

X. The Historiography and Cartography of the Macedonian Question

by Basil C. Gounaris

1. The contest for the Ottoman inheritance in Europe

From the moment that the word ‘Hellas’ was deemed the most appropriate for the name of the modern state of the Romioi, the question of Macedonia, in theory at least, had been judged. Historical geography – according to Strabo’s well-known commentary – placed the land of Alexander within Greece, but in actuality, of course, the issue did not concern the Greeks directly. Their territorial ambitions extended at a stretch beyond Mt Olympus. Moreover, until the mid-19th century at least, the absence of any rival competitors meant that the identity of the Macedonians was not an issue yet. Knowledge of their history in medieval times was foggy, whilst the multilingualism did not surprise anyone: to be an Orthodox Christian was a necessary factor, but also sufficient enough for one to be deemed part of the Greek nation.¹

If there was any concern over Macedonia and its inhabitants, then this was clearly to be found within the Slavic world, in particular within the Bulgarian national renaissance and its relations with both Russia and Serbia. Prior to the foundation of the Greek state in 1822, Vuk Karadjic, the leading Serbian philologist and ethnographer included some Slavic folk songs from Razlog as ‘Bulgarian’ in one of his publications. In 1829 the Ukrainian Yuri Venelin also classed the inhabitants of Macedonia as Bulgarians, in his study *The Ancient and Present-Day Bulgarians and their Political, Ethnographic and Religious Relationship to the Russians*. In 1842 the Czech geographer P.J. Safarik, who lived at Novi-Sad but had never travelled to the southern Balkans, produced his ethnographic map, the fruits of a twenty-year labour, in which the Macedonians occupied a huge area from Dobrusha as far as Ochrid and Thessaloniki.² A little later (1844-45), Victor Grigorovic, professor of Kazan University, found himself in north Macedonia, a good deal before the Great Idea that was at that moment being born in the Greek parliament ever reached those parts. His contact with Dimitar Miladinov at Ochrid was decisive in inspiring the latter’s interest, and that of his brother Konstantin, in collecting Slav folk songs. These were published in 1861 as *Bulgarian Folk Songs*, with funding from the eminent supporter of the Southern Slav idea, the Catholic Bishop Strossmayer, at a time when this idea did not exclude the Bulgarians. A similar work by Stefan Verkovic, attaché of the Serbian principality at Serres, *Songs of the Macedonian Bulgarians*, had been published only a year earlier (1860) in Belgrade. This was followed in 1867 by Verkovic’s submission to the Moscow ethnographic exhibition of his notorious ‘Song of Orpheus’, in 1868 by his study *Table of the Life of the Macedonian Bulgarians* and in 1874 by his publication in French of the ‘Veda Slave’, the bogus 250,000-line Pomak epic. With the rise of Russian pan-Slavism in the late 1860s,³ it became clear that Verkovic’s pro-Bulgarian works were not at all in keeping with the interests of Belgrade, which instead now supported a new cycle of studies and theories, with Milos Milojevic, a professor of Slavic Studies playing a leading role. Following the road trailed by Verkovic for the conquest of ancient Thrace, Milojevic attempted to detach the Macedonians from the Bulgarians and to attach them to ancient Macedonia and Alexander the Great, the most powerful living symbol of the ancient world. Such a detachment was particularly necessary after the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate. Yet, from the beginning of the 1870s, it was clear that attempts to codify Macedonian history and the Slav-Macedonian language, and to integrate them into the as yet un-

formed framework of either Serbian or Bulgarian literature were creating conflicts and problems of a parochial nature.⁴

Concern over the issue was not a Slavic privilege. After the Crimean War, the West was equally concerned for the future of the European inheritance of its 'sick man', of which Macedonia was an important element. It was an area rich in raw materials, wheat and cotton, which proved to be of great value for the Western markets during periods of military conflict (1853-56, 1861-65 and 1877-78). The mission of the French explorer Guillaum Lejean, commissioned by his government, led to the publication of an ethnographic map of European Turkey in 1861.⁵ Macedonia was discovered once more through the texts of a new generation of travellers, including Mary Walker,⁶ the Austrian diplomat and ethnographer Georg von Hahn,⁷ Georgina Mackenzie and Adeline Irby,⁸ Lady Blunt, the wife of the diplomat Sir John Blunt,⁹ the archaeologist Leon Heuzey, a member of the French Archaeological School of Athens,¹⁰ Lieutenant Colonel James Baker, who passed through Macedonia in 1874,¹¹ Valentine Chirol, correspondent of the newspaper *Levant Herald*, in 1880,¹² and the prolific Leon Hugonnet, who in 1886 published a book on 'unknown Turkey', which also included Macedonia.¹³ Such texts could hardly be described as academic studies or even unbiased observations. It is widely acknowledged, for example, that Madams Mackenzie and Irby had been heavily influenced by Georgi Rakovski, and thus found Macedonia to be a great Bulgaria, which included not only its Slavophone population, but that of Thessaloniki as well. Generally speaking, however, the highlighting of the Slavic character of Macedonia on the basis of speech was a useful precept for Bulgarian rights, thanks to the overwhelming publicity that the Bulgarian issue was soon to garner throughout Europe.¹⁴ It was also to provide the basis for much of subsequent map production.

In Greece, research and interest in Macedonia was initially almost the personal undertaking of Margaritis Dimitis, a Vlach-speaker from Ochrid who was a schoolmaster at Monastir, Thessaloniki and, finally, Athens. Once he had gotten over his initial views on 'Hellenimacedonianism', his ambition to write a history of the 'Macedonian nation',¹⁵ and failed in his efforts for the linguistic cleansing of Macedonia, he finally dedicated himself, with greater success, to cleansing the Greek past of the Slavs.¹⁶ In the beginning, however, he did not have many supporters. Of the few Greeks who had seriously concerned themselves with Macedonia prior to the emergence of the Eastern Question and the redrawing of the borders in 1878, we can count first of all Constantine Paparrigopoulos, who in 1865 had finished the second volume of his great history, with its chapters on ancient Macedonia,¹⁷ and Ioannis G. Vasmadjides, author of the ethnographic treatise *I Makedonia kai oi Makedones pro tis ton Dorieon kathodou* [Macedonia and the Macedonians before the descent of the Dorians]. All of them expounded incurably.

After the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate (1870) and the schism with the Ecumenical Patriarchate (1872) publishing interest intensified. The Athenian newspapers (and the Greek newspapers of Constantinople) were flooded with anxious letters from East Rumelia and Macedonia, where the Exarchate had begun to infiltrate. But, despite the noise, it was too late to make up for the scholarly gap on the ethnographic composition of modern Macedonia. At the Constantinople Conference in 1876, a newly drawn (1876) ethnographic map by the German Heinrich Kiepert, possibly using data provided by Verkovic, was used on the suggestion of Count Ignatieff.¹⁸ It became clear that the Greek arguments about antiquity did not suffice, and so Athens proceeded with certain systematic moves, resulting in the production of three pro-Greek maps, those of Edward Stanford, A. Synvet and F. Bianconi. The first was based upon data provided to the British geographer by the Association for the Diffusion of Greek Letters via Ioannis

Gennadios, the Greek chargé d'affaires in London. The same data had been brought to the attention of Kiepert by Paparrigopoulos himself, who requested, and got, a partial adjustment made to the 1876 edition. The second map was drawn up by A. Synvet, professor of Geography at the Ottoman Lyceum of Constantinople, with data provided by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Bianconi, a French engineer with the Ottoman railways, based his map on the Ottoman tax registers. The frequent reference to non-Muslims as Romioi and the association of all Romioi everywhere with the Greeks was exceptionally favourable to Athens. On all three maps, Slavophones who adhered to the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Vlach-speakers were classified as Greeks.¹⁹ And this is why the maps were taken to the Congress of Berlin (1878). Along with them went the map of Karl Sax, former Austrian Consul at Adrianople. Sax, on the basis of the diplomatic sources that he had available to him, limited Bulgarian predominance within Macedonia, distinguishing between the Serbo-Bulgarians (to the north of Nish) as well as between adherents of the Exarchate and the Patriarchate, Uniates and Muslim Bulgarians (Pomaks).

As part of this renewal of Athens's Macedonian interests, which followed the foundation of the principalities of Bulgaria and Rumelia, two of the most able 'newspaper men' of the day published their views extensively. The first was the then parliamentary deputy Athanasios Papalouka Eftaxios, author of the study *To ergon tou ellinismou en Makedonia* [The work of Hellenism in Macedonia] (1880). The other was the publisher of the newspaper *Sphaira*, Ioannis Kalostypis, who published the treatise *Makedonia, itoi meleti oikonomologiki, geographiki, istoriki kai ethnologiki* [Macedonia, being an economic, geographical, historical and ethnological study] (1886). Both had lived and served in Macedonia during the 1870s and saw the union of Macedonia as salvaging Greece from its territorial, economic but also ideological asphyxiation. Both defined Macedonia in the broadest possible way, for obvious reasons. Kalostypis's study, which he dedicated to the adolescent heir to the throne Constantine, was essentially a response to the publication of Atanas Shopov, secretary of the Bulgarian Exarchate in Constantinople, who under the pseudonym Ofeikov revived the issue of the borders of Bulgaria as foreseen in the Treaty of San Stefano.²⁰ The annexation of East Rumelia had confirmed the concerns of all in the worst possible way. Nikolaos Schinas, a French-educated officer and engineer French education, undertook an on-the-spot survey, producing the impressively detailed three-volume *Odoiporikai simeioseis Makedonias, Ipeirou, neas orothetakis grammis kai Thessalias* [Traveller's notes to Macedonia, Epirus, the new border and Thessaly] (Athens 1887). His information would have been of exceptional importance ten years earlier. But such studies were the most suitable for neutralising the effects of 'public commentators, cartographers and journalists', whom Kalostypis justifiably criticised as drawing their information from suspect sources.

Indeed, with autonomy, Bulgarian academic interest in Macedonia moved on two levels. Within the Principality, the strong Macedonian lobby, organised into associations, published a variety of leaflets pushing their demand for decisive movements within Macedonia. In 1880 the newspaper *Makedonets*, published by N. Zifkov of Rouse openly proposed that arms be sent. In the same city in 1888 the newspaper *Makedonja* was published by Kosta Sachov, whose ideas are believed to be the ideological origins of the IMRO. The newspaper *Loza* was published in Sofia in 1891 by a group of young people who wanted to revive the Slav-Macedonian dialect and to 'awaken' the Macedonians. It was followed in 1893 by *Yugozapadna Bulgaria (South-east Bulgaria)*, and in the same year Sachov published, in place of *Makedonja*, banned due to Ottoman protestations, the *Macedonian Voice (Makedonski Glas)*, in which the foundation of an organisation dedicated to the Macedonian issue was proposed. This

was a few days before the foundation within IMRO in Thessaloniki. But the Bulgarian government did not remain inactive. At the time the Army Ministry had asked Giortse Petrov, a future leading figure of IMRO, to gather material on Macedonia, which was published in 1896, whilst Petrov was rewarded with a state scholarship to study – what else – cartography in Europe.²¹

The second level of Bulgarian interest was Europe. Immediately after autonomy was gained, the British-educated economist and later politician Ivan Gesov, already a regular correspondent for *The Times* and the *Daily News*, had just toured and completed a successful propaganda campaign in France and Britain. In the following decades, the European press was so pro-Bulgarian as to provoke regularly the surprise and anger of the Greeks.²² It was not, however, just a question of propaganda. First the Bulgarians and then the Serbs had made sure to publish their views in Western European languages. If these views were also being expressed for them by European academics, then so much the better for Sofia, which had as its occasional ally the interests of the Catholic Church within the Balkans.²³

Even so, the Bulgarians were no longer the only serious contestants for Macedonia. The appearance of the book and map by Gopcevic (1889), a career diplomat but also a recognised scholar, brought Milojevic's extreme views back to the fore again, i.e. the existence of a large number of Serbs in Macedonia to the south of the Sar mountain range. According to Gopcevic, these populations had only been considered Bulgarian because of a deficient knowledge of the Slav languages and folklore. It was, of course, not just a coincidence that these ethnographic criteria, as became clear in other maps in the following years, were identifiable with the boundaries of the medieval Serbian state.²⁴ Nor is it a surprise that the conflict between the Bulgarians and the Serbs over the Macedonian Slavs proved to benefit the scientific distinction of the one from the other.²⁵

Undoubtedly, the linguistic argument, as made by the Bulgarians and the Serbs, was easily understood and accepted everywhere. The Greek side, after the Eastern Question and having acknowledged its clear weakness on the language front, attempted to link the refusal to accept the Patriarchate combined with the partial use of Greek as an indication of a 'Hellenised' positioning of various populations. This argument allowed the Greeks to keep their sights set further to the north of the Greek-speaking zone, to the middle zone that in the 1870s was almost solidly Bulgarian-speaking. But documenting this argument was not a simple matter, and its international promotion even more difficult. Far simpler for the Greek side was the highlighting of its sphere of educational influence within the space of Macedonia. This had first been attempted by the veteran teacher of the local Greek population Georges Chassiotis, secretary for many years of the Greek Philological Association of Constantinople, in his study *L' instruction publique chez les Grecs* (Paris 1881), with an accompanying map. He was followed with similar arguments by Kleanthis Nikolaidis, a journalist based in Berlin and publisher of the periodical *Orientalische Korrespondenz*. The map in his *La Macédoine: La Question Macédonienne dans l' Antiquité, au Moyen-Age et dans la politique actuelle* (Berlin 1899), also published in German, represented the extent of the use of the various languages as a means of exchange. Greek, of course, prevailed. It is also notable that Nikolaidis, although he did not accept Gopcevic's view of the geographic stretch of Old Serbia to the south of the Sar mountain range, still marked the northern boundary of the linguistic influence of the Serbs at the Krusovo height.²⁶ The supremacy of Greek education was also demonstrated by the contemporary (1899) maps of Richard von Mach, author of the study *Die Makedonische Frage* (Vienna 1895).

