

Bishop went immediately to the spot where the fire was raging in the Jew Quarter and seeing that the Pasha made no kind of effort to check the flames he ordered his men to destroy three houses, by which means the rest of Salonika was saved. On Monday night, fearing that the fire might again break out, the Archbishop kept guard with his people and Mussago Bey; the Pasha and Beys retired to their harems (p. 298).

John Morier, also, in his report to Lord Hawkesbury from Iannina, June 30, 1804, gives the following details about Suliotes :

They were only 1500 fighting men, inhabiting a mountainous tract 30 miles to the S.W. of Yanina, and the only tribe of Greeks in Epirus who had maintained their religion and their liberties entire, since the conquest of that country by the Turks. The history of this people and of their fallen liberty would furnish an interesting tale. Their last struggle was really worthy of the blessings for which they were contending. Women fell fighting by the sides of their husbands, others rather than be led captives, destroyed their children, and the (*sic*) hurled themselves headlong down the precipices. One of these heroines named Kaidow is now at Corfu, where those who escaped death or slavery have fled (pp. 186-187).

All in all, *The Komisija za Publikovanje na Arhivski Materijali* (a nice title with three Latin and one Greek word!) is to be congratulated for the publication of this selection of British documents; even if it did not mean to do it, it has offered excellent details of Greek life in Macedonia and Epirus as the ones quoted above.

Institute for Balkan Studies

ATH. ANGELOPOULOS

Krste Bitoski, *Dejnosta na Pelagoniskata Mitropolija 1878-1912* (The Activity of the Bishopric in Pelagonia 1878-1912), Skopje. 1968. Pp. 322.

This study, reflecting the views of Skopje, examines the Greek religious and educational activity of the Greek Bishopric of Pelagonia between the years 1878-1912 and it is divided into two parts: The first, entitled "The Bishopric of Pelagonia from the Berlin Congress (1878)

to the revolution of Ilinden" consists of five chapters (pp. 15-181) and the second, entitled "The Bishopric of Pelagonia from the revolution of Ilinden to the Balkan Wars," consists of three chapters (pp. 185-294). There is a preface (pp. 1-11) and an extensive summary of the main points in French at the end (pp. 295-306) and bibliography (pp. 308-312).

The author of this study, when writing it, had a definite purpose in mind, that is, to prove *a posteriori* the historical existence of the so-called (by him) "Slavomacedonian" nation (p. 8). But did there indeed exist during the period in question (or in any other period for that matter) a "Slavomacedonian" national conscience and history, which could be subject to discussion? For an unbiased scholar, who looks at the sources — and in this case, where ethnological and linguistic boundaries of an area are concerned, all kinds of documents should be regarded as sources, if they are contemporary with the events, such as public registers, Consular reports, statistics and other official documents — during the period of 1878-1912 in the region of the Bishopric of Pelagonia, on the basis of the official written Turkish registers (pp. 266-267) and statistics used by the author of this study, such as those by M. Brankoff (p. 28) and H. Kiepert (p. 48), not, of course, Greek, a distinct "Macedonian" Slavic nation with its own national conscience and language is unknown in the region of Pelagonia, apart from the Serbians and the Bulgarians.

The view expressed in note 29 (p. 27), that from the time that Macedonia became part of the Bulgarian State the Byzantines used the name of Bulgarians to denote the "Slavomacedonians," is a personal opinion of the author, not sufficiently documented. On the contrary, no Byzantine writer mentions a distinct "Slavomacedonian" ethnic element in Macedonia. And not only the Byzantines, but also the Slavs of the Balkan Peninsula ignore the existence of a "Macedonian" ethnic group. The second contention of the author, that under the name of "Bulgarians" or "Exarchists" we should understand the "Macedonian" Slavic population as well, is also an invention of the historical fancy of Skopje (pp. 85-86), rejected by the Bulgarians as historically untrue; the Bulgarians have always vehemently denied, and more particularly lately, the existence of a distinct "Macedonian" Slavic ethnic conscience and language. This is best illustrated by the position taken by the Historical Institute of the Bulgarian Academy of Science in Sofia, which on a recent edition (Makedonskijat Vâpros-istorikopolitičeska spravka =

The Macedonian Problem—historicopolitical information, Sofia 1968, pp. 1-40) maintains that Macedonia has a geographic and not an ethnic connotation, and rejects the existence, either in the past or in the present, of a "Slavomacedonian" nation.

