

DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. V [illegible] M[illegible]

Ac. No. [illegible]

Date of release for loan

5 NOV 19[illegible]

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of [illegible] will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

D. MISHEW
MEMBER OF THE BULGARIAN
ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

THE BULGARIANS IN THE PAST

PAGES FROM THE BULGARIAN CULTURAL HISTORY



LAUSANNE
LIBRAIRIE CENTRALE DES NATIONALITÉS
RUE CAROLINE
1919

TO MY DEAR AND NEVER TO BE FORGOTTEN SON

ALEXANDER

FALLEN IN THE EPIC BATTLE OF LULE-BURGAS
ON THE 17th OF OCTOBER 1912.

PREFACE

The present volume treats and delineates the most important phenomenon*) in the social life of the Bulgarians, side by side, as far as that is expedient, with that of their neighbouring peoples to whom they are intellectually and organically related. Being a first attempt of its kind among us, it may not be free from omissions or other defects which seem almost unavoidable in the sketching out of so numerous and so various facts and events, persons and ideas. But in order to neutralize any tendency to subjectivity which, as a rule, underestimates when it tries to overestimate, the explanation of the principal facts, events, persons, and ideas has been levelled to a criterium already established by native and foreign writers, authorities on the question.

It would be a great moral satisfaction to the author if the present work succeeds in emphasizing the fact, that *in our past, so little known, there is still a good deal of* ore in which undoubtedly many precious metals lie hidden. It remains for the ore to pass through the smelting process of scientific investigation, through which may be obtained the pure elements which, refined by objective criticism, may regain their genuine brilliancy. But that will be the aim of those who would devote their energy in a more

*) Here are not treated plastic art, architecture, painting, etc., which are being made object of a new study.

fundamental manner to the study of the history of the past, and who would give a more thourough scientific sifting to the facts, events, ideas, and persons.

One thing is evident: a purple clue, dipped in the blood of martyrs, links together all facts and events, and testifies of a persistent struggle of a democratic people to work out its destiny through culture, and of an unceasing effort to come to an understanding with its neighbouring states, and to federate with them. In the string of the recorded events the largest beads standing out most conspicuously are the literature and culture created in Bulgaria, known as Slavic, and the idea of democracy and reformation to which Bulgaria gave birth. In the same string shines out the most resplendent personality not only in the annals of Bulgarian history, but also in those of the history of south-eastern Slavdom — that of Tzar Simeon. Indeed for a time he did check the development of the Slavic spirit of democracy, nevertheless, without his firm autocracy — his greatest weakness, without his fine education and love for learning, without his extensive Bulgaria, Saint Clement and the host of Bulgarian writers would not have succeeded in laying the foundation of Slavic Literature. A patron strong and enlightened, and a state powerful and well organized were needed in the Balkans in order to facilitate and promote the growth of the Slavic alphabet and letters originated by St. Cyril and Methodius, and to pusl Slavic civilization to the front. Such a man was Simeon, and such a state was Bulgaria in the IXth century. On this all foreign writers of weight, who have studied up this question, are unanimous.

All the more striking is the fact that ten centuries later the same Bulgarian peasant people, with their hands on the plough, rise up to a new life, open up schools, restore their literature and national church, impose their name and ethnical boundaries upon Europe, and win an important place among the nations of the world. This is the grandest and most sympathetic phenomenon in the history of Bulgaria which brings on the scene new facts and new men of action. The new epoch broadens up the Bulgarian horizon and enlarges the list of historical themes which are awaiting the investigation of the diligent student.

On this question, however, as well as on the book's contents in general, it is for the objective criticism to pronounce its verdict. Its comments will be listened to with gratefulness and carefully profited by, whenever an occasion presents itself. Whoever claims perfection in his labours, forgets he is human.....

D. MISHEW.

CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . . page V

I. BYZANTINE EMPIRE. — Capital of the Byzantine Empire, Its Founder and Embellishment. — Its Population. — Library; the Capital a Centre of Culture — Boundaries, Nations. — Slavs on the Peninsula. — Language, Dynasty, Rulers. — Cosmopolitanism of the Byzantine Empire, Its Abolition, Empire's Conversion into Greek, its Struggle with Slavs and Bulgarians . . . . . page 1

II. BULGARIA AND ITS CIVILIZING MISSION. — Bulgarian State, Byzantine Civilization, and Simeon. — The two Creative Ideas of Boris — Simeon Creates the National Church, Samuel Preserves it. — Caloyan and Pope Innocent III — Primate and Caronation. — Ioan Assen II Reestablishes the Bulgarian Church. — Boris, and the Diciples of Cyril and Methodius. — Simeon, Author and Patron of Bulgarian Literature — Bishop Clement, Reformer, Pedagogue, and Orator. — Ioan Exarch, Chernorizetz Chrabre, Presbyter Cosmos — Literature during Peter and Samuel. — Literature during Second Kingdom. — Patriarch Eutimius, Teacher, Writer, and Educator. — Character of Bulgarian Literature. — Bulgarian Language, Literary, Medium of Roumanians. — Literary Criticism . . . . . page 20

III. BULGARIA'S ROLE IN THE REFORMATION. — Slavs and Bulgarians. — Slav's Conception of the World, its Expounder Priest Bogomil. — Theogony and Cosmogony of Bogomils. — Bogomil Ethics and Dogmatics. — State under Tzar Peter. — Reaction. — Bogomil Doctrine Slavic. — Diciples. — Bogomil Religion in the West. — Spirit of Tolerance in Bulgaria. — Revolution and Reformation in the West — Slav Contribution to World's Civilization — Bogomil and Apocryphal Literature page 55

IV. BYZANTIUM, GREEKS, BULGARIANS, AND SERBIANS. — Latin Period. — Hellenized Emperors — Christian Period — Iconoclastic Movement and Reforms. — Religious Struggles in Constantinople — National Feeling. — Byzantine Empire Greek or Slav. — *Simeon and the Union of the Slavs* — *Simeon*, Byzantium and the Serbians. — Russians and Greeks in Bulgaria — Samuel and Basilius. — Samuel's Plan for the Federation of the Slavs — Byzantium after Basilius II — Decline of the Empire. — Ivanitza and the Idea of Federation. — Ioan Assen II and the Federation, Stephan Dushan and the Federation. — Bulgarians, Serbians, and Greeks under Turks — Causes of Downfall . . . . . page 100

V. BULGARIANS UNDER POLITICAL AND SPIRITUAL YOKE. — Attitude of Turks towards Greeks and Bulgarians. — The Patriarch Political Chief of the Christians — Eutimius Exiled, Patriarch's Metropolitan in Turnovo — Christian Peoples in Turkey under Name of Romaioi. — Persecution and Extermination of Learned Men and Leaders. — Bulgaria during the XVth and XVIth Centuries. — Turkey Slav Empire — Conversions to Mohammedanism. — Rulers — Greek Renaissance and the Hellenization Idea. - Greek Bishops during the XVIIth Century. — Destruction of Bulgarian Books. — Hellenization. — Cherontes and Ephors at Patriarchate. — Phanar, Sale of Eparchies and Parishes. Life and Morals of Greek Bishops. — Bulgarian People Unrecognized Officially. — Trying Times for Phanar. — Two Periods of the Patriarchate. — Idea of Nationality page 170

VI. SELF-PRESERVATION AND AWAKENING. — Sultans Impartiality towards Christian Races — Bulgaria Continually Devastated. — Western Countries and Balkan Christians. — Insurrections in Bulgaria. — Emigrations. — Janissaries and Horrors. — Civil Wars and Revolutions. — Feudals and Spachis. — Guilds and Peasants. — Unofficial Representatives of the People. — First Bulgarian Communes. — Notables. — European Countries and Their Treaties with Turkey. — A Nation Exerts Protectorship over Orthodox. — Awakening and Pioneers . . . . . page 218

VII. RENAISSANCE. — Beginning and Character of Bulgarian Awakening. — Paissi and his Ideas. — Disciples of Paissi. — Uri Venelin — V. Apriloff and Neophyte of Rilo. —

Leaders and First Schools. — Struggle for Establishment of Bulgarian Schools. — Greek Bishops and Turkish Authorities against Bulgarians. — Greek Schools — Normal Schools and Teachers. — Three Gymnasias and their Alumni — Number of Primary Schools. — Literature. — Societies and Reading-Rooms. — Bulgarian School Wins Out page 280

VIII. BULGARIANS AND EUROPEAN POWERS. — Western Ideas — Reforms. — Russian Wars and the Bulgarians. — The Balkan Revolutionary Movements and the Bulgarians — Insurrections. — Personal Initiative and Centres. — Treaties by Bulgarians, Serbians, and Roumanians. — Serbia and Roumania towards Bulgaria — Balkan Confederation. — The Church Question — Restoration of the Bulgarian Church. — Democratic Character of the Church — Turkey, the Great Powers, and Bulgaria. — Europe and the Bulgarian Ethnical Boundaries . . . . . page 333

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . page 465

INDEX . . . . . page 467

I.

BYZANTINE EMPIRE.

Capital of the Byzantine Empire, its Founder and its Embellishment. — Its Population. — Library; the Capital a Centre of Culture — Boundaries, Nations. — Slavs on the Peninsula — Language, Dynasty, Rulers — Cosmopolitanism of the Byzantine Empire, its Abolition, Empire's Conversion into Greek, its Struggle with Slavs and Bulgarians

The Byzantine Empire was founded by Constantine I, called the Great and canonized, a son of the Roman Emperor Costance-Chlore. It was a Roman Empire as its founder was also a Roman by birth. — He was born at Naissus (Nish), in Moesia (274—337). For capital of the Empire he selected the ancient town of Byzance[1]), modern Constantinople, situated on the border-line of two peninsulas — the Balkan and the Anatolian, two continents — Europe and Asia, and three seas — the Black Sea, Marmora and the Aegean. Its location is the most valuable advantage of the capital, to which the Empire to a great extent owed its strength, tenacity, and life.

The new capital was built, as the old one, on seven hills. It was not surrounded by ramparts, as was the case with the ancient Rome. Its founder did not begin, as Romulus and Remus, with earthworks, clay houses, without plan, relying mainly on the sinews of its citizens. He conceived the future capital with its palaces, forums, monuments. There he came with a definite idea and plan for

[1]) Constantine had in view four cities for his capital: the ancient Troy, Salonica, Serdica (modern Sofia), and Byzantium; he preferred Byzantium because of its geographical position. See Gibbon, *Histoire de la décadence et la chute de l'empire roumaine*, vol. XIV, pp 17—20.

it, with his surveyors and architects. Having demolished the small town of Byzantium and cleared its site, with his sword in hand, heading a public procession, he started to mark out the city-belt of his future capital. In his zeal having gone too far ahead, his suite, amazed at the magnitude of the projected zone, asked him how far he intended to proceed. « Wherever stops he that leadeth me, » answered the Emperor. Traditions vary as to who his leader was. Some say it was an angel, others that it was Saint Mary herself who later on was chosen as the patron of the city. And to her the Capital always directed its prayers for help. Such a prayer is also the hymn «*Vosbrannoî Voïvodi* . . . composed and sung when the Bulgarians were besieging the Capital. Having defined the limits and dotted the quarters, he began to raise along the belt-line walls and fortifications of hewn stone, and inside the belt — marble palaces, houses, temples, porticoes, arches, statues, etc. In building his capital Constantine had at his disposal the talents, science, and arts of the Romans and Greeks, also the works and the treasures of three ancient civillizations — Egytian, Greek, and Roman.

The building up of the new capital was a gigantic undertaking. Thousands of labourers and a corresponding number of directing brains were needed. As the contingent of architects was inadequate, the Emperor sent instructions to the governors of the provinces, charging them with the responsibility of opening schools, of calling to them as teachers at a lucrative remuneration and privileges the best experts, and of bringing there the most promising youth. In these institutions the young men were given ample opportunity of becoming trained master-builders. In this way the Emperor was enabled to provide himself with the necessary quota of architects.

In order to beautify the Capital, Constantine made use of the masterpieces of the greatest of ancient Greek

and Roman artists. He stripped Athens, Rome, Sicily, Cæsarea, Sardis, Tralles, Chaldera, Antioch, Cyprus, Crete, Chios, Rhodes, Seleucia, Smyrna, Nicæa, and other cities, deporting from them the finest statues and monuments. He availed himself of the richest war-trophies of Rome, and of the highly esteemed artistic statues of gods, heroes, sages, and poets. In short, all that was valuable and rare, all objects of skill were employed for the embellishment of new Rome.

On the second of the seven hills he erected the principal forum. That was the hill on which he had pitched his tent as the conqueror of Licinnius, the Eastern Emperor with whom he was waging war. The forum was raised in honour of that victory. Its form was eliptical with two entrances. Over each entrance there was a triumphal arch; the porticoes surrounding the arches were adorned with statues. In the midst of the forum was looming up a column of white marble, on a pedestal twenty feet high. The column itself consisted of ten blocks of porphyry, each ten feet high. Parts of that column, in later years called «Burnt Column», are still preserved. On the very top of the column, hundred and twenty feet high, was placed a statue of Apollo which is said to be the work of Phidias. The statue was made of bronze and is believed to have been brought from Athens or from some other Phrygian town. It represented the god of light with a scepter in its right hand, a globe in its left, and a resplendent crown on its head. Some historians note that the statue was new and represented Constantine himself, others assert that there were two statues — one of Apollo, the other of Constantine[1]). The circus was no less wonderful. It was filled with statues and obelisks.

[1]) The statue of Apollo and Constantine was demolished by the Emperor Alexis Comnenus. See Gibbon, p. 35.

To this day there may be seen some of them: an obelisk and a column around which three serpents of copper are interwoven. Once their heads supported a golden tripod, which the Greeks had consecrated to the Delphian temple in memory of Xerxes' defeat and their victory over the Persians. In the circus was found a throne from which the Emperor watched the games, it was connected with the palace by means of a sliding staircase. The royal palace occupied the eastern angle which dominates the Bosphorus. Next to it was built the imperial forum encircled by the senatorial palace.[1]) A century after its foundation the new capital vied already with the old one. The following details in regard to the structures have come down to us from those times. The new Rome possessed a capitol, a circus, three basilicas, two theatres, eight public and one hundred and fifty-three private baths, fifty-two porticoes, seven granaries, eight aqueducts or cisterns, four halls of justice where the senate held its sessions, fourteen churches, fourteen palaces, forty-three hundred and eighty-three houses which in point of size and architectural beauty constituted a great contrast with the dwellings of the general population. The largest of the public baths, Zyoxyp, was an enormous edifice, decorated with marble columns of various hues, and with fifty bronze statues. The biggest of the cisterns had one thousand and one marble columns.

Emperor Constantine's care for the welfare of his subjects was no less than his efforts toward the adornment of his capital. Having collected into it the most exquisite productions of man's genius, having converted it into a grand museum, the Emperor took care to attract to it the

[1]) Ducange, vol I, chapter 24, p. 76. — Abbé de la Bretterie, *Histoire de Jovien*, vol. I, pp. 382—385. — M. Crevier, *Histoire des Empereurs*, vol. XII, p. 186. Gibbon, vol. IV, pp. 18—50. — Le Beau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. I, pp. 473—492.

noblemen, the rich, and the learned. It is said that in company with him there emigrated to Propontis on the Marmora the most prominent Roman families, the senators and Roman warriors. The increase of the population in the new capital took place at the expense of other cities. To the Roman senators, to the noblemen of Rome and the provincial towns the Emperor accorded priveleges, means, and facilities. To his favorites he presented palaces or mansions which he had ordered to be constructed in the various parts of the city, he also presented them with large tracts of land along the Black Sea and Asia in order to enable them to better their state. Many rich people driven by greed began of their own accord to flock from the country. Thousands of servants, workers, craftsmen, and merchants began to throng into the new city. Scarcely had a hundred years elapsed when the wealth, commerce, industry, and population increased to such an extent, that the original city-belt proved too small. Soon the inhabitants were compelled to build houses and palaces outside of it on both sides of the Bosphorus.

The founder took steps to guarantee the city population also with food supply. He introduced the same custom which existed in Rome of distributing bread, olive oil, meat, and money to the poor. He made it obligatory upon Egypt and some provinces in Asia, Africa, and Europe to pay their taxes in kind. Thus grain came from Egypt, oil from some Asiatic and African districts, meat from Europe and Asia.

Like Rome, the Capital was divided into fourteen quarters. It was publicly dedicated, some say in the year 330 A. D., others in 334 A. D., and was called *Second* or *New Rome.* That name was engraved in letters of gold on a marble column. But time and man had their own way and called it by the name of its founder, the city of Constantine or Constantinople which it still retains.

The descendants and successors of Constantine the Great continued to deck the Capital and multiply the number of its monuments. Julian the Apostate moved the library into one of the basilicas built by his predecessor, placed in it his own books, and converted it into a public institution. From the Vth up to the VIIIth century the emperors continued the building up of Constantinople: they erected temples, palaces, aqueducts baths, etc. The Emperor Justinian made his name immortal by the construction of the temple of St. Sophia, the most extraordinary masterpiece of world's architecture. The library, however, was the most precious treasure of the new capital. During the IVth century at the time of its foundation, according to some chroniclers and historians, the library counted about six hundred thousand volumes. It possessed a hundred and twenty thousand manuscripts in the reign of Emperor Zeno the Isaurian, in whose time it was burned down. Both the basilica and the books were destroyed. Zeno restored the library, but it took a long while before it reached its former completeness. At the end of the VIIIth century the books numbered as high as thirty-six thousand volumes. Later on in connection with it an academy was founded where twelve professors under the direction of a chief, called *universal*, were kept at work. The professors were chosen from among the most erudite class of men in the Empire. They taught in the academy gratis, and were at the same time court consellors. They were often entrusted with high missions. Under their guidance were also occupied fifteen clericals, conspicuous for their learning and virtues. The Emperor Leo III, an iconoclast and fanatic, failing to draw to himself the professors, which he considered a dangerous element, decided to get rid of them. At his instigation the library was one night set on fire and burned completely. That happened in 730 A. D. It is asserted that the professors

who lived in the library also became victims of the conflagration [1]). In the reign of the Byzantine emperors who came after Leo III the library was refitted and gradually enriched.

Such was the new Rome. It was the Paris of the IVth century, the greatest centre of culture in the world. It attracted savants and artists from various parts of the globe, of which some came to display their knowledge and skill, others to complete their education, while the young men eager for learning crowed the institutions. And as after the conquest of the Balkan Peninsula by Rome, the Romans, haugty rulers as they were, condescended to go to Athens in order to perfect there knowledge in the Greek schools of philosophy and oratory, in the same way during the middle ages there used to swarm into Constantinople from the neighbouring states and even from the far West crowds of seekers for high learning. The father-in-law of Luitprand used to say that he was ready to give a half of his fortune in order to have his nephew master the Greek literature and philosophy. Visitors and admirers from both France and England were to be seen there. In the beginning of the XIth century a certain Adam of Paris started for Constantinople through Dalmatia with the ambition of acquiring perfection in the art of writing. «Tzar Simeon,» writes Rambaud, «was undoubtedly not the only Bulgarian pupil of the Greeks. Constantine VII must have had more than one young man from the same nation mingling with the school youth of Constantinople.» [2])

In truth, Constantinople as a centre of culture never came to be what Athens was in ancient times: the Byzantine genius never succeeded in creating both in literature and in art such immortal productions as those of Eschylus

[1]) Le Beau, vol. I, p. 414, vol. XIII, p. 357, and vol. XXVII, p. 203.

[2]) Rambaud, *L'Empire grec au dixième siècle.* Paris, 1870, pp. 541 and 542.

Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato Aristotle, Demosthenes, Phidias, Praxiteles, etc., but it nevertheless played the part of a curator of the works of Homer and the rest of the ancient creators of the beautiful, besides giving birth to a host of Christian chroniclers, historians, philosophers, and orators. It also had its Christian Demosthenes whom it called John Chrysostom who thundered his philippics against the basilei, and its law-giver Solon whose name is Justinian.

Secondary centres of culture existed in many of the provinces of the Empire such as Athens, Salonica, Adrianople, Cæsarea, Nicæa, etc.

At first the Empire was called the *Eastern Roman Empire* in distinction from the *Western Roman Empire* whose capital remained Rome. Later on it assumed the name of its capital *Byzantium*, or *Byzantine Empire*. During the middle ages it was the greatest, most powerful, and most civilized country in Europe. Its boundaries stretched beyond the Danube and Euphrates. They often included all of the Caucasus, entire Armenia, sometimes all of Dalmatia, in Europe. Constantine VII in the Xth century considered the domains of the Western Roman Emperors as passing over under the jurisdiction of the Byzantine, and asserted that the authocrat of Constantinople was the lord of the sea up to the Pillars of Hercules. Leo Diaconus, too, states that had not Nicephorus Phocas died prematurly, the boundaries of the Empire might have reached as far as India and the Ocean. But whether they extended as far as India or Euphrates, the boundaries of the Empire often contracted, its provinces were often wrested from her by conquest, and her emperors were deprived of all but their capital. [1]). But as long as it re-

[1]) According to Rambaud, p. 337, when Roman Lacapenus and Simeon met each other under the walls of Constantinople, there were sighted two eagles which passed over their heads, touched each.

tained Constantinople, its vast walls with their numerous fortifications, the Byzantine Empire was able to maintain its existence, and as soon as opportunity presented itself, it easely recovered and widened its dominions as far as Danube and Euphrates. Constantinople once lost, the Empire was lost also. That happened twice: first in 1204 A. D., when the Crusaders conquered the Byzantine Capital, and again towards the end of the middle ages, in 1453 A. D., when Mohammed II entered the same and occupied the throne of the Byzantine Emperors. In general, during the middle ages Constantinople was a rock which resisted, not without serious concussion for the Empire itself, the blows of all invaders. From the IVth to the Xth century, however, the Empire was continually harassed and her territory encroached upon by Goths, Huns, Vandals, Slavs Persians, Anti, Bulgarians, Avars, Serbians, Hungarians, Russians, Hazars, Arabs, Pechenegs, etc. The Empire received the most serious wounds leaving deepest scars from the Slavs, and in particular from the Bulgarians. Its history and geography of the middle ages clearly show these evidences. To-day's ethnographic cast of the Balkan Peninsula is a living witness of those wounds and traces.

Some of the invading nations only passed through the Empire, devastated and plundered its cities and provinces, and went their way. Such were the Goths, the Huns, the Avars, the Hazars, the Russians, the Pechenegs, the Koumans, etc. Others continued their invasions for centuries, occupied some of its provinces, settled, and remained in them. Such were the Slavs who began to

other, and flew away, one toward Constantinople, the other toward Thrace. In those days, indeed, two empires existed on the Peninsula, the Bulgarian, vastly extended, and the Roman, left with but one city, its capital. According to the same author, in the days of Heraclius, the Empire was stripped of all its possessions but Constantinople and its Asiatic provinces.

immigrate into the peninsula during the Vth century, and later on the Bulgarians who came from the Ural in the VIIth century. During the Vth and VIth centuries Slavic tribes seized one by one Moesia, Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, a large part of Epirus, Thessaly, and Peloponnesus. The entire region from the mountain Haemus down to the Peloponnesus and the Aegean Sea was called Slavinia[1]). These tribes assumed the names of the territory they occupied, viz., Northerners, Branichevs, Kouchevans, Timokchans, Moravians, Birzaks, Strumanians, Smolians, Richnins, Sagoudats, Dragovichi, Volnichi, Vesselichi, Zagorians, Miltzi, Ezertzi, etc. The whole of Peloponnesus was settled by Slavs, chiefly by Miltzi, Ezertzi, Dragovichi. Settlements existed as far as Lasconia, in Sparta and in Attica — clear to the gates of Athens itself. Having organized themselves, they remained the masters of Peloponnesus for a certain period of time. Christianity and the Greek civilization absorbed them. They were assimilated by the more cultured native element, the names of their settlements only surviving. Between Volo, the mountain Ossa, and Peloponnesus there is a district named Zagorie. In the Xth century under the jurisdiction of the Larissa episcopacy there existed the *Ezero* bishopric which is believed to have derived its name from the Slavs called Ezertzi or lake-settlers. The Slavs changed the name of Peloponnesus itself. Since the middle ages its geographical name is generally known as Morea. Throughout Morea, nearly all the appellations of settlements, moutains, and plains are Slavonic. Such is the case both in Epirus an Thessaly. «The Slav element,» writes Rambaud[2])

[1]) Dr. Constantine Ireček, *History of the Bulgarians.*

[2]) Other Slavonian tribes settled in Illiria, Bosnia, Zachloumie, Duclea, Dalmatia, Pannonia, etc. They were called Serbians, Hrvats, Bosnians, Zachloumians, Travounians, Ducleans, Nareehani, etc. — Rambaud, pp. 220—230. — M. Drinoff, *Zasselenie Balkanskago Poluostrova Slavianomi,* edited by Prof. Zlatarski, vol. I, pp. 295—316.

« changed the language of both geography and history; it compelled the Byzantine authors to speak not only of Moesia, Thrace, Dardania, Thessaly, Epirus, Hellas, Peloponnesus, but also of Bulgaria, Serbia, Moravia, Slavinia and Zagoria, Morea and Bersetia, etc. Almost to the walls of Athens, in the sacred Eleusia, is found a Slavic inscription. Lenormant notes down as Slav colonies the villages Vranya, Bastani, Varnaby, Matsi, Tchourka, Brana, lying in the plains and upon the slopes of Marathon, and Zouno, in the plain of Eleusia.

« On Peloponnesus we rely upon the accurate evidences collected by Falmereier, who after scrutinizing over the topographical appellations, district by district, and after carefully examining the etymology of each, arrives to the same conclusion as Constantine VII did, viz., that the entire Peninsula had become Slavonian. In the first place the very name of Morea which superseded the old name of the island of Pelops and which in Slavonic means maritime country; the name of mountains, such as Hulm, in Achaia, of towns such as Orechovo, Sholmina, in Laconia, of counties, such as Slavochorion or Slavinia in Mecenia; Zagora in Arcadia; Veligosta on the ruins of the same Mantinea which had seen the fall of Epaminondas; Goritza perched upon the site of ancient Tegea; Nicla which in turn gives over its place to Tripolitza.

« But in citing these results obtained from topographical and etymological investigations made by Falmereier, one should not forget the objections raised against the above assertions. Lick, for example, assures us that in the geography of Peloponnesus, one Slavonic name stands against ten Greek ones.

« The Greek Emperors often waged war against the two Slavonias — against the Southern and Macedonian Slavonias. » [1])

[1]) Rambaud, pp. 227—230.

Of the same Peloponnesus Ireček writes: «Not only Epirus and Thessaly, but Hellas itself, the ancient and famous plains of Peloponnesus, Athens, and Beotia are covered with Slavonian appellations of localities. Three fourths of the local names testify of the Slavic settlements now extinct. Helicon is known by the name of Zagory, close to Marathon is found a village called Vranya. Here we discover the mountain Hemnos (Hulm), and the well known villages: Bistritza, Boucovina, Goritza, Granitza, Kamenitza, Nivitza, Podgora, Tsernitza,[1]) etc. In a Venetian record of the year 1293 A. D. Tsaconitza is given simply 'Sclavonia de Morea', The modern name of Peloponnesus, Falmereier derives from the Slavic word *morë*. Kopitar, however, is opposed to this view, while to-day Professor Hopf proves that *Morea* is a mere metathesis of *Romea* la Mourée, l'Amorea».

In his map of Peloponnesus, Hellas, and Thessaly, without the islands, Kiepert grades the geographical names in the following proportion, viz., three fourth Slavic, one tenth Albanian, one tenth New Greek, and only one tenth ancient.[2])

The Slavonian tribes that settled in Moesia, Thrace, Macedonia, and Dardania, as we will see later on, were more fortunate than their kinsmen in Peloponnesus, Thessaly, and Epirus. Here they succeeded in preserving their individuality, and soon created in the Balkan Peninsula a state of their own, with their own church, literature, and culture.

The Byzantine Empire at the period of its foundation was a motley of nations and tongues. From the IVth to the Xth century that racial mosaic becomes more varie-

[1]) Dr. Constantine Jos. Ireček, pp. 148—157. — The works of M. Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 80 and 41.

[2]) Kiepert, *Inhaltreiche Texte*. pp. 29. — Ireček, p. 171. — *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. I, p. 288.

gated still. The Empire was called Roman, but ethnographically it was neither Roman, nor Greek. During its existence it was able to impose its name upon the Greeks only. From the very beginning, the Greeks though possessed of a high civilization, preferred to style themselves *Romani* or *Romaioi,* instead of *Hellenes* or *Greeks.* When the Turks captured Constantinople they found the Greeks calling themselves with their new name. Thus they applied it to the entire Greek people and church, viz., *Roum-mileti, Roum-klissesi.* Paparrhigopoulo says the Hellenes sacrificed their name in order to become masters of the Empire.

No real Romans existed in the Byzantine Empire, or if there were any, they were very few. The Emperors, the Church, and the Administration used the Greek language. Nevertheless, the Empire was by no means Greek, neither were its Emperors and public men. The patriarchs and men of letters were often persons of alien descent. The Empire was a cosmopolitan country where the avenues for advancement to the hierarchical ranks in the clerical, civil, and military administration, and even to the very throne itself, were open to all talented persons irrespectively of their race. That was due to the fact that Roman citizens were a scarcity, while the Greek element was far too insignificant in point of number to be able to satisfy the great need for government and church officials. For that reason the Empire was compelled to avail itself of the services of able and fit men found among the other races of which the Empire was composed. It drew its armies, war chiefs, magistrates, even its patriarchs and Emperors from the Slavs, Armenians, Goths, Hosars, Arabs, Albanians, Alants, and others. Thus the barbarian himself could climb to the highest office of Byzantium once he had gone through the baptismal ordeal. The converted pagan, therefore, who was an individual of ability,

had all the chances of making his way up to the highest imperial posts. And so it often happened.

Next to the Greeks, the Slavs and the Armenians supplied the Empire with greatest number of talented men, and of all other races helped to enhance the glory and grandeur of Byzantine rulers.

In Constantinople they vied with each other in point of talent, eagerness for assimilation, and subserviency. Which of the two races was more conducive to absorbtion is still an open question, waiting for a detailed investigation. One thing, however, is certain and that is that the majority of historians are unanimous in asserting that both the Slavs and the Armenians have given the Empire a large number of archonts, patricians, writers, even patriarchs, emperors, and empresses. This statement is not denied by the Greek historians. Prof. Paparrhigopoulo himself writes: «Another means of attracting foreigners to the Empire was opening to them wide the doors for civil and military posts. Being fascinated by such privileges, the Slavs it seems more easily than the other races conformed with the existing order of things. The emperors Justin and Justinian are a splendid example of this. A great many Goths and Alants were thus tamed. The Bulgarians alone remained obdurate. Indeed they studied in Constantinople, but even as conquered and slaves they imbibed as much knowledge as was expedient under the circumstances, always looking for an opportunity of escaping into their own country in order to resume their desperate struggle against Hellenism.[1])

The dynasty of Justin I from which Justinian descended, and the dynasty of Basilius the Macedonian were not Greek, neither were those of Leo V and Roman

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, *Histoire de la civilisation hellénique*, Paris, 1878, p. 305—308; 275 and 276. — M. Drinoff, *Works of*, vol. I, pp. 37—39. — Rambaud, pp. 534 and 555. — Ireček, p. 103.

Lacapenus. Until very recently the emperors come from the first two dynasties were considered Slavs by the historians, as for exemple, Rambaud, Drinoff, and Ireček (viz., the Macedonian), and Paparrhigopoulo himself.

Lately, however, Vassileff[1]), the Russian historian, and some others prove this to be a legend. It is asserted too that Leo V, Roman Lacapen, Nicephorus Phocas and John Zimisces were Armenians.

In the reign of Justinian there distinguished themselves the Slavic warriors Hvaliboud, Vsegord, Dobrogost, Savarouna; under his successors — the patricians Tatimir and Onogost; and under Michael Slavesien — Thoma. Andrea, one of the most valiant chiefs of Basil I, the victor of the Arabs and the right-hand of Leo VI, was a Slav. Eudoxie, the third wife of Leo VI, and Sophia, the wife of emperor Christophor Lacapen, were Slavs[2]). In 766 A. D. the patriarchal throne was occupied by Nickita, a Slav from Peloponnesus. «In the Byzantine Empire,» writes Drinoff, «there are met a good many noted personages from the Slavs who fell under the sway of Byzantium, while the number of lower officials clerks, officiers, and warriors reached up to legions».

In the Xth century the invasions into the Empire cease, and the peoples settled in it establish themselves first as vassals to the Empire, and subsequently as independent states. The first free country within the boundaries of Byzantium was Bulgaria. With its appearance the vassalage of the Slavic states gradually vanishes. Next follow suite as free nations Serbia, Croatia, Hungary, later on in the XIIIth century, the Roumanians also. The

[1]) See: *Vizantiiski vremyannik*, the article: *Slaviane vo Gretsu*, vol. V.

[2]) Rambaud, the same, pp. 315—345, pp. 534 and 535. — M. Drinoff, *Works of*, vol. I, p. 38. — *Russkaya Besseda*, 1859, section, Sience, pp. 105—160.

Greeks group themselves into vassal states such as those of Athens, Trebizond, Epirus, and later on into an independent state, that of Nicaea, the latter being created after the Crusaders captured Constantinople and founded the Latin Empire. But the strongest of all the states after the Byzantine Empire, and the one organized first was Bulgaria, established by the Bulgarians who in the VIIth century crossed the Danube and settled on the Peninsula, and the Slavs whom they found in Mœsia. The Bulgarians in fusing with the Mœsian Slavs and thus creating a new political unit, imposed their name not only upon the Slavs in Mœsia, but also on those in Thrace, Macedonia, and Dardania.

Thus Bulgarians, Serbians, and Roumanians, after centuries of struggle against Byzantium, against Greeks and Albanians, as well as against each other, finally settle down and with their might and main delineate their ethnical boundary-lines. During the middle ages though the political confines of the various states fluctuate, their ethnical remain the same. When the Turks conquered the Balkan Peninsula, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Albania, and Roumania did not possess their ethnical limits. The Turks, though masters of the Peninsula, and though they had destroyed these states one after another, were powerless before the racial compactness and tenacity manifested by Bulgarians, Serbians, Greeks, Roumanians, and Albanians. Those ethnical boundaries remained the same then as they were during the Xth century and as they are to-day. Rambaud, therefore, rightly asserts that the Turkish invasion of the Balkan Peninsula resulted only in the change of the Byzantine *Basileus* to *Sultan*, and the colonization of a million of Turks in Thrace.[1])

But during the middle ages a radical change takes place both in the spirit and in aims of the Empire. At the

[1]) Rambaud, p. XIV, *Préface.*

time when on the Balkan peninsula began to assert themselves as independent states Bulgaria, Serbia, Roumania, and later on Albania, the Byzantine Empire saw itself pushed toward the Aegean Sea and left only with the Greek and part of the Slavic element, the latter being driven thither by the wave of historical necessity. Then it was filled with an anxiety about its fate and makes the decision of abandoning its cosmopolitanism. The greek Emperors and patriarchs occupying the thrones of Constantinople during that period made an encroachment upon the historical documents and records of Byzantium, changing and counterfeiting them with the result that the Roman or Byzantine Empire was thus converted into *purely Greek*. Side by side with this they set themselves a new task, namely, with both arms and culture to subjugate the Slavic and other states by assimilating all foreign element and converting it into Greek. The struggle was begun with Bulgaria, the strongest Slavic state country and the one nearest to the Byzantine Empire. They resorted to all sorts of means and methods which the Byzantine genius and diplomacy was capable of inventing, during the Middle Ages. Before hurling their armies into Bulgaria, the Emperors of Constantinople first used to bribe with gold and array against it one after another Serbians, Hungarians, Russians, Pechenegs, Roumans, Tartars, Arabs, etc. [1]), and when these had weakened it, Byzantium in turn dashed its legions into it. That struggle continued for hundreds of years. Various other policies were employed to the same end. Money, promises, privileges and tracts of land were lavishly given, away in order to expatriate whole tribes from Asia and to colonize them in purely Slavic communities. And vice versa, the Byzantine rulers transplanted into Asia the population of whole Slavic

[1]) Prof. V. Zlatarski, *Principal Epochs of the Bulgarian History*, Bulgarian Review, vol. III, nomber II, pp. 32 and 35.

provinces fallen under their power. Such wholesale exiles have been recorded by greek chroniclers also who have marked down three such immigrations, viz., an immigration of Turks [1]) from Asia into the region around Vardar and Uskub, the Turks being subsequently called *Vardiotes;* an immigration later on of Turks around the districts of Ochrida and Vodena; and an immigration of Syrians, Armenians, Paulicians in Thrace and chiefly in Philippopolis and its vicitrity. They have also described three immigrations of Slavs from Thrace and Macedonia into Asia. Justinian II at once caused the deportation of thirty thousand Slavs [2]), and another time of seventy thousand into Asia, not to speak of partial expatriations forced upon various districts in the Balkan peninsula. In the VIIIth century about two hundred and eight thousand Slavs immigrated into Asia. It is certain that other Slavic immigrations have taken place of which nothing in known.

In order to arrest the power of the growing Slavs and Bulgarians, the Byzantine Emperors built fortresses. Emperor Anastasius raised a wall from Selimvria (modern Silivria) at the Propontis (on the Marmora) to Dercon at Pontus (Black Sea). Justinian erected many fortresses along the Danube and about six hundred fortifications in Macedonia, Thessaly, Epirus [3]) and elsewhere.

In short, Byzantium made use of both religion and culture in its eagerness to change the character, nationality and language of the Slavs. [4])

---

[1]) Lejan, *Etnographie de la Turquie d'Europe*, pp. 20 and 38. — Rambaud, pp. 214, 215 and 269.

[2]) Rambaud, pp 213 and 218. — *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. I, p. 40. — Ireček, pp. 174, 175 and 186. — St. Stonoyevich, *Istoria srpskago naroda*, 1910, p. 26.

[3]) Ireček, pp. 107 and 109. — Rambaud, p. 264. — Paparrhigopoulo, p. 60.

[4]) Rambaud, Préface, p. IV. — Prof. V. Zlatarski. *Bulgarian Review*, vol. III, number II, pp. 36 and 37.

The struggle between Greeks and Bulgarians continued incessantly from the reign of Anastasius to the invasion of the Balkans by the Turks. It was being carried on not only on the field of battle, but also in the school and church. During the turkish dominion the conflict was narrowed down to a struggle principally between the Bulgarians and the Greek patriarchy now no more championing the aims and ideals of the Byzantine Empire, but those of the Greek.

II.

BULGARIA AND ITS CIVILIZING MISSION.

Bulgarian State, Byzantine Civilization and Simeon — Boris' two Grand Conceptions. — Simeon creates National Church, Samuel preserves it. — Caloyan and Pope Innocent III. — Primate and Coronation. — Joan Assen II reestablishes the Bulgarian Church. — Boris and the Disciples of Cyril and Methodius Simeon, Author and Patron of Bulgarian Literature — Bishop Clement, Reformer, Pedagogue and Orator. — Joan Exarch, Chernorizetz Chrabre, Prespyter Cosma — Literature during Peter and Samuel. — Literature during Second Kingdom. — Patriarch Eutimius, Teacher, Writer and Educator — Character of Bulgarian Literature. — Bulgarian Language Literary Medium of Roumanians. — Literary Criticism.

The Slavs who colonized the Balkan peninsula in the Vth century led an isolated tribal life. Some of them had established themselves into principalities vassal to the Byzantine Empire, others formed loose organizations under the direct control of Constantinople. Though numerous, brave and tempered in warfare, they did not represent a mighty power because of their being divided[1]), disorganized and hostile to each other. Byzantium knew how to profit by the sinews and military ability of the majority of them in using them against various barbarian races and often against Slavs. The Bulgarians who appeared in Moesia during the VIIth century conquered the northern Slavs, on the Severyani, and established a Slavic state to which, as was already seen, they gave their name. They accomplished this under the leadership of their prince Asparouch who is considered the founder of the first in-

[1]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. I, p. 31.

dependent Slavic state on the Balkan peninsula. In order to live amicably with this new power, Byzantium was compelled to conclude a treaty with its ruler according to which the Empire bound herself to pay tribute to the latter. Under the successors of Asparouch the treaty was renewed and amended with a clause by which the commercial relations between Bulgaria and the Empire were stipulated. That took place during the reign of Trebbel. Though it had to face many serious foes, the now kingdom managed to preserve its independence and power. Under Tzar Kroum Bulgaria displayed such energy and dash that shook the foundation of the Byzantine Empire. The Bulgarian Tzar came to the very walls of Constantinople an in the Capital itself had a parley with the Greek Emperor. During Kroums reign the boundaries of Bulgaria reached beyond the Danube as far as the Transylvanian mountains and almost to the city of Adrianople in Thrace. He also conquered Sofia. Under Pressiam and Boris Bulgaria extended its limits north-west to the river Iber, and south-west beyond Ochrida. Almost the whole of Macedonia was included in the kingdom.

The boundaries of Byzantium, on the other hand, had begun to contract since the foundation of the Bulgarian kingdom. But if the Empire lacked the strength and energy of the Slavs who were united and organized by the Bulgarians, it had at its disposal its culture which was a stronger weapon than the Bulgarian arms. It also possessed on the peninsula a series of moral citadels which were more effective than the walls of Emperor Anastasius and the thousands of stone fortifications raised against the Bulgarians by the Byzantine emperors throughout Moesia, Thrace, Macedonia and Dardania, Constantinople, the new Rome, being then its greatest centre of culture was naturally its strongest moral citadel. That fortress needed for its defence no forts, catapults, bows and shafts, for

its libraries, museums, schools, science, arts, monuments, industry and commerce were far mightier weapons. Against such a stronghold and arms of defence the Bulgarian tendous and lances, and the military genius of Kroum were powerless. Kroum, indeed, was able to smite and defeat the Empire with his physical superiority, but he was unable to conquer and rule over it intellectually and morally. The Empire made greater conquests, exerted stronger influence upon the subdued nations and kept them more securely in its power through its culture than with its legions led by talented generals. Through her civilization it succeeded in assimilating the Slaws inhabiting the Peloponnesus, Thessaly and Epirus. The rest of the Balkan Slavs would have shared the same fate had they not made a common cause to free themselves from Greek culture.

Byzantine Christianity, too, side by side with Byzantine culture were brought to play in the Empires policy of assimilating the barbarians. The influence of both was far-reaching. The rays of Constantinople civilization illumined everything around. They permeated all the neighboring states and nations, be they vassal or independent. They even pervaded the remotest regions of the globe. Because of its geographical nearness to the Empire, Bulgaria could not help being directly exposed to the Byzantine culture and designs. The very greatest danger, therefore, existed for the Bulgarians lest they should be affected, gradually assimilated with the *Romaioi* and finally, like their kinsmen on the Peloponnesus, be entirely obliterated, leaving to geography only the names of the settlements they once inhabited, and to history a record of their struggle with Byzantium. The culture of a nation or state is its greatest shield of defence. The Byzantine basilei were well aware of this truth and acted accordingly. But the perspicacious and enterprizing Bulgarian kings Boris and Simeon were also equal to the occasion. It was through this

power of perspicacity that shone the brilliancy of the bulgarian creative genius which within the limits of Byzantium gave birth not only to a Bulgarian state, but also the Bulgarian literature and civilization, which subsequently served as the foundation of the Slavic literature and civilization. Tzar Kroum is being treacherously received in Constantinople and lured away with gifts. He is seemingly contented with the weight of silk and gold. Simeon, on the other side, did not appear in Byzantium in quest of silk and gold, he had both. In him the Eastern Empire sees a Christian Bulgaria and bulgarian civilization. Simeon is its representative and personification. In respect to intellect, education and learning, he vied with the most cultured Byzantine statesmen of those days. The address of emperor Romanus to Tzar Simeon, whether authentic or apocryphal, is already an appeal of culture to culture, of a weaker to a stronger, of Byzantium to Bulgaria. «In Byzantium», says Rambaud, «Simeon detested the Byzantine Empire. Emperor, patriarch, Senate, sacred relics, — all was an abomination to him. His triumph was complete, but not his success.»

At his meeting with Simeon whose hosts enveloped the walls of Contantinople four times in succession, the greek emperor felt the impetuous threatening of the Slavs directed by the Bulgarians. On the other side Simeon, too, felt the fascinating power of civilization exerted by Byzantium, which was the work of Romans and Greeks, and which was such a potent instrument for the preservation of the Empire. In the personality of Simeon Byzantium saw the Slavs no more mere barbarians armed with weapons only, but warriors armed also with books and culture pushing for more room for its might, energy and enterprizing spirit. Side by side with the roman and greek literature, a new one — the Slavonic[1]) was ma-

[1]) V. Zlatarski, *Bulgarian Review*, vol. III, number II, p. 32.

king its appearance in the world, and Bulgaria from Simeon to the XIVth century becomes the centre of slav learning and civilization.

In the political life of Bulgaria, during the first and second Bulgarian kingdoms the traces of a prevailing national idea are clearly in evidence. Dim at the start they begin to get clearer and more tangible as events outline themselves. The tendency of the controlling idea is the consolidation of Slavdom on the Balkans and the creation of a Slavic literature and culture able to hold its own against the rivalling Greek and Latin which were unsuitable to its spirit and dangerous to its race individuality. The seed of this idea is originally sown by Boris, the first Bulgarian Christian Tzar and Slavic saint. Guided by this idea, in bringing about the conversion to Christianity of the Bulgarian people, he does not make his state spiritually subordinate neither to Rome, nor to Byzantium but endeavors to found an independent national church — an epochal exploit which at the conversion of their respective nations neither the Serbian great, Jupans, the Russian Grand Dukes, Prince St. Vladimir, nor the Hungarian-Wallachian Voïvode Alexander, are successful in accomplishing. On this account Serbia, Russia and Roumania, though independent countries politically, religiously remain for a long time under the jurisdiction of a foreign authority. [1]) Before passing over to the Patriarchy, the Serbians used the Latin tongue in their churches. — After their conversion they accepted the Patriarch as their supreme religious chief. Not so King Boris. He made the question of conversion a «sine qua non» for a national church. And one of the inquiries which he makes through his delegates to Pope Nicolaus, and which bespeaks the profound and sagacious statesman that he was, is: May Bulgaria have a Patriarch of its own? He raises the same point before

[1]) Goloubinski, *Kratkii ocherk Istorii chervei*, Moscau, 1871, p. 148.

the patriarch of Constantinople. By this question he had run against church traditions. Neither Constantinople, nor Rome recognized any national church: [1]) indeed, they acknowledged an independent church, but not a separate church of this or that nation. As education in those days was connected with the church and represented by it, Boris was equally aprehensive of both the eastern and the western churches. Besides he had other no less important reasons for acting thus. The newly-born Slavic literature and education were in need of a special care lest they should be stifled and crushed at their very appearance in the world. In order to protect them against every injurious influence, he wished to have the Bulgarian nation maintain its freedom from all foreign authority. And if the Byzantine patriarch Photius compares the act of Boris in converting the Bulgarians and proclaiming the Christian faith for national with the achievements of Constantine the Great, then his conception of an independent national church is undoubtedly the most brilliant ray in the aureole of the first Bulgarian Christian Tzar.

That ideal Boris bequeathed to his successors. In a few words it may be expressed: an independent national church and slavic literature. His son Simeon took it up and brought its full realization. In his reign Bulgaria lays the foundation of a state church. He was able to achieve this success trough his treaties with the Pope whose benediction sanctioned the new institution. During Simeons time Bulgaria besides a free church had its own writers and

[1]) A. d'Avril, *Les Hierarchies Orientales, Revue de l'Histoire Diplomatique,* Paris, 1901, p. 298: «From the IXth century to our day there were created as many autonomons and autocephalous churches as there were independent states: For ancient Bulgaria in 952 (?) A. D., for Wallacho-Bulgarian in 1234 A. D., for Serbia 1376 A. D., for Russia in 1588, for Greece in 1856, for modern Serbia 1879, for modern Roumania in 1885.»

Slavic literature which quickly spread among the other Slavs, driving out the Greek and Latin. Under his successor, Peter, by order of the Byzantine emperor, Romanus Lecaponus, the patriarch of Constantinople recognized the autonomy of the Bulgarian church. The integrity of the church continued during the reign of Samuel, also, who after the fall of the Eastern Bulgarian Church, removed its seat to Western Bulgaria [1]), first to Serdica (Sofia) and then to Ochrida. There it was able to maintain its existence even after the fall of the Western Bulgarian Kingdom, now under the name of the Ochrida archbishopric. The greek Emperor Basilius II with his three edicts given to Ochrida archbishop Joan, about 1020 A. D., confirmed the religious rights of the Bulgarians and the independence of Ochrida archbishopric [2]) In one of those edicts he defines its diocese, naming the bishoprics comprised in it. The archbishopric remained in Ochrida clear through the second Bulgarian Kingdom when the patriarchy of Tirnova was founded. It existed until 1767, when the greek patriarch Samuel prevailed upon the Turkish government to abolish it.

During the second Bulgarian Kingdom the independence of the Bulgarian Church was restored this time at Tirnova. For its restoration Tzar Ivanitza, or Kaloyan, as he is usually called, made great exertion. Being encouraged by a flattering letter he received from Pope Innocent III one of the ablest, most ambitious and practical pontifs, who made half of the european rulers his vassals, Ivanitza zealously resumed the traditional undertaking of Boris.

According to his thinking, in order that Bulgaria would regain its full independence from the greek yoke,

[1]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. I, p. 349. — Ireček, pp. 262 and 263.

[2]) *Works of* M Drinoff, vol. II, p. 205. Article: *Three Edicts (Tri gramoti).*

it was not sufficient to obtain its political freedom without at the same time possessing its religious or church independence. In his answer to the letter Pope Innocent III who had written him first with the purpose of predisposing him to take part in the Crusades, but chiefly of bringing Bulgaria under papal authority and of latinizing it, Ivanitza makes the following demands, viz., a crown for himself and an independent church for his people. The Pope consented to grant his first request, but refrained from giving his sanction to the second one the way it was defined by the Bulgarian Tzar — a fully independent national church. Between Tirnova and Rome begin long negotiations, letters are being exchanged and delegations become frequent. Pope Innocent sends in succession three delegates armed with credentials investing them with full powers to conclude treaties; Archbishop Dominic of Brindisi, the abbot John Capelan, a confidential person at the court of Rome, and Cardinal Leo. Ivanitza, in turn, despatches three delegations bearing rich gifts to the Pope. The first delegation was headed by the bishop of Branichevo, whose diocese covered the province of Lower Bulgarian Morava with Branichevo as its seat. The city of Branichevo was situated at the point where the river Mlava empties itself into the Danube, near modern Smederovo, and like Belgrade itself, was subordinate to Bulgaria and inhabited by Bulgarians. The second one was led by Basilius Bishop of Tirnova. The third delegation started with the Branichevo's bishop again as its spokesman. Metropolitan Basilius did not reach Rome. He was turned back by the Greeks who allowed his suite alone to resume its journey to the Holy City. Innocent III agreed to consecrate the Tirnova bishop to the dignity of a primate on the condition that his successors should never be eligible to the same post without first receiving their pallium from the pontiff of Rome. Ivanitza meanwhile was

leeding correspondence with Byzantium also. In order to win the Pope over, he wrote him saying that the Byzantine emperor, hearing of Romes negotiations with Bulgaria, sent the patriarch of Constantinople to Tirnova bearing a letter to him, in which he appeals to him with the words, «Come to me, we will crown you as Emperor, and establish a Bulgarian patriarchy, since there does not exist an independent country without having its own separate patriarchy.» The Pope, however, remained firm. Finally Ivanitza accepted all his terms, except one. He admitted 1) that his predecessors used to receive their imperial crown from the Roman church: 2) that the Pope has the power to authorize whowever he choses to organize and consecrate the higher clergy in Bulgaria, in which capacity his representative should have full authority: 3) that both the higher and lower Bulgarian clergy should be subordinate to the Roman church and remain faithful to its rituals; 4) that the Bulgarian state should never draw away from Rome for which it should give a written oath in its behalf and in behalf of the successors, affixed with the royal seal; 5) that all the lands, be they Christian or pagan, which might be added to the (Bulgarian) Empire should also be placed under the authority of and in obedience to the apostolical See. «The Papacy», writes the french historian, Achille Luchaire [1]), had taken all steps. It is plain from the conditional clauses here mentioned that the question at issue refers not only to religious or spiritual independence. That is made all the more clear from Innocents epistle of February 25, 1205 A. D., in which he solemnly informs Ivanitza that his wishes have been fullfilled. The letter is addressed, not as heretofore, to the Lord, *domino*, but to the King, *regi*, of the Bulgarians and Wallachians. Its contents emphasize the fact that it

[1]) Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III, Les Royautés vassales du Saint-Siége*, Paris, 1908, p. 91—117. Magyars et slaves.

is the Pope alone that has the power to invest with royal authority. After a lengthy introduction on the pre-eminency of Apostle Peter and of his authority which he has handed down to his successors, the Roman Pontiff says: «we are making you King of the peoples in Bulgaria and Wallachia, we are investing you with the right of coining money in your own name. We are sending you a kingly scepter and diadem which our delegate Leo, cardinal of the Holy Cross, will present to you. He will place it on your head as if done with my own hands.» It is impossible to express it more plainly, nor could anyone exact with a greater force the right which the Papacy reserves for itself to dispose of empires, to invest rulers with authority, to give and take back crowns. Rome is the source of royal authority and royal rights.

Before receiving the above letter Ivanitza writes to the Pope in which he insists that the Patriarch be made independent. » Tirnova», he declares, «is too far away from Rome and the communications owing to the wars is bad. Should we be compelled to go to the Pope for the ordination of a patriarch Bulgaria runs the risk of remaining for a long time without a ruler. The misfortunes which may befall in the meanwhile will weigh heavily upon your conscience. Is it not possible that the Tirnova church have the right to ordain and consecrate its own chief?» On the 7th of November, 1204, A. D., Cardinal Leo consecrates metropolitan Basilius primate, in Tirnovo. The next day he blessed Kaloyan, set the crown on his head, and presented him with a scepter and a standard. Shortly after this Innocent got an enthousiastic letter from the Bulgarian Tzar, brought to him by two young men, Basil and Bethleem. «I am sending you these», writes Ivanitza, «in order that they may learn Latin, as I have with me no grammarians able to translate your letters to me. After they have mastered it, please send them

back to me. At the same time I am sending you a few humble presents: two silk gowns, one purple and the other white, and a camel. When sending ministers to Your Holiness, be assured I shall not forget you.»

Luchaire thinks that Ivanitza made his country both politically and spiritually subordinate to Rome and that Bulgaria had become vassal to the Papacy, such as were then Spain, Portugal, Hungary, Bosnia, Serbia, England and France. Schmidt, Drinoff, Ireček and Goloubinski, on the other side consider that the whole thing came to an end with the coronation [1]). Bulgaria kept its political and religious independence. More than that, Ivanitza, contrary to his treaty and to the warnings of the Pope, rose against the crusaders and liberated the captive Latin emperor Baldwin. Under the Bulgarian King Boril, who had unlawfully ascended the throne, the Roman church was able to increase its influence. But that did not last long, Ivan Assen II not only severed all relations with Rome, but completely reverted to the idea of Tzar Boris, — neither under Rome, nor under Byzantium. He restored the independence of the Bulgarian national church neither through the Pope, nor trough the patriarch of Constantinople, nor even through any political treaties and understanding with the greek Emperor, but with the consensus and the benediction of all autocephalous churches.

Being the most powerful ruler on the peninsula during the XIIIth century, Ivan Assen II showed his strength and abilities in extending the territory of his state and in raising it to a higher standard of culture. During his reign in place of the Byzantine Empire there grew up four new states, viz., the Latin in Constantinople and vicinity,

[1]) C. Schmidt, *Histoire et doctrine de la secte des Cathares* Paris, 1849, vol. I, p. 113. — M. Drinoff, *Works of*, vol. II, p. 64—85. — Ireček, pp. 306—315. — *Kratkii ocherk Istorii Pravoslavnich cherkvei, bolgarskoi, serbskoi*, etc. E. Goloubinskago, Moscau, 1871, pp. 72—80.

that of Trebizond, the Nicaean, and that of Epirus, which warred against each other, and chiefly against the Latin. Ivan Assen, as he himself has recorded on a monument, had widened the limits of his Empire from Adrianople to Durazzo, in Albania and Serbia, and made vassal the French of Constantinople who were stripped of all their possessions except their capital and the adjacent towns. Being a friend and relative of the Nicaean emperor Batacius and taking advantage of the trying condition of the Greeks, he decided to have the Bulgarian church recognized as independent. Batacius obtained the consent of all the patriarchs. At Lapsaki on the Dardanelles, in the year 1234 A. D. he convoked a council of metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, archimandrites, and abbots both Bulgarians and Greeks. There the independence of the Bulgarian church was unanimously and solemnly recognized, and the Tirnova metropolitan Joachim was consecrated as its patriarch. Germanus, the patriarch of Constantinople, and all others present at the council made out a record of the event, which duly sealed, was transmitted to the pious Bulgarian Tzar and the newly consecrated patriarch Joachim, « in eternal and indelible remembrance[1] ». That is the greatest event in the reign of Ivan Assen and the most signal triumph of Bulgarian culture. Under Ivan Assen Bulgaria's territorial extension rivals even that achieved by Simeon.

In that manner was reestablished and consolidated the autonomy of the Bulgarian church so vital for the national independence of Bulgaria itself. Thus the grand ideal of Boris for the creation of a state religious institution was fully realized. The Patriarchy of Tirnova continued to exist down to the turkish invasion.

Neither the state, however, nor the church could long preserve their inpendence without possessing a literature

---

[1]) *Work of* M. Drinoff, pp. 79—82, vol. II. — Ireček, p. 338.

and culture of their own. That idea and theory also emanated from the brain of Tzar Boris. If the conversion of the Bulgarian people is considered an event of capital importance during the XIXth century, the conception of a Slavic alphabet, no doubt is the greatest achievement of that age. Such an exploit approaches the borders of the sublime: it creates a new literature and civilization, — at this period, a Slavic literature and civilization. The creation of a new alphabet was first conceived not by Boris, but by the brothers Cyril and Methodius who ingrafted the same idea into the minds of their numerous Slavic pupils and followers, the majority of whom inhabited Macedonia, called Slavinia in the VIth century and Bulgaria in the VIIIth century. The translation of religious books begun in Macedonia, continued in Moravia and Panonia, whither the two brother-reformers had gone together with their pupils to preach the Christian faith to the Slavs living in those provinces, as well in Dalmatia and elsewhere. The translation, according to Jagič, Leskin, Oblak, Vondrak, Florinski, Kulbakin [1]) and others noted Slavic Scholars, was made into the Bulgaro-Macedonian dialect. The genius of Simeon helped give form to the idea of the Slavic educators Cyril and Methodius.

Boris who takes such pains for the enlightenment of his people, who is always looking for preachers and teachers to help him in his civilizing mission, sending for them now to Constantinople, now to Rome, and even to the German emperor Louis with whom he was on friendly terms [2]), finally discovers fitting assistants among the pupils of Cyril and Methodius exiled in Moravia, such

---

[1]) N. S. Derjavin, *Bolgarsko-Serbskiya Vzaïmootnosheniya*, p. 122. — Jordan Ivanoff. *The Bulgarians in Macedonia*, p. 67.

[2]) *Bertini chronicle*, Hinkman of Reims, Rodinon. — *Foulda Chronicle* (866–868 A. D). — Le Beau, vol. XIV, p. 40. — Goloubinski, p. 249. — Prof. V. Zlatarski, *Bulgarian Review*, vol. IV, Number 3.

as Clement, Naum, Gorasd, Angelarius, Savva and others. Against the latter whose number exceeded two hundred, together with their leader Methodius, who at the desire of Prince Kotzel of Blaten had been appointed Sirmo-Panonian bishop, there arose a great persecution by the « three-linguists », who opposed the Slavic liturgy and against the Slavic books, because according to their opinion there existed but three languages worthy of glorifying God, viz., Hebrew, Latin and Greek. After the death of St. Methodius the persecution grew more desperate. It was led by the German Viking, bishop of Nitra. After long and tedious wanderings, suffering and hunger through forest and mountains, the disciples reached the borders of Bulgaria. In the latter they found not only refuge and safety; but also a new field for Christian and educational activity. They carried with them a most precious treasure for the Bulgarians, viz., liturgy books rendered by them into the Slavic from the translations of Cyril and Methodius. In Belgrade, then under Bulgaria, they were met by the governor, Boritakana, who directed their course to Preslau, the capital of Bulgaria. Tzar Boris received them with enthusiasm and due respect. He lays his court open to them, and his boyars-their homes. With the cooperation of these exiled Slavic apostles he sets himself at work for the organization of the Bulgarian church, erection of temples, monasteries, opening of schools and preparation of teachers and preachers. The state was divided into three archbishoprics, that of Preslau, Moravia, and Koutmichevo or Ochrida. The first one comprized eastern Bulgaria, with Preslau as its seat. Its archbishop, who was at the same time the presiding bishop under Boris was Joseph [1]). The second one included the territory lying with in the Serbian and Bulgarian Morava which was

[1]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 30.

inhabited by the Bulgarian tribes, Branichevs, Kouchevens and Moravians. As Moravian archbishop the name Agathon is being mentioned with his supposed seat the town of Morava which was situated on the Danube where the united river Morava discharges itself [1]). The third one covered all western Macedonia. That was the choice of Clement for his field of educational and evangelical activity [2]). There he labored all his life as a teacher, pastor and writer, finally dying in Ochrida as Bishop of Slavonia and Velitza.

Having sought and drawn to himself all available talents, Boris set them at work. Soon there was undertaken throughout the country an intense religious and school reform. In Boris the Slavic literature driven out of Moravia found its first mighty protector. During his successor it is able to obtain a solid footing and to reach a flourishing state of development. Without the patronage of the Bulgarian rulers the pioneers of Slavic letters, according to the verdict of modern historians, would have found themselves stranded and their labors would have been of short duration. Without the effective assistance rendered by Tsar Boris the South-Eastern Kingdom would have long yet remained in a barbarous condition, and its history as state would have been entirely different. In that respect Boris career as a reformer stands out in bold relief in comparison with that of his contemporary Slav colleagues. Hence the reason for his occupying such a distinguished place in the history of Slav culture and literature.

In the reign of his successor Bulgarian letters and civilization arrive at their apogee. Simeon, called *the Great*, not so much for his military as for his social and intellectual achievements, on account of which his epoch is

---

[1]) Same, p. 40. — Goloubinski, p. 84. — Ireček, p. 149.

[2]) Goloubinski, p. 169. — Ireček, p. 197.

styled by Slavic scholars, «the Golden age of Bulgaria» [1]) occupies the most conspicuous place alike in Bulgarian annals as in Slavic thought. He was, undoubtedly, the best educated Bulgarian and one of the few great men of learning in Europe during the IXth century. In that respect he rivals his contemporary, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the Byzantine emperor. As Porphyrogenitus was the soul of the literary and scientific movement [2]) in Constantinople, encouraged the writers and himself wrote, so was Simeon the soul and patron of the first Bulgarian educators and men of letters. He even surpasses him. He begins his part of Maecenas long before Constantine did, and does not limit his sphere of activity to his capital Preslau only. He exerts his patronage over the pioneers and authors in Ochrida at the head of which stood bishop Clement. He certainly must have guided and given his protection to the writers in the archbishopric of Moravia also.

The court of Simeon was the first Bulgarian academy. It was filled with books and was continually frequented by men of letters. In his palace they had their meetings and consultations. There under his directions they made

[1]) S. N. Palaouzoff. «*The age of the Bulgarian King Simeon*». — Shafarick: «Simeon is styled great because he war to able win laurels not only on the battle-field against his enemies, but also on the field of science and letters whither he concentrated his efforts toward the edification of the spirit and the cultivation of the heart and thought.» — *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 44. — Dr. Bojiadar Petranovich: «While at the successor of Boris national culture enjoyed its golden age. (See *Bogomils, Bosnan Church,* by Dr. G. Petranovich. Zadrou, 1867 (p. 22). — Ireček: «The age of Simeon is the golden epoch of the Bulgarian literature» (p. 204).

[2]) Kalaïdovich: «Simeon himself, in spite of his constant wars with the Greeks, found leisure time to busy himself with tranlations from Greek; he at the same time surrounded himself with a circle of able and enlightened men each one of whom he entrusted with a definite task. According tho the testimony of one of them, he had filled his palace with books. — Joan Exarch, p. 102, preface.

translations and produced original works. The Tzar himself wrote and produced. The Ochrida workers and writing-masters always found the doors of Simeon's court wide open for them where they, too, came for advice and directions. This is the way foreign critics characterize and appreciate his efforts as a writer and educator, viz., the French Slavist Louis Leger and the French historian Rambaud:

«Let us take and study up thad noted personage, Simeon, that chemiargos, as contemporary wisten call the semi-Greek who in his boyhood went to Constantinople to master up the Rhetorics of Demosthenes and the Syllogisnis of Aristotle. He was noted for his fondness of luxury, silk and gold-trimmed clothes. A pious man, he styled himself the ruler of the Bulgarians, by the grace of God. He was wont to surround himself by literary men, as used to do the Byzantine basilei. It was at his request that Presbyter Gregorius translated into Slavic Malala *Chronicle*, and Bishop Constantine the *Orations or Discourses* of Athanasius the Great against the Arians. At his wish were dedicated to him the *Commentaries on the Gospels* and *Chestodnev*, containing citations from Aristotle as well as from John Chrysostom both, written by the same author. Like a second Porphyrogenitus he himself made compilations. That is corroborated by the voluminous patrological encyclopedia of 1073, found in manuscript in the preface of which he is being compared with Ptolemus. He himself burned for an authors fame and wrote *Zlatostrouy* [1]) with his own hand. It was compared of selections taken from John Chrysostom. The golden-tongued Constantinople Bishop, it is evident, was his favorite author. On this point Porphyrogenitus and

[1]) L. Leger, *La Littérature bulgare au temps de Syméon:* Revue de Cours, 1868—1869.

his terrible rival meet for once on common ground, for both fondly loved the same writer. In short Simeon was Bulgarias Charlemagne the Great, only a far better educated and happier monarch, because he was the creator of his countrys literature. But that bibliophile king, that busy bee which gathered honey from every flower in order to impart is to his boyars, occasionally manifested symptoms of barbarian fits. Then he recalled the old Kroum.» [1])

In that characterization has been omitted the name of the most fertile and original writer of Simeons time, Joan Exarch. Only one of his writings is mentioned — *Shestodnev*. It is not a translation. It contains six sermons whose contents is partly original and partly an imitation of Basil the great and Sevelian of Cheval. Another of his works is a translation of *Heavens* by Damaskin. In his philosophical meditations in *Shestodnev*, as well as in his translations, he considers theology, philosophy, history and natural science relatee, at the same time bringing out the views of Aristotle, Plato, Tales, Theocrytos and other philosophers [2]). In the same characterization the name of Chernorizetz Chrabre has also been omitted. He is the author of the polemical monography *O Pismenich*.

No less brilliant educational and literary activity was being carried on in South-Western Macedonia whose centre of culture was the city of Ochrida, which, as was already mentioned, also enjoyed the patronage of Tzar Simeon. Its guiding spirit, however, was Clement, one of the most learned and zealous disciples of St. Cyril and St. Methodius. The educational work in Western Macedonia was taken up by two secondary stations, Glavinitza, and Devol in Albania. In that respect Ochrida vied with

[1]) Rambaud, pp. 330—331.

[2]) N. S. Derjavin, p. 121.

Preslau, as far as can be judged from the dates and monuments thus far discovered. As in Preslau all literary men received their directions from Simeon, so in Ochrida all went for inspiration to Clement who was the central figure. He had for his co-worker his fellow-student Naoum, a man fond of learning, and it is believed Gorasd also, a person endowed with strong will and master of the Slav, Latin and Greek languages. Methodius had on his death bed pointed him out as his successor to the Moravian Archbishopric. From the biography of St. Navum is known that he worked and taught in Devol[1]). A tradition exists that Gorasd also worked in Albania, which is evident from the fact that his sacred relics had been preserved in the metropolitan cathedral of the Albanian town Berat. Besides Clement, Gorasd and Naoum there were also found other disciples of Methodius[2]).

Clement is one of the most active apostles, orators, and teachers, and one of the most productive writers in Simeons epoch[3]). To him is attributed the honor of inventing the *Cyrilitza* (alphabet), being supposed that St. Cyril and St. Methodius were the authors of the *Glagolitza*. Whether he is the author of any of these alphabets or not, one thing is certain, and that is, that his signal educational labors entitle him to a place next to that occupied by the Slavic reformers Cyril and Methodius. From a social and religious point of view he played a part second to that of Tzar Simeon. Clement and Simeon are two slavic men of genius of the IXth century. They are the ones that have done most for Slavic civilization, while Cyril and Methodius were the original in-

[1]) Periodical «*Russkaya Besseda*», 1859, vol. IV, Number XIV. article by Gylpherding: «*Gecheskaga Sloujba, etc. and Gitié St. Naoum Bolgarskago.*» — Jordan Ivanoff: «*Bulgarian Antiquities*», p. 62.

[2]) Dr. B. Petranovich, pp. 21—22.

[3]) G. Balastcheff, *Clement, Bishop Slavonian.* Sofia, 1891, pp. IX-XXII.

spirers. Joan Exarch and other writers have left panegyrics in which they praise Simeons services as a lover and promoter of letters. Clement has his own panegyrist, too, the anonymous author of his biography who was one of his pupils. His disciple gives the best description of the life of his master and of the field in which he worked. In the biography one sees the hand of a pupil worthy of his great teacher.

