

Bulgarian government archives, especially police and army intelligence reports, are made accessible. These materials, coupled with German military and diplomatic reports on Bulgarian affairs during World War II, and classified Soviet and Comintern materials, will one day facilitate a reappraisal and a revision of much that has been written on the history of the Bulgarian Communist Party. In the meantime, however, this useful survey of the history of the Bulgarian Communist Party, 1934–44, is welcome both because it is the best available work in English and because it points the direction which future research on this topic must take.

WAYNE S. VUCINICH
Stanford University

THE GREEK PHOENIX. By *Joseph Braddock*. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, 1973. xii, 233 pp. \$6.95.

From its outbreak in March 1821 the Greek War of Independence has received extensive coverage in Europe and America. After the initial spate of valuable reminiscences, however, there have been few published works which contribute to an understanding of this interesting and complex conflict. Indeed, many of the books are distinguished by a romantic outlook, characteristic of the post-Napoleonic age during which the revolution took place. It is thus desirable that these numerous accounts of the Greek struggle for independence be superseded by intensive political, social, and economic studies that investigate the important primary sources available in several languages. In recent years, belatedly but fortunately, a small number of scholarly publications on the subject have appeared.

Regrettably, at least for the serious historian, Joseph Braddock's *Greek Phoenix* adds another title to the long list of readable but not informative studies of the Greek campaign to overthrow Turkish rule. The author does not pretend to investigate the subject in any depth, which in any case would have proved difficult, since he seeks to describe Greek politics and society from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the coming of Otho, the first king of Greece, in 1833. Also, Braddock falls victim to his slim bibliography of exclusively standard English sources. His analysis, highly literary but not startlingly interpretive, tends to be shallow on the political developments in Greek society and superficial on the intricacies of European diplomacy from 1815 to 1833. A pro-British bias emerges occasionally, and in one instance results in false information. On page 56 Braddock emphatically states, in his description of the Philhellenes, that "it was from the British Isles—an impressive number from Scotland and Ireland—that most of these Philhellenes came. . . ." William St. Clair, in *That Greece Might Still Be Free* (1972), systematically proves that greater numbers of foreign volunteers arrived in Greece from Germany, France, and Italy.

The author does achieve the objective proposed in the preface of reproducing the "colour and atmosphere of the scenes chosen" and revealing the "principal characters as living men and women" (p. xi). Biographical material and entertaining anecdotes on the careers of distinguished personalities such as Ali Pasha of Yannina, Makriyannis, Karaiskakis, Kolokotronis, and Lord Byron, among others, provide lively reading. Hence the person who desires a simplistic but well-written presentation of the Greek Revolution can read this book with some profit.

The close observer of contemporary Greek politics might deride Braddock's use of the mythological phoenix in the title. The legendary bird behind a soldier with bayonet became the official symbol of the recent regime in Greece, thus reducing the phoenix to a hollow cliché.

S. VICTOR PAPACOSMA
Kent State University

AZ ANTINÓMIÁK KÖLTŐJE: DOSZTOJEVSZKIJ ÉS AZ INDIVIDUUM
VÁLSÁGA. By *Ferenc Fehér*. Budapest: Magvető, 1972. 490 pp. 29 Ft.

Rather than writing a traditional monograph, the author sets out to identify the essence of Dostoevsky's philosophy and ethics and offers an explanation for the world-wide response to Dostoevsky's art and ideas. Focusing on the "crisis of the individual," clearly felt by the time of Dostoevsky's appearance, the author follows the historical process through which the "antinomies of the bourgeois society" developed. In agreement with his teacher, Lukács, Fehér states that the socioeconomic structure of the bourgeois society inevitably leads to a subject-object split, and the conflict between voluntarism and fatalism creates, also in the mind of the individual, a dual image of the world. This antinomy necessarily constitutes the *condition humaine* of society and consequently brings about a devaluation of values, replacing them either with the mere *desire* to reach them or by *convention* as a substitute for ethics. Rejecting the "interest theories" and "love ethics" alike, Fehér suggests that no philosopher can avoid the recognition of these antinomies, and that neither the state of "chained freedom" (Kierkegaard) nor the thought of a synthesis based on a new community (Nietzsche) can resolve the conflicts until *all* antinomies are *totally* resolved and material relations become human ones.

Having familiarized his reader with the philosophical background of his thesis, Fehér shows how these antinomies constitute the essence of Dostoevsky's art. Illustrating how the antinomic ideas and heroes collide in Dostoevsky's novels, he proves that this hopeless battle also releases forces of a centripetal nature which indiscriminately pull together the oppressor and the oppressed. The author establishes a *basic model* of the Dostoevskian novel and points out that the heroes move in a "soul sphere" (Lukács) separating them from the material world. Their only aim is to achieve self-realization, and none of them is an *active* person in the traditional sense. Thus the backdrop is also of secondary importance: it is an *artificial medium* in which the conflicts occur. The powers of real life appear as abstract forces, while money through which personal relations are expressed, instead of being the ultimate abstraction, becomes the sole concrete form of human relations. The only ones who can step out of this magic circle (and even then only to a limited extent) are those who have severed their ties with the material world.

Pointing out that Dostoevsky concentrated precisely on those antinomies with which the thinkers of the nineteenth century battled, Fehér discusses his philosophical and aesthetic principles (directly stated or as expressed in his works) and compares and contrasts them with the views of Kant, Hegel, Schiller, Kierkegaard, and others. In the chapter "The Revolution as Demon or as Love in Action" the author analyzes Dostoevsky's approach to social change. Here the opinions of Lunacharsky, Gide, Uspensky, Wellek, Steiner, and others are taken into consid-