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Foreword

This dissertation forms part of the Philology and National Culture programme at the University of Amsterdam. More precisely, it was written as part of the project: Cultural nationalism in the Balkans during the nineteenth century: Scholarly and intellectual institutions and networks in a multi-ethnic region, initiated by Joep Leerssen, professor of Modern European literature. In addition to my research, this project consists of studies about national movements among Greeks, Serbs/Croats and Romanians. Other projects undertaken within the programme include studies of the scholars Joast Hiddes Halbertsma and Jernej Kopitar.

Most of the documents from archives used in this study have been edited, interpreted and published, mainly by Bulgarian scholars. In the Bulgarian tradition it is quite common for scholars to render citations in Bulgarian, sometimes even without mentioning which language was used in the original. I have tried to find and use original versions of quotations as much as possible. In the case of longer citations from languages which use the Cyrillic alphabet, the Cyrillic writing system has been adopted. To avoid practical problems with letters and ligatures like å, •, ø, œ, «, æ,˝ and Á, older citations are quoted using the modern spelling. Nevertheless, I have tried to keep their original grammatical and lexical features. Shorter citations, names and book titles in Bulgarian, Russian, Serbian or Greek are presented in Latin transliteration, according to the system recommended by the United Nations.

Geographic names have, as far as practical, been represented by their modern names. Therefore ‘Istanbul’ instead of ‘Carigrad’ or ‘Constantinople’. This last name is used only in reference to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Whenever mention is made of ‘Bulgaria’, I use it in the 21st-century sense, unless stated otherwise. For the areas (partly) inhabited by Bulgarians in the
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1 See http://www.hum.uva.nl/philology/ (under projects) for a description of the project.
2 These studies are carried out by Marjolijne Janssen, Floris van Nierop and André Kom respectively. In short, the term ‘the Amsterdam Balkan Group’ is sometimes used to refer to the four PhD students, coordinator Roel Schuyt and project leader Joep Leerssen.
3 Undertaken by Alpita de Jong and Ingrid Merchiers.
4 See http://www.eki.ee/wgrs The system presented here leads to an unambiguous way of pronunciation, also for people who do not have a command of the language in question. Some remarks about the pronunciation of unfamiliar letters:

Bulgarian: č š ž are pronounced as ch sh zh in English, u as the oo in fool, h is pronounced as the ch in loch, ā as the u in mud, e sounds like the ts in let’s, and j is pronounced as y.

In transliterations from Russian, е is pronounced yo, and я is pronounced as a sound in between i and u. Transliterations from Serbian have two more letters: е which is pronounced ch, but further forward in the mouth than е, and d, which sounds roughly like dj.

In transliterations from Greek, ch is pronounced as the ch in loch.
nineteenth century (modern Bulgaria, Macedonia and Thrace) I use the combination ‘the Bulgarian lands’.

The same basic principle holds for personal names, although there are numerous cases of people who in modern conceptions, have more than one nationality, or none at all. I have chosen to use the name and spelling which reflects the national tradition to which individuals contributed most. Thus I speak of Nikolaos Sava Pikkolos (the way Greeks do), and not Nikola Pikolo (the Bulgarian version) or Piccolo (the French version); and Adamantios Korais (Greek), instead of Coray (French, the way he did himself). An exception to this rule is made to avoid obscuring family links between people. Thus I used the Bulgarian version Atanas Bogoridi over the Greek Athenasios Vogoridis, to express his kinship with the prince Stefan Bogoridi and his descendants, who are much better known among Bulgarians. The names of Pavel Jozef Šafárik and Franz Miklošič are represented not in the German version that they used themselves, but in their native Slovak and Slovenian respectively.

For readers who are not familiar with any Balkan language the endings of personal names will often provide a clue to a person’s primary identification. A widely-known anecdote tells the story of a man who, depending on the political situation and the place where he is at the moment, can introduce himself as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Name</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petrov</td>
<td>(Bulgarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrović</td>
<td>(Serbian/Croatian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petro(v)ski</td>
<td>(Macedonian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroglu</td>
<td>(Turkish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrou/Petridis</td>
<td>(Greek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrescu</td>
<td>(Romanian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal and geographical names that are well known in another language, like the Greek Moschopolis (nowadays Voskopoja in Albanian), or have a current English name, like Vienna and Moscow, have been given in the more widespread form. The appendix to this dissertation provides a glossary of some terms that might be unfamiliar to the reader.
By 1914, when the First World War was unleashed as a result of the Sarajevo incident, Bulgaria was already an established state on the Balkans. It had, in the immediately preceding Balkan Wars, seen a dramatic expansion, and then a re-curtailment, of its territory, and counted as one of the major geopolitical players in the region.

A century previously, the very concept of ‘Bulgarian’ was practically unheard-of. If the name of ‘Bulgaria’ was known at all, it was as the name of a medieval realm which had disappeared; ‘Bulgarians’ were a tribe of uncertain identity and origin, like other shady ethnicities from an undocumented past such as Thracians, Sarmatians, Huns, Magyars or Turks. The name had survived as byword for a heresy, and as a term of abuse (Bugomil, bougre, bugger). The population was identified only as subjects of the Ottoman Empire, ruled by a Greek-Orthodox (and Greek-speaking) church hierarchy under Ottoman auspices, and at best speaking (in the private sphere) some obscure dialect which was not even generally recognized yet as belonging to the Slavic language family.

In the nineteenth century, then, this amorphous group was constituted into a Bulgarian nation. The present thesis wants to analyse this process. It is known, generally, as the Văzraždane or Bulgarian ‘rebirth’, culminating in the creation of a Bulgarian state when the Treaty of San Stefano concluded the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-78.

This San Stefano-Bulgaria was extensive and the Great Powers of Europe feared that it would give Russia too much influence on the Balkans. As a result, in July 1878 at the Berlin Congress, the European powers decided that the size of Bulgaria was to be reduced drastically. The
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5 Many definitions have been applied to the term nation. In this work I will follow the definition as given by Ernest Gellner. He stated that two men are of the same nation if 1) and only if they share the same culture, where culture in turn means a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating, and if 2) they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation. Gellner, Ernest (1983). Nations and nationalism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 7.

A nation is, according to Miroslav Hroch, to be distinguished from what he calls a Non Dominant Ethnic Group in the following aspects: 1) the nation possesses a complete or almost complete hierarchical social structure, including educated elites and an entrepreneurial bourgeoisie; 2) members of the nation also form a community of citizens with equal rights, and they act and proceed as such; 3) they have or strive for an institutionalized internal administration for the territory they inhabit, and are aware of its boundaries; 4) they use a codified standard language, or demand that this be used in schools; 5) they claim a collection of works of high culture, specifically their own, although this may include elements from a previous pre-national period; 6) next to their awareness of a common origin, they also acquired a knowledge of their own history. Miroslav Hroch, In the national interest. Demands and goals of European national movements of the nineteenth century: a comparative perspective (Prague: Faculty of Arts, Charles University, 2000), 16.
part of the country north of the Balkan mountain range was turned into the principality of Bulgaria, 
owing only nominal suzerainty to the Ottoman Turks. The southern half of the country became, 
under the name of Eastern Rumelia, an autonomous province of The Ottoman Empire. After an 
uprising in Eastern Rumelia in 1885 the principality and the autonomous province were united. In 
1908 Prince Ferdinand proclaimed complete independence from The Ottoman Empire.

The political events of this time were preceded by a process of nation formation and 
nationalism: the growth of the belief, both among Bulgarians and abroad, that this nation deserved 
an independent state. In general Văzraždane is used to denote the period between the late 
eighteenth century and either 1876, the year in which the insurrection broke out that led to the 
Russian-Turkish war, or 1878, the year in which a Bulgarian principality was established.

§1.1 Political/historical background: (dis-)continuities prior to 
Bulgarian statehood

Almost no institutional traces of the medieval Bulgarian realm had survived the Ottoman 
conquest of 1393; the hereditary nobility, the national church organisation and the czar had all been

6 Nationalism is defined, again by Gellner, as the political principle which holds that the political and the 
national unit should be congruent. The term is also used for nationalist sentiment, which is the feeling of anger 
roused by the violation of this principle, or the feeling of satisfaction aroused by its fulfilment. A nationalist 
movement is one actuated by a sentiment of this kind.

It is necessary to make a distinction between patriotism and nationalism, a distinction that not all researchers 
of nationalism make. In this, I follow Maurizio Viroli. For love of country. An essay on patriotism and nationalism. 

Although an exact border between the two concepts cannot be given Viroli described the main difference 
between them as follows: The crucial distinction lies in the priority of emphasis: for the patriots, the primary value is 
the republic and the free way of life that the republic permits; for the nationalists, the primary values are the spiritual 
and cultural unity of the people. The main objective of patriotism is liberty, and the most important values of patriots, 
inaugurated from antiquity, are pietas (respect for the state) and caritas (charity). The primary goal of nationalism, which 
is a transformation and adaptation of patriotism, is homogeneity, which requires the value of loyalty. Maurizio Viroli. 

Patriotism, as Viroli described it, had a long development over time, from Antiquity to French 
Enlightenment philosophers like Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau. Patriotism has a strong connotation of 
Enlightenment, whereas nationalism is often linked to Romanticism. The former is inclusive in character, the latter 
exclusive.

For the Bulgarian case, the distinction between patriotism and nationalism has been made by Thomas 
Meininger, who describes a patriot as a person ‘for whom a nationalist perception may be sufficiently satisfying in an 
emotional sense’ and a nationalist as someone who ‘is almost by definition an activist who strives in various ways to 
bulwark his people’s claim to a place in the sun’, Thomas Meininger, The formation of a nationalist Bulgarian 
intelligentsia, 1835-1878, iv.

The first Bulgarian state had been founded by the Khan Asparuh in 681. It converted to Christianity in the 
ninth century under Boris I, flourished under Tsar Simeon the Great in the early tenth century, and was subjugated in 
1081 by the Byzantine Empire. A revolt by the brothers Petar and Asen led to the creation of the second Bulgarian 
state in 1186. It was subjugated by the Ottomans in the late fourteenth century; the capital of Veliko Tarnovo was 
captured in 1393, and the despotate of Vidin (the last remaining independent part of Bulgaria) in 1396.

7 For the Bulgarian case, the distinction between patriotism and nationalism has been made by Thomas 
Meininger, who describes a patriot as a person ‘for whom a nationalist perception may be sufficiently satisfying in an 
emotional sense’ and a nationalist as someone who ‘is almost by definition an activist who strives in various ways to 
bulwark his people’s claim to a place in the sun’, Thomas Meininger, The formation of a nationalist Bulgarian 
intelligentsia, 1835-1878, iv.
swept away. The Bulgarian orthodox diocese had become part of the orthodox patriarchate, in which all leading figures, irrespective of ethnicity, were ‘Greeks’.

The only cultural centres in the eighteenth century that did conserve a Bulgarian cultural continuity were monasteries, like the ones in Rila and on Mount Athos. These continued to preserve and pass on the Bulgarian literary tradition, but on a small scale and in a very restricted ambit.

In spite of the disappearance of the national high culture, the Ottoman period was, in general, not one of destitution. During the eighteenth century, Ottoman trade had flourished, to the benefit of many Bulgarians. However, towards the end of that century, a period of instability, known as kărdţalijstvo, broke out; local landlords revolted against the central government, cities and towns were ransacked and large numbers of Bulgarians fled their homeland to Romania and Bessarabia (nowadays Moldova). When stability was re-established, the economy again improved. Especially after the Crimean war of 1853-1856, trade with Western Europe increased. This led to a cultural bloom when rich Bulgarian merchants, civil servants and the upcoming bourgeoisie utilised their money to further Bulgarian culture.

Various insurrections occurred in the course of the nineteenth century, for instance the one in Veliko Tarnovo of 1835; Bulgarians also participated in the Serbian uprisings of 1804 and 1815 and the Greek revolution of 1821. Furthermore, Bulgarians joined the Russian troops in their wars against the Ottomans in 1806-1812 and 1828-1829. None of these activities can be said, however, to have been motivated by a sense of Bulgarian nationality, rather they were the result of economic difficulties. Bulgarian national aspirations manifested themselves for the first time, not in an uprising, but in what became known as the church struggle, the movement that aimed to establish a Bulgarian national church. It started in the 1840s when numerous Bulgarian eparchies faced with social unrest. After the Greek revolution and following the establishment of a Greek state, the concept of nationality, previously unimportant in the church hierarchy, was introduced and the word ‘Greek’ (until then ethnically a-specific) started to be seen as foreign to local culture in the Bulgarian lands. Local Slavic-speaking communities then started to ask for priests who were capable of speaking the local language to replace ethnic Greek clergy, who were incapable of communicating with their flock. This struggle, exacerbated by the attitude of the Greek church
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8 Among those leaders there were also hellenised Bulgarians, as ‘Greek’ was a social denomination rather than an ethnic one in that time (see also §3.2). In the Ottoman system, like in the Byzantine tradition, ‘Romeos’ (Greek) was synonymous with ‘Orthodox’ or even ‘educated person’, ‘city dweller’ or ‘merchant’ such that among the appointed ‘Greek’ bishops ethnic Bulgarians, Serbs or Albanians were also present. Be that as it may, the blanket appellation ‘Greek’ left no room for any ethnic (self-)identification.
authorities, developed over the decades into a national movement, in which claims were made for an independent national church.

The first generation of Bulgarian Revival activists pursued political reforms within the Ottoman Empire. Later, revolutionaries started to ask for outright independence, using arguments from the field of culture to prove that, as a separate nation, they deserved a separate state.

It is in this time that the first history about the Bulgarian lands in Bulgarian was re-discovered. This was the *Istorija Slavjanobolgarska* (Slavo-Bulgarian history) by the monk Paisij Hilendarski (described in greater detail in §5.3). The history, written in 1762, calls in patriotic tones upon Bulgarians to take pride in their origin and not to feel inferior to the Greeks. It was copied a few times during and after Paisij’s lifetime but gradually disappeared from memory. When it was first printed in 1844, it received little attention. When it was reprinted in 1871, however, it became a great success. From this time on Paisij has remained an icon of Bulgarian national thought.

Inspired by Paisij’s work and the spirit of his day, the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski (1821-1867) organised a četa (band) of Bulgarians in Serbia and moved into the Bulgarian lands in an attempt to free it by force. This movement had little success; nor did later attempts to stir a revolution from Walachia succeed.

The April Uprising of 1876, which broke out in the Central Balkan mountain range, however gained momentum, only to be crushed by the Turks costing many Bulgarian lives. This led Russia to declare war on The Ottoman Empire, which broke out in 1877 and was followed by the treaties of San Stefano and Berlin, which ensured Bulgarian autonomy.

The Bulgarian *Văzraždane* has been most widely studied by Bulgarian scholars. The studying of this period, which was a crucial one in Bulgarian national history started soon after the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian state, or even before that9. The name *Văzraždane* (rebirth) was given to this period at the time itself in the 1840s, although in the first decades, it had to compete with words like prosvesštenie (enlightenment), svestjavane (regaining of consciousness), văzkresenie (resurrection), săbuždane (awakening), or săživjavane (restoration to life)10. One of the
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9 Genčev, Bălgarsko văzraždane, 5.
first Bulgarians to use the term was Vasil Aprilov (see §7.8), who probably followed the example of the Russian Jurij Venelin (see §7.7).

In western languages, only a small number of studies and monographs are available, notably those by Dennis Hupchick, who edited a collection of studies by James F. Clarke about Bulgaria (1988)\textsuperscript{11}, Richard Crampton wrote a short introduction to Bulgarian history (1997)\textsuperscript{12} and Thomas Meininger's doctoral thesis (1987) is dedicated to the Bulgarian Vâzraždane\textsuperscript{13}.

The predominance of Bulgarian works poses two problems. First of all a lot of the works by Bulgarian scholars written after the creation of an autonomous Bulgarian principality are strongly teleological, that is they tend to draw only those conclusions that led to the establishment of Bulgaria in the first place or they provide an explanation of the situation in their time without offering any deeper analysis.

Historiography thus was, and still is, an important instrument of nation building, an issue detected and well-discussed by Rumen Daskalov in his *Kak se misli bâlgarskoto vâzraždane* (2002). The Vâzraždane is seen as a positive period, which is an example to the people of today. ‘Bad groups’, like Greeks, Turks, or the rich – bourgeois – Bulgarian čorbadžijas, the elite of the nineteenth century, are ignored\textsuperscript{14}.

Scholars also ensured their works fulfilled the expectations of the nationalist and/or communist society they served. While the Bulgarian philologists of the Vâzraždane itself saw nationality as decided by subjective factors, later marxist scholars believed in nationality as a characteristic that can be defined in an objective way\textsuperscript{15}.

A further consequence of the approach taken by Bulgarian scholars of the second half of the twentieth century, is that, if any attention is dedicated to the international contexts of the Vâzraždane, it is given predominantly to Russia and the Russians. Relationships between Bulgarian and Russian scholars in the period before 1873 have been studied more extensively than the comparably influential links between Bulgarians and people inside The Habsburg Empire of the time. This is likely to be the result of friendly ties between the Soviet Union and Bulgaria stemming from the assistance provided by Russia in the war of 1876-1878 which ultimately led to the establishment of the autonomous Bulgarian principality. Ties were strong when Bulgarians were publishing their works and indeed, communists had control over their output.

\textsuperscript{13} Meininger, The formation.
\textsuperscript{14} Daskalov. *Kak se misli*, 356-358.
\textsuperscript{15} Daskalov. *Kak se misli*, 46-47.
Furthermore, Bulgarian scholars have tended to see the role of the Turks negatively. It is often stated that Bulgarian medieval culture was highly developed, but ruined in one blow during the Ottoman conquest. Sustained in both oral and written traditions, this image was expressed already in the earliest history written by a Bulgarian, that by Paisij Hilendarski of 1762. After the formation of the Bulgarian independent state, this idea became one of the cornerstones of Bulgarian historiography.

In the beginning of the twentieth century a more balanced view started to emerge. Bojan Penev, for instance, wrote in his study *Istorija na novata bălgarska literatura* (History of the new Bulgarian literature 1930-1936), that ‘Bulgaria fell in a time, when a common national spiritual life had not been formed yet’ (България пада през една епоха, когато общият духовен живот на народа не е бил още оформен).

After 1945 however, the old anti-Turkish image returned and the socialist views that took hold among Bulgarians saw feudalism - the Ottoman Empire was a feudal state - by definition as bad. This idea, which was as good as dogmatic, was also expressed in the fourth volume of the prestigious *Istorija na Bălgarija* (History of Bulgaria), published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in 1983:

Разрушенията засягали не само крепостите, но и градовете, обществените сгради в тях, болярските жилища, манастирите, пазарите, складовете и пр.

The destructions did not only involve the fortresses, but also the cities, the public buildings in them, the houses of the noble, monasteries, markets, warehouses etc.

Machiel Kiel speaks in this respect about the ‘catastrophe theory’, the idea that the Ottomans were barbarians who had ruined a flourishing Bulgarian culture. This catastrophe theory has had a deep imprint on the academic work that was carried out after the second world war and was repeated over and over again.

Furthermore, socialist historians focused largely on class struggles in nineteenth-century Bulgarian society and ignored the contributions that the middle class made to its development. Nikolaj Genčev speaks in this respect of an ‘otricatelski duh’ (a spirit of denial), and an ‘otricatelski

16 Bojan Penev, Načalo na bălgarskoto văzraždane [Istorija na novata bălgarska literatura, I] (Sofia: Ministerstvoto na narodnoto prosveštenic, 1930), 143.  
18 Machiel Kiel, Art and society of Bulgaria in the Turkish period (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1985), explicitly argues that 'Old Bulgarian culture did not disappear with one resounding bang, but vanished very gradually', p. 351.
period. Recently, a more balanced view has appeared, of which Nikolaj Genčev’s Bălgarsko Văżraždane and Rumen Daskalov’s The making of a nation are good examples.

§1.2 Theoretical background: aim, method, nationalism studies

What does this study aim to add to the material already known from Bulgarian sources and analysed by Bulgarian scholars?

To begin with, the scope applied here is emphatically cross-national. Whereas, as I have pointed out, scholarship within Bulgaria has tended to look at the nation-building process within its own national frame of reference, I intend to thematize international ideological cross-currents, and the fact that early nation-building actors and precursors were situated in a context which at the time must be qualified as pre-national, which, from a contemporary point of view, is tantamount to trans-national. The rise of a Bulgarian national consciousness took place to some extent within a local context, involving tensions between ethnic Bulgarians, Greek church authorities and Ottoman rulers. But a very important part was also played by people working outside what is now Bulgaria; or coming to that region from outside; or by the cross-currents of cultural and political thought which spread all over the Balkans and indeed all over Europe. Existing research has tended to relegate such factors (which I contend, were of crucial importance) to the margins of the analysis. I aim to give them the attention that is their due.

In taking, as I do, an approach that stresses the traffic and influence of ideas, I am aware that I go against the grain of many studies on nationalism and national movements. In this respect, too, this thesis hopes to add an original contribution to our knowledge on the subject. Nationalism studies have on the whole been dominated by sociologists, political scientists and social historians (Gellner, Smith, Anderson, Hobsbawm are all from these fields); accordingly, national movements tend to
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19 Genčev. Bălgarsko văżraždane, 30, 38.
be seen in the first instance as social and political phenomena, and their cultural aspects are treated as side effects of social developments or political ideologies\textsuperscript{21}.

Miroslav Hroch’s work has shown, however, that in the course of historical developments cultural actors tend to precede social mobilization, and that philological activities tend to form what he calls ‘phase $A$’ of national movements. This insight was taken up by Joep Leerssen in Amsterdam, where the project ‘Cultural nationalism in the Balkans during the nineteenth century: Scholarly and intellectual institutions and networks in a multi-ethnic region’ was started to put Hroch’s theory to the test of a multi-cultural-multilingual region like the Balkans. The present thesis results from that project and does demonstrate that culture precedes politics; indeed that cultural activities in Bulgarian lands constitute the very precondition of a national category known as ‘Bulgarian’, within which and on the basis of which all later social and political developments take shape. As such it strengthens, if anything, Ernest Gellner’s contention that nations are created by nationalism rather than vice versa. The findings of this thesis also confirm that in this process, a particularly important role was played by a cohort of cultural actors who are now by and large neglected, falling as they do between the sphere of interest of social and of literary history: the philologists and literary scholars\textsuperscript{22}. To be sure, the role of individual intellectuals in the formation of nations has been studied\textsuperscript{23}, but the network of connections observed here has been given little attention\textsuperscript{24}.

While this study does not present an extended description of the prevailing theories of nationalism, some words dedicated to the issue are useful. Briefly, in the history of the debate on nationalism, two main currents can be seen: primordialism and modernism. Primordialism states that nations have always existed, or at least can be traced back into history for hundreds of years. From this

\textsuperscript{21} Joep Leerssen. The cultivation of culture. [Working Papers in European Studies Amsterdam, 2], (Amsterdam: opleiding Europese Studies, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2005) (also published on www.europesestudies.nl), 9.
\textsuperscript{22} Joep Leerssen, "Irish cultural nationalism and its European context", in Hearts and minds: Irish culture and society under the act of union, ed. B. Stewart (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 2002), 174-176.
\textsuperscript{24} Some work has been carried out. See for instance the articles about Bulgarian literature of Aleksandr Kiosev, Inna Peleva and Bojko Penčev in Marcel Cornis-Pope & John Neuhauer (eds.) History of the literary cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and disjunctures in the 19th and 20th centuries, I. (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004). [A comparative history of literatures in European languages, XIX].

Works on the history of ideas that adopt a Balkan-wide approach are more numerous. See for instance Paschalis M. Kitromilides. Enlightenment, nationalism, orthodoxy (Aldershot: Variorum, 1994).
perspective, intellectuals are those who articulate ‘what was actually there but had remained hidden, the pervasive submerged presence of the national in conditions of unfreedom and unconsciousness’.

In a project like this, which strives to study the multinational Balkan from a supranational point of view, encompassing competing national movements, a primordialist approach appears unworkable, and would lead to few results that have not previously been discussed in the national historiographical traditions.

The alternative, modernism, considers nationalism a consequence of modernisation and industrialisation, which has led to the alteration of societies. For modernists, intellectuals are ‘the articulators of necessary social processes without which industrial society was inconceivable’. Examples of modernists are scholars like Eric Hobsbawm, Ernest Gellner, Miroslav Hroch, and Benedict Anderson. Like them, I adopt a modernist perspective on nationalism for this work.

All over Europe, the first intellectuals operated within the private sphere. Rulers and nobility maintained collections of books and art and sponsored artists and scholars. Their activities were little known outside their circle. Later, science and arts, as well as debates on the state of society, were increasingly taken out of the private and into a more public setting. Literary salons represent a first phase in this shift from private to public, as do coffee houses. Still private in character, they allowed more people the possibility to participate in intellectual debate. Both patriotism and nationalism were facilitated by this increasing communication between members of a group. Over time, the number of people who are in contact with others increased, and the groups extended. In other words, sociability increased.

This process took place in Western Europe in the eighteenth century. On the Balkans, it came later. Both in Western and in Eastern Europe it was facilitated by technological developments, most importantly, the advancements made with the printing press and the decreasing price of paper. With these developments, the stage for opinion forming extended enabling discussions to take place over time and place, which had not been possible in the salons to date. With this, the public sphere emerged.

The concept of public sphere, is, in nationalism studies of this kind, a crucial one, and needs some specification. The dynamics of what in German is called Öffentlichkeit have been memorably described by the philosopher Jürgen Habermas (1929– ) as a facilitating precondition for the development of any nation. The public sphere in the ideal scenario is a virtual Agora or

---


26 Ibid.
marketplace, where all subgroups of society can express their opinions in democratic discourse. After all contributions are heard, participants can jointly decide on a course of action which is most beneficial to the group. Habermas traces the origin of this phenomenon to the Agoras of classical Greece

Although he does not directly quote Habermas, Benedict Anderson elaborates on this. In his well-known book *Imagined communities* (1983) Benedict Anderson describes how the growth of cultural nationalism, and later political nationalism, became possible through the increased availability of media, for instance printing presses. This is also the opinion of Hobsbawm who claims that:

> Nations exist not only as functions of a particular kind of territorial state or the aspiration to establish one […], but also in the context of a particular stage of technological and economic development.

Joep Leerssen proposed a subdivision of public sphere into a formal and an informal component. The formal component, which he calls the Institutional Infrastructure, comes into being through support of a government or other ruling organ and is expressed in actions like the foundation of libraries, archives, museums, universities or university chairs, certain government agencies like academies, folklore surveys, archeological committees etc.

The informal component, Social Ambience, is the collective of bottom-up activities by members of a group. Examples are the foundation of learned, cultural and other associations, city academies, and publishing ventures such as periodicals, book clubs and reading societies.

A problem of most modernist views is that they are focussing mainly on political agitation. There is little attention given to the role of culture, which is often seen as no more than a representation of what is happening in a given society. To bridge this deficiency, the Czech scholar Miroslav Hroch has elaborated on the ideas of Habermas and developed his theory about the successive stages of the formation of a nation and nationalism. He distinguishes three consecutive stages: A) a scholarly phase of interest in language, history and culture; B) a phase of deliberate national agitation; and C) a phase of mass national movement. Phase A is strongly linked with the

27  Jürgen Habermas, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1990), 56.
idea of what Leerssen calls the ‘cultivation of culture’ (see below), or cultural nationalism, lending support to the view that culture can play a crucial role in the development of a nation.

Hroch does not acknowledge cross-cultural influences, but sees the process of the formation of a nation as a result of internal social, economic and political developments. He denies the possibility of transfer, or ‘plagiarism’, in the idea of the national state:

...the struggle for national identity and for its propagation appeared with such marked temporal intervals in different countries that this in itself rules out the notion that it was above all a product of external influence, some sort of ideological infiltration or ‘infection’31.

In his work, Hroch focuses on phase B, and tends to see phase A as merely a prelude to it, which can even be skipped in the national movements of what he calls the insurgent or Balkan type32. He sees Bulgaria as an illustration of the insurgent type, in which virtually no phase A activities were to be distinguished33.

Hobsbawm and Gellner used the term ‘protonationalism’ for activities in the period preceding political nationalism, to show that nationalism did not originate from nothing. In their work as well, intellectual activities of the A phase are studied only cursorily. In this thesis, however (as in the Balkan project at large), phase A is the main object of study. We consider this period worthy of study in its own right, not as a mere overture of something else.

Facilitated by both formal and informal cultural infrastructure, various activities take place in the public sphere. For this research, the activities that are of the most interest are those that have a national aspect in them. Examples are the publication of dictionaries, grammars and folk tales of a nation or an ethnic group that strives to become a nation, or the writing of (historical) novels. These various manifestations of cultural nationalism together constitute Hroch’s phase A; a challenge lies in their operationalization for analytical study.

Joep Leerssen has proposed a framework that facilitates understandings of different manifestations of cultural nationalism34. His first step is the division of the field of culture into four areas of interest: LANGUAGE; DISCOURSE; MATERIAL CULTURE; and PRACTICES. Then, activities concerning any of these fields can be distinguished along degrees of political instrumentalization;

31 Hroch, National Interest, 35.
32 Ibid., 57.
33 Ibid.
34 Leerssen, The cultivation of culture, 28.
Leerssen distinguishes three degrees of intensity in the “cultivation of culture”: *salvage,* *productivity,* and *propagation.* The result allows for a matrix as reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>SALVAGE, RETRIEVAL, INVENTORY</strong></th>
<th><strong>FRESH CULTURAL PRODUCTION</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROPAGATION, PROCLAMATION IN THE PUBLIC SPHERE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE</strong></td>
<td>dictionaries, grammars</td>
<td>orthography</td>
<td>language activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standardization / dialect</td>
<td>language planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debates</td>
<td>language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCOURSE</strong></td>
<td>editions of older</td>
<td>[a] translations / adaptations</td>
<td>history education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– literary texts</td>
<td>b) Bible, world classics</td>
<td>historical pageants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– historical documents</td>
<td>c) national / historical</td>
<td>commemorations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– legal sources</td>
<td>drama, novel, poetry</td>
<td>literary events / festivals / awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTEFACTS, MATERIAL CULTURE</strong></td>
<td>archography</td>
<td>[d] literary history, literary / cultural criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monumental remains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbolically invested sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCES, CULTURAL PRACTICES</strong></td>
<td>editions of oral literature</td>
<td>rustic-real literature</td>
<td>received or invested traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proofs, superstition, pastimes</td>
<td>traditional sports / pastimes</td>
<td>festivals / awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manners and customs, folklore</td>
<td>national music composed</td>
<td>(folklore, sports, music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>folk dances, folk music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL AMBIENCE</strong></td>
<td>[a] associations, city academies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b] periodicals, publishing ventures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>[a] state academies, universities, chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b] libraries, archives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[c] museums, government agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Joep Leerssen: the cultivation of culture.

Activities in the field of **LANGUAGE** range from the compilation of dictionaries and grammars (*salvage*) through language debates and purism (*productivity*) to language activism and the wish to have education in the national language (*propagation*).

The category **DISCOURSE** is all about philology, in the wide nineteenth-century meaning of the term. *Salvage* designates the inventorization of older literary, legal and historical texts and documents; *productivity* involves the translation of world classics or the Bible into the vernacular and the writing of both national history and historical fiction; and *propagation* covers the manifestation of this discourse in the public sphere through, among other things, history education and historical pageants.

---

35 In the nineteenth century, the word ‘philology’ had a more extended meaning than is common usage now, the study of language and literature. In the period under investigation, it meant much more than that. Following the definition of Giambattista Vico in *La scienza nuova* of 1724, philology is the investigation of all truth created by humans, and it covers the fields of language, literature, (legal) history, mythology etc. It has a lot in common with what is now called Cultural Studies. It is opposed to philosophy, which strives to study the truth that is not man-made. The division between creative, literary, work and scholarly work that is common now did not exist as such at the time. To modern eyes, many intellectuals of nineteenth century Europe were double talents. As literature and learning were not distinct fields, historians could, for instance, also be writers of historical fiction. Walter Scott is one of the most famous illustrations of such a double talent. Also many Bulgarians combined scholarly work with literary activities. Accordingly, in the following pages, the words philology and philologist are used in the nineteenth century meaning of the word. (Leerssen, 2004, 2005).
The category MATERIAL CULTURE includes activities like inventorization, protection and restoration, and the presence in the public sphere of the national element through for instance the erection of monuments, and historicist architecture and design. Finally, salvage of PRACTICES designates the retrieval of oral literature in all its forms (folk songs, proverbs, superstitions) and other practices like folk dances, music and traditional pastimes, productivity includes their cultivation, for example the creation of new literature in a rustic-demotic mode and the composition of ‘national’ music, and propagation involves the (re)incorporation of these practices in public life, in the form of events like cultural festivals.

The matrix which is the result of plotting of these fields of interests and intensities facilitates a comparison between different national movements. It enables an analysis of questions like: ‘Were activities from one field of interest more frequent in one national movement than in another?’ or ‘Which field was studied first?’ Moreover, if cultural nationalism is seen as the sum of varied activities, instead of one monolithic whole, it becomes easier to acknowledge influences from one national group on another, or to identify networks of philologists.

These influences are here studied, then, as a dynamics of ideas and ideological currents. Individual actors are seen first and foremost as the carriers of ideas and ideologies. This approach, which situates the following thesis firmly in the field of intellectual and cultural history rather than social or political history, has been fruitfully described by the French scholar Dan Sperber as an ‘Epidemiology of beliefs’. It is an extension of Benedict Anderson’s media-oriented study of nation-building as an ‘imagined community’ by seeing the community as an ambiance for contagious behaviour and spreading opinions.

Benedict Anderson made one step that other modernist theoreticians did not make: he pointed to the existence of a model of a national state that can be transferred from one community to the other, or, in Anderson’s words, plagiarised. Thus a group of people in the process of forming a nation, often followed the example of another group who were ahead in the process or had already finished it:

In effect, by the second decade of the nineteenth century, if not earlier, a ‘model’ of ‘the’ independent national state was available for pirating.36

Although Anderson touched upon the possibility of transfer of ideas and concepts between different national groups, little theoretical work has been carried out on this theme. One useful

---

concept in this regard is the idea of the ‘Epidemiology of beliefs’ (La contagion des idées), as formulated by sociologist Dan Sperber. Sperber applied epidemiology to the study of the development and spread of culture. According to Sperber, culture is a system of public representations which mirror mental representations. Mental representations are stored by individuals in their memory. They can be either unique for the given individual or shared by a group. By being shared between individuals, representations become part of the culture of a certain group. In Sperber’s words:

Only those representations which are repeatedly communicated and minimally transformed in the process will end up belonging to the culture\(^37\).

Thus, the idea of the existence of a national identity will only become cultural if it is communicated frequently. For this to occur a public sphere is required – where ideas can spread from one individual to another, or from one group of people to another. In other words, these ideas behave, in a way, like a virus and can thus be studied with the help of epidemiology:

Certaines représentations sont transmises lentement de génération à génération; ce sont ce qu’on appelle des traditions, comparable à des endémies. D’autres représentations, typiques des cultures modernes, se répandent rapidement à travers une population, mais ont une durée de vie courte; ce sont ce qu’on appelle des modes, comparables à des épidémies\(^38\).

This is, next to the existence of diaspora nationalism (see below), an important reason why cultural nationalism should be studied in a cross-national comparative approach\(^39\). Philologists all over Europe were in contact in the nineteenth century and were active in networks. Apart from the developing national cultures, a universal European culture continued to exist. It is in this public sphere that Herderian cultural relativism spread like an epidemic: anyone who ‘caught’ the idea was in a position to pass it on.

§1.3 Cultural-historical background: the impact of Herder


\[^39\] Leerssen, The cultivation of culture, 15.
Until the nineteenth century, there were no distinct nationalities on the Balkans; there was an ethnic continuum in which different neighbouring Slav groups (Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Macedonians and Bulgarians) blended into one another. Moreover, these groups were not firmly distinguished from non-Slav populations such as Vlachs, Greeks, Albanians or Gypsies. Different ethnic groups mingled within a single state. For example, the medieval Czar Ivan Asen II called himself ‘Czar of the Bulgarians and Greeks’, while his father, (Ivan) Asen, was of Vlach origin, and he himself had both one Slav and one Proto-Bulgarian name.

The Ottoman and Habsburg Empires were no nation states, but multi-ethnic empires. The borders between the empires were the result of battles, not of national or ethnic borders. Both in the field of language and culture, West-Bulgarians had more in common with East-Serbians than with East-Bulgarians. Serbs in The Habsburg Empire initially did not differ from Serbs in the Ottoman Empire, but the different political situations in which these two groups were living led them through very different social and political experiences.

As a result, it it impossible to study cultural nationalism on the Balkans in the framework of the modern national states. Philologists undertook activities to further their national cause outside of the national states that we know now: often they had their bases in neighbouring countries, or in the major cities in the empires. Vienna and Budapest, for example, housed colonies of all Habsburg peoples, and in the Russian Empire, Odessa attracted emigré Jews, Bulgarians and Greeks who were active. They were displaying diaspora nationalism, which is seen by Ernest Gellner as a distinct subtype of nationalism. It was in Odessa, for instance, that the Greek Filiki Etairia was founded, the society that prepared the Greek revolution. Similarly, Bulgarians in the city organised themselves in societies that combined cultural, political and revolutionary objectives.

The process of nation formation that took place among Bulgarians was not unique. In the nineteenth century, nations all over Europe were inventing or re-inventing themselves. Italy had its Risorgimento and the Greeks went through their national movement, for instance.

In the case of Bulgaria, the term used to describe the movement, Vâzraždane, literally means ‘rebirth’. Notably the analogy with a second birth is not unique. Compare for example the Catalan ‘Renaixença’, the Croatian ‘Preporod’ and the Irish ‘Revival’. What these movements share

---

40 Cultural nationalism is the cultural component of nationalism. It can be seen as the collective of different public activities which underline the creation or existence of a nation. Cultural nationalism is often treated as a by-product of political nationalism. The Czech historian Miroslav Hroch, John Hutchinson and Joep Leerssen argue that cultural nationalism is a force of its own, which does not merely reflect social developments and public movements, but also anticipates it. It is this definition which is adopted here.

is an understanding of the ‘nation’ as a living organism – one which had been dormant and needed to be waken up.

On the Balkans, with its changing state borders and population groups, people can, and in the nineteenth century could, hold two different identities, for instance an ethnic consciousness of belonging to one group by birth, and a social one of belonging to a group by education. As a result, there are people whose primary identification shifted over time from the social group to the ethnic one. In the case of Bulgaria, Vasil Aprilov (§7.8) is a good illustration of this process. More frequent are cases in which changes in identification occur between two generations. The fluid situation in nineteenth century Bulgaria foreshadowed the voluntarism that is now commonplace, whereby membership of a nation is not biologically determined, nor a logical consequence of modernisation, but a result of free will. To use the famous words that Ernest Renan spoke in 1882:

L’existence d’une nation est (pardonnez-moi cette metaphore) un plébiscite de tous les jours….42

The development of new nations followed the introduction, in the late eighteenth century, of the nation as the main ordering principle for the classification of human beings. The one who was largely responsible for this mental shift was the German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). Herder introduced the concept of cultural relativism in the European discourse: he stressed that cultural diversity, and not one universal cultural tradition, is the greatest treasure of man. He was the first to emphasise the national language as the most important factor determining a man’s loyalty. In book seven of his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (1784-1791), he made this point thus:

In so verschiedene Formen das Menschengeschlecht auf der Erde erscheint: so ist’s doch überall Ein’ und dieselbe Menschengattung. Sind in der Natur keine zwei Blätter eines Baums einander gleich: so sind’s noch weniger zwei Menschengeschichte und zwei menschliche Organisationen.43

In his *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* of 1778/9, Herder underlined this by including folk songs of various peoples from all over Europe: Morlacks, Estonians, Bohemians next to German, French and English contributions. This interest in folk songs and all other aspects of folklore spread

---

across all of Europe. Some people who shared it were the brothers Grimm, Claude Fauriel and his publication of Serbian folk songs, and Elias Lönnrot, who published the Finnish *Kalevala*.44

Herder explicitly idealised the Slavs, whom he regarded as a community of high morality and glorious destiny. He felt sympathetic towards the Slavs and depicted them as peaceful people with a high level of civilisation and culture. In the second part of *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* of 1787, Herder devoted a chapter to the Slavs, which is now known as the ‘Slawenkapitel’. In it, he predicted a great future for the Slavs:

Das Rad der ändernden Zeit drehet sich indess unaufhaltsam; und da diese Nationen grösstenteils den schönsten Erdrich Europas bewohnen, wenn er ganz bebauet und der Handel daraus eröffnet würde; da es auch wohl nicht anders zu denken ist, als dass in Europa die Gesetzgebung und Politik statt des kriegerischen Geistes immer mehr den stillen Fleiss und das ruhige Verkehr der Völker unter einander befördern müssen und befördern werden, so werdet auch ihr so tief versunkene, einst fleissige und glückliche Völker endlich einmal von eurem langen, tragen Schlaf ernurnt, von euren Sklavenketten befreit, eure schöne Gegend vom Adriatischen Meer bis zum karpatischen Gebirge, vom Don bis zur Mulda als Eigentum nützen und eure alten Feste des ruhigen Fleisses und Handels auf ihnen feiern dürfen.45

In his notions about the Slavs, Herder had been influenced by the works of philologists like Schlözer, Frisch, Popović, and Dobner, deriving from them the idea of the peaceful nature that they attributed to Bohemians – the best studied Slav people of his time. Herder generalised this vision to include all the Slavic peoples.46

How this Herderian valorization of national-ethnic specificity affected Bulgarian developments specifically, is a complex question. To be sure, few Bulgarians indeed were in a position to read Herder prior to ca. 1840. My analysis will indicate, however, an indirect influence through Slovene-Serbian conduits like Kopitar and Vuk Karadžić or Russian panslavism (Pogodin and Venelin), allowing, I think, for a firm conclusion that cultural consciousness-raising, imported from the sphere of the European Republic of learning, created the preconditions which were to allow political mobilization in Bulgaria. It is telling fact, for instance, that the abovementioned first Bulgarian history, by Paisij Hilendarski, led (as I show in more detail below, in §5.3) an obscure

---

44 See further Leerssen, Nationaal denken, 87-92.
45 Herder, Ideen, II, 290.
and somnolescent existence as a unique singularity during the decades it took for Herderian thought to sensitize something like an emerging Bulgarian public sphere.

I present the Bulgarian case in seven chapters. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 deal with the Bulgarian situation as it was up to the Văzraždane. Chapter 2 describes the influences from catholic intellectuals, both directly from Rome and indirectly through Croats on Bulgarian philologists in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. In Chapter 3, the cultural landscape in Bulgaria in the eighteenth century is sketched. Chapter 4 shows how in the early nineteenth century, on the eve of the Văzraždane, Greek culture continued to be dominant among Bulgarian intellectuals.

Chapter 5 describes how changes in the Bulgarian lands in the field of economy, politics and in the social life prepared the way for the intellectual Văzraždane. In chapter 6, a sketch of the activities of the Văzraždane is given. It focuses largely on the events inside the Bulgarian Lands, with excursuses to activities that took place outside The Ottoman Empire. This is the theme that has been given the most attention by Bulgarian scholars.

Chapter 7 and 8 demonstrate how the Bulgarian cultural nationalism of Chapter 6 was inspired and influenced by links between Bulgarians and inhabitants of the two great empires of the nineteenth century, the Russian and the Habsburg. The development of the academic discipline of slavistics raised a generation of philologists all over Europe. These philologists took the lead in investigating Slav people, and introduced some lesser known peoples, including Bulgarians, to the international discourse.

Concluding remarks about the Bulgarian Văzraždane and its reciprocity with wider European movements are presented in Chapter 9.

It would be impossible to write a study of the Bulgarian national movement of the early nineteenth century without mentioning the Macedonians that participated in it. Leading figures, like the brothers Miladinov were born in the area which is now known as the (Former Yugoslav) Republic of Macedonia. Although Macedonian intellectuals from this period are often claimed as the founders of the Macedonian national movement, I have however chosen to include them also in my analysis of the Bulgarian national movement.

They declared themselves Bulgarian, and they were active in the Bulgarian public sphere. A clear illustration for this is that the brothers Miladinov included in their collection of folk songs
contributions from their native Macedonia as well as contributions from throughout the Bulgarian lands and named their collection *Bălgarski narodni pesni*.

A separate Macedonian public sphere was only created from the 1860s onwards and especially after a Bulgarian state had been formed (an autonomous principedom in 1878, and an independent state in 1908) and the Macedonian territories remained in the Ottoman Empire. Even then, while some Macedonian intellectuals dedicated themselves to the development of a Macedonian identity, others, like Grigor Părličev⁴⁸, sought to join the Bulgarian cultural world.

2: Illyrianism and the catholic mission

Although it is often said that during the period of Ottoman rule Bulgaria was cut off from the rest of Europe, this is not entirely true. Europe-wide cultural currents also reached Bulgaria, especially the north-western border regions. A remarkable case is the catholic influence that came from and through Italy, Croatia and Bosnia. In Bulgarian historiography these missions are often ignored or treated briefly under the name of ‘Catholic Propaganda’. However, the catholic influence was of crucial importance to Bulgarians, as it sowed among them the very first seeds of a national awareness. This chapter focuses on the catholic mission of the seventeenth century and the Illyrian ideals of the Habsburg Serbs of the eighteenth century. It shows how the idea of Illyrianism, and the concept of the existence of separate nations, were introduced in Bulgaria in the seventeenth century.

§2.1 The Ottoman context

In 1393, the Bulgarian capital Veliko Târnovo had been captured by the Ottoman armies⁴⁹, and the largest part of the territory which is now known as Bulgaria became part of the Ottoman Empire. In the Ottoman Empire, people were politically defined not by ethnicity, but by religion, that is they were divided according to their religion into groups known as millet (nation). Each millet was represented at the court of the sultan. Bulgarians were part of the orthodox millet, as were orthodox Serbs, Romanians and Greeks. The millet-başı, spokesman for the millet in the sultan’s court, was the Patriarch of Constantinople, and he held the Ottoman rank of paşa. The orthodox millet was autonomous with regard to taxes and legal jurisdiction. It organised all orthodox believers of the Balkan in one ‘common society’, that was ethnically undivided⁵⁰. As long as there was no unrest, the Patriarch had every freedom to make decisions. The millet, which was

---

⁴⁹ Unlike the Serbian case, no historical information or heroic accounts of battles between the Bulgarians and the Turks have been preserved. This has led some to believe that the Bulgarian kings were not conquered, but joined the Ottoman Empire as vassals. Lilova, Vázroždenstvo značenija, 249. This has had a large influence on the possibility to use historical arguments in the Vázraždane.

considered as an ‘internal vassal state’\textsuperscript{51}, was not a unique institution, it also existed in the Roman Empire and in the Medieval empires of Europe\textsuperscript{52}. The orthodox millet was, under Ottoman dominion, from the eighteenth century, itself dominated by a vassal elite, known as Phanariots (see § 3.5).

The Patriarchate of Veliko Tărnovo was abolished shortly after the capture of the city such that the church in the eastern parts of Bulgaria was ruled from the Patriarchate in Constantinople. This led to the hellenisation of the Bulgarian intellectual population: everyone who wanted to advance in society, and thus in the church hierarchy, had to learn Greek and adapt to Greek cultural standards. This concept of ‘Greek’ was however, not equal to ‘ethnic Greek’. Bulgarian culture was rusticated to a low-prestige demotic vernacular.

\section*{§2.2 Illyrianism}

The idea of the existence of an ethnic group called Bulgarians, or Slavs, did not disappear completely, though. Of great importance to the development of feeling of Slav community on the Balkans was Illyrianism, the tendency to look back to the Illyrians of antiquity as the ancestors of the contemporary Slavs. Nowadays it is generally believed that the descendants of the Illyrian people of ancient times, who were defeated by Philippos of Macedonia, are the Albanians. In the seventeenth until the nineteenth century, however, the idea lived that the Illyrians were the forefathers of the Croats or even the South Slavs in general.

Of great importance for Bulgaria were the links with the city-republic of Dubrovnik, which in turn had close ties with the republic of Venice\textsuperscript{53}. Because of the similarity in language between the Croats of Dubrovnik and the Serbs and Bulgarians on the Balkan peninsula, Dubrovnikians were well placed as intermediaries for passing on western ideas.

The Dalmatian lands surrounding Dubrovnik were Venetian territory until the end of the republic in 1791. The ties between Dalmatia and Venice dated from as far back as the year 1000. In
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1699 and 1718, after the treaties of Karlowitz and Passarowitz, Venice extended its territory inland\textsuperscript{54}.

Dubrovnik was a very wealthy city which was rich in culture as well. In the seventeenth century, it was considered ‘the Slavic Athens’\textsuperscript{55}. Inhabitants of Dubrovnik enjoyed merchants’ privileges and exemption of taxes in the Ottoman Empire\textsuperscript{56}. Colonies of merchants from Dubrovnik lived all over the Balkans, twelve of these were in Bulgaria\textsuperscript{57}.

The culture of Dubrovnik was heavily influenced by the Italians. Literature was written in Latin, Italian or Slavic. The best-known poet of the seventeenth century is Ivan Gundulić, who wrote the epic \textit{Osman}. The first one to write about the Illyrians was Vinko Pribojević, a Dominican friar from Dalmatia, who published in 1532 in Venice his book \textit{De origine successibusque Slavorum}. In this work, he stated that Slavs were the autochthonous inhabitants of the Balkan peninsula. He had been inspired to write this book by the work of the Byzantine historiographer Laonikos Chalkokondilis\textsuperscript{58}.

This concept of Illyrian ancestors became popular among both Serbs and Croats. In 1595 the Dubrovian Petar Ohmućević established a genealogical link between the Illyrian empire and the medieval Serbian Czar Stefan Dušan\textsuperscript{59}, Dušan, the Nemanjid dynasty and the medieval Prince Marko Kraljević also appeared in Gundulić’s \textit{Osman}.

Mavro Orbini’s \textit{Il regno degli Slavi}\textsuperscript{60} is another exponent of the Illyrian tradition. Orbini was a Benedictine monk from the island of Mljet, close to Dubrovnik. He wrote his book in 1601 as a history of Dubrovnik and its Slavic hinterland. Orbini relied largely on Byzantine sources, containing quite some remarks on the Bulgarians. Likewise, Orbini’s work in many places refers to Bulgarians, although Orbini did not regard them as Illyrians. According to Orbini, the place of origin of the Slavs was Scandinavia\textsuperscript{61}.

The Illyrian view on world history was given a graphical form– very important in a time when literacy was not as widespread as it is now – by the Croat Pavao Ritter Vitezović (1652-1712).

\textsuperscript{56} Shaw, Empire, 164.
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Vitezović is considered to be the first Croatian professional man of letters. Concerned with the hard fate of the south Slavic peoples, who were divided under different rulers, he drafted a plan in which Austria was to free all the South Slavs and unite them in one single nation. He justified this plan with historical legal documents. In 1701, Vitezović published, in Vienna, his *Stemmatographia, sive armorum illyricorum delineatio, descriptio, et restitutio* (Stemmatographia, or a drawing, description and reconstruction of the arms of the Illyrians). The poems under the shields and the texts were translated into Slaveno-Serbian by Pavel Nenadović for the album of Hristofor Žefarović. Vitezović was not the first to make a heraldic album of the South Slavs, but he was the first to maintain a hierarchy of kingdoms (empires) and regions. In the Bulgarian case, apart from the kingdom Bulgaria he showed the weapons of Misia, Thrace and Dardania. Because not all of the newly introduced regions had a coat of arms, he invented some of the 56 coats of arms in his *Stemmatographia* himself, inspired by Orbini’s *Il regno degli Slavi*.

§2.3 The catholic mission in Bulgaria

The Illyrian ideal of unity among the South Slavs facilitated attempts to convert Bulgarians to catholicism, so as to achieve religious unity with the catholic Croats. Already in the Middle Ages, there had been catholic missions among Bulgarians. Both Jesuits and Franciscan monks intended to propagate their faith among the people of the Balkans, but as Jesuits, with their ties with Ottoman enemies Spain and Venice, were not admitted in the empire, the catholic influence in Bulgaria came mainly through the Franciscan order. The first mission of Franciscan monks into Bulgaria, or more specifically the empire of Ivan Stratsimir, started in 1365. In the first centuries of Ottoman rule, this mission weakened, but from the second half of the sixteenth century, during the counter-reformation, the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, which had been founded in 1622, gave new momentum to the activities in the Balkans. The Union between the Ruthenians and Rome of 1508 may well have been an inspiration for the missionaries on the Balkans. In Bulgaria, the peak of the catholic mission was in the seventeenth century.

---
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The mission aimed mostly at, and was most successful among, the Bulgarian Paulician population\textsuperscript{67}, a religious group that continued the medieval tradition of the Bogomils, a heresy connected with the Albigensians or Cathars, that are better known in western Europe. It was coordinated from Bosnia, and the Bosnian Petar Solinat was a pioneer: he founded a catholic monastery in Čiprovci, in northwest Bulgaria.

Čiprovci was the centre of the Bulgarian catholic community. It was a mining town with a large community of miners from Saxony, who had adopted Bulgarian as their language, but had retained their catholic religion. In the seventeenth century, Čiprovci was a wealthy city and it was known as \textit{Cveteto na Bâlgarija} (The flower of Bulgaria)\textsuperscript{68}.

In 1620, a separate catholic church province, Custodia Bulgaria, was split off from the Bosnian one. In 1640, the catholic diocese of Sofia was founded, with Petar Solinat as its first bishop. It was raised to the rank of archdiocese three years later, then with Petar Bogdan (see below) as archbishop. A second archdiocese followed in 1644 (Marcianopolis), and a third one in 1647 in Nikopolis, where Filip Stanislavov was appointed\textsuperscript{69}.

The catholic missionaries were highly educated in comparison with their orthodox counterparts. Parčević, for instance, was a doctor of theology\textsuperscript{70}. The missionaries were the first to open schools in Bulgaria in which not only religious subjects were taught. In these schools, Latin and Slavonic (Croatian) were studied together with arithmetic and grammar. In Čiprovci, the centre of the Bulgarian catholic community, a seminary was opened, and the best pupils were sent to the ‘Illyrian colleges’ of Rome, Bologna and Loretto\textsuperscript{71}.

The first book printed if not in Bulgarian, at least in Slavonic and aimed at Bulgarian readers, was a book originating from and intended for the catholic community: the \textit{Abagar}. Filip Stanislavov, the archiepiscopate of Nikopolis, compiled this prayer book, which was printed in 1651 in Rome. The language used in the \textit{Abagar} was unique for its time, because, although it was based on Croatian, it contained a number of Bulgarian elements\textsuperscript{72}. All other works to which Bulgarians contributed in the time were written in (Slaveno)Serbian. There are people who point to the number of borrowings from Croatian and deny that the language can be labelled as Bulgarian, but still the \textit{Abagar} was the first printed book which was intended to be written in Bulgarian\textsuperscript{73}.
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§2.4 Petăr Bogdan

Petăr Bogdan was born as Bogdan Bakšev in 1601, and died in 1674. He received the name Petăr when he entered the Franciscan order, probably in honour of pioneer Petăr Solinat⁷⁴. From 1643, Bogdan was archbishop of Sofia, but he also wrote a number of works on Bulgarian history. He composed a history of Bulgaria in 1667, called Historia Bulgariae, which was going to be printed in Venice, but of which no copy is known to survive⁷⁵. It might have been printed after all, since a copy of parts of the text has been found which has corrector’s notes written on it, and an inventory from 1711 of a Franciscan monastery in Deva, Romania, mentions the presence of a copy of a history of Bulgaria.

From the preface and a summary that did survive, it is possible to have an impression of the character of the work. Bogdan used many classical and medieval sources in his study, ranging from Ovid and Ptolemy to Caesar Baroni and Mauro Orbini⁷⁶. Furthermore, Bogdan included several extended descriptions of Bulgaria in his ‘relationes’ to the congregation, which he may well have intended to be published. Among them are Relaziones del regno di Bulgaria (1640), Storia di Soffia (1653) and Storia di Obrid’ (1655)⁷⁷.

§2.5 Political pursuits

The catholic movement among Bulgarians was not strictly religious or cultural, it had political aspirations as well. The catholic leaders of the Bulgarians were hoping for an invasion by the catholic powers into Ottoman territory. Then, Bulgarians could rise in a rebellion and thus be freed from Turkish occupation.

Typical are the activities of Petăr Parčević (1612-1674). Parčević was born in Čiprovci in a family of Bosnian immigrants. He had his education in the Illyrian college in Loretto and later in
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Rome. He was appointed as secretary of Marcianopolis upon the creation of the archbishopry in 1644. Its see was on the northern side of the Danube, in Baciu (Moldavia), sheltered from Ottoman control. Parčević soon undertook his first political mission, when he went to the Polish-Lithuanian king Vladislav IV and offered him the Bulgarian crown, promising that 40,000 Bulgarians would rebel and support the Polish claims. After the death of Vladislav, Parčević repeated his offer to the new king Jan Cazimir. He then went to Vienna to plead in front of the Emperor Ferdinand II for a new anti-Ottoman league. Parčević spoke thus to the senate of Venice in 1649 about his plan:

We, the peoples of the East, that is of the Balkans, and above all of the rich kingdom of Bulgaria, with white beards, with white heads, weighed down by the tyranny, with sunken eyes, our strength draining away… we turn for help towards the leaders of the world… to chase the tyranny from the East. The people again insist to be freed and send the same envoy Don Petar Parčević the Bulgarian to the most enlightened king Cazimir, to the most honourable Emperor and to the most enlightened and renowned republic of Venice, as we wish that she continues her fortunate success and awakes the Bulgarian lion which had fallen asleep, because it, although it is still breathing, is not fully alive.

The plan failed. In 1654, Parčević was promoted to be archbishop of Marcianopolis. He then offered the Bulgarian crown directly to Emperor Ferdinand, who in his turn promoted him to the rank of baron.

Parčević started out with broad support for his political missions, both from Bulgarian clergy like Petăr Bogdan, and from Rome. Later, church authorities became increasingly displeased with his activities, as Parčević violated the rule that missionaries should not be politically involved. In 1662, when Parčević became involved in a conflict with colleague Filip Stanislavov about the exact border between their territories, he was relieved from his duties.

After the outbreak of the Polish-Turkish war of 1672 Parčević, by then restored in rank, travelled through Europe (Warsaw, Vienna, Venice and finally Rome) one final time to find support for the Bulgarian cause. Again, no great power wanted to change the status quo.

Petăr Bogdan was also involved in politics. He was, as far as I have been able to establish, the first to describe in some detail the borders of Bulgaria, in 1640:

---
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La Bulgaria si chiama adesso tutto quello, che si chiamava prima Misia superiore, et parte della inferiore Misis, tutta la Tracia, pur que adesso intorno al mar di Gallipoli s’usa la lingua Greca, et la maggior parte della Macedonia et tutta la Moravia sino l’Ohrida, et sino alli confini d’Albania et di Grecia, et della Servia, et verso l’Oriente si estende sino al Mar negro; et il Danibio la divide di Aquilone con la Valacchia e Moldavia, anticamente dette Dacia antiqua, ultra Danubium, etc.

Today, all that land once named First Moesia Superior, part of Moesia Inferior, all Thrace, with the exception of the Gallipoli littoral where the Greek language is spoken, the greater part of Macedonia, all Morava, as far as Ohrida up to the boundaries of Albania and Greece, and from Serbia eastwards to the Black Sea is called Bulgaria. In the north the Danube divides it from Wallachia and Moldavia, in olden times called Ancient Dacia, Transdanubian Dacia etc.

These catholic intellectuals were the first to consider the people who were living in the Bulgarian lands, both orthodox and catholic, as one nation, and thus give more weight to nation than to religion as distinctive criterion. The bishop of Sofia, Ilija Marinov, mentioned in a report in 1626, that the heretics (orthodox inhabitants) of north Bulgaria and the Paulicians ‘sono di medissima genti’ (are of one and the same people) . Filip Stanislavov stated in 1659 that the Paulicians ‘slavi sunt’ (are Slavs). This idea appeared among orthodox Bulgarians only in the nineteenth century.

There was some feeling of solidarity between catholic and orthodox people. During the war that Poland, Russia, Habsburg and Venice fought against the Ottoman Empire from 1683 until 1699, there were three major uprisings in the Bulgarian lands in which catholics and orthodox joined forces: in Veliko Târnovo (1686), Čiprovci (1688) and in the north-east of Macedonia (1689).

All three uprisings were crushed, and large numbers of Bulgarians fled across the Danube. Partly because of this, Bulgarians gradually lost their faith in the catholic leaders of Europe. This process had started before the uprisings. Petâr Parčević already expressed his hope in the Russian Czar.

§2.6 Habsburg Serbia

Another conduit between Bulgarian and catholic Europe was opened when, with the Treaty of Sremski Karlovci of 1699, part of Serbia came within the borders of the Habsburg Empire. This part, nowadays known as Vojvodina, developed into an important cultural centre for Serbs.

---
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Sremski Karlovci became the seat of an archiepiscopate, and the monasteries on the Fruška Gora, the Serbian Holy Mountain, turned into important cultural centres. Because of the closeness in both religion and language, Bulgarians and Walachians also benefited from the cultural bloom. In 1751, the Bulgarian Partenij Pavlović became episcopate in Sremski Karlovci85, which probably strengthened the links with monasteries in the Bulgarian lands.

Two books by Serbs from this community that had a large impact among Bulgarians were printed in Vienna: The Stematografija by Hristofor Žefarović of 1741, which was an adaptation of the Stemmatographia of Pavao Ritter Vitezović (see §2.2), and the 1794 Istorija raznyh slovenskih narodov, nai-pače Bolgarov, Horvatov, Serbov (History of various Slavic peoples, especially the Bulgarians, Croats and Serbs) by Jovan Rajić, which was translated into Bulgarian for the first time in 1844 by P. Sapunov86. The translations of these two books, which represent the Illyrianist tradition, played an important role in the Bulgarian Văzraždane.

Hristofor Žefarović was born near Dojran, a lake in the southeast of current Macedonia, in 1690, and probably had his training as a painter in Habsburg Serbia87. His Stematografija, like that of Vitezović is a collection of copper engravings showing the coats of arms of the Illyrian lands, cut by the renowned engraver Thomas Messmer88 and drawn by Žefarović. The book was written in Slaveno-Serbian, the Slavic church language of the time. It was financed by, and dedicated to, the then patriarch, Arsenij IV89. It was very popular: only a couple of months after its first appearance, a second edition was printed90.

The book opens with 16 engravings of saints, including Method (appearing, strangely enough, without Cyril), Sava, Naum and Kliment (disciples of Cyril and Method), who were among the first to spread the faith on the Balkan peninsula, Serbian saints like Stefan Nemanja (St. Simeon) his sons Stefan Prvovenčanyj and St. Sava, and Lazar. Bulgarian saints, as listed on the Bulgarian church calendar91, are missing, only St. Naum and St. Kliment of Ohrid could be considered Bulgarian, although they are more often seen as common Slav saints92.
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Žefarović was orthodox, not a catholic, but still his work follows the examples of the catholic Illyrianists. The engravings that are included in the work clearly radiate the Illyrian ideal. They represent the coats of arms of the patriarch and of 56 regions, inhabited by Illyrians. The collection opens with the shield of Illyria itself and then, in the order of the Latin alphabet, displays regions like Serbia, Bosnia, Bulgaria and its parts Moesia, Thrace (divided in Trakija Odrizijskaja and Trakija Rimskaja), Makedonija and Dardanija and Croatia, as well as non-Slavic areas like Greece, Hungary, and some regions of which it is not clear whether they have ever formed a state or unity that was organized well enough to carry one coat of arms: Kelta, Japodia and Trivalija (after the Celts, the Illyrian tribe of the Japodi and the Thracian tribe of the Triballi). There are even surprising ones like Kreta (Crete) and Turcija (Turkey). It is hard to imagine that there ever was an Illyrian population there.