«Saint Clement», he writes, «was continually going about from place to place in that country, preaching the Gospel. His chosen pupils numbered up to thirty five hundred which were distributed among the various districts. He spent most of his time with them, and we that were always with him were able to see and hear what de did and said. We never saw him idle. Once he was instructing the children. To some of them he was showing how to write the alphabet, to others he was explaining the meaning of what was already written, and still others, he was teaching how to hold their hands when writing. Often he worked night time too, spending it in prayer, reading and writing. Some times he would write and teach at the same time. From among his pupils he prepared readers, deacons, subdeacons, priests, about three hundred of whom he sent out to differents parts of Bulgaria.»

That is the first Slavic pedagogue, the Pestalozzi of the IXth century.

St. Clement was also efficient as an orator. His pupil justly calls him an eloquent man. «For all holidays», continues the biography, «he used to prepare simple but judicious sermons in which he propounded the Gospels truths. Should you wish to learn the principles of the Holy Fathers? Them, too, you would find written in Bulgarian by the all-wise Clement»!

The first foundation for preaching the Gospel was laid by St. Clement [1]). Seeing that the people were ignorant, that the majority of the priests could only read the Scriptures without understanding them, and that no sermons in the Bulgarian tongue existed, he wrote precepts and sermons for all holidays. The precepts are of two kinds. Some of them are written in a simple language accessible to the uneducated congregation, while others treated on lofty subjects expressed in a rhetorical style. The first ones are sunday instructions, while the others are praise-sermons or panegyrics. «Nearly all the sermons of Clement», says the Russian bishop Anathonius, «possess the characteristical features of the solemn discourses of the learned greek preachers. In point of their intrinsic qualities they are similar to the church chants. The knowledge of the more important historical events of the Christian Church which are being brought out in his more serious sermons, written by Clement in memory of the apostles, martyrs and saints, is necessary in teaching religion and in enlightening a people in Christianity. In that manner preaching in young Bulgaria was given the right direction from the very start. It was set on such a broad and rational basis that nothing better could be obtained. In that respect Bulgaria was happier than Russia where the living and independent sermon did not reach such a development.»

Should we desire to range the authors in point of originality and merit, we must then place te names of Joan Exarch, Chernorizetz Chrabre and Presbyter Cosma next to those of St. Clement and Bishop Constantine. For they are independent, original and creative. They do not copy.

An erudite encyclopedian, Joan Exarch, as far as it may be judged from fragments of his works, is original

[1]) G. Balastcheff, pp. 48—49.

in conception and reasoning. Though not scholarly in form, his thoughts are distinguished for their depth, soundness and philosophical turn. His originality becomes more conspicuous when he is describing or narrating. The picture he gives of Simeons palace, is a masterpiece considered as such even in our day. It at once becomes plain that the pen is held by the hand of an artist resorting not to words and colours but to feeling and action. His description, therefore full of pathos and life, thrills the soul. He possesses taste, breath, style.

Chernorizetz Chrabre has in his monography combined history with polemics, apology with criticism. He describes how and why the Slavic alphabet came to existence, and what in point of origin and sanctity is its superiority over the Greek which was the works of pagans. In all he says he reveals stores of knowledge. Chrabre uses powerful logics, warmed up by faith and riveted with facts. He pleads the right of the Slavs to have their own alphabet and books. He shatters the legend of the «three-linguists». One striking feature in the writings of that Slavic neophyte of the Xth century is that he transports himself several centuries ahead of his time when he raises up the question of the right and freedom of races to self assertion and independence. In truth, it is the same question of racial rights which occupies the minds of the world to day. Way back in the Xth century that ideologue of Slavdom makes it his task to champion the right of the Slavs in general and of the Bulgarians in particular to have their own language, alphabet, literature, culture, and way of thinking. In his refutations he says: «Some put the question: is there any need for Slavic books? While other poor souls think that God alone is the author of the alphabet.» According to Goloubinski, those others were undoubtedly the Greeks. The same authority asserts that the appearance of Slavic books in

Bulgaria was received inimically by the Greeks as it was so received by the Latins and Germans in Moravia. In order to silence the enemies of Slavic letters, Chernorizetz Chrabre argues that «the Greeks themselves, before the invention of their own alphabet, for a long time used that of the Phoenicians.»

Presbyter Cosma lived at a later period, in the reign of Tzar Peter, nevertheless, he had for his contemporaries some of the host of writers surviving Tzar Simeon. In respect to originality and independent thinking he resembles Joan Exarch whose pupil and imitator he was. A lengthy sermon of sensorious character has come down to us. It is he best characterism of the religious, moral and social-condition of the Bulgarians during the Xth century. Cosma does not copy the Byzantine standards. His sermon as regards form, contents and conception breaks loose from the limitations of the Greek. There is nothing of the abstract and scholarly in him. His subjects are based on actual life, on the evil and its perniciousness. He is equally severe at either of them wherever he finds them. That new Chrysostom equally deprecates the evil whether committed by Bogomils or Orthodox, clergy or laymen. For him all sinners are equally pernicious: the first ones on account of their delusion and destructive doctrine, the second, on account of their stoniness, hypocrisy, formalism; the first ones because of their opposition to the church, the second because of their tenacity to outside appearance — the cossacks and rituals. He has a ward of reproach for the laity, too, chastizing it for attending games and amusements rather than church, while he stigmatizes the boyars for being hypocrits like the Bogomils. As the latter outwardly show themselves with pale faces and feigning temperance while secretly they give themselves over to a life of incontinence, so the boyars pretend to be pious by buying religious books which they never

read but cast aside to mould and to be eaten up by worms.»

In the reign of Peter and Samuel the Bulgarian literature continued its course of development by inertion. The disturbed state of affairs in the country under Tzar Peter was unfavorable to literary achievements. Still more unfavorable were the times under Samuel whose whole reign was taken up with war against the Byzantine Empire. But even in the midst of war he did not neglect either the church, or the literature. They were equally dear to him, for they were the corner-stone on which rested the national union and independence for which he fought. In his time Ochrida becomes a centre of culture. With the removal of the Bulgarian Patriarchy there, the literary activity interrupted in Preslau, was resumed. Two biographies of Samuels time are extant, viz., one of St. Anthonius the Great, and another of the martyred saint Pancratius. Both of them were translated by Presbyter Joan at the request of the Ochrida patriarch Joan, as the translator himself points out.

During the second or Tirnova Kingdom the literature continued its development. At first it made slow strides, for all spiritual and intellectual efforts were focussed into one aim — the establishment and organisation of the restored kingdom. But among the rulers of the Second Kingdom also we see followers of Simeon. They, too, gathered learned men around them, gave them encouragement and even exerted an influence over them. From the inscriptions of surviving monuments is seen that even the weakest of the Bulgarian Kings manifested an interest in the cause of learning and education, Boril in 1211 caused to be translated the law-book inserted in the Synodica bearing his name. It contained the laws enacted against the Bogomils. A great lover of books and a true follower of Simeon was Tzar Joan Alexander II. At his bidding it

was that the translation of the Chronicle of Constantine Manassius was made. A copy of that Chronicle was artistically made out containing seventy drawings of persons and events taken from the Biblical and profane history as well as from the Bulgarian historical records. During the Tirnova epoch the majority of literary productions is chronicles and histories mostly in translations. Real original works were few, but nevertheless, they existed, as is evidenced from the Caloyans letters to Pope Innocent III. In one of them we read: «I have examined our older periodicals and books, as also the statutes of the revered emperors, our predecessors.» [1]) In his letter dated 28 of November, 1202, Innocent answers him, saying»[2]) Touching the question of coronation which you desire, our legate is being charged with duty of looking over the old books and documents (in Tirnova) in order that he may find out how your forefathers were crowned by the Roman Church, and when he comes back whe shall then see what is the best to be done». To the Statute book against the Bogomils was added by a certain copyist a note concerning the restoration of the Bulgarian Patriarchy. Generally speaking during the existence of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom were translated and compited a number of historical books, compendiums, etc.

But the greatest patron of letters during the Second Kingdom was Joan Alexander. Owing to his love for books and his enlightened mind Tirnova the capital becomes in his time and in the reign of his successor Ivan Shishman such a great centre of culture as Preslau used to be under Simeon. Into Tirnova there begin to flock writers and divines. At the same period two famous schools are founded. One was opened in the monastery of

[1]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 97.

[2]) Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III, Les Royautés vassalles*, pp. 99 and 100.

Kalifarovo by Theodosius of Tirnova who later on was enrolled among the saints. The school counted some fifty pupils. One of them happened to be Eutymius a future writer, founder of a second school and patriarch of Tirnova. The city of Tirnova with its schools, men of letters, and educators soon became next to Constantinople the greatest seat of learning on the Balkans. Youth burning for knowledge, came to study there not only from Bulgaria but also from Serbia, Roumania and Russia. Tirnova with the school of Euthymius becomes a Bulgarian Athens for the neighboring states, and especially for the south-eastern Slavs. The Roumanian historian, prof. Jorga calls the school of Euthymius *scoalà vestita* [1]), celebrated school. In the same institution of learning obtained their education Josaph, Mitropolitan of Bdin, Cyprian, Metropolitain of Kiev, Constantine, the philosopher of Kostenetz, Gregorius Tsamblak, and others, noted writers. But none of the illustrious pupils surpassed the master, either in erudition, educational zeal, creative power, or productiveness. He was the most learned Bulgarian and Slav of the XIVth century in the Peninsula. In point of literary fertility, eloquence, style and energy he may be compared with St. Clement. His pupils derived inspiration from him through his piousness, ideals and example. Gregorius Tsamblak has given us a glimpse on the powerful influence his marter exerted over all those who came in touch with him. In his panegyric written in honor of Euthymius, he characterizes the works of his great teacher as «sweeter than honey». By this works is meant the translation of the divine books from the Greek into the Bulgarian tongue. Euthymius revised the already existing translations, and having a perfect knowledge of both languages, he corrected all the panages wrongly cendered or copied from the Greek

[1]) N. Jorga, *Istoria Bisericii Românesti*. 1908, vol I, pp. 13 and 14.

text, bettered the diction, and eliminated the grammatical faults and mistakes. At the same time he wrote down a series of orthographical rules. The corrections he thus made in the translations of the Scriptural books were subsequently copied in Serbia and Russia where they were duly appreciated. Euthymius undertaking in this respect is considered epochal. It is known to the literature of the Orthodox Slavic Churches under the appellation « New Tirnova Extracts ». Besides his translations and revisions Patriarch Euthymius is the author of beautifully written panegyrics and biographies. [1])

One of the most important events during the Second Bulgarian Kingdom is the educational, literary and reformatory activity of Euthymius. Through his labors the fame of Bulgarian literature as well as his own quickly spread in Russia, Serbia, Roumania and Mt. Athos. His name typifies a whole epoch in the history of the Slavic Church literature. His literary career, his beautiful life, his great and noble soul continued to throw their resplendent rays for two centuries after his martyr's death as an exile far from Tirnova and his flock. These rays penetrated into Serbia, Russia and Roumania through his numerous disciples. Many of them, both from the clergy and laity, after the fall of the capital, whose trenches the valiant Patriarch was the last to leave, crossed over to Wallachia where they resumed their literary endeavors. They caused the regeneration of that country both intellectually and socially. Prof. Jorga in his « History of the Roumanian Church » records with greatfulness the fact that the school of Patriarch Euthymius spread a light far and wide and that its rays illumined Roumania also. « After

[1]) P. A. Syrkou: *Kistorii ispravlenia knig v Balgarii*, in the XIVth century, vol. I, pp. 170—255; 411, 580. — A. Theodoroff, *Bulgarian Literature*, p. 180. — K. Radschenko, *Criticism and Bibliography*. — Yatzemirski *Gregori Tsamblak*, 1902, p. 435.

the fall of Tirnova», says he, «many bishops, literary workers and Poyars, persecuted by the Turkish soubashi, fled to us for safety with all their hierarchical degrees, culture and talents».[1])

Those are the writers and pioneers who created the literature of Bulgaria through its three centres of culture during the First and Second Kingdoms. They are by no means the only ones. Space does not permit the mention of all that are known. About a good many of the writers of the two Kingdoms there is a lack of information, while on the other hand there exist many works whose authors are still unkown. Dates are particularly scarce about the authors and educators that lived and moved in the province of Moravia.

The literature of Bulgaria is mainly of a church and theological order. There exist some works which are historical and philosophical, while others treat on jurisprudence, for example *Nomocanona* of Photius. Among them may be mentioned the book «Zakon Soudni Ludem». Church eloquence is paramount. The entire literature is of an abstract and scholastic kind. With few exceptions it is a copy of the Greek of the Middle Ages. It was a stranger to the national soul and to the people's conception in general. It stood aloof from the people, its past and traditions. It failed to reproduce its feelings in song and its past struggles and experiences in poetry. Indeed there were not lacking a Roland, a Siegfried, a Cid, etc., among the Slavs on the Peninsula, but scholasticism drowned them, and dogmatism buried them. As the works of Homer, written in gold; whose serpentine roll was set aside in the Constantinople library to mould and be covered with dust, so the Bulgarian epic creations almost succumbed under the influence of scholastic formalism and church

[1]) N. Jorga, pp. 13, 14.

dogmatism. Strictly speaking Bulgarian literature was of the church and states. It lived in them in three forms, viz., biographies, church discourses and frail attempts at chronicles and history. The people remained a passive witness to all this and subsequently, as we shall see, tried to produce a literature of its own. But it must be pointed out that though the church and state literature lacked ideas, imagination, feeling, enthusiasm and inspiration, it, nevertheless, had its great merit and performed a very important service. It proved a great barrier against Greek literature, and naturally, against the Greek language and culture. For it was the means of creating a national literature and Slavic civilization. It attained on the Peninsula that ideal of the Bulgarians which Bulgaria's arms could not realize, or if they could realize for a certain period, were unable to maintain it long-the literary and spiritual consolidation of the Slavs.

As far back as Simeon's epoch, all Balkan Slavs used the Slavic language in their church services. The same language and books were in vogue throughout. The same thing prevoiled through the Second Kingdom also. All writers employed the same vernacular, the Bulgarian language. It was, it should be remembered, the church language of Serbs, Russians, Roumanians and even Albanians, while the Bulgarian literature be Slavic literature. It continued so until the subdual of the Bulgarians by the Turks, nay, it lasted so for two more centuries after the fall of the Peninsula in the hands of the Ottoman conquerors.

Bulgaria was, then, a centre of culture for all south-eastern Slavs who at the beginning employed the Bulgarian language and were taught and educated by Bulgarian teachers and priests. Bulgaria was the educational and spiritual fountain from which all neighboring states drew their learning and religious ideals. The Russian Prince Vladimir turns to the Bulgarian Tzar Samuel acking to

send him enlightened priests and books, the request is promptly granted. During the XIIIth century the Kiev and Allkussian Metropolitan Cyril begs of Tirnova to supply him with a Slavic nomocanon. Cyprian and Tsamblak, metropolitans of Kiev, were Bulgarians. Cyprian took with him a good many church books which served him to revise the Russian translations. The Russian professor Lamanski in discussing the question of the spiritual relationship between Bulgarians and Russians during the XVth century says that «during all that period Russia continued to receive from Bulgaria, not only Slavic manuscripts, but also holy fathers, writers, artists, singers, because Bulgaria up to its conquest stood, in point of religious culture and development, far higher than did Russia then»[1]).

Much closer still were the intellectual and religious ties between Bulgarians and Serbians. It was mainly due to the influence of Bulgarian Simeonian literature that Serbia and Bosnia in after time forsook Rome and saved themselves from latinism. This fact is being corroborated by a number of Serbian slavists also. Thus Dr. B. Petranovitch writes: «The Serbian lands Bosnia included, were unable to refrains from taking part in harmony with the Slavic spirit in the religious movement which then was taking place in Bulgaria and the Adriatic coast. The ties of blood and kinship stirred to work the Serbians too, and under the influence and guidance of the disciples of Methodius and later on of those of Clement come from Bulgaria (chiefly from the Ochrida district), Slavic church service in Serbia received an impetus and was firmly established»[2]). The civilizing mission of Bulgaria in this instance is not derived even by the greatest Bulgarian enemies found among the Serbian writers. Professor M. Vukichewitch

[1]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. II, pp. 89 and 90.
[2]) Dr. B. Petranovitch, pp. 22 and 23.

and D. I. Semitch write: « The undesputed service of the Bulgarians to history and Slavdom consists in this, that they succeeded in maintaining and preserving the old Slavic language and literature founded by the first Slavic educators in Moravia, and thus helped the development of the literatures of the rest of the Orthodox Slavic peoples » [1])

The Serbian letters, as is evident from the above citations, are brought into life under the direct influence of the Bulgarian literature. That influence, created through books and teachers, continued to be exerted during the first and Second Kingdom. « The Serbian literature », says Ireček [2]), « which sprung in the reign of the great zhupan Neman and his son St. Savva, borrowed a great from the Bulgarians. . . . The best historical work of the old Serbian literature was written by Constantine of Kostenetz, a pupil of the Tirnova school founded by Patriarch Euthymius. »

The literary language of Bulgaria as well as its literature crossed over its ethnical borders during the Second Kingdom. Bulgarian letters and influence soon spread beyond the Ochrida take on the west, in Albania, and on the other side of the Danube, on the north, in Roumania. In Wallachia the Bulgarian language is introduced not only in the churches, but as the written language of the people too. Here we see history repeating itself. For as during the IXth century the written French language spreads across the Lamanche, in England, and beyond the Alps, in southern Italy and Sicily, where for a time the French literature [3]) reaches a flourishing state, so in Roumania the Bulgarian language opens the way for the rize of Slavic literature. To what extent the Bulgarian

[1]) Serbs and Bulgarians in their Struggle for liberty and culture, p. 18

[2]) Ireček, pp. 543, 553.

[3]) T. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française*, Paris, 1904, p. 6.

language and the influence of Bulgarian culture were ingrafted in Roumania may be judged from the testimony of the Roumanian historians themselves. In the most voluminous and authentic history of the Roumanian people *written by professor A. D. Xenopal we read:*

« The Daco-Roumanians received Christianity from the Bulgarians, being their political vassals. That is confirmed by two legends, one Roumanian and the other Bulgarian. . . . The Bulgarians were more cultured than the Roumanians. They had their own church with an origanized hierarchy. . . . They possessed a literary language and consolidated statehood as far back as their First Kingdom. . . . From the separation of the Church in 1054 down to Matea Bessarab and Basil Lupa, the educated Roumanians expressed themselves in the Slavic tongue. That factor alien to the majority of the Wallachians after a period of more than eight centuries thoroughly stifled every intellectual self assertion of the Roumanian people. . . . We find written in Slavic all the church books used in worship, also official documents, and even private bills of sale. The further back into antiquity we go, the more widely spread in Roumania in the Slavic language. It may be traced not only in Wallachia and Moldavia at the time of their rise, but also among the Roumanians in Transylvania, and the smaller states in the first two countries before their union. . . . »

« The first Roumanian chronicles were written in Slavic. Their authors are monks. In general, the Slavic language was considered sacred by the Roumanians, as was the Latin to the Germans and the French, and Hellenic to the Greeks. The earliest printed books of Roumanians were in the Slavic tongue. And even when Bulgaria succumbs under the Turks the Slavic language continued to flourish in the Roumanian churches and monasteries. . . . The first to raise a cry against the attempt to introduce

the Wallachian language in public worship were the very clergy and boyars, not only in Wallachia and Moldavia, but in Transylvania also. It was considered an act of profanity by them to pray to God in the yet unrecognized and uncultured Roumanian dialect. Prayers should be offered in a sacred tongue. Such, however, to them was the Slavic.»[1])

The Bulgarian nation, indeed, was unable to create on the Balkans a lasting political organization which was to comprize Bulgarias ethnic boundary lines, but, notwithstanding, it created something far more durable on the Peninsula. The great unity of Slavic literature, and a spiritual bond between the south-eastern Slavic races. That unity was the work of four men of genius: St. Cyril and St. Methodius, Tzar Boris, Tzar Simeon, Bishop Clement and Patriarch Euthymius, assisted by a host of writers and disciples, the productions of many of whom, as it was pointed before, are known to us, though not their authors names. The list of names of the known writers and teachers is in itself a very long one. In the IXth century when the Slavic reformers Cyril and Methodius extended their work in Bulgaria, Methodius then had more than two hundred pupils. Bishop Clement at the beginning of the Xth century had in every educational centre of his bishopric thrirty five hundred pupils. Only from one of those centres he had sent three hundred of them to Bulgaria. But if the names of all writers are not known, the works, however, of some of them are known and form but a small part of the extensive literature brought to existence during the First and Second Kingdom. Noted Slavists, both Slavs and foreigners, are justified in comparing the Slavic church literature with the respective Greek and Latin. One of the greatest Slavists Jagič is warranted in saying:

[1]) A. D. Xenopol, *Histoire des Roumains*, vol. I, pp. 29, 145, 155, 177, 460.

«The ancient Bulgarian literature had attained such a phenomenal development in respect to the number of books of a church and religious character which it was able to acccumulate, that it may justly take its rank side by side with the richest literatures of those days, viz., the Greek and Latin. It certainly surpassed all the other European literatures of the same kind. Strictly speaking, during those times the church literature existed only in three languages: the Greek, Latin and Slav. [1]) . . . When fortune abandoned Bulgaria, the fruits of its literary activity were soon inherited by the other Slavic races, the Serbians, their nearest neighbors in particular, and the Russians. Thanks to them that those ancient documents were preserved down to our day, though the majority of them in Serbian and Russian copies in which the ancient Bulgarian dialect was signally corrupted. On that account they are all the more important and valuable for the history of Slavic literature and language. In respect to the literature, they are an undeviable possession of the Bulgarian people. In respect to the language, the claim over them must be shared conjointly between Bulgarians, Serbians and Russians.» [2])

To that literature is due the spark that enkindled the racial self consciousness among the Slavs. «Bulgaria gave Slavdom its language upon which there grew up the contemporary Slavic culture. Through the Bulgarian language Slavdom was called to life and to race selfconsciousness. In the course of several centuries it was destined to be not only the prayer language of the Slavs, but also a medium for wielding Slavdom into a cultured unity and, in certain cases, into a political unity also. . . . But the exalted honor which by right belongs to the Bulgarian people lies in this that the Bulgarian nation gave the

[1]) V. Jagič, *History of the Serbo-Croatian literature*, 1871, p. 82.
[2]) Same, p. 90.

Slavic world not only its language. The nucleus of culture and education, but that also in this that hard-tried Bulgaria is, at the same time, the cradle of Slavic civilization.» [1])

[1]) N. S. Derjavin, pp. 118 and 119.

III.

BULGARIAS PART IN THE REFORMATION.

Slavs and Bulgarians. — Slavic Democracy and Monarchism. — Slavic Conception of the world, its Expounder a Priest Bogomil. — Theogony and Cosmogony of Bogomils. — Bogomil Ethics and Dogmatics — Believers and Perfect — Political and Social Ideals. — State under Tzar Peter. — Reaction. — Bogomil Doctrine Slavic — Disciples. — Bogomil Religion in the West — Spirit of Tolerance in Bulgaria — Revolution and Reformation West. — Slavs Contribution to worlds Civilization — Bogomil and Apocryphal Literature

The Bulgarian state and church organization was modeled after that of Byzantium. As in literature the Bulgarian writers availed themselves of the Byzantine church and religious literature, copied the biographies, panagyrics, chronicles, canonical books, church eloquence, etc., so the state and church reformers took the Byzantine government and religious organization as their standard. During the Middle Ages there existed two state organizations which were considered as models — the Byzantine in the East and the Carolingian in the West. The Byzantine already of a long standing and development was the expression of the Roman spirit, ideals, and temperament. It was this form of government that preponderated among the Slavic tribes in the Balkans, no matter that they themselves had from the very beginning a spirit, world-conception, and temperament of their own. Rome conquered the world and kept it in subjection through its might and civilization. With its love for power and spirit of organization it imposed its authority on all races it came in contact with and in the name of its state ideal moulded them into an empire. The Roman state, a mosaic of various peoples,

blended their spiritual characteristics, while the Roman genius, no less mighty than the Roman arms, and as capacious as the vast Roman Empire itself, made use of their sinews. The Slavs, who settled on the Peninsula one tribe after another, led a separate life. Each had its voïvode, jupan or prince, who ruled the tribe aided by elders and national assembly in which took part all able to carry arms. Every tribe had its own territory. The Slavs disliked a big state. Their *jupanships* or principalities were small. «They wished,» says Professor Siegel, «their state to be something like a commune, that is, it had to be so small that its inhabitants might attend the peoples assembly in the morning and be able to return home in the evening.» [1]) So are the Slavs represented by history from the Vth to the VIIth centuries. In Moesia, Thrace, Macedonia, Dardania, Dacia, Zachlume, Duclea, Bosnia, Dalmatia, Illyricum, etc., they do not form established and independent political organizations. Every tribe lived on its own domain and tilled its own soil. Whenever engaged in war, they waged it separately, and mainly for land and booty. They more often fought each other than their neighbors, and still more often they fought for others than for themselves. [2]) Therefore, it is easy to explain why Zeta Rascia, Zaculmia, Primorea, Decclea, etc., lived for centuries isolated, and why they formed a Serbian state but at the end of the XIth century and why they began to manifest their literary life not earlier than the XIIth century, and also why Bulgaria constituted itself into an independent unit as late as the VIIth century. «During the reign of Emperor Basilius I», writes professor Stanoevitch, «the whole Balkan peninsula, with exception of

---

[1]) F. Siegel, *article:* N. B. Jastreboff, *Studies on Peter Hilchitzktand, his Times,* Slavic Review, 1908, p. 389.

[2]) *Works of* M. Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 292—294.

Bulgaria, was formally or actually under the supreme Byzantine authority.» [1]) But the Slavs were not the only tribes that were politically disunited. The Greeks, also, up to the conquest of the Peninsula by the Romans, did not form a compact organization but existed as separate states and under various forms of government. They, too, continually made war upon each other. As is known, during the most flourishing period of their existence they sealed their racial disjointedness with the bloody Peloponnesus war which was recorded by Thucydides the greatest ancient historian and philosopher.

The Slaws were a democratic people, loved freedom and equality, and stuck to full local self-government. When the Bulgarians invaded the Balkans and were assimilated with the Slavs, with whom they organized themselves into a state after the Byzantine fashion, their princes did not disregard that spirit. They did not abolish the council of elders: to the Bulgarian princes and kings were always attached six great boyars as advisers. The monarchical principles suited the temperament of the Bulgarians and their dynasties, yet the Bulgarian princes respected and preserved the national institutions of the Slavs. In 888 Tzar Boris calls as national assembly in Presla in which he proclaims Simeon as his successor instead of his son Vladimir whom he had deprived of the throne. [2]) But, notwithstanding all this, between the founders of the Bulgarian state and the Slavs, their equals, there existed a radical distinction in respect to their nation of government, as also in respect to their spirit, temperament and conceptions. That distinction, though soon

[1]) St. Stanoevitch, p. 49. — Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 147—150.

[2]) Rambaud, p. 326. — M. Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 451—454. — S. S. Bobtcheff, *History of ancient-Bulgarian Law*. pp. 289—290; 336—338. — G. Belastcheff, *Notes on the Property Management of the Ancient Bulgarian Chans*, Sofia, 1902, pp. 28, 34, 35.

submerged in the language which the Bulgarians adopted from the Slavs, nevertheless, continued to live for centuries in their soul, mind and tendencies. The Bulgarian princes were inclined toward a monarchical form of government. That tendency is especially conspicuous in Kroum, less in Boris and strongest in Simeon. The latter concentrates everything to himself. He dresses up, lives and maintains himself similarly to the Byzantine Emperors whose throne he is anxious to acquire. The clergy and magnates imitate his example. The Bulgarian Church was in the hands of Simeon in the same way as the church of Constantinople was in the hands of the Basilei: he employed it as means to enhance his monarchical prerogatives. The hierarchs, with few exceptions, were more the servants of the kings than the servants of the Church. The forms of state and church organization were new to the Slavs who preserved not only their democratic spirit but also their heathen superstitions and beliefs which radically differed from those of the Bulgarians. Among the Slavs pagans were still to befound. If during th VIth, VIIth, VIIIth and even IXth centuries whole districts of Peloponnesus were still inhabited by Greek heathens [1]) who held high posts in Constantinople, it is not strange that during the Xth century not all Slavs in the Bulgarian state were Christians, and that not all Christian Slavs were able to completely forsake the pagan theology and the traditional philosophy of the Slavs. They lived with those ideas and, being Slavs, they often had to undergo an inward struggle in their efforts to reconcile them with Christianity or at least to give them a Christian expression. Paganism in Bulgaria continued to exist down to the reign of King Peter and even later. [2])

[1]) Paparrhigopoulos, pp. 283—284. — Bikélas, *La Grèce Byzantine et Moderne*, p. 51.

[2]) Ossokin, p. 141.

Among the Bulgarians, up to their conversion, and even after, there existed not only preachers of the Orthodox Christianity, but Christian sects, also who introduced into Christianity the Iranian dualism of the diety. The latter were mostly Armenians and Syrians transplanted into Moesia and Thrace by the Byzantine Emperors. Among these settlers were found Manichaeans, Paulicians and Massilians. Eager sectariars they readily spread their doctrine among the Slavs. The full picture is this: a pagan Slavic theology, dogmas and rituals of Orthodox Christianity, alien state and church forms of administration, sectarian dogmas of Manichaeans, Paulicians and Massilians, Roman and Byzantine rivalry and their struggle to win and spiritually subjugate the Bulgarians which effort finally ended in the separation of the two great churches, teachings, life and works of the clerical class not conformable with the doctrine of Christianity, — all this caused a confusion in the mind of the Slavic people, filled it with disappointments and prepared it toward scepticism. The slavic soul was unable to reconcile its democratic bent of mind, its love for peace, freedom, and brotherliness with the love for power and monarchical ambitions of their rulers. The result is, all that mixture of creeds, dogmas and beliefs, of theories and forms, of church and state management, together with that consisting of heathen theologies, sui generis democracy and love for independence, freedom and equality, is being cast into the kiln to be moulded into a new conception and theory of life and government. The elements thus brought together are being smelted, and after a long process of refinement, a new alloy is obtained which represents the Slavic world conception composed of Christian and sectarian dogmas, but which in reality is neither Christian, such as advocated by the Church, nor Manichaean, Paulician or Massilian. It resembles in some respects the Iranian dualistic theory

concerning the doctrine of good and evil which the Slavic pagan theology now transforms into a religious system suiting its notion and imagination about the Good which it calls Belbog and the Evil which is called Chernbog. The new doctrine was a protest against the existing religious, and principally against the Byzantine church and state forms of organization. This purely Slavic product was named *Bogomilstvo* after Bogomil its founder. He it was who took it out from the Slavic kiln — the Slavic soul — shaped it into a doctrine and commenced to preach it around. Father Bogomil, or Jeremiah as he is often called, is that Christian reformer[1]) who precedes all other European reformers. His efforts were directed at reforming the teaching of the Manichaeans and of the official Christianity. The criteriums followed in his undertaking were the Slav soul yearning and the Slav conception of the world. Bogomil was no Peter of Amiens preaching to Christians slaves of counts and barons and calling them to arms against the userpers of Jerusalem, but an educated man a prototype of the Christian reformers. This forrunner of Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin, as early as the Xth century, appeals to Christians to free themselves from Rome and Constantinople and seek salvation only in the pure Gospel truths, in the moral and religious perfection of man, the citizen, and the liberation of the mind and soul from every authority. Being a protest against the state and the Church, the Bogomil doctrine had two sides — a religious and a political and social one. It also had its own theology, cosmogony, dogmatism and ethics.

The system of belief of the Bogomils was dualistic. It recognized two coequal supreme beings, the God of Good and the God of Evil. The first one was God the Father, the second Satanael, his son. God the Father was

[1]) M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 50. — Ossokin, pp. 141—154. — Siegel p. 386. — C. Schmidt, vol. I, p. 12, and vol. II, p. 267.

the creater of the invisible world, the angels at the head of which stood Satanael. [1]) Carried away by pride and conscious of his might and worthiness he revolted against his father. Some of the angels subordinate to him went on his side. On account of his disobedience and quarrels he was driven out of heaven. But being endowed with creative power he made the visible world — the earth, plants, fowls, and the first man — Adam. He tried to breathe a soul in him but failed. The soul which he breathed into the body escaped through the right side of Adam, passing in the form of vapor through his big toe and turning into a snake. Despondent over his failure he applied to his father for help. The father promised to grant his request on the condition that both of them should rule over man, and that the places made vacant through the fallen angels should be filled by the souls of saintly men. God in his mercy brought Adam to life endowing him with noble qualities. He also created Eve, whom, too, be endowed with the same gifts. Satanael became jealous of his own creation and began resorting to intrigues. He seduced Eve who bore him two children — a son, Cain, and a daughter, Calomena. Adam committed the same sin, and Eve gave birth to Abel who was pure and good. Instigated by Satanael, Cain begrudged his brothers goodness and perpetrated the first act of homicide on earth —

[1]) Jean Benoit, *Histoire des Albigeois et des Vaudois*, Paris, 1681, pp. 16—25. — Ch. Schmidt, vol II, pp. 12—57. — Abbé Donais. *Les Albigeois, leurs origines*, 1878. — Bossuet, *Histoire des variations*, vol. IV, pp. 174—176. — Dr. Fr. Racki, *Bogomil i Patareni*, in Rad Jugoslavenske Academie, numbers VII, VIII, X. — Dr. Bojidar Petranovitch, pp. 44—79. — M. Drinoff, vol. II, pp. 49—54. — Ireček, pp. 226—237. — Sismondi, *République Italiennes du moyen-âge*, pp. 111 and 112. — Achille Luchaire, membre de l'institut, *Innocent III, Croisade des Albigeois*, couronné par d'Académie, Paris, deuxième édition, 1906, pp. 9—21. — Ossokin, pp. 151—161. — Al. Lombard, *Pauliciens Bulgares et Bons-hommes*, Genève, 1879, pp. 69—80.

the killing of Abel. As the kind and gentle Abel perished by the hand of the wicked Cain, so all men were fated to perish. By seducing the souls of the first men Satanael lost his heavenly beauty. He became gloomy and dirty looking. He began to act mischievously toward men, to rage, and do all he could to estrange them from God. In turn he sent them a flood, confounded their languages, scattered them upon the earth, destroyed Sodom and Gomorrha, appeared at Sinai, and through Moses gave them bad law. In order to save humanity from the sway of his prodigal son, God the Father, thirly-five hundred years after the creation of the world, plucked from his heart the Word-Jesus, or his own son, whom people called Christ, and sent him to earth to deliver the human race. The word passed through the ear of Virgin Mary and came out in the form of a human being. In the kingdom of Satanael Jesus Christ was persecuted, tortured, tried and condemned. He was seemingly crucified, died and rose from the dead seemingly. His sufferings were also seeming, with his resurrection he crushed the power of Satanael, chained him, deprived him of what creative force was left in him, dropped the last syllable IL of his name which is permitted only to the angels, and *Satana* alone was left. Chained and degraded, Satana was shut up in Hades. Having accomplished all that for which he was come on earth, Jesus returned to heaven and was united with God the Father, casting off his human form in the air.

As the theology and cosmogony of the Bogomils, so also their dogmatism, ethics, and social and national ideals differed fundamentally from those of the other Christians.

The Bogomils rejected Church-teaching, the sacraments, hierarchy, rituals and liturgy. Icon-worship was considered idolatry, abhorred and turned away from the cross, because it was taken as an instrument for punishment. They did not worship Saint Mary because they did not

believe she was the mother of Jesus, did not consider the relics sacred, because demons stood on them who performed miracles and alured men.

They rejected the Holy Communion because the water and the bread were created by Satanael. For the same reason they rejected baptism with water, but accepted the baptism with spirit and fire as it is in the Gospels, and that only for grown-up persons by laying up of hands or the Gospel of St. John upon their heads. They confessed their sins and did penance publicly, but without enumerating their sins.

They did not believe in the resurrection of the body which was created by Satanael, but only in the resurrection of the soul.

They built no temples, because they believed the demons lived in them asserting, that in the temple of Jerusalem, and later in the church of St. Sophia, Satan himself made his abode there. They prayed four times daily and as often during the night, but out-doors, or in their own houses. They read the Lords Prayer, and wherever they prayed they set the book of the Gospels on a chair decked with a white cover.

They rejected the marriage sacrament, were opposed to matrimony, and all those who married, could, — whenever one of the sides, especially the husband, wished it, — annul it.

No holidays were observed, the Bogomils worked even on Sunday, ate no flesh, butter and milk, but preferred vegetable food, cabbage, olives, olive oil. They kept three periods of fasting, of forty days each, while they fasted three days during the week, living on bread and water only. In general, they were vegetarians.

Of the Scriptures they believed only in the Gospels, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

According to them homicide or the killing of any being whatever, with the exception of the snakes, which were considered the work of the devil constituted the greatest crime. The Bogomil sect was against every form of killing, even in self-defence. The Bogomils were also against capital punishment and against war.

They did not believe in the miracles of Christ. The miracles in the Gospels they understood and explained from a spiritual point of view. Jesus did not cure human ailments, because the body is souls prison, and work of Satanael. The blind whose eyes he opened were blind on account of their sins. The grave of Lazarus was a spirutual grave. The miracle of the bread with which Jesus fed such a large multitude was the word of life. The storm which He assuaged represented mans passions sent by Satan.

They did not hide the truth, committed no lie, would not be sworn before a court and, in general, were opposed to lying and oaths.

They recognized no spiritual or civil authority. Presbyter Cosma says, that the Bogomils taught disobedience to the authorities, hated the Kings, spoke disparaginly of the elders, reproached the boyars, considered hateful before God those who served the King, and instigated the Slaves to cease working for their masters[1]). The same writer states that they called their spiritual advisers blind Pharisees and stigmatized them for their indolence, avariciousness, intemperence, and luxurious life.

The Bogomils were divided into *credentes* or believers, and *perfecti* or selected.[2])

[1]) M. G. Poprougenko, *Sinodik Tsarya Borissa*, Odessa, 1889.

[2]) See besides the foot-notes on p. 64 also: Kyprianovitch, *Jisn i Utchenie Bogomilov po Panoplii.* — Ev. Sigabena e «Istorii Athona» by Bistrop Porphyrius. — R. Karoleff, *The Bogomil Teachings*, Numbers III—IX. — Dr. M. Pantchoff, *The Bogomils*, Sofia, 1907. — N. Philipoff, *The Origin of the Bogomils*, Bulgarian Review, vol. V, Numbers 5 and 9.

The believers in their mode of life were not distinguished from the others Christians; they were allowed to marry, to serve the state, and to go to war.

It was different with the perfect. Their life was hard and severe. The were forbidden to marry — their marriage was considered an adultery, they were interdicted to mingle with the non-Bogomils, to occupy state posts, to go to war, to seek redress through court, to kill, they were prohibited even to defend their lives and, in general, to stand and defend themselves against evil. They were not allowed to be seen at public gatherings, to attend weddings, national festivals, to enter inns, to be loquacious, to get angry, to eat meat and drink wine. They observed a most strict fasting — lived only on vegetable food. On one occasion only were the allowed to talk to unbelievers and that was when some one out of their sect wanted to become a Bogomil. As a rule the perfect renounced all earthly blessings called by them the «soul's rust». They had to give up parents, wife and children. They shun society-life, and devoted themselves to preaching, and were always ready to die for the principles they propagated. On that account, the perfect were few in number. During the XIIIth century the Bogomils' followers reached up to several hundred thousand, while the perfect numbered some four thousand members. The perfect were highly respected by the believers for their exalted virtues. They would to them when meeting them eager to obtain their benediction. The perfect, men and women, wore black gowns similar to those of the monks under which they always carried the New Testament in a bag. Their faces were pale and emaciated with fasting.

The Bogomils were organized into religious communities. These communities were strictly democratic. In them all numbers enjoyed equal privileges. There was no distinction between believers and perfect, between men

and women. Any man or woman, having reached one's majorities, could become a preacher. The religious communities were represented by three orders: the bishop or father, the apostle or stroynik (organizer), and the visitor or old man. The religious representatives did not consider themselves invested with any rights or authority received at a sacrament; they rather looked upon themselves as authorized members of the communities. The apostles used to go from place to place to preach and teach. The Bogomil communities formed parishes or churches at the head of which stood a bishop.

The Bogomils possessed two kinds of property: church and private. The church property was obtained through gifts and bequests. Some members gave their whole property to the church. The income of the church property was used for the support of the poor and sick and for maintainance of missionaries. Private property was the result of industry and economy. The Bogomils never ceased working, worked even on Sunday, were very thrifty and self-contained, were content with what was most indespensable, lived simply and looked after the poor and the helpless. Among the women perfect some did fancy work, some taught school and educated the children, others took care of the poor, and still others attended the sick and invalid.

In their leisure hours the Bogomils, especially the perfect, were given to reading, chiefly the Gospels or the apocryphal books of the Old and New Testament. They were wonted to read even when they journeyed, in crossing a bridge and entering a village. Every parish had its school. Nearly all believers had an education, which exercised a great influence over the development of literature.

The Bogomils called themselves *Christians*. They considered their religion the purest and the best, on which account they called themselves the salt of the earth, the

light of the world, the lily of the valley, immaculate saints, and their life-heavenly.

The socio-political teaching of the Bogomils is closely connected with the religious. Professor Siegel made an attempt to treat apart the socio-political doctrine and according to its gradual development to delincate it in five aspects which we present in a concise form: [1])

1. The state system which resorts to means of compulsion is replaced by self-governing communes, which possess their own land and till it themselves.

2. Reorganization or regeneration of the community through a moral change in man by rejection of church Christianity which was founded on tradition and worked out by theology.

3. Compact form of life based on a cosmopolitan ideal of Christianity, but under an intercommunal federation guaranteeing liberal self-government to each commune.

4. Democratical equality, for it is a pledge for genuine Christian love. Whether consciously or instinctively, the commune was opposed to personal pre-eminence, personal and real property, authorities and magnates, but was strongly attached to agricultural labor which tends to bring men to the same level and stands in the way of individal superiority.

5. Rejection of military distinctions as being savage and barbarous; putting a stop to aggressive warfare and to capital punishment.

Siegel, discussing the teaching of one of the apostles of the Hussites, Peter Hilchitzki, who lived in the XVth century, finds out that in its principles it resembles that of Father Bogomil or the doctrine of the so-called Christian anarchists whose number is greatest among the Slavs. He is convinced that the above-mentioned five clauses

[1]) Siegel, pp. 380—382.

would be signed by all Slavic anarchists from Father Bogomil down to the present representatives of indentical teachings which are quite unjustly called anarchistic. He asserts that such ideas became evident during the first half of the Xth century in Bulgaria in the so-called Bogomilian heresy. While expounding the socio-political views of the Bogomils and noting down their theoretical resemblance to the beliefs of Hilchitzki, Siegel concludes: «In the first place it must be kept in mind that the political ideals of the Bogomils were conceived by the Balkan Slavs, they are not known to have existed among the nomadic horde of the Bulgarians come from a Finnish or Chudic tribe, neither were from the East by the Armenians. The very change of the name of Father Jeremiah to Bogomil after he became a reformer, the names of the spiritual authorities, the numerous pagan Slavic customs and usages, folklore, etc., preserved in the Bogomilian literature, and, especially, the extraordinary rapid dissemination of the Bogomilian heresy among the Slavs clearly points out the Slavic origin of the Bogomilian doctrin.» [1]) That it is a Slavic product has been established by many authors even during the last two centuries. J. Oedor, a protestant writer of the XVIIIth century, states that the Bogomils preached Christianity in its primitive purity and had nothing to do with dualism. C. Schmidt, indentifying the Bogomilian doctrine with that of the Catharites, remarks that is was spread during the XIth century among the Slavs in Macedonia independently of the Manichaeans and Paulicians. [2]) Gibbon says that the religion of the Bogomils was simple and their morals irreproachable. Undoubtedly the socio-political principles of the Bogomilian teachings on the subject of equality,

[1]) Siegel, p. 386.

[2]) C. Schmidt, vol. II, p. 267. — A. Molinier, *Cathares*, *La grande encyclopédie*, vol. IX, p. 829

liberty and democratic self-government are Slavic, and that the very Eastern religious tendencies betray a Slavic couloring.

The Eastern and Western chroniclers, writers and invertigaters, catholic and Orthodox differ in their respective interpretation of the Bogomilian teaching. To some it is a religious doctrine, to others it appears ascetic, fit for hermits who live for heavens only. Many historians also have been led to hold such a view. They paid mere attention to Bogomilian theology, cosmogony, dogmatism and ethics but not to the Bogomilian spirit whose aim is the liberation of mans mind from the bondage of the Biblical patriarchs and New Testaments imperialists who try to defend their absolutism and their claim to religious authority by citing the Books of Moses. This spirit of protest against a religious and intellectual bondage is in reality the enemy of the new lifes theory preached by the Bulgarian Bogomil sect. It is their positive and actual point of view. Taken in this light and stripped of all legends and mythes about gods, creation of the world, origin of mans soul etc., it will be seen that at the beginning the Bogomilian belief was not strictly religious, much less ascetic. It, indeed, is tinged by religious aspects, but, nevertheless, the political, social and national interest in humanity are indelibly interwoven in it. It is directly concerned with the life of man in the State and the Church. Ossokin and Drinoff were the first ones to point out and emphasize this fact.[1]) Later on Goloubinski goes even further by showing that the Bogomilian heresy was not only hostile to the Church but also to the State.[2]) Ireček asserts

[1]) Ossokin, *Istoria Albigoitzeff*, p. 141.

[2]) Same Author, p. 161: The Bogomilian theory on the social and lay life of man is not less striking and reactionary. The Slav heretics were a native product, they were espousing national ideals and utopias. They clothed their teaching is such phrases that their

that from the very beginning it was conspicuous as a political movement. Though it was inimical to the State it was anti-national.[1]) On the countrary, the Bogomils stood from the very start for a church independent of Rome and Constantinople. Being pervaded with a nationalistic spirit, they worked for the awakening of a slavic self-consciousness, and on that account they loathed the Latin and Greek churches the enemies of Slavic literature.[2]) Drinoff after discussing select panages from the Presbyter Cosma's discourse against the Bogomils employs them to demonstrate the ideals of the Bogomils as political and social. And that is the distinguishing feature of the Bogomil doctrine which is lacking in the teachings of the Manichaean, Paulician, and Massilian sects.

We do not know all that was said and preached by the Bogomils against kings, clergy, boyars, magnates, and against the existing order of things in general, but judging from the statements mode by Cosma alone, it is not difficult to comprehend how great a chasm divided the people from its rulers, and what was the condition of things in the country after the death of Simeon the Great when Bulgaria was completely made subordinate to the Byzantine court and the Church of Constantinople. The Bulgarian people in general, cherished a strong prejudice toward everything that was Byzantine, in those times coming as they did immediately after the disappearance of

---

opponents and foes were compelled to prove the necessity for state authority. The republican proclivities of the Albigenses, their predilection for civil constitution, their struggle directed not less for civil liberty than religious emancipation — all this is sufficient to establish the political character of the heresy. They preached disobedience to the civil authorities, reproached the elders, spoke against the boyars hooted down all those who were engaged in the kings service, and as Cosma says, interdicted the slaves to serve their masters.

[1]) Drinoff, vol. II, p. 51.

[2]) Goloubinski, pp. 161 and 163.

their mighty ruler wo had taught them to lay no faith in the words of the very Patriarch himself, and to look upon Constantinople Empire as a phantom. Naturally enough, then, the Bulgarians could not look with amity upon the resumption of friendly relations between its rulers and Byzantium, and upon the innovations introduced into the state administration owing to the approach taken place between the courts of Preslau and Constantinople. There were many, of course, that were in desperation at seeing Byzantine court manners and customs replacing the native simplicity. The entry, however, of a Byzantine Princess into the Bulgarian royal house of necessity rendered such a change almost imperatrice. The body of boyars in the days of King Peter, always hostile to him profital by the general discontent manifested in the people, did all they could to enhance the popular discontent. So things went from bad to worse.

«The Church, in the meanwhile, relying on its traditional authority stepped in to defend the Tsar and his government, but if found itself unequal to the task, its prestige having been well nigh destroyed through the moral degeneration and incompetence of the Bulgarian hierarchy. In the reign of Peter the Church of Bulgaria was finally reorganized after the fashion of the Byzantine hierarchical government and assumed an important place in the State. The Bulgarian Patriarchy then counted some forty episcopal sees, as many as were comprized by the Byzantine Patriarchy. . . . Both the Patriarch and the Bishops surrounded their seats of authority with such a luxury and splendor which vied with the magnificence of its Byzantine rival. The Patriarchal staff in Constantinople included about forty clericals, the same number was adopted for the church officials attached to the court of the Bulgarian Patriarch. Some of the Bulgarian bishops, too, considered it below their degnity to have a staff of

less than forty members, as was the case, for example, with the Castoria Bishopric. The least pretentious of them, the Strouma Bishop, was content with no less than twenty clericals. In the Byzantium Empire, all civil processes were placed under the jurisdiction of the Church. The same thing was introduced in Bulgaria where the Bishops enjoyed still wider privileges. . . . Bulgarias higher clergy always acted on the side of the King and his dynasty. . . .

«The Bulgarian rulers, on the other side, either through pious tendencies or political considerations, endowed the clergy with many prerogatives and rich gifts. Tsar Peter, especially, was noted for his liberality in this respect, which was due to some extent to his exceedingly pious nature, but more to the unusual zeal with which the Clergy espoused the defence of his authority threatened by internal foes. In addition to the incomes accruing to them from church fees and legal suits, new revenues had to be devired for the support of the clergy. But in order to meet the necessity for an increased budjet, taxation rates had to be increased which had to fall upon the shoulders not only of the alien races comprized in the Bulgarian Empire, viz, Wallachians, Vardar Turks, etc., but of the Bulgarian people also. Thus the temporal authority supplied the archbishops and the bishops with a certain number of *parroikoi*. The archbishop under Peter and Samuel had forty of them while some of the bishops had also forty, such were those of Triadica, Nish, Belgrade, Uskub, Vodena and Petritch. The wealth of the higher Clergy and its material opulence developed in it a passion for luxury which inspired it too early with a sense of rivalry with the Byzantine hierarchy. . . . Presbyter Cosma reproaches the clergy for not living according to the *Scriptures*. . . . The love for pomposity, magnificence, and a life of dissolution increased

its avaricious appetites, its greed for amassing great riches, the realization of which was accompanied with all sorts of abuses. — The clergy rendered partial justice, it resorted to extortion, wronged the helpless, etc.

The people, naturally, was not and could not be content with its rulers and their rule. It failed to see any more in the ranks of the clergy the enthusiastic teachers, diligent writers and preachers of Simeons time. The priests showed no interest in education and literature. But a few among them could write, were given to teaching and preaching, and fewer still followed in the footsteps of St. Clement. The majority of the clericals preferred a prodigal life, pleasures, feasts and intemperance. The few virtuous members of the clergy, unable to bear this state of things, withdrew into the mountains and fastnesses where they became hermits. Among these may be mentioned Joan Rillski, the founder of Rillo-monastery. Prochor Pshinski, Gabriel Lesnovski and Joachim Ossogovski in whose memory monasteries were built in Macedonia. The Bulgarian clergy, similar to the Bulgarian civil authorities, maintained friendly relations with the Greeks and displayed the Greek tyrannical spirit. They stood aloof from the people and were estranged from its democratic principles and religious yearnings. They were looked upon as strangers to whom the throbs of the noble Slavic heart made no impression. The people hated the Greeks whom it considered dangerous intruders. An apocryphal document contains the following description of their character: «They are inconstant and inconsistant in their political views, are boasters, haughty, avaricious, act as false witnesses and administer justice for money.»[1]) As far as the common people was concerned, Satanael was not in heaven, nor chained in hell, but lived on earth, in the State, the city and village, and even in

[1]) Drinoff, pp. 441—443.

the homes. Clothed in authority, he pilfered mans granary and purse, plundered his property, deprived him of justice, and in general, made the life of the people unbearable. The number of the Satanaelian fellowers was a legion. They were to be found in every state and nation. Their chief seats were Constantinople and Rome. The real Satanaelians however, were no others than emperors, kings, popes, patriarchs, magnates, oppressors. To battle against all these there rose the spirit of freedom and independent thought. Against them sprung up Father Bogomil with the Gospels in hand. On his banner lifted up high were written the words: Slavic Democracy, Equality, Justice, Religious and Political Freedom. This was Slavs religious and political platform, and Bogomil was its champion. When Zimisces entered Preslau and occupied Tsar Peters domains, it was that creed that drew the Bulgarians close to their Tsar Samuel in his struggle against the Greeks; and it was under the inspiration of the same doctrine that a hundred and eighty years later the Bulgarians led by their brave rulers Assen and Peter [1]) renewed the struggle against the Greeks.

Such then was the Slavic and human side of the original teaching of the Bogomils which was subsequently degraded by rigorists and ascetics. As is seen, in the beginning the real Bogomilian teaching was a practical one; it had nothing to do with the extreme conception of life advocated by the latter. It was founded on a broader basis and the ideals it pursued were more comprehensive and tangible than those preached by a mere sect of ascetics and rigorists. Though at the bottom it was Slavic, it, notwithstanding, was equally human. And because it was more Slavic than Paulician or Manichaean, the Bogomilian belief found easy acceptance in all

[1]) Ireček, p. 323. — Drinoff, vol. II, p. 22. — N. P. Blagoeff, *Juridical and Social Views of the Bogomils*, Sofia, 1912, pp. 91—94.

Slavic lands — in Bosnia, Dalmatia, Serbia, Bohemia, etc. And because it was human in its views, it made its way into other countries of Europe, in Italy, Southern France, Germany and even England. The Bogomilian followers and communities are known under various names; thus in Bulgaria they are known as Bogomili, Babuni, Technikeri and Torbeshi [1]), in Greece Bogomili, Tundaiti; in Bosnia and Italy Patareni and Cathari; in Southern France Albigenses or Bulgari, Cathari and Waldenses; in Germany and England Cathares. People in Southern France called them Bulgari, so are they called by certain writers [2]).

[1]) Ireček, p 269. — Jordan Ivanoff, *the Bulgarians in Macedonia*, p. XI.

[2]) Ch. Benoits was authorized by Louis XIV to publish his work: «Histoire des Albigeois et des Vaudois». In it he writes: «The word Bogomili in Moesian and Bulgarian means *dear to God*.... That heresy which King Robert tried to destroy was widely spread due to the intercourse whit was established between the French and Bulgarians after the conquest of the Holy Lands. The Waldenses driven out of Lyons united with the Albigenses so called Bulgari or good people (bons hommes) in Carcassone, Albi, Foix, and other places. In truth, from 1170 till 1176, that sect was as far from the Catholic religion, as was that of the *Bulgari* or the Albigenses... When Baron de Tennières expelled the Bulgarians from the city of Mur du Buroy and saved the city of Rodez from the heretics, Philip Augustus caused him to be knighted and ordered to be sent six delegates from Rodez to render due honors to the Baron Augustus had also decreed the citizens to pay the Baron and his heirs a yearly tribute of nine florins in gold, on the 21 of September, on which occasion they were to cry out in a simple language: «vive Tennières qui nous a dépendus et préserves d'Hérésie des Bulgaris!» (Long live Tennières who depended and saved us from the Bulgarian heresy.) Benoits used in his statement the name Bulgaris instead Bulgares, because, he says, the Gascons called them Bulgaris, due to the peculiarity of the Gascon dialect » See pp. 16, 17 and 24.

Bossuet: »It is further evident from this old author, de Vignier, that that heresy brought over beyond the sea by the Bulgarians was spread in the other provinces. It was greatly revered in Languedoc, Toulouse and Gascon where its adherents were called Albigenses or

Already during the last half of the XII th century and at the beginning of the XIII th, in Europe, between the Atlantic and the Black Sea, there existed some sixteen Bogomilian churches. One was founded in Philadelphia, in Asia Minor. Two Bogomilian parishes existed in Constantinople, one Greek, the other French-Italian, there were three Slavic churches, viz., the Bulgarian, the Dragovish, in Bulgaria, and the Slavic in Bosnia. According to Rheiner Sakoni, a Cathartist apostate, who subsequently turned an inquisitor, the head of all churches were the two established in Bulgaria, namely, the Bulgarian and the Dragovish. The first one represented a mild dualism, while the second, an extreme view of it. As regards the seat of the second there are two opinions. Some assert its diocese was Dragovish situated in the north-western part of Thrace, while others maintain it was found in the Macedonian Dragovish, in Melnik near Prlep, on the Babuna mountain, whence the Macedonian Bogomils called themselves Babuni. The latter opinion is shared by the majority of competent writers. The disseminators of the Bogomil doctrine, specially the bishops were considered as authority in the west. So at least

Bulgari. They called *Bulgari* in order to be shown that it was Bulgaria the country from where the heretics came.» *Oeuvres de Bossuet, Les variations,* vol. IV, p. 175.

Achille Luchaire, membre d'Institut: «The doctrine of the Cathartists came from a distant region. Its origin is oriental. It first sprung among the Graeco-Slavs on the Balkan Peninsula, and chiefly among the Bulgarians. Thence it passed over to Bosnia, Dalmatia, and through the Adriatic ports, as far as Italy. At the beginning of the XI th century it was carried over to France by students and merchants already recognized agents of heresies. See *Innocent III, la Croisade des Albigeois,* Paris, 1906, p. 11.

Ossokin: «The Bogomils were also called Cathari... Later on people began to call the Albigenses, too, Bulgari, as a remembrance of their origin. In after time, the name Bulgari was shortened to *Bugres*. When the cause of the heretics failed, the name Bugres fell into disrepute,» pp. 150 and 176.

may be inferred from the fact that the western churches looked upon them as such, and often appealed to them requesting their presence whenever important questions were to be discerned or decided in their meetings. One such meeting was held by the Albigenses in the city of Saint-Felix-de-Caraman, during the year 1167. It was presided and directed by a delegate come, according to some from Byzantium, according to others from Bulgaria [1]). Generally Bogomil bishops were sent to Lombardy were the Bulgarian Bogomil church often came into conflict with the Greek [2]) While the Albigenses in southern France were called Bulgari, in Italy the very bishopric founded in Lombardy in the XIth century by the Bogomils, there called Cathares, bore the name *Bulgarian*. During the second half of the XIIth century the Cathartist bishopric was presided by Bishop Marco an appointee of the Bogomil episcopacy

[1]) Achille Luchaire: «In 1167 the heresy held its public meetings cofraternally with Albigenses and foreign bishops, in Saint-Felix-de-Caraman. Under the leadership of a representative come from the Greek Empire, it decided unmolested many questions of discipline and administration.» p. 7 — Th. de Cansons, *Les Albigeois et l'Inquisition*, Paris 1908: «The supreme chief of the Albigenses resided in Bulgaria. The Albigenses met at Saint-Felix-de-Caraman where under the presidency of its Bulgarian pope distributed their dioceses, etc» pp. 18 and 26.

[2]) Ossokin: Bulgarian Bogomilian priests often came to preach in Lombardy. p 164.

[3]) Bossuet: «As soon as the Bulgarian heresy grew in importance in lombardy. It chose for its bishop a certain Marko appointed from Bulgaria. Under his authority were found the Lombardians, the Toscans and the Marians. Soon, however, there came in Lombardy from Constantinople another Pope, called Nikitta, who condemned the Bulgarian Church. Marco received an appointment from the Dragovites». vol. IV, p. 175.

C. Schmidt: «Nikitta made an effort in Lombardy, in 1167, to show to the Catharists that the Bulgarian Church illegally claimed preeminence among the churches as the only apostolic inheritor. Bishop Marco who was present at the council held at Saint-Felix-de-Cara-

in Bulgaria. In 1167 arrived in Lombardy from Constantinople Bishop, or as he is better known, Pope Nikitta, who belonged to the Bogomil church of Dragovish. He immediately began to criticize the Bulgarian Church on account of its moderate dualism, and to protest against the appointment of Bishop Marco. The latter was dissuaded and together with his followers went over to the Dragovish church espousing its extreme dualism. That caused schism in the Catharist Church in Italy which toward the end of the XII th contury was divided into three episcopacies: 1. Ordo Bulgariae, 2. Ordo Druguriae, and 3. Ordo Sclavoniae.

The second church, Ordo Druguriae, bore the name of the Dragovish church which also was Bulgarian, its seat being in the vicinity of Philippopolis in Bulgaria. It

man, in the Principality of Toulouse, turned over to the Dragovish church. Marco was succeded by a certain John, also named Judaius. A second attempt was made by the latter for the reetablishment of the prestige and the moderate dualism of the Bulgarian Church. Petrach, undoubtedly, arrived in Lombardy from Bulgaria. He divulged discrediting information about Nikitta and the Bishop Simeon of Dragovish through whose recommendation Nikitta was appointed. Some of the adherents remained true to the old order of things and retained John Judaius ar their bishop, while others accepted a more liberal view and chose as their leader-Bishop Peter Lombardo of Florence. From that day on the two churches became rivals in Italy, one of them kept close ties with Dragovish and Albona, the other, with Concorezo and Bulgaria. A third church, a *Slavic* one, was also organized. Its seat was found in the small town of Danolo», pp. 61 and 62.

L. P. Karsavin: «That Pope, Nikitta by name, who had arrived in Lombardy from Constantinople set himself to criticizing the Bulgarian church forms introduced by Marko. On that account Bishop Marko weakened in his faith, gave up the Bulgarian religious order, and in unison with his followers, accepted that of the Dragovish church in which he remained as chief for many years. But in the days of John Judaius, the successor of Marco there «came» from across the maritime lands, i a «from the Orient again, a certain Petrack who disclosed discreditable allegations against bishop Simeon from whom Nikitta obtained his Dragovish church system.»

was noted for upholding an extreme dualistic teaching. In Lombardy in after time it branched into two bishoprics. During the XIII th century Ordo Bulgariae was the most powerful Cathartist church in Italy. One of her bishops was Nazarius who frequently visited Bulgaria for the settlement of church affairs in which his diocese was concerned. The seat of Ordo Bulgariae is supposed to be in Garta, near Milano, or Milano itself [1]). The Bulgarian Bogomils have left many traces in Italy [2])

The Bogomil apostles, as a rule, were conspicuous not only for their education, but also for zeal, strong convictions and self-sacrificing spirit. Truth and virtue were dearer to them than their own life. Neither persecution, nor torture, nor even death, could deter them from their beliefs. One of the principles of their tenets was to disdain any fate no matter how dreadful. And, indeed, they met death with fortitude and joy. Basilius, the chief of the Bogomils in Bulgaria, a physician by profession, a man of education and of many virtues, was burned alive at the Constantinople hippodrome [3]) in the year 1100. He was the first Bogomil apostle to die for religions liberty.

---

[1]) L. P. Karsavin; pp. 6—8; 35.

[2]) Ossokin: «In Italy, vis., in the northern part, the Bulgarian movement left behind it even traces of geographical luninology. As early as 1047, in the Turino district, a certain place was called Bulgaro. A castle in the diocese of Vercelli bore the same name. A noted family in Turin was known by the name of Bugarelo. Families of the same name lived in Bologna, Sydna and other towns as *Bulgaro, Bulgarini.*» p. 161.

Drinoff: «According to an evidence found in the registers of the first part of the XIV th century, one of the streets in Naples was called *Bulgarian Street*, Vicus qui vocatur Bulgarus. All this shows that during the XIV th and XIII th centuries and even earlier, in the capital of the Neapolitan Kingdom as well as in many of its districts, there lived many Bulgarians.» *Works of*, vol. I, p. 84.

[3]) Fleury (L'Abbé), *Histoire des Christianisme,* v. 4, livre 66, ch. 10 et 11. Paris, 1837. — Le Beau, vol. XVIII, p. 403—414.

His martyrdom took place in the presence of Emperor Alexius, the patriarch Nicholaus, the senators, magnates and a large multitude. Instead of bowing to the cross placed opposite the state on the hippodrome in order to be pardoned to which end he was repeatedly counciled personally by the Emperor or by persons sent by him, Basilius, nevertheless, preferred death. Agitated but filled with faith, he stepped on the stake and was enveloped by the flames. The flames, according to an eye-witness, rose to the top of the obelisk on the hippodrome.[1]) Many followers of Basilius ended their lives on the same stake. In south France, in the town of Saint-Gilles, Pierre Bruis, the first French preacher of the new religion, meets his doom fearlessly in the flames, in 1140. With equal calmness and resoluteness perish many apostles of the Catharist sect in Vicenza and Milano in Italy [2]), in Cologne in Germany, and even in London. In the town of Cicenza, Lombardy John of Cicenza in the year 1233 causes to be burned sixty well known Catharists. In Cologne Arnold, the Catharist apostle, together with three of his comrades unhesitatingly climbs the stake. From amidst the flames, Arnold, filled with enthusiasm, addresses the multitude gathered around him, urging his followers to stand firm for their faith. His intrepidite amazes the people and especially his judges. A maiden, who was a neophyte in the sect and a wonderful beauty, fired by the heroism of the four apostles, throws herself into the flames and is consumed by them. The reform movement, first sprung in Bulgaria, spreads far beyond its boundaries. The sparks emitted from the first stake in Constantinople where Basilius was martyred, enkindle one after another the pyres of Western Europe. The doctrine and ideas of

[1]) A. Molinier, La Grande Encyclopédie, vol. XI, p. 837. — Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, Paris, 1887, t. II 325 et 705.

[2]) C. Schmidt, vol. I, pp. 96 and 99.

Bogomil, however, did not perish at the stakes. On the contrary, the stakes became their most powerful disseminators.

The Bogomil teaching was not hindered in the Bulgarian state as well as in the neighboring Slavic countries in general. That spirit of tolerence, which is being emphasized by the majority of historians, is explained with the fact that it harmonized with the yearnings of the soul of the people and was considered the religion of the nation. Aware of this truth, the Bulgarian Tzars dared not raise hand against the Bogomils. The Church alone persecuted them, but it did this in theory and by intimidating anathemas. Some of the Bulgarian kings openly took their side, for political reasons may be, but others actually sympathized with Bogomilian Cause. There is a tradition noted down by all historians in which it is stated that Tzar Samuels son and his wife were Bogomils. Certain chroniclers maintain that Samuel himself was a Bogomil. This at least is sure, he tried to be on good terms with them whose influence was felt throughout the country. [1]) During the XIth and XIIth centuries the Bogomilian religion was at its adminating point in the state. It was then the religion of the people, its political credo. During that period of foreign oppression, the Bogomils were the most rigorous apostles of Bulgarian independence against the Greek dominion. In the insurrection which soon took place they were its principal inspirators. Nothing said about the Bogomilians in the time of Peter and Assen. The Court of Rome alone raised its voice against them, fearing their power and growing influence in Bulgaria. Joan Assen II, known for his great erudition and wisdom becomes avowed protector of the Bogomils, and in spite of the crusade started by the Pope against Bulgaria on account of the state patronage accorded them,

[1]) G. Schlumberger, membre de l'Institut, *L'Epopée Byzantine*, vol. I, p. 615.

not only left them continue their work unmolested[2]), but gave them equal rights with the orthodox and full freedom in practicing their religion. Three Bulgarian Tzars are recorded to have been hostile to the Bogomils: Peter, Boril and Joan Alexander. In the reign of Peter they were strongly persecuted because of their vigorous campaign against the State and Church whose form fo organization was more Greek than Bulgarian. Hence the Greeks were the greatest inspirators in the anti-Bogomil movement. Tzar Boril started a persecution against them for political motives. Threatened by foes both from without and within and instigated by Pope Gregory IX, he called a council in Tirnova, in 1210, where a sort of inquisition was established. The Tirnova Council condemned and anathemathized the doctrine of the Bogomils. Some of the followers of the sect were immediatly punished with death, others were imprisoned, while a good many of them were driven out of the country. The anti-Bogomil acts were not approved by the people of Bulgaria nov by those of the neighboring countries. The author of the biography of St. Simeon of Serbia stigmatizes Tzar Borilo for «shedding the blood of his own children», Joan Alexander convoked two councils, one of them against the Bogomils Essichati and Adamites, and the second against the Jews.

[1]) Here are some extracts from the letter of Pope Gregory IX addressed to the Hungarian King Bella IV, touching the Crusade instituted against Joan Assen II, the protector of the Bogomils: — «We have sent circular letters to the Hungarian archbishops and bishops in which we command them to preach a crusade against that Assen and his land .... Now we turn to your Majesty whom we conjure in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost... to take up arms and blot out that wicked and perversed people (the Bulgarian.) — — By the Grace of God we absolve from all sins your Majesty and all those who lend their support toward the realization of this undertaking; we have decided to divide their land among you and the rest of the Catholic Lords.» Drinoff, vol. II, pp. 83 and 84.

[2]) O. Schmidt, p. 113.

The Bogomilian doctrine in those days had underzone a degeneration. The Hesychats went to extremes while the Adamites exerted a perverted influence. The Council condemned all three heresies and launched their teaching to anathema. Many of the adherents of the sects conpened to have been mislead and repentant. The active and resolute leaders of the Adamites were exiled after being branded on the forehead.

