

Party. Finally, there is a survey of the activities of the Rumanian Academy between 1879 and 1918 by Dan Berindei. Based chiefly on the *Annals* of the Academy, the sketch continues the author's work on the history of this important Rumanian cultural body and provides an informative introduction to the Academy's operation, membership, and evolution.

To summarize, this collection successfully elucidates several important and interesting topics in nineteenth-century Rumanian history, and presents new documentary materials and sources for the same period. All of the contributions are worth reading.

PAUL E. MICHELSON
Huntington College

BŪLGARI-UCHASTNITSI V BORBITE ZA OSVOBOZHDENIETO NA GŪRTSIIA, 1821–1828: SBORNIK DOKUMENTI. By *Nikolai Todorov* and *Veselin Traikov*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŷlgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1971. 1020 pp. 10.05 lv.

It is well known that philhellenes from Western Europe, America, and the Balkans participated in the struggle for Greek independence of 1821. The Western Europeans and the Americans came to Greece inspired by certain ideals; the supporters from the Balkan countries were governed by more realistic motives. The revolution was not only a Greek matter but also their own; it concerned them personally, as much as it concerned their particular country. We know, from older works, especially those of the memorable N. Traikov, that a certain number of Bulgarians participated in the revolution on the side of the Greeks. The present book determines the precise number of these Bulgarians, and describes their personal stories as well as the extent of their contribution. Seven hundred and four Bulgarians took part in the struggle—168 fought with the Philiki Etairia in Moldavia and Wallachia under Alexander Ypsilantis, and 536 fought in southern Greece, when the revolution was restricted to that area. (There were, undoubtedly, some other Bulgarian combatants, but they remain anonymous.)

The work of N. Todorov and V. Traikov is the result of many years of exhaustive research in the Greek archives in Athens and in various Russian archives. The method of presentation is exemplary. A general informative introduction (pp. 5–47) is followed by a presentation of the Greek documents in the original and in translation in Bulgarian (pp. 51–935). The Russian list of the Bulgarian soldiers in the Danubian Principalities (pp. 936–48), a summary of the introduction in French, and indexes are also included.

From the published archival material it is quite obvious that the revolution inspired not only those who were Greek by origin, but also the rest of the Balkan peoples. This was to be expected. The Balkan peoples were living in the Greek intellectual atmosphere and the nationalist differences between them had not yet developed. Up to that time, the fact of being a Bulgarian or a Serb merely indicated an origin but not a national origin. The distinction between subjugated Balkan peoples on the one hand and Ottomans or other nationals on the other had as a sole criterion the fact that the former were Christian Orthodox, under the jurisdiction of the supranational Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Some years after the revolution, on September 23, 1845, a Regulation was published in Athens covering the establishment of a settlement for Bulgarians and

Serbs who had taken part in the revolution and who had subsequently settled in Greece. The Regulation stated that they belonged by origin and birth to the "Hellenic races of Bulgarians and Serbs. . . ." Thus, Todorov and Traikov's excellent edition is not only an extremely useful source of historical material, it is also a valuable and welcome proof of the cooperation between the Balkan peoples and their common struggles.

CHARALAMBOS K. PAPASTATHIS
University of Thessaloniki

NEW DIRECTIONS IN LITERARY HISTORY. Edited by *Ralph Cohen*.
Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974. viii, 263 pp. \$10.00.

Whether or not Edmund Wilson's "ordinary language of literature" exists, there exist ordinary difficulties in making words say what we mean. Experience slips from us, and the literature that has captured a portion of it is supplanted by a newer literature of new experience; then literary history itself becomes trammled in obsolete allegiances, or, as Robert Weimann says, in separating past significance from present meaning. The approach of Leavis and of Brooks, he says, "even though it satisfied current aesthetic assumptions, was not very helpful in establishing criteria by which a new approach to literary history might have prospered" (p. 51).

These thirteen essays—drawn from *New Literary History*, the most stimulating magazine in literary history today—and the introduction, written by thirteen professors and one novelist-teacher, make a first-rate summary of the present status of literary criticism. Their history is accurate and thorough; their proposals, responsible and challenging.

According to Geoffrey Hartman, the growth of historical consciousness has produced a synchronism of abstract, formal potentialities. "There are too many forms already: they now debouch into life directly, without the special mediation of masterworks" (p. 98). Art, like an adolescent, is marginal, located somewhere between self and society and exposed directly to spiritual powers: "If we reflect that marginality is dangerous not because it is empty but because the absence of conventional social structuring allows room for an irruption of energies society has not integrated, then we see how similar this state is to the 'chaos of forms' which art explores" (p. 102). In those terms, literary history would be the history of literary forms, which Michael Riffaterre says it is: "*Nachleben* studies . . . assign variations [in the popularity of a text] to competition from later works, to upheavals in literary taste or sociological conditions, and above all to the evolution of esthetics. . . . The most important factor is . . . the evolution of language" (p. 155).

The vitality—indeed, the charm—of Professor Cohen's book is that all his contributors are right, and all only partially agree. The book is a symposium in print. The conversation is engagingly intellectual.

Louis Mink, for example, sets linguistic and literary forms to one side in order to propose comprehension in modal terms: theoretical, categorical, and configurational. "Narratives . . . are not imperfect substitutes for more sophisticated forms. . . . The comprehension at which narratives aim is a primary act of mind. . . . Narrative qualities are transferred from art to life" (pp. 123–24). His extremely fine essay offers a philosophical base for understanding fictional complexity and simplicity without weakening either. "Stories answer questions," as he puts it (p. 124),