

Clarke noted that the Yugoslav experience, as revealed in the conference papers, appeared to confirm the view that traditional Communism is bankrupt.

Among those scholars attending the Conference were several from outside the United States, including Professors Rudolf Bičanić of the University of Zagreb, and Ivan Avakumović of the University of British Columbia. The papers of this most successful Conference will be assembled and published by the Stanford University Press in the near future. In December 1967, the Conference will concentrate its attention on the Russian peasant.

University of Pittsburgh

JAMES F. CLARKE

## ENGLISH HISTORIES OF BULGARIA

For years a common complaint has been the lack of a history of Bulgaria in English. There was a time when English readers had to depend on the historical portions of Macdonald and Monroe and on Mishev.<sup>1</sup> Then all at once we get several histories of Bulgaria following on each other's heels; Stanley Evans, *A Short History of Bulgaria* (1960); Mercia Macdermott, *A History of Bulgaria. 1393-1885* (1962); and Kossev, Hristov and Angelov, *A Short History of Bulgaria* (1963). For several reasons the most attractive of the three is that by Mrs. Macdermott.<sup>2</sup>

The date limits of the Macdermott title indicate the emphasis on the period between the loss of independence to the Ottoman Turks and the events in Eastern Rumelia, following Bulgaria's liberation in 1878. The book begins with a very short and rather questionable chapter on Bulgarian history before 1393. A postscript adds little at the other end.<sup>3</sup> A note on transliteration, glossary, selected bibliography, end-paper map, and 24 attractive illustrations complement the well-written and well-printed volume. There are almost no references. Although the author's greatest interest is evidently in the revolutionary movements, organizations, leaders and plots climaxing in the 1876 rising, which she describes in detail, she also devotes attention to economic, social, educational and literary matters especially in the national revival. This breadth, along with her evident enthusiasm for her subject and

---

1. John Macdonald, *Czar Ferdinand and his People* (New York, 1913); Will S. Monroe, *Bulgaria and her People* (Boston, 1914); Dimitŭr Mishev, *Bulgarians in the Past* (Lausanne, 1919), badly translated from Bulgarian but with good cultural information.

2. Mercia Macdermott, *A History of Bulgaria, 1393-1885* (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd, 1962), pp. 354.

3. The ground covered is essentially that in A. Hajek, *Bulgarien unter der Türkenherrschaft* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1925), still the best account in a Western language.

her competence in Bulgarian language material, are the chief merits of the book. Nowhere else will the English reader find readily so many names, titles, and local color.

There are, inevitably, some questionable features of this *History*. There is a little too much of the "good guys" (Russians) and "bad guys" (Turks, Greeks). The narrative is needlessly "adjectival." As is often the case with amateur historians, in the absence of adequate sources, Mrs. Macdermott's Bulgarian history comes out blacker, more catastrophic and atrocious, than it need be, because sensational items are more apt to be recorded (or invented by later generations), e. g., tormented cats in baggy female trousers (p. 49). On a number of points the author takes an old-fashioned or ultra-nationalist line, for example

In their ardour for Hellenization, the Greeks ... resorted to appalling acts of vandalism. During the nineteenth century enormous numbers of priceless Slavonic manuscripts were burnt .... In many monasteries all the Bulgarian books and manuscripts were ... burnt. Even the ancient library of the Patriarchs of Turnovo was taken out into the Metropolitan's garden and burnt, after the Greek books had been removed to safety." (p. 55).<sup>4</sup>

At the same time, the book has an ultra-modern flavor. Crossing the pages we find master races (the Turks), quislings, collaborationists (e. g., the Patriarch in 1453), partisans, freedom-loving peoples (e. g., the original Slav settlers); petty, middle and upper bourgeoisie; in the absence of workers, peasants shoulder the national-liberation movement, although the poor ones are classed as petty bourgeoisie (p. 239); feudalism, capitalism, fascism (before fascism) are frequently identified for the reader.