In the Slavic lands the Bogomilian sect was next to Bulgaria most widely spread in Bosnia, and had least success in Serbia where it was constantly being persecuted by the Serbian kings. In Bosnia it had taken deep roots. In the time of ban Koulin in whose reign Bosnia had reached a great commercial development and enviable material welfare, the Bogomil doctrine became almost a state religion. Ban Koulin himself, joined by his wife, sisters, relatives and the thousand Christians, turned Bogomil. The new religion achieved still greater success in Southern France and in Italy. After its phenomenal growth, Rome makes the Bogomilian apostles an object of persecution and instigates a series of crusades against the kings, princes, and counts who protected or even tolerated it and against the people that embraced it. In Bosnia are begun those terrible and bloody persecutions against the Bogomils which continue to the downfall of Bosnia under the Turks. Pope Innocent III raised several crusades against Southern France where an inquisition also followed. By this act he stimulated the first revolution — that of the Albigenses. The crusaders devastated the rich and flourishing regions of France and exterminated its enlightened aod freedom-loving citizens. The papacy conquered the Albigenses but could not root out their religion nor the idea of reformation. Though it triumphed over them by dint of arms and inquisition, morally it felt itself defeated. Its throne was shaken. The impetus toward

reformation proved stronger than the armies of the crusaders and the tortures of the inquisition. After a long pause Father Bogomils idea is taken up again by another Slavic genius. Jan Huss is the man who now gives it a scientific form and infuses a new life into it. The Czech peasants, the most literate class of people in those days raised the flog of freedom, equality and fraternity three centuries before the French Revolution. That struggle shouldered up by the Czechs under the leadership of Jan Djishka immediately after the burning up of Huss in Constance is unique in the history of mankind. It was a struggle of democracy against aristocracy, of freedom against tyranny, of light against darkness, of souls enfranchisement against the authority of the Pope. But the reformatory movements, conflicts and cataclysms taken place in Bohemia were an indirekt result of the religious, political and social ideals of the Bogomils exerted upon the Czech nation. «The Bogomil teaching», writes Siegel, «was initiated in Bohemia through the Waldensian sect, which was spurred on to a more intense activity. The Waldensian teaching had thrived already for a long time in the land of the Czechs where it counted a large following. It happened that while the higher and most educated Czechs were seriously discussing the question of Church reforms and were studying the treatises of foreign reformers, such as Wickliff, the common people, on the other side, eagerly flocked into public squares and under thatched roofs to hear the firy sermons of the Waldensian preachers thundering against the existing social and political conditions and against all forms of life which they considered anti-Christian.» But it is now conceded that the Bogomil religion found its way into Czechia much

[1]) Siegel p. 392 and 393.

[2]) Simonde de Sismondi, Historie des Republiques italiennes du moyen âge, vol. II, pp. 110–119.

earlier than was believed. «The Bulgarian merchants», writes Sismondi, «together with their goods carried up the Danube river had brought into Bohemia the first seed of the Reformation. The Bogomil teaching found a fertile soil here and the way for the work of Jan Huss and Jerome of Prague was payed.» The same fact was corroborated at an earlier date by the English historian Gibbon. [1]) The Bulgarians (Paulicians) and the Albigenses had accepted the Bible as the standard for their faith and had rejected all creeds. The efforts of Wickliff in England and Huss in Bohemia were premature and fruitless, they however did a good deal to facilitate the successful mission of Zwingli, Luther and Calvin.»

The wars of the Albigenses, lasting twenty years, and those of the Hussites, continuing for eleven years, were two links of the long chain of persecution and hostilities to which were exposed the adherents of the Bogomilian doctrine that preached freedom of thought and belief. These wars that devoured thousands of victims were but an echo of the sufferings and groans which escaped from the flames of the stakes of Martyrdom at Constantinople, Saint-Gilles, Vicenza, Milano, Cologne, London, Constance and other places. The stiff teaching of the Paulicians and Manichaeans wanting in social and political ideals had no bearing upon these conflicts. The Albigenses, on the other hand, and the Catharists, Patareni, Waldenses and Hussites are offshoots of the same trunk which is called Bogomilianism. Thest rongest branch of that tree was Lutheranism or Protestantism which brought about the Reformation. The Slavs in Bulgaria and Bosnia helped it with ideas, feelings and sacrifices, the Latins in France and Italy elevated it by a more synthetic and scientific interpretation of its principles, while the practical genius of

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XV, p. 36—40.

the Teutons took up the Bogomilian doctrine, sifted it up, picked what was the best and most practical in it, and applied it to daily life. Racki attaches great importance to the part played in the Reformation by the Bogomils and through them, by Bulgaria. He considers very important the part Bulgaria took in the intellectual movement of Europe. The admission to priesthood of every human being, without any special ceremonies, provided he is morally qualified for such a post, also the free interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as the only source of fait, so generally obscured by Church doctrines, — these signally advanced ideals were introduced from the Bogomilian Bulgaria into the west, into Italy, France and even Germany. There two principles were first embraced by the Hussites and from them they passed over to the Lutherans. [1])

The views on this question found in the works of the Russian learned writer A. N. Vesselovski, are still more explicit and convincing. In one place he says:

«It was through the Bogomilian teaching that the Slavic nations were the first before Huss to contribute to the European civilization their intellectual share which left lasting traces upon the development of the literature of the Middle ages.» [2])

Bogomilianism, indeed, imparted its ideas to the European culture, but it was carried with its zeal so far, that is forgot Bulgaria. In its activity altruism stands out more conspicuously than egoism. The Bogomils thought and worked more for humankind in general than for the people of that land which gave birth to their teaching. The Bogomil apostles reasons out that through a general amelioration of humanity's lot Bulgaria will also be benefited. By this they weakend the stimulus which had

[1]) Dr. Fr. Racki, *Rád jugosl. Acad.*, Number X, pp. 261, 263.

[2]) *Slavyanskiya Skazaniya*, pp. 146—147.

individualized the people and had kept it closely connected with the state. Being against the church, they helped diminish even the little faith which the nation had in it and consequently in the state which was inseparable from the church. That is the negative side of the Bogomil doctrine on account of which it was always criticized and condemned. Its religious cosmopolitanism weakened the nation and isolated it from society, Church and State, rendered it indifferent to national interest and incapable of defending the country against its foes.[1]) The same effects were produced also upon all the Southern Slavic states,[2]) especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina. And if Southern Slavdom which was so numerous was unable to resist the invasion of the Turks, this, according to some historians, was due to the Bogomil doctrine. It is also being accused of corruption and its apostles of dissimulation and many other vices closely allied to hypocrisy. These accusations, however, have but one and the same source — the accusers of the Bogomils are their persecutors, judgers and executors and those who have first written about them and preached against them, Alexius Comnenus, Siegaben, Cosma, the Roman inquisitors, the councils in Bulgaria, the protocols of the inquisition courts, etc. The Catholic writers of the west draw their information almost exclusively from these sermons, protocols and books. C. Benoits, a prejudiced writer on the subject, asserts in his book, which bears a royal sanction, that the believers under an outward rigorousness[3]) committed great crimes, while the perfect he accuses of licentious life, extortion, usury and even robbery. Other Catholic writers maintain the same opinion. It must be admitted, nevertheless, that among the Catholic historians are found a few impartial

[1]) M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 52.
[2]) Siegel, p. 401.
[3]) C. Benoits, pp. 28, 29.

ones who not only extenuate the accusations, but even reject them Achille Luchaire quotes the words of a certain knight of Languedoc, a Catharist, reverted to Catholicism through the inquisition. Being asked by Falke, the bishop of Marseilles, why they did not chase the Catharists out of their land, he answered: «We could not. We have been brought up among them: many of our relatives lived with them and it is my duty to confess, they behaved themselves with great probity.» [1]) Bernhard de Clairvaux, a Catholic prelate, accuses the Catharist heretics of holding night orgies. The young Russian professor Karsavin, basing his investigation upon testimonies and documents of the XIIth and XIIIth centuries, writes: «The so called perfect are irreproachable: they are real saints. Like the apostles, they are emaciated, they look pale and worm out with fasting, are not addicted to swearing, but live according to the Gospel.» [2])

We possess no direct dates concerning the Bogomilian literature. Yet it is absurd to think that the Bogomils did not have a literature of their own. According to Drinoff, their preachers were men of education, had the new Testament always with them and were continually explaining its truths to their hearers. Goloubinski, too, says that every one of the Bogomils wanted to be a teachor. [3]) The Bogomilian Church in Bulgaria was the chief one and directed all the Albigensian and Catharist Churches in the West. As was already pointed out, it always sent some of its bishops and apostles to participate in the councils of the Western Churches. [4]) This intercourse,

---

[1]) Achilles Luchaire, *Innocent III. La Croisade des Albigeois*, couronné par l'Académie, 1905, pp. 21, 22.

[2]) *Ocherki Religuiosnoy Zhisni v. Italii*, p. 54.

[3]) Goloubinski, p. 160.

[4]) Gibbon, vol. XX, p. 33. — Karsavin, p. 7. — Ossokin, see note p. 81.

which was maintained regularly and continually, gives us the right to suppose that the delegates were not mere figures, but educated and erudite persons. It is impossible to imagine that the church would have sent unfit and uneducated men as its representatives to the West, especially to Italy and France, where the Cathares had many schools, and counted among themselves even doctors of divinity who were best qualified to render both literal and allegorical interpretation of the text to suit their thesis. One may with certainty conclude that Bulgarias Church representatives must have been familiar with the Greek language, and especially the Latin, in order to be qualified for those deginfied positions as guiding spirits in the meetings and councils of the western churches. It is also probable that some of the bishops of the West must have known Bulgarian. The Lombardian Catharist bishops and those of Southern France used to exchange visits in the interest of their churches. Many Lombardian religious chiefs used to visit Bulgaria. Thus it is recorded that Nazarius, Bishop of the Bulgarian Church in Lombardy with Gata or Milano as its seat, made frequent journeys to Bulgaria,[2]) from where he once brought with him the apocryphal Gospel of St. John translated into Bulgarian from the Greek. Petrarch[3]) also is said to have been sent with missions to Bulgaria. He was, as it will be recalled, a convert of the Bulgarian Bogomil church and opposed Bishop Nikitta. A continual fluctuation existed between the Bulgarian Church and those of the West. In Italy the Cathares had a great number of pupils, especially in Rome, near Florence. But Lombardy prided itself in having more than any other centre. There was a Catharist school in Gata,

[1]) M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 51.

[2]) C. Benoits, p. I, Evidences, p. 295: — Ireček, p. 549. — Karsavin, p. 28.

[3]) C. Schmidt, see note on p. 82; — Karsavin, note on p. 89.

the supposed residence of Nazarius. It is not known whether those schools found in the diocese of the Bulgarian Church in Italy were not attended by Bulgarians come to master the Latin languages, as well as the italian tongue and the sciences. It is not established, either, whether italian students did not go to Bulgaria to study. It seems however, that such a custom must have been in existence, for a mutual intercourse would have been found a necessity since the western churches were governed from Bulgaria.

The bulk of people also must have been literate. The believers among them had to read the Gospels and other books. They would not have been satisfied with listening to the sermons of the perfect alone. On that account the study of literature was in the nature of things. It is, of course, to be supposed that there were among the followers some illiterate persons who after a constant repetition of sermons and readings were able to commit to memory whole texts of the New Testament. A distinguishing feature of the Bogomil, and Catharist Christians was that even those among them, who were illiterate or lacked a school education, were more familiar with the Gospels, than their Orthodox and Catholic brothers. This assertain is being confirmed by examples of the every day life of the Catharists. Stephen of Bourbon was acquainted with many almost illiterate citizens who in the course of conversation quoted whole passages from the New Testament. An uneducated peasant knew by heart the entire book of Job. In order to enrol more listners, preachers and readers were necessary. There were therefore, a large number of readers, and an increasing supply of books had to be provided for. The Bogomils generally were eager to attend church meetings and to study. A good knowledge of the New Testament was ones principal duty and was considered a dignified acquirement. The zeal for education and learning, naturally tended to elevate the

Bogomils and to create of them, in all probability, the most enlightened class of people in the state. To their love for knowledge is due, in a large measure, the subsequent building up of the national literature.

During the Bogomilian epoch the growth of the romantic or apocryphal kind of literature received a great stimulus. It is as a rule composed of translations. Original productions are very few in number. As the original works so those obtained through translations were not the fruits of Bogomils only. In both of them, Orthodox writers no less than Bogomil authors tried their talents in discussing important questions the solution of which they looked in vain to find in the official literature. Bulgaria was a centre of a sort of revolutionary or opposition literature. Here were being translated, written and edited, the bulk of Bogomilian and apocryphal books which were scattered throughout Slavdom. Bulgaria served for a long period as a literary depot for this kind of literature as it used to be for liturgic books, rubrics, sermons, biographies, panegyrics, chronicles, annals etc. The translations, made more from Greek than from Latin, were apocryphal in character, dealing on Bible topics. They are simple narratives in which the heroes are taken from the Scriptures or the Church history, but the events treated, though biblical in character, are so worked out by the phantasy of the narrators that they interest, fascinate and astound the reader. That which the common people was anxious to know and which was not to be found in the Bible, the writer took up, explained and enlarged. His imagination made an ingenious use of cosmogony, theogony, events, personages, history, geography, philosophy etc. The Old and New Testaments had to undergo a process of evolution similar to that of the Iliad and Odyssey and its heroes. As a certain Stassinos of Cyprus recites events [1])

[1]) M. Egger, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, 16 édition, p. 69.

which preceded the Trojan war and on which the Iliad is silent, or as a certain Hegias tells how the remaining heroes returned after the destruction of Troy, of which nothing is mentioned in the Odyssey, in the same way various anonymous authors of the apocryphal books take bible stories and ornament them with incidents which are not contained in the Scriptures. That is clearly seen in the story of »Discourse on Adam or Eve's Confession» in which is described the experience of Adam and Eva after their expulsion from Eden, how they ploughed the fields, how they quarelled with Satan about land, and how they lived as home providers, as a family, how they died and were buried;- such also are the narratives «questions concerning Adam and Abraham on Mount Olive,» «Sermon on the Death of St. Mary», «St. Mary in the Footsteps of the Tortures»; Questions and answers by the three Saints John Chrysostom, Gregory, the Theologian, and Basil of Caeserea», «On Wine-drinking, invented by Satan», in which it is told that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the vine and that Adam and Eve got intoxicated of its juice, etc. The list of such narratives is a long one.

The most important Bogomil book was the apocryphal collection «Sermon on the Holy cross and on the Enunciation of the Holy Trinity». It consists of six books. It was translated and compiled from the Greek. Its author is believed to be Father Jeremiah or Bogomil. It contains the history of the three trees from Moses down to Christ, a story on the thunders, the twelve daughters of Herod and the conjuration of the evil spirits so-called nezhiti. The most interesting is the narrative in which is related how Christ was ordained a priest, how he became a ploughman, how King Prod called Christ his comrade, how and of how many parts Adam was created. Another important Bogomil book was «The Questions of John the

Theologian» which was also a translation from the Greek. That is the same book, which was already mentioned and which Bishop Nazarius of the Cathares took with him from Bulgaria to Italy and translated.

More literary than sectarian were the narratives treating worldly and religious subjects. Their origin is oriental. Their source is in India, the land of Buddhism.[1]) Fond of illustrations and proverbs, the followers of Buddha collected stories from all countries, besides writing such themselves. These stories were spread into Western Europe through Byzantium and the Arabs. The Greeks brought them over to Bulgaria. Byzantium itself had received them through Syria and Persia where they were introduced from their birth-place India. These narratives are the beginnings of the romance. Since the subjects of the romances were picked out from historical events dating as far back as the origin of Christianity, they naturally were interwoven with pagan and christian elements. It often happens that then heroes lived several centuries before Christ, and Christian theogony, cosmogony, philosophy and ethics are intermingled with heathen beliefs, conceptions and theories of the world. The most popular narrative in Bulgaria during the Middle Ages was «The Story of Alexander the Great». Besides the two translations of it made at different times, there exists an original one of the same subject whose author in unknown. The first translation was made by Bishop Gregory and is included in the chronicle of Malalla. The translation of the latter was made at the request of Tzar Simeon. The second translation of the story, again from the original Greek, was made by Protopopovitch of Karlova and pub-

[1]) See *Bulgarian Literature* by A. Theodoroff pp. 100—117, where the list of most of them is given.

[2]) G. Paris, *La Littérature française au moyen âge*, Paris, pp. 111, 213, 218.

lished in 1844. The original story on Alexander was written in Moldavia in 1562. In the narrative on the great Macedonian chieftain, which is popularly known as *Alexandriata*, Christian and pagan beliefs and superstitions are promiscuously brought to play. In it, among other things, the author tells of the wonderful exploits of Alexander the Great, how when in Cena, he visited the Island of the Blessed where people related to him the story of Adam and Eve, of their life in Eden, of their fall and expulsion, of the righteous and the wicked, of the blessed, resurrection of the dead; how he made a journey to Paradise where be saw angels endowed with three pairs of wings,[1]) etc. Another similar book, no less popular, was «the Story of Troy». In general it describes the Trojan war and tells of the Trojan heroes. It also was included in the Malallas Chronicle, and was translated by Bishop Constantine. Among other interesting incidents found in the story, the author asserts that Achilles, the hero of Homer, had an army of his own which was composed of Myrmidons today called Bulgarians. Of similar nature are also the narratives «History of Synagrippa, the King of the Adores and Alluvian Countries», «The feat of Deugenius», «Stephanite and Inchilate», «The Story of Solomon and Kytophrastes», etc.

As a typical religious romance of the Middle Ages may be taken «Josaphat and Barlaam». For a long time it was considered the work of John Damascene. Modern critics reject this view, asserting that it belonged to the VIIth century literature. It was written in Greek. Many of the episodes outlined in it are met in the works of Buddha. The biography of Josaphat abounds in beautiful Indian proverbs[2]) adapted to suit the Christian themes treated in

[1]) *History of Alexander the Great*, translated from the Greek, Karlovski, Slavonian-Bulgarian teacher. Belgrade, 1884 pp. 97—103.

[2]) G. Paris, pp. 236 and 257. — A. H. Pipin, *History of Russian Literature*, pp. 48 and 49. — B. Tsoneff. *Origin of the Trojan Parable*, Ministerial Sbornik, No. VII.

it. To the Indian King Abener, a heathen and persecutor of Christianity, was born a son, Josaphat. In order to keep him out of the way of lifes afflictions and of the influence of Christianity, he isolated him in an exquisite palace surrounded with all kinds of luxury. The son, however, became aware of the fact that he practically was a prisoner, and began to grumble. The King, his father, then permitted him to go out of the palace but took steps that no misfortune befell him. No sooner had the boy ventured out than he saw before him a leper, a blind man and a decrepit old fellow, and discovered that suffering and death existed on earth. He began to meditate upon these things and wished some one to explain them to him. The hermit Barlaam prognosticated the thoughts that were working upon the mind of the boy. Disguised as a pearl merchant he succeeded in gaining admittance to the Kings son. He told the boy he had a pearl that possessed wonderful properties. It could open the eyes of the blind, restore the hearing of the deaf, cure the sick, and drive out demons. The pearl could be seen only by persons having sound eyes and clean body. With parables Barlaam reveals the doctrine of Christianity to Josaphat and baptizes him. The King finds out about his sons conversion, sends men after him, despatches his sage, also, in order to win Josaphat back, but the sage himself, after a short conversation with Josaphat, is persuaded to become Christian. The King then sends out his sorcerer, who also fails though he tries to seduce the young man by surrounding him with beautiful maidens. Finally the King also turns Christian. Josaphat abdicates the throne he inherits from his father, starts out to seek Barlaam and becomes a hermit. As is seen, the author has taken the subject of the story from the Gospels, while the name he borrowed from the Oriental narratives.

To the popular literature also belong the various

books on magic and witchcraft, such as *Kolednik* or *Calender*, *Lunik*, etc., which deal on astronomical questions and atmospheric changes in connection with the economic and sanitary conditions of man. In them it is told of the weathers variations, and the readers are instructed to expect certain climatic changes not through mere observation but according to the days on which falls this or that holiday. Days were divided into good and bad, the calender specifying what kind of work was to be done on a certain day, if it was to prosper, or what misfortunes were to follow him who worked on an evil day, etc. These books were translations from Greek originals. In them the pagan prophesies in regard to good and evil days have been made to suit the usages and beliefs of Christian people of those times. The authors have to a great extent christianized the contents of « Work and Days », also, and especially « Days », by Hesiod. [1])

The translations and imitations of the Greek narratives constitute one of the most attractive features of the Bulgarian literature. The efforts to render foreign works into Bulgarian gave the Bulgarian writers the opportunity to dip into the rich sources of ancient classics. Only a longer time and more favorable conditions were necessary in order to get rid of the scholastical and religious barrier which screened the genuine classical productions from the eyes of the beginners in Slavic literature. Bishop Constantine as early as Simeons time was the first to force the barrier by writing a poem and using it as a preface to his collections «Preceptive Gospel». The poem is a lyric outburst, the first of its kind written in Bulgarian. In reality it is a prayer in which the author singspraises at seeing the Slavic nation, too, enlightened with true faith. We possess no other poetical production written

[1]) Alfred Croizet et Maurice Croizet, *Histoire de la littérature Grecque*, Paris, 1896, vol. I, pp. 463—470. — Max Egger, pp. 70—73.

by this Bulgarian Damascene. Neither do we possess a similar work by any Bulgarian writer whatever. But attemps at lyrical and epical production probably existed. Church lyric-writers are all anonymus authors of troparions in honor of St. Cyrll and St. Methodius, the seven martyrs, St. Clement, etc. The chroniclers and historians [1]) give the intimation for an epical productiveness: such an intimation is warranted by the recorded legend given in the chronicle of Luitpand and Peretz, which has been reproduced by various historians. It presents Boyan, the youngest son of Simeon, such a subtle magician that with a single glace he could turn a man into a wolf ar another animal. It was supposed he performed this miracle not with a reed-pipe as Orpheus used to do, but with his muse, for he was believed to be a poet, such as was the Russian bard, the author of the «Sermon to the Igorev Regiment», where similar miracles are met with. [2])

The Bogomil or apocryphal literature was more widely disseminated among the people because it gave the questions in which the people were interested a more naïve and fascinating explanation. The Orthodox read the Bogomil books with no less interest which exerted such an influence upon them, that there were periods when it was impossible to distinguish an Orthodox from a Bogomil. The circulation of Bogomil literature was for a long time unimpeded and, side by side with the national literature, it had a free access everywhere even into foreign countries like Serbia, Bosnia and Russia, where it was translated and eagerly read. Having a larger circle of readers, the Bogomil and apocryphal literature produced upon the imagination, beliefs and creative power of the people a deeper impression than did the so-called national literature. Thus in the Bulgarian folklore many traces of

[1]) *Modern Bulgarian Collection*, Moscau, 1863, pp. 40—47.

[2]) Rambaud, p 330. — Ireček Ibid, p. 219.

Bogomilianism are noticeable. The common people become familiar with Christianity through the Bogomil books which they read themselves or heard read by others. The knowledge thus obtained was turned to oral literature into which the soul of the nation gave vent to its feelings and ideas. The very life of the people was made to conform more and more to the Bogomil teaching. The vegetarian principle of the Bogomils suited his mode of life, for he himself was an unconscious vegetarian: he seldom ate meat, not because fowl and cattle were lacking, nor out of stinginess but simply because his father and grandfather lived so. He strictly observed all fasts, obstained from eating forbidden food on Wednesday and Friday, and in the villages, even on Monday.

But the Bogomil literature was more extensibely spread when the period of Bogomil persecution set in, and the authorities issued their interdictions against the reading of «apocryphal» or «rejected» books. The Bogomil doctrine and educational methods had taken so deep a root in the country that the national literature was, inspite of itself, benefitted by it, for it began to grow more and more independent of the Greek influence and forms. Thus to the Bogomilian culture are due the Condemnatory Sermon of Corma, the Sinodic of Boril, the various decrees and debates of the Councils, held in Borils time, as well as in the reign of Tzar Joan Alexander. But to the Bogomilian sect must be recognized another service, which is all the more important, because of its international character. Its phenomenal success as a propagating medium was greatly instrumental in internationalizing the Bulgarian language and literature which imposed themselves not only in Serbia, Bosnia and Russia but throughout the south-eastern Slavdom. Bogomilianism played the same civilizing part in Bulgaria as that in the Albigenses did in France. The French writer, professor Lanson, touching

this question, says that the terrible persecutions instituted against the Albigenses was no less a political and religious than a literary event of great magnitude; it helped the introduction of the French language as far as the Pyrenees and the Aegean.[1]) If that is so, then is not Bogomilianism an equally great historical event, all the more, since in a large degree it helped the popularization of the Bulgarian literary language among the Southern Slavs? In favor of the Bogomils should be said even more, — as a doctrine their teaching had during the Middle Ages an unusual success, Rome and abroad, became international,[2]) and prepared the way for the Reformation.

[1]) G. Lanson, p. 5.

[2]) Vassilev, *Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, (Brockhaus and Ephron, vol. VII. p. 174).

IV.

BYZANTIUM, GREEKS, BULGARIANS, SERBIANS.

Latin Period. — Helenized Emperors. — Christian Period. — Iconoclastic Movement and Reforms. — Religious Struggles in Constantinople. — National Idea. — Byzantine Empire Greek or Slav. — Simeon and Slav Unification. — Simeon, Byzantium and the Serbians. — Russians and Greeks in Bulgaria. — Samuel and Basilius. — Samuels Plan for the Federation of the Slavs. — Byzantium after Basilius. — Decline of the Empire. — Ivanitza and the Federation Idea. — Joan Assen and the Federation. — Stephan Dushan and the Federation. Bulgarians, Serbians and Greeks under Turks. — Causes of Downfall.

The Greeks in a compact mass inhabited the territory occupied by Greece down to 1913, including the Aegean and Jonic islands, Eolia in Asia Minor and the colonies along the coasts of the Black, Marmora and Aegean Seas. In the Byzantine Empire they were not a ruling class, but like the Slavs and other tribes were one of the subject races. Their wealth, however, and their civilization and language soon secured for them a privileged place in the Empire. Their culture at once opened the way for them to all administrative posts. In certain districts the Greek language which was already widely spread in Asia Minor and Thrace, was adopted as a matter of fact. Greek language and civilization existed in Asia Minor and along the African seacoast since the days of Alexander the Great.[1]) Later on, in Antioch, Beirut, Kaza, Tyre, Alexandria, Nicomidia Amassia, Eusebia, and other centres there flourished philosophical schools where many sons of pagan

[1]) Gibbon, vol. V, pp. 18—22. — Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 123 and 124; 141.

families received their education. At the foundation of the Byzantine Empire a large number of hellenized Thracians, Capadocians, Isaurians and Armenians were already in evidence. They felt themselves as Greeks, for they were educated amid the influences of Greek culture, and wrote in the Greek tongue, having no alphabet and literature of their own.

The Romans organized the New Empire after the pattern of the Old one. They gave Latin appellations to the provinces, military and administrative bodies and hierarchies. All medals and coins bore Latin inscriptions. The official language at the Court, Senate, Courts of Justice, public meetings, in the administration, etc., was the Latin. Constantine the Great opened the first Occumenical Council at Nicea, 325 A. D., with an address in Latin, which was immediately translated into Greek in order that the Greek representatives who were in the majority may understand it. The court decissions were written in the Roman tongue and later on in the reign of Emperor Accadius — in both Latin and Greek. Theodosius II introduced the Greek language still more widely. At his request in the Constantinople High School or University side by side with fifteen professors who taught the Latin language and literature, Law and Philosophy in Latin, fifteen more were appointed to teach the Greek language and literature in Greek. It was the first step taken toward the recognition of the Greek language on equal footing with the Latin. Politically, however, the Romans, though inferior in numbers remained the same lords and masters over all other races of which the Empire was composed. Emperor Marcian, too, followed the tradition of Constantine the Great: he, too, opened the Fourth Occummenical Council at Chalcedon with a Latin speech.[1]) At the Council the papal delegates spoke only the Latin language, though some of them

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 124—128.

knew Greek, or even came from Greek parentage. Bishop Julius of Cos, acting as proscy to the Roman Bishop, at the Fourth Oecumenical Council spoke in Latin, afterwards translating it into Greek. The Roman rulers and authorities in the Byzantine Empire, at the beginning, in general resorted to the use of the Greek tongue only in cases of expediency. Previous to the establishment of the Second Roman Empire, sound education and learning in the Orient could be obtained chiefly through the language of the Hellenes. The employment of the two rival tongues followed up gradually. It continued so down to the fall of the Western Empire when radical changes of world-wide importance took place, viz., the beginning of the Middle Ages, a social revolution in the Byzantine Empire which is marked by the official recognition of the Greek language, and a reconstruction of the Empire's institutions which thenceforth show a preference for Greek appellations and usages. The coins struck off then bear Greek inscriptions.

In vain did Justinian try to restore the ancient Roman Empire and to introduce the Latin tongue as an official medium throughout his Empire. He soon became convinced of the impossibility to impose it upon the peoples of whom the Empire was composed. He himself was compelled to publish his own *Novels* in Greek, though his earlier laws were edited in Latin.

Another signal reverse befalls the Empire entailing important consequences. The Latin royal line is broken and a new not Greek, but an Oriental one supersedes it. After the seven Roman emperors, beginning with Constantine the Great and ending with Theodosius I, the Byzantine throne begins to be occupied by Eastern and Hellenized rulers. The latter commence the new reign with Arcadius and finish off with Constantine XI, who falls fighting the Turks whose chief puts an end to the

Byzantine Empire. The number of the Byzantine Emperors reaches up to eighty, but not one of them is Greek, neither by descent or birth. All of them are Hellenized strangers to the Empire. The Empire therefore, was ruled not by Greeks, but by Orientals. Greece originally loaned to it only its culture and language, but gradually and imperceptibly, without much ado or shedding of blood it became master of Byzantium. The Greek writers themselves admit that in the long row of Eastern Emperors not a single one came from Greek blood. On this point Bikelas says[1]: «And if some of the Emperors were married to Athenian women, they themselves were all Thraccians, Armenians, Isaurians, Cappadocians, but never Athenians or Spartans, or men of genuine Hellenic origin.» The same thing may be said of the writers. They, too, as a rule, were not pure Greeks, but Hellenized aliens. Even St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory the Theologian and St. John Chrysostom whom the Greeks consider their greatest teachers and reformers were not from Greek extraction. The first two were Cappadocians, while the third one came from an Antiochian family. St. John of Damascus, too, was not a Greek. But no matter what lineage they came from, and how little in common they had with the race of Pericles, nevertheless, the Byzantine Emperors, patriarchs and writers worked for the Hellenic civilization and styled themselves Hellenes. The Byzantine Empire was not a nation and belonged to no race in particular. It was a conglomeration of various peoples subject to the despotic rule of Hellenized emperors and patriarchs. Between the Emperor and the Patriarch, and between the State and the Church there existed no people which could impoint its character upon the Empire, there was no national spirit and patriotism.

Byzantium was not a homogeneous state as Athens,

[1]) *La Grèce Byzantine et Moderne.* Paris, 1893, p. 45.

Sparta or Thebes used to be; it had no citizens but subjects, who were animated by no love for country but by a desire for personal advancement and gain. It could not be compared with the Roman republic composed of free men, using the same language and observing the same customs and traditions. Byzantium lacked the burning patriotism, civil virtues and national unity which made Rome the Mistress of the World. Neither was Byzantine Empire like the Roman Monarchy in which the praetorians had the power to change senates, and crown and uncrown emperors. Byzantium rather was a new political organization, with its Emperor, patriarch and archonts, but without a people, without a homogeneous population even in the capital itself. The people of Rome preserved its homogenity to the end; its consuls, patricians, plebeians were all Latins. In Constantinople, on the other hand the population never attained a homogenious compactness, while its Emperors, archons and administrative officials remained staunch Hellenophiles to the very end. In Rome the crown was dependent upon the good will of the praetorians, in Constantinople, the court archons and eunuchs with the support of the royal guards, often of the street rabble, used to dethrone and enthrone. The archtons served as *cadre* for Emperors.

As a consequence of that anomaly of things the succession to the throne in the Byzantine Empire seldom followed in due order or was effected without recourse to violence. It was not uncommon for archonts, eunuchs, and strangers to the court to usurp the royal insigna. The line of succession was continually interrupted usually by foul deeds, intrigues and heinous crimes. Out of eighty Emperors fifteen were murdered, seven were blinded, four of them, after being dethroned, were imprisoned in a monastery, while ten others were forced to abandon their thrones. Among these should be included four empresses also. All numbers of the

royal family, their kindred and friends, with few exceptions, resorted to illegal means and methods in realizing their nefarious designs and ambitions. Sons conspired against fathers, mothers against sons and brothers against brothers. The Empress Irene in 797 dethrones her own son Constantine VI, and after had his eyes pierced with awls by one of her accomplices.[1]) Empress Zoe causes her husband Romanus III to be drowned while bathing which happened on Passion Thursday, 1034, and the next day on Passion Friday, she marries her lover Michael IV. The Patriarch was sent for in the temple to perform the marriage ceremony, for which he was paid a hundred livres in gold. While the Patriarch was invoking God's blessing upon the couple, in the adjoining room the body of the deceased basileus was waiting burial.[2]) The Emperors and Empresses in turn vied in cruelty and cynism.

As was intimated before, the street mob also often took post in the dethronement of the Byzantine rulers. The Hippodrome[3]) was the place where two rival parties, called according to the colour of their clothes, *Green* and *Blue*, were in a continued turmoil, and where the fate of many basilei was settled. Here the faction of Green insulted Justin II, dethroned him and placed Anastasius II in his stead. Here were pronounced verdicts, and the guilty ones punished. Here the people of Constantinople celebrated the Empires triumphes over the barbarians and the revolting provinces. The Hippodrome was the meeting ground where took place religious discussions and debates. On this spot used to congregate artists, and learned men to display their skill and erudition. Here, too, were sown the seeds of superstition and delusion.

Constantinople was a religious centre. It was the

[1]) G. Schlumberger, *Les Iles des princes*, Paris, 1884, p. 144.

[2]) Same author, pp. 172—174,

[3]) Al. Rambaud, *Le monde byzantin et l'hippodrome*, Revue des Deux Mondes, Août, 1872.

Church that held together the various peoples of the Empire and not any feeling of nationality. The state was not the fatherland for them, the interest of the motley races in the Empire was focused in the Church ritual and the Cross. And the Byzantine subject gladly fought and died under the banner of the Cross. [1]) It was Christian patriotism emanating from a Christian state, which the Empire really was, from the IV th to the VII th centuries, before becoming Greek or Slavic. « The terms « Country » and « Nationality », says Paparrhigopoulo [2]), did not signify anything in those days. The vast Empire was peopled by various nations and tribes; none of them looked up to it as its country. The Greek race, indeed, on account of their language, education and administrative ability occupied a preeminent position in comparison with the other peoples, but the only powerful tie that held all of them together was Christianity, the common belief in the same doctrine and subordination to the same religious chief. That Empire, called *Roman, Byzantine, Greek*, must be christened *Hellenic* or *Christian*, particulary *Christian*, from the IV th to the VIII th centuries. The character of the state was more Christian than anything else, because the Hellenic spirit for a certain period clouded up. The State calls Oecumenical Councils, through the State the dogmas receive their final form and sanction, and through the Championsship of the Empire the new religion faces and carries on its wars against its direst foes. »

The State served the Church and Religions, not the People and Nationality. The Emperor Justinian erected the most magnificent temple on earth for which purpose he overburdened his peoples with taxes, closed up the schools in Athens, suspended the salaries of the teachers, some assert, for economys sake, others because they were

[1]) Bikelas, pp. 42 and 50.

[2]) Paparrhigopoulo pp. 175 and 176

pagan and detrimental to Christianity. Those schools of Rhetorics and Philosophy founded by Plato himself, were the pride and renown of the Greek nation. They were the seminaries for training statesmen and jurists. Seven of the philosophers, professors in those schools, had to leave their country. They went to the court of Chosroes, King of Persia, where they found freedom and protection, and were enabled to continue teaching the philisophy of Plato. In the pagan institutions of learning established by such exiles, many Christian educators, lawyers, and philosophers obtained their training. It is sufficient to mention the names of the greatest orators and theologians, Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian [1]) who were graduates from the Asiatic schools. There are some writers who find a justification in this arbitrary act of Justinian. It is asserted by some of them that Justinian enjoined the pagans only from teaching. He also decreed that Jurisprudence should be taught in Constantinople, Rome, and Miletus alone, and by Christian professors only. It is stated that the Athenian schools continued to exist after Justinian and had acquired a great renown during the Xth and XIth centuries. The ruler of Georginia, David II, used to send thether twenty young men each year to study Greek and Latin sciences. Students even from England and France came to study in Athens. [2])

During the Christian period of the Empires existence the majority of the people remained uneducated. They only changed their names: instead of Hellenes, Armenians, Arabs, Slavs, etc., they called themselves Christians. Every race preserved its heathen beliefs now mixed with Christian metaphysics, which the neophytes could not comprehend. Christianity contented itself with an outward

[1]) Gibbon, vol. IX, pp. 448—469.

[2]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 288. — C. Bayet, *Art Byzantin*, Paris, pp. 115—117.

appearence. It was narrowed down to mere prayers, rites, ceremonies, genuflection and seeming worship. The idea of God never very clear to man, was now made dimmer. From God-worshippers the people turned man-worshippers. Martyrs and saints cloud up the personality of God. The Christians begin to take them for Gods chosen representatives, for divine and holy beings, worthy of worship. Forgetting that martyrs and saints are mere human beings they begin to worship them as Gods. They consider their relics sacred, pray to them, worship them as to God. The Church, indeed, had instructed men that the saints and martyrs, because of their holy life, were Gods chosen people, mediators and agents, and that prayers to God should be offered through them, but the people in general was unable to understand this metaphysical teaching. They went to extremes and began to worship the icons and relics of saints.

During that same period monasticism was in a flourishing state. Monasteries were being built everywhere, especially in the suburbs of Constantinople and other large cities. The most beautiful places were chosen for that purpose. [1]) It seemed as if everybody was intent to building monasteries — high magistrates and statesmen — in order to spend their last days of retirement or to seek refuge after posing their position; rich men — in order to manifest their piousness; sick people — in order to obtain a cure; lovers — in honor of their mistresses. The monasteries consisted of beautiful structures amid shady gardens. They looked more like summer-houses than monasteries. And as people to-day go during the summer to summer resorts for fresh air, rest, excursion and amusement, in those days they used to visit the monasteries in order to find a recovery from their daily toil,

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 163 and 164.

to attend church service and listen to church-chanting, and quite often to have rendez-vous and diversions. Many able-bodied men fled to the monasteries and put on the cassock. Among these were found many infidels who resorted to his expediency in order to avoid their responsibilities as fathers, citizens and soldiers. The monasteries became asylums for the indolent and inactive. They robbed the state of its soldiers, farmers, merchants and manufacturers. All this, however, tended to weaken the Empire. The monasteries and their property kept on increasing. The richess and the energies of the Empire were poured into them. The most fertile and extensive regions, as well as the most productive buildings and estates, belonged to the monasterios. « And it may be said », adds Paparrhigopoulo, « that the Empire itself looked more like a vast monastery inhabited by sloths and dawdlers than a state organization, whose citizens were devoted to the execution of their civic obligations. The Empire was constrained to levy mercenary forces for its army and fleet and welcome into its service many alien subjects whose presence exerted a deteriorating effect upon the native population. The state revenues considerably diminished owing to the privileges accorded to the church and monastery corporations the State at one period became so poor that Emperor Heraclius in order to meet the expenses of his expedition against the invading Persians was compelled to borrow money of the churches at an exorbitant rate of interest. » [1])

Not only the common people, but the Emperors themselved lived by faith and relied upon God for the protection of the Empire against the barbarians. Whenever the state was invaded or threatened by an enemy, it was believed to signify Gods punishment for its many sins.

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 186.

When the Arabs defeated Heraclius and wrested Syria from his power, he summoned a council in Antioch in order that through it he might learn of the causes of his reverses and the success of the Mohammedans. An elder rose at the council and declared that the enemys successes were due to Gods displeasure and anger with the Empire because of its great sins.[1]) The Emperor was convinced.

The Christian period of Byzantium had its Emperors, prelates, writers, and literature. During the time of Justinian it reaches its culminating point in respect to Christian art and Christian legislation. The period is ushered by the appearance of noted ecclesiartical preachers and authors, such as John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Gregory the theologian and others and may be said to end with John of Damascus in the VIIIth century. The literature becomes enriched with the Justinian *noveli,* and the numerous Church Sermons, in prose, and with the church service books and hymus, in poetry. In the sermons of Chrysostom, Basil and Gregory, some of which are written in the form of philosophical treatises others in the form of poems,[2]) are represented all kinds of prose and poetical writing: descriptions, characteristics, narratives, meditations, dialogues, lyrics, etc. Lyric poetry and the Drama are given in an original manner, the first in church hymnographies, the latter in Paschal songs, Christmas and Epiphany services. The greatest church lyrical writer was, and remains so to this day, John of Damascus.

Though the Christian period was championed by most genial church writers and divines, it was bound to be of short duration, because it had no hold upon the people. The Empire itself that cherished and promoted it was gro-

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XII, pp. 413—414. — Paparrhigopoulo, p. 184.

[2]) Edmond Bauvy, *Etude sur les origines du rythme tonique dans l'hymnographie de l'Eglise grecque,* Paris, 1888, p. 195.

wing weaker and weaker, with the constant attacks of the barbarian races with whom she could no longer cope. Its decline was worst felt in the reign of Emperor Leo Isaurian and his successor Constantine Copronymus, the first Byzantine rulers. To make an attempt at reforming the Church, they set to work fearlessly and resolutely. Relying on the support of his army and magistrates and with the consent of the Synod, Leo gave orders all icons to be cast out of the Churches, because the people through ignorance worshipped them and turned Christianity to idolatry. That act on the part of Emperor Leo touched the most sensitive nerve of the religious life of the people and clergy. It causes great conflicts and upheavals in the Empire, alienates Italy, arouses Hellas and the Cyclades, angers up the Pope, and necessitates four consecutive Church councils, two local ones in 754, which interdict icon worship, and two extraneous (of which one is the Seventh Oecumenical Council at Nicaea, 787 and 842) which restore icon worship, divide the people into two warring factions and afflict the State with internecine strifes for a hundred years to come. This period of the Byzantian history is known under the name *Iconoclastic Movement.* The opinions of historians vary on this question also. Some of them as Gibbon [1]) consider Leo III an uneducated man ignorant of the Christian doctrine and Hellenic paganism, a merchant by trade prior to his coronation, who set his mind on this reform mainly through the influence of the Turks and Jews with whom he maintained a close intimacy. He often witnessed them mocking their Christian brethren for bowing before icons calling them idolaters and wood-worshippers. As Archon and later on as Emperor he waged several wars against the Mohammedans unsuccessfully. Coming to the conclusion

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XII, p. 418. — Le Beau, vol. XIII

he could more easily subdue them through religion than by dint of arms he decided upon the plan of winning them over to Christianity. But in order to achieve this he had to eliminate from Christianity those features which were obnoxious to Mohammedans and Jews—Icon-worship, Idolatry. More recent writers versed on the subject think the Iconoclastic movement only a guise for a radical political and social reform. This view is shared by the Greek historian, professor Paparrhigopoulo. According to him the reform undertaken by Leo III was far more serious and extensive than is generally believed, and that its author was a great reformer and legislator.[1]) Its aim was not only the abolition of icons and sacred relics as well as their worship, but also the release of the schools from Church control, the suppression of slavery, the closing up of monasteries, the imposition of taxes on church and monastery estates, the equalization of the social and political condition of man and woman, the limitation of parental authority, etc. To strengthen this view, Paparrhigopoulo cites the eclogue of Leo III. This eclogue, in truth, is a destinguishing feature of the legislative reforms initiated by this Emperor and his successor, but it must be had in mind that other pioneers like Nikitta, Moren, Nonnus, and others before Leo, as well as during his reign, had also associated their names with these reforms. In it the icon and school questions are not treated. It also should be remembered, that the Councils, two of which were for, and two against the proposed changes,[2]) dealed with the icon question only. The question of the saints and sacred relics was not discussed in them. The Iconoclastic Council held in Liera under the patronage of Constantine Copronymus at which were present three hun-

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 188, 202, 207, 208.

[2]) *Rules and Regulations of Orthodox Church*, a translation, by Dr. St. Tsankoff and others, 1912, vol. I, p. 54.

dred and fifty-eight Fathers, without counting those come from foreign countries, had passed the following resolution [1]): «We unanimously decree that all images, be they painted or sculptured, be cast out of the Christian churches, that henceforward none should dare to be engaged in the wicked and criminal icon trade; whoever would venture in the future to manufacture icons or to worship them, to set them up in a temple, or in a private dwelling place, or conceal such, he should be excommunicated, if he be a bishop, priest, or deacon; anathema be upon him, if he be a monk or layman subject to the imperial jurisdiction, as an enemy of God's laws and the dogma, such as is fit for men to believe in.»

The reform is undertaken from on high, but meets with a serious opposition from below, from the mass of the people, the monastic classes, and the women in particular. The case is as rare as it is original; the women rise up against social equality, while the common people and the monastic order are for slavery. Constantine Copronymus applies to practice the decree passed by the Council. He resorts to force against the monasteries and the monks who were loathe to part with the icon cult. He closes a large number of monasteries in the suburbs of Constantinople, turning them to barracks and hospitals, and the monks he sends to various prisons. A general persecution of monks, prelates, and other icon worshippers ensues. Many monks engage in lay occupations, cast off their cassock and marry. Some of them go in the army. Those who persisted in their old cult are insulted and maltreated wherever found. They are driven through the Hippodrome, hand in hand with a woman on the side of each, and the rabble and army hoot and mock them. Iconoclastic adherents and icon worshippers persecuted

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 213 and 214.

each other with a most intense animosity and cruelty. The struggle was taken up in the field of letters, too. The writers belonging to the opposing factions vied with each other in representing their foes in the blackest hues possible. Emperor Constantine himself was not spared; he was nicknamed Copronymus. In the chronicles of some of the hostile writers he is called a heretic, Jew, Mohammedan, pagan, infidel, lewd person, bloodsucker, Nero. His reign is described as a vast slaughter-house of saints, of the noblest and most innocent men. It is asserted that he was always present at the martyrdom of his victims, found pleasure in their groans, revelled in their death agonies, never seemed to have satiated his thirst for blood, and in order to gratify his cruel propensities, he always had a vase full of human noses on his table. The Iconoclastic chroniclers and writers, on the other hand, went to the other extreme. They praised him for his great virtues and piety. The recriminatory literary fight continued during the reigns of Leo IV, Constantine V, Constantine VI, and Empress Irene. Empress Irene, it will be recalled, dethroned her own son, causing his eyes to be put out, and in her reign the Seventh Oecumenical Council was convoked and icon worship restored. To the Iconoclasts Constantine Copronymus was a saint, while to the icon worshippers he was a demon. The first, forty years after his death, used to go to his grave to pray and sing praises to him, the Saviour of the Empire and Christian hero, as they were wont to style him. A most unbiassed characterization of the two hostile parties is found in two chronicle notes. According to them the Iconoclasts, in a long procession start for the Church of the Holy Apostles, where Emperor Constantine is believed to have been buried. All of a sudden the grave opens with a great noise, after which the frenzied and fanatical icon-breakers cry out aloud: «Rise up, o thou Great Potentate, hasten to save

the dying Empire!» At the same time thousands of voices issuing from the multitude begin to shout, saying: «There he is, make room for him, see him riding on his charger, he is on his way to scatter the Bulgarians. Flee ye, barbarians, before the Saviour of the Empire![1]) Dumb-founded the crowd is hypnotized into seeing what it believes, and all begin to assert that they had seen the Emperor riding, holding a lance pointed toward the heathen Bulgarians. An icon-worshipping chronicler, on the other hand, writes: «This is a foolish fable: Copronymus is chained with the demons at the lowest regions of Hades!»[2])

Iconoclasm was one step between Christianity and nationalism. But this transition, however, was not effected without strifes, painlessly, without paroxyms, and considerable loss of life. The iconoclastic fever which continued from 720 to 842 had engulfed the minds of both state and church in the Byzantine Empire, but, on the other hand, it had given Bulgaria ample opportunity to consolidate itself and extend its boundary lines. Already Emperor Nicephorus had measured strength with the forces of Tzar Kroum, which cost him his head and brought the Bulgarian King to the walls of Constantinople. But soon there was put an end to the civil war and the retrogression of the Empire. When the Byzantine throne was occupied by Basil I, the Macedonian, the Empire recovered, not only from the effects of the internal troubles, but there soon was initiated a policy for the subjugation and hellenization of the Slavs — hellenization through Christianity, and moral subjugation through the Byzantine Church. From the IXth century onward the Basilei chose the Christian religion for their ally. In it they found a mightier weapon than were the lances and arrows of the Byzantine legions. As early as the Xth century, John Co-

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XII, p. 251. — Le Beau, vol. XIV, p. 286.
[2]) Gibbon, vol. XII, 253—254.

meniat, after explaining why Salonica was saved from the constant attacks and disturbances of the Slavs, says: « The conversion fused the Scythian tribes with the Christian people, feeding both of them on good milk. » [1]) Christianity becomes an instrument in the hands of Hellenism. From the IXth century on Byzantium makes attempts to replace Christianity with Hellenism, as at an earlier date Latinism was replaced by Christianity. The Graecophile emperors tried to hellenize the population of the various provinces of the Empire, as they had hellenized Constantinople and had made it a centre of Greek culture. But in this project they had to encounter the ambition of the Bulgarian princes and kings to make Constantinople Slavic in the same way the occupied provinces of the Empire were made Slavic by them. And from the IXth century onward on the Balkan Peninsula there appear two different races and civilizations — one Greek and one Bulgarian or Slavic, as well as two national ideas — a Greek and a Bulgarian. The Greek idea was represented and personified by the Byzantine rulers Basil I, Nicephorus Phocas, Zimisces, and Basil II Bulgaroctonos, while the Bulgarian idea was championed by Simeon the Great, Samuel, Ivanitza, and Joan Assen. The Bulgarian national self-consciousness becomes apparent from the very time of their conversion to Christianity. Among the Bulgarians the idea of nationality manifests itself much earlier and more intensely than is the case with other nations. It is a historical fact that the Bulgarian Church from its very foundation indentified itself with the national spirit of the people, in direct contrast with the Byzantine Church which was cosmopolitan rather than national. This has been corroborated by the Service literature of both churches. In the hymns, called troparions, are being praised singly or

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 269.

conjointly the deeds and exploits of John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and Gregory the Theologian. Here they are called «universal divine educators», and not Hellenic or Greek. Also, St. Athanasius, St. Nicholaus, and other Orthodox saints are being praised in the troparions as divine educators and religious pioneers, but nowhere do the church poets remind us of their being Hellenes. Not so the Bulgarian church. Its teachers, prelates, and educators were from the very beginning called Slavic or Bulgarian. In the church-chants St. Cyril and St. Methodius are being praised, sung, and called Slavic reformers and teachers. The hymns sing praises of St. Clement, St. Naoum, and other Bulgarian religious workers and leaders, calling them Bulgarian saints. Gregory, Archbishop of Ochrida, sings: «*O, Thou, all blessed Father Clement, thou highly revered apostle of Bulgaria*», or «*O, Clement, thou Bulgarian enlightener.*»

When in the Xth century Comeniat wrote that Christianity was absorbing the Slavs, at that same period Clement was preaching to his followers that the Slavic race and language were different from those of other Christians. In his panegyric of St. Cyril he says: «By the grace of Jesus Christ, thou didst come among men as shepherd and teacher, and like a lion, thou didst open thy mouth against the three-linguistic heretics who blinded by envy, preached that it was derogatory to praise God in any other language except Hebrew, Latin, and Greek, and out of malice became accomplices of Pilate. Thou didst destroy their blasphemies with plain parables. Having translated the rubric from the Greek into Slavic, thou went to Rome.»

The political, religious, and literary life of Bulgaria during the IXth century is pervaded with the national idea. The first and most conspicuous personificator of this idea was Tzar Simeon. His ambition to consolidate Slavdom in the Balkans, not only religiously and intellec-

tually, but also politically, was in a large measure realized. During his rule, according to William Turski, Bulgaria extended from the Danube to Constantinople, and from the same river, clear to the Adriatic. But in order to maintain Bulgarian sovereignty on the Peninsula and to imprint the Bulgarian character upon the other Slavic tribes who shared the use of the same literature and were professing the same religion, the possession of Constantinople, the seat of intrigues and plots directed against the Bulgarian state, was deemed by him a necessity. In the Byzantine Empire Simeon saw the greatest enemy of Slav unification. Hence his project of wresting Constantinople from the hands of the Basilei and adorning his head with the crown of Constantine the Great, in order that the Slavic union be set on a solid foundation. The very cosmopolitan character of the Empire spurred him on to such a resolution. If various adventurers, Syrians, Armenians, Thracians, etc., had an access to the Byzantine throne, why should not a king who stood at the head of a large and cultured Slavic state, and backed up by a mighty army? Once seated on the Byzantine throne, he would have found means for the realization, not only of his personal aspirations, but also of a united Slavdom. Events had come to such a pass that the fate of Constantinople had to be decided one way or the other: it had to be either Greek or Slavic. If the majority of the Balkan peoples were Slavs brought together under one scepter and possessing a church and literature of their own, it was quite plain to imagine that the natural capital of the state they thus formed would in time become Slavic. That capital, of course, was Constantinople itself. This idea fascinated Tzar Simeon and he set himself seriously at work for its realization. The Byzantine Empire itself first gave occasion for a friction between the Bulgarian ruler and the Byzantine court. No sooner had Simeon ascended the

throne than the Byzantine Government instituted a series of provocations which justly aroused a strong indignation among the Bulgarians. In Constantinople there existed a Bulgarian colony and a number of Bulgarian business concerns. There also a large number of students belonging to noted Bulgarian families pursued their studies. All of a sudden the Constantinople market is closed to Bulgarian trade. Two influential Greeks from Attica had succeeded in buying off the customs revenue accruing from Bulgarian goods, which yielded a considerable income to the Empire, with the right of moving the market for Bulgarian trade to Salonica. In this city, far away from the control of the central government, the Bulgarian products were taxed with heavy duties and the Bulgarian merchants subjected to all sorts of exactions. The latter complained to their Tzar. Simeon turned to the Emperor for redress and, receiving no satisfaction, declared war on the Empire. That happened in 889, the second year of his reign. «A quite unusual sight», exclaims Rambaud,[1]) «a war is declared in the IXth century out of purely commercial motives.» The conflict proved disastrous to the Empire. In order to avenge itself on Simeon, Byzantium raised against Bulgaria the Magyars inhabiting the region between the mouth of the Danube and modern Moldavia. The Magyars invaded Bulgaria and devastated the Danubian lands, returning home with rich booty and a large number of prisoners. Simeon, however, soon got even with them. He attacked them, penetrating to their own dwellings, crushed and compelled them to seek refuge beyond the Carpathian mountains. Having thus punished its allies, Simeon then turned against the Byzantine Empire itself and shattered its armies at Bulgarofik, halfway between Adrianople and Constantinople. The Empire was forced to beg for peace

[1]) Rambaud, pp. 228, 329. — Drinoff, vol. I, 376. — Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 276, 277. — Gibbon, vol. XV, p. 60

which was concluded under very hard and humiliating terms for Byzantium. It bound itself to pay Bulgaria a yearly tribute, as also to give back all Bulgarian prisoners captured either by the Greek or the Magyar armies during the wars. Simeon profited by the respite which the peace offered him, for he was given an opportunity to turn his attention toward the betterment of the internal State of things in his Empire and toward the promotion of Bulgarian literature and culture. At the accession to the throne of the minor Emperor Constantine VII, called Porphyrogenitus, the treaty was rejected in an insulting manner by his regent Alexander. That incident gave Simeon another chance to take up arms against Byzantium, not so much in view of obtaining a satisfaction for the insult, as principally with the great political design of assuring Bulgaria its independence. If the Byzantine emperors had twice in succession violated their treaty obligations, what guarantee was there that they would not do the same again and again in the future, which fact would render the Byzantine Empire a dangerous neighbor to a new state like Bulgaria? Simeon had only one course open — his occupation of the Byzantine throne. For this reason he entitled himself Tzar of the Bulgarians and Romans. The news of this proclamation frightened the regents of the young emperor, and especialy the Constantinople patriarch Nicholaus Mystic, an educated man and energetic diplomat who stood at the head of the regents. He engaged into correspondence with Simeon and tried to win him over to a peaceful understanding. The letters exchanged between the two are precious historical documents. They give us a glimpse not only of the state of affairs then existing in the Empire, and of the psychics of its rulers, but also of Tzar Simeon's statesmanlike ideas and his dreams of a vast Slavic empire with Constantinople as its capital. In his letters the Patriarch begs of Simeon, saying that he does not

write with ink, but with tears. He weeps, flatters him, and extols his kingly qualities. When nothing avails, he turns to the Pope, whose letters he forwards to Simeon and in whose name he even threatens the Bulgarian Chief. When this also does not produce any impression, he finally entreats Simeon to receive him. In a word, he does everything to retard and frustrate the realization of Simeon's imperial policy. But the decision of the Bulgarian ruler is cathegorical, his policy clear and well-defined. At first he resorts to peaceful methods for the acquisition of the Byzantine throne — by marriage alliance. He therefore gladly offers the hand of his daughter to Constantine,with the hope of becoming his *Basilcoptor* or guardian. The Patriarch and all the imperial councillors accept Simeon's proposition with great enthusiasm and readiness, and the date for the marriage is early arranged by both sides. Strong ties of friendship and kinship are established between the two courts. Tzar Simeon and his household are overwhelmed with civilities, attention, and affection on the part of the Byzantine Emperor, Patriarch, and senators. The two sons of Simeon are met and received with great pomp at the Vlacherna Gates and taken to the Imperial Palace where they dine with the Emperor. The Patriarch himself goes out of the City to meet Tzar Simeon who receives him, and, according to some chroniclers, bows to him with due reverence. Simeon and his sons are the recipients of many and costly presents lavishly given them by the Byzantine Court. All now wait for the still greater event — the royal marriage. But it never took place, because of the interference of the exiled Empress Zoe, the young Emperor's mother, who unexpectedly, some say, with the connivance of the Court councillors, made her appearance in Constantinople, drove out Constantine's regents, and took the reins of government herself. Soon after, the Empress was again taken and sent to a monas-

stery. Basilcoptor of the minor Emperor then became Romanus Lakapenus who later on succeeded in winning his royal protégé for his daughter, and in subsequently proclaiming himself Second Emperor of Byzantium. Simeon's plans for establishing a closer affinity between the Bulgarian and Byzantine imperial families with a view to finally transferring his capital to Constantinople itself were thus brought to a signal failure. No alternative was left him but to again resort to the force of arms. He wreaked his vengeance on the Byzantine provinces lying between Constantinople and Adrianople. He succeeded in annihilating the imperial forces at Anchialo and Kapansirt, and laid waste of everything before him. Then he sent an army across the Rhodope mountains, and in a short time, Thessally, Phocis, Beotia, and Attica became prey to its victorious march. All territory, with the exception of Salonica and Durazzo, lying between the Aegean and Adriatic seas, were conquered by another expeditionary force sent for that purpose by Simeon. All fortresses found between Adrianople and Constantinople fell into the hands of the Bulgarians. To Byzantium remained only Constantinople. The Bulgarian Tzar later on sent an army to seize Lapsaki, the key to the Dardanelles. Patriarch Nicholaus who was restored to his former seat at the request of the Byzantine Emperor hastened to send word to Tzar Simeon, earnestly entreating him: « Form family ties with Romanus [1]), either by giving your daughter to his son, or by taking his daughter for your son. Such an alliance would enhance yours and your people's renown. Formerly you were desirous of such a relationship, but your offer was not heeded, today you may adorn yourself with a marriage into the imperial household. » Simeon received the Patriarch's message disdainfully. The latter writes to the

[1]) Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 391 and 392.

Tzar again, now making new promises, now threatening him in his own name as well as in the name of the Pope with excommunication from the Church, and with a coalition which would be directed against him, in case he refuses to conclude peace and cease shedding Christian blood. The Bulgar Chief remains imperturbable, but sends this answer to the Patriarch, in which he emphasizes the fact that he does not demand what is impossible, he «does not require of the Patriarch to bring to life the lost Bulgarian soldiers», but sets up a condition which can be fulfilled, namely, the Emperor to give up his throne, and he himself be proclaimed such by the people and the authorities. «This is God's wish», asserts Simeon, «which if realized would put an end to further bloodshed.»

Not being able to come to any peaceful understanding with Byzantium, Simeon appears anew at the gates of its capital. «In order to administer the last blow to the Empire in Europe, there was left but one more city to be captured. That, apparently, was not a difficult task for the energy and genius of Simeon. The time had arrived for the Bulgarian dominion to supersede the Roman in the East, and the inheritance of Augustus and Constantine the Great to pass into the hands of one of the descendants of Asparouch. It was not in vain that Simeon had studied in Constantinople, had turned Greek, and an accomplished Byzantine adept. It seems he was preparing himself for the management of a great heritage. With an impudence bespeaking the Scythian, he compelled the Romans to acclaim him their Autocrat throughout his march.»

In September 924 Simeon and his legions were for the second time at the Golden Gates of Constantinople. Almost all Byzantium on the European side was brought under his sway. All magistrates of Constantinople obeyed his orders. For once he was Byzantium itself. Though remaining with his armies out of the Capital, it was he who

gave orders to magnates, Patriarch and Emperor, he who ruled and commanded. His will was a law to them. If pleased to send for Nicholaus or the primates, behold, they immediately came before his presence. After questioning them, he ordered them back to tell that he wanted to see the Emperor himself. The latter, too, obeyed. A day was fixed for the royal meeting which was to take place near Cosmidia or modern Balat on the Golden Horn. A special terrace was built for the occasion. There the Byzantine Basileus was made to wait four days for the expected arrival of the Bulgarian warrior who finally deigned to appear on the fifth. Those days during which the Byzantine Emperor and Government were only nominal rulers of Constantinople constitute the most humiliating period of the Empire's existence — Emperor, Patriarch, and government authorities lay prostrate at the feet of a Bulgarian tzar. But his prime object was not the discomfiture of the Empire's ruler and his subordinates, but the virtual possession of the Capital itself. That was his greatest dream which circumstances did not favour with a realization. This failure accounts for the nervousness and vehemence which are read between the lines of all his arrangements, orders, and decrees. There at the very entrance of the Byzantine Metropolis he finds out that the solution of the most vital question concerned with the future of Bulgaria, which he at that hour considered almost solved, had to be postponed for another day. That unsettlement and restlessness which had set in upon Simeon's mind at this juncture, and the terrible devastation of the Byzantine territory which continued to the eve of his meeting the Emperor Romanus, as also his insolent behaviour even during the royal interview, show that he was filled with desperation, because he believed the hour for striking at the Byzantium Capital had not yet arrived. During the pourparlers he turns disdainfully to the Pat-

riarch and interrupts him with the words: «Your prayers, Holy Father, caused my horse to be killed,» (hinting at the battle of Anchialos). The Greek Emperor, on the other hand, endures all the affronts of the Bulgarian in a most submissive manner. Being stripped of all his European possessions, and left without an army in the Capital, he is constrained to do anything else but pray to the Virgin Mary, the Patron saint of the City, and cater to the caprices of the terrible foe on whose whims depended not only his own life, but the fate of his whole Empire. Kneeling in the Temple of Vlacherna, he fervently entreats Saint Mary to soften the heart of the haughty and implacable Simeon and ingraft in him an inclination for peace. Clad in her omophorium instead of military armor, he patiently waits the arrival of Simeon. «Romanus», says Rambaud [1]), «prefers to fall back upon a mystic submissiveness, than face his doom with kingly fortitude. He finds it most expedient in the name of God to bow before the Barbarian and thus terminate a further effusion of blood. He confronts humiliation with voluntary submission. He needed peace, but he wanted it in the name of God and Christian brotherhood ... «When Romanus Lacapenus and Simeon met in Constantinople, there existed two empires on the Peninsula: the Bulgarian, which was extremely extended, and the Roman which was left with almost one city. The one, lacking a centre of support, without a capital, felt in its organism the germ of disintegration, its unity depending on force rather than civilization; the other, concentrating its strength and civilization in one point, in a city, felt the necessity of expansion. Constantinople resembles an old trunk which could not be eradicated: in spite of repeated devastations new sprouts would shoot forth. Constantinople's wonderful vitality kept on its process of re-creat-

[1]) *Empire grec au dixième siècle*, p. 336, 337.

ing the Empire and repairing the losses which were constantly inflicted upon it.

«From the very day in which it became evident that, on the one hand, Constantinople could not be the capital of Bulgaria, and, on the other, that Bulgaria could not be a province of the Greek Empire, some way out of the difficulty had to be found, some *modus vivendi* between the two monarchies. Simeon declined to conclude a peace treaty with the Empire, but historical necessity imposed it upon his successor.»

Byzantium needed rest in order to recover from the severe wounds inflicted upon it by Simeon and to prepare for a future struggle against Bulgaria, its direst enemy. To secure peace, Byzantium was ready to give everything for it: the niece of the Emperor for a wife to Tzar Peter, Simeon's heir; the title of *Basileus* to the Bulgarian Tzar; to the Bulgarian representative in Constantinople, the most prominent place of honour at court receptions and festivities; it recognized the independence of the Bulgarian Church, the new boundary-lines of the Bulgarian State, and bound itself to pay a yearly tribute to Bulgaria. Simeon possessed a crown and the title of *regi* granted him by the Pope, such as had Peter, Samuel, and Ivanitza, but thus far the title of *Basileus* was accorded by the Empire to no ruler in Europe. The Bulgarian Tzars were the only recipients of it. «A hundred years after their victory over the Emperor Nicephorus (811),» writes Bikelas, «the Bulgarians invested Constantinople again, and the Byzantines were in time compelled to bestow to the Bulgarian princes the title of *Basileus* which was never given to any other head of a state in Europe»[1]). Ireček says the Greeks had proclaimed Simeon as *Basileus* of

[1]) *La Grèce byzantine et moderne*, p. 21. — The Byzantines called Basileus only the Persian King; Ibid., same page. — Rambaud, p. 325.

the Bulgarians already when the latter were besieging Constantinople. [1])

The Byzantine Empire hastened to conclude peace under most humiliating terms because it felt itself at the mercy of the strongest state in the East. Its rival Bulgaria had in a considerable short period of time become a mighty empire. Bulgaria's boundaries already extended north, up to the Carpathians Mountains, east, to the Black-Sea, south, — the line passed this side of Adrianople, went down to the Aegean, and taking a westernly direction, it slipped north of Serres and Salonica and touched the river Arta; continuing its course further west, it reached the Adriatic Sea, whence it wended its way along the entire coast, with the exception of the cities of Durazzo and Alessioi, crossed the river Boyana and pent itself on the Great-Morava border. Within these limits were included, Thessaly, Epirus, Albania, present Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Dalmatia, Srem, etc. In these the Slavs were banded together by Simeon, intellectually, religiously and politically. It was the first attempt to fuse the Balkan Slavic peoples into a state, and Simeon's is the glory for effecting the first Slavic union on the Balkan Peninsula, on which fact all historians are agreed.

On this question it is interesting to read the words of the well known Serbian authority, the historian Stanoevitch, who says: « Bulgaria in the reign of Tzar Simeon grew so extensive that it became master of nearly all the lands of the Balkan Peninsula and the strongest state in the East. Under such circumstances, it was natural, that one of its ambitions should be the subjugation of the Serbs also, in order that it might utilize them against Byzantium. On the other side, however, the Byzantine Empire, too, was anxious of winning the Serbian people

[1]) Ireček, *Serbian History*, p. 130.

to itself and hurl them against their Bulgarian neighbor. Of all other nations the Bulgarians of Simeon's day exerted upon the Serbians the greatest influence which was maintained to the end of his reign. On that account many Serbian principalities during that period made common cause with the Bulgarian State.» [1])

And in truth, many Serbian families were brought over to Bulgaria, among them being a considerable number of boyars and zhupans who had maintained close relationship with Byzantium. Thus the heir to the Tcheslav zhupanship was born in Bulgaria, and his mother, too, was a Bulgarian. He was bred at the Bulgarian Court though he was educated as a Serbian in spirit, as the pretender to the Serbian throne. The aim of this colonization was an eventual amalgamation of the Slavic races. Simeon thought he could effect such a change by dint of force. But such an idea, at once so premature and grand, was not to the liking of the Byzantine rulers. Seeing how dangerous a policy it might prove to his Empire, Romanus Lacapenus, taking advantage of the peace treaty recently concluded between the two Empires, and of the royal marriage linking together the two courts, tried in the meanwhile to secretly encourage the Serbian national aspirations and the Serbo-Bulgarian rivalry. For that reason noted and influential Serbians were always welcome in Constantinople where they were the recipients of signal attention and privileges. [2]) And Rambaud touching this point says: «The restoration of Serbia through the efforts of exiled Serbs, under the protection of the Byzantine Empire, whither they had found refuge, was a Byzantine Imperial policy; it was a reaction against Bulgaria's victories, it was Lacapenus' revenge on Simeon.» [3]) With this aim in view, Emperor

[1]) *History of the Serbian People*
[2]) Ireček, *History of Serbia.*
[3]) Rambaud, p. 464.

Romanus encouraged and assisted the Serbian pretender Tcheslav to escape from Bulgaria and place himself at the head of the Serbian Zhupanship, with Rashka as its centre, around which most of the other Serbian principalities grouped themselves. Backed by Byzantium, Tcheslav soon gathered under his authority the zhupanships of Bosnia, Travunia, Zachulmia, Dioclea, with whose rulers he organized a Servian State subservient to the Constantinople Government. Byzantium thus succeeded in creating a new state whose hostility to Bulgaria and Croatia became advantageous to its foreign interests. Still with the same aim in view, Emperor Nicephorus Phocas made an alliance with the Russian Prince Svetoslav, which resulted in a Russo-Bulgarian conflict. After the death of Simeon, the Byzantine rulers left no stone unturned in their efforts to capture the Bulgarian citadel from within. Through generous promises and lavish gifts, and guided by a skilful diplomacy, the Byzantines were enabled to ingratiate themselves not only with the Bulgarian Church and civil officialdom, but with the Bulgarian Court also. Greek influence in Bulgaria grew stronger and stronger. The people, however, were in general dissatisfied with their rulers and murmured against everything Byzantine. As an outcome of this discontent there sprung up two rival parties, Monarchists and Anti-Monarchists, whose hostility to each other knew no bounds. [1]) The first one was represented by the high magistrates, the clergy, and the military chiefs, while the second one was recruited from among the disappointed boyars, autonomists, and feudalists, and principally from among the nationalist large following, to which belonged a great number of the Bogomil adherents as well. The one was a Greek party, the other a people's or democratic faction.

[1]) Rambaud, p. 340. — Schlumberger, p. 507. — Drinoff, vol. I, p. 507.

