

ISTORIA NA BŪLGARSKATA LITERATURA. Vol. 3: BŪLGARSKATA LITERATURA OT OSVOBOZHDENIETO (1878) DO KRAIA NA PŪRVATA SVETOVNA VOINA. Edited by *Pantelei Zarev*, *Stoian Karolev*, and *Georgi Tsanev*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BŪlgarskata akademiia na naukite, Institut za literatura, 1970. 980 pp. 9.53 lv.

The book under review is the third volume of the four-volume history of Bulgarian literature from the beginnings to the present published by the Institute of Literature of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The first volume (1963) dealt with Old Bulgarian literature, the second (1966) with the literature of the Bulgarian Renaissance, and this one with literature from Bulgaria's liberation in 1878 to the end of the First World War. The last one is supposed to come down to, roughly, the present day. In terms of sheer bulk the second volume is larger than the first, the third is more than twice as extensive as the second, and one suspects that the fourth may well have to be published in two parts. But such is the rise in literary productivity, if not literary quality, as we approach our own day.

A considerable portion of the first volume is given over to essays on areas of literature, such as stories and tales, and apocryphal literature. Even here, however, the organization is primarily by individual authors, with general essays introducing each major chronological period. This approach, no doubt the best one for a history covering a great deal of ground and written by divers hands, is adhered to systematically in the volume under review, which is broken down into three major subdivisions: the 1880s (with an essay by Georgi Tsanev), the 1890s (with an essay by Pantelei Zarev), and the early twentieth century up to the end of the First World War (again introduced with an extensive essay by Zarev). Each of these subdivisions includes several chapters by various scholars on individual writers thought by the editors to fit primarily into this period. In a volume that embraces a relatively brief span of time, however, this approach unavoidably leads to anomalies, such as placing the chapter of some 130 pages on Vazov by Georgi Tsanev under the 1880s, even though Vazov did not die until 1921 (after the concluding date of the volume) and was active during all three subperiods. Another placement with which one might quarrel is the essay by Rozalia Likova on Emanuil Popdimitrov found under the third subdivision, when he might well have been left for the following volume on the interwar period. But these are matters of judgment, and the editors cannot definitively be proved wrong in this case.

In their approach to the subject matter the authors of this volume generally adopt a rather less doctrinaire attitude than many have done in the past. This is less true of Tsanev in his essay on the 1880s, but Zarev in his wide-ranging treatments of the 1890s and the early part of this century offers clearly organized essays on general literary developments, including considerable background on minor figures and displaying a lively sense of the richness of literary history. Dogmatism is being winnowed out of Zarev's writing.

The choice of figures to whom individual essays are dedicated is wider than one might have expected. In addition to the recognized writers one would count on finding, such as Vazov, Velichkov, Vlaikov, Aleko Konstantinov, Pencho Slaveikov, Iavorov, Todorov, Khristov, Stamatov, Elin Pelin, and several others, one discovers not only a few lesser figures included primarily because of their importance in the early development of Communist literature (Dimitŭr Polianov), but also others who might well have been passed over—for example, such former

unpersons as the "bourgeois" literary critic Dr. Krüst'o Krüstev and the "bourgeois" literary historian Boian Penev, and also that quintessentially symbolist poet Teodor Traianov. Moreover, such figures have been assigned for the most part to scholars generally sympathetic toward their work. Thus Zdravko Petrov's chapter of around thirteen pages on Traianov is interesting and erudite and contains a number of apt observations; it emphasizes *Panteon*, however, published in the 1930s, and Traianov's romantic roots, and avoids the more general question of symbolism's place in Bulgarian literary history. Nevertheless, it advances the process of symbolism's rehabilitation in the eyes of Bulgarian scholars and represents a fuller approximation to historical objectivity in dealing with such subjects. In her essay on the symbolist Emanuil Popdimitrov, Rozaliia Likova comes considerably shorter of objectivity than Petrov: she constantly speaks of "contradictions" in his work after his divergence from the Communists in the mid-1920s, ignores almost totally the religious element in his writing, and so forth. But she is nevertheless generally well disposed toward the subject of her essay (the only one she has contributed to this volume), and with time the Bulgarian scholarly world may arrive at a more objective public evaluation of him. In sum, the fetters of ideology are still fastened upon this collection, but they are now a burden more lightly borne. Certainly this volume, like those preceding it, should be in the library of every serious student of Bulgarian literature.

The book is equipped with a detailed index and an extensive selected bibliography, which is, however, limited almost exclusively to works in Bulgarian, with a few Russian items included.

CHARLES A. MOSER

The George Washington University

BULGARIA UNDER COMMUNIST RULE. By *J. F. Brown*. New York, Washington, and London: Praeger Publishers, 1970. ix, 338 pp. \$11.00.

J. F. Brown, director of the East European Research Department of Radio Free Europe in Munich, presents in this book a comprehensive account of communism in Bulgaria in the last two decades. Brown is a veteran observer of the East European political scene. His previous works include *The New Eastern Europe* and numerous articles on Communist affairs.

The once volatile Bulgarians have remained politically docile during the last generation. Bulgaria has neither deviated from the political standards set by the Soviet Union nor produced visible internal combustions of any consequence. Her immobilism has left her in the shadows of European politics. The turmoils of the early years of sovietization have calmed to a state of apparent acceptance of Communist dominion and Moscow's overlordship. As a result, Bulgaria has remained almost entirely neglected in Western scholarship. All too often the attention of the serious academic community specializing in contemporary politics is geared to crisis situations. But Brown's *Bulgaria Under Communist Rule* offers excellent proof of the intrinsic importance of scholarship directed toward clarifying the nonsensational spheres of sociopolitical interactions.

The book under review makes no particular claim on the period of Bulgaria's sovietization. The years between 1944, when the country was occupied by the Red Army, and the death of Stalin are summed up in a brief opening chapter. The history of these eventful years is yet to be written. The impact of Stalin's death on