It was now the turn of the Bulgarians to reply, and the task was charged to Vasil Kunchev, inspector of Bulgarian schools in Macedonia. In 1900 he published in Sofia

his work *Makedonija: Ethografija i Statistika*, with analytic charts of demographic data for each village as well as an ethnographic map. Almost at the same time (1901) the Institute of Cartography in Sofia published the map of the Bulgarian Exarchate with similar findings.²⁷ Both were republished in various editions over the next years, but their common characteristic was an insistence on the geographical meaning of Macedonia, of which Bulgaria was interested in its entirety, in contrast with the Greek and Serbian maps, which attempted to set out their spheres of influence. The same interest for Macedonia as a geographical whole was of course also shown by the now organised Slav-Macedonian autonomist groups. In 1903 Krste Misirkov, a teacher who had studied in Serbia, published in Sofia his work *Za Makedonskite Raboti* [On Macedonian Matters]. It is ironic that, although the book emerged as the Bible of Macedonian separatism and was banned in Bulgaria, Misirkov himself 15 years later worked at the Ethnographic Museum of Sofia and spoke in favour of a greater Bulgaria.

But the period of academic interest in Macedonia was coming to its end. The activities of the Bulgarian committees (1895-96), the Greek-Turkish war and related guerrilla activity (1896-7), the kidnapping of Ellen Stone, the summer uprising at Ilinden and, of course, the beginning of the violence of the Struggle for Macedonia, opened a new cycle in international research. Its main characteristics were a great journalistic interest, flimsy analyses and the systematic efforts on the part of both Athens and Sofia to exploit them for their own interests. In 1897 Victor Berard, a Hellenist and archaeologist, published his study *La Macedoine* in an effort to explore the limits of Hellenism, without necessarily supporting Greek ambitions. He was the first to realise that Greek identity in Macedonia was a matter of free choice and not of criteria. The next year Arden G. Hulme-Beaman, a former correspondent for the *Standard*, in his own book *Twenty Years in the Near East* argued in favour of the Bulgarian character of the Slavs of Macedonia, although he did not see them as 'genuine' as those of Bulgaria and Rumelia. Frederick Moore, the American correspondent for the *Daily Express* noted in 1903 the strange phenomenon of the three children of one family each choosing a different national party.²⁸ The Scot John Foster Frazer, special correspondent in many exotic parts, posed and answered the following question:

*But who are the Macedonians? You will find Bulgarians and Turks who call themselves Macedonian, you find Greek Macedonians, there are Servian Macedonians, and it is possible to find Roumanian Macedonians. You will not however find a single Christian Macedonian who is not a Servian, a Bulgarian, a Greek or a Roumanian.*²⁹

The celebrated British diplomat Sir Charles Eliot had a different view, although he acknowledged that the terms he used were perhaps unidiomatic.

*Though Bulgarians have become completely Slavised and can with difficulty be distinguished as a body from the Servians yet the faces of the Macedonian peasantry have a look which is not European, and recalls the Finns of the Volga and the hordes of the Steppes.*³⁰

Allen Upward, on the other hand, known for his sympathy for the Greeks, concluded that his Slavophone host was a Greek, judging only on the basis of his warm hospitality.³¹ Upward's escort in Macedonia had been appointed by the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The same happened with the visit of Michel Paillares to Konstantinos Mazarakis's band.³² In 1905 William Le Quex, who in 1905 had joined a Bulgarian *cheta*, came to the opposite conclusion from these two.³³ The adventurous American journalist Albert Sonneschen also lived with the *comitadjis* and praised their struggle in central Macedonia.³⁴ On the other hand, the Briton Martin Wills, an employee of the Ottoman tobacco monopoly whom the *comitadjis* had kidnapped and indeed cut off his

ear, was not as enthusiastic about their goals.³⁵ In a similar way, the views expressed by Abbott,³⁶ Booth,³⁷ Knight,³⁸ Wyon,³⁹ Lynch,⁴⁰ Durham,⁴¹ Kanh,⁴² Berard⁴³ and Amfiteatrov⁴⁴ were contradictory, in keeping with their informants and patrons. The last, for example, a liberal Russian journalist and a correspondent for various Russian newspapers, came out in favour of distinguishing the Slav-Macedonians from the Bulgarians and the Serbs.⁴⁵

The political analyses that appeared as articles in international journals⁴⁶ or as books⁴⁷ were also full of bias, but there were certain cautious indications too. In particular after the Ilinden uprising, the Europeans did not hesitate to criticise Turkish policy in order to justify their own diplomatic interventions, and Greek armed involvement in order to justify the obvious failure of their intervention. The situation in Macedonia looked conspicuously like that of Bulgaria in 1876 and it was to be expected that there would be a similar conclusion, i.e. the autonomy of the Bulgarians of Macedonia, without, however, necessarily being preceded by an armed crisis similar to that of 1876-8. Given the balance of alliances and armaments, something like this would have been fatal for international peace. Sofia was also systematically pushing their decisions in the direction of autonomy, making this wish clear in all contacts with reporters and politicians.⁴⁸ Added to this, the Slav-Macedonian autonomists of IMRO were also writing and pushing for autonomy, thus making the demand far more general and their differences with the Bulgarian government unclear. Already in 1900, A. Brutus, i.e. Anton Drandar from Veles, had published his *A propos d' un mouvement en Macedoine* in Brussels. This idea was being echoed all the more throughout Europe, in particular after Ilinden, thanks to various newspapers, such as the Swiss *L' Effort* and the French *Le mouvement macedonienne*, in which distinguished Bulgarian journalists, such as future diplomat Simeon Radef, wrote articles with funding from Sofia.⁴⁹ At the same time Boris Sarafov, a former officer of the Bulgarian army, Bozidar Tatarchev, a notable of Resna, and professors Liubomir Miletich and Ivan Georgov, visited Britain, amongst other European countries, and gave lectures organised by the Balkan Committee of the Buxton brothers.⁵⁰ 'The Bulgarians are more English in their manners than the Greeks and to this fact I attribute part of their popularity in England', wrote Upward.⁵¹ The Balkan Committee also contributed to the creation of a by no means negligible pro-Bulgarian bibliography, the best examples of which were the writings of the liberal brothers Noel and Charles Buxton,⁵² Henry Noel Brailsford,⁵³ correspondent for the *Manchester Guardian* and president of the British committee for the victims of Ilinden as well as the parliamentary deputy David Marshall Mason, a member of the National Liberal Federation.⁵⁴ Part of this output consisted of photographs of crimes against Bulgarians.⁵⁵ To this same Bulgarian campaign of enlightenment, we can add the books by Sarafov;⁵⁶ Atanas Schopoff, which cost the Bulgarian government 4,000 francs;⁵⁷ D. Michev, General Secretary of the Bulgarian Exarchate, who published statistics and a map under the pseudonym Brancoff;⁵⁸ Petar Danilovich Draganoff, a Russian Slav scholar of Bulgarian descent and former teacher at the Bulgarian school of Thessaloniki;⁵⁹ and I. Voinov.⁶⁰ Even as late as 1912 a committee of Bulgarian refugees from Macedonia toured Europe, under the presidency of professor Liubomir Miletich, in an attempt to influence the French press.

The Serbian presence in Europe, by comparison, was non-existent. It included Milos Milojevic's study, *La Turquie d' Europe et le probleme de la Macedoine et la Vielle Serbie*, published in Paris in 1905 and an article by the diplomat Ceda Mijatovitch in the journal *Fortnightly Review* in 1907. Most important was the study of the ethnographer and geographer Jovan Cvijic, *Remarks on the ethnography of the Macedonian Slavs*, published in 1906 in French, English and Russian. Cvijic argued that there were differences between the Slav-Macedonians and the Bulgarians and Serbs, but that they were

still more closely related to the latter. His book, re-published in 1912, was highly influential, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world. His style of writing indicated that Cvijic was not driven by any nationalist ideology, despite his conclusion that the amorphous mass of Slavs in Macedonia would be better and more completely integrated by the Serbs. His view was never confirmed, but the argument in favour of a third, distinct but unformed Slavic group in Macedonia, finalised in 1913 by the linguistic observations of Aleksandar Belic, was fully in keeping, in theory at least, with a significant section of Bulgarian positions.⁶¹

The Greek bibliographical counter-attack in European languages was disproportionately smaller than the enthusiasm reigning in Athens and the great efforts being made on the battlefields of Macedonia. Neoklis Kazazis, professor of Law and Political Economy, Dean of the University of Athens (1902-3), founder of the society Hellenism (Ellinismos) (1894) and leading public speaker, published the books *L' Hellenism et la Macedoine* in 1903 and *Greeks and Bulgarians in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* in 1907. More useful for the Greek position was the journal *Bulletin d' Orient*, which Kazazis published under the aegis of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs,⁶² as well as his lectures in Europe, in particular Paris, where he could count important figures amongst his personal friends, including the senator Georges Clemenceau.⁶³ His colleague Andreas Andreadis, professor of Economics and educated at Oxford and Paris, published a lecture in the journal *Contemporary Review*.⁶⁴ Antonios Spiliotopoulos, a journalist with a background in legal studies and publisher from 1902 of the journal *Kratos*, published two studies in French in 1904: *La Macedoine et l' Hellenisme* and *Lettres sur la question de Macedoine*. Joanna Stephanopoli, the first female student at the University of Athens and daughter of the publisher of the *Messenger d' Athenes*, in 1903 published her studies *Macedoine et Macedoniens. La Macedoine inconnue. La nationalite hellenique de la Macedoine d' apres le folklore macedonien*. There were not even five books in all; in reality, most were the transcriptions of lectures.

By contrast, the bibliography on Macedonia in Greek was colossal. In contrast with what is believed today, the truth is that the Struggle for Macedonia was never a secret, at least outside of Macedonia. Even subjects that are today regarded as minor details and have not been cross-checked were printed in the Athenian press, almost at the moment that the events themselves were taking place. For four years the Struggle was on the front pages of all the newspapers of the Greek Kingdom (and Greek diaspora everywhere),⁶⁵ and illustrated as a rule with photographs of the fighters. But *Embros*, thanks to its connection, known to all, with the Macedonian Committee, always held a comparative advantage: the returning fighters would provide, either orally or in writing, details on the activities of the bands, official documents, even their own diaries. All these were published by the editors of the newspaper in serial form for a broad readership.⁶⁶ The best-known product of this type of article writing was the book by Stamatis Raptis, regular editor of *Embros*, titled *O Makedonikos Agon* [The Macedonian Struggle], which circulated as 313 eight-page leaflets, most likely between March 1906 and April 1908.

Alongside populist article writing, there developed during this same period a somewhat more scholarly output, which was used extensively, and still is today, by all those interested in matters relating to the Macedonian Struggle. These were articles published in the *Makedoniko Imerologio* [Macedonian Diary], published initially by the Megas Alexandros (Alexander the Great) association (1908), and subsequently by the Pan-Macedonian Association (Pammakedonikos Syllogos) (1909-1912),⁶⁷ as well as in *Ellinismos*, the journal of Neoklis Kazazis's society of the same name.⁶⁸ The *Imerologio* was rife with obituaries of celebrated *Makedonomachoi*, fighters for Macedonia, and the already canonised national heroes, landscapes and long-suffering Macedonian commu-

nities (particularly in the north), published statistics for Bulgarian acts of violence and analyses of national rights on the basis of the educational feats of Hellenism. The articles in *Ellinismos* focused more on the diplomatic dimensions of the Macedonian issue and on the publication of documents. If the purpose of the *Makedoniko Imerologio* was to mobilise through rousing emotions, *Ellinismos* was more interested in informing the reading public, 'enlightenment on this always burning national issue and the reinforcement and guiding of the national struggle that is being carried out.' Always, however, within the framework determined by the Greek government.⁶⁹ The society's other publications on Macedonia were along the same wavelength,⁷⁰ as were the slim but highly popular volumes by Gnasios Makednos,⁷¹ AlMaz,⁷² Titus Makednos,⁷³ and a few other known and unknown writers. These writers would dedicate their studies (often the transcripts of lectures) either to the recently deceased *Makedonomachoi*,⁷⁴ to Bulgarian crimes,⁷⁵ or to the behind-the-scenes diplomacy of the Struggle.⁷⁶ It should, however, be noted that all the forms of Macedonian historiography that were developed in Athens appeared to be reconciled with the Slavic language of the Macedonians, whom they praised for their patriotism. They were, in other words, in tune with the argument, popular internationally, that identity was a matter of free choice. On the other hand, the insistence on the importance of choosing a Greek education as an indication of this free will, created the impression that the speaking of Slavic was something temporary that would pass if Greek schools were opened on a regular basis. Even more so when different studies insisted that the Slavic dialect of the Macedonians was, at root, Greek.⁷⁷

After 1903, with the armed developments and the journalistic charge, the central focus of output shifted from ethnographic theories to violence and crimes. The image of co-existence was swiftly replaced by one that saw conflict and intolerance to be characteristics of Macedonian history. These stereotypes came to dominate in the long term, not only because they better served the diplomatic circumstances that followed, but also because this body of work had been written in English and could thus be recycled easier. By contrast, the majority of works that proposed other versions of the situation, serving mainly Greek and Serbian interests and which were written in French and Italian were lost. The classic example is the study and map on the basis of religion by the pro-Greek Italian diplomat G. Amadori-Virgilj, to which nobody refers.