The texts under the coats of arms express sadness about the Turkish oppression of some areas, like the ones about the Macedonian and the Greek coat of arms:

| Сут Лвом щити златья | Golden shields are covered |
| черневленим прекрити | with a red lion |
| Знамение се Царску | I, the flag, want to show |
| хотя чест явити | the honour of a czar |
| Лву отял Великому | The Turk has taken the |
| турчин диадему | diadem from the lion |
| Изгубих аз чест всякую, | I lost every honour, |
| ему таку зриму† | you can see it from him |

| Во плаветной зде шар | In the blue colour here |
| мудрост ест высока | there is great wisdom |
| Ейже злато в подданстве, | gold in the background, |

This site lists both Bulgarians who are considered reverend (rev.), one step below being beatified, and saints (st.), and does not completely conform with the list of Bulgarian saints as published by the Bulgarian Synod. Curiously enough, Asen Vasiliev in his preface to the facsimile edition identified some more Bulgarian saints: St. David, St. Theoktist, St. Nikodim, St. Anna and St. Elena. None of them is considered a saint on the Bulgarian calendar, however. It is true that in the text in the Stematografija, David is called ‘car bolgarskij’ (Bulgarian Czar), but we should not assume that in the time of Žefarović, these were clues to relate him to the area that is now Bulgaria. Especially Vasiliev’s argumentation about the identity of Anna and Elena is extremely weak. He assumed they are Bulgarian saints, because they are present next to saints he himself labelled as Bulgarian. Looking for female saints of royal birth in Bulgarian history, he drew the conclusion that they must be a wife and the mother of Czar Ivan Asen II. One look at the Serbian orthodox calendar provides a more logical identification of all these saints: both a St. Anna and a St. Elena are present, next to a venerable (but no saint) David, a venerable Theoktist, and both a venerable and a saint Nikodim (see Serbian orthodox diocese of Raška and Prizren, Serbian church in history. Published on http://www.kosovo.com/socheng2.html). Given the large number of Serbian saints among the other portraits, it is much more likely that the saints on the illustrations were the Serbian ones. The fact that large parts of what is now Bulgaria were under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate in Peć, up to its abolishment in 1766, supports this conclusion.
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Apart from the Slavic communities in Vienna and Budapest, many people in the monasteries on the holy mountain of Athos and the metropoly of Sremski Karlovci were also attracted to the Illyrian idea. The Austrian powers were clearly unhappy about this thinking, since the Stematografija was put on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum.95

The engravings of Žefarović served as examples for copyists of the Bulgarian history of Paisij Hilendarski (see §5.3) who added them as illustrations to the text. In the manuscript with miscellaneous content known as Abtarov sbornik of 1842, Paisij’s Istorija was bound together with illustrations of the coats of arms of Turkey and Bulgaria from the Stematografija.96

The other Vienna imprint, Istorija raznyh slovenskih narodov, nai-pače Bolgarov, Horvator, Serbov (History of various Slavonic peoples, especially the Bulgarians, Croats and Serbs, 1794-1795) by Jovan Rajić, is an impressive work in four volumes. It is a historical work that integrates most of the Serbian historiographic work that was available in the time, and focuses especially on the medieval Serbian kingdom and on Serbian heroes. It also has a section on Bulgarian history. Jovan Rajić came from Karlovci in Habsburg Serbia, and his father Rajo (Radoslav) was from Vidin, in present-day Bulgaria.97 Rajić is known to have visited the monastery of Hilendar on Mount Athos in the middle of 1757, during his research for his history.98 It is not impossible that the Bulgarian monk Paisij was there at the time, and the suggestion has been made that Rajić inspired Paisij to write his history of the Bulgarians (see §5.3).99

Catholic missionary work continued in the eighteenth century in cities like Vienna, Zagreb and Novi Sad. Works by people like Georgi Pejačević and Krāštjo Pajkić continued the literary tradition that was started by Filip Stanislavov’s Abagar.100
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The Illyrian movement of the eighteenth century was to have a come-back in the nineteenth century, but then more as a political movement than as a cultural one. Also, it was mainly Croat in character, with Ljudevit Gaj as its leader. By that time, Croats had experienced political autonomy, since they had had their own Illyrian provinces during the Napoleonic area. In 1843, the use of the word ‘Illyrian’ was completely forbidden by the Habsburg government, and the movement lost impetus.

This new movement had a much smaller impact on the Bulgarians than the Serbian Illyrianism of the eighteenth century. Translations of the Illyrianist works of the eighteenth century continued to appear throughout the first half of the nineteenth century in Bulgarian, but then the idea disappeared from Bulgarian discourse, as it was marginalized by Venelin’s thesis that the ancestors of the Bulgarians were the Huns101.

§2.7 The Bulgarian Uniate movement

Later, in the nineteenth century, the ideas of the Illyrianistic catholic ‘activists’ were carried on by Bulgarian Uniates, whose aim it was to bring the Bulgarian church under the shelter of the pope in Rome, instead of the patriarch in Constantinople. They expected this to lead to the foundation of a new (Bulgarian) catholic millet in the Ottoman Empire, and thus to more autonomy for Bulgarians. A catholic millet, in which Armenians formed the majority, had been founded in 1831. After the church conflict inside the orthodox church had started to develop in the 1840s, this soon became the main focus around which Bulgarians joined forces (see also §5.5). From then on, Uniates were given little attention by other Bulgarian intellectuals, and their role became marginal. This may have been largely because of the position of Russia, which intended to keep the orthodox millet united. When in 1860, 120 Bulgarians in Istanbul, claiming to speak for 3000 Bulgarians proclaimed Union with Rome, Russia had their bishop Josif Sokolski kidnapped, after which the movement lost impetus.

The first Bulgarian grammar in German, which was based on an eastern Bulgarian dialect, was written and published in Vienna in 1852 by Dragan and Anton Cankov, who were supporters of the Uniate ideal102. The brothers Cankov were inspired to compose the grammar by the work of
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the respected Slavic philologist Franc Miklošić, who continued to study (old) Bulgarian and, while following Kopitar's Pannonian theory (see §8.5), suggested that Bulgarian, just like modern Slovene, could be a descendant from Old Slovene. In his foreword, Cankov explained why he thought it necessary to write the grammar:

Uns leitete bloss das lebhafte Verlangen, unsere geliebte Muttersprache, wie man sagt, in die Welt einzuführen, und ihr gegen manngfache Unbilden, die ihr von verschiedenen Seiten angethan wurden, gerechte Würdigung und Anerkennung zu verschaffen.

Speaking about 'Unbilden', Cankov comments on the idea that Bulgarian was a Scythic or Tatar language:

Es wird nämlich jedem kundigen Leser, namentlich aber jenen, die mit einer oder der andern slavischen Sprache vertraut sind, auf den ersten Blick in die Augen springen, dass die bulgarische Sprache ein Zweig jenes grossen und mächtigen Sprachstammes ist, den man mit dem Namen des slavischen bezeichnet. Die geringen Abweichungen, wie der Gebrauch des Artikels, der Mangel des Infinitivs, dürften wohl nicht dagegen entscheiden. Hoffentlich wird man nicht länger mehr Meinungen und Behauptungen hören müssen, welche die bulgarische Sprache für ein skythisches, tatarisches, und Gott weiss was noch für ein anderes Idiom, ausgaben.

It appears that Cankov, who had been a student in Kiev, Odessa and Vienna, was well informed about what was happening in the academic world in his time. For further reading about the Bulgarians, he referred his readers to the work Les slaves de Turquie by Cyprien Robert (see also §4.3), and to three books by Jurij Venelin (see §7.7): Drevnie i nynešnie Bolgare, O zarodyše novoj bolgarskoj literatury and Kritičeskie izsledovanija ob istorii Bolgar.

The Cankovs’ grammar did not receive much attention, due to the isolation of Uniate supporters in that time and their suggestion to write Bulgarian in the Latin alphabet. Dragan Cankov had plans to found a Bulgarian literary society and start a print shop in his home town Svištov, which is said to be the reason why he quit university and became typesetter. The print shop in Svištov was never realized because the outbreak of the Crimean war interfered with the plans.
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Cankov went to Istanbul where he became active as a teacher, journalist and printer. There he became the leader of the Uniate movement among the Bulgarians\textsuperscript{109}, and the leader of the 120 uniate supporters who signed the Union.

In 1869 and 1870, Anton Dobroslov published a *Kalindar* for the Bulgarians in the Banat area, which was printed with Latin letters at the print shop of the Mechitarists, an originally Armenian catholic order that had established a monastery in Vienna\textsuperscript{110} (see §8.4).

**Conclusions**

The greatest achievement of the catholic intellectuals of the seventeenth century for the Bulgarian national movement was that for the first time mention was made of a Bulgarian nation, consisting of people of different christian religions. This was at odds with the current concept of dividing people according to religion, ignoring ethnicity. This idea was not developed independently by Bulgarians or by Croats, but it was ‘contracted’, to use Sperber’s analogy with illnesses, from examples elsewhere in Europe. The links with Rome were instrumental: Rome was a major city in which people from all ethnicities were meeting.

This idea of a Bulgarian nationality was consolidated by the creation of national histories. This Bulgarian historiographical tradition came into being after being influenced from Rome, and later by Croat and Serb scholars. The tradition was as yet abortive and intermittent. It spread among Bulgarians only in a restricted region. When the role of the catholic community in the Ottoman Empire weakened, this idea was not communicated anymore, and it ceased to be a cultural representation, in Sperber’s words.

It did not disappear completely, however, and when the *Vâzraždane* started, in the nineteenth century, it was taken up again. Then catholic Bulgarians claimed a separate millet, to gain independence from the Patriarchate. Until this period, the role that catholics played among Bulgarians was marginal.
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3: Bulgaria in the eighteenth century

Before separate nations started to develop their profiles, the population of the Ottoman Empire was basically divided into two groups: Muslims and non-Muslims. In the orthodox group, the predominant language and culture were Greek, just as it had been in Byzantine times. In this chapter, an analysis is attempted of the cultural landscape of the eighteenth century, and of the options (or lack thereof) Bulgarians had to express a national identity. Until the eighteenth century, Bulgarians were relatively well off in the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman defters (census records) show a population growth over the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. Especially villages and towns which were exempt from certain taxes, developed into thriving cultural centres.

Agriculture benefited to the Bulgarian economy. In Macedonia, cotton and tobacco were grown and trade flourished. Indeed, as early as 1729, Macedonian cotton was sold on the market of Leipzig.111

Cities like Sofia, Plovdiv, Ruse, Veliko Tarnovo and many others prospered through the efficient system of esnafs (guilds) and the growing trade with the Levant and Central Europe112. In these cities, people of different ethnic groups co-existed peacefully113.

§3.1 Greek or Bulgarian? The concept of nationality

As mentioned in §2.1, Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire were part of the same millet as the Greeks, and intellectual Bulgarians were part of the same ‘common society’ as intellectuals from other orthodox groups114. Therefore, there was, in contrast to the Serbian case, no Bulgarian national church to provide what Hobsbawm labels ‘protonationalism’, for instance through the cult of national saints115. Until 1767, there remained one archiepiscopate which was Bulgarian in name, in Ohrid, in what is now Macedonia. However the servants of this archiepiscopate were also
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hellenised, the higher clergy was exclusively Greek, in the social, not the ethnic meaning of the word\textsuperscript{116}, and the population was mixed Slav-Greek. This archiepiscopate had jurisdiction over a part of the eparchies in the southwest of the Bulgarian lands\textsuperscript{117}, and relative autonomy in appointing priests and bishops and collecting church taxes. As a consequence, the Patriarch in Constantinople did not have direct control over those Bulgarian villages. Furthermore the (north)western parts of Bulgaria were until 1766 under jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarchate in Peć, which was largely Slav-speaking.

Given the central place of religion in defining the people of the Ottoman Empire, the concept of nationality did not carry the same connotations as it does today. In the twenty-first century, the terms Bulgarian, Romanian and Greek are used to denote a person’s birthplace or state of origin. In the period that concerns this study, until well into the nineteenth century, notions of nationality were much looser and tended to indicate the cultural sphere with which people were associated. Notably, the word ‘Bulgarian’ did exist in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, but as an ethnonym, just like ‘Slav’\textsuperscript{118}. They were used by the catholic missionaries. ‘Greek’ was an indication of someone’s religion and social status.

It has been argued that the Ottoman Turks exerted pressure on the Bulgarians to convert to Islam and start to speak Turkish. There was however no obligation to do so and although stories about forced conversions to Islam do exist\textsuperscript{119}, these were exceptions rather than the rule\textsuperscript{120}. It was nevertheless forbidden for converted Bulgarians to speak languages other than Turkish with the mufti. Furthermore, some people converted to Islam in name, but continued to baptise their children as Christians, and used their muslim names only in front of state officials\textsuperscript{121}. This phenomenon is known as cryptochristianity.

Slav inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire often converted to Islam to have a career in the civil service. There was no Turkish hereditary elite, but a meritocratic one, so converts could reach high positions. At one time, Slavic even rivalled Turkish as a court language\textsuperscript{122}. Some converted to avoid being treated as second-class civilians, as non-muslims had no access to the civil service, the army, and their testimony in court was considered weaker than that of muslims: testimony of one

\textsuperscript{116} Angelov, Bălgarskata narodnost, 262.
\textsuperscript{117} Ivan Snegarov, Istorija na Ohridskata arhiepiskopija-patriašija. Ot padaneto i pod turcite do nejnoto uništoženie (Sofia: Makedonski Naucen Institut, 1932), 165-181.
\textsuperscript{118} Angelov, Bălgarskata narodnost, 151.
\textsuperscript{119} Gandev, Bălgarski jat narod, 61.
\textsuperscript{120} Crampton, A concise history, 36; Raymond Detrez, Historical dictionary of Bulgaria (Lanham: The scarecrow press, 1997). [European historical dictionaries, 16.], 230.
\textsuperscript{121} Angelov, Bălgarskata narodnost, 258-259.
muslim witness overruled that of three non-muslims. Furthermore Christians and Jews were not allowed to ride horses, wear green clothes or build churches over a certain height and paid more taxes, supposedly for not performing military service.\textsuperscript{123}

Other Bulgarians learned Greek to advance socially. The name Greek could be used for any orthodox inhabitant of the Ottoman Empire, even one who did not speak Greek. Similarly the name Turk could be used for all Ottoman Muslims, even for Albanians, Bulgarians and Bosnians.\textsuperscript{124} During the Ottoman period fifteen patriarchs of Constantinople were ethnic Bulgarians.\textsuperscript{125} Atanas Bogoridi and Petar Beron (see §4.2 and §4.5) called themselves Greeks, which while sounding strange to modern ears, did not surprise their contemporaries.

It was customary for Bulgarian merchants to use Greek in their trade contacts, and present themselves as Greeks when they were abroad. With the increasing trade of Bulgarians abroad in the late eighteenth century, these Bulgarians started to form a new Bulgarian philhellenic elite. The process of hellenisation among Bulgarians intensified. Bulgarians started to use Greek in communications with other Bulgarians as well. Greek became the language of the Bulgarian urban elite. Bulgarian was still spoken, but in the private rather than in the public sphere, by the women and children.\textsuperscript{126} The identification with the Greeks went so far that Bulgarians from the city took it as an offence to be called a Bulgarian. Peasants, for their part, used the word Grăk (Greek) as an abusive term for citizens dressed in bourgeois clothing.\textsuperscript{127}

An example of a Bulgarian identifying himself as Greek is an inscription in a church in Timișoara, Romania. A certain Zlatko, definitely not a Greek name, from the north Bulgarian city of Gabrovo, who contributed to the building of this church, is labelled as follows: ‘Εσύστησε Ζλάτκος φιλογενής έλλην από Γάμπροβον\textsuperscript{128} (This was built [by] Zlatkos, Greek patriot from Gabrovon).

Furthermore, of some people it is not possible to state their nationality, simply because the idea of nationality as we think of it now did not exist yet. In the twentieth century, scholars have often debated about the nationality of nineteenth century public figures. The historiographer
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Atanas Nešković (see §8.2), for instance, who was active during the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century was ‘claimed’ by both Serbian and Bulgarian scholars.

§3.2 Kârdžalijstvo

The period of political stability in the Ottoman Empire came to an end in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries with a period of anarchy called *kârdžalijstvo*. Then a few ayans (local lords) defied the central rule of the Sultan. These pašas turned their area of responsibility into a personal fiefdom. They employed bands of roaming Ottoman soldiers and janissaries (Ottoman elite troops) to collect taxes for them. These bandits, called *kârdžalijas*, plundered the villages, raped and used weapons against the peasants. The central government in Istanbul lost all control over these areas. The best known of these ayans were Ali Paša of Ioannina and Paša Osman Pazvantoglu of Vidin, who controlled over 200 villages around Vidin129, but there were many more. In this time of *kârdžalijstvo*, about 250,000 Bulgarians fled their country to Walachia, Moldavia, the Habsburg Empire and the south of Russia130.

The kârdžalijstvo was also the time of hajduks. Hajduks were highwaymen who plundered merchants and anyone else carrying valuables. They shared their wealth occasionally with the local population from which they originated and in turn received assistance from them, ranging from food, shelter and care for their wounded. Hajduks are, comparable to Greek klephts, present in many folk songs and in literature, depicted as the true representatives of the nation. This image of outlaws preserving a suppressed national identity, exists also elsewhere in Europe, the best-known example being Robin Hood.

§3.3 Education

In the seventeenth and eighteenth century, the Bulgarian educational system was poorly developed. Education was restricted to Greek or Bulgarian-language monastery or cell schools (kililno učilište

---
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in Bulgarian), or secular Greek schools. In a cell school, monks taught a limited number of skills that were needed for a career in church: reading liturgical Greek or Old Church Slavonic, writing, learning liturgical texts by heart and church singing\textsuperscript{131}. This form of education was not restricted to monks in monasteries, there were also priests in villages who were teaching in this way as well. Taksidiots (travelling monks) of the larger monasteries opened cell schools in villages, and some lay teachers, called daskal, taught in the same way. Some towns had secular Greek schools\textsuperscript{132}. In the seventeenth century, the number of cell schools in Bulgaria rose\textsuperscript{133}.

In the eighteenth century, a small start was made to introduce secular topics to Bulgarian education, with subjects that were already part of the curriculum in Greek schools. For example, Jovan Rajić’s work (see §2.6), translated by Atanas Nešković (see §8.2), was used to teach history\textsuperscript{134}.

After finishing primary school, the only possible secondary education for a Bulgarian child was at the Greek academies. These academies, modern schools that were not religious in character but focussed on studying the Classics, had been founded in the second half of the eighteenth century. The first one was established on the Isle of Patmos in 1733 by Makarios Kalogerias. It turned into an important cultural centre for the Greeks; among others Emmanuil Xanthos, one of the founders of the \textit{Filiki Eta"iria}, went to study there, as did the later Patriarch Gregory V. A strong supporter of the academies, which gradually spread throughout the Balkans, was the intellectual Adamantios Korais.

In addition to the schools and academies, scholarly publications were also much more widely available in Greek (the language of culture) than in Bulgarian. This is also because there were few people with the skills to translate from the Greek, and those that did have the ability chose not to because they thought their mother language, being archaic and limited in vocabulary, was not fit for scholarly literature. Deemed unsuitable for translations of modern abstract texts, Bulgarian was thus used mainly in church.

§3.4 Moschopolis

One very famous Greek academy was that in Moschopolis, a city now called Voskopoja in the south of Albania. It was a cultural centre of hellenised Vlachs, but it also had far-reaching influence
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in the region, playing an important role in modernising the spiritual and cultural life of the entire Balkan peninsula, until its partial destruction by the Albanians in 1769.

The school of Moschopolis, which was founded in the beginning of the sixteenth century and was supported by rich tradesmen, became a grammar school in 1744 and from 1750 it went by the name of New Academy. In 1720, a Greek print house was set up in the city\textsuperscript{135} to provide the Academy with grammars and text books. This was the second Greek publisher in the Ottoman Empire, after the Patriarchal Press in Istanbul, and the first secular one. It is in Moschopolis that pope Daniil, a writer about whom little is known, wrote a famous four-language book, intended for the students of the school. This book, called \textit{Eisagogiki didaskalia}\textsuperscript{136} (Introductory education) in short, or even shorter \textit{Tetraglosson}, contains a dictionary of Greek, Bulgarian (the earliest known dictionary of Bulgarian), Albanian and Vlah-Romanian. In the foreword, the author encourages his readers to become Greeks, in the eighteenth century meaning of the word:

\begin{align*}
\text{Αλβανοί, Βλάχοι, Βούλγαροι, Αλλόγλωσσοι,} & \quad \text{Albanians, Bulgars, Vlachs and all who} \\
\text{χαρήτε Κ΄ ετομασθήτε όλοι σας,} & \quad \text{now speak an alien tongue, rejoice,}
\\
\text{Ρωμαίοι να γενήτε Βαρβαρικήν αφήνοντες} & \quad \text{prepare}
\\
\text{γλώσσαν, ψωνήν κ’ ἡθη} & \quad \text{to make you Greek.}
\\
\text{Οποιο προφάνω επογόνω σας} & \quad \text{Change your barbaric tongue,}
\\
\text{να φαίνωνται σαν μύθοι.} & \quad \text{your customs rude forego,}
\\
\end{align*}

\text{Οποιο προφάνω επογόνω σας} & \quad \text{so that as bygone myths}
\\
\text{να φαίνωνται σαν μύθοι.} & \quad \text{your children may them know.}^{138}

The book was written by Danil, who called himself Moisiodax, (Moesian-Dacian) and intended for Bulgarian, Vlach and Albanian pupils, who would benefit from their knowledge of Greek in their trade\textsuperscript{139}.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 29.
\textsuperscript{136} The full title is \textit{Εισαγωγική Διδασκαλία περιέχουσα Λεξικόν Τετράγλωσσον των τεσσάρων κοινών διαλέκτων, ήτοι της απλής Ρωμαϊκής, της εν Μοισία Βλαχικής, της Βουλγαρικής και της Αλβανικής 'Introductory education, containing a dictionary of four common languages, being Colloquial Greek, Walachian of Moesia, Bulgarian and Albanian'.}
\textsuperscript{137} Daniil Moschopolites, \textit{Eisagogike didaskalia} (Venice, 1802), 5.
\textsuperscript{139} Penev, Načalo, 318.
In the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the Patriarchate in Constantinople started to centralise. In 1767, the Ohrid archiepiscopate was dissolved (formally, archiepiscopos Arsenij resigned his position\textsuperscript{140}) and direct control of the Bulgarian eparchies taken. This followed the disbandment of the Serbian patriarchate in Peć a year before in 1766. From that moment, the position of the Slav religious communities became weaker. The higher positions in the church hierarchy, both close to the Patriarch in Constantinople and in the archiepiscopates outside the capital, were taken by Greeks from one influential elite: the Phanariots.

The Phanariots originally took their name from the Fener-district of Istanbul. Later people who were born elsewhere, but were active in these circles were also called Phanariots. This elite provided most of the higher officials in the orthodox church. Many princes of the Danubian principalities in the eighteenth and nineteenth century came from this class. Bulgarian studies habitually speak of Phanariots in a broader sense, that is every Greek person fulfilling a high position in the church. During the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, when the Ottoman Empire weakened economically and politically, it was common for the Patriarch, metropolitans and other high church officials to misuse their power. They consecrated more priests than were needed, often without regard for the capacities of the candidate, in order to collect more bribes from the candidates. Higher priests collected different taxes from the inhabitants of the eparchies\textsuperscript{141}. In some cases, when the people could not pay, their churches were sealed, and the servants of the officials pillaged the houses of the villagers\textsuperscript{142}. After the dissolution of the patriarchate of Peć and the archiepiscopate of Ohrid, the Patriarch banned the use of Bulgarian and Serbian in the churches and in schools.

The respected Bulgarian scholar Bojan Penev\textsuperscript{143} has suggested that it was in the interest of the Phanariots that the Bulgarian lower priest and the entire population remained uneducated or even illiterate. That way, it would remain easy to exploit them. It is, however, not likely that there was a conspiracy to keep Bulgarians uneducated, as the misuse of power by Greek church officials was not restricted to Bulgarian villages. Serb and Greek rural populations faced just as much

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{140} Snegarov, Istorija, 149.
  \item \textsuperscript{141} Crampton, A concise history, 45.
  \item \textsuperscript{142} Constantin Jos. Jireček, Geschichte der Bulgaren (Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1977 [1876]), 512.
  \item \textsuperscript{143} Penev, Načalo, 214.
\end{itemize}
unjustified taxing and as many bad priests\textsuperscript{144}. Rather, it would appear to be more a matter of wealth: after all the Phanariots in the higher ranks of the church had paid large bribes to reach their high positions. They thus needed a way to enlarge their incomes, since given the economic and political problems of the time they could lose their posts or be banished from one day to the next. Other Phanariots were great patriots and supported the education, of which also Bulgarian pupils benefited.

To understand how this period was understood by the people of the time, and how this understanding was transferred to later times, it is useful to review the biography of one intellectual Bulgarian of the beginning of the nineteenth century, Sofronij Vračanski, who was the first member of an important Bulgarian family that made its way into the Phanariot elite. Despite his Bulgarian origin, Sofronij made a career in the higher ranks of the orthodox church. As status was hereditary within Phanariot society, two of Sofronij’s grandchildren profited from their grandfather’s elevation making an impressive progress within the Greek-Ottoman society, one of them as an intellectual and the other as a diplomat (see §4.2).

Sofronij Vračanski was born in 1739 under the name of Stojko Vladislavov in the town of Kotel, a centre of craft and trade in the Balkan mountains. As many of the inhabitants here travelled around, they had a comparatively good knowledge of the world around them. The city also had a rich tradition in education. In 1741 the first school of Bulgaria was opened in Kotel, providing education according to the tradition of the monastery cell.

Sofronij’s father was a celep (dželep in Bulgarian); he earned his living trading animals in Constantinople. Sofronij had a thorough education for the time at the local school, where he studied for four years from when he was nine years old. He became an orphan at the age of 13, and an uncle and aunt raised him. But they too died after some years, leaving their nephew with their debts, in addition to the ones that he had inherited from his father\textsuperscript{145}.

Vladislavov, who was married by then, had little choice but to find employment. He planned to start working as a day labourer, but the opportunity arose to become a priest. After an initiative by the local čorbadžijas, the wealthiest and most influential inhabitants of Kotel, he was consecrated in 1762. In his autobiography, there is a description of this event, which illustrates the indifferent attitude of the higher clergy toward the lower priests:

И намислих да оставя и дом, и жена, да отида долу до селата да работя да се оправя. И чули някои от най-първите чорбаджии, че искам да ида, повикаха ме и рекоха:

\textsuperscript{144} G.F. Abbott. The tale of a tour in Macedonia (London: E.Arnold, 1903), quoted in Vermeulen, 245.
\textsuperscript{145} Todorov, Българско възраждане XVIII, 154.
- Не ходи никъде, седи тука, тия дни ще дойде нашият владика, и да му се примолим да те направи свещеник.
И на третия ден дойде архиерей, и му се примолиха, и той тозчас благоволи да ме хиротониса в неделя. И дахода му седемдесет грош. Ала това заплащане стана в сряда, и аз си готвех потребното за в неделя. В петък вечерта дойде икономът и ми върна парите и рече:
- Да знаеш, че няма да те направи владиката свещеник, защото друг даде сто и петдесет грош — тогава ще да хиротониса
Ами каква скъб и жалост ми обзе, като бях се изповядал на духовника и бях си взел мартория и всичко потребно си бях приготвил. Ами кому да изкажа тази моя скъб? Прибягах до ония човеци, шо бяха молили и дали парите, и те отидоха и дахода още тридесет грош, и ръкоположи ме в лето 1762-о, 1 септември 146.

And I thought about leaving my house, and wife, and go down to the villages to work in order to survive. But when some of the first čorbadžijas heard that I wanted to leave, they called me and spoke:
-Don't go anywhere, stay here, these days our bishop will come, and let us ask him to make you a priest.
And the third day the archierej came, and they asked him and he immediately agreed to sanctify me. And they gave him seventy groschen. This payment was on Wednesday, and I was preparing everything that was needed for Sunday. On Friday evening the ikononomos came and returned me the money and said:
-Know, that the bishop will not make you a priest, because someone else gave 150 groschen— he will sanctify him.
What grief and pity took hold of me, when I had taken the vows of a priest, had taken my martorium and everything that was needed I had prepared. But to who should I speak about my grief? I ran to these people that had asked me and had given the money, and they went and gave thirty groschen more, and he sanctified me in the year 1762, the first of September.

After the consecration Vladislavov worked as a teacher in and near his native city. He started out with a small cell school at his house. In 1768, after the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war, Sofronij went on a six-month journey to the holy mountain of Athos, where he spent his time in a community of Bulgarian monks. When he came back, he started a public school, to which he had been invited by the church board. He taught for twenty years, according to his autobiography. Sofronij taught with Greek textbooks, but explained the lessons in Bulgarian to his pupils 147. In the church as well, he gradually replaced Greek with Bulgarian.

Sofronij faced much misfortune. The bishop of Šumen forbade him to practise as a priest for six years when he had asked for assistance from local traditional healers. He was also imprisoned by the Turkish authorities after being accused of allowing illegal sales of sheep in his

146  Sofronij Vračanski, Žitje i stradanija grešnago Sofronija (Veliko Tărnovo: Slovo, 1999), 19.
house. Following the Russian victory against the Turks in 1774, Sofronij fled from Kotel\textsuperscript{148}. Some of the places where he lived and preached afterwards were Karnobat, to the southeast of Kotel, and Karabunar, to the northwest of Plovdiv.

As part of his work as a priest, Sofronij was active as a philologist. He copied several Middle Bulgarian damascins, religious anthologies modelled after the \textit{Thisatros Damaskinou ypodiakonou ke stouditou tou Thessalonikeos} (Treasury of Damascin, the subdeacon and stoudit of Thessaloniki) of the sixteenth century Greek writer Damaskinos Studitis. Translations and adaptations were very popular in Bulgaria, especially in the eighteenth century. In 1765, Sofronij was the first one to copy the history of Paisij Hilendarski (see §5.3). According to legend, he deposited this copy in the Church of St. Peter and Paul in Kotel and protected it with the curse: ‘Should anyone steal this book, may he be anathemised, and may steel and stone turn into dust but his body never’\textsuperscript{149}.

In 1768 he wrote \textit{Časoslov} (Horologium), a book of liturgical texts. It was intended to be used in schools to teach children to read and have them learn the text by heart. Realising that children were not able to understand difficult religious texts if they were written in Church Slavonic, Sofronij composed his book of simple prayers in the colloquial language of his pupils\textsuperscript{150}.

When his second son Conko died\textsuperscript{151}, Sofronij took his three young grandsons Stefan, Georgi and Atanas in his home. Together, they went to the village of Arbanasi, where he became igumen (abbot) of the Kapinovski monastery in 1789. This post was offered to him by the čorbadžijas of the nearby city of Elena.

Significantly, Arbanasi had a special status within the Ottoman Empire. It was exempt from paying tax to Istanbul, which made it a refuge for wealthy merchants, Greek, Bulgarian and Vlah. In the late eighteenth century it was the favourite summer resort of the metropolitans of the nearby Târnovo and of Walachia\textsuperscript{152} and the episcopes of Preslav, Červen, Loveč, and Vraca.

Through connections with people in Arbanasi, Sofronij was invited to fill the position of episcopate of Vraca in 1794. Sofronij at first turned down the invitation, partly because he was old - he was 54 years old at the time – but also because the eparchy of Vraca was divided into many small villages which meant much work. His son and sons-in-law however, wealthy and influential merchants by that time, insisted, because they wanted to have a bishop as father. Eventually
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Sofronij agreed, persuaded not only by his offspring but also by the argument of an archdeacon named Theodosij:

Слушай – рече – отче, ние слугуваме по двадесет години, та не можем да се удостоим да приемем архиерейство, а други откуп дават и молители пращат. А тебе е донел този дар без слугуване, без откуп и без молители!\(^{153}\)

Listen, he said, father, we have served twenty years, and we cannot be worthy to take the rank of archierej, and others give bribes and sent people to plead for them. And this gift has come to you without doing the service for it, without bribe and without champions!

In 1794, Sofronij was consecrated as bishop. Before he left for Vraca, he sent his grandsons off to Bucharest to study at the Bejska Akademija, an elite school (see §4.1). Through the Vlah population of Arbanasi, there was a strong link between the village and Bucharest.

Occurring during the kărdžalijstvo, which lasted from 1770 to the beginning of the nineteenth century (see §3.2), it would appear that Sofronij’s consecration was due to the lack of other candidates. Apparently, because of the political instability, no Phanariot was to be found in Istanbul or in the province who wanted to pay the sum that was required for the post.

Vladislavov was installed on September 16\(^{th}\), 1794, taking the name of Sofronij Vračanski on this occasion. He did not spend great lengths of time in his eparchy, though, as the constant attacks of kărdžalijas and outbreaks of the plague kept him away. This created many problems as he was not able to collect the taxes that he was obliged to hand over to the Synod. In his autobiography, Sofronij described his situation as follows:

Епархиита се разсипа, села не останаха, изгориха ги кърджалиите и пазвантските хайдуци, хората се разбягаха по Влашко и по други страни, а Синодът не вярва, иска всичко напълно, и не е възможно да изляза наглава с тая епархия и с тоя дълг!\(^{154}\)

The eparchy has fallen apart, there do not remain any villages, the kărdžalijas and the hajduks of Pazvan burnt them, the people have fled to Walachia and other countries, and the Synod does not believe this, wants to have everything completely, and it is not possible to cope with this eparchy and these debts.

From 1800 until 1802, Sofronij was held as a captive in Vidin, the capital of Paşa Pazvantoglu. The Greek metropolitan, Kallinikos, kept him there as a quasi-slave, making him do the administration of the metropolis. As soon as he was able to flee from Vidin, Sofronij went to join his grandsons in Bucharest, abandoning his eparchy for good.

154 Sofronij, Žitie i stradanija, 42.
From 1803, Sofronij worked in Walachia. He stayed in the house of the metropolitan of Hungro-Walachia Dositheos Filitis, who also mediated in relieving Sofronij of his eparchy in Vraca. In Bucharest with its many libraries, Sofronij could finish the works that he had started in Vidin.

In 1806 in Bucharest, Sofronij published *Kiriakodromion, sireč Nedelnik poučenije* (Kiriakodromion, that is Sunday homiliary), the first orthodox book ever printed in Bulgarian. It was a translation of the Greek work, called *Kyriakodromion Ay* by Nikphoros Theotokis. In a letter inviting a group of merchants to publish the text, Sofronij stated that it was his aim to write a book which could be read in church and be understood by the masses, who were largely uneducated. This aim is also reflected in the extended title of the book, which states that the book is written ‘na bolgarskij prostij jazik […] k razumeniju prostomu narodu’ (in simple Bulgarian […] for the understanding by the simple people). Although the book was expensive and literacy low among Bulgarians of the day, the thousand copies of the book that were printed sold quickly.

In 1804, Sofronij founded a Committee for the Liberation of Bulgaria, which existed until 1812. This committee was in contact with the Russian government and supported the Russian troops in Bulgaria during the Russo-Turkish war of 1806-1812. At this time Sofronij travelled into Bulgaria with the Russians, appealing to trust them and receive them with hospitality, as they would bring liberation. Sofronij also protected Bulgarian refugees during this war.

Because of his support to the Russians, it was obvious that Sofronij could not stay in Bulgaria after the war had ended. He therefore travelled with the Russian troops back into Walachia and then on to Bucharest, where he stayed until the end of his life. The exact date and
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156 Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez părvara polovina, 277.
157 The Abagar (see chapter 3) had been published long before, although not everyone considers it to be written in Bulgarian. It is possible that Sofronij’s work was not the first orthodox work either. A work called Molitvennyj Krin, printed in Buda, possibly appeared earlier in that year. However, it would seem that no copy of this book has survived until recently, which is problematic. See: Grigorii K. Venediktov, "O pervoj novobolgaskoj pečatnoj knige", in Typographia universitatis Hungarica Budae 1777-1848. (Actes du colloque intitulé: 'A budai Egyetemi Nyomda szerepe a kelet-európai népek kulturális társadalmi és politikai feljödésében' le rôle de l'imprimerie universitaire de Buda dans le développement culturel, social et politique des peuples d'Europe centre-orientale, ed. P. Király (Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977), 187-94.
159 Narod can mean either ‘people’ or ‘nation’. Sofronij most likely hinted at the first.
160 For an image of the cover page see Todorov, Bălgarsko vazraždane XVIII, 152.
162 It was simply called ‘Komitet za osvoboždenieto na Bălgarija’ (Committee for the liberation of Bulgaria). Ivan Radev, Enciklopedija, 684.
163 Genčev, Bălgarskata vazroždenska inteligencija. Enciklopedija, 604.
cause of Sofronij’s death is not known, but as no documents by or about him are known after 1813, it is assumed that he died in that year.

After his death, Sofronij was almost forgotten, but he re-emerged in Bulgarian discourse in the book *O zarodyše novoj bolgarskoj literatury*, written by the Russian scholar Viktor Grigorović (see §7.5) in 1838. Later, Jurij Venelin (see §7.7) referred to Sofronij ‘Nezaboravennij vračanski episkop Sofronij’ (The unforgotten episcop of Vraca Sofronij)\(^{164}\), and Georgi Rakovski published Sofronij’s autobiography in his magazine *Dunavski Lebed*\(^{165}\). From then, Sofronij was seen as an important figure for the Bulgarian nation. In 1856 a second edition of the *Kiria kodromion* was printed in Novi Sad\(^{166}\), and third and fourth editions followed in 1865\(^{167}\) and 1868\(^{168}\), indicating that Sofronij became a well-known and well-read author once again.

In the 1880s, the then famous poet and patriot Petko Slavejkov was working on a biography of Sofronij Vračanski. In a letter to Emanuil Bogoridi, son of Nikola Bogoridi Konaki, grandson of Stefan Bogoridi and great-grandson of Sofronij, Slavejkov wrote:

> Аз смело мога да ви се препоръчвам като неизменен привърженик на фамилията Bogoridievci. Родоначалникът на вашата фамилия...Софроний, с делата и деянията на когото съм запознат още от крехката си младост, те са имали най-голямо и плодотворно влияние на моето развитие\(^{169}\).

> I can boldly recommend myself to you as an unaltered supporter of the family Bogoridievci. The primogenitor of your family...Sofronij, with whose works and actions I am familiar from my tender youth, and have had a very large and fruitful influence on my development.

In his biography, Slavejkov reaffirmed the positive views of Sofronij that were current in his time. It was likely that the tone of his work was nevertheless influenced by his own predicament: in 1881, in the then autonomous Bulgarian princedom, Slavejkov was denied the right to teach. He crossed the Balkan mountains to Eastern Rumelia, which was still Turkish, where he found shelter in the

---


\(^{165}\) Genčev, *Bălgarsko vzravždane*, 15.

\(^{166}\) The second edition was adapted since the original was, as was stated in the subtitle of the second edition, ‘mnogo nerazumitelno’, ‘incomprehensible and now copied and corrected into pure Bulgarian language by the Svištev teacher Teodor Teodorov Hruljuv’.

\(^{167}\) A. Granitski, *Evangelie poučitelno za sičkite nedeli prez godinata, za gospodski i bogorodični praznici i za po-golemite svijatii*. Sábral ot slavjanski i ot græčski Sofronij, episkop Vračanski, rodom kotleneč, i sačinil na bălgarskij jazik v 1806, a sega pregledeno i popraveno ot A. Granitskago, a napečatano ot Petra Stojanova, târnovčanina. V. Bukešte v knjigocetnijata na Stefan Rasideskuva, 1865 (Bucharest, 1865).


capital Plovdiv under the protection of governor-general Aleksandăr Bogoridi, Emanuil’s uncle and grandson of Sofronij.

Conclusions

This chapter shows that in the eighteenth century, there was little literacy or anything resembling a public sphere in which Bulgarians could express their ideas. The few Bulgarian men of letters that existed were completely immersed in the Greek cultural sphere, where the term ‘Greek’ referred to the ‘common society’ of all orthodox peoples of the Ottoman Empire.

Sofronij Vračanski did plan to translate liturgical texts into Bulgarian for ordinary folk, and indeed made a number of translations, but he did not present himself explicitly as a Bulgarian. Following the Ottoman model, he identified himself primarily as orthodox. His concern for the ordinary people was more in the line of the orthodox church policy than nationalist. Only towards the end of his life Sofronij shifted from this position, whereby he added what seems like political nationalism to his cultural nationalism of before. Then he considered himself in the first instance to be Bulgarian and at this time, he started to seek assistance from the Russian Czar to liberate Bulgarians. Although this could still be regarded as protecting orthodoxy, it can also be seen as a nationalist pursuit.

Sofronij’s work was at that time only available to Bulgarians in Walachia, and it did not reach Bulgarians south of the Danube. He was a solitary figure and had no immediate impact on the developing of a Bulgarian national identity.

For the generation that followed him, however, he turned out to carry a great symbolic value. This was because then Bulgarians were more organised, and had more possibilities to exchange ideas in a network.
4: Secular Bulgarian-Greek contacts

As noted in the previous chapter there was no ‘Bulgarian’ cultural life in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Bulgarians were not visible as such in the public sphere. There are, however, a number of intellectuals from the Bulgarian lands who were successful among the Greeks. In this chapter, I introduce some of them and describe the cultural atmosphere in which they grew up. I also discuss the Greek educational system of the nineteenth century, which differed from the Greek education of the century before, as discussed in chapter 3. Furthermore, the European discourse about Greeks during this time is described.

§4.1 The Princely Academy of Bucharest

At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, Greek philologists were greatly influenced by the Enlightenment, and adopted what one may call (in Viroli’s sense of the word), a ‘patriot attitude’170. Although the political thought of the Enlightenment did not gain a foothold on the Balkans, cultural and educational issues were very influential. Modern sciences were introduced in the school curriculums, and there were many discussions about them in the new magazines171.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Greek academy of Bucharest, also known under the Romanian name Academia Domneasca (princely academy), or in Bulgarian Bejska akademija (academy of the bej) emerged as a very important cultural centre, like Moschopolis in the previous century. Founded in the last decade of the seventeenth century, probably by Prince Constantin Brâncoveanu, it was ranked among the best schools of the Balkan peninsula. The academy was led by the renowned Greek teachers Lambros Fotiadis (1795-1805), Konstantinos Vardalachos (1805-1815 and 1820-1821), Neofytos Doukas (1815-1818) and Veniamin Lesvios (1818-1820).

170 Viroli, For love of country, 2.
In 1776, the school’s curriculum was modernised\textsuperscript{172}. Both classical and modern Greek were used in the classroom. Sometimes, especially in the case of the natural sciences, lessons were taught through the medium of a modern foreign language. In 1810, new subjects were introduced by metropolitan Ignatios of Walachia and the head of the school, Konstantinos Vardalachos, including Russian, German, metaphysics, mathematics and experimental physics\textsuperscript{173}. At this time, the school consisted of 12 staff and 250 pupils, who spent an average of four years there. The school attracted not only Greek, but also Walachian, Serb and Bulgarian pupils. In the case of ethnic Bulgarians, most students came from Bucharest, but there were also some children who attended from south of the Danube. The Academy gave scholarships for talented pupils, and for an intelligent Bulgarian child who did not have rich parents, this was the only possibility to receive a higher education.

Many of the graduates of the Bucharest Academy went to Vienna for further study or to carry out their profession, so that the ties between the Greek cultural elite in Bucharest and the Greek colony in Vienna were close. This link has been of great importance not only for the Greek, but for the Bulgarian cultural elite as well. This can especially be seen in the example of Atanas Bogoridi (see §4.2)

In July 1810, pupils and teachers of the Academy, including Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos (of whom more is said in §4.2 and §4.3) founded the literary Filologiki Etairia (Philological society) or Graikodakiki Etairia (Greco-Dacian society). Its first president was Grigoriij Brăncoveanu, and metropolitan Ignatios of Walachia was among the founding members. The society was closely connected to the school and held its meetings in its festival hall, which was decorated with scenes from the Iliad and the Odyssey, portraits of erudite Greeks, the Russian Czar and his mother\textsuperscript{174}.

The Greco-Dacian society was also closely involved in the publication of the Greek magazine Ermis o Logios (Hermes the Scholar), also known as Logios Ermis, that was printed in Vienna\textsuperscript{175}. People who were working at the school provided material for the magazine, and the teacher Vardalachos was responsible for its distribution in Walachia.

\textsuperscript{172} The programme was since then composed of four cycles of three years each with the following subjects: 1) grammar, receptive knowledge of Latin, 2) Latin and classical Greek and knowledge of the classics, 3) idem, and also poetics, rhetoric and French or Italian, 4) Geometry, arithmetic, history and geography.

\textsuperscript{173} V. Beševliev, “Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo kato klasik i filolog”, Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, istoričeski i filologičeski fakultet, XXXVIII (1941) #3: 7.


During the first meeting of the society, metropolitan Ignatios called for the members to publish original or translated works to enlighten both the Greek and Romanians. At the fourth meeting, Vardalchos presented his textbook of physics and chemistry, and Pikkolos his translation of Rousseau’s *Émile ou de l’éducation*[^176]. The society folded after the peace of Bucharest in 1812, two years after its establishment.

The Bulgarian scholars Stefan and Atanas Bogoridi, Nikolaos Pikkolos and Petar Beron who are discussed below, all went to the school in Bucharest during the directorship of Konstantinos Vardalchos (1775-1830), who was head of the school from 1805 until 1815 and from 1820 to 1821. Vardalchos, a personal friend of statesman Ioannis Kapodistrias[^177], was a renowned pedagogue and encyclopaedist and firmly believed in the ideal of Enlightenment, that all scientific disciplines should be studied as one complex whole. The fact that one of the most precious possessions of the school in his time was a copy of the famous French encyclopaedia by Diderot and D’Alembert, illustrates this stance[^178].

In 1817, Vardalchos went to teach on the island of Chios[^179]. The island was Ottoman territory, but because of the strategic trade in mastic, it enjoyed a considerable amount of liberty. After a short time he moved to Odessa, a city with a large and very active Greek society, to become director of the Greek grammar school there in 1819.

It was probably in Odessa that Vardalchos learned about the allilodidactic method of Bell/Lancaster, which was used successfully by the Greek teacher and playwright in the city, Georgios Lassanis. In this method, older pupils assisted the teachers in instructing the younger ones. This method had been described and discussed in the magazine *Ermis o Logios* in 1816[^180], and it proved to be the best way to deal with the increased demand for education with a relatively small number of qualified teachers. In his second term as director of the school in Bucharest, Vardalchos introduced the Bell/Lancaster method there as well.

At the time of the Greek and Romanian insurrections of 1821, the Greek academy was closed following an order by the Ottoman authorities. Later, the school reopened under the name of St. Sava, after the former monastery in which it was housed. From then on, its significance was mainly for the Romanian community. It was on the foundations of the St. Sava Academy that in 1864 the university of Bucharest was founded.

---

[^178]: Beševliev, “Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo”, 5
After the establishment of an independent Greek state, the schools within this territory became intellectual centres. The role of the Greek educational system for the development of a Bulgarian intelligentsia did not however diminish. The Zosimea academy of Ioannina, for instance, which remained in the Ottoman Empire, continued to attract a lot of young Bulgarians, mainly from Macedonia. With the founding of the University of Athens in 1837, another very important centre was added, and it was here in the 1840s that Bulgarians like Ilarion Makariopolski and Ivan Seliminski were educated.

§4.2 Grandsons of Sofronij: Stefan and Atanas Bogoridi

Stefan Bogoridi and his brother Atanas, two grandsons of Sofronij Vračanski (see §3.7), were among the first Bulgarian pupils to study at the Greek Academy of Bucharest. The nickname Bogoridi was attributed to both of the brothers and, later, to their descendants 181. As they spoke no Greek, not ‘even the spoken Greek of today’ 182 the brothers were placed in a preparatory class. Once they developed a knowledge of the language, they proved to be good students.

Stefan Bogoridi, who was born under the name of Stojko Ivanov, was the eldest grandson of Sofronij. After his graduation in Bucharest, he went to work as a French teacher for a Phanariot family, Mourouzis, in Istanbul. Shortly after that he joined the Turkish navy, where he fought against Napoleon, nearly losing his life in the battle of Abukir in 1799. After his return to Istanbul, Bogoridi was sent to Moldova as a hetman (military leader). There he worked under his friend, Phanariot Skarlatos Kallimachis, who had become knjaz (prince) of the principality. In 1821, Kallimachis was transferred to Walachia and Bogoridi, who clearly had done his job to the satisfaction of Sultan Mahmud II (1808-1839), became his agent and stayed in Moldova.

181 There are several theories about the etymology of this nickname. Most likely is that it comes from the medieval Bulgarian Czar Boris, known as Bogoris in Byzantine chronicles. In 1825, apparently after a fight with Atanas Bogoridi, his classmate and friend Nikolaos Pikkolos wrote with sarcasm: Νάτζκος Στογιάννου ήτον ο εξοχώτατος κυρ Βογορίδης, από το τιμίον χωρίον του Καζανίου πριν υιοθετηθή από τον βασιλέα της Βουλγαρίας Βόγοριν. (His majesty mister Bogoridi used to be Načko Stojanov from the respected village Kotel, before he was adopted by the Bulgarian Czar Bogoris) . E.G. Protopsaltis in “O Nikolaos Pikkolos kai to ergon tou”, Athina 68 (1965), 105.

182 This information comes from the memoirs of friend and classmate Theoklitos Farmakiidis. Tatjana E. Kirkova, “Doktorskata disertacija na d-r Atanas Bogoridi”, in Sbornik v čest na akademik Nikola V. Mihov po slučaj osemdesetgodišnata mu (Sofia: BAN, 1959), 197.
Coinciding with the beginning of the Greek insurrection in 1821, an uprising in Romania, led by Tudor Vladimirescu, forced Bogoridi to flee to Istanbul, from where he, after a short service as dragoman in the navy, was exiled by Mahmud II. Why Bogoridi fell into disgrace with the Sultan is not clear. According to a letter from his brother Atanas to a German, Carl Iken, Stefan Bogoridi was about to become supreme commander of the Ottoman army, when he was arrested in Bucharest in 1822. For months, Atanas believed the rumours that his brother had been beheaded183.

When during the Russian-Turkish war of 1828-9 there was an urgent need for able diplomats, Mahmud called Bogoridi back and sent him to St. Petersburg for talks with the Russians. Bogoridi performed his duty to the satisfaction of both the Sultan and the Russian Emperor Nikolaj I (1825-1855) and from then held a pivotal position in Mahmud’s court. Bogoridi took part in negotiations between Turkey and European countries, including those regarding Greek independence in 1830 and the future of Walachia and Moldova in 1856-8. In the talks about Greek independence in 1826-1827, Bogoridi acted as intermediary for the English attaché Canning184.

In 1833, Bogoridi was placed in charge of Samos (1833-1850) with the title and rank of Prince, a job he mainly fulfilled from the capital via his intermediaries. Sultan Abdulmecid (1839-1861) trusted Bogoridi so much that he created the function of ‘imperial advisor’ especially for him. This role was abolished after Bogoridi’s death185. Bogoridi was a member of the Tanzimat Council, which was to advise on the reorganisation of the Ottoman Empire starting in 1839. Bogoridi was also a member of the Synodical Council of the Patriarchate. A rumour went that the patriarch called Bogoridi ‘the omnipotent Bogoridi’, and did nothing without consulting him first186.

In addition to this work for the Greek elite, Stefan Bogoridi was also influential in the Bulgarian community in Istanbul. His intervention in the discussions about an autonomous Bulgarian church was decisive (see §5.5). He also provided scholarships for talented Bulgarians, like Rajno Popovič (see §6.1), his relative Georgi S. Rakovski (see §6.12) and Gavril Krăstovič (see §6.2). Moreover, he sent money to the school in Kotel, that because of his support became one of the best Hellenic-Bulgarian educational institutions in Bulgaria.

186 Todev, Koj koj e, 44.
The opinions that Bulgarians formed and still hold about Stefan Bogoridi vary. On the one hand, there are those, like the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski and the very influential twentieth century literary historian Bojan Penev, who claim that he completely abandoned his people. On the other hand, Bogoridi was and is greatly valued by Bulgarians because of his actions to force a solution in the church conflict (see §5.5). There are also those whose opinions seem to shift, as is the case of Petko Slavejkov, a poet of the late Văzraždane period. In 1857 in a letter to N. Palauzov, a Bulgarian intellectual in Odessa, Slavejkov discussed the Bulgarians living in Istanbul in that time. In this letter, Slavejkov claimed that Bogoridi ‘forgot his people’. In the beginning of the 1880s, in a letter to Emanuel Bogoridi, Slavejkov is less derisive:

И после аз застигнах незабравенний за нас българите ваша дядо и лично имах знакомство с него. Също и с покойния ви баща имал съм случай да работа за преуспяването на българщината, и най-после с стрика ви съм бил в близки отношения.

I met your grandfather, unforgettable for us Bulgarians, and personally knew him. Also with your late father (Nikola Bogoridi, js) I had the chance to work on the success of the Bulgarian cause and finally I was in close contact with your uncle (Aleksandăr Bogoridi, js)

As discussed earlier, apparent appreciation for the Bogoridi family was often influenced by political motives, so it is in fact difficult to know for sure how Stefan Bogoridi was received.

The younger brother of Stefan Bogoridi was Atanas. Like his sibling, Atanas was a good student at the Academy of Vardalacho. At the completion of his schooling, even though he was only 18 or 19 years old, he replaced his teacher of ancient Greek, Lambros Fotiadis, to take the classical Greek class. He also joined the Greco-Dacian philological society that was founded at the Greek school of Bucharest.

In 1811, Bogoridi left for Austria, where he studied medicine with private teachers. When he was in Vienna he was actively involved in the Greek colony there: he contributed literary reviews and analyses of classical works to the journal Ermos o Logios, and was in close contact with the revolutionaries of the Filiki Etaireia (Society of Friends), the secret society that was founded in Odessa in 1814 in preparation for the Greek revolution. Bogoridi also was a member of

---

187 Bojan Penev calls him a ‘оръдие на гръцката патриаршия’ ‘weapon of the Greek patriarchate’ Penev, Българската литература през първата половичина, 992.
189 Petko Račev Slavejkov, Literaturen arhiv (Sofia: BAN, 1959), 367.
190 Genčev, Българската възрожденска интелигенция. Енциклопедия, 76.
the literary society *Filomoussos Etairia* (Society of Friends of the Muses), which was founded in 1815 during the Vienna Congress.

In 1815, Bogoridi went to the German university city of Würzburg. According to Grigor Pârlîčev, a writer and a leading figure among the Macedonian intelligentsia in the 1860s, he moved because in Vienna he was at the risk of being arrested:

Българинът Атанас Богориди, брат на Стефанaki Бей, беше във Виена енергичен апостол на Хетерията, изложен винаги на опасност да бъде арестуван от австрийската полиция и да го сполети участта на Рига Ферос.

The Bulgarian Atanas Bogoridi, brother of Stefanaki Bey, was an active apostle of the Filiki Etairia in Vienna, always exposed to the danger of being arrested by the Austrian police and to share the fate of Rigas Fereos.

This information is clearly not first-hand. It is impossible that Pârlîčev and Bogoridi met, since the former was born in 1830, four years after the death of the latter. Pârlîčev indeed wrote these lines in the 1860s, well after Atanas Bogoridi had passed away. Thus if Pârlîčev did not meet Bogoridi, the question remains as to how he obtained this information? Additional sources underlining that Bogoridi was active within the Greek revolutionary circles in Vienna, and later in Paris, nevertheless suggest the possibility that the move from Austria to Germany was to escape the strict Austrian police of Metternich.

Another reason for the move may have been that Bogoridi wanted a better education. In Vienna, he had not been enrolled at university, but may have been taking private classes with university professors. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Würzburg housed one of the four most renowned medical faculties in the German lands, together with Göttingen, Jena and Vienna.

In the registers of the university, Bogoridi enrolled on the same day as the Greeks K. Liverios, who studied mathematics, and Stefanos Kanelos, a student of medicine and mathematics. Given that they had cooperated on articles for the *Logios Ermis* later, it is possible that they were friends and had arrived in the city together. It is known that Kanelos received a three-year

---


scholarship from the Filomoussos Etairia of Vienna to study in Germany\textsuperscript{193}, so it is also possible that Bogoridi had a scholarship from Vienna as well.

Bogoridi collaborated with Kanelos and Liverios during their student days in Germany. Together they wrote a letter to Logios Ermis, that was published on the 15\textsuperscript{th} of April 1816, stating that having heard that Joannis Salepis was working on the translation of Francoeur’s \textit{Cours de mathématique pure} (Paris, 1809), a translation that they were also working on, they had decided to commence work on another text, which would be equally valuable to Greek education. Kanelos remained a friend of Bogoridi, as is clear from the ensuing contributions to \textit{Logios Ermis}, of which they are co-authors\textsuperscript{194}.

In 1816 Bogoridi defended his dissertation in Würzburg, with ‘brilliant success’, as his friend Theoklitos Farmakidis notes in his biography. Details cannot be traced, since the archives of the university burned down in the second world war. In any case, he was the first Bulgarian student to graduate from a western university as a doctor.

Bogoridi’s dissertation appeared in German\textsuperscript{195}, and not in Latin, as was usual at the time. Tatjana Kirkova suggests two possible reasons for this in her article about the dissertation\textsuperscript{196}. Firstly she suggests that although dissertations had to be written in Latin, an exception may have been made, as the candidate was a foreigner. The second explanation she provides is that dissertations may have been accepted in German in Würzburg before this became common at other universities. An indication for this is that already in 1780, teachers like F.H.M. Wilhelm and K.K. Sibold at the medical faculty started to give their lectures not in Latin, but in German\textsuperscript{197}.

On the title page of his dissertation, Bogoridi is presented as originating from Alvanitochori (which is the Greek name for the village of Arbanasi) in Thrace. This is also stated by Bogoridi on his enrolment form. In modern geography, the word Thrace is used to designate the area which comprises the southeastern part of Bulgaria, the northeastern part of Greece and the European part of Turkey. Its northern border is the Balkan mountain range. Bogoridi used the word Thrace in an older, classical meaning, including all the land between the Aegean sea and the Danube. That he chose this term, can be explained by Bogoridi’s classical education. Another explanation is that

\textsuperscript{193} http://www.space.noa/hellinomnimon

\textsuperscript{194} Kirkova, “Doktorskata disertacija”, 203.


\textsuperscript{196} Ibid.

Bogoridi deliberately used a word that was familiar to western readers. In the preface, Bogoridi called himself a Greek, and excused himself for his imperfect knowledge of German:

Du aber, geneigter Leser! Verzeih, wenn die Tat hinter dem Willen zurückblieb, und wenn der Grieche nicht im Stande war, die Fülle der deutschen Sprache nach ihrer ganzen Bedeutung zu benutzen.

After taking his doctoral degree, Bogoridi returned to Vienna and practised as a doctor for some years. In 1819 he moved to Paris, where he stayed for the rest of his life. There, he became involved in the Greek community, contributing to the Paris-based magazine Melissas. As a correspondent, he also continued to write Ermis o Logios, which was published until 1821. In Paris, he met influential Greek intellectuals like Adamantios Korais, Dimitrios Darvaris and Theoklitos Farmakidis, his old friend from the lyceum. Works written by Bogoridi in Paris are all published in French.

Bogoridi’s contributions to Logios Ermis, published from 1811 until 1821, have been examined by Afrodita Aleksieva. She explains that it was logical for him to submit his writings to this journal, as it was closely linked to and financially supported by the Graeco-Dacian society in Bucharest, of which Bogoridi had been a member.

In the first volume of the journal, Bogoridi published Poiiitikes parerga (Parerga on poetics), an article which is probably a fragment of his work Ponima peri poiiitikis (Study on poetics), which was the piece that saw him accepted as a member of the Graeco-Dacian society. In this article he aimed to provide an ‘analysis of the best tragedies of antiquity’. Starting with Sophocles he agreed with Adamantios Korais, that Ajax was the most outstanding work, and so he commenced with this. In later issues Bogoridi also analysed Sophocles’ tragedy Oedipus Tyrannos.

In the second volume of the journal, Bogoridi paid attention to Homer. In several articles he discussed which works were considered to be written by the real Homer, and which ones by another author, now known as pseudo-Homer. He also contributed to the contemporary

---

198 Ibid., 195.
199 The first one to call himself a Bulgarian (Bulgarus) on the title page of a dissertation was Dimităr Mutev, who obtained his doctorate with a thesis on physics at the University of Berlin in 1842. Mutev was born in Kalofer, went to school in Walachia, and then finished a grammar school and the famous Richelieu-lyceum in Odessa. He then studied in Bonn, before going to Berlin. See: Todev, Koj koj e, 178.
203 Ermis o Logios, 1811, 207.
discussions about the status of the Greek language. In the debate between supporters of the formal katharevousa and the speech-based demotiki, he took a moderately progressive stand. In 1819, in a letter in *Ernis o Logios*, Kanelos and Bogoridi announced that they were planning to write a series of articles on the state of affairs in physics and new inventions that were not yet known to the Greeks. This may be the work they hinted at in 1816, when stating that they would present a work - other than *Cours de mathématique pure* - that would be useful to the Greeks.

In the same year, they published a critical review of *Ernis o Logios*, stating that, compared to earlier volumes, the journal had broadened its themes, and had enriched its contents and, as a whole, had become more beneficial to the national cause. This paper came at a time when the journal faced criticism that it was ‘full of articles, written in ignorance’.

Bogoridi was not only involved in the literary development of the Greeks, he also acted on a political level. On the 27th of July, 1821, Adamantios Korais, Nikolaos Pikkolos and Atanas Bogoridi wrote and signed a letter to an American professor, Edward Everett, of Harvard, in which they asked for support for the Greek cause.

When Pikkolos and Kanelos were preparing a trip to Greece in 1822 to fight in the war of independence and take part in the developing political life, Bogoridi was keen to join them, but in the end, he remained in Paris. It is likely that this is because he did not want to compromise his brother Stefan, who was at that time having problems with the Sultan (see above).

In 1826, Atanas Bogoridi unexpectedly died in Paris. The probable cause of death was illness, although family members claimed that he was poisoned by Greek clerical groups because of his love of freedom and his free thinking. This claim, however, does not appear to be supported by any facts.

Bogoridi was the first Bulgarian to write articles as a literary critic, years before the development of Bulgarian criticism. Throughout his life, Bogoridi was active within Greek society.

---

204 In a letter to the director of *Ernis o Logios*, Antimos Gazis, in 1811, Bogoridi stated that the dative case, which was dying out in the written Greek of his period, and the accusative case did not differ in meaning. For stylistic reasons however he advocated the use of the dative case ‘where the harmony and euphony of speech demands it, and the accusative when the dative leads to unharmony’. To support this point of view, Bogoridi quoted classical authors like Homer, Sophocles and Plutarch, but also investigated the use of dative by modern writers like Gazis himself and Korais. Aleksieva, “Atanas Bogoridi”, 94.