In addition to describing the neo-feudal, landholding and other legal and illegal relations between Bulgarians and Turks, for which the author had available the work of leading contemporary Bulgarian scholars, as indicated in the bibliography (e.g., B. Tsvetkova), the importance of Mrs. Macdermott's book lies in the detailed account (four-fifths of the book) of Bulgarian economic and cultural revival and political revolution from the eighteenth century to the coup d'état of 1885, which heretofore has been available in English only incidentally and piecemeal.

There is much bio-bibliographical information, although it is not always wholly reliable. To designate four different books, printed in Targoviste (1508), Venice (1560), Rome (1651), and Rimnik (1806) as the first Bulgarian

---

4. This last obviously refers to Metropolitan Ilarion, native of Crete, the legends of whose Bulgarophobia have been thoroughly discredited.

book is confusing, perhaps explainable by the fact that three different authors were responsible for pertinent sections in the Bulgarian Academy's collective *History of Bulgaria* used by Mrs. Macdermott.<sup>5</sup> The date 1714 instead of 1741 for Zhefarovich's *Stematografiya* is repeated (pp. 61 and 90). One can find other mistakes in dates and spelling.

Students of Bulgarian history may be surprised to find only a brief mention of the United States or Americans in the person of Eugene Schuyler. Great Britain gets considerably more attention thanks to the difference of political opinion between Disraeli and Gladstone on Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria. Protestant activity, whether American or English, gets shabby and inaccurate treatment, following the Bulgarian Academy model. Conversely, the author's analysis of the cross-currents of revolutionary movements and organizations, their platforms and their underground, partisan leaders is detailed and painstaking. The resulting picture is more serious and heroic than the usual serio-comic, chocolate-soldier version. The climax comes with the 1876 rising, of which the reader gives an exciting blow by blow, village by village account until it literally gets rained out. Causes of failure from the Bulgarian side, according to the author, were: faulty organization, planning and tactics; treachery and collaboration of the upper and upper middle bourgeoisie; and cold feet on the part of the lower middle bourgeoisie. The price of failure is given as 30,000 the highest possible massacre figure, contrary to the findings of the author's distinguished fellow-countryman, Harold Temperley.<sup>6</sup> In spite of the author's efforts, one gets the feeling that the Turks were at least partly justified.

The last portion of the book, dealing with liberation and reunion, officially confirmed in April, 1886, comes as an anti-climax. The earlier revolutionary theme is carried through the successful efforts to restore San Stefano Bulgaria in Eastern Rumelia and the unsuccessful ones in Macedonia. This period has less interest for the author because the old revolutionary leaders are either dead or respectable, Battenberg's principality was not what Levsky and his fellow travellers had imagined, and the coming revolution of labor against capital was a long way off.

Perhaps one should be grateful that Mrs. Macdermott did not continue her history beyond 1886. The postscript tells us that the 1876 revolutionary principle of equality for Turks "who wished to remain in Bulgaria" has been fully implemented in present-day Bulgaria (p. 344), but makes no mention

5. *Istoria na Bŭlgariya*, 2 v. (Sofia, 1954-55).

6. "The Bulgarian and other Atrocities. 1875-78, in the Light of Historical Criticism," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XVII (1941).

of those expelled in 1950-52. On this point the only disagreement has been over the degree of force employed and whether it was 150,000 or 300,000 with most authorities holding for 250,000 expellees.