2. Demographic changes and Bulgarian revisionism

With their bayonets, the Balkan armies were carving out the borders of the Balkans, especially the zones of influence within Macedonia, with far greater ease than the cartographers, the ethnographers and the diplomats. But not all countries accepted the changes as a *fait accompli*. The university professors were thus called upon once more to support with scholarly arguments the boundaries that the generals had succeeded or failed to defend. The Bulgarians certainly had a much harder task of documenting the revisions. In 1913 Miletich published his book *Atrocities greques en Macedoine pendant la guerre greco-bulgare*. In the same year an international committee was set up by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to investigate the crimes that had been committed during the Balkan Wars. The findings were published in Washington in 1914 with the title *Report of the International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars*, which demonstrated that the game of creating impressions was continuing unabated. Members of the committee included Henry Brailsford, Victor Berard, and the Russian deputy and professor of history and archaeology Pavel Nikolaevic Miljukov – all of them well known for their pro-Bulgarian sympathies.⁷⁸ Greece reacted by publishing her own version of the crimes.⁷⁹ The worst thing for the Greeks, however, was that the committee presented its own demographic data on Macedonia, as it had received it from the Bulgarian professor Jordan Ivanov, who in his turn had re-

produced the details given by Vasil Kunchev (1900).⁸⁰ In order to counter the image of the occupation of ethnically alien territory, Venizelos invited the Swiss law professor Rudolph Archibald Reiss to tour the northern provinces and to investigate the situation of the population. His report, published in French in 1915, confirmed that the Macedonians were not Bulgarians nor was their language Bulgarian, they were simply 'Macedonians', from a perspective then completely favourable for Greece since it also neutralised Bulgarian and Serbian claims.⁸¹

But the occupation of Eastern Macedonia during the First World War provided the Bulgarians with the opportunity for a comeback, and not simply to uproot any resistance they had encountered there ten years previously but to study the region from up close. In the summer of 1916 the Bulgarian government sent a mission of distinguished scholars and well-known activists to the region, such as Jordan Ivanov, Anastas Isirkov, Bogdan Filov and Liubomir Miletich.⁸² But, the outcome of the War, unfortunate for Sofia, shifted the front to Western Europe. Ivanov and his collaborators, professors Isirkov, Georgi Strezoff, a member of the Geographical Society of Geneva, and Dimitar Micheff, now a member of the Bulgarian Academy, travelled to various European cities, mainly in Switzerland, in an attempt to influence the results of the Paris Peace Conference. Their activities were supported by the Macedonian unions of Switzerland, which had received funding of 20,000 francs from Sofia.⁸³ A number of these lectures were published in French.⁸⁴ Of course, total Bulgarian output was far greater than a few lectures. The whole of the Bulgarian-Macedonian intellectual community had been recruited: Simeon Radeff from Resna with law studies at Geneva and an old member of the IMRO,⁸⁵ S. Kitintcheff,⁸⁶ K. Solarov,⁸⁷ V. Tsanov,⁸⁸ and Kostadin Stefanov, literature professor and member of the Central Macedonian Association in Switzerland.⁸⁹ The flagship of these publications was Ivanov's study, *La Question Macedonienne au point de vue historique, ethnographique et statistique*, published in Paris in 1920, which recapped the Bulgarian views on Macedonia and Sofia's rights over what was now Greek Macedonia. Of course, aside from citations of all the texts favourable to Sofia from the 19th century, the volume was accompanied by two maps. The first exploited 19th-century pro-Bulgarian map-production to portray the ethnically Bulgarian region at its most expansive. The second presented the contradictory views that had emerged after 1878 and which clearly – and unjustifiably according to Ivanov – limited this region.

As we know, after all that had taken place during the war, it was now impossible for the proposals of Ivanov and his country to be satisfied at Paris, even though an Italian proposal for an autonomous Macedonia was discussed.⁹⁰ Indicative of the relative weight given to academic publications was the ultimate hand-over of land to Serbia, based on Cvijic's revised map, despite the fact that his country had far less academic output and activity to show.⁹¹ It helped, of course, that Cvijic, who was particularly highly regarded as an academic both in Europe and the USA, dominated throughout the procedures of the Conference. His views made Serbian authority over a large section of Macedonia inevitable, without a Bulgarian minority even being recognised, although ultimately this bred anxieties for Serbia, as the country now had to verify the maps of the great ethnographer, quickly absorbing the 'Macedonoslavs.'⁹² Moreover, Cvijic's views did not leave the Greeks unaffected either. A map prepared in 1918 by professor Georgios Sotiraidis, a Macedonian in origin and personal friend of Venizelos, was submitted to the Peace Conference. This map also recognised the existence of 'Macedonoslavs' within the Greek state, where Kleanthis Nikoalaidis had seen only Greeks.⁹³ Sotiraidis's view was not adopted by all Greek writers of the period.⁹⁴ Prominent among them was Vassilios Colocotronis, a high-ranking member of the diplomatic service, who took on the task of recapping, as Ivanov and Cvijic had done, all the Greek

arguments as well as the international historical and cartographic work favourable to Greece in his study *La Macedoine et l' Hellenisme: Etude historique et ethnologique* (Paris 1919). For Colocotronis, the 'Macedonoslavs' were Slavic-speaking Greeks.⁹⁵

Of course, the First World War and the disarray it brought to the Balkans did not leave the rest of the European academic community unaffected. Some of the most important works to be produced were those of R. Seton-Watson, *The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans* (London 1917), the first study by Jacques Ancel on the Macedonian issue, *L' unite de la politique bulgare 1870-1919* (Paris 1919) and Jacob Ruchti's dissertation *Die Reformaktion Osterreich-Ungarns and Russlands in Mazedonien 1903-1908. Die Durchfuhrung der Reformen* (Gotha 1918), which was first submitted to Bern University. Switzerland had indeed emerged as the centre of academic interest on the Macedonian issue, and this had to do not simply with the conditions of peace that prevailed in this country, but also with the covert efforts of Sofia.⁹⁶ It is impossible to count all the inter-war studies and articles that were published in the Press, in journals such as *International Pressekorrespondenz*, *L' Europe Nouvelle*, *The Advocate of Peace* and the *Voix des Peuples*. Even so, some of them became important reference works: Ancel's book, who by now was a professor of Geography and History,⁹⁷ and those of Andre Wurfbain,⁹⁸ Weigand,⁹⁹ and others.¹⁰⁰ A new generation of travel writing also emerged, memories old and new and, as always, never neutral. The most important, because of the depth of their knowledge, were those of Sir Robert Graves,¹⁰¹ the British Consul at Thessaloniki after 1903, his contemporary, the French official Leon Lamouche, who gave pro-Bulgarian speeches funded by Sofia,¹⁰² Edmond Bouchie de Belle,¹⁰³ a top official and veteran of the Macedonian front, Franceska Wilson¹⁰⁴ and others.¹⁰⁵ During the inter-war period the relevant titles had also begun to be published in the USA, thanks to the flourishing patriotic Bulgarian-Macedonian organisations and their main representative Chris Anastasoff, from Florina with studies in America.¹⁰⁶

Many of these books provided retrospective justification for Bulgaria; but for Sofia, on the diplomatic level at least, the Macedonian issue had been lost for good. It remained, however, alive throughout the inter-war period, both in refugee memories as well as in the country's political arena. To be exact, the Bulgarian-Macedonian refugees became both the authors and the primary readers of an extensive patriotic bibliography, which included memoirs from the Struggle for Macedonia to the micro-histories of their now completely lost homelands in Greek Macedonia. A primary role in this productivity was the foundation of the Macedonian Scientific Institute in 1923, under the leadership of Professor Ivan Giorgov, and, two years later, the publication of the journal *Makedonski Pregled*. In the meantime, Liubomir Miletich, by now president of the Institute, had begun the publication of a series of memoirs of the *voyvodas* of Ilinden. His example was followed by a number of veterans, such as Christo Matov¹⁰⁷ and Christo Silianov.¹⁰⁸

The Bulgarians' international worries had now completely passed. Time had stopped for them at Bucharest, but, generally speaking, the same had happened for the Greeks, albeit for different reasons. Their academic interest in Macedonia and its populations had receded. With the exception of works of an international standard by Stephanos Ladas,¹⁰⁹ Christos Evelpidis¹¹⁰ and Alexandros Pallis,¹¹¹ who laid the foundations of Greek domination now on the basis of the exchange of populations, only a few other studies were published on the region and even fewer on its inhabitants, in particular the old ones.¹¹² Of these only the various public services now wrote, and they were ignorant as to how to handle their particular needs, thus increasing the gap between the image created by history and diplomacy and the reality they were faced with. Of all the aspects of this complicated issue of integration (the latest phase of the Mace-

donian Question), in public at least only one appeared to monopolise their interest, that of their role during the Struggle for Macedonia.

This issue was approached along three axes, the first of which was linked to the unrelenting efforts to create a register of the old *Makedonomachoi* in order to provide them with moral and economic support. In response to this effort, a series of articles were published in the journal *Makedonikos Agon* [Macedonian Struggle], which circulated between 1929-1931.¹¹³ Even if most of the articles are not characterised by any particular historical accuracy, the diary entries and other interesting documents published in this journal, unfortunately sometimes fabricated,¹¹⁴ should not be ignored. In this same context, that of autobiographical testimonies, we could include a series of publications in newspapers, diary entries, reminiscences and other letters, of which we no longer have the originals today.¹¹⁵ Many of these, unfortunately, were accompanied by mutual charges and different interpretations of events, which the listing and hierarchisation of the fighters according to the current laws entailed. Extreme anti-communism is also characteristic of this type of publication, as a result of the well-known stand of the Comintern for a united and independent Macedonia in 1924, but also the expectations that certain political alliances would favour the order of the old fighters and their giant patronage networks.

Around the second axis revolved biographies, reminiscences and books that were published either as historical reference books or as literary works. The letters of Pavlos Melas,¹¹⁶ the reminiscences of Nikolaos Garbolas,¹¹⁷ of Angeliki Metallinou¹¹⁸ and of Antonios Hamoudopoulos,¹¹⁹ as well as the first biographies of Captain Kotas,¹²⁰ Melas,¹²¹ and Dragoumis¹²² could be considered as relatively reliable reference works, since they were based on the knowledge and experience of the generation of the Struggle. In this same category we should also include the post-war stories of Georgios Modis as well as the *Mystika tou Valtou* [Secrets of the Marsh]. The former, as a rule, echoed real events that Modis knew of personally, whilst at the same time they contributed to the creation of a peculiar ethics of the Struggle.¹²³ But, as we know, Penelope Delta's hugely popular works were based on interviews and diaries of *Makedonomachoi* that were transcribed by Antigone Bellou-Threpsiadi in 1932-1936. This made up for the lack of archive material, which, most likely for political reasons, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had denied Delta access to.¹²⁴ Only a few of the memoirs in her collection came to public light after the war.

Far luckier than Delta was Nikolaos Vlachos, assistant professor of History at the University of Athens, who had in this same period, 1932, already secured the requisite permission and was working in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Vlachos himself had said encouragingly to Belou-Threpsiadi that a work based on the living narratives of the *Makedonomachoi* had its own advantages, whilst he was working exclusively with 'soulless documents and papers.'¹²⁵ The course of events, as shall become clear, justified his judgement perhaps even beyond his own expectations. Vlachos's study, *To Makedonikon os phasis tou Anatolikou Zitimatos 1878-1908* [The Macedonian Question as a stage of the Eastern Question] (Athens 1935) is justifiably considered a classic and unsurpassed work of diplomatic history. Vlachos dedicated around 200 densely typed pages to the Macedonian Struggle, which essentially remain unread even today. He used, obviously as an exception to the rule, the archive material of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, indeed in depth, as well as all the available diplomatic bibles of the countries implicated in the crisis. Influenced by the subsequent developments and diplomatic needs at the time of writing, he attributed the character of a joint Greek-Serbian effort against the Bulgarians to the Struggle. It is difficult for one to clarify ultimately whether these priorities condemned the work to obscurity; probably not. In any case, his exceptionally useful and brave, in today's climate, observations,

which provide us with a general description of the Struggle without losing sight of isolated incidents, have been conspicuously ignored, and this is not by chance, as shall be made clear below.¹²⁶

To this meagre, third category of historical reference works, we could add the earlier *Politiki Istoria tis Neoteris Elladas* [Political History of Modern Greece] by Georgios Aspreas, as its second volume published in 1930 has around 20 pages dedicated to the Macedonian Struggle. Aspreas, a veteran journalist with *Embros*, notes¹²⁷ that he used material that he had found in Kalapothakis's archive, and even 'reports addressed to the Min.[ister] of Foreign Affairs from the centres in Thessaloniki and Monastir, notes and archives of contemporary politicians and military figures and in the confidential reports sent to George I.' Even so, from his generalised descriptions it does not appear that this material was particularly rich; his most important contribution was essentially the publication of the 'Organisation' of the Macedonian Committee.¹²⁸ Finally, we should not forget to mention the then young lawyer Georgios Modis, who co-wrote, in collaboration with the veteran *Makedonomachos* Nikostratos Kalomenopoulos, the entry 'Macedonian Struggle' for the first edition of the *Pyrros Great Greek Encyclopaedia* (1927).

