

opponents and ideologicopolitical adversaries. All in all, this commendable achievement is likely to become an important reference for any serious student of modern Serbian intellectual history.

GEORGE V. TOMASHEVICH  
*State University of New York College at Buffalo*

ČEMU PRAXIS. By *Gajo Petrović*. Zagreb: Praxis, 1972. 240 pp.

The chronicles, reviews, and interviews included in this quintessential booklet were published in various contexts between 1964 and 1968. Except for the "Addendum" ("Dodatak"), enlarged with information dating from 1968 to 1971, all the articles are republished unchanged. Besides a preface, an introduction, and a bibliography the volume consists of fifteen largely independent topics from the whole range of current Marxism, as experienced by a leading Yugoslav philosopher surveying the highlights and problems of its recent development at home and abroad. These topics are grouped under three subtitles: "Yugoslav Philosophy and the Journal *Praxis*," "Marxism in the West and in the East," and "Chances of Disalienation." The concluding article deals with questions of Yugoslavia's multinational society, and the "Addendum" with the development of its philosophy since World War II (1945–71). According to Professor Petrović, *Praxis* is meant to be a "philosophical journal in the sense in which philosophy is a thought of revolution: a merciless critique of everything existent, a humanistic vision of a truly humane world, and an inspiring force of revolutionary action." A well-known anti-Stalinist, opposed to repression and administrative interference, he defends the freedom of expression and categorically rejects every preconception about who has the right to be regarded as an "authentic" Marxist.

GEORGE V. TOMASHEVICH  
*State University of New York College at Buffalo*

LIUBEN KARAVELOV: ZHIVOT, DELO, EPOKHA, 1834–1879. By *Mikhail Arnaudov*. 2nd edition. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1972. 874 pp. 8.71 lv.

Historians of the Bulgarian national renaissance have acknowledged the particular contribution and significance of Liuben Karavelov not only in the development of the ideology and tactics of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement and the establishment of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee but also in the general cultural and literary revival. Mikhail Arnaudov is one of the leading authorities on the renaissance. Through his voluminous writings, especially those dealing with the major figures of the renaissance, he has greatly contributed to our knowledge and understanding of the period. Thus his work on Karavelov, completed in the 1950s but not published until 1964, is not only a continuation of the series of works on the *vŭzrozhdentsi* (enlighteners) and his efforts to study the period through the leading personalities—or, as he calls them, the "heroes of the Bulgarian renaissance"—but also a successful completion of those writings.

Arnaudov's meticulous work on Karavelov is chiefly an intellectual biography of the complex personality, activities, and ideology of the writer, journalist, revolutionary, and politician. Based on archival sources, Karavelov's published works,

and a wide range of writings on Karavelov and the renaissance, the book reflects a deep and sympathetic understanding of the cultural and sociopolitical conditions of nineteenth-century Bulgaria against the wider European background. Taking a broad and penetrating view of Karavelov, the author relates the various stages of his intellectual growth to the ideological currents and political realities of the period.

Karavelov's childhood experiences in his native Koprivshitsa nourished his creative spirit all through his life. His stay in Plovdiv, Adrianople, and Constantinople, as well as his travels throughout Bulgaria, broadened his mental horizons, making him aware of the plight of the people, and the national and political conflicts within Ottoman society. His thirst for knowledge and commitment to work for the liberation of his country led him to travel to Russia.

The author examines in detail the social and intellectual climate in Russia during Karavelov's period of residence, and the influence that the writings of the Slavophiles, the Westerners, the Pan-Slavs, and the "people of the sixties" exerted on Karavelov. It was here that his world outlook was formed. Arnaudov believes that the ideas of Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and the Nihilists more than anything else determined Karavelov's ideology and style of life. After making his first literary debut in Russia he left for Serbia and then Rumania in order to be closer to his homeland.

