and political topics. For example, the strongest section of the book deals with the period of Turkish rule over the Catholics of Slavonia and Bosnia, which saw interruptions of ecclesiastical administration in these regions and a general migration of Croats northward and westward into Habsburg-held territories. Another topic that is covered well is the Patavine or Bogomil heresy of medieval Bosnia. One wishes only that the authors had explored other topics, such as the interaction of Catholics and Orthodox in mixed dioceses, the Reformation in the Croatian lands, or the role of the Catholic clergy in the Illyrian movement. The whole question of Church-State relations in the Habsburg Empire is superficially treated from an ultramontane viewpoint. A mere eighteen pages are devoted to Yugoslavia after 1918. The abortive 1937 concordat between Yugoslavia and the Vatican is barely noted. The world wars are entirely omitted, as are Church-State relations under Tito's regime.

Despite these shortcomings, the book remains a valuable reference work for scholars interested in the religious history of the South Slavs. It has very thorough indexes, five fold-out maps, and lists of all Catholic bishops, but the bibliography is short.

JAMES B. BUKOWSKI
Augustana College

KULTURA BOŠNJAKA: MUSLIMANSKA KOMPONENTA. By *Smail Balić*. Vienna: Adolf Holzhausens, 1973. 247 pp. + 13 pp. photographs. Paper.

As the first exhaustive survey of the cultural evolution and activity of the Bosnian Moslems, from the second half of the fifteenth century (that is, from the beginning of Ottoman rule in Bosnia) to the present, this work must be viewed as something less than a success. The book, based on an extensive use of both archival sources and published material, contains an impressive mass of data and covers virtually every aspect of this important and much misunderstood component of South Slavic culture. Its documentary format does credit Balić's work, but, unfortunately, its prodigious and detailed presentation of specific information is not given any far-reaching systematic analysis. The analysis that does appear very seldom goes beneath the surface of the various issues and serves only to support a particular set of facts within Balić's polemics against the writers on the culture of the Bosnian Moslems who have preceded him.

The book as a whole suffers from Balić's inability to organize and consolidate his material and from his failure to bring out the essential and to suppress the