The two characteristics that the interwar bibliography had in common with the period before the Balkan Wars, were the profound national orientation and the use of the French language in all international publications. Thus, on the one hand, the integrity of Greek publications was undermined whilst, on the other hand, whatever was written in French was little used in the post-war period, in particular in the Anglo-Saxon world. The worst was that the type of history that was being developed within the Balkan states did not draw sufficiently either from what was being written internationally, nor from the rival – Slav or Greek respectively – bibliography. The narration of wars, declared or undeclared, victorious or otherwise, was considered the most suitable method to uphold vested interests and to reinforce sensibilities. The Macedonian Question was not a scholarly but a patriotic concern. If each country had carefully read the studies and maps produced by its neighbours, it would have been able to find many useful guidelines for the policy that it should follow both at home and abroad. But no country did this, and history was to be repeated as farce.

3. Bulgarian occupation, Yugoslav aggression and Greek anxieties, 1940-1960

This particular shift in post-war historiography, i.e the further distancing from scholarly history, of course has its historical explanation. The Bulgarian occupation of East Greek Macedonia as well as Serbian Macedonia during the Second World War, Yugoslav involvement in the Greek Civil War, before the Second World War had ended, the foundation of the federal People's Republic of Macedonia (PRM) were events that had a dramatic effect on the writing of history within the Balkan states. Greece found itself trapped within a double ideological front. Bulgarian-Macedonian patriotic nationalism, which completed its third round of clashes with the Greeks and the Serbs during the Occupation, was followed by Slavmacedonian nationalism, a product of the old federal, socialist-leaning wing of IMRO as well as Serbian ethnological theories. Both threats, the Bulgarian and the Yugoslav, justified the anti-communist anxiety of the inter-war period and compounded the current communist threat, both within and without. And, worse, the two threats were not simply ideological. In this climate of pressure, there was no space for studies such as that which Nikolaos Vlachos had attempted, there was no space for Slavophones; absolutism and fanaticism were required. All academics and leading figures were obliged to reinforce sensibilities, to develop and codify simple his-

torical arguments, to use whichever memories were convenient and to construct strong ideological boundaries, stronger than the unprotected borders of the state.

The burden fell primarily on the Society for Macedonian Studies, which, since its foundation in 1939, had as its primary statutory purpose the investigation of every issue relating to the 'Macedonian people' and the 'Macedonian land' (sic).¹²⁹ It was indeed supported by many distinguished Macedonians, many of them from families with military distinctions in the anti-Bulgarian struggle. The decade's strong tremors left their stamp on many studies, which dramatically narrated and marked the Bulgarian occupation of east Macedonia, as well as the ramifications of the Greek Communist Party's (KKE) involvement in the Macedonian issue. Some of these had already begun to make their appearance during the years of the Occupation.¹³⁰ Other publications followed, which proposed, either directly or less directly, a reassessment of the northern borders, reminding that the boundaries of Macedonia were not the same as those of Greece.¹³¹ Then came those studies that linked the Slavic danger to the communist threat.¹³² Some of these were for internal consumption, rarely academic and mainly political,¹³³ written in a spirit of divisiveness, without any margins for tolerance. Others, following the lessons of the past, were written in western European languages, by old and young academics, who believed that the question of the communist threat could tip the scales of national historical rights in Greece's favour.¹³⁴

It hardly needs mentioning that there was a fervent interest in the history of the Struggle for Macedonia once more, and with a new direction: in the desolate Macedonian countryside the recognition of the sacrifices made was a necessary precondition for the restoration of national and, at the same time, political sensibility. The events had to be made known, warts and all. It was the least mark of respect that could be paid to all those families that had suffered two or three times in less than 40 years. Moreover, the departure from Greece of all those Slavophone Greek citizens who had, with a delay, changed their ethnic and their political identity left the field now open for the emergence of more rhetorically extreme studies. Angeliki Metallinou,¹³⁵ Generals Dimitrios Kakkavos,¹³⁶ Alexandros and Konstantinos Mazarakis,¹³⁷ Antonios Hamoudopoulos,¹³⁸ and Yiannis Karavitis¹³⁹ published their recollections, most of them during, and under the burden of, the Civil War. But the need to re-examine the glorious history of the period now clashed with an unforeseen obstacle: the *Makedonomachoi*, in their vast majority, were no longer alive. The generation change created a gap that was difficult to fill at the exact moment that the Macedonian Question was being re-examined. The state rushed to fill this gap, starting in 1951 with an effort to record and collect material from that era with purpose of writing an official history. This decision was not at all made by chance.

Theoretically, the post-war division in Europe appeared to serve Greek interests in Macedonia. Anti-communism would suffice as a shield under which the Greeks would have the luxury of focusing on the local histories of the villages of Macedonia and the biographies of the *Makedonomachoi*. Yet, it was not to be quite like that. Bulgaria was a defeated country that was obliged to rethink its policy of reassessment so as not to be isolated from its Slav partners, Belgrade and Moscow, a tripartite relationship that made the existence of the PRM even more difficult. Furthermore, the right-wing of IMRO, under the leadership of Ivan Mihailov, was seen as a formidable factor on the Bulgarian political scene, although in the end the opposite proved true.¹⁴⁰ The Macedonian organisations had to undergo a transformation in order to position themselves against visions of a Greater Bulgaria and in favour of Macedonian national liberation, albeit under pressure. And so it happened. In place of the journal *Makedonski Pregled*, the new journal *Makedonska Misil* circulated, adjusted to the new ideological demands. The newspaper *Makedonsko Zname* also played an important role in the promotion of the

new politics. Skopje was promoted as the new Piedmont for the unification of the 'Macedonian nation', not, of course, without resistance, as long as there was still a political opposition. But this was not enough. The Macedonians no longer had any place in Bulgaria. In 1947, the Macedonian Scientific Institute was suspended. Its archives, and the relics of Gotse Delchev were transported to Skopje. Circulation of the newspaper *Makedonska Misil* and the journal *Makedonsko Zname* was also suspended. The blow was hard and, although from 1948, as is well known, Bulgarian policy shifted, the progress in the field of history slowed.¹⁴¹

For the Greeks, the problem was no longer Bulgaria. During the inter-war period (1945-60) in Yugoslavia, although historical output was tame, significant ideological work and infrastructure improvement was taking place, and not unnoticed.¹⁴² In 1948, even before the University of Cyril and Methodius, the Institute of National History was founded in Skopje, with the purpose of gathering archive material and memoirs for the writing of the history of the 'Macedonian people', minorities and ethnic groups who lived within the Republic.¹⁴³ The Matista na Iselenitsite ot Makedonija (Centre for Macedonians Abroad) followed in 1951, with responsibility for the cultural heritage. The newspaper *Glas na Egejtsite* [The Voice of the Aegean Macedonians] circulated from 1950 to 1954, the official journal of the Slav-Macedonian political refugees from Greece, and was an important factor in the popularisation of Slav-Macedonian ideology. Its columns were full of articles on the military evens of the 1940s, associations with Ilinden and the biographies of Slav-Macedonian heroes. As early as 1951 this material was used by the press of the Union of Refugees to publish Hristo Andonovski's book *Egejska Makedonija* [Aegean Macedonia], whilst in 1952 an effort was launched (as in Greece) to collect material on the 'Macedonia of the Aegean.' Also in 1952 a government call was issued for the collection of new memoirs of Ilinden veterans. By that point, the memoirs of 398 individuals had been collected, certainly more than the corresponding number for the *Makedonomachoi* of Greece.¹⁴⁴ In the meantime, the first generation of young historians had emerged from the university, amongst whom Slav-Macedonian political refugees were well represented. Their output became well known mainly through their articles in the periodical *Glasnik*. Within its pages, Lazar Kolishevski, first president of the Republic, and historians such as L. Ljuben, S. Dimevski, B. Mitrovski, M. Pandevski, D. Zogravski, H. Andonov-Poljanski, H. Andonovski, G. Todorovski, H. Bitoski, T. Simovski and R. Kirjazovski started to present a new history of Macedonia, removed from its Greek and Bulgarian origins, with the 'Macedonian nation' as its point of reference, and a Marxist methodology. A central point in this was taken by the old Bulgarian vision of Macedonian geographical unity, which was invested with the requisite historical arguments from ancient times until the Second World War and set out on a map, which has since then followed the historical journey of this Republic.

On the surface, the international repercussions of these developments were not particularly worrying for the Greeks. At first sight, the pro-Slav bibliography on the Macedonian issue was limited to the books of Serbs and Bulgarians of the Diaspora,¹⁴⁵ mainly the works of Anastasoff and Ivan Michailoff, the inter-war leaders of the IMRO.¹⁴⁶ Level-headed studies, such as those of geography professor H. Wilkinson and Elisabeth Barker,¹⁴⁷ pro-Greek works such as those of Christopher Woodhouse, whose *Apple of Discord* was published in 1948, and of course Greek works in English and French balanced things satisfactorily. Yet, things were not quite as they seemed. The Macedonian issue now automatically featured in every publication on Yugoslav history issued by Belgrade, and in every publication by third parties on Yugoslavia and the Balkans, ultimately benefiting Skopje politically.¹⁴⁸ It was no longer simply a part of Greek, Bulgarian or Serb history. Moreover, the country's language was now a distinct

field of study for Slav scholars the world over. All this scholarly output was now classified as 'Macedonian.'¹⁴⁹

More trouble, 1960-1990: The Slav-Macedonian historical attack

It is noteworthy that, as has happened in Greece and Bulgaria, so Yugoslav Macedonian history was first written by individuals who sought their own personal historical justification. Indeed, up until 1960, very few of those working on Macedonia – not only in the Balkan nations, but in western Europe as well – were university professors, and even fewer were professional historians. This is not difficult to explain, as historical output followed diplomatic, political and military developments. There were no historical sources yet, just a need for historical arguments that would frame political decisions. These needs now burdened Skopje, only this time the scale was different. The need here had to satisfy the existence of the Socialist (from 1963) Republic of Macedonia (SRM) within the Yugoslav system of federal republics, as well as the wider network of the relations of the socialist republics with Moscow on the one hand, and the western democracies on the other.

The way in which the new Republic's outstanding historical issues were dealt with is characteristic. The prevailing social ideology also helped, which dictated the historical method and secured total professional loyalty to the preordained goals, the progress of historical science and the availability of the sources. First the University and then, after 1967, the Macedonian Academy of Sciences, in collaboration with state- and semi-state-run publishing houses, embarked upon an fantastically voluminous production of history, which naturally cannot all be discussed here. Nor can its ramifications in relation to the course of socialism or Skopje's relations with Belgrade, Athens, Sofia and Moscow. What is certain is that, in terms of the subject matter and number of the studies, within 30 years the gap with Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian historiography had been more than covered, with the exception perhaps of studies of Ancient Macedonia. Within this output, and in general in the new history of the SRM, 'Aegean Macedonia' was given a central position, and was the particular focus of attention for the younger generation of political refugees who had been educated in Skopje and staffed the Institute of National History.¹⁵⁰ It is also clear that this campaign 'took off' worldwide, and the reasons were not only political, the desire, that is, of the West to support this most vulnerable corner of Yugoslavia. As had happened earlier with the theories of Cvijic, the views of the Slav-Macedonians appeared to provide a compromise or a solution to the perpetual conflict between the other state histories. In any case, they were the product of an existing historical trend that, irrespective of whether it served irredentist goals, followed its own evolution, as we have seen, from the middle of the 19th century. Moreover, the emphasis on social and economic issues meant that this work was more in keeping with newer trends in international historical research, and the published sources were all-important for western scholars. Much of the publishing effort already from the 1950s was dedicated to the publication of archive sources.¹⁵¹ The translation of basic works into English took off in the 1960s, so that western scholars had access to this historical output.¹⁵² From 1971 this work was mainly undertaken by the periodical *Macedonian Review*, in which abstracts of all the historical studies currently in progress were published. Three concise histories were also published in English. First was Dragan Taskofski's *The Macedonian Nation* (Skopje 1976) by the publishing house Nasha Kniga. *A History of the Macedonian Nation* (Skopje 1979) was a collected volume produced by a team of scholars headed by Academician Professor Mihaylo Apostolski, former general of the resistance army, and published by the Institute of National History. And, most well known internationally, was *Macedonia its People and History* (Pennsylvania 1982) by Stoyan Pribichevich, associate of *Fortune* magazine and *Time*

correspondent at Tito's headquarters, based to a great degree on official publications of the SRM, and which fully adopted the Republic's historical interpretation and irredentist line.

In Greece and Bulgaria after 1960 the trend was in the opposite direction. The Macedonian Question was passing increasingly into the hands of professional historians, without, of course, this meaning that the popular histories were on the wane. In Sofia, despite the constant shifts in its relations with Belgrade, and the total guidance by the Macedonian refugee unions, production never ceased, particularly in Bulgarian in the periodical *Istoritseski Pregled* and, to a lesser degree, in French and English through the periodicals *Etudes Historiques* and *Bulgarian Historical Review*. It particularly flourished after 1978, when the two governments failed to come to a historical compromise. The most important of the subsequent publications was the volume *Macedonia. Documents and Materials on the History of the Bulgarian People*, published in that same year by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, with the purpose of demonstrating the Bulgarian character of the Slavs of Macedonia from the medieval era onwards.¹⁵³ A large part of the documents in this volume, as with the corresponding two-volume Slav-Macedonian publication of 1985,¹⁵⁴ came from books of the 19th-century and inter-war period, which were now seen as historical records. A little later, on the 80th anniversary of Ilinden, Panajotov and Sopov released a photostat reprint of a selection of inter-war memoirs of leaders of IMRO, which had originally been published by Miletich, as director of the Macedonian Scientific Institute.¹⁵⁵ The *comitadjis* had returned to active duty.