Karavelov's participation in the activities of the Serbian youth organization, his relations with Serbian intellectuals and politicians, and his contributions to Serbian literature are closely examined by the author. However, he regards Karavelov's "Bucharest period" as the most significant in his short life. In 1869 Karavelov became active in the Bulgarian national liberation movement. As editor of the two most important revolutionary newspapers and as president of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee, Karavelov became one of the most influential Bulgarians of the period. His relations with Vasil Levski, Khristo Botev, and other revolutionaries are treated with particular care.

Among the many questions students of Karavelov have disagreed on, two stand out as most significant. The first concerns Karavelov's ideology, and the second focuses attention on his practical revolutionary activity. Arnaudov regards Karavelov as the "tribune" of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement who believed that the Bulgarians could successfully carry out their national revival through "enlightenment and revolution." Although the author speaks of Karavelov as a revolutionary and a democrat, he does not fully agree with those historians who claim that Karavelov was a "revolutionary democrat." On this as well as on the question of the origins and formation of the Revolutionary Committee, Arnaudov's views coincide with the opinion expressed by the late Mikhail Dimitrov, who stated that it was not Karavelov who swayed Levski toward a revolutionary path; rather the revolutionary movement created by Levski won over Karavelov to its cause, even though temporarily, without making him a consistent and thoroughgoing revolutionary. This, in Arnaudov's opinion, does not in any sense diminish Karavelov's greatness or place in the Bulgarian renaissance. He perceives the roles of the two revolutionaries as complementing one another.

A large part of the book is devoted to the study of Karavelov's philosophical and political outlook, stressing his view on the relation between enlightenment and revolution as a means for the liberation of the country, and his concern with the role of the Great Powers in the Balkans and the necessity of a Balkan federation.

The author also considers Karavelov's literary works as well as his views on the role of art and the artist in society.

Although Arnaudov's book is well written, its encyclopedic character may make it difficult for some readers to follow his main arguments. This reviewer has discovered no major changes in this edition. Pantelei Zarev's preface, which praised the work and at the same time pointed out some disagreements with the author, is not reprinted in this edition. The numerous illustrations in the first edition were also eliminated. There is improvement in the footnoting system, the bibliography, and the index. The reviewer expected to find in this edition a consideration of Krumka Sharova's view that Karavelov was involved in revolutionary activity before he went to Rumania in 1869, and more information and analysis of his relations with Rumanian intellectuals and politicians.

In general, this is an original work, presenting many interesting insights not only on Karavelov but also on various individuals and events of the period. It also probes deeply into the nature of Karavelov's ideas, the influences affecting his views, and the motives underlying his revolutionary activity and writings.

PHILIP SHASHKO

*University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee*

STO GODINI BŪLGARSKA AKADEMIIA NA NAUKITE, 1869–1969. Vol. 2: PROFESORI I STARSHI NAUCHNI SŪTRUDNITSI: OBSHTE-STVENI NAUKI. Edited by *P. Zarev, E. Mateev, and E. Savova*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŷlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1972. 396 pp. 4.18 lv.

The three-volume biobibliographic directory of the members and scholarly staff of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, which was initiated for its centennial in 1969, is now complete. The first volume (see *Slavic Review*, December 1970, p. 762) was devoted to the Academy's elected members; the second and third volumes, which appeared in 1972, provide the same kind of information for its appointed staff in the social sciences and the natural and applied sciences, respectively. Volume 2 includes 170 scholars of two ranks making up the research staffs of the Academy's institutes of economics (the largest), history (second largest), Balkan studies, linguistics, literature, folklore, and other fields.

The Academy's organization by institutes supplied with research staffs is a development of the postwar years, when the Soviet Academy of Sciences became the model for the creation of a central agency of research in all fields. Before 1944 its only operational units in the social sciences were a commission for collection and publication of sources for Bulgarian history and an "office" for the compilation and publication of a dictionary of the Bulgarian language, but of the two only the dictionary office had a full-time scholar on its staff. Judging from the bibliographies presented in the directory, the approach taken since 1944 has been very fruitful.

MARIN PUNDEFF

*California State University, Northridge*