

victory. Traikov shows that Rakovsky wanted to accomplish these tasks by associating the Bulgarian movement with the other movements for national liberation in southeastern Europe.

To a large degree, Traikov succeeds in integrating and discovering links between Rakovsky's ideas and the events of his time. He shows how existing conditions shaped Rakovsky's activity and ideology and underscores the difficulties he encountered in his struggle with "the sword and the pen" against the Ottoman Empire. The author attributes almost all of Rakovsky's problems and failures to domestic and external realities which were beyond his control. In general, Rakovsky is presented as a man who, impelled by revolutionary nationalism, transformed the Bulgarian national liberation movement into a conscious revolutionary force. Traikov gives special attention to the contributions Rakovsky made in the fields of Bulgarian literature, folklore, ethnography, history, and especially journalism. He also shows the impact Rakovsky had on the next generation of Bulgarian revolutionaries.

Traikov's masterly exposition of Rakovsky's ideas and programs, developed in great detail, rests on an intimate knowledge of the archives and on everything that has ever been written on Rakovsky. An entire chapter is devoted to the historiography and sources in which the author critically examined about two hundred works dealing with Rakovsky. There is a French-language summary, name and subject indexes, and illustrations.

Traikov makes no secret about his sympathy for Rakovsky. However, his admiration does not prevent criticism of Rakovsky's shortcomings as an individual, scholar, writer, and revolutionary. Since there is a great amount of information available on Rakovsky, this reviewer would have liked to see a psychologically oriented examination of Rakovsky's personality. Nevertheless, whatever view one takes of such a question as emphasis, this is a well-written book and a valuable contribution to the study of the national revolutionary movements in southeastern Europe. The biography is so exhaustive and authoritative that it will remain for the foreseeable future the definitive life of Rakovsky and his time.

PHILIP SHASHKO

University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

MARXIST MODELS OF LITERARY REALISM. By *George Bizstray*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. viii, 247 pp. \$13.00.

This is a solid, clearly argued account of the Realism debate in Marxist criticism. Mr. Bizstray sketches the history of the problem from Hegel via Marx and Engels to Gorky and Lukács and then establishes a typology of the main concepts (which he unnecessarily calls "models"). Four concepts are distinguished which he labels "democratic" (Lukács), "populist-collectivistic" (Gorky), "party bureaucratic" (Mehring, Plekhanov), and "popular front" (Garaudy and Ernst Fischer) (p. 202). Lukács very properly is the central figure, although he is not treated at all uncritically. Mr. Bizstray brings out his wavering between a concept of Realism as a universal method, as "the collective basis of any great literature" (quoted from "Puschkins Platz in der Weltliteratur," in Lukács's *Werke*, published by Luchterhand, vol. 5, p. 27), and a period concept limited to the novel and drama between *Robinson Crusoe* and Solzhenitsyn. He shows well Lukács's ambiguous attitude toward Socialist Realism and the injustices of his polemics against Naturalism and Modernism (oddly enough identified by Lukács). Bizstray is also good on Gorky's harsh rejection of the bourgeois past, his favorable view of the role of Romanticism, and his stress on the share of labor in art, and he clearly shows how Garaudy's "réalisme sans rivages" and Ernst Fischer's tolerant concept make the term Realism so broad as to make it almost meaningless. In conclusion, he states that "Marxist critics have never convincingly proven the superiority of the realistic method" (p. 206) and cannot justify the claim that Socialist Realism is the highest form of art.

Still, Mr. Bisztray ascribes momentous significance to the debate, because "Marxist aesthetics has made the most consistent and unabrupted [*sic*] efforts to establish an epistemological foundation for literature" (p. 208). But ultimately one comes away with a sense of the sterility of a logomachy forced by the power of the dogma that *only* Realism is good literature, and that all literature is "Widerspiegelung der Wirklichkeit"—the obsessive phrase which Lukács repeats no less than 1,036 times in the first volume of his *Aesthetik* alone. The spectacle of men trying to reconcile this dogma with the overwhelming contrary evidence of history and, often, with their own taste is pathetic rather than illuminating.

Mr. Bisztray is shrewd and knowledgeable. I doubt, however, whether one can dismiss Lucien Goldmann and Galvano della Volpe as spreading "pure nonsense" (pp. 158 and 160) and whether Lukács's theories are really similar to those of Otto Ludwig (p. 209) or have anything in common with those of Charles Sanders Peirce (pp. 198 and 209) as the author claims.

I cannot help commenting on a passage (p. 53) where I appear in the mixed company of "Zhdanov, Gorky, Radek, Bukharin and [Harry] Levin" as regarding Socialist Realism as something radically new. Mr. Bisztray instructs Gorky and me that the older novel was often as didactic as Socialist Realism. It surprises me that anybody could think that I am not aware of the didactic novel. I criticize, for example, Erich Auerbach for excluding the didactic novel and specifically George Eliot and Tolstoy from his concept of Realism (*Concepts of Criticism*, New Haven, 1963, p. 243) and I expressly define the novelty of Socialist Realism as the obligation "to spread socialism: that is, communism, the party spirit, and the party line" (p. 346). The older didactic novel had no such task, voluntary or imposed.

RENÉ WELLEK

Yale University (Emeritus)

SOUL AND FORM. By *Georg Lukács*. Translated by *Anna Bostock*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1978 [1971, 1974]. vi, 176 pp. \$4.95, paper.

The essays in this volume are seventy-year-old witnesses of the intellectual milieu which nurtured the young Georg Lukács. Neo-Kantianism and existentialistic *Lebensphilosophie* were his first two great European experiences. The ten essays are distinct variations on the same theme, and the sources of inspiration were, recognizably, Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and Richard Wagner.

The theme is stated in the introductory paper, in which Lukács equates critique with essay and finds the critic's great moment in the instant "at which things become forms," and "the union between the outer and inner, between soul and form" is completed. Ordinary life experiences are chaotic, and matter is unrefined. It is the transformation of raw experience in the poetic soul, its reshaping into artistic form—in short, the subjective genesis of a work of art—whose reflection Lukács expects from the essay. The recurring theme is the birth of form, that is, order.

Most of the writers Lukács discusses—Novalis, Kierkegaard, Kassner, George—are lonely and suffering men. Their bittersweet *raison d'être* is the forging of their experiences into literary master forms. An aesthetician is one who not only gives form to his experience but also realizes the paradoxes of existence. Lukács analyzes the various shapes of the eternal confrontation with existence through different models which compose the chapters (except the first one) of his volume. There is a feeling of repetition, yet also an impression of unity, but nothing of history or any pattern of development in the essays. The metaphysical dominates the dialectical, Kant overshadows Hegel. Compared with *Theory of the Novel*, a major document of the next phase in Lukács's intellectual development, Kantianism and the lack of a historical perspective, both evident in *Soul and Form*, appear in striking contrast to the follow-