But the *Makedonomachoi* had also returned. The Institute for Balkan Studies (IMXA), initially an annex of the Society for Macedonian Studies, had assumed responsibility for Greek post-war history on the Macedonian issue. Zotiades's study *The Macedonian Controversy* was republished by the Institute in 1961, to coincide, obviously, with the new crisis in Greek-Yugoslav relations, with new chapters and further details for the inter-war period. The use of new sources was also followed by Evangelos Kofos, one of the few scholars who systematically wrote about Macedonia in English.¹⁵⁶ This was mostly for IMXA's new periodical *Balkan Studies*, which also included a number of articles, mainly by academics of the University of Thessaloniki, on the diplomatic history of Macedonia.¹⁵⁷ The search for archive material, and the challenge posed by the SRM, helped to further research interest into new, almost unknown to Greeks, aspects of Macedonian history,¹⁵⁸ the main contribution being Apostolos Vakalopoulos's concise history of Macedonia.¹⁵⁹ But the Struggle for Macedonia still remained the most popular chapter in history, to which most research was dedicated until 1990. The memoirs of Gyparis,¹⁶⁰ Demestichas,¹⁶¹ Kois,¹⁶² Florias,¹⁶³ Stavropoulos,¹⁶⁴ Danglis,¹⁶⁵ and other important figures of the Struggle came to light, whilst periodicals, such as *Makedoniki Zoi*, *Chronika tis Halkidikis* and other provincial periodicals increased the number of works on micro-history, individuals, villages and events. Two studies can be considered as the high point of this trend: *Makedonikos Agon 1903-1908* [Macedonian Struggle] by Angelos Anestopoulos, a non-commissioned officer of the Gendarme, who in two volumes¹⁶⁶ (Thessaloniki 1965-1969) published the activities of hundreds of *Makedonomachoi* in the cities and market towns of Macedonia, and *O Makedonikos Agon kai I neoteri makedoniki istoria* by Georgios Modis (Thessaloniki 1967), in which he condensed all his personal experiences and detailed knowledge of the Struggle. In 1979, after an effort of 25 years, the Army History Section published its study with the title *O Makedonikos Agon kai ta eis tin Thrakin gegonota* [The Macedonian Struggle and the events in Thrace]. In the meantime, Douglas Dakin's book had been published by IMXA in English,¹⁶⁷ and Pavlos Tsamis's by the Society for Macedonian Studies.¹⁶⁸ Finally, in 1984 IMXA, on the oc-

casion of the 80th anniversary of the outbreak of the Struggle for Macedonia, published – a year after Sofia had already done so – a new set of memoirs of leading fighters, in two volumes.

It is surprising, however, that there are only a few, vague references in these books on the Macedonian Struggle to the developments in the Macedonian issue during the occupation; any references to post-war events are totally absent. This also characterises Konstantinos Vakalopoulos's important Macedonian studies of the 1980s,¹⁶⁹ as well as the grand publication *Macedonia: 4,000 Years of Greek History* (Athens 1982), where only two pages are given over to developments from 1940 onwards. This lack of a connection between the Macedonian Struggle and Macedonian history in general with contemporary developments of the Macedonian Question, a connection that had essentially alighted post-war Macedonian studies in Greece, is, I believe, fully explainable. It should first be taken into account that the internal political situation in Greece prevented scholarly involvement with a subject that was closely associated with unpleasant aspects of the Occupation and Civil War. It was a sensitive subject for a large section of the population. Greece's difficult diplomatic position within the Balkans immediately after the fall of the 1967-1974 junta and the tragic events in Cyprus should also be taken into account. As far as Athens was concerned, the Macedonian Question had been pushed to the back of the drawer, and it would go to any lengths to keep it securely there. Over 30 years of studies and publications could ultimately be characterised in the following way: although written in the aftermath of the events of the 1940s and within the context of the new diplomatic and scientific differences between Greece and its northern neighbours, they continued to serve, on the whole, local emotional needs: incorporation of the Struggle for Macedonia into national history, with the ultimate goal of raising the morale and strengthening the national feeling of the Macedonians, as though some kind of deficiency had been ascertained. There were only a very few studies in the Greek language that referred to the SRM as a cultural, diplomatic or ideological threat.¹⁷⁰ For many years, the main threat in terms of the Macedonian Question for the wider Greek public was Sofia, not Skopje.

The opposite phenomenon emerged in the rest of Europe and the USA. Just as before, so also after 1960 the Macedonian Question was seen primarily as a problem of security between East and West. It was a required chapter in all books that studied the post-war Balkan scene either as part of the communist world or as part of the Yugoslav federation. Basically, it was treated as an internal Slav problem, a view that also spread to history as for most scholars of the Balkans there was no need to learn Greek or to consult Greek sources.¹⁷¹ In the 1970s a scholarly interest in the formation of Slav-Macedonian nationalism arose, from both a historical as well as a linguistic perspective.¹⁷² The first studies by western social anthropologists – who had carried out research in Greek Macedonia, the only area accessible to them – also made their appearance.¹⁷³ Generally speaking, however, although the references to Greek studies in western historiography were rare, it is difficult to argue that this international output until 1990 had incorporated the great mass of Slav-Macedonian historiography. The SRM, as a country and as a Slavic nation, had been completely integrated primarily through the Yugoslav route, but it was clear from a historical interest perspective, that the Bulgarian inter-war period and the communist factor were perhaps the most important themes. In each case, regardless of the dilemmas posed by scholarly research and the sources vis-à-vis the origins of the modern 'Macedonians', scholars were more interested in the international relations and entanglements of the Question, rather than identities and their formation.

4. Epilogue

The foundation of an independent Macedonian state, FYROM, and the concomitant post-communist period in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, revived Macedonian studies, but the clock could no longer be turned back. Bulgaria, which in 1991 re-founded the Macedonian Scientific Institute and re-published the *Makedonski Pregled* anew, regurgitated its Macedonian output, this time, however, with very little access to the western academic community. Cut off for years from the predominant Anglo-Saxon research, and without the financial wherewithal for translations, it remained for at least a decade unable to influence international historiography. But, finally, it seems to have made a comeback with a new generation of historians who have a critical approach to their national history. In FYROM, nothing more was needed than what had already been done. The work had already been completed much earlier, and any new chapters that were added after 1991 were simply repetitions. It is still too early even today (2005) to expect significant breaks with its historiography, given the country's political and diplomatic position. In Greece the trends were, and still are, divided. One side appears to accept completely the Slavic line – Slav-Macedonian and not Bulgarian – whilst another continues the tradition of the unceasing struggle of historical rights. A third group recognises the complexity of an issue that has been inextricably confused with its scholarly bibliography and politicised since its birth, but this group is under siege from all sides, as it is methodologically incompatible with the other two perspectives. One could say that this scene is reminiscent of the inter-war period. The dispute is due mainly to disagreement in the use of modern methodologies that have been adopted by new academic fields, as well as in the choice of a point of view. As in other periods, the western point of view has determined the importance of cartography and the entrenchment of ethnic groups and protection of ethnic minorities. Since 1990, therefore, it has encouraged the study and protection of ethnic groups and their cultural identities. Perhaps the only difference is that this time western academic output on Macedonia – in which much was invested thanks to the collapse of Yugoslavia – almost acquired the overtones of a reform process, which influenced Greece most, Bulgaria to a lesser extent, yet FYROM, so far, almost not at all.

Yet, this is not peculiar. The acceptance of one or the other view in the Macedonian Question has always been linked to diplomatic developments and not to its quality or volume. This is why the Bulgarians were able to mobilise the liberal Britons at the beginning of the 20th century, but not in the 1920s, even if their humanitarian arguments were just as solid then. This is why, at the end of the Second World War, all accepted that 'Macedonianism' was a means for the expansion of the communist Tito, but a few years later accepted unbothered the autonomous ethnological existence of the SRM. For the same reason again, the cultural rights of the Slav-Macedonians incite more interest, whilst those of Greek-Macedonians or Bulgarian-Macedonians only indifference. Due to the inability to develop a common methodology between the countries or the academic schools and the incongruities between different historical periods, we are forced to resort to an agnostic approach to the Macedonian Question, which is more functional and convenient for all.

In order to make this better understood, it is worth noting some factors that, rather than helping it to evolve, simply recycle the research. Language is the most important. Whatever has been written in Greek or the Slavic languages, sources or reference works, is not of particular use to western scholars, with perhaps the exception of Hellenists, German Balkan scholars and Slav scholars in general. Yet neither can they, thanks to their studies, their nationality and their sources, escape from their ideological starting points. Thus in Greece, the depth of time and extent of thinking around the autonomy of Macedonia have not yet been fully appreciated even today. Even studies in French,

which constitute a huge chunk of the research on Macedonia, remain untouched in Britain, the USA and Australia, and the same is unfortunately true for the German-language bibliography. In contrast, whatever is written or translated into English is an investment which makes good countless times, regardless of the quality. The inability to compare, then, facilitates the uncritical acceptance of certain views. The second factor is the vast mass of accumulated bibliography. The inability to consume it all facilitates the selection of only those books, articles, citations, statistics or maps that will confirm a particular working hypothesis or fit with the researcher's ideological perspective. The researchers constitute the third factor in this recycling. In the above discussion of the bibliography the important role played by politicians and all types of activists in the formation of the history of the Macedonian Question has been made clear. The role of the Diaspora and of refugees has been distinct, whether we are talking about Bulgarian students in Switzerland, Monastiriots in Thessaloniki, 'Aegeans' in Skopia or Kastorians in Sofia, the USA or Perth. University professors have been used as an alibi, to provide an 'objective' validation for statistics and maps, rather than as providers of a deeper understanding.

The progress of technology, and in particular the use of the Internet, is the surest guarantee that the recycling of output on the Macedonian issue will continue for as long as history remains a vital concern for Balkan policy and for the self-definition of the peoples of the region. And there is no doubt that there is no lack of organisations and individuals ready to offer their services in this direction. Politicians and professors have always formed theories that they then passed on to teachers, priests and other willing missionaries to consolidate in the populations of Macedonia. Diplomats, in their turn, diffused the feelings stirred by these theories further, to draw up maps of the results. The possibilities of moving on from this framework are truly limited, because even the production of the sources, from at least the 19th century, is linked to the demands of politics. Unfortunately, we cannot see the Macedonian issue through the eyes of an 18th-century farmer or livestock breeder, and we know very little about the private perspective of even the most educated people of the 19th and 20th century. There are no texts free of political objectives. Even for the formation of home and foreign policy, we only know about the highest level, rather than the actual decision-making process and the discussions that preceded it. We are thus left with only one picture, which illustrates the conflicts, the crises and extreme phenomena, rather than the ways in which society itself overcame them. Yet this, ultimately, is not a distortion, but the core of the Macedonian Question. Politics and ideologies were always produced outside of the region itself, and then imported at the fastest pace at which society could absorb them, to trickle from the top downwards. How, then, can we anticipate a historical perspective viewed from the bottom upwards?

Notes

1. On this issue, see Ioannis S. Koliopoulos, *I „peran“ Ellas kai oi „alloi“ Ellines: To synchrone elliniko ethnos kai oi eteroglossoi synoikoi christianoi (1800-1912)* [The Greece of 'Beyond' and the 'Other' Greeks], Thessaloniki 2003, pp. 60-1 and the whole of chapter 3.
2. H. R. Wilkinson, *Maps and Politics. A Review of the Ethnographic Cartography of Macedonia*, Liverpool 1951, p. 35.
3. In this period he published a series of maps emphasising Slav predominance in the Balkans over the Greeks and the Turks, whilst avoiding discussion of their differences. See Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-7.

