income, to "close the Jewish question" (106) in Hungary. Still Cornelius asserts that even though "the law was in the books there were a number of individuals and groups who refused or delayed in carrying out . . . [it was] actually sabotaged by the government" (109). Unfortunately, that was not the case and half a million Hungarian citizens were deported and lost their lives.

As Cornelius sees it, the deportation of the Jews in the summer of 1944 to Auschwitz was the consequence of the German occupation. This is partly true. But Hitler's plenipotentiary in Hungary, Edmund Veesenmayer confessed that "the deportations [of more than 437,400 Jews] would not have taken place" if the Hungarians had refused to meet the German demand, "since the Germans did not have a sufficient force available" (298). Horthy, indeed, *was able* to stop the deportation of the Budapest Jews after being warned by President Franklin Roosevelt that if he did not, he would be held responsible for their death.

Cornelius is trying to find some excuse for the Horthy regime; this is the aim of her reevaluation. Though the book includes hundreds of pages detailing events not previously well documented, presenting good interviews, and highlighting an assortment of minor actions undertaken by Horthy and his leading elite, its main message is mistaken. Horthy's Hungary efficiently served Hitler and was able to regain some lost territories, but was hopelessly incapable of ending the war before nearly one million people had died. The country remained "caught in the [devil's] cauldron."

IVAN T. BEREND
University of California, Los Angeles

Between Two Motherlands: Nationality and Emigration among the Greeks of Bulgaria, 1900–1949. By Theodora Dragostinova. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011. xvi, 294 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Maps. $45.00, hard bound.

This excellent book provides a compelling, archivally rich account of the early twentieth-century ethnic unmixing of Bulgaria. In Theodora Dragostinova's deft hands, an impressive array of primary sources—materials from governmental and private archives in Bulgaria and Greece, as well as a range of periodicals—illuminates the lived reality through which the labels "Greek" and "Bulgarian," briefly fungible, fluid, and negotiable, took on their modern hard-edged, exclusive properties.

Following an account of emergent Bulgarian national consciousness among Slavic-speaking Ottoman subjects who belonged to the "Greek" Orthodox Christian *millet*, the book features six chapters each dealing with a 6-to-11-year span between 1900 and 1949. Yet, despite organizing her book as a historical monograph, Dragostinova consistently engages with broader social scientific discussions of national identity, refugee politics, and bureaucratic practice, making this book significant for anthropologists, sociologists, and political scientists as well.

Between Two Motherlands makes four particularly significant points. Perhaps most important, the book illustrates how migration disrupts models of identity that presume nesting spatio-social concentric circles of belonging. Like Renée Hirschon (*Heirs of the Catastrophe,* 1998) and Georgios Agelopoulos and his colleagues (*Communication between Places and People: Messimvria and Nea Messimvria,* at afroditi.uom.gr/mahabbet/Messimvria/index.html [last accessed 1 June 2012]), who traced the difficult paths of assimilation for newcomers to the Greek nation-state in the wake of the traumatic population exchanges following World War I, Dragostinova documents the regrets and sense of loss that scarred communities unmixed by the so-called re-patriation—which in her analysis is revealed as "de-patriation"—of many residents of the Hellenized Black Sea coast in Bulgaria. Her vivid use of local newspapers and journals in particular makes clear that, far from the fictions of patriotic longing for ethnonational purity, refugees and exiles and their former neighbors missed each other and exhibited parallel nostalgias for their once-diverse hometowns.

Second, the book simultaneously challenges easy assumptions that frictions in these multilingual borderlands were either age-old or generated merely out of geopolitical con-

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.71.3.0679 Published online by Cambridge University Press

frontation in World War I. Through a marvelous processual analysis of the 1906 burning of the Greek town of Anhalio, the reprisals that followed, and the increasing occurrence of hate speech in Greek periodicals following the incident, Dragostinova provides a closely documented case study of the effect of media coverage, disinformation, and national-level simplifications in the brewing of intercommunal strife. Particularly compelling is her archival detective work, which traces this sequence of events back to a piece of political satire at the expense of a new "Greek" bishop. In showing how, in her words, "an incident that had begun by dressing a donkey in a cassock ended with profound repercussions" (48), Dragostinova affirms the strategic importance of local symbolic protest.

Third, the argument represents a fine synthesis of historical rigor and anthropologically informed insight. In particular, Dragostinova takes up the concept of the "converging frontiers" of nationhood discussed explicitly by anthropologist Anastasia Karakasidou (*Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood,* 1997) and shows in still greater detail how individuals, families, and communities were stripped of their ability to control their own destinies. As national bureaucracies gather legitimacy and authority, they insist on the singular or "total" legibility of citizens and make impossible the contingent and contextual work of negotiating identities and loyalties. The book does an excellent job of tracing how, in this particular case, various state and international agencies police, prevent, and punish attempts to finesse or fudge categories of absolute belonging, in large part through rhetorics of double-dealing and untrustworthiness.

Finally—and perhaps implicitly—the book lays bare the deep-rooted insecurity of the nation-state, especially in its early twentieth-century Bulgarian incarnation. Underlying much of the officially generated discourse that Dragostinova presents so powerfully, one can intuit a tacit suspicion among the agents of the state that the "other" category of belonging—in this case, Greek, though the roles are easily reversible—may in fact be more appealing, or perhaps even more authentic, than the Bulgarian version they are seeking to advance. If it were not so, they would not need to insist so shrilly on the need for limited horizons. The book, then, slyly reveals the extent to which these historical processes of nation building, conventionally understood as reducing or dispelling contingency and lability, in fact make manifest the uncertainties of nation.

In short, then, this is a book of early twentieth-century Balkan history that illustrates the value of painstaking, compassionate archival work and illuminates not only its designated topic and period, but also the broader issue of how religious, national, and international politics challenge and are challenged by lived, local, human experience.

KEITH BROWN
Brown University

Nationalism from the Left: The Bulgarian Communist Party during the Second World War and the Early Post-War Years. By Yannis Sygkelos. Balkan Studies Library, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 2011. xv, 291 pp. Appendixes. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Tables. $141.00, hard bound.

Yannis Sygkelos explores the intricacies of "Marxist nationalism" as adopted by communist parties in eastern Europe from the 1930s on, focusing on the national(ist) discourses of the Bulgarian Communism Party (BCP). Criticizing the propensity to accept the communist internationalist self-image and date the resurgence of nationalism in eastern Europe to the late 1950s (after a period of supposed socialist internationalism), Sygkelos asserts that Marxist parties readily adopted the language of nationalism to build up popular support for their projects of political and socioeconomic transformation. Drawing parallels with the practice of the Soviet Union, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, the author asserts that the Bulgarian case confirms communist parties' attempts to present themselves as the only true defenders of national interest. Because of the prominent position of the Bulgarian Georgi Dimitrov in the Comintern and the traditional pro-Russian stance of Bulgarian society, the message of the BCP was largely successful.

In classic Marxism, nationalism and communism occupy opposite sides of the ideological spectrum with their respective horizontal (national) and vertical (class) views of

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.71.3.0679 Published online by Cambridge University Press