205 Ibid., 94.

206 Everett was a unitarian minister, Professor of Greek at Harvard and politician.

207 Stojan Maslev, “Pisma ot Nikola S. Pikolo i svedenija za nego v grâčki izvori”, in Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo. Izsledvanija i novi materiali izdadeni po slučaj sto godini ot smârta mu, ed. V. Beševliev, N. Todorov & T.E. Kirkova (Sofia: BAN, 1968), 423

208 Todev, Koj koj e, 46.
Although he did not have many contacts with Bulgarians inside what is now called Bulgaria, indeed in some Greek studies, he is called a Greek intellectual, without any reference to his origin.

§4.3 I Graikomania: Nikolaos Sava Pikkelos

Nikolaos Pikkolos was another Bulgarian raised in the Greek cultural sphere. Pikkolos was born in the city of Veliko Tarnovo on the 15th of November, 1792\textsuperscript{209}. His father Sava hadži Ilija was also known as Kazanlaklaoğlu or Kazanlakli, indicating that he originated from the city of Kazanlak, south of the Balkan range. Pikkolos’s mother was Theodora Bujukljuoglu, daughter of a wealthy family of Tarnovo.

Some scholars claim that Pikkolos was born from Greek parents, others say that his parents were a mixed Greek-Bulgarian couple. As we have seen in §3.2, ethnic origin was not relevant in the ottoman society of Pikkolos’s time, and we know for sure, that by his contemporaries, Pikkolos was considered Greek\textsuperscript{210}.

The nickname ‘Piccolo’ (Pikkolos in Greek), which means ‘small’ in Italian was probably inspired by the small stature of Pikkolos\textsuperscript{211}. Pikkolos’s family held the belief that he received it whilst studying in Italy. However ‘Pikkolos’ was mentioned for the first time in Logios Ermis in 1811, long before Pikkolos actually went to Italy. A plausible alternative is that Vardalachos, a teacher who had studied in Padua and knew Italian, came up with the name for Pikkolos, his pupil and later close colleague\textsuperscript{212}.

Pikkolos studied at the Greek school in his home town and later went to Bucharest, where he studied at the Bejska Akademia from 1802\textsuperscript{213} until 1806. Upon graduating, he was appointed teacher of French at this school, where he worked from 1811 until 1816. Like his colleague Atanas Bogoridi, he was one of the founding members of the Greco-Dacian society at the school in 1810

---

\textsuperscript{209} Radev, Enciklopedija, 568.

\textsuperscript{210} Most likely, at least one of Pikkolos's parents was Greek. Protopsaltis, “O Nikolaos Pikkolos”, 81 sums up some ideas about Pikkolos’s parents. In 1868, Marinos P. Vretos mentioned that he was born ‘εκ γονέων Θεσσαλών’, the brothers Alexandros and Panagiotis Soutsos described him as ‘issu d’une famille grecque établie en Tournavos en Bulgarie’, the French philologist Egger mentioned that Pikkolos was a child of Greek-Bulgarian parents.

\textsuperscript{211} See his portrait in: Krumka Šarova and others (eds.), Balgarsko vázraždane 1856-1878 (Sofia: BAN, 1987). [Istorija na Balgarija, 6/14], 334.

\textsuperscript{212} Beševliev, “Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo”, 10.

\textsuperscript{213} Beševliev mentions that Pikkolos went to Bucharest in 1800. This seems to be very early, given the fact that Pikkolos was only born in 1792.
During the period in Bucharest Pikkolos translated Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *Émile ou de l’éducation*, presenting it at the fourth meeting of the society. He never published it, as far as is known.

In 1817, Pikkolos became a teacher of Greek and history in the seminary on the Greek island of Chios. He followed his former teacher, Konstantinos Vardalachos, there. Later, the two men both moved to Odessa, where Vardalachos became the director of the Greek grammar school. Pikkolos started to work as a playwright and director at the local Greek theatre. He conducted a version of Sophocles’ *Filoktetes* in contemporary Greek and staged two plays in classical style of his own: *Leonidas* and *O thanatos tou Dimosthenous* (*The death of Demosthenes*).

Especially *The Death of Demosthenes*, with its revolutionary content, met with critical acclaim. This is evidenced in *Ermis o Logios*, in a letter by Georgios Lassanis, teacher and playwright in Odessa, to his father-in-law and business partner Georgios Takiadzis in Bucharest, which is full of praise for the production. Jakovakis Rizos Neroulos also appreciated the play, including it in his *Cours de la littérature grecque moderne donné à Genève* (1827).

The play’s cast included the primadonna of Russian theatre, who played the part of a prophetess, and the English philhellene, Frederick Wilkinson. Profits from the play, collected during 1818 and 1819, were mostly donated to the Greek schools in Odessa, however some money was sent to Paris, to Pikkolos, so that he could have the play published. Pikkolos thanked the Greek community for their support, in a letter to *Logios Ermis* of 29-6-1819, although it is not clear whether the play in fact went to press or whether copies have survived until now. An English translation of the play by Grigorios Palaiologos nevertheless appeared in 1824 in Cambridge.

---

214 Genčev, Bălgarskata възро̀жденска интелектуалност. Енциклопедия, 531.
215 A copy of this adaptation, in Fauriel’s handwriting with notes in Pikkolos’s handwriting, has been found in the manuscripts of the French scholar Claude Fauriel.
216 The final passages from the translation of Palaiologos:

Archias: The dread of the Macedonians is dead./ Philotimus, (sorrowfully): And the liberty of Greece/

Theano: Do not blaspheme, Philotimus! The liberty of Greece is not dead; it sleeps only for a time./

[Thunder and lightning]

ORACLE: YES, IT IS NOT DEAD, IT IS SUNK ONLY IN SLEEP, -- A SLEEP SURELY DEEP AND LONG – BUT, AS IT WILL BE DEEP AND LONG, SO WILL ITS AWAKING BE SUDDEN, AND ITS SUCCESS RAPID AND GLORIOUS!! [capitals in original]

[Thunder and lightning].
217 Ermis o Logios 1818, 575-582.
218 Беълев, В. "Две малко познати творби на д-р Никола С. Пиколо", in Dr. Nikola Pikolo. Изведвания и нови материали по слу̀чаи 100-годѝшна от смъртта му, ed. V.Беълеве, N. Тодоров & T.E. Kirkova (София: БАН, 1968), 16.
219 Ermis o Logios 1819, 609-610.
In Odessa Pikkolos became a member of the secret revolutionary organisation *Filiki Etaíria*, that had been founded there in 1814\(^{220}\). From that time, he was actively supporting the Greek movement for independence.

In 1818 Pikkolos went to Paris, where he was welcomed by the French elite, a group which was, to a large extent, philhellenic. Pikkolos met with the famous Greek scholar Adamantios Korais\(^{221}\), who brought him into contact with publisher and printer Ambroise Firmin-Didot\(^{222}\). Firmin-Didot, who had learned Greek from Korais, was the secretary of the Paris Philhellenic Committee for five years. In 1872, he became a member of the Academy of Sciences. In that time, Pikkolos was a correspondent for the Greek magazine *l'Euphorie*\(^{223}\). Together with Korais and Bogoridi, Pikkolos wrote the aforementioned letter to professor Everett. In 1821, Korais sent Pikkolos to London to raise support for the Greek cause\(^{224}\).

In Paris, Pikkolos also met with Claude Fauriel, with whom he became friends. Fauriel, who was later to occupy the Chair of Foreign Literatures at the Sorbonne (from 1830 onwards), played a crucial role in the developing Europe-wide appreciation of folk songs. In 1824, he published *Chants populaires de la Grèce moderne*, which became extremely popular in all of Europe. It is likely that it was Pikkolos, Fauriel’s teacher of Greek, who assisted with the collection of Greek folk songs, dimotiki. They came from a collection that had been given before to Christodoulos Klonaris from Korais\(^{225}\). It was also probably Pikkolos who wrote the eulogy for Fauriel in the Athenian newspaper, *Athina*.

During this first stay in Paris, Pikkolos had contacts with Victor Cousin and François Guizot, who were later to become towering figures in French intellectual and political life, but who were at this time (the Bourbon Restauration) under a cloud because of their liberal ideas. Both had been discharged from university at the time because of their liberal ideas. Other French intellectuals of the time, who were in contact with Pikkolos, were J.A. Cramer (1793-1848), J.F.

---

\(^{220}\) According to Todev, Koj koj e, 220, Pikkolos joined the Filiki Etaíria in Paris in 1819.

\(^{221}\) Adamantios Korais (1748-1833) was a key figure in the development of a new Greek language. See also Janssen, “The Greek pre-revolutionary discourse”.

\(^{222}\) Ivan Duječev, "Témoignages sur les rapports entre Adamantios Koraïs et N.S. Piccolos", Athina OG-OD (1972-3): 821. Firmin-Didot was also the publisher of the work of Augustin Thierry Essai sur l'histoire de la formation et des progrès du tiers état (1883). Thierry was a liberal, who was in contact with Guizot. Furthermore he is said to have been in contact with the Carbonari and have participated in organizing anti-government resistance. Ceri Crossley, French historians and romanticism (Londen New York: Routledge, 1993), 47.

\(^{223}\) Ibrovac, Claude Fauriel, 125.

\(^{224}\) Protopsaltis, “O Nikolaos Pikkolos”, 90.

Dübner (1802-1867), Sainte-Beuve\textsuperscript{226}, the writer Stendhal\textsuperscript{227}, Noel Guenneau de Mussy, Emile Egger, Charles Augustin, Em. Miller and the widely popular patriotic poet Pierre Béranger.

Béranger is an interesting figure because of the many poems in attack of tyrants, for instance Octavia, and a ‘voyage imaginaire’ to an ideal, classical Greece. He is a classical example of a poet playing the role as a pioneer in society, a philologist of ‘the pen and the sword’. Pikkolos visited him when he was imprisoned.

Another friend of Pikkolos, was the Greek Politis, who had also studied medicine in Italy before living in Paris. Like Pikkolos, he was invited by Lord Guilford to teach at the Corfu Academy. Slav friends of Pikkolos in Paris were Mihail Czajka Czajkowski and, through correspondence, Jernej Kopitar\textsuperscript{228}. He was also in contact with the Turkish envoy Nafi efendi.

In 1820, the Porte urged the Patriarchate to show disapproval of the nationalistic activities carried out by the Greek intellectuals. Pikkolos was among the Greeks who were excommunicated because of their activities in this regard\textsuperscript{229}.

Pikkolos’s first stay in Paris came to an end in the summer of 1823. After the Greek insurrection of 1821, in the middle of the war for Greek independence, Pikkolos went to Greece, to the Isle of Hydra, with the ambition of taking part in the developing political life. In 1826, the French writer A. Guerrier de Dumast, also a friend of Pikkolos, published an appeal in verse, in which he asked Pikkolos, in vain, not to leave for Greece.

The plan was for Pikkolos to go with Kanelos and Bogoridi\textsuperscript{230}, but as mentioned earlier (in §4.2), Bogoridi did not go. Thus Pikkolos and Kanelos set off together. Their journey had an unsuccessful start, as they were robbed when they entered Greece\textsuperscript{231}. In Greece, Pikkolos met with the members of the Executive Committee of the Greek revolutionaries and from Mili he sent a letter to Hydra, in which he called the leaders of the island to send Kanelos as their representative to the meeting of the senate\textsuperscript{232}.

Kanelos and Pikkolos arrived on Hydra in July, 1822\textsuperscript{233}. There, Pikkolos was given Greek citizenship\textsuperscript{234} and was selected to join a delegation that was to go to Verona to the conference of

\textsuperscript{226} Kirkova, “Nikola S. Pikolo”, 123.
\textsuperscript{227} Radev, Enciklopedija, 568.
\textsuperscript{228} Ibrovac, Claude Fauriel, 71.
\textsuperscript{229} Protopsaltis, “O Nikolaos Pikkolos”, 87.
\textsuperscript{230} Iken, Leukothea, 11.
\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 277.
\textsuperscript{232} Stojan Maslev, “Pisma ot Nikola S. Pikolo i svedenija za nego v gr\u010cmki izvori”, in Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo. Izseleđavanja i novi materiali izdjeni po slučaj sto godini ot smårta mu, ed. V. Beševliev, N. Todorov & T.E. Kirkova (Sofia: BAN, 1968), 430.
\textsuperscript{233} Protopsaltis, “O Nikolaos Pikkolos”, 91.
\textsuperscript{234} Ibid., 93.
leaders of the Holy Alliance in the Autumn of 1822. But when he met with some members of the
and others), he was advised that he could not attend because members of the government did not
approve235. Orlandis convinced his colleagues otherwise, and Pikkolos was once again included.
Then, the government received a letter from the Hydriots stating that they did not approve of the
travel allowance demanded by Pikkolos nor his appointment as head of the mission, which was
possibly also a condition set by Pikkolos236. The government replied that the mission was crucial,
and that Pikkolos, although his demands were excessive, should be given what he asked for. In the
end, Pikkolos did not go on the mission, the French retired navy officer Philippe Jourdain went in
his place 237.

Disappointed, Pikkolos went to Athens and then to the Ionian islands. There he met the
English philhellenic Frederick North, the Fifth earl of Guilford238. Invited by Guilford in 1826,
Pikkolos started to work as a teacher of rhetorics and ethics at the Ionian Academy on the island of
Corfu. During this period, he published a translation of Descartes’ Discours de la méthode239, probably to be used in the school. From Corfu, Pikkolos wrote to his friend, Fauriel, to inform him about the events of the Greek war of independence and to send him some folk songs240. He thus fulfilled the promise that he had made to Fauriel in his poem Adieu à la France, in which he stated: “Vois-tu, ami Fauriel, que je n’abandonne pas les chants.”241

Retaining his salary from the Ionian academy242, Pikkolos enrolled to study medicine in
Bologna in 1826-7. He sat his first exams in January 1828, and two months later, in March, he
fulfilled the requirements of the second year. In April 1828 Pikkolos moved to Pisa, where he
completed his study and graduated on the 2nd of March, 1829. It is likely that he moved due to the
death of his patron Lord Guilford in the autumn of 1827243. Pisa housed a considerable colony of
wealthy Greek merchants, and thus provided many opportunities for a student looking for work as
a private teacher.

235  Ibid., 96.
236  Ibid., 98.
237  Ibid., 99. Protopsaltis is convinced that Mavrokardatos himself was involved in the whole affair, but has no
proof for it.
238  V. Beševliev, Nikolaj Todorov et al.(eds.), Dr. Nikola Pikolo. Izsladjanija i novi materiali po slučaj 100-
godišna ot smrtta mu (Sofia: BAN, 1968), 6.
239  Pikkolos, Nikolaos (1824). Renatou Kartesiou logou peri methodou (Kerkyra). See the website
http://195.134.75.8/0807231103280000/main.htm for the text (last checked 9-3-2005)
240  Ibrovac, Claude Fauriel, 126.
241  The poem is kept in the library of Cousin in the Sorbonne. Ibrovac, Claude Fauriel, 678.
243  Tatjana E. Kirkova, “Nikola S. Pikolo v Italija i Francija”, in Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo. Izsladjanija i novi
materiali izdadeni po slučaj sto godini ot smrtta mu, ed. V. Beševliev, N. Todorov et al. (Sofia: BAN, 1968), 382.
After his graduation in 1829, Pikkolos returned to Paris, where he worked as a physician and was in contact with famous Byzantinists, Hellenists and other intellectuals. Publisher Firmin Didot engaged Pikkolos to work on the famous *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, together with Korais, Jean François Boissonade (1774-1857) and Charles Benedikt Hase (1780-1864)\(^{244}\).

Pikkolos also wrote reviews of French literature from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and St. Beuve praised him for his ability to recognise cross-references to Greek originals that had not yet been identified\(^{245}\).

From 1831 until 1839, Pikkolos lived in Walachia, which since the war of 1828-9 was a Russian protectorate. The Russian general, Pavl Kiselëv, supervised the administration of the Danubian principalities as ‘président plénipotentaire’. Pikkolos worked under Kiselëv as a civil servant, a personal physician\(^{246}\) (until 1834), and inspector of the *Efuria of education*, an institute akin to a modern ministry. This function included the supervision of the Greek Academy, his old school, and the selection and acquisition of school books.

Pikkolos was also a censor with the state council, and in 1838 became head of the entire censorship department\(^{247}\). At this point, Pikkolos had some very influential friends both in Walachia and Moldova, among them were: Mihail Sturdza (Prince of Moldavia 1834-1849), his successor Gregorij Ghica (1849-1854/1854-1856), Alexandros Ghica (Prince of Walachia 1834-1842), Georgi Bibescu (Prince of Walachia 1842-1848), and others.

In 1840, Pikkolos withdrew from active service in Walachia. There are rumours that he decided to do so after an argument with leading intellectual Eliade Rădulescu, who claimed that in his function as censor, Pikkolos had allowed a Frenchman named Vaillant to anonymously publish a response to one of his articles. This response\(^{248}\) criticised the spelling reforms that Rădulescu advocated and suggested the use of the Cyrillic letters Ч and Щ. In his fury, Rădulescu then declared, in the magazine *Currierul Românesc*\(^{249}\), that the censors worked inconsistently, allowing the publication of politically loaded fairytales and unsigned personal attacks. He went on to declare he would refuse to present future work to the censor’s office.

---

\(^{244}\) Ivan Dujčev, "Témoignages sur les rapports entre Adamantios Koraïs et N.S. Piccolos", Athina OG-OD (1972-3): 822.


\(^{246}\) About that period Pikkolos later published a book in Paris: Paul Kisselef et les principautés de Valachie et de Moldavie par un habitant de Valachie (1841).

\(^{247}\) Constantin N. Velichi. "Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo vâv Vlaško", in Dr. Nikola Pikolo. Izsledvanija i novi materiali po slučaj 100-godišna ot smârta mu, ed. V. Beševliev, N. Todorov & T.E. Kirkova (Sofia: BAN, 1968), 247.

\(^{248}\) Pâjmântianul 9 of 31-7-1839, as cited by Velichi, 247.

\(^{249}\) 4th of November 1839, quoted in Velichi, 248.
Following a proposal by Pikkolos, which was handled by Prince Ghica in person, the state secretariat reacted by forbidding the publication of Currierul Românesc, as it had carried material, which offended a public servant. A special committee was set up to investigate the case, and this led to a trial where Pikkolos received a warning for leniency. Pikkolos admitted that he should not have let the article in question be published, but that too many texts were published each year to review them all properly. The administrative council pleaded for the replacement of Pikkolos as head of the censorship department, but Pikkolos was not dismissed. He resigned half a year later, though, and moved to Paris. This move came after the death of his mother in Veliko Târnovo, which left him with no close ties to people on the Balkan anymore.

Pikkolos stayed in Paris for the rest of his life. He supported his nephews Petar Protić, Dimitar Kirovič and Theohar Savov Pikkolos (the last two being brothers despite their different names), so they could study in Paris. He worked as a physician for some time after he had received a licence to practise through the mediation of his friend Victor Cousin, who had become Minister of Education.

In 1844, Pikkolos gave up medicine and devoted himself entirely to his literary work. He published two compilations of lyrical poems in Greek.

In Paris, Pikkolos provided information about the Balkan and the Bulgarians to the economist Jérôme-Adolphe Blanqui and Cyprien Robert. Robert was a central person in the European network of philologists of the time, as he was lecturer of Slav languages and literatures at the prestigious Collège de France (where he was successor to the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz), editor of the Revue des deux mondes, and writer of Les Slaves de Turquie.

Pikkolos contributed to scholarly editions of Greek texts and Greek newspapers and magazines. From the date of his departure from Bucharest in 1840, he was corresponding member of the education eforia of Walachia, which meant that he had to supervise the Walachian students in Paris and report on their advancements in science. He was appointed to this position by George Dimitrie Bibescu, Prince of Walachia since 1842, who paid him 250 złotici a year for his services. He worked in this role until the revolution of 1848, when his pay was suspended. Following the revolution, his salary decreased to 200 złotici. In 1847, the eforia sent Pikkolos 10,000 francs so he could arrange for books and a teacher of French for the St. Sava lyceum.

251 A złotic is a golden coin.
252 Velichi, 254.
Pikkolos also was correspondent in Paris for the Mihailjana-academy of Iaşi from 1840 onwards. In 1853, he became a corresponding member of the Academy of Stanislas in Nancy. On behalf of his friend Barbu Ştirbej, who was Minister of Internal Affairs of Walachia, he mediated in sending a French hydraulic engineer, Jean Baptiste Marsillon, to Bucharest. In 1856, the post of Paris correspondent for the Walachia eforia was suspended due to the Crimean war. In 1858 it was reinstated, but then a Frenchman was engaged in Pikkolos’s place.

When Pikkolos died in 1865, he left his books and 12,000 francs in cash, plus the income generated by his books still in stock with Firmin-Didot to a public school in his home city Veliko Târnovo. He furthermore donated 1500 francs to the church-with-school Uspenie Bogorodično, in the poor quarter of Asenova mahala. A smaller amount was left to the Church of the Assumption there. Books that he sent home are now in the city library of Veliko Târnovo. Some of them contain inscriptions stating that they came from the collection of Lambros Fotiadis, or were donated by Vardalachos.

Sixteen letters by Pikkolos have been discovered in the remains of the archive of his nephew Petăr Protić. Part of the archive was destroyed during the bombardment of Sofia in 1944. What was left is now kept in the library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

The obituary on Pikkolos, which was drawn up by his friend and publisher Firmin-Didot mentions his place of birth as Târnovo in Walachia. Pikkolos was buried at the famous courtyard of Père Lachaise in Paris. His gravestone cites his name in French and in the Cyrillic alphabet, not in Greek. The service of his funeral was secular, in accordance with his own request. Speakers were Firmin-Didot and Guenneau de Mussy. Many intellectuals were present, including one Bulgarian, M. Balabanov (1840-1921), who was a student at the Sorbonne then, and later became one of the leading Bulgarian intellectuals. The grave, in the fifth quarter of the cemetery, was bought by Firmin-Didot for eternity.

Nikolaos Pikkolos was highly educated and was versed in many languages: Greek, Latin, French, Romanian, English, Russian, German and Italian. He not only wrote his original works in Greek, but he also translated from French into Greek, such as Paul et Virginie, the novel of his friend Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and works by Descartes and Rousseau. Pikkolos had many positive reviews in Ermis o Logios and was (and still is) valued among Hellenists and Byzantinists because of his critical editions and translations of classics, including the History of the

---

253 Genčev, Bălgarskata vâzroždenska inteligencija. Enciklopedija, 531.
254 Ibid.
255 Beševliev 1968, 6.
animals by Aristotle. One of his most important works is a supplement to the authoritative anthology of classical Greek texts.256

When Pikkolos left Bulgaria at the age of ten, there was nothing that resembled a cultural life within the borders of what is now Bulgaria. But still he was not a complete stranger to its people as he received attention in Bulgarian-based publications. In 1851, for instance, Aleksandár Ekszarch called him, in his newspaper Carigradski Vestnik, a ‘compatriot’257. Georgi S. Rakovski mentioned Pikkolos in his preface to his famous work Gorski Pătnik, and the death of Pikkolos is mentioned in the Bulgarian newspaper Tureija of N. Genovič.

Of his collection of lyrical poems dedicated to a certain P.D.K., Parigorimata (1839), which is seen as his best work, only one copy has survived to the present day. This copy, with an autograph of the author, was given to the university library of Leipzig by the philhellene Dr. Th. Kind. They are, as far as is known, the first lyrical poems written by a Bulgarian (albeit not in Bulgarian).

It is interesting that Pikkolos did not refer to himself as a Greek as Bogoridi did, although he once called himself graecobarbarus258. He is characterised further by his nephew Petăr Protić in his poem I graikomania, written in Athens, in 1844:

На Търново Велико син
От именит е род излел
Той мъдрост събрал е и научност
Говори гръцки с чудна звучност
Той елининист е смел

И в Корфу бе учител
Книжовник е и съчинител
И чудно гладко е превел
Романа ‘Павел и Виргиния’
И книга вешта след години
За Аристотеля стъквми

Но дойде ден, сърдце му трепна
И с болка ревностно защепна
За родни български земи
Бе гръц, с италианско име
Но нито връзките незрими
Веч с родни край не ги еломи259.

---

258 Beševliev, “Dr. Nikola S. Pikolo”, 33.
This poem reflects an evaluation of Pikkolos consistent with the views of him held by Bulgarian scholars: Pikkolos may have been ‘Greek’ for a long time, but over the course of his life became a Bulgarian.

§4.4 Paris as a cultural centre for Bulgarians

Initially, Bulgarians in Paris were part of the Greek cultural colony in France. As explained above (in §3.2), there was no perceived distinction between Bulgarians and Greeks in terms of ethnicity. Korais, in a letter to his friend Kokkinakis for instance, mentioned Pikkolos as an example of a good Greek.

People like Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos went to Paris in the course of their scholarly careers, following the Greek and non-Greek philhellenic intelligentsia, who were quite numerous there (see §4.3). Paris was, of course, one of the most important cultural and scholarly centres of Europe at the time. The most influential Greek in the group was, without a doubt, ‘le grec savant’ Adamantios Korais (see §4.3).

A distinct Bulgarian cultural colony first emerged in the French capital following Greek independence in 1830. No longer identifying with Greeks, Bulgarians started to act collectively in the interest of their own cause.

Nikolaos Pikkolos exemplifies this well. Starting out as a Greek intellectual his work became focussed on Bulgarian autonomy. Beševliev notes that this shift paralleled the death of his Greek friends, Vardalaches (1830) and Korais (1833).

Pikkolos thus became part of the Bulgarian colony in Paris, joining Petăr Beron, Alexandăr Ekzarh, Gavril Krâstević, Teohar Savović, Dimităr Kirović, Petăr Protić, Vasil H. Mihajlov and Georgi Atanasović in the 1840s. From 1845, Ivan Seliminski was also active among them. Reports of travellers kept these men well acquainted with the situation in their home country, providing rich impetus for their discussions. One important theme was how Bulgarians could have more

---

259 The poem was originally written in Greek under the title Η γραικομανία. The Bulgarian translation, probably from T. Trajanov, was published in Poésie par Dr. P.D. Protić (1844-1846). Cited from Penev, Българската литература през първата половина, 82.

260 Stamate Karatza, Korais kai Nikolopoulos (Athens, 1949), 35. Korais mentions a certain P., the identification as Pikkolos is by Karatza.


262 Ibid., 22.
influence in Istanbul and more specifically, about how they could help Neofit Bozveli, who was involved in the church conflict there. Pikkolos wrote a manifesto about this movement in 1841, which is discussed in further detail below.

One of the most influential Bulgarians to study in Paris was Aleksandăr Ekzarh. His real name was Aleksandăr Stoilov Boev/Bojoglu, while the name Ekzarh was a nickname, that had apparently been in the family for generations. Ekzarh arrived in Paris in 1836, to study mathematics. As a result of the Tanzimat reforms, and with the help of Stefan Bogoridi (see §4.2), whose son Nikola worked at the Turkish embassy in Paris at the time, he received a scholarship from the government under the provision that he changed his study to medicine. Losing this stipend for political reasons in 1841, Ekzarh stayed in Paris until 1848, where he published on the Bulgarian cause and visited politicians and literary salons to lobby for the Bulgarians.

Some of Ekzarh’s ideas were quite radical: he put forward a plan to take the patriarchate in Constantinople by force and put a Bulgarian in charge there to help the fate of the Bulgarians. He thought Ivan Seliminski to be the best candidate for this position. In 1848, Ekzarh visited Russia (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Odessa) and then settled in Istanbul, where he founded a print shop, and published for thirteen years the first Bulgarian newspaper, Carigradski Vestnik. During this time, his calls for attention to the plight of the Bulgarians were openly supported by Petăr Beron (see §4.5).

Behind the scenes in Paris, Polish diplomats, including Czajka Czajkowski, who was connected to Prince Adam Czartoryski, the ‘Polish King in exile’, were working on the Polish programme. This programme intended to spread Turk- and French-friendly attitudes in Bulgaria through Polish teachers working there. It was argued that in this way Bulgaria would be ‘detached’ from the Russian sphere of influence. This plan split the Bulgarian community. The majority, including Nikolaos and Teohar Pikkolos and Aleksandăr Ekzarh were in favour of it, while others, like the pro-Russian Ivan Seliminski were against it. Because of this difference, Seliminski gradually alienated himself from his contemporaries that formed the Bulgarian colony.

One publication pushing the Polish line of thought was an almanac, called Zabavnik za leto … (Almanac for the year…). The issue for the year 1844 was printed in Istanbul, by

263 Todev, Koj koe, 99
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265 The relationship between Pikkolos and Dr. Ivan Seliminski was problematic. Seliminski argued that Pikkolos had turned his back on his mother country. Maybe this antipathy was fed by the fact that the eforia of education of Walachia, with Pikkolos as a member, had closed Seliminski’s school in Ploiești.
Konstantin Ognjanović. For the following issue of 1845, Ognjanović and his assistant Ilarion Makariopolski received pre-publication support by Czajkowski, and then it, and the ensuing volume of 1846, were published in Paris with his financial backing by Firmin-Didot. The issues of 1845 and 1846 contain the manifesto for the Bulgarian church conflict, which was sent to the editor from Leipzig by a certain P.N., widely accepted to be Nikolaos Pikkolos (see §4.3).267

Petăr Beron and Nikolaos Pikkolos continued to advocate for the ‘Bulgarian programme’. In 1856, around the time of the Paris Peace conference at the end of the Crimean war, they pleaded before the Congress of Paris for the recognition of a Bulgarian state. They also wrote articles in the French press raising awareness for the Bulgarians, in their quest for autonomy, as already won by the inhabitants of the Danubian principalities, Walachia and Moldovia. This action did not have any success, however, because it was in the interest of the great powers that the Ottoman Empire should not disintegrate.

§4.5 The first Bulgarian schoolbook: The *Riben Bukvar*

We have seen that in the eighteenth, and well into the nineteenth century, Greek education was authoritative on the Balkans. It is thus not surprising to find the first schoolbook in modern Bulgarian heavily influenced by Greek. This book, written by Petăr Beron, was entitled *Bukvar s različni poučenija* (Primer with various admonitions, 1824) or in short *Riben Bukvar* (Fish Primer) - so named because of the illustration of the whale it contained.

Petăr Beron, the author, was from Kotel, the youngest son of a prosperous tailor. The exact date of his birth is not known, but judging from his university application, it must have been in 1799 or 1800. Beron was schooled under the famous teachers Sofronij Vračanski (see §3.7) and Rajno Popović268.

Because Kotel was positioned on an important connecting road, many Turkish troops were stationed there, and after Beron’s father had sympathised with the Russian troops in the Russian-Turkish war of 1806-1812, the Turkish administration of the city disowned him. Due to lack of money, Beron stopped his education and became an apprentice tailor, first in Kotel, and from 1815, in the coastal city of Varna. Rumour has it that he was dismissed there because he made the


268 Popović, as did his pupil Beron later, studied at the Bucharest academy.
wrong garment for his client. Without employment and with some savings, Beron decided to go back to school. He departed for Bucharest, where he was soon accepted in the Bulgarian community. From 1817 to 1821 he studied at the Greek Academy of Bucharest, partly under Konstantinos Vardalacos (see §4.1).

After the Greek-Romanian insurrection of 1821, the Greek Academy was closed by the Turkish authorities. As a result of his support for, and possibly also, participation in the uprising, Beron was included in a list of unwanted foreigners. He therefore moved to Braşov (Kronstadt) in Transylvania, which, since 1718, was part of the Habsburg Empire.

In Braşov, Beron worked as a private teacher for the family of Anton Iovanovič Kamburov(oglu), a merchant who originated from the town of Sliven, not far from Kotel. With his support, Beron finished his secondary education. He learned and improved his skills in classical and contemporary Greek, Latin, Romanian, French and German, and he kept in touch with his former teacher Vardalacos, who had also fled from Bucharest to Braşov.

He became active in a Bulgarian cultural circle in Braşov. This group, of which Vasil Nenovič and Atanas Kipilovski were also part, had ambitious plans to print schoolbooks, in the spoken language of the time. With this, they advanced the language debate regarding New-Bulgarian (see §6.2). Beron’s book was the first to be realised according to the programme they had established.

In 1824, with the financial support of Iovanovič, Beron published the aforementioned primer, which was inspired by the book *Eklogárion*, a Greek work by Vlach Dimitrios N. Darvaris of 1804, and a Serbian textbook of 1812 by Pavle Solarić. Beron was of the opinion that education should suit the nature of the child. He may have learned about this idea, originally formulated by J.J. Rousseau, from his teacher Nikolaos Pikkolos at the Bucharest academy, who (as I have noted) had made a Greek translation of *Émile ou de l'éducation* shortly before Beron came to the school of Bucharest (see §4.1).

*Riben Bukvar* was the first schoolbook that aimed at teaching Bulgarian literacy. It commences with rudimentary exercises, letters first, then syllables, and finally words. Longer texts follow on mathematics, geography and biology. The book includes a number of prayers, but Beron did not insert any other religious texts, because he realized that they would not be fully understood by his young audience.

Written in the vernacular form, *Riben Bukvar* enjoyed wide-spread popularity from the start, resulting in no less than 34 editions. Previous text books had been written in a mixture of
Church Slavonic, with many Russian borrowings, and an archaic form of the vernacular, neither of which were languages of the intended pupils.

In *Riben Bukvar*, traditional orthography is used to a great extent. Beron maintained some church Slavic case forms that had become extinct in the spoken language of his time, but also used some neologisms. The prayers were written out in full, without the contractions that were usual in religious literature.

In the preface to the book, Beron advocated the educational method as developed by Bell/Lancaster, also known as the allilodidactic method. He had been educated under this system himself in the school of Bucharest, when Vardalachos was head (see §4.1). He deemed this to be the best method to teach large numbers of Bulgarian pupils, as there were few trained teachers available.

*Riben Bukvar* was a substantial stimulus for secular education and literacy in Bulgaria. During discussions with Bulgarian intellectuals in Brașov, like Vasil Nenović and Atanas Kipilovski, Beron developed the idea to found a philological society so that a series of textbooks could be published. After the primer a history and a geography of Bulgaria, among others things, were supposed to appear. This society was not established formally, however, until many years later. Beron nevertheless published a second schoolbook, the first writing method in Bulgarian, which appeared in 1843.

After publishing *Riben Bukvar*, Beron continued his own education. To this end, together with Ivanović’s son, Ivan Andonov, he went to Germany. In 1825 and 1826 he studied at the University of Heidelberg (two semesters of philosophy and one semester of medicine), and from 1826 to 1831 at the University of Munich.

A generation previously, talented Bulgarians like Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos, just like the Greek intellectuals, had gone to Vienna to further their education. In Beron’s time, they went to German universities. This is because the reforms of Metternich had made the political climate in Austria hostile to Greeks and Bulgarians alike. On his enrollment papers in Heidelberg, Beron put his place of birth, like Atanas Bogoridi as Thrace in Greece. And on the title page of his dissertation, he called himself Thracian.

---

269 Beron, for instance, used the traditional sign (ă) for the nasal e, but introduced the new sign (ã) for the nasal o, where (o) was traditionally used. This sign remained in Bulgarian, for instance in texts of Rajno Popović, literatо Vasili Nenović and Vasil Apilov until 1844, when Ivan Bogorov again replaced it with the sign ş. Both sounds were however not pronounced as a nasal anymore in the northern/eastern Bulgarian of his time. They have survived in some Macedonian dialects until now.

270 Ivan P. Ormandžiev, & Ivan St. Penakov, eds, Dr. Petar Beron i Odrinskata bălgarska măžka gimnazija “dr. Petar Beron”, sbornik ot statii i dokumenti (Sofia, 1958), 552.
Heidelberg was an important cultural centre in that time. Some of Beron’s teachers in Heidelberg were world-famous. Among them were Gervinus\(^{271}\) and people of the ‘Heidelberger Kreis’.

Later, Beron moved to the University of Munich, most probably because his pupil Ivan Andonov was transferred to Munich at this time\(^{272}\). Apart from subjects in medicine, it is likely that Beron attended lectures by Schelling as well, who was head of the Department of Philosophy in Munich.

During his stay in Munich Beron, together with his fellow student Janulas (Ivan Januli) from Ioannina, published two small dictionaries of Greek. One of these was a technical dictionary.

In 1831, Beron was one of the first Bulgarians to defend a medical dissertation, becoming the first Bulgarian obstetrician/gynaecologist. On the title page of the dissertation, and later on in life, he called himself by the western name of Petrus (hadži) Beron, instead of his family name hadži Berovič.

From 1832 onwards, Beron worked as a physician in Bucharest and Craiova. In addition, he operated a small trade company, which, thanks to the business talents of his cousin and business partner Nikola Hristov Berov, was very successful. As a result, Beron became a wealthy man, and he was able to take his nephew Vasilij Stojanov Beron\(^{273}\) into his house and pay for a good education.

From 1839 onwards, Beron gave up his medical practice and devoted himself entirely to the study of science. Like his former teacher Varaldachos, Beron was a true encyclopedist and Enlightenment scholar, working in the fields of physics, astronomy, mathematics, geology (he published a work on the Deluge), atmospherology, chemistry, meteorology and philosophy. In total he published 32 books, written in German, French and Greek.

In his work *Slawische Philosophie* of 1855, Beron set out his philosophical ideas regarding the universe, humankind and the microcosmos. In his seven volumed *Panépistème* (1861-1867), Beron addressed all his fields of interest: earth and social sciences, medicine, and philosophy.

Some of Beron’s ideas appear a bit strange to modern eyes. For instance, he claimed that human life developed in Malacca, and that the Slavs were direct descendants of the original human. In demonstrating this, Beron constructed some recherché etymologies, claiming authenticity for the Bulgarian language: Nebucadnesar – Nebu k dne tsar (czar from heaven to the bottom);

---

\(^{271}\) Germanist. He thought among other things that literature is a cultural medium that expresses the process of nation formation.

\(^{272}\) Andonov finished the military academy in Munich, went to Greece and under the name Andonidis became a general there.

\(^{273}\) Vasil Beron later became a famous member of the Bulgarian intelligentsia.
Penthesilea – Pet sili (five forces); Macedonia–read in reverse, being written originally from right to left: de sam (where am I). He clearly did not follow what was happening in the study of Indo-European languages.

Beron was well travelled, visiting major commercial and cultural centres throughout his life, including: London, Berlin, Vienna and Prague, as well as many other parts of Europe. Nevertheless, Beron maintained his commitment to the Bulgarian educational movement, and until his death, he had his publisher send copies of his books to libraries and schools throughout the Bulgarian lands. He also supported schools throughout Bulgaria with other books and financial donations. Furthermore, he sent out teachers. His brother Rusko travelled through the country to personally spread the recommendations of his elder brother. Beron founded and supported schools in Kotel, Elena, Šumen, Sliven, Stara Zagora, Târnovo, Ruse, Târgovište, Kazanlâk, Jambol and elsewhere, mostly in the north-eastern part of Bulgaria. He aimed at opening a school in every town or large village. He was also the first to pay attention to girls’ education and helped to found a large number of girls’ schools. In 1861 Carigradski Vestnik, an influential Bulgarian magazine printed in Istanbul, published a list drawn up by Beron, stating which cities, in his opinion, needed a girl’s school.

In 1840, in a letter to his hometown Kotel\textsuperscript{274}, Beron pleaded for the creation of an organisation that would supervise the education in the whole of the country. Such an organisation came into existence, however, only after the liberation in 1878. In another letter, Beron wrote: ‘I regard as my home country not Kotel, but the whole of Bulgaria’\textsuperscript{275}.

Beron’s commitment to education is also reflected in his support of young Bulgarians who were studying abroad. One of them was Ivan Seliminski, who studied medicine in Athens. Aleksandâr Rusev hadži Roseti was another of his protégés. He studied at Beron’s expense in Strasbourg, and was then sent out as a teacher to Kotel in 1846. In 1854 Beron posted Ivan Dobrovič, who studied in Vienna at his expenses, to the Kotel school. After graduating in Vienna, the artist from Svištov, Nikolaj Pavlovič\textsuperscript{276}, went to the art academy in Munich with the help of Beron\textsuperscript{277}.

Petâr Beron died on the 24th of March, 1871, on his estate in Romania, presumably murdered by his agent Teohar Papazov after discord about Beron’s will. Beron’s nephew, Stefan Ruskov Beron waived his share of the inheritance, to have more money available for education.

\textsuperscript{274} This letter was written in Greek, since this was the language in which Beron had learned to write.
\textsuperscript{275} Penev, Bâlgarskata literatura prez pârvata polovina, 405.
\textsuperscript{276} The son of Hristaki Pavlovič, one of the first modern Bulgarian teachers.
\textsuperscript{277} Pavlovič later made the illustrations for a meteorological atlas of Beron and he made the only two known portraits of Beron. He had to make the sketches for them, however, through a keyhole, as his patron refused to pose.
The other inheritors followed this example. From the inheritance, which amounted to 400,000 francs, a grammar school with dormitory was built in Edirne (now in Turkey). Replacing a secondary school with four classes that had existed there from 1846, but had burned down²⁷⁸, the school opened in 1894.

Stefan Beron had the heart of his uncle embalmed. Later, it was put in a glass box with the inscription: ‘24-11-1878. This heart beat during its life only for the beloved homeland Bulgaria. Please bury it in the capital of a free Bulgaria, because that is what it loved’. Stefan Beron donated this box to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. In 1964, it was brought to the Revival Museum in Kotel, where it can be found today.

Both Bulgarians and foreigners praised Beron’s work, although of his contemporaries in Bulgaria, only some intellectuals were familiar with it. To most, it was unknown, since it appeared outside of Bulgaria. However, as a person, Beron was widely known, mainly as an example of how well a Bulgarian could do in life. As such he was also described in magazines. He was praised by revolutionaries Georgi Rakovski and Ljuben Karavelov, and the Russian scholar Jurij Venelin. Venelin (see § 6.7) wrote in his well-known book *Drevnie i ninešnie bolgari* (Ancient and Contemporary Bulgarians), of 1829, that in the whole of Russia he had not seen a book that was as good as Beron’s *Riben Bukvar*. He added that Bulgarian, in contrast to popular belief, was in fact a suitable language to express a wide variety of concepts and ideas. Beron was one of the first Bulgarian scientists, and on account of this, and his versatility, he was given the honorary title of ‘Bulgarian Lomonosov’²⁷⁹. Beron was also one of the first Bulgarian patrons of the arts. His support in the form of funds, books and teachers was crucial to the formation of education in the Bulgarian lands.

Although very early Beron expressed himself in Bulgarian, took Bulgarian as the object for his etymological studies, and did his best for Bulgarian education, his pursuits overall remained patriotic rather than nationalistic.

§4.6 The incorrigible philhellene? Ivan Seliminski

²⁷⁸ In his history of the school, Ilija Petkov accuses the Greeks of arson, but he, following a good Balkan tradition, does not give any evidence. Petkov, Ilija T. *Bilgarskata mążka gimnaziia na dr. Petăr Beron v Odrin* (Burgas: Geopan, 2001), 12.

²⁷⁹ The first modern scientist of Russia, who lived in the eighteenth century. Like him, Beron practised all of the respected sciences of his time, from physics to philology.
Widely known in Bulgaria these days, as their lives and works have been the subject of much study, it is accepted that Petăr Beron and Nikolaos Pikkolos, morphed somewhere in their lives from philhellenes into ‘bulgarophiles’. This is not the case with Doctor Ivan Seliminski, who is otherwise regarded an incorrigible philhellene. All the same, he was a very important figure in the Bulgarian colony of Bucharest, and contributed much to the development of Bulgarian education and scholarship generally. This was particularly so in Walachia and Besarabia.

While Seliminski shared the same educational vision as Beron, he appears to have been more of a pragmatist in his actions than his contemporaries. Over the course of his life, spent in many different places, he responded to different conditions in ways that were often inconsistent: sometimes he looked towards the Greeks for help, sometimes towards the Russian Czar, but he also did not hesitate to apply for British citizenship when he thought it could help him.

Ivan Seliminski (his real name was Jordan Georgiev Hristov; the name Seliminski was derived from the Turkish name for his place of birth) was the son of a merchant from Sliven in northern Bulgaria. He received a basic education in Sliven and then in 1814, shortly after his parents died, made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. From 1817-1821 he studied at the grammar school of Kydonies under the Greek teacher, Theofilos Kairis. This school, following the directorship of Veniamin Lesvios from 1802 until 1812, was renowned for its excellence in the field of science.

When, following the outbreak of the Greek revolution, the Turkish troops set fire to Kydonies, Seliminski fled to the Zograf Monastery on Mount Athos. In the Greek war of independence, Seliminski fought, from 1821 until 1823, as an officer in the Greek army. In 1844, he was decorated by the Greek government for his participation in the insurrection. After his withdrawal from battle, Seliminski moved to Italy and then to Austria, visiting Vienna and Pest and ending up in Brașov, where he taught Greek to Bulgarian émigrés. In Brașov, he tried to establish a secret national organisation, but it is not clear if he succeeded in doing so.

Back in Sliven, in 1825, he opened a hellenobulgarian school and founded the secret Narodno Bratstvo (People’s Brotherhood, or National Brotherhood) to support the poor and prepare the people for the fight for independence. In 1827, when he visited Šumen, he founded a brotherhood there as well. In 1828-9 he was director of the Greek school in Plovdiv.

After the Russian-Turkish war of 1828-9, which ended in the Peace of Edirne, many Bulgarians emigrated to Walachia, Moldavia and Bessarabia. A large number of those emigrants came from the Sliven area. Seliminski was one of the refugees to Bessarabia, and he became one of

---

280 Genčev, Българската възрожденска интелигенция. Енциклопедия, 586.
the leading figures among the Bulgarians there. In turn, he became well acquainted with members of the Bulgarian colonies in cities such as Galați and Bucharest.

Seliminski found employment as a teacher in Bucharest, but later, he accepted an invitation of the local Bulgarian merchants’ esnaf (guild) to teach in Roșiori de Vede, in the south of Romania, where he was engaged from 1833-4. There, from a letter sent to the brothers Bakloglu in Bucharest, Seliminski heard for the first time about Vasil Aprilov (see § 6.8) and Nikolaj Palauzov and their plan to found a Bulgarian school in Gabrovo. Seliminski wrote to Aprilov and Palauzov to express his enthusiasm for the project, but he received no reply. Later, in 1840, Seliminski responded to a circular written by Vasil Aprilov, stating that he shared Aprilov’s ideas on orthography.281

In 1835, Seliminski worked as a private teacher in Berjazka, a village close to Ploiești, also called Nov Sliven (New Sliven). From there he applied for and received British citizenship, and with the assistance of the English consulate fought legal cases on behalf of the Bulgarian refugees. One case sought the permission to found a Greek school.

From 1835-7 Seliminski taught in Ploiești, and then from 1837-9 in Bucharest he worked as private teacher of Greek and French, and was advisor to the Russian consulate regarding Bulgarian matters.

In 1840, Seliminski decided to start a completely new education. He started to study medicine in Athens and working at hospitals in Florence. He was supported financially by Anton Ivanov, Ivanov’s former protégé Petăr Beron, and other Bulgarian merchants in Walachia.

In Athens Seliminski regularly met with Bulgarian students and assisted Hadži Hristo (see §4.7) in the realization of a Thraco-Slavonic committee. This committee served to unite Bulgarians in Greece, who had stayed behind after the end of the war of independence, so they could have a representative in the Greek parliament.282 Seliminski was active in the church conflict and in the sending of delegates to the Greek government to argue for the recognition of Bulgaria.

In 1845, Seliminski became a doctor of medicine after his final exams in Sienna. Then he travelled to Paris, where he was in contact with Pikkolos and Beron. Upon his return he worked as doctor in several places in Walachia and Bessarabia.

In 1853, shortly before the outbreak of the Crimean War, Seliminski signed a petition from the Bucharest Bulgarians to Czar Nikolaj I, in which they pleaded for some degree of autonomy.

281 Both letters are published in Dr. Ivan Seliminski. Săcinenija. (Sofia: Bălgarski pisatel, 1989), 355-365.
282 Todorov, Bălgarsko văzrajdane XVIII, 367.
like that of the Serbians and the Romanians. Hoping that Bulgarian military support for the Russians would do good to the Bulgarian cause, Seliminski went to war: he worked as battalion doctor in the Russian army, for which he received two silver badges of honour. He also was a member of a committee that was recruiting new Bulgarian volunteers to fight with the Russians, for which he enrolled close to a thousand volunteers.

Seliminski was also active within the community, supporting schools in Sliven schools, for example. In 1857, during the church conflict, Seliminski was chosen to represent the Bucharest Bulgarians in Istanbul. Relatively early, it was Seliminski’s opinion that Bulgaria should have its own independent church, as opposed to the modest demand for Bulgarian priests in Bulgarian dioceses, that was for a long time the aim of the negotiators Neofit Bozveli and Iarion Makariopolski. In 1846, Seliminski handed a plea to the Sultan when he was visiting Ruse to combat the abuse of power by the priests in the Bulgarian lands and to determine maximum pay for them. In 1863, he acted as delegate of the Brăila community at the celebration of the millennial anniversary of the acceptance of Christianity in Prague.

When he died, in 1867, he left his possessions to Bulgarian education, for scholarships for the poor and the translation of books. During his life Seliminski visited many cities, for instance Dresden, Leipzig, Berlin, Frankfurt, Strasbourg and Paris.

His works, mainly in Greek, deal with historical, cultural and moral subjects. He also translated schoolbooks from French into Greek. His opinion was that the revival of the Bulgarian people was to be attained only by a good education and a standard language. He saw Russia as the most reliable partner to support the Bulgarians in the pursuit of these goals.

The case of Seliminski illustrates the complexity of allegiances and perceived allegiances that surrounded a Bulgarianist stance at the time. Vasil Aprilov (see §7.8) criticised Seliminski for his philhellenism (see § 6.8), as he went to Greece for his education. The image that Seliminski was an incorrigible philhellene has remained mainstream long since. Still, Seliminski did underline the importance of Russia for the revival of the Bulgarians: he even tried to have Bulgarian students in Athens transfer themselves to Russian institutions.

---

284 Radev, Enciklopedija, 663.
285 Todorov, Bālgarsko vážraždane XVIII, 314.
286 B. Nedkov, "Brailskite buntove/1841-1842/ v Turski dokumenti", in Pamet na M. Dimitrov (Sofia, 1974), 702, quoted in Todorov, Bālgarsko vážraždane XVIII, 325.
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§4.7 Bulgarians fighting alongside with Greek revolutionaries

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, before the onset of the church conflict, there was a great deal of sympathy among Bulgarians for the Greeks and their pursuit of an independent state. It is likely that this was a continuation of the orthodox sense of community that existed in the eighteenth century. We have seen this with intellectuals like Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos. Moreover, many Bulgarian intellectuals were members of the secret Greek organisation, *Filiki Etaireia*, which conspired to organise the revolution. Among them were the Bucharest-based Dimităr hadži Ivanov (Ioanov) Mustakov, who was based in Bucharest and also had ties with the Serbian Prince Miloš Obrenović, and his brother Konstantin (Kostake) hadži Ivanov (Ioanov) Mustakov, who was later also involved in the Brăila uprisings. Other Bulgarian members of the *Filiki Etaireia* were Grigorij N. Mustakov; Hristo hadži Račkov, the local agitator in Gabrovo for the *Etaireia*, who was also known as Gabrovali or Grek and committed suicide in Târnovo in 1821, after the insurrection in the Danubian principalities had failed; Vâlko and Stojan Todoro Čalâkov.

The *Filiki Etaireia* had a great appeal for Bulgarians, because plans were drafted for simultaneous outbreaks in Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria. It is said that Dimitrios Vatikiotis, who was the ‘apostle’ (coordinator) of the *Etaireia* in Bulgaria, could count on the assistance of 14,000 Bulgarians. According to Ivan Seliminski, in every important Bulgarian town (also in the Danubian principalities and Bessarabia), there were members and supporters of the *Etaireia*.

When Alexandros Ypsilantis, the leader of the Greek insurrection, crossed the Russo-Moldavian border, he was met by a Bulgarian delegation, who declared that 10,000 Bulgarians would join his troops. They also offered eighteen large ships to transport the troops across the Danube. About one third of the troops of Ypsilantis and Vladimirescu, who headed the Romanian uprising that broke out at the same time, consisted of Bulgarians, mainly from the Danubian principalities, but also from Bessarabia and southern Russia, and Bulgarian cities south of the Danube.

When the insurrection in the Romanian lands was suppressed, and the Turkish authorities had carried out serious reprisals throughout Bulgaria, many Bulgarians joined the rebels on the Greek Peloponnese peninsula. Other Bulgarians, like Hadži Hristo, who were already in Greece at the outbreak of the revolution in Turkish service, defected to the Greeks. A third group of
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Bulgarians joined the effort, many of them coming from Bulgaria’s South. In total, the number of Bulgarian volunteers who fought the Turks in Greece exceeded the number of all the other nationalities (Serbs, Montenegrins, Romanians, Albanians) put together 291.

One of best known among them was Hadži Hristo Bălgarin, (Hadži Hristo, the Bulgarian). He followed in the footsteps of his father and brother, who had fought in the Serbian revolution. Hristo went to Bosnia and later to Egypt, where he joined the service of Mehmed Ali Paša. During the siege of Tripolitsa he defected to the Greeks, where he was made head of a group of Bulgarian volunteers, and in 1824 became general. After the war of independence, Hadži Hristo remained in Greek service, and was one of the members of the Thraco-Slavonic Committee, that was founded in Athens to represent Bulgarians politically.

Hadži Hristo became a representative in parliament and, as general-major, he was adjutant to King Otto 292. The work of Hadži Hristo, and other heroic actions of Bulgarians who fought for the Greek cause, are even commemorated in Greek folk songs 293.

After the Greek state had, more or less, been established, there were Bulgarians who went to Greece to offer their services in the development of all kinds of institutions. This was the case with Nikolaos Pikkolos (see §4.3), who was not only a member of the Filiki Eta'iria, but when the uprising had actually broken out, went to the island of Hydra to offer his services in the new hierarchy. After the foundation of the independent Greek state, Bulgarians continued to benefit from the Greek cultural infrastructure. Doctor Bodev (known in Greek as Bodeas), Ivan Seliminski, and Grigor Părliečev, for example, went to Athens to study. Indeed, towards the end of the 1840s, approximately 30 Bulgarians were enrolled at the university there and had organised the Slavjanobălgarsko učenoljubivo družestvo (Slavo-Bulgarian study circle). In 1863, when revolutionary Georgi Rakovski was in Athens, he founded a ‘Macedonian circle’.

Poet Grigor Părliečev, who was born in Ohrid, wrote his works in Greek and even won a Greek literary competition in 1860 with his poem Armatoles. Later in his life, Părliečev identified himself as Bulgarian, as reflected in his autobiography, which was written in Bulgarian 294.

Gradually, Athens lost its central position when more and more Bulgarians went to Russia to study.

293 Nikolaj Todorov, Balkanski izmerenija na grăčkoto văstaniya ot 1821 godina: prinosat na bălgărite (Sofia: Otečestvenijat front, 1984), 114.
294 Părliečev’s Avtobiografija is the subject of the dissertation of Raymond Detrez: Detrez, De autobiografija.
Conclusions

Among the Bulgarian intellectuals that were presented in this chapter, two parallel developments are to be witnessed. The first one is the shift from patriotic to nationalistic activism. A second development is the shift in orientation from the orthodox (Greek, but not ethnic Greek) cultural world to the Slavic-Bulgarian one.

The first Bulgarian intellectuals, like their Greek friends and examples, had more characteristics of patriots than of nationalists. When ideas about Enlightenment and patriotism first reached Greek society, also Bulgarian intellectuals, who were part of the social group of Greeks, started to act upon its principles: they provided funding to further science and learning, and to build an education system that would make the Ottoman Empire a better place for all, regardless of ethnicity. They did not act from the nationalist idea to establish a separate Bulgarian state for a separate Bulgarian nation.

The majority of these people, like Atanas Bogoridi (§4.2), Nikolas Pikkolos (§4.3) Petăr Beron (§4.5), and Ivan Seliminski (§4.6) received their education in Greek schools, three of them in the Greek academy of Bucharest. They represent a type of patriot, an emigré-patriot, which matches with the following description of Viroli:

To be committed to the common liberty of our people means that if our country is unfree we have to work to make it free instead of leaving to look for liberty elsewhere, and if we are forced to leave, we have to continue to work in order to be able to go back to live in freedom with our fellows.295

The other development which had large consequences was the introduction of the concept of nationality. Had religion long been the main defining characteristic of a person in the Ottoman empire, in the nineteenth century this started to be replaced by ethnic identity. As members of the Greek social group, Bulgarians were also introduced to the concept of a national state, that was taking shape within this group. While in the beginning of the nineteenth century Greek had been a social denomination, in the time of the Greek revolution it started to change its meaning and turn into an ethnic characteristic. Claims for a national state were made with this new meaning of the word ‘Greek’ as point of reference.

295 Viroli, For love of country, 9.
Some Bulgarians witnessed this process from the inside, either as members of the revolutionary armed forces, or as members of the diaspora group that first combined forces to raise support for the new Greek state among foreign states, and then had a role in the developing Greek political life. This idea of a national state was later transferred to the newly developing Bulgarian nation, in a process highly similar to the patterns described by Benedict Anderson.

While some people changed from patriots to nationalists first, and later from ‘Greek’ to ‘Bulgarian’, others did the other way around. Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos are examples of the first type: they changed from ‘Greek’ patriots into ‘Greek’ nationalists and only later, if at all, turned from ‘Greek’ nationalists into ‘Bulgarian’ nationalists. Petăr Beron and Ivan Seliminski underwent the two developments in the other order: they changed their allegiance from ‘Greek’ to ‘Bulgarian’ first, but did not fully complete the turn from patriots into nationalists: they continued to represent patriotic ideals of Enlightenment and education.

This chapter also shows the crucial importance of networks. Where as the first patriotic intellectuals operated more or less individually, in the course of time the networks in which they were operating increased in density. The Greek cultural world had contacts with western Europe, and it was in Greek networks and through Greek interpretation that Bulgarians were first introduced in the European debates of the time. The Greek network in Paris, of which Adamantios Korais, Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos were part, serves as the best illustration. In hindsight, the people who were active in these networks, like Stefan Bogoridi, have been better preserved in the cultural memory of the Bulgarians than solitary figures like Seliminski and Beron.

The Greek example of the early nineteenth century proved to be a major influence on the Bulgarian education, which was to start in the second quarter of that century, both in a practical and an ideological way. Petăr Beron and Neofit Rilski learned about the allilodidactic method of teaching in Walachia, from Greek teachers, and transferred this idea through Bulgarian schoolbooks.
5: Changes in the Bulgarian lands

The situation in the Ottoman empire in the eighteenth century has been described in the previous two chapters. In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman empire witnessed important political and economical changes, which improved the opportunities for Bulgarians to organise themselves. This chapter gives an overview of these developments.

§5.1 The development of Bulgarian cities and towns

As described above (in §1.1 and 3.1), Bulgarians inside the Ottoman Empire were relatively well-off for a long time. In the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a strong Bulgarian economy developed, despite the kârdžalijsctvo period (see §3.2), which interrupted the process for approximately twenty years between 1790 and 1810. This coincided with significant population growth.

Between 1825 and 1875, the number of inhabitants in the Bulgarian lands doubled with the return of large parts of around half-a-million Bulgarians from Walachia and Serbia, who had fled their country during the kârdžalijsctvo and in the Russian-Turkish war of 1828-9. Interestingly, the share of urban population remained stable, at about 20%, and a primate city did not develop, at least not within the Bulgarian lands, rather a network of smaller towns emerged. Around 1850, there were twenty towns in Bulgaria of over 5,000 inhabitants, and six of over 15,000. Plovdiv, with 30,000 people, was the largest city296. Of course the sizeable Bulgarian colonies in the nearby cities Istanbul and Bucharest constituted a factor to be reckoned with. Istanbul is sometimes called ‘the largest Bulgarian city of the nineteenth century’297: it is estimated that in the time of the Crimean War, it housed between 30,000 and 40,000 Bulgarians298.

As the production of agricultural products and trade with Western Europe increased, the role of towns as centres of trade and craft also became important299. Craft became more and more specialised, no longer the side-line activity of farmers that it had been before. The esnafs, in which

298 Meinerger, The formation, 10.
craftsmen were organised, increasingly dominated town life. They were active in charity, mediated between the ruling class and their members, and also organised celebrations and festivals.\(^{300}\)

The wool industry was the best developed, thanks to events in 1826, when Sultan Mahmud II disbanded the Janissary order after its troops had revolted against his plans for modernisation.\(^{301}\) In its place, the Sultan created a regular army, and it bought the aba (the woollen cloth used for their uniforms), or the uniforms themselves, from abadžijas, weavers, in Bulgaria.\(^{302}\) In 1830, the weavers of Sliven provided the army with 1000 bales of aba, one bale usually containing around 20 meters of cloth. Three years later the army ordered, from Sliven and Kotel together, 60,000 bales, and this grew to 80,000\(^{303}\).

Other flourishing crafts were cord-knitting, carpet-weaving and dying of textiles. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, industries started to be automated. The first weaving factory was opened in Sliven in 1834, under the direction of an employee of the Turkish army.\(^{304}\)

Trade also developed, both inside the Ottoman Empire and internationally. A good illustration is the family Gešov, who in 1834 founded their trade firm in Plovdiv. One year later, they opened a branch in Vienna, where they sold rose oil, aba, cotton and other products from Bulgaria and imported from there products from Austrian factories.\(^{305}\) The village Bansko benefited in particular, as many of its merchants who traded cotton in Vienna became very wealthy.

Because of the trade with the Habsburg Empire, cities on the Danube had the most direct contact with western culture, so that architecture in cities like Ruse is still very central-European in its look. These cities took a leading role in the development of the new Bulgarian national culture, becoming cultural hubs, whose influence spread throughout the region.\(^{306}\) The first čitalištes (reading rooms, see §6.7), theatres, and other cultural institutions appeared in cities on the Danube. In cities in the Balkan mountain range, like Kotel and Gabrovo, craft developed in the eighteenth century, and was only later followed by trade. These cities nevertheless became cultural centres, with impact on the villages around them.

Some villages, like Koprivštica, Arbanasi, and Bansko enjoyed a special status in the Ottoman Empire and were subsequently very wealthy. They profited from exemption from certain

\(^{300}\) Shaw, Empire, 157.
\(^{301}\) Stanford J. Shaw, Ezel Kural Shaw. Reform, revolution and republic; the rise of modern Turkey 1808-1975 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977) [History of The Ottoman Empire and modern Turkey, II], 20-22.
\(^{302}\) Crampton, “Bulgarian society”, 188.
\(^{303}\) Tjutjundžiev, Kratka stopanska historija, 98.
\(^{304}\) Lampe, Balkan economic history, 145.
\(^{305}\) Todev, Koj koj e, 69.
taxes in return for services like guarding roads or passes or delivering goods to the Ottoman government. According to Richard Crampton:

… the inhabitants of Koprivštica joked that Sofiotes who visited the town usually crossed themselves every time they passed a merchant’s house for so imposing and opulent was the building that the visitors assumed it must be a monastery.\footnote{Crampton, “Bulgarian society”, 14.}

An important change in the Ottoman administration contributing to the development and spread of nationalism among Bulgarians was the appointment of Bulgarian tax collectors in lieu of the Ottoman sipahis (the sultan’s vassals), who had done this work before. These tax collectors, recruited from the ranks of čorbadžijas, the Bulgarian elite, often also became mayors of their towns. Furthermore, in 1864, town councils were established, in which the esnafs were also prominent. This led to fierce local debates about how best to spend tax revenue. The conflicting views of conservative and progressive Bulgarians became increasingly apparent, leading to a clearer articulation of political ideas.