The frequent use and repetition by the author of this study alone of the terms "Macedonian," "Macedonian population," "Slavic Macedonian population" and the like (pp. 35-36, 41, 69, 74, 79, 85, 260 etc.), by which are meant the fictitious "Slavomacedonians" of Skopje, are historically inadmissible and non-existent, because a terminology, coined during the last 25 years in the People's Republic of Skopje, cannot correspond with the ethnological reality of a past historical period, such as the period between 1878-1912, nor can it be presented on the guise of history.

The author, expressing his personal and undocumented views, contends that the Christian population of the Vilaet of Monastir (Pelagonia) was up to the middle of the 19th century primarily Slavic (he excepts only the Vlachs) (pp. 31, 27, 28, 35, 40 et passim). But both the statistics and the events prove the predominance of the Greek element in Macedonia. Thus, according to official Turkish statistics for 1905 in the Vilaets of Thessaloniki and Monastir, conducted by the General Inspector Hilmi Pasha, under the auspices of Russia and Austro-Hungary, in these two Vilaets of Macedonia there were 678,905 Greeks and 385,465 Bulgarians. These statistics, coming from circles with the least philhellenic intentions, are not mentioned, as they ought to be, by K. Bitoski in his study. According to the English ethnologist Edward Stanford (V. Bérard, *La Turquie et l'Hellénisme contemporain*, Paris³ 1896, p. 228), in 1877 only in North-Western Macedonia there were 102 Greek schools with 4,639 students. K. Bitoski, while citing Bérard, by-passes the above mentioned statistical data of Edward Stanford.

The conclusion of the author in the preface (p. 5) about the Greek bishopric of Pelagonia, that its role during the period 1878-1912 "was negative versus the interests of our people in its entity" (i.e. the "Slavomacedonian" people) and that it was an organ of propaganda for the "imperialist" Greek intentions regarding Macedonia, does not have a sound scientific basis and it is rejected even by the author himself, who elsewhere points out that "up to now we do not possess authentic data concerning the activity of the Greek church and propaganda all over Macedonia" and "that for the moment we do not have at our disposal enough material based on the sources to clarify the role of the Greek Bishop of Pelagonia in the Macedonian Struggle as a personality" (p. 10).

However, we should conclude this review by pointing out to the credit of Mr. Bitoski that in spite of the shortcomings of his book, the material he has collected—especially that from the archives of the Greek Bishopric of Pelagonia—would eventually be quite useful for an objective study of the history of Modern Greece.

Institute for Balkan Studies

ATH. ANGELOPOULOS

Robert F. Byrnes, Editor, *The United States and Eastern Europe*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, 1967. Pp. 168.

Among the various indicators useful in "measuring" the intensity of the Cold War conflict none is more interesting than governmental as well as academic preoccupation in the United States with developments in Communist-ruled Europe. In the past, as Soviet-American tensions ran high, there was a strong temptation to dismiss the regimes of that region as mere extensions of Soviet power and politics, unworthy of official attention and detailed study. More recently, as relations at the higher level appear to be improving, however haltingly, the Iron Curtain tends to become a transparent muslin drop allowing not only a close scholarly look at these countries but giving rise to the question whether a "viable, mutually beneficial relationship" across this barrier can now be fostered. In turn, the careful study of Eastern Europe and particularly of its efforts to shrug off the after-effects of Stalinism might have positive influence on East-West relations. Thus, *The United States and Eastern Europe*, published by The American Assembly, is welcome evidence of such a trend. Unfortunately, events which followed its publication also show clearly that, even today, in attempting to examine developments in certain countries of East-Central Europe, one must not underestimate the ability of the Soviet Union to impose its will, by force if thought necessary.

This small volume is the work of a number of well-known specialists, each approaching the subject matter from a different perspective. The result is a very brief but comprehensive description of principal developments in Communist Europe. It would appear that "Eastern Europe" has become a political-ideological rather than a strictly geographic term: the book's scope includes Communist Germany but not