4. Voin Bozinov and L. Panayotov (eds), *Macedonia. Documents and Material*, Sofia 1978, pp. 130, 137-138; V. Colocotronis, *La Macedoine et l' Hellenisme: Etude historique et ethnologique*, Paris 1919, pp. 524-5; Spyridon Sfetas, *I Diamorfosi tis slavomakedonikis taftotitas* [The Formation of Slav-Macedonian Identity], Thessaloniki 2003, pp. 17-45.
5. Wilkinson, *op. cit.* pp. 42-3.
6. *Through Macedonia to the Albanian Lakes*, London 1864.
7. *Reise durch die Gebite des Drin und Wardar*, Vienna 1867 and his *Reise von Belgrad nach Salonik*, Vienna 1868.
8. *The Turks, the Greeks, and the Slavons: travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe*, London 1867. This volume was accompanied by an ethnographic map; see Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-3.
9. Published anonymously by John Murray with the title *The People of Turkey by a Consul's Daughter and Wife*, London, 1878, vols 1-2.
10. *Mission de Macedoine*, Paris 1876.
11. *Turkey in Europe*, 2nd edition, s.l., 1877.
12. *Twixt Greek and Turk or Jottings during a Journey through Thessaly, Macedonia and Epirus in the Autumn of 1880*, Edinburgh 1881.
13. *La Turquie inconnue: Roumanie, Bulgarie, Macedoine, Albanie*, Paris 1886. See Mackenzie and Irby, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-68.
14. K. Sharova and A. Pantev, 'Mackenzie and Irby and the New Trends in English Policy towards the South Slavs', *Etudes Historiques*, 6 (1973), 117-42.
15. See the introduction to his study *Ta peri tis aftokefalou archiepiskopis tis protis Ioustianis* [On the autocephalus Archbishopric of Justiniana Prima], Athens 1859.
16. Margaritis G. Dimitis, *Archaia geografia tis Makedonias* [Ancient geography of Macedonia], Athens 1870; *Topographia tis Makedonias* [Topography of Macedonia], Athens 1874; *Epitomos Istoria tis Makedonias apo ton archaiotaton chronon mechri tis tourkokratias. Pros chrisin ton Ellinikon scholeion kai parthenagogeion tis Makedonias* [Brief History of Macedonia from ancient times until Turkish rule. For use in the Greek schools and girls' schools of Macedonia], Athens 1879; *I Makedonia en lithois pfhtengomenois kai mnimeiois sozomenois* [Macedonia uttered in stone and saved in monuments], Athens 1896, vols. 1-2.
17. See C.T. Dimaras, *Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos. Prologomena* [Constantine Paparrigopoulos. Prologues], Athens, 1970, p. 20.
18. This was also the year in which Konstantin Jirecek's *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague 1876) was published. Jirecek was the grandson of Shafarik and later served as Bulgarian Minister of Education. See Colocotronis, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-8.
19. Evangelos Kofos, *I Ellada kai to Anatoliko Zitima, 1875-1881* [Greece and the Eastern Question], Athens 2001, pp. 77 and 157. Cf. Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 63 and n. 2.
20. This work was also published in French two years later, see Ofeikov, *La Macedoine au point de vue ethnographique, historique et philologique*, Philippopolis 1887. Cf. Kalostypis, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-8.
21. Gortse Petrov, *Materijali po izutsenieto na Makedonija*, Sofia 1896.
22. Ivan Ilchev, *Rodinata mi prava ili ne! Vansnopoliticheska propaganda na balkanskite strani (1821-1923)*, Sofia 1995, p. 113.
23. See, for example, the study by the Belgian commentator Emil de Laveleye, *The Balkan Peninsula*, translated into English by Mary Thorp (London 1887) and the two-volume work by the celebrated Balkanist Gustaf Weigand, *Die Aromunen* (Leipzig 1894-5) accompanied by a pro-Bulgarian ethnographic map. See also the studies by the first Bulgarian Uniate Bishop Lazar Mladenoff, *Rapport sur la situation religieuse des Bulgares catholiques de la Macedoine* (Lyon 1884) and the director of the Catholic school of Thessaloniki E. Cazot, *Regeneration d' un peuple. La Macedoine catholique* (Paris 1901). For a comprehensive discussion of the Bulgarian bibliography, see N. Mikhov (ed.), *Bibliographie de la Turquie, de la Bulgarie et de la Macedoine*, vols. 1-2, Sofia, 1908-1913.
24. Spiridion Gopcevic, *Makedonien und Alt-Serbien*, Vienna 1889; see Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-109. During the next decade two more studies were published in Bel-

- grade in Serbian, *The truth about Macedonia* (1890) and *The ethnographic relations between Macedonia and Old Serbia* (1899).
25. See the introduction in Karl Hron, *Das Volkthum der Slaven Makedoniens*, Vienna 1890.
26. Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-5.
27. Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-32.
28. *The Balkan Trial*, London 1906, pp. 147 and 155. In 1905 Moore had also published the article 'The Macedonian Committees and the Insurrection' in the volume *The Balkan Question*, Luigi Villari (ed.), London 1905, pp. 184-227.
29. *Pictures from the Balkans*, London 1906, p. 5.
30. Charles Eliot, *Turkey in Europe*, London 1908, p. 322 and also p. 265 n. 1.
31. *The East End of Europe: The Report of an Unofficial Mission to the European Provinces of Turkey on the Eve of the Revolution*, London 1908, p. 210.
32. *L'imbroglia macedonien*, Paris 1907.
33. *An Observer in the Near East*, London 1907, p. 296.
34. *Confessions of a Macedonian Bandit*, New York 1909.
35. *A Captive of the Bulgarian Brigands: an Englishman's Terrible Experiences in Macedonia*, London, 1906.
36. G. Abbott, *The Tale of a Tour in Macedonia*, London 1903.
37. J.L.C. Booth, *Troubles in the Balkans*, London 1905. The author was a special correspondent for *The Graphic* in 1904.
38. E.F. Knight, *The Awakening of Turkey: A History of the Turkish Revolution*, London 1908.
39. Reginald Wyon, *The Balkans from Within*, London 1904.
40. H.F.B. Lynch, *Europe in Macedonia, being five articles reprinted from the 'Morning Post'*, London 1908.
41. Edith Durham, *The Burden of the Balkans*, London 1905.
42. M. Kanh, *Courriers de Macedoine*, Paris 1903.
43. Victor Berard, 'A Travers la Macedoine Slave', *Revue des deux Mondes*, 114 (1892), 551-578, and *Pro Macedonia*, Paris, 1904.
44. Aleksandr Valentinovic Amfiteatrov, *Strana razbora* (1903).
45. See Hristo Andonov-Poljanski et al (ed.), *Documents on the Struggle of the Macedonian People for Independence and a Nation-State*, Skopje 1985, vol. 1, pp. 412-5 and also the article 'Oi neoi Slavoi tis Makedonias' ('The new Slavs of Macedonia'), *Sphaira*, 10 Feb. 1901.
46. For example, see J. Gambier, 'Macedonian Intrigues and their Fruits', *Fortnightly Review*, 78 (1902), 747-758; H. Vivian, 'The Macedonian Conspiracy', *Fortnightly Review*, 79 (1903), 827-837; K. Blind, 'Macedonia and England's Policy', *Nineteenth Century*, 54 (1903), 741-755; E.J. Dillon, 'Macedonia and the Powers', *Contemporary Review*, 79 (1903), 728-750; W. Miller, 'The Macedonian Claimants', *Contemporary Review*, 83 (1903), 468-484; G. Azambuta, 'Le Conflit des Races en Macedoine d' apres une Observation Monographique', *Le Science Sociale*, 19/2 (1904); Anonymous, 'Macedonia and the Powers', *Quarterly Review*, 198 (1903), 485-514.
47. F. Stevenson, *The Macedonian Question*, London 1902; M. Leroy, *La Question Macedonienne. Etude d' histoire diplomatique et de droit international* (Paris, 1905); G. Verdene, *La verite sur la Question Macedonienne*, Paris 1905; E. Engelhardt, *La Question Macedonienne, etat actuel, solution*, Paris 1906; G. Amadori-Virgilj, *La Questione Rumeliota e la Politica Italiana Macedonia, Vecchia, Serbia, Albania, Epiro*, Bitondo 1908, vols 1-3; R. Pinon, *L' Europe et l' empire ottoman*, Paris 1909; P. Rolley and M. de Visme, *La Macedoine et l' Epire*, Paris 1912.
48. See Le Queux, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-8 and Upward, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-6.
49. Ilchev, *op. cit.*, pp. 132 and 215.
50. Ilchev, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 and 215.
51. Upward, *op. cit.*, p.135.
52. See, for example, the works of Noel Buxton, *Europe and the Turks*, London 1907; 'Freedom and Servitude in the Balkans', *The Westminster Review*, 159 (1903), 481-490; 'Diplomatic Dreams and the Future of Macedonia', *The Nineteenth Century*

- and After*, 63 (1908), 722-733; and Charles Buxton, *Turkey in Revolution*, London 1909.
53. See, for example, his study 'The Bulgarians of Macedonia. A Psychological Study', *The Fortnightly Review*, 75 (104), 1049-1059, and primarily his book *Macedonia, its Races and their Future*, London 1906.
 54. D.M. Mason, *Macedonia and Great Britain's Responsibility*, London 1903. Proceeds from the sales went to the Balkan Committee Relief Fund.
 55. See, for example, *Macedonian Massacres: Photos from Macedonia*, published by the Balkan Committee with articles by Victoria de Bunsen.
 56. B. Sarafoff, *The Desperate Outlook in Macedonia*, London 1904.
 57. A. Schopoff, *Les reformes et la protection des chretiens en Turquie 1673-1904*, Paris 1904. Cf. Ilchev, *op. cit.*, p. 220.
 58. *La Macedoine et sa population chretienne*, Paris 1905.
 59. *Macedonia and the Reforms*, London 1908.
 60. *La question Macedonienne et les reformes en Turquie*, Paris 1905.
 61. Cf. Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia. Origins, History, Politics*, Ithaca and London 1988, pp. 311-3.
 62. Perikles Argyropoulos, 'O Makedonikos Agon. Apomnimonevmata', *O Makedonikos Agon. Apomnimonevmata* [The Macedonian Struggle. Memoirs], Thessaloniki 1984, p. 6.
 63. Thanos Anagnostopoulos-Palaiologos, 'Neoklis Kazazis kai oi Galloi philhellines stin periodo tou Makedonikou Agona', ['Neoklis Kazazis and the French philhellenes during the period of the Macedonian Struggle'], *O Makedonikos Agon. Symposio* [The Macedonian Struggle. A Symposium], Thessaloniki 1987, pp. 259-271.
 64. A. Andreadis, 'Greece and Macedonia', *Contemporary Review*, 88 (1905), 376-388.
 65. See Petros Papapolyviou, 'I Kypros kai o Makedonikos Agonas', ['Cyprus and the Macedonian Struggle'], *O Makedonikos Agon. Symposio*, Thessaloniki 1987, pp. 459-473.
 66. See, for example, 'O agon mas en Makedonia. Selides apo to imerologion enos syntrofou tou kapetan Verga. O vios ton vounon kai tis pyritidos' ['Our struggle in Macedonia. Pages from the diary of a companion of Captain Vergas. A life of mountains and gunpowder'], *Embros*, September 1905, *passim*.
 67. Founded from the union of all the Macedonian associations of Athens.
 68. See Despina Giarali and Mary Zangli, *To periodiko Ellinismos (1898-1915, 1928-1932): Parousiasi-Vivliographiki katagraphi* [The periodical 'Ellinismos': Presentation-Bibliographical record], Ioannina 1993.
 69. Giarali and Zangli, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
 70. See, for example, Neoklis Kazazis's *To Makedonikon provlima* [The Macedonian Problem], Athens 1907 and the reprint of Kalostypis's study in 1900.
 71. Gnasios Makednos [Stephanos Dragoumis], *Makedoniki Krisis: Ta Komitata kai oi dynameis 1901-1903* [Macedonian Crisis: the Committees and the Powers], Athens 1903; *Makedoniki Krisis B: Metarythmiseis, Macedonia kai Ellas* [Reforms, Macedonia and Greece], Athens 1903; *Makedoniki Krisis C, D, E 1903-1904*, Athens 1906; and *Makedoniki Krisis F: I Tourkiki diakoinosis kai I diakoinosis ton dyo (1904-1907)* [Turkish diplomatic notes and the diplomatic notes of both], Athens 1907.
 72. AlMaz [Alexandros Mazarakis], *Ai istorikai peripeteiai tis Makedonias apo ton archaiotaton chronon mechri simeron* [The historical adventures of Macedonia from ancient years until today], Athens 1912.
 73. Titus Makednos, *Kapetan Nakis Litsas* [Captain Nakis Litsas], Athens 1906.
 74. For example, see A. Thomaides, *Istoria Pavlou Mela*, Athens 1909.
 75. See G. Konstas [most likely Germanos Karavangelis], *Energeiai kai dolofoinika orgia tou voulgarikou komitatou en Makedonia kai idia en ti eparchia Kastorias* [Actions and murderous orgies of the Bulgarian Committee in Macedonia and in particular in Kastoria province], Athens 1902; G. Ditsias, *I katastrofi tou Krusovo: theriadeia Voulgaron and Othoman enantion Ellinon* [The destruction of Krusovo: atrocities of Bulgarians and Turks against Greeks], Athens 1905, as well as the publication of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, *Episima engrapha peri tis en Makedonia*