§5.2 Bulgarian monasteries: Athos and Rila

Throughout the period of Ottoman rule, Bulgarian monasteries remained important cultural centres. It was there that old books were copied and oral traditions passed on. Taksidiots, monks who were travelling around to collect donations for their monasteries, also acted as important points of contact between the monasteries and the villages and towns, and from one village to the next, transporting not only money and books but information as well. Sometimes taksidiots stayed in a place for a longer stretch of time, and worked as a teacher with the local population.

The holy mountain of Athos was particularly important not only as a Bulgarian cultural centre, but as a Slavic centre generally. On Athos were three Slavic monasteries: Hilandar (in origin Serbian), Zograf (in origin Bulgarian) and St. Pantaleimon (in origin Russian); they were home to Slavic monks from different nationalities.

The Zograf monastery, which is believed to have been founded in the beginning of the tenth century, had close links with the political leaders of the second Bulgarian kingdom. Ever since the Middle Ages, monks of Zograf, but also from other monasteries, had travelled the
Bulgarian lands as *taksidiots* cementing strong ties with the Bulgarian community. It is no coincidence that Paisij Hilendarski (see §5.3) composed his history of Bulgaria from there.

Inside the Bulgarian lands, the monastery of Rila, in what is now southwest Bulgaria, was regarded the most important centre of Bulgarian religious life since the Middle Ages. It enjoyed many privileges handed down by the Sultan, and despite being destroyed and looted on a number of occasions, was always restored to its previous stature.

Rila had close contacts with the Slavic monasteries on the Holy Mountain of Athos, with Russia, from where it received many books, and with the monasteries in Habsburg Serbia through the activities of taksidiots. The monastery had ties with cities and towns all over Bulgaria.

In the eighteenth century the monastery produced many well-known scholars, including: Josif Bradati, Todor Vračanski, Teofan Rilski and Joan Vračanski. These men were active, among other things, in the production of religious anthologies known as damascins. Bradati also made a completely new translation of *Thisavros* by Damaskinos Studitis, which was hand-copied a number of times by his pupils, especially by Nikifor Rilski. Moreover, Bradati was a supporter of the use of the vernacular language in church services and among the first to stress the importance of education for children:

> Тако длъжни се родителите от малки да накажат своиите деца, да ги учат от седма или пето, докато да придут до ~ис~ лета. Понеже душа малдо дете т' подобна е ст како бело платно, и аще ва каква боя поставиш его, то остане сму до последи.

Thus parents have to discipline their children, to educate them from the seventh year or fifth, until they are 16 years old. The soul of a young child is like a white cloth, and whatever paint you put on it, it will stay there afterwards.

When in 1833 the Rila monastery was rebuilt after having burned down, money for this purpose came from all over the country. Significant donations came, for example, from inhabitants of Gabrovo. The increasing number of pilgrimages to the monastery from all over Bulgaria turned it into a symbol for the *Văzraždane*. In the late *Văzraždane*, Rila, like other Bulgarian monasteries,
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became a shelter and refuge for revolutionaries. In 1852, the hajduk leader Iljo Markov (better known as djado Iljo Vojvoda) sheltered here.

When the Russian scholar Viktor Grigorovič (see §6.5) visited Rila in 1845, he was very impressed with the fact that the service in the monastery church was conducted in Slavic and that Neofit Rilski was teaching Greek, Slavic and Bulgarian alongside church history. Grigorovič was dismayed, however, about the limited means available to the school, so he donated some of his Russian books to Neofit314.

Rila was also an early centre of the printing business. In the 1830s and 1840s proigumen315 hadži Isaj Rilski was in charge of this and he saw that a special building was made for the presses that had come from Vienna316. The prints, of which tens of copies a day were produced, usually depicted scenes from the life of its patron saint, Ivan Rilski, and views of the monastery. These were very popular among pilgrims. Through the taksidiotis, the prints were also distributed as far as Russia and Serbia. In this way, the monastery helped to raise Ivan Rilski to the rank of national saint.

The Rila monastery is just one example of the role that monasteries played in the Bulgarian Văzraždane. There were other monasteries as well that had a printing press, like Trojan, or gave shelter to revolutionaries.

§5.3 The first Bulgarian history: Paisij Hilendarski

A fundamentally important text that was written from the Zografs monastery on Athos, and a key work in the Bulgarian Văzraždane, was Istorija Slavjanobolgarska317 (Slavo-Bulgarian History) of 1762, by the monk Paisij Hilendarski (of Hilendar). It was a history of Bulgaria in which Paisij, although committed orthodox, continued the work of the Illyrianist intellectuals of the eighteenth century.

315 A proigumen is in the orthodox hierarchy a monk who is one rank below the igumen, the abbot.
317 Paisij himself did not give his work a title. See the facsimile of the original: Paisij Hilendarski. Istorija Slavjanobolgarskaja 1762. Zografska černova (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1989), 1a.
Paisij Hilendarski was born in 1722, son of Mihail hadži Vălčov, in the town of Bansko, now in West Bulgaria. His first name probably was Petăr or Penko. His brother Lazar, Lavrentij by his monk’s name, was igumen (abbot) of the Hilendarski monastery on Athos. Paisij did not receive a formal education but went in 1745 to the Hilendar monastery to become a monk.

Thirteen years later he travelled to Sremski Karlovci in Habsburg Serbia to collect the inheritance of igumen Gerasim, who had died there. On that trip, in the library of the Archiepiscopy, Paisij read a number of works, which were referenced in Istorija, a book he commenced after his return to the Holy Mountain. There are suggestions that Paisij met the Serbian historiographer Jovan Rajić (see § 2.6) in Serbia, and that he travelled further north, maybe even to Vienna, but we lack firm proof. It is certain that after disagreement in the Hilendar monastery, Paisij moved to the Zograf monastery, where he finished his manuscript in 1762.

Peter Mackridge states that in writing a national history of the Bulgarians, Paisij was heavily influenced by Chronographos, a Greek text by Dorotheos of Monemvasia, written in 1631. It is likely that, in addition to the books he had read in Sremski Karlovci, Paisij also drew on works in the libraries of the Athos monasteries, which contained gramotas (charters) of Bulgarian Czars, and works of the literary school of Tărnovo of the fourteenth century, such as the vitae (hagiographies) written by Evtimij Tărnovski and Konstantin Kostenečki, and the story of Grigorij Camblak about the transfer of the relics of St. Petka from Veliko Tărnovo to Serbia. It is known that Paisij also used the Russian Kormčaja kniga (Pidalion), and several Russian vitae, as well as Serbian works: the Vita of St. Sava and both the Latin Stemmatographia and its Slaveno-Serbian translation (Stematografija, see §2.6). However the sources that Paisij used most are the Russian translations of Annales Ecclesiatici (Venerable Cesare Baronius, 1538-1607) and Mauro Orbini’s Il regno degli slavi (1601, see §2.2).

Paisij’s work starts with an explanation about the value of history. This essay was originally written by the Polish Jesuit P. Skarga for the Polish translation of Baronius’ work, but was also included in the Russian translation. Paisij continues with a discussion of the ancestry of the
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Bulgarians, repeating the Biblical myth that the different peoples are descendants from the different sons of Noah, whereby Europeans are believed to be the descendants of Japhet. The father of the Slav people is Japhet’s son, Moshos, who gave his name to the Moskva river\textsuperscript{326}.

Paisij also briefly describes the history of the Serbian kings, about whom he is less than complimentary. He writes, for example, that the legendary medieval ruler Stefan Dušan killed his father and usurped the titles of Czar and patriarch. More attention is given to the Bulgarian kings, who receive a favourable critique.

Paisij’s version of the story of Cyril and Method, appearing in the history, is an interesting one. According to Paisij the Bulgarian Czar Murtagon (another name for Boris), wanted to have his palace painted and asked Method, who was a skillful painter, to paint him animals, birds and a lion. Method painted instead the coming of the Lord. It is said he did this so well, that the Czar felt overwhelmed and converted to Christianity\textsuperscript{327}. Only after this, according to Paisij, did the brothers and their pupils go to Moravia.

Compared with other versions of the same story, Paisij has reversed the order of events, namely that Cyril and Method first went to Moravia, and then with their pupils to Bulgaria, where they converted the Czar. In his sequence of events, Paisij stressed that the Bulgarians were the first among the Slavs to convert to Christianity, and that it was the Bulgarians who gave the alphabet to the Slavs:

Тако болгари от сви народи славенски прежде приели православие, прежде имели себе патриарха и цара и по своему языку читати почели\textsuperscript{328}.

So the Bulgarians accepted orthodoxy before all other Slavic peoples and before them they had their patriarch and began to read in their own language.

In his history, Paisij also discussed, in bleak terms, the Bulgarian culture of his day. He bewailed the loss of religious autonomy, the fact that Bulgaria did not have its own church to speak of\textsuperscript{329}. He compared the Bulgarian situation with that of the Serbian. It is clear that Paisij viewed the churches as vital in this regard:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Hilendarski, Paisij (1989). Istorija Slavjanobolgarskaja 1762. Zografska černova (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo), 8a. This last thesis is not present in the works of Baroni and Orbini. Angelov, Bălgarskata narodnost, 245, suggested that Paisij took this from the Nestor chronicle, or Povest’ vremennih let (Tale of bygone years), but in this chronicle, no mention of Moshos is made. Meshech (Mosoch in Greek) is mentioned as the fifth son of Japheth in the Bible.
  \item Hilendarski, Istorija, 57a and b.
  \item Hilendarski, Istorija, 59a.
  \item Paschalis Kitromilides suggests that Paisij does not show hostility towards Greeks in this respect, as is the traditional Bulgarian view, but that he urged Bulgarians to follow the example of the Greeks. Kitromilides, “Orthodox Culture”, 139.
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Notably those Serbs who are subjects of the Turk are much more simple and poorer than the Bulgarians, but the ones who are in the German [Habsburg, js] state, they are a bit more skillful in reading and writing, because they have freedom in their church.

Towards the end of his history, Paisij provided an overview of Bulgarian saints, explaining in his afterword that for this he had to dig for information, since Orbini, being a ‘Latinin’ did not write in his *Il regno degli Slavi* about Bulgarian and Serbian saints who lived after the Great Schism331.

For his research, Paisij relied on the Illyrianist Slavic scholars before him, and partly shared their Illyrian tendencies. But his primary identification seems to have been Bulgarian rather than Illyrian332, and for certain he did not agree with the primacy of the Serbs within the Illyrian ideology that Žefarović expressed in his *Stematografija* (see §2.6)333.

The original copy of Paisij’s text was unknown for a long time. It was discovered in the library of the Zograf monastery on Athos in 1902 by Anton Stoilov and identified as the original334. Consequently, throughout the *Vâzraždane*, Paisij’s text was only known through copies.

Paisij travelled in person to distribute his text. It is known that he was in Kotel in 1765, where Sofronij Vračanski made a copy. It is assumed that he died on his way back to Athos335. Older scholars took the date of 1798 for his death, later the consensus was that he died in 1772, in Stanimaka, nowadays Asenovgrad336.

The first copy of Paisij’s history was made by Sofronij Vračanski (see § 3.7), in 1765. This copy is therefore academically known as the ‘Sofronij-copy’: *Sofroniev prepis*. The second copy (*Samokovski prepis*) was made by Aleksi Velković Popović, in Samokov in 1771. This copy is also believed to have been made from the original. The following year, a further copy was made by Nikifor Rilski for the library of the Rila monastery337.
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Over the years, a series of copies were made that from 1782, when Sofronij made a second copy, to an increasing degree contained changes, additions and corrections. In total, about 60 copies were made throughout the Bulgarian lands, from Macedonia to Bessarabia. Most of them were made in the 1830s, about sixty years after the completion of the text. The latest is from 1845, one year after the text had become available in print. Most copies were made in the northern parts of Bulgaria.

Meanwhile, we can register some repercussions of Paisij’s history with Hristaki Pavlović, Vasil Aprilov and Konstantin Fotinov. The first printed version of Paisij’s history was released in 1844, by Hristaki Pavlović in Pešt, under the name Carstvenik (Kings’ Book). Pavlović used several manuscripts for his edition and corrected their language and punctuation. In his introduction, Pavlović indirectly calls upon the Bulgarians to become one again, claiming that it was disagreements that had made the medieval Bulgarians weak.

Ппо времени же пак ослабеха, обезславиха и под его подпаднаха. Но това от где? От несогласия их: понеже разбезаха союз согласия, разделихасе един на една страна, а друг на друга. Й така они со согласием прославихасе, а с несогласием изгубиха свою славу…

With time they became weaker, they lost their fame and fell under a yoke. And why so? Because of their disagreement: because they broke the bond of agreement, and separated themselves one in one direction, and another one in another direction. So in agreement they were famous, and in disagreement they lost their fame…

Pavlović had published Razgovornik grekobolgarskij (a Greek-Bulgarian language guide) in Belgrade, nine years earlier. In this glossary, he had stressed the importance of education in the native language, and, like Paisij, claimed that Bulgarians had a history just as impressive as the Greeks. To prove this, a short history of Bulgaria, consisting of excerpts from Paisij’s Istorija, had already been appended to the Razgovornik.
Despite the publication of the *Carstvenik*, in the 1830s Paisij did not yet have the status of a national hero. The intellectual Vasil Aprilov (see § 7.8), one of the leading figures of the Bulgarian colony in Odessa, sent his friend, the Ukrainian scholar Jurij Venelin (see §7.7) in Moscow, a copy of Paisij’s history in 1837. In that time, the history of Paisij was seen as only one of the important works of the period just preceding the *Văzraždane*. Aprilov, in his *Dennica* of 1841, placed the beginning of the *Văzraždane* not with Paisij, but with the reforms in the Ottoman Empire, the abolition of the Janitsar corps in 1826 and the Tanzimat, the programme of reforms that started in 1839.

In *Mysli za segašnoto bălgarsko učenie* (Thoughts about the Bulgarian education) of 1847, Aprilov explained why he did not want to contribute to the *Carstvenik*, the edition of Paisij’s history that Pavlović was preparing for publication:

...защото е пълен с много неправилности, погрешки, анахронизми, не считаме за добро да даваме лъжливи понятия за нашето билоописание.344

...because it is full of mistakes, errors, [and] anachronisms, we do not consider it just to give an incorrect understanding of our ethnography.

Nikolaj Aretov remarks that this should be seen in the debate of the 1840s, when the Bulgarians in Odessa saw themselves as the only true representatives of the Bulgarian people, and looked down on everyone, like Pavlović, who had not received a thorough (read: Russian) education.

The history of Paisij was referred to by Konstantin Fotinov, in his introduction to *Ljuboslovie*, the first periodical in Bulgarian, printed in Izmir345. Paisij’s work is mentioned again, in 1852, by the Russian scholar Viktor Grigorović346. Many Bulgarians remained oblivious to the text: the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski, for example, did not know about the work in 1858, when he wrote to Dragan Cankov:

Открих една история ръкопис българска, писана в лето ~αψξβ~ (1762) в Атонска гора от някого си иеромонах Пансия. Тя е досто обширна и писана от ученаго човека.347.

I discovered a Bulgarian history manuscript, written in the year 1762 on Mount Athos by a certain monk Paisij. It is sizable, and written by an erudite man.

---
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One year later, in the announcement of his work *Njakovko reči o Asenju Părvomu i Asenju vtoromu* (Some words about Asen the First and Asen the Second) in the newspaper *Carigradski Vestnik*, Rakovski wrote about Paisij’s history. But when Rakovski compiled his cultural programme *Pokazalec* in 1859, which listed Bulgarian activists that deserved a biography, he did not include Paisij, whereas Sofronij Vračanski and Neofit Bozveli were both mentioned. In 1863 Rajko Žinzifov (see §7.9) apparently considered Paisij to be of importance, since he quotes it in a foreword.

Only after the special attention that Marin Drinov paid to Paisij, did the monk start to be seen as ‘the one who started it all’. In 1871, Marin Drinov, professor of Slav philology at the University of Harkiv, in Ukraine, wrote a portrait of Paisij in the fourth issue of *Periodičesko spisanie na Bălgarskoto kniţovno druţestvo* (Periodical journal of the Bulgarian literary society), which was called *Otec Paisij, negovoto vreme, negovata istorija i učeničite mu* (Father Paisij, his time, his history and his pupils). This had been prefaced by Vasil Drumev in previous issues in writings on the importance of historical biography: *Životopisanie. Značenieto na životopisite* (Biography writing. The importance of biographies). In the fifth issue, Drumev added a biography of Sofronij Vračanski.

In the first article of the series, Drumev praised Paisij in great words:

Какъв език! Какъв чуден и лързовит език, особено в онези тежки времена! С такъв език е можал да говори само онзи, който е имал неизказана, небесна любов към своя злочест, но мила и драг народ. […] O, велик е бил отец Пансиий!

What a language! What a wonderful and steadfast language, especially in those hard times. Only a man who has an unspoken, heavenly love for his ill-fated but loving and precious people could speak with such a language. O, great was father Paisij!

It was Marin Drinov who proposed that Paisij be considered as the founder of the *Văzraţdane*. Until then, figures including Neofit Rilski, Vasil Aprilov and Jurij Venelin, who acted 60-70 years after Paisij, were regarded as such. Drinov’s authority ensured that this opinion was adopted by Bulgarians, and through his close friend, the Czech slavist Konstantin Jireček, this view also
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became acknowledged outside Bulgaria. From 1878 onwards, the consensus was that the Vǎzraždane had started with Father Paisij.

In the twentieth century, social historians like Bojan Penev and Ivan D. Šišmanov argued that Paisij was to be seen as merely a representative of a collective process of growing awareness. Nevertheless, Paisij continues to enjoy personal glory as an icon in Bulgarian national awareness, and nearly all histories of the Bulgarian Vǎzraždane start with a chapter on Paisij. Efrem Karanfilov puts it like this:

И все пак особен интерес събужда фактът, че Паисий е първият. Така сме свикнали да мислим за него. Той е родоначалник на нашето възраждане, на нашата историческа наука, на нашата литература.

And still it is of special interest, that Paisij is the first. That is how we are used to think of him. He is the one who founded our Vázraždane, our historiography, and our literature.

§5.4 The Hatt-i-Şerif and the Tanzimat reforms

In 1839, Sultan Abdulmejid issued the Hatt-i-Şerif decree marking the start of major reforms in the Ottoman Empire. The ensuing period is known as Tanzimat. The decree itself was very general in parts, but stated explicitly that it would guarantee security for subjects of the Ottoman Empire, and would regulate taxation and a system of payment for troops. This extended to all peoples, regardless of their religion. A Tanzimat-council was established to monitor the implementation of the reforms mapped out in the decree. Of this council, Stefan Bogoridi (see §4.2) was a member.

Later in the Tanzimat, new reforms were proclaimed in other areas. A reform in the justice system was to give Christians the same rights as Muslims, and to forbid paşas from confiscating property, or torturing at will. Furthermore, provincial administration was to be more strictly monitored from the capital. Although most of the reforms were implemented in part only, or not at all, the symbolic value of the Hatt-i-Şerif was great.
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In 1856, the *Hatt-i-Hümayun* decree promised further reforms. It proclaimed equality for all citizens of the empire, and announced a reorganisation of the millets to suit “the progress and enlightenment of the times…”

§5.5 The church conflict

Around 1850, the main vehicle of the developing Bulgarian national identity was the church conflict. Raymond Detrez points out that, right from the beginning, it displayed many features of a mass movement, and thus a phase C activity in Hroch’s classification, aiming to achieve independence through democratic reforms, negotiations and diplomatic pressure.

As noted above, already the Catholic intellectuals of the seventeenth century (§2.6) and in the eighteenth century the monks of the Rila monastery, like Josif Bradati (§5.2), stressed that it was the right of the people to hear church services in their own language. For a long time, until the growing centralisation of the orthodox church, and the abolishment of the Ohrid archiepiscopate in 1767, Bulgarians had had that right in the Ottoman Empire.

Although Paisij Hilendarski (see §5.3) had already remarked in 1762 that the Serbs were better off than the Bulgarians, because they had a national church, the discussion about the church in The Bulgarian lands was, in the spirit of Josif Bradati (see §5.2), entirely about the designation of Bulgarian priests to Bulgarian villages, to avoid language problems. In the 1840s and 1850s, however, attention shifted to the political question of an autonomous Bulgarian church. The foundation of the Catholic millet in 1831, and the Greek national autocephalous church of 1833, probably strengthened the Bulgarian cause, showing that the political situation in the Ottoman Empire was not unalterable, and that Greek could be seen as an ethnic rather than a social indication.

The first events to shape the church debate were calls from the čorbadžijas of Vraca in 1824, that the corrupt Greek bishop, Methodios, be deposed. A second event came in 1838, when 16 Bulgarian ‘kaazas’ (districts) expressed their wish to have the Bulgarian, Neofit Bozveli, appointed as metropolitan of Veliko Târnovo. The patriarch ignored this wish, appointed a Greek metropolitan instead. But the third event, which made the church debate a mass movement, was the so-called Cretan Rebellion of 1866–1868, which brought many thousands of Greeks to the mountains of Thrace, and gave the church conflict a new impetus.
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metropolitan, and made Bozveli ‘protosingel’ (secretary). Meanwhile unrest was brewing throughout the lands. In 1839, the Bulgarian community in the city became more organised with the arrival of Neofit Bozveli in the city. He became one of the spiritual leaders of the community, which was to play an important role in the church debate. Neofit Bozveli (1785-1848) was a monk from the Hilendar monastery on Mount Athos, whence he was also known as Neofit Hilendarski. From the monastery, he was sent to Svištov, where he worked as a teacher and published a number of educational books. In 1839, after he was nominated protosingel of Veliko Târnovo, instead of metropolitan, he went to Istanbul to support the Bulgarian side in the church conflict. He was banished in 1840 because of revolutionary activities.

The other leader of the Bulgarian community in Istanbul, Ilarion Makariopolski (1812-1875), was also a monk in the Hilendar monastery. He had been educated in Arbanasi, Veliko Târnovo, Athos, the island of Andros (where he joined the Bulgarian society), at the grammar school of Athens, and in the Kuruçeşme school of Istanbul. This school was the best secular school for the orthodox population in the Ottoman Empire360. There were a number of Bulgarian students in the school, and they organised themselves in a ‘Macedonian society’, of which Makariopolski was a member, as was the future revolutionary Rakovski.

In 1844, Bozveli and Makariopolski handed a petition to the Sultan to build a Bulgarian church in Istanbul. For this, they were banished, Bozveli for the second time. Bozveli died on Athos, Makariopolski returned to Istanbul in 1850, where one year later he became representative of the Athos monasteries at the court.

At first the most influential Bulgarian of the time, Stefan Bogoridi (see §4.2), remained aloof from the conflict, although he did have contact with Neofit Bozveli. In 1848, this changed: while the patriarch was still hesitating about whether to give permission for the construction of a Bulgarian church in Istanbul, Bogoridi sent a petition to the Sultan, offering his own house in the Fener district as the place to erect the church. This intervention, and Bogoridi’s continuing involvement with the church, was probably decisive. As soon as the Sultan agreed, in 1849, a small ‘paraklis’ was built, dedicated to St. Stefan in honour of the donator. From that moment, Bulgarians in Istanbul had their own religious and cultural centre, where they could not only hold services in Bulgarian, but also debate about church matters and politics in general.

The situation changed after the issue of the Hatt-i-Hümayun decree of 1856, which confirmed and extended the reforms that were issued in the Hatt-i-Şerif of 1836. This decree was intended to deal with discrimination between Muslims and Christians, but Bulgarians interpreted it
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as relevant for their own relations with the Greeks within the orthodox millet. Then Bulgarians started to ask explicitly for a national church, with a separate church hierarchy. The patriarch, as was expected, refused. Significantly, during the Easter service of 1860, Ilarion Makariopolski, who had been appointed as episcope in charge of the Bulgarian church in 1858, omitted the name of the patriarch in his Easter litany. In doing so, he denied the Patriarch’s authority over the community. This event, known as Bălgarski Velikden (Bulgarian Easter), was to have decisive consequences: it led to a long period of unrest, in which a series of church councils was held without any clear results, that only ended when the Sultan, on February 28, 1870, intervened and acknowledged a Bulgarian exarchate, consisting of fifteen eparchies. As we shall see, the Sultan’s decision was strongly influenced by Russian diplomacy. The Bulgarian church was the first national institution for the Bulgarians, and as such had great symbolic value.

§5.6 Diplomacy at the sultan’s court

As discussed above (in §3.1), the most authoritative figure in the Ottoman Empire, the Sultan was reluctant to give freedoms to national groups in the beginning of the nineteenth century, as it was believed this would undermine the millet-system of governance. In the course of the century, however, there was a shift in this position, as a result of the Greek war of independence, the decline of Ottoman power in general and the weakening of central government particularly. With the gradual collapse of the Ottoman regime the influence of foreign diplomacy became stronger, which greatly assisted the Bulgarians in achieving their goals.

One person to influence the Ottoman court in favour of the Bulgarians, was the Russian diplomat Count Nikolaj Pavlovič Ignatiev (1832-1908), the son of a captain who supported Czar Nikolaj at the Rising of the Dekabrists in 1825. With the Czar as his godfather, Ignatiev was a rising star at the court, negotiating for Russia’s interest after the defeat in the Crimean war, and becoming a general at the age of 26. In 1858, he pulled a trick on the leaders of the English and French armies, jointly fighting against China, when he, as diplomat based at the Beijing court, warned them not to march against Beijing, because a gigantic Chinese army would be waiting for them. In fact, there was no such thing as an organised Chinese army left. When the European troops withdrew, Ignatiev signed the Treaty of Aigun with the Chinese Emperor, which handed over the
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In 1864, Ignatiev became special envoy and authorized minister at the Russian embassy in Istanbul, where, in 1867, he became ambassador. He made a good impression on both the Ottoman court and the other European diplomats in the city, not only because of his talents as a diplomat but also because of his ability to speak Turkish to the Ottoman men of state and the Sultan. Ignatiev had studied Turkish in the four years that he had been based in Beijing. This made him the only diplomat in Istanbul who held negotiations with the Porte, the sultan’s government, without an interpreter.

Ignatiev played a major role in the break of the Bulgarian church from the orthodox Patriarchate, which set him at odds with the Patriarch. He also played a crucial role in the final stages of Bulgaria’s struggle for independence. It is said that when the final insurrection broke out in April 1876, Ignatiev convinced the Sultan that it was just a couple of railway employees on strike, and that it was not worth intervening with military action. This delay on behalf of the sultan gave the insurrection time to gain momentum.

Conclusions

After a long period of relative stability, the Ottoman Empire changed its character drastically in the nineteenth century. The Greek revolution provided an example for Bulgarians of how a national state could be won, as was the foundation of a national Greek church. Nationality, instead of religion, became a distinguishing criterion, as it had become in the late eighteenth century in western Europe.

This idea spread to the Bulgarians and strengthened their wish for national institutions of their own. In the practical realisation of this wish they were to an increasing degree supported by Russian diplomacy.

Amur region to Russia, to emphasize the friendship between the two countries. In 1860, Ignatiev managed to convince the Chinese Emperor again to cede a part of land to Russia, this time a piece as large as France, including 160 miles of coastline and three good harbours, which in fact gave Russia control over all the Chinese and Japanese waters.
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\[363\] Ibid., 247.
\[364\] Ibid., 243.
\[365\] Ibid., 255.
\[366\] Ibid., 259.
Bulgarian national ideas were first expressed in the church conflict. In the absence of a secular public sphere, the religious sphere was the first public platform where Bulgarian nationally oriented intellectuals joined forces. Initially, they were mostly monks and priests. Later, Bulgarians organised themselves more and more in a secular public sphere, formed by societies, secular schools, periodical press etc. This process is described in the following chapter.
6: The development of the Bulgarian nation

What information about the Bulgarian language and culture was available for Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire? How did the news about what was happening elsewhere reach them? In this chapter, an attempt is made to chart the development of Bulgarian sociability and the public sphere in which a national discourse could circulate. As this public sphere was not restricted by state borders, these borders are repeatedly transgressed in this chapter. The main focus of attention are the events inside the Ottoman Empire that contributed to the development of a Bulgarian identity. In chapters 7 and 8, I will elaborate on the influences from the Russian and the Habsburg Empires on the Bulgarian national movement.

§6.1 Bulgarian education

As we have seen in § 3.3, until the nineteenth century the only possible education in the Bulgarian lands was in monastery cell schools or Greek schools. A central issue in the development of a Bulgarian national identity was the introduction and professionalisation of education in Bulgaria in the nineteenth century. The belief grew that, with the increase of international trade, what the nation needed most was a national system of education. At first, the intentions were strictly patriotic. Although until the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, there was no coordinated system of schools, in the decades preceding, the number of Bulgarian schools rose sharply. Especially the opening of the first Bulgarian secondary school in Gabrovo in 1835 marked the start of an explosive development in Bulgarian education. Bulgarian schools started taking in all students, regardless of their wealth. In addition, with the foundation of čitalištes (see §6.7), pupils had much more possibilities for self-education after school. Because there was a high mobility of teachers, the schools formed a network spanning the Bulgarian lands, which helped to create the Bulgarian ‘imagined community’ (see §1.2).

Initially, subjects were delivered entirely in Greek, but gradually, Greek was replaced by Bulgarian, first in teaching practice, and later in the text books as well. This was initially done to help the pupils to learn Greek faster. Schools in which education was provided (partly) in Greek
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and in which the allilodidactic method of teaching (see § 4.1) was used, were called Helleno-
Bulgarian schools. The first of these was opened in the town of Svišťov in 1815 by Emanuil
Vaskidovič. Next to the school, Vaskidovič founded the first school library in the Bulgarian
lands.

Vaskidovič (1795-1875) was a student of the academy of Chios and the Princely Academy
of Bucharest. He had links with Neofit Bozveli and with him had co-authored Slaveno-bolgarskoe
detevodstvo (Slav-Bulgarian pedagogy, 1835), a comprehensive book for all subjects of primary
education, containing lessons in orthography, grammar, arithmetic, and geography. Although
instruction was in Greek, the school of Svišťov became a national patriotic centre, in which
Vaskidovič developed in all his pupils a ‘Bulgarian feeling’.

A second Bulgarian school followed in 1819 in Kotel, with Rajno Popovič, (ca. 1773-1858),
as its first teacher. Born in Žeravna, Popovič received his education there and in Sliven,
Thessaloniki, Chios and in the Princely Academy of Bucharest (where he was admitted in 1816
after assistance of his distant relative Stefan Bogoridi). Popovič worked as, in his own words, a
‘Helleno-Greek’ teacher in Kotel, Žeravna, Karlovo, Kalofer, Sopot and Plovdiv. The helleno-
bulgarian schools that Popovič founded in Kotel and Karlovo were divided in two grades: in the
first grade the language of instruction was Bulgarian, in the second grade this was replaced by
Greek.

Popovič educated numerous people who went on to become influential intellectuals. Petar
Beron and Atanas Kipilovski (see §4.5 and 7.14) were among Popovič’s pupils as were the
journalist Ivan Bogorov and the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski.

More secular schools for Bulgarians were founded in 1820 in Sliven by Ivan Seliminski, in
1826 in Karlovo by Rajno Popovič and in 1828, among emigrants, in Izmir by Konstantin
Fotinov. The school of Fotinov illustrates the need for Bulgarian teachers to use the allilodidactic
method of teaching: starting as a small school for children of the Bulgarian colony in Izmir, with
around ten pupils in one room, it grew in a couple of years to 200 pupils, from all over the
Bulgarian lands.

The first Bulgarian-only school was the school of Gabrovo, which opened in 1835 with
support of the Odessa Bulgarians Vasil Aprilov and Nikolaj Palauzov (see also §7.8 and §7.11).
There is a story that Aprilov and Palauzov decided to start this school when they found out that
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Palauzov’s nephew Vasil Rašev, who came to Odessa at the age of 12, could not read, despite having been in a cell school. What had made the largest impression on the boy was the stick the daskal used for beating his pupils, which had made him run away from school.

When plans were made for the opening of the school, there was no Bulgarian teacher who knew the Bell/Lancaster system (see §4.1), that Aprilov wanted to have introduced in the school, and thus Aprilov sent Neofit Rilski to Bucharest to study it. In 1835, with the return of Neofit Rilski in Bulgaria, the Gabrovo school started with the allilodidactic method, which made it the first modern school in Bulgaria. The opening of the school was celebrated on the 2nd of January 1835. It boasted 70 pupils, 20 of whom were from outside Gabrovo. Regarding those, Aprilov wrote to the supervisors of the school:

Няма да земате от чуждите момчета нито пара освен ако щат бащите им похарчат нещо. Школата е обща и открай светът, ако дойдат нека се учат.

Don’t take even a para from the boys from outside, except when their fathers offer money voluntarily. The school is communal and even if they come from far, let everyone who comes study.

Aprilov intended the school to be a centre of national education, supporting other schools where possible. Indeed people from other cities than Gabrovo turned to Neofit Rilski to seek his advice on school management, and in the decade following the opening of the school, 53 allilodidactic schools were started in all major Bulgarian towns. Later, in the 1850s, Gabrovo lost prestige because of continuing conflicts between teachers and the local authorities, and it never turned into the lyceum or even university that Aprilov had wanted it to become.

Allilodidactic schools were from 1840 onwards replaced by class schools, in which children received their education in year groups. Adapting to the needs of their pupils - future merchants - these schools offered a broad range of subjects; languages (Bulgarian, Turkish, Greek and western languages) as well as mathematics and natural sciences, history, and geography. The first Bulgarian
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class school was founded in the village of Koprivštica in 1846, by Najden Gerov (see §6.8), who also founded a class school in Plovdiv in 1850.

Secondary education in Bulgarian only became available much later. In 1853 the Odessa Bulgarians requested support from the Russian government to change the class school of Plovdiv into a grammar school, so teachers could be trained within the Bulgarian lands, but this plan failed. The first Bulgarian grammar schools were opened in Bolgrad, Russia in 1859, in Plovdiv in 1873, and in Gabrovo in 1874. For third-level education, Bulgarians had to wait until 1888, when an Institute of Education was founded in Sofia, which was to turn into the Sofia University later. Until that time, Bulgarians were dependent on education abroad, in Russia, but also in the Habsburg Empire, Greece and Serbia.

The schools and book production were a stimulus for each other. As the network of Bulgarian schools expanded, the production of primers and other school books increased. Petăr Beron’s Riben Bukvar was the first school book in 1824: many were to follow.

Neofit Rilski had a large share in this production, as he produced a number of books for the needs of the Gabrovo school. Neofit Rilski (1793-1881) is often considered as the driving force behind the development of Bulgarian education. In this connection, he was later honoured by the Czech historian, Konstantin Jireček, with the title ‘Patriarch of the Bulgarian teachers’.

Neofit was born as Nikola Poppetrov Benin in Bansko, in 1793, and became a monk in Rila in 1818. Neofit studied in the monastery and in the school of Melnik, was a teacher in Samokov for a couple of years, and then returned to Rila. After the 1833 fire in the monastery Neofit was sent as taksidiot to Kazanlák. He was then asked by Vasil Aprilov and Nikolaj Palauzov to found the Bulgarian school in Gabrovo, for which he was sent to Bucharest to study the allilodidactic method.

Neofit Rilski stressed the importance of a good general education which, according to him, should precede religious education, which was his ultimate goal:

До сега нашите съотечественици не са познавали коя е била причината на непросвещението и защо е трябвало по-напред да се устроят училища, а патом църкви и манастири. По-напред да се напечатат на нашия български език и потребните на учението книги, а после Ветхий и Новий Завет.
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Until now our compatriots did not understand why they were underdeveloped, and why it is necessary to build schools first, and then churches and monasteries. First the books that are necessary for education in Bulgarian should be printed, the Old and New Testament can follow.

Neofit Rilski wrote and published many schoolbooks, most of them in readiness to teach at Gabrovo, like the *Vzaimno-učitelni tabeli* (Allilodidactic tables, 1835), *Bukvar izvlečen ot vzaimno-učitelni tablici* (Primer selected from the allilodidactic tables, 1835), and *Aritmetika* (Arithmetics, 1851)\(^{384}\). Neofit was, moreover, also the author of the first grammar of modern Bulgarian, *Bolgarska gramatika* (Bulgarian grammar, 1835), which was published in Kragujevač, Serbia, in 1835. In writing the grammar, Neofit followed Greek examples\(^{385}\).

After his time in Gabrovo, Neofit became a teacher of Church Slavonic at the island of Halki, and returned to Rila in 1852, where he stayed the rest of his life, as igumen from 1860 until 1864.

Neofit also intended to publish a Greek-Bulgarian, Bulgarian-Greek dictionary, on which he worked most of his life. He started this work when he was still at school in Melnik. The Greek-Bulgarian part had apparently already been finished when Viktor Grigorović visited Rila in 1845 (see § 6.5)\(^{386}\). There is a manuscript of (parts of) Neofit Rilski’s Greek-Bulgarian dictionary in the Hungarian National Archives, which was apparently intended for publication\(^{387}\). Its title page mentions Neofit as Professor Neophytus Pappa Petrus, and the year 1828. This manuscript was not printed, however. The first two letters of the dictionary were eventually published in Istanbul in 1875. A possible reason why the work was not printed is that Neofit’s notion of written Bulgarian was different from the view that was held by the Serbs and Bulgarians of Budapest (see §6.2).

Neofit Rilski educated a whole generation of teachers, who were instrumental in spreading modern education throughout Bulgaria. One of them, Zahari Knjažeski (whose real name was Žeko Petrov), was among the Bulgarian intellectuals to benefit from the scholarship programme set up by Vasil Aprilov and others in Odessa (see § 6.12). After his primary education in Stara Zagora, and further education at Veliko Târnovo, on Mount Athos and in Gabrovo (where he visited Neofit’s school), Knjažeski became a teacher. He worked at Stara Zagora (1832), Gabrovo (1836-7) and Târnovo, where he founded a ‘vzaimno učilište’, or allilodidactic school. He then travelled
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widely: around the Balkan peninsula, to the Near East and Africa. A visit to Jerusalem brought him the prestigious title of hadži.

On the age of 29, Knjažeski started his education at the seminary of Odessa, with a scholarship granted by the Gabrovo school. He studied there until 1845. During a trip through Russia in the following two years, visiting Harkiv, Moscow and St. Petersburg, he collected studybooks for Bulgarian schools and patens and chalices for use in Bulgarian churches.

During this trip, Knjažeski made contact with important Russian scholars like Izmail Sreznevskij, Osip Bodjanskij (see §7.3), Mihail Pogodin (see §7.6), and slavophiles like the brothers Aksakov and Homjakov. He arranged 13 scholarships from Russia for Bulgarian boys and girls.

In Petersburg, in the print shop of the Synod, Knjažeski learned something of the print trade and received a printing press as a gift. Upon his return to Bulgaria in 1847, Knjažeski distributed the books and magazines that he had brought from Russia throughout Bulgaria. He started teaching in Stara Zagora, where he laid the foundations for a girls’ school, together with Anastasija Toševa, who had studied in Russia with a scholarship that he had provided. In 1869, Knjažeski was appointed dragoman in the Russian consulate of Veliko Târnovo, and later in Ruse. A dragoman was officially an interpreter, but in practice dragomans had much more influence than that.

Knjažeski was interested in Bulgarian history and folklore, which led to the publication of works like *Vvedenie v istorii bolgarskih slavjan* (Introduction to the history of the Bulgarian slavs, 1847) and a contribution of Bulgarian folksongs to a collection by the Russian scholar P. Beszonov (1855) 388.

A second pupil of Neofit, who went on to contribute to the spread of modern education in Bulgaria was Zaharij Kruša, born in Samokov. In 1828, as Neofit’s assistant teacher, he composed a Bulgarian-Greek grammar, which remained unpublished. He went to teach in Koprivštica, but studied again in Gabrovo, under Neofit. Like his educator, Kruša was an ardent supporter of the allilodidactic method. Until his retirement in 1870, he was a teacher in Sofia, Vraca, Samokov, Odrin, Koprivštica, Panagjurištë and Radomir. Two of his children followed in their father’s footsteps: Hristofor, who had received his education in Serbia (1866-1871) and was a teacher in Svištov, Vidin and Sofia until 1877 and Olga, who studied in Russia until 1879 and then started to teach in the state girls’ school in Sofia 389.

388 Todev, Koj koe, 140.
389 Todev, Koj koe, 148.
§6.2 The development of one standard written language

With the rise of written communication among Bulgarians in Bulgarian (as opposed to Greek) and the spread of Bulgarian-only education, the demand for a standardised national language grew. The question of how this language should be standardised, was met with different points of view. Two main perspectives can be distinguished:

The first, espoused by the Church Slavonic school, aimed to use Old Church Slavonic as the main source of inspiration. Proponents of this view were mainly members of the clergy, including Konstantin Ognjanović and Hristaki Pavlović, who wanted the difference between the language used in liturgy and outside the church to be as small as possible. This would continue an approach that was common throughout the Middle Ages. In this writing system, cases would be used, but not articles390.

This proposition was taken up by Gavril Krăstević and Joakim Gruev of the so-called Plovdiv school, and the Russian scholar Jurij Venelin (see § 6.7), who found fault with much of the syntax, featuring in the spoken Bulgarian of his time. For example, the loss of markers in the declension of nouns, and the growing use of the postpositioned definite article were considered monstrous grammatical misstakes.

Эта непростая привычка простого народа прилагать ко всякому слову -ат, - та, -то, не только в именительном, но и в прочих падежах, была единственной причиной, что язык Болгар начал лишаться правильных форм своих падежей...

This unfortunate practice of the common people to add to every word -at, -ta, -to, not only in the nominative case, but also in other cases, was the only reason that the language of the Bulgarians began to become deprived of the correct form of its cases...

Venelin wanted Bulgarian to mirror Church Slavonic and Russian as closely as possible, and suggested an orthography based upon etymology, not on phonetics.

---


391  Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez pàrvata polovina, 614.
The second school of thought proposed to take *spoken Bulgarian* as the basis of a writing system. This stems from the catholic intellectuals (see § 2.5), who wrote in ‘Illyrian’, a language based on Croatian, but containing Bulgarian words. For example, *Ogledalo na istinata meždu Iztočnata i Zapadnata Cerkva*, (Mirror of the truth between the Eastern and the Western church, 1716), by Krăsto Pejkĉ, which incorporates typical Bulgarian words in an Illyrian text392.

This idea was developed further in the eighteenth century among scholars of the Rila monastery (see § 5.5), which included the likes of Josif Bradati, Todor Vračanski, Teofan Rilski and Joan Vračanski. As expressed by Bradati in *Slovo poučenie radi prostim* (Admonition about the education of the simple, written between 1740 and 1760), the most important thing is that any written language be accessible to the masses:

Кога пастир соберет овци да ги кармит и не дава им и трици и сол, ами починет да им свирит, а они жално блеют. Тако творят и мирски попове, една соберут люде в церков, а они почнунут да читат псалтир, да поют каноне.
Где могут прости людия да разумеют псалтирское тълкование и канонское четание! Мирски цръкви друго правило требуе, да имат книги поучителни по прости язык, да се разбираят и прости люде безкнижни да разумеют393.

When the shepherd herds up the sheep to feed, and does not give them chaff and salt, but starts to play them music, they bleat plaintively. This is what village priests394 do, when they gather people in the church, and start to read the Psalter and sing psalms. How can simple people understand the explanation of the Psalter and the reading of psalms! Village churches have different needs, they need to have educational books in a simple language, so that also simple, uneducated people can understand them.

Indeed most of the Bulgarians in Buda and Pešt, who were seen as part of the Serb community there, were adherents of this idea. Kiril Pejčinović, for example, mentioned on the title page of his book *Ogledalo* (Mirror, 1816), published in Buda, that the book was written in simple Bulgarian, as opposed to the literary, archaic, version:

...ради потреби и ползования препростейшим и не книжним езиком болгарским долния Миссии395

...because of the need and the use in the simplest and not literary Bulgarian language of lower Moesia

392  Angelov, Българската народност, 230.
393  Angelov, Съвременци I, 81.
394  Literally secular priests, as opposed to regular priests, who live in monasteries.
395  Pejčinović, title page.
Other works published in Budapest that used or claimed to use spoken Bulgarian language were Hristaki Pavlovič’s *Grammatika Slaveno-bolgarska* (Slavic-Bulgarian grammar, 1836); Emanuil Vaskidovič’s *Preskorbnoe opravdanie* (Sad Justification, 1846), which promoted the systematic teaching of Bulgarian in schools396; *Bibličeska povest vethago zaweta* (Biblical Story from the Old Testament, 1847), by K. Teodorovič and G.M. Vladykin397; and *Kratko načertanie na vseobštata istorija* (A short sketch of the universal history, 1836), by Ivan Kajdanov and Atanas Kipilovski. To this last work, the authors even added a *Rečnik ili leksikon* (Dictionary or lexicon), proposing a number of Slavic words to replace church-slavisms, Russian and international words398.

A milestone for this school of thought was the printing of Petăr Beron’s *Riben Bukvar* in 1824 (see §4.5), the first school book to take spoken Bulgarian as a basis. Later followers are to be found in the Bulgarian colony in Odessa (see §7.11): Vasil Aprilov, Ivan Bogorov (who expressed his ideas in his *Părvička bălgarska gramatika* (Primary Bulgarian grammar) of 1844), Najden Gerov, and Ivan Momčilov399. In the language debate, Aprilov diametrically opposed the view of Venelin, whom he honoured in other fields:

Здравият ум показва, че само народат има власт да изменява наречието си, писателите трябва по него да вървят ако правят свои видумки стават смешни на другите родове....
Като Италиянците, Французите и другите народи, така и Българете внесоха в говорнияят и язик, за облекчение, членовете. Никой няма право да им ги отнеме400.

Common sense dictates, that only the people have the power to change their language, writers have to follow them, if they make their own inventions they become ridiculous to other groups…
Like the Italians, the French and other peoples, the Bulgarians also introduced in their spoken language definite articles, for simplification. No-one has the right to take these away from them.

Supporters of the spoken language as a basis for the standard language were following a path set by the Serbs before them. As stated by Dositej Obradovič in his *Pismo Haralampiju* (Letter to Haralampije) of 1783, the spoken language should be the model for the written language. Following this track, a phonetic spelling system for Serbian had been introduced by Vuk Karadžić (see §8.6). He rigorously followed Adelung’s maxim ‘write as you speak’, as introduced to Serbs by

396 Király, National endeavours, 49.
397 Ibid.
398 Ibid.
400 Vasil Evstatiiev Aprilov, Mysli za segašnoto bălgarsko učenie (Odessa, 1847), 33, quoted in Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez XVII i XVIII vek, 507.
Sava Mrkalj, and then extended it by adding ‘read as it is written’\footnote{Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez părvara polovina, 174.}. In the late Văzraždane, Ljuben Karavelov was the fiercest proponent of this position among Bulgarians.

Between those who argued that the written language should be based on the spoken word there were divisions on the question of which dialect to take as its foundation: the western, as spoken in Macedonia, and near Rila, or the eastern, as spoken to the north-east of the Balkan range, in cities like Gabrovo, Kotel and Sliven. The intellectual circle of Brașov, including Petăr Beron and Vasil Nenović (see §8.3), clearly favoured their native eastern Bulgarian dialects. We see this is reflected in correspondence between Nenović and his cousin and agent P.S. Nenović concerning the editing of his book \textit{Sveštennaja istorija cerkovna} (Sacred church history, 1825). After Nenović requested the assistance of the Serb Atanas Nešković, as proofreader, he wrote to his cousin four months later, concerned that Nešković would serbianise the language in which the work was written:


And let him not make any other correction, that is to change the meaning of the history according to the Serbian syntax, but to leave it like it is, in simple Bulgarian, and only to correct the spelling and in rare cases a word or two, if it happens to be ambiguous.

Vasil Aprilov, the leading figure of the Bulgarians in Odessa (see §7.8 and 7.11), also favoured the eastern Bulgarian dialect as a basis for the written language, because he found it to be closer to Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian)\footnote{Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez părvara polovina, 673.}, than the Church Slavonic used in the churches of his time, which according to him, gave it a degree of prestige. He was the first to distinguish between these two variants. As an example of ‘pure’ Old Church Slavonic, he named the Ostromir gospel, published by Vostokov in 1843 in St. Petersburg. In 1836, he sent a \textit{obštestveno pismo}, a circular (see §6.6), through Bulgaria (in Greek!), in which he called upon all men of letters and teachers, to come to some agreement about the use of one standard language.

Between the vernacular and the Old Church Slavonic perspectives, a third position regarding the writing system was the suggestion of a \textbf{compromise}: to take the language of the people as starting point, but turn to Old Church Slavonic in those cases where Bulgarian dialects
were too different to provide a single solution. Adherents of this method were Rajno Popović and Neofit Rilski.

Over time, the ideas of the different groups converged, and eventually, in the 1840s and 1850s, a standard Bulgarian language emerged. In *Istorija na Bǎlgarskija ezik* (History of the Bulgarian language, 1979) Stefan Mladenov credits much of this achievement to Neofit Rilski, who, born in the region where eastern and western dialects meet, combined these two in his grammar of 1835. The development and spread of a unified writing system was also the result of the birth of numerous magazines in Bulgarian from 1844 onwards. As most important Bulgarian writers (Botev, Karavelov, Slavejkov, Drumev Vojnikov, Čintulov etc.) originated in the East, the standard language was based much more on eastern dialects than on western. In spite of Neofit Rilski’s efforts, dialects of the West were less well represented.

§6.3 Bulgarian printing press and book trade

The first books in Bulgarian were printed in the sixteenth century, but not inside the Ottoman Empire (see §2.6). The place where books in Cyrillic alphabet were first made in relatively large numbers was Venice. These books were intended for Croats and Serbs, but given the similarity between the South Slavic languages they could also be read by Bulgarians, especially those from the western parts. In the second half of the sixteenth century, Serbian books were traded in Skopje (part of the archiepiscopate of Ohrid), Kjustendil, Samokov (part of the patriarchate of Peć), and also around Sofia. Also in Transylvania, books were printed in (Middle) Bulgarian as early as the sixteenth century (see §8.3).

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century, most Bulgarian books were still printed outside of the Bulgarian territory, most of them in the Habsburg Empire (see §8.2 and §8.4). Petar Beron’s *Riben Bukvar*, to name just one, was printed in Brașov. From the period from 1806 until

---
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1840, 53 books were published outside Bulgaria. Of these, 21 were published in Buda, 5 in Bucharest, 12 in Belgrade, 11 in Kragujevac, 2 in Moscow and 1 each in London and Rimnicu.

Printing was financed either by the support of rich benefactors, or by the sale of the book in advance to subscribers. Where this was the case, subscribers were often listed at the end of the book. Rajno Popović, for instance, sold 1356 copies in advance of his book Hristoitija, a book on etiquette, in 1837. The 936 subscribers came from 45 villages from all regions inhabited by Bulgarians. Among them were 145 clergymen, 16 teachers, 43 students, 151 craftsmen, 31 čorbadžijas, mayors and merchants.

In the period from 1800 until 1820, books were distributed mainly by travelling merchants. This was particularly so in the south-western part of the Balkan peninsula. Later, during the 1830s, books in Bulgarian made their way to all larger cities. Bookshops were slowly established at the same time. The first one was opened in Veliko Târnovo, in 1809, by Velcho Atanasov Džamdžijata. He imported mainly religious books from Kiev and Moscow, and sold them to the residents of the monasteries around the city.

Until well into the nineteenth century, even when printed books were already available in Bulgaria, the practice of hand-copying manuscripts did not completely disappear. Paisij Hilendarški’s work, for example, Istorija Slavenobolgarskaja, continued to be copied after its publication in print in 1844 under the title Carstvenik. And Grigor Pârlîčev, who was one of the leading figures of the Vâzraždane in Macedonia in the 1860s, worked as a book-copyist (copying Greek books) for a doctor in his home town, in his student days.

Printing presses inside the Ottoman Empire became available for Bulgarians only in the mid-nineteenth century. Until then, printing had been largely restricted to the woodcuts made in some monasteries. In the 1820s, a small start, in the printing of Bulgarian books, was made by Nikola Karastojanov. Karastojanov had received his education in the Rila monastery, and had worked there for some time as bookbinder. After he left the monastery, he became a travelling bookseller. He sold books in Russian and Serbian that had come from the presses of Venice and Buda. Most of these were to sold to the clergy, but at fairs he also sold some texts to private
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persons. Probably in 1828, Karastojanov smuggled an illegal press from Serbia to Samokov. As he did not have Cyrillic letters available to him, he printed at first only images, drawn by his son Anastas. In 1835, Karastojanov bought Cyrillic fonts from the Budapest university press and started to print books, but, probably out of fear for the Turkish government, did not produce many works. On the title pages, he indicated as the place of printing cities abroad, to avoid drawing the attention of the authorities.

A second illegal press, which also came from Belgrade, was set up in Vatoša, Tikveško (Macedonia) in 1835. It was transferred to Thessaloniki a year later, and then destroyed in a fire in 1837.

A third printing press became available to the Bulgarians through the activities of the protestant mission in the Ottoman Empire. In 1840, the British Bible Society provided the printing press in Izmir, which had been installed by missionaries from the United States, with Cyrillic letters. This Slavic type came from Leipzig, probably from the press of Brettkopf and Hertel, or Tauchnitz. This installation was to be used for the printing of a New Testament in Bulgarian (see §6.4). The printing of this Bible was of great symbolic value to the Bulgarians: it underlined that Bulgarian was a separate language, not a dialect of Russian or Serbian, and that it was adequate to be used in all kinds of works. Besides the Bible, the printing press was put to use for other projects. Konstantin Fotinov, for example, used it as well for his magazine Ljuboslovie, the first Bulgarian periodical (see §6.6).

In 1847, there was some hope that one more Bulgarian press would become available in Istanbul, as Zahari Knažeski, who had studied in Russia with a scholarship, returned to Bulgaria with a lot of books, magazines and even a printing press, a gift from the printing shop of the St. Petersburg Synod. He was however forbidden to start printing, and placed the press and fonts in a monastery while waiting for future permission. However it was never to be used as it burned down with the monastery not much later.

Until the foundation of an autonomous Bulgarian principality in 1878, Bulgarians continued to use printing presses abroad: in Russia, especially in Moscow and Odessa, and in the Romanian principalities.
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§6.4 Literature in Bulgarian

Literature is an important factor in the establishment of an *imagined community*422. This is valid in the case of the Bulgarian national movement as well. In any discussion of Bulgarian literature, it is important to take into account, that in the years before the establishment of a school system in the Bulgarian language, literacy was not widespread. Only members of the clergy learned to read. Until the eighteenth century, authors who wrote their books as manuscripts intended them to be read in public. Paisij, for instance, addressed his audience thus:

Внемайте ви, читатели и слушатели, роде болгарски, кои ревнуете и усердсвуете по своего рода и по свое отечество...423

Pay attention you, readers and listeners, of Bulgarian blood, who revere your blood and Bulgarian fatherland...

Once a Bulgarian standard language had been established, and printing presses became accessible to Bulgarians, rates of literacy improved, and a market for literature in Bulgarian, both translated and original, developed. Even people who themselves had not learnt to read came into contact with literature in Bulgarian, as it was common for children to read to their parents424.

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the only works to be translated into Bulgarian were religious. This practice had been carried out more or less continuously since the Middle Ages, but in the seventeenth and eighteenth century the ‘damaskinari’, the men who produced damascins, translated for the first time into colloquial Bulgarian, instead of the traditional Church Slavonic.

The New Testament was printed in modern Bulgarian in 1840, an event that affected the Bulgarians profoundly, as it led to a higher status of Bulgarian as a literary language. Plans to translate the Bible had existed even before 1820, but the first result, a translation made by archimandrite Teodosij of the Bistrica monastery near Bucharest in 1828, was either destroyed or
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otherwise disappeared in Russia. No copy of it has even been found, although it is mentioned that in 1823, five years before, a Bulgarian translation of the Gospel by T. Bistrički (of Bistrica) was available in Bulgarian churches in Bessarabia.

The task of making a new translation was given to Neofit Rilski, by the English Bible Society, and was eventually published in Izmir in 1840 to critical acclaim: over a 1000 copies were distributed almost immediately, and by 1844, this number had risen to 5000. The patriarchate reacted swiftly on hearing about the publication, and ordered its metropolitans to find and destroy every copy of it. The population boycotted this campaign, and the translation by Neofit stayed in demand, being reprinted seven times until 1859. A second edition of the New Testament was prepared by Konstantin Fotinov and Petko Slavejkov, appearing in 1866. This was undertaken, because the western dialect used by Neofit had gradually been replaced by the eastern one in writing. Fotinov also worked on a translation of the Old Testament. The first complete bible in Bulgarian was published in Istanbul in 1871.

Patriot philologists who were raised in the Greek cultural sphere, like Nikolaos Pikkolos and Ivan Seliminski, worked on translations from French into Greek. Petăr Beron worked on a Greek dictionary, it was only with people of the following generation that Bulgarian translations started to appear. This is one of the activities that Joep Leerssen has identified as a transitional productivity in the development of a national literature, from the dissemination of older texts towards the production of fresh discourse. Secular texts that were translated relatively early into Bulgarian were works by and about Jurij Venelin, other historical works, and classics of world literature.

Aleksandr Fomič Vel’tman’s tale Rajna, koroleva bulgarskaja (Rajna, Bulgarian queen) of 1843 was popular because of its theme. The story, set in the 10th century, was popular among Bulgarians because it represented an episode of their history. It is about an expedition by Prince Svjatoslav of Kievan Rus against the Byzantines on Bulgarian territory, and his romance with Rajna, the daughter of Bulgarian Czar Petăr.

The story depicted the Russians as the protectors of the Bulgarians, the Byzantines as evil, and the Bulgarians themselves as unorganised, weak and dependent on foreign assistance. In 1852,

---

it was translated into Bulgarian both by Elena Muteva from the original Russian, and Joakim Gruev from a translation in a Serbian magazine\textsuperscript{429}.

What follows is an overview of some of these translations as made by Bulgarians, both religious and secular, including as far as it has been possible to establish, the place and date of publication\textsuperscript{430}:

\textsuperscript{429} Boršukov, Istorija, 39.
\textsuperscript{430} This overview does not intend to be complete, but serves as an illustration. See for more information the lemmas on Anglophone (p.15), German (482), French (751), and Russian (646) literature in the Radev’s Enciklopedija.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Book translated</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Transl. from</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th c.</td>
<td>Several monasteries</td>
<td>Thisavros</td>
<td>Damaskinos Studitis</td>
<td>Among others Rila school</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>In manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Kiriakodromion</td>
<td>Nikiphoros Theotokis</td>
<td>Sofronij Vračanski</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Bessarabia</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
<td>Teodosij Bistrički</td>
<td>Russian?</td>
<td>No copy survived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Auserlesene Gebische Historien</td>
<td>Johann Hùber</td>
<td>At. Kipilovski</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td>Petár Sapunov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td></td>
<td>Works by Dmitrij Rostovskij</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>Poor Richard’s Almanack</td>
<td>Benjamin Franklin</td>
<td>Gavril Krăștević</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td>Neofit Rilski</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Assignment of the English Bible Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>O zarodyše novoj bolgarskoj literatury</td>
<td>Jurij Venelin</td>
<td>M. Kifalov</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dvorjanski vibori</td>
<td>Dimităr Brajković</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Istorija slavenno-bolgarskog naroda</td>
<td>Atanas Nešković</td>
<td>P. Sapunov Slaveno-Serbian</td>
<td>Nešković’s work was a translation of Rajić’s history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td></td>
<td>Das verlorene Kind</td>
<td>Christoph Schmid</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>Belisar</td>
<td>H.C.H. von Trautzschen</td>
<td>At. Kipilovski</td>
<td>German From a Greek translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Les avantures de Télémaque, fils d’Ulysse</td>
<td>François de Fénelon</td>
<td>P. Piperov</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work of Dositej Obradović</td>
<td>Hr. Pavlović</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reichtum und Ehre</td>
<td>Chr. Gellert</td>
<td>N. Kasapski</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Istanbul (Carigr.Vestnik)</td>
<td>Robinson Crusoe</td>
<td>Daniel Defoe</td>
<td>Bogorov Russian?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Istanbul (Carigr. Vestnik)</td>
<td>Paul et Virginie and La chaumière Indienne</td>
<td>Bernardino de St. Pierre</td>
<td>Granitski</td>
<td>French from the Greek translations by Nikolaos Pikkolos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stunden der Andacht</td>
<td>H. Zschokke</td>
<td>G.j. Seslavčanin</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Translation Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>The bride of Abydos</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>From the Russian transl. by I. Kozlov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Napoleon Bonaparte</td>
<td>Alexandre Dumas-père</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>From a Serbian translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Istanbul (Carigr.Vestnik)</td>
<td>Rajna, koroleva bolgarska (1843)</td>
<td>Aleksandr Vel’tman</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>From a Serbian translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Biography of Venelin</td>
<td>Palauzov himself?</td>
<td>Nikolaj Palauzov</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>La jeune Sibérienne</td>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
<td>Aleksandar Ekzarh</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Les prisonniers de Caucase</td>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
<td>P. Kisimov</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Rajna, koroleva bolgarska (1843)</td>
<td>Aleksandr Vel’tman</td>
<td>Elena Muteva</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Fragments of Ossian</td>
<td>MacPherson</td>
<td>Petko Slavejkov</td>
<td>English In the collection Smesna kitka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Učilište za decata</td>
<td>Marie Leprend de Bonhomme</td>
<td>Al. Granitski</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Nравуење за decata</td>
<td>Marie Leprend de Bonhomme</td>
<td>S. Radulov</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Prokaznj na gradat Aost</td>
<td>Xavier de Maistre</td>
<td>Irina Popgeorgieva-Ekzarh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</td>
<td>Harriet Beecher-Stowe</td>
<td>D. Mutev</td>
<td>English In Bъlgarsки knižici, unfinished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Unknown novel</td>
<td>Cervantes</td>
<td>Hr. Vaklidov</td>
<td>Spanish From a French translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Forest man</td>
<td>J. Fenimore Cooper</td>
<td>J. Gruev</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Slovo o polku Igoreve Rukopis Králowedvorsky Guslar</td>
<td>unknown, Václav Hanka, Taras Ševčenko, Rajko Žinzifov</td>
<td>Old-Russian, Czech, Ukrainian</td>
<td>Works were included in Žinzifov's Novobǎlgarska sbirka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Literature translated into Bulgarian

Another aspect of literary cultivation is the appearance of original national historical dramas, poems and novels. Literary production in Bulgarian started late. Once it did develop however, national historical themes were very popular. The first novel in Bulgarian was Neštastna familija (An unhappy family, 1860) by Vasil Drumev. In 1872, Drumev also wrote the first original play in Bulgarian: Ivanko, ubiecăt na Aсенja (Ivanko, the killer of Asen).
§6.5 Bulgarian historiography

Paralleling the work of intellectuals to translate literary works into Bulgarian, a number of authors were writing historical works about Bulgaria. Joep Leerssen makes a distinction between history writing and history education. I combine these two aspects here, because they are so closely linked together in the Bulgarian case.