In the meantime Byzantium did not stay idle. It was steadily recuperating from the shock caused by the furious onset of the Bulgarians. Emperor Nicephorus Phocas was a talented military leader. He moulded the disorganized forces of the Empire into shape and soon was enabled to lead a powerful army on to victories, and augment Byzantium's boundaries in Asia. Highly elated over his successes, both at home and on the battlefield, Nicephorus assumed an attitude of arrogance towards Bulgaria. He insulted the Bulgarian delegates come to Constantinople for the yearly tribute which the Empire owed by treaty to its western rival, broke the peace compact itself, and hurled his armies against his old enemy. He succeeded in seizing a number of Bulgarian fortified towns along the boundary-line, but had soon to relinquish them as his presence was imperatively needed in Asia, where several of his generals had risen against the Empire. Before his departure, he entered into an understanding with the Bulgarian ruler, by which the previous peace treaty was recognized by him as valid, and the territory occupied by his forces was evacuated. To still better guarantee his rear, he had concluded a secret alliance with the Russians against Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian State at that period was rent by internecine strifes. Michael and Ivan, brothers of Tzar Peter, who were wronged by Simeon, rose in revolt against their own brother. They were joined by the feudalists, and particularly, by the nationalist boyars. The revolution failed, but it weakened the state. So when the Russians invaded Bulgaria, a good many of the discontented inhabitants threw their lot with the newcomers. The internal disorders and the occupation by Russia of most of the territory of North Bulgaria, including the capital Preslav itself, completely unsettled the national defense of the country. The Byzantine throne about this time was filled by John Zi-

misces, a great war master and diplomat. On the pretext of driving away the Russians whose presence in Bulgaria was considered very dangerous to the Empire's capital itself, he threw his armies into Eastern Bulgaria which he occupied and subsequently incorporated into his domains. Zimisces captured the Bulgarian Tzar Boris II himself and took him to Constantinople, where in the temple of St. Sophias, he uncrowned him publicly. The crown of the Bulgar ruler was deposited as a trophy in the same Church.

The chief task of Emperor Zimisces was to garrison the Bulgarian citadels and other important towns with imperial troops and prepare the way for the hellenization of the occupied provinces. He expelled the Bulgarian Patriarch from the city of Dorostol, his seat of authority, and made all bishoprics subordinate to the Constantinople Patriarchy. He caused to be brought over from Asia thousands of Paulicians who formed a colony in and about the vicinities of Philippopolis, «with a view to strengthening Hellenism in Bulgaria», as Paparrhigopoulo aptly remarks. [1])

But Zimisces' measures affected Eastern Bulgaria only. The other part of the country succeeded in preserving its political independence and national character. The idea of Slavic union was never lost sight of, either. Forty years later Samuel, the youngest son of the Boyar Shishman, was crowned Tzar of Bulgaria. He proved a most worthy successor of Simeon and most energetic and enthusiastic promoter of Simeon's idea for Slav unification. He, too, set his whole heart and genius on this gigantic undertaking. To his credit it must be said that he devoted his abilities towards bringing about on the Peninsula the ascendency and triumph of no one Slavic race in particular, but of Slavdom in general. The hundreds and thousands of Bulgarian exiles who fled into Macedonia from Eastern

[1]) Stanoevitch, p. 55.

Bulgaria which fell into the hands of Byzantines and Russians, flocked around Tzar Samuel and gladly offered their services to the cause of Slavic freedom and consolidation. In them Samuel found staunch nationalists, sincere patriots, and faithful and efficient co-workers. All of them were at least invoterate enemies of the Greeks and Russians. In the reign of Samuel Macedonia became the centre of activity for the realization of Slavic interests, Slavic independence, and Slavic culture, as in the days of Simeon, it was a centre of religious awakening, literary achievement, and Slavic learning. Samuel is Bulgaria's most popular Tzar. He was a man noted for his liberal ideas, penetrating insight, and statesmanlike grasp. During his whole reign he worked for the cause of the entire Slavdom unceasingly and with an unsurpassed energy, zeal, faith, and spirit of self-sacrifice. His career in this direction should be viewed with greater admiration since the rest of the Slavic princes were not imbued with the same feelings and ideas for a united Slavdom, and manifested very little interest in such a general movement.[1]) The French historian Schlumberger characterizes this famous Bulgar chief thus: «That man of iron,» says he, «was the noblest embodiment of the struggle for national independence in the X.th century. A talented ruler who rivalled Emperor Basil, the Byzantine greatest warrior of that century, Samuel, was not only a distinguished military leader, strategist, and organizer, but a wise, cautious and farsighted administrator. He commenced his reign with a well defined plan in view, — the expulsion of the Byzantine from the Peninsula and the unification of the Balkan Slavic races. The first step he took was to come to the rescue of the Bulgarians in the East, who had risen against the Byzantine yoke, which was later on followed by a dash

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 271 and 272.

against Hellas, the Home of Hellenism, and the greatest enemy of the Slavic idea of federation. He succeeded in regaining Eastern Bulgaria and thus driving the Byzantine rule from Bulgaria's former domains.»[1]) On this point it is of interest to hear the opinion of some of the modern Greek historical writers. Paparrhigopoulo[2]), for example, says, «The Bulgarians rose up again in 976 under the leadership of their mighty ruler Samuel. From that time on begins the stubborn struggle of Basil II, whose aim was to annihilate once for all times the foolish dreams and pretensions of the Bulgar autocrat, and thus rid Hellenism of any danger of a future rear attack. Samuel's plan was to subjugate in a short time nearly all of the Empire's provinces in Europe. He first turned westward and moved his capital to Prespa near the Ochrida Lake. Soon after that he became master of Macedonia without Salonica, and of Epirus without Nicopolis. Samuel invaded Thessaly and captured Larissa, whose inhabitants he caused to be sent to Bulgaria, the able-bodied men among them being taken into his army. Thence the bold adventurer made a dash further south, entered Greece and threatened Peloponnesus. He was just about to fall upon Corinth when the news informing him of the Emperor's march toward Sofia compelled him to make a hasty retreat homeward. The first expedition of Basil proved disastrous. Having been distracted for many years by other wars elsewhere, he was not in a position to wage a successful war against the Bulgarians. Taking advantage of his rival's difficulties, Samuel continued to realize his ambitious expectations, and in 895 he tried to conquer Salonica.... Unwilling to lose time and energy attendant upon a siege, he hastened to the southern regions and provinces, some of which, like Peloponnesus, were dependent upon

[1]) *L'Epopée Byzantine*, vol. II, p. 389.

[2]) *Histoire de la civilisation hellénique*, pp. 265—267.

the Byzantine crown. Passing through the valley of Tampea and Penea, he emerged into Thessaly, Beotia, Attica, and crossing the promontory of Corinth, he flung his armies into Peloponnesus itself, burning and devastating everything he set his foot on. It seemed all the territorial possessions of the Empire were doomed to come under Bulgarian dominion. Man is inclined to believe that the phenomenal advance of Samuel was facilitated by influential inhabitants from Peloponnesus, Salonica, and Adrianople. In Peloponnesus, John Maleken of Lacedemon, a man noted for his wisdom and noble descent, was suspected of treachery and taken to Constantinople. Suspicion also rose against the magistrate Vovos of Salonica, for which he was exiled in Asia. A number of prelates from Adrianople went over to Samuel's camp in order to escape the punishment which awaited them. Were these men Greeks, or were they Hellenized Slavs whose racial feeling and self-consciousness were not wholly extinguished in them? These incidents, anyhow, as well as the victorious march of Samuel, were sufficient to convince Basil II that the hour had come for a deadly conflict with a most dangerous foe.»

During his first entry in Hellas, Samuel had succeeded in reaching clear to the Adriatic coast. In turn he captured Durazzo, in which Simeon had failed, and Alessio, situated at the mouth of the river Boyana. On the right bank of this river were found the Slavic zhupanships. Samuel conquered Dioclea, Travunia, Zachulmia, Bosnia, and the greatest of the zhupanships — Serbia. His dealing with these Slavic principalities reveal the wise and far-seeing diplomat Tzar Samuel really was. In order to win and attach them to himself, he, in imitation of the Byzantine Empire, granted them a full autonomy, [1]) while the Dioclean

[1]) Stanoevitch, p. 56. — Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 512 and 513. — Ireček, *History of Serbia*, pp. 196—197.

Zhupan, an avowed Hellenophile, he made his son-in-law. His treatment of the churches, too, was characterized by a liberal and impartial policy. He looked upon both the Orthodox and the Bogomils with the same paternal interest; his army was recruited from them. He availed himself of all things and agencies in furthering his well-defined ideal. «That Tzar», says Schlumberger, «always tried to be on good terms not only with the Orthodox Church which proved such an effective weapon against the Byzantine missionaries, but also with the heretics who were swarming in all of his domains. This spirit of toleration and fair-mindedness on the part of Samuel distinctly shows why he and his descendants who were coldly and even hostilely treated by the chroniclers and panegyrists of the National Church were so early and easily forgotten, while the names of his predecessors, like Boris, Simeon, Terter, and Shishman, continue to live in the memory of the Bulgarian people down to our day.»[1]) Tzar Samuel the diplomatist co-ordinated his actions with Samuel the strategist. While the first endeavored to build his power upon a general fusion and affiliation of the Slav races with which he came in contact, the second, in the meanwhile, was busily engaged in erecting strongholds in order to better strengthen a united Slavdom. Rambaud who wrote the history of Byzantium during the IX th century, in drawing attention to this feature of Samuel's activity, says: «The Bulgaria of Ochrida did not depend only on the goodwill and unreliable support presented by the Slavic tribes, but also on its well-built fortresses, such as Prilep, Castoria, Bitolia, Prespa, Ochrida, etc. . . . . Samuel's Empire was happy in the possession of many fortified towns and places. On the north the Bulgarians had in their hands Belgrade, Nish, Pristina and Liplian. Sofia or Serdica

[1]) *L'Epopée Byzantine*, vol. I, p. 615.

and Pernik, together with thirty-five other strongholds, helped to maintain communications between the Danube and Macedonia. In the vicinity of Strouma there rose Velbudge or Kustendil, Stob on Rilo Mountain, Melnik, Skopie on the Vardar, Veles (Kupruli), and Prossiak. In western Bulgaria the principal fortified locations were Prilep, Muglen, Vodena, Ostrovo, Castoria, Prespa, Ochrida and Dievol, most of them lying along the shores of fascinating lakes. In Albania and Epirus whose wierd valleys were still inhabited by a people akin to the Slavs, the Bulgarians possessed Belgrade, modern Berat, Drinopolis, etc. [1]) »

Samuel's quickness of grasp, his perspicacity, breath of view, and striking talent for organization, make themselves manifest in everything he undertakes. Now he leads his host of sturdy warriors from Viddin to Attica, now he makes a lightning dash from the Danube to the Adriatic Sea. Since Alexander the Great a profounder intellect, a more energetic ruler was not seen on the Balkans. The exploits of Samuel are not legendary, like those of Marco Kralevitch, but real. By dint of skilful manoevres he shook the Byzantine Empire and extended the boundaries of Bulgaria even further than they were in the time of Simeon. He is a man of action and achievement, an embodiment of Slavic genius and energy during the Xth century. Schlumberger is justified in his admiration of this extraordinary Bulgarian chief: « Samuel, Samuel the Great is one of the grandest rulers of Bulgaria, and one of the most noted though little known men of the Xth century.... He is a national hero.... At the head of his nation he carries on for many years a heroic struggle against the Emperor Basil and all the forces of the vast Greek Empire. »[2]) The French historian considers Samuel and Basil the two giants of the Xth century. To him

[1]) Rambaud, pp. 317—318.

[2]) *L'Epopée Byzantine*, p. 606.

Samuel is a man of first magnitude. He knew how to accelerate his strength at the expense of his colossal neighbour thus threatening his very existence. Out of his undisciplined peasants and mountaineers he created a regular army able to fight against the best soldiers in the world and to come out victorious. In his opinion Samuel is a barbarian, cruel, wily, of few scruples in choosing his means, but the author hastens to exonerate him in asserting that nearly all of his contemporaries were like him in that respect. His great rival, Emperor Basil, was far more cruel and surpassed him in duplicity and underhandedness. Samuel was, indeed, noted for his iron will, military talent, and extraordinary fortitude and valiance. He knew no fatigue, despondency or disappointment. His resourcefulness in times of direct emergency was phenomenal, else he wouldn't have been in a position to bring to such a successful issue his conflict with Byzantium, which is considered one of the greatest and most difficult wars in the world. Tzar Samuel was a perfect tactician; his strategem was unsurpassed. Like Simeon and Peter, he, too, received a kingly crown from the Pope, but this was achieved not through any compromise or alliance with Rome. What distinguished him most from his Byzantine adversary is his never ceasing zeal and efforts for a united Slavdom, for an ideal state in the Balkans, in which the kindred Slavic peoples might together work out their destiny, while the Constantinople Monarch was guided by no such motives. The one laboured for the greatness of his race, the other for the greatness of his Empire. Samuel fought his battles in order that Slavdom might triumph over the conglomerate Byzantine Empire, Basil, on the other hand, retaliated and strove to annihilate the Bulgarian power, in order to preserve the artificial unity of his state in which no particular race predominated. To effect his grand scheme of Slavic unification, Samuel relied

on the patriotism of the Slavic races, and on the co-operation of the Slavic princes. He grouped round himself the most distinguished Slavic boyars and chiefs, such as Nikolitza, Ivatza, Dragshan, Ilitza, Dobromuge, Nestoritza, Krakra, and others, all of whom were autonomous rulers, possessing an army and strongholds of their own. They were feudal lords. Animated, however, by the same idea of Slav federation by which Samuel was, they of their own accord renounced personal ambitions, titles, and rights, and joined issues for the creation of a mighty Empire—Bulgaria. They gladly accepted Samuel as their supreme Chief, and in mutual co-operation set themselves at work for the political independence of the Balkan Peninsula. Samuel, after subjugating the Serbian zhupanship, won them, too, over to the Slavic Cause, and their zhupans became his co-workers.

The conflict between Bulgaria and Byzantium was of a long duration. Both sides vied in cruelty and barbarities. The Empire was repeatedly shaken to its foundation, its territory overrun and laid waste. On several occasions it was stripped of all its domains in Europe. Within a quarter of a century Emperor Basil undertook five expeditions against Bulgaria. During this period the Peninsula was turned into a veritable battlefield. At the Gates of Trajan, in 986, Basil was defeated and barely saved himself through flight. His whole camp, with its tents, treasures, siege machines, horses, and arms, were captured and nearly all of his army annihilated by the Bulgarians. Leo Diaconus who accompanied the Emperor in this campaign has most vividly described the terrible rout of the Greeks and the Emperor's miraculous escape. At the river Sperchia in Peloponnesus, nine years later, it was Samuel's turn to meet with a similar reverse which nearly cost him his life. For some twenty years, fortune favoured, now the one, now the other side, until in 1014 the

Bulgarian arms suffered a most signal disaster. A Bulgarian army twenty thousand strong was hemmed in the fastnesses of Belassitza Mountain and badly beaten by the Byzantines. At this battle fifteen thousand Bulgarians were made prisoners. At the order of Basil the eyes of all of them were put out, leaving a single eye to the leader of every hundred, that he might lead them. The aged Tzar Samuel was unable to bear the cruel sight, fell senseless to the ground, and died on Sept. 15, 1014.

But at Belassitza only a part of the Bulgarian general army was destroyed. The war between the two hostile empires continued even after the death of Samuel with varying results. Finally Bulgaria succumbed under the overwhelming forces of Byzantium. But Emperor Basil was able to achieve this success not so much by dint of arms, as by dint of skilful diplomacy. Bulgaria was rather conquered from within than from without. The internal disintegration of the Bulgarian state was begun when the Bulgarian princes and boyars suffered themselves to be allured by the crafty Basil with lavish gifts, concessions, and titles. The greatest ally of the Byzantine Emperor were the home quarrels in Bulgaria. When Samuel was gone, the oligarchical spirit again took the upper hand. Dynastic strifes again came to the front. Gabriel, Samuel's son, who ascended the throne, was killed by Ivan Vladislav, son of Aaron, Samuel's brother. There were formed two parties, one of which desired to continue the war to the end, while the other insisted upon an immediate peace with the Byzantine Emperor. The War Party which was led by the valiant prince Ivatza, prevailed and Tzar Vladislav resumed hostilities. He attacked Ochrida which was then in the hands of Basil, routed the Greek forces, and took the city. Ivatza, too, had defeated the Greek army at Pelagonia. Basil then sent two expeditions to Sroumitza and Sofia, but both of them met with disaster. There-

upon he was compelled to enter into an alliance with the Russians against Bulgaria. On the other hand Ivan Vladislav concluded a similar alliance with the Petchenegs. But neither the Byzantine Emperor, nor the Bulgarian Tzar profited by those alliances. The internal dissensions in Bulgaria, following closely upon the death of Tzar Vladislav who was killed at Durazzo while bivouacking in the year 1018, proved Basil's more effective ally than the Russians. Bulgaria once more found itself rent by two opposing factions. The majority of the boyars, on one side, were for peace at any price, while the rest insisted upon the continuation of the struggle. At the head of the first stood Patriarch Damyan, the Tzaritza, and the Voivode Bogdan, while at the head of the second, Froujin, a nephew of Samuel, Nicholitza and Ivatza, who moved to the mountains in order to continue the war. The peace party, however, prevailed. All had to capitulate, even the brave Krakra.

As soon as Emperor Basil heard of the death of Vladislav and the attendant intestine contentions in Bulgaria, he started for Ochrida. His journey from Adrianople to the latter city was a veritable triumph. At Serres he was met and welcomed by Krakra of Pernik and Dobromuge of Sroumitza. The Voivode Bogdan and Patriarch Damyan came to meet him at Sroumitza on behalf of the Bulgarian Tzaritza from whom they bore a letter to him. At the city of Ochrida the Bulgarian Tzaritza and the whole dynasty were present at his arrival. Emperor Basil sanctioned the privileges of the Bulgarian boyars whom he, besides, endowed with titles of honor. Froujin together with his two brothers, after a series of unfruitful engagements in the steepy mountains of Berat, finally gave themselves up at Devol. Only two valliant warriors remained true to the Bulgarian cause — Ivatza and Nicholitza. The former was decoyed and blinded, while the latter

found refuge in the mountains.[1]) «In this manner,» writes Stanoevitch, «Basil became master of the whole state founded by Samuel (1018).» In the same manner the Serbian lands, also, which were incorporated into Bulgaria, fell under the Byzantine sway. And thus all Serbian provinces and nearly the entire Balkan Peninsula became part of the Byzantine Empire. According to the edict of Basil, Bulgaria was made subordinate by treaty. In it the Emperor says: «Though we conquered that country, we did not annihilate its rights, but sanctioned them with our decrees and seals.»

The Slavic oligarchy opened the doors of the Bulgarian court to the invaders to whom it had practically sold the state in advance. This fact proves that among the Slav magnates personal interests and ambitions prevailed over the spirit of race solidarity. But though Basil succeeded in defeating Bulgaria by means of corruption to which individual princes and zhupans became an easy prey, the feeling and national ideas of the people as a whole remained unaffected. Samuel's ideal of Slav federation had met with failure, but it was not totally extinguished. That struggle of the Slavs for unity and independence is perhaps the most interesting and dignified feature of the history of the Xth century. It shows that a ruler and his nation may be conquered, but not so with the aims and ideals with which they are inspired to action. The true spark of civil and religious freedom cannot be put out by physical force. A nation's ideals and aspirations, as well as its pioneers and promoters, live forever. Fire and iron are too weak to crush them.

The prolonged military expeditions in Asia and the victory over the Saracenes emblazoned the name of Emperor Basil II, but they added no strength to his state. The

[1]) *History of the Serbian Nation*, p. 59.

subjugation of Bulgaria, on the other hand, was celebrated as the Empire's greatest triumph since the days of Belizarius. Basil himself considered his success over his bitterest enemy as his most signal exploit. On that occasion he went to Athens and in the church of St. Mary he offered fervent prayers to God in grateful recognition of Providence's protection over his Empire. By so doing he wished to manifest his special attention and favour to the Athenians and Peloponnesians who had suffered terribly in the wars with the Bulgarians. Thence he returned to Constantinople where at the Golden Gates he was given a glorious reception. His head was adorned with a crown thickly set with pearls. Before his chariot walked Empress Maria [1]), the wife of Tzar Vladislav, the daughters of Samuel, and many Bulgarian notables. Throughout the Emperor was cheered and acclaimed Bulgaroctonos or Bulgar-Killer, which appellation has clung to his name ever since. On entering the Temple of St. Sophia, Basil himself joined in the song of praise which the exulting throng was singing.

But it must be remarked, in spite of his noted services done to the Empire, and in spite of the tremendous popular outburst shown in his honour on that account, Basil II was disliked by the people. For in the person of the Conqueror they saw the miser, and in that of the Emperor, the monk and ascetic. Lacking good breeding and education, though he was a nephew of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, one of the most enlightened Byzantine rulers, Basil II lived a secluded life, [2]) and behaved as a hermit. It is said that previous to his becoming Emperor he wore monastic clothes, and that after his triumph over the Bulgarians, he wore the cassock under his royal mantle, because he had made a vow to God that he

[1]) Le Beau, vol. XVI, pp. 341 and 342.

[2]) Gibbon, vol. XII, p. 321.

would become a monk should his arms come out victorious over the Bulgarians. He lived a very rigorous life, abstained from meat and wine, and in general, was noted for his severity.[1])

Bulgaria's incorporation into the Empire also proved disadvantageous to Byzantium. From the very first the Empire felt greatly exhausted and crippled. After the death of Basil it grew weaker and weaker. Internal disorders made things worse. Byzantium now was passing through a period of general decrepitude such as followed in Bulgaria after the days of Simeon. As is natural, every organism after a strenuous effort undergoes a corresponding reaction and debility. Under a powerful ruler a state goes through a most intensive experience. All its energy, vitality, and resources are brought to play and exerted to the maximum limit. A great chief of state makes use not only of what the State actually possesses, but also of that which it has stored for future utilization. He also disposes of the means and strength of several generations to come. The latter, indeed, become heirs of what their predecessors have handed down to them, glorious victories and exploits, territorial extention, culture and civilization, but side by side with all these, they inherit a far greater responsibility, financial and moral; they are constrained to shoulder up colossal budget, and meet all other expenses required for repairing the terrible losses caused by wars. Posterity is called forth to take care of thousands of households rendered helpless and destitute through the death of their providing members who had left their bones on the battlefield, fighting for their country.

Emperor Basil, together with the crown of the Bulgarian king, carried to Byzantium all the riches and articles of value he found in the Bulgarian court.

[1]) Ireček, *History of the Bulgarians*, pp. 257—361.

Gibbon says that he found in Ochrida four hundred thousand pounds sterling which seemed to have to a certain degree appeased Basil's keen avariciousness. [1]) Ireček notes down that in the Bulgarian court, besides the crown and gold-trimmed apparel, were discovered forty hundredweights in gold.[2]) Paparrhigopoulo, in speaking of the riches which the Empire had at the death of Basil II, states that in his coffers were found two hundred and twenty millions. A considerable part of this wealth was, no doubt, brought over from Bulgaria. [3])

All this wealth, however, availed the Empire but very little. Basil's enormous fortune did not enhance its stability, nor did it help to lengthen its days very long after its possessor was gone, or to check the process of disintegration which ensued during the reign of his successors.

The great Emperor Basil II had scarcely disappeared from life when his absence was felt throughout the Empire. Dynastic dissentions at once set in in Constantinople, and corruption, extortion, and plunder, on the part of administrative officials, began to sap the Empire's prestige both home and abroad. The governors of provinces were able to amass great fortunes, acquire extensive lands, and become owners of thousands of slaves. They vied with the emperors themselves in point of opulence and luxury. The slaves were generally Slavs, the lands were tilled by Slavs, while the fruit of their labour helped to swell the purse of their Byzantine masters. The Slavs increased the number of the Greek population as well as its wealth in the Balkans. They were to these provinces what the slaves used to be to ancient Greece after the first migrations into Asia. Some of them were turned to slavery, as was the case with the Slavs in Achaia and Eulida, who having revolted, were suppressed by Emperor Nicephorus,

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XVI. p. 54. [2]) Ireček, p. 260. [3]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 290.

made slaves and attached to the church of St. Andrew in Patras. The Slavs in Thrace, Macedonia, and in the southern provinces were engaged in cattle-raising and agriculture.»

The subjugated Slavs then were doomed to work and toil for their masters and conquerors. Thanks to their industry many Greeks became rich and prosperous. At Salonica, in the days of Basil the Macedonian, a lady, Danielis by name, owned such an immense wealth as even emperors seldom had. Her great riches,[1]) consisting in silver coins, vases made of precious metals, luxurious clothes, ships, slaves, beasts of burden, etc., were worthy of an emperor, according to the words of Constantine Porphyrogenitus who had been her guest and who was a man living in palaces amid purple and gold. She had so many slaves and such vast estates, that after her death three thousand of her slaves were set at liberty and transported to Italy, while eighty farms fell as the share of one of her heirs. There were many Greek families who had acquired such colossal wealth. The slaves they owned were by no means Greeks.

The greatest abundance of food and cattle was found in the southeastern provinces of the Empire, Peloponnesus included. In the Xth century Peloponnesus supplied Romanus Lacapenus with a thousand cavalry horses. In the XIth century, during the great Constantinople famine, the government bought 800,000 bushels of grain from Peloponnesus and other parts of Greece. Such opulence was unknown in those provinces prior to the settlement of the Slavs in them. It is quite evident, therefore, why Simeon used to send his armies to Peloponnesus, and why Samuel began his war against the Empire in that region. Besides, both of them were anxious to liberate the Slavs who groaned in slavery and were exploited by the Greeks.

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 294. — Platon, *La Grand Encyclopédie*, vol. XI, p. 261. — Le Beau, vol. XV.

Was there any slavery in Byzantium during the VIIIth, IXth, and Xth century?

Byzantine historians claim that slavery with the Greeks during the Middle Ages was not like that which existed in Roman times. «It did not resemble our serfdom», says Montreuil.[1]) «If there is legal ground to believe that conditions for maintaining slaves existed, there are evidences that it was abolished.» The Russian scholars versed in the Byzantine history of law, Vassilevski, Pavloff, Gribovski, and others, cite the Eclogue of Leo Isaurian as a testimony of the existence of landed proprietorship or *Agricultural Law* in Byzantium. This law created to regulate the condition of the Slavs found within the borders of the Empire stipulated that the land was to be owned by the communes and not by individual persons. A sort of communal ownership of land was established. According to the new land statutes, the peasantry was divided into two classes: *free peasants*, who lived on communal estate and were its husbandsmen, and *dependent peasants*, who were attached only to the estate and not to its owner or master. But the fact that the Slavs in Greece proper were condemned to slavery and bound to serve the church of St. Andrews, as well as the fact already mentioned of the rich Greek woman, Danielis, possessing many farms and slaves, contradict the assertions contained in the Eclogue of Isaurian. Danielis and the church of St. Andrews maintained slavery much later on, almost a whole century after the said Eclogue was written. Isn't this sufficient to convince anyone that the condition of the peasantry was very bad, that they were actual slaves, and the statutes mentioned in the Eclogue were at least not enforced, as was the case with the anticon law? The interest and influence of the ruling class

[1]) Montreuil, *Histoire du droit byzant*, vol. III, p. 56.

of the Empire were so strong, that similar arrangements were difficult to be executed.

Side by side with slavery there flourished despotism. Despotism even prevailed over monarchism. The will of the Emperor was a law in the capital, as that of his lieutenants was such in their respective seats in the provinces. Such things as personal freedom, national spirit, social organization, etc., were unknown, as they could not be tolerated. The Emperors who usually succeeded to the throne through foul methods, violence, and murder, resorted to despotism in order to maintain their authority. The biographies of nearly all the Byzantine rulers are replete with revolting misdeeds, base intrigues, plots, putting out of eyes, murders, imprisonment, exile, to which the Court had recourse in order to get rid of undesirable relatives, magnates, and citizens. The Emperor primarily took pains and interest in preserving his own head and in furthering his own wellbeing. The Empire had to supply him with means that he might live in abundance, magnificence, and luxury, as well as to provide him with the necessary armed force in order to be able to fight his enemies. The notorious spendthrifts among the Emperors were often compelled to seek money from rich merchants and other men of wealth, who, as a rule, were aliens, Venetians, Genoese, etc. Constantinople contained many foreign colonists who did a thriving business, made enormous fortunes, and often occupied high imperial posts. The richest and most influential of these were the Venetian and Genoese settlers. They had acquired such prosperity and weight in the Empire, that very often they were the actual rulers in Constantinople. They enjoyed such independence and immunities, that they presented, as it were, a state within

[1]) V. M. Gribovski, *People and Authority*, Petersburg, 1897, p. 64. — Vassilevski, *Icon Legislation*, Journal of the Ministry of Education, 1878, No. 200, p. 105.

a state. Their quarters were near the Vlacherna palaces and were surrounded by double and treble walls. Galata and Pera sections of the Capital which were inhabited by them were well fortified. The Genoese and Venetian colonies were like small republics, were autonomous, and chose their own chiefs and officers. Commerce was in their hands, they were the Empire's bankers, they supplied the Emperors and the Empire with funds, and as such, often dictated the issues of war. The Byzantine fleet was made up mostly of Venetian and Genoese ships, and manned by Venetian and Genoese sailors who were wont to sell their services to the highest bidder. The Crusaders and the Saracenes were brought to the walls of Constantinople on Venetian boats. The Venetians and Genoese were animated by no patriotism and Christianity, but solely by their mercantile spirit. Whoever paid them best, to him they sold or lent their fleet. Venice for a long time had refused to carry the Crusaders against the Turks, because the latter were better and more constant clients. [1]) «The first Turkish expedition against Constantinople,» says Bikelas, «was brought over on Genoese ships.»

A keen rivalry existed between the two Italian colonies in Constantinople, which at various times resulted in serious and bloody conflicts. Then in turn the Byzantine Emperors took advantage of their quarrels, now taking the side of the Venetians, now favouring the Genoese, and in so doing, helped to weaken their influence and activity. The inhabitants of Constantinople disliked both factions because they were Catholics. [2]) The Orthodox clergy availed itself of this popular animosity in order to check the growth of the Catholic heresy, as the Romish Church was derogatively called. The Emperors often abetted the hatred against the foreign settlers in the Capital, which often proved

[1]) Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III, la question d'Orient*, pp. 77—149.
[2]) *Grèce byzantine*, p. 65.

a disastrous policy to the Empire. Thus when in 1169 Emperor Manuel Comnenus in a fit of rage had given orders for the seizure of all Venetians and the confiscation of their possessions, the latter soon retaliated and wreaked their terrible vengeance upon Byzantium.[1]) A Venetian fleet consisting of a hundred and fifty ships assailed the shores of Euboea, Chios, and other islands, and destroyed a large number of their ports. The Emperor was compelled to ask for peace which was concluded on the condition that the damages caused to the Venetians should be generously indemnified. Encouraged by the arbitrary acts of their Emperors the Byzantines would frequently fall upon the Venetian and Genoese quarters, especially at times of disorder attendant upon a dethronement. On these occasions the «heretics» were hunted down, robbed, maltreated, and many of them killed, the infuriated rabble shouting, «Death to the heretics, foreigners and court favourites!» A typical example of such popular outbreak took place at the dethronement of Emperor Andronicus. On his return to power in 1183, however, he caused the guilty persons to be arrested and most mercilessly punished. The usurper of the throne, on the other hand, took the side of the people and sent his army in their support. Then a veritable debâcle ensued. The enraged and fanatical populace hurled itself at the Latins with redoubled vigour, sparing neither young, nor old, and heeding neither laws, friendship, nor treaty obligations.[2]) The streets were filled with dead and the foreign quarters were turned to ashes. The Catholic priests were burned in their churches. Even the sick in the hospitals were not spared. About four thousand Latins who had succeeded in escaping death were sold as slaves to the Turks. The Byzantine monks and priests led the mob and

[1]) G. C. Sismonde de Sismondi, vol. II, pp. 125 and 126.

[2]) Gibbon, vol. XVI, pp. 224 and 225.

directed its work of blood and destruction. While singing church songs they beheaded the Roman Cardinal and the Papal delegate and tied their heads to a dog's tail. The frightened animal was then let loose and driven in the streets with the heads dangling behind him, amid the shouting and hooting crowds. A similar popular outbreak occurred also in 1187, during the reign of Isaac Angelus II.

The frequent riots, internal desorders, and strifes, mismanagement, lack of public control, loss of authority and prestige, especially in the conquered Bulgarian provinces, favourization, dissipation, and luxury, were sure signs of the decline of the Empire. The reign of Isaac Angelus gives us a most typical picture of court demoralization and state disintegration to which the Empire was exposed. This Emperor thought of nothing else but personal pleasure and gratification. He spent all of his time in indolence and a dissolute life. He was infatuated with his throne where he could always be found, usually in a dozing posture, from which he would awake when lust and depravity seized him anew. He was unsurpassed in point of licentiousness, love of outward show, and lavishness. He kept in his palaces some twelve thousand eunuchs and servants. The daily expenses for court dinners amounted yearly to over twenty million of dollars.[1]) Magnificent feasts, clothes, furniture, perfumes, concerts, ceremonies, object servility by his subordinates, — all these things gave Emperor Angelus an infinite joy and satisfaction. He surrounded himself with clowns tho he was greatly irritated by their disrespect of him. He was seldom seen in the Capital, for he preferred to spend most of his time in various islands on the Sea of Marmora, where he had built himself splendid palaces. But though he scattered money on trivial objects, he took pleasure in

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XVI, pp. 227 and 228. — Le Beau, vol. XX, pp. 123, 124, 145.

performing certain things which were not entirely useless. Thus he gloried in filling up of certain places along the sea-shore and in forming new islands. He would cause the demolition of private mansions, palaces, and temples, in the place of which he built new ones, into which were brought pictures, marble statues, ornaments, etc., taken from elsewhere. He used to rob the churches of their chalices and consign them to an ignominious and shameful use. He tampered with coinage, increased taxation, sold the public offices, usurped the salaries of the state officials, compelling them to live by extortion. Though leading a most licentious life throughout the year, during the Passion week, however, he turned a saint and gave himself to charity. He gave succour to widows and endowed poor girls. He took pride in being generous, though his extravagant piousness was exerted at the expense of his people. Taxation grew more unbearable day by day. His preparation for marriage with Margaret, the daugther of Bello, the Hungarian King, after the death of his third wife, was conspicuous for its great sumptuousness. New imposts were exacted from the people, in order that the wedding be celebrated with unparalleled magnificence and splendour. The levying of taxes was done with unheard of harshness and severity, especially in the distant provinces of the Empire. In Bulgaria, particularly, the arbitrary and excessive taxation was felt, not only as an unbearable burden, but as a terrible curse. The inhabitants were robbed of everything the greedy tax-gatherers or the state officials could lay hands on. Their flocks were carried away, their granaries emptied out, and even the doweries of the virgins were not spared. Soon the unscrupulous Imperial agents took to selling out of their lands. This last act touched the Bulgarian population to the quick and forced them to seek redress in armed resistance, revolts, and uprisings. In 1040, barely twenty years after

Bulgaria's subjugation by Byzantium, the Moravian Bulgarians made the first serious but unsuccessful attempt to throw off the authority of Emperor Michael IX, the Paphlagonian. A second equally unsuccessful uprising took place in Skopie, in 1073, in the reign of Constantine Monomachus. It gave occasion to the Byzantine Ruler to drive away the majority of the Bulgar population replacing it by bringing over the Petcheneg tribe, and to strengthen and enforce the garrisons throughout Bulgaria. By so doing he fulfilled the testament of Basil II, bequeathed to his successors, which was inscribed upon a marble slab in the Monastery of Sosten near the Bosphorus, and which reads: «If ever the Bulgarians rise in revolt anew, Bulgaria should, after my example, be thouroughly garrisoned; this is the only way to check and keep down that unruly and insubordinate people.»[1]) But neither the counsel, nor the armies of Byzantium could save her from her impending decline and doom. The Byzantine Empire soon succumbed to the same malady that caused Bulgaria's downfall—civil strifes, oligarchic misgovernment, and state anarchy.

The unsettled state of things which prevailed in Constantinople was well known to Assen and Peter, two brothers of royal Bulgarian lineage and vassals to Byzantium. Emboldened by the internal disintegration through which the Empire was passing, and by virtue of the privileges granted to the Bulgar princes and boyars by Basil II, they presented themselves to Emperor Isaac Angelus while on a hunting trip through Thrace, and in behalf of the Bulgar people, protested against the wrongs and iniquities to which the Bulgarians were exposed at the hands of the Byzantine authorities. Among the other requests they made before Emperor Angelus, they demanded that the Bulgarian mercenary forces be treated

[1]) Le Beau, vol. XX, pp. 145. and 146.

on equal footing with the Byzantine,[1]) and receive the same pay, and forwarded their claims to some lands in Stara Planina. But the Greek Emperor who was accompanied by his uncle, John Sevastocrator, turned a deaf ear to all the complaints brought forth by the Bulgar princes. Then Assen assumed a firm and rather threatening attitude, saying that if the official oppression, violence, and rapaciousness did not cease, the Bulgarian people would be compelled to rise. John Sevastocrator cut him short and slapped him on the face. Assen's prophetic words came out too true. In 1186, after a bondage lasting more than a century and a half, the Bulgarians revolted against Byzantium, drove out the Byzantine garrisons, and restored their independence. A worse catastrophe awaited the Hellenized Eastern Empire when in 1204, eighten years later, the Crusaders became masters of the city of Constantine, and resuscitated the Eastern Latin Empire.[1])

Assen I was made the first Tzar of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom. His chief aim was to extend Bulgaria's boundaries, reorganize the State, and consolidate Bulgaria's position in the Balkans. During the reign of Ivanitza, his successor, Bulgaria became mightier in territory and influence, and once more she regained her supremacy on the Balkan Peninsula. Once more she rose to a position of a first class power, such as she was in the days of Simeon the Great. The Latins were the first to feel the force of her might. As soon as Bulgaria became conscious of her strength, the old idea of conquering the capital of Byzantium and of unifying the Balkan Slavs by blending them into a potent state again began to work upon the mind of both king and people, as is evident from the correspondence carried on between Tzar Ivanitza and Pope Innocent III. When Baldwin, the Latin Emperor of Con-

[1]) Achille Luchaire, membre de l'Institut, *Innocent III, la question d'Orient*, Paris, 1907, pp. 128—131.

stantinople, fell in the hands of the Bulgarians, the Roman Pontiff wrote to Henry, Baldwin's successor, in this peremptory manner: «Make haste to sign a seperate and lasting peace treaty with our much beloved son Ivanitza, the Tzar of the Bulgarians and Wallachians.»

Simultaneously he sent a letter to Ivanitza, in which in a flattering and entreating tone, he addresses him thus: «We extol you above all other Christian rulers. We love you so much that we think only of your interests and glory. We are confident, therefore, that you will give evidence of your increasing devotion to the Roman Church, through whose benediction you were enabled to triumph over all of your enemies. You have received through our degate the royal diadem and St. Peter's banner. By these insignia your Kingdom is placed under special patronage of the Apostle. Our fervent wish moreover is only this, that unmolested by any of your foes, you may wear and enjoy your crown in peace. We inform you, our greatly beloved son, that a large army is getting ready to leave West for Greece, in order to reinforce the armies already there. You should lose no time in coming into an understanding with the Latins, for if they should attack you from the south and the Magyars from the north, it would be very difficult for you to withstand such a coalition. We request of you to free Emperor Baldwin who, they say, is in your hands, in order that you may conclude an enduring peace with the Latins and thus rid youself of the danger of being assailed by them. We shall sent orders to Henry, the brother of the Emperor, who commands the Latin army in Constantinople, to enter into communication and friendly relations with you. . . .»[1])

There is a great difference in the style of the two letters: to Henry the Pope sends orders as to a subordi-

[1]) Same book, p. 175.

nate, while to Ivanitza he speaks as to a friend, turning to him with words of endearment. «Comparing the two letters», says Achille Luchaire, from whom we borrow them, «it is clear that he (the Pope) manifests deeper concern about the interests of the Bulgarian Kingdom than about those of the Latin Empire, but it is also evident, that his aim is to win over the crafty and unscrupulous warrior who was fired with the idea of unifying the Balkan Slavic races and of establishing a mighty Slavic Empire.»

The intercession of Innocent III, however, met with ill-success. The Bulgarian potentate, familiar with the wiles of Papal diplomacy, sent to Innocent the following answer: «As soon as I learned of the fall of Constantinople, I immediately sent delegates to the Latins with full authority to conclude a treaty with them. The Latins, however, received my delegates in a haughty manner, and declared they would never come into a peaceful understanding with me before I cede to them a part of the Greek Empire which, they allege, I have unlawfully retained. This was my reply to them: 'I have better right to claim that territory than you to be masters of Constantinople. I simply got back the lands once owned by my predecessors. You have usurped a city and an Empire which never belonged to you. Besides, I am the possessor of my crown given to me by the Roman Pontiff, while he (Aexius III) who styles himself «Basileus» of Constantinople is a mere usurper of the crown he wears.' That is the reason why I have better claim than he to be the heir of the Byzantine throne. Relying on God I could crush those Latins whose bodies are decorated with false crosses. They challenged me, and I was obliged to defend myself against them. God favoured me with a victory greater than my expectations, for according to the words of the Apostle, God smites the arrogant, but strengthens the arm of the humble.»

Tzar Ivanitza is anxious to emphasize his rights over Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire. From the statements made by him it becomes evident that he, too, poses as champion of Slavic federation with Constantinople as capital — the great ideal of his renowned predecessors, Simeon and Samuel. Achille Luchaire attaches even wider meaning to Ivanitza's words. He asserts that in his opinion the Bulgarian ruler had the ambition of uniting all the Balkan peoples under his own scepter.

Ivan Assen II was the last great Bulgarian Tzar to champion and promote the grand conception of Slavic union and solidarity, so dear to his most illustrious predecessors Simeon and Samuel. In order to effect this, the first task that faced him was the reconquest and liberation of Bulgaria's lost provinces on the Peninsula. The first ruler with whom he immediately came into conflict was Emperor Theodorus of Epirus. At Klokotnitza in Thrace the armies of the two mighty chiefs met in a most bloody struggle, at which the Epirian forces were utterly routed, Emperor Theodorus himself made prisoner, and his kingdom annexed to the Bulgarian dominions. That victory alone was sufficient to render the name of Tzar Assen famous. That and the subsequent signal military successes made him the most powerful ruler in the East. In his reign Bulgaria possessed nearly the entire Balkan Peninsula, Constantinople excepted. Bulgarian dominions then dipped into three seas, the Black, the Aegean, and the Adriatic. Within her boundaries were included, Kavalla and Salonica on the Aegean, Durazzo and Alessio on the Adriatic, Thessaly, Epirus, Albania, and a large part of Serbia. « In the days of Ivan Assen II », writes the historian Ireček, « the power of the Bulgarian Empire had reached its culminating point. Soon after his death, however, it became clear that the State's greatness was closely connected with the life of one man, its able ruler. The ambition of

Assen II was to found a Slavic Empire with Constantinople as its capital, as is evident from the traditional title he bore, 'Tzar of the Bulgarians and Greeks'. »[1])

While the Bulgarians from the very beginning of their existence took to organizing themselves into a political state to which they tried to draw the rest of the Balkan Slavic races, with a view to ultimately lay the foundation of a Slavic Empire with Constantinople as its centre, the Serbians, on the other hand, tended to live in seperate and disunited principalities or zhupanships, subordinate to Byzantium. From the reign of the Zhupan Peter (917) to the time of Stephan Neman (1159) there existed three Serbian zhupanships which were hostile to each other and vassals, now to the Byzantine Empire, now to Bulgaria.[2]) Both Byzantium and Bulgaria vied with one another in winning them on their side. The zhupans under Peter (917), as well as Peter himself, and the zhupans Paul, Zachari, and Tcheslav, that followed him, used to pay tribute to Constantinople. In 1018 the Serbians who were incorporated into the Empire of Samuel were, together with the Bulgarians, conquered by Byzantium and, as was the case with Bulgaria, were ruled by a governor appointed by the Byzantine Emperor. Subsequently both the Bulgarians and the Serbians made repeated attempts to rid themselves of the Greek yoke. The first effort was made in 1034, resulting in failure. A second one took place in 1038, under the leadership of the zhupan Boislov, which succeeded. Michael, the son of Boislov, was able to extend the territory of his state and to obtain the title Kral or King from the Pope in 1078. In the reign of his son Bodin, Dioclea became the centre of the Serbian dominions. After Bodin and Valkan, the Serbians were ruled by the great-grand-

[1]) Ireček, p. 349.

[2]) Ireček, *History of Serbia*, pp. 185—190; 202, 221, 532; 244—264 335 and 345. — Goloubinski, pp. 426—440. — Stanoevitch, pp. 35—89 128; 130—142.

father of Stephan Neman. In 1159 the throne was occupied by Vakchin or Primysl who entered into war with the Byzantines, but was defeated by them, after which he was compelled to become vassal and pay tribute to Byzantium. The Greeks again became masters over Serbia. The Greek Emperor placed Urosh, the brother of Primysl, on the Serbian throne. Not until the appearance of the great Stephan Neman, do we see most of the Serbian zhupanships united into one state and forming an independent political organization. At the beginning Neman was vassal to Byzantium, continuing to pay the stipulated tribute to the Byzantine Basileus and to undergo all the humiliations exacted from him as a subordinate prince. According to a chronicler, «he used to hurl himself prostrate at the feet of the Byzantine Emperors, though with some awkwardness, on account of his stalwart stature.» But the day was not far distant when he felt his State sufficiently strong, not only to put an end to his vassalage, but, morever, to widen its boundaries at the expense of the same Byzantium. His reign lasted till 1195 when he turned his throne over to his son Stephan Pervoventchan (first crowned), while he himself embraced the monastic life and retired to Mt. Athos in the Chilender Monastery founded by him. The Serbians did not maintain their independence long. Under Kral Stephan Dragoutin Serbia became tributary to the Magyar Kingdom. In the reign of Stephan Miloutin, however, it again won back its independence. Miloutin left a long record of victories over Byzantium and Bulgaria, as a result of which Serbia became the possessor of Skopie, Oftche-Polie, Zletovo, Kichevo, and Dibra. His successor Stephan Urosh extended Serbia's boundaries still further by conquering Kustendil, Dubnitza, Samokov, and the region north-east of Nish.

The zenith of Serbia's might and influence was reached under the scepter of its renowned Emperor Stephan Doushan

who ascended the throne in 1333. Taking advantage of the internal weakness prevailing, both in the Byzantine Empire and Bulgaria, he pushed his conquests right and left, extending his sway over all of the southern Slavs. Serbia in his day bordered upon the Black and Adriatic seas. It embraced Macedonia without Salonica, Thessaly, and Epirus on the south, Bosnia on the north, and all the territory south of the Danube, with the exception of Thrace.

After realizing his military ambitions, Stephan Doushan, with the benediction of the Bulgarian Patriarch, established an independent Serbian Patriarchy, with Ipek as its seat. Shortly after, he convoked a great Sobor or Assembly at Skopie, at which he was solemnly crowned, not as Kral, but as Tzar, styling himself « Emperor of the Roumelians or Romans, Serbians, Bulgarians and Albanians. » But his greatest ambition was the conquest and possession of Constantinople. He was inspired toward such an undertaking, not through any plan of amalgamating the Balkan Slavs and creating a Slavic federation, but through a desire of rising at the head of a glorious and mighty empire, after the example of the Byzantine emperors. Having studied in Constantinople, he returned to his own native country, deeply imbued with Byzantine ideas, and a great admirer of Byzantine state organization and institutions. In imitation of Byzantium, he divided his Empire into seperate autonomous principalities, at the head of which he placed hereditary chiefs, viceroys or despots. Seven such Despotships are known to have existed in the Serbian Empire those days. This system of decentralization, however, proved detrimental to the country's future. Greeks, Bulgarians, and Serbians reverted to their original racial or clannish form of government. Racial rivalry and hostility became rampant throughout the Balkans, a circumstance which tended to weaken the stability of the petty Christian states, and make them an easy prey

to foreign invasions. This state of political disintegration that set in on the Peninsula, paved the way for a successful Ottoman inroad which was effected sooner than it was expected. The mutual jealousies, animosities, and strifes of the petty Balkan chiefs and the various Balkan tribes came out to be, as it has been often pointed out, the greatest allies of the Turks.

The struggle for supremacy in the Balkans was led mainly by the Greeks, Serbians, and Bulgarians, and is continued down to our very day. The fearful conflicts into which these three races have been engaged may be summarized in the following manner, based upon concrete facts and events, such as existed on the Balkan Peninsula between the IVth and the XVth centuries, —

Constantine the great founds the Eastern Roman Empire whose stages of development, down to the XVth century, form a long curved line. That Empire is an embodiment of Roman and Greek culture. The highest elevations marked out by the curved line represent the epochs of Justinian, Basil I, Nicephorus Phocas, Zimisces, and Basil II.

The early Bulgarian chieftain, Asparouch, lays the foundation of a strong state which, too, has its ups and downs in its historical career. It achieves its greatest political and cultural success in the reigns of its tzars, Kroum, Boris, Simeon, Samuel, Ivanitza, and Ivan Assen II.

Serbia as an independent state comes into prominence in the XIIth century, under the leadership of her Kral Stephan Neman. Until then the Serbians had lived in seperate zhupanships subordinate to Byzantium. Serbian power and culture reached their culminating point under the scepters of Stephan Pervoventshan, Urosh, Miloutin, and Stephan Doushan the Strong.

The low points or the declining periods delineated in the history of the same three rival peoples may be given as follows, —

The Bulgarians pass through two yokes — the Greek one (1018—1187), and the Turkish (1371—1877); the Greeks suffer three bondages — one under the Romans, lasting to the VIth century, one under the Crusaders (1204—1268), and one under the Turks; the Serbians undergo also three bondages which are, their vassal state under Byzantium, the Greek yoke (1018—1038), and the Turkish domination.

There fell three states and vanished from the political horizon three peoples which were engaged in a centuries long struggle for the supremacy of the Near East. In the Greek Empire the world witnessed the disappearance of Byzantium and the obliteration of a culture and civilization of universal importance. With the destruction of the Byzantine Empire there ensued a great revolution and cataclysm in the life of man. What were the causes of the decline and fall of these three countries, or rather, what were the causes of the disintegration and death of the original state which preceded the other two and which is known to history as Byzantium?

Montesquieu[1]) and Gibbon[2]) have tried to give an adequate answer to this momentous question. Their explanation is at least convincing if not exhaustive.

Montesquieu has summed up all the causes in one and has elucidated them by means of aphorisms. He finds that the great cause which brought about the ruin of the Eastern Roman Empire, and subsequently of the Byzantine Empire, lay hid in the Christian monasticism which was in vogue in the everyday life of the Byzantines, sapping the state organism, and hindering every attempt at reform. No lasting good could be expected of a fanatical doctrine which preached that the state should blindly entrust its

[1]) Montesquieu, Oeuvres complètes, *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des roumains et de leur décadence*, Paris, vol. I, pp. 103, 107, and 108.

[2]) *Histoire de la décadence et de la chute de l'empire roumaine*, Paris, 1795, vol. XVIII, pp. 155—159.

destiny to Providence. « From the days of Phocas the history of the Empire was a series of riots, disorders, and treacheries. Revolutions created revolutions, and the effect became the cause . . . Emperor Andronicus Paleologus neglected the state marine, because he was persuaded that God who was so pleased with his zeal for establishing peace and order in the Church would never permit his enemies to attack him. He also believed that Providence would not deal with him harshly for entirely forsaking his duties towards the state and turning his whole attention to the interests of the Church . . . When Mohammed II laid siege to the Capital, the theological discussions and debates did not cease; in Constantinople at that time the Byzantines were more interested in the decisions of the Florentine Council than in an impending Turkish invasion. »

Gibbon is more explicit and categorical. He traces the causes in Christianity. He finds that Christianity had destroyed the ancient civilization and the Roman power, and to it were due the adversities and the gloom of the Middle Ages. « A certain fanatical priest preached in Constantinople that the Turks would succeed in entering the Capital and would pursue the Greeks only as far as the Column of Constantine which stands in the square in front of the Church of St. Sophia. As soon as they reach that point their might would be suddenly spent, and at the same time an angel would come down from heaven, bearing a sword which he would hand over to a poor man found sitting at the pedestal of the column, to whom he would say: 'Take this sword and avenge God's people.' At these words the Turks would take to flight and the Greeks would pursue them clear to Persia. The historian Duka speaks on this subject and condemns the dissensions and stubborness of the Greeks manifested even at those critical times: 'If the angel were ac-

tually to appear', urges the contemporary Greek historian in turning to his compatriots, 'and propose to help your enemies on the only condition that you guarantee by your signatures the unity of the Church, even under those trying circumstances you would reject the offer for salvation.' While the Greeks were waiting for the appearance of the angel who was never seen, the Turks had become masters of St. Sophia.»

The Greek historians including even those who have tried to confute the conclusions of Montesquieu and Gibbon, and who in harmony with the English historical writer, Finlay, assert that «the Byzantines had been morally superior to all other people in Europe, to which fact was chiefly due the longevity of the Byzantine Empire»[1]), admit that the Greek clergy and the kind of Christianity it preached prepared the way for the Empire's downfall. Bikelas,[2]) too, says: «When the numerous monasteries were overcrowded with people who flocked in them in order to be relieved from any civic duties and responsibilities, when the very authorities disgraced the monastic order by imposing the cassock on those whom it desired to punish and drive away from society life; when the clergy preached that all wars were wicked because they destroyed life, and when a defeated army attributed its reverses to its sins, then all hope was lost, and the hour of ruin had arrived.»

But Bulgaria and Serbia, living in close proximity with Byzantium, together with its state and church forms and principles also inherited its negative qualities. They were infected with the same malady that killed the Greek Empire which they imitated in so many respects. But besides the distorted christianity which was made rather the religion of hermits than of free citizens animated by social, religions, and racial obligations, there are other

[1]) Finlay, *Byzantine Empire*, vol. I. p. 258.

[2]) *La Grèce byzantine et moderne*, p. 55.

causes which helped bring about the Empire's doom. They are to be found in the blood and temperament of Greeks and Slavs, Bulgarians and Serbians, whose deep rooted hatred of each other has been manifested in long and bloody struggles abroad, and in internecine strifes and disorders at home. Then, too, the tendency in each of these peoples of retaining their oligarchic spirit and forms of governement was to a great degree responsible for the estrangement which existed between the people and the ruling class of the state, and which daily enfeebled the country, both politically and economically, thus making the march of the Turks into Europe a light task.

The Greeks borrowed from the Romans the monarchic institutions which were not suited to their character. In the days of old they used to lead a free life, seldom ruled by kings. They formed as many little states as there were tribes. Every tribe had its own form of government, its own army, its own ambitions, and each of them strove to acquire the ascendency over the others. Their army was not mercenary as that of Carthage or Byzantium. The tribal army was composed of all its members. A typical example of their clannish spirit and tendencies are Athens, Sparta, Thebes, while of their struggle for supremacy — the Peloponnesian war which weakened and exhausted them all and made the approach of the Macedonian phalanx a sure possibility. Philip of Macedon was virtually invited to invade Greece. The Macedonian yoke was later on replaced with the Roman. There were, of course, periods when the petty Greek states displayed a phenomenal genius, energy, and greatness. That happened when Athens, Sparta, Thebes, Megara, and other states came to an understanding and united their efforts. It was on such occasions that history records Thermopylae and Salamis, the defeat of Darius and his hosts, and other signal Greek exploits. At such occasions rose the immortal Aeschylus, himself a warrior, who by

writing his *Persians* and presenting it on the stage created an apotheosis of Hellenic unity and patriotism. Greece, however, presented a different picture when the spirit of dissention and envy prevailed among its tiny commonwealths. Then an era of dejection would set in, and the chronicler has to record the destruction of Miletus and the subsequent appearance in the Athenian theater of Phrynichos' drama, *The Capture of Miletus*, reminding the Greeks of the terrible national disaster due to the rivalry and lack of unity and patriotism among the Hellenic states. The military successes over Hellas of Philip and Alexander of Macedon, the Macedonian bondage, the *Philippics* of Demosthenes also belong to such a period of political looseness and disintegration.

The Slavs continued to live on the Balkan Peninsula for centuries under their primitive tribal mode of life. Under the Byzantine rule they persevered in maintaining their tribal character. The Byzantine State and Church forms of government, though for a time successful in fusing their energies into one which later on helped them to create independent states of their own, were, notwitstanding unable to keep them long attached to the Empire, because the Byzantine spirit and institutions were foreign to their taste and temperament. The Church impressing itself upon them more with its monastic character and superstitious beliefs about heaven and hell than with any sound doctrine had no hold upon their actual life, and there lacked the magnitic power to unite them and keep them together. Their *sui generis* feudalism and oligarchic form of government, too, repelled them from the State. Bulgaria and Servia were made up of petty chiefs humbly bound to the mother country, but they felt they were allied more with the personality of the King or Tzar than with the State. The tzars [1]) and

[1]) Rambaud, p. 325.

kings themselves were responsible for the creation of *sui generis* feudal rulers in order to be able to control them more easily, without taking into account that by so doing they were undermining the foundation of their own state and power. Thus the Turkish invasion found Bulgaria divided into two kingdoms and one principality, viz., Tirnova, Widdin and Dobroudja, Servia into seven zhupanships, and Greece into four states: Constantinople, Athens, Epirus, and Trebizond. The people in Bulgaria, Serbia, and Greece at that period were labouring under unbearable economical distress. The common people were being deprived of everything they possessed which could be turned to use by their rulers. They were compelled to give their sons to the army, their grain to feed it, and in addition, pay heavy taxes for the maintenance of the state. Long continued warfare and unbearable imposts had reduced the three nations to the point of starvation. «The State», writes Stanoevitch [1]) «took away everything from the peasantry without giving them in return any security whatever to life or property. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that in many places the people preferred to fall under the Turkish dominion, believing that it might grant them some advantages which the Serbian state could not, and that, at any rate, a change of masters might bring an amelioration in their life. They reasoned that they were not obliged to work and fight for their masters who squeezed everything out of them without being able to defend them at least from the incursions of their enemies.» Such was the condition of mind and body among the Serbians, the Bulgarians, and the Greeks, on the eve of the Turkish occupation.

Bikelas regretfully remarks that Europe viewed with utter disconcern the awful catastrophe which was threaten-

[1]) *History of the Serbian People*, pp. 196 and 197.

ing Byzantium and turned a deaf-ear to the appeals for help made to it by Paleologus. But it must be remembered that during that period the European countries themselves were distracted by religious conflicts — Bohemia by the Hussite movement, Germany by Lutheranism, while an intense hostility reigned between Englishmen, and Frenchmen, Genoese and Aragonians, Germans, Hungarians, and the Czechs. Pope Nicholas V, though warning the world of the impending doom that was awaiting the Greek Empire, did nothing towards warding it off, but stood aloof in anxious curiosity of seeing his prophecy fulfilled.

The indifference of the West to the Empire was, indeed, worthy of censure, but how must one characterize the indifference of the Empire herself to her own interests, which proved fatal not only to her own existence, but also to that of her neighbouring states? She, too, remained a passive witness of the bloody struggle between Turks and Bulgarians, and did not raise even a finger in defence of Bulgaria, her immediate neighbor. The Balkans at this juncture, presented a real political and social chaos. The various states were rent with internal dissensions and strifes. While Bulgaria was being overwhelmed by the Turkish hordes, neither Greeks, Serbians, Roumanians, nor Albanians came to its rescue, for at this very same time these nations presented a typical picture of a house divided against itself: Greeks rose against Greeks, and Serbians against Serbians. Paleologus was engaged in dead earnest against Cantacuzenus whose throne he wished to seize. The latter allied himself with the Turks themselves in order to withstand the ambition of the first. [1]) «Even with the invading Turks at their very doors», says Stanoevitch, [2]) «the Serbians failed to unite in a common struggle against them. They were distracted by home quarrels and warred

[1]) Gibbon, vol. XVII. 90—95.

[2]) *History of the Serbian Nation*, p. 195.

against each other. Russia had risen against Bosnia, Bosnia against Chelma or Zaculmia, and Chelma against Zeta . . . » History repeated itself. This was especially true of the Greeks who at the invasion of Mohammed II manifested the same negative virtues which they displayed at the encroachments of Philip of Macedon two thousand years back. « They (the Greek state), » says Demosthenes in his third Filippic, « looked like those farmers who during a hailstorm each in their hearts made vows to God lest their fields be affected, but none undertook to do anything. That was the greatest indifference possible. » And as through the indifference and disunion of the Greek states Philip's conquest of Greece was made an easy task, so the Turkish inroads and conquests in South-Eastern Europe were effected through the mutual hostilities of the Balkan states. Europe, nevertheless, was not wholly unconcerned with the Turkish military successes upon its own soil. In 1396 the Hungarian King Sigismund, in alliance with many French and Italian knights, led by the Prince of Nevers and Marshal Buzziko, hastened for Bulgaria in order to drive away the Asiatic invaders. After capturing Viddin and Orechovo with the assistance of the Bulgarian garrisons which were stationed there together with a considerable number of Turkish troops, Sigismund reached the city of Nicopolis. Here the allied armies were reinforced by many Bulgarian and Servian volunteers. A terrible struggle followed between Christian Europe and the furious Mohammedan aggressors. At first the fortune smiled on the side of the Christians, but, unhappily, at the critical moment, the Serbian Prince Stephan Lazarevitch [1]) came to the rescue of the Turkish throngs headed by Beyazid I, with the result that the Sultan's armies won the day. Many of the knights were made prisoners, inclu-

[1]) Stanoevitch p. 161.

ding the Prince of Nevers himself, while King Sigismund was barely able to save his life by fleeing across the Danube. In 1440 the Polish King Vladislav who succeeded to the Hungarian throne undertook two expeditions against the Turks. His first expeditionary forces made up of Poles, Magyars, and Czechs, which were subsequently joined by Bulgarians and Serbians, were commanded by the legendary Hungarian chief Hunyadi. The expedition met with success, the Turks were decisively beaten at Temyanetz. Vladislav's second attempt, however, ended disastrously. At Varna in 1444 the Turks led by Sultan Murad came out victorius, while King Vladislav was himself killed in the battle.

Thus, though unfavoured by signal successes, Poles, Magyars, and other European Christians had done their share in the general struggle for the expulsion of the Turks from the Continent.

V.

BULGARIANS UNDER POLITICAL AND SPIRITUAL YOKE.

Attitude of Turks towards Greeks and Bulgarians. — The Patriarch Political Chief of the Christians.— Euthymius Exiled, Patriarch's Metropolitan in Tirnova. — Persecution and Extermination of Learned Men and Leaders. — Christian Peoples in Turkey under Name of Romaioi. — Bulgaria during the XVth and XVIth Centuries. — Turkey Slav Empire — Conversions to Mohammedanism; Rulers. — Greek Renaissance and the Hellenization Idea. — Greek Bishops during the XVIIth Century. — Destruction of Bulgarian Books. — Hellenization. — Cherontes and Ephors at Patriarchate. — Phanar, Sale of Eparchies and Parishes. — Life and Morals of Greek Bishops. — Bulgarian People Unrecognized Officially. — Trying Times for Phanar — Two Periods of the Patriarchate. — Nationality Idea, page 174.

The Turkish invasion in Europe during the XIVth century brought about great revolts among the Balkan states and changed the map of the Balkan Peninsula. The Turks conquered in succession Bulgarians, Serbians, Roumanians, Greeks, and Albanians. The states founded by all these peoples vanished, and in their place arose a strong Ottoman Empire. The Turkish establishment upon the Balkans was detrimental to all the Christian people inhabiting it, but particularly to the Bulgarians. The Greeks, the Serbians, and the Roumanians had, indeed, lost their political independence, but they were able to preserve their spiritual integrity, the Greeks for all times, while the Serbians and Romanians only for a short period. Of all the Balkan peoples the Greeks were the people who most easily ingratiated themselves with their conquerers, making use of the advantageous position thus acquired for the realization of their national ideals. They had lost their political freedom

but retained their church and civil rights. The Constantinople Patriarchy remained intact. It not only strengthened its position, but in addition obtained from the invaders such privileges as it had not enjoyed even under the Byzantine rulers. It now came into possession of a diocese with greater population than had been hitherto recorded. Mohammed II, the conquerer of Constantinople, showed special favour toward it. The chronicles assert that he was personally present at the election of the Patriarch Gennadius Scholarius to the vacant seat of St. Andrew. The elated Turkish Conqueror showed a special magnanimity towards the Greeks. He presented the chosen patriarch with a staff beset with brilliants. Simultaneously he gave him a *berat*[1]) with which he not only sanctioned the rights which the patriarchs enjoyed under the Byzantine Emperors, but even increased them. The Greeks under the name of *Roum Mileti* formed a separate community or organization endowed with full church and civic autonomy, with their Patriarch at its chief. According to Paparrhigopoulo[2]), the Patriarch was recognized as the supreme political head of the Christians. The latter were allowed to enjoy local self-government and to elect their own magistrates. The Turks never considered the Christians as organic members of their Empire, but as so many more vassals and tax-payers. The Government dealt with them through its *Reiz-Effendi* or Foreign Minister who in turn communicated and carried the business correspondence with the Patriarch.

Notwithstanding the above signal privileges accorded to the Greeks by the Ottomans, neither the common Christian subjects, nor the Christian officials and magistrates, nor even the Patriarch himself, were immune from the

[1]) M. D. Hammer, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. I, livre III, p. 246; and

[2]) *Histoire de la civilization hellénique*, p. 392.

arbitrary rule of the sultans. The rayahs were compelled to undergo all sorts of humiliations and provocations, were exiled, had their property confiscated, and their very lives taken at the mere whim, not only of the Sultan, but of the last Turk of the Empire.

To the Patriarchy was attached a Synod with whose members the Patriarch was in constant consultation on important questions. The Patriarchy possessed its own courts of justice. In these courts were examined all devorce and civil suits pertaining to Christians only. The members in the Patriarchal tribunals were chosen from among the clergy and laity. The punishment imposed upon guilty persons consisted of fines, bodily chastisement, and imprisonment. The Patriarch had the right of distributing and imposing of taxes for the support of the Patriarchy and the communities. The legal decisions of the Patriarchy were executed by the Turkish authorities. The ecclesiastical courts established at the bishoprics enforced their judgments in the same manner. The local authorities were enjoined to execute all decisions issuing from the episcopal courts and all dispositions and orders sent out by the bishops. The dioceses were divided into parishes called *Roum-Milets* or «Communities of the Roman People», which were autonomous organizations.[1]) Among their other functions there figured the responsibility of distributing and collecting of state taxes. Equipped with such and so many important rights and privileges, the Patriarchy was able not only to rise in power and significance, but it thus became the eloquent spokesman of the Greek people before the Sultan and his Government. In the Ottoman Empire the Greek Patriarchy was considered not only the head of the Greeks, but of all the other Christian races. «As far

[1]) Ubicini, *Lettre sur la Turquie*, Paris, 1853-54, vol. II, p. 1281 — B. Collas, *La Turquie*, 1861, Paris, pp. 29 und 30.

as the Turks were concerned,» writes Krousse, «all Orthodox peoples, Greeks, Slavs, Albanians, Bulgarians, Roumanians, were known as Romans, ruled by an Orthodox Patriarch.» [1]) This exalted position secured by the Patriarchy gave the Greek people a pre-eminence over the rest of the Christian races of which the Turkish Empire was composed.

The lot of the Bulgarians under the yoke of the Ottoman rulers was perhaps the worst of any of the subjugated peoples. The new changes which had taken place in the Balkans deprived them of both their political and religious freedom. At the fall of Tirnova, the capital of Bulgaria, the Turks sent into exile Patriarch Euthymius together with many boyars and primates. Two hundred years later, in 1767, they abolished the Bulgarian Archbishopric at Ochrida, and the Serbian Patriarchy at Ipek, while their dioceses were turned over to the Constantinople Patriarchy. Thus the design long cherished by the Byzantine Emperors, but which they had failed to realize, was finally effected by the Patriarchy under a foreign regime. The Ottoman rulers so enhanced the influence and power of the Greek Patriarchy that after a short lapse of time it was able to stamp its authority and jurisdiction over all the other Christian races of the Empire. Once obtaining full political control over them, the Greek patriarchs set themselves at the task of instilling the Greek culture, spirit and traditions and of imposing the Greek language upon Bulgarians, Serbians, Roumanians, and Albanians. The Bulgarians were the first to be assailed with this far-reaching policy. The Constantinople Patriarchy, relying on the great confidence the Sultans had in it, hastened to take advantage of its highly privileged position in order to spread its authority over the Bulgarians, the greatest enemies of Hellenism. The

[1]) Pranze Crousse, *La Péninsule grèco-slave*, Bruxelles, 1776, p. 170.

history of the long struggle between Byzantium and Bulgaria served as a strong incentive for the complete subjugation and absorbtion of the stubborn Bulgarian race. Conscious of the historical development of events upon the Balkan Peninsula, and still feeling the smart of the bitter sting inflicted upon it through the rivalry of the two peoples, the Greek — exulting in an extensive culture, and a glorious past, animated by keen pride and haughtiness, now, nevertheless, grown old and weak both physically and morally; the Bulgarian — of inferior civilization, of less outward polish, but, notwithstanding, young, robust and sinewy, in the bloom of its intellectual and bodily faculties, earnest and industrious, and deeply imbued with the thought of keeping, safeguarding and advancing the Slavic ideals, institutions and culture, — the Patriarchy took steps for the destruction of the Bulgarian Kingdom, which soon became an accomplished fact, and sent one of her own prelates as Metropolitan of Tirnova in place of the Bulgarian who was driven away by the new conquerors. As it was already intimated, the Turks after capturing the Bulgarian capital in 1393, exiled the Tirnova Patriarch Euthymius who was the most renowned hierarch, writer, and scholar in the East during the XIVth century. Two years later the Tirnova patriarchal see was already occupied by a Greek, the Moldavian Metropolitan Jeremiah, by orders of the Patriarch of Constantinople. It may not be asserted that Jeremiah followed in the footsteps of the invaders of Bulgaria, but one cannot help being struck with the fact that a foreign patriarch should so soon be sent to lay hand on Bulgaria's highest religious institution. The Roumanian historian professor Jorga throws some light on how this event came to pass.[1]) Basing his evidence on certain documents, he states that in 1392 the Patriarch of Constanti-

[1]) N. Jorga, *Istoria Bisericii Romanesti*, vol. I, pag. 49 and 50.

nople had formally appointed Jeremiah Metropolitan of Moldavia, but it happened that the Moldavian voivode rejected him, sending word to Constantinople that his country had its bishop, Joseph, and that he could not recognize another as such. On that account Jeremiah was compelled to leave Moldavia, against which he pronounced anathema. In 1394 the Patriarch with the sanction of the Turks appointed the same «Metropolitan of Moldavia» bishop of Tirnova in place of Patriarch Euthymius who was exiled for life when the Bulgarian capital succumbed.[1]) In this way, then, was the Tirnova Patriarchy abolished. It is an established fact, moreover, that the Constantinople Patriarchy had always in mind the annihilation of the Bulgarian Church and the invigoration of the Greek race through the Bulgarian element. This view has been corroborated by all foreign writers who have made a special study of the past history of Bulgarians and Greeks.