Mercia Macdermott's book is interesting in its reflection of the position and results of current Bulgarian historiography. But in a history for English readers one would like to find mention of at least some of the few scholarly works published in English. True, the two dozen titles of "more important works consulted," which includes two Bulgarian works published before the last war, does have half a dozen English titles, including Gladstone's *Bulgarian Horrors* (1876), Marriott's outdated *Eastern Question* (first published in 1918), books on William Morris and on English Radicalism, and H. L. Saxena's *Bulgaria under the Red Star*.<sup>7</sup>

Of probably greater use to the student of Bulgarian history are half a dozen relatively recent works in English. One might start, appropriately, with Steven Runciman, *The First Bulgarian Empire* (London, 1930), a splendid introduction to Bulgarian history.<sup>8</sup> A fitting sequel is Dimitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils* (Cambridge, 1948), in effect an exceptionally scholarly history of medieval Bulgaria. At the other end of the historical spectrum are a pair of American monographs, one by Cyril Black, *The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria* (Princeton, 1943), which goes from 1877-78 to 1884-85, with a useful chapter on the antecedents of Bulgarian independence; the other is Joseph Rothschild, *The Communist Party of Bulgaria. Origins and Development, 1883-1936* (New York, 1959), which gives a good deal of other Bulgarian history as well, and has an unusual bibliography.<sup>9</sup> Two somewhat overlapping works which fall within Mrs. Macdermott's main period are B.H. Sumner's classic *Russia and the Balkans 1870-80* (Oxford, 1937), which inevitably concerns Bulgaria; and Charles Jelavich, *Tsarist Russia and Balkan Nationalism. Russian Influence in the Internal Affairs of Bulgaria and Serbia, 1879-1886* (Berkeley, 1958), which is more Bulgarian than Serbian and more Russian than Bulgarian. There is also a monograph on

7. Delhi, 1958; 622 pp.; essentially a starry-eyed travelogue, written after a fortnight's visit to Bulgaria, for Indian fellow-countrymen and travellers, which was also a doctoral dissertation at the University of Sofia. A better guide is *Bulgarian Background* (London, 1961), by Bernard Newman, professional traveller and author of over 100 similar books.

8. There is of course J.H. Gaul, *The Neolithic Period in Bulgaria* (Cambridge, Mass. 1948) but this has nothing to do with Bulgarian history.

9. A sequel, "The Bulgarian Communist Party, 1934-44" by Nissan Oren (Columbia dissertation, 1960) is not yet published. In this connection, mention may also be made of L. A. D. Dellin, ed., *Bulgaria* (New York, 1956), in the series *East-Central Europe under the Communists*, which covers the post-war period and includes a useful classified bibliography (pp. 413-36).

a subject which greatly interests Mrs. Macdermott, *Britain and the Bulgarian Horrors of 1876* (Chicago, 1939), by David Harris, which is more concerned with Britain than Bulgaria.

Somewhat specialized but informative works are W.W. Hall, *Puritans in the Balkans*, an objective dissertation on American Protestant missionary activity in Bulgaria;<sup>10</sup> and C.A. Manning and Roman Smal-Stocki, *The History of Modern Bulgarian Literature* (New York, 1960), with proper pre-modern introduction and odd Ukrainian flavor. Toward the end, the book dissolves into names and titles without coming to grips with post-World War II literature.

Understandably, American historians, at least, have directed their attention as far as Bulgaria is concerned, mainly to diplomatic history and the Berlin Congress era.<sup>11</sup> There are also a few short studies aimed at the World War I epoch. For the inter-war period there is little with a pretense at scholarship. Nevertheless, mention should be made of C.C. Logio's *Bulgaria Past and Present* (Manchester, 1936) and R.H. Markham, *Meet Bulgaria* (Sofia, 1931). Logio, an Englishman stationed in Bulgaria, gives his own critical views of Bulgarian politics along with considerable historical background; Markham, American teacher and journalist and long-time resident of Bulgaria, gives the most sympathetic, informal but informative introduction for which any country could wish.<sup>12</sup> Mention may also be made of a book by an able and critical English journalist, Joseph Swire, who had the distinction of being ordered out of several Balkan countries, including Bulgaria. *Bulgarian Conspiracy* (London, 1939), deals mainly with Macedonia in Bulgarian politics. Lastly, any list of basic books on Bulgaria in English must include Irwin Sanders, *Balkan Village* (Lexington, 1949), a pioneer sociological diagnosis of a Bulgarian village, which set the pace for the now fashionable village studies.