- odyniras katastaseos* [Official documents on the painful situation within Macedonia], Constantinople 1906.
76. See, for example, I. Vlassis, *Peri ton Makedonikon logos* [On the Macedonian cause], Athens 1904; T. Yerogiannis, *I Makedonia prodidomeni* [Macedonia betrayed], Athens 1904; A. Argyros, *I Makedoniki mas politiki* [Our Macedonian policy], Athens 1906; I. Hoidas, *Istoria tis makedonikis ypotheseos* [History of the Macedonian issue], Athens 1908.
 77. G. Boukouvalas, *I glossa ton en Makedonia Voulgarophonon* [The language of the Bulgarian-speakers of Macedonia], Cairo 1905; K. Tsioulkas, *Symvolai eis tin diglossian ton Makedonon ek synkriseos tis slavophonous makedonikis glossas pros tin Ellinikin* [Counsel on the bilingualism of the Macedonians in a comparison of the Slavophone Macedonian language with the Greek], Athens 1907.
 78. Miljukov had been a visiting professor at Sofia and the author of a Russian book on European diplomacy and the Macedonian issue (1899).
 79. *Les cruautés bulgares en Macedoine Orientale et en Thrace, 1912-1913*, Athens 1914.
 80. The same report was reprinted and circulated in 1995 by the Free and Democratic Bulgaria foundation.
 81. *Rapport sur la situation des Boulgarophones et des Musulmans dans les nouvelles provinces Grecques*, Lausanne 1915.
 82. The reports were published by Petar Petrov in the volume *Naucna ekspedicija v Makedonija i pomoravieto 1916*, Sofia 1993.
 83. Ilchev, *op. cit.*, p. 217. See also H. Andonovski, 'Movement in Switzerland for a Macedonian State', *Macedonian Review*, 4 (1974), 254-5.
 84. J. Ivanoff, *La Region de Cavalla*, Bern 1918; G. Strezoff, *Les luttes politiques des Bulgares Macedoniens*, Geneve 1918; D. Micheff, *La verite sur la Macedoine*, Bern 1918; A. Ishirkov, *La Macedoine et la constitution de l' Exarchat Bulgare, 1830-1897*, Lausanne 1918.
 85. *La Macedoine et la Renaissance Bulgare au xixe s.*, Sofia 1918.
 86. *Quelques mots de reponse aux calomniateurs des Macedoniens*, Lausanne 1919.
 87. *La Bulgarie et la Question Macedonienne. Les causes des guerres balkaniques*, Sofia 1919.
 88. *Reports and Letters from American Missionaries Referring to the Distribution of Nationalities in the Former Provinces of European Turkey 1858-1918*, Sofia 1919.
 89. *We the Macedonians*, Bern 1919.
 90. Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-35.
 91. V. Djerić, *Ethnographie des Slaves de Macedoine*, Paris 1918; T. Djordjevic, *Macedonia*, London 1918; V. Marcovic, *La Macedoine a-t-elle ete consideree comme pays bulgare par les Serbes du Moyen Age*, Paris 1919.
 92. *La peninsule balkanique; Geographie humaine*, Paris 1918.
 93. Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-5.
 94. Stephanos Phocas-Cosmetatos, *La Macedoine. Son passe et son present. Etude historique ethnographique et politique de la Macedoine avec considerations sur les pays limitrophes et l' Hellenism*, Lausanne 1919; Konstantinos Mazarakis-Ainian, *I lysis tou valkanikou zitimatos* [The settlement of the Balkan Question], Athens 1919.
 95. See esp. pp. 515-7.
 96. E. Kupfer, *La Macedoine et les Bulgares*, Vevey 1917; J. Melchy, *Le Martyre d'un petit peuple*, Geneva 1917; G. Lepide, *La Macedoine indivisible devant le future Congress de la Paix*, Lausanne 1918; V. Sis, *Mazedonien*, Zurich 1918, first published in Czech in 1914; A. Delvigne, *Le Probleme Macedonien*, Bern 1919; N. Derjavine (or Derschawin), *Les rapports bulgaro-serbes et la Question Macedonienne* (Lausanne, 1918), obviously the translation of his work published in Sofia in 1915. See also his *Uber Macedonien, Wissenschaftliche und Kritische Untersuchung*, Leipzig 1918. It is acknowledged that the studies of this Russian historian were directly funded by the Bulgarian government. See Ilchev, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-8.
 97. *La Macedoine, et son evolution contemporaine*, Paris 1930; *La Macedoine, etude de colonisation contemporaine*, Paris 1936. Ancel had come to Macedonia during the

- First World War and had written the study *Les travaux et les jours de l' Armee d' Orient 1915-1918*, Paris 1921.
98. *L' echange greco-bulgare des minorites ethniques*, Paris 1930.
 99. *Ethnographie von Mazedonien*, Leipzig 1924.
 100. R.A. Reiss, *La question des Comitadjis en Serbie du Sud*, Belgrade 1924; J. Schultze, *Makedonien Landschafts- und Kulturbilder*, Jena 1927; H. Schacht, *Die Entwicklung der Mazedonischen Frage um die Jahrhundertwende zum Murzsteger Program*, Halle 1929; W. Jacob, *Die Mazedonische Frage*, Berlin, 1931); K. Kratchounov, *La politique exterieure de la Bulgarie 1880-1920*, Sofia 1932.
 101. *Storm Centres of the Near East. Personal Memories 1879-1929*, London 1933.
 102. *Quinze ans d' histoire balkanique 1904-1919*, Paris 1928); cf. Ilchev, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-8.
 103. *La Macedoine et les Macedoniens*, Paris 1922.
 104. *Yugoslavian Macedonia*, London 1930.
 105. A. Goff, and H. Fawcett, *Macedonia: A Plea for the Primitive*, London 1921; D. Footman, *Balkan Holiday*, London 1935.
 106. *The Tragic Peninsula: A History of the Macedonian Movement for Independence since 1878*, St. Louis 1938.
 107. *Vastanitski Deistvija*, Sofia 1925, and *Osnovi na Vatreznata Revolutsiona Organizatsija*, Sofia 1925.
 108. *Osvoboditelnite borbi na Makedonija*, Sofia 1933. On the Macedonian output and intellectual activity in general in Bulgarian literature, see Sania Velkov, 'Prosfyges kai prosfygikes mnimes sti vougariiki ethniki ideologia kai logotechnia (1878-1944)' ['Refugees and refugee memories in Bulgarian national ideology and literature'], in B. Gounaris and I. Michailides, *Prosfyges sta Valkania. Mnimi kai ensomatosi* [Refugees in the Balkans. Memory and integration], Athens 2004, pp. 329-81.
 109. *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*, New York 1932.
 110. *Les etats balkaniques*, Paris 1930.
 111. *Peri antallagis plithysmon kai epoikismou en ti valkaniki kata ta eti 1912-1920* [On the exchange of populations and settlement during the Balkan peninsula during 1912-1920], Constantinople 1920; *Statistiki meleti peri ton fylitikon metanastevseon Makedonias Thrakis kata tin periodon 1912-1924* [Statistical study of the race immigrations of Macedonia, Thrace during the period 1912-1924], Athens 1925; *Syllogi ton kyrioteron statistikon ton aforosan tin antallagin ton plithysmon kai prosfygikin apokatastasin meta analyseos kai epexigiseos* [Collection of the main statistics of those included in the population exchange and refugee rehabilitation with an analysis and explanation], Athens 1929.
 112. K. Karavidas, *Agrotika: Erevna epi tis oikonomikis kai koinonikis morphologias en Elladi kai en tais geitonikais slavikais horais* [Agrarian matters: research on the economic and social formation in Greece and the neighbouring Slav countries], Athens 1931; M. Mavrogordatos and A. Hamoudopoulos, *I Makedonia: Meleti dimographiki kai oikonomiki* [Macedonia: a demographic and economic study], Thessaloniki 1931; S. Gotzamanis, *Ypomnimata epi tis exoterikis kai esoterikis politikis, peri meionotiton kai afomoioseis plithysmon* [Memoranda on foreign and domestic policy on minorities and population integration], Athens 1939.
 113. See Basil C. Gounaris, 'Vouleptes kai Kapetanioi: Peletiakes scheseis sti mesopolemiki Makedonia' ['Parliamentary Deputies and Captains: clientist relations in interwar Macedonia'], *Ellinika*, 41 (1990), 313-335.
 114. See the diaries of the bands of Stephanos Mallios and Mitsos Gouras, which were published by Stephanos Akrivos, secretary of the band in issues 5-12 and 8-12 respectively. From an extract of the Mallios diary, the original of which is in the Museum of the Macedonian Struggle, it appears that Stephanos Akrivos amended the text.
 115. See the series in the journal *Tachydromos tis Voreiou Ellados* [Postman of northern Greece] for 1926-27, with the title 'I iroikotera selis tis Neoteris Ellas. I istoria tou Makedonikou Agonas' ('The most heroic page of modern Greece. The History of the Macedonian Struggle'), the publication of the diary of Philolaos Pichion in

- the newspaper *Dytiki Makedonia* of Kastoria in 1930, various texts of Vardas's in the *Eleftheros Anthropos* [Free Man] of 1931 and some reminiscences by Yiannis Karavitis in the newspaper *Kritikos Kosmos* [Cretan World] of Hania in 1940.
116. [Natalia Mela], Pavlos Melas, *Viographia apo diegiseis, grammata dika tou kai allon* [Biography from the anecdotes and letters of himself and others], Alexandria 1926.
 117. N. Garbolas, *Pos i Makedonia paremeinen elliniki: istorikai selides* [How Macedonia remained Greek: historical pages], Thessaloniki 1933.
 118. A. Metallinou, 'Anaminseis tis didaskalikis mou zois' ['Memories of my life as a teacher'], *Makedoniko Imerologio*, 1 (1925), 62-66.
 119. A. Hamoudopoulos, *Ellinismos kai Neotourkoi: ethniki drasis tou ypodoulou Ellinismou kata tin neotourkikin periodon 1908-1912* [Hellenism and Young Turks: the national activity of enslaved Hellenism during the Young Turk period], Thessaloniki 1926.
 120. A. Kontoulis, *Viographia kapetan Kotta* [Biography of Captain Kottas], Florina 1931.
 121. I. Bakopoulos, *Pavlos Melas (Biography)*, Athens 1939.
 122. K. Paraschos, *Ion Dragoumis*, Athens 1936.
 123. Giorgos P. Argyriades, *Georgios Modis, o afigitis toy Makedonikou Agona: Makedonikes Istories* [Georgios Modis, the narrator of the Macedonian Struggle: Macedonian Stories], Thessaloniki 1991, pp. 205-209.
 124. Bellou-Threpsiadi, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15. Vasilios Laourdas, 'I Penelope Delta kai i Makedonia' ['Penelope Delta and Macedonia'], *Makedonika Analekta*, Thessaloniki 1980, p. 90 and n. 33.
 125. Bellou-Threpsiadi, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
 126. See Vlachos, *op. cit.*, e.g. pp. 92-94, 393-395.
 127. Vol. 2, p. 55, n.1.
 128. Vol. 2, pp. 67-74, footnote. Aspreas had first published the same statutes in 1929 in the *Megali Stratiotiki kai Naftiki Enkyklopedia* [Great Military and Naval Encyclopedia], vol. 4, for which he co-wrote the entry 'Macedonian Struggle' (pp. 435-440).
 129. 'Katastatikon tis en Thessaloniki Etaireias Makedonikon Spoudon' ['Statutes of the Thessaloniki Society for Macedonian Studies'], *Makedonika*, 1 (1940), 638.
 130. P. Argyropoulos, *La Question Greco-Bulgare*, Cairo 1944; P. Nikoulakos, *Voulgaroi, aimovoroteri anthropoi, oi aspondoteri echthroi mas* [Bulgarians, the most bloodthirsty people, our most hard-line enemies], Alexandria 1944; Committee of Professors, *I Mavri Vivlos ton voulgarikon englimaton eis tin Anatolikin Makedonian kai Dytikin Thrakin, 1941-1944* [The Black Book of Bulgarian crimes in east Macedonia and west Thrace], Athens 1945.
 131. See, for example, I. Voyiatzidis, *Ta pros vorran synora tou Ellinismou* [The northern borders of Hellenism], Thessaloniki 1946; S. Kyriakidis, *Ta Voreia ethnologika oria tou ellinismou* [The northern ethnological boundaries of Hellenism], Thessaloniki, 1946; C. Naltsas, *Ta Ellinoslavika Synora* [The Greek-Slav borders], Thessaloniki, 1948; P. Dragoumis, *Prosochi sti voreian Ellada 1945-1948* [Attention to northern Greece], Thessaloniki 1949.
 132. See, for example, I. Voyiatzides's study, 'I Dynamis tou Panslavismou, tou Kounounismou kai tou Imperialismou os pros tin Ellada' ['The Strength of Panslavism, Communism and Imperialism in relation to Greece'], *Makedoniko Imerologio*, 18 (1948), 33-48.
 133. N. Vlachos, *I ethnologiki synthesis ton anikonton eis tin Ellada tmimata tis Makedonias kai tis Dytikis Thrakis* [The ethnological composition of the sections of Macedonia and west Thrace that belong to Greece], Athens 1945; A. Papaevgeniou, *Voreios Ellas: Meionotites apo statistikis apopseos en schesi me ton plithysmon kai tin ekpaidevsin* [Northern Greece: minorities from a statistical perspective in relation to population and education], Thessaloniki 1946; I. Papakyriakopoulos, *Voulgaroi kai Italoi englimatiai polemou en Makedonia* [Bulgarian and Italian war criminals in Macedonia], Athens 1946; E. Grigoriou, *To Voulgarikon orgion aimatos es tin Dytikin Makedonian 1941-44* [The Bulgarian bloodbath in west Macedonia], Athens