The first authors, like Paisij (see §5.3), were inspired by the Illyrianist ideas of the seventeenth century. Later, histories were written in Vienna and Budapest, still influenced by Serbian examples. Often the work *Istorija Slavjanobolgarska*, written by Paisij Hilendarski in 1762, is regarded as the starting point of the Bulgarian historiographical tradition, and historiographical works are listed according to the date of creation. In reconstructing the national movement however, it is in fact more fruitful to look at the tradition of history reading, and study the works in the order in which they became available to the Bulgarian public, or at least to a large part of the Bulgarian intellectuals. We might call this the date of availability. The following table presents the works in this way, providing a sense of when historiography became an important part of the Bulgarian cultural landscape. It includes works that nowadays would be considered literature, because philologists of the nineteenth century could be active in both literary and scholarly activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of availability</th>
<th>Date of Creation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Original author</th>
<th>Editor/translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801*</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td><em>Istorija slavenno-bolgarskog naruda iz g. Raića istorije i nekih istoričeskih kniž</em></td>
<td>Jovan Rajić</td>
<td>A. Nešković</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td><em>Svjaštennoe cvetoobranie ili sto i cetyre svjaštenni istorii</em></td>
<td>Johann Hüber</td>
<td>A. Kipilovski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td><em>Kratko naletanie na vseobštata istorija</em></td>
<td>Iv. Kajdanov</td>
<td>A. Kipilovski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td><em>Dennica novobolgarskago</em></td>
<td>Vasil Aprilov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

431 The following paragraph is an adaptation of a paper that I prepared for a workshop with the members of the Amsterdam Balkan Project. The full paper can be found at http://cf.hum.uva.nl/natlearn/Balkan/athens_sampimon.html.
432 for instance Canev, Bălgarskata istoričeska knižnina.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Jurij Venelin</td>
<td>“O zarodyshe novoj bolgarskoj literatury”</td>
<td>M. Kifalov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Paisij Hilendarski</td>
<td>Carstvenik</td>
<td>Hristaki Pavlovič</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Ananas Nešković</td>
<td>Istorija na slov. Bolg. narod</td>
<td>P. Sapunov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Vasil Aprilov</td>
<td>Bolgarskie gramoty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>A.L. Schlözer</td>
<td>Vvedenie v vseobsta istorija</td>
<td>A. Čolakov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852/1853</td>
<td>Aleksandr Vel’man</td>
<td>Rajina, koroleva bolgarskaja</td>
<td>J. Gruev/E. Muteva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>J. Venelin</td>
<td>Kritičeskie issledovaniya ob istorii bolgar</td>
<td>B. Petkov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>J. Venelin</td>
<td>Drevnie i nyešnije bolgare v polititeskom, narodopisnom, istoričeskom i religioznom ib otnošenii k russijanam</td>
<td>G. Slavov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>P. Slavejkov</td>
<td>A schoolbook on Ottoman history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Jakov</td>
<td>Istorija vkratec o bolgarslovenskom narode</td>
<td>G. Rakovski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>G. Krăstević</td>
<td>Istorija bălgarska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>M. Drinov</td>
<td>“Otec Paisij, negovoto vreme, negovata istorija učenicite mu”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>M. Drinov</td>
<td>Zaselele Balkanskogo polnostrava slavjanami</td>
<td>Masters thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Spiridon Jeroshimonah</td>
<td>Istorija vo kratce o bolgarskom narode slovenskom</td>
<td>V.N. Zlatarski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Historical works available to Bulgarians

This table shows that historiography took off among Bulgarians late. If we ignore the work of Nešković, of which I have not been able to establish whether it was widely read among Bulgarians or not, a continuous tradition of history reading started only in 1836, 54 years after the creation of Paisij Hilendarski’s work, that usually is taken as a starting point. The famous three Bulgarian histories in manuscript by Paisij, Jakov and Spiridon (in bold) entered the broad Bulgarian discourse much later than their creation, in 1865 or later, even later than printed works did.

---

434 Jakov used Paisij’s work for his book, but also Andrija Kačić-Miošić’s Razgovor ugodini naroda slovinskoga of 1756. He gave short descriptions of the Bulgarian Czars, Dimitar Canev. Bălgarskata istoričeska knižnina prez Văzraždaneto. XVIII-Părвata polovina na XIX vek (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1989), 56.

435 Spiridon had at his disposal the libraries of the Moldavian monasteries. According to Spiridon, all Illyrians were Bulgarians. Canev, Bălgarskata istoričeska knižnina, 57.
In his book *In the national interest*, Miroslav Hroch claims that historical arguments were often used to support nationalist claims, but that this did not happen if there were no skilled historians available:

The national movements reflected these facts already from Phase A, and particularly in the course of national agitation strove to create such a portrait of the ‘national’ past that would adequately substantiate it: “eramus ergo sumus”. In this respect, of key importance was whether during Phase A there emerged a reliable working out of the national past, national history, that met the level of contemporary science\(^{436}\).

That the Bulgarian national movement did not use historical arguments to support nationalist claims until quite late is not surprising, given that Bulgarians for a long time did not have the conditions for the development of a historical culture: at the beginning of the Bulgarian \(\mathcal{V}a\z\zdra\z\zjane\), around 1820, they had neither trained historians, nor access to printing presses, periodicals, or national institutions. A history of Bulgaria had been written in 1762, and it was available in manuscript, but it was not used for quite a long time. Only later, when the new education system and new possibilities to study abroad had produced a generation of philologists, history became an argument\(^{437}\).

Although the philological actions of the catholic intellectuals of the seventeenth century and Paisij Hilendarski have some characteristics of phase A-activities, they did not constitute the beginning of the Bulgarian national movement. First of all, a considerable amount of time elapsed between the two, so they cannot be seen as expressions of one and the same ideology. When in 1762 Paisij Hilendarski wrote *Istorija slavjanobalgarska*, he sourced the material his catholic predecessors had used, and re-introduced it into the discourse of his time. Then, in spite of the initial succes of the work among his contemporaries, it was more or less forgotten, and both Paisij and the catholic historians faded from memory. This was partly caused by the kârdžalijstvo, when the difficult political situation prevented philologists to engage in their work. While all this implies there was no phase A in the Bulgarian case – and the national movement started with phase B, this is not true.

Everything changed by the time the Russian, or ‘second’, tradition of historiography started to bloom. In the 1840’s, the historical subcurrent of the Bulgarian national movement

\(^{436}\) Hroch, National interest, 128.

\(^{437}\) Another problem is that there was not one single view on Bulgarian history. Until well into the nineteenth century, it was not even clear to Bulgarians what their ethnogenesis was. Widely differing tribes and peoples were suggested as ancestors. In alphabetical order they were: Avars, Alani, Bulgarians, Byzantines, Chazars, Čudi, Finns, Gethi, Goths, Huns, Illlyrians, Kutiguri, Macedonians, Moesians, Mongols, Onogunduri, Pečenegs, Sarmatians, Skythians, Slavs, Tatars, Tures, Vlachs. Lilova, Vázroždenskite značenija, 270.
recommenced. In the field of history, phase A intellectuals (to stay with the terms of Miroslav Hroch) included Jurij Venelin, Vasil Aprilov and Zaharij Knjažeski. Short as it was, the period of scholarly interest was intense and was followed by a phase of national agitation and a phase of mass support for the national cause. In these two phases, recourse to some of the early historical works from the eighteenth century can be seen. The oldest works of the first dead-ended phase A, the ones from the eighteenth century, were incorporated in the Bulgarian discourse when phase B was well on its way, or even in phase C. Paisij was re-introduced by Marin Drinov, and the two other now famous histories in manuscript were found in libraries. Only then, over a century after he finished his history, did Paisij Hilendarski become the ‘icon of national thought’ that he is now.

To complicate matters even further, Raymond Detrez also notes that the history of Paisij, which at first sight may seem like an activity typical of phase A, displays a lot of characteristics of deliberate agitation, fitting in phase B.438

After histories had become available (through both salvage and fresh productivity in the field of discourse), the assertion of history in the public space followed. The first historical commemoration in Bulgaria was the first celebration of St. Cyril and Method’s day, organised by Najden Gerov in Plovdiv in 1851 (see §6.8).

§6.6 Newspapers and magazines

Like literature, periodical press, as one of the expressions of increasing sociability, generally plays a leading role in the formation of an imagined community. With considerable delay in comparison to other national movements in Europe, this process was also visible among Bulgarians.

The Ottoman Empire lagged behind the rest of Europe in its use of the printing press and the introduction of magazines and newspapers. This was not only true for the orthodox millet, but also for the ruling elite. The first newspapers to appear in the empire were French; one published in Istanbul in 1796, and a second in Izmir in 1824. Only in 1831 did the government start an official periodical, which was for the publication of new legislation. This paper, called Takvim-i-Vekayi, had a circulation of 5000, its French translation, called Moniteur Ottoman appeared only in 300 copies.439

438 Detrez, “Bulgarian national movement”.
439 Shaw, Reform, 35.
Non Dominant Ethnic Groups (in Hroch’s term, see Introduction) of the Empire had their own publications even later, so Bulgarian philologists established other platforms to encourage public discussion. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, they debated through open letters, called obštestveno pismo in Bulgarian. These were letters, which were sent to friends, understanding that they would be read, maybe read aloud to others, copied and passed on. It was in letters such as these that almost all enlightened patriots of the time, including Neofit Rilski, Vasil Aprilov, Nikola Palauzov, Rajno Popović, Gavril Krăstević, Konstantin Fotinov, Ivan Seliminski and others, expressed their opinions on matters of public importance, in particular about Bulgarian education.440

These letters had also been a popular medium in Western Europe from the thirteenth century onward, and was still used in the nineteenth century. There, the practice developed into the genre of the hand-written newspaper. In Bulgaria, however, there are no handwritten newspapers known of the period before the first printed periodicals.441

With the appearance of printed periodicals, communications became much easier, and the number of people that could be reached increased largely. The first printed magazine in Bulgarian was Konstantin Fotinov’s Ljuboslovie, which first appeared in 1844. Printed in Izmir, on the printing press of the British Bible Society, it continued until 1846. The title is a translation of the Greek word ‘philologia’ and Fotinov, an archaist in the language debate, modelled it after the Greek Apothiki ton ofelimon gnoseon. This magazine was a publication by American missionaries, with whom Fotinov was in contact.

Fotinov (1790-1858) was a pupil of the Greek school in Plovdiv and the Greek grammar school of Kydonies. He worked as translator in the French consulate of Izmir, where he opened a Bulgarian private school in 1828. In 1838, he published a Greek grammar and in 1843, Bolgarskij razgovornik za onij koi obiçat da se naviknuvat da govorjat grečeski (A language guide for Bulgarians who wish to learn Greek). By then Fotinov had adopted the philosophy first voiced by Petăr Beron, that the most efficient way to teach a child a foreign language is through the mother language.

The first newspaper in Bulgarian, Bălgarski Orel (Bulgarian Eagle), appeared for the first time in Leipzig in 1846. Editor Ivan Bogorov could not survive practical difficulties for long and stopped the publication one year later. His second effort, the newspaper Carigradski Vestnik

---

440 Boršukov, Istorija, 13.
441 During the Vázraždane, there were 27 hand-written newspapers. Ibidem, 205.
(Istanbul Herald\textsuperscript{443}), was much more successful, probably because it appeared in a thriving Bulgarian community, the one in Istanbul.

After the first magazine and the first newspaper, others followed. Many magazines had a short life, or even consisted of no more than a trial issue. The average lifespan of a Bulgarian magazine in the Văzraždane was a year and a half: this was often due to financial problems\textsuperscript{444}. Here is a short (and incomplete) overview which depicts the births and deaths of a number of Bulgarian magazines and newspapers in the period until 1870\textsuperscript{445}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s) of publ.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of publ</th>
<th>Editor(s)</th>
<th>Contr. by (among others)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840? 1844</td>
<td>Bălgarska novina</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Konstantin Ognjanov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1846</td>
<td>Ljuboslovie</td>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>Fotinov</td>
<td>Aprilov, Krăstević</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1847</td>
<td>Bălgarski Orel</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>Bogorov</td>
<td>Kostović</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-1872</td>
<td>Carigradiki vestnik</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Bogorov, Ekzarh</td>
<td>Čintulov, (D) Miladinov, Slavejkov, Filaretov, Drumev, Gerov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1851</td>
<td>Mirozrenie</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>Dobrovski</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852,</td>
<td>Telegraph Bosforski</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Bălgarska dnevica</td>
<td>Novi Sad</td>
<td>Rakovski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-?</td>
<td>Bălgarski knižici</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Bogorov, Cankov, Krăstević</td>
<td>Čolakov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-1863</td>
<td>Bălgaria</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Cankov, Vladikov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1861</td>
<td>Dunavski Lebed</td>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>Rakovski</td>
<td>D. and K. Miladinov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1862</td>
<td>Bratski trud</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Žinzifov, Popović</td>
<td>K. Miladinov, N. Bončev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Žurnal za nauka, znanja i târgovija</td>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>Bogorov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1864</td>
<td>Bălgarska pšela</td>
<td>Brăila</td>
<td>Vaklidov</td>
<td>Vaskidović, Dobroplodni, Karavelov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1867</td>
<td>Gajda</td>
<td>Brăila</td>
<td>Slavejkov</td>
<td>Karavelov, Botev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-1865</td>
<td>Sâvetnik</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Mihajlović, Burnov</td>
<td>Krăstević, Dobrovski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Băduštnost (bilingual Bulg./Rum.)</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>Rakovski, Hašdeu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{443} Carigrad was the Bulgarian name for Istanbul.

\textsuperscript{444} The magazine Gajda, for instance, had large problems to pay the postage, as only 50 subscribers were living in Istanbul, and the rest scattered all over the Bulgarian lands. Lilova, Văzroždenskite značenija, 112.

\textsuperscript{445} Most information for this table is taken from Radev, Enciklopedija and Elena Siupiur. Bălgarskata emigrantska inteligencija v Rumânia prez XIX vek (Sofia: BAN, 1982), 227-230.
The table makes clear initially Bulgarian magazines developed slowly and with difficulty. Later, however, especially after 1860, the number and viability of magazines in Bulgarian rose sharply. This can be connected firstly with the church conflict: the struggle had broken out with the Easter declaration of 1860 (see §5.5). The Hatt-i-Hümayun decree of 1856, which proclaimed reforms of the millets, probably contributed to the atmosphere of discussions and public opinion-making. Secondly, the development of Bulgarian theatre, prose and poetry called for platforms on which
authors could publish their works. Further, after the union of Moldavia and Walachia in 1859, a
great number of Bulgarian educational and cultural institutions were set up in the Danubian
principalities, which also fostered the publication of magazines.

The landscape of Bulgarian printed media was diverse, and there were heated discussions
about which magazines represented the Bulgarian nation best. Editors accused their colleagues of
other magazines of being influenced by and spreading propaganda from the side of Russia, the
Ottoman government, Serbia, Phanariots, Catholics and Protestants. Editors of
magazines more loyal to the Ottoman government accused other editors of revolutionary activities.
Several times, the censorship office banned Bulgarian periodicals temporarily.

Of the Bulgarian magazines and newspapers printed during this period, *Carigradski Vestnik* was by far the most influential both in its circulation and lifespan. *Carigradski Vestnik*
dealt with internal and external politics, agriculture, craft, ethnography, education and literature. It
published letters from correspondents all over the Bulgarian lands, and was also the place where
translated literature was to be read first. Among the contributors to the magazine were Najden
Gerov, Emanuil Vaskidovič, Konstantin Ognjanovič, Dimităr Miladinov, and Nikolaj Palauzov.
Due to the support it received from both the Patriarchate and the Russian consulate, and its large
number of subscribers, it took a moderate stand.

The table also shows that there were several people who founded or contributed to more
than one magazine or newspaper: Georgi Rakovski, Ljuben Karavelov, the brothers Cankov, P.I.
Blăskov and others. But there is only one man who can be considered as the ‘father of Bulgarian
journalism’, founding a number of magazines and both the first and the most important newspaper
of the Văzraždane: Ivan Bogorov (1818-1892).

Bogorov received his education in Karlovo, under Rajno Popovič, in the Greek school of
Kuruçeşme, and in the Richelieu lyceum in Odessa. In Russia, he started his publishing career with
a lithography of the Bulgarian coat of arms (from Žefarovič’s *Stematografija*, see §2.6), combined
with portraits of the Bulgarian medieval Czars Ivan Asen and Ivan Šišman. The print became very
popular.

From 1845 until 1847 Bogorov, with some financial support from Bulgarian merchants of
Bucharest, studied chemistry in Leipzig. There he wrote, edited and published the first Bulgarian
newspaper *Bălgarski Orel* (Bulgarian eagle), of which no more than three issues appeared in 1846
and 1847. When financial problems terminated the project, Bogorov moved to Istanbul, where he
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opened a print shop and started the newspaper *Carigradski Vestnik* (Istanbul Herald), which he sold two years later to Aleksandar Ekarh. Later, Bogorov studied medicine in Paris, and for the rest of his life, in various places, combined work as a doctor with his activities as journalist and publisher. He initiated, edited and, as seen in the table above, contributed to the following periodicals: *Bălgarski Knizići* (Bulgarian Booklets), 1858, *Žurnal za nauka, znanajat i târgovija* (Journal for science, craft and trade), Plovdiv 1862, *Tureția* (Turkey), 1864-1873, *Săvântik* (Counselor), 1863-4, and *Narodnost* (Nationality), Bucharest 1867-9.

Next to founding his own newspapers, Bogorov also wrote and translated books, including *Robinson Crusoe*, and contributed to other periodicals, voicing his thoughts, among other things, about the language debate. In 1844, he published a Bulgarian grammar. His work *Njakolko dena razhodka po bălgarskite mesta* (A few days’ trip around the Bulgarian lands) of 1868 was the first travel diary written in Bulgarian. Bogorov also collected folk songs, which he published in 1842 as *Bălgarski narodni pesni* (Bulgarian folk songs, see also §6.9).

In 1867, Bogorov represented the Bulgarians at the Ethnographic Congress in Moscow. This congress, which had a great effect on the distribution of Slavophile ideas among Russians, will be discussed in more detail in §7.9.

### §6.7 Čitalištes

The increasing sociability in Bulgaria in the nineteenth century and the growth of a public sphere were expressed in an important institution, the čitalište. Literally, čitalište means reading room, but the German word *Kulturheim* represents its meaning better⁴⁴⁸, because čitalištes were more than libraries, they were also a meeting place, often in the centre of the village or town. In čitalištes, people could gather to read newspapers and magazines, as well as books from the library, which could range in number from 100 to over 15,000⁴⁴⁹. Sometimes, books were read aloud or explained by teachers in organised meetings.

Čitalištes were organised as societies, to which members paid a contribution. The money was used for the building (which was often rented from a church or school), the activities that were organised in it, and to provide financial support to poor pupils in primary education. There were also evening schools and Sunday schools to alleviate illiteracy among adults. Some čitalištes housed
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a museum, in which Bulgarian ‘antiquities’ were kept, and societies of people gathering folk stories were hosted. In addition, čitalištes provided a venue for activists to organise their meetings. The foundation of čitalištes made it much easier for Bulgarian philologists and activists to spread their patriotism and their nationalist ideas to large numbers of people.

In 1856, the first Bulgarian čitalište was opened in Svištov, with the help of teacher Emanuil Vaskidovič, as a continuation and expansion of the school library that was already available. In the same year, čitalištes were opened in Lom and Šumen. Other towns and cities followed, and on the eve of the war of 1876, there were 186 čitalištes in the Bulgarian lands. These čitalištes formed a network: from 1870 until 1875, they had their own magazine, called Čitalište, which was sent from Istanbul to as many as 1700 subscribers.

The emergence of a Bulgarian national theatre started with plays performed in čitalištes. Indeed, some čitalištes had their own troupe of actors. Some of the plays that were staged were translated, but those which were most successful were historical plays, originally written in Bulgarian. It was in the čitalište of Šumen that the first play in Bulgarian was staged. Bulgarian philologists of the city were probably inspired by the Hungarian and Polish colony there, including Lajos Kossuth, who fled to Šumen after the revolution of 1848, and set up a cultural life there. The refugees founded their own orchestra, staged plays, opened a casino and published a newspaper450.

The man responsible for the first Bulgarian play was Sava Dobroplodni (1820-1894), one of the initiators of the Šumen čitalište. Dobroplodni had received his education in Kotel and in the Greek Kuruçeşme school in Istanbul. He was a teacher in Šumen from 1848 until 1852. During the Crimean war, he left the country to teach Greek in Sremski Karlovci, Serbia. After the war, he returned to Šumen, opened the first class school for girls in the Bulgarian lands, and, in 1856, the čitalište. The comedy Mihal (1856), which Dobroplodni had translated into Bulgarian, was the first performance in Bulgarian. It was an adaptation of the Greek O leprentis of M. Hourmouzis, which in turn was influenced by Molière’s L’Avaré451.

A pupil of Dobroplodni, Dobri Vasiliev Vojnikov (1833-1878), continued his teacher’s work. Vojnikov, a pioneer in two fields: music and theatre, was born in Šumen, and had his primary education there, not only from Dobroplodni, but also from Ivan Bogorov, who was a teacher there before the Crimean war. After the Hungarian immigrant Šafran had founded his orchestra in Šumen, Vojnikov joined, playing the violin. With financial assistance of his family, Vojnikov went to the catholic Bebek school in Istanbul from 1856 until 1858. Upon his return, he
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worked as a teacher in the town school, where he introduced music as a subject. He became active for the local čitalište and founded the first Bulgarian student orchestra in 1861.

After he had been forced to flee Bulgaria because of his involvement in the church conflict, Vojnikov went to Brăila, where he became director of the Bulgarian school and founded a theatre company. He wrote a number of schoolbooks in Bulgarian, including a literary anthology (partly translated from French), a student grammar, a collection of plays to be performed by students, songs and poetry. His works were printed by Dragan Cankov in Istanbul, by L. Somer in Vienna, and by Hristo Vaklidov in Brăila. Of the plays that Vojnikov wrote, *Rajna Bălgarska Knjagina* (Rajna, Bulgarian queen) (1866) and *Krivorazbranata civilizacija* (Civilization, misunderstood, 1871) are the best known. *Rajna, Bălgarska Knjagina*, is an adaptation of a novel by the Russian writer Aleksandr Fomitch Vel’tman *Rajna koroleva bolgarskaja* (1843), as translated by Joakim Gruev and Elena Muteva (see §6.4). Vojnikov in his adaptation of 1866 shifted attention from the military events to the love story between the Kievan Czar Svyatoslav and Rajna, daughter of the Bulgarian Czar.

The activities that took place in the čitalištes covered all four fields of cultural nationalism that Leeressen identified: Language, Discourse, Material culture and Practices, and all degrees of intensity. Because of the large number of people that could be reached, čitalištes can be considered as the most effective manifestation of Social Ambience of the Bulgarian Văzraždane.

§6.8 Najden Gerov and his schools

Najden Gerov Hadžidobrevič (1823-1900), born under the name of Målčan Mušek in Koprivštica, studied in Plovdiv and from 1837 until 1839 under Neophit Rilski. Neofit had introduced the allilodidactic method in the village school there. Later, Gerov went to Odessa with the financial support of a čorbadžija from his village. In 1845, he finished at the Richelieu lyceum (see §7.11). While studying in Odessa, Gerov started to collect folk-tales and songs from the Bulgarians living around the city. He then went back to Bulgaria to work as a teacher. Following the success of the class school that he had opened in Koprivštica in 1846, Gerov was invited by the elite of the city of Plovdiv to open a similar school there. This school, named after the saints Cyril and Method, was established in 1850.
Gerov was instrumental in the cultural revival of Plovdiv. He had a large influence on the decision to have the Turkish name, Filibe, replaced by the older Bulgarian one, Plovdiv, and it was his proposal to introduce the celebration of the 11th of May, as the day of the Slavic Enlighteners (Cyril and Method), who gave their name to the Bulgarian school. It was first celebrated in 1851, although it was opposed by the sizeable Hellenized community there.

During the Crimean war Gerov, who had become a Russian citizen as a student, was forced to leave the country. He used his time in Russia to air his opinion in letters to Russian diplomats and the press, to publish folk songs and the first three letters of his Bulgarian dictionary. After the war, Gerov returned to Plovdiv as a Russian diplomatic agent. Later as vice-consul, he became a central figure in Bulgarian society, providing scholarships, and distributing books from Russia.

From Russia, he received orders to maintain unity among the orthodox, but Gerov repeatedly reported that the Bulgarians had lost their confidence in the Greek patriarch. He shared with Russia an aversion to the Uniate movement, and, following a personal order of Aleksandr II, organised the kidnapping of the Uniate Bishop Josif Sokolski (see §2.7).

Gerov was well-known abroad for his folkloristic and linguistic work. In 1859, he received a letter from Vuk Karadžić, asking him about Bulgarian city and village names, and rivers across all of the Bulgarian lands. Gerov’s dictionary consisted of 5 volumes and included 78,620 words, as well as fragments of folk songs and proverbs. Working on it for over 50 years, volumes appeared between 1895 and, posthumously, in 1904.

Furthermore, Gerov wrote the first lyrical poetry in Bulgarian. His poem Stojan i Rada (Stojan and Rada, 1845), was inspired by his love for Elena Muteva, a Bulgarian poetess from Odessa (see §7.11). He also wrote revolutionary poetry, but that remained unpublished.

§6.9 The birth of Bulgarian ethnography: the Miladinovs

As in other national movements, an important element contributing to the formation of a Bulgarian national identity in the nineteenth century was the study of folklore. A small start in the
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documentation of the Bulgarian people was made by the monk Josif Bradati of the Rila monastery, who collected material on folk superstition, to which Viktor Grigorovič referred in 1845.\footnote{Angelov, Sävremenici I, 25.}

More extensive work was carried out by Vuk Karadžić, in addition to his work on Serb folklore, who became a major influence encouraging ethnographic studies by Bulgarians in diaspora as well as inside the country: Vasil Aprilov, Neofit Rilski, Ivan Bogorov, Najden Gerov, Ljuben Karavelov and Petko Slavejkov were inspired by Karadžić in their work.\footnote{Ilija Konev, "Vuk Karadžić i Bălgarite", Vukov zbornik IV (1964), 207-208.}

In the beginning of the 1840s, Ivan Bogorov and Najden Gerov were collecting folklore in and around Odessa, and Bogorov’s Bălgarski narodni pesni (Bulgarian folk songs) of 1842 was the first collection of Bulgarian folk songs to be printed.

All this is overshadowed, however, by the achievement of the Miladinov brothers: Dimităr (1810-1862) and Konstantin (1830-1862) Miladinov. Dimităr, a pupil from the grammar school of Ioannina, was a teacher in various places in Macedonia. In 1845, he was visited by the Russian scholar Viktor Grigorovič (see §7.5), who wrote down a number of folk songs, narrated by Miladinov’s mother and encouraged his host to collect more of them. In 1846, Miladinov wrote to Grigorovič, assuring him that documentation was underway:

…my efforts concerning our Bulgarian language and the Bulgarian (folk) songs, in compliance with your instructions, are unsurpassed. I have not ceased for a moment to fulfill the pledge I gave you, Sir, because the Bulgarians are spontaneous and reliable.\footnote{Vojnov, Documents, 84. The original is in Greek, a Bulgarian translation is included in N. Trajkov, ed. Bratja Miladinovi. Prepiska. (Sofia: BAN, institut za istoria, 1964), 15.}

Later, Miladinov travelled around Macedonia for years to collect folk material. He also continued to work as a teacher, and he raised a generation of Macedonian intellectuals, among them his brother Konstantin and the poet Grigor Părličev (see §4.8). Miladinov was also active in the church conflict: he collected money throughout Macedonia for the renovation of the Bulgarian church, St. Stefan, in Istanbul. Furthermore, he agitated against Greek cultural domination in Macedonia and for the rights of the Bulgarian language in schools and churches. This led to his arrest and later his death in a prison in Istanbul.

His younger brother Konstantin Miladinov studied in Russia from 1857 until 1860 with a scholarship, following his education in Ioannina and at the University of Athens. In Moscow, Miladinov was one of the Bulgarians associated with the magazine Bratski Trud (see §7.9). He also worked on the editing of the folk songs that he was given by his brother and his Bulgarian

\footnote{Miladinov, Documents, 84.}
friends in Russia. One of these songs was published in the journal *Russkaja beseda* by Osip Bodjanski, a teacher of Miladinov.

Among Russian scholars, Konstantin Miladinov searched for assistance to have his brother’s collection of folk songs published. Failing to find Russian assistance, he went to Vienna to look for sponsors there. The collection, *Bălgarski narodni pesni*, was eventually published in 1860 with financial aid of the Croatian bishop Strossmayer, who saw it as an illustration of his Illyrian ideal. Shortly after the collection appeared in Zagreb, Konstantin Miladinov learned that his brother had been arrested, went to look for him in Istanbul and was also imprisoned. He too died in prison. Today, Konstantin Miladinov is best known for his poetry, among which the melancholic *Tâga za jug* (Desire for the south, written during his student years in Moscow) is the most popular.

Once folk songs were accepted as an essential part of Bulgarian national identity, poets started to compose original works as well in the style of folk songs. Petko Slavejkov, for instance, wrote *Izvorât na belonogata* (The well of the white-legged [woman/girl]), inspired by the folk songs he knew.

§6.10 Serbia

In the nineteenth century, there were close ties between Bulgarians and Serbs. As noted above, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, Serb cultural life inside the Austrian empire (the area that is now known as Voivodina), was influential in the developing Bulgarian culture (§2.6). But it is also the case that the Ottoman Serb lands, and, after the Serbian autonomy of 1815, the state of Serbia contributed to the Bulgarian culture as well.

Links between Bulgarians and Serbs emerged as early as the Middle Ages, when migrants started to flow from the Bulgarian to the Serbian lands.

N. M. Petrovskij has argued that because of the cultural and political dominance of Serbia on the Balkans in the late Middle Ages, the Serbian language started to oust Bulgarian as a literary code. Moreover, it is said that in the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries in Sofia, the language
that was used was a Serbian variant. The churches in West-Bulgaria, including the Rila monastery, were under the jurisdiction of the Serbian patriarch of Peć.

A few hundred Bulgarians fought in the Serbian insurrection of 1804, and in the period when Vuk Karadžić was teacher and officer in Belgrade, there were lively contacts between Bulgarians and Serbs.

The Serb intellectual Dositej Obradović was well-known among Bulgarians. He is seen as intermediary between the European Enlightenment and the Balkan lands. He had a Bulgarian student when he was teaching in Vienna, and it is believed (but not documented) that he met with Paisij Hilendarski and Sofronij Vračanski. In the late Vâzraždane, starting with Hristaki Pavlović in 1846, Dositej’s works were translated into Bulgarian.

From the 1830s onwards, many young Bulgarians went to the then autonomous Serbian state. This was not only because of the linguistic closeness of the two languages, or the short distance between the two capitals, but also because Prince Miloš Obrenović protected the Bulgarians, facilitated the printing of Bulgarian books in Serbia, including Neofit Rilski’s Bulgarian grammar, and mediated in the acceptance of Bulgarian students in the schools in the principality.

It was crucial that the Serbian orthodox community did not fall under the religious jurisdiction of the oecumenical patriarch in Constantinople, but after the abolishing of the patriarchate of Peć in 1766, under a metropolitan in Sremski Karlovci in the Habsburg Empire. Without strict Phanariot censorship, it was much easier to print books in Bulgarian there than in the Ottoman Empire.

One of these books was Hristaki Pavlović’s Arithmetika (Arithmetics), published in Belgrade in the royal print shop in 1833. Hristaki Pavlović (1804-1848) was educated in his native town, Dupnica, in a monastery on Athos, and in Melnik. Later, he became a monk in Rila. In 1831, he founded a Hellenobulgarian school in Svištov, the second following that established by Emanuil Vaskidović.
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In 1835 a text on writing followed the *Arithmetika*, as did the Greek-Bulgarian *Razgovornik* (Language guide), in which a short Bulgarian history, taken from Paisij's work (see §5.3) was included. Pavlović's works were not only printed in the Serbian principality, in 1836, he published a Bulgarian grammar in Buda, and a second edition followed in 1845, in Belgrade. A canon of prayers to the saint Haralambos was printed in Bucharest in 1841. Pavlović's *Carstvenik*, the first printed version of Paisij's history, appeared in 1844 in Buda.

Neofit Rilski's *Bolgarska Grammatika* (Bulgarian grammar, 1835) was published in Kragujevac, although it was written in Bucharest and funded by the brothers Mustakov who lived there. Serbian Prince Miloš Obrenović had contacts with Hristofor hadži Ivanov Mustakov (unknown-1860), a graduate of the Princely Academy of Bucharest (Atanas Bogoridi and Nikolaos Pikkolos were among his teachers, see (§4.1). As one of the leading figures of the Bulgarian merchants’ colony in the city, he contributed much to Bulgarian education. Mustakov was manager of the Bucharest estate of the Serbian Prince, for whom on several occasions he acted as diplomatic representative, just like his brother Dimităr.

Serb influence on Bulgarian nationalism culminated in the person of Ljuben Karavelov (1834-1879). In 1867 he went to Belgrade as correspondent for the magazine *Golos*, where he became a supporter of the idea of a South Slav federation, joining Bulgaria and Serbia. He founded a Bulgarian committee there, that was to organise četi (regiments) on Serbian territory and prepare the Bulgarian insurrection. He contributed to the Serbian press, for instance to the newspaper *Srbija*, and the magazines *Zastava* and *Matica*.

Karavelov was exiled because of his activities to Novi Sad and later, suspected of complicity in the murder of Prince Mihail Obrenović, imprisoned for some time in Budapest. Back in Bulgaria, Karavelov started to agitate for the Bulgarian cause, but did not abandon his South Slav ideals. Inspired by the work of Vuk Karadžić, he urged the Bulgarians to furnish documentary proof of their historical presence:

Изучете вие народа, опишете неговите нрави и обичаи, неговата статистика и положение, съберете народните песни, приказници, пословици и поговорки, потрудете се да съставите български речник...

You, study the people, describe their morals and customs, their statistics and situation, collect the folk songs, stories, proverbs and sayings, strive to compose a Bulgarian dictionary...
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In Pamjatniki narodnogo byta Bolgar (Monuments of the folk life of the Bulgarians), Karavelov included over 250 Serbian proverbs and expressions. He dedicated his collection of folk songs to Konstantin Miladinov and Vuk Karadžić. When in 1861, Karavelov had to defend his choice of language used in his collection of folk songs Bolgarskie narodni pesni, against Russian slavophile opinions, he used Karadžić’s thesis about the dialectal basis of orthography: Мы пишем так, как говорит народ и сохраняем все местные отличия языка⁴⁶⁸ (We write in the way, in which the people are speaking, and preserve all the local distinguishing features of the language).

Not only did Bulgarians go to Serbia in the nineteenth century, but Serbians also went to Bulgaria, where they contributed to the development of the Bulgarian school system and literature. This was the case with Sima Milutinović Sarajlija (1791-1847) and Konstantin Ognjanović (1798-1858).

Milutinović was originally from Sarajevo, then Austrian territory. Fleeing the regime of Miloš Obrenović, he ended up in Vidin, where he founded a school in 1815. He used Greek and Serbian as the language of instruction, and made use of Serbian school books⁴⁶⁹. In 1817, Milutinović was arrested on the suspicion of cooperation with the members of the Filiki Eteria. After his release, which was realized probably after support from the Austrian administration, he returned to Serbia.

In 1826, with the help of his pupil Hristofor Hadžiivanović, who was studying there at the time, he published in Leipzig the Bulgarian folk song Serbijanka (Serbian woman). This is the first Bulgarian folk song that appeared in print. Before he had come to Bulgaria, he had already provided Karadžić with Serbian folk songs, that were included in Karadžić’s publications in 1814 and 1815⁴⁷⁰.

In 1840, Milutinović came back to Vidin, but the next year he went to Russia. He remained in contact with Bulgarian intellectuals there.

Ognjanović, born in Pančevo, Serbia, moved to Bulgaria in 1815. There he worked as a teacher in Vidin in the school that Sima Milutinović had founded, and Vraca, where he founded a Slav school in 1822. He also taught at the island of Halki. When he was in Istanbul, he joined the movement for an independent Bulgarian church. There he contributed to the founding of the Bulgarian press, named Trudoljubivata pčela (the zealous bee), that was realised in 1841, and
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started a Bulgarian newspaper, *Novina Bǎlgarska* (Bulgarian news)\(^{471}\). In the language debate, he expressed allegiance to the Church-Slavonic school. In his book *Žitie svetago Aleksija čeloveka božija* (Life of the St. Aleksij, man of God), printed in 1833, he pleaded for the development of new-Bulgarian culture and education. Like Paisij, he reproached intellectual Bulgarians who denied their origin and native tongue\(^{472}\). Ognjanović is also credited with the only two Bulgarian books published in Paris in the nineteenth century, two almanacs, printed by Firmin-Didot, in 1845 and 1846\(^{473}\) (see §4.4).

### §6.11 The fate of Bulgarian medieval manuscripts

All over Europe, nineteenth-century Romanticism invoked a ‘salvage operation’ to retrieve, edit and publish old texts\(^{474}\). This holds for religious as well as secular (legal) texts, witness the Russian case, of Johann Ewers’ edition of *Das älteste Recht der Russen in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1826, see §7.2).

Among Bulgarians, this historical-philological trend was extremely late to develop. There were no trained philologists with the skills to study and edit old manuscripts. Most manuscripts were sold, donated or stolen before the Bulgarians themselves started thinking about publishing them, which explains why most of the texts in Old Church Slavonic (which Bulgarian scholars call Old Bulgarian) and Middle Bulgarian were published outside of Bulgaria by non-Bulgarians. Kujo M. Kuev describes this process in his book on the fate of Bulgarian manuscripts. He gives the example of the church of St. Sofia in Ohrid, where in the time of the visit of Viktor Grigorović in 1845, there were 23 Slavic manuscripts. By 1979, when Kuev published his book, all of them, with the exception of what Grigorović took with him, were missing\(^{475}\).

Many manuscripts ended up in the collections of famous slavists. Jernej Kopitar for instance, who collected Slavic manuscripts and owned 34 of them, had Bulgarian manuscripts in his possession\(^{476}\). Among these were pages from the famous *Codex Suprasliensis*. How the *Codex Suprasliensis* came in the possession of Kopitar is typical. In 1838, Kiril Bobrovski sent
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Kopitar pages from the *Codex*, on the condition that they would be returned. The first time Bobrovski had sent Kopitar pages from the manuscript, they were returned as promised, the second time, however, for some reason the pages remained in Vienna, as Kopitar never sent them back. Nowadays, this part of the *Codex Suprasliensis* is in the Kopitar collection at the university library of Ljubljana\(^{477}\).

The Slovak scholar Pavel Jozef Šafárik also owned eight Bulgarian manuscripts\(^{478}\). Another foreigner who collected a number of Bulgarian manuscripts was the English Lord Curzon, who travelled through the Levant and Mount Athos in 1837. He received, as a present from the igumen of the St. Pavl monastery, the *Ivan Aleksandrovo Evangelie* (Ivan Alexander Gospel or London Gospel) of 1356\(^{479}\). This is the most beautiful manuscript of the period known to Bulgarians as the Second Golden Age. The manuscript is housed today in the British Library\(^{480}\).

Jurij Venelin was the first to publish Bulgarian manuscripts, when in 1840 he published some old texts in his *Vlabo-bolgarskie ili dako-slavjanske gramoty* (Vlacho-Bulgarian or Dacio-Slavic charters). No doubt inspired by the example of Venelin, Vasil Aprilov in 1845 published his collection of medieval Bulgarian texts: *Bolgarskia gramoty* (Bulgarian charters).

It was only in the 1860s that Bulgarians themselves started to think about preserving and publishing ancient manuscripts on a larger scale. This effort arose more or less simultaneously with the desire to document and preserve folk songs. Both the manuscripts and songs constituted a part of what ethnographers of the time referred to as ‘antiquities’ which could be anything from an old coin to a manuscript, a costume or a folk tale. A manifesto by Georgi Rakovski on how to find and treat old manuscripts, was an influential example of this mind-set. What is more, Rakovski himself embodies the connection between cultural and political nationalism.

\[\text{§6.12 Georgi Stojkov Rakovski (1821 – 12-10-1867)}\]

Maybe the best illustration among Bulgarians of a national activist who fought ‘with the pen and the sword’ is the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski. Rakovski came from a family of brothers and a 

\(^{477}\) Kuev, Sădaba, 161.
\(^{478}\) Kuev, Sădaba, 51.
\(^{479}\) Ibid., 158
\(^{480}\) Some illuminations of the manuscript are to be seen on http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=8071&CollID0=27&NStart=39627
father who fought against bandits of the kârdžalijstvo period in the late eighteenth century. A relative took part in the Russian-Turkish war of 1828-1829 and was one of the organisers of the Velčova zavera, the uprising in Veliko Târnovo of 1835.

Rakovski received his education from 1837 at the renowned Kuruçeşme school in Istanbul, and subsequently in Athens and in Paris. During a stay in Serbia, he became acquainted with the work of Vuk Karadžić. He recognized Karadžić’s effort to put the Bulgarians on the map, although he did not agree with his ideas on orthography.

Rakovski combined the actions of a revolutionary with the notions of a nineteenth-century Romantic philologist. Rakovski’s standards of scholarship were lower than those of the brothers Grimm or Jernej Kopitar. He clearly was a dilettante in the field of philology, where his work and conclusions are more inspired by his nationalist ideals than by serious academic research.

Rakovski’s most ‘serious’ scholarly work was the Pokazalec ili râkovodstvo kak da sa iziskvât i izdirjât najstari čârti našego bytija, jazyka, narodapokolenija, starogo ni pravljenija, slavnago ni prošestvija i proč. (An explanation of how to look for and dig up historic signs of our existence, language, historic folklore, our government, our wonderful genealogy and further, 1859). In it, Rakovski advocates the study of the Bulgarian language, as he believed it would prove a relationship between Bulgarians and old Indian tribes:

ше най-голям и най-верен източник е българския жив и говорим язик, кой твърде малка разлика има от самъсъкритаго и зендскаго язика, коих учений свят е мислил за мъртви язици!

Our largest and most reliable source is spoken Bulgarian, which is not so different to Sanskrit and Avestic, languages the academic world had thought to be long extinct!

Rakovski was an amateur and a dreamer, and his work was dismissed by the influential slavist Vatroslav Jagić in 1910, who claimed that everything in Rakovski’s work leads ‘k Hindistanu i samskritskomu i zendskomu jazykam’ (to Hindistan and to Sanskrit and Avestic). In the Bulgarian intellectual discourse of the time, in magazines and school books, Rakovski’s ideas were not incorporated.

Nevertheless, an important aspect that Rakovski introduced to the discourse of his time was the admiration for the activities of hajduks. He clearly made a link between the hajduks of the
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kârdžalijstvo and the revolutionary četa’s of his time, bands of volunteers who entered Bulgaria to fight as revolutionaries. This idea was taken up in the poetry of Hristo Botev (1848-1876), also an organiser of the revolutionary movement, who wrote a number of poems on hajduks in the years preceding the April Uprising. This type of poetry, which was made to look like original folk poetry, remained popular into the 1870s. Petko Slavejkov’s Izvorăţ na belonogata (The well of the white-legged [woman/girl]) of 1873 still fitted in the trend that Rakovski had started. Rakovski also brought the autobiography of Sofronij Vrачanski to light together with the ethnographic texts of Josif Bradati, re-introducing them to the discussions and debates of his day484.

In his revolutionary activities, Rakovski received help from, among others, the Odeskoto българско настоjателство, which in 1861 gave him 13,000 silver rubles to establish his četa, the First Bulgarian Legion, 7000 of which were handed to him by Nikolaj Toškov in person485.

Rakovski’s main contribution to the development of Bulgarian nationalism thus lay not in his academic work, but in his revolutionary activism. To use the terms of Miroslav Hroch: Rakovski carried out activities that are typical for both phase A and phase B, but it was the phase B-activities that had the most impact on the Bulgarian national movement.

§6.13 Veda Slovena

Rakovski’s ideas about the genealogy of Bulgarians were incorporated in a forgery of folk tales, the Veda Slovena, that was just as sensational in Eastern Europe as Macphersons Ossian had been in Western Europe in 1773. Although this book appeared in a time that falls outside the period of this study, it is a striking example of how folklore was often used for nationalist propaganda.

In 1874 and 1881, the Bosnian Serb, Stefan Verković (1827-1893), published two volumes of his Veda Slovena, the first one in Belgrade, the second in St. Petersburg. The work was presented as a collection of folk songs and myths, in the style of the Indian Veda, containing legends about how things like the plough, the sickle, wine, and writing came into existence, but also stories about the Indian god Vishnu, the Thracian singer Orpheus, Philip and Alexander of

\[484\] Angelov, Савременици I, 26.  
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Macedonia, the Trojan war etc. The Veda is very long: it consists of 23,809 lines (for comparison: the German *Nibelungenlied* has 9776 lines)\(^{486}\).

Verković was born in Bosnia and was educated in a Franciscan catholic school, as a Franciscan monk in a monastery, and in the lyceum in Zagreb. Inspired by Illyrianism, he started to work for the Serbian government in the time that Serbian policy was under the influence of the 1844 *Načertanie* (Sketch). In this sketch, which was only published in the 20\(^{th}\) century, and is often compared to the Greek *Megali Idea* (The Great Idea), the later prime minister Ilija Garašanin laid out his plans for the liberation of all South Slavs (Serbs still under Ottoman rule, Bulgarians and also Macedonians) and their unification under the Serbian flag. Serbia and Greece were both young autonomous states at the time and both tried to win as many people as they could in the Ottoman empire to identify with their national identity. The area where these two ambitions clashed was Macedonia, with its mixed Greek-Slav population.

From 1850, Verković was Serbian envoy in Macedonia, where he stayed until the war of 1876-8. He had contacts with the Bulgarian intellectuals in Macedonia and in Istanbul, and he contributed to the development of education in Bulgarian, instead of Greek. He collected ‘antiquities’ (manuscripts, coins, and objects of art), and was also searching for folk tales. In 1860, he published *Narodne pesme makedonski bugara* (Folk songs of the Macedonian Bulgarians). Inspired by Rakovski’s ideas about the Indian provenance of the Bulgarians, Verković started to look for folk songs that contained traces of ancient songs\(^{487}\). He heard these stories in abundance from Ivan Gologanov (1839-1895), the village teacher of Tarlis.

The impact of the collection among slavists was great, because the news of its discovery reached them when they were together in Moscow at the ethnographic congress of 1867. It was soon translated into Russian, but then attention faded\(^{488}\). Verković also presented his findings to the French scholar Emile Burnouf, who was director of the French school in Athens. Burnouf introduced the book to French intellectual circles, where it was received with great enthusiasm. This enthusiasm dwindled as well, when it turned out that no one could trace the singers that the informant Gologanov had used, and of whom Gologanov himself had said that they would not perform their singing in front of Verković, but only for himself\(^{489}\).

Initially, it was believed that the stories had to be genuine, since Gologanov, being a simple village teacher, would not have been able to create them himself. But Gologanov had received a
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thorough Greek education, knew classical and contemporary Greek very well, was familiar with Greek mythology and the work of Homer and also wrote original mythological poetry. Thus the general opinion is now that Gologanov was responsible for the forgery.

There is also the theory of Petko Slavejkov, that the *Veda* was the work of a collective of composers, joining forces to extract as much money as possible from Verković, who paid by the piece. It is not clear whether Verković was aware of the fact that his informant provided him with invented material. One argument that leads us to believe that he was sincere is that, in 1891 and 1892, when he was living on a pension from the Bulgarian state, Verković himself twice went back to Macedonia to find the singers of the songs.

Josef Jireček (1825-1888), who from the outset refused to believe in the authenticity of the *Veda*, made his views clear in a speech to the Royal Bohemian Academy of Sciences, remarking that the book contained no more than an imitation of the quasi-historic songs that Georgi Rakovski had included in *Nekolko reči o Asenju I* (Some words about Asen I) of 1860. The Russian slavist Aleksandr Nikolaevič Pypin also noted that the *Veda* was a very suitable response to Rakovski’s demands about the collection of national material posed in his *Pokazalec* (1859, see §6.12) or in his one-issued magazine *Bălgarska starina* (1865). While Gologanov forged the *Veda* probably just out of financial motives, the way Verković and the Serbian government reacted to it showed that Serbia was eager to incorporate Macedonians into their nation.

§6.14 Bălgarsko knižovno družestvo

In the years after 1859, when Walachia and Moldavia, since 1856 including the south of Bessarabia, were united under Prince Alexandre Ioan Cuza, the Danubian principalities started to become an extremely important cultural centre for Bulgarians. There were Bulgarian schools, Bulgarian publishers, and Bulgarian societies, especially in Bucharest and Brăila. A society that was to become a leading institution among Bulgarians was the *Bălgarsko knižovno družestvo* (Bulgarian literary society). It was founded in 1869 by a group of Bulgarian intellectuals in Brăila, Walachia, as the successor of the Russia-based Bulgarian *Matica* (see §7.9) and the *Obšestvo bolgarskoj pismennosti* (Society of Bulgarian literature) in Istanbul. It was deliberately opened in Brăila, so the
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leaders did not have to choose for its headquarters between Odessa and Bucharest, the two cities with the most active Bulgarian communities.

The society in Brăila had many influential intellectuals among its members, including Vasil Drumev and Marin Drinov. It aimed to spread enlightened ideas as current among other nations, and, specifically, to contribute to the formation of one Bulgarian language, and to the study of Bulgarian ethnography and history.

Where as the literary society in Istanbul had its periodical Български Книжичи (Bulgarian Booklets), the Brăila society had its Periodičesko spisanie (Periodical journal). In the period from 1870 until 1876, only twelve issues came out, but those that did appear had a large impact. It was after Drinov’s contribution to this magazine that Paisij Hilendarski received widespread acknowledgement, for example. The magazine printed much Bulgarian folk poetry, and some original works as well.

In 1881, three years after the Bulgarian autonomy, the Българско книжовно дружество was moved to the new capital Sofia and in 1911 it was renamed, as the Academy of Sciences.

Conclusions

This chapter demonstrates, by adducing a wide range of cultural activities, how in the course of the nineteenth century, a public sphere developed in Bulgaria. In this public sphere, it became possible for the Non Dominant Ethnic Groups of the Bulgarians to develop into a nation, meeting all criteria that Hroch posed to a nation: a hierarchical social structure; equal rights; the wish for a territory ‘of its own’; and a common language, culture and history. There is a rise of ‘Bulgarianness’, or what is often called ‘Bulgarian awareness’ or ‘national awareness’ (Български/nacionalno съзнание)492 in Bulgarian studies.

The development of Bulgarian education, influenced by modern Greek education, together with the growing number of students sent abroad, enabled the emergence of a group of intellectuals with philological interests who acted first from patriot motives and later as nationalists. They expressed their views both in literature, in scholarly work, in schoolbooks and in the newly formed periodical press.

492 See Obretenov, Spiritual leaders, 26, or Genčev, Българско Възраждане, 320.
Increasing literacy enabled increasing sociability. The network between these intellectuals became denser and more intense. All this took place in the absence of government-sponsored institutions and was wholly carried by the emerging middle class. While initially, the number of societies and periodicals in which attention was paid to the Bulgarian cause was large and diffuse, over time the Văzraždane philologists concentrated their efforts in a restricted number of societies, like the Българско книжовно дружество. Čitalištes were organised in a network spanning all the Bulgarian lands.

Bulgarians were greatly dependent on foreign assistance in developing this new cultural life, both on a practical level and when it came to the spread of ideas. Practical assistance came from the Habsburg Empire (for instance printing presses and letters were bought there) and Russia, which provided access to printing presses and education.

New ideas entered the Bulgarian debate through Greek, Habsburg and Russian philologists. Periodical press, literature, performing arts, historiography, and folklore all developed following foreign examples. Serbians furthermore provided the Bulgarians with an example of a small Slav people that thrived culturally because of the presence of a national church. The spread and dissemination of these new attitudes form a good illustration of that process which Sperber has termed the ‘Contagion des Idées’.
7: The Russian Empire and the Bulgarians

Around 1840, Russia became the most important centre of diaspora nationalism among Bulgarians, as emigrés founded patriotic societies and contributed to the printing of Bulgarian literature and education. Russia became the source of many new ideas among Bulgarians. Bulgarians who studied in Russia adopted the slavophilism that they witnessed there and turned it into Bulgarian nationalism.

This chapter traces the rise of slavophilism in Russia from the 1820s. It also sketches the development of the academic discipline of slavistics, and contacts between Bulgarians and Russians and their impact on Bulgarian developments.

§7.1 The Russian rediscovery of Bulgarians

In the Middle Ages, there had been much contact between Bulgaria, then a leading centre of Slavic orthodoxy, and Russia. Especially in the time just before and just after the conquest of Bulgaria by the Turks in 1393, the Târnova literary school of the Bulgarian capital provided Russia with influential men like Kiprian, who became metropolitan of Kiev and Lithuania in 1375, and (after he united the church) in 1390 of the whole of Russia, and Grigorij Camblak, who became metropolitan of Kiev and Lithuania in 1416.

After the gradual decline of the Târnovo school, and especially after the Turks captured Târnovo, contacts ceased. For centuries, Bulgaria became ‘terra incognita’ to Russians and the place of Bulgarians in Russian history was forgotten. Bulgaria was obscured from the greater European view. There were, in the eighteenth century, sporadic mentions of Bulgarians, e.g. in August Ludwig von Schlözer’s (1735-1809) Allgemeine Nordische Geschichte of 1771, but works of this period are extremely ill-informed.

Only in the nineteenth century, when the political constellation changed, did Bulgaria come into the Russian purview again. One of the key factors in this respect was the expansion of the Russian Empire in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Russia acquired territories from the weakening Ottoman Empire, and reached out closer and closer to the Bulgarian lands. In 1774, the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca gave Russia the right to protect the orthodox inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, with the 1791 Treaty of Iaşi Russia acquired the Krim up to the Dnjejestr, in
1812 (Treaty of Bucharest) the remainder of Bessarabia became Russian territory and in 1829 the Treaty of Edirne accorded Russia military government over the Danubian principalities.

A second factor was that a growing number of Bulgarians settled in Russia or in the territories it controlled. These groups of settlers consisted of ambitious merchants, and of refugees, fleeing the disturbances of the kārdžalijsvo times (see §3.2) and the repeated wars. Bulgarians moved to the Russian heartland, for instance to the cities of Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kiev, into the areas that Russia just obtained, like the Crimea (Odessa) and Bessarabia, or to the areas that were under Russian protection, like the Danubian principalities. In particular in Bessarabia there was a large influx of Bulgarian settlers in the period after the treaties of Iaşi (1792) and Bucharest of (1812). By 1821, the number of Bulgarians in Bessarabia had risen to 38,000. The immigration of Bulgarians to Bessarabia occurred again on a larger scale after the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-1829, when Ivan Seliminski led a large group of people from Sliven northeast.

A third factor promoting intensified contacts between Russians and Bulgarians in the nineteenth century was the changing attitude in Russian society towards foreign lands and especially the Slavs that lived outside Russia. A movement of slavophilism emerged, emphasizing the idea of solidarity between the Slavs all over Europe, including those in Russia.

§7.2 Slavophilism

In the eighteenth century, Russia had undergone a process of radical europeanisation. Peter the Great (reigned 1682-1725), had initiated a drastic modernisation programme. Peter stimulated trade with and the import of knowledge from western Europe, created a new western-style capital, St. Petersburg, and even forbade ‘old-fashioned’ habits like wearing kaftans or beards. Catherine the Great (1762-1796) followed in Peter’s footsteps. She built up the collection of western art that Peter had started and corresponded with French intellectuals like Voltaire.

From the 1830s onwards, the europeanisation of Russia led to a debate between two groups of intellectuals: zapadniki (westernizers) and slavophiles. The zapadniki advocated further modernisation of Russian society, following the example set by Western European countries. Slavophiles, on the other hand, felt that Russian society should return to pristine values, of the time before Peter.
Slavophiles and zapadniki were not only distinct ideologically, but also sociologically. Slavophiles were largely landowners. They lived outside the city and their cultural centre was Moscow, the capital of the traditional Russian heartland. The orthodox religion was to many of them a crucial part of their identity. Zapadniki were more closely tied to the court and bureaucracy of St. Petersburg. Both groups, however, consisted mainly of intellectuals who were well acquainted with the works of (German) philosophers of the day.

At the heart of the debate between slavophiles and zapadniki was the character of Russia. Never before Russian intellectuals had to choose whether their country was European or not. The historian Nikolaj Mihajlovič Karamzin (1766-1826), who published his history of the Russian state from 1818 (see below), had still boasted the fact that Russia had such a diverse heritage and was situated between Europe and Asia.

One factor that contributed to the development of slavophilism was the changing role of Russia in the European context. The love for everything French, that had ruled the Russian court in the time of Catherine, declined drastically when Napoleon attacked Russia in 1812. And when Russia defeated Napoleon and Russian troops were among the allied forces in Paris in 1814, Russia had become militarily and politically an important player on the European stage. This not only lifted Russian self-esteem, it also made Slav people outside Russia more likely than ever before to look to Russia for assistance to improve their own situation.

Russians became acquainted with these new ideas through Slavs in the Austrian empire, who in the period 1750-1850 went through a period of cultural bloom, thanks to the reforms and the enlightened policy of especially Maria Theresa, Joseph II and Leopold II. This enabled young protestants among the Czechs and Slovaks, who felt affinity with the German protestantism, to study in Germany. They were the first Slavs to be influenced by German nationalism.

Among Russian intellectuals, works by philosophers such as Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling (1775-1854) and Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) were eagerly read. It is likely that the cultural relativism of Herder was most popular among slavophiles.

The spread of German philosophical ideas throughout Russia was in part the result of changed conditions for freemasons. On the 1st of August 1822, all Masonic lodges and other secret organisations were banned by interior minister Viktor Pavlovič Kočubej, because of the unrest that
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they had stirred in other European countries. In the wake of the termination of the Masonic lodges, study groups began to meet to discuss the work of German philosophers and disseminated their ideas. In this way, theories of Schelling, for example, soon became very popular at the university of Moscow. The work of the German philosopher George Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel (1770-1831) also became popular. From him, Russians took on the idea that the world was divided between West and East, Europe and Asia, nations regarded by Hegel as the ‘saved’ and the ‘damned’, although it was unclear to which of the two Russia belonged. Following Hegel, the zapadniki sought evidence to place Russia among the European, ‘saved’ nations. Meanwhile, slavophiles were critical of the importance that Hegel gave to rationalism and individual liberty. They argued that unity, not individual liberty, was the ultimate aim of societies.

It is this position that perhaps explains why there was a new interest in ‘pre-European’ Russian history in this time. August Ludwig Schlözer’s (1735-1809) edition of Povest’ vremennykh let (Tale of bygone years, 1st vol. 1801) became highly authoritative. It was based on historic Russian chronicles created by the monk Nestor in the eleventh century. Another important study is the Istorija gosudarstva Rossiskogo (History of the Russian state) by the well-known historian and writer N. M. Karamzin. Taking over two decades to write (1804-1826), and fitting the European spread of Romantic historiography, the first eight volumes of this work appeared in 1818 in Russian. In 1820, they were translated into French, German and Italian.

Karamzin’s work and its distribution among the public are sometimes compared to that of Walter Scott, who by that time had published six books on the Scottish history. Both were regarded in Russia as pioneers for the way in which their works opened an entirely new world to their readers. Puškin put it this way: ‘Древняя Россия казалась найдена Карамзиным, как Америка Колумбо’. (Ancient Russia seemed to be discovered by Karamzin, like America by Columbus.)

Unlike Scott however, Karamzin did not use the narrative form for his work, regarding it as inappropriate. The preface to the first part of his history stated bluntly: ‘История не роман’ (History is not a novel).
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Karamzin was the first modern Russian to dedicate attention to the oldest periods of the Russian state. In his history, he quoted the Nestor chronicle, in which it was claimed that the Russian Slavs did not have one absolute ruler, but followed the rules of their fathers, ancient customs and traditions. These were described in the seventh century by a Greek historian and had the status of laws. With this, it might be said that Karamzin laid the foundation for the idealisation of traditional Russian society, which was the bedrock of slavophilic argument to come.

Slavophilic ideas were further developed by Mihail Pogodin, who translated into Russian and wrote a review of the work *Das alteste Recht der Russen in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* by Johann Philipp Gustav Ewers.

In his book, Ewers, a (German) professor at the university of Dorpat (current Tartu in Estonia, then Russian territory), described the legal system of early Russia, concluding that the oldest laws mainly served to settle discord among individuals, and that what we now know as criminal law, did not yet exist. The absence of criminal law was explained by the fact that those who did not abide by the rules of society were excommunicated.

…wer sich dem Gesetze und der gesetzlichen Gewalt widersetzt, wird dadurch gesetzlos, d.h. ausser dem Schutze der Gesetze jeder willkürlichen Behandlung preisgegeben.

In case of complicated problems that could not be solved without mediation, the community appointed a committee of twelve old and wise men, who were engaged to settle the question according to customary law. According to Ewers:

Hier haben wir die Grundlage aller Jury, ein sehr altes, wahrscheinlich allen Völkern ursprünglich gemeinschaftliches Institut.

The oldest records about Russian law keep silent about the position of a leader. According to Ewers this should not surprise us, as rules were very clear then and needed no further explication or confirmation by a leader. A feudal system which was, according to Ewers, so pernicious in European history elsewhere, could not develop in this situation. Ewers compared the Russian state to a large family:
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Die fürstliche Gewalt beruhte auf desselben natürlichen Grundlage, wie die Gewalt des Familienhauptes; es bedurfte also keine Bestimmung darüber. Die Obergewalt des Fürsten war einfach und unbegrenzt.\footnote{Ewers, Das älteste Recht, 301.}

The legal system created the conditions for the development of the \textit{mir} or village community, that ruled itself. For the slavophiles of the nineteenth century, the \textit{mir} encapsulated their aspirations for ‘modern’ Russia, and while this traditional way of life had been left behind in the process of Europeanisation, they contested, some of the smaller Slavic tribes outside Russia had preserved the ideal.

In the two decades preceding the Crimean war of 1854-1856, the slavophile movement had neither an organisation nor a clear political programme.\footnote{Sumner, Russia and the Balkans, 57.} Czar Nikolaj I kept the slavophiles under tight control, because he feared the public unrest that he thought they might unleash.

That was probably the reason that at the first Slav congress of 1848 in Prague, no official Russian delegation was present, although invitations had been sent to Mihail Pogodin, Izmail Sreznevskij, Osip Bodjanskij, Viktor Grigorovič and the minister of education Sergej Uvarov.\footnote{Picht, M.P. Pogodin, 186.} Pogodin received a letter from the Slovak scholar Pavel Jozef Šafařík (see §8.10) following the conference, stating that ‘die Tendenz und das Benehmen des Congress durchaus loyal waren’.\footnote{Corespondence Pavla Josefa Šafaříka.Vzájemné dopisy P.J. Šafaříka s Ruskymi učenmi (1825-1861) (Praha: Naklad české akademie věd a umění, 1927-1928), 717-718.} With no Russians present, except for Bakunin and Miloradov, who were there in the capacity of ‘Beobachter’,\footnote{Palacky, Gedenkblätter 182, quoted in Picht, M.P. Pogodin, 186.} organiser Palacký had turned the congress into a manifestation of austroslavism.

Slavophilic ideas differed in strength from person to person. The most radical was Konstantin Sergeevič Aksakov (1817-1860), who presented his views in a memorandum, \textit{O vnutrennem sostoyanii Rossi} (On the internal situation of Russia, 1855). He believed that the \textit{mir}, the Russian peasant commune was a good model because it offered an arena in which social life could take place without being regulated by the external authority of law.\footnote{O vnutrennem sostoyanii Rossi, p. 234 quoted in Michael Hughes, "State and society in the political thought of the Moscow slavophiles", Studies in East European thought 52 (2000): 159-83, 162.} In this model, the state would have limited powers, its main role being to protect the land against foreign invasion. This view, however, was not shared by others.
Others stressed the possibility of a union between state and society or, like Ivan Kireevskij and Jurij Samarin, shifted over time from the basically anarchistic position of Aksakov to one which saw greater state involvement\textsuperscript{516}.