That Mercia Macdermott makes no mention of *A Short History of Bul-*

---

10. *Puritans in the Balkans. The American Board Mission in Bulgaria, 1878-1918*, unfortunately published in Sofia (1938), hence less well-known than it should be, with a chapter on the pre-liberation period. *The Bulgarians and Anglo-Saxons* (Berne, 1919) by Constantine Stephanove, author of the first Bulgarian-English dictionary (1914) should be avoided not only because of style but because of its exaggerated notions.

11. A.M. Hyde, *A Diplomatic History of Bulgaria, 1870-1886* (Urbana, 1931), is a case in point. It was done without the use of Bulgarian or Russian materials.

12. Both books suffer from being badly printed in Sofia. Logio also wrote *Bulgaria: Problems and Politics* (London, 1919), and a book on Rumania; Markham, a sort of American, "J. D. Bouchier" later also wrote books on Rumania and Yugoslavia. On the other hand, historical perspective is lacking in William Cary, *Bulgaria. The Land and People. A Voyage of Discovery* (New York, 1965), a pretentious little book which belongs in the guided tour category.

garia by a fellow country man, Stanley Evans, published only two years before her own *History* and with a similar point of view, is odd. Yet Evans has things which Macdermott does not: a whole chapter on Bulgaria before Bulgaria, going back to the Ice Age; one third of the book given to history before the Turks and one-third to the period since 1886. That so little goes to Bulgarians under the Turks before "Rebirth and Liberation" is perhaps because the author does not use Bulgarian language materials. Another reason may be his fascination with the "Bulgarian Horrors" issue to which he gives ten pages plus twenty pages of "Horrors" bibliography, or half the total. Like many clerical Englishmen of the nineteenth century, Evans goes for causes. But one is tempted to apply to his work the euphemism he uses for authors with whom he disagrees — "politically defective." Evans has a score of good photographs, half a dozen sketch maps and some errors which historian members of the Bulgarian Academy who read the manuscript should have caught. Repeatedly he refers to the author Yordan Yuvkov as "Yankov."

But the unique feature of Evans' book is the forty page "Note on Books," an understatement into which the author appears to have emptied his files. More than making up for deficiencies in Mrs. Macdermott's list, Evans' catalogue of Western, mainly English, materials has almost everything from Thucydides to *The Trial of American Spies in Bulgaria* (Sofia, 1950), reflecting his omnivorous reading and antiquarian industry. It contains many pamphlets, especially English, on the Eastern Question, dated issues of periodicals and newspapers, archive material, some rarely encountered titles and some surprising omissions. The listing, not always accurate, is somewhat indiscriminate and unalphabetical, by chapter subject, with chatty comments. Nonetheless, it is a bibliographical treasure and one only wishes the author had devoted the whole book to a description of sources for Bulgarian history in Western languages.

The third and most authoritative recent English history of Bulgaria is by three prominent Bulgarian historians, D. Kosev, H. Hristov and D. Angelov *A Short History of Bulgaria* (Sofia, 1963). The Bulgarian original, published in 1962, was designed for Bulgarians (émigrés) living abroad. Given its authorship and purpose, it can be described as official history for export. It has numerous illustrations and maps, a thorough index, but no references or bibliography.<sup>13</sup> Beginning with the Mousterian Age, it ends with "Bulgaria, Land of Victorious Socialism." It is better balanced than Macdermott or E-

---

13. On pp. 210-11 are the same pair of English illustrations as in Macdermott (facing p. 258) but one is dated 1867 instead of 1876.

vans, with approximately half of its 436 pages falling to the period since the liberation (1878).