«In July, 1393,» writes Teploff, «the Turks, after capturing Tirnova, abolished the Bulgarian Patriarchy and exiled Euthymius, its Patriarch. This was a case in which the Turks proved inconsistent with their general policy of preserving the previous order of things and of avoiding to intrude upon the spiritual life of the conquered nations. Therefore, it is more than natural to suppose that the destruction of the Bulgarian church independence was the work of the Constantinople Patriarchy which had always been hostile to the Bulgarian National Church and now left no stone unturned, resorting to all sort of means and intrigues, in order to prejudice the minds of the conquerors against the Tirnova Patriarchal see, and to finally cause its extinction .... At this unexpected turn of events new hopes take possession of the Hellenic breast and in it is

[1]) Drinoff, Vol. II, pp. 109—111. — Ireček, pp. 445—446. — Balastcheff, *Minalo,* Numbers I and II. — Jordan Triphonoff, *The Abolition of the Tirnova Patriarchy,* National Folklore, Num. XXII.

born «the Great Idea» dear to every Greek down to our day. The grand Hellenic ideal consists in this — through a Hellenization of the Balkan nations the enfeebled Greek race might be infused with new vitality which in due time would enable it to crush the Ottoman power, and resuscitate the Ancient Greek Empire in its place. Cherishing such dreams in their hearts, it was very natural that the Greeks should show themselves hostile to any people who stood in the way of their aspirations. The Bulgarians who for centuries disputed the dominion of the Balkans with Byzantium were the greatest barrier to the realization of their imperial designs. On that account the Patriarch who was the pioneer of the Great Hellenic Idea used all efforts to stifle the Bulgarian element in the Ottoman Empire and thus once for all times rid the Greeks of their most dangerous enemy. Failing to check the growth of the Bulgarian race by material means and dint of force, the Greeks at length chose religion as their weapon; the religion was resorted to in the hope of extinguishing the national spirit of that people.» [1]) The idea was grand, its execution, however, did by no means occur during the XIVth century, but much later. There exist evidences that at a local council taken place in Constantinople during the year 1454—1456, and presided by the Patriarch Gennadius Scholarius, a resolution was passed which decreed the abolition of the Tirnova, Ochrida and Ipek patriarchies, and that the decision for the abolition of the Tirnova Patriarchy only was carried out. [2]) Cyprien Robert writes that in 1463 the Tirnova hierarch still continued to style himself «Patriarch of Tirnova and all Bulgaria.» [3]) The same view

[1]) V. Teploff, *the Graeco-Bulgarians Church Question.*

[2]) See also articles on the same subject, by G. Balastcheff and G. Triphonoff.

[3]) Cyprien Robert, *Les slaves de la Turquie*, Paris, 1844, vol. II pp. 284—585. — Drinoff, vol. II, p. 110.

is held also by Drinoff on the basis of Latin manuscripts. But that is an item of small importance. What is really important is the fact that the hierarchical cathedral at Tirnova was not occupied by a Bulgarian prelate, and that the Tirnova Patriarchy, even if it were abolished during the XVth or XVIth century, practically did not any more exist as a Bulgarian institution. And from that day in which an alien sets foot on the Tirnova Patriarchal seat, and especially after the privileges given to the Constantinople Patriarchy by Mohammed II, the Bulgarian people ceases to exist officially as a personality, church, and community. The exact date of the formal subordination of the Tirnova Patriarchy to that of Constantinople may interest the historian only, but as far as the intellectual and spiritual life of the Bulgarian nation is concerned, this fact is of paramount significance, namely, that to the Bulgarians the Tirnova Patriarchy is no more the centre of culture which used to spread light and instil national self-consciousness, not only in every corner of their own land, but out of it — in Serbia, Roumania, and Russia. That centre of Bulgarian political, intellectual, and religious activity was no more. Of still less consequence is to know exactly what Bulgarian bishoprics had remained under the Ochrida Archbishopric: the see of that Bulgarian Archbishopric was also long ago hellenized. Its hierarchs bore only the title «Bulgarian Archbishop», but the archbishops themselves, with few exceptions, and especially after the complete conquest of the Peninsula, were either Greeks, or hellenized Bulgarians. In a word, as soon as Patriarch Gennadius Scholarius was recognized with «berat» as the political chief of the «Roum-Mileti», under which appellation were included all the Orthodox Christians on the Peninsula, the Bulgarians cease to exist as a nation. And, indeed, once the capital of Bulgaria destroyed, that centre of culture which was at the same time the home of the

Patriarchy, the greatest civilizing institution of the country, the Bulgarians find themselves deprived of the unitive agency and paternal care of their own state; with their Patriarch expelled from the land and his seat occupied by a Greek bishop subordinate to the Constantinople Patriarchy, they are left without the patronage of their religious chief and without their representative and spokesman before the Turkish government; with their teachers and learned men forced out of the country or exterminated, they remain without leaders, without a guiding idea, and a standard; the boyars and the leading Bulgarians having fled or having been killed, the community which held them together and looked after their social and intellectual wants, is shattered; once their monasteries and libraries stamped out, the Bulgarians are despoiled of the last means of enlightenment.

Ireček [1]) says that many of the prominent inhabitants of Tirnova were treacherously put to death, while a great number of them were compelled to embrace Mohammedanism. Russian chronicles state that Patriarch Euthymius, together with a group of metropolitans, bishops, and magnates, was exiled. His pupils were dispersed, and some of them who fled to Russia, Serbia, and Roumania, carried with themselves a great many Bulgarian books, which fact reminds us of the Greek scholars who at the fall of Constantinople took to the West the ancient classics. «After the fall of Bulgaria», writes Stanoevitch,[1]) «where in spite of its agonizing existence during the last ten years the Bulgarian literature and science had been prospering under the direction of its learned Patriarch Euthymius, a considerable number of his pupils sought refuge in the country of Lazarus' sons, where they found warm reception and encouragement, especially at the court

[1]) Ireček, pp. 443—446. — Drinoff, Vol. II, p. 109.

of Stephan Lazarevitch.» [1]) The Roumanian Professor Jorga asserts the same thing in regard to those of Euthymius' pupils who fled to Wallachia. Thousands of Bulgarians saved themselves by flight abroad. Hundreds of families, following in the footsteps of the boyars and clergy, crossed the boundaries over to Roumania, Hungary, and Serbia. Some of them reached as far as Italy. It is recorded that during the XVth century in the kingdom of Naples there was found a score of Bulgarians who occupied high posts. [2]) Bulgarians were found also in some of the other Italian kingdoms. In Bulgaria itself the people fled to the mountains, abandoning their demolished cities and devastated plains. Thus many new towns sprang in the mountain fastnesses. [3]) As it was already mentioned, even the monasteries, those centres of culture and letters, were not spared by the invader: many of them, as well as many Bulgarian churches, were robbed and converted to ruins. Bulgaria's greatest sanctuary, the Rilo Monastery, was destroyed and its monks and inmates scattered. Only the temple and the tower of Chrel escaped demolition. The Turkish invasion created a veritable cataclysm: it ruined and swept away all monuments, institutions, and vestiges of intellectual life. Those of the unfortunate inhabitants who were left behind in the cities and villages felt as stupefied. It took them a long time to recover from the shock. The catastrophy was a terrible one. It affected everything and everybody in Bulgaria, for the Bulgarians had lost their state, their Church, and the most cultured members of their communities. The blow proved to be a deadly one. They fell under two yokes — political and spiritual, and under two masters — Turks and Greeks. The former assumed the right of disposing of their property

[1]) *History of the Serbian Nation*, pp. 164, 165. — *Istoria Bisericii Românesti*, Vol. I, pp. 49—55.

[2]) Drinoff, Vol. I, p. 84.

[3]) Ireček, p. 453.

and life —, the latter — of their soul and national self-consciousness.

Very little is known about the life of the Bulgarians under the Turks during the first two centuries of their conquest of the Peninsula. It has been shown that it took the new rulers of the Balkans a long time to colonize the occupied regions. The conquest of the Peninsula was followed by the colonization of one million of Turks in Thrace.[1]) In order to increase the number of the Mussulmans, the Christians in many places were forced to embrace Mohammedanism. But the Turkish colonies and religious conversions could not change the ethnical character of the Peninsula. Its new masters had destroyed the cities and the Christian centres of culture, had usurped the throne of the Balkan kings, but in turn had brought no culture and no state organization of their own to replace them. They brought over with them only their splendid military organization, on which depended their strength, and were content to preserve the old order of thing in the countries which they conquered. Rambaud is justified in saying that the Turks affected but one alteration on the Balkan Peninsula — they changed the Christian *Basileus* to *Sultan*. Everything else was left as it was found. In Bulgaria they retained not only the old administrative institutions, but for a long time employed the Bulgarian language as an official medium.[2]) Thus for two centuries the Turkish administration availed itself of the Bulgarian tongue and terminology.[3]) The governer of Tirnova, Sofia, and other districts was called *Voivoda*. An idea of the condition[4]) of our forefathers during this period may be obtained from a description given by Vladislav Gramatik, found in a manuscript in which the author tells how sacred relics of

[1]) Rambaud, p. XIV.
[2]) Drinoff, Vol. I, p. 524; Vol. II, p. 45.
[3]) Ireček, p. 568. — Prof. Dr. Ishirkoff, Sofia, p. 44.
[4]) Ireček, pp. 470—472.

Ivan of Rilo were removed from Tirnova to the Rilo Monastery in 1469. From that document is seen that during the XVth century there were still to be found some boyars who had preserved their property and position, and that in the country a limited religious freedom was tolerated. Three brothers, Josaph, David, and Theophan, of boyar descent, had turned monks and restored the Rilo Monastery. The same brothers through the influence of Maria, the daughter of George Brancovitch, and wife of Murad II, succeeded in obtaining permission of the Sultan to remove from Tirnova the relics of St. Ivan of Rilo. The Tirnova citizens refused to give them up, so the city magistrate had to interfere and the Sultan's order was executed. The carrying of the sacred relics from Tirnova to Rilo Monastery was a real triumph for the Christians. In the city of Nikopolis, situated at the river Rossitza, the relics and the monks who carried them were solemnly received by the local magnate and boyars. The magnate opened wide his palace to the monks, and his palace-chapel to the coffin containing the relics. Mass was said at which all the inhabitants, women and children included, were present. The magnate gave a general feast, at which he himself, bareheaded, together with his servants waited on the guests, and only late in the night took his seat with them at the table. Their joy knew no bounds. The people sang church hymns. The next day the magnate, after presenting the monks with rich gifts, accompanied them together with his boyars as far as the river Ossem. In the same glorious manner were the relics received in Sofia where they were deposited in the Church of St. George. On the seventh day a large multitude of men, women, and children, many of the inhabitants riding their horses, came out to send them off, escorting them four stadiums out of the city, while the boyars and clergy accompanied them clear to Loeshnitza. At the river called Gherman the Abbot David of the Rilo

Monastery and a large throng of people were long waiting to meet them. All this shows that in the country more lenient times had set in.

The Ottoman Empire ethnically was more Slavic than Turkish or Greek, and was ruled, especially during the XVIth century by converted Slavs. The Grand Vizier during the first part of that century was Mehmed Sokolovitch, a Herzegovinian by birth, who re-established the Ipek Patriarchy and extended its diocese. During his viziership one half of the members of the Imperial Council were Mohammedan Slavs. The beylerbeys, admirals, and governors were also, almost all of them, Slavs. During the latter half of the same century the greatest influence upon the Sultan was exerted by three viziers again of Slav descent. One of them was a Bulgarian re-christened Mehmed. The Slavic tongue was spoken not only in the Royal Council, but in the Sultan's court also. Sultan Selim II had a good knowledge of the Slavic language. Bassano asserts that Selim II considered the mastery of this language indispensible since it was used in Dalmatia, Serbia, Bosnia, Albania, Thessaly, Peloponnesus, as well as in Bulgaria, Thrace, Wallachia, and farther north, in Poland, Russia, Bohemia, and Ukraine. Many of the official documents of the Sultans were written in the Cyrillic alphabet of the Slavic tongue. The Turkish charters granted to the Dobrovichani during the XVth and XVIth centuries, as well as the correspondence of the Turkish beys and pashas, were written in Slavic. [1]) The corps of Janissaries used the same language. The official correspondence with the Venetians, on the other hand, was carried in Greek.

«The Turks», according to Paparrhigopoulo, «believed that the Mussulman fanaticism was especially strong among the neophytes and that it weakened with the future

[1]) Iraček, pp. 469, 563, 564.

generations. For this reason they preferred individual conversions to Mohammedanism, provided they were constantly kept up, because in that way they were able to maintain its moral strength principally in their own communities. In order to realize that plan, it had been decided, as early as the days of Orchan, to recruit the Janissaries' corps exclusively from Christian renegades. No one of Mussulman descent was eligible to this extraordinary military organization. Later on Mohammed II, the Conquerer of Constantinople, went still further in his zeal to infuse Christian blood into his empire. Thus, he bequeathed to his descendants the strong advice and charge to intrust the highest state posts and distinctions preferably to renegades. And it is remarkable to notice that as long as the members of the Janissaries' corps, as well as the higher dignitaries — viziers, generals, admirals, etc., were so selected, which custom continued down to the XVIIth century, the Empire grew in power and prestige, and that its decline began from the day when the elite of the Ottoman army and the ruling class were chosen from among the Mussulmans. Of course, there are other causes responsible for the subsequent retrogration of the Turkish Empire, but the splendid military exploits of the Turks during the previous centuries were undoubtedly due to the Christian contingents incorporated into the army and to the management of state affairs by men of alien descent. Any how, the Turks never resorted to wholesale conversions to Mohammedanism; they preferred to make use of the Christians according to well established rules. » [1])

There also existed an idea for the hellenization of the Bulgarians and the other races on the Balkan Peninsula. That idea was conceived by the Constantinople Patriarchy much later on, in the XVIIIth century. Its author was

[1]) *Histoire de la Civilization hellénique*, pp 190 and 391.

Samuel, one of the most noted scholars and most energetic patriarchs during the period of Turkish dominion. With him begins the renaissance of the Greek nation and the hellenization of Bulgarians, Roumanians, Albanians, and Serbians. Being a friend and great patron of the Greek literary men, he tried to develop in the Greek a taste for literature and science. Under his care and through his encouragement were translated into Greek the new classics of Europe.[1]) As a prelude to hellenization was the abolition of the Bulgarian archbishopric at Ochrida and of the Serbian patriarchy at Ipek. After long and incessant efforts, Samuel in 1797 succeeded in wresting from the Sultan a berat by which the independence of the Ochrida and Ipek sees was suspended and their eparchies turned over to the diocese of the Constantinople Patriarchy. After this signal success, a great effort was made towards the promotion of school education and enlightenment of the Greek people through reorganization of the Greek schools, encouragement of Greek literature, and establishment of Greek printing-press throughout the Empire. The Patriarchy becomes a centre of culture, the home of learned men, pedagogues, and writers. At the head of the Greek renaissance stood in the XVIIIth century Eugene Bulgaris, a hellenized Bulgarian[2]) and the most erudite Greek scholar of that period, who was afterwards made Archbishop of Cherson in Russia. He reformed the Greek schools by introducing into them the sciences and the western pedagogical methods.

[1]) G. Shassiotis. *L'instruction publique chez les grecs*, Paris, 1881, p. 30. — D. M. Brancoff (D. Misheff), *La Macédoine et sa population chrétienne*, Paris, 1905, p. 51.

[2]) A. Lebedoff, *Ancient and Modern Russia, Eugene Bulgaris, Slavic Archbishop of Cherson*, p. 210; *Russian Encyclopaedic Dictionary* by Brokhaus and Ephron, Vol. 21, p. 413.

The Greek Patriarchy, indeed, had succeeded in renovating the Greek schools within the Ottoman Empire, but had failed to give them an organization in harmony with the age and its requirements. To its indisputable influence, however, it must be admitted, is due the preservation of all Greek schools in the principal cities of the European and Asiatic Turkey. The modern Head School at Phanar in Constantinople was founded as early as 1480, when after the fall of the Byzantine capital it rose upon the ruins of the Greek higher schools. Its principal in 1504 was Manuel Koryptos, a celebrated theologian, philosopher, and orator. The establishment of the Phanariote school was followed by opening gymnasiums at Janina, 1532,[1]) Moschopolis, and Athos, which turned out enlightened monks who devoted themselves to teaching in the various cities of the Empire. At Athens, as well as in the island of Chios, the educational institutions were never closed up. The Pathmos gymnasium was dedicated in 1500, that of Kojani — in 1746, that of Salonica — in 1760, the full gymnasium of Adrianople — in 1819, and the progymnasium of Philippopolis — at about the same time. A Greek gymnasium and an acadamy were founded at Bucarest in 1558, and a gymnasium in Jassy in the year 1648. According to Athanassius of Naussa, there existed in 1706 about forty Greek schools in Epirus, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Peloponnesus. Choladius writes that in 1714 gymnasiums were flourishing in every Greek town. In the preface of his dictionary, published in 1757, George Constantine says: «The number of the Greek schools existing today is a most eloquent argument against the assertion that the Greeks had sunk into great ignorance. There are two schools in Constantinople, three in Janina, two in Salonica, two in Bucarest, one in Jassy, and one

[1]) G. Shassiotis, pp. 32—36. — D. M. Brancoff, pp. 50—51.

each in Adrianople, Philippopolis, Athos, Veria, Castoria, and Satishta.»

At Mt. Athos in the days of Patriarch Cyril was laid the foundation of an Academy whose first president was Eugene Bulgaris. That event was one of greatest significance for the Greek people. Bulgaris succeeded in elevating the institution to such a prestige[1]) and importance as it has never enjoyed since. There Bulgaris taught philosophy, literature, and theology, but in general he tried to infuse in it the spirit of Western learning. Under his presidency the Academy numbered two hundred students, the largest enrolment in its history. To Bulgaris and his disciples the new literary Greek language owes its origin. Before going to Athos this great educator was in succession principal of the gymnasiums of Janina and Kojani where he taught mathematics. From Mt. Athos he was called to Constantinople to take charge of the school of Phanar.

The primary and normal Greek schools, too, were effected by the educational movement and reform. The monk Cosmas of Aetolia, a student of Bulgaris at the Academy, was the greatest pioneer for the reorganization of the general school-system in the Greek schools. He was so enthusiastic in his work that he loved to go about and teach and preach the new learning to the people, addressing them in a pure and simple language. Between the years 1760 and 1779 he visited ancient Roumelia, Thrace, Macedonia, Aetolia, Epirus, and Akarnania. In a letter written to his brother in 1779, Cosmas says that he had opened thirty high and about two hundred primary schools. Towards the later part of the XVIIIth century the Greek schools were officially and solemnly recognized by the Turkish government. Sultan Selim III with an autho-

[1]) G. Shassiotis, pp. 30—31. — Paparrhigopoulo, p. 415.

graphed decree appointed Dimitrius Monroussis chief inspector of all the Greek schools and hospitals. Thus publicly sanctioned, the Greek educational institutions increased fast in number, and Greek learning received a powerful impetus. In 1780 the Missolonghi gymnasium under the directorship of Palamas counted three hundred students, that of Chios, under Proio, Vambas, Bardalakos — seven hundred, among whom two hundred foreigners; that of Zydonia — three hundred, that in Pathmos — two hundred, and the gymnasium of Bucarest, under the directorship of Ducas — four hundred students. In Chios, Bucarest, Janina, and Athens there were a large number of Bulgarian students.

Meanwhile printing-presses were established at Mount Athos, Salonica, Melnik, Moschopolis, and other towns. In 1610 a library and a school were opened at the monastery of St. Naoum under the direction of Constantine Moschopolitis. During the same year a printing-press, too, was added, in which the teachers had their text-books printed. But also other books were printed there. Of the Greek schools the most celebrated were those of Janina, Bucarest and the island of Chios. The school at Janina turned out teachers. Thus equiped with schools, teachers and workers, the Constantinople Patriarchy set itself in earnest to bring about the realization of the great ideal of the Greek emperors — the establishment of Greek superiority and predominance on the Balkan Peninsula through an assimilation and absorption of the other Christian races. To effect this end it had at its disposal a whole army, as well as army chiefs. The host of teachers and merchants made its army, while the metropolitans and bishops were its chiefs.

Louis la Croix, *L'Univers, Histoire et description de tous les peuples. Iles de la Grèce*, Paris, 1853, pp. 290—292. — Shassiotis, pp. 30—35.

The Bulgarians who had lost both their political and religious liberty gradually became subordinate to the Patriarchy of Constantinople. The Bulgarians felt their spiritual bondage less during the first two centuries of the Turkish dominion than was the case during the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries. Though it had extensive rights over the Bulgarians, the Patriarchy at first was satisfied with the nominal usurpation of the Bulgarian diocese; it sent its own bishops to take charge of the Bulgarian bishoprics mainly with the purpose of exercising an authority over them and of augmenting its incomes. Its representatives in Bulgaria during the XVIth and XVIIth centuries were as a rule men of small education, often common and illiterate Greeks. One of the metropolitans sent to Adrianople was altogether unlettered.[1]) The Phanariote bishops had but one care — how to rob and plunder their diocese and how to amass great fortunes, and that in the name of their religious prerogatives. The people were cold to them, never liked them, and always avoided them, for they were forced upon them. The Greek prelates were able to retain their posts in Bulgaria through the interference of the Turkish authorities. Bogdan Bakshitch in his report to the Roman congregation in 1640, in speaking of the Sofia archbishopric and remarking that his diocese counted fifteen hundred parishes, the monasteries and churches excluded, says that the archbishops had been always Greeks, while the population was Bulgarian.[2]) The Catholic archbishop Peter Bogdan writes that the Greek metropolitans in Bulgaria, escorted by Janissaries, visited the villages to levy the bishop's tax, ill-treating and imprisoning those who were unable to pay, robbing others of whatever they found

[1]) Jordan Ivanoff, *Greek Bulgarian Relations before the Church Struggle*, Sofia, 1912, p. 160.

[2]) Prof. A. Ishirkoff, *The City of Sofia during the XVIIth Century*, Sofia, 1912, p. 76.

in their houses, and committing «a thousand improper acts.» The population was inspired with great fear of the Greek bishops, and especially, their extortions. How much they dreaded them may be judged from the following fact handed down by Francesco Soimirovitch, Ochrida Catholic Archbishop. Failing to win to Catholicism the Paulicians at Lovetch, Soimiroitch threatened them that be would turn them over to the Greek bishop. That frightened the Paulicians who begged of him to allow them time to think his poposals over.[1]) In this manner he succeeded later on to convert them. Through their fear of the Greek bishops the Turkish government was enabled to hold the Bulgarians in obedience and to keep close watch upon them. In this way it was saved from the unnecessary expense of keeping big garrisons in the country. «The Sultan», writes Cyprien Robert, «found it more expedient to have the distant Bulgarian churches governed by creatures of the Greek Patriarch... This ecclesiastical centralization proved a success: it saved the Turks the trouble to establish a political centralization. During that time the churches in Bulgaria were ruled by Greek bishops who were ever indifferent to their needs and local interests. Their only motive in coming to Bulgaria was to get rich and to return home to spend the amassed wealth together with their families. They were not familiar with the language of their flock.»[2]) These facts are confirmed by Kousineri.[3])

Having obtained full control over the Bulgarian eparchies and parishes, the Greek bishops, all devotees of the Hellenic idea, begin to encroach upon the most sacred objects of the Bulgarian people — its churches, schools, language, literature, and nationality. In doing this they

[1]) N. N. Mileff, *The Catholic Propaganda in Bulgaria during the XIIIth century*, Sofia, 1914, pp. 49—51.

[2]) *Les Slaves de la Turquie*, Paris, 1844, Vol. II, pp. 286—287.

[3]) *Voyage dans la Macédoine*, Paris, 1828, Vol. I, p. 159.

touched upon the most tender spot in the body of the nation. In Bulgaria there set in an era of darkness, oppression, and cruel persecution. Its clergy, educators, and leading men, the defenders of the people, its name and language, were hunted down, calumniated, exiled and many of them exterminted. The metropolitans, availing, themselves of the patriarchal privileges, acted as judges and sentenced to imprisonment and incarceration the intelligent and more enlightened Bulgarians. The persecution instituted by the patriarchal agents was most bitter against the use of the Bulgarian language, literature, and especially, against Slavic liturgy. Slavic books and church service in the Slavic language were rejected from all metropolitan centres. Gradually, church service began to be officiated in the Hellenic, the Bulgarian language in the community gave place to the Greek, and soon the Bulgarian parishes were renamed « Roum-Mileti ». All sorts of means were resorted to in order to destroy every vestige of Bulgarian self-conciousness, as well as every relic which might remind the Bulgarians of their past greatness, or incite them toward freedom and independence. Bulgarian monuments, literature, and institutions, were destroyed systematically wherever found. How great that destruction was and to what extent the Greek bishops were responsible for it may be judged from the testimony of foreign historians.

« In 1823 », writes Ireček, [1]) « the Sofia Greek metropolitan had discovered that in the village church of Tzerovina, Berkovitza district, were found ancient Bulgarian manuscripts and frescoes. He ordered the villagers to dig a ditch and throw all of them into it. Accidentally, only three manuscripts escaped this fate, being concealed by the village priest. The Greek bishop of Shoumen did the same thing in 1840 at the village of Titcha where he was

[1]) *History of the Bulgarians*, pp. 643—645.

called to consecrate the local church. There his attention was attracted by many ancient Bulgarian manuscripts which he, too, ordered in his presence to be dug in. The manuscripts of Stara-Zagora shared the same doom. At the monastery of Zograph, founded by Bulgarian Kings, the Greeks destroyed nearly all Slavic manuscripts, some of which were burned, while others were cast into the sea. The Slavic codexes found in the monastery of Xenophon at Mt. Athos were also devoured by the waves. The monks of the Vatoped monastery at Mt. Athos heated their bread-ovens with Slavic manuscripts, as did the inmates of St. John monastery, near Serres. Dyonissius, the Greek abbot of St. Naoum monastery, situated near the Ochrida lake, caused to be burned all the Slavic manuscripts found there. Those were the last remnants of Slavic literature which, according to authentic evidences, were burned by the Greek clergy during the last century. It is an established fact that the auto-da-fe of the Bulgarian manuscripts was done systematically from the XVth to the XIXth century inclusive.

The library of the Tirnova Patriarchy also was turned over to the flames. Drinoff asserts that according to tradition the books of that library, which had remained intact down to the beginning of the XIXth century, were converted to ashes in the year 1828, at the bidding of the Tirnova Metropolitan Hilarion, a Greek by birth. Ireček gives a guarded explanation of this fact. [1]) According to his statement, Hilarion was an enlightened and scholarly divine whose name is closely connected with Bulgarian education and literature. It was he who had at his own expense sent to Bucarest Neophyte of Rilo in order to master the Lancaster method with a view to introducing it into the Bulgarian schools. At his request Neophyte translated the

[1]) Drinoff, Vol. II, p. 132.

New Testament into Bulgarian. The translation was later on published by the American Bible Society with the sanction and benediction of Metropolitan Hilarion. Professor Shishmanoff,[1]) relying on these two facts, supposes that the implication of Hilarion's name in the story of the burning of the Tirnova library is without foundation. His opinion is that future investigation will confirm the falsity of the imputation, will rehabilitate the Metropolitan and enrol him among the great religious educators and friends of Bulgarian learning and letters. That happy exception is not the only one among the Greek pastors in Bulgaria. Suffice here to mention the name of the Greek Paissius, the Philippopolis Metropolitan, which is so intimately connected with the successful solution of the Bulgarian Church question. True to his principles and religious convictions, the noble prelate worked, suffered, and passed through extremely trying experiences in his zeal for the triumph of justice.

With their books, manuscripts, and sacred souvenirs so wantonly destroyed, the Bulgarians found themselves severed from their past. It remained for time to obliterate the remaining remembrances of its great history. The Greek bishops, moreover, did not cease in their nefarious work to undermine and completely blot out the Bulgarian national spirit and element. After they had succeeded in doing away with the Tirnova Patriarchy and Ochrida Archbishopric, and after the burning of the Bulgarian books, the efforts of the emissaries of the Constantinople Patriarchy were directed toward the hellenization of the Bulgarian schools and churches. Here, too, they were successful. For hundreds of years in the majority of the Bulgarian towns the church-language was the Greek. The people, naturally, did not understand the Hellenic tongue in which

[1]) Dr. Iv. Shishmanoff, *New Datas about the History of our Renaissance. — America's Rôle in our Renaissance,* Sofia, 1898, pp. 11, 12.

the church service was said, neither did they understand the official documents, many of which were written in the same tongue. In order to obtain a place in the parish and to be understood by the Greek clergy, the Bulgarian notables were obliged to take up the study of the Greek language. The knowledge of Greek, at first a necessity, later on was considered an accomplishment and sign of nobility. The Bulgarian who was a master of it was liked and respected by the Bishop. The Bishop's mansion was always open to him. In the communes Greek was the official medium. The members of the town councils gradually introduced it into their homes. And since man's vanity is stronger than his common sense, those of the families who spoke Greek styled themselves noble, in distinction from those who were strangers to it and were considered simple and ordinary. «The hellenization of the Bulgarians», says Ireček, «reached its culminating point during the first twenty five years of the XIXth century. Whoever did not know Greek, or whoever did not season his speech with Greek phrases and sentences, did not pass for an educated person. They went so far as to identify the term man with that of Greek.» [1]) The communes were the greatest disseminators of the Greek tongue and culture. That continued for more than two centuries. All who were connected with the official life learned Greek and were imbued with the Greek spirit which they imparted to their households. The townships were, so to speak, a baptismal font in which the leading Bulgarians were dipped and transformed into ardent adherents to Hellenic language and ways. Generations after generations went through this process of gradual hellenization. The representatives of these generations were apostles of Greek culture in the home, the village, and the town. The speedy growth of the number of Greek schools greatly facilitated

[1]) *History of the Bulgarians*, p. 638.

the Greek cause. In nearly all the Bulgarian towns and cities the schools were Greek. Through these educational agencies passed several generations. These institutions yearly turned out a large number of merchants, priests, etc., who were to a large extent hellenized. In the Church, in the commune, and in the school, as well as in the more prominent families, only Greek was used. Bulgarian was spoken only by the populace on the market place and at home. The rich and leading Bulgarians not only knew and spoke Greek, but thought and worked as Greeks. The majority of Bulgarian merchants and notables at home and abroad, at Odessa, Bucarest, Brailla, Vienna, Temešvar, etc., spoke Greek, called themselves Greeks, and considered themselves descendents of Pericles. The Bulgarian writer and revolutionary Rakowsky in his work «*Forest Traveller*» cites the following inscription in Greek which he had seen in the Greek Church at Temešvar in Austro-Hungary. *The Hellene Zlatko from Gabrovo near the Balkan* (Mountain). Hellenized Bulgarians became ardent promoters of Greek schools. Thus well-to-do Bulgarian merchants living in Russia, Roumania, and Austria, opened and supported in purely Bulgarian towns Greek schools where the teachers were born Greeks or hellenized Bulgarians. In general, the local pride and national self-consciousness in the principal cities fell so low that the better class of Bulgarians were ashamed to be known as such. Some of them even felt offended when called «Bulgarians». How deeply rooted Hellenization was in Bulgaria may be judged from the fact that at the time of the Greek Revolution (1821—1827) the Turks persecuted the hellenized Bulgarian notables and merchants who behaved as staunch Greeks and were members of Greek revolutionary organizations. Not only in Athens, Missolonghi, and in the Greek Islands, but also in Bulgarian towns such as Tirnova, Svistow, Roustchouk, Vidin, Tulcea, etc., gibbets

were erected on which were executed many prominent Bulgarians. Many Bulgarians even took an active part in the Greek movement and gladly shed their blood for the liberation of the Greek people which they considered their own. They looked upon Greece as their own country. The Greek Revolution counts many Bulgarian chiefs and warriors among its heroic fighters. The exploits of these have been sung side by side with those of the Greek champions.

The Bulgarian Hadji Christo of Stara-Zagora was the commander of the Bulgarian rough-riders; and Hadji Stephtcho of Ochrida — of the Bulgarian volunteers, who in 1827 formed a very strong contingent of the Greek revolutionary forces in the struggle for independence which the Bulgarians called «Zavera». Marco Bodjar, later on known as Marco Bozzaris of Vodena, was another Bulgarian who became a legendary hero in the Greek Revolution. Spiridon Tricoupis, father of the late Greek minister, in his *History of Modern Greece*[1]) gives out the following historical fact about the first two warriors:

«Dramali Pasha, one of the best generals of the Sultan, invades Greece with a large force. The Greek leaders, instead of checking his advance which this time is more furious than the previous ones, divide themselves into two hostile sides in north Peloponnessus, ready to dash into a civil war. The question which kept them apart was the claim of some of them to promotion to the rank of general which was denied them. They were about to attack each other when suddenly there rushed between the two hostile camps two Bulgarian voivodes, Hadji Christo, at the head of Bulgarian cavalry, and Hadji Stephtcho — of Bulgarian infantry, and turning to the

[1]) Joan Philemon, *Athènes*, Vol. I. — A. Shopoff, *Union of the Balkans*, Sofia, 1915, pp. 11—14.

foolish patriots who were about to throw themselves at each other's throats, addressed them as follows: 'We crossed mountains and valleys, we and our comrades came to you to assist you in the struggle for the Cross and the Greek nation. We did not ask any remuneration whatever for our services. Should you wish to acknowledge any obligation of gratitude on your part, we beg this one favour for the help we believe to have rendered you — to shoot us all before you kill each other, for we can not survive the shame of seeing you rent up by internal quarrels, and this in the sublime moment of the war for the liberation of your country.'»

Tricoupis adds: «Thanks to the interference of those two noble souls, and to them in particular, the leaders of the two camps, cooled down, came to their senses, and reconciled each other in order to be able once more to ward off the danger which threatened to deprive them of the fruit of so many bloody struggles.»

During the XVIIIth and the beginning of the XIXth century many Bulgarians who had passed through the Greek schools considered themselves Greeks. These Bulgarians in after time had forgotten all about their native tongue, their history and traditions. One of them, who made a name for himself not only in the Greek Renaissance, but in the European literature as well, is the already mentioned Greek educator, Eugene Bulgaris. Many of these hellenized Bulgarians were great patriots, but were lacking national self-consciousness. The Greek church had succeeded in dulling their race-feeling by ingrafting into them the Greek spirit and love for the fatherland of the Greeks, and teaching them to look upon it as their own country.

Basil Apriloff, the greatest Bulgarian patriot and benefactor, who made his name immortal through his bequests to the schools of his native town of Gabrovo,

passed for Greek in Odessa where he resided. He was even the treasurer of the Revolutionary Committee in that city. Bucarest, Brailla, Vienna, and other European cities gave refuge to a considerable number of Bulgarians, merchants and others, some of whom had completely severed their relations with their native country.

In most Bulgarians towns the notables, merchants, and landed proprietors, were hellenized, but in the industrial and working class of the people Hellenism met with great resistance. The bitterest opposition to the hellenizing idea was shown by the village folk. Nearly all Bulgarian villages and a considerable number of the Bulgarian monasteries remained firm to the last against the Greek influence. [1])

Though strong in the cities, Hellenism was powerless to make its way among the peasant class which was by nature reserved, cautious, unyielding, and extremely distrustful. Two other obstacles hindered the success of the Greek cause in the Bulgarian villages — the plains and the mountains. Besides, in those days nobody ever thought of enlightening and educating the peasantry.

The Greek village clergy, proverbial for its ignorance, would have been the last to be inspired with such an idea. Then, too, the Greek clergy had an aversion towards the Bulgarian village population and looked upon it with contempt. They did not consider the Bulgarians as human beings. [2])

---

[1]) Friar Parthenius, *Wanderings and Travels in Mt. Athos in European Turkey*, Moscau, 1856, second Edition, Vol. II, p. 51: »In the cities the priests who are Greeks do not allow the Bulgarians to read and sing in Slavic, neither their children to learn it. But in the villages, in spite of the interdiction of the Greek priest, they continue to read in Slavic.» p. 5: «In Tatar-Pazardjik (1842) the morning service was read in Greek. All the Christians are Bulgarians who do not understand Greek .... In the villages is read in Slavic.»

[2]) J. J. Mileff, *The Catholic Propaganda in Bulgaria*, Sofia, 1914, p. 80.

In the eyes of the Greek bishops the village population was a dumb flock of sheep created only to be fleeced. And they did fleece it clear to the skin. For centuries the Bulgarian population was robbed in the name of the privileges accorded to the Greek clergy. All clericals, from the Patriarch down to the last village priest, preyed upon both the purse and the granary of the peasant. All agents of the Greek Patriarch were addicted to extortion and plunder. The ill-gotten gains thus acquired helped to adorn Phanar with numerous palacial structures and to fill them with immense wealth. Many families were thus enabled to rise in importance and to play a great part in state affairs. Banking houses were created at Phanar which supplied with loans the Turkish rulers themselves. At the Phanar Exchange could be bought and sold all that pertained to the Greek Patriarchy: parishes, churches, monasteries, eparchies, metropolitan dioceses, and even the office of patriarch. The patriarchy, bishoprics, monasteries, and churches were treated as farms which were leased for a definite period of time. The venders were the synodal priests from among whom the «cherontia» were selected, while the buyers were the aspirers to the patriarchal seat and the metropolitan cathedra. The bankers or userers were the very «cheronts» who constituted a special institution under the name of «ephoria», while their clients were the candidates for the patriarch's throne and the metropolitanate. The members of the «cherontia» were in fact the metropolitans of the five eparchies adjoining Constantinople, namely: those of Heracleia, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Nicaea, and Chalcedon. Later on three more metropolitans were added — those of Dercos, Ephesus, and Caesarea. Taking advantage of the brevity of office[1]) who held by those

[1]) Gregory Troubezkoi, *Vestnik Europi, Russia and the Occumenical Patriarchy after the Crimean War*, 1901, Numbers 4, 5, 6, pp. 589, 590, 591.

occupied the patriarchal seat, the cheronts appropriated to themselves the right of permanent membership in the Synod. The entire management of the Constantinople Church was in their hands: they chose or dismissed the patriarchs at will and preferred to have this uncertain post occupied not by themselves, but by their tools.

The Cherontia established at the Oecumencal Patriarchy gave birth to the Ephoralty. That was another institution founded by the cheronts. Its creation served to further their own individual interests only. Availing themselves of their permanent residency in Constantinople they in the course of time assumed the right to represent whole provinces which contained several eparchies each. The cheronts were a sort of spiritual rulers of these provinces, while the bishops who owed their appointment to them were their vassals. Every one of the bishops borrowed money of the Ephoralty in order to pay for his investiture. The rate of interest he was compelled to pay the Ephoralty was very high. The prime object, therefore, of the bishop, as soon as he reached his diocese, was to take steps for a speedy collection of vast sums from his flock for the reimbursement of his debts. Later on he had to think of providing yearly gifts for the members of the Ephoralty as well as for other influential persons. The system of selling the ecclesiastical posts to the highest bidder introduced by the Phanariot authorities drove the diocesan prelates to resort to most revolting forms and methods of extortion.

The Patriarch, as well as every metropolitan, whose tenure of office was liable to be interrupted at any moment, made every effort to enrich himself and insure his future in case of dismissal. Both the patriarchs and the cheronts appeared as competitors at the Phanar Exchange. To them the bishoprics, especially the Bulgarian ones, were what the tithe was to the State: as the State sold

the tithe to the highest bidder among the laity, so the Patriarchy sold its various posts to the highest bidder among the clergy — the eparchies to bishops, the churches to church-wardens, and the monasteries to abbots. Some of the richest bishoprics commanded fabulous prices. If the successful candidate for one of them was unable to advance the entire sum at once, he could make up the deficiency by having recourse to the Phanar banking institutions where he was readily supplied with the necessary funds at the usual exorbitant rate of interest. But neither the magnitude of the purchasing value, nor the excessive usuring were considered an unsurmountable obstacle by the ambitious and covetous aspirant to the high ecclesiastical office, for he was sure he would soon be able to settle his indebtedness at the expense of his future diocese. And it happened that as soon as the newly-appointed bishop entered upon his duties, he immediately set forth to distribute among the inhabitants of his district such taxes as were commensurate with his indebtedness and greediness. The tithe-collectors accompanied by Turkish gendarmes were let loose upon the people executing their iniquitous duties in a most heartless and brutal manner. It was an every day occurrence to see how people's grain, household furniture and utensils, and domestic animals, were carried away and sold in case of a person's inability to pay the bishop's fees and the numerous other large or small exactions. The bishops pushed forward the collection of the taxes with the greatest possible vigour in the first year during which their stay in office was generally guaranteed. In that short space of time they did all they could to cancel all their financial liabilities, and at the same time, if possible, to lay aside a sufficient sum of money for a rainy day. It was not an unsual practice for a patriarch or cheront in turn to sell his diocese to another who might offer him a far greater price than he had paid

for its seat. A Russian monk, Lukianoff by name, who had traversed Turkey during the first part of the XVIIIth century in speaking about the shameful trade the Phanariot authorities carried on with the elevated ecclesiastical posts, says: [1]) « The Greek Patriarch rents the churches, charging a hundred and fifty thalers for each yearly. At the end of the year a new bidding takes place, and whoever offers most for a church, though he may outbid a rival even by two thalers, he gets it. There (in Constantinople) a metropolitan may dethrone another: should a new candidate make himself known and be willing to give more for a diocese, why, he is sure to obtain it; that is exactly the way the thing is done. For this reason one may meet many a disappointed prelate strolling about in the streets of Constantinople. Such kind of people are the Greeks: they do worse than the Turks for they carry on business with the institutious of God. »

The sale of eparchies, parishes and churches by the Greek Patriarchy has been dealt with by every writer who has directly or indirectly discussed the Phanar Period of that great religious organization. This is what F. Kanitz has to say on the subjet: « At Phanar there was actually instituted a commerce with large and small spiritual seats which were sold either by the Patriarch himself or by one of his lieutenants. For the bishop's see was paid four thousand ducats to the Patriarch. This sum should not be considered a very high one when one has in mind that many Bulgarian bishoprics as the Samokove, for example, yielded an income of some two hundred thousand piasters, though, of course, exacted with violence . . . . »

What the patriarchs and the Synodal prelates did in Constantinople, the samo thing was imitated by the bishops in their dioceses — the patriarchs used to sell the

[1]) Drinoff, vol. I, p. 126. — *A Pilgrimage to the Holy Land by Father Lukianoff*, published in Russkii Archive, 1863.

eparchies, while the bishops — the churches and monasteries. At every change of a diocesan bishop, and this happened quite often — at the metropolitan seats was inaugurated a new public sale of parishes, churches, and monasteries. The highest bidder had his own way in these transactions. The parish once bought could be sold over again to another anxious bidder. Neither piety, nor education, nor even literacy, was considered as a requisite for the men who entered into the bosom of the church. The particular qualification of the buyer that satisfied the bishop was his ability to pay the best price for a parish. On that account not only in the villages, but also in the towns, there were to be found but few clericals who were barely able to read, while others were utterly illiterate. The Greek metropolitans often had with them as protosingels men who never had an education. The Bulgarian priest Stoiko of Kotel, later on Bishop of Vratza, in his autobiography gives the following description of the archimandrite of the Tirnova Mitropolitan: «The office of protosingel was filled by a Greek prelate, a person unschooled and illiterate; this man disliked me very much. It was but natural, for the learned love to associate with learned, the ignorant with ignorant, and the drunkards with drunkards.» [2])

The ignominious trade with the bishoprics and parishes, as well as the systematic robbery to which the Bulgarian people was exposed at the hands of the Phanariots, are historical events well authenticated by official documents and certain chronicles which have been preserved. From the testimony of these we learn that the Greek bishops used to put at auction sale the monopoly of marriage certificates. The Sofia metropolitan Jeremiah who in 1614 had borrowed fifty thousand *aspras* of Hassan Che-

[1]) F. Kanitz, Danubian Bulgaria and the Balkan Peninsula (Russian Translation), p. 144.

[2]) A. Theodoroff-Balan, *Sophronius of Vratza*, Sofia, 1906, p. 74.

lebi Sinan, and thirty thousand of Suleiman Beg, in order to settle his indebtedness with the Patriarchy, gave as security for these loans the right of collecting subscription and sacrificial fees, as well as the monopoly of marriage certificates in certain districts. From a document issued by the Sofia Court of Justice is evident that the same bishop had sold to a Turk the income from marriage certificates of the Sofia, Berkovitza, and Pirot districts, which amounted to some four thousand *aspras*. A certain Sofia priest in 1662 had written down a note in a memorandum book which is found in the synodal library in which he states that he was compelled to pawn his Book of the Gospels «in order to pay the Jew empowered to collect the bishop's fees.» [1])

Owing to the close competition and the enormous big prices paid for the episcopal ranks, the fortunate candidates, as a rule, arrived at their seats almost in a state of penury. It did not take them long, however, to become men of wealth, to clothe themselves in silk and gold, and surround themselves with splendour and luxury. And when leaving their dioceses, they took with them immense riches. «Nothing presents such a striking constrast», says Kaniz, «as the extreme poverty of the Turkish imami (clergy), and the vast wealth and luxury of the Greek bishops. Very few Turkish pashas were able to vie with them in point of opulence and magnificence. But some may ask: Where are the church property and capital from which the Greek priesthood derived such generous income? In vain must one wait for an answer to this question, for though the Greek clergy enjoyed inexhaustible sources of income, it was not the parishes, nor the monasteries which supplied those sources, but the unhappy Bulgarian people. It was Phanar that provided Bulgaria with priests. Phanar

[1]) Prof. Dr. A. Ishirkoff, *The City of Sofia* during the XVIIth century, p. 42. — N. Mileff, p. 49.

(fena-er, bad place), the Greek quarter in Constantinople, which, it seems, had embodied all the Byzantine vices, blended with Turkish and Asiatis customs and peculiarities, used to let loose from its walls a swarm of church merchants who bought out all the bishoprics in Bulgaria. To secure an episcopal seat, no great education, piety, or other qualities, such as we are accustomed to see in high religious dignitaries, neither advanced age, nor other qualifications, were deemed necessary. Not at all. The bishoprics were awarded to him who paid most for them .... In order to be able to raise the sums which they paid to the Patriarch, the Greek prelates in turn used to sell the ecclesiastical places found under their jurisdiction. Thus in Bulgaria as well as in Constantinople, there existed a great abuse in regard to the allotment of church orders. He who could give most was able to obtain a parish. There were cases when a well-to-do bidder bought as many as twenty parishes, selling them to others at a great profit. In this manner the Bulgarian rayahs were treated as a saleable stock for the benefit of the higher Greek clergy, and one need not wonder, that the Bulgarian people considered the Greek priesthood as evil genius.»[1])

Side by side with the ruination of the material welfare of the Bulgarians followed their moral degeneration, for the pernicious influence of their Greek religious leaders had affected every phase of their existence. The Phanar pastors brought with them to Bulgaria all the bad traits, practices, and vices, inherent in the Phanariot organization

[1]) *Danubian Bulgaria*, pp. 143 and 145. — Ireček: «During the XVIIth century an episcopal seat was worth between five hundred and a thousand Turkish pounds. That is why it happened that even cooks, coffee-mongers, and tabacco pipe-sellers, were able to become bishops. The office of the head of a bishopric has a greater significance in the East than in Russia, because there the bishop appears as mundane chief and representative of the rayahs before the authorities,» pp. 586 and 587.

in the same way as, according to the words of Juvenal, the Greeks went to Rome bearing with them 'the vices of all lands'. Nothing in the country was left uncontaminated. After stamping out the native language from the churches and communes, the Phanar authorities committed a far worse crime against humanity; by their example they destroyed the foundation of the Christian religion and morals, while by their insatiate greed and avidity they ruined the nucleus of every state — the family. Their unscrupulousness went so far as to interfere with the conjugal and social life of the Bulgarian communities. Under the pretext of blood relationship, often a very distant one, parents were separated from each other and compelled to pay exorbitant fees for the divorce licence granted them by the priests who subsequently encouraged them to enter into another matrimony. On the other hand, couples closely related were allowed to marry contrary to the church canons, provided the avaricious propensities of the priest were satisfied. Divorce suits were used as means for robbing the people and ruining the richer families. Through their protosingels, deacons, or stewards, or other confidential persons, the Greek bishops undermined conjugal love, purity, and fidelity. Parental indifference and estrangement were encouraged in order to supply the ecclesiastical courts with divorce processes. The villagers were the greatest victims to this peculiar system of corruption. Bishop's emissaries were sent among the peasantry, who on trivial pretences imposed fines and fleeced the simple-minded rural population. «I commenced», writes the well known Bulgarian prelate Sophronius in his autobiography,[1]) « under orders of the Bishop and after the fashion of the Greek priests to impose fines for offences of kindred matrimonial alliances, as well as for other

[1]) A. Theodoroff-Balan, *Sophronius of Vratza*, p. 11.

delinquencies; I became a judge, more for money, not on my own account, but in order to please the Bishop. God, however, justly punished me according to the deeds I had done.»

The Bishop was inaccessible to his flock. It was extremely difficult for one to be admitted to his residence. Whoever had business with him came to his abode with gifts. The better and the more costly the presents, the more easily the bearer was admitted to the Episcopal favour. Every market day the parish and village priests used to send to their spiritual chief whole waggons filled with butter, cheese, floor, poultry, etc. All this was collected from the peasant folks. The Episcopal courts were not only an emporium of plundered goods, but also places of moral depravity and licentiousness. Nearly all of them possessed secret entrances and underground passages. In the Bishop's apartments could be seen many women, young girls, and young boys, all of whom passed for relatives of their master. In general, the Greek bishops lived in luxury and affluence, and were always escorted by a numerous suite of deacons, priests, and cavasses. They had forgotten they were religious leaders and pastors. They served not the church, but the gods of power, covetousness, and sensuality. «To complete the picture», continues Kanitz,[2] «there remains for us to imagine how the Phanar representatives corrupted the morals of the people whose spiritual guides they were sent to be.... The Phanar clergy resorted to all sorts of oppressive measures in their dealing with the people, and devised various means of keeping their flock tightly in their grip, in order more thoroughly to drain its vitality. Space doesn't permit to ennumerate all the disgusting methods they employed in

[1]) Ireček, pp. 642 and 643. — *Dr. John Selimsky's Library*, Sofia, 1914, vol. I, pp. 57—62.

[2]) *Danubian Bulgaria*, pp. 149 and 150.

robbing their victims. One of them, however, is worth calling our attention to, and that is their divorce suit system. The Bishop's courts did all they could to sharpen the differences between rich litigants with the hope of driving them to institute a divorce suit proceedings, and once their design realized, it proved an inexhaustible source of revenue to the Phanar chief. In order to prolong matters, all kinds of existing and imaginary rubrics were cited, various obstacles were placed in the way, the sanction from Constantinople was sent for, and when finally, after it had cost the parties vast amount of money in keeping the correspondance with Constantinople agoing, all difficulties seemed to have been surmounted and the looked for permission obtained, unexpectedly new legal hindrances were found, whereby the decision had to be deferred. This tactics was continued as long as the litigants were able to finance their case or until they were utterly ruined and there was no more to be squeezed out of them. The Bulgarians, who by nature are a religions people and greatly revered their spiritual leaders, now looked upon the degenerate Greek prelates with aversion. The loose manners and dissoluteness of the Phanar bishops were especially disgusting to them. The licentiousness of the Phanar clergy had become proverbial. The honour of many families was ruined by the lewd designs of the Greek bishops and higher clergy. During 1860 as the Turkish Grand Vizier was making a journey through Bulgaria and Macedonia all towns through which he had passed made identical complaints before him against the Greek bishops. The latter were being charged with having committed most revolting crimes. It is sufficient to mention just this one fact of the many exposed in the complaints. The Greek physician at Pirot had been called to examine a thirteen year old school-girl who had been violated by the Greek bishop of the same town. The Greek

priesthood was also accused of another crime — it encouraged abortion among the women. I relate these items with a feeling of great aversion....»

It must be born in mind that the Greek Patriarchy in having recourse to the above alluded means and methods which were employed at first intentionally and systematically, and later on, out of purely selfish motives, had to a certain degree realized its traditional plan of hellenizing the Balkans. The better class of people in most of the towns had indeed been won over by Greek influences and culture; they already called themselves «Greeks», while the village population, deprived of enlightenment, and materially ruined, was reduced to a most wretched state. The Turks called the Bulgarian people *rhayah*, the Greeks styled them *choriati*, while the Bulgarians called themselves *christiani* or christians. Greek school and religious policy did more towards the effacement of the Bulgarian national existence and self-consciousness than the arms of the Byzantine Empire. The name Bulgarian in the course of time disappeared from the state registers and official correspondence. It was seldom heard in conversation. Within the Ottoman Empire there indeed existed both in the towns and villages a Bulgarian people, but the majority of them was poor, illiterate, and down-trodden. They spoke «Bulgarian», but such a thing as Bulgarian community, or Bulgarian municipality representing the interests of the Bulgarian people, had long ceased to exist. Bulgaria continued to live merely as a geographical term, officially, however, the Bulgarians were not recognized as a particular people. Bulgarian history and traditions were so thoroughly blotted out by the enemies of the Bulgarian race, that a period arrived when many Bulgarians in Moesia, Thrace, and Macedonia, though speaking the Bulgarian tongue, did not know they were Bulgarians and that they belonged to a people which had a glorious past,

and which had been the founder of a mighty empire, and possessed a highly developed state organization and culture. In a nutshell, the Bulgarian people was obliterated and was converted into a formless mass of human beings, nameless, animated by no idea of its past, and no consciousness of its present. By absorbing and assimilating this formless humanity, the Greek patriarchs believed they could inject new life into the Greek race, and thus prepare the way for the resuscitation of the Greek Empire on the Balkans. But it was too late, for the western movements for freedom and national independence which swept whole Europe before them had to a certain extent affected the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. The Great Idea of Phanar, therefore, soon discovered itself powerless before the popular fermentation and national awakening which began to take place among the oppressed races in south-eastern Europe. The Ottoman Empire was shaken to its very foundation, and the Constantinople Patriarchate, its protégé, found its further activity blocked, and its great dreams shattered.

But the privileges accorded the Constantinople Patriarchs by the Sultans of Turkey were not always observed by the latter. At about the middle of the XVIIth century the Patriarch was deprived of the right of maintaining direct communications with the Sultan, as well as of receiving the berat of his appointment personally from the Ottoman Ruler. From that time on the berat began to be given in the presence of the vizier and through him. To the Patriarch was also denied the privilege of visiting the Sublime Porte with his cortège of twelve metropolitans and numerous other dignitaries. From the very beginning, asserts Paparrhigopoulo, the Sultans began to restrict the rights originally granted to the head of the Constantinople Patriarchy. Mohammed II himself was guilty of bad faith towards it. In spite of the existing berat, according to which

the Patriarch was recognized as inviolable and holding his office in perpetuity, the Sultan dethroned Patriarch Joseph, the third successor after Gennadius Scholarius, and ordered his beard to be shaven, because he wouldn't sanction the intended marriage of a certain person, in all probability, an influential Christian. The Patriarchal master of ceremonies and councillor, Maxim, too, was punished by having his nostrils cut off for not being able to prevail upon the Patriarch. The bishop of Trebizond was called to take the place of the Patriarch fallen in disfavour, but on the condition that he renounce the yearly subsidy the Patriarchy received from the Sultan's Exchequer for its support, and in addition pay the State a yearly tax of one thousand piasters for holding the post of patriarch. The yearly tribute was soon raised to thrice that amount. Besides, the patriarchs were expected to send lavish presents to the Sultan's wives and courtiers and treat generously his janissaries and eunuchs.

During the XVIth century the Constantinople Patriarchate was no more elective, but became transferable — it was offered for sale by the viziers as well as by the cheronts themselves. Any individual who bade highest for the exalted post became Patriarch. Once it was sold for forty thousand piasters, at another occasion the Vizier Ali Pasha sold it for a hundred thousand piasters. As a result of the saleableness of the office, the patriarchs were frequently deposed. From 1623 to 1700 some fifty men in succession occupied the Patriarchal seat. A certain Greek renegade, an officer in the Turkish army, offered twenty thousand piasters for the Patriarchy only. He advised the Sultan to abolish the office of the Patriarch. Against this measure rose all prelates and the people. The struggle for existence of the Patriarchy and its heads is a long and interesting one. Some of the ablest and fearless among the Greek spiritual rulers lost their life in resisting the en-

croachments of the sultans aiming at the ultimate annihilation of the Patriarchy. Thus in 1657 Patriarch Euthymius was hanged for his staunch defence of the Patriarchal rights. The Constantinople Patriarchy had also to face the hostility of the Catholic and Protestant missions, especially that of the Jesuitical propaganda which exerted a powerful influence upon the higher Ottoman circles. By means of bribery they caused the deposition of many a patriarch. In order to dethrone Cyril Lukaris, the Jesuits paid the Porte the sum of forty thousand piasters. The Greek population, however, rose in support of its chief, and by offering a counter sum of one hundred and eighty thousand piasters, succeeded in retaining the Patriarch on his post. But the Porte's interference in the affairs of the Greek Patriarchy was due to the mutual jealousies and intrigues of the Greek prelates and magnates themselves who stooped for the Sultan's favour and assistance. Both Paparrhigopoulo and Troubetzkoi [1]) are agreed on this point. The first writer says: «This deterioration of the Greek, Church was due to the intrigues and avidity of many Greeks, but they were a minority, and as such they could not be said to represent the entire Greek people. Everywhere and in all times there are to be found a number of individuals who in their efforts and zeal to attain their own interests are ready to sacrifice those of their own country and become the tools of an arbitrary government.»

But in spite of the persecutions of the Greek Patriarchs by the Ottoman authorities, they, nevertheless, were able to preserve the Patriarchy from annihilation. The Turkish rulers found it expedient to maintain the Constantinople Greek Hierarchy and to retain many of the privileges with which they had endowed it. The same Paparrhigopoulo asserts that according to some written docu-

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 408 and 409. — Viestnik Evropi, *Russia and the Greek Patriarchy*, No. 5, 1901.

ments, the Christians in the Ottoman Empire considered the Patriarch as an Emperor and Master.[1]) The Patriarch and his prelates had the right of performing their duties independently of the influence or interference of the temporal authority. The spiritual Chief of the Romaioi enjoyed a tacit recognition of his prerogative of direct intercourse with the rulers of the foreign nations. The manner in which he availed himself of that advantage in his dealings with Venice, Russia, the German Emperor, the English and Swedish kings, plainly shows what a great freedom of action he was allowed to have by the sultans. The Porte itself dealt with the Patriarchate through its foreign ministry, in the same way it did with the representatives of foreign powers. The persecutions of this greatest of Greek institutions were intensified during the XVIIIth century, but luckily for the Greeks, the prelates who filled the Patriarchal throne during that period were nearly all of them men of extensive learning and far-reaching influence, who not only safeguarded the prestige and traditions of the Patriarchy, but made it the mightiest organ of the Great Greek Idea.

During the Turkish domination the Constantinople Patriarchy passed through two periods of development. The first extends from the fall of Constantinople to the beginning of the XVIIIth century, the second — from the beginning of the XVIIIth century down to modern times. During the first period it is the Patriarchy of the Romaioi, as the Turks used to call the Christians, or the Patriarchy of the Christians, as all Greeks, Bulgarians, Wallachians, and Serbs, used to call themselves in those days. During the second it becomes Greek, and Phanar looms up as second Athens championing the Greek culture and ideals.[2]) In the course of that period the Patriarchy began

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, pp. 409—412

[2]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 416.

to designate as Hellenes or Greeks all Orthodox Christians on the Balkan Peninsula. Some historians consider the two epochs closely related, with the Hellenization idea carried on throughout in both. Others fail to see a uniform plan for Hellenization. The actual facts, however, speak in favour neither of the first, nor the second of them. During the first period the prime object of the Patriarchy was the spiritual subordination of the Bulgarians and other Christian peoples, an idea which was realized. If in certain places the Hellenic language imposed itself, that was due to the schools which then were mainly Greek, to the commercial necessity of carrying on trade in the Greek, and to the fact that church service was performed in the same language by priests educated in the Greek schools. No idea for Hellenization existed down to the end of the XVIIth century. The teachers who taught in Greek or the clergy who officiated in the same tongue were animated by no such idea, and it should be born in mind, that they called themselves Romaioi or Christians. Both the teachers and their pupils who spoke and wrote in Hellenic did not style themselves Greeks. The Greek language and literature were deemed by them suitable mediums for the spreading of Byzantine civilization and political and commercial interests among the Bulgarians. A striking testimony corroborating this view on this question may be gathered from the first hand information obtained by the Russian monk Parthenius who in 1839 had traversed the Balkans. On visiting the monastery of St. John the Baptist, situated near the city of Serres in Macedonia, he found in it more than a hundred fellow-monks, all of them Bulgarians from Macedonia. «As they led us into the library of the Monastery» says Parthenius, «we were shown many Slavic books written both on pergament and on ordinary paper; I guessed their number must have reached a thousand. They were carelessly strewn or piled up, which

disappointed us very much. A good many of the books were already mutilated. To our inquiry why the library was in such a neglect the monks answered: 'What is the use of them, as we do not known Slavic? Though all of the brethren here are Bulgarians, not one of us understands the Slavic language. We all come from Macedonia, where in both, the villages and the towns, people read Greek, not Bulgarian. Though we are all Bulgarians, and though no one, be he a priest or a layman, understands what he reads in Greek, nevertheless, such a custom has prevailed among us from olden times. So we, too, follow in the footsteps of our forefathers. We have begun to learn Greek and chant in Greek since we were children. This library was presented to the Monastery by Bulgarian and Serbian kings. In those days people read and sung in Bulgarian, to-day, however, it is done only in the village of Pettak and in the Monastery of the Holy Father John of Rilo!»[1]) If the Greek language was being studied and spread in such a matter of fact way in Macedonia and elsewhere during the first half of the XVIIIth century, when there had already sprung up a number of Bulgarian schools, both in Macedonia and Thrace, one may easily imagine how unimpededly were disseminated the Greek language, literature, and customs among the Bulgarians in those 'olden days', as the monks of the Monastery of St. John the Baptist naively put it, and how that long usage of a foreign tongue came to be handed down as a tradition.

Towards the close of the XVIIIth century the idea of nationality becomes the dogma of the Patriarchy, its churches, and schools. The Constantinople Patriarchate is transformed into a purely Greek institution. From now hence it devotes its efforts, energy, and influence to the purely Greek cause, Greek ambitions, and ideals. There are no

[1]) *Wanderings and Travels, etc.*, Moscow 1856, vol. II, p. 67.

more Romaioi or Christians, but only Greeks. In 1790 three delegates from Athens and Sparta are sent to Petrograd charged with the exalted mission of asking Empress Catherine's permission and sanction for the election of her nephew Constantine as their ruler who was to bring to life the Empire of Constantine the Great, however, not as Byzantine or Christian, but as Hellenic. They speak no more as Romaioi or Christians, but as Hellenes and descendants of the ancient Athenians and Spartans. During the second half of the XVIIIth century begins the Hellenization of the Bulgarians and the neighbouring races, which the historian Teploff asserts to have begun as early as the XIVth century, immediately after the Byzantines usurped the Bulgarian Patriarchy of Preslav. That during the XVIIIth century the Hellenization of the Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman Empire was an underlying plan of the Constantinople Patriarchate, and that the patriarchs were the most worthy and effective champions of the national idea originated and promoted by Basil II and cherished and encouraged by his successors, is a fact which has been emphasized by the Greek historians and writers themselves.[1] « The Constantinople Church », states Shasiotis,[2] « with its prelates and dignitaries who represented it in every community was virtually their supreme ruler in matters of national affairs as well. It becomes the inheritor of the Byzantine life and aspirations, and the patron of the Greek language and institutions. » The Russian diplomatist, Prince Gregory Troubetzkoi writes : « Byzantium's aims and traditions continued to be fostered by the religious and nationalistic organization of the Constantinople Patriarchy. »[3] But the most convincing evidence clearly pointing out to

[1]) See, p. 179.

[2]) L'Instruction publique chez les grecs, p. 4.

[3]) *Russian Policy in the East*, translated from French by Al. D. Misheff, Sofia, 1910, p. 7.

the existence of a Hellenization idea on a large scale is the quaint but piquant literary production of Father Paissi, the celebrated Bulgarian monk of the Chilender Monastery. His *Slav-Bulgarian History* which he made public in 1762 was a mighty and irrefutable protest against the imperial designs of the Greek Patriarchy. Though this original historical work made its impression upon the Bulgarians stirring them to a new life nearly a century later, when it was printed and circulated, its thrilling appeal to the Bulgarians lost in oblivion and its eloquent language in resuscitating the old Bulgarian glory, give the first potent signal of revolt against the encroachments of the Greek Patriarchy, and the first great impulse towards a national self-consciousness among the Bulgarian people. The mission of Paissi's history is so exalted and epochal, as his heart was pure, his motivs patriotic, and his courage unbounded. The appearance of this monk's historical labour is all the more noteworthy when one has in mind the fact that during that very period in which he lived, his contempories were such hellenized Bulgarians, as the famous educator and philosopher, Eugene Bulgaris, already mentioned in the previous pages of this book, Dr. Nickola Piccolo, another equally able, erudite, and zealous Greek neophyte, and many other noted Bulgarians, infatuated converts of Hellenism, for the triumph of which they proved more ardent and staunch workers than the Greeks themselves. Piccolo was noted for his spirited odes extolling Greek science and culture, and exhorting the Greek youth to greater achievements.[2]) And what is still more curious, is the fact, that there was a considerable number of good Bulgarians, some of them pupils at secluded monasteries, who wrote in pure Bulgarian language, but considered

[1]) B. Tsoneff, *Neo-Bulgarian Literature before Paissi*, published in the Bulgarian Review, VIII.

[2]) M. D. Balabanoff, *Gavril Krustevitch*, Sofia, 1914, pp. 25 and 26

the Greek Patriarchy as their religious mother, urged the people to look up to God and prepare themselves for the last Judgment which was at hand.[1]) During the period of Bulgarian atrophy and degeneration the history of Paissi makes its miraculous appearance, which opens the eyes of his countrymen, reminds them of their glorious past of which they had no reason to be ashamed, recalls afresh to them the extensive boundaries the Bulgarian kingdom once possessed, and appeals to them never to forsake their beautiful language and nationality, and to beware of the teachings, influence, and intrigues of the Greek clergy whose aims and designs were not the spiritual welfare of the Bulgarian people, nor its preparation for the «Last Judgment», but their complete Hellenization.

[1]) B. Tsoneff, *Monography*, p. 83.

VI.

SELF-PRESERVATION AND AWAKENING.

Sultans' Partiality towards Christian Races. — Bulgaria Continually Devastated. — Western Countries and Balkan Christians. — Insurrections in Bulgaria. — Civil Wars and Revolutions. — Feudals and Spahis. — Guilds and Peasants — Unofficial Representatives of the People. — First Bulgarian Communes. — Notables. — European Countries and their Treaties with Turkey. — A Nation Exerts Protectorship over the Orthodox. — Awakening and Pioneers.

The majority of the Bulgarian people remained in their own country which was conquered, plundered, and devastated by the Turks. The Asiatic invaders not only destroyed the Bulgarian towns, institutions, and culture, but the inhabitants themselves were converted by them into veritable slaves condemned to work and sell their labour mainly to enable them to pay their heavy and manifold taxes. If the conquerors did not convert to Mohammedanism the Bulgarians and the other Christian peoples during the first years of their entry into the Balkans, that was due principally to the fact that they did not care to elevate the *Giaours* to the exalted condition the Turks enjoyed, and thus deprive the State of a large number of serfs or slaves who were necessary to work and toil for its maintenance. Had the Mohammedanized *rhayah* been accorded the same rights which the Mussulmans possessed, they would have been drawn into the army, and the door to all civil and military offices opened to them. Should such a change have taken place, the number of the actual Mohammedans would have dwindled into a very insigni-

ficant minority in comparison with the millions of new converts. Such a policy, naturally enough, was deemed extremely dangerous, for the neophytes would have had on their side not only a superiority in point of number, but also in point of culture. The new Mohammedans would have been in a position to impose their language, customs, and traditions upon the minority, and would in a short time have completely overwhelmed and absorbed them. The invaders, however, desired to retain their privileged position of lords and masters, to enjoy the fruits of their victories, and live in opulence and contentedness. But their wealth could come only from the Christians who were the producers of it, being the tillers of the land,[1]) the craftsmen, manufacturers, and merchants of the Empire. So the Ottoman rulers found it a wiser policy not to interfere with the religion of the conquered races. They were contented with squeezing out the fruit of their labour through burdensome taxation.