Aksakov tried to reassure the Czar in a letter saying that slavophiles were conservatives and it was the zapadniki who formed a threat to political stability, but this did not persuade him\textsuperscript{517}. The Czar kept a close watch on slavophile activities. Dressing in traditional Slavic clothes (wide gowns, sheep skins and long beards), which became a fashion among slavophiles, was seen as sedition, and father and son Sergej Timofeevič Aksakov and Konstantin Sergeevič Aksakov, who had a position within the court, were even compelled to shave in 1849\textsuperscript{518}.

Aleksej Stepanovič Homjakov (1804-1860) was a moderate slavophile\textsuperscript{519}. Born in a family of old nobility in Moscow, Homjakov was educated thoroughly in Russia and abroad, and made a career as publicist and writer. In 1825 and 1826 he travelled through Europe. In the course of the 1830s he became involved with the slavophile movement, for which he became a spokesman. He stressed the role of orthodoxy and its importance for the Slavs.

The Romantic interest in folk material, instigated by the ideas of Herder, is present in Homjakov’s writing, including \textit{Severnij Orel} (Northern Eagle) of 1832, and \textit{Serbskaja pesnja} (Serbian song, 1849), in which he referred to the legend of the sleeping ‘kral’ Marko’ (king Marko, also called Marko Kraljevič), taken from a well-known South Slavic folk song. In 1847, Homjakov visited Hanka\textsuperscript{520} in Prague and Schelling in Germany.

According to Homjakov, mankind stemmed from two tribes: Iranians and Kushites, in which the Russians belonged to the freedomloving Iranians\textsuperscript{521}. This mirrors Herder’s idea about the peacefulness of the Slavs and pre-empts admiration for the \textit{mir}.

The first generation of slavophiles\textsuperscript{522} had a platform to exchange their thoughts in the conservative journal \textit{Moskvitjanin} (Muscovian), which was edited by Pogodin and Ševyrëv. They also contributed to \textit{Majak sovremennogo prosveščenija} (Beacon of contemporary enlightenment),
which appeared in St. Petersburg. These two journals were seen in Russia as the best journals 'для любителей славянства' (for lovers of Slavdom)523.

In this first period of slavophilism, before the Crimean war, other Slavs seemed to look more towards the Russians than the Russians looked towards them. The one exception to this was Mihail Pogodin, who already in the 1820s paid a great deal of attention to other Slavic peoples524. In the period after the Slav congress of 1848, the situation slowly changed. Russian intellectuals became more aware of their Slavic brothers and their plight. The movement of slavophilism in Russia became much stronger and the slavophile ideal rose to reform Russian society by reverting it to old Russian models.

§7.3 The beginnings of slavistics in Russia

The growing interest for the Slavs outside Russia went hand in hand with the rise of slavistics. At first, it was a pastime for intellectuals, later it became an established scholarly discipline. The distinction between slavists and historians was not that clear in that time. It was only in the course of the nineteenth century that slavistics and history grew into two separate disciplines.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Russian slavists gathered informally in a circle around Count Nikolaj Petrovič Rumjancev (1754-1826)525. Rumjancev was a son of the army commander P.A. Rumjancev-Zadunajskij, who had made the Turks sign the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca during the reign of Catherine the Great. Rumjancev junior served at the court and as a diplomat from 1776-1795, then became a member and later president of the ‘Gosudarstvennyj Sovet’, the state council. In 1813, he retired, and from then on devoted himself to Russian and Slavic history and the study of documents and manuscripts connected with it. He also supported scholars from abroad, like Vuk Karadžić526. Rumjancev collected materials on Russian history inside and outside the country, and his collection of manuscripts lay the foundations for the Russian State Library, which was founded in 1862 as the Rumjancev museum, the first public library in Russia. The later famous slavist Aleksandr Hristoфорovič Vostokov worked for a long time on the collection, to which he published a catalogue in 1842. Rumjancev financed the
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publications of many studies by historians and archeologists, including work by Aleksandr Vostokov.

Vostokov (1781-1864), born in Livland and raised in a German family, is considered one of the three founders of slavistics (next to Josef Dobrovský and Jernej Kopitar). Already in the 1820s, he was interested in Slovenian. Vostokov corresponded with Jernej Kopitar (see §8.5) in Vienna until the end of his life. He asked Rumjancev to order books for him on Slovenian, which he needed for the first complete publication of the Freisinger Denkmäler, which he undertook together with Pëtr Ivanovič Köppen in 1827527. Köppen himself had met Jernej Kopitar in person in Vienna in 1822 and it was through an article that Köppen brought with him, that Kopitar learnt about the work of Vostokov528.

An immense stimulation for the professionalisation of Russian slavistics was an ustaw (decree) of 1835, which provided for the foundation of four new chairs of slavistics in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan and Harkiv. The candidates for the positions, O.M. Bodjanskij, P.I. Prejs, I.I. Sreznevskij and V.I. Grigorovič, were sent at the public expense on a trip abroad to further their knowledge529.

Viktor Grigorovič (see §7.5), was the only one of the four candidates who went to the Balkans on his tour. Prejs’ plan, with approval by Vostokov, was to study the Slovenes. He went abroad in 1840 and after a stay in Prague, he met with Kopitar and Karadžić. Sreznevskij, a close friend of Václav Hanka (see §8.11), went to Prague as well.

Osip Bodjanskij (1808-1878) was a scholar of Russian/Ukrainian origin. He defended his Master’s Thesis on folk poetry of the Slavs in 1837. Then he left for a journey to some of the Slav peoples, which also took him to Prague. Upon his return in 1842, he was appointed professor of history and literature of the Slavic peoples at the university of Moscow. He was inspired by the work of Jurij Venelin, which made him an important mediator between Bulgarian students in Russia and the Russian academic world.

Other Russian scholars who travelled abroad were N.J. Nadeždin and A.S. Turgenev. Nadeždin was in Vienna in the winter of 1840-41 and enjoyed a stimulating period with Kopitar and Karadžić. Kopitar encouraged him to write an article about the role of Russian in the Slavic language system, that was published in the Wiener Jahrbücher für Literatur in 1841530. Turgenev,
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who called himself ‘voyageur en histoire’ went on a trip through Europe to search for texts that were related to Russia.

Such trips to non-Russian Slav lands by these and other Russian students greatly contributed to the development of feeling of friendship or solidarity (vzájomnost in Czech/Slovak, usually translated in English as reciprocity) among Slavs. Especially Czech and Slovak scholars developed a close contact with their Russian colleagues in this period (see also §8.7 a.f.)

§7.4 A Tatar tribe: Russian ideas about the Bulgarians

As we have seen, Russians knew very little about Bulgaria or the Bulgarians. This changed after 1771, when in his *Allgemeine Nordische Geschichte* (1771), August Ludwig Schlözer pointed to Bulgarian as the language that was used by Cyril. He proposed to study the modern Bulgarian language and make a grammar and a dictionary for it. This was in the hope to find in the language clues to the origin of the old Bulgarians. In his edition of Nestor’s chronicle *Povest vremennyh let* (Tale of bygone years), Schlözer again drew attention to the fact that Bulgarian (‘slavon. Bulgarischen Dialekt’) was completely unknown.

However, the growth of interest in, and knowledge of, Bulgarians was slow and erratic. In 1774, the Swede Johann Thunman introduced in *Untersuch über die Geschichte der östlichen europäischen Völker* the idea that the Bulgarians were of Tatar origin. This was repeated by J. Chr. Adelung, who announced in the second part of his *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachkunde* of 1809, that the ancient Bulgarians were a Tatar tribe, who in the fifth century had overran the Serbs close to the Danube, and had taken over their language and culture.

In 1787 and 1788, Catherine the Great had a comparative dictionary published, the famous two-volumed *Sravnitel’nye slovari* (Comparative dictionaries). It aimed to include all the

---
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languages of the world. This series of dictionaries gave the translation of 273 words from Russian, that Catherine herself had chosen, into 200 languages. Among them were twelve Slavic languages, including Illyrian and Serbian, but not Bulgarian. Catherine may have been inspired to undertake this programme by G.L.Hr. Bakmejster who published in 1773, in St. Petersburg, his brochure *Idea et desideria de colligendis linguarum speciminibus* in Latin, Russian, French and German, with a sample from the Bible in Latin, Arabic, French, German, Russian, Swedish and Finnish, as an example of how to collect material.

Catherine’s dictionary had a great impact, although it was not widely distributed: only forty copies were sold (through the book shop of Weitbrecht), the rest were presented as a gift in court circles. As Vuk Karadžić pointed out in his preface to his addendum to the dictionary, only one copy was in Serbian hands: the one of Sava Tekelić, one of the leading figures of the Serb colony in Budapest.

Very soon, in 1792, an addendum to the dictionary was published by Josef Dobrovský, the ‘patriarch of slavistics’. He argued that the distinction between Illyrian and Serbian that was made in the dictionary was superfluous, and that Slovenian and Croatian should have been included. He did not mention Bulgarian. Later, when Dobrovský wrote his *Slovanka* (1814), which gave an overview of the old and contemporary Slavic languages and the Slavic peoples, he labelled Bulgarian a dialect of Serbian.

Another scholar who reacted to the selection of languages was Anton Linhart in 1796. He opposed the use of ‘Illyrian’ as a category, and indirectly pleaded for adding Bulgarian:

> Es ist nur bedauerlich, dass diese Ungerechtigkeit sogar in dem unsterblichen Werk von Katharina der Grossen hingenommen wurde: unter 200 europäischen und asiatischen Sprachen ist in diesem Werk die illyrische Sprache als slavische Mundart akzeptiert worden; das ist falsch und kränkend, weil Illyrien nicht mehr existiert; auf diesem Territorium leben heute verschiedene Völker, die mit ihren eigenen Sprachen dargestellt sein sollten.
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Given the lack of recognition for the Bulgarian language as described here, it is no surprise that the Russians widely believed that the Bulgarians who had existed in medieval times had become extinct, and that the population that was found in Bulgaria in their time was of Tatar origin. This idea was confirmed by Russian officers, who campaigned in the north-eastern part of Bulgaria and met people who spoke to them in what they thought to be corrupted Russian545. In 1827, one Moscow-based journal published the opinion that all Danube-Slavs had disappeared, and that near the Danube no Slavic language was spoken546.

The first one to re-introduce Bulgarian and the Bulgarians into the world of Russian and international scholars was Vuk Karadžić (see also §8.6). In 1822, in Vienna, he published Dodatak k S.Peterburgskim sravniteljnim rječnicima, sviju jezika i narečija s osobitim ogledima bugarskog jezika (Addition to the St. Petersburg comparative dictionaries of all languages and dialects with special attention for the Bulgarian language, see also §8.6).

§7.5 An influential traveller: Viktor Grigorovič

An important step towards the Russian recognition of Bulgarian is linked to the name of Viktor Ivanovič Grigorovič (1815-1876). He encountered many Bulgarians on a trip he made through the Bulgarian lands, and shared his impressions with the Russian public through the publication of his travel diary.

Grigorovič was born in the south of Russia (either in Balta, Podolia area, which had been Polish until 1772, or in a village in the Herson area), in 1815. His father was Ukrainian, his mother Polish. As a child, he spoke Polish and he received a catholic education. In 1830, he went to the university of Harkiv, and in 1833 he moved to the University of Dorpat (Tartu). In 1839 he moved to the University of Kazan.

At first he became a lecturer of Greek there. In 1840 he wrote his degree thesis Izsledovanija o cerkovno-slavjanskom narečii, osnovannija na izučenii ego v drevnejših pamjatnikah, na istoričeskij svjedetel’stvah i otnošenii ego k novejšim narečijam (Study of the Church-Slavic language, based upon its study in ancient manuscripts, upon historical evidence and
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its relation to newer languages). Based on the linguistic ideas of Dobrovský, Kopitar, Šafárik, Kalajdović and Vostokov, he came to support Kopitar’s thesis about the Slovene origin of the Old-Church-Slavonic language, the so-called Pannonian theory.

His master’s thesis, now focused on literary history rather than on linguistics, followed in 1842, with the title: *Opyt izloženija literatury sloven v eja glavnejših epohah. Čast I: 1. i 2. epohi* (Attempt to describe the literature of the Slavs in its most important periods. Part I: 1st and 2nd era). In 1842, Grigorović began to lecture slavistics in Kazan, using these two texts as starting point. Thereby he took one of the four new chairs of slavistics that had been promised by the Czar in 1835. In the spring of 1843, he went to Moscow to discuss with the new professor of Slav history, Osip Bodjanskij, an upcoming trip through Europe, a trip that came with the chair he took.

Grigorović planned to study Slavic literature during his travels, as he found that Slavic linguistics had been studied sufficiently. Initially he planned a ‘grand tour’ of south-eastern and central Europe, visiting all areas inhabited by Slavs and all important cities of the area, including Leipzig and Dresden. He changed his plan after he realized that his most important aim was the libraries of the South Slavs, with Byzantine and Old Slav manuscripts, and thus he headed straight for Constantinople, and from there, with a short stay in Thessaloniki, to Mount Athos.547

In Constantinople, he went to the print shop of the Patriarchate, where he met the Bulgarian Gavril Krástović, father Ilarion from Elena (better known later under the name Makariopolski, see §5.5), Ioann Dmitrović from Ohrid548, and other Bulgarians. In his travel diary he stressed the importance of this print shop, where not only Church-Slavonic, but also Bulgarian books were printed. During the 16 days that Grigorović stayed in Istanbul, two books in Bulgarian appeared: a *Pravoslavnoe Učenie* (Orthodox Manual) from Platon, metropolite of Moscow and a *Pervonačalna Nauka* (Primary Science)549.

From mid-October 1844 until end of January 1845, Grigorović visited the monasteries of Athos, where he acquired many manuscripts550. He sent his new purchases home through Constantinople, but he must have taken some with him, as it is known that he had interesting material to show to both Kopitar’s pupil Franc Miklošič in Vienna and to Pavel Jozef Šafárik (see §8.10) in Prague. After a three-month stay in Thessaloniki, Grigorović continued his journey through what is now Macedonia, Bulgaria and Romania. In Macedonia, he had the meeting with Dimităr Miladinov which was to change Miladinov’s life (see §6.9).
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Even though he did not consider himself a linguist, Grigorovič made some interesting observations about the Bulgarian language. He was the first to notice and describe the important difference between western and eastern Bulgarian dialects\(^{551}\), and he heard a trace of the nasal vowels, extinct everywhere else, in the dialect spoken south of Bitolja\(^{552}\).

In Macedonia, Bulgarian was only used in the family circle\(^{553}\). When Grigorovič travelled there in 1845, he did not find anyone who could read Slavic.

But the Greek influence has strongly suppressed their natural language, in which Bulgarians speak with difficulty outdoors. It only has its rights in the small family circle which is enlivened by the presence of women: outside, Bulgarians take refuge in Greek. I did not meet anyone in Ohrid who could understand even the most clear writing in Slavic. On the other hand, reading the Greek, as is known quite difficult, handwriting in old manuscripts, many of them were very skillful.

Then Grigorovič went to Pešt, where he met Kollár, then to Vienna, where he met Karadžić and Miklošič in the spring of 1846. In Zagreb, Grigorovič met the Slovene poet Stanko Vraz, and he published in Vraz’ magazine *Kolo* some Bulgarian songs\(^{555}\). In Prague he spoke with Šafárik, who was the first to study the material that Grigorovič had brought from Albania and Macedonia\(^{556}\). Interesting was that in this material Saint Kliment, that is Kliment Ohridski, was mentioned as the creator of the new\(^{557}\) alphabet. Šafárik wrote to Pogodin in Moscow to discuss the interest that Grigorovič’ discoveries presented\(^{558}\).

Grigorovič returned to Kazan in the summer of 1847. A year later, he published his travel diary, which was, except for some omissions, identical with the report that he had sent to the ministry about his travels\(^{559}\). During his trip, Grigorovič met with many Bulgarians. His report mentions the names of over thirty Bulgarians that he met in Moscow, Odessa, Istanbul and the
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Bulgarian lands. Grigorovič was the first Russian scholar to travel through Bulgaria and his account of his trip was the first one of its kind in Russia. The diary was reprinted in 1877, when because of the Russian-Turkish war, fought on Bulgarian territory, the interest for Bulgaria in Russia grew. The manuscripts that Grigorovič collected during his trip were later donated to the State Library in Odessa and the Russian State Library in Moscow.

In addition to this mediating function between Bulgarian culture and Russian readers, Grigorovič obviously played a highly important role in mediating between cultural activists from the various Balkan areas. His activities contributed greatly to the tightening of intellectual and philological networks in the region.

§7.6 Mihail Pogodin

As mentioned, one of the first intellectuals that directed the attention of a large public in Russia towards the Slavs in Europe, was the historian Mihail Petrovič Pogodin (1800-1875). Pogodin was greatly influenced by Karamzin. He was also influenced by the Russian freemasons; he declined an invitation to join a lodge, but he did read some masonic books.

Pogodin’s interests were international. Between 1825 and 1830 he published articles in his magazine Moskovskij vestnik, both original and translated from French, German and English, about William Shakespeare, whose works had not yet been translated into Russian, until the Hamlet translation of 1828 by M. Vrončenko. Pogodin published in 1827 the maps of the German geographer Carl Ritter (1779-1859) into Russian. Pogodin was interested in Slavic philology as well. In 1836, when Jernej Kopitar published his Glagolita Clozianus, he sent one copy to Pogodin.

Pogodin travelled through Europe in 1839 and kept a diary. Furthermore, he wrote letters to the Czarevič and ministers. In 1838, before departing on his travel through Europe, he wrote a
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letter to the Czarevič, in which he presented an introduction to Russian history. In the first letter, Pogodin applied the idea of Herder, that the future belonged to the Slavs, specifically to the Russians:

Ja dir, dir ist es beschieden, die Entwicklung der Menschheit zu fröhen und zu vollenden, alle Phasen ihres Lebens, die bisher nur einzeln glänzten, in herrlicher Vereinigung zusammenzufassen, die antike mit der modernen Bildung zu verschmelzen, Herz und Verstand zu versöhnlen, Recht und Frieden allüberall zu stiften, in Wirklichkeit zu zeigen, dass das Ziel der Menschheit nicht blos in der Wissenschaft, nicht blos in der Freiheit oder der Kunst, oder der Bildung, oder der Industrie und dem Reichthum besteht, sondern dass es etwas höheres giebt als Gelehrsamkeit und Gewerbe und Bildung und Freiheit und Reichthum - die ächte Erleuchtung im Geiste des Christenthums, die Bildung durch das Wort Gottes, dass dieses, und nur dieses - wir wiederholen hier den Ausspruch zweier unserer großersten geistlichen Redner - den Menschen die Glückseligkeit schenken kann, die irdische wie die himmlische.

For Pogodin Russian cultural domination over the other Slavs had political consequences. He stated that the 30 million Slavs living in Europe outside the borders of the Russian Empire were brothers of the Russians, and wanted nothing more ardently than to join the Russian state. Expressing these ideas, Pogodin was one of the first spokesmen of the political panslavism that developed on a larger scale only after the Crimean war:

Und fügen wir zu jener Menge noch 30 Millionen unserer Brüder und Vettern, der Slawen, die über ganz Europa ausgesät sind, von Konstantinopel bis Venedig, von Morea bis zur Ostsee und Nordsee – der Slawen, in deren Adern dasselbe Blut fliesst, wie in den unsren, die dieselbe Sprache reden und folglich nach natürlichen Gesetzen eines Sinnes mit uns sind – der Slawen, die, trotz geographisch-politischer Trennung, nach Abstammung und Sprache mit uns ein geistiges Ganze bilden!

... Der grösste Teil der Bewohner Bulgariens, Serbiens, Macedoniens, ja Rumeliens, von der Moldau und die Walachei nicht zu reden, sind reine Slawen, unsere Stammesgenossen nicht blos, sondern auch unsere Glaubensgenossen, die in jedem Kriege auf unsere Seite treten werden, und, im Verein mit den Griechen, nichts so sehr wünschen, als Unterthanen des Weissen [sic, js] Czaren zu werden.
These letters by Pogodin were not published, but are said to have been passed on in hand-made copies in large numbers. The letter however never reached the Czarević, as count Stroganov, to whom Pogodin sent the letter did not pass it on, with the comment ‘Many words, only one new thought (panslavism), and that too is false’. This illustrates the attitude of the court of the time against panslavism571.

In a later letter to the Russian minister of education, written in 1840 after his journey through Europe, Pogodin worked out a plan of cultural support for the Slavs, which would aid the Habsburg and Ottoman Slavs in their struggle against foreign cultural oppression572. He envisaged: a comparative grammar573, separate national grammars, a general dictionary, separate dictionaries574, collections of proverbs and songs from all tribes, a Slavic anthology, both in Cyrillic and Latin alphabet, a history of the Slavic empire, geographical and statistical descriptions of the separate regions, collections of myths and legends, as well as old acts and certificates, biographies of important men (Pogodin spoke about a ‘Slavic pantheon’), a Slavic journal, sending out Slavic scholarly studies to libraries all over Europe and the founding of a Slavic bookshop in Leipzig.

During his life, Pogodin gathered a large collection of important manuscripts. He paid special attention to the manuscript collection of the late Jernej Kopitar, after his death in the hands of his former pupil Vuk Karadžić, who was always short on money and traded Slavic manuscripts for a living. Pogodin suggested to the Minister of Education, Sergej Uvarov, that Kopitar’s manuscripts be bought. He stressed their usefulness for the university of Moscow575. Pogodin thus became the largest customer of Karadžić. Furthermore he recommended that Vuk’s scholarships, of 1000 rubles, be doubled576. Karadžić received a pension from the Czar from 1826.

In the 1840s and 1850s, Pogodin, since 1835 professor of history at the University of Moscow, was one of the most influential intellectuals in Russia. He was one of the founders and the second president of the Moscow Slavonic Benevolent Committee, that was founded in 1858.

Pogodin was interested in the fate of all Slavs, and that is why he welcomed in 1840 the Croat Ljudevit Gaj (1809-1872), leader of the Illyrian movement, and introduced him to his friends. Gaj had first visited the Russian Imperial Academy, which in a special session granted him a subsidy of five thousand rubles. In Moscow, Pogodin and his friends collected 17,500 or 20,000 rubles more for Gaj. During his visit to Russia, Gaj claimed that most of the patriots and the
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younger catholic clergy of Croatia had begun to regard the orthodox church as the genuinely national Slavic church. In a memorandum, he described the ‘natural yearning of the Slavs for union with Russia’\(^577\). Gaj complained about the magyarisation policy of the Hungarians in Croatia, making Hungarian the official language, and warned Russia that the Hungarian state could join forces with its number one enemy of the time, Poland. He asked for three million Austrian guilder sto bring together a number of fighters, who would rise as soon as the first shot in the war between England and Russia was fired. He asked the Czar to set up a secret agency in Croatia to protect pro-Russian elements and to influence literature in favour of panslavism.

The first report that Pogodin wrote on the South Slavs had been read by the Czar ‘with pleasure’. But when the Habsburg leaders started to worry about possible revolutionary tendencies among the Slavs, the political situation changed drastically. Pogodin’s report of 1842 was not so well received, and he was warned not to be as enthusiastic about the Slavs in his magazine Moskvitjanin. Šafárik, out of fear for the Austrian police, asked Pogodin not to refer to him again. And when in 1842 the conservative Austrian statesman Metternich expressed his concern to the Russian Czar about alleged Russian support to the Illyrian movement, Nikolaj denied that he wanted to encourage the Croat nationalists even the slightest bit\(^578\).

As professor at the University of Moscow, Pogodin had influence on the distribution of scholarships, from which many Bulgarians, including Sava Filaretov (see §7.10), benefited. But for all his support of the developing Bulgarian national culture, that which had the greatest effect was the encouragement, financial and otherwise, Pogodin gave to the Russian Jurij Venelin.

\section*{§7.7 The impact of a dilettante: Jurij Ivanovič Venelin}

By putting Bulgarians on the map in Russia, Jurij Ivanovič Venelin (1802-1839) was without doubt the most pivotal player in the development of Bulgarian awareness. He was born under the name of Georgi Huca in Velika Tibava (then in Habsburg Ruthenia, nowadays in Slovakia. The area consisting of what is now known as Western Ukraine, Eastern Slovakia, Northwestern Romania and Northeastern Hungary, was predominantly populated with Ruthenians, a people closely related to the Ukrainians. Venelin called himself Karpatorus. Venelin was educated at the Užgorod
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Grammar School and the Lyceum of Satu Mare, with financial help of the church authorities after his father had died\textsuperscript{579}.

When he realised that he was not born to be a priest, he transferred to the University of L’viv in the Russian Empire, where he dedicated himself to Slavic history. To erase his traces, so as not to be found if church authorities were to demand their money back, he changed his name to Venelin\textsuperscript{580}.

From 1823 onwards, Venelin worked as teacher and caretaker at the Seminary of Chişinău in Moldava\textsuperscript{581}. It was here, in Chişinău, that Venelin came into contact with Bulgarians for the first time: he met with Bulgarian refugees and merchants who had settled in Bessarabia.

In 1825, Venelin registered as a student of medicine in Moscow, probably because a future in medicine promised him a better income than the life of a historian. Next to his study he continued his historical research. At first, he lived as a poor student, but his life turned for the better when he became the teacher in the house of Sergej Timofeevič Aksakov, to educate his son Konstantin. Aksakov introduced him to the slavophile circle of which he himself was a part. This is how Venelin met Pogodin, who was to play an important role in his life.

The first meeting between the two was in 1825\textsuperscript{582}. Pogodin, interested in all non-Russian Slavic peoples, heartily welcomed this man, who could tell him not only about the area where he came from, but also about the Bulgarians and other Slavs that he had met in Bessarabia. Pogodin encouraged Venelin to write for his magazine\textit{ Moskovskij vestnik}. Venelin’s debut came with a book review in that magazine in 1828. In this review on the book \textit{Nynee sostojanie tureckih knjažestv Moldovii, Valabii i Rossiijskoj Bessarabskoj oblasti} (Actual situation of the Turkish principalities Moldavia, Walachia and the Russian oblast’ of Bessarabia) by Ign. Jakovenko, Venelin expressed his indignation that not only foreigners, but also the Russians themselves and the slavists in particular were guilty of forgetting the Bulgarians:

\begin{quote}
Нека чужденците по незнание или по нерадение малко се грижат за българите, но непростително е за нас да забравим този народ. От ръцете на българите ние сме получили кръпението, те са ни научили да четем и пишем, на техния език се извършва днес нашето богослужение, на този език сме писали почти до времето на Ломоносова-

люлката на българина е неразривно свързана с люлката на руския народ\textsuperscript{583}.
\end{quote}
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Let the foreigners out of ignorance or indifference care little about the Bulgarians, but it is inexcusable for us to forget this people. From the hands of the Bulgarians we have received baptism, they have taught us to read and write, our worship today is carried out in their language, in that language we have written almost until the time of Lomonosov – the cradle of the Bulgarian is inseparable from the cradle of the Russian people.

Pogodin further supported Venelin in publishing his first book, *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare v političeskom, narodopisnom, istoričeskom i religioznom otnošenii k rossijanam* (The ancient and the present Bulgarians in their political, ethnographical, historical and religious relationship to the Russians), which appeared in 1829, the year in which Venelin finished his medical education.

This work contained information about Bulgarian religion, the political situation, education and literature. Venelin stressed, for instance, the importance of education to improve the situation of the Bulgarians:

Величайшим благодеянием для сего народа было бы, если и просит у Порты вместо колоколов, позволение заводить собственныя типографии и высшие училища если запретят Грекам восходить на Болгарские кафедры и продавать оныя в Константинополе...

The greatest blessing for this people would be, if they asked the Porte, instead of church clocks, permission to set up their own printing presses and higher schools[,] if they would forbid the Greeks to ascend Bulgarian sees and sell those in Constantinople…

In this quotation, another ideal of Venelin is to be recognised: that of an independent Bulgarian church. He probably became interested in the difficult religious situation of the Bulgarians during his time as a teacher at the seminary in Chişinău.

The teachers at the seminary were already aware of the lack of liturgical books in Bulgarian. That is why Gavriil Banulesco-Bodoni, who had been exarch and metropolitan in Walachia, Moldavia and Bessarabia during the Russian-Turkish war of 1806-1812, and after the war metropolitan of Chişinău and Hotin, had initiated the translation and printing of a New Testament in Bulgarian. After his death, this task was taken over by archiepiscop Dm. Sulima of Chişinău and Hotin, who also supported Venelin.

And so it is said that in 1823, in Bulgarian churches in Bessarabia, a Bulgarian gospel, translated by T. Bistrički, was in use. This was the first gospel translated into Bulgarian. This
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seems to be the same translation that was printed in 1828 (see §6.4), of which no copy has been found. Perhaps the version that was used in Bessarabia was the manuscript of Bistrički’s translation.

Venelin did not have much to say on Bulgarian literature in his book. The only original work that he knew of was Petăr Beron’s Riben Bukvar (see §4.5). He praised this work, because he found it to be better than any schoolbook he had seen in Russia. Venelin also cited a work titled *Resumé géographique de la Turquie* and the travel diary of an Englishman called Walsh about the character of the Bulgarians, in particular their hospitality.

The largest part of Venelin’s book is devoted to the origins of the Bulgarians. He argued that the Huns were the same as the Avars, whom he equalled to (Proto)-Bulgarians. He said that Bulgarians originated in the area of the river Wolga (which gave them their name) and called them Volgaro-rossy. He rejected the theory about the Tatar origin of the Bulgarians. He also opposed the now widely acknowledged idea that the Varangians, who founded the first Russian state, were Scandinavians. Venelin argued that Bulgarians were once part of the Russian people and that Bulgarian is one of the three main dialects of Russian: (Great-)Russian, Little-Russian (=Ukrainian) and Bulgarian. These ideas were a significant contribution to discussions of ethnic descent and came at a time when very little was known about the Bulgarians.

The work *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare…* became a very popular book among those Bulgarians that had access to it, for instance the Bulgarian émigré community in Bucharest. Atanas Kipilovski sent a letter to the Moscow bookseller Širaev in 1831, to know the address of Venelin, whom he called a ‘bezsmârfen vâzobnovitel’ (an immortal innovator). Kipilovski stated in this letter that he had read Venelin’s *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare…* six times in a row, and that it had caused in him the same excitement for the Bulgarians as the writer had probably felt while writing it. Since there was only one copy of the book in the whole of Bucharest, Kipilovski wanted to order a couple more.

Later, Kipilovski himself became active in the distribution of Venelin’s work. In 1837, he let Venelin know that he already had taken orders for 80 copies of the work and expected to eventually reach the number of 150. Because of the appearance of Venelin’s work, Kipilovski did not finish his own history of the Bulgarians, that he had announced in 1827. When subsequent
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volumes of Venelin’s history failed to materialise, Kipilovski announced his plan for his history again in 1836. His studies followed the conclusions of Venelin, because Kipilovski too believed in a Slavic, as opposed to Tatar, descent of the Bulgarians.

In 1849, in *Carigradski Vestnik* there was an announcement that a Bulgarian was working on the translation from the original manuscript of *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare*. It contained a warning for others that it would be of no use to translate from the published text, as Russian censorship had curtailed it by taking out one third of it. In 1856, *Carigradski Vestnik* mentioned that the translation, made by a certain G. Slavov, was ready. The hope was expressed that means could be found to print it, but this did not happen.

After the publication of his *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare...*, Venelin travelled through Bulgaria on a journey funded for him by the Russian Academy of Sciences in 1830. He entered Bulgaria through Varna, but because of the end of the war between Russia and Turkey, and the withdrawal of the Russian troops to the north, he could not travel further south. He then went west, to Silistra, but managed to visit only a couple of cities. When he returned to Russia at the end of 1831, he had less material than he had hoped for. He managed to collect around 50 folk stories, and a further 66 manuscripts, 20 drawings and material to compose a grammar. Most Bulgarians that he met had refused to cooperate with him, because they distrusted this strange Russian and they either failed to understand why he was interested in their old manuscripts and in their songs, or they asked enormous amounts of money for them.

The grammar Venelin prepared following his trip to Bulgaria, which was supposed to be published by the Academy of Sciences, was ready and handed in, in a 400 pages manuscript, in 1835. In spite of the positive remarks of Vostokov, who reviewed the work to be ‘useful for Slavic linguistics’, the Academy decided that it did not meet its standards and rejected it. In 1852, Nikolaj Palauzov (see §7.11) stated in an article to *Carigradski Vestnik* that he would do everything that he could to have this grammar published, because the language needed a critical grammar. It was not published, however, until very recently, in 1997.

After his trip to Bulgaria, Venelin met the Bulgarian Vasil Aprilov, most likely in Bucharest. This meeting was very important for Venelin, as Aprilov provided him with more material about
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the Bulgarians. Furthermore, he brought Venelin, for the first time since his student days in Chişinău, into personal contact with more Bulgarian people, mostly in Odessa. From 1836 onwards, Venelin and Aprilov had a continuous correspondence.

Aprilov provided Venelin with tips on how to win the sympathy of Bulgarians. When he found out that Venelin was working on *O zarodyše novoj bolgarskoj literature* (About the birth of a new Bulgarian literature), for example, he suggested mentioning a Bulgarian, like Beron, Pešakov or Kipilovski in its preface (and not in the journals, which were not read by Bulgarians), or to include one of their poems, so as to arouse the envy of those who were not named, so they too would become interested and devote themselves to the Bulgarian cause:

Като се спомене за тях и се дават за пример на другите, не е лошо да се спомене и за братя Мустакови и Бакологу, като им се отдаде нужното за тяхното усърдие и старание и да ги подтикнем въпреки всичко да дадат парична помощ в полза на Габровското училище...

Основателите на български училища в техните родни места, в Копривщица и Филипопол, братята Чаликов, също трябва да се похвалат, като се прибави, че има слухове и за други стараещи се българи за основаване на училища в техните селища, но тъй като те още не работят, то ще се говори за тях, като се учредят.

When you mention them and give them as an example for the others, it will not be wrong to mention also the brothers Mustakov and Bakologlu, giving them the attention they deserve for their effort and to persuade them in spite of everything to give financial support to the Gabrovo school... The founders of Bulgarian schools in their home towns Koprivštica and Philipopolis (Plovdiv, js.), the brothers Čalikoglu are also worthy of praise, and you should add that there are also rumours about other Bulgarians who are trying to found schools in their places of residence, but since these are not working yet, that there will be spoken of them once they are started.

From 1838 on, Venelin found the Bulgarians to be more cooperative. This was after Aprilov had mobilised his friends in Odessa to help him. Aprilov also sent Venelin a copy of Paisij's *Istorija Slavjanobolgarska* and the charter of Ivan Šišman that was kept in the library of Rila.

Mihail Pogodin continued to support Venelin during this time. He defended him against attacks and encouraged him in 1834 to apply for the Chair of Slavic studies at the Moscow university. Venelin was not accepted though, because the proposal for a series of lectures that he
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wrote was not considered good enough\textsuperscript{600}, or, as Venelin himself put it in a letter to A. Kraevskij, editor of the magazine \textit{Oтечественные записки}, for formal reasons, since he did not have a doctoral degree in slavistics\textsuperscript{601}.

Not much later, in 1835, Pogodin started to doubt the scholarly quality of Venelin’s theses about the Slavic origins of the Avars and the Huns and ceased to support him. This occurred after a conversation between Pogodin and Šafárik.

When Venelin was turned down for the Chair of Slavistics at the University of Moscow and lost the support of Pogodin, his financial situation became precarious and he was forced to give private lessons again for a living. In 1836, he was appointed as school inspector in Moscow, which gave him the opportunity to spend more time on his research. He started working on the materials he had collected in Bulgaria, and got in touch with his Bulgarian contacts in Walachia, but they did not answer him and failed to keep promises. This frustrated Venelin, as expressed in a letter to Aprilov of 1836:

На 48 странице, я прекратил печатание, и, в праведном негодовании, чуть было рукопись не бросил в огонь.....
Вы видите, Милостивый государь, что после подобных неудач, самое сильное болгаролюбие может охладеть...\textsuperscript{602}

On page 48 I stopped the printing and, in justified anger, almost threw the manuscript in the fire…
You see, dear Sir, that after such adversities, the most ardent love for Bulgarians might cool off…

Further in the same letter, Venelin told Aprilov, who had complained that the Russians had forgotten about the Bulgarians, that this was completely their own fault. He mentioned that the Greeks and Serbs, who thanks to people like Fauriel and Karadžić saw their folk songs read with great interest all over Europe, had themselves cooperated in making these publications possible. He pointed out that when Vuk Karadžić was in Vienna collecting Serbian folk songs, people sent him songs from all parts of Serbia, even people whom he had not asked and had not even met\textsuperscript{603}. When the Bulgarian Georgi Pešakov composed an ode to Venelin, he was not very pleased with it. In a letter to Aprilov, he stated that he had preferred a folk song instead\textsuperscript{604}.
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\textsuperscript{603} Ibid. 612.
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A famous article by Venelin was published in 1837 in the magazine *Moskovskij nabljudatel’* (Moscow Observer). This piece, *O zarodyše novoj bolgarskoj literatury* (About the birth of a new Bulgarian literature) was published separately one year later and in 1842 it was translated into Bulgarian. In this article, Venelin spoke about how his journey into Bulgaria had shown him the sad fate of the Bulgarians, who had very little means to express their culture and he gave his suggestions about how to improve this. He stated that as long as the Bulgarians were culturally dominated by the Greeks and had no higher education of their own in their own language, he did not expect a Bulgarian literature to develop.

As mentioned in §6.2, Venelin’s suggestions for improvement also touched on the linguistic. He advocated the creation of a standard language based on an archaic form of Bulgarian. When *O zarodyše* was translated into Bulgarian, in 1842 and 1860, an archaic variant of Bulgarian was used in both instances, consistent with Venelin’s ideas about the language. Paradoxically, it is likely that the choice of this language had a negative effect on the willingness of Bulgarians to read the work. Especially in 1860, the translation must have made an extremely old-fashioned impression on the readers.

Venelin did not have the chance to benefit long from the assistance by Bulgarians that had been brokered by Vasil Aprïlov, because he died in 1839. He did however leave behind various manuscripts which were printed posthumously.

In 1840, sponsored by the Russian Academy in Moscow, Venelin’s *Vlahobolgarskie gramoty* (Vlacho-Bulgarian charters) were published. These charters were Bulgarian manuscripts that Venelin had copied when he was in Walachia after his trip to Bulgaria, and had been sent to the Academy in 1833. In 1841, his *Drevnie i nynešnie slovene v političeskom, narodopisnom, istoričeskom i religioznom ih otноšenii k rossijanam* (The ancient and the present Slovenians in their political, ethnographical, historical and religious relationship to the Russians) was published. Like his work about the Bulgarians, this had great importance, because it was the first study in Russia that was devoted entirely to the Slovenes. Venelin introduced the name Slovenija for the area inhabited by the Slovenes.

A third work was published in 1849. Sponsored by the wealthy Bulgarian Ivan Denkoglu (see §7.10), this was an edition of Venelin’s *Kritičeskija ızsledovanija ob istorii Bolgar* (Critical
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studies on the history of the Bulgarians), which continued the description of Bulgarian history where the 1829 study had stopped.

It must be admitted that Venelin’s method of research was fragmentary and typical of a dilettante. James Clarke even described him as “a Slavic Don Quixote, tilting in all directions”\(^{608}\). For this reason he did not fit into the community of professional slavists, that was developing at the time (see §7.3). Venelin’s opinions contradicted those of some of the best historians that had preceded him, including Schlözer (see §7.4). It was not surprising then that scholars inside Russia and abroad tended to disregard his work. Only Pogodin defended him against the constant critique, which is perhaps best typified by Pavel Šafárik:

Если все исторические източники, предания молчат вплоть до VI столетия о славянах, хорватах, чехах и т.п. то важные усилия заполнить этот пробел напрасны…
этимологическими догадками о старинности и общности славянского имени или о славянском происхождении фракийцев,斯基фов, сарматов, роксоланов, жазитов, гуннов, аваров и бог знает еще каких других народов… и что пора уже открыто и навсегда отказаться от этих скифо-сарматских глупостей и заблуждений, оставить это этимологическое болото и ступить на истинное историческое поле, так как здание нашего прошлого должно строиться на надежных исторических доказательствах, если хотим хоть в некоторой степени сравнивать его с прошлым других европейских народов по своему внутреннему достоинству, содержанию и основательности, дабы оно устояло перед судом беспристрастной критики.\(^{609}\).

If all historical sources, [and] stories remain silent until the 6\(^{th}\) century about the Slavs, Croats, Czechs and so on, then all efforts to fill this gap are in vain… [efforts] with etymological guesses about the age and the commonness of the Slavic name or about the Slavic origin of the Thracians, the Scyths, the Sarmatians, the Roksolans, the Jazygi, the Huns, the Avars and god knows what other peoples…and that it’s time to openly and forever reject these Scythian-Sarmatian follies and vagaries, leave this etymological swamp and step onto true historical grounds, because the construction of our past must be built on reliable historical evidence, if we want to, be it to some extent, compare it to the past of other European peoples according to its internal value, content and establishedness, so it can stand against objective criticism.

Venelin had followed other models, though. One of these was a book by slavist Konstantin Kalajdović\(^{610}\) about the Bulgarian medieval man of letters John Exarch, Ioann ekzarh Bolgarskij,
1824. In this work, Kalajdžiç stressed that Bulgarians were a Slavic people, among which traces of ancient Slavonic literature could be found. This work was probably the only study devoted to Bulgaria in Russia for many years.

Another work that influenced Venelin was Josef Dobrovský’s study on Cyril and Method, that had been translated into Russian by Pogodin in 1825. In this work, Dobrovský claimed that Cyril and Method had translated the sacred writings from Greek into Bulgarian. Thus Slavic literacy had moved from Bulgaria to Moravia, and not the other way around. It is probable that these ideas led Venelin to criticise Kopitar’s Pannonian theory (see §8.5) and claim that Old Church Slavonic was not the same as Slovenian, as Kopitar did.

Venelin’s work on the Slovenes lacked scholarly merit in much the same way as his study on the Bulgarians. One of the assumptions that Venelin made in this book was that the Slovenians were in fact Etruscans, who had been chased out of Italy by the Romans. The Etruscan alphabet that the Slovenes used in ancient times, was, according to Venelin, the same as the Glagolitic. Venelin concluded this on the basis of linguistic comparisons that Jernej Kopitar had made. He was influenced in these theses by the Croat archeologist M.P. Katančić, who also used dubious linguistic comparisons to demonstrate that the inhabitants of Pannonia in ancient times were Slavs.

In his studies of folk poetry, Venelin likewise tended to let his romantic ideas guide him. This can be seen very clearly in the conclusion of his article Ob iztočnike narodnoj poeziji voobšč i o južnorusskoj v osobennosti (About the source of folk poetry in general and South-Russian in particular), published in 1834, which suggested the heart of the Russian people lies in the south, and its head in the north.

In 1910, Vatroslav Jagiće described Venelin’s work in his famous Istorija slavjanskoj filologii (History of Slavic philology) as amateurish and he chastised the Bulgarian intellectual world, who in 1901 had just celebrated the centennial of Venelin’s birth, for failing to look at his work critically. In his words, Venelin was ‘a product and even a victim of a romantic weakness’.
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All the same, Venelin loved the Bulgarians and felt sympathetic to their cause. He stressed that in the Middle Ages the Bulgarian culture was very well developed and exerted a great influence on Russia. He lamented that in his days, Europe seemed to have forgotten about the Bulgarians completely. He exclaimed:

Бедные, бедные болгаре! Болгаре, которые еще и ныне наполняют Болгарию, Румелию, Македонию, часть Тессалии, Албанию, которые гораздо многочисленнее Греков - бедные Болгаре! Не стало их великого Бояна, нет Карана, нет Владимира второго, бедные старинные друзья, наставники и просветители Руси, нет более у них св. Кирилла, нет св. Мефодия! Кто призрит бедных сирот? До сих пор Европа оплакивала судьбу одних греков, ни одна душа не вздохнула о Болгарии; все их забыли! Бедные сироты, кто призрит их! Надежда на Бога, да на великого царя Русского и на его добрых Россиин.

Poor, poor Bulgarians! Bulgarians, who even now fill Bulgaria, Rumelia, Macedonia, part of Thessaly and Albania, who are much larger in number than the Greeks - poor Bulgarians! They have no great Bojan left, no Karan, no Vladimir II, poor old friends, mentors and teachers of Russia, they have also no Saint Cyril, no Saint Method left! Who will take care of the poor orphans? Until now, Europe has pitied the fate of only the Greeks, not one soul has sighed over Bulgaria; they have all forgotten them! Poor orphans, who will take care of them! Hope towards God, and to the great Russian Czar and his good Russians.

Bulgarians, in turn, cherished Venelin. In the Bulgarian communities inside Bulgaria, where Neofit Rilski spoke highly of Venelin, in the Danubian principalities and in Russia, Venelin was considered as a great example. Bulgarians saw in him, as Vasil Aprilov put it in Dennica novobolgarskogo obrazovanija (Dawn of the new Bulgarian education), ‘the one genius’, who could pull them out of ignorance and introduce them to their brothers, the Russians, and put them at the same height as educated peoples.

When in 1836 no Bulgarian in Bucharest had heard from Venelin in a long time, and everyone assumed that he had died, Kipilovski expressed his great relief in a letter to Rajno Popović that this was not the case. He wrote:

...за обща радост на целия ни народ, той е писал от Москва на някои наши сънародници в Одеса

...to the great joy of all of our people, he has written from Moscow to some of our compatriots in Odessa
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Two letters by Venelin to Aprilov, written on the 27th of September and the 9th of October of 1837, called for the study of Bulgarian folklore and ethnography. Aprilov passed them as a circular ('obštestveno pismo') to Neofit Rilski, Rajno Popović, Emanuil Vaskidović, Zaharij Kruša and others.

In 1836, Georgi Pešakov sent Venelin from Bucharest, through Aprilov, some Bulgarian folk songs, originating from the area of Vidin, where he came from. He said that he was urged to do so by Atanas Kipilovski. One year later, Pešakov sent again some Bulgarian folk songs, as well as an ode to Venelin, which was later included in Aprilov's Dennica novobolgarskogo obrazovanija (Dawn of the new Bulgarian education) and in the preface to Venelin's Drevnie i nynešnie slovjane....(The ancient and present Slovenians...) It expressed the kinship that Bulgarians of the time felt towards Russians.

Тебе, Юрий Венелине
Всите чада болгарски
Благодарност ти приносят
Весердечни, роднински

You, Jurij Venelin
All Bulgarian children
Will bring gratitude
From the heart, like kinsmen

Two years after his death, in 1841, Bulgarians in Odessa paid tribute to Venelin. They erected a monument for him on the Danilov cemetery in Moscow, where he was buried next to the great Russian writer Gogol. The text on the monument reads:

Напомнила свету о забытом, но некогда славном и могущественном племени Болгар и пламенно желала видеть его возрождение. Боже всемогущий, услышь молитву раба твоего.

He reminded the world about the forgotten but once glorious and powerful Bulgarian people and fervently desired their rebirth. Lord, fulfill the prayer of Thy servant.

Until the rediscovery of Paisij Hilendarski’s Istorija Slavjanobolgarska in 1871, Venelin and Aprilov were seen as the great instigators of the Bulgarian revival. That is why in 1851, N. Hr.
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Palauzov translated and published in Odessa a biography of Venelin. The original author is not mentioned, but it is possible that it was Palauzov himself\textsuperscript{629}.

In the late \emph{Văzraždane}, Venelin even became the centre of a kind of cult in Bulgaria. In Čirpan, a village to the north-east of Plovdiv, the school children and members of the čitalište honoured Venelin on the 11th of May, the day of Cyril and Method, in 1867. After the mass, the people of Čirpan went out on the streets, where they listened to a lecture about the life of Venelin and sang together.

Also, portraits of Venelin were very popular. The poet Petko Slavejkov wrote that the Gabrovo school not only distributed 63 portraits of Venelin that they had received from Russia, but also manufactured portraits themselves. Aprilov mentioned that in 1841 an oil portrait was ordered to make lithographies of it in Odessa.

Venelin was important enough to the Bulgarians that they composed and spread legends about him. One is that he was Bulgarian himself, or that his mother (of which very little is known) was. As beautiful, as unlikely, are the stories that Venelin on his deathbed in 1839 cried because he had not been able to bring his Bulgarian grammar to the public, or that his last act was to pray to Cyril and Method, asking them to teach all Bulgarians the Slavic grammar.

After hearing the news of Venelin’s death, Pešakov wrote an elegy to him, which was published in the same books as the ‘ode’ mentioned above and later in the magazine \emph{Ljuboslovie}.

\begin{verbatim}
Плачете, ридайте
Вси болгарски чада
Изгубихме вечно
Юрия Венелина
Наш премилий брат

Cry, wheep
All Bulgarian children
We have lost for ever
Juri Venelin
Our very dear brother
\end{verbatim}

Thirteen years later, in his collection \emph{Smesna Kitka} (A mixed bouquet), the poet Petko Slavejkov stated that Venelin ‘Umrjal togaz, kogato sâživi nas’ (He died, when he had revived us).

\section*{§7.8 Venelin’s link with the Bulgarians: Vasil Aprilov}

\textsuperscript{629} Angelov, “Venelin i”, 239-242.
\textsuperscript{630} Angelov, “Venelin i”, 242.
As we have seen, the man who was crucial in establishing contact between Jurij Venelin and the Bulgarians was Vasil Evstatievič Aprilov (1789 – 1847). Aprilov was born in the Bulgarian city of Gabrovo, at the foot of the Balkan mountain range in 1789. Gabrovo, established in the eighteenth century, had by then become an important centre of manufacture and trade. Many merchants from the city went to Bucharest and later to Moscow. When the free port of Odessa became an important trade hub, the Gabrovians who were active in Moscow moved southwards, and the trade with Moscow from then on went largely via Odessa.

Aprilov attended a kilijno učilište, cell school, in Gabrovo. At the age of 11, when his father died, he went to Moscow, where his brothers Hristofor and Nikofor ran a business trading cotton and rose oil. There, Aprilov was sent to a Greek teacher, since his likely future in trade would require proficiency in Greek. When his eldest brother moved to Bucharest, Aprilov continued his education at the German grammar school of Brașov. Brașov (historically also known as Kronstadt) in Habsburg Transylvania was a refuge for Bulgarians from the Ottoman Empire and had a Bulgarian quarter in that time (see also §8.3). Many of its inhabitants came from Gabrovo, that had been attacked and looted in 1800 by the kărdžalijas. Among the people who had fled at that time, were Aprilov’s brothers.

The German grammar school was maintained by the German protestant church, known by the name of Biserica neagră (Schwarze Kirche). The school gave scholarships to children from less fortunate families, and given the fact that Aprilov was listed in the school register as an orphan, it is very likely that he received one of them. The teachers in the grammar school were mostly graduates of the university of Jena, which was the most outstanding university in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is known that the school offered courses in experimental physics, a new subject in those days, and Stojan Maslev argues that it was precisely these experiments that drew Aprilov’s attention to science and motivated his later choice of study in medicine.

In 1807, Aprilov enrolled at the University of Vienna as a student of medicine, but because of either an illness or the deteriorating financial situation of his brothers, or both, he
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did not stay long enough to graduate. In 1809, he returned to Russia, where he became a Russian citizen. In 1811, he joined his brothers in Odessa, where he established himself as a merchant. In the city, culturally dominated by Greeks, he became a committed philhellene. During the Greek war of independence, he assisted volunteers from Odessa who wanted to fight in Greece. Aprilov retired from trade in 1826, and then engaged in cultural activities. He was a member of the Greek educational eforia and contributed large sums of money to the Greek educational movement. However, in 1830, he came into conflict with the Greek eforia of the city and went to Istanbul.

Inspired by the Turkish reforms that he saw in Istanbul, he developed the idea to found a European-style school in Bulgaria. After he had left Istanbul, he read Jurij Venelin’s book *Drevnie i nynešnie bolgare...* (see §7.7). The ideas espoused in this book, combined with the animosity he now felt for the Greek community, led Aprilov to swiftly change from philhellene into a Bulgarian national activist.

How and when Aprilov saw Venelin’s book for the first time, is not known for sure, since Aprilov himself did not write about it; two different possibilities circulate in the Bulgarian academic world.

According to the Russian V. Jakovlev, who claims he heard it from N.Hr. Palauzov, Aprilov received the book from Georgi Stojkov, a poorly educated member of the Bulgarian community in Odessa, who was illiterate but knew it had something to do with Bulgarians. Following the advise of Palauzov senior (Nikolaj Stefanovič), Stojkov took the book to Aprilov.

The other version is that Aprilov’s interest for the book was aroused by Atanas Kipilovski, whom he met in Bucharest in the beginning of 1831, the year that Kipilovski wrote to bookseller Širaev, asking for information about Venelin (see §7.7). As Aprilov had contacts in Bucharest, it is likely that he visited the town on a regular basis, and found Venelin’s book there.

Five years elapsed before Aprilov actually addressed Venelin. This happened in 1836, after Atanas Kipilovski had urged him to do so. Aprilov then started a correspondence with Venelin, which lasted until his death in 1839, and also supported him financially. In 1836 and 1837 Aprilov and Nikolaj Palauzov sent 500 rubles to publish his history of the Bulgarians.
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Aprilov was the ideal go-between for Venelin, as he had a wide network of correspondents. He corresponded not only with Venelin and a great number of Bulgarians, but also with Russian scholars like Pogodin, Grigorovič, Sreznevskij, Saveliev-Rostislavič (who later wrote a biography of him) and with the Czechs Hanka and Šafárik.

Even before personal contact between Venelin and Aprilov had been established, just after he had read Venelin’s book, Aprilov had started to act for the Bulgarian cause. In 1832, he proposed to Nikolaj Palauzov to found a school in their home town of Gabrovo. In this school, the modern educational method of Bell/Lancaster was to be used (see §4.1). Although Aprilov had broken with the Greek eforia of Odessa, he did not forget about the teaching system there. He had seen how efficient the system of Bell/Lancaster was, and wanted the new school to be organised according to the same system.

Aprilov and Palauzov themselves donated 2000 groschen each for the school. Because there were few wealthy people in Gabrovo and the inhabitants were not likely to contribute large sums to an uncertain project, Aprilov and Palauzov searched for assistance from rich Bulgarians who had moved from Gabrovo to Bucharest. Aprilov tried to provide the school with a print shop as well, but did not manage to realize this plan.

At the same time, Aprilov provided scholarships for Bulgarian students at the Odessa seminary. In 1840, for example, he wrote a letter to Rajno Popovič, stating that at that time he was taking care of five boys, who had from three to six more years of study ahead of them. The two that were closest to graduation were already ‘promised’ to the villages of Koprivštica and Karlovo, and the other ones in time would be deployed wherever they should be needed. In the same year, following an initiative of Aprilov, Palauzov and Toškovič (see §7.11), the Russian Czar issued a decree, in which he announced four scholarships for young Bulgarians, two for the seminary in Herson, two for the lyceum of Odessa. In 1846, the Czar again handed out 20 scholarships, this time for Moscow, Kiev and St. Petersburg. Between 1840 and 1878, a stream of Bulgarian students, over 500, studied in Russia.

Aprilov himself wrote some influential works. His first publication, in 1841, was a booklet, Bălgarskite knižici ili na koe slovensko pleme sobstveno prinadleži kirilovskata azbuka? (Bulgarian letters or to which Slavic people does the Cyrillic alphabet actually belong?), which was
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written in reaction to the Serb Dimitrije P. Tirol, who claimed, in the magazine *Odesskij Vestnik*, that the origin of the saints Cyril and Method was Serb. To prove that Tirol was wrong, Aprilov quoted Jovan Rajić, Josef Dobrovský, Mihail Pogodin, Jurij Venelin and others. Later that year, Aprilov’s famous *Dennica novobolgarskago obrazovanija* (Dawn of the new Bulgarian education) appeared. This was intended for the school in Gabrovo as clearly stated in its subtitle *Sočinenie Vasilija Aprilova, izdannoe im na своем издивении v пол’zu Gabrovskago učilišta. Čast’ pervaja. Odesa, v Gorodskoj tipografii. 1841* (A work by Vasil Aprilov, published on his costs for the benefit of the school in Gabrovo. Odessa, City print shop. 1841). The work was dedicated to the Russian count M.S. Voroncov, who had helped to secure the Bulgarian scholarships at the Czar’s court. The *Dennica*, and its addendum which followed in 1842, set forth Aprilov’s ideas about Bulgarian history and his vision for Bulgarian. The first of the volumes consisted of a cultural history of the Bulgarians, followed by a sketch of the situation faced by the Bulgarians during the Ottoman oppression. Aprilov used his own story as an illustration how destructive it was for Bulgarians to be ashamed of their descent:

…it is a pity that there are among the Bulgarians people who are ashamed to call themselves Bulgarians or Slavs. They have been the reason why this nationality has not developed. This prejudice must be overcome and the evil must be eradicated. Let me be the first example.

Another important goal of the work was, as is apparent from the introduction, to familiarize the Russians with their ‘brothers’ the Bulgarians,

…, народом, живущим в отделении от Европейской цивилизации… который страдает под всей тяжестью необразованного деспотизма, но который не менее всех прочих Славянских племен имеет право на известность.

A people, living in isolation of the European civilisation… that is suffering under the entire weight of uneducated despotism, but which just as much as the other Slavic tribes is entitled to be known.
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This work contained three illustrations: one showing Bulgarian coins, one with a portrait of the medieval Czar Ivan Aleksandăr, and one with the monument for Venelin in Moscow.

In 1845, in Odessa, Aprilov published *Bolgarskija gramoty* (Bulgarian charters), a collection of historical texts from the times of Czar Kalojan and Ivan Šišman. This collection was meant, like the *Dennica*, to be used in the school in Gabrovo, as stated in its full title: *Bolgarskija gramoty, sobrannyja, perevedennyja na russkij jazyk i objasnennyja Vasiljem Aprilovym. Izdanny v pol'zu Gabrovskago učilišta. Odessa, v Gorodskoj tipografii, 1845.* (Bulgarian charters, collected, translated into Russian and explicated by Vasil Aprilov. Published for the benefit of the school in Gabrovo. Odessa, city print shop, 1845).

Aprilov was acting to fulfill two of his wishes: on one hand, to raise interest in Russia for the Bulgarian cause, and second, to further Bulgarian education with the help of Russian books and materials. For the first cause, he advised the members of the Russian academy to send out researchers to Bulgaria. The Academy’s sponsorship of Venelin’s mission was based on this advice.

Aprilov saw the Russians as the most important force to assist the Bulgarians in their national development and he was critical of those who turned to the Greeks for help or who inspired their students do so, like R. Popović. Aprilov wrote to Popović:

От братята си Русите могат да получат всекаква помощ за просвещението си, никога обаче от гърците или от други некои народи654.

They can receive all kinds of assistance for their education from their brothers the Russians, never however from the Greeks or whichever other people.

About Ivan Seliminski, who, when he went to Athens to study medicine (see §4.6), had apparently taken some of his students with him, he wrote:

Я поставил на вид г. Селеминскому, что из центра своего местопребывания, Букореста, откуда он отправился в Афины с юношами, должно было ему направить путь не к Югу, а к Северу, ибо, если когда либо Болгаре увидят у себя правильные учебные заведения, и народную литературу, то это будет не иначе, как посредством изучения своего собственного языка, помощью Русских и Славянских книг, выходящих в великом числе в России...655

I brought it to the attention of Mr. Seliminski, that from the centre of his domicile, Bucharest, from where he left for Athens with young people, he should have turned north, instead of
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south, because, if ever Bulgarians will see in their country correct schools and national literature, then this will be only through study of their own language, with the assistance of Russian and Slavic books, that are published in great numbers in Russia.

Aprilov was active in other areas of cultural activism as well. He collected folk songs and sent them to Venelin at his request. This was after Venelin had posed him Vuk Karadžić as an example. In this pursuit, Aprilov used his large network of contacts, which included Neofit Rilski, Rajno Popović and Konstantin Fotinov. After Venelin’s death, he prepared the collection of 181 songs for publication, but this never materialised. Aprilov nevertheless left a large correspondence with Bulgarians in Bulgaria, Walachia and south-Russia.

Although Aprilov was aware of Venelin’s view on the Bulgarian church question, both from his works and from personal correspondance, he did not give his own opinion until 1838. One explanation for this might be that among Bulgarians, the church question was not topical then, and rarely discussed. A second explanation is that Aprilov believed the shortcomings of the education system should be dealt with first; Bulgarians should be educated before demanding that high church positions be filled by their compatriots656.

When Aprilov did express himself about the church issue later, he did so in a cautious, diplomatic way. When, for instance, he found out that the Patriarchate had prohibited Neofit Rilski’s translation of the New Testament, published by the English Bible Society, he tried to solve the conflict with diplomacy, so that the situation would not escalate and threaten the development of Bulgarian education657. Gradually, as the church issue became more and more the principal one on the Bulgarian agenda, Aprilov became more radical. In 1845, he wrote a  _Pismo kâm otečestvenicite_ (Letter to my fellow countrymen) in which he urged the large masses of Bulgarians to come in action to have Bulgarians appointed on episcopal sees. He however did not call for an independent Bulgarian church yet658.

Until 1847, Aprilov’s works were written in Russian. _Misli za səgəšnoto bəlgarsko učenje_ (Ideas about the current Bulgarian education), which appeared in Odessa in 1847, was the first book that he wrote in Bulgarian. He pointed to the good example of Konstantinos Vardalacos (§4.1), who had been head teacher of the Greek school in the city in 1819 and 1820, who had published a grammar of new Greek in 1829. Aprilov greatly valued the idea that children started to read in the modern language, and later continue with classical Greek659. It is remarkable, however,
that Aprilov did not mention Vardalachos’ pupil Petăr Beron, whose textbook of modern Bulgarian of 1824 had been so highly praised by Venelin, and which used the Lancaster method that Aprilov championed.

Aprilov died on October 2nd 1847, in Galați, on his way home from a therapeutical trip to Istanbul and Bursa. During his trip, he had made a stop in Gabrovo, where he was met with great celebration by the people there. His last wish, as written in his will, reflected the depth of his commitment to Bulgarian education. He wanted his savings to be used:

...за просвещението на соотечественниците българете, които са едно племя с другите словене, но останаха от тях назад в образованието и учението.

For the education of my fellow Bulgarians, who are one tribe with the other Slavs, but trail behind in education, science and arts.

Aprilov left 60,000 Russian rubles in a bank account, of which the interest was to be given to the Gabrovo secondary school. In his opinion, the school should develop into a lyceum, and have a library and a print shop at its disposal. The Gabrovo school was intended to serve as an educational centre for the whole of Bulgaria, providing other Bulgarian cities with teachers, know-how about the allilo-didactic method and books and tables, to be used in the classrooms.

Furthermore, Aprilov had arranged for more scholarships for talented Bulgarian pupils. These scholarships would be given as a loan, remitted in three equal parts, if the student agreed to (i) complete an education to be a clergyman; (ii) teach for five years at the school of Gabrovo, or fifteen years elsewhere; and (iii) publish a book in Bulgarian (original or translation), consisting at least of 25 pages.

