

socialism. Nevertheless, it deserves attention, since it is still the only comprehensive work on Bulgarian prewar social democracy.

*Prinos* is a rich storehouse of information, revealing the complex nature of the Broad-Narrow conflict which engulfed every aspect of the Bulgarian Socialist movement up to 1919. It includes extensive quotes from Bulgarian Socialist journals and newspapers that are unavailable outside of Bulgaria. In a sense the book is unique, because, unlike all modern Bulgarian histories of the Bulgarian Socialist movement, it does not depict Bulgarian socialism as merely following in the wake of the Russian Revolutionary movement and destined to merge with it in 1919. In fact, as Blagoev depicts it, Bulgarian socialism was eclectic: it was formed not only under the influence of the Russian Revolutionary movement, but also under several West European and indigenous strains of Bulgarian socialism. In general, Blagoev is too anti-Russian for present-day Bulgarian tastes, judging from the editors' revisions of his interpretations of the Russian role in the liberation of Bulgaria in 1878 and Russia's part in the Congress of Berlin. Despite the editors' pro-Russian bias, however, their notes, which cover the entire period of Bulgarian socialism up to 1919, offer valuable and detailed information that would be difficult to find on one's own.

It is instructive to compare this edition of *Prinos* with its three earlier versions. The two that appeared in 1949 and 1954 are virtually identical, but differ considerably from the editions of 1960 and 1976. In the first two editions, there is no attempt to revise or explain Blagoev's anti-Russian attitude, nor do the explanatory notes continue Blagoev's anti-Broad polemics. Moreover, the introduction is lifted from one of Georgi Dimitrov's speeches and is a surprisingly frank analysis of the Broad-Narrow schism, negating any Russian influence on the Narrow Party before 1919. There is more concern in the earlier volumes with exposing "Trotskyites" and "traitors," references that are completely absent in the 1960 and 1976 editions. In addition, the latest versions omit Dimitrov's introduction and replace it with one that centers on correcting Blagoev's anti-Russian interpretations of Bulgarian history. The scholarship and organization of the earlier editions are superior: aside from the explanatory notes, there is a separate list at the end which contains detailed information on journals and newspapers mentioned in the text, and another list that focuses on important figures in Bulgarian Socialist history. The 1960 and 1976 editions cram this information into one list and entirely omit the informative biographical and bibliographical notes on important West European Socialists. On the whole, *Prinos* is treated more fully and objectively in its 1949 version than in the present edition.

These differences undoubtedly reflect changing ideological emphases in the leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party, which in turn patterns itself on the Kremlin. Thus, a study of *Prinos* is useful not only to the historian but to the political scientist on the lookout for changes within the closed arena of Bulgarian or Soviet politics.

SINA MARIA DUBOWOJ

*University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*

DAS RUMÄNISCHES FÜRSTENTUM MOLDAU UND DIE OSTSLAVEN IM  
15. BIS 17. JAHRHUNDERT. By *Ekkehard Völkl*. Veröffentlichungen des  
Osteuropa-Institutes München, vol. 42. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz in  
Kommission, 1975. 123 pp. DM 32, paper.

Ekkehard Völkl's study focuses primarily upon what he sees as Moldavia's special role in the world of Orthodox Christianity between the Turkish conquest of Byzantium and the emergence of a powerful Muscovite tsardom. Initially, Völkl contends, Moldavia served as the bulwark of Orthodoxy, preserving the Byzantine-

Slavic religious culture of the Balkans and playing a prominent part in the transmission of the "second South Slavic influence" to Orthodox East Slavs in the neighboring lands of the Polish kingdom (especially Galicia and Podolia) and in the lands "gathered" by the rulers of Moscow. Völkl then turns to a detailed examination of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century contacts between Moldavia and the Ruthenians, emphasizing the various measures by which Moldavia undertook to assist fellow adherents to Orthodoxy across the Polish border to defend the Orthodox faith against threats from both Roman Catholicism (especially the Uniate movement) and Protestantism (especially Calvinism). Moldavia's relations with Muscovy—treated much more briefly—passed from coexistence with the remaining Orthodox crowned heads to rivalry in both the political and religious spheres. Acquiring its own patriarch in the late sixteenth century, Moscow gradually outstripped its competitor and, during the seventeenth century, became the source of support and alms for Orthodox subjects of non-Orthodox rulers, and eventually even for the churches and monasteries of Moldavia. By the eighteenth century, Moldavia's Slavonic culture had disappeared, supplanted by the emergence of Rumanian as a literary language and by the use of Greek in the upper levels of society.

Völkl's concern in this study is to illuminate Moldavia's role as a cultural transmitter and its contribution to the survival of Orthodoxy. Given his narrow focus and emphasis on specific detail, his study will be of most interest to specialists. Yet he also raises the wider question of the "basic uniformity in historical development," which characterized Eastern Christendom (p. 107). Hopefully, he and others will pursue this broader theme in subsequent studies.

A. M. KLEIMOLA  
University of Nebraska

DIE ALTRUSSISCHE WALLFAHRTSLITERATUR: THEORIE UND GESCHICHTE EINES LITERARISCHEN GENRES. By *Klaus-Dieter Seemann*.

Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste, vol. 24. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. 484 pp. DM 200.

Seemann has written an exhaustive literary study of the Old Russian genre of the *khozhdenie*, or "pilgrim tale." The first half of the book attempts to define the genre in terms of form criticism. Seemann sees the essence of the pilgrim tale as the description of sacred places, shrines, or relics. The experience of the sacred elicits a personal response from the pilgrim. Reporting on the object of the pilgrimage and his experience of the object leads the pilgrim to discuss related legends and religious objects, and then to introduce secular marvels seen in the context of the pilgrimage. Finally, he comes to describe the pilgrim journey itself, made sacred by its object. At an early stage in the evolution of the genre, the addition of dialogue lends drama to the static report, and the classic *khozhdenie* comes into being.

Such, indeed, might have been the genesis of the pilgrim tale, but it should be noted that all of these elements were already present in the first preserved example of the genre, the early twelfth-century "Pilgrimage of Prior Daniel to the Holy Land" ("Khozhenie igumena Daniila"). This work, as Seemann points out, emerged full-blown in Russia—without benefit of translated Byzantine antecedents—to serve as the ever-present model for pilgrim tales until the demise of Old Russian literature during the time of Peter the Great. The *khozhdenie* canon is, in essence, Daniel's work; his choice of subjects and his heavily Slavonic language were imitated (and copied!) whenever a Russian traveler chose to describe the shrines of the Christian East or Constantinople. Seemann correctly notes a weakening in the rigor of Daniel's work as exemplum in the fifteenth century, when Russian came to predominate over Slavonic in the language of the *khozhdenie*, and the genre increasingly began to