And yet the Turks did not treat all the subdued races and nations alike. They were most hard on the Bulgarians whose state was the first to fall in their clutches. They deprived them of everything: of their churches and priests, of their teachers and leading men, of their communes and municipalities, and of their property. Towards the rest of the Balkan Christian peoples their conduct was quite different. Indeed, they were very cruel to them, too, but that was only at the beginning of their conquest. The school, the churches, and the other institutions of culture found among the rest of the Balkan races were left practically

[1]) H. Omont, *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, Projets de prise de Constantinople, 1893, number 2, pp. 241 and 242. «By driving the Turks out into Asia, the European provinces would not be affected, on the contrary, they would rid themselves of millions of parasites, as the Turks are not farmers, but employ the Christians to till the land for them ....»

intact. The sultans went even so far as to manifest a benignant interest and care for the subjugated people. Even Mohammed II on his entering Constantinople and seeing whole quarters of it desolate, the inhabitants being driven away or exterminated by his soldiery, immediately took steps to repeople them. He, therefore, caused thousands of Greek and Armenian families to be brought over from Asia Minor and Thrace, offering them great facilities and promising them protection. Most of the newcomers came from Trebizond and Sinope.[1]) At the head of the Armenian settlers stood their Archbishop Joseph. The Sultan had requested him to do so in order to encourage the project. To Archbishop Joseph were accorded the same privileges enjoyed by the Greek Patriarch. Greek and Armenian notables soon made their way into the official circles and won the favour of the Ottoman ruler. The first became the leaders in diplomacy, the second distinguished themselves as the Empire's financiers. The Greeks created a diplomatic aristocracy, the Armenians — a financial aristocracy. Both the Greeks and Armenians were able to maintain there exclusive favours under all Sultans. The birth of strong Greek and Armenian communities which enjoyed many privileges sanctioned by the Turkish rulers is due chiefly to their efforts. The Constantinople rulers showed particular lenity and consideration toward the people of Moldavia and Wallachia. In 1392 Mohammed II declared as valid the treaty concluded between Moldavia and his predecessors. In the renewed treaty made between Vlad V and Sultan Mohammed, in 1462, the latter pledges himself and his heirs to defend and protect Wallachia from all foes, in return for which he reserves for himself the

[1]) B. Collas, pp. 27 and 30. — Gibbon, pp. 172 and 173.

[2]) L. A. Vaillant, *La Roumanie*, 1844, vol. I, pp. 228 and 229. — Elias Regnault, *Histoire politique et sociale des principautés danubiennes*, Paris, 1855, pp. 34 and 35.

right of suzereignty over the Principality. He further agrees not to interfere with the internal affairs of the Wallachian people. According to the same instrument, the Wallachians could choose their own prince selected by the Metropolitan, the bishops, and boyars, his investiture alone depending upon the sanction of the Sultan. The Prince had the right to declare war or conclude peace, to have his representatives abroad, and to be the arbiter of life and property in his land, without being held accountable for his acts before the Porte. The Wallachians were exempt from paying the *haratch* or capitation tax, no matter in what part of the Empire they resided. No Turk was allowed to set his foot on Wallachian soil, unless he had special reasons for doing so, and was provided with a permit. No Turk could hold office in the Principality, nor could a mosque be built in it. The Principality of Wallachia, on the other hand, bound itself to pay a yearly tribute of ten thousand piasters. In 1573 [1]) a similar treaty was concluded between Beyazid II and Prince Bogdan of Moldavia. In 1557 [2]) the Serbians were granted special church privileges. They were permitted to restore the Ipek Archbishopric and raise it to Patriarchy, with a jurisdiction covering not only all Serbian dioceses, but also most of the Bulgarian ones in Macedonia.

The Bulgarians, deprived of such signal rights and privileges as the other Christian peoples received of the Sultans, and lacking a nobility and a strong representative in Constantinople, had to content themselves with the good will of the arbitrary Roumelian Beilerbeg or Governer-General of Bulgaria, who had Sofia as his seat of government. This was not the worst evil that befell the country. The work of devastation and destruction never ceased in the unhappy land. Through Thrace and Bulgaria passed the

[1]) El. Regnault, p. 35.

[2]) Stanoevitch, p. 206; see p. 186.

principal highways leading up to the Danube, Hungary, and Austria, and through Macedonia to Bosnia and the Adriatic Sea. The Turkish armies constantly moved to and fro by these roads, with the result that the towns and villages situated along the marching zone were plundered and ruined, and their inhabitants killed or frightened away. If along the highways of the West there exist numerous and flourishing towns, in Turkey, on the contrary, during the XVth and XVIIIth centuries no hamlet, nor even a living creature, could be seen to a considerable distance from the roads. The inhabitants of those districts affected by the movement of troops fled for their lives into the interior or more secure places where there was less danger of being reached by the Janissaries or the main Imperial armies. That is the reason why the two banks of the Danube were rendered waste and destitute. At a good distance from its water course, and particularly near by the strongholds, no village was to be seen. The land was lying untilled and deserted. The Bulgarian cities and towns on the way were continually devastated by both Mohammedans and Christians. In 1462 the same Vlad V of Wallachia who had concluded a treaty of alliance with Mohammed II crossed the Danube over to Bulgaria which was practically razed

[1]) The privileges granted by some of the sultans to particular Bulgarian towns and villages, such as Koprivschtitza, Panagiurishty, Kotel, Gradetz, Jeravna, Yambol, Sliven, and even some Sofia quarters, have no national character, and, therefore, cannot serve as a comparison with the generous and extensive privileges accord·d to Greeks and Armenians who were the recipients of both civil and religious rights. Indeed, the inhabitants of some of the above-mentioned towns were often exempt from certain imports, but the same peoples were, nevertheless, obliged to furnish the Empire with a certain number of militia whose chief duty was to mow the Sultan's and Grand-Vizier's meadows and tend their horses, act as garrisons at important passes, or be Imperial hunters. The first were called *soldiers*, the second *martossuli*, and the third *falconers*. In a few towns only Turks were not permitted to live (Ireček, 56).

to the ground by his army. On that occasion he carried away with him twenty-five thousand Bulgarians and Turks, men, women, and children, who at his order were are impaled as soon as they were brought over the other side of the Danube. The plain where the terrible slaughter took place is called Proelata. When later on Sultan Mohammed had arrived in Wallachia in order to punish Vlad for his devastations in Bulgaria, his eyes were dazed at the awful spectacle where so many of his subjects had met with a most horrible death at the hands of the Wallachian soldiery,[1]) and turning to his courtiers, he exclaimed: «What should I do to the Principality of a man who is capable of such deeds?»

The condition of things in Bulgaria, as may be imagined, was getting unbearable and desperate. Besides being harrassed, robbed, and maltreated by the frequent incursions of the Imperial forces and the Janissary troops, their every day life was being constantly tormented by the exactions of the *spahis* or cavalry irregulars who often

[1]) Vlad V was a terrible tyrant. He took the life of five hundred boyars whom he suspected of disloyalty to himself. At one occasion he empaled five hundred peasants and gypsies whose property he was anxious to seize, and at another he caused four hundred missionaries in Transylvania to be burned alive. These awful crimes shocked the inhabitants of his capital Tirgovishtea. Taking advantage of his absence, Vlad's boyars complained of him to the Sultan and begged of him to help them out. They also entered into communications with the Prince of Moldavia. Having been informed of this, Vlad hastened back to Tirgovishtea where on the very day of Easter becaused to be empaled three hundred of the boyars, while their women and children were driven to work in a fortress. Just about that time arrived the Sultan's envoys charged to censure him for his barbarities. Because they failed to take off their turbans on being ushered to his presence, he ordered the turbans to be nailed down on their heads. A few days before he had caused to be empaled the Governor of Widdin, Hamsi Pasha, and his secretary, a Greek renegade. — G. A. Vaillant, vol. I, p. 231. — Elias Regault, pp. 45 and 47.

deprived the inhabitants of all their possessions, food, cattle, poultry, etc. Gehrlach, the German tourist who visited Bulgaria during the XVIth century, says the *spahis* robbed the Bulgarians of everything they could lay their hands on, and life in general had become so insecure that the inhabitants were compelled to flee to the mountains and out of the way regions in order to escape from the rapacious eye of the Turk.[1]) And Adam Wenner who had traversed the Near East during the first part of the XVIIth century notes down that « from Belgrade as far as Constantinople[2]) no village or a house was to be seen at intervals of two or three days' journey. »

During the XVIth century the condition of the Bulgarian people grew still worse on account of the military expeditions undertaken by the western countries with the purpose of expelling the Turks from Europe. At every such attempt Bulgaria was laid waste and left in ruins by the foreign armies which invaded it in oder to fight the Turks as well by the Sultan's forces which were sent to face them. Every conflict between Turkey and Europe was felt most disastrously by the Balkan states and particularly by the Bulgarians. Lured by hopes of delivery from the Turkish yoke and of restoring their former state and independence, the Bulgarian people rose thrice in succession against their Asiatic oppressors. In every one of these attempts to win their freedom they were encouraged with support from the western states, and from their northern neighbors, the Moldavians and Wallachians. Austria, after the subjugation of Hungary, came to have common borders with the Ottoman Empire. And it was Austria which first began the struggle with the Sultans.

[1]) Dr. G. W. Shishmanoff, *Ancient Journeys Through Bulgaria* Ministerial Sbornik, IV, pp. 383—389.

[2]) Same author, p. 459.

In this strife she was joined by Poland, Italy, and even Spain which after the expulsion of the Moors and the discovery of America had become rich, powerful, and important. Next to Venice Spain had the greatest interests at stake in the Adriatic. The Balkan races believed that the western nations would help them to drive away the Turkish armies and tyranny. On the other side, some of the European states had their eye on the Balkans and were eager to measure swords with the Sultan's forces with the hope of extending their territories. Thus Spain was desirous of possessing Morea, Venice — the Ionian Islands and the Archipelagus, Austria — the adjacent provinces, while the Transylvanian and Wallachian princes had long coveted the Bulgarian destricts along the Danube. The Pope, too, was anxious of enlarging the area of the Holy See. Already there appeared in Europe several pretenders to the Byzantine throne. The expulsion of the Turks from Europe and the liberation of the Balkan Christians became the most popular themes in the West. A whole literature was created as a result of this agitation and movement. Some of the Occidental powers had their secret agents in the Balkans. There sprung up men who made it their business to play the part of freedom-mongers in behalf of the Balkan races. These persons worked among the oppressed Christians themselves as well as among the various European courts. To the Christians they preached the belief that the Western states would come to rescue and liberate them as soon as they were ready to raise the standard of revolt against the Turk. On the other side, they did all they could to convince the European rulers of the West that the Turkish power was on the wane, that the Ottoman armies had grown exhausted and weak, and that the Balkan peoples were ready to strike the blow at their tyrants as soon as they saw the Western armies set foot upon their soil. The three centres on the Conti-

nent where there was manifested the greatest interest in the fate of the Ottoman Empire were Vienna, Warsaw, and Venice. These three capitals supported the largest number of emissaires in Turkey, and to them chiefly were turned the eyes of the Turkish *rahyahs*.

« Especially towards the end of the XVIth century », says Stanoevitch, [1]) « there were many adventurers who exploited the question of the Turk's expulsion and the deliverance of the Christian races under him. They were wont to canvass the Western crowned heads, trying to win them over to the cause of the Balkan Christians. They tickled their ambition by pointing out to them the fertility and the wealth of those regions, and by emphasizing the fact that on the Balkan Peninsula a vacant throne was in store for them. They proved that the Turks were not so strong as was generally supposed, and that they could easily be defeated and the Christian people under them liberated. They asserted that the Balkan oppressed races were on the verge of revolution, that they were all ready to rise, and by so doing the work of the Western armies would be greatly facilitated. Some of these adventurers were able to obtain from ambitious European potentates large sums of money as a remuneration for alleged services done in stirring the Serbians and the Albanians to action, though the majority of them never visited the Balkans. Their efforts, nevertheless, were not in vain, for they succeeded in enlisting the sympathies of many influential personages. European public opinion was aroused and people began to discuss the question of Balkan liberation. Thus during the second half of the XVIth century, under the inspiration of various agitators and immigrants who frequented the courts of the West, the movement was enhanced, notably in Italy and Spain. »

[1]) *History of the Serbian People*, pp. 211 and 212.

In Bulgaria the Dobrovtcha merchant Paul Djordjevitch and the Croat Komoulovitch were two of the most conspicuous apostles of liberty. The former during his second visit continued to tour the Country from 1520 to 1591, while the latter spent the time from 1584 to 1587 in preaching freedom to the Bulgarians. The first one transmitted to the Transylvanian Prince Sigismund Bathori, and thes econd one, to Pope Gregory XII, a written report of the condition and spirit of the Bulgarians. From these documents it becomes plain whose emissaries they were.[1])

When in 1593 Austria began her war with Turkey and defeated her armies, the news of her success sent a thrill of hope and joy through the Balkan peoples. The talk of the day every where was the annihilation of the Ottoman forces by the Christian armies.[2]) Shortly after Austria's action Prince Sigismund of Transylvania and Michael Vitese, vassals of the Sultan, hurried up to join Austria in a general attack upon Turkey. The Pope also entered into the Alliance, soon to be followed by Prince Aaron of Moldavia, the Italian Emperor, and the rest of the Italian rulers. The Pope further tried to gain Poland and Russia on their side. The Wallachian and Transylvanian princes, however, did not wait. In the winter of 1594 Michael the Brave[3]) and Albert Coralli at the head of their armies composed of Roumanians, Serbians, Bulgarians, and Magyars, crossed the Danube and captured the towns of Hirsova, Silistria, Toutrakan, Roustchouk, Sistova, Nicopolis, Orechovo, Razgrad, and Babadagh, all of which they sacked. A strong detachment of irregulars forming a contingent of Michael's army and led by the noted Bulgarian voivode Baba Novak attacked Plevna, plundered it, and carried away the wife of the Governor Mihal Beg.

[1]) M. Drinoff, vol. I, pp. 533—642; 547.
[2]) Ireček, p. 590.
[3]) Stanoevitch, p. 216,

Another detachment made of Serbians and Bulgarians fell upon Sofia, the seat of Beglerbeg, and pillaged it. These inroads of Christian armies and their achievements quickened the spirit of the Bulgarians. The people in Bulgaria commenced to think that the hour of their deliverance had come in accordance with the assurances of the foreign emissaries. Steps were taken and preparations made for the organization of an insurrection. The movement was directed by the Tirnova Metropolitan Dionysius Ralli,[1]) a Greek by birth and a descendant of the house of the Emperor Cantacuzenus. In this he was enthusiastically supported by Jeremiah, Bishop of Roustchouk, Theophan, Bishop of Lovtcha, the boyar Theodor Ballin, the most influential among the nobles in the district of Nicopolis, and other leading Bulgarians. Metropolitan Dionysius, though a Greek, was an indefatiguable pioneer for the political emancipation of his diocese during the XVIth century. In the same way the Greek Metropolitan Paissius of Philippopolis made his name conspicuous for the great part he played during the XIXth century in the liberation of the Bulgarian Church from the Constantinople Patriarchy. Dionysius was in touch with Michael the Brave, the Wallachian Ruler, upon whom he exerted a powerful influence. He was the man chosen to be sent in 1795 as a secret delegate to King Sigismund of Transylvania whom he was to apprize of the fact that as soon as his army was sighted the Bulgarians would raise the standard of revolt against the Turks. A deputation was also dispatched to the Austrian Emperor to entreat him for both military and material assistance. One of the members of the deputation was Paul Djordjevitch already referred to. The Emperor promised them to send directly to Bulgaria and Wallachia an army six thousand men strong and a

[1]) N. Mileff, pp. 168—170.

sum of money. The Bulgarians had agreed to pay the soldiers as soon as they set foot on Bulgarian soil. A Tzar,[1]) too, was gotten up in readiness, a supposed scion of Shishman III. The insurrection broke out in 1598 when at the urgent appeal of the Bulgarians Michael the Brave crossed the Danube and devastated the cities of Florentine, Viddin, Nicopolis, Vratza, etc., and more than two thousand villages along the highway to Sofia. On retreating he carried away with him some sixty thousand Bulgarians together with their household furniture and implements, and settled them in various parts of Wallachia. The war did not last long because the Polish legions turned their ire upon one of the allies. The Tirnova revolt proved unsuccessful.

A second uprising took place in 1612. This time all the Balkan Christians participated in the struggle as allies. The undertaking was in charge of Prince Charles II of Nevers, a pretender to the Constantinople throne. Many prelates and notables from Greece, Epirus, Bulgaria, Serbia, Herzegovina, and Dalmatia gave him their support. A general council was held at the Albanian town of Kouki at which were present representatives from all the above mentioned countries. From the minutes of the meeting which is preserved is seen that the members of the Council had decided in favour of a general insurrection. They had taken steps to provide the enterprise with everything necessary to bring it to a successful issue. Sufficient arms and ammunition were to be procured, an army of one hundred and sixty thousand men was to be collected, paper money was to be issued, which was to be redeemed after the war was over, and a plan was laid out as to what fortified towns and localities were to be attacked and seized. The Council had decreed that Adrianople and Constantinople

[1]) Irečck, pp. 591—592. — N. Mileff, pp. 168—171.

should be assailed first. From the protocol signed it is evident that the conspirators had concluded an alliance with the Princes of Wallachia and Moldavia, and that they had counted on the support of the German Emperor. The Prince of Nevers, however, who already styled himself Constantine Paleologus failed to appear on the scene. The fearless Bishop of Trik rose at the head of the revolutionaries, but the insurrection proved a fiasco.

The third uprising which was a purely Bulgarian affair occurred in 1669 after the war for Crete between Venice and Turkey, at the end of which the Ottoman Empire was left considerably weakened and exhausted. At this time a new hope for freedom was pervading the hearts and minds of the Bulgarians, as a result of which the people were getting ready for another attempt at dealing a deadly blow to the tyranny of the sultans. The soul of the new movement were Peter Parchevitch, Peter Bogdan, Franko Markanik, Prince or Knyaz of Tchiprovo, and many other Catholic and Orthodox notables of Western Bulgaria. But the greatest apostle of liberty in this insurrection was Parchevitch, a Bulgarian Boyar from Tchiporovtzi, an educated prelate and Doctor of Divinity. He was a master of the Greek, Latin, Italian, Wallachian, Armenian, and other languages and enjoyed the acquaintanceship and friendship of many influential personages in Europe. In order to devote all of his time and energies to the liberation of Bulgaria, he sacrificed his religious post and became a political leader. His patriotic zeal and virtues were so strong that he preferred the uncertain and dangerous carreer of a revolutionary outlaw to a most exalted and lucrative post. The Bulgarians chose the right man when they selected him as their emissary and sent him to plead their cause before the European courts. His mission

[1]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 433.

to Vladislav IV, King of Poland, proved very successful. Vladislav who had become famous for his victory over the Turks at Hotin received him very cordially. He sent him away with rich promises, and as a token of his assurances and friendship he gave him his photograph, a red flag made of plush, a ring, and other things. The Polish King was sincere in his sympathies shown to the Bulgarian cause, which was manifest from the military preparations he immediately began to make against a second struggle with the Turks. But, unfortunately, he died before he could realize his future plans in regard to the Balkans. The premature death of so eminent an ally did not dishearten the Bulgarian people. At the request of Deodatus, Archbishop of Tchiprovo, and the Wallachian Prince Matthew Bassarab, Parchevitch was delegated to Jan Kasimir, King of Poland, to the Austrian Emperor, and the Venetian Court. In 1657 Emperor Ferdinand officially recognized the boyar nobility of the Parchevitch family, created Peter Parchevitch, a count and sent him to Hmelnitzky, Hetman or Chief of the Cossacks, charging him to use his influence in reconciling him with Poland and inducing him to take part in the struggle against the Turks. In 1673 backed up by Stephen Petrash, Prince of Moldavia, the Archbishop Deodatus, and other men of power, he was preaching the cause of Bulgaria and Serbia whose emissary he then was in Warsaw, Vienna, and Venice. His eloquence, great erudition, and unquestionable patriotism made a deep impression everywhere he went, which exceedingly facilitated his mission. We find the historian Ireček making this allusion in regard to this extraordinary Bulgarian pioneer: «When Sobieski administered his crushing blow to the Turks at Hotin, at that time Parchevitch was busily en-

[1]) Dr. L. Miletitch, *Our Paulicians*, Ministerial Sbornik XIX, pp. 19—24. — N. Mileff, pp. 124—129; 174—179.

[2]) *History of the Bulgarians*, p. 594.

gaged in exhorting the Western Slavs to lend their support to the victorious Poles in their efforts to cross the Danube and destroy the Ottoman sway in Bulgaria. At all events, we must admit that Parchevitch was the greatest Bulgarian patriot of the XVIIIth century.» The service rendered to his country by this rare son of Bulgaria is of a phenomenal order. He was the spokesman of his unfortunate land before the Western world and Russia, where he worked unceasingly in arousing the European public opinion and interest in behalf of the oppressed Christians in Bulgaria and its neighbouring states groaning under the unbearable yoke of the Turks. The hope and confidence of his countrymen in him was unbounded. He was the embodiment of the wishes and ideals of his compatriots. While he was enthusiastically and convincingly pleading their cause in Europe, they themselves did not remain idle in Bulgaria, but were making hasty preparations for the revolution. The chief seat of the insurrectionary activity was the small town of Tchiporovtzi. The most promiment leaders of the movement were Peyatchevitch and Peter Bogdan. The affair was held in readiness, what it lacked was the signal to strike.

Against Turkey there was formed a coalition consisting of Austria, Poland and Venice. Russia, too, had promised to attack Crimea simultaneously. All of these countries counted a great deal on the support of the Balkan Christians. The Balkan peoples themselves were ready with their legions to join the Europeans army come to shed its blood for their freedom. Their readiness is emphasized in the letters sent to the Russian Court by Scherban Cantacuzenus, Prince of Wallachia, and the Patriarch Tchernoevitch of Ipek. Cantacuzenus assured the Russians that the moment they made their presence at Akermann, three hundred thousand Roumanians, Bulgarians, Serbians, and Greeks would rise to arms and open

the way to Constantinople. Thus it came to pass that since 1661, Austrians, Poles, Venetians, and later on, Russians, too, were engaged in war with the Ottoman Empire. The Austrian armies occupied Hungary, Nish, Widdin, and Skopie, and the Venetian — Morea. In 1688 the Austrians succeeded in capturing Belgrade, driving away the Ottoman garrison whose commandant Osman himself had risen against the Sultan's authority. Turkey at this period, therefore, was threatened by foes both from without and within. Bulgaria now thought the hour had arrived for her to get rid of her hateful oppressor and the inhabitants of her western districts all took to arms for their country's independence.[1]) Their action, unhappily, did not meet with the expected support from their European friends, and it was doomed to failure. The rebels were defeated at Koutlovitza, afterwh ich they were compelled to flee, some to the mountains, others to Wallachia. Tchiporovtzi their revolutionary centre was seized, plundered, and laid in ruins. A similar fate awaited almost the entire western half of Bulgaria.

The effect of the rebellion proved most disastrous to the country. The majority of the Bulgarians hastened to the forests and mountains for safety. The inhabitants of whole districts abandoned their homes and sought refuge across the Danube in Roumania and Transylvania. Thousands of Paulicians, too, joined their countrymen in the hasty exodus.[2]) Emigration denuded the country of a large number of its inhabitants. A great many localities were totally deserted and laid waste. From the conquest of Bulgaria under the Turkish Dominion down to the second half of the XIXth century three dragons were con-

[1]) Dr. L. Miletitch, pp. 26—27. — Ubiciris, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, vol. II, p. 173.

[2]) Ireček, pp. 174—180; — Dr. L. Miletitch, pp. 32 and 33; — N. Mileff, pp. 122—130.

tinually devouring its flesh, — the Turkish scimitar, Hellenization, and emmigration and Roumanization. The number of the Bulgarians lost by forced exile during the Turkish bondage reaches up to several hundred thousand. In Wallachia many districts and towns were settled by Bulgarians. Such were the cities of Ploesti, Alexandria, Tirgovishtea, Giurgiu, Kraiova, etc., besides a number of large villages, like Poyana and others. Nearly all of the Bulgarians in these places were after an elapse of time absorbed and assimilated by the Roumanians, not through culture and education, but through ignorance and neglect which were prevalent in those days among the Wallachians with whom they were compelled to identify their fate. Though more intelligent, enlightened, and more energetic than their Roumanian brothers, the Bulgarians were unable to retain their moral and intellectual superiority throughout. In the course of several generations the Roumanians forced upon them their language, customs, and national garb. Of all the Balkan races the Wallachians are the most tenacious and unsusceptible to change. They have imposed their individuality not only upon Bulgarians, but also upon Serbians, and Greeks. The greatest number of denationalized Greeks is to be found in Roumania. It is an established fact that Roumania imposes its character not only within its domains but also out of its boundaries. In Serbia and Bulgaria where certain districts are settled by Wallachians, the Roumanians or Tsintsars, as they are usually called, have not only preserved their race characteristics, but have exerted a strong influence upon the people with whom they associated themselves. These peculiar traits have been dwelt upon by a number of writers versed in the subject. Thus Elias Reniaud in speaking of the Wallachs says:[1]) «The Roumanian peasant possesses such

[1]) Histoire politique et sociale des Principautés Danubiennes, Paris, 1855, p. 278.

a power of assimilation that he can swallow any mixture of races without having his character affected. There are entire villages in Serbia and Bulgaria founded by Wallachian settlers whose language and racial traits have remained unchanged down to this day. The Serbians and the Bulgarians have been compelled to study up the Roumanian tongue and to adapt themselves to their mode of life in order to be understood by the newcomers. On the other side, whole Bulgarian colonies in Roumania became thoroughly Roumanized in the second generation. One is led to the conclusion that in the Roumanian villagers so poor, so patient, and good-natured there is hid a certain social magnetism which attracts and subordinates all elements with which it comes in contact.»

Devastation, depopulation, and migration were Bulgaria's most terrible curse. Its Danubian districts, as was already pointed out, were the greatest victims of these scourges. Friar Parthenius, of whom mention was made before, gives us a very vivid picture of the deplorable state of things which prevailed in the country at the beginning of the XVIIIth century when he visited the Balkans. He had traversed the entire Danubian Bulgaria. The territory from Macin to Roustchouk he covered on foot which took him nine days. All the way he was struck with the contrast that existed between the richness of the country and the extreme poverty of its inhabitants. There was in evidence a fertile soil, flourishing nature, a land of paradise, yet the people found there were exceedingly wretched. From Macin to Roustchouk he saw but two churches which looked more like stalls than temples. Misery, destitution, and want were conspicuous everywhere, even in the sanctuaries which were decorated with paper icons. On asking the peasants of the causes of their wretchedness when their land was so rich, they told him with tears in their eyes:

«Our country indeed is fertile and blessed, but being situated on the border line, it has been made the battle-ground every ten or twenty years from times immemorial to the present day. No sooner have we made up the loss of our cattle or repaired our fields, behold another war sets upon us, then again we take to flight, whoever can, to Wallachia. Those of our countrymen whom the Turks seize are carried away with them into the interior. The Turks burn down our houses and devastate our gardens. At the close of the war the survivors again return to their homes and begin life anew. But there is another worse affliction which often befalls us, and that is the plague. Once more we abandon everything and flee for our lives to the mountains where we try to avoid meeting each other, even our own brother. But the Turks, always furious and pernicious, oppress us, ruin us, burn down our churches, rob us of all we have. There is nobody to whom we may make a complaint, the Pasha is hard to reach and Constantinople is too far away.»[1])

Such frequent flights and migrations tended to convert nearly the whole country into a veritable wilderness. Under such trying conditions it was impossible to continue the ordinary pursuits of life and maintain any culture whatever. The one and only thought that possessed all was the preservation of one's life, everything else was left in neglect. Even when in time of comparative peace, the people were not free from serious molestations and perils. Then, too, they were often compelled to desert their villages and towns and seek asylum in the woods and mountain fastnesses. They were forced to this by the barbarous behavior of the Janissaries, the exactions and robberies of the *spahis*, and by the burdens of an arbitrary system of taxation. The *blood-tax* or the tribute of giving the Sultan the best youth to be enrolled in his Janissary

[1]) *Wanderings and Travels*, etc., pp. 46 and 47.

Corps was the most painful impost demanded of them. It weighede qually hard upon all Christians, — Bulgarians, Serbians, Greeks. «It was the most horrible imposition ever forced upon a people by another», says Lavelé.[1]) In this strange manner the victorious Turks found a means of both depriving the Christians of their manhood and at the same time of increasing the number of their troops without running any risk of offering the *rahyahs* a weapon which might be turned against them.

The Turkish authorities levied the children of the Christians at the age of ten or eleven years. The most handsome and robust boys were selected. Some of the children recruits were sent to the Sultan's courts, some were entered into the Constantinople School-barracks, others were attached as attendants upon the provincial Governors, while still others were taken to the Imperial farms and gardens to work in them. All were drilled by Janissary officers. As soon as they became of age they were incorporated into the Janissary Corps. The recruiting of the Christian boys occurred, some say, every seven years,[2]) while others assert it took place every five years,[3]) and there are writers who put the interval at three years.[4]) According to some authorities one out of every ten boys was taken, according to others the fifth male child in a family, while third maintain that one out of every three or four boys was selected, and that the best. Those were most terrible times for the Christians when companies of some three or four hundred Janissaries made their appearance with the orders of levying the *blood-tribute*. The inhabitants were seized with horror and consternation. All of a sudden many hamlets and villages became deserted, their inmates having rushed to the ravines, caves, and

[1]) T. Lavelé, *Histoire de la Turquie*, p. 75.
[2]) Drinoff, vol. II, p. 557.
[3]) Ireček, p. 562; — Paparrhigopoulo, p. 391.
[4]) N. Mileff, pp. 29 and 30.

woods for safety. Francesco Soimirovitch, a Catholic custodian and later on Bishop of Ochrida, happened to be an eye witness of such a recruiting at the village of Tchiporovtzi. That happened in 1610. There had arrived three hundred Janissaries and had begun their dreadful business of hunting Christian boys. «The sight of the Janissaries», says Soimirovitch, «created a great panic in the towns and villages. The population horror-stricken as if escaping from a plague or other calamity took to flight into the mountains, caves, and woods where it remained until the danger was over. The Sultan's emissaries took a number of children, besides a lot of money, and put in chains some of the older men in order to help them hunt down more boys. Filled with dread at what we saw, we hurried up and made for the mountains together with our youth. Many parents crippled their sons in order to make them unfit for the Janissary corps.»[1])

No less pernicious to the Christians in Turkey were the strifes of the sultans with the pashas who often declared themselves independent of their authority. Such insubordinate and self-willed pashas were Mahmoud Roushatli of Skodra or Scutari, Ali Pasha of Janina, Pazvanoglou of Viddin, Tchapanoglou, Governor of Middle Asia Minor, Kara-Osmanoglou of Smyrna, Kiutchouk Ali of Cilicia, some Mesopotamian begs, Egyptian mamelukes, etc. Towards the latter part of the XVIIIth century the prestige of the sultans had sunk at a very ebb and as a consequence the Empire grew weak and fell to pieces. Anarchy reigned unchecked. Almost two thirds of the territory of Ottoman power fell into the hands of disobedient and ambitious pashas. The sultan at that period was left, as was the case with his Byzantine predecessors, with only the possession of Constantinople and its vicinity. But the internal condition of things in the Empire assumed a

[1]) Stancevitch, p. 206.

most threatening aspect when its domains began to be harrassed and devastated by famous organizations of robbers known under the names of *Kirdjali* and *Doali*. Among their leaders these may be mentioned as most conspicuous: Kara-Feizi of Breznik, Kara-Mustapha of Philippopolis, Gushantz Ali Halil, Kara-Manaf Ibrahim, and others. The Kirdjali infested and plundered nearly all the districts of East Roumelia. By them were burned down and destroyed the towns of Koprivshtitza, Panaghiurishty, Kalofer, Stanimaka, Arbanassi, Rakovo, Moschopolis, and many other blooming cities. The towns which escaped such a fate were mostly those that served as stronghold, such as Silistria, Viddin, Roustchouk, Varna, Adrianople, Philippopolis, Shumla, Skopie or Uskub, Prilep and some others. As fortunate were also the mountain towns, such as Kotel, Karnobat, Aitos, Stara-Zagora, and those containing a mixed population of Turks and Christians. The Kirdjali threatened Constantinople itself. The Janissaries, too, became a dangerous element for the Empire's integrity. Sultan Selim made an attempt at reforming the army and abolishing the Janissary Corps, but his good intentions cost him his head. In 1826, however, Sultan Mahmoud II finally succeeded in getting rid of the Janissaries. They were nabbed by him just about the time when they were directing a revolt against his authority. The Sultan's faithful troops surrounded them at the Hippodrome or At-Megdan in Constantinople, killing more than fifteen thousand of them, while twenty thousand others were made prisoners and sent in exile to various points of the Empire. A Sultan's *hati-sherif* subsequently announced that the Corps of the Janissaries was done away with for ever. Shortly after the Sultan invited General Moltke to come to Turkey and reorganize his army on European standard.

[1]) A. Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, 2me édition, Paris 1885, vol. I, p. 5. — Ireček, pp. 608—624.

During the periods of internal dissentious and struggles which distracted the Empire and favoured all sorts of lawlessness and brigandage, the Bulgarians were able to find life more tolerable and secure in the fortified and mountain localities and settlements, as well as in those cities and villages where the population was mixed with Mohammedans. In these places, it may be said, Bulgarism was saved from utter annihilation. Here were preserved the cadres for the future Bulgarian communes which grew up as mushrooms as soon as better days set in.

The creation by the sultans of the *spahi* cavalry on the feudal fashion was another of the great evils which caused the Christians to forsake their habitations and seek relief either by betaking themselves to distant and secure settlements, or by emmigrations to foreign lands. The *spahi* organization, like that of the Janissary Corps, was a dreadful scourge for the *rahyahs*, for it lived on the shoulders of the Christian population which was left to its tender mercy. The *spahi* cavalry came into existence as early as the establishment of the Ottoman powor on the Balkan Peninsula. Prior to that time Turkey was a feudal state. After conquering the Balkan states the Turks introduced on European soil the feudal system with feudal lords[1]) to whom the sultans granted land. This was done with a twofold purpose, to increase the military strength of the Empire and to offer the land as prizes to signal military services rendered to the State. The feudals in Turkey we called *spahi* or cavalry. They received part of the produce obtained from their own estate worked out either by Christians or Mohammedans, over which the *spahis* possessed a full jurisdiction. Another part of the produce in the form of a tax was levied by the State, but

[1]) D. Ohisson, Tableau général, vol. VII, p. 372. — Hammer vol. II, p. 251. — A. Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, 2me édition, vol. I, pp. 265—267; — Irečak, *The Principality of Bulgaria*, p. 230.

it was collected not from the *spahis* but from the peasantry which tilled the land. The ploughmen actually were the owners of the soil they tilled, but had no right of transferring it to others except in the order from father to son. Others might inherit land only with the approval of the *Spahis*.

In Turkey land was divided into four categories:[1]) private or *mulk*, state or *has*, church or *vakouf*, and feudal or *timar*. The feudal landownership was most detrimental to the Christians. The latter or the *Spahis* were divided into three classes: *timari*, *zaimi*, and *begs*. Every *Spahia* was obliged to provide the sultan with one rider, which was to correspond to an income of three thousand *aspras*. Of the third class there were fifty thousand, of the second three hundred, and of the first two hundred and ten. The *timari* were subordinate to the *zaimi*, the *zaimi* to the *begs*, and the *begs* together with them were enrolled into the ranks of the pasha of one of the provinces. The *zaimi* went to war with at least twenty riders, the *timari* with one, varying up to four. The begs equipped the largest number of cavalry force. The farmer, whether Turk or Christian, made a life use of the land, or rather, owned the land, but had no title to it, because it formed an inseparable part of the *miria* or *adiet*. Ownership of land was considered nominal as it was taken for granted that all land belonged to God.

The village settlements and farms were generally divided into free and dependent. The latter were worked out

[1]) Properly speaking land in Turkey was known under nine subdivisions: *adiet*, vacant or untilled land; *has-houmayune* or Sultan's private estate; *emliak humayune*, imperial land, non-inheritable; *has selaten* or estates granted to sultanesses, princes, and princesses; *has-youmera* or lands held ex-officio by viziers as feudal lords; *arpalik* or lands held by ministers; and *ziameti timari*, or lands held by *spahis*, by government officials, and by private individuals. The last were most numerous. — Ubicini, p. 265.

by the rhayah or villagers. There were three kinds of villagers or *seleni:* the *ispolichari*, the *momtsi*, and the *kessimdji*. The *ispolichari* worked for half of the produce obtained from the land, the other half went into the coffers of the *spahi*. The land-tax was paid by the *ispolichari*. The *momtsi* were day laborers. The *kessimdji* were the owners of their own houses, but the *spahi* to whom their settlement was attached had the right of selling the village income to another *spahi*. Each house of the *kessimdji* was obliged to give the *spahi* yearly about three pecks of wheat, besides supplying him with a certain quantity of butter, cheese, wood, charcoal, timber, etc. They were also compelled to assist in the cultivation of the fields, meadows, and vineyards of the *spahi*. During the XVIIth century the district of Kustendil comprized some thirty-five to forty-eight *zaimi* and five hundred and eighty-eight to one thousand and seventeen *timari*. In 1876 two thirds of the land of the same district were in the hands of Turkish landlords.

The Christians called the spahi *gospodari* or landlords, and the spahias *gospodarlitsi* or lord's estates. No state control being exercised in the provinces the *spahis* in the course of time because absolute masters of both the property and the honour of the villagers who lived under their protection. The *spahi* on one side, and the state on the other, deprived the peasant of nearly everything he earned by the sweat of his brow. It often happened that the villagers were unable to pay the heavy taxes imposed upon them, so they were constrained to leave their settlements and flee elsewhere in quest for better opportunities and treatment. Emigration was found by them a most expedient means of relief. Professor Miletitch tells of the Paulicians of the village of Byelini that, « being exceedingly poor and unable to pay the burdensome Turkish taxes, they often moved from place to place, some settling in

Thrace, others crossing the Danube and establishing themselves in Wallachia . . . . » [1])

During the year 1826, after the annihilation of the Janissaries, with the introduction of a regular army in the Ottoman Empire followed the abolishment of the *spahias*. That measure was considered a godsend by the Christian peoples throughout. They were thus rid not only of the obnoxious and rapacious army of *spahis*, but with their efforts and industry they soon became the actual possessors of their soil. The army reorganization, the manifold needs and requirements necessary for its maintenance, and the new order of things in general, inaugurated during that period, resuscitated the crafts and artisans who recommenced their trade in order to meet the wants of the military authorities. The traders and merchants also began to do a thriving business as contractors for the various garrisons. In 1839 Sultan Medjid by the *Hati-Sherif* of Ghulhaneh announced the *spahi* system annulled and declared that from that time on every Ottoman subject, be he a Mussulman or a Christian, had the right of owning land. Unfortunately, the *hati-sherif* was not put in force everywhere in the Ottoman Empire. Thus in the districts of Nish and Kustendil the *spahias* continued to exist down to the very independence of Bulgaria, 1877, while in certain Macedonian districts, viz., Serres, Salonica, Skopie, and Monastir they existed till the Balkan war of 1912. Sultan Medjid's decree, however, was applied in most places of his dominions. Towards the middle of the XIXth century already beneficial results ensued from it in those Bulgarian provinces where it was carried out. A great economical impetus was soon in evidence there. Parallelly with the betterment of the economical and material welfare of the Bulgarian people there followed the awakening of the Bulgarian national self-consciousness.

[1]) *Ministerial Sbornik XIX*, p. 15.

The *spahias* in the Sandjak of Viddin were not abolished until 1851. The revolts which occurred in the districts of Nish, Pirot, Leskovetz, in 1835—40, and those which took place in the districts of Belogradchik, Viddin, Koula, and Lom in 1850, were due to the oppressive regime maintained by the spahis, to the exorbitant rates of taxation, and to the inhuman way by which the *soubashi* or tax-gatherers collected the state dues. The leaders of the Viddin rebels informed the Sultan's emmissary sent to find out the cause of the disturbances that the Bulgarians requested of the Sultan but this: to abolish the *spahis* and deliver them from the Viddin *aghas* or local Turkish notables [1]), and being Bulgarians, to allow them to live apart from the Turks. They also demanded the *gospodari* to abstain from interfering with their land, and to allow them

[1]) .... «We beg of you», ran the protest and request of the Viddin revolutionary chiefs to the emmissary of the Sultan, «to write our Tzar and tell him that all we wish of him is to rid us of the *gospodari* and *soubashi*, to cease sending *seiment* to our villages as we will pay our taxes to our knezes (mayors) who will send them over. Let no judge come out to divide our property, for when someone dies we know ourselves who are the rightful heirs and what share belongs to each of them. The Turkish law is not for us. We also beg that the Governor (of Viddin) be removed because no good will come out of him. This, too, tell our Tzar, that Sahrata, Belogradchik, and Polome are inhabited by Bulgarians so that let him see to it to seperate us from the *aghi* of Viddin, and be sure to abolish the *spahia*. .... The taxes we pay our Tzar are lighter than the ones exacted from us by our *gospodari* and *soubashi* who make sport of our family honour. We, too, have honour of home.» — Ilia Tsarroff, *From my Memoirs*, Bulgarian Review, VI, pp. 88 and 89.

The insurrection and the petition of the revolutionary leaders were not in vain. *Bash-Knezes* or Christian governors were soon appointed in the districts of Koula, Bielogradchik, and Lom in the place of the *spahis*, who together with their *soubashi*, were interdicted from entering the villages. The taxes for the *gospodari* together with the state taxes were deposited by the *bash knez* in the State treasury from where the gospodari received their own. — Same authority, p. 94.

to be governed by their own knezes (mayors). They did not want any Turks in their villages.

Who preserved the Bulgarian people during its Turkish and Phanariot bondage? Was it the Bulgarian Church? Such, however, had ceased to exist. Was it the Bulgarian literature? It also had disappeared, was well nigh extinguished. Could it be the traditions and the memory the Bulgarians cherished of their past? Such things had also vanished from sight, or if they did show any signs of life, they were very dim and confused. Was this accomplished by the Bulgarian educated class and its magnates? These, too, were no more. Who then performed this miracle?

The answer to all these questions is quite plain. The mysterious power that guided the Bulgarian nation and preserved its national character through all its vicissitudes was its spirit of industry. The factors on which depended the vitality of that power were the Bulgar ploughman or the man with the hoe and the craftsman. The plough and the craft of the Bulgar were the means which brought about this miracle. Without the plough and the craft the Bulgarian people wouldn't have been able to survive all the national cataclysms it was fated to go through, neither would it have been possible to have a subsequent Bulgarian awakening or Bulgarian renaissance, schools, literature, and restored Bulgarian Church and State. In the Bulgarian people are founded two rare pearls, which are, the Bulgarian realism and the Bulgarian working hands, or, in other words, the Bulgar good common-sense and his plough coupled with the handicraft. With his plough the Bulgarian, imperceptibly and gradually, but stubbornly and steadfastly, kept on creeping from his mountain strongholds down into the plain, until in the course of time, his furrows touched the very banks of the Danube and the shores of the Black and Aegean seas. By dint of his handicraft he finally opened his way to the Imperial centres

and public markets where his goods bearing the stamp of his industry and honesty made his name proverbial. The Bulgarians lived by their plough and skill, and with the help of these they little by little imposed themselves upon the Turkish rulers as early as the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries.

During the first Bulgarian Kingdom the handicrafts and industries were in their inception.[1]) During the Second Bulgarian Kingdom, in the golden bull given in 1348 to the Orechovo Monastery by Tzar Joan Alexander, mention is made of artisans[2]) or craftsmen, and in that given to the Prizren Monastery by Kral Dushan of Serbia, of smiths, taylors, masons, etc. In the report of Wala-Shahin Pasha concerning the conquest of Sofia its author asserts that in that city there existed a considerable number of iron works superintended by the military authorities, industrial factories, manufacturing establishments, and severals work-shops.[3]) In 1675, and even earlier still, in 1604 and 1617, according to official documents, there were found in Sofia about sixty guilds,[4]) forty of which were composed only of Bulgarians, while the remaining twenty were supported by a mixed membership of both Bulgarians and Turks. Guilds or trade-unions were in existence in Viddin, Nish, Pirot, Vrania, Svishtov or Sistova, Roustchouk, Shumen, Tirnova, Samokov, Karlovo, Sliven, Plovdiv (Philippopolis), Velles, Monastir, Skopie, and in nearly all the important Bulgarian towns. The mountain towns

---

[1]) P. Tishkoff, *Contributions to the History of the Bulgarian Guilds*, Sofia, 1911, pp. 23 and 24.

[2]) V. Zanetoff, *The Bulgarian Population during the Middle Ages*, p. 184. — N. Blagoeff, *History of the Ancient Bulgarian Jurisprudence*, p. 66.

[3]) Dr. A. Ichtchieff, *Notices of the Historical Society*, number 2, 1906.

[4]) Prof. Dr. Ishirkoff, *The City of Sofia in the XVIIth Century*, pp. 57—63.

of Kalofer, Koprivshtitza, Sopot, Etropole, Teteven, Tchiporovtzi, etc., were conspicuously flourishing industrial centres. The Bulgarian Guilds became potent industrial and commercial factors when they were firmly organized and when the Ottoman Empire legally and officially recognized their charters. Thence commences their national and civilizing rôle. Once their state formally sanctioned by the Porte, the local Turkish authorities were bound to respect them and to admit their importance. Soon the Ottoman administration began to treat them as most useful and honourable groups of men. The State considered the guilds synonymous with industry, respectability, and goodness. A member of a guild was an embodiment of integrity and equity. The rules and regulations by which the guilds governed themselves were so practically devised that the profits were very fairly distributed among their members, and no individual was permitted to enrich himself at the expense of the others. Notwithstanding, competition was not discouraged, but it was limited within the scope of personal ability and desert. Everyone was remunerated according to the quantity and quality of the work done. Whoever deviated from the accepted norms was fined or had his shop closed for a certain time. The decisions of the guilds were a law even to the Turks who belonged to any of these associations. The Turk when fined was ordered to give either wax to a church or candles to a mosque. Absolute confidence regulated the relations between one guild and another, as well as between the members of the various kindred organizations. Money was mutually borrowed or loaned at one's word of honour. Such a thing as notes or bills were not needed. [1]) Guided by such stern principles and staunch

[1]) L. Karavelloff, Znanie, Bucharest, 1874, No. 9, the article on *Our Associations Called Guilds;* one of the Philippopolis Christian merchants was going to the Ouzundjovo County Fair for goods. As

probity the Bulgarian Guilds commanded the respect of all. The Government considered them indespensable and was in constant dealing with them. The State workshops in Constantinople were filled with Bulgarian *abadji* or native taylors who were employed in making the army uniforms, etc. Through their artisans, tradesmen, and later on, through their contractors and caterers, the Turkish Government had the opportunity of getting acquainted with the Bulgarians. And though the name Bulgarian was eliminated from the official records, the Bulgarian handicrafts and guilds were in due time able to restore its importance and make it respected by the Ottoman officialdom. If it were not for the influence exerted by the Guilds, the Bulgarian spirit in the towns would have completely disappeared. As it was, the Bulgarian Guilds were in themselves well organized social agencies. They were the nucleus of the future communes or parishes. The Guilds thought and worked for the Bulgarian nationality. Before there were any Bulgarian schools or communities, there were the Guilds. It may justly be said that in those times the Bulgarians as people lived through their Guilds. Even in Salonica, in 1833, where there was in evidence no Bulgarian parish or church, the Guilds composed largely of Debra, Kichevo, and Kroushevo inhabitants had their own teachers and used Bulgarian books. [1]) The Bulgarian spirit manifested itself more strongly in the interior districts of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia where the Bulgarian character of the people was least affected. In Skopie, Prilep, Veles, Krivoryechna-Palanka, Shtip, Kiustendil, Samokove, Kar-

---

he got up on his horse and was about to start, there came to him an ordinary Turkish merchant who taking out his purse said to him: «Here, take these fifty liras (Turkish pounds) with which I beg you to buy me *makata*.» That merchant dealed in *makata*. The Bulgarian took the money, said good by, and went his way . . . ., p. 141.

[1]) *Paptssanie*, No. XXXV, pp. 703—707.

lovo, Gabrovo, Shoumen, Silistra, Roustchouk, Tirnovo, Svishtov (Sistova), Viddin, Vratza, and many other towns, the guilds, as early as 1850, and even earlier, had created parishes of their own to which they had intrusted the management of all church and school affairs. Those parishes or communes had their seals, chairmen, scribes, constitution, etc. They took care of the local church, the school, and even of the social interests of their respective territory, which fact is being corroborated by various protocols, codicils, and seals come down to us.

The Guilds subsequently supplied the communes, the churches, and the schools with enlightened leaders, and were most instrumental in the promotion of the Bulgarian language, books, and learning. That is seen from the number of the subscribers whose names were printed at the end of the books published during the last century.[2]) At first there were only industrial and cloister teachers. In the comedy «Cloister» or «Cell» written by Ilia Christovitch[3]) the hero of the play is a typical cloister schoolmaster. During the first half of the XIXth century the struggle between the Patriarchy and Bulgarism was carried on by the Bulgarian Guilds. These institutions were the first Bulgarian organizations whose membership, fees, and subscriptions were gladly employed for the support of newly

[1]) V. Kuntcheff, *Pspissanie*, No. XI, p. 565. — Jordan Ivanoff, *The Bulgarians in Macedonia*, 1915, pp. 191—200. — Chr. Shaldeff, *The City of Prilep*, 1916, pp. 17, 28 and 29.

[2]) In the book called *History of Alexander the Great of Macedonia*, and printed in 1844 at Belgrade, there are given the names of one hundred and thirty subscribers members of various guilds, viz., the goldsmiths, dyers, shoe-makers, native taylors, black-lace manufacturers, etc., representing the cities of Sopot, Kalofer, Pleven, Lovetch, Sliven, Sofia, Panaghiurishty, Kiustendil, Dubnitza, Nish, Prokupie, Skopie, Constantinople, and other towns.

[3]) N. Iv. Vankoff, *History of the School Education in Bulgaria*, 1908, p. 22. — Jordan Ivanoff, p. 160, *Ochrida*, 1869 and 1860.

founded Bulgarian schools and churches, and for the circulation of Bulgarian books. Later on the Bulgarian merchants, contractors, and caterers proved most generous patrons of the Bulgarian school and educational movement. The original petition for allowing the introduction of Slav church service and for granting a permit for the errection of a Bulgarian church in Constantinople was the work of the Guilds. The petition was addressed both to the Patriarchy and the Porte. How great an influence exerted the Guilds in those days may be judged from the words of the Constantinople Patriarch spoken to N. Sapounoff, grand master of the Native Taylor Guild, who was chosen to present the petition. «Show me a letter of authorization sealed by the Guilds», told him the aged Patriarch, «and not mere signatures of merchants, because the word of the Guilds is respected, for the Guild never dies, is never lost, while the merchants are seen to-day and are no more to-morrow.» [1])

Before the appearance of Bulgarian leaders, pastors, educators, and public men, it was the Guilds who guarded and directed the welfare of the Bulgarian communities. They were the inspirers of their countrymen to a national awakening, intellectual, spiritual, and social development. It is a noteworthy fact that the first promoters and patrons of Bulgarian school and literature came from among the labouring and industrial classes. Bulgarian democracy was doing its noble work through these humble pioneers of the Bulgarian regeneration. The dignified part of the educational and religious initiators which during the First and Second, Kingdoms as also during the period of Greek Bondage was played by the Bulgarian princes and voivodes, now was taken up by unpretentious and obscure representatives

[1]) T. S. Bourmoff, *The Bulgaro-Greek Church Controversy*, Sofia, 1900, p. 82. — *Pravo*, 1873, Nos. 4 and 5. — *Pspissanie*, No. XI, p. 29.

of the Bulgarian people. It may with justice be asserted that the Guilds with their compact organizations, brotherly relations, wholesome virtues, intense patriotism, and their means which, though limited, but liberally given, have contributed more, perhaps, than any other factors towards resuscitating the national pride and self-consciousness of their countrymen. Here we better quote the words of Mr. P. Tishkoff which we take from his valuable work on the historical importance of the Bulgarian Guilds:[1] «The Guild Organizations,» says he, «were prior to the Liberation, the first pioneers who valiantly and successfully shouldered up not only the awakening and the religious emancipation of our people, but to a considerable extent its political liberation also. They were mighty agencies which before the realization of Bulgaria's independence filled their historical mission with striking aptitude, tact, and sacrifice.... They proved the centres where the apostles of our Renaissance successfully sowed the first seed which soon blossomed into our national fermentation, and without exaggeration may be said, they gave all they had, both their moral and material support, to the cause and happiness of the entire Bulgarian people.»

But one must not forget that the real strength and zeal came from the Bulgarian peasant, the typical representative of the Bulgarian people. The Bulgarian peasantry was, as is still, distinguished for its patience, power of endurance, industry, perseverence, energy, and inflexible character. The Bulgarian village class is the inexhanstible source of vitality and power of the Bulgarian nation. The Preslav and Tirnovo Kingdoms came into existence thanks to the Bulgarian autonomous parish communities. The same thing may be said as regards the awakening and the appearance of the Third Kingdom. Every Bulgarian

[1]) P. Tishkoff, *Contribution to the History of the Bulgarian Guilds.*

village represented a well-organized association, an autonomous social unit which drew its vitality from the land. The auspicious times that followed the promulgation of the *Hati-Sherif* or Sultan's edict of 1839, gave the Bulgarian peasantry an opportunity of rebuilding and restoring their demolished and devastated villages. Through their wonted thrift and industry the Bulgarians soon transformed the dreary wastes into their original attractiveness, new houses rose in the midst of the debris, and quaint school buildings and churches shone forth, bespeaking love for knowledge and religious devotion. Under the leadership of their practical and serious-minded elders, and by means of the plough, the Bulgarians quickly changed the desolate aspect of their former homes. The Bulgarian villager feels happiest when wielding his own plough and tilling his own land. He recognizes but one real blessing on earth, and that is *land*. He loathes but one misfortune, and that is slavery, or the condition of being *landless*. His long experience had taught him that land is a *sine qua non* to true prosperity, riches, and independence. As long as he is the owner of his own acres he is guaranteed, safe, and free. And to this day the Bulgarian peasant remains the greatest worshipper of land. He who once becomes the possessor of real estate tries to increase it, and he who has none, does all he can to acquire his own premises. Land and liberty are synonymous terms to the Bulgarian. Whenever he sees a fine soil, he falls into a fit, takes a handful of it, examines it, exults in feeling it, and imagines he is holding the most precious diamond in the world. Land, plough, industry, and thrift are to him the requisite elements of human happiness, wealth, and freedom. Centuries' long traditions have convinced him of this. He intuitively arrived at such a conclusion long before his contemporary sociologists and economists did. His dearest occupation, or one may say, his most sacred creed, is agri-

culture. Land is his life and salvation; it is his greatest ideal. Land preserves a nation and renders it free. The Bulgarian nation is a typical example of this. It was the plough that saved it and regenerated it. This cult of the Bulgarian was not overlooked by Western writers who had the opportunity of studying up his character. «The wealth of a Bulgarian», writes Sauvebœuf, as early as 1788,[1] «consists in large flocks and as much land as he is capable of cultivating.» During the first half of the XIXth century European authors in general turned the attention of their readers more to Bulgarian agriculture than to Bulgarian schools and churches. Blanqui who travelled in the Balkans during the year 1841 calls the Bulgarians «the Germans in Turkey.»[2] «The most distinguishing characteristic of the Bulgarian people,» says he, «is their love for land and their aptitude as agriculturists.» Cyprien Robert whose visit to the Balkans occurred much earlier, expresses his admiration of the Bulgar farmer in still stronger terms. «The Bulgarians», writes he, «are the most intelligent husbandmen in European Turkey. They are acquainted with the irrigation system and have a wonderful knowledge of the principles of statistics. Even the smallest water sources are utilized by them. Every furrow receives its due supply of moisture, not a single drop of wates is lost.»[3] Ubicini, too, declares, «The Turks themselves, the worst agriculturists next to the Albanians and Serbians, take to farming with such a zeal as do the Bulgarians.»[4]

---

[1]) Dr. Ivan Shishmanoff, *Ancient Journeys through Bulgaria,* Ministerial Sbornik, IV, p. 470.

[2]) M. Blanqui, *Voyage en Bulgarie pendant l'année 1843,* Paris, pp. 211; 222—224.

[3]) Cyprien Robert, *Les slaves de la Turquie,* Paris, 1844, vol. II, pp. 36 and 37.

[4]) Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie,* Paris, 1853, pp. 375—376.

Generally speaking, the Bulgarians sought and found their goal of life in agriculture which Gustave le Bon, the noted French sociologist, recommends to his compatriots. «Up to this day», says he,[1]) Europe obtains its grain from the East. Soon, however, the Orient will feel no need of our goods, as it produces them at lower prices. Commerce is founded on exchange and money is a conditional symbol. But according to scientific discoveries the future of Europe, and especially of the countries which depend mainly on their commerce, seems very gloomy. In the forthcoming struggle it looks as if two categories of nations will be able to survive. The first category includes those countries where agriculture is well developed and the population not numerous, so that they will be in a position to produce sufficient food to meet the need of its people, even if their foreign commerce be completely suspended. The second category comprizes those countries whose initiative, will, and capabilities are of a very high order. In the first category are found but very few peoples on the European continent. France, happily holds a respectable place in this. England and America belong to the second category.»

The Bulgarian peasant has for a long time held such a view of things, at which he has arrived instinctively. What his soil yeilds to him is sufficient to cover up his immediate needs, while his use of foreign articles he has reduced to a minimum. He makes all his clothing at home — he buys very little from abroad. On this account it took the Bulgarian villagers but a very short time to recover from the terrible calamities which often befell them. In the course of four or five generations they succeeded in healing the wounds inflicted upon them by fate, regained

[1]) *Psychologie du socialisme* par Gustave le Bon, 5th édition, Paris 1907, pp. 247 and 248.

their former prosperous state and began to multiply. During the XVIIIth century, and particularly during the first part of the XIXth, the Bulgarian peasant had already increased his estate, dotted the villages with his sprighty dwellings, and the length of his furrows marked out his ethnical boundaries. In 1762 Father Paissi, the monk-historian, traced them and found them to be the same as existed during the Preslav and Tirnovo Kingdoms. Already during the first half of the last century the Bulgarian peasantry in Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia in general was enjoying a tolerable good prosperity. [1]) The economic

[1]) In the book «Wanderings and Travels» already cited we find the following description of some of the Bulgarian villages during the year 1840—41». From Roustchouk to Tirnovo we journeyed four days among Bulgarians. At the end of the fourth day we were nearing Tirnova the capital of Bulgaria. We did not stop in it but directed our course through the adjacent Bulgarians villages, or I better call them towns, each containing from two to three thousand houses, all built of stone, also churches, large stone edifices, lacking crosses and cupolas, but their interior richly ornamented with icons and lustres, and surrounded by stone walls, unlike those we saw along the Danube. The villages are not devastated and the people are prosperous though they live in bondage and labour under the Turkish yoke, and though they are ground more heavily by the Turks than is the case with the Greeks, because the latter have a protection, their own spiritual authority, the patriarch, metropolitan, archbishop, bishop.... A happy land is Bulgaria and blessed is the people that inhabit it. The Bulgarians are very industrious and they have left no foot of ground untilled. Farming, gardening and sericulture are in a flourishing condition with them. The Bulgarian people is commercial, social, courteous and is very friendly to Russia, because it is of the same race, language, and customs.» The author pictures Gabrovo as a big and rich village, with seven market places and last which their rose a tower with the town clock, he also calls attention to the opulence he saw in Kalofer.» Kalofer is a village famous throughout Bulgaria. It is a large settlement, resembling a city. Its merchants are rich and do business with Europe. There are many factories and workshops in it. A great deal of silk and black-lace is manufactured here. All factories are run by water. The

amelioration of the Bulgarian race had the advantage of greatly facilitating its intellectual and spiritual awakening. The growing prosperity of the Bulgarians manifested itself in the numerous schools and churches that sprung up throughout the Balkans. In the peasantry, in the trade-unions, in the new-born Bulgarian communes come into existence quietly and yet without any official recognition, the Bulgarian people was able to preserve its national character and to prepare the way for its future ideologues who gave themselves heart and soul to the Bulgarian liberation movement. The instinct of self-preservation banded together and directed the people toward economical and material advancement. This tendency towards organization and blending of energies was an inherent impulse, it was purely native, it was Bulgarian. It was free from any foreign influences. It is the product of a pure democracy, such as exists among the Bulgarians. Being hard-pressed by a twofold bondage, they had to resort to their own intelligence and strength in their struggle for life and self-preservation. [1])

village is cut through by a large river from which deviate numerous water-ways which pass through every house, and every house is a factory. Water-power does the spinning, weaving, and knitting, which fact amazed us exceedingly. There are many churches and two monasteries. In all of the churches they use Russian books and chant in Bulgarian... The village of Bistritza situated at the foot of the Rhodopes has the appearance of a big town. Two stone churches can be easily distinguished at a distance. In one of them Greek books are employed, in the other Russian... The village of Battak has some three hundred houses, mostly wooden, and a good many of them were two storied-structures. One wouldn't take it for a Bulgarian village, in all things it resembled a Russian hamlet. The village church is built of stone and encircled by stone walls. All religious books bear Moscow printing firms..., (pp. 50 and 51; 55, 57 and 59.)

[1]) Iv. C. Ivanoff in his work *Sbornik Stately*, Kishinev, 1896, submits his own views, as well as those of the Russian generals concerning the welfare of the villages from the Danube down to

The Bulgarian plough and diligence are considered the most potent factors in the long process of self-preservation and regeneration of the Bulgarian nation, which fact has also been recognized by foreign authorities versed in the matter. The French sociologist Poinsard goes as far as to predict a larger extension of the Bulgarian ethnical limits, not through fire and steel, but by dint of industry and the plough. «The Bulgarian», states he,[1]) «is patient and assiduous and makes a daily progress, constantly moving down from the mountains and ravines to the valleys and the sea, draining the soil with his industry and peaceful pursuits, which at the end will make him master of nearly the entire Balkan Peninsula. That is a splendid example of the triumph of the peasant over the city inhabitant, of agriculture over commerce, of the agricultural population over the industries which do not attach him to the soil, do not inspire him with love for the land, but hold him always in a mobilizing readiness to emigrate

---

Tirnovo during the year 1877.... «The region from the Danube clear to Tirnovo charmed everybody. Those beautiful plains strewn with sheaves and hay-stacks, the fragrant fruit tress, those srpings spouting crystal water, the fine highways, dwellings, backyards crowded with domestic animals, — all this resembled a panorama. On returning from Tirnovo I met Adjutant General Nepokoitchitzky, chief of the field-staff, who turned to me and said:

«Well, my dear Ivanoff, in Kishinev you used to tell us that your Bulgarians lived in poverty, that they were persecuted, but I assure you that even in Germany I have not seen such flourishing villages. God grant that our own peasants reach such an opulence fifty years hence, but I am certain that will not occur even after one hundred years.... Yes, yes, I could'nt help telling you at once all my impressions. My conviction is that the Bulgarians needed liberation from nothing; they are far better off than the ruling Turks. It is evident that we have come down here to perform comedies», pp. 154—156.

[1]) Léon Poinsard, *La production, le travail et le problème social dans tous les pays au début du XXme siècle*, Paris, 1907, pp. 320—322.

elsewhere. We pointed out that such was the case with the Turk, and we should add, the Greek is not better off in this respect. Thus Bulgarism, agricultural and peasant, is the most dangerous rival of Hellenism, commercial and municipal. The latter subsists on moveable property and empty historical pretensions. The first, or the Bulgarian, has struck deep root into the soil of which he is the master by virtue of his labour. Should he continue to march in this direction, the success of his efforts is assured .... Such is the outlook of things on the Peninsula. It is apparent that all chances of preponderance are in favour of the Bulgarian. We now understand the reason why. But this will come out so, provided the Bulgarians succeed in preserving their democracy which is the source of their strength ....»

Prior to the promulgation of the vilayet exactments there existed no laws governing the village communities in Turkey. The villages were left independent as far as their administration was concerned. The management of their local affairs was the same as it existed during the Second Bulgarian Kingdom. After the abolition of the *spahi* system the Government only agents in the villages were the *seymeni* who looked after the collection of taxes and after the *angaria* or forced labour. Every village had its own mayor and its elders. The latter were usually called *tchorbadjis*[1]) (rich men or magnates) by the Turks. The mayor

[1]) There had assembled, there had come together
Mayors and Tchorbadjis,
Right in front of the village square,
The Sultan's taxes to assess;
To many a man impost was imposed,
To many a man state dues were incised,
To poor Theodore dear three hundred was inscribed,
Three hundred with full fifty to boot,
For Theodore was a person rich in land

(Popular song)

assisted by the elders assessed the taxes according to the ability and property standing of a peasant, saw that peace and order were maintained, defended the interests of the community, looked after all village and private property, represented the commune before the State, and protected its members against the abuses of Government officials. In short, the villagers possessed a local autonomy, since they had in their own hands the legal and judiciary authority. Many of the mayors and magnates by virtue of their talents and tact exerted a great influence upon their rulers. It often happened that their name became known in several districts.[1])

The village commune system of government of the Bulgarians was not a new thing. It derived its origin from the old Slav rural organization.[2]) The Turkish Government seldom interfered with the traditional administration of the Bulgarian village. It found it more expedient to leave the villages govern themselves as they had done from generation to generation in the past.[3]) So the first Bulgarian communes sprung up in the villages with the tacit recognition of the Turkish authorities. The town and city parishes appeared later on even after the church wardenships and committees.

Outside the village communes and the Guild associations, through their ability and means there rose into importance and influence individual Bulgarians and Bulgarian families, especially from among the merchant class, the army contractors, caterers, etc. Prominent persons and families were to be found in every town, county and dis-

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. II, p. 309

[2]) See pp. 54 and 60.

[3]) Cyprien Robert, vol II, p 390. — Léon Poinsard, pp. 318 and 319: «The Turks indifferent towards the Christians because they felt incompetent to rule over them did not affect their domestic and society form of organization. This fact explains why the nationalities were preserved

trict who by virtue of their position were greatly respected by the State authorities. The deeds and renown of many Bulgarians often extended throughout a whole district, and even a whole province. Such distinguished men were the first factors who helped bring about the fusion of the village communes and the guilds, villagers, and town folk. This result was effected by their untiring zeal, self-sacrificing spirit and efforts in behalf of their hard oppressed countrymen. The latter could turn to them in case of need, and looked to them for protection and guidance. The homes of these individual men and patriots were always open to their compatriots seeking advice and encouragement. On the other hand, the village, the town, often the entire people, gladly accorded them their support. Gradually the Ottoman authorities began to look upon these self-made leaders as the representatives of the Bulgarian population, while the latter found in them their spokesmen and kindred protectors. As was intimitated, they were officially known and called *Tchorbadjis.*[1]) The people also began to call them by the same name which signified a landed proprietor and protector. It likened them to the boyars and often addressed them by that appellation. In the folk-songs both of these names are used,[2])

---

[1]) Bianchi et Kieffer, *Dictionnaire turc-française,* Paris, p 658: 1) *tchorbadji,* broth-maker. 2) Regimental commandant in the Janissary Corps. — A Djavid Bey, *Etat militaire ottoman:* The officers in every Janissary battalion were six, *tchorbadji, odabashi, vekilhardji, bairaktar, bash eski,* and *ahchi.* A *tchorbadji* was commander of the battalion and of the *oda.* His rank was equivalent to that of colonel or major; pp. 29 and 45. The Turks gave the name *tchorbadji* to the Bulgarian notables as a distinction from the man of the common people.

[2]) The Tzar (Sultan) to Peter turned and spake:
O thou Peter, first boyar,
This request have I with thee,
And thou should'st frankly answer it:
How came it thou shouldst boyar be.

During the first half of the XIXth century nearly every Bulgarian town had its own *tchorbadjis* or unofficial representatives. The interests of the Bulgarian population, its school, and churches were intrusted in their hands. The new Bulgarian notables were the first and only popular representatives before the Turkish Government. As such they proved enthusiastic workers for the awakening of their race, intellectually and politically. Later on many Bulgarian emigrants in the neighbouring countries took up the Bulgarian cause and carried it on even with greater fervour and persistence. The *tchorbadjis* who usually were highly respected by the Ottoman officialdom did a great deal in inducing the Turkish Government to grant the request of the Bulgarians for opening educational institutions and temples of their own in which the language employed

---

A boyar and head-tchorbadji?
People say a better boyar thou art
Than I, and my illustrious Vizier.
— O Sire, o most blessed Tzar,
Since thou questionest me, I needs an answer give
How a boyar I came to be,
A boyar and head-tchorbadji;
Nine sons have I,
And nine daughters-in-law,
When to the fields we daily go,
Nine ploughs we take with us,
Mine added to them, makes them ten;
When to the vineyards we wend our way,
Nine hoes we carry in our hands,
Mine added to them, makes them ten;
Hence why am I now a boyar,
A boyar and head-tchorbadji.
The Tzar to Peter these words spake;
— O thou Peter, boyar chief,
May thou long thy wealth enjoy,
Since with thy brow's sweat has it been earned.