§7.9 Panslavism and Bulgarian students in Russia after 1850

In the 1840s, a second generation of Russian slavophiles emerged, including Jurij Samarin, Konstantin Aksakov and Ivan Aksakov. With them, especially following the Crimean war, slavophilism became more politically oriented. In the years following the war, under the more
lenient regime of Czar Aleksandr II, the position of the slavophiles in Russia also improved. The
government allowed both the zapadniki and the slavophiles more freedom, as it realized that after
the humiliating defeat in the war, only a liberal course could avoid a revolution. Gradually, the gap
between zapadniki and slavophiles was bridged and both sides recognized that they were striving
for a reform of Russian society. The abolition of serfdom was advocated by both zapadniki and
slavophiles.

Under Aleksandr II, who came to the throne in 1855, slavophiles were granted greater
freedom of expression. Censorship was softened, and this allowed new slavophile magazines to be
published, like the Russkaja Beseda (Russian discourse) and Sel'skoe blagoustrojstvo (Rural
organization). In 1857, the journal Molva (Rumour), which had been banned before, was
allowed to appear again. The Czar also allowed the re-establishment of the Obščestvo ljubitelej
rossijskoj slovesnosti (Society of lovers of russian literacy).

The Czar himself appears not to have shared slavophile ideas, since the slavophiles were
quite hostile towards the court and bureaucracy in St. Petersburg. The Czarina and Czarevič
however, were attracted to them. Konstantin Aksakov and Anna Tjutčeva, the daughter of the
poet Tjutčev and wife of Ivan Aksakov, were important insiders in the court who acted as a link to
the slavophiles outside.

Cultural ideas gave way to political ones. Slavophilism, a cultural concept, which more or
less reflected Herder’s idea of cultural diversity among Slavs, slowly developed into panslavism, a
political ideology, a disguise for Russian nationalism. Panslavism, which was feared in western
Europe during the Eastern Crisis, is based on the idea that all Slavs are closely related by blood and
have to be freed and brought together in one empire with the Czar as its head. It advocated war
(with the Ottoman Empire and Austria) to realise its imperialistic aims.

Panslavism became mainstream in Russia and the government made use of it for its own
imperialistic programme. There were however three major flaws in the Pan-Slavic agenda. First,
by focusing on orthodoxy, panslavists ignored developments according to western models in some
Slav areas, like Poland and some Habsburg territories. Furthermore, there was no common Slav
language. For example, Pogodin’s correspondence with Czech and Croat scholars, like Šafárik, was
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carried out in German\textsuperscript{671}. Finally, Russian claims to cultural predominance were resented elsewhere. For instance Homjakov’s \textit{Poslanie k Serbam} (Address to the Serbs) of 1860 aroused ill feeling in Serbia\textsuperscript{672}.

In the 1870s, when panslavism had become synonymous with panrussianism, Russian intellectuals did not even bother to disguise their imperialistic vision with ideological motives. The diplomat Count Nikolaj Pavlovič Ignatiev (1832-1908, see §5.5) was straight to the point in this regard. As Sumner puts it:

Sooner or later, he held, Russia must fight for the first place in the Balkans and for the leadership of Slavdom: only for the attainment of this task should Russia make sacrifices for the Slavs under Austrian and Turkish rule and be solicitous for their freedom and growth in strength. To aim merely at emancipating the Slavs, to be satisfied with merely humanitarian success, would be foolish and reprehensible\textsuperscript{673}.

Panslavism did not even limit itself to Slav peoples. In his 1869 book \textit{Rossija i Evropa} (Russia and Europe) (sometimes called the ‘Bible of panslavism’) Nikolaj Danilevskij outlined a Slavic federation, including, besides Slavs, also Greeks, Romanians and Hungarians\textsuperscript{674}.

Panslavists founded Slavonic benevolent societies. In transforming their ideology into action, the Moscow Slavonic Benevolent Society (\textit{Slavjanskij Blagotvoritel’nyj Komitet}) was founded in 1858 with the approval of Czar Aleksandr II\textsuperscript{675}. It was led by Ivan Aksakov\textsuperscript{676} and had the support of metropolit Filaret of Moscow\textsuperscript{677} and later also of the department of Asiatic affairs, headed by Ignatiev. The Society aimed to support South Slavs in developing religious, educational, and other national institutions and to bring young Slavs to Russia to be educated\textsuperscript{678}. There were three other Benevolent Societies in Russia: one in St. Petersburg, founded in 1868, that was more in contact with the Czechs, one in Kiev and one in Odessa, both of which focussed on Bulgaria, like the one in Moscow. The core members of the latter two comprised of Bulgarians from the Bulgarian émigré colonies in those cities\textsuperscript{679}.

The first one to provide scholarships to Bulgarians and other Slavs was the Czar in person, and later, the various benevolent societies and the Odessa board of Bulgarians also handed out scholarships, as did private persons. In 1856, the Russian Synod decided to call to life an annual
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contribution of 11,025 rubles, so non-Russian Slavs could study in Russia. It was mainly Bulgarians who benefited from this programme.

The Russian government, also influenced by pan-Slavist motives, started to support Bulgarian education. Between 1846 and 1852, the ministry of education provided Bulgarian schools with 1768 schoolbooks, to be shared among the ca. 100 Bulgarian schools then in existence. Furthermore, in 1847, Alexandar Ekzarh was awarded funds, 10,000 silver rubles, to support Bulgarian schools.

Many Bulgarians benefited from the program. Between 1856 and 1876, around 500 Bulgarians studied in Russia, with funding from the Benevolent Committee or privately from Russians. They studied mostly in Moscow, Odessa and Kiev. The Slavophilism they encountered among Russian intellectuals inspired them in developing their own brand of nationalism.

Some of the Bulgarian students, like Hristo Botev (1847-1876) and Stefan Stambolov (1854-1895), were in contact with radical Russian students and turned into revolutionaries. They sought Russia’s help in an armed struggle for political independence.

A striking example of a pan-Slavist young Bulgarian is Rajko Žinzifov, a student in Russia. At the All-Russian Ethnographic Exhibition, organised by the Moscow Slavonic Benevolent Society in 1867, he spoke about the fraternal relationship between Bulgarians and Russians. He pointed to Cyril and Method and their Bulgarian provenance and then asked the Russians for support:

Brothers! The Bulgarian people firmly believe that when the hour comes and this hour is soon to come, the whole Russian nation will lose no time and come to their aid to save them from the centuries-long heavy bondage!...

The large number of Bulgarians who studied in Russia laid the foundation for a Bulgarian national intelligentsia. They were the ones who were, upon their return in the motherland, the teachers in the developing class schools, replacing the daskals of the allildidactic schools. They also greatly contributed to public life in their villages and to an emerging public sphere in Bulgaria.
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trained intellectuals founded čitalištes, organised meetings, and wrote in the newly developed periodical press.

Bulgarian students in Russia developed a communal cultural life. In 1852, a small group of them established the *Bulgarian Matica* in St. Petersburg. Founding members were Konstantin Petkovič and Natanail Stojanov, among those who joined later were Ivan Šopov from Prague, the brothers Anton (Aleksandr) and Dragan Cankov from Vienna, Partenij Zografski from Istanbul and Nikolaj Palauzov from Odessa. Unlike the Maticas formed by Serbs, Croats and Slovaks, which became influential cultural centres, the Bulgarian Matica remained on the margins of society. After the Crimean war, it was replaced by the *Obšestvo bolgarskoj pismennosti* (Society of Bulgarian literature), founded by Dragan Cankov in Istanbul in 1856. It soon had 300 members and its own magazine: *Bǎlgarski Knižici* (Bulgarian Booklets). This society, in turn, was the precursor of the well-known *Bǎlgarskoto knižovno družestvo* (Bulgarian literary society), which was founded in 1869 in Brăila.

In 1859, a society of Bulgarian students in Moscow, *Moskovsko bǎlgarsko družestvo* (Bulgarian society of Moscow), was founded. It was also known as *Bratski trud* (Fraternal Labour). Among the members were Ljuben Karavelov, Nešo Bončev, Marin Drinov, Rajno Žinzifov, Konstantin Gerov (the brother of Najden) and Konstantin Miladinov. The activities of the society were limited to Moscow and were not well known in Bulgaria. The society collected literature for a library to be used by young Bulgarian intellectuals, and also sought to provide them with financial assistance if necessary. A lot of the members later turned into activists for the Bulgarian cause. The society published a journal, also called *Bratski Trud*, which was devoted mainly to poetry and folklore.

Two outstanding representatives of this cohort of Russia-trained intellectuals deserve special mention. To begin with, there was Ljuben Stojčev Karavelov (1834-1879), born in Koprivštica. Karavelov started his education in the local cell school, then in the class school under Najden Gerov and Joakim Gruev, and finally in the Greek school in Plovdiv. From 1853 he studied abadžijstvo (weaving) and worked with his father in the trade. During his travels through Bulgaria, he collected folk songs and other folkloristic material. In the summer of 1857, Karavelov went to Odessa, but because of his age he was not allowed to enter the military school. With the help of A.V. Račinski and the Moscow merchant V.A. Kokarov he entered the University of Moscow as auditor. In Moscow, he came into contact with leading slavophiles like Pogodin and
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Ivan Aksakov (1823-1886), and contributed to the slavophile magazines Den' (Day), Moskva (Moscow), Moskovskie vedomosti (Moscow Gazette) and Golos (Voice). He was one of the founders of Bratski Trud.

Apart from scholars, Karavelov also met political activists in Russia, like Aleksandr Ivanovič Herzen (1812-1870) and Nikolaj Gavrilovič Černyševskij (1828-1889). In 1861, he published a collection of folk material together with the Russian revolutionary I.G. Prižov.

Later in his career, Karavelov started to distance himself from the panslavic ideas he had advocated while in Russia. He became more and more influenced by the austroslavism of Jernej Kopitar and Vuk Karadžić (see §8.5), that saw Habsburg, rather than Russia, as the hope for Bulgarians. Shortly after Karadžić’s death, Karavelov defended his work:

Враги Вука и до сих пор трудятся уменьшить его славу и всячески стараются доказать, что Вук вместе с Копитаром действовали против славянских интересов и православия [...] Но эта наглая ложь уничтожается сама собою, потому что каждому ученому, знакомому с сербским языком, известно, что Вук писал на том языке, какой в настоящее время употребляется сербами, т.е. на разговорном сербском языке [...] Народные памятники записаны по народному произношению [...]688.

The opponents of Vuk even until now strive to diminish his fame and in all ways try to prove that Vuk and Kopitar were working against the interest of the Slavs and against orthodoxy […] But that big lie is self-destructing because every scholar, familiar with the Serbian language, knows that Vuk wrote in that language, which the Serbians of our time use, that is colloquial Serbian. […] The manuscripts of the people are written according to the pronunciation of the people.

Karavelov went to Serbia in 1867, and in 1869 to Walachia, where he became more and more involved in the political struggle for national liberation. He became one of the great leaders of this struggle, and worked together with among others Georgi Rakovski (1821-1867), Vasil Levski (1837-1873) and Hristo Botev (1847-1876).

Another Bulgarian student to contribute to the Bulgarian cause following study in Russia was Rajko Ksenofont Žinzifov (1839-1877). Žinzifov was born in Veles and had received a Greek education there and in Bitolja. He worked as the assistant to Dimităr Miladinov when he was teaching in Prilep in 1856. Through mediation of Miladinov, Žinzifov was able to go to Russia to further his education689. He went first to the seminary in Herson and then moved to the philological faculty of the University of Moscow in 1858 with a scholarship from the Slavonic
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Benevolent Society. In Moscow, from 1860 until 1862 he was involved in both the society and the magazine *Bratskij Trud*, and he contributed to many Russian and Bulgarian newspapers and magazines. He returned to Bulgaria in 1866 for a couple of months, only to move back to Moscow, where he applied for and received Russian citizenship. He stayed in Russia until the end of his life, working as a teacher and journalist.

Žinzifov’s poems appeared in numerous magazines, including *Dubovni knižki* (Spiritual booklets), *Vremja* (Time), *Narodnost’* (Nationality), *Dunavska Zora* (Danubian sunrise) and *Čitalište*. He made also some remarkable translations into Bulgarian. In his collection *Novobâlgarska Sbirka* (New Bulgarian collection) of 1863, he incorporated translations of *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (the Song of Igor’s Campaign) from old Russian, the *Rukopis Královédvorsky* (the Koniginhof Manuscript) from (old)Czech, and the *Gusljar* (Guzla-player) of the Ukrainian Taras Ševčenko. Thereby he helped to spread to Bulgaria the European fashion of that time, the publishing of medieval national texts or writing new ‘medieval’ texts. In the same line of thought is Stefan Verković’s work *Drevnjaja bolgarskaja pesna ob Orfee* (Ancient Bulgarian song about Orpheus), which Žinzifov helped to edit in 1867. This book appeared seven years before Verković’s *Veda Slovena* (see §6.13). As a motto to his *Novobâlgarska Sbirka*, Žinzifov chose the following quote from the history of Paisij Hilendarski (see §5.3), who at that time was little known:

О неразумне и юроде, поради что се срамиш да се наречеш болгарин, и не четиш по свои язик и не думаш...692
...ти болгарине, не прелащани се, знан свои род и язик и учи се по своему язику. Боле ест Болгарска простота и незлобие...693

O stupid person, why are you ashamed to call yourself Bulgarian, and don’t you read and speak in your own language… …you, Bulgarian, don’t deceive yourself, know your people and language and study in your own language. Bulgarian simplicity and good-heartedness is better.

In doing this, Žinzifov was among the first to rediscover Paisij’s work and give it the prestige it received from 1870 onwards.
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690 The authenticity of the former is still disputed, the latter is considered a forgery, see §8.11.
691 Ibid.
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§7.10 Ivan Denkoglu and his protégés

Some Bulgarian students came to Russia with scholarships not from societies or institutions, but from private persons. One of the people who provided such scholarships was the rich Bulgarian merchant Ivan Denkoglu (1799-1861). Denkoglu was popular within the Bulgarian community of Moscow, he hosted a Bulgarian salon in the city, and came to know the Bulgarian students well.

Denkoglu was born in a village near Sofia and moved to Moscow in the 1830s, where he became rich through trading pelts. In 1844, he donated a large sum of money to the University of Moscow, which was to support Bulgarian students. Recipients included Sava Filaretov, Nikola Katranov and others. Denkoglu also provided Osip Bodjanskij, the professor of many of his protégés, with the money to publish the Svetoslav-Izbornik (Anthology of Svetoslaw) of 1073.

Upon Denkoglu’s death in 1861, Rajko Žinzifov acknowledged:

And if at present we observe a spiritual revival of our whole nation, if the Bulgarian language resounds from Salonica to Ohrida, from Sofia to Vidin, from Tărnovo to Varna, we owe all this to such people like Jurij Venelin and other Russian men of science, who looked at us with sympathy, and also to such Bulgarian patriots as Ivan Nikolaevič [Denkoglu, js], whose memory will be remembered forever by the grateful future generations.

Among the students benefitting from Denkoglu’s generosity were Nikola Katranov (1829-1853) and Sava Filaretov (1825-1863). Katranov studied at the University of Moscow from 1848 until 1852, after studying at grammar school in Kiev with a scholarship of the community of his home town, Svištov. In Moscow, in 1850, he translated Byron’s The Bride of Abydos into Bulgarian, and folk songs into Russian. After his studies Katranov went to teach in Svištov. When he became infected with tuberculosis, Denkoglu paid for him to seek medical attention in Vienna and Venice, where he died in 1853. The story of his life inspired Ivan Turgenev for the description of his hero Insarov in the novel Nakanune (On the Eve).

Sava Filaretov (1825-1863), another Denkoglu protégé, came from Žeravna. He was first educated at the local cell school, then he continued his study in Kotel from 1840 to 1843 under
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Sava Dobroplodni (see §6.7). Then he worked as a teacher in Šumen for approximately one year\textsuperscript{697}. He studied at the famous school in Kuruçeşme, Istanbul, where he received his nickname ‘Filaretov’, friend of virtue. With the help of Aleksandăr Ekarh, Filaretov went to the first grammar school in Odessa in 1848 and then, with a recommendation from the Odessa Bulgarians, started to study in Moscow. From 1852 until 1857, with a scholarship from Denkoglu, studied Slavic philology. Having been appointed private secretary to Denkoglu, Filaretov came into contact with slavophiles, like Pogodin and Aksakov.

During the Crimean war, Filaretov was the link between the Moscow-based slavophiles and the Bulgarians in Odessa. In that time, he composed the first language guide with dictionary of Bulgarian: \textit{Karmannaja kniga dlja russkikh voinov, nabodjaščija v pohodah protiv turok po bolgarskim zemljam} (Pocket book for Russian soldiers, who are in the campaigns against the Turks in the Bulgarian lands), which appeared in St. Petersburg in 1854, and was sent to the front\textsuperscript{698}. After his study, Filaretov travelled with Denkoglu through Europe. On one of these trips he met Pavel Šafárik and Václav Hanka in Prague, thus establishing his position in the international network of slavists of the time.

To pay off his debt, Filaretov went to teach in Denkoglu’s native Sofia, where he also founded a girls’ school. Forced to leave the city after his pro-Bulgarian stance in the church conflict, he went into Russian diplomatic service in Odrin in 1861. Filaretov died of tuberculosis in Cairo in 1863, where he had been sent to convalesce.

As a student, Filaretov contributed to \textit{Carigradski Vestnik} (The Istanbul Herald) and some Russian magazines. He collected Bulgarian folksongs for \textit{Bàlgarski knižici} (Bulgarian Booklets) (1858) of which he was editor shortly in 1862. And he used his connection with Ivan Denkoglu to persuade him to fund Rakovski’s magazine, \textit{Dunavski Lebed} (Danube Swan), of which he himself was a distributor.

\section*{§7.11 Odessa as a cultural centre for Bulgarians}

During the nineteenth century, Odessa developed into a prosperous city, and by extension – as a consequence of its many people and significant wealth, it became an important cultural centre for

\textsuperscript{697} Filaretov left a large impression on his geography pupils. Because he did not have a map or globe in the classroom, he let a watermelon spin to illustrate the movement of the earth. The traces of the continents he had carved in himself with a knife. Todev, Koj koj e, 273.

\textsuperscript{698} Ibid.
émigré communities, such as the Greek (the *Filiki Etairia*, the secret Greek revolutionary society, was founded in Odessa), Serb and Jewish. It was also an important site of Bulgarian cultural development.

In addition to the Bulgarian merchants from the Ottoman Empire who had settled in Odessa, many were drawn to the city from Bessarabia, which had received large numbers of Bulgarian immigrants in the late eighteenth century. There were also entire Bulgarian villages in the vicinity of Odessa. The first of them, Malyj Bujalyk, nowadays Sverdlovo, was founded in 1801.

Established by Catherine the Great in 1794, Odessa radiated the new élan of the Russian Empire. This grew after a series of territorial enlargements of Russia at the expense of the Ottoman Empire. Being a free port until 1857, Odessa soon expanded to become a substantial harbour exporting mainly agricultural products. This was stimulated further by the Treaty of Edirne in 1829, which permitted all ships not at war with Turkey to pass through the straits on both sides of the sea of Marmara (the Dardanelles and the Bosporus).

Odessa’s cultural bloom was largely the result of the prestigious Richelieu-lyceum, which was founded in 1817 and became an official university in 1865. Named after the city’s popular governor (1803-1814), the lyceum attracted intellectuals from Russia and abroad, it stimulated the establishment of other schools, a number of publishing houses, and from 1858 had an important magazine, the *Odesskij vestnik*. Indeed, by 1850, as described by Patricia Herlihy:

…Odessa could boast three printers, one lithographer, six bookstores, and forty-one institutes of learning. Odessa seems to have been more literate than most cities in the Russian Empire. It attracted educated, ambitious immigrants.

At first, the Bulgarians in Odessa were integral part of Greek cultural circles. From 1818 until 1820, Nikolaos Pikkolos (see §4.3) worked in Odessa as dramatist of the Greek theatre. Vasil Aprilov was involved in Greek education.

Later, when the number of Bulgarians had risen and especially after the Greek independence, Bulgarians became more visible in their own light. They started to organise themselves culturally. The Mutev family from Kalofe established a literary salon in the city. There, Bulgarian writers could present literature in their own language and Bulgarian literature started a quick development. In this salon, for instance, student Najden Gerov (1823-1900) met with Elena
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Muteva, to whom he dedicated his poem *Stojan i Rada*, the first lyric poem in Bulgarian\(^701\). Other young Bulgarians in this Odessa circle were Dobri Čintulov, Ivan Bogorov and Zahari Knjažeski\(^702\).

As early as 1843, a group of young Bulgarians gathered in the city to discuss the question of an independent Bulgarian church. The struggle to have Bulgarians appointed at the head of Bulgarian eparchies was reinforced from Odessa\(^703\).

One of the institutions representing the Bulgarians in Odessa was the *Odeskoto bǎlgarsko nastrojatelstvo* (OBN-Odessa Bulgarian representation). It was founded in 1854 by, among others, Stefan D. Toškovič, Nikolaj M. Toškov, Nikolaj Hr. Palauzov, and Konstantin N. Palauzov. Its aim was to represent Bulgarians to the Russian government. Initially, its activities were aimed at collecting money and volunteers to support the Russian army at the Danube front\(^704\).

After 1858, this society became involved in cultural charity. One of the main goals of the organization then was to distribute scholarships to Bulgarian students. Among the beneficiaries were Konstantin Miladinov, Vasil Drumev, Rajko Žinzifov, and Sava Filaretov\(^705\).

Another activity of the OBN was to support the church conflict. Nikolaj Palauzov lobbied the Russian synod and the Department of Asian Affairs to support the quest for a separate Bulgarian church hierarchy. Palauzov’s main argument was that the refusal of the Constantinople Patriarchate to submit to the Bulgarian demands formed a threat to the influence of Russia in the Ottoman Empire and the unity of orthodoxy. The OBN also collected funds for Bulgarian churches and church schools. To win the support of the Russian church, Nikolaj Palauzov persuaded archiepiscopate Inokenij of the Herson and Tavričeskii area to act as custodian for the OBN in 1856 and 1857\(^706\).

Later, from 1866, the OBN established and maintained ties with the *Taen Centralen Bǎlgarski Komitet* (Secret central Bulgarian committee) and the *Bǎlgarski Revoljucionen Centralen Komitet* (Bulgarian revolutionary central committee), secret revolutionary organisations that were active within Bulgaria. In this connection, OBN gave 13,000 silver rubles to Georgi S. Rakovski, the leader of the Bulgarian insurrection. Notably 7000 of this came from Nikolaj Toškov\(^707\), a founding member of the OBN.
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\(^702\) Todev, Koj koj e, 46.
\(^703\) Grek, “Jurij I. Venelin”, 55.
\(^704\) Todorov, *Bǎlgarsko vǎzraždane XVIII*, 392.
\(^705\) Šarova, *Bǎlgarsko vǎzraždane 1856*, 198.
\(^706\) Todev, Koj koj e, 203.
\(^707\) Ibid., 268.
The range of philanthropic, patriotic and nationalist activities that Odessa Bulgarians were involved in is exemplified in the figure of Nikolaj Mironovič Toškov (1816-1874). His munificence encompassed all charitable, religious, cultural and national spheres, and shows the extent to which these were interrelated in the process of Bulgarian nation building. To begin with, Toškov, and indeed other members of his family, were prominent figures in the Bulgarian community which had been established in Odessa. Originating from the Balkan city of Kalofer, Toškov moved to Odessa in 1833, where he first worked for his cousin, Stefan D. Toskovič, in his trade office708, but soon started his own business buying and selling wheat from the Plovdiv area.

Toškov was known in Odessa for his extensive library which he opened to Bulgarian expatriates and students. His house thus became a meeting point for intellectuals including Najden Gerov, Ivan Bogorov, Dobri Čintulov, and Elena Muteva. All his life, Toškov was a pivotal point for the Bulgarian cultural and political elite in Odessa.

Toškov was an ardent supporter of the revolution, as I have already indicated above. Indeed it is suspected, but not proven, that already during the Brăila uprising of 1841-1843, Toškov financially supported the Bulgarian revolutionaries inside the Ottoman Empire709. In 1858, Toškov opened his house to the revolutionary Georgi Rakovski, when he was rallying support among the Odessa Bulgarians710. Later, in 1871, Toškov purchased weapons for the revolutionary Filip Totju, and indirectly for Vasil Levski, stating:

Аз жертвам тези пушки на името на отечеството ни, защото вярвам, че нашето отечество няма да се освободи само с перо, а и с хората, дето ще проливаме кръв.

I sacrifice these guns in the name of our fatherland, because I believe, that our fatherland will not be liberated by means of the pen alone, but also by means of people, in which we will shed blood711.

He also financially assisted, in the beginning of the 1860s, Bulgarian priests, who were prosecuted during the church conflict (see §5.5).

Toškov firmly believed in the importance of newspapers. He was a subscriber to practically all Bulgarian papers that were published in Istanbul, and paid for the newspaper Vremja (Time) to be sent to Bulgarian communities in several Russian cities. He also offered 50 Turkish lira to prevent the folding of Săvetnik, a Bulgarian magazine printed in Istanbul.

708 Note the difference in family name. Where Toškov has the Bulgarian ending –ov, Toškovič, has a Serbian tone in it.
709 Todev, Koj kój e, 268.
710 Šarova, Българско възраждане 1856, 202.
711 Ibid., 269.
In addition, Toškov supported Bulgarian education. Already from the 1830s he sent an annual sum to the school in Kalofor. In 1867, he donated 21,000 rubles for girls’ schools in seven Bulgarian cities, mainly in Macedonia, and in 1868, he provided scholarships for five girls to take up studies to become teachers.

Nikolaj Stefanovič Palauzov (1776-1853) was born in Gabrovo, but as a young man, he was forced to flee his native land after killing a Turk. He went to Bessarabia first, where he worked as a shepherd, but then for lack of employment was forced to find his luck in the cities of Chișinău and later Odessa. From 1812, he became the servant of a Greek merchant there. He saved as much money as he could to start a business of his own. He was able to donate generously to the Gabrovo school (see §6.1), even though he had a large family of his own to maintain.

His son Spiridon Nikolaevič Palauzov (1818-1872) took a course in law at the Richelieu Lyceum (1838-1840), then continued his study in Bonn and Heidelberg, graduating in 1843 in Munich. He became a lecturer in the Faculty of Arts in Moscow in 1845, under supervision of Osip Bodjanskij. He was then elected as a member of the Moscow Association for History and Antiquities. In 1852 he received his doctor’s title from Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskij at the University of St. Petersburg for his publication of *Vek bolgarskogo carja Simeona* (The age of the Bulgarian Czar Simeon). This made him the first medievalist of Bulgarian origin. From 1852 until 1856 he had a special mission with the Russian Ministry of Education. He stayed in service of the Russian government until his retirement in 1868. Back in Odessa in 1854, he was a member of the OBN and assisted his cousin Nikolaj Hristoforovič Palauzov in the formation of volunteer divisions to assist the Russian troops in the war and prepare a Bulgarian uprising at the same time.

Nikolaj Hristoforovič Palauzov (1819-1899), a nephew of Nikolaj Stefanovič Palauzov, went to Odessa at the age of 10 or 11 years to live with his uncle. In 1840, he received Russian citizenship, and in 1842 he finished a course of law at the Richelieu Lyceum. Like his cousin Spiridon, he joined the civil service. He was employed by the customs office in Odessa, where he continued to work all his life. In 1845 he went to Gabrovo on the recommendation of Vasil Aprilov to inspect the school there. During his trip, he visited the Bulgarians in Walachia and present-day Bulgaria to arouse pro-Russian feelings. He met with Neofit Rilski and, in Gabrovo, Viktor Grigorovič, who was travelling through Bulgaria at the same time (see §7.5).
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714 During the Crimean War, Palauzov was part of the staff of Field Marshal Paskevič, who was the commander in chief of the Russian army. He later received the Russian Order of St. Anne for his services. Following the war, he was active in the emigration of 5614 Bulgarians to Russia. Ibid.
During the Crimean war, he was officer of Bulgarian affairs in the staff of the southern troops. He assisted Bulgarian immigrants in the south of Russia in the periods 1854-6 and 1861-2. From 1861 he was censor for the Slavic languages in the international mail office of Odessa. From 1860 until his death, he was a member of the board of governors of the Gabrovo school 715.

Nikolaj Palauzov wrote a booklet on the life of Jurij Venelin, which appeared in 1851. He was one of the founders of the OBN and, without interruption, its president until his death in 1899.

Conclusions

In this chapter, we have seen that Russia and Russian scholars played an important role in the rise of Bulgarian nationalism. This happened in the first place in the Bulgarian colony in Odessa, later also in Moscow. People like Aprilov, the Palauzovs and Denkoglu made their fortune in Russia, and spent part of their money on the Bulgarian cause. They were inspired by the slavophilism that was popular among Russian intellectuals.

Initially, Bulgarian philologists adopted a patriotic stance (in Viroli’s sense of that term) in a patriotic manner, both individually and in organised forms, like in the Odesko Bălgarsko Nastojatelstvo. Aprilov supported Bulgarian education, which he clearly modelled after the Greek education he had seen in Odessa. Aprilov became the hub in the web of contacts, acting as intermediary between Bulgarians in the Bulgarian lands and émigré Bulgarians in emigration, not only in Russia, but also in the Danubian principalities. The beginning of cultural nationalism was seen in phase A activities in the early 1840s when people like Aprilov, Bogorov and Gerov, inspired by Russian philologists like Pogodin and Venelin, started to collect folklore and old manuscripts.

Later, especially during and after the Crimean war, patriotism was replaced by what Gellner terms ‘diaspora nationalism’. This coincided with the evolution of slavophilism into panslavism in Russia, which made it a state ideology to support small Slav groups on the Balkans. The Russian state offered the Bulgarians at this time something important which was missing in the Ottoman Empire: formal institutions. The fact that the emperor himself provided scholarships for Bulgarians, and that the Academy of Sciences deemed Bulgaria worth of study, must have had a great impact on Bulgarian national awareness.

715 Ibid., 203.
The idea of slavophilism strengthened Bulgarians in their identity. The feeling that they were one in a large family of Slav people supported their desire to have a state of their own, but closely linked to the ‘mother state’: Russia. By 1867, slavophilism had turned into panslavism, and Russian support became stronger.

Whereas Bulgarians of Aprilov’s generation in the 1840s asked from Russia support in the sphere of culture and education, Žinzifov and his contemporaries of the 1860s clearly sought political support.

Inside Russia, different groups were active and influenced Bulgarians in different ways. Depending on with whom they were in contact during their time in Russia, Bulgarians turned into patriots (Aprilov), panslavist nationalists (Žinzifov), revolutionaries (Botev) or even anti-panslavist nihilists (Karavelov).
8: The Habsburg Empire and the Bulgarians

As discussed in chapter 2, the Habsburg Empire provided fertile ground for the development of Bulgarian intellectual life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This continued to be the case well into the nineteenth century where in cities such as Vienna, Budapest and Prague, intellectuals were able to meet with colleagues from other nationalities, engage in scholarly debates and, most importantly, were able to publish their books and articles. The first books in modern Bulgarian were printed in Budapest as early as 1806, in Braşov in 1824 and in Vienna in 1845. Merchants who spent time in the large cities Vienna and Budapest took these books with them on their way home.

Some Bulgarian students went to the Habsburg Empire to study. The Serb scholar Dositej Obradović had a Bulgarian pupil when he was teaching in Vienna. Other students went even further north, to the universities in Germany. Petar Beron (see §4.5) and his nephew Vasil went to Munich and Würzburg, Ivan Bogorov studied in Leipzig and Spiridon Palauzov, after studying in Moscow, continued his studies in Heidelberg and Munich.

This chapter takes a closer look at these developments as they unfolded in the Habsburg Empire. This covers activities in smaller Habsburg cities in Transylvania and the Habsburg parts with a South Slav population; activities in Vienna and Budapest, especially those undertaken by the influential figures Jernej Kopitar and Vuk Karadžić, and by Bulgarians there; and activities undertaken by Bulgarians and West Slavs, especially Czechs and Slovaks (Kollár, Dobrovský, Šafárik) and the Bulgarians that were in contact with them.

§ 8.1 Trade with the Habsburg Empire

As a result of economic developments in the second half of the eighteenth century, the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Empire began to change. The industrialization of Austria and Germany saw the need for raw materials and live stock grow, and as a consequence they became market places for these products.

717 Penev, Načalo, 330.
719 Ibid., 64.
The Habsburg and Ottoman Empires signed a treaty in 1655, which allowed the inhabitants of both empires to sail the Danube in peace. After the Treaty of Požarevac (1718), which shifted borders between the empires, the economies of the previously Ottoman Hungarian lands, Walachia and Serbia became more closely related to the business and trade of Austria. Timișoara, the centre of the Banat-area, became an important trade centre.

Many raw materials came from inside the Ottoman Empire and were brought to merchants and craftsmen from the Balkan to the Austrian, and especially the Hungarian lands. Those who travelled from the western parts of Bulgaria followed the trade routes that were also used by Dubrovnik merchants earlier, via Solun, Skopje, Niš, Belgrade and Zemun.

In Vienna the ‘Ost-compagnie’ was founded in the second half of the eighteenth century. This company, which enjoyed state support, opened branches in south-east Europe. It sold Austrian products, for instance hardware, tools and textiles, and imported oriental goods. So as not to be dependent on the merchants from the Balkans for raw materials, the company equipped its first ship, the Donau, in 1783.

Trade was also established with Russia. After the Russians had obtained free access to the Black Sea and the Danube in the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca of 1774, an intensive programme of development took place on the northern shore of the Black Sea. Central to this development was the founding of Odessa in 1794. In 1780, when Emperor Joseph II visited Russia, plans were made to intensify trade relations between the two empires. The Black Sea and the Danube formed the obvious point of access.

By the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, and in spite of all their and the state’s efforts, however, Austrian merchants had still not succeeded in establishing a regular trade with the Ottoman Empire. This was attributed to the instable internal organization of the Ottoman Empire, and a technical issue, that loaded ships could not easily pass the Iron Gate in the Danube, a passage of the river that is infamous because of the challenge it poses to navigation.

The trade between the two empires was thus carried out largely overland by inhabitants from the Ottoman Empire, who in increasing numbers settled in the Austrian capital. In the 1740s, Balkan merchants started to organise themselves in a society. In 1766, their club counted
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268 members, half of whom lived in Vienna more or less permanently. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, some wealthy merchants from the village of Bansko (near the city of Razlog in southwest Bulgaria) traded cotton in Belgrade and Vienna. Other villages in Bulgaria such as Arbanasi, Melnik and Žeravna, enjoyed special privileges from the sultan in craft and trade.

As a result of flourishing trade, the western parts of Bulgaria took the lead in cultural developments. Schools in the national language were founded earlier in the western than in the eastern part of Bulgaria. The Serbian national school system may have served as an example.

Bulgarians from the eastern parts of the Bulgarian lands reached the economic centres of the Habsburg Empire by a different route. They went to Budapest and Vienna via cities along the Danube, and then the cities of Transylvania, like Sibiu and Brașov. Along this trade route, Bulgarian colonies formed in Brașov, Sibiu, Novi Sad, Zemun, Timișoara, Miskolc and Eger.

Documents from the Ottoman archives show that by the sixteenth century cities along the Danube like Tulcea, Brăila, Silistra, Ruse, Svišov, Nikopol (on the trade route to Brașov and Târgoviște), Orjahovo, Vidin (which had contacts with Brăila, Smederovo, Belgrade and Buda) and Orșova were already important trade centres. These cities retained their importance until the nineteenth century. Some of these cities, in particular Svišov and Ruse, became cultural centres, spreading western culture through the Bulgarian lands. In these Danube cities, architecture of the Central European type spread, and it is no coincidence that it was in cities like Svišov and Šumen, which after 1848 housed a large Hungarian community of refugees, that Bulgarian theatre first developed. (see §6.7)

§8.2 The Serbs and Bulgarians in Budapest

The most important Bulgarian colony, comprising Bulgarians from both the east and the west of what is now Bulgaria, took shape in the Hungarian capital, Budapest. There were Bulgarians there as early as 1689, when many sought refuge after the crushing of the Karpoš-insurrection. For this community, a deacon called Velko Popović published two anthologies with a moral
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content (written in Middle Bulgarian) in 1704. Bulgarians however were not really visible in the city. This is because they blended in with the local Serb community.

The Serb community in Buda and Pest was already sizeable and wealthy during the Turkish occupation of the city, which lasted from 1541 until 1686. Around 1640 it owned three churches and had its own metropolitan. In 1690, the massive immigration of Serbs from the Ottoman Empire into the Habsburg lands, also known as the Velika Seoba or Great Migration, enlarged the Serb community in Buda and Pest. This community had its greatest prosperity in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century.

Budapest was an important economic and cultural centre for the Serbs. There was a public literary salon, Aranýszarvas (Golden Stag), whose host, Sima Ignjatović (1802-1847) frequently welcomed Vuk Karadžić, to take part in the debates there regarding language reform. Another visitor was the Slovak Jan Kollár, Lutheran clergyman in Pest and the great poet and ideologist of cultural panslavism (see §8.9).

Culturally, the printing press in Buda was important. The press, which had been in Buda from 1577, became property of the Jesuit university there in 1648. In 1777, after the dissolution of the Jesuit order in 1773, the university, including the printing press, became state property. In the same year, the law Ratio educationis granted each of the seven nationalities in Hungary the right to education in its own national language. The Buda printing press received the privilege to publish school books in Hungary.

The literary publications and activities that emanated from this printing press belong properly to the history of Serb nation-building and do not concern us here - even though Bulgarians may have witnessed these developments, have profited from them, and may have been inspired by them. More specifically relevant to us is the fact that a Bulgarian production of such was in fact sparked off in Budapest.

With the arrival of the Cyrillic typesets and the Emperor’s permission to print in Slav languages, Bulgarians were also able to publish their works in Budapest. And from 1801 until 1820,
with the exception of Sofronij Vračanski’s *Kiriakodromion* (printed in Bucharest), all books that appeared in Bulgarian were printed in Buda\(^{742}\).

The first book with a Bulgarian topic to be printed on the Buda university press was the *Istorija slavenno-bolgarskog naroda* (History of the Slav-Bulgarian people), written by Atanas Nešković (1801)\(^{743}\), a Serb from Srem\(^{744}\). The book was an adaptation of the famous four-volumed *Istorija razných slavenských narodov, naj-pač Bolgar, Horvatov i Serbov* (History of various Slavic peoples, especially the Bulgarians, Croats and Serbs) by Jovan Rajić (1794-1795, see also §2.6). It has been suggested that the adaptation was ordered by Bulgarian merchants, since it is dedicated to merchant Nikolaj Černojević, a well-known merchant of the time\(^{745}\). Nešković himself did not mention for which public he wrote his history: Serbs, Bulgarians, or both. It is written in a mix of Serbian and Bulgarian elements\(^{746}\), ‘for the sons of the fatherland’ (за синове отечества\(^{747}\)).

Nešković took from the work of Rajić only those parts that referred to Bulgarian history\(^{748}\). Interesting is that Nešković was much less outspoken about the fate of the Bulgarians, in comparison to Rajić. Compare the following passages:

\begin{align*}
\textbf{Rajić} & & \quad \textbf{Nešković} \\
\text{Попадше они под иго турское и до дняшнего дне под ярмом их стенут.} & & \quad \text{И от того времени подпала в Болгария под поданство турско и до данашнего дня.}\,\text{749}
\\
\text{They fell under the Turkish yoke and until today they moan under their burden.} & & \quad \text{And from that time Bulgaria fell under Turkish subjection until today.}
\end{align*}

The history by Nešković became well-known and was widely read among Bulgarians in the Habsburg Empire, even more when, in 1844, it was translated by Petar Sapunov into standardised Bulgarian and a further 2040 copies were printed in Bucharest. It was the most accessible way for Bulgarians to learn of Jovan Rajić’s ideas, especially his thesis that Bulgarians were of Slav origin. Rajić had been the first to claim this; as we have seen, it was taken up later, by Jurij Venelin in Russia (see §7.7)\(^{750}\).

\(^{742}\) Venediktov, "O pervoj novobolgarskoj pečatnoj knige", 188.  
\(^{743}\) Radev, Enciklopedija, 92.  
\(^{744}\) In Bulgarian, his name is written Neskiovic. It is interesting to note that some Bulgarian scholars of later time, starting with Marin Drinov in 1890, considered Nešković to be of Bulgarian origin. Miltenova, “Njakoi nabljudenija”, 116.  
\(^{745}\) Penev, Načalo, 360.  
\(^{746}\) Miltenova, “Njakoi nabljudenija”, 116.  
\(^{747}\) Ibid.  
\(^{748}\) Miltenova, “Njakoi nabljudenija”, 117.  
\(^{749}\) Ibid., 119.  
\(^{750}\) Ibid., 120.
The first books from the Buda press that are generally accepted as being written in Bulgarian were published in 1814\textsuperscript{751}. These were: the *Slovo, iskazanoe zaradi umiranie* (Lecture, spoken because of dying) and the *Povest radi strašnago i vtorago prišestvija Hristova* (Story about the terrible and second coming of Christ), by Joakim Kârčovski\textsuperscript{752}.

Another Bulgarian who published work in Buda before 1820 was a student of Kârčovski, named Kiril Pejičinovič\textsuperscript{753}. He was igumen of a monastery close to Skopje. In his work *Kniga sija zovomaja* Ogledalo ([Book named] Looking Glass), he was assisted financially by a certain pop Kosta from Prizren\textsuperscript{754}.

Later publications followed, by Rajno Popovič, Hristaki Pavlovič and his pupil Todor Hrulev, Emanuil Vaskidovič, K. Teodorovič and G.M. Vladykin\textsuperscript{755}. Most of the books were concerned, in some way or another, with issues surrounding the standardisation of the language (see §6.2). Pejičinovič stated that he had written his book *Ogledalo* ‘in the simplest language’, which proves that he was influenced by the ideas of Vuk Karadžić (see §8.6), and K. Teodorovič and G.M. Vladykin used the foreword of *Bibličeska povest vethago zaveta* to emphasize the need to come to one standard language.

Judging by the list of subscribers to the works published between 1814 and 1819 in Buda, it is clear that book production mainly served two groups of Bulgarians: the clergy and the merchants.

After the Brašov group, the group including Petâr Beron that envisaged a series of school books in Bulgarian(see § 4.5), fell apart, their programme was not completely forgotten. Some books that were planned were realised after all, but in Buda instead of Brašov. In 1825 Atanas Stojanov Kotljanin (Kipilovski) published in Buda his *Svjaštennoe cvetoobranie ili sto i četyre svjaštenni istorii* (Holy anthology or hundred and four holy stories)\textsuperscript{756}, ten years later followed by *Kratkoe načertanie na vseobštata istorija* (A short sketch of the universal history) (1836).

\textsuperscript{751} Venediktov, "O pervoj novobolgarskoj pečatnoj knige", 187-194 references a book called Molitvennyj Krin, that was published in Buda in 1806. The Russian philologist, Ivan Sreznevskij mentioned this book in a letter to Hanka in 1846. Unfortunately it is not known who compiled the book, and no copy has survived. Therefore it is impossible to say more about it here.

\textsuperscript{752} Rusinov, “Izdanijata”, 171.

\textsuperscript{753} Radev, Enciklopedija, 92.

\textsuperscript{754} Kiril Pejičinovič, *Kniga sija zovomaja ogledalo* (Budapest, 1816), title page.

\textsuperscript{755} Rusinov, “Izdanijata”, 172.

\textsuperscript{756} This work was translated from a German work. Nadežda Andreewa-Popowa. “Die Europäische Aufklärung und die bulgarische Wiedergeburt”, in Aufklärung und Nationen im Osten Europas, ed. L. Sziklay (Corvina Kiadó, 1983), 259.
Vasil Nenovič published in 1825 his *Sveštennaja istorija cerkovna* (Holy church history), and in 1826 a primer called *Bukvar za decata na slavjano-bolgarskij-et narod* (Primer for children of the Slavo-Bulgarian people).

Vasil Nenovič was a merchant and it is highly likely that he visited Budapest in person. But from his correspondence it is clear, however, that his cousin, P.S. Nenovič, took care of his affairs in Buda. In a letter from the 12th of March 1825, Nenovič asked his cousin to invite Nešković to proofread his church history, apparently because he was seen as an authority in the field of historiography:

Ако има таквици хора да разумеват от нашите болгарски, или ако не, а то каке на типографията да го. Афанасия Несковича, ако цъл да го приемат за коректора на тази книжка, тоест ако го намерите и господство Ви мунасип, защо ако има други по-добър, може по-добриет да бъде.

If there are no people who understand Bulgarian, then tell the print shop to engage mr. Afanasij Nešković as corrector for this book, that is if you find him and he is willing, however if there is someone else better, let him do it.

Among the subscribers to Nenovič’s history were Anton Ivanovič, the benefactor of Petăr Beron (see §4.5), and Ivan Načovič, who each paid for 500 copies. Petko Mihailovič and hadži Iordan Nenovič each paid for 100 copies.

In 1837, Rajno Popovič, who had been teacher of Petăr Beron and Atanas Kipilovski in Kotel, published his educational book *Hristoitija ili blagonravie* (Hristoithija or morality) in Buda. Popovič shared the ideology of the Brašov group, witness the fact that he claimed to write the book ‘in a simple style so that even children could understand it’, but already for the title of his book, he had to admit that there was no Bulgarian word equivalent to ‘Hristoithija’ and so he chose the Church Slavic word ‘blagonravie’. Not only the supporters of the New-Bulgarian school in the language debate found their way to the printing press in Buda. In 1844 Hristaki Pavlovič, who was a follower of the Church Slavic school, published in Buda Paisij Hilendarski’s *Istorija slavenobolgarskaja*, transmitted until
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then in manuscript. Pavlović gave his book the title *Carstvennik ili istorija bolgarskaja* (Book of kings or Bulgarian history)\(^{763}\). Perhaps because of the choice of the language variant to be used, this publication did not receive the attention that later editions had (see §5.3).

There were a number of reasons why Bulgarians chose the Buda press over Serbian presses at this time. Firstly, the press in Buda was technically better and produced higher quality books. Importantly, the print shop also had its own type-foundry. Vasil Nenović made use of this when he was preparing his *Sveštennaja istorija cerkovna*, and requested that the letters ŏ and ō, both with and without accent (to render the sounds ā and jā with and without accent) be cast\(^{764}\). He defended them in the preface to his book, where he claimed that ŏ and ō were in use 'у ветхите книги' (in the old books) and that more important, they were pronounced as separate sounds:

> А ныне и до ныне держим таково-то произношение на ó, зато имамы потребность и да го пишем\(^{765}\).

And we still keep until today that pronunciation of ā, therefore we must also write it.

Another point in favour of Buda was the presence of wealthy Bulgarian merchants, who could assist writers in raising the money needed to print their books. And perhaps the most important reason was that the costs of printing in Buda were lower than in Serbia. This can be seen in a letter by Atanas Kipilovski to Rajno Popović of 1836, in which he wrote:

> Вероятно мислите да напечатате книгата си в Сърбия. Там печатането е два и половина пъти по-скъпо, отколкото в Пешта\(^{766}\).

You are probably considering to print your book in Serbia. Printing there is two and a half times as expensive as in Pest.

It was also in Budapest that Bulgarians bought one of the first set of Church Slavonic letters to be used in Bulgaria. The letters that Nikola Karastojanov used in the print shop in Samokov (see §6.3) were purchased in Buda in 1836\(^{767}\).

> The printing press of Buda, and thereby the city itself, lost its important role for the culture of the Bulgarians eventually to Serbia\(^{768}\).
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\(^{763}\) Ibid.

\(^{764}\) Rusinov, “Izdanijata”, 172.

\(^{765}\) Nenović, Svjaštennaja istorija, ii.

\(^{766}\) Ivan Snegarov, Prinos k biografijata na Rajno Popović (Sofija, 1959), 75, quoted in Rusinov, “Izdanijata”, 172.

\(^{767}\) Radev, Enciklopedija, 93.
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§8.3 Bulgarians in the smaller cities of Transylvania

As early as the Middle Ages, in the thirteenth century, Bulgarians from both Bulgaria and Walachia fled in times of anarchy across the Danube to the Habsburg lands. The number of Bulgarian émigrés in Habsburg rose dramatically in 1802 and 1803, because of the kárdžalijstvo and related riots and unrests in Walachia. Around the middle of the eighteenth century, there were sizeable Bulgarian colonies in Alvine, Deva (both in Transylvania), Vinga and Bešenov (both in Banat).

The elite of Transylvania was ardently protestant. This underpinned their arguments about the availability of (not only religious) books in the spoken language of the people. In the sixteenth century the print shops in Transylvania were thus provided with Cyrillic letters, in which Romanian was printed at the time. These letters were also used for books in Bulgarian.

In Brașov, there was a large Bulgarian colony until well into the 1830s. Bulgarians occupied an entire quarter of the city, which was called Bolgarszeg (in Hungarian). Among the inhabitants of the community were teacher Vasil Nenović, translator and philologist Atanas Kipilovski and doctor Ivan Seliminski. Also Petăr Beron was active there, who fled to Brașov after the Greek-Romanian insurrection of 1821. His primer, the first Bulgarian book to be printed in Brașov after the insurrection, appeared in 1824. Vasil Aprilov was another Bulgarian intellectual who studied in Brașov, he attended the German grammar school there (see §7.8).

§8.4 Vienna as a cultural centre

Although the number of Bulgarians in Vienna was not as high as in Budapest, Vienna also had a significant impact on Bulgarians and the development of national ideas among them. After all, Vienna as the capital of the enormous Habsburg Empire had a large concentration of scholars and cultural and academic institutions within its walls (or, after 1850, within its Ringstrasse). This was,
for instance, the city where Josef Dobrovský, in 1822, published his grammar of Old Church Slavonic.

The role that Vienna played in the printing of books in the Bulgarian language was much greater than that of Buda and Pest, especially in the later Văzraždane, after 1850. Between 1845 and 1878 no less than 341 books in Bulgarian were printed in Vienna773, most of them schoolbooks774. They were, in majority, from the period between 1852 and 1878, when in the print shop of Somer in Vienna alone, 248 Bulgarian books appeared.

The first Bulgarian book that was published in Vienna, in 1845, was a translation of a part of Fênelon’s novel Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d’Ulysse775. It was followed by books from Hristo G. Danov, Dr. Mančov, Ivan Momčilov and Joakim Gruev.

Most Bulgarian books were printed on the presses of L. Somer and of the Order of Mechitharists776. The Mechitharists were particularly important in the production of Bulgarian works, as they had at their disposal an unusually wide range of fonts. The Mechitharists were a catholic order of Armenians, originally led by the abbot Mechithar, who fled persecution in their native country and established themselves in Venice in 1717777. There they set up a composing room, and in 1789 they obtained a printing press778 and the authorisation to print books in the Armenian and Latin alphabets. In 1776 they expanded to Triest, where the Greek colony was one of their largest customers779. After the Pressburg peace of 1805, when Venice was handed over to Napoleon, the members of the order sought refuge in Vienna, where they restarted their publishing house in 1811, this time also with permission to print in ‘orientalischen und occidentalischen Sprachen’780. In 1828, they also were given the right to start a publishing house and a bookshop (‘das Recht eines Verlags- und Sortimentsbuchhandels’)781. In 1838 the print shop, that had just been rebuilt following a fire in the previous year, was further equipped with a workshop to cut and cast new letters. This made it possible to develop a large collection of fonts: the largest collection of Armenian fonts in the world, and also a wide range of Latin, Greek and Cyrillic ones. When Vuk

775 Radev, Enciklopedija, 169, mentioned that the first Bulgarian book printed in Vienna was in 1849. He probably has the first original Bulgarian work in mind. Unfortunately this entry does not mention the title nor the name of the author.
776 Ibid.
778 Ibid.
779 Ibid., 2.
780 Ibid., 6.
781 Ibid., 19.
Karadžić had his Serbian-Latin-German dictionary printed by the Mechitarists in 1818, he was not satisfied with the letters that were used and he himself assisted in the cutting of some new sets.\(^\text{782}\)

The Mechitarists were the printers of the Bulgarian translation mentioned above of Fénelon’s novel *Télémaque*, which appeared in 1845.\(^\text{783}\) It was translated by Paraskev Piperov, a merchant in Leipzig and Odessa.\(^\text{784}\) The Mechitarists further realized Ivan Momčilov’s *Cărkoven cvetnik* (Church anthology), a book written in a combination of New Bulgarian and Church Slavonic. As an appendix, it includes the Gospel of the unbelieving Thomas in Greek (printed in Greek letters), Turkish, French and Romanian (all printed in Cyrillic letters).\(^\text{785}\)

The Mechitarists also printed *Mirozrenie* (World View), one of the first Bulgarian magazines, which appeared in 1850 and 1851. It was edited by Ivan Dobrovski.\(^\text{786}\) This magazine, in which the austroslavic ideology of its editor was reflected, was read by people like Petăr Beron, Josef Jireček, Bishop Strossmayer, Vuk Karadžić, Najden Gerov and even by an orthodox priest in Manchester.\(^\text{787}\)

In the print shop of Somer, the Bulgarian *Letostruj ili domašen kalendar* (Annals or home calendar), edited by Hristo Danov (1869), Joakim Gruev (1870-74) and Janko Kovačev (1875-76) was made.

Later, in 1874, Hristo Danov and Janko Kovačev opened a Bulgarian printing press in Vienna, or rather a Bulgarian subdivision of the publishing house of A. Kais and F. Löb. About forty books and five periodicals were realized on their press.\(^\text{788}\) After the liberation of Bulgaria, in 1878, the shop was moved to Plovdiv and later, in 1881, to the new capital Sofia.\(^\text{789}\)

Initially, Bulgarians who had their works published in Vienna, travelled for short periods to the city. Later, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the Habsburg capital also became a cultural centre for Bulgarians through the Bulgarians that lived there. The first significant group of Bulgarians in Vienna were merchants that moved there in the 1850s.\(^\text{790}\) They organised themselves culturally for the first time in 1863, when the čitalište *Napredak* (Progress) was founded.\(^\text{791}\)

---

\(^\text{782}\) Ibid., 23.

\(^\text{783}\) Wytrzens, “Die Bedeutung”, 128.
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\(^\text{785}\) Wytrzens, “Die Bedeutung”, 130.
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\(^\text{787}\) Ibid.
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\(^\text{789}\) Udolph, “Österreichisch-bulgari sche Kulturbeziehungen”, 224.

\(^\text{790}\) Radev, Enciklopedija, 169.

\(^\text{791}\) Ibid.
The Slovene Jernej Kopitar (1780-1844) was a key figure in the developing academic discipline of slavistics in the first half of the nineteenth century. He is considered one of the three ‘founding fathers’ of slavistics. His position in the Habsburg capital, where he was censor of Slavic and Greek texts for the court and librarian in the Royal library, enabled him to establish contacts with Slavs and non-Slavs from all over Europe. His importance for slavistics can be compared to that of the brothers Grimm for Germanic philology. Like the brothers Grimm, Kopitar was a central figure in an international web of scholars.

Kopitar had received a solid education in the secondary school of Ljubljana and through the patriotic circle of Baron Zois, who was the centre of a circle of people in Ljubljana who dedicated themselves to science in the Enlightenment tradition. Faithful to his education, Kopitar worked on a wide range of topics, like (historical) linguistics of the different Slav nations, and history. He also studied small and little-known ethnic groups, like the Bulgarians. One of his merits, at least according to himself, was that he put the Bulgarians on the academic map. In 1838 he wrote:

Hab’ich nicht zu erst die Bulgaren aus dem Servischen Chaos ausgeschieden, worin sie von Dobr.[ovský j.s.] geworfen worden?

Already in his first major work, Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Kärnten, Krain und Steiermark, which was published in Ljubljana in 1808, Kopitar recognised the Bulgarians as a Slavic tribe, distinct from the Illyrians, but in his classification of Slavic languages he maintained Dobrovský’s organisation, in which Bulgarian was seen as a dialect of Serbian. Later, Kopitar did acknowledge Bulgarian as a language in its own right, separate from Serbian, and stimulated his pupil Vuk Karadžić to investigate the Bulgarian language. He wrote:

Herr Vuk könnte uns im übrigen auch etwas über die bulgarische Mundart sagen, die bisher für Serbisch gehalten wurde.

Kopitar made incidental remarks about grammatical aspects of the Bulgarian language in his reviews of Petru Maior’s Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachiia (1813) and the first part...
of Dobrovský’s *Slovanka* (1814)\(^796\). One year later, in his review of the second volume of *Slovanka* Kopitar expressed the hope that the British Bible Society would succeed in translating the Bible into Bulgarian\(^797\). In that same year, in a review of Karadžić’s grammar *Pismenica* of 1814, he asked the author to inform the world about the Bulgarian language:

...которое до сих пор считали сербским[...] А всё таки не только в лингвистическом, но и в историческом отношении было бы важно знать это. В Болгарии, как в Краине, славяне появляются лет на двести раньше, чем в остальном Иллирике. Кирилл, говорят, перевел Библию для Болгар\(^798\).

…that until now is considered Serbian [...] It is important to know more not only from a linguistic, but also from a historical point of view. The Slavs appeared in Bulgaria about two hundred years before the rest of Illyria, like they did in Krajina. Cyril, they say, translated the Bible for the Bulgarians.

And indeed, in the second volume of Karadžić’s *Pesmarica* (Song book) of 1815, a Bulgarian song is included (see §8.6). After the publication of Karadžić’s *Dodatâk* (see §8.6), Kopitar was certain about the separate existence of a Bulgarian language, and in his review of Dobrovský’s *Institutiones*, he claimed that the use of the definite article and loss of cases made Bulgarian very interesting for him. He considered Bulgarian as the only ‘modern’ language, which was related to other Slavic languages in the same way as French, Italian and other Romance languages were related to Latin\(^799\).

Kopitar is the father of the Pannonian theory, a view that claims that the oldest written Slavic language, which Kopitar called Old Slovene, originated in the Slovenian territory of Pannonia. In his correspondence with the great Russian scholar Vostokov, Kopitar said that Bulgarians and Slovenians belong to one branch of Slavs\(^800\).

Kopitar met with Russian slavists, and with the historian Pogodin, twice, in 1835 and 1839. When Kopitar and Jozef Balthazar Sylvestre\(^801\) were preparing their edition of the *Rheims Gospel*, Pogodin, in his magazine *Moskvitjanin*, called upon the Russian academy to support the
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\(^{796}\) Petrovskij, “O zanjatijah”, 27.

\(^{797}\) Ibid.

\(^{798}\) Ibid., 28-29.

\(^{799}\) Penev, Българската литература през първата половина, 176.

\(^{800}\) Čurkina, “Ernej Kopitar”, 397.

\(^{801}\) Jozef Balthazar Sylvestre (1791-1861) was a French paleographer who met Jernej Kopitar on his first journey to Rome in 1837. Sylvestre discussed the Rheims gospel with Kopitar, since he was appointed to search for a professional slavist for its publication.
publication. This edition came out in 1844 with 13,000 francs of Russian money and was dedicated to Czar Nikolaj I. Kopitar's Pannonian theory explains why he was concerned with the fate of medieval Slavic manuscripts. In this regard, in 1822, he proposed to send an expedition to Athos to copy or buy the oldest manuscripts. He agreed to cooperate with Josef Dobrovský, after reading about Joseph Carlyle's mission to Mount Athos, who described the Slavic manuscripts of the monasteries there. Kopitar was of the view that the old manuscripts could be useful in the quest to purge Russisms from the Church Slavonic language which, in his theory, originated in what was then the Habsburg empire. When in 1830 Kopitar heard that Jurij Venelin was preparing a trip to the Balkans (see §7.7), he was afraid that Venelin had been sent to Athos by the Czar to buy precious Slavic manuscripts there, and urged his superiors even harder to send a mission to Athos, since 'es nun die höchste Zeit ist, diesen intakten Schatz, wo möglich, noch vor den Russen zu exploitieren.' In fact, Venelin had been sent to collect material on Bulgarian language and folklore.

In any case, Kopitar's plan was not carried out for lack of money. Twelve manuscripts were nevertheless brought to the Austrian imperial internuntius Franz von Ottenfels-Geschwind in Istanbul by the sultan.

One aspect of Bulgarian which was of particular interest to Kopitar was the existence of nasal vowels. The first one to mention their existence was Pavel Jozef Šafárik, following the conclusions of Vostokov. Kopitar was not keen to acknowledge this position since it undermined his Pannonian theory.

In the years when Kopitar undertook his pioneering work for the recognition of Bulgarian, he had no contact with Bulgarians. But later, towards the end of his life, some personal contacts developed. In 1842, for example, Kopitar received a copy, with a dedication from the author, of Vasil Aprilov's *Dennica novo-bolgarskago obrazovanija* (see §7.8) 'в знак уважения' (as a token of esteem). In Kopitar’s library, a copy of Aprilov’s *Bălgarskite knižnicy* was found also, as well as Hristaki Pavlovič’s *Pismennik* and the *Bolgarska grammatika* of Neofit Rilski. Other books
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with a Bulgarian theme in Kopitar’s collection were: *Starye i nynešnie bolgare* … (see §7.7) by Jurij Venelin, a geography by Ivan Bogorov, and one by Neofit Bozveli and Emmanuil Vaskidović. From the latter two there was also an Arithmetic and a pedagogic book809. Furthermore, he possessed a copy of Hadži Joakim’s810 *Povest radi strašnago i vtorago prišestvija Hristova* which he described as ‘duos sermones ridiculissimos’811.

The role that Kopitar played in the development of Bulgarian studies was and is viewed differently by different scholars. While some Bulgarians see him as a great benefactor to the development of the Bulgarian identity, others regard him as no more than an agent of political austroslavism, a movement which aimed at joining all Slavs in one state under the Habsburg Emperor. Kopitar was indeed the greatest champion of austroslavism. He saw the Habsburg Empire as the ideal place for Slavs to form a single state of their own. Kopitar was quite sceptical of Russian panslavism, which also aimed to bring all Slavs together in one empire, but under the Russian Czar.

§8.6 Vuk Karadžić

While Jernej Kopitar provided the impetus to investigate Bulgarian and the Bulgarians, and to introduce Bulgarian as a separate language in the discourse of slavists of his time, the actual work was carried out by the Serb Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (1787-1864).

The Serb linguist Vuk Karadžić was largely self-taught. When he came to Vienna, he started to collaborate with Jernej Kopitar. He was urged to study Bulgarian next to Serbian not only by Kopitar, but also by Pavle Solarić, the Serb who was responsible for the printing press in Venice. It seems that Solarić was interested in Bulgarian as part of a larger plan to gain insight into Balkan languages in general. He wrote to Karadžić:

Замолите Г-на Kopitara с моје стране, нек Вам каже, пак ми јавите: у власком језику, кроме речи Римски и Славенски, и нешто Грчки, чији речи има јоште и који или којега језика речи има у њему највише, мање, јоште мање, и до најмање. Такође Власи, који себе зову Славене? Како Грке? Како Мађаре? Како Немце? Како Италијане и Французе? Постарајте се ту у Бечу, увредати каква Бугарина, и испитати у њем Бугарско наречје812
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Ask Mr. Kopitar in my name, to tell you, and then you inform me: if in the Walachian language, apart from Latin or Slavonic, or some Greek words, there are any other words or other languages, and, if so, which is the dominant one, which is less, even less and the least present. What about the Walachians who call themselves Slavs? What about Greeks? And Hungarians? And Germans? What about Italians and French? Make sure that there, in Vienna, you catch one Bulgarian, and sound him out about the Bulgarian dialect.