Prof. Dimitŭr Angelov, ranking Bulgarian authority on the Byzantine period of Bulgarian history, did the first four chapters up to the Ottoman conquest.<sup>14</sup> Prof. Dimitŭr Kosev, member of the Academy, director of its Historical Institute and rector of the Sofia University, handled the nineteenth century.<sup>15</sup> Prof. Hristo Hristov who was responsible for the short chapter on the Ottoman period and the twentieth century, was the editor of the original text.<sup>16</sup>

Aside from the last portion, which might be considered too statistical and contemporary to be history, this Bulgarian *Short History*, though designedly popular and following the established tenets of current Bulgarian historiography (for example, 855 as the date for the beginning of Slavic letters), is reasonably complete and as factual as can be expected. Yet one might question such anachronistic statements as: "The efforts of the Entente to suppress the revolutionally movement in Bulgaria were supported by the United States which at the end of the imperialist war (1918) emerged as the chief counter-revolutionary force in the world" (p. 326).

A better text for translation into English might have been another *Short History of Bulgaria* compiled by Prof. Angelov and five other members of the Historical Institute and published by the Academy of Sciences in 1958.<sup>17</sup> In addition to following established periodization and patterns, it has a chronology, bibliography and maps in color. It came out between the first and second editions of the Academy's more ambitious collective *History of Bulgaria*, with the stated purpose of giving domestic and foreign readers (in translation) a more manageable Marxist-Leninist interpretation of Bulgarian history, summarized from the two-volume work with some revision.<sup>18</sup>

14. Angelov's first important work was on the Bogomils (1947).

15. Since the death of Alexander Burmov (Sept. 3, 1965), "dean" of post-war Marxist Bulgarian historians, Kosev's first major work was *Lectures on Modern Bulgarian History* (Sofia, 1951), from the national revival to the liberation, a scholarly textbook containing an excellent bibliography, pp. 472-521. Used by Mrs. Macdermott.

16. Both Kosev and Hristov are credited with Chapter VII, which is the work of Kosev according to the Bulgarian edition. Hristov's major work has been on party and revolutionary history.

17. *Kratka istoriya na Bulgariya* (Sofia, 1958), pp. 409.

18. The number of Histories of Bulgaria and Short Histories of Bulgaria is confusing. First was the Soviet Academy's *History of Bulgaria (Istoriya Bolgarii)*, 2v., Moscow, 1954-55, which set the pace for the Bulgarian Academy's *History of Bulgaria (Istoriya na Bŭlgariya)*, 2v., Sofia, 1954-55, Vol. I of which was edited by D. Kosev, D. Dimitrov, Zh. Natan, H. Hristov and D. Angelov, and Vol. II by Kosev, Hristov, Natan, V. Hadzhinikolov and K. Vasilev. The interim *Short History* (1958) was followed by the 2nd revised edition of the

One must conclude that there is still no satisfactory history of Bulgaria in English. A serious obstacle in the past — the paucity of information especially on the period of the Turkish Yoke — is being remedied by the industry of the Historical Institute in Sofia, showing what planned and directed historical team work can accomplish, particularly since the separating out of the Institute for Balkanology (1963), which is putting Bulgaria into a broader historical context.<sup>19</sup>

Another invaluable aid to the student of Bulgarian history should prove to be *Bulgaria: A bibliographical Guide*, by Marin V. Pundev, issued by the Slavic and Central European Division of the Library of Congress (Washington, D.C., 1965). More than half of its 98 pages is given over to surveys and short descriptive comments under seven broad categories, followed by an alphabetical listing, card-catalogue style, of 1243 wide-ranging items, including periodical titles, mostly modern, in all languages<sup>20</sup> (not including Greek or Turkish). For the historian (but not the librarian), the omission of older works may be a drawback, as well as giving only the date of the latest edition, without noting that of first publication. For the most part it is meticulously accurate.<sup>21</sup> It suffers, however, from being both over and under-selective. In trying to be comprehensive it includes marginal items, such as general reference works, to be taken for granted or not readily identifiable as "Bulgarica," at least in the alphabetical second part of the bibliography. Such items might better have become footnotes in the survey part instead of cluttering up the bibliography as such.<sup>22</sup> Space requirements, consequently, result in some noteworthy omissions, illustrating how personal even a bibliography can be. *Bulgaria* suffers from being unselective to the extent that it is primarily a catalog-