(Popular song.)

should be the native Bulgarian. The influence of the Bulgarian notables was especially conspicuous in the cities of Adrianople, Plovdiv (Philippopolis), Sliven, Kazanluk, Shoumen, Tirnovo, Svishtov, Roustchouk, Viddin, Vratza, Sofia, Skopie, Prilep, Monastir, and other towns. These centres vied with each other in the encouragement and promotion of learning and race-pride among the Bulgarian people. There was a general impetus towards founding of schools and churches, and the leading Bulgarians manifested the greatest interest in this respect. Thus the well-known patriot Naiden Krusteff laid the foundation of the first Bulgarian school at Adrianople. Similar institutions were opened in Plovdiv by the Chaluckoff family under whose guidance and untiring endeavours that city became the greatest educational centre and soon took the lead in the stubborn struggle against the Greek spiritual bondage. In 1822 «Little» Vulko of the Chaluckoff family becomes the founder of the St. Trinity School, while his brother «Big» Vulko championed the interests of his countrymen of the entire vilayet. Stoyan Chaluckoff, a rich state contractor, was a man of wide and important acquaintances. He exerted great influence upon the Turkish minister of his day and was a particular friend of the Viddin Governor, Hussein Pasha, a former vizier and dire enemy of the Janissaries. In Viddin Manol Shishmanoff made his name endeared to the people by his educational and philanthropic endeavours. Under his direction and patronage in 1848 a theological school was founded at the monastery situated near the village of Rakovitza, not far from the city of Koula, since the Ottoman Government wouldn't grant a licence for the opening of a secular institution in the same city. The first teacher in that school was a certain Philip who subsequently turned monk in order to be eligible to the mastership of the newly founded religious establishment. The Rakovitza theological seminary sup-

plied the district of Viddin with the first Bulgarian priests who obtained a thoroughly Bulgarian training from a real Bulgarian school.

Unfortunately there were found among the notables some who made common cause with the Turks and the Greeks and despised their own kin. But such renegades were few in number and were powerless to check the speedy advance the Bulgarian people was making in all directions. The patriotic nobles usually had their own way at the long end. They always identified their interests with those of their countrymen and both at home and abroad did all they could to win the favour of the Turkish authorities. They were ardent disseminators of Bulgarian books most of which had to be secretly transmitted from hand to hand.

The Bulgarian notables in general were as good patriots as they were generous benefactors. They were generous not only to their own, but to all who needed their assistance. The poor no matter of what nationality were benefited by their liberality of heart and purse. Naiden Krusteff of Adrianople was beloved by all the inhabitants of that district no matter of what race they came. «The house of 'Little' Vulko,» wrote Dr. Iv. Seliminski, «was a refuge for all afflicted and indigent persons of any faith and nationality whatever. On signal holidays he would distribute large sums of money to the poor. He devoted his life to the enlightenment of his people, and thanks to his financial and moral encouragement, there was soon errected a Bulgarian school in his native town.»

The Turks, however, were inimically inclined towards culture and enlightenment. On that account every move towards progress and advancement, especially on the part of the Christians under their domination, was looked upon

with contempt and immediate steps were taken for its suppression. The Ottoman authorities, therefore, considered the educated and wide-awake Bulgarians a dangerous element for the State. Such individuals were singled out and put out of the way. Thus Naiden Krusteff was secretly murdered by orders of the Government because it feared his growing influence with the people. The prominent Stantcheff family was similarly dealt with on account of their zeal in behalf of their race. Jealous of the great popularity of Demiter Hadji Toshoff, Hussein Pasha, the Governor of Viddin, caused him to be beheaded. A folk-song commemorates the martyrdom of that dinstinguished Bulgarian. A good many of the prominent Bulgarians were persecuted and banished. Many families were compelled to emigrate and seek their fortune abroad.

The European countries which at first were hostile to the presence of the Turks in the Balkans, from fear lest they themselves should in turn fall a prey to the Ottoman sway, in the course of time changed their attitude toward the sultans, and some of them even sought the friendship and co-operation of the Turkish rulers. They showed the least sympathy with the oppressed Balkan Christians who groaned under an unbearable despotism. The West cherished a hatred towards the Orthodox peoples. In their eyes the Balkan states were schismatics. In spite of the religious reforms that had pervaded Europe and the struggles that resulted from them, the popes had succeeded in grafting upon the rulers of the Continent as well as upon their councillors a contempt for the Orthodox Christians. As early as 1332 Brohard in his project for an alliance of the Western nations directed against the Turks, which was dedicated to the French King, plainly betrays his scorn for the Orthodox peoples of the East. «It will be criminal from a religious point of view,» declares he, «to form alliances and to deal with our inveterate foes and

schismatics.» [1]) France was the first to conclude a treaty of alliance with the Turks. In 1528 François I allied himself with Sultan Suleyman against the Spanish Emperor Charles V, his detested enemy, and since then the friendship between the two countries continued uninterrupted. In 1536 a closer alliance was concluded between Turkey and France. This treaty included a capitulation provision which greatly enhanced France's prestige in the Levant. The capitulation arrangement guaranteed both to French subjects and to catholic foreigners placed under the protection of the French Government full freedom of visiting the Holy Land, religious liberty, and the right of building their own churches. In 1581 the capitulation privileges were still further extended, giving France a preeminence over the other countries represented in Constantinople. In article 1 of the Capitulations it was stipulated that Venetians, Genoese, Englishmen, Portuguese, Catalonians, and other nationalities could travel through Turkey under the protection of the French flag. The French Government continued to enhance its influence in the Ottoman Empire by new treatres and capitulations which were effected in 1604, 1635, 1673, and 1740.[2]) In the last compact there were defined and enlarged all former rights and privileges accorded to Catholic congregations and *uniati* or Orthodox adherents of the Church of Rome. In none of these agreements is found any mention of Orthodox Christians. From the XVIIth century down England, Prussia, and Austria begin to take steps to liberate

[1]) T. G. Djuvara, *Cent projets de partage de la Turquie*, Paris, 1914. p. 34.

[2]) T. de Martens, *Traité de droit international*, Paris, 1886, vol. II, pp. 172—176. — Baron A. d'Avril, Revue d'histoire diplomatique, monography, *Protection des chrétiens dans le Lévant*, 1900, N° 4, pp. 538—544. — A. Shopoff, *Les réformes et la protection des chrétiens en Turquie*, Paris, 1904, pp. 5—7.

themselves from the French tutelage and put an end to the humiliating position which they held in the East.

The example of France was followed by Spain and Naples; they, too, entered into treaty alliances with the sultans. Venice, Austria, and Poland continued to be at war with Turkey, but each one of them was guided by its own interests. The long conflicts between Venice and Turkey ended disastrously for Venice. They cost her Cyprus, Crete, Peloponnesus, and well nigh the Ionian Islands also.

Being threatened by a Turkish invasion Austria was compelled to carry on protracted wars with the sultans. When the Turks were besieging Vienna under the leadership of their Vizier Kara-Mustapha, John Sobieski, King of Poland, came to Austria's assistance. Sobieski did this in virtue of the defensive and offensive alliance concluded between him and the Austrian Emperor Leopold, which was directed against the Turks in case they attempted to assail either Vienna or Warsaw. King Louis XIV of France tried to undo this alliance out of hatred for Leopold. He, therefore, did all he could to dissuade Sobieski from his friendship with Leopold. He went so far as to accuse the Austrian Emperor of perfidy to the Polish King, stating that there was an understanding between Leopold and the Sultan and that the latter was urged to attack Warsaw. Louis himself, on the other hand, was in constant communications with the Turks and the Magyars whom he wished to win over and hurl against the Austrian Empire. He reasoned out that once the Turks masters of Vienna, the road to Warsaw was open for them. Sobieski, nevertheless, tho cherishing a personal dislike for the Austrian ruler, came to his rescue, defeated

[1]) Comte Jean du Hamel Le Breuil, Revue d'histoire diplomatique, *Sobieski et sa politique,* 1893 and 1894, Nos 4 and 1.

the armies of Kara Mustapha and saved Vienna. After this victory Austria continued her struggle with Turkey with greater intensity. She organized the Serbian population inhabiting the border regions by sending them military instructors and chiefs and utilized their forces against the Ottoman Empire. In 1788 Austria formed from the Serbian contingent a special volunteer corps. [1]) The army which Charles IV left to his daughter Maria Theresia contained some fifty-five thousand Serbians. Austria frequently made common cause with Russia against the sultans. But in all her military undertakings towards the Balkans she had in mind but her own interests; her principal aim was the aggrandizement of her dominions at the expense of the Balkan Christians. In her treaties with Turkey all her efforts were turned toward safeguarding the rights and liberty of her Catholic subjects, the Roman colonies, and the holy pilgrims. In no dealings with the Turks did she show any interest in behalf of the Orthodox peoples. This fact may be corroborated by the treaties and capitulations made between her and Turkey at Karlovetz in 1699, Pojarevetz, 1718, Belgrade, 1739, and at Svishtov (Sistova), 1791. The last compact was concluded with the cooperation of England and Russia.

In the treaties and capitulations concluded between Turkey and Venice and Poland, too, only the rights and privileges of the Catholics are dealt with and vouchsaved. [2]) At a later day the capitulation clauses were accorded to all countries alike, [3]) i.e., all Western states could profit by them.

As regards the Catholics and Protestants the capitulations contained two important reservations, namely,

---

[1]) Stanoevitch, p. 254. — J. Skerlitch, Srpska Knizevnosti XVII veku, Belgrade, 1909, pp. 25—27.

[2]) Comte A. d'Avril, Revue d'histoire diplomatique, *Protection des chrétiens dans le Lévant*, N° 4, p. 536—543.

[3]) Same, 1901, N° 1, pp. 69 and 71.

the foreign citizens enjoyed the privilege of exterritoriality,[1]) while the naturalized Ottoman subjects availed themselves of the protection of the Western powers within the scope of the Turkish laws.

Neglected and foresaken by both the Catholic and the Protestant countries of the West, the Orthodox Christian peoples in the Balkans during the first two centuries after their subjugation by the Turks could not obtain any relief even from the only strong and independent Orthodox nation — Russia, because Russia herself was beset with internal problems and was continually waging war against her neighbours, chiefly the Tartars and the Turks. In her first encounters with the latter she fought for her own interests only. Though in her proclamation of 1688 allusion is made to the fact that «the Boussurmans put to the knife more than three hundred men, women, and innocent children, while many were carried into captivity across the sea, all being inhabitants from Greek, Morean, Roumelian, Serbian, and Bulgarian lands,» still, it must be remembered that the Russian army which was dispatched to help the Christians was unable to go farther than Perekop,[2]) because the Tartars invaded their land.

In the Russo-Turkish relations in respect to religious matters which in those days were political as well, there are distinguished three periods,[3]) viz., the first one begins with the Fall of Constantinople down to 1774, the second, from 1774 to 1856, and the third, from 1856 down to our day. During the first period Russia, like the rest of the European countries, showed no interest in the fate of the Balkan Christians, but was rather bent on defending the religious concerns of its subjects found in Turkey. During the second she became the protectress of the Orthodox

[1]) Same, 1901, N° 14, p. 82.
[2]) Ireček, p. 596.
[3]) T. de Martens, vol. II, pp. 177—182.

Christian subjects of the sultans. During the third period she was deprived of her exclusive protectorship over the Orthodox peoples ruled by Turkey, which was replaced by a collective surveillance of all the European countries.

From 1681 to 1833 Russia had concluded twelve treaties with Turkey. The first one effected in 1681 at Bachtchi-Sarai, and the second at Karlovetz, 1698, dealt with territorial questions,[1]) while the treaties made out in Constantinople in 1700, and in Belgrade in 1739, treated on religious matters. Article 12 of the first treaty runs: «Both laymen and clergy of Moscow nationality will have full freedom of visiting Jerusalem, the Holy City, and those other places worthy of being seen, without being subjected to pay any taxes or fees whatever. Besides, the Moscow and Russian monks residing within the Ottoman dominions will be exposed to no restrictive measures or any persecution whatever on religious grounds.»

The remaining eight treaties deal on questions connected with the Orthodox subjects of the sultans. By wresting these documents from Turkey Russia laid the foundation of international altruism until then unknown to history. By the promulgation of the Kiutchouk-Kainardjik Treaty, 1774, she virtually became the patron of the Orthodox Christians living in the Ottoman Empire.[2]) In article 7 of this compact the Porte promised to protect the Orthodox Faith and Church and to grant the Russian ambassador permission to errect an Orthodox temple in Galata. In article 16 the Porte bound herself not to interfere with the religious worship of the Orthodox, with the building of new churches, and the repair of old ones, and

[1]) T. de Martens, vol. II, pp. 177 and 178. — A. d'Avril, 1901, pp. 69—75.

[2]) See the full text of the treaty as given by W. Wilkinson, *Tableau historique, géographique et politique de la Moldavie*, Paris, 1821, p. 118.

to recognize the right of the Russian ambassador to intercede in behalf of the Danubian Principalities on religious and political matters. In article 17 was stipulated that the Orthodox Faith was not to suffer restrictions, nor its clergy be exposed to persecution, while in article 22 the Russian ambassador was authorized to intercedo in behalf of the Christians and to defend them before the Porte. These clauses empowered Russia to future interference in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. The subsequent treaties merely sanction the validity of the treaty of 1774. Those compacts are the ones concluded at Ainali-Kavak, in 1779, at Jassy, in 1791, at Bucharest, in 1812, at Ackermann, in 1826, and at Adrianople, in 1929, in which among the other questions settled were, the liberation of Serbia, Greece, and the Danubian Principalities, and the definition of their form of Government. A direct result of the Adrianople Treaty which guaranteed the religious privileges of the Orthodox was the Hati-sherif of Gyulhaneh which contained the Sultan's decision for the introduction of administrative and financial reforms within his Empire.

Russia, then, is the first country to manifest a tangible interest in behalf of the subject Christian peoples in Turkey. Her victories over Mussulmans won for her all the above-mentioned treaties by virtue of which she was recognized as the Protector of the vassal principalities and defender of the Orthodox Christians throughout the Ottoman Empire. These military and diplomatic successes greatly enhanced Russia's prestige among the Christians of the East. To the Western nations, however, they constituted a coming danger.

In order to do away with them and destroy the growing influence of the Tzars in the Ottoman Empire, they proclaimed the Principle of the Integrity of Turkey. Austria, too, which had more than once allied herself with Russia

against the Ottomans espoused that course of action, for she dreaded a Russian ascendency in the Balkans. Taking advantage of the mutual jealousy of the European powers, the Porte began to disregard her treaty obligations with Russia. In 1853 Prince Menshikoff, the Russian Minister Plenipotentiary, presented the Porte an ultimatum which demanded that Russia be recognized Protector of the Orthodox Christians, as France was of the other Christian denominations. The Sultan supported by both France and England rejected the ultimatum and that refusal occasioned the Crimean war. France, England, and later on, Sardinia came to Turkey's assistance against Russia. Austria had also decided to join this coalition against her northern rival but Prussia stepped in and dissuaded her from taking part in the war. At the Conference of Vienna, in 1855, France, England, and Austria accepted as the fundamental principle of their policy the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as an indispensible condition for the European balance of power.[1]) This doctrine was speedily popularized; it was supported by ministers, press, and literature. Toyvenett, the French minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote to the French ambassador at St. Petersburg: «Everyone admits that Turkey must exist on the same footing as all other states.» Saint-Marc de Girardin wrote in the *Journal des Debats*, «It is plain that should either Russia or Austria, and Russia especially, procure religious protectorship which would mean political, too, for religion in the Orient has always been considered politics, if either of them should succeed in wresting the right of interference in behalf of the people inhabiting Bulgaria, Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia, etc., or in other words, in behalf of eleven millions of Orthodox followers, when it is taken in consideration that in Europe there are all in all about

[1]) De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités*, vol. 6, p. 315.

three million of Turks, the effect of such a change is easy to conjecture.» [1])

At the same Conference of Vienna and at the Paris Congress of the year following, France, England, and Austria did all they could to avoid hurting the self-esteem of Russia without yielding the principle of the Turkish integrity. In Paris they guaranteed the validity of this principle. But as far as the fate of the Orthodox races was concerned they were reticent on this point; the Orthodox Christians were again left under the care of the Sultan. Notwithstanding the assertion of Martens that the Russian protectorate was replaced in Paris with a collective one subscribed by all the great powers, [2]) Albert Cahuet, the French writer, on the other side, says, « One of the greatest obstacles encountered by the plenipotentiaires convened in Paris was how to settle the question of protectorship over the Christian peoples in the Turkish Empire. The Congress had in view the abolition of Russia's assumed right of protectorship over the Eastern Christians. Yet, it could not allow the victorious Sultan to exercise unlimited power in his domains, nor abandon the Christian peoples under a despotism which heretofore could only be restricted by the interference of the European Governments. At the instance of France and England the Sultan in February signed a *hati-houmayune* which was worded in practically the same sense as the one given out in 1839. In order to render thus *hati-houmayune* binding on the Sultan, and to instil in him a respect for the will of the European governments, the members of the Congress present ingeniously made article 9 of

[1]) Alberic Cahuet, *La question d'Orient*, préface de M. Frédéric Passy, membre de l'Institut, Paris, 1905, p. 131.

[2]) Same, p. 131.

[3] T. D. Martens, *Traité de droit international*, vol. II, p. 181. — *La question d'Orient*, pp. 170 and 171

the Paris Treaty read: «The Firman has been made known to the Powers, and they take cognizance of the important significance of this notification.» Under a very dignified form the Sultan was compelled to feel the obligatory force of the Treaty signed by him. Out of courtesy to him the representatives of the European countries admitted that the document was a voluntary act on his part, and that «he would under no circumstances grant the designated Powers the right of interfering, either collectively or singly, with the relations of the Sultan to his subjects, or with the internal government of his Empire.[1])

Thus in order to preserve the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, an action inspired not so much for the maintenance of the European equilibrium as for paving the way to a future aggrandizement at the expense of the Sultan's dominions, France, Austria, and England sacrificed even the scanty rights of the Orthodox Christians of Turkey which were wrested from the Ottoman rulers by Russia and sanctioned by treaty obligations. The Western countries abandoned the Orthodox subjects of the sultans to the mercy of the latter with the result that the condition of the people in Bulgaria and Syria became worse than ever before. Notwithstanding the Paris Treaty France was constrained to send a military expedition in behalf of the persecuted Syrians. This move on the part of France shows that though the Western Powers collectively posed as upholders of Turkey's integrity, individually however,

[1]) Martens says: «It was no secret for any one that the *hatti-houmayoune* was the work of the English Ambassador Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and that it was he who obtained its confirmation. The assurances of the Powers that they had no right of mixing in the Turkish affairs are also false. They cannot be reconciled with the fact that while the members of the Congress admit their attitude of non-interference, they at the same time note down their acceptance of the Firman imposed by them upon the Porte.» — Martens, vol. II, p. 189.

they lost no opportunity whereby they could despoil her of her provinces. France at first planned to become the sole inheritor of the Ottoman Empire, failing in which she then turned to Russia for support. Austria's and Russia's foreign policy always aimed at the dismemberment of Turkey. Even a treaty was concluded by them to this effect. Before the will of Peter the Great[1]) concerning the conquest of Constantinople made its appearance, Louis XIV already had a plan of becoming lord of the Ottoman capital. Louis' ambition was to lay the foundation of a new French Empire in the East which was to comprize: Morea, Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Roumelia, and the islands of the Archipelago. He ceded to Venice Slavonia, Croatia, Bosnia, Dalmatia, Albania, and Epirus in exchange for Morea, Achaia, and the Island of Negropont. Wallachia and Moldavia were to be given to Poland, while the principality of Temesvar was to be made independent. The plan itself of the war with Turkey was already drawn up, as well as the necessary budget

[1]) Apocryphal and written in 1811. See the monographs: *Politique extérieure de Pierre le Grand*, in Revue d'histoire diplomatique, by Roger Roux, 1903, vol. II, p. 214. « The idea of Russia's necessity for extending her dominions over the Baltic and Black seas is based upon the famous 'political testament' attributed to Peter the Great. There is no need of dwelling long upon the question of the authenticity of the document written in 1811, but it cannot be doubted that if this plan is not sketched out by the Tzar for his successors, it at least corresponds quite exactly with his policy . . . . »

Histoire générale (vol. VI, p. 722), par Lavisse et Rambaud: the authors think that the Testament was invented by Lesur to please Napoleon.

Berkholz thinks Napoleon I as the real author of the will. See *Napoleon Ier, auteur du Testament de Pierre le Grand*, Paris, 1863.

The Russian writer Sokolnitzky considers the Testament the work of General Sokolnitzky.

T. G. Djuvara, *Cent projets de partage de la Turquie*, pp. 240 à 244.

made out.[1]) Similar ambitious projects were fostered by Catherine II and Joseph II of Austria, by Napoleon and Alexander I. Catherine of Russia, and Emperor Joseph concluded a treaty which aimed at the restitution of the Greek Empire with Constantinople as its capital. According to its stipulations all Balkan Christians were to be included in it. A new Kingdom, that of Dacia, was created which was to include Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bessarabia. Most of the remaining Turkish provinces were to be divided between the contracting parties. Joseph was willing to cede to Venice Peloponnesus, Crete, Cyprus, and a number of the Ionian Islands. Russia, however, raised an objection to such a deed,[2]) proving that it would weaken the new Greek State. The Treaty proved a dead letter. In 1807 Alexander I of Russia and Napoleon came into an understanding leading to the Treaty of Tilsit[3]) which was renewed in 1808 at the Congress of Erfurt. The fate of whole Europe was affected by this arrangement.

In conformity with the terms of this treaty Russia was allowed to occupy Sweden and the Ottoman Empire, and Napoleon — Western Europe. At Tilsit Handenberg, the Prussian Minister, proposed to Alexander I the following plan for dismemberment of Turkey: Russia was

[1]) H. Omont, «Revue d'histoire diplomatique,» 1898, see *Projets de prise de Constantinople,* n° 2, pp. 198—208. — Djuvara, pp. 297 à 305

[2]) Paparrhigopoulo, p. 438: — Djuvara.

[3]) T. de Martens, vol. I, p. 158. — Edouard Driault, Revue d'histoire diplomatique, *La Question d'Orient,* 1901, n° 1. — A. Vandal, *Napoleon et Alexandre Ier,* vol I, pp 189—233. — Serge Tatitcheff, *Alexandre Ier et Napoleon, d'après leur correspondance inédite,* 1801 à 1812, Paris, 1891, pp. 211—219; 237; 240—247; 290. — A. Vandal, *Document relatifs au partage de l'Orient négocié entre Napoléon et Alexandre Ier,* Revue d'histoire diplomatique, 1890, n° 3, pp. 422—470, particularly, pp. 456—457, and 467—470.

to take possession of Wallachia and Moldavia, Bulgaria and Roumelia as far as Adrianople, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles; to Austria was given Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Serbia, while France was to seize Greece and the Islands. Besides, it was left to the option of Russia, Austria, and Prussia to cede their respective portion of Poland in favour of the King of Saxony. According to the plan of Napoleon and Alexander, Turkey was divided into three parts: Russia took Roumania, Bessarabia, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Constantinople; Austria — Bosnia, Hercegovina, Slavonia, and Montenegro; France — the Adriatic coast, Albania, Epirus, Macedonia, Greece, and the Islands, the Dardanelles and Asia Minor. It was decreed for Serbia either to fall under the rule of Austria, or to be made independent. A dispute arose between Napoleon and Alexander concerning Silesia, Constantinople, and the Dardanelles. The Russian Emperor was in no wise willing to see Silesia out of Prussia and handed over to France, nor to accept Constantinople without the Dardanelles. On the other hand, Napoleon would never agree to see Constantinople in Russian hands. In his memoirs written in St. Helena he says: «I could divide the Turkish Empire with Russia, this question was discussed between us more than once. Constantinople always saved Turkey. That capital was a great obstacle, the stumbling-block. Russia wanted it, I would not let her have it; it is a precious key; it alone is worth a whole empire. Whoever obtains it can rule the world .... Constantinople is the key of the world.»[1])

These projects which were laid out by the European governments in spite of the existing treaties between them and the Ottoman Empire throw abundant light upon the history of the diplomatic relations of Europe with Turkey, and point out the actual motives by which the first was animated in its dealings with the latter. While the Christ-

[1]) T. G. Djuvara, pp. 343—344.

ians were groaning under the Turkish yoke, the Great Powers were busy scheming and working out various plans for their own aggrandizement at the expense of Turkey. They were inspired by no thought of ameliorating the lot of the oppressed Christian races in the Balkans. At Petrograd alone people showed an interest in the fate of the Balkan states. At first an idea was started for the union of all the heterogeneous races and for the resuscitation of the ancient Greek Empire, then the question of Greek and Serbian independence came to the front. The Greeks and the Serbians themselves turn to Petrograd for help. The Hellenes appeal for the restoration of their former empire. The Serbians seek for educators and books in Russia. The Greek clergy, the spokesman of the Greek race, set at work for its liberation and the restitution of the Greek Empire. The Patriarch of Karlovetz sends many young men to study in Russia, begs for teachers and literature.

The first promoters of culture and education in Serbia were Russians. «Particularly from the commencement of the XVIIIth century,» says Stanoevitch,[1]) «the original leaders of the Serbian church and all conscientious representatives of the Serbian people worked for the promotion of Serbian enlightenment. Besides, young men were sent abroad, especially to Russia, to be educated. In those days (1722—1726) there began to come to us Russian educators, and Russian books were being introduced. Under the influence of the Russian educators and literature, and especially the Russian church-service books, there was formed a Slavic-Serbian language which becomes the literary language.» According to Skerlitch,[2]) the Kiev Academy from 1721 to 1761 was attended by twenty-eight Serbian holders of

[1]) Stanoevitch, p. 247.

[2]) Jovan Skerlitch, *Srpska Knjavnost u XVIII veku*, Beograd 1909, pp. 165—166.

scholarship. Serbian students were also found in the Russian military schools. At the request of the Serbian Patriarch of Karlovetz many Russian educators were sent to Serbia, headed by Souvoroff who settled as teacher in Karlovetz.

At the beginning of the XVIIIth century the Bulgarians did not exist as a people. They had no clergy, nor public men of their own to lead and represent them. Thus during the XVIIth and at the commencement of the following century the Russians in speaking of the Orthodox Christians in Turkey meant the Greeks, Serbians, and Montenegrins. Peter the Great is anxious of liberating the Eastern Christians and in this way eclipse the glory of John the Horrible. He poses as the greatest foe of the Ottoman Empire and the Liberator of Wallachia and Moldavia, of the Serbians, Montenegrins, and the Greeks.[1]) On the 8th of March 1711 he publicly declared war against the enemies of Christ in the Cathedral Church of Moscow where he showed to his army a banner with the inscription of Constantine the Great: *In hoc signo vinces.* Later on when Empress Catherine was animated with the ambition of restoring the Greek Empire and when Russian educators were sent to Serbia and Serbian youth went to Russia to be educated, the Russians were still ignorant of the existence of the Bulgarians. They spoke of Orthodox in Bulgaria, but the name Bulgaria to them was merely a geographical term.

The Bulgarians did not consider themselves in respect to race and language a seperate body from the rest of the Orthodox inhabitants. It was just about this period that they began to awaken from their slumber, in which they had been lost for centuries. The Bulgarian guilds and communes were just commencing their exalted work of eco-

[1]) **Roger Raux**, *Revue d'histoire diplomatique*, 1908, N° II, *Politique extérieure de Pierre le Grand*, p. 196 and 197.

nomic and intellectual advancement which was the first step towards national self-assertion.

Bulgaria's awakening to new life was accelerated and assisted by several factors. They were: 1) the ideals disseminated by the French Revolution, 2) the reforms introduced in Turkey, 3) the Russo-Turkish wars and the revolutions that broke out in the neighbouring states, and 4) personal initiative. The awakening and national individualization of the Bulgarians began with their schools, churches, and literature which were the product of the Bulgarian people itself. These were the elements of which subsequently was created the youngest state on the Balkan Peninsula. The Bulgarian school, church, and literature were the fruit of the democracy of the XIXth century. That is the most striking feature of the history of the Bulgarian Renaissance. Prior to the appearance of the ideologist of the Bulgarian democracy, there were the guilds and the communes which paved the way for them. The democratic ideas with the Bulgarians were in their inception. They were the seed of the traditional democratic notions of the Slavs.[1]) Paissi, the ideologist of the Bulgarian Renaissance, cleansed them from their mould and dust, and presented them in three forms, viz., National Church, National School, and National State.[2])

[1]) See pp. 60 and 61.

[2]) Professor J. D. Shishmanoff, *Uchebnoe i kulturno-prosvetitelnoe dielo u Bolgarii*, Moscow, 1913, p. 7.

VII.

RENAISSANCE.

Beginning and Character of Bulgarian Awakening. — Paissi and His Ideas. — Disciples of Paissi. — Uri Venelin. — V. Apriloff and Neophyte of Rilo. — Notables and First Schools. — Struggle for Bulgarian Schools. — Greek Bishops and Turkish Authorities Against Bulgarians. — Greek Schools. — Normal Schools and Teachers. — Three Gymnasias and their Alumni — Literature. — Societies and Reading-Rooms. — Bulgarian School Wins Out.

There are two views or opinions concerning the Bulgarian Renaissance which is the work of many pioneers and promoters. One group of writers considers the appearance of Father Paissi [1]) as the beginning of it, and his disciples and the copyists of his history of 1762 as his pioneers. A second group of authors traces its origin earlier than the age of the venerable monastic chronicler, namely, in the anonymous compilers of the *damascenes*, [2]) and finds its workers and promoters in the copyists and readers of these writings. Should we accept the second theory, one may be justified in going even earlier than the era of the *damascene* authors, viz., the XVI[the] century, when there were printed and edited the Church-Service books, such as were the *Psalter* [3]) and the *Prayer-Book*, published in Venice by Jako Kraikoff of Sofia, in

[1]) Drinoff, vol. I *Father Paissi and His Times, History and Disciples*, p. 137. — Boyan Peneff, *Paissi of Chilender*. Spissanie, N° LXXI, pp. 747—752.

[2]) B. Tsoneff, *Neo-Bulgarian Literature before Paissi*.

[3]) Drinoff, vol. II, pp. 495—498.

1562 and 1570, respectively. To the same series of books belonged *Abagor* or the prayer-book of the Bulgarian Paulicians, which was printed in 1641. During the XVIth century there were two Bulgarian schools in Sofia. During the following century there flourished at the town of Tchiporovtzi a Bulgarian institution, a sort of theological seminary, in which the languages employed were Latin and Croatian.[2]) One of the most noted teachers of that school was Ivan Liloff, a native of the same town and a pupil of the Roman Congregation. But these books and schools cannot be considered as the beginning of the Bulgarian revival. The written copies, the printed books, and the schools such as existed in those days were a continuation of the Bulgarian education of the Middle Ages. That continuation was rather the effect of inertia. In it there could be found no symptom or idea bespeaking a new life. The explanation of those manifestations depend on what is meant by *renaissance*. The meaning of this notion, however, was determined as early as the time of Petrarch. Taken in that sense, *renaissance* means the liberation of literature, educaton, ideas, and the individual person from the ascetic spirit of the Dark Ages. During the two Bulgarian kingdoms, the Bulgarian literature and school were the product of the Middle Ages. Both the Bulgarian State and its institutions were deeply engrossed by the spirit of those ages, and the Bulgarians retained it down to and after the Ottoman Conquest. It was necessary that Bulgaria put off the cloak and asceticism of the former epochs. She had to be renovated and stimulated by the spirit of freedom and the logic of science and man's reason.

The *Damascenes*, however, spread about and disseminated just this narrow religious conception of life among

[1]) Ireček, *the Bulgarian Principality*, translated by St. Arghiroff, part II, p. 28.

[2]) N. Mileff, pp. 161—162.

the Bulgarian people. Indeed, the *Damascenes* of Joseph Bradati touch upon such subjects as nation, language, and Greek bondage, but it is done with a Christian resignation. The tone of the history of Father Paissi sounded altogether differently. It also lacked a scientific character, and the beautiful Bulgarian language possessed by the *Damascenes*, but from it, nevertheless, emanated a refreshing breath and an impulse, though not very vigorous, towards a new era of life which was soon to be inaugurated by the French Revolution, — an era of liberty, national self-consciousness, and democracy. With the new ideas set forth by Paissi the soul of the Bulgarian people is awakened from its long lethargy and spurred on to a life of culture, progress, and independence, though these ideas succeed in exerting a controlling influence upon the Bulgarian people half a century later. But if the Bulgarian Renaissance commences with the history of Paissi, which evokes a spiritual, intellectual, and political awakening, was the Bulgarian people ready and fit for such a change, and who were the pioneers and promoters of the national regeneration?

The renaissance of the Bulgarians forms a special chapter of the modern history of the Balkan states. It has a character of its own and has its particular course of development. Its inception starts with the encyclopedians who stirred the Western nations during the XVIIIth century, and whose doctrines were subsequently espoused by the leaders of the French Revolution. But the ideas of the encyclopedians reached Bulgaria many years after Greeks, Serbians, and Roumanians had embraced them.

That is due mainly to the geographical conditions with which these nations are favoured. Serbia borders on Austria, Roumania — on Russia, and Austria, and Greece — on the sea through which she comes in immediate contact with Europe. Bulgaria, on the other hand, in virtue of her

geographical position, formed the heart of European Turkey and, therefore, was thoroughly isolated from the Western civilization. The mass of the Turkish military forces were centered in her territory and her inhabitants were living under a strict surveillance, were continually searched for arms, and severely punished when found with them.[1]) During all the wars of Turkey with Russia and Austria, as well as during the revolutionary movements in Serbia, Roumania, and Greece, Bulgaria was the arena of war operations, in consequence of which she suffered terribly.

The greatest Turkish strongholds were found in Bulgaria. For the belated awakening of the Bulgarians there are, besides, deep-rooted historical causes. The Greeks, Serbians, and Roumanians, and the Greeks in particular, labored under one yoke only, a political one, while the Bulgarians were ground down by two, a political and a spiritual one. The Greeks had Constantinople for their center of culture, and they never ceased to exist as a people. Not so with the Bulgarians: they possessed no educational or religious centre, for all Bulgarian towns, their capital Tirnovo included, were condemned to decay or were hellenized. The Greeks boasted of their own church, literature, communal administration, public men, and leaders, and had in their Patriarch a potent religious, political, and national representative and patron.[2]) The Bulgarians, in the meantime, from Shar mountain down to the Aegean, and from the Aegean up to the Black Sea and the Danube, lacked all of these agencies, and consequently, showed no sign of national feeling and existence. The Greeks on account of their glorious past reaped abundant sympathy from the European countries, while no one in Europe knew or cared to know anything about

[1]) Ami Boué, La Turquie d'Europe, 1840, pp. 103 and 186.

[2]) Gregory Trubetzkoi, *Russian Oriental Policy*, p. 4.

the hard-oppressed Bulgarian people in the Balkans. The Bulgarians not only were the last among their neighbours to awaken to a new life, but they had to commence a struggle in all directions, since they were robbed of everything, — their name, nationality, literature, church, school, community, rights, etc. The Greeks, Serbians, and Roumanians had to fight against a foreign foe — the rulers who oppressed them. The Bulgarians, on the other hand, before taking up arms against their foreign foes, the Turks, and Greeks, had first to rid themselves of their internal or home enemies — the hellenized Bulgarians who proved a very dangerous element to their national cause. The first commenced with their political emancipation, the latter with their spiritual freedom. Bulgaria's neighbours were restored to life by means of arms, the Bulgarians by means of their schools and chapels which had yet to be created. In Serbia and Roumania political liberty precedes the religious; in Bulgaria happened the reverse, political freedom grew out of the spiritual. In Greece the educated class, the notables, and the higher clergy led the struggle for liberation; in Bulgaria, on the contrary, the national regeneration and awakening came from below, from the common people, which gradually dragged along the Bulgarian notables and enlightened class, and the first battle fought was against the Greek Patriarchy.

The seed of culture once sown by the Bulgarian tzars, patriarchs, and writers, though trampled upon and stifled for centuries by the Greek clergy, was not totally destroyed. Here and there in the out-of-the-way towns, recesses, and mountain settlements it was preserved, and like Phoenix which rose out of its own ashes, the Bulgarian literature and national idea sprung up from the dust and mould of the Bulgarian monasteries of Mt. Athos, Rilo, and other such isolated intellectual centres. The monks and priests of these religious strongholds were the first

humble disseminators of the Bulgarian letters and books. They began with the *Damascenes* in the churches, and finished with the alphabet which they taught in the monastery cells. The metochs or parsonages they converted into schools, where Slavic was studied. These so called *'cloister'-tutors at first instructed their pupils in the* Slavic and acquainted them with the Slavic books, but that was all. They inspired them with no knowledge of the history of Slavic letters, of the history of their own country, and of their renowned past. The Bulgarian self-consciousness and thought were to be evoked later on by the caloyer Paissi of Chilender Monastery, a humble monk, who nevertheless proved no less a patriot than a historian. In 1762 he shared his history with the people by spreading it in written copies. Its title was, « A History of the Slavic-Bulgarian People, Tzars, and Saints. » This modest book was so enthusiastically received and devoured by all, its popularity and influence was so strong with the people, that we may justly assert that the Bulgarian Renaissance begins with its publication. Paissi's history, or rather attempt at history, was a simply written story-book, without any critical analysis and literary pretensions. It was in reality a panegyric of the past history of the Bulgar nation and a bold protest against the Greek Patriarchy, Bulgaria's *religious oppressor. People saw in it a revellation* of the past, a beacon of the present, and a stimulus for the future of their country. Father Paissi first delineated Bulgaria's bygone days in vivid pictures. He it was who told his countrymen that the Bulgarians were the first to become Christians, that the first Christian church was Bulgarian, that the first Christian school was opened by the Bulgarians, that the first Slavic books were Bulgarian, that the first Slavic writers, educators, prelates, and saints were also Bulgarians, and that among all the Slavic races the Bulgarians were the first to have their own Pa-

triarch and independent church. He bitterly assailed and condemned the Greeks for having exterminated the Bulgarian leaders of thought and action, burned the Bulgarian libraries, usurped the Bulgarian Patriarchate, hellenized the Bulgarian churches and schools, and tried to hellenize the Bulgarian himself. He was, however, most severe on those Bulgarians who were ashamed of their birth and language. «O thou foolish and degenerate man,» he wrote, «why art thou ashamed to call thyself a Bulgarian? Have not the Bulgarians had a kingdom and dominion of their own? Why shouldst thou, o imprudent man, be ashamed of thy race and shouldst labour in a foreign tongue?» The pious friar criticized the Serbians and Russians for reviling their brethren the Bulgarians, telling them that before either of them were converted to the Christian faith the Bulgarians were already a well organized and educated Christian people at the head of whom stood the great Tzar Simeon, a learned man and philosopher, whose court was thronged with literary men and filled with books, and that he himself was an author. This first Bulgarian history book was eagerly spread among the people who burned for learning. It passed from hand to hand zealously copied by those who could write, for in those days there was no printing press. The 'cloister'-teachers were the first ones to take it up and share its contents with their apprentices. Many read it over and over with tears of joy. Those who went over it advised others to do so. Upon the margin of many written copies of Paissi's national story book are found such exhortations: «See to it that you, too, read it over, dear brethren. Read it for your edification, for the benefit of the Bulgarians, and the detriment of the Greeks.» And again «whoever reads this book let him read it diligently, in order to know that the Bulgarians once had a kingdom

[1]) Drinoff, *Father Paissi, His Time, His History, and Disciples*, vol. I, p. 104—106; 126 and 127.

of their own.» So fascinating was the short history of the Bulgarian Chilender Father. It kindled the original spark of national pride and awakening. By pleading for religious freedom and race self-consciousness, he was the first apostle of Bulgarian self-assertion,[1]) independence, and unity. He ushered new spirit in the life of his people, thus severing the bonds of religious asceticism which held it enchained for centuries.

Father Paissi was a monk of the Chilender monastery in the days when Mt. Athos was a Greek centre of activity, a seat of Greek education and patriotism, and the birth place of the famous Greek Academy founded at the Monastery of Vatoped. Here, it will be remembered, Eugene Bulgaris,[2]) a man of great erudition and liberal ideas, gave his lectures on the philosophy of Locke and Leibnitz. The young Bulgarian monk Paissi eagerly imbibed all knowledge he could obtain at the Greek religious and educational institutions of Mt. Athos. He was a living witness of the intense activities carried on here by the Greeks, of their patriotic zeal, and the future mission for which the Greek students were preparing themselves in the Academy and the various monasteries. Mt. Athos in the first half of the XVIIIth century was swarming with intelligent, public-spirited, and energetic Greek students. But though the young Bulgarian historian of the future was obtaining his education surrounded on all sides by powerful Hellenic influences, he, nevertheless, did not cease to be a Bulgarian. We can easily imagine how mortified he must have felt at seeing at the head of the Academy a learned Bulgarian, who must have either totally forgotten his derivation, or considered it derogatory to be known otherwise than a Greek. He also must have felt exasper-

[1]) Dr Ivan D. Shishmanoff, *Paissi and His Epoch*, Periodical of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, N° VIII, p. 17.

[2]) B. Peneff, *Paissi of Chilender*, p. 661

ated at meeting here many Bulgarian monks who concealed their identity and passed for Greeks. His cry, so loud, so painful, and so unexpected in the XVIIIth century, and his questions, «why art thou ashamed to call thyself a Bulgarian,» were they not addressed to the Academy professor and the monk students at Vatoped? If this is psychically probable, then mustn't we look to this supposition for an answer often raised by the biographers and admirers of Paissi, namely, who has influenced him to write his history and to instil in it the ideas and spirit which it contains? None, is the reply in our estimation. The book is an original product of a soul struggle which existed in the venerable toiler of the Chilender Monastery. The idea of writing his history was born within him and was reared up in the new atmosphere which was created by the Mt. Athos libraries and the Vatoped Academy. It has to be sought in the psychological bent of mind of Paissi and in the monastery environments. Though psychically probable, this supposition cannot be considered as yet a full answer to the query: under whose inspiration did he write his work teeming with so subjective a spirit and feeling, and so great a patriotic enthusiasm? The real answer should be explained from a practical point of view; it should he based and supported by facts. That, however, is a question which awaits investigation.

In the days of Paissi there were two kinds of educated Bulgarians: some of them were unconscious of their nationality and history, while others never ceased to call themselves Bulgarians. The first ones who called themselves with the vague name of Christians fused themselves with the Greeks who were their nearest brother Christians. The second ones felt as Bulgarians, and though they, too, calledy, themselves Christians, kept aloof from the Greeks. A typical example of the former was the learned Vatoped Academy professor, Eugene Bulgaris. Most Bulgarians in those

times belonged to this class. A representative of the second type was Father Paissi. Of him professor B. Peneff[1]) says: «He was the first important personage who appeared at the threshold of the Neo-Bulgarian literature. His ideas and feelings proved stronger than the philosophy of men like Eugene and the Christian resignation of his Bulgarian followers. On this point it is interesting to read the opinion of the Greek historian Paparrhigopoulo. «The racial disputes,» says he, «which formerly caused frequent collisions between Greeks and Slavs were stifled by the heavy clinch of the Turk. The common peril and misfortune banded all Christians together, and for a long time it was believed that the common danger and the common hatred of the Turk would unite them in a struggle against him, and once the victory won, would mould them into a political unit. That is the reason why a good many enlightened men of that epoch were anxious to retain the general name of *Romaioi* as a symbol of such a unity. Though it was felt at the very start that it would be difficult to restrain the people from its desire of restituting its traditional appellation, actual experience, however, showed such a wish illusory; a fusion of Hellenes and Slavs into a political whole was an impossibility. The bitter remembrances of the long past were against such a change. The struggle, indeed, was common, but, unhappily, it was never undertaken by common efforts. The realization and maintenance of such an utopian unity under the authority of the Oecumenical Patriarchy was so difficult a problem, that the result of it all was the seperation of the Bulgarians from the Greek Church.»

Paissi took a determined stand against the Christian resignation to which the Bulgarian people was being led by its own sons. He stepped in just in time to save his

[1]) Paissi of Chilender, p. 752.

[2]) *Histoire de la civilisation hellénique*, pp. 406 and 407.

race from utter annihilation. The ideas of the Encyclopedians reached Bulgaria by way of Mt. Athos. There they were introduced by Eugene Bulgaris whence his pupil Paissi subsequently spread them throughout his own country. He effected this mission by means of his history.

Father Paissi was favoured not only with a large circle of readers, but he also had a large number of followers and disciples. Father Spiridon of Gabrovo was one of his most conspicuous admirers and imitators. After Paissi's example, he, too, wrote a book entitled «A Short History of the Bulgarian Slavs, Written in the Year of 1792 by Friar Spiridon.» [1]) The work of this monastic writer, however, failed to make a name for its author. The most noted disciple of Paissi was Father Stoiko of Kotel, later on Bishop Sophronius of Vratza. He was for over twenty years teacher in Kotel, after which he was ordained priest and finally bishop. Being an ardent lover of his native tongue which he wished to popularize, Sophronius copied Paissi's history and read it to his pupils and to all who flocked to hear him. In the churches he preached to the people in their vernacular. His sermons consisting of Sunday discourses and precepts were printed in 1806 at Rimnik. He was the first Bulgarian writer and his collected sermons were the first Bulgarian book to appear at the beginning of the XVIIIth century. The title of his work is «Kyriakodromion», or «Sunday Sermon Book», but in after time it was named in honour of its author — *Sophronie.*

These sermons were didactic in character. For the first time in the lapse of four hundred years the Bulgarians were happy to see in their midst an inspired pastor, to listen to a church sermon spoken in their native tongue, and read a book printed in Bulgarian. About the same time there rose two other prominent monks, Hadji Joakim

[1]) V. N. Zlatarsky, published by the Bulgarian Holy Synod, 1900.

of Kitchevo, and Cyril Peitchinovitch of Teartsi, district of Tetovo. Both of these men wrote and published books in Bulgaro-Slavic language, by means of which they did a good deal in spreading learning among their own kin.

But the works of Paissi and his worthy disciples and followers reached only the educated class of the Bulgarian people, particularly the teachers and the clergy that stood faithfully throughout the struggle against the Greek Hellenization policy. The better class of the hellenized Bulgarians turned a deaf ear to the new ideas preached by the Chilender apostle. The hellenized communities, notables, and merchants looked contemtuously upon the priests and teachers who read and taught in Slavo-Bulgarian. They boycotted the schools and churches opened and directed by them, and showed a disgust with everything Bulgarian. Thinking themselves descendants of the Marathon heroes, they loathed to be identified with the Bulgarian race, its glorious name, and the past traditions and history of the Bulgarian people. All these things they took for a legend. And Goloubinski was right when he wrote: «During the first thirty years of the present century in that part of the Balkan Peninsula inhabited by Bulgarian people about whose nationality there was raised a question, namely, in the town population, there existed, literary speaking, not a single Bulgarian who was conscious of the fact or wished to admit that he was a Bulgarian and not a Greek, and who prayed in his native tongue and not in the Greek language. As is usually the case with all miserable renegades, those self-styled Hellenes showed greater aversion to all Bulgarians and Slavs than the genuine Greeks themselves ..... Thus the so-called better or higher class of people which in other countries makes up the intellectual and educated portion of it here did all it could to dissociate itself with Bulgarian nationality which had become a meaningless term, and to

ally itself with the Greek which was considered the real one.» [1])

The race self-consciousness, weak and glimmering in the monastery cells and isolated Bulgarian settlements, had to be given a push and envigorated. In order to effect this it was necessary for it to make its way into the cities and towns, that is, into the hellenized Bulgarian communities. It had to transform the hellenized Bulgarian notables who heretofore were wholly given to the Greek cause. It was necessary for the Bulgarian national spirit to have its own worthy representatives, both before the Bulgarian people and abroad. It was necessary for the Bulgarians to have their own centre of culture. Another Paissi had to shine forth equipped with better education and greater authority, to continue the mission of the first one — to convert into flame the spark already kindled, to awaken the political self-consciousness among the hellenized Bulgarian communities, to regain for Bulgaria its stray sons, to snatch them away from the firm grasp of the Greek Patriarchy, and to bring them back to their own people whom they had renounced and deserted.

Every epoch has its great pioneers and creative men, and Bulgaria at this junction was fortunate in availing herself of the most valuable services of Uri Venelin — who, though not a native Bulgarian, was, however, a true and patriotic Slav from Ukraina. His name is intimately connected with the history of the Bulgarian intellectual and political revival.

Uri Venelin became acquainted with Bulgaria through his Bulgarian fellow students at the Kishinew Seminary. Later on he went to Moscow to study medicine, but here too his interest in the Bulgarians never ceased. He con-

[1]) E. Goloubinski, *A Short Description of the History of the Orthodox Bulgarian, Serbian, and Roumanian Churches*, Moscow, 1881, pp. 176—178.

ceived a great liking for the oppressed Bulgarian nation and decided to study up its past history. While still a student he manifested an unusual interest in all historical works which dealed on Bulgaria. One of the fruits of his historical researches was his essay « Ancient and Modern Bulgarians, » which was published in 1824. This was the first attempt in the Russian literature at studying up the history of the Bulgarian people. As such, naturally enough, it cannot be considered a very successful one. His book, nevertheless, was received well by the Russian Academy and the Russian learned men. The Academy entrusted Venelin with the mission of visiting Bulgaria and familiarizing himself with the facts on the spot. A result of his sojourn in Bulgaria came out in his « Character of the Popular Songs among the Danubian Slavs », « Wallacho-Bulgarian and Daco-Slav Documents », and a voluminous Bulgarian grammar. The last work was never published. By means of his writings, and especially, his correspondence with leading Bulgarians, as well as through his residence in Bulgaria, Uri Venelin wrought a great change in the minds of the educated Bulgarians.[1]) His works made a considerable impression in Russia itself. In 1826 there appeared a monography on the history of Bulgaria, which might be attributed to the influence of his literary productions. It was printed in « Viestnik Evropi ».[1]) Venelin's works gave a powerful impetus to the awakening of the Bulgarian people. Bulgarian regeneration, as has been already pointed out, progressed very slowly down to the thirties of the XIXth century. Since then however, it commenced making fast strides, exerting its influence everywhere and among all classes. The popularity of Venelin's writings proved too strong a temptation even for the hellenized Bulgarians, who also took to reading them. The

[1]) Dr. Ivan D. Shishmanoff, *Venelin's Correspondence in Moscow*, Bulgarian Review, N° VIII, pp. 2—23.

name of the new Bulgarian historian became a byword of the day. The hellenized Bulgarian communities brought up in the Greek schools and churches and imbibed with the Greek spirit for a time restrained their interest in the works of the learned foreigners. At first they vacillated, unable at once to decide which course to take. They were, so to say, bewildered and felt as being in a dream when reading the graphic description of the « History of the Ancient and Modern Bulgarians ». They were inclined to disbelieve the assertions made about the glorious origin of the Bulgarian race, but the learned Russian authority was fascinating and convincing. Through his pen the entire chain of historical events with which the Bulgarian people is identified were presented in a most telling manner. Soon the educated and intelligent Bulgarians who heretofore abhorred to be classed as Bulgarians began to recover from their delusion, turned their back to Hellenism, reverted to their own people, and even took the lead in the Bulgarian national movement. The noted Bulgarian philanthropist, Vassili Apriloff, according to his own statement, was « born anew » after reading the history of the Bulgarians by the Ukraine author. Apriloff could not help being thrilled with the fascinating narration of Bulgaria's past greatness. A change took place in his soul; he was filled with a tender feeling for his nationality, and an aversion to his Hellenic tendencies. He subsequently wrote to Venelin with whom he entered into discussion on various topics, viz., Bulgarian history, grammar, poetry, etc. A similar transformation occurred in the hearts of many Bulgarian merchants and notables residing in Odessa, Bucharest, and other foreign cities. At Odessa Apriloff took the initiative of organizing a committee for opening a Bulgarian school in Gabrovo, his native town. The first man chosen as teacher for that school was Neophyte of Rilo, the well known monastery pedagogue and cloister reformer. Before

shouldering up his new duties, Neophyte went to Bucharest where he spent some time in preparing himself for the task. There he mastered the Ben-Lancaster teaching method, wrote a Bulgarian grammar, a book of catechism, and a sort of rapid calculator. Thus equipped he set out for Gabrovo. There, however, many obstacles had to be surmounted before he was able to start a Bulgarian school. As was feared, the Tirnova Greek Bishop was against such an undertaking. And though Apriloff and the Bulgarian notables of that town did all they could in obtaining the sanction of the obdurate prelate, their efforts would have been in vain if it were not for the breaking out of the Russo-Turkish war in 1829, which proved disastrous to the Ottoman arms, and brought about the Treaty of Adrianople by which Sultan Mahmoud II was bound to introduce reforms in his domains for the betterment of the lot of his Christian subjects. Availing themselves of the favourable times, the Odessa Bulgarians succeeded in obtaining the needed licence for laying the foundation of the long-planned school in Gabrovo. That was the first institution of learning organized after a European model. Soon the example of the Odessa Bulgarians was followed by other native philanthropists. The Kalofer merchants Mouteff, Toshkoff, Toshkovitch, and others residing in Odessa, took the initiative in opening a school in their birthplace. Ivan H. Angeloff who amassed a fortune in Bucharest became instrumental in opening a school in his native town of Svishtov. The Philippopolis merchant Hadji Vulko Tchaluckoff built a school on his own ground. Another Philippopolis merchant, Christo Hinata, who carried on trade with Vienna and Odessa, errected a school in his native town of Kazanluk, and in addition, provided it with a fund of fifteen thousand piasters. Patriotic citizens of Kotel raised a sum of fifty thousand piasters for the establishment of a school in their own town, while their learned fellow-

citizen Peter Beron gave large sums yearly for the support of ten girl schools in Kotel, Shoumen, Osman Bazar, and other places. Peter Christoff, a Tirnovo business man, converted his own house into a school. Hadji Stoyan of Sevlievo paid the entire cost of a massive school building errected in his native town, besides providing for the salaries of its teachers. Enlightened and public-spirited Bulgarians vied with each other in patriotic zeal, material support, and moral encouragement, in every effort toward national awakening. Most towns and villages gloried in the benevolent work of one or more patrons. Such bright rays illumined the eve of Bulgarian Renaissance.

After the example of Apriloff, the well-known Bulgarian Hadji Vulko Tchaluckoff sent to Gabrovo at his own expense the teacher Zachary Krousha of Samokove in order to master the Reciprocal Educational Method under Neophyte of Rilo. In 1837 he resorted to the services of Neophyte himself in order to found a pedagogical school at the town of Koprivshtitza. The pupils of Neophyte, who graduated from the Gabrovo and Koprivshtitza schools, scattered throughout the country, most of them becoming schoolmasters and disseminators of the Reciprocal Method.

The spirit of self-conciousness which was spurred on with such a great enthusiasm and energy filled the Greek bishops with no small apprehension, while the fast strides Bulgarian education was making by means of its constantly increasing schools made them furious. As enemies of the Bulgarian race, language, and literature, they lost no time in doing all they could to stamp out every sign of national awakening among the Bulgarians. Availing themselves of the official position they were privileged with, they tried, with the help of the Turkish authorities, to extinguish every effort towards enlightenment and learning made by the Bulgarian people. Taking advantage of the *berats* in which the Bulgarians too were

classed as Greeks or *Roum-Mileti*, they raised a fierce opposition, not only to the establishment of Bulgarian schools, but also to the introduction of the Bulgarian language in them side by side with the Greek, although these schools were founded and maintained by Bulgarians. They employed to all sorts of devices and intrigues in order to discredit the claims of the Bulgarians before the Turkish Government. Thus they accused the apostles of Bulgarian Renaissance of being revolutionists. The Ottoman authorities generally believed these charges, in consequence of which tho pioneers of Bulgarian education and learning were persecuted, imprisoned, interned or exiled. This explains the reason why the first Bulgarian schools were opened and flourished in those mountain towns and villages and remote settlemenls where the power of the Greek Patriarchy and the Turkish authorities was least felt.

The central localities had to struggle long against the encroachments and hostile resistance of the Greek clergy. In 1837 Hadji Vulko Tchaluckoff decided to open a Bulgarian school in Plovdiv (Philippopolis) and invited Neophyte of Rilo to be its schoolmaster. But before putting his plan into practice he informed the Greek Bishop of his project. The latter after hearing him said: «Tchorbadji (Squire), you know well that personally I have nothing to say against your enterprise, but in view of the strict orders which we have from our Patriarchy to have a close watch over every effort on the part of the Bulgarians in opening schools, especially in the cities, I am duty bound to inform it of your intention of laying the foundation of such an institution. The Patriarchy, I am sure, would not show its opposition at once, nor will it take immediate steps to close it, but in due time it will discover a plausible reason to discredit you before the Government, with the result that you will be exiled and your school closed. On that account if you care ought for

your own interests, you better desist from your undertaking.» The Bulgarian notable, after thinking it over, decided to open a school in Koprivshtitza instead. In 1840 the Plovdiv Bulgarians made an effort to open a school of their own, or at least to have the Bulgarian language taught in the existing schools common for all. The Greek bishop Chrysant not only objected to having the «barbarous and dissonant language», as he described the Slav-Bulgarian tongue, studied in the schools, but immediately protested before the Ottoman authorities against the wishes of the Bulgarian notables whom he accused of being inspired by revolutionary ideas, and therefore acting as enemies of the State. And, indeed, the calumnies of the Greek prelate bore their evil results — many of the influential Bulgarians interested in the educational welfare of their countrymen were arrested and sent to prison, while some of them were exiled. This and other similar drastic measures on the part of the Ottoman authorities did not diminish the patriotic zeal of the Bulgarian people. With a doggedness characteristic of their race, the Bulgarians never swerved from their purpose. Gradually and quietly they succeeded in taking possession of various schools in which their children were taught in their own language. Not only in Plovdiv, but in nearly every city and town the Bulgarians had to face and surmount great obstacles before they were able to open schools and churches of their own. The history of nearly every Bulgarian institution of learning is in one respect a martyrological book. How many a public-spirited schoolmaster, priest, merchant, etc., suffered persecution, imprisonment, exile, and even death for his country's sake! At first a few of the inhabitants of a town, often one or two, fired by an irresistible desire to see their countrymen awake from their profound ignorance of their history, began the long struggle for educational and religious freedom. Later on, however, their cause was taken

up by the whole people. In the beginning all the Bulgarians asked was to have the Bulgarian tongue, also, used in the schools supported by them. Every opposition they encountered only increased their determination to realize what they struggled for during generations. Failing to obtain the sanction of the Patriarchy for the introduction of the Bulgarian tongue in the schools, the Bulgarians then turned to founding schools of their own. This move, however, as was already seen, brought them into bitter conflicts with the Greeks, which evoked the interference of the State authorities.

The question at issue was, then, a purely educational one. It was purely a matter of culture. The demand for Bulgarian schools or schools of their own on the part of the Bulgarian people caused the first serious collision between the Greeks and the Balkan Slavs. Thus the school question preceded the church question. The latter grew up out of the first. The school question opened the eyes of the Bulgarian race. Now the Bulgarians clearly saw that they were not recognized as a people, had no communes or representatives of their own, were deprived of the most elementary human rights, were an object of severe persecution by the Greeks, and that the Turkish authorities sided with them. The terrible reality loomed up before them in all its detestable ugliness. They were shocked at the fact that a Greek bishop was in a position to keep under his feet and oppress the inhabitants of a whole town, county, district, nay, of a whole people, of entire Bulgaria. That thought embittered and exasperated the Bulgarians whose self-consciousness as a nation was fast progressing. The real truth stung them to the quick and made them mortal enemies of Hellenism. Its voice was all-powerful and convincing. It spoke to the Bulgarians this wise, at is were: «Here is a Greek occupying a high office and clad in holy garb, who treads upon several

hundred thousand Bulgarians belonging to his diocese, and imposes upon your children the Greek language and customs; here is that Greek on his way to the Government house whither he is going to discharge a heap of evil reports and columnies against the Bulgarians. Behold his victims, your countrymen and brethren, some of them marked down and singled out, others persecuted and hunted down, third exiled, and others cast into prison.» And why is all this? It is all because the Bulgarians wish their children to be taught in their vernacular, and because they are anxious to preserve their national character. Time always uses truth as its most-potent and eloquent apostle. The Bulgarian people holding steadfastly on the truth to which the Western movement directed them rose equal to the emergency. The wrongs heaped upon them tended to harden their hearts and unite them more closely together in withstanding the determination of both Greeks and Turks to annihilate them. Bulgaria's only weapon against its foes was a united front. Bulgarian unity employed with tact finally won, and the establishment of the Bulgarian school became an accomplished fact. Instead of whining before the Government and of making formal protests for their deliveranco from Hellenism, they withdrew their children from the Greek schools and closed their pocket-books. Thus the Greek schools being left without students and due material support began to drop out one by one. Their place was gradually taken up by the newly created Bulgarian institutions of learning. The Bulgarian inhabitants of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia vied with each other in educational enterprize. A great enthusiasm filled the hearts of the Bulgarian people throughout. The Greek bishops, naturally, protested before the Turkish authorities, in consequence of which the leaders of the Bulgarian educational movement were as usual exposed to all sorts of restrictions, maltreat-

ment, imprisonment, and even death. But no protests, no authorities, and no violent methods were able to compel the Bulgarians to send their children to the Greek schools. The spirit of unity, when conscious and inspired by a sublime ideal, is an irresistible moral power, and in this case the moral force and justice was on the side of the Bulgarians. The spirit of unity prevailed. Hellenism was shaken at its foundation. The appearance of the Bulgarian school on the Peninsula administered it the first and most decisive blow.

Thus came into existence the Bulgarian educational institutions. Until then there was to be found no officially recognized Bulgarian community, and the Bulgarians were not treated as a particular people.

The enlightenment brought about by the introduction of the Bulgarian schools illumined the horizon of the Bulgarian people, so that they now clearly saw the artificial frame work upon which the Greek community was founded. Created in the XVth century by the Patriarchy, it tried to maintain itself through intrigues, threats, and intimidation. Sooner or later, however, it was bound to succumb under the indestructible vitality of the Bulgarian race. The chains with which it had fettered the Bulgarian people had long been in the progress of rusting, until finally, the appearance of the Bulgarian school shattered them completely. Education in the Country began to make rapid advancement. The number of schools began to multiply and to widen their scope of work. A dozen years after the opening of the Gabrovo school there came into existence as many as eighty others, throughout Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia, some of which were incomplete or half-gymnasias, and one a commercial institution which was founded at the city of Veles. One of the most conspicuous features of the history of Bulgarian national regeneration is the fact that the first rays of Bulgarian self-consciousness, as well as

the first educational pioneers, came from Macedonia. Wasn't it St. Clement who in the IXth century sent three hundred teachers to Bulgaria? His successors during the XIXth century were Father Paissi, Neophyte of Rilo, Pavlovitch, Vaskidovitch, and many other Macedonians.

Towards the close of the XVIIIth and at the beginning of the XIXth century many Bulgarians obtained their education in Greek schools, especially at Athens, Chios, Sidonia, Jannina, Constantinople, Bucharest, Jassy, and other towns. These schools were well-organized institutions, most of them equipped with rich libraries. They were centres of Hellenism. A glimpse of the character of these institutions of learning may be gotten from the description of the Greek school at Jannina made by the French Consul General Pouqueville who had visited it in 1810. It was a full gymnasia and was supported from funds founded by two rich and patriotic Greek merchants, Kapelan and Zossimos.[1]) Here, besides Greek, were taught also the Latin and French languages. Most of the students were supported from the same funds. The school was provided with physical and chemical laboratories, globes, maps, and other facilities. Its library contained some fifteen hundred volumes, mostly in the classical tongues. There was also a considerable number of French books in it. Many celebrated Greeks received their education in this school. Its fame was so great during the XVIIIth century that the Greeks were wont to say, « our writers are Jannina men.»[2]) During the first half of the XIXth century the Jannina School turned out two noted Bulgarian learned men whose names are intimately connected with the history of Bulgarian Renaissance. These men are the well-known

[1]) F. C. H. D. Pouqueville, *Voyage de la Gréce,* deuxième édition, Paris, 1824, vol. I, pp. 153 and 154. — Ubicini, p. 201.

[2]) G. Shassiotis, p. 53.

Macedonian brothers Demeter and Constantine Miladinoff, natives of the quaint and picturesque city of Strouga.[1])

Early during the last century the Bulgarian students who graduated from Greek Schools were animated by no national feeling, and manifested no inclination to stir up the political self-consciousness of their people. Though they entered the Greek institutions as Bulgarians, at the end they came out imbued with Greek ideas and Greek spirit.[2]) Those among them who bravely stuck to their race and language were soon lost out of sight, because there existed no enlightened Bulgarian communites to welcome and encourage them. There were but few Bulgarian intellectuals in those days, and such as were found, generally leaned toward Hellenism. It was a dangerous thing for a young Bulgarian educated in a Greek School to pose as a Bulgarian, far more so, should he actively identify himself with any occupation which helped to arouse an independent sentiment among the Bulgarian people. On this account his first care was to establish himself on a solid footing. But in order to do this he was compelled to make concessions with himself: he either kept secret his origin and language, until he had made his fortune and strengthened his position,[3]) or he passed for a Greek and was assimilated with the Greek community for good. The latter course was adopted by such eminent Bulgarians as Eugene Bulgaris, Dr. Nicholas Picolo, the very sons of Bishop Sophronius of Vratza, and many other noted Bul-

[1]) Dr. Iv. Seliminski's Library, N° 3, p. 87.

[2]) Dr. Iv. D. Shishmanoff, *Significance and Services of the Miladinoff Brothers*, Magazine of the Bulgarian Academy, N° 3, pp 58—80.

[3]) Panayot Rasheieff, subsequently Bishop of Pagonia, used to call himself Peter Jonidi. While a student, teacher, and deacon he passed for a Greek. As soon, however, as he became an important dignitary in the service of the Patriarchy in Bucharest, he declared his identity as a Bulgarian. See *Zlatna Kniga*, by Sava Veleff, pp. 102 and 103.

garians, all graduates of Greek schools. Such a Bulgarian was even Stephan Bogoridi, later on, Prince Bogoridi, a nephew of the same Bishop Sophronius. Bogoridi was an alumnus of the Greek Academy at Bucharest. After his graduation, he found a warm reception in the Greek community which he joined and soon became opulent and a man of great weight and influence. Shortly after he was appointed by the Porte to various important posts which he filled with success. His diplomatic abilities attracted the attention of the Sultan who subsequently called him at his court to be his councillor. His sterling qualities won for him the title of prince and paved the way for his appointment as Governor of Samos. Here we may also cite the names of similar famous hellenized Bulgarians, such as Constantine and Stephan Karatheodori, natives of the Adrianople district, professor Bodli of Ochrida, and many others. Of Dr. Picolo and Prince Bogoridi it must be said that they always remembered their native towns. Thus the first one bequeathed through a Paris notary public the sum of twelve thousand francs to the communal school of the city of Tirnovo,[1]) while the latter founded at his expense a Greek school in Kotel. The motives which prompted Bogoridi to choose a Greek school were largely of an economical nature. A knowledge of the Greek tongue at that time gave the student a better opportunity for advancement than the study of the Bulgarian language. As was noted elsewhere, this tendency to espouse Hellenism was general among the Bulgarian people in those times. Philip Sakelari, a Bulgarian merchant at Vienna, in 1824 supplied the means for the opening of a Greek school in Svishtov (Sistova), his birth place. Naturally enough the majority of the Bulgarian youngmen educated at Greek institutions of learning preferred the Greek to their native

[1]) Sava Veleff, *Zlatna Kniga*, p. 453.

[2]) *Voyage dans la Macédoine*, Paris, 1828, p. 159.

tongue. Cousinery, Cyprien Robert, and Victor Gregorovitch who had visited the Balkan Peninsula during the first half of the last century, all speak a good deal about the Greek schools found in the Bulgarian towns. «The Bulgarians,» says Cousinery, «are more easily linked with the Greeks in the cities where there resides a Greek Bishop and where Greek schools are to be found. They consider it more dignified to attend the Greek schools and obtain a Hellenic learning.» Cyprien Robert says almost the same thing on this point. [1]) Of special interest are the remarks made by Gregorovitch [2]) on the Greeks schools in Bulgaria. «My chief aim was,» declares that writer, «to find out how much of the Slav character was preserved in the country where in the churches, schools, and even in the everyday life of the Bulgarian the Greek influence and culture predominated . . . . . The Ochrida Bulgarians impressed me with their good education and vivacity. I often met Bulgarians looking uncouth, who, nevertheless, had read a good deal and betrayed a great thirst for knowledge. My guide, for example, a tailor by trade, was familiar with a good many Greek works, and in conversation often quoted passages from Miletius, Kouma, and from a number of Church books. He, of course, acquired such an erudition, not by attending the excellent Greek schools, or by mingling with the Greeks. The Greek influence, however, had almost stifled the Bulgarian tongue outside the home. I did not meet any one in Ochrida who could read Slavic. The Bulgarian language was spoken only within the narrow family circle enlivened by the presence of the women. In public the Bulgarians employed the Greek . . . . Throughout the entire southern Macedonia, from Salonica to Ochrida, and from the Thessalian border to Skopie and Melnik, church service was

[1]) *Les Slavs de la Turquie*, Paris 1844, pp. 283—290.