In Vienna, Karadžić met with a Bulgarian merchant from the area of Razlog, now in the southwestern part of Bulgaria. From him he learned Bulgarian folksongs. When in 1815 the second volume of Karadžić’s Narodna srpska Pesmarica (National Serbian Songbook) appeared, which included one Bulgarian song, he explained in his preface that he had more than twenty Bulgarian songs, but he did not want to publish them until he knew that they were indeed pronounced in the way that they were written down in his copy. He promised to include them in a third volume, even with accents. This volume never appeared, however. In 1817, Karadžić wrote in a letter to Lukijan Mušicki that Sima Milutinović (Sarajlija) was working on a Bulgarian grammar and collecting songs in Vidin. Mušicki suggested that he would add a Bulgarian translation of a Serbian comedy, but in fact he only published one Bulgarian fairytale.

In 1821, Kopitar asked Karadžić for information about the language of the Gypsies, which he considered to be just as much of interest as Bulgarian. Karadžić was a bit reluctant to take up this case. He answered:

аше књижевне наручибине нећу заборавити, колико и буде могуће испунити; али то још у напредак знајте, да од бугарскога и од циганскога језика неће бити ништа.

Your literary recommendations I will not forget, as far as it is possible to carry them out: but know already in advance, that from the Bulgarian and Gypsy language nothing will result.

Despite his low expectations, Karadžić started to research the Bulgarian language. In the beginning of 1822, he published the first linguistic work concerning Bulgarian. In Vienna he published, as a supplement to the paper Novine Srbske, his Dodatak k Sanktpeterburgskim sravniteljnim jrešnicima sviju jezika i narečija (Addendum to the Saint Petersburg comparative dictionaries of all languages and dialects). It was a reaction to the comparative dictionary that Catherine the Great
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had published in 1787-1788 (see §7.4). The booklet of 54 pages includes a list of words, adding to the Russian, Illyrian and Serbian forms as included in the dictionary, a corrected Serbian and a Bulgarian version. Then it continues with translations from parts of the New Testament.

In his research for this publication, Karadžić again made use of informants from the area of Razlog, in the west of Bulgaria. He personally knew the Bulgarian Lazar German, who came to Vienna, speaking no language but Bulgarian, and all Bulgarians who frequented Kopitar and Karadžić’s favourite inn, ‘Zum weissen Wolfe’819.

Furthermore Karadžić used Bulgarian material that Sima Milutinović Sarajlija from Vidin and Dimitrij Frucić had sent him. Another source was the four-language dictionary of Daniil of Moschopolis (see §3.4)820. In the Dodatak, Karadžić noted that he knew only three works that were published in Bulgarian, namely a small booklet (in octavo) about suffering, which must be Joakim Kârčovski’s Sija kniga glagolemaa mitarstva (This book, called suffering), printed in Buda in 1817; various admonitions by Kârčovski (the sermones ridiculissimos, as Kopitar described them); and the above-mentioned tetraglosson of Daniil821. He also observed that Leake included Bulgarian words (in Latin script) in his book Researches in Greece of 1813822.

Karadžić’s Dodatak can be seen as a response to Dobrovský’s Institutiones, in which the status of Bulgarian as an independent language was disputed. The appearance of the Dodatak thus had a great effect on the position of Bulgarian as an object of study for slavists. Suddenly, Bulgarian merchants in Vienna, Zemun, Belgrade, Banat and Russia were regarded as interesting, and were questioned about their language by various scholars823.

In wider circles of Habsburg intellectuals however, Bulgarian literature never became as popular as Serbian literature, which was well known thanks to the works of Karadžić. There was considerably less information about Bulgarian and Bulgarians in the magazines of Vienna. In Archiv für Geographie 152 of 1822, it was even remarked that, although Russian slavists were enthusiastic about the appearance of the Dodatak, it would be better if Vuk had spent his effort in preparing the rest of his collection of Serbian folk songs824.

After the publication of the Dodatak, Karadžić entered into a discussion with his friend, the Russian scholar Pëtr Ivanovič Köppen, who had used the services of the Bucharest-based Bulgarian Mustakov, when he was collecting Bulgarian language material. Köppen learned from
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Mustakov, who originated from Gabrovo in the east of Bulgaria, that the language of the *Dodatak*, which reflected the spoken language along the Serbian border, was not typical for Bulgaria as a whole⁸²⁵. Köppen wrote in the Vienna *Jahrbücher für Literatur*:

…aber auch dieses soll, wie mich sachkundige Bulgaren, welche den Ternawer Dialekt den übrigen vorziehen, verzicherten, hauptsächlich nur diejenige Mundrat betreffen, die an der Gränze Serbiens gesprochen wird…⁸²⁶

Thus the discussion about which dialect to use as the basis of a standard language was first held among foreigners, and only about a decade later, became topical among Bulgarian intellectuals (see §6.2).

At the time of their release, the *Dodatak* and other works by Karadžić were little known in Bulgaria⁸²⁷. Indeed, Karadžić did not have any contact with intellectual Bulgarians until much later. His correspondence does not mention any Bulgarians in the years from 1811 until 1825⁸²⁸.

In 1840, Karadžić met with Odessa-based Bulgarians Spiridon Palauzov (see §7.11) and Dimitar Mutev, who were on their way to a university in Germany. Through Palauzov, Karadžić was acquainted with the Russian scholar Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskij and the Bulgarian patriot Ivan Denkoglu (see §7.10). He became personally acquainted with Najden Gerov, Sava Filaretov, and was aware of the works of Nikolaj Toškov, Ivan Bogorov and Georgi Rakovski⁸²⁹.

In the second half of the century, when the *Văzraždane* was in full progress, Karadžić’s ideas became very popular among Bulgarians. In particular, he influenced the way in which some Bulgarian intellectuals thought about language standardisation. In his view, the language of the people should form the base of any literary language, spelling should be strictly phonetic and graphics should be adapted to represent as precisely and reliably as possible the sounds of the language⁸³⁰. Ljuben Karavelov (see §7.9) especially advocated Karadžić’s ideas on orthography and dedicated his collection of Bulgarian folk songs to him and the Miladinov brothers. P.R. Slavejkov introduced the phonetic spelling that Karadžić advocated in his magazine *Gajda* (Bagpipe)⁸³¹.
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In 1859, Karadžić wrote two similar letters to Najden Gerov, then Russian consul in Plovdiv, and Sava Filaretov. He asked them to inform him about city and village names in all of the Bulgarian lands and their inhabitants. He needed this information for a book ‘about Serbs and Bulgarians’, on which he was working\footnote{Ibid., 327.}. In Karadžić’s archive several folksongs labelled as Bulgarian were found after his death, six of which he had received from Maksim Škrlić from Radujevac\footnote{Ibid.}. There was also a list of words made by a certain Geča Boroolu from Loveč, which he had received from Köppen\footnote{Polenakovi'k, “Drugi, neobjavljeni”, 10.}. This indicates that Karadžić was interested in learning about the eastern dialects of Bulgarian in addition to the western variant that he had learned in Vienna.

§8.7 The West Slavs and the Bulgarians

When in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century the academic discipline of slavistics developed, Czech and Slovak scholars became trendsetters\footnote{Kohn, Pan-slavism, 3}. The discipline of slavistics developed quickly in the Czech and Slovak lands, especially in Prague, in the period after 1781. In that year, Emperor Joseph II issued his Toleranzpatent, which gave protestants the same rights as catholics. In the same period, he ended bondage, which still existed in Bohemia and Hungary, and introduced German as state language to replace Latin in Austria. This development provoked a fear of Germanisation among Czechs, and among Slovaks the fear that Hungarian would be imposed throughout the Hungarian kingdom (which indeed briefly happened in 1844). A group of scholars thus took up the task of conscious nation-building. Exponents among Slovaks were Juraj Papánek (Historia Gentis Slavae. De regno regnibusque Slavorum atque cum prisci civilis et ecclesiastici, tum huins aevi statu gentis Slavae, 1780) and Juraj Sklenar (Vetustissimus Magnae Moraviae situs et primus in eam Hungarorum ingressus et incursus, 1784), who represented Slovaks as the heirs to the kingdom of Great Moravia\footnote{Peter Petro, A history of Slovak literature (Liverpool: Liverpool university press, 1995), 44.}.

A number of Czech and Slovak students had at German universities become acquainted with the ideas of Herder and they had witnessed how they had led to a national revival among
Germans. Ján Kollár, for instance, as a student in Jena, had been present at the Wartburgfest, which had made a deep impression on him.837

This developing notion of nationalism was combined with the growing influence of Russia, which since the Napoleonic wars had turned into one of the leading powers of Europe. Together, these two tendencies created the idea of Slavic unity, the idea that all Slavic people form one nation, and that it is up to Russia to take the lead in establishing freedom for the Slavs. From the beginning, this Russia-oriented form of Slav nationalism was at odds with the Austro-Slavic tendency, that looked to Vienna as a focus.

A major expression of panslavism was the Prague Slav Congress of 1848. Directly or indirectly, it affected all Slav groups in Europe. Bulgarians were not present there, but news about it did reach Bulgarians, at least those who were living outside of the Ottoman Empire838.

Although the Czech influence on Bulgarians was always smaller than the Russian and Serbian influence, and direct contacts between Bulgarians and Czechs were weak839, the ideas of the Czech and Slovak scholars did reach the Bulgarians, mainly via Russia.

Šafárik’s Slovanské starožitnosti (Slav antiquities), for example (see §8.10), was translated into Russian by the Russian scholar Osip Bodjanskij, who had gone to Prague in 1837 in order to prepare himself for the Chair of Slavistics that he was going to take up in Moscow (see §7.3)840.

It was common for Russian scholars in the 1830s to have frequent contacts with West Slav scholars. Apart from Bodjanskij, Pogodin (see §7.6), Prejs, Sreznevskij841, Grigorovič, and Panov (see § 7.3), many others departed on a Grand Tour of Slav lands early in their academic career, and maintained the friendships they had made abroad.

Later, when economies developed, or more precisely the increased traffic along the Ottoman-Habsburg trade routes enabled Bulgarians to be in closer contact with the Habsburg world, the relationships between Bulgarians and the West Slavs (especially the Czechs) intensified. After 1848, a substantial number of Bulgarians went to Tábor, Prague and Písek to gain a proper education842. When Hristo Danov wrote the article Das Gymnasium und die landwirtschaftliche Schule zu Tábor (in der Tschechei) in the Letostruj (Annals) for 1870, he reviewed the grammar school and agricultural school in Tábor favourably, which made them both quite popular. From the
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opening of the grammar school in 1866 until 1878, an average of between 20 and 25 Bulgarian scholars attended the school, with peaks up to 90.  

§8.8 Josef Dobrovský

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the pre-panslavist ideas of Josef Dobrovský (1753-1829), the 'patriarch of slavistics', were most successful in reaching a Bulgarian audience. Dobrovský for a long time did not consider Bulgarian to be an independent language. In his *Slovanka* (Slav woman) from 1814, he made his position in this regard very clear:

*...Mehrere Schriftsteller versichern, das Bulgarische sey ein eigner, obgleich sehr grober, Slawischer Dialekt: aber keiner hat uns noch Proben davon gegeben. Weder eine Bulgarische Grammatik, noch ein Bulgarisches Lexicon, ist mir bekannt. Beydes müsste gleichwohl für die Geschichte sehr wichtig werden. Vielleicht hat die Sprache der heutigen Bulgaren noch Wörter in sich, die uns auf die Spur brächten, was die alten nich-slawischen Bulgaren für ein Volk gewesen...* 

Das Bulgarische kann mann für keine eigene Species gelten lassen. Es gehört unter das Servische oder Illyrische. Die Bulgaren griechischer Religion haben keine andere Bücher, als die Servier, und die Römisch-katholischen richten sich nach den Dalmatischen.... Nach den Proben, die ich als einen Beytrag zu dem Petersburger allgemeinen Vocabulario erhielt, zu urtheilen, gehöret das Bulgarische, wie gesagt, unter das Illyrische, und zwar, wenn man diess in zwey Varietäten, in das Bosnisch-Dalmatische und Servisch-Macedonische theilt, mehr zum letztern... 

*Das Bulgarische Vater unser, wie mann es bey Chamberlayne und in andern Sammlungen findet, ist bis auf unbedeutende Abweichungen das Dalmatisch-Illyrische...* 

Dobrovský might have been drawn to this conclusion by the ideas of J. Chr. Adelung, who stated in 1809, in *Mithridates*, that the Bulgarians were a Tatar people (see §7.4), which came to the Balkans in the fifth century and conquered the Illyrians.  

In 1822, Dobrovský published in Vienna the first scholarly grammar of Old Church Slavonic, the *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris*. This work is seen as the foundation of modern slavistics. In it, Dobrovský called Old Church Slavonic of Old Serbian origin. In  

---

843 Paskaleva, “Bulgarische Studenten”, 60.  
844 Behinjova, “Českata slavistika”, 319.  
845 Dobrovský, Slovanka, 193-194.  
846 Ibid., 194.  
847 Ibid., 195.  
849 Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez părvara polovina, 172.
Cyrill und Method, der Slawen Apostel of 1825, he changed the language description to ‘serbisch-bulgarisch-macedonisch’850.

The Slovanka itself did not reach many Bulgarians851, but the Institutiones and Cyrill und Method, der Slawen Apostel, travelled to Bulgaria quickly in Russian translations and adaptations. The grammatical ideas of Dobrovsky influenced Neofit Rilski, Ivan Momčilov, Ivan Ohridčanin and others852.

Later, after seeing more material on Bulgarian, including Vuk Karadžić’s Dodatak, Dobrovský did acknowledge Bulgarian as an independent language. He stated so in his review in Jahrbücher der Literatur of Pavel Šafárik’s Geschichte der slavischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten (1826):

...der Bulgaren, die gleich bey den Hügeln im Norden von Salonich anfangen, dürften mehr als 600,000 seyn; auch unterscheidet sich ihre slawische langue romane bedeutend genug (mehr als Slowakisch vom Böhmischen) im Grammatik und Lexiko vom serbischen Dialekte, um eine eigene Mundart zu bilden853.

Dobrovský’s recognition of Bulgarian as a separate language was pivotal in raising awareness, among Bulgarians and foreigners alike, that Bulgarians constituted a separate national group.

§8.9 Ján Kollár

Heavily influenced by Herder and German nationalism, the Slovak poet Ján Kollár (1793-1852) and scholar Pavel Jozef Šafárik (1795-1861), the ‘fathers of early panslavism’854, played a key role in the development of panslavism, which contributed to the revival of several Slavic nations. Like Herder, Kollár saw the Slavs as peaceful people. As he wrote in one of his letters:

…nie beschäftigten sie sich handwerksmässig mit dem Blutvergiessen und der Unterjochung anderer Völker, weil sie die Freiheit auch an dem Feinde ehrten und liebten, überhaupt liebten zie mehr den Frieden, als den Krieg855.
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The idea that all Slavs were part of a single nation, was not uncommon at the time. It had already been expressed by Schlözer and Herder. Kollár was one of the first Slavs to speak about the unity or, as he called it, the ‘cultural reciprocity’ of Slavs. He did so in his work Rozpravy o slovanské vzájemnosti (Treatises on the Slav reciprocity), which was published in 1836. In 1837, Kollár himself translated it into German, adapted it and published it under the title Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit zwischen den verschiedenen Stämmen und Mundarten der slawischen Nation. He undertook this translation, because he could not be certain that the knowledge of Slavic ‘dialects’ was good enough among educated Slavs to read the original text. Writing in German gave the work a wider audience, and at the same time, was a sign of protest against the magyarisation, the growing imposition of Hungarian culture in the Hungarian lands, including Slovakia. In preparing the translation, Kollár added more citations of Herder.

In this work, Kollár spoke about Slavic dialects, not Slavic languages. He expressed his view of panslavism as a cultural programme:

Vzájomnost je teda spoločné prijatie, vzájomná výmena a spojený pôžitok. Ale literárna vzájemnost je spoločná účasť všetkých národných veteň na duševných plodoch vlastného naroda; je vzájomne kupovanie, čitanie spisov a kníh vydaných vo všetkých slovanských nárečiach.

Reciprocity is thus a collective undertaking, an exchange, a shared pleasure. And literary reciprocity is the taking part of all branches of the nation in the forthbringings of their own people; it is the buying and reading of texts and books published in all Slavic dialects.

The work recommended cooperation between schools, universities, libraries and scholars, and, according to Kollár, all Slavs should study the four standardised Slavic ‘dialects’ of the time, being Russian, Illyrian, Polish and Bohemian-Slovak. Kollár explicitly stated that reciprocity for him had no political implications.
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Nespôsíva v politickom spojení všetkých Slovanov ani v demagogických úkladoch alebo v revolučnej vzbure proti krajinským vládam a vládcom l'udu, z čoho vzníka len zmätok a nešťastie.\footnote{Kollár, O literárnej vzájomnosti, 111.}

It is not based on a political union of all Slavs, nor on the traps of demagogy or revolutionary uprisings against the local governments and the rulers of the people, from which only chaos and misfortune will arise.

Another work by Kollár is his \textit{Slovník slavjanských umělcův všech kmenův...} (Dictionary of Slav artists of all tribes...), in which he portrayed 749 artists who were (or who Kollár believed to be) of Slavic descent. Among them feature Byzantine Emperor Justinian (called Upravda in Slavic), the man who ordered the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul to be built. Based on his place of origin, Illyria, Kollár declared him to be a Slav and added that he wore Slavic dress and spoke Slavic. This is very unlikely, though: historians place the settling of Slavs in this region not before the seventh century.\footnote{Schaumann, “Kollárs Panslawismus”, 18} Incorrect as it was, this idea was taken over by other scholars and, among Bulgarians, the story about the Slav descent of Justinian can for instance be found in the work of Vasil Aprilov, and Marin Drinov.\footnote{Aretov, Bălgarskoťo văzrađane, 60-61.}

Kollár's rise to fame is, however, linked to his poetry. His ballad \textit{Slávy dceřa} (The daughter of Slava), inspired by his idea of cultural panslavism, became widely popular throughout the Slavic-speaking world. This work can be seen as a paraphrase in poetry of Herder's ideas about the Slavs as peaceful people.\footnote{Schaumann, “Kollárs Panslawismus”, 19.}

Kollár's views seem to have been inspired largely by his own difficult situation. He worked until 1836 as a clergyman in the Slovak community of Pest. There he was confronted with cultural oppression by the Hungarians. In 1828, he wrote to Jerzy Samuel Bandtkie:

\begin{quote}
Man will die magyarische Sprache die alleinherrschende machen, sie auf alle mögliche Art und Weise verbreiten, in alle Gerichte, Schulen und Kirchen einführen... Diese Magyarisationswuth wüthet aber gegen keine hier wohnende Nation so sehr, als gegen die ruhigen, arbeitsamen Slowaken.\footnote{Kollár, Listy, 75, quoted in Neuland, “Die Aufnahme”, 31.}
\end{quote}

Kollár himself put his reciprocity into practice: he had contacts with slavists and historians all over Europe: Jernej Kopitar, Pëtr Köppen, Václav Hanka, František Čelakovský, John Bowring, Ljudevit Gaj, Pavel Jozef Šafárik, and others.\footnote{Jozef Ambruš (ed.) Listy Jána Kollára I. 1816-1839 (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1991).} He shared with them information about books that
had appeared in Budapest, but also asked and offered help in all kinds of research, e.g. in Slavic etymologies.

Although Kollár’s idea of reciprocity, which started with the unity of Czechs and Slovaks, did not become very popular among Slovaks, it did influence other Slavs. The Yugo-Slav idea, for instance, arose in the shadow of Czecho-Slovakism. Kollár corresponded with Ljudevit Gaj.

It is known that Kollár had contact with Serbs in the large Serb colony in Budapest, for instance with Teodor Pavlović, and Vuk Karadžić, whom he met when Karadžić was in Budapest. In 1845, Über die literarische Wechselseitigkeit… was translated into Serbian.

It is not known to what extent the Bulgarians were familiar with Kollár's work. Kollár himself did not study the language or history of the Bulgarians, he never mentioned them, and there were no Bulgarians among his correspondents. It is however very likely that at the very least the Bulgarians in Buda and Pest, who were integrated in the Serb community there, were familiar with Kollár’s work and his idea of how Slav reciprocity would benefit Slav Non Dominant Ethnic Groups (in Hroch’s terms).

§8.10 Pavel Jozef Šafárik

One of the earliest scholars to recognize the status of Bulgarian as an independent language, and not a dialect of Serbian, was the Slovak P.J. Šafárik (1795-1861). He is considered the main scholar of cultural panslavism. His works on Slavic history and literature contributed to the emancipation of several Slav peoples, notably the Serbs and Ukrainians. Here, I will focus on the influence that Šafárik had on the Bulgarians.

Šafárik had his secondary education in the town of Kezmarok, northern Slovakia, which had had German, Slav and Hungarian inhabitants from its foundation in the thirteenth century. Thanks to its position on a trade route linking the Orient with the north of Europe, it was visited by Serbians and other Slavs. Like other Slovak scholars of his time, for instance his close friend Kollár, Šafárik was from a young age interested in the Slavs in general. Even before he went to study at the University of Jena, he published his work Tatranská múza s lýrou slovanskou (The muse of the Tatras with Slavic lyre) in 1814. He had started to write this piece at the age of 16, and when it was published, he was 19. The work was praised by Jungmann for its elegant use of Czech.
In this work, the theme of the Tatra mountains as cradle of all Slavs was presented\(^{867}\), which was later taken over by the Young Slovaks, the revolutionary generation under the leadership of Ljudevit Štúr. In 1817, Šafárik published a *Proclamation to the Slavs*, in which he referred to Herder\(^{868}\). He urged others to collect Slavic folksongs, which he started to do himself as well.

In 1819, Šafárik was appointed director of the school of Novi Sad in Habsburg Serbia, where he also met with Bulgarian merchants, on their way to Vienna and Leipzig. He was able to buy books printed in Bulgarian\(^{869}\), and he used the meetings with Bulgarians to learn their language. His notes from that time record meetings with Bulgarians from Macedonia, Sofia, Samokov and other places\(^{870}\).

In 1826, Šafárik published his *Geschichte der slawischen Sprache und Literatur nach allen Mundarten*, the first comparative history of Slavic languages and literatures. In his romantic perceptions of the past and of the virtues of the primitive life of the Slavs, the influence of Herder and the German Romantics is apparent\(^{871}\).

Šafárik took some notice in passing of Bulgarian, albeit in no more than three pages. He stated that Bulgarians were living between the Danube, the Balkan mountains, the Black Sea and the Serb lands. This shows that he was not aware of the Bulgarian population south of the Balkan range. The number of Bulgarians was, according to Šafárik, 600,000. He mentioned contemporary Bulgarian as a dialect of Serbian, in accordance with the views of Dobrovský (‘das Bulgarische ist eine Unterart des Gesammtserbischen’\(^{872}\)). With Kopitar, Šafárik shared the opinion that from all Slavic languages, Bulgarian had undergone the largest changes (‘Entslawisirung’) in relation to Old Church Slavonic, as it had lost the system of noun declination. He mentioned Vuk Karadžić’s *Dodatak*, but clearly this work had not convinced him to see Bulgarian as a separate language.

Later, from his continuing contacts with Bulgarians that he had during his stay in Novi Sad, Šafárik gradually came to realize that the Ottoman Empire housed a bigger Slav population than had been assumed before. He also started to consider Bulgarian as an independent language. In the second edition of his *Geschichte*, which appeared in 1827, he described the Bulgarian language in its own right. This followed the shift in Dobrovský’s work, who had by then, among other things
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\(^{870}\) Penev, Българската литература през първата половина, 199.
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inspired by the first edition of Šafárik’s *Geschichte*, changed his mind about Bulgarian and stated that it differed too much from Serbian for it to be the same language. The first mention of this new position is made in a letter from Šafárik to Ján Kollár in 1827:

> In the forthcoming edition I will go even further – the Bulgarians have to be completely separated from the Serbs.873

The *Geschichte* was not translated into Bulgarian or Russian for a long time, and it was thus not completely available to readers in Bulgaria. His name and his ideas were known there only indirectly through the works of Jurij Venelin874.

In his influential book *Serbische Lesekörner* (1833), Šafárik argued that the different Slavic languages are not subordinated to, but coordinated with Old Church Slavonic875, and that already in the ninth century Serbian and Old Church Slavonic were distinct dialects. He mentioned Bulgaria as the place from where Old Church Slavonic had been introduced in Serbia:


Šafárik had plans to write a similar book about Bulgarian, as is clear in his letter to Pogodin in Russia877, but this project was not realised. However, from the 1830s onward, Šafárik systematically collected everything he could find on and in Bulgarian878. His library contained more than 60 Bulgarian books879.

Šafárik’s fame reached as far as Russia. When in 1835 there were plans to found four more university chairs of slavistics in Russia, Šafárik was invited to the position of Slavic Literary History at the University of Moscow, but he turned down the offer880.
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873  Published in Časopis Českého musea, 1874, 286, but cited from a translation in Bulgarian in Georgiev, “Značelen prinos”, 10.
876  Šafařík, *Serbische Lesekörner*, 5-6. Šafárik invoked linguistic arguments, like the ending–ga of the singular genitive case of adjectives and pronouns in Serbian, instead of the OCS –go, as the distinguishing characteristics between the Illyrian idiom and the Russian-Bulgarian one, which includes ‘kirchenslawische und ihre stark abgeartete Tochter die neubulgarische’. Šafařík, *Serbische Lesekörner*, 116
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Šafárik’s scholarly output culminated around 1840. By then, he was living in Prague, and supported by Czech friends, compelled to write his works in Czech. In *Slovanské starožitnosti* (Slav antiquities, 1837), he described the oldest history of the Slavs. His aim was to show that Slavs had been in Europe as long as the Celtic and Germanic peoples, and that the Slavs had not immigrated into Europe in the fourth century together with the Huns. He also distinguished the Slavs from non-Slavic peoples like the Illyrians, the Thracians, and Proto-Bulgarians. Šafárik had planned to write a second volume as well, but although he had undertaken research, it was never realised.

Bulgarians were also mentioned in the ethnographical map *Slovanský zeměvid* (Slav geography) that Šafárik published in 1842 and his standard work on Slavic ethnography *Slovanský národopis* (Slav ethnography 1842-1849). In the latter, he tried to subdivide Bulgarian into dialects, but he was not very precise. It is important to note that Šafárik in this work modified the number of Bulgarians. Instead of the 600,000 that he believed to live before, he stated that there were 3,587,000 Bulgarians.

Most of the examples that Šafárik quoted in his *Slovanský Národopis* were from southern or southwestern dialects of Bulgarian. They were either citations that he had recorded himself from personal contacts with Bulgarians, or examples taken from Karadžić’s *Dodatak* and the few printed books in Bulgarian that he had seen. Still Šafárik was convinced that there were two different dialects of Bulgarian: a western and an eastern one. He realized, like Dobrovský and Köppen, that the language of Karadžić’s *Dodatak* was not representative for Bulgarian as a whole.

After the appearance of the *Slovanský Národopis*, Šafárik published an article about Old Bulgarian toponyms (1847), and another about the Bulgarian golden age of literature at the time of Czar Simeon: *Rozkvět slovanské literatury v Bulharsku* (The bloom of Slav literature in Bulgaria, published in *Casopis Českého musea*, 1848). This article, which describes the activities of Saint Cyril and Method, was translated into Russian by Osip Bodjanskij, then into German and into Serbian by Janko Šafárik and from the Serbian into Bulgarian by deacon Hrisant Jovanović from
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Kalofer in 1849, under the title *Cvetosobranie na staroslavensku-tu knižninu v Bălgariju* (Anthology of the old Slavic literature in Bulgaria)\(^{891}\). It was printed in Belgrade.

Apart from writing about the Cyrillic and Glagolitic alphabets, of which he showed that the Glagolitic was the older, Šafárik also edited and published the Old Church Slavonic text *O pismeneh* (About the letters, 1851). He prepared a work with the title *Popis pisemnosti bulbarské* (Description of Bulgarian literature), but this was not printed. It contained a list of Bulgarian manuscripts and books that had been printed until then. It was much more elaborate than the *Slovensky narodopis*\(^{892}\).

During his life, Šafárik gradually came to see the tenuousness of Kopitar’s Pannonian theory, which traces the origins of Old Church Slavonic to the Slavs of Pannonia. The more he came to know the Balkan Slavs and their language, the more he saw the similarities with Old Church Slavonic. In 1826, he wrote in a letter to Kollár:

In the Ottoman Empire there are more Slavic tribes, than Vuk and Kopitar imagine. One of these tribes, that inhabits Macedonia and Thessaly (and some other places), is the great-grandson of Cyril. We will explain him all of this. But it takes time to clear these Augean stables. Who would have thought, that in Dupnica (Dupindži), Stob (in Strob), Batak etc. etc. there are Slavs! …Don’t speak about this, not to come in conflict with mr. P.K. (Kopitar- B.P.) about his Caranthania. When I am armed, then I will step out in the battlefield\(^{893}\).

Šafárik dreamed of undertaking a trip to Macedonia, in which he hoped and expected to find (traces of) the old language of the work of Cyril and Method\(^{894}\). He was especially intrigued by stories about the monastery of Rila, in the Pirin mountains\(^{895}\) (the name of which he believed to come from Perun, head of the Slavic pantheon). He wrote to Kollár:

Kopitar is still dreaming about his Cyrillo-Methodian Caranthania. I have found it somewhere else. May god give me the chance to visit the ‘Perun mountain’ in Macedonian Thrace, between the Struma and Mesta. I hope, that there we will find, if not anything older, than at least the original text of Cyril and Method\(^{896}\).

Internal unrest in the Ottoman Empire, especially the Russian-Turkish war of 1828-29, prevented Šafárik from undertaking his trip. In 1830 he abandoned the idea. In a letter to Palacký he
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expressed his hope that others would be able to do research in Macedonia, for instance Jurij Venelin, of whom he had heard that he would be sent to Bulgaria.897

After Šafárik moved from Novi Sad to Prague, he continued to study Bulgaria and Bulgarian. He took excerpts from travel diaries like Walsh’s, and a speech of poet Alphonse de Lamartine in the French Assemblée.898

In the period when he was in Prague, Šafárik, who was by then a renowned scholar, remained in contact with scholars throughout the Slavic world, many of them Russian.899 One recurring topic in his letters to Russia was research on Bulgarians: he repeatedly asked for material on the Bulgarians that had been published in Russia, for instance the works of Venelin, which, in stating that Bulgarians were Slavs, opposed his own thesis. He recommended Pogodin and the Russians assist the Bulgarians intellectually, like the Bulgarians had been the teachers of the Russians before. He also urged Osip Bodjanskij to publish the work of the Bulgarian medieval scholars Ioan Exarch and Kliment of Ohrid. He stimulated Preis and Sreznevskij, whom he met in Prague, to undertake a journey through the Bulgarian lands, in which Preis was to browse the libraries, and Sreznevskij was to study the people and their ethnography.

Among his correspondents were also Bulgarian intellectuals. Ivan Bogorov sent him – through Hanka – information about Bulgarian villages and antiquities, and Vasil Aprilov offered to publish on his costs the Bulgarian manuscripts that were in Šafárik’s possession. Šafárik met with Natanael Stojanovič, and in 1857, he received Sava Filaretov, who was accompanying Ivan Denkoglu to Bulgaria (see §7.10).

Šafárik’s work was important for the Bulgarians of his time, as it added prestige to the Bulgarian language. In the late Văzraždane however, Šafarik was less appreciated by Bulgarian intellectuals, because of his opinion that Cyril and Method had been Greeks, and that Proto-Bulgarians had been a non-Slavic tribe. Georgi Rakovski nevertheless sent Šafárik copies of his works.

897 Ibid., 203.
898 Ibid., 204.
899 He was in contact with e.g. Köppen, Vostokov, Bodjanskij, Sreznevskij, Prejs, Grigorovič, Uvarov, but had the most frequent contact with Pogodin. Šafárik, Korespondence, 490.
900 Šafárik, Korespondence, 591.
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902 Ibid., 207.
903 Ibid., 208.
§8.11 Václav Hanka

Václav Hanka (1791-1861), one of the founders of the society that was to be turned into the Czech national museum, was also interested in Bulgarians. Already in 1818, the same year when the museum was founded, he paid attention to the Bulgarian people when he translated Kurze Geschichte der slawischen Völker aus alten Zeiten by one F. Rise.

Hanka was an exponent of the panslavist movement. Inspired by Kopitar and Karadžić, especially by their work on folksongs, he translated Vuk’s Pesmarica (Song book), and also the Russian Slovo o polku Igoreve (The tale of Igor’s campaign). Hanka’s panslavist ideas are also expressed in his linguistic work: he published grammars of Czech, Polish and Russian, although Bojan Penev has argued that due to the vast scope of his research not one of them was good904.

In Hanka’s time, Prague became the international centre of slavistics. Hanka himself was in correspondence with several scholars abroad905. He had personal contacts with Bulgarians including Aprilov and Bogorov906, for whom he bought and sent books. Aprilov praised him in 1846 for calling the language in which the Rheims gospel was written, Old Bulgarian907, instead of the name Church Language that was often used in the time. Bogorov sent Hanka the first copies of his newspaper Български Орел from Leipzig908, and informed him later from Istanbul about his literary activities. When Hanka received Natanael Stojanović, the later metropolitan of Ohrid and Plovdiv in Prague in 1852, he organised meetings with representatives from Czech cultural and political life. According to the autobiography of Stojanović, Hanka spoke to Natanael in the church of St. Nicholas the Miracle-Doer, in front of the sculptures of Vasilij the Great, Grigorij Bogoslov, Ioannos Hrysostomos and Grigorij Dvoeslov:

Отец Натанаил! Видите ли эти изображения этих величайших мудрецов мира, жалко что на них наложили папский тиары, жалело бы я уделиться видеть в этом храме что бы совершались их Божественные литургии на Кирило-Методиевскими языке. Из Македонии через Болгарию принесли в эти места писмена и христианскую веру, и потомство наше будет ожидать, чтоб честы от туда получили оно их письменность и веру и все то, что потерялось насилием западной церкви. Трудитесь передать их нам909.

904 Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez първата половина, 181.
905 Ibid., 182.
907 Penev, Bălgarskata literatura prez първата половина, 185.
908 Ibid.
Father Natanail, do you see the portraits of these men, among the wisest of the world, it is a shame they put on them the tiara of a pope, I would like to be worthy to see their Divine liturgy performed in this church in the language of Cyril and Method. From Macedonia and through Bulgaria, Cyril and Method brought the letters to these lands and the christian faith, and our posterity will wait to receive again from there their literacy and religion, and everything what was lost by the pressure of the western church. Try to pass these on to us.

Hanka was also the leading intermediary for the publication of Bulgarian works in Prague\textsuperscript{910}. He corresponded in 1860 with D. Mutev, director of the Central Bulgarian school in Bolgrad, Bessarabia.

Hanka is best known as the \textit{Slavic Macpherson}, the man who was responsible for the falsification of the presumably Old Czech \textit{Rukopis Královédvorský} (\textit{Manuscript of Dvůr Králové}, or \textit{Koniginhof Manuscript})\textsuperscript{911}, and \textit{Rukopis Zelenohorský} (\textit{Manuscript of Zelená Hora}, or \textit{Grünberg Manuscript}). Dobrovský, Hanka’s teacher, did not believe in the authenticity of the works, but influential scholars like František Palacký, the president of the Czech museum, and Šafárik did. The works, filled with Czech ideas of patriotism and struggles with the Germans, had a Bulgarian parallel in the \textit{Veda Slovena} (see §6.13).

Hanka also published a letter addressed to him from the Russian scholar Izmail Sreznevskij (1812-1880), in which an overview was given of the works that were published in Bulgarian from 1840 until 1846\textsuperscript{912}. Sreznevskij had received the information for this list from Dimităr Mutev\textsuperscript{913}.

\section*{§8.12 Bulgarians in the Czech lands}

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Bulgarians started to travel to the Czech lands. Before then, Bulgarian scholars were dependent upon Russian mediation and translations in Russian to learn the thoughts of their West Slav colleagues. Later, Bulgarians travelled northwest themselves, but still relied on their Russian network to do so.

One of the first Bulgarians to study in Prague was Ivan Šopov (1826-1853). He first studied in Russia, and then, with a recommendation from Osip Bodjanskij to Pavel Šafárik and Václav Hanka, went to Prague in 1850. Although he was enrolled as a student of medicine, he

\begin{itemize}
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started to work together closely with Šafárik. In 1852, this led to a bibliography of books in Bulgarian. Šopov was assisted in his work by Natanail Stojanovič, also a friend of Šafárik, who later became metropolitan of Ohrid and Plovdiv. The bibliography, although it was composed in Prague, was published in the *Carigradski Vestnik* in Istanbul\(^{914}\). In the preface, N. H. Palauzov explained from Odessa that he had urged Šopov to work on it.

Šopov became a close friend of Šafárik’s son Janko, who even arranged his funeral after Šopov took his own life. Šafárik senior informed Pogodin of the events\(^{915}\). Šopov’s library, which consisted of over 1000 volumes in various languages, was brought to Kalofer after his death.

A later Bulgarian student in Prague was Vasil D. Stojanov (1839-1910), who spent the period from 1858 until 1868 in Prague, first at the grammar school and later as a university student\(^{916}\). He wrote biographies of Sofronij Vračanski (1865) and Georgi Rakovski (1865-1866)\(^{917}\) and a number of other pieces for Czech magazines. Later, Stojanov became secretary of the Bulgarian philologic society (*Bălgarsko knižovno družestvo*) and editor of its magazine *Periodičesko spisanie*.

**Conclusions**

By Šafárik’s time, we see that pan-Slavism is firmly established in the cultural and scholarly life of Central Europe, and that it offers a basis and ambience for Bulgarian consciousness-building. This process was simultaneous with the emergence of russophile interest in Bulgaria, and interacts with it. This interaction almost defines the dilemma that an emergent Bulgarian national movement was to face: the choice between a Russian and an Austro-slavist or Illyrian/Balkan orientation. It is also remarkable that the ideas were more mobile between the poles than were the Bulgarian actors.

An epidemiology of beliefs is easily acknowledged in the Romantic pan-Slavic revival, which spread through all Slavic lands: both the ones that were independent, like Russia, and the lands that were under non-Slavic domination. West Slavs were responsible for transferring the ideas of Herder to Bulgarians, and did so in two ways: directly, through Bulgarians who visited the Czech lands; and before that, indirectly, through mediation of Russian philologists. The ideas of Herder
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were spread among Slavs by Kollár. His works were translated into Russian, and reached Bulgarians in that translation. Exponents of Romanticism among Slavs in the Habsburg Empire were Josef Dobrovský, Jernej Kopitar, Pavel Jozef Šafárik, and Václav Hanka. Bulgarians who were following their example included Rajko Žinzifov and Ljuben Karavelov.
9: Conclusion

There was no Bulgarian national cultural life in the beginning of the nineteenth century, no such thing as a Bulgarian public sphere, a virtual meeting space in which opinions are formed, nor even a concrete idea as to the meaning or usefulness of the term ‘Bulgarian’. Bulgarians participated in academic and social debate, but those debates were universal and international, rather than national, and they took place in Greek. Private conversations and private letters were the only way for Bulgarians to exchange opinions about common affairs.

Nevertheless, from these beginnings a public sphere did evolve over the course of the nineteenth century and had developed by 1876, to the point that it could form the intellectual ambience for the April Uprising – an event which tested the resolve of the Bulgarian people, to declare themselves as such; an event which thus, in Renan’s terms, manifested the will of Bulgarians to be a nation.

§9.1 ‘Imagined community’ and a Bulgarian public sphere

The process of the creation of public sphere, which is concretely expressed in Bulgarian education, the language debates and increasing sociability, occurred later on the Balkans than elsewhere in Europe. This stands to reason, given the fact that Balkan nations had limited access to widespread media, and for a long time absolutely no access to any national media. There were very few printing presses in the Ottoman Empire, and those that did exist were under strict control, either by the government or the Patriarchate.

The Bulgarian public sphere developed even later than that of the Serbian, Romanian and Greek communities. This can be attributed to the more autonomous status of Serbia and the Romanian principalities inside the empire, which allowed for printing presses. Greek intellectuals, as far as their ideas were supported by the Patriarchate, could use its printing press in Istanbul to spread their opinions. Bulgarians by contrast were dependent upon the manual copying of books, which was restricted to a limited number of monasteries until very late.

In the Ottoman period, Bulgarians had neither political power, nor national cultural infrastructure. Formal national cultural institutions, like an Academy of Science, or a Ministry of Education, which play an important role in the establishment or accentuation of a nation and
require support by a state or some other ruling organ (Leerssen’s Institutional infrastructure), were opened only after the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian state and played a negligible role among Bulgarians in the period of this study (1800-1860). The foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870 provided the Bulgarians with their own millet, but at the time, due to the reforms in the Ottoman Empire, millets were not as autonomous as they had been before.

Although an institutional infrastructure among Bulgarians was poorly developed for a long time, an informal social ambience, to follow Leerssen’s terminology, developed earlier. We have seen in the introduction that the development of national culture generally starts in the private sphere, and is then transferred to the semi-private sphere of the salons.

It is important to realize that this process took part outside Bulgaria proper. Emigré centres of Bulgarians in diaspora played a considerable role in the evolution from private to public sphere. The Bulgarians in Brašov (see §4.5), drew up a programme for national education in the 1820s. In the 1840s we also saw salons in the Bulgarian communities in Moscow, hosted by Ivan Denkoglu, and Odessa, of the Toškov(č)-family (§7.11). Bulgarians in Istanbul were also fulfilling the role of national pioneers.

Out of a process of intensification, these loose and isolated communitarian and national initiatives condensed. Sociability, the participation in public life, expanded and societies obtained an increasingly organised character. In the 1850s, there were numerous societies, like Bratski Trud in Moscow (1859, see §7.9), the Odeskoto bălgarsko nastojatelstvo (1854, §7.11), the Bălgarsko knižovno družestvo (Brăila 1869, §6.14) and its precursors the Bulgarian Matica (St. Petersburg 1852, §7.9), the Obščestvo bolgarskoj pismennosti (Istanbul, 1856), and the Slavjanobălgarsko učenoljubivo družestvo of Bulgarian students in Athens. Some of these institutions, especially the Bălgarsko knižovno družestvo, acquired official character, even without, or with Russian, state support, and had a great influence on public life.

After the initial development of the salons and student societies had taken hold among émigrés, both in Istanbul and beyond the borders of Ottoman territory, a confluence into the Bulgarian lands of cultural infrastructures occurred. A typical meeting place was the public čitalište, where people could gather, read books and periodicals, or enjoy theatre pieces. Some examples were established in 1856 in Svištov, Lom and Šumen (§6.7).

The appearance of a regular press is also another manifestation of social organisation. In the Bulgarian case, this developed comparatively late, too. For a long time, Bulgarian intellectuals only had public letters (obštestveno pismo), to express their views. The first Bulgarian journal, Konstantin Fotinov’s Ljuboslovie, was founded only in 1844 in Izmir, and the first newspaper,
Bălgarskij Orel, in 1846 in Leipzig. The first newspaper which was widely read, Carigradski Vestnik, followed in 1848. These provided the first, albeit limited, forums for Bulgarian intellectuals to espouse their opinions on public affairs. The first journals and newspapers to be published within Bulgaria came even later. But once the development was set in train, a great number appeared (although some of them were rather short-lived) and most of the Bulgarian intellectuals contributed to one or more of them. This testifies, if not to their successful functioning, at least to the responsive chord they struck among the intelligentsia.

A further manifestation of a developing national social ambience is to be found in the philanthropy of patriots who donate money to schools, subscribe to books or provide scholarships. The activities of people like Anton Iovanović Kamburoglu, Vasil Aprilov, or Ivan Denkoglu, in this regard, facilitated the activities of intellectuals, and made nationality a criterion in their decision which students to support.

With the development of a standard language, the birth of Bulgarian magazines and newspapers, and the improved access to printing presses, first in the Habsburg Empire, then in Russia, the possibilities for Bulgarians to express themselves publicly increased sharply. National education, salons and čitalištes heightened this effect, since they facilitated the spread of ideas, formulated by small groups of intellectuals, among a much larger portion of the population.

Although there were instances of people claiming to be Bulgarian before 1800 (e.g. the catholic activists, Paisij Hilendarski), the adoption of a Bulgarian identity, and the number of people familiar with notions of ‘national awareness’ was slow to take hold. Slowly, a Bulgarian society was formed, in which expressions and actions ceased being isolated, began to reinforce each other and were passed on; in the process the concept of a Bulgarian identity took hold.

Especially for the first generation of Bulgarian intellectuals, people like Petăr Beron, Neofit Rilski and Vasil Aprilov, who were active in the 1820s and 1830s, ‘Bulgaria’ takes on the quality of an ‘imagined community’ as described by Benedict Anderson. There was no state, there were no cultural institutions, but still Bulgarian intellectuals agreed that they had something in common. They felt that they were members of a Bulgarian national community, even though the nation was not established as such, and even though they were too far-flung and too dispersed to form a ‘real’ (local, face-to-face) community.

In the generation of intellectuals that followed them, through increased communication, the ‘mental representation of a Bulgarian nation’, to use the words of Sperber, became public, and part of what may be called a national culture. This development was only completed in the period after
the establishment of an autonomous Bulgarian state in 1878, when many institutions were established, first informally and then formally, and discussions on many subjects could take place. Only then, a canon of Bulgarian cultural heritage emerged.918

§9.2 Was there a Bulgarian ‘phase A’ nationalism?

It is clear that a crucial role in the development of Bulgarian national thought was played by philologists. Long before political activists appeared and started claiming independence for the Bulgarian people, scholars were actively studying Bulgarian history, Bulgarian folklore and the Bulgarian language. It would seem anachronistic to label these men as historians, linguists or give them similar names of specialised occupations: they were, if anything, ‘philologists’ as described by Leerssen.919

According to Hroch’s model of nation building, three consecutive phases are to be observed: scholarly interest (A), agitation (B) and mass support (C).920 To some extent these phases can be observed in the Bulgarian case, though the progression through them was not continuous. Hroch himself regards the Bulgarian national movement as being of the ‘insurgent type’, where virtually no phase A activities can be distinguished. The material presented here suggests a different conclusion.

The Bulgarian Văzraždane consisted of a number of different undercurrents: a movement for church reforms, an educational movement, and a language struggle. This by definition makes it difficult to compare it to a model that presupposes a monolithic movement. Even when distinct fields of cultural interest are studied, a smooth progression from A to B to C cannot always be seen.

The complex process of nation building in Bulgaria thus contains all elements of Hroch’s model but with the different phases occurring concurrently. Older elements are incorporated into newer activities and presented as novel. This ‘recycling’ of old material can be witnessed in more than one field, but most clearly in historiography, in the case of Paisij Hilendarski’s history.

Bulgarian nationalism did not follow the strictly successive order A-B-C. Raymond Detrez has rightly pointed out that the first subcurrent of the Văzraždane to develop was the church

918  Kiossev, “The literary canon”, 133.
919  Leerssen, The cultivation of culture, 20.
920  Hroch. Social preconditions, 13.
This was a movement for political reforms within the Ottoman Empire, not a separatist national movement based on ethnicity. Considering the other main subcurrent next to the church conflict—the emancipation of education—the entire early Văzraždane can be seen more as a civil rights movement than as a revolutionary liberation movement. It has the social penetration and characteristics of Hroch’s phase C, but was not necessarily triggered by A and B activities.

The stadial and chronological orders of the various aspects of the Bulgarian revival (did events take place in the order (A-)B-C or C-A-B?) pose a question that will probably call for more discussion than it provides answers. It is clear, however, that at some point, a crucial role was played by Bulgarian philologists engaged in activities that Hroch would label ‘phase A’, and that the Bulgarian revival was driven not only by social and economic developments, but by cultural activities as well.

§9.3 The European context

Bulgaria experienced cultural developments that were occurring in the rest of Europe, but considerably later. Enlightenment ideas about the improvement of society and the drive towards perfect and universal knowledge, omnipresent in Europe in the eighteenth century, also affected the Balkans, just like the ideas of Romanticism, about cultural relativism and the value of national traditions enabling nationalism. But where Enlightenment came first in Western Europe, among Bulgarians, as among Romanians, Enlightenment and Romantic thought came almost simultaneously. This has been noted by Georgi Gačev, who called it ‘Ускорённое развитие’ (accelerated development).

The Bulgarian Văzraždane was at first mainly a movement in the style of cultural patriotism, striving for cultural emancipation and political rights within the millet system, rather than a romantic-nationalist one. When the church conflict started, the central issue was not so much one of ecclesiastical-national self-determination as bishops abusing their powers and priests incapable of speaking the language of their parishioners. Only later, the church conflict became focused on the nationalist goal of achieving an autocephalous church, linking the Bulgarian nation to a Bulgarian territory, in which there was no place for Greek influences. Of course, it would be

921 Detrez, “The Bulgarian national movement”.
922 Gačev. Uskorennoe razvitie literature.
overly schematic to see this in terms of a ‘patriotic’ to ‘nationalist’ shift: similar shifts have elsewhere in Europe also been described in terms of civic versus ethnic nationalism, as a shift within national thought from an early democratic register to a later ethnic exclusivism. Nonetheless the fact remains that such shifts do occur, usually in one direction rather than the other, and that this happened in Bulgarian in accelerated or collapsed form.

Likewise the interest in language, as spoken by the people, initially had a patriotic motivation: the creation of a standardised national language would be beneficial to national education. In this, Bulgarians followed the example of the Serbs, and Vuk Karadžić in particular.

Romanticism, as it reached Bulgarians, was cloaked in Pan-Slavic guise. The cultural relativism, introduced by Herder, led to two trends: interest in history, and interest in the people, which, in the Slav context, gave rise to the notion of Slav ‘reciprocity’.

When the catholic intellectuals of the seventeenth century, long before Herder, dedicated their attention to history, they were following the example of Dubrovian clergymen and the catholic church tradition. In the nineteenth century, a completely different trend arose: the Romantic historicism that was present all over Europe. The Romantic interest in national history is reflected in the works of Atanas Nešković, Hristaki Pavlović, Jurij Venelin, Vasil Aprilov, Georgi Rakovski and Marin Drinov.

In Western Europe, exponents of the interest in folklore were people like Claude Fauriel in France, Elias Lönnrot in Finland and the brothers Grimm in Germany. The most outstanding exponent of the new interest in folklore on the Balkans was Vuk Karadžić. Stimulated by Jernej Kopitar, Karadžić extended his academic interests from the Serbs to the Bulgarians. His first publications on Bulgarians were of a linguistic character, like the Dodatak, but later he collected folk material as well. Viktor Grigorović was, in the 1830s, the first Russian to adopt a Romantic approach to the study of the Bulgarians. Bulgarian followers in the field of ethnography were the brothers Dimităr and Konstantin Miladinov, Vasil Aprilov, Ivan Bogorov and Georgi Rakovski. They were greatly stimulated by Russian scholars like Osip Bodjanskij.

The interest in history and folklore that developed among Bulgarians in the nineteenth century shows that the Bulgarian Vazraždane fits in the European Romantic movement of the nineteenth century.
§9.4 An epidemiology of beliefs

Bulgarian participation or implication in wider European developments raises the question of how this came about. Which influences from other intellectuals in neighboring countries and elsewhere in Europe were most important to actors of the Bulgarian Văzraždane? As we have seen, numerous examples of Bulgarian intellectuals were influenced by foreign examples, such that Bulgarian culture clearly did not develop in isolation of what was happening in the rest of Europe.

It is not a coincidence that the first cultural nationalism among Bulgarians took place in a foreign setting. Nationalism among émigrés, or, as Gellner calls it, diaspora nationalism has also been apparent among other national groups, like the Greeks. Especially in major cities like Odessa, Vienna, Bucharest, Paris, where different national communities were living in close contact, examples of cultural nationalism in one group often stimulated nationalist activity in other groups.

Throughout the period from 1800 until 1860, Bulgarian intellectuals were inspired by examples from abroad. Not only ideas and examples were adopted, but Bulgarians turned to other nations for practical support as well: to use their printing presses, visit their schools etc. It has become clear, though, that the surrounding nations and states all contributed something else to the Bulgarian national movement. How this occurred differed from case to case and depended on the issue at hand. Roughly in temporal order the following influences can be distinguished:

The **Illyrian** intellectuals sowed among Bulgarians the seed of the idea of a national identity and influenced the birth of Bulgarian historiography.

The **Greek** intellectuals demonstrated to Bulgarians national education and patriotism and the love for literature. Especially in the early Văzraždane, Greek examples were crucial. Greek schools provided the educational basis without which no Bulgarian cultural nationalism could have been possible. Apart from this facilitating factor, the Greeks also demonstrated that a national state was a cause worth fighting for.

This is a good illustration of Anderson’s thesis about the transferability of the wish for a national state: one group of people who have formed a nation are an example to other groups who are striving for that status. This stands at odds with Hroch’s thesis that nations develop individually, without being influenced by foreign examples.

After Greek independence, it was difficult for Bulgarians to gain practical support from the Greeks, and other national groups became more influential for Bulgarians.

The **Habsburg Empire**, and especially the Serbs in the empire, provided Bulgarians with examples of performing arts and the collection of folklore, showed the direction in the language
debate, and facilitated education. The Habsburg Empire was an important channel through which ideas about science and society were passed from west to east. This started already with the works of the seventeenth-century Illyrian scholars, and Jovan Rajić in the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century, there were two channels from Habsburg to the Bulgarians: one through the connection Kopitar-Karadžić-Bulgarian merchants, and the other one through German-Czechs and Slovak scholars-Russian scholars-Bulgarian students.

**Russia** was the most important foreign actor that contributed to Bulgarian historiography, the church conflict and education. Later, Russia also took the lead in directing Bulgarian in the language debate and in collecting folklore. Initially, slavophilism was a movement of Russian individuals, who felt themselves related to the other Slavs of Europe and supported them out of charity.

From the 1840s onwards, the Russian state – inspired by its notions of panslavism – assisted the development of a Bulgarian civil rights movement into political nationalism. In the final years before the war of independence, Russia was the greatest influence on Bulgarian nationalists, and the one nation they were looking to for ideological and practical support.

In circles of Russian philologists, a number of Bulgarian immigrants (in Bessarabia and Odessa) and students (in St. Petersburg and Moscow) came into contact with the ideas of Slavic interconnectedness and Herder’s idealization of the Slavs, and Russian slavophilism. This process follows fairly precisely the pattern as described by Dan Sperber in *The epidemiology of beliefs*: through communication, a concept that is accepted in one group is passed on to another group.

Bulgarian intellectuals did not reinvent the wheel. Their national feelings at the end of the period under study were reflections of national feelings and the movement for a national church and state that they had seen abroad: among other Slav peoples, among Greeks, and in Russia. This was a conscious development. Nineteenth-century Bulgarians were fully aware that they should adopt the cultural self-reliance that other peoples had in other political circumstances. Without the contributions of surrounding states and nations, the Bulgarian national movement would not have taken place – or would, at least, have taken a very different course.

§9.5 Personal networks
The epidemiology described above could only be carried out through personal contacts. A number of Bulgarian intellectuals were each individually inspired by foreign examples, and passed on their newly formed ideas to their compatriots. Vasil Aprilov followed the ideas of Jurij Venelin, Neofit Rilski learned about the new allilodidactic method of teaching from Greek teachers in Walachia, Najden Gerov was formed by Russian teachers at the Richelieu school in Odessa, and it was the Russian Viktor Grigorovič who urged Dimităr Miladinov to start collecting folklore material.

These personal contacts were part of a larger European network of philologists, in which ideas circulated from one national group to the other. A good example is Vuk Karadžić. Karadžić was led in his activities by Jernej Kopitar and was, through him, in contact with almost the entire European community of philologists, including the brothers Grimm in Germany, Dobrovský and Šafárik in Prague, and Russian philologists like Pogodin. These networks of personal contacts, expressed in correspondence and debates in periodical press, cooperation, as well as teacher-pupil relationships, offer a fruitful approach in the study of intellectual history.

A next step in the research of the ‘epidemiology of beliefs’ would be to apply network theories, as they are used in sociology, to e.g. Balkan intellectuals, or, even better, to European philologists at large. An analysis of their personal contacts will show that the European intellectuals formed a network, of which members of all nations were part; of more developed nations as well as the nations that were inventing themselves at the time. This network carried the spread of ideas and ideologies and at the same time provided an interface with the institutional infrastructure of the respective countries.

§9.6 A new picture of the Văzraždane

A vital point for anyone studying the Bulgarian revival was made by Rumen Daskalov in his book Kak se misli bălgarskoto văzraždane. He demonstrates that the image of the Revival varied greatly over time and is strongly dependent on the context of the time in which the study was produced. Nationalist scholars of the 1930s, who focussed on the developing of the Bulgarian nation in a primordialist way, created a different picture of the period than communist scholars of the 1950s, who were the most interested in class struggles, or the post-communist scholars of the
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last ten years. What they have in common, though, is that they consider the Văzraždane as a positive process, one that deserves admiration.

Of the three phases of nationalism, as distinguished by Hroch, in the Bulgarian case phase B has been studied in the greatest detail. Agitators who fought with the pen, the sword, or with both, like Georgi Rakovski and Hristo Botev, have become national heroes. Since Russia was the leading intellectual centre for Bulgarians in the time when nationalism was at its peak, Russian influence on the formation of the Bulgarian nation has been studied in great detail.

Paisij Hilendarski, who does not really seem to fit in his own eighteenth century, fits in perfectly with the themes of the Romantic nationalists. This can explain, why, in hindsight, he has become so popular. Paisij is usually named as the one who started the process of Văzraždane among Bulgarians, because the activists of the late Văzraždane named him as such.

The preceding Enlightenment patriotism, which provided the educational system that made later activities possible, and appeared at a time that Bulgarians themselves were not yet aiming at the foundation of a national state, has been studied less in the Bulgarian academic community. This does not mean that it has not been crucial for the development of Bulgarian culture. First, the possibilities the Greek community offered for education, and later the Habsburg support for the printing of books and the meetings with Serbs, ignited the Bulgarian minds, that burst into flame much later.

Those Bulgarian intellectuals who were active inside the nascent Bulgarian public sphere, but in hindsight turned out to have constituted a side track in the development of ‘Bulgarianness’, like the Cankov brothers, who supported the uniate idea, Ivan Seliminski, who was considered to be too much influenced by the Greek cultural sphere, or people who remained loyal to the Ottoman authorities, have over time received less and less attention of academics. If we want to draw a more complete picture of the Bulgarian Revival in the European context, it is fundamental that not only the big names, but also the lesser known philologists be studied.

The image of the Văzraždane was constructed in Bulgarian historiography a long time ago, and remained surprisingly stable for a long period. It is up to a new generation of scholars to study it once again in the context of Europe in the twenty-first century, with an open mind to the relevant actors and developments. It should be realised that the Bulgarian public sphere of 1800-1860 extended across state borders just as easily as it does now and will do after Bulgaria’s entry into the European Union.
Appendix I: Register of some unfamiliar words

Abadžija
Weaver: one who makes aba, woollen cloth.

Ayan
A local leader in the time of kârdžalijstvo, who took all power into his own hand, denying the sultan his authority.

Celep (Dželep)
A livestock merchant, dealing mostly in sheep, for slaughter. Because of the growing demand for sheep in Istanbul, Bulgarian celeps became very rich in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.

Church Slavonic
The language used in the orthodox churches of Slavonic people until the nineteenth century. It has many Russian influences and is more archaic than the Slavic vernaculars of the time.

Četa
A band of revolutionary Bulgarian volunteers who entered Bulgaria from the Danubian principalities or Serbia in the last decade before the April Uprising.

Čitalište
Literally: reading room. A čitalište was (and still is) a cultural centre where people can read books and journals, take creative courses, visit exhibitions and/or stage productions.

Čorbadžija
Literally: one who provides čorba (stew). The čorbadžijas were rich and influential merchants. They fulfilled the role of an elite, replacing the Bulgarian nobility (bojars) who had been were eradicated during the Turkish conquest.

Damaskin
A literary genre, which developed at the end of the sixteenth century. Damascins have a religious-educational content and are written in the spoken language. The first damascins were translations of texts by the sixteenth century Greek writer Damaskinos Studitis, from where the name comes. Later, texts by other authors were also included.

**Danubian principalities**

Collective name for Walachia and Moldavia, nowadays Romania.

**Dragoman**

Interpreter in service of the Ottoman administration. A dragoman often had much more responsibility than the title of translator would suggest, and was employed more in the capacity of a consultant. Greek dragomans often rose high in the Ottoman hierarchy.

**Eforia**

An institute that can be compared to a modern ministry.

**Esnaf**

Guild, especially powerful in the developing town economies of the 1860s.

**Gramota**

Charter, certificate.

**Hadži**

Title given to a person who had completed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Among Bulgarians, the title carried much prestige.

**Hajduk**

Bandit or freedom-fighter who roamed the Balkan mountains. The hajduks were organised in small groups under the direction of a leader and took part in the insurrections in Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria against the Turks. Through folk songs and stories, they were mythologised.

**Janissary**
Ottoman elite soldier in direct service to the sultan. Janissaries were originally recruited as young boys from non-muslim populations as devşirme (blood tax). Towards the end of the eighteenth century, they became extremely powerful and during the kârdžalijstvo, many janissaries sided with the rebelling ayans. The corps was disbanded by Sultan Mahmud II in 1826.

**Kaaza**
District, administrative division of the Ottoman Empire.

**Kârdžalijstvo**
A period at the end of the eighteenth century when local ayans assumed complete power of their areas, hiring bands of roaming soldiers or janissaries to collect their taxes and maintain order. These kârdžalijas used much force and plundered greatly.

**Kilijno učilište**
Cell school, a school in which small numbers of pupils learnt skills required for a church career: reading and writing in Greek and Church Slavonic. Teachers were most often monks.

**Mechitharists**
An Armenian catholic order, founded by Abbot Mechithar in the early eighteenth century.

**Middle Bulgarian**
The Bulgarian written language in use from around the twelfth until the seventeenth century.

**Millet**
Religious community with much autonomy for its own affairs. Non-muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire were all part of a millet. Originally there were orthodox, Armenian, and Jewish millets, in the nineteenth century Roman Catholic and Protestant millets were established.

**Millet-başı**
Head of the millet, and spokesman for it at the sultan’s court. For the orthodox millet, the patriarch was millet-başı.

**Old Church Slavonic**
The language used by Cyril and Method in translating the Bible into Slavonic. Most Bulgarian scholars refer to this as Old Bulgarian, although it is not anymore believed to be the direct precursor of Bulgarian.

Odeskoto bălgarsko nastojatelstvo (OBN - Odessa Bulgarian representation)
Founded in 1854, as a cultural organisation, the OBN distributed scholarships for Bulgarian students and funded cultural activities like the publishing of magazines. It was in fact also a political force that supported Bulgarian revolutionaries.

Panslavism
The political ideology among Russian intellectuals that aimed at gathering all Slavs in one great empire, with the Russian Czar at its head.

Phanariots
The Greek cultural elite in Istanbul, that owed its name to the Fener district of the city where they lived. The Phanariots had control over the orthodox church and for a long period the princes of the Danubian principalities were selected from Phanariot circles.

Slaveno-Serbian
The language used in Serbian and Bulgarian literature from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century. It is a combination of the Russian variant of church Slavic with Serbian elements.

Slavophilism
The ideology among Russian intellectuals that idealised the Slav element in Russia’s past and its tradition of self-government in small village communities (namely the ‘mir’). The ‘slavophiles’ deplored the Europeanising modernisations that Peter the Great had carried out.

Taksidiot
An itinerant monk who travelled widely to gather donations for his monastery and sometimes stayed for a while in a village to teach some basic skills.

Zapadniki
A group of Russian intellectuals who saw Russia’s future in implementing European modernisations in the society. The name literally means ‘westerners’.
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