---

*History of Bulgaria* in three volumes (Sofia, 1961, 1962, 1964); the enormous second volume of the 1st ed. (1064 pp), covering the period since the Liberation (1878) was now divided at the Russian Revolution; the overall editorial committee consisted of Kosev, Natan and Burmov. In between comes the Kosev-Hristov-Angelov *Short History* (1962). For a critical review of the first Bulgarian *History of Bulgaria*, see "Retsenziya na Istoriya na Bulgariya" by I. Duichev, N. Todorov, G. Todorov and K. Lambrev in the Academy's *Spisanie*, 1957, No. 1, pp. 105-27.

19. For a review of its first year's work see N. Todorov and S. Dimitrov, "Institut za Balkanologiya", *Istoricheski Pregled*, vol. 21, No. 3 (1965), pp. 131-36.

20. A disadvantage of such dual arrangement, for example, is that one looks in vain for Manyo Stoyanov, author of a prodigious two-volume bibliography of Bulgarian books and periodicals (1806-78), which is listed under "Sofia National Library," the sponsoring institution (no. 992). But Pundev is particularly good for institutional publications.

21. But Yurdan Ivanov (no. 510) is confused with Iordan (nos. 507-9).

22. For example, No. 386. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Chicago, 1957, or No. 1217. *The World of Learning*, 1962-63, London, Europa Publications, 1963. 1430 p.



gue of the Library of Congress holdings, noteworthy as they may be. By necessity it omits periodical literature but a useful contribution could have been made by a more thorough canvass of less obvious collective works.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, no one professionally concerned with Bulgaria can afford to do without Pundev's *Bulgaria*.<sup>24</sup>

It is to be hoped that the presence of three new short histories of Bulgaria in English will not deter the publication of a fourth and better one. An acceptable one-volume synthesis of Bulgarian history should now be feasible and is still a prime requirement.

University of Pittsburgh

JAMES F. CLARKE

## LE PRINCIPE DE L'AUTODÉTERMINATION DES PEUPLES

*Une série de conférences organisée par la Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Économiques de l'Université de Thessaloniki*

La Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Économiques de l'Université de Thessaloniki a organisé une série de conférences concernant le principe de l'autodétermination des peuples, dans la salle des fêtes de cette Université, entre le 2 et le 4 Mai 1966. C'est le prorecteur de l'Université, le professeur Aspiotis qui inaugure cette série de conférences en exprimant sa joie du fait que la dite Faculté de Droit a pris l'initiative de l'organiser. Car, d'après lui, le sujet de l'autodétermination des peuples n'est que le sujet de la liberté même, qui unit tous les peuples du monde, indépendamment du fait s'il concerne la liberté de la grande île hellénique de Chypre, ou la liberté de l'autodétermination du peuple allemand, ou l'autodétermination des peuples africains avec lesquels des liens spéciaux d'amitié et de collaboration unissent cette Université de Thessaloniki.

Le maire de la ville de Thessaloniki, Monsieur Tsiros, qui succéda au prorecteur à la tribune, a salué les participants à cette série de conférences en mettant l'accent sur le fait que la région de la Macédoine, qui est la région extrême de la Grèce vers le Nord, a un intérêt tout à fait spécial pour soutenir

---

23. For example. D. C. McKay, ed., *Essays in the History of Modern Europe* (New York, 1936); H. S. Hughes, ed., *Teachers of History* (Ithaca, 1954); H.G. Lunt. ed., *Harvard Slavic Studies* (Cambridge, 1953 ff).

24. For post World War II material, periodical as well as book, on pre-war Bulgaria, the historian will find invaluable an exhaustive Soviet bibliography. *Istoriya Bolgarii do 9 sentyabr 1944. Ukazatel literaturyi 1945-1958*, Vol. I. (Moscow, 1962), 551 pp., which includes items in English.