

the «Besěda». On pp. 481-523 Begunov describes the 25 manuscript codices which today contain the full text of the «Besěda» and which were used by the scholar for his critical edition found in pp. 297-392. And lastly, on pp. 525-559 there are included an index of names (pp. 527-535), list of titles of works that were consulted (pp. 536-544), a list of archives that were used (pp. 545-547), a list of references from the Holy Scriptures that were cited by Cosmas in the «Besěda» (pp. 548-550), a list of photographs, plans and maps (p. 551), abbreviations used (pp. 552-556), and lastly, a table of contents (557-559).

Begunov's work can without exaggeration be described as nothing short of monumental. The author thus adds to the international bibliography a third basic work on the literary contribution of the priest Cosmas which follows in the wake of the two previous studies by G. M. Popruženko and A. Vaillant. But it stands out as the foremost work in the corpus of Slav literature. With this major production Begunov continues the work of the Byzantinists and Slavologues of the Leningrad school. The book without doubt is a work of many years of patient scholarship. When the author points out that the nature of the text of Cosmas was such as to play an important role in Russian polemic literature (apologetica), especially in the works of Stefan Permskij, Iosif Volockij, the Bishop Daniel, Maxim the Greek, and Zinovij Otsenskij (p. 118), he adds characteristically that this argument he puts forth with reservations in view of the fact that as yet there does not exist a sufficient number of comparative studies of the rhetorical texts in Slavic literature. When he records that Cosmas may have been a learned cleric and could have been a bishop holding an administrative post in the province of Preslav (p. 256), he makes these claims with all possible reservations. And last, with great modesty, he writes characteristically in the conclusions to the first part of his major study (p. 290) that this monograph does not give the answers to many questions, and expresses the hope that it will be of some use to those scholars who wish to understand the problems inherent in the work of Cosmas in conjunction with the manuscript tradition of Slav literatures. Begunov's work certainly fulfils the scope for which it was written. All we can wish is that J. K. Begunov will have the strength and the patience to enrich the international bibliography even further with similar works in the field of Slav letters.

*Institute for Balkan Studies  
Thessaloniki*

CONSTANTINE PAPOULIDIS

Frederick B. Chary, *The Bulgarian Jews and the Final Solution, 1940-1944*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972, pp. 199, appendices, bibliographical essay, index.

A book-length treatment in English of the survival of the Bulgarian Jews (until now covered as part of the European Holocaust, except in some articles) is more than warranted and Professor Chary attempts to fill this gap by his research and interpretation.

Although his Introduction does not contain any clear-cut thesis, the implication is that he wishes to identify those forces (people and/or events) responsible for the salvation. Indeed, the author refers us to the existing literature (primarily in Bulgarian and Hebrew) and to the various theses pretending to answer this important question. There are those who ascribe the decisive role to the masses of the Bulgarian people (the Communist and—one could argue—paradoxically, the thesis of many anti-Communist Bulgarians); others (mostly Bulgarian Jewish writers, especially B. Arditi in his early writings) credit the King,

Boris III; most authors opt for a combination of important factors (a thesis initiated by C. Kishales and adopted with a difference in emphasis by Chary himself).

The author's own research has taken him to many places and he has perused his sources (spanning from the captured German papers to the archives in Sofia and Jerusalem) carefully and judiciously. The substantive treatment starts with a background part on Bulgarian developments after 1934 (which is the weakest, as it relies often on one-sided Communist interpretations of the period and sometimes omits source references altogether), proceeds with the well-documented details of the anti-Semitic legislation and its application, and reaches its strongest level of scholarship in the description and analysis of the deportation of Greek and Yugoslav Jews from the territories under Bulgarian control, on the one hand, and the failure of deportation from Bulgaria proper, on the other.

The uncertainties of those days are dramatized by the wording of the deportation-authorizing Warrant No. 127 by the Bulgarian cabinet of March 1943 which—for unidentified causes—contained an insertion limiting the deportation to Jews «inhabiting the recently liberated territories», thus amending a preceding warrant which included a plan to deport undesirable «Old-Bulgaria Jews» as well.

Chary's Conclusions (up to their last paragraph) try to analyse the role played by various Bulgarian actors in preventing the holocaust and to give credit where and if credit is due. Thus, King Boris' role is reduced to that of a passive bystander; the Bulgarian Church is given unreserved credit for its anti-Semitic opposition; members of the Bulgarian Parliament receive recognition for their courage; yet neither they, nor the Bulgarian nation as a whole (which the author credits with «relative lack of anti-Semitism») could have saved their fellow Jewish citizens by their action alone.

Consequently, Chary turns to the course of events, primarily the successes of the Allies, as a most important cause for the salvation, but then—in the last paragraph of his Conclusions (p. 199)—he writes: «The critical question, then, 'Who saved the Bulgarian Jews?' cannot be answered because it is not really a valid question» (sic!). Yet, he continues that «the determining factors. . . were the political forces at work on the Sofia government», namely—as listed previously on the same page—«on the one side, the Reich, and on the other, influential opinion inside Bulgaria uniting with the Allies».

The reader remains perplexed: Why does a difficult and many-faceted answer make a question not valid, especially when the author himself had given an answer and repeated it concisely in rebutting the validity of the question? Thus, Chary—who had previously identified the many factors, internal and external, influencing the Final Solution—becomes unnecessarily his own detractor.

Despite the above ambiguity, which might be of a semantic or definitional nature, and despite some shortcomings in writing style and some inaccuracies, this relatively short study is a valid contribution to the ever challenging topic of the salvation of the Bulgarian Jews in a small country, willingly allied to the Axis and hosting German troops on its territory.

*The University of Vermont*

L. A. D. DELLIN