

Vazov's place in Bulgarian literature still resound through the pages of this study. Though Vŭlchev criticizes Vazov for his political lapses, he is wholly persuaded of Vazov's importance in the history of Bulgarian literature, and so rejects the opinions of several prominent Communist theoreticians and critics who wrote about him during Vazov's lifetime and later. At one point he even goes so far as to declare that the "party line" on Vazov in the early 1920s was incorrect. That "line" has now been considerably straightened through the contributions of such books as this one.

CHARLES A. MOSER

*George Washington University*

STANOVLENIE MARKSISTSKOI ISTORIOGRAFIJ V BOLGARIJ (S KONTSA XIX V. DO SOTSIALISTICHESKOJ REVOLIUTSII 1944 G.): PROBLEMY BOLGARSKOGO VOZROZHDENIIA. By *A. S. Beilis*. L'vov: Izdatel'stvo L'vovskogo universiteta, 1970. 240 pp.

Two considerations make Beilis's study a useful contribution. First, it is somewhat of a pioneering effort, given the dearth of book-length studies on any aspect of Bulgarian historiography. Second, most of the issues discussed have continued to be controversial problems among Bulgarian historians.

In part 1 (on the establishment of a "Marxist" historiography on the Bulgarian Revival), Beilis analyzes the writings on historical topics of Dimitŭr Blagoev and such other "narrow socialist" activists as Todor Petrov, Gavril Georgiev, Georgi Kirkov, Georgi Dimitrov, Khristo Kabakchiev, and Vasil Kolarov. Part 2 (the "Marxist-Leninist" period) covers Georgi Bakalov, Todor Pavlov, Mikhail Dimitrov, and Zhak Natan. The author treats chiefly three issues: the penetration of capitalism into the Bulgarian economy, the class composition of nineteenth-century Bulgarian society, and the classification of the leaders of the national liberation movement. Beilis wants to show how historical materialism, "revolutionary objectivism," Leninist teachings on the revolutionary democrats, *partiinost'*, and so forth, have aided Bulgarian Marxists in unmasking "bourgeois-idealist" and "fascist-chauvinist" conceptions of Bulgarian history.

In terms of his own conceptualization of his task, Beilis does a competent job. His presentation of the views of his subjects is generally accurate, with one major exception: Blagoev did not consider Vasil Levski the revolutionary equal of Liuben Karavelov and Khristo Botev (p. 70). The author is careful in noting subsequent refinements and changes in the views of the writers he discusses.

There are shortcomings. The book is not well organized. Perhaps too much attention is given to general theory and to the political battles in which Beilis's subjects were involved. He is not bothered by the fact that only two or three of the writers he studies were historians, or by the failure of pre-1944 Bulgarian Marxist writers to contribute much new factual knowledge about the revival. The author does not mention the impact of a changing Comintern line on the Marxian treatment of the idea of a "Greater Bulgaria" in the nation's past.

Beilis's failure to draw general conclusions from his study is suggestive, especially in view of the manner in which problems of interpretation continued to bedevil Bulgarian Marxist historians after 1944.

THOMAS A. MEININGER

*Atkinson College, York University*