

Moscow in 1935, is understandably focused on Zlatarov's politics. A democrat by nature, he was drawn to socialism during his student years in Geneva through contacts with Russian émigrés and a memorable encounter with Jean Jaurès. In Bulgaria he sided with Ianko Sakūzov's "Broad" Socialists, whose democratic and evolutionary view of Marxism appealed to him more than the sectarian and dictatorial bent of Dimitŭr Blagoev and the "Narrows." Jaurès, not Lenin, was his political idol, but he was also enough of a realist to recognize what the Bolshevik regime was achieving in Russia. With the establishment of relations between Bulgaria and the USSR in 1934 he became a leading member of the Bulgarian-Soviet Society, set up to promote mutual knowledge and close ties. An opportunity to see the Soviet reality for himself came in 1935, in connection with an international congress of physiologists, but the stay was brief and he saw mainly what his hosts wanted him to see. He went away impressed by the construction and the regime's investment in science. Although the methods of the dictatorship were offensive to his innate sense of democracy and humanism, what he wrote about the visit in his *V stranata na Sŭvetite* (1936) was on the whole favorable and very beneficial for the purposes of the Soviet government and the Bulgarian Communists. He failed to see the rising wave of Stalin's crimes which destroyed millions of human beings, including his friend, the Soviet minister in Sofia, F. F. Raskolnikov. Although, as Nedev points out, Zlatarov never became a "true" Marxist and remained a convinced democrat, in the view of the Communists he began to emerge as a "central rallying figure" likely to play a leading role in the Popular Front they advocated.

Issued in the Fatherland Front's series "Belezhiti Bŭlgari" and intended for a wide audience, the book is nonetheless the result of careful, even meticulous research in archival materials, the periodical press, and other printed sources. Writing perceptively and sensitively, Nedev has managed to convey well the many facets of Zlatarov's personality and mind. The portrait he has produced does justice to the subject.

MARIN PUNDEFF

California State University, Northridge

IAVOROV: LICHNOST, TVORCHESTVO, SUDBA. By *Mikhail Arnaudov*.
2nd edition. Sofia: Bŭlgarski pisatel, 1970. 468 pp. 3.18 lv.

"First melody, then words and finally content follow"—this is how the Bulgarian symbolist poet Pejo K. Iavorov explained to Professor Arnaudov the process of composing his poems. "In my soul sounds music," continued Iavorov, "it departs from a certain mood. . . . I am seeking words in this direction to express melody." The remark, made in 1911 in an interview, is reminiscent of the famous confession of Paul Verlaine that poetry is "la musique avant tout."

This and other interesting revelations, which may be of great value not only to Slavists but also to those who pursue comparative studies of literature, are found throughout this book by Mikhail Arnaudov (born in 1878), the most prominent Bulgarian literary scholar in our time. The book is the result of many years' work and includes a series of studies from various periods of his long and rich career. It is not, however, a mechanical collection of these treatises. The author has supplemented his earlier research with new data, and to achieve the utmost

exactness in his evaluation of Iavorov as a man and an artist he compares his results with those of his contemporaries, many of whom are now dead, and younger colleagues. To be sure, these comparisons generally favor Arnaudov, and this is the gauge of his book's value. The meticulous care and devotion with which he has collected facts are admirable.

The second virtue of the book is its methodology. Arnaudov does not hesitate to combine various methods of literary analysis: he is a critic and historian of literature, philologist, formalist, subtle analyst of the poet's psychology, and biographer. The reader thus gets a comprehensive view of Iavorov himself and of the whole epoch.

The first chapter is devoted to Iavorov's literary output. Arnaudov has established beyond any doubt that Iavorov's transition from realistic (epic) to symbolistic (lyrical) poetry was not the result of literary influence from abroad but developed from a deep spiritual crisis. A definite literary atmosphere coincided with an internal pessimism following the suppression of the Macedonian uprising of 1903. To reproach Iavorov, as some critics did, for yielding to a literary mannerism betrays a superficial reading of his poems.

Especially interesting is the chapter "Kum psihografiata na P. K. Iavorov," which deals with some peculiarities of the poet's psychology of writing. This was one of the first experiments of this kind by a literary scholar (some earlier attempts had been made by psychologists), and it offers a valuable insight into the psychology of the creative process.

Having established Iavorov's literary rank in the first part of his book, Arnaudov proceeds to the next major question: Who was Iavorov the man? Was he a subtle dreamer or a shrewd wife murderer? This question drew the attention of the Bulgarian public after the tragic death of the poet's wife in 1913. In fact Iavorov himself seemed to answer the question when under the pressure of slander and suspicion he committed suicide on November 16, 1914. But curiosity did not cease until the late thirties. When Arnaudov tried to solve this complicated enigma he turned detective himself. Once again he looked over the records of the court proceedings, examined the statements of the investigating magistrate and the death certificate, and consulted even the ballistics experts. This survey of documents is complemented by Iavorov's letter to the court of appeals, some of his wife's letters, and letters from relatives. Arnaudov lets the documents speak for themselves and leaves the final decision to the reader, who can draw only one conclusion: Iavorov did not kill his wife.

Arnaudov is obviously fascinated by the personality of the author of *Podir senkite na oblatsite*. Out of this admiration has emerged a book that will be a lasting contribution to the history of Bulgarian literature. For the younger generation of students this book, devoid of dogmatism, will be a model, a source of inspiration, and undoubtedly an excellent example of objectivity in literary scholarship. These characteristics are particularly important in today's Bulgaria.

EDWARD MOŽEJKO
University of Alberta