- 1947; G. Georgiadis, *To mixoglosson en Makedonia idioma kai I ethnologiki katas-tasis ton omilounton touto Makedonon* [The mixed language idiom in Macedonia and the ethnological condition of those Macedonians who speak it], Edessa 1948; D. Pefanis, *Oi Ellines slavophonoi tis Makedonias kai oi Ellinovlachoi* [The Greek Slavophones of Macedonia and the Greek Vlachs], Athens 1949; K. Antoniou, *Slaviki kai kommounistikiki epivouli kai i antistasis ton Makedonon* [Slav and communist designs and the resistance of the Macedonians] Thessaloniki 1950; A. Kyrrou, *I synomosia enantion tis Makedonias 1940-1949* [The conspiracy against Macedonia], Athens 1950; K. Bramos, *Slavokommounistikai organoseis en Makedonia, propaganda kai epanastatiki drasis* [Slavo-communist organisations in Macedonia, propaganda and revolutionary activity], Thessaloniki 1953; P. Papadopoulos, *I ethniki antistasis kata tis voulgarikis epidromis* [The national resistance against the Bulgarian incursion], Athens 1953; S. Gotzamanis, *Ethnika zitimata. Makedonia kai Makedones. Glossikai meionotities, xenikai vlepseis* [National questions. Macedonia and Macedonians, linguistic minorities, foreign designs], Athens 1954; S. Gialistras, *Oi plithismoï tis Makedonias pro tou 1912* [The populations of Macedonia before 1912], Athens 1960; P. Sotiropoulos, *Ai slavikai organoseis kai i anthelliniki ton propaganda* [The Slavic organisations and their anti-Greek propaganda], Athens 1960.
134. A. Andreadis, *The Work of the Greek State in Macedonia and Thrace*, Athens 1947; S. Cosmin, [Phocas-Cosmetatos], *La Macedoine. Questions diplomatiques*, Paris 1949; Ch. Christides, *The Macedonian Camouflage in the Light of Facts and Figures*, Athens 1949; A. Pallis, *Macedonia and Macedonians: A Historical Study*, London 1949; G. Zotiades, *The Macedonian Controversy*, Thessaloniki 1954; D. Konstandopoulos, *The Paris Peace Conference of 1946 and the Greek-Bulgarian Relations*, Thessaloniki 1956.
 135. A. Metallinou, *Fylla ek tis istorias tis polypathous Makedonias mas* [Pages from the history of our long-suffering Macedonia], Thessaloniki 1947; 'Anamniseis apo ton Makedoniko Agona: kapetan-Mitsos' ('Memories from the Macedonian Struggle: Captain Mitsos', *Makedoniko Imerologio*, 19 (1949), 206-208 and *Makedonikes selides* [Macedonian pages], Thessaloniki 1949.
 136. D. Kakkavos, *I Makedonia kata tin teleftaian tessarakontaetia kai ta ethnika imon dikaia* [Macedonia during the last forty years and our national rights], Thessaloniki 1946.
 137. A. Mazarakis-Ainian, *Apomnimonevmata* [Memoirs], Athens 1948; K. Mazarakis-Ainian, *Apomnimonevmata Polemou 1912-13. Drasis ethelonton Makedonomachon* [War Memoirs 1912-13. Actions of the Makedonomachoi Volunteers] Athens 1941.
 138. A.H. Hamoudopoulos, *Apo to imerologion enos dimosiographou 1908-1948* [From the diary of a journalist], Thessaloniki 1948.
 139. *Ellinikos Vorras*, 22 May 1949 until 25 March 1950.
 140. For a detailed discussion, see I. Nedeva and N. Kaytchev, 'IMRO groupings in Bulgaria after the Second World War', James Pettifer (ed.) *The New Macedonian Question*, Houndmills and New York 1999, pp. 167-83.
 141. See more analytically Vemund Aarbakke, 'Prosfyges kai prosfygikes organoseis stin Voulgaria, 1940-1990', ['Refugees and refugee organisations in Bulgaria'], *Prosfyges sta Valkania* [Refugees in the Balkans], pp. 382-447.
 142. On this, see Iakovos Michailidis, 'Slavomakedones politikoi prosfyges sti yiougo-slaviki Makedonia' ['Slav-Macedonian political prisoners in Yugoslav Macedonia'], *Prosfyges sta Valkania* [Refugees in the Balkans], pp. 83-163.
 143. See, for example, the Institute's first publications: *Turski dokumenti za makedonskata istorija*, Skopje 1951; *Izvestai od 1903-1904 godina na avstriskite pretstavnitsi vo Makedonija 1903-1904*, Skopje 1955; *Dokumenti od vienskata arhiva za Makedonija od 1879-1903*, Skopje 1955.
 144. See G. Petrov, *Spomeni na G. Petrov*, Skopje 1950.
 145. Wayne S. Vucinich, *Serbia between East and West. The Events of 1903-1908*, Stanford 1954; Djoko Slipcevic, *The Macedonian Question. The Struggle for Southern Serbia*, Chicago 1958; K. Koitseff, *Mazedonien geschichtlich, Staatspolitisch und*

- volkerrechtlich in verbundung mit der Entwicklung des bulgarischen Staates bis zum Balkankrieg*, Heidelberg 1948.
146. C. Anastasoff, *The Case for Autonomous Macedonia*, St Louis 1945; Makedonicus [Ivan Mihailov], *Stalin and the Macedonian Question*, St Louis 1948, *Macedonia; a Switzerland of the Balkans*, St Louis 1950 and *Macedonia's Rise for Freedom*, Indianapolis 1954.
 147. *Macedonia, its Place in Balkan Power Politics*, London and New York 1950.
 148. See L. Dellin, *The Bulgarian Communist Party and the Macedonian Question*, New York 1955; J. Tomasevich, *Peasants, Politics and Economic Change in Yugoslavia*, Stanford 1955.
 149. See Dimitrije Djordjevic, 'West-European and American Post-war Historiography on Macedonia in *The Foreign and Yugoslav Historiography of Macedonia and the Macedonian People*', Skopje 1970, pp. 147-62.
 150. R. Kirjazovski (ed.), *Egeiska Makedonija v Narodnoosloboditelna Borba, 1944-1949*, vols. 1-6, Skopje 1971-1983.
 151. T. Tomoski (ed.), *Dokumenti od vienskata arhiva za Makedonija od 1879-1903*, Skopje 1955; H. Andonov-Polianski (ed.), *Britanski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod*, Skopje 1968; A. Lainovic (ed.), *Francuski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod*, Skopje 1969; D. Zografski (ed.), *Avstriski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod*, Skopje 1977; Institut za Nacionalna Istorija, *Dokumenti za borbata na Makedonskiot Narod za samostojnost i za nacionalna darzava*, Skopje 1981.
 152. See, for example, L. Kolishevski, *Macedonian National Question*, Belgrade 1962; K. Miliofski, *The Macedonian Question in the National Program of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia: 1919-1937*, Skopje 1962.
 153. See Kiril, Patriarch, *Balgarskata Ekzarhija v Odrinsko i Makedonija sled osvoboditelna voina 1877-1878*, vols 1-2, Sofia 1969-1970; A. Pantev (ed.), *Collection of Documents on the National-Liberation Movement in Macedonia and the Adrianople Region*, Sofia 1978; V. Bojinov, 'L'instruction bulgare en Macedoine et en Thrace d'Andrinople 1878-1903', *Etudes Historiques*, 8 (1978), 255-274.
 154. H. Andonov-Poljanski et al (eds), *Documents on the Struggle of the Macedonian People for Independence and a Nation-State*, Skopje 1985, vols 1-2.
 155. L. Panajotov and I. Sopov, *Materiali za istorijata na makedonskoto osvoboditelno dvizenie*, Sofia 1983.
 156. E. Kofos, 'Balkan Minorities under Communist Regimes', *Balkan Studies*, 2 (1961), 23-46; 'The Making of Yugoslavia's People's Republic of Macedonia', *Balkan Studies*, 3 (1962), 375-396; *Nationalism and Communism in Macedonia*, Thessaloniki 1964; *Greece and the Eastern Crisis 1875-1878*, Thessaloniki 1975; 'Dilemmas and Orientations of Greek Policy in Macedonia: 1878-1886', *Balkan Studies*, 21 (1980), 45-55; 'The Macedonian Question: The Politics of Mutation', *Balkan Studies*, 27 (1986), 157-172.
 157. S. Nestor, 'Greek Macedonia and the Convention of Neuilly 1919', *Balkan Studies*, 3 (1962), 169-184; A. Angelopoulos, 'Population Distribution of Greece Today According to Language, National Consciousness and Religion', *Balkan Studies*, 20 (1979), 123-132; I. Stefanidis, 'United States, Great Britain and the Greek-Yugoslav Rapprochement 1949-1950', *Balkan Studies*, 27 (1986), 315-343; B. Kondis, 'The 'Macedonian Question' as a Balkan Problem in the 1940s', *Balkan Studies*, 28 (1987), 151-160; 'The Termination of the Greek Civil War: Its International Implications', *Balkan Studies*, 29/2 (1988), 299-307.
 158. I. Notaris, *Archeion St. Dragoumis. Anekdota engrapha gia tin epanastasi tou 1878 sti Makedonia* [Archive of S. Dragoumis. Unpublished documents on the revolution of 1878 in Macedonia], Thessaloniki 1966; E. Kofos, *I epanastasis tis Makedonias kata to 1878. Anekdota proxenika engrapha meta syntomou istorikou episkopiseos* [The 1878 revolution of Macedonia. Unpublished consular documents with a brief historical survey], Thessaloniki 1969; S. Papadopoulos, *Oi epanastaseis tou 1854 and 1878 stin Makedonia* [The revolutions of 1854 and 1878 in Macedonia], Thessaloniki 1970.
 159. *Istoria tis Makedonias (1354-1833)* [History of Macedonia], Thessaloniki 1969.

160. P. Gyparis, *O kathreptis tou Makedonikou Agonos 1903-1909* [The mirror of the Macedonian Struggle], Athens 1962.
161. I. Demestichas, *O Navarchos Ioannis Demstichas (1882-1960)* [Admiral Ioannis Demestichas], Athens 1964.
162. A. Kois, *Engrapha ek tou archeiou tou kapetan Valtsa* [Documents from the archive of Captain Valtsas], Thessaloniki 1961.
163. P. Pennas, 'Archeion Makedonikou Agonos Alexandrou Dangli: Simeioseis Demosthenous Florias' ['The Macedonian Struggle archive of Alexandros Danglis: notes by Demosthenes Florias'], *Serraika Chronika*, 4 (1963), 97-138.
164. V. Stavropoulos, *O Makedonikos Agon. Apomnimonevmata* [The Macedonian Struggle. Memoirs], Thessaloniki 1961.
165. P.G. Danglis, *Anamniseis-engrapha-allilographia. To archeion tou* [Reminiscences-documents-correspondence. His archive], X. Lefkoparidis (ed.), Athens 1965, vols 1-2.
166. A third volume was published in 1980.
167. *The Greek Struggle in Macedonia, 1897-1913*, Thessaloniki 1966.
168. Pavlos L. Tsamis, *Makedonikos Agon* [Macedonian Struggle], Thessaloniki 1975.
169. Konstantinos A. Vakalopoulos, *O Voreios Ellinimos kata tin proimi phasi tou Makedonikou Agona 1878-1894* [Northern Hellenism and the early phase of the Macedonian Struggle], Thessaloniki 1983; *I Makedonia stis paramones tou Makedonikou Agona 1894-1904* [Macedonia on the eve of the Macedonian Struggle], Thessaloniki 1986; *O Makedonikos Agonas 1904-1908. I enopli phasi* [The Macedonian Struggle 1904-1908. The armed phase], Thessaloniki 1987; *Neoutourkoi kai Makedonia 1908-1912* [Young Turks and Macedonia], Thessaloniki 1988.
170. T. Vafeiadis, *Diati oi Slavoi idrysan to dithen makedoniko kratos ton Skopion: I thesis tou KKE enantion tou dithen Makedonikou Zitimatos* [Why the Slavs founded the supposed Macedonian state of Skopje: the position of the KKE regarding the supposed Macedonian Question], Thessaloniki 1965; D. Zanglis, *I Makedonia tou Aigaiou kai oi Yugoslavoi* [The Macedonia of the Aegean and the Yugoslavs], Athens 1975.
171. P. Shoup, *Communism and the Yugoslav National Question*, New York 1968; R. King, *Minorities under Communism. Nationalities as a Source of Tension among Balkan Communist States*, Harvard 1973; I. Banac, *With Stalin against Tito. Cominformist Splits in Yugoslav Communism*, Ithaca and London 1988; S. Fischer-Galati, 'The Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization: its Significance in 'Wars of National Liberation'', *East European Quarterly*, 6/4 (1973), 454-472; F. Adanir, *Die Mazedonische Frage Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung bis 1908*, Wiesbaden 1979; S. Troebst, *Die Innere Mazedonische Revolutionare Organisation 1923/24*, Berlin 1979; L. Sherman *Fires on the Mountain: The Macedonian Revolutionary Movement and the Kidnapping of Miss Stone*, Boulder 1980; S.J. Aptiev, *Das Deutsche Reich und die Mazedonische Frage 1908-1918*, Munich 1985; D. Perry, 'Ivan Garvanov: Architect of Ilinden', *East European Quarterly*, 19/4 (1986), 403-416; S. Troebst, *Mussolini, Makedonien und die Muchte 1922-1930. Die IMRO in de Sud-osteuropapolitik des fasistischen Italien*, Cologne and Vienna 1987; D. Perry, *The Politics of Terror: The Macedonian Revolutionary Movements 1893-1903*, Durham 1988; S. Troebst, 'Macedonia Heroica': zum Makedonien-bild der Weimaren Republik', *Sudost-forschungen*, 49 (1990), 293-364.
172. M. Bernath, 'Das Mazedonische Problem in der Sicht der Komparativen Nationalismusforschungen', *Sudost-Forschungen*, 29 (1970), 237-248; Jutta de Jong, *Der Nationale Kern des Makedonischen Problems. Ansätze und Grundl Agen einer Makedonischen Nationalbewegung*, Frankfurt 1982; H. Lunt, 'On Macedonian Nationality', *Slavic Review*, 45/4 (1986), 729-734; V. Friedman, 'Macedonian Language and Nationalism during the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries', *Balkanistica*, 2 (1975) 83-98.
173. Hans Vermeulen, 'Agrotikes syngrouseis kai koinoniki diamartyria stin istoria enos makedonikou horiou 1900-1936' ['Agricultural conflicts and social protest in the history of one Macedonian village'], Stathis Damianakos (ed.), *Diadikasies koinonikou metaschimatismou stin agrotiki Ellada* [Processes of social transformation

in rural Greece], Athens 1987, pp. 221-44; R.M. Yeager, 'Refugee Settlement and Village Change to the District of Serres, Greece, 1912-1940', unpublished dissertation, Berkeley 1979).