[2]) *Ocherk puteshestvii po evropeiskoi Tourtsii*, 1844, pp. 99—115.

officiated in the Greek language, not only in the city but also in the village churches. In only very few churches or rather monasteries was the Bulgarian tongue still retained in the liturgy. According to my information, Slavic liturgy was preserved in Debretz, Dibra, and around the city of Prilep.» Gregorovitch found Greek schools only in the towns of Vodena, Strouga, Ressen, Stroumitza, Demir-Hissar, Melnik, which were attended by Bulgarian boys. He was greatly elated to come across the town of Shtip where he visited its school in which Slavic was the vernacular. «The schools in most of the places visited by me» declares this noted Russian scholar, «had been recently founded. They deserve special attention from various points of view. They are built close to the churches and are supported either by subscription or annual fees paid by the inhabitants. The schools are divided into advanced and primary. Down to 1833 Greek was taught in both of them, since that date, however, the Bulgarians began to introduce their own language in them and teaching was carried on in Bulgarian. The number of schools in which Bulgarian was used are twenty-six in Danubian Bulgaria, sixteen in Thrace, and nine in North Macedonia.» [1])

The Greek language and institutions were, as was already pointed out, spread in all important Bulgarian towns. It was thought in those days that the most enlight-

[1]) These are the towns and villages with Bulgarian schools:
Danubian Bulgaria: Viddin, Svishtov, Roustchouk, Silistra, Razgrad, Djoumaya, Shoumen, Tirnovo, Kotel, Ellena, Trevna, Leskovetz, Drenovo, Gabrovo, Sevlievo, Lovetch, Troyan, Plevna, Teteven, Etropolé, Pirdop, Vratza, Lom, Berkovitza, Sofia, and Nish.
Thrace: Kazanluk, Kalofer, Karlovo, Sopot, Yambol, Sliven, Jeravna, Karnobad, Stara-Zagora, Tchirpan, Pazardjik, Samokov, Panagyurishty, Koprivshtitza, Peshtera, and Vranya.
Macedonia: Nevrokop, Veles, Shtip, Kiustendil, Banya (Razlog), Doubnitza, Gorna-Djumaya, Rila and Rilo Monastery. (See Gregorovitch, pp. 166 and 167.)

ened and best educated men came out from the Greek schools. Whoever had good schooling was as a matter of fact considered a Greek. Not only the Bulgarians, but the Roumanians also entertained the same notions about the superiority of the Greek language. The Greek schools in Wallachia and Moldavia were even more numerous than in Bulgaria. The schools in Bucharest and Jassy, the capitals and chief centres of culture in these principalities, were Greek. Though they enjoyed liberty and a government of their own, though they were rich and prosperous, and in addition were in close communication with Russia and Austro-Hungary, the Roumanians were devoid of national self-consciousness. The Roumanian intellectuals and educated class spoke, wrote, and thought in Greek, borrowed the Greek ways and customs, imitated the Greeks in all things, and considered themselves true Greeks. «Hellenism,» says the Roumanian historian Xenopol, [1]) «struck deeper roots in Wallachia than in Moldavia .... Nearly all the boyars spoke Greek. Many of them occupied themselves with Greek literature, translated into Greek the dramas of Voltaire and Alfieri, while their children presented them in amateur fashion. The élite of Roumania used only Greek in their drawing-rooms. The women particularly were very fond of speaking it. Thus Prince Line, a French representative, was so utterly deceived by some Moldavian ladies whom he met and heard talk Greek, that he took them for real Greeks who detested to speak the language of their husbands. The feeling for one's nationality had fallen to such a state of disrespect, that the Metropolitan Jacob Stamat in his essay on education is puzzled to know why people in other countries so easily mastered the Greek language which was foreign to them, while in Moldavia it was mastered with difficulty. To

[1]) *Histoire des Roumains*, vol. II, pp. 343—346. — Ed. Damé, *Histoire de la Roumanie contemporaine*, Paris, pp. 52 and 53.

Metropolitan Jacob the Greek language was not considered foreign for the Moldavians!»

It is putting it too strong, as some authors are inclined to do, to assert that the Greek schools and the Greek classics caused the revival of the Bulgarian school during the last century. The Greek language and literature, indeed, exerted a powerful influence over the Bulgarian language and taste, but it would be absurd to say that they instilled self-consciousness and patriotism into the soul of the Bulgarian. The Moldavian prelate Jacob knew Greek perfectly, and was familiar with Greek literature, he, however, was wanting in that knowledge which the science of logic reveals to a truly enlightened man, viz., a recognition of one's origin and language which is the foundation of national education. The Greek language and the Greek school did not resuscitate the Bulgarians, on the contrary, they checked and retarded Bulgaria's regeneration. How pernicious to Bulgarian national interests Hellenism proved may be judged from the fact that in 1829, after the Treaty of Adrianople, Dibitch, the Russian Commander-in-chief, in answer to a petition sent to him by the inhabitants of Sliven, wrote them «in Sliven dialect with Greek characters, which the people used in those times.» [1])

The Greek schools in Bulgaria presented the greatest danger to Bulgarian national self-consciousness. They threatened to completely denationalize the Bulgarian people. To counterbalance the influence of the swarms of Greek schools and the powerful domination Hellenism exerted upon the country, the Bulgarians could rely only on the efforts of a handful of small and isolated schools scattered throughout Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. Thus during the year 1750 there were only twenty-eight cloister

[1]) Dr. Iv. Seliminski Library, N° 2, p. 57.
[2]) N. Iv. Vankoff, pp. 106 and 107.

or private schools, but two of which were in the city, all the rest being in the villages. In 1800 there were found forty-eight Bulgarian schools, of which only six were in the cities.

In 1834 they reached the number of one hundred and eighty-nine, of which thirty-three were in the cities. The principal studies taught in these schools were, reading in Slavic, writing (not general), and arithmetic. [1])

These were the only monastery schools come down from the Middle Ages. In them the pupils studied the breviary, psalter, etc., preparatorily to becoming priests. It is ridiculous to imagine that these improvised schools were in a position to withstand the influence and culture propagated by Hellenism. On the contrary, they it may be said, tended to increase the number of the Greek schools in the Bulgarian cities and villages, since they encouraged the reading and study of Greek books. Neither did the «Graeco-Slav schools» founded by Bulgarian graduates of Greek institutions, show any opposition or hostility to the Greek education and culture. The «Graeco-Slav schools», nevertheless, represented a transitional period between the *Kilia* or cloister schools and the real Bulgarian institutions of learning. The service they performed was to prepare a teaching staff for the future generations which were soon to rid themselves of Hellenic influence and domination. In the «Hellenic» or «Graeco-Hellenic» and Graeco-Slav or Graeco-Bulgarian schools founded by Raino Popovitch in Kotel and Karlovo, of Christaki Pavlovitch in Svishtov, of Em. Vaskidovitch in Svishtov and Plevna, of Sava

[1]) Cyprien Robert in 1841 writes the following of the Bulgarian schools: «Every bishopric has its school attached to its cathedral church. All such schools are of similar construction; in every one of them a monk assisted by deacons teaches the children writing, arithmetic, catechism, and the psalter. Many of these institutions have adopted the *reciprocal method* in teaching, as is the case in Sofia and Lozengrad,» pp. 284 and 285.

Dobroplodni in Shoumen, later on in Sliven, etc., etc., were educated the first Bulgarians who after specializing themselves in Russia and the West returned to Bulgaria and laid the foundation of the modern Bulgarian school. The first Bulgarian merchants, writers, and public men received their training there. In the school of Popovitch in Karlovo[1]) had studied S. Rakovski, Gavrail Krustevitch, the brothers Eulogius and Christo Gheorghieff, the brothers Ivan and D. Ghesheff, the Shopoff brothers, Bottyo Petroff of Kalofer, and many others. No matter how important a part was played by the « Helleno-Greek » or « Helleno-Slav » schools, they at all events did not bring about the Bulgarian renaissance. Nations are being regenerated in their own tongue and national spirit. Popovitch and Dobroplodni taught in Greek, acquainted their pupils with the Greek classics, Greek mythology, Greek religion and profane writers, rhetorics, oratory, general history, and even Greek history, but in their curriculums handed down to us we find no place reserved for national geography, one of the most important subjects studied in the modern school. They taught Hellenic history, but nobody ever thought of Bulgarian history. The spirit and ideas of the « Slavyano-Bolgarska Istoria » of 1762 waited for national teachers of the type of Paissi to usher them, into the genuine Bulgarian educational institutions. Such national pioneers and patriots were subsequently to be discovered in the future disciples of Popovitch, Pavlovitch, Neophyte of Rilo, Dobroplodni. Among them stand conspicuous N. Gheroff, B. Petkoff, T. Bourmoff, Iv. Momtchiloff, N. Michailovsky, G. Tchintiloff, and others, all graduates of Russian schools. In their work of regeneration and reform they were greatly assisted by Christaki Pavlovitch who in 1844 published Paissi's history under the title *Tzarstvenik*, or King's book, and B. Petkoff who translated into Bulgarian

[1]) M. Balabanoff, *Gavrail Krustevitch*, p. 44.

the «Ancient and Modern Bulgarians» of the Russian historian Venelin.

If the employment of the *alilodidactic* educational system is considered a marked reform and an epoch in the history of the Bulgarian school, for which credit should be given chiefly to P. Beron, Neophyte of Rilo, and K. Photinoff, then a still greater event should be deemed the Bulgarization of the Helleno-Slav schools, by the introduction into their programmes of Bulgarian history and other vital disciplines. It is with this innovation that the Bulgarian Renaissance actually begins. The radical change of the school system filled the hearts of the young Bulgarians with a new spirit. For the first time in the history of Bulgarian education the study of Bulgarian history and geography, as well as language, was introduced and made the basis of the school programme. In 1851 the philologist Gheroff and the erudite B. Petkoff delighted the youth by opening a course on Bulgarian national history, the first in the Plovdiv *class* or high school, the second in the Kalofer school.[1]) In 1859 the similar institution at Gabrovo adopts the same subject under the direction of T. Bourmoff, while N. Michailovsky introduces it in Tirnovo. As early as 1865 Bulgarian History becomes a general study in all schools, both primary and advanced. The ideas of Father Paissi pervaded all institutions of learning. All of a sudden the Bulgarian school was transformed. It was infused with a new life, new hope and aspirations. It was rescued from the dead and stagnant atmosphere of the cell or monastery environment, and freed from its inertness and lifeless cosmopolitanism in which it was placed by the Helleno-Bulgarian schoolmasters, pupils of the Greek institutions and culture. Paissi's history ushered into the Bulgarian school a different conception of things: it brought

[1]) N. Iv. Vankoff, pp. 115, 126, 130, 131.

with it a knowledge of one's country, love for one's native tongue, and a consciousness of a future full of hope. The miraculous book of Paissi, though appearing in the XVIIIth century, remained intact in the dusty shelves for nearly a hundred years, until its great worth was revealed by its introduction into the people's schools. Ninety years after its author had written its last page, it created a wonderful change in the Bulgarian race. Illumined by its revellation and ideas, the Bulgarian people was born anew, as it were; the Bulgarians immediately deserted the Greek schools. The general emulation in the national movement thus created seized all regions inhabited by Bulgarians. Everybody yearned for enlightenment.

The newly opened *reciprocal* schools, as they were called, proved very fruitful and of good results. The youth that came out of them could not be contented with the mere elementary education it obtained there. Many of the youngsters who could afford it flocked into larger towns and centres to continue their studies. A considerable number of them began to go abroad to enlarge their scope of learning. At first the nearest foreign schools were frequented, such as were found in Constantinople, Odessa, Athens, Bucharest, Belgrade, Prague. Already in the second quarter of the last century the Bulgarian lads studying in Constantinople, Athens, and Odessa manifest a predilection towards their nationality. In Kuru-Tcheshmé, the famous Greek School in Constantinople, in the school founded on the river Andros, and in Athens University the Bulgarian students even organize a society whose aim is to work for the awakening of their own people. In Odessa at the Risheleff Gymnasia the Bulgarian youth is animated by similar motives. One of the Bulgarian students here conceives the idea of writing a Bulgarian grammar. In all those institutions the life of the Bulgarian young representatives was animated by a nationalistic spirit and

love which later on was followed by more positive and broader activities. Among the most distinguished Bulgarians of those days, whose names are inscribed in the history of Bulgarian Renaissance, were Ilarion Makariopolski, Gavrail Krustevitch, Dr. St. Tchomakoff, Panaret of Plovdiv, Dr. Mishaikoff, Naiden Gheroff, and others. In the course of time the craving for a still higher and more solid education induced many a Bulgarian young man to penetrate into the interior of Russia and the West, — into France, Austria, and Germany.

Already in 1850 in the bigger towns there came into existence not only *reciprocal* schools, but semi-gymnasias superintended by well-prepared Bulgarian teachers of European training. Simultaneously with the Gabrovo school which under the guidance of T. Bourmoff, Ilia Christovitch, G. Sirmanoff, and others became an important educational centre, there sprung a large number of similar institutions throughout the country. Thus in Plovdiv there was soon founded a flourishing school under the management of the ecclesiastic J. Grueff, and Naiden Gheroff, a graduate of the Risheleff Lyceum. In Tirnovo N. Michailovsky, a graduate of the University of Moscow, stood at the head of the school. The institution of Shoumen was in the hands of Sava Dobroplodni, a man of Greek training, and of D. P. Voinikoff, of French education. In the city of Helena the school affairs are managed by Iv. Momtchiloff and K. Nikiphoroff, both of them graduates of Odessa Seminary. Iv. Bogoroff, an alumnus of Risheleff Lyceum and Vitanoff of Petersburg University were the venerable schoolmasters in Stara-Zagora. The Sofia school was directed by Sava Philaretoff, a graduate of Moscow University, while the one at Kalofer was in the hands of Botio Petkoff, of Russian training. The school of Toultcha (Dobroudja) was superintended by T. Ikonomoff, a graduate of a Russian academy. D. Miladinoff, Purlicheff, and Jinzi-

phoff, all Greek graduates, were managing the schools of Prilep, Koukoush, Ochrida, and other towns. D. Yantcheff, a Russian graduate (of Kieff University), was at the head of the Roustchouk school, and Tchintiloff, another Russian graduate, of the Sliven school. The Pedagogical school at Shtip was presided by Joseph Kovatcheff, a graduate of a Russian theological seminary. We find V. Popovitch, another Russian seminary man, at the head of the Veles school. Class or normal schools, too, are in demand everywhere. Such higher grade of educational institutions are opened in Constantinople, Svishtov, Pleven, Viddin, Lom, Stara-Zagora, Sliven, Roustchouk, Vratza, Veles, Skopie, Koukoush, Prilep, etc. In the educational movement espoused by the Bulgarian people at that period there loom up the noble personalities of the illustrious countrymen, Neophyte Bosveli, Hilarion Stoyanovitch, Michailovsky, P.R. Slaveikoff, Demiter Miladinoff, Gavrail Krustevitch, and others. All the schools were overcrowded with students burning for knowledge and culture. The parents themselves lacking education were eager to give their children the advantages of learning. How great was the zeal for education among the Bulgarian people may be judged from the fact that while prior to the first half of the last century the number of schoolboys was very insignificant, already in 1845 we find five hundred of them in Kazanluk, in 1848 six hundred in T. Pazardjik, in 1850 one thousand in Stara-Zagora, over seven hundred in Veles, while in 1852 in the small town of Kalofer, there were some three hundred and eighty.

But the greatest product of Bulgarian educational genius were the famous three gymnasias, of Bolgrad (Bessarabia), Gabrovo, and Plovdiv. The Plovdiv Gymnasia was in fact a well-organized normal school. The Bolgrad Gymnasia was founded in 1858 by Bulgarian emigrants and supported by a strong and patriotic Bulgarian colony. It soon

became a centre of Bulgarian intellectual and religious life. Its first principal was D. Mouteff, a doctor of philosophy of Berlin University. The dormitory attached to it was filled with young Bulgarians, not only from Bessarabia, but from Bulgaria proper. Soon a printing press, too, was added to the school buildings, which greatly furthered the educational enterprise of the studious Bulgarian settlers. In Bulgaria proper the Gabrovo Gymnasia under its noted directors Iv. Gyuzeleff and R. Karoleff, and their colleagues P. Ghentcheff, An. Manoloff, St. Zographski, educated in Russia, and N. Markoff, educated in France, and the Plovdiv Seminary under the directorship of D. Blagoeff and Christo Pavloff, Russian graduates, — these two institutions of learning were the greatest intellectual centres for the Bulgarians. The dormitories or boarding houses linked with them drew students from all parts of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. The Gabrovo school, later on raised to gymnasia, occupied the most prominent place among the educational institutions of those times. The graduates of these three schools joining efforts with the pupils of Gheroff, Grueff, Michailovsky, Dobroplodni, Momtchiloff, Slaveikoff, created an epoch in the history of Bulgarian Renaissance. The Robert College (Constantinople) alumni, as well as those of the Petro-Pavlovsk Divinity School, at a later date, came to their aid in a most worthy cause.

The school agitation affects the Bulgarian rural districts, too, some of the villages even outstripping certain towns with their initiative for intellectual and moral improvement. It is a notworthy fact that P. R. Slaveikoff, the distinguished pioneer, writer, and poet, Christo G. Danoff, Bulgaria's greatest publisher, and Ilia R. Bluskoff, author of precious historical memoirs of the pre-Liberation era, as well as of several novels on subjects drawn from the everyday life of the people, were originally all village teachers

and school reformers. Some rural schools succeeded in making a high reputation for themselves, such as Kalipetra, district of Silistra, Tcherkovna, district of Provadia, Dragoevo and Divdevo, district of Shoumen, Enina and Shipka, district of Kazanluk, Vidrary, district of Orchanie, Banya, Razlog district, Adjar, district of Plovdiv, Peroushtitza and Radouilovo, district of T. Pazardjik, and others. The village of Radouilovo prided itself in its large and beautiful school building. Here in 1852 there were 80 boys and 40 girls studying. The village schools quickly multiplied, some of them doing excellent work, considering the difficulties they had to encounter. In general, the number of schools in all Bulgarian districts grew very rapidly. The greatest intensity in the growth and development of the Bulgarian educational organizations was achieved between the years 1850 and 1876. Those twenty-five years of the last century are unique in the progress of Bulgarian intellectual regeneration. It was the richest in beneficent results. Towards the seventies of the same period there was hardly a village without a school. During 1875 in the Stara-Zagora district there were 129 schools,[1]) in the district of Tirnovo — 129, in that of Plovdiv — 106, and in that of Kiustendil — 100. In 1874 in the small town of Drenovo and its environs, counting some 10,685 inhabitants, there were 940 schoolchildren, which means that one schoolchild corresponded to 11.5 inhabitants. The writer who gives these interesting statistics[2]) compares the figures with similar datas obtained in Europe and American, and states that in Saxony one student corresponded to 7 inhabitants, in Prussia — one to every 8 inhabitants, while in the United States — one to every 5 inhabitants.

[1]) K. G. Popoff, *School Statistics in the Principality of Bulgaria*, Part I, Sofia, 1898, p. IV. — *School Almanac*, vol. I, pp. 683 and 684. — N. Iv. Vankoff, pp. 83 and 84.

[2]) *Tchitalishte*, vol. V, Fundamental Guide, N° 6, p. 120.

Though in this comparison no question is made of the quality of the work done in the primary schools in Europe and America, which was undoubtedly of no inferior order, the very fact that in every village of the small Drenovo county such institutions existed, shows in what short time Bulgaria obtained signal results in educational matters, and how rapidly the number of schools and schoolchildren grew throughout the country.

In spite of the difficulties caused by both the Government authorities and the Greek Patriarch's representatives, the quickly improvised Bulgarian communities never ceased in their determination to open schools of their own, which were supported with revenues derived from church and school real estate, from school taxation voluntarily imposed upon their members, and from gifts offered by rich and patriotic Bulgarians.

During the year 1876 there were in Bulgaria and Thrace 1472[1]) male and female primary schools in both the towns and the villages, and about 350 similar institutions in Macedonia, or all told, 1892 schools. The importance of these figures may be better judged if one places side by side with them those representing the growth of the primary schools in free Greece, Serbia, and Roumania at about the same period.

Greece commenced in 1830 with 71 primary schools. In 1855 she possessed 409 schools, in 1873 — 1248, while in 1878 — 1468, of which 276 were private.[2])

Serbia began organizing her primary schools since 1835, after she had established her Ministry of Education. In 1855 she possessed 330 schools in all, including her pri-

[1]) N. Iv. Vankoff, pp. 83 and 84. — Opheikoff, *Macedonia at the Millenium of St. Methodius*, 1885, p. 47. — *Review of the Work of the Bulgarian Exarchy*, Plovdiv, 1902, pp. 11—15.

[2]) Shassiotis, pp. 183 and 496. — *La Grande encyclopedie*, vol. 19, p. 292.

mary schools, high schools, and university,[1]) while in 1885 there were 565 primary schools in the Country.[2])

In Roumania in 1878 there were 2182 village and 232 town primary schools, or 2414 in all.[3])

During the year 1876 after the insurrections which took place in South and North Bulgaria, the correspondents of the various European papers, as well as the consuls who came to inspect the devastated regions in the districts of Pazardjik, Sliven, Panagyurishty, Koprivshtitza, and other places were surprized to find the Bulgarians so far advanced in popular education. As regards the quality and grade of this advancement an idea may be had from the letters of the well-known American correspondent, J. A. McGahan, printed at the time in the London Daily News under the title of «The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria in 1878.» The thrilling description of the actual state of affairs in Bulgaria by that noble and talented American coincides with the first cycle of the history of the Bulgarian school — the cycle covering the pre-Liberation period.

«In England and in Europe in general,» writes McGahan, people have a very wrong opinion of the Bulgarians. I had always learned, and to be frank, I myself until recently believed that they were savages no superior in point of civilization to the American Indians. You can conceive my amazement, however, when I discovered that almost every Bulgarian village had its school, and those that had escaped destruction were in a flourishing state. They are being maintained by a voluntary tax, without any Government encouragement, but, on the contrary, in spite of innumerable obstacles created up by the very state au-

[1]) Professor M. Vukitchevitch and D. J. Semitch, *Serbyi i Bolgaryi*, pp. 152 and 153.

[2]) *Statistika Kralevine Serbye*, Band VII, 1896, p. LXIV.

[3]) Meyer, Konversation Lexicon, vol. XIII.

thorities. Tuition in the schools is free, education is equally available both to rich and poor. It would be difficult to find a single Bulgarian child who cannot read and write. In general, the percentage of literaracy in Bulgaria is not smaller than that existing in England or France.» [1])

Parallel with the growth of the schools followed the development of Bulgarian literature. At the beginning of the previous century the first printed books were of church and religious character. After *Kyriakodromion* of Bishop Sophronius, [2]) published in 1806 at Rimnik, and subsequently renamed *Sophronie*, there followed a number of books prepared or translated by Hadji Joachim Kirtchovski and Cyril Peytchinovitch. These, too, were in general with religious contents. The authors and translators of these books intended them principally for the use in the *cloister*-schools, in which they themselves were employed as schoolmasters. The first to make an attempt to conform literature with the practical requirements of life, and to reduce it to a pedagogical system, and thus introduce a radical reform into the worn-out school methods in vogue in the *kilii* or

[1]) J. A. Mc Gahan, *The Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria.*

[2]) There are books written and published by Bulgarians during the XVIIIth century, before the appearance of the *Sophronie*, but in Serbian. To this category belongs *Stematographia*, compiled by Chrıstophor Jafarovitch, a Bulgarian from Doiran, and printed in Vienna. As a «staunch lover of his country,» he inserted in his book the coat of arms of the southern Slavs and pictures of their saints. Ivan Raitch, a Bulgarian of Viddin, was the author of the «History of the Various Slav Peoples, chiefly the Bulgarians, Croates, and the Serbians», 1794 A. Neshkovitch imitating Raitch published «A History of the Slav-Bulgarian People», 1801, at Budin. From the preface of the book in which he calls it «A History of the Slav-Bulgarian People for the Sons of my Country», is evident that he, too, was a Bulgarian. Between 1801 and 1810 his History passed through three editions and was widely read by Bulgarians. See Drinoff, vol. II, pp. 474—477. — Jordan Ivanoff, *The Bulgarians in Macedonia*, p. 84

monastery schools, was Peter H. Berovitch (Beron), a native of Kotel. Having fled from Bucharest at the time of the Greek *zaviera* (insurrection) whither he had gone with the purpose of studying Greek under the famous Greek scholar Vardalach, he came to Cronstadt where he became a private tutor in a well-known family. Here he had an ample opportunity of getting acquainted with more rational forms of instruction, whereby he saw very clearly the many defects of the *cell* pedagogy. He quickly came to the conclusion that the *cell* methods of instruction needed a radical reform. On that account in order to facilitate matters and to save the Bulgarian youth of those institutions from a rude, painful, and old-fashion educational process, he set at work and prepared a Bulgarian Reader. The front page of the book bore the inscription: «A Reader, Accompanied with Various Precepts, Prepared for the Bulgarian Schools, by Peter H. Berovitch». The Reader was subsequently known under the appellation «Reeben» (fish), because its last page ended with the picture of a fish. It was published in 1824 with means provided by G. Antoneff Jovanovitch of Cronstadt. The author's aim in writing this book was to introduce in the Bulgarian school the Ben-Lancaster school method which was very popular in those days. He was anxious of doing away with the *alilodidactic* method employed in the *cloister* schools and of supplanting it with the intuitive, though the inductive or vowel method did not quite meet his approval, either. Thus he recommends the pupils to pronounce the consonant letters *b, v, g, d,* for example, not openly *ba, va, ga, da,* according to instructions given out by the Petrograd Academy, but as if ending in a dull vowell, thus *bb, vv, gg, dd.* But the teaching staff of the *kilii* was neither able to comprehend his inovations nor was it in a position to adopt it if it had understood them. His pleading for the introduction of the Ben-Lancaster method,

nevertheless, was in vain. A decade later, that is in 1835, Neophyte of Rilo appears as an energetic and successful school reformer. The «Reeben» Reader was a priceless contribution to the young Bulgarian pedagogical literature and would have done credit to any similar literature in Europe. Uri Venelin, speaking of the origin of the Bulgarian pedagogical writings, says that he did not know of any primer in Russia which was so well prepared as this one of the Bulgarian educator Beron. Beron's Reader is undoubtedly the most important book in Bulgarian, published during the first half of the last century. With it he reforms and lifts up the Bulgarian school. By eliminating the routine of the school system of the Middle Ages, he poses as the first Bulgarian pedagogist and educational reformer. Beron's Primer lays open the reality of things to the Bulgarian school youth by acquainting it with Natural Science. Indeed, his ideas and theory were not readily accepted by all, they, nevertheless, were in due time embraced by the more enlightened class, especially by those Bulgarians who had studied in Russian and Western institutions. Peter Beron, therefore, is the reformer of the mediaeval school system then in vogue among us. His pedagogical views are up to date, meeting the requirements of the times. By inserting the study of prayers and Biblical lessons he shows himself a true contemporaneous observer. The Reader is filled with a new spirit and vigour.

Down to 1840 only a group of Bulgarian translators and compilers were busily engaged in literary labours. Since that date the number of translators, compilers, and authors rapidly increases, while the Bulgarian literature becomes conspicuous for its pedagogical character. A series of textbooks on philology, national history, geography, natural science, mathematics, etc., begin to come into existence. Besides the two Bulgarian grammars, the one of Neophyte of Rilo, published at Belgrade, and the other of Christaki

Pavlovitch, published at Kraguevatz at about 1844, a dozen others appear down to 1870, the best of which were one written by Iv. Momtchiloff and another by Joachim Grueff. Meanwhile other Bulgarian scholars set themselves to the task of working out philological questions and of establishing a uniform spelling. In the philological field Gavrail Krustevitch, N. Gheroff, and later on, N. Purvanoff, a pupil of the Serbian professor Danichich, and M. Drinoff, Bulgarian historian and professor in Russia, shine forth as the foremost pioneers. The works of Drinoff are, without any question, the most worthy gifts to Bulgarian literature. His treatise on « the Bulgarian Alphabet » is still considered a standard work by Bulgarian grammarians. The new authors of educational text-books try to introduce in their works graphic lessons of the Bulgarian history, in order to cultivate in the students a love for their Fatherland and thus create true patriots out of them. Besides the history of Paissi published at Budin in 1844, eight other similar works appear after a short interval, the most popular of which were those of Dragan Tsankoff and D. P. Voinikoff. In 1853 Botio Petkoff translated and published at Zemum the « Critical Investigations in the History of the Bulgarians », written by Uri Venelin. The works of this author were eagerly read and devoured by the youth. These subsequently are followed by the historical essays of S. Rakowski under the name of « Bulgarian Antiquity », in which he extols the origin of the Bulgarians, traces their descent in India, and follows their development and culture in South Europe, and of « Several Addresses in Honour of Tzar Assen I. » M. Drinoff, however, is the man whom Bulgarian history singled out as its best and authoritative representative. In 1889 he published two remarkable works which create an epoch: « A Historical Review of the Growth of the Bulgarian Church from Its very Origin down to our Times, » and « Origin of the Bulgarian People and

Early Period of the Bulgarian History». In 1871 and 1876 he launches in Russian two more historical researches: «The Settlement of the Slavs in the Balkans», and «The Southern Slavs and Byzantium in the Xth Century». The last two works won for him the degree of Doctor of History, made his reputation known to Europe, and Slavdom enrolled another big name among its distinguished rank of slavists. Previous to the publication of Drinoff's works Gavrail Krustevitch had printed the first volume of his «Bulgarian History». From the pen of P. Beron, outside his famous «Reeben» Reader, there came out a number of scientific treaties on Physics, Mathematics, and Slavic Philolosophy. Here he divulges his own theories in regards to Light, Electricity, Earth's Life, Origin of Man, etc. He takes his stand in Science as positivist. He wrote his literary productions in French, in German, and even in Greek. The following of his works were published in French: «*The Deluge and the Life of Plants*», 1858; «*Metereological Atlas*», 1860; «*Celestial Physics*», in three vols., 1864; «*Light's Currents*», 1862; «*Physical Physiology*», 1864; «*Physical Chemistry*», 1870, and «*Pampistem*» in which he takes the electrical currents as the basis of all things. His «*Slavic Philosophy*» was written in German.

The treatises on geography also increased in number. There were in Bulgaria more text-books on geography than there were in the independent adjacent states whose schools had enjoyed a long process of development. Alexander Hadji Rousset prepared and published in Strassburg a map of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. In 1863 the well known Bulgarian publisher Danoff edited in Vienna a map of all the continents, to which was attached

[1]) Leger, *La Grande Encyclopédie*, vol. 6, p. 604. — *Papissanie*, band IV, pp. 130—132. — *Entsiklopedutcheskii slovar*, Brockhaus, vol. 6, p. 583.

one of European Turkey. In 1865 the same Danoff is the author and publisher of two geographical Atlases, a larger one called, *A School Atlas*, containing twenty-four different maps, and a smaller one with nine maps. On Mathematics and Natural Science, besides a number of translations, there came into existence several original text-books. Dr. Mouteff, Dr. V. Beron, and later on, Iv. Gyuzeleff and Vitanoff, Russian graduates, were the chief authors in this branch of study. Gyuzeleff's Physics is noted for its exact and concise style such as is required in expressing mathematical truths.

Polite Literature, too, was welcomed in the country. Works of Fenelon, Milton, Voltaire, Chateaubriand, George Sand, Silvio-Pelico, Lessing, Schiller, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Victor Hugo, Pushkin, Gogol, and many other literary masters were translanted into Bulgarian. N. Michailovsky reveals himself a very successful translator of Telemachus by Fenelon, The Mysteries of the Inquisition by Ferrol, the Last Days of Pompey by Lytton, and many other classical works. The greatest literary productions of the world — the divine Bible and the almost divine Iliad — were rendered into Bulgarian about that time. After the translation of the Gospels by Sapounoff in 1828, came the translation of the Bible by a committee composed of Neophyte of Rilo, P. R. Slaveikoff, Setchanoff, Photinoff, the American Missionary Dr. Elias Riggs, under the auspices of the American Bible Society. Several attempts were made at rendering Homer into Bulgarian, but the whole of the work was never translated. G. Purlitcheff, poet-laureate of the Athens University, N. Bontcheff, F. Veleff, and the poet P. R. Slaveikoff translated certain cantos of the Iliad. Veleff translated eighteen of them. The best work rendered was that of N. Bontcheff who trans-

[1]) Dr. Iv. D. Shishmanoff, *New Datas in the History of our Renaissance. — America's Rôle in it*, pp. 11 and 12.

lated the First Song, strictly observing the meter and number of the verses of the immortal Homer. S. Rakovsky, the author of «Gorski Putnik» (Forest Traveller), showed in it that he was as good a poet as he was a prose-writer. «Gorski Putnik» though lacking in good style and other qualities, nevertheless, with its simple but fascinating narrative and glowing patriotism became a very popular book of the day. A copy of it would repeatedly pass from hand to hand and house to house, and old as well as young read it with intense interest.

In P. R. Slaveikoff the Bulgarians have their first poet, a lyric one, in L. Karaveloff the first belles-lettrist, hence called the Father of the Bulgarian novel, in V. Droumeff the first dramatic writer, and in N. Bontcheff their first literary critic. After P. R. Slaveikoff, the Bulgarian polite literature is represented by the writings of Christo Boteff, Iv. Vasoff, St. Michailovsky, and C. Velitchkoff. These were all young authors fired with the ambition to make a name for themselves in it and even surpass their revered master Christo Boteff, a man of fiery disposition and revolutionary tendencies, who died prematurely at the altar of liberty and thus was unable to reveal in full his great creative powers so strikingly manifested in the lyric verses he left us. He is the poet of freedom and man's duty to humanity. Iv. Vasoff, an inimitable artist of the Bulgarian novel writing, poetry, and style, is Bulgaria's national poet, the singer of Bulgaria's greatness, her nature and glorious exploits, the embodiment of his people's sufferings, and aspirations, their faith in her strength and hope in her future. C. Velitchkoff, the translator of Dante and writer of psychological novels, is the poet of sorrow. St. Michailovsky, a profound thinker, is the Juvenal of Bulgaria, with this difference only, that the arrows he hurls against the vices of society and his contemporaires are made of steel and dipped in truth and bile. The Bulgarian anthologies and advanced readers are

filled with selections from these authors whose works are widely read and dear to every Bulgarian. Stephan Stambouloff, the statesman, Tchintouloff, Char. Angeloff, and others made attempts at poetry with varied success. Stambouloff, the comrade of the great revolutionaries Karaveloff and Levski, was the most gifted among them. A group of mediocre dramaturgists and critics made their appearance about that period, the most prominent of whom was D. P. Voinikoff whose reputation is more closely connected with the history of the Bulgarian theatre than with the production of any serious dramatic work.

All Bulgarian young men who received their education abroad came back and became scrupulous workers for the good of their Fatherland. The majority of them turned schoolmasters and devoted their energy to public education. A goodly number became doctors of medicine. Some of them even studied law. But commerce and finance were the studies that attracted the largest percentage of the Bulgarian youth. D. Shishmanoff was the first to graduate from a commercial school. The well known national leaders Natchevitch and Ghesheff were also graduates of commercial schools, the first one having studied finance in Paris, the latter in Owens College, Manchester. Those who had espoused the law profession, finding no employment under the Turkish régime, were compelled to become teachers, merchants, or publicists. Such were for example Chr. Pavloff, Chr. Stoyanoff, M. Balabanoff, L. Iovtcheff, V. Neytchoff, A. Manoloff, St. Zografski, etc.

The school attracted by far the largest number and the best of Bulgarians. The old Bulgarian teachers were ideal pedagogists both in the school room and outside of it. Owing to their public zeal in the Country there soon appeared, beside the «schools for youth», founded by the notables, «schools for adults», established and run by the schoolmasters. The latter institutions were also known

under the name of «Reading-Rooms», and «Sunday Schools». Women's societies, too, came into existence at that period. Every Reading-Room board, and every Society had in view the spreading of education and culture among their members left without any school training. All Bulgarians were eligible to these organizations whose lecture rooms, libraries, and examplary teaching staff were a great attraction to them. These institutions became meeting-places where notables, educators, merchants, artisans, peasants, and laborers came in close contact with each other under a most democratic atmosphere. Books, newspapers, periodical, etc., were thrown open to all. Lectures were frequently given, acquainting the hearers with various useful subjects. Teachers and students vied with each other in disseminating knowledge among their less fortunate countrymen. [1]) As time advanced shows and entertainments commenced to be given in the Reading-Rooms. Voinikoff's services in portraying on the stage Bulgaria's past glory were highly appreciated by the people. Memorable events and heroes of Bulgarian history were vividly displayed to the view of eager listners. His historical dramas were played throughout the country. They revealed Bulgaria's former exploits and renown and thus evoked among the hearers national pride and patriotism. Theatre decorators and music conductors were found to further the popular enterprise. In Shoumen the Hungarian Sillaghi showed his decorative skill, while the same Voinikoff founded the first orchestra. The city of Shoumen was in those days celebrated for its theatre and music.

Through the Reading-Room Associations sprung up, later on, the Sunday schools which were introduced into nearly every place possessing an ordinary school. Thanks to those Sunday institutions many merchants, craftsmen,

[1]) P. Athanasoff, *A Short Description of the History of Our Theatre*, Pspissanie, pp. 384 and 385.

apprentices, servants, and labourers learned to read and write. All schools in the country seemed veritable beehives. Everybody connected with any of them was busily engaged in some capacity or other for the general welfare of the community. The teachers taught and preached, the notables and guilds patronized the schools and Reading-Rooms, rich and poor gave all they could spare for their maintenance, and the learners were noted for their earnestness and zeal. The extent of the enthusiasm among all classes may be judged from the following striking incident published in «Macedonia» in 1870. A humble artisan had died in the city of Koukoush. At his death he had bequeathed all his savings to the local Reading-Room Board with the instructions that his money be used for buying books for Reading-Room libraries. This act of generosity he had done in gratitude to the institution in which he had learned to read and write and had been helped in many other ways. In the course of time the Reading-Room organizations became very powerful and rich. Their work was not limited to mere local interests. Thus many of them were instrumental in establishing schools in places where there were none, and in helping pupils to finish their education. They even possessed funds for supporting students abroad. Such distinguished «Tchitalishta», as they are called in Bulgarian, were found in Constantinople, Plovdiv, Viddin, Toultcha, and other cities. The Constantinople «Tchitalishty» was the first among them, which in 1870 started a periodical bearing the same name. But the most enlightened «Tchitalishty» was the one found in Braila, which later on became «the Bulgarian Literary Association», and which after the liberation of Bulgaria, grew into the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Its founders were distinguished Bulgarian educators, writers, and professors, such as Marin Drinoff, Vassil Droumeff (later on Bishop Clement), and Vassil Stoyanoff. Its members were drawn

from among the well known Bulgarian teachers and authors. Its magazine *Perioditchesko Spissanie* was the first of its kind published in Bulgarian.

Reading-Rooms and Women's Associations began to appear from 1856 on. In 1870 Reading-Room organizations existed in Tirnovo, Svishtov, Roustchouk, Viddin, Lom, Vratza, Sofia, Gabrovo, Gorna-Orechovitza, Shoumen, Razgrad, Toultcha, Gorna-Djumaya, Kiustendil, T. Pazardjik, Trevna, Pleven, Lovetch, in Bulgaria proper;[1]) in Plovdiv, Sliven, Stara-Zagora, Yambol, Koprivtchitza, Klissoura, Kazanluk, Karnobat, Kotel, Karlovo, Kalofer, Sopot, Panaghurishty, Tchirpan, in Thrace; Prilep,[2]) Veless, Koukoush, Voden, Doubnitza, Samokov, Skopie, Shtip, Krivoryetchna-Palanka, in Macedonia. In some towns there were more than one Reading-Room organization. Here it is worth while to notice that not a single Serbian Reading-room association or a library was to be found anywhere in Macedonia.

The Teachers' Conferences were another extremely beneficial agency in the early stages of Bulgarian awakening. They, too, were the product of the patriotism and never-flagging efforts of the Bulgarian schoolmasters. The Bulgarians were the first to introduce the Teachers' Conference in the Ottoman Empire. Both town and village teachers took part in these *sobors* which were convened according to a definite programme. At the Conferences the participants exchanged views, took decisions on special questions, usually of pedagogical nature, discussed matters pertaining to the curriculum of primary education, the methods, text-books, school apparatus, pedagogical literature, aid to students, etc. The first *Sobor* took place in 1868, in

[1]) Tchitalishty, 1873, p. 1150.

[2]) Tchitalishty, 1870, p. 181. — Chr. G. Danoff, *Letostrou*, 1871, p. 238. — N. Vankoff, pp. 41 and 42.

[3]) Jordan Ivanoff, *The Bulgarians in Macedonia*, p. 201.

the town of Stara-Zagora. Two Teachers' Conferences were held in Plovdiv, one in 1870, the other in 1874. Prior to Bulgarias' Liberation *Sobors* were held also in Gabrovo, Prilep, Toultcha, Shoumen, Samokov, Lovetch, Roustchouk, and Viddin. Up to 1874 the *Sobors* were convoked at the initiative of teachers' councils and school boards. After that date, the Exarchate which was invested with the religious and educational jurisdiction over all Bulgarian churches and schools, began to exercise this function through its metropolitans. In Stara-Zagora the school board and teachers' staff managed to arrange two or three conferences during the year, viz., during the Christmas, Easter, and summer vacations. The same practice was in vogue in many other cities.

The Women's Societies organized side by side with the other culturial associations of the Country performed manifold functions. They aimed at the moral and intellectual elevation of their members, devised various means for increasing their funds, aided poor girls in school, and in general tried to raise the position of the woman whose education was very much neglected during the centuries of Turkish oppression. In 1873 a number of women's societies gave an exhibition in Constantinople in which the Bulgarian daughters showed their aptitude in fancy work.[1]) The income obtained from the sale of the exhibited articles was handed over to the Constantinople Benevolent Brotherhood for the purpose of using it in assisting the Bulgarian schools in the vicinity of the Turkish capital. The idea was considered highly ennobling and patriotic. The exhibition took place in the Metochia of the Bulgarian Church at Phanar, and was opened with unusual ceremonies by Antim I, the first Bulgarian Exarch.

[1]) D. P. Ivanoff, *A Statement of the Bulgarian Benevolent Brotherhood «Prosveshtenie,»* Constantinople, 1873, in Pravo, Nos 16 and 17 of 1873.

The concluding sentence of his speech delivered for the occasion runs as follows: «The objects brought on exhibition in the Turkish capital are clear proof of Bulgarian industry, taste, and progress.» That Bulgarian miniature exhibition was brought about by the joint efforts of Bulgarian womens' organizations and was a display of the skill, toil, and patriotism of the Bulgarian woman of those early days.

At the gymnasias and advanced schools of Bulgaria the students emulated their masters and elders in forming school boys' and students' societies whose chief aim was to set up libraries of their own, to give free readings and lectures, and further the intellectual growth of members. The best organized student societies were found at the Gabrovo Gymnasia, Plovdiv Seminary, Robert College, Constantinople, and the Lyceum at the same capital. In 1875 all these young men's organizations were animated by the good idea of uniting their efforts and means with a view to publishing a pedagogical journal, the management of which was entrusted to an experienced editor with a salary.[1])

Such was the fruit of the Bulgarian idea 'cast upon the ocean' by the Chilender monk during the XVIIIth century and caught and espoused a hundred years later by another ecclesiastic — Father Stoiko of Kotel. The Bulgarian National Idea at first enhanced by a few individuals, in the course of several decades, counted hundreds of divines, teachers, physicians, jurists, merchants, artisans, and peasants. And if in 1806 it was inspired and inculcated by a single book, the «Sunday Sermons and Preceptors» of Bishop Sophronius, in 1872 it was represented by a literature consisting of over eight hundred volumes. In 1835 but one school, that of Gabrovo, was built as a result of its awakening power; fifty years later, however, almost

[1]) «Vyek,» 1875, No 50, p. 4.

every Bulgarian town and village was rendered conspicuous by its beautiful school buildings and churches. The great civilizing mission of the Bulgarian school was subsequently further enhanced by the birth of the Reading-Room Organizations and Sunday Schools. The School, man's most potent medium for advancement and culture, came to the rescue of the down-trodden Bulgarian people. It helped to revive and regenerate the Bulgarian Literature, the Bulgarian Church, and the Bulgarian National Idea, paved the way for Bulgarian Independence, and opened a new era for the Bulgarian nation, once more established on the Balkans.

VIII.

THE BULGARIANS AND THE EUROPEAN POWERS.

Western Ideas. — Reforms. — The Russian Wars and the Bulgarians. — The Balkan Revolutionary Movements and the Bulgarians. — Insurrections. — Personal Initiative and Centres. — Treaties of Bulgarians, Serbians, and Roumanians. — Serbia and Roumania towards Bulgaria. — Bulgarian Confederation. — The Church Question. — Restauration of the Bulgarian Church. — Democratic Character of the Church. — Turkey, the Great Powers, and Bulgaria. — Europe and Bulgaria's Ethnical Boundaries.

The awakening of the Bulgarians was largely due to the influence of the Western ideas which emanated from the French encyclopedians and the French Revolution. Those were the ideas that heralded to humanity the sweet blessings of Liberty, Equality, and Brotherhood. The spirit of the new ideas which regenerated Europe penetrated the East, too, crossed the Ottoman boundary lines, entered into the very courts of the sultans, invaded the region of Turkish traditions, and to a certain degree, affected the new Turkish legislature, but failed to reach the hearts of the Turkish rulers and lawgivers. Unable to resist the force of events, the sultans for a time yielded to the reformation waves which were rolling their weight upon the Ottoman Empire. Discomfited by the prolonged and cruel wars with Russia and by the political upheavals in eastern and western Bulgaria, which shook the very foundations of a most arbitrary régime, they finally gave ear to the counsels for reforms given them by the representativs of the Western Powers, as the integrity of their Empire was at stake. The first

attempt to introduce good government and ameliorate the condition of the Christians in Turkey was made immediately after the conclusion of the Adrianople Peace Treaty between Turkey and Russia. In December 1829 Sultan Mahmoud II[1]) signed a firman which assured a betterment of the lot of the Christian races, the Bulgarians in particular. In order to please Russia who showed herself magnanimous at the conclusion of the Treaty, the Sultan amnestied all the Bulgarians who had joined the Russian army fighting against the Turks, and in order to mitigate the ill will of the Western Powers because of the existing system of misgovernment within his domains, he made a formal promise to reform his Empire. In 1831, two years later, Mahmoud II set on a journey through Bulgaria and Thrace with the purpose of getting acquainted with the condition of his subjects and to see personally the application of his firman by his authorities who were instructed to treat both Christians and Mohammedans alike. It is said that the good Sultan often repeated to his officials the following fatherly advise: «I want the Turks to be Turks only in their mosques, the Christians, in their churches, and the Jews, in their synagogues. Outside of these places I want them all to be equal, to enjoy the same political rights and royal patronage.» The people welcomed and sent off the Sultan with joy and faith in his words. The Padishah returned to his capital highly pleased and elated over the flattering welcome of which he was the recipient everywhere. Soon after his tour his plan for reforms ripened up into a decision which he considered bound to carry out into effect. He had resolved to be a reformer not only in theory but also in reality. He meant to grant his subjects, no matter of what

[1]) Ch. Seignobos, *Historie politique de l'Europe*, pp. 591—594. — Th. Lavallée, *Historie de la Turquie*, vol. II, pp. 351—355. — H. Mathieu, *La Turquie*, vol. II, pp. 291 and 293.

race and faith, not only religious freedom and equality before the law, but also equal political rights and freedom of conscience. These radical changes were being recommended to him by the noted Turkish statesman, Rashid Pasha, whom he made his minister and councillor. He was led to take such steps also by the difficult situation in which the Empire found itself after its war with the headstrong Egyptian ruler, Mehmed Ali, whose son Ibrahim Pasha had recently shattered the Turkish army sent against him. Unfortunately, Mahmoud II did not live to see his plan put into practice. It was reserved for his successor Abdul Medjid to formally proclaim the plan of reforms which Rashid Pasha, after having been degraded, was recalled to power and charged with the difficult task of preparing. Though the opposition to the reform programme was very great on the part of the conservative Turks, Abdul Medjid finally caused the *Hati-Sheriff* sanctioning them to be read in public at the Kiosk of Ghyul-Hahneh, in the presence of the European diplomats, court and state dignitaries, and many civil and religious representatives. The Reforms which in reality were a parody of a constitution were derogatorily called the *Ghyul-Hahneh Hati-Sheriff*, from name of the Kiosk from which they were solemnly proclaimed. That was considered an unusual event for the Empire. It was a surprize to all, both to Mussulmans and Christians. Even the foreign representatives were astonished when invited to witness the reading of this signal act of the Sultan. The latter were all the more amazed at the very liberal spirit that pervaded the Hati-Sheriff, particularly at the many privileges which the Sultan granted to his subjects without destinction of race or religion. The Royal Decree of the Sultan guaranteed the life, honour, and property of all; provided for a just and uniform levying of taxes; regulated the salaries of officials; instituted general military

service; prohibited the sale of offices or the state privilege of collecting taxes; introduced the system of district councils in which the Christians had the right to participate. The Diplomatic Body hastened to congratulate the Porte on its generous decision to introduce such liberal changes in its domains. Only Boutneff, the Russian Ambassador, stood aloof; he looked upon the Ghyul-Hahneh act with suspicion and called it *coup de théâtre*.

The Sultan, his ministers, and high dignitaries, indeed, solemnly pledged themselves to see to it that the privileges and rights granted the people should be strictly observed and executed. In reality, however, the Hati-Sheriff remained a dead letter. It was not put in practice, and wherever the authorities made an attempt at applying it, it met with a stubborn opposition on the part of the Turkish population. The latter showed themselves most hostile to the reforms. They could never tolerate the idea of treating the rahyahs on equal footing with the Moslems. They could never reconcile themselves to the thought of seeing the Christians whom they did not consider human beings and whose property, life, and honour were always at their disposal, enjoy the same rights and privileged position to which they were the lawful heirs from time immemorial. The number of the discontented was legions found throughout the Empire. Their leaders were members of the Sultan's court itself. The enemies of reform finally succeeded in prevailing upon the Sultan against Rashid Pasha who was again driven out of his ministerial post. Abetted from the Capital itself, the hostility assumed greater proportions everywhere. First the Albanians, a wild, uncouth, and insubordinate race, rose against the changes that tended to diminish their traditional prerogatives in favour of the hated Christians. The reforms they styled in derision «a Christian affair come from France». Anti-reform riots took place in Adrianople, Skopie, Smyrna, and especially

in Nish and Bosnia. The armed and fanatical Mussulmans attacked the Christian villages, and pillaged and burned them down, destroyed the churches, and tortured and killed the defenseless rahyahs. The fury and bloodthirstiness of the Turks knew no bounds and instilled terror among the Christian population. The Turkish authorities did little to arrest the lawlessness thus set in many places of the Empire, either because they were powerless to cope with it, or rather because the anti-Christian feeling and riots were secretly encouraged by influential Turks of high rank. The Turkish atrocities were allowed to assume such revolting aspect and proportion, especially in Bulgaria and Bosnia, that Russia, Austria, and France were compelled to step in. This was as displeasing to the Porte as the reforms themselves. Fearing a more efficacious interference by the European powers in 1844 it hastened to promulgate a series of statutes under the name of *Tansimat.* Here in this document were specified and elucidated the principles of the Ghyul-Hahneh Hati-Sheriff which guaranteed the same rights to all of the Empire's subjects. But the *Tansimat,* too, shared the fate of the Hati-Sheriff: it proved to be a mere blank paper. The defects of an arbitrary and tyrannical rule remained uncured and the Christian Powers of Europe greatly dissatisfied with the internal order of things existing in the Ottoman Empire. The lot of the Christians continued to be as unbearable as before, even worse. The rahyahs continued to be fleeced out of everything, they had to defray the expenses of the Government and that without receiving from the State any remuneration in the form of certain rights and privileges or any other kind of compensation. Justice was ever denied them. Their life and property were never safe. The last of the Mussulmans could lay hand on them whenever he pleased. The Russian protection over the Christians was almost annulled by the Porte. The inter-

ference of Europe availed but little. Taking advantage of the mutual jealousies distracting the western governments, the Porte turned a deaf ear to their remonstrances. After the Crimean war which Russia declared on Turkey in behalf of the Christians ground down under the latter's yoke and which was a sure evidence of Europe's suspicions of Russia's policy in the Near East, the three allied countries, England, France, and Austria manifested a stronger interest in the fate of the Christian peoples in Turkey. In order to gain the sympathy of the Orthodox Christians whom Russia had won over on her side, the Western Powers' representatives both at the Vienna Conference, 1855, and at the one held in Constantinople, laid a great stress upon the necessity for devising some scheme of reforms which would ease the lot of the Porte's Christian subjects. And indeed the European diplomats worked out a plan of reforms which was prepared by the hand of Lord Redcliffe, the English ambassador. The Sultan accepted it and proclaimed it under the name of *Hati-Humayune.* The wording of the Hati-Humayune was, therefore, commenced in Constantinople, subsequently it was sent for revision to the Peace Conference of Paris, 1856,[1]) and finally solemnly proclaimed in Constantinople by Sultan Medjid, on February 18, 1856, as an act seemingly initiated by the Turkish ruler himself for the good of his people. The Hati-Humayune enunciated religious and radical freedom and equality before the law for all.

The most important articles of the Hati-Humayune which dealt with the interests of the Bulgarians were the second in which the Patriarchy was enjoined to convoke a council, reorganize itself, and introduce the necessary reforms in its administrative organs; the third which abolished the fees and imports exacted by the bishops,

[1]) See pp. 275 and 276.

and provided revenues for the support of the clergy and the Christian communities. It also provided for the regular remuneration of the priests according to the rank they occupied, thus stopping the abuse with Church property incomes. Further it created at every parish a board, composed of both ecclesiastics and laymen, whose duty was to regulate the spiritual and material welfare of the community; the seventh and the tenth which guaranteed full religious liberty; and the fifteenth which granted to every community the right of opening schools.[1]) Though the Hati-Humayune was never put in force, to the Bulgarians it proved of inestimable value as it gave them a legal weapon with which to carry their struggle against the spiritual and educational oppression and encroachments of the Patriarchy. As soon as the Sultan's decree was promulgated, the Bulgarians felt their hands free to act, and the inhabitants of many cities, led by the citizens of Viddin, Tirnovo, Plovdiv, Ochrida and others immediately sent petitions to the State authorities asking for the execution of its clauses and particularly for the replacement of the Greek bishops by Bulgarians.

The Russo-Turkish wars had a very disastrous effect upon the internal state of things in the Ottoman Empire. Every crossing of the Danube by the Russian armies tended to weaken the Sultan's power and discredit his authority before his own subjects. At every peace treaty concluded between Russia and Turkey the latter was deprived of new province or territory, especially in Europe. One after another Russia in cooperation with France and England helped to create a new Roumania, Serbia and Greece. The liberation of these states is a concrete result of international altruism, and at the time was a most eloquent means of raising the prestige of Rus-

[1]) A. Shopoff, *Les réformes et la protection des chrétiens*, pp. 48—52.

sia in the Balkan Peninsula. The Christians in the Balkans began to look upon the Tzars as their protectors and liberators. To them Russia appeared as the distributor of justice and liberty upon earth. The Russian soldiers who crossed and recrossed the Danube and repeatedly invaded European Turkey had the opportunity of coming in close touch with the Bulgarians with the result that the two kindred peoples were drawn together. The mutual acquaintance resuscitated in both of them the ties of a glorious past. Russian scholars came forward with their voluminous works in which they pointed to the ancient civilizing mission of the Bulgarians, and Slavdom's indebtedness to them. In the mind of the Russians rose the past, in that of the Bulgarian — the ugly reality of the present. The Bulgarian people learned to see in the Russians not only their liberators, but also their brethren. The entire Bulgarian nation was animated but with one hope — the hope and belief in the mighty arms of the Russian Tzar. It lived with the great idea that sooner or later the Russian brothers would swoop down upon the Turk and drive him out of their land. That implicit faith in the Russians shattered all barriers that divided the two Slav peoples; it created most intimate ties between them; it drew the Bulgarians closely to their Northen brethren. In the wars of 1806, 1811, 1829, 1852 and 1854, the Russian ranks were swelled by Bulgarian volunteers who at their withdrawal gathered their families and emigrated to Russia and Roumania. As early as the latter part of the XVIIIth century [1]) thousands of Bulgarians exasperated by the Turkish misrule and in order to save themselves from the brutal incursions of the *kirdjali, daahli* and other Turkish colonists of most rapacious instincts, fled to Russia for safty.

[1]) A. Skalkovski, *Bolgarskia kolonii v Bessarabii*, Odessa, 1848, p. 4. — C. H. Palaouzoff, *Roumanskia Gossoudarstva*, 1859, p. 1859, p. 20.

They settled in the provinces of Cherson and Tavris, and later on, in Bessarabia. The Russian Government facilitated the emigration which was not always voluntary. Thus in 1811 General Koutouzoff [1]) forcibly drove the Bulgarians from Roustchouk to the Pruth valley in Russia. Still later on, in 1860, Russian agents allured the Bulgarian inhabitants of Viddin, Lom, and Belogradchik to emigrate to Russia. About 10,000 Bulgarians settled in Crimea, many of whom in after time returned to their homes in Bulgaria.

In 1821 in Bessarabia there were more than 7,500 Bulgarian families. After the Treaty of Adrianople, 1829, the number of the Bulgarian colonists reached 70,000 souls. [2])

The Bulgarians who emigrated to Bessarabia formed separate communities. That helped them to preserve their language and ethnical characteristics. These Bulgarian parishes were the first to conceive the need of schools in which their children could be taught in their mother's tongue, and the first to show symptoms of national awakening and self-consciousness. That is why the Bulgarian settlements in Bessarabia were the first to take active part in the wars between Russia and Turkey. In 1829 the contingent of the Russian General Dibitch contained a large number of Bulgarian volunteers. A battalion composed entirely of Bulgarians was commanded by Captain Gheorghi Ŝtaikoff Mamartcheff, a native of Kotel, and another one by the voyvoda Boitcho. During the Crimean war, 1852—1855, there were thousands of Bulgarians who joined the Russian army. The Bulgarians believed the war was undertaken in defence of the Orthodox Christians in Turkey. They expected to obtain their liberation as a recompense for taking part in the struggle. It was

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. I, p. 326.

[2]) Ireček, p. 681. — J. S. Ivanoff, pp. 18—28. — Jove Titoroff, *Gheorghii Iv.*, Tsanko-Kilkik, pp. 9—22.

just at that period that the Odessa Bulgarian Committee came into existence. All were filled with enthusiasm at the idea that Nicholas I had declared war on Turkey with the purpose of freeing Bulgaria and place her under Prussia's protection. The Bulgarian people, therefore, welcomed the Crimean war with open arms and unbounded joy. Volunteers flocked from all points. It was calculated that upward of 4,000 Bulgarian fighters marched side by side with the Russian warriors, their «big brethren».

On the 22 of September, 1855, Innocent, Archbishop of Cherson, delivered in the Odessa Cathedral Church the following farewell address to the Bulgarian volunteers: «Christ loving and manly Bulgarian warriors,» great must be your disappointment that your burning desire of taking part in the Sebastopol struggle side by side with your Russian comrades was not realized, and that now after having covered half of your tedious journey on the way to the conflict you have to return back to the Danubian shore. But this unexpected turn of events should rather cheer than grieve both you and us, because what else does this sad retracing of your steps back to your Danubian homes mean, than the fact that the Sebastopol citadel has no need of increasing the number of her defenders, that the enemy that threatened it has finally spent his force? ... Go back in peace whither the voice of your leaders call you. Though you did not reach the wished for goal of your journey, you have fulfilled your duty and realized your aim by showing both, to Russia and to the whole world that your religion and nationality are dearer to you than all other things ... On arriving home do not fail to tell your kindred that Orthodox Russia has not forgotten who it was that gave her the Gospel in her native tongue, that she will never forget her sacred alliance with the Bul-

[3]) Innokentii, *Sochinennia,* vol. III, p. 264.

garians your forefathers, and that when the opportune moment comes she will doubly repay you for your noble services . . . Long live the valiant and Christ-loving Bulgarian people! »

The revolutionary movements in Serbia, Roumania and Greece rendered the Bulgarians more courageous in their struggle for religious and political rights. Those movements, needless to say, were closely connected with the Russo-Turkish wars. Many Bulgarians took part not only in the wars between Russia and Turkey, but also between Turkey and Serbia, Greece and Roumania. The volunteer regiments in Roumania were largely made up of Bulgarians. In Bulgaria many Bulgarians were members of the Greek Heteria. The heterists in Roumania were composed mainly of Bulgarians and Serbs. [1]) The Greek insurrection was a popular struggle in the eyes of the Bulgarians. In Greece proper it was called by the Bulgarian name *Zaviera*.[2]) The idea of throwing off of the Turkish yoke was as popular among the Bulgarians, as it was among the Greeks and the Serbians. At the altar of this idea Bulgarians gave their lives in the plains of Roumania, on the rocky mountains of Greece, and in the valleys and fastnesses of Serbia. In the insurrection of Hellada there were found a considerable number of Bulgarian volunteers not only from Macedonia and Thrace, but also from South Bulgaria. In the history of the struggle for Greek and Serbian independence there have been preserved the names of a number of Bulgarian voyvodas. Their names and their birthplaces are known in tradition and sung in national songs. [3]) Even in 1862 at the expulsion of the Turks from

[1]) Ireček, p. 657.

[2]) M. Balabanoff, p. 30. — Dr. Iv. Selimski Library, № 1, pp. 82 and 83.

[3]) To the list of names already mentioned on pages 199—201 must be added also the names of Hadji Mihail of Koprivshtitza

the Belgrade citadel a contingent composed of Bulgarians under the leadership of the Bulgarian writer and revolutionary, Sava Rakovsky, and Illio Voivoda, had barricaded itself, in the streets of the Serbian capital and fought the Turks side by side with the Serbians. In general, the Bulgarians were the first to respond to liberty's call, no matter what part of the Peninsula it came from, and readily shed their blood even for the freedom of their alien neighbours. They eagerly fought for the cause of their neighbours because the cause they struggled for was the same, and because by helping to win the independence of Greece, Serbia, [1]) or Roumania they were hastening the day of their own country's deliverance from the Ottoman yoke.

The Bulgarian veterans of many foreign wars returned home with bitter disappointment. They now saw

Hadji Christo of Plovdiv District, Semko of Tirnovo, and the military chief Hadji Peter (see Rakovsky's *Gorski Putnik*, Novii Sad, 1857, p. 231. — Apriloff, *Dennitza*, pp. 70—73. — The Greek historian John Philemon writes that on February, 1821, among the 15,000 warriors under the leadership of Sava Kamenare, 8,000 had been Bulgarians and Serbs and that his two lieutenants were the Bulgarians Hadji Ghentcho and Hadji Prodan, both natives of Shoumen. The same authority asserts that the Greek revolutionary society «Heteria» had under the name of «Zaviera» large branches throughout Bulgaria with a membership running up to thousands. The adherents of «Zaviera» called themselves *pobratimi* (foster brothers), and not a single betrayer was found among them. The founder of the Heteria in Odessa had for his assistant the Bulgarian Apriloff (Jean Philemon, Athens).

In the Cretan struggle for independence in 1866 there participated the Bulgarian Spiro Djeroff who later on became a voyvode in the Bulgarian insurrections (A. Shopoff, *Balkansko edinenie*, Sofia, 1915.

Cyprien Robert, p. 302: One of the Bulgarians, Botzar by name and a native of Viddin, became famous through all Europe under the name of Botzaris.

[1]) P. R. Slaveikoff, *Bulgarian Volunteers and Workers for the Serbian «Zaviera,»* Pspissanie, № XIII, p. 300. — G. Zanetoff, *Bulgarians in Morasia*, Sofia, 1914, p. 93.

more clearly that their countrymen were labouring not only under the Turkish yoke, but also under the religious oppression of the Greek Patriarchy. Their past experience and their acquaintance with the real motives that animated Bulgaria's neighbouring nations rendered them all the more determined and desperate in doing away with both their political and religious bondage. Therefore they set earnestly at work against all the enemies of Bulgarian national and spiritual regeneration. Even after the Peace of Adrianople which brought no solace to their suffering, the Bulgarians several times attempted to obtain single-handed that amelioration of their condition which they expected to be effected by the Russians in their war with Turkey. The Russian armies had not yet completely evacuated Bulgaria when captain Mamartcheff and Boitcho Voyvoda led the revolts in North and South Bulgaria. The insurrection met with no success. The two leaders were captured by the Russians, Mamartcheff was arrested, while Boytcho was exiled to Siberia. In 1836 captain Mamartcheff left Silistra still held by the Russians as a guarantee for the payment of indemnities, and started for Tirnovo, the centre of a great revolutionary plot. The leaders of the projected rebellion were well known notables from Tirnovo, Gabrovo, Elena, Trevna and other towns of the Tirnovo district. But it was supported also by the inhabitants of Sofia, Stara-Zagora, Lozengrad, etc. Hadji Jordan of Elena, one of the conspirators, divulged the secret to his relative Hadji Jordan, Jr., in order to initiate him in the affair. The latter who at first seemed to be elated over the project, later on repented and fled to Tirnovo where he informed Ilarion, the Greek Bishop, of the revolutionary place of the Bulgarians, and the latter lost no moment in calling the immediate attention of the Turkish commandant of Tirnovo. Just at the time when captain Mamartcheff was in the Monastery of

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. II, pp. 306 and 307.

Kapinovo, waiting for the arrival of the Bulgarian notables with whom the question of the date of the revolution was to be decided, the Monastery was suddenly surrounded by a large cordon of Turkish soldiers. Captain Mamartcheff and the Abbot were caught and put in chains. The majority of the notables captured by the Turkish authorities were hanged without a trial. Among the ill-fated patriots was the engineer Jovanaki of Sofia. He was headmaster of the fortifications in Bulgaria and had under his charge over 2,000 workmen, the picked men of the insurgents. He died on the gallows in Tirnovo at the same time with Hadij Jordan the elder, and Ivanitza, a rich Tirnovo merchant. The rest of the conspirators were imprisoned, most of them dying as a result of horrible torture. The venerable Abbot of the Monastery met his doom in like manner.

Among the sturdy and obstinate Bulgarian revolutionaries exiled to Siberia by Russia was the terrible Dontcho Voyvoda, Vatacha of Koprivshtitza.[1]) He soon fled from his place of detention and managed to return back to Bulgaria where he gathered around himself a company of trusted bravodoes, and took to the mountains. For twenty years he roamed in woods and fastnesses continually fighting the Turks and avenging the wrongs of his countrymen.[2]) About this time his example was followed by many other Bulgarians of stout heart and resolute will, no longer being able to endure the shame of the Turkish oppression. These «voyvodas», as the leaders of the Bulgarian insurgent bands were called, supported by their faithful «haiduks» or revolutionary bandits, proved the terror of the Turkish army and Government authorities. In these reckless

[1]) Ireček, pp. 663 and 664.

[2]) Cyprien Robert, p. 290; «There are many families whos sons are haiduks. — «The Pasha robbed me and I sent my son hayduk,» says the father calmly. — Ed. Engelhardt, *La Confédération Balkanique*, p 30.

and often bloodthirsty Bulgarian outlaws the down trodden and helpless Bulgarian people found their first and most ardent defenders. They at once became heroes in the eyes of the groaning peasantry. The haiduks came to be looked upon as the saviours of their kindred. They were dear to the hearts of the people who idolized them and interwove their names and exploits in many a folk-lore and national song. In the eyes of the people the voyvodas are invincible. They destroy the mighty armies of the Sultans. The very elements of nature are their ally. The woodlands and mountains rejoice in their patriotic feats and mourn their tragic death.

The most famous revolutionary haiduk whos name has been handed down in popular lore and song is Strachyl Voyvoda,[1]) while Dontcho Voyvoda's personality is the richest in popular traditions. Dontcho was famous not only for his bravery and wonderful guerilla exploits, but also for his charitable spirit. His appearance in a locality filled with a shudder the Turks whom he punished most mercilessly for wrongs perpetrated on the Bulgarians. The unscrupulous and cruel local Bulgarian *tchorbadji* or notable was treated with even harsher contempt by him. The money Doutcho seized from rich Turks or Bulgarian notables who acted as their tools he distributed to poor people no matter of what race. He would pay their debts or buy them land. On account of these noble traits he was admired and loved both by Turks and Bulgarians, and even by the Turkish authorities. Once he was captured and taken to Adrianople, but the Governer set him free: the superstitious Pasha throught it a sin to harm such a valiant man and benefactor. The bands of haiduks were the masters of the Adrianople district. For many years the highway between Constantinople and Adrianople was in their hands. They held the mountain passes so that the

[1]) P. Bezsonoff, *Bolgarskia Pesni*, vol. I, p. 177—181.

traveller venturing through them without their permission did it at the risk of his life. « During that period or between 1838 and 1842 all communications between the Turkish capital and the northern fortified places were cut off. The entire region north of Adrianople was policed by the hayduks who had established a sort of a government of their own. The couriers and travelers of foreign countries passing through the Balkans were obliged to do this under an escort of haiduk guards in the hands of whom they were as safe as if they were making a journey in the best organized country in the world. » [1]) This period probably represented the days of Dontcho Voyvoda's active life. Tradition says that he spent most of his time at the bridge of Ouzun-Kupri, was wont to sleep under its arches, and to hold intercourse with waternymphs.

The wars, as we said before, brought the Bulgarians no relief from the unbearable state of things existing in the Ottoman Empire. The revolutionary régime of the haiduks could not bring any effective or lasting solace either. The Bulgarian people was daily being exasperated by the lawlessness of the state officials and the utter corruption of all state organs. It was finally left no other alternative but self-defence. Popular movements ripening into rebellion were felt throughout European Turkey where the Bulgarians lived. The armed protest of the Bulgarians was directed not so much against the Ottoman Government, as against the misgovernment practiced by the state officials. These popular movements against the local misrule prevalent in Turkey were the preliminary attempts at throwing off a most detestable and unhuman régime. Local revolts took place in Berkovitza in 1836, in the vicinity of Pirot in 1836, in Nish and Pirot in 1840, and in Viddin, Koula, Belogradchik and Lom in 1851. The latter four instances were

[1]) Cyprien Robert, p. 311.

caused by the wrong execution of the Hati-Sheriff. The Pirot and Nish uprisings were suppressed by Turky with such cruelty and barbarities, that the attention of the European Governments was attracted and the press of the western states commenced to talk of the Turkish misrule and the rights of the Sultan's Christian subjects. The Russian and the French Governments immediately sent special delegates to the scenes of horror and devastation in order that they investigate the causes of Bulgarian discontent, and the atrocities committed on them by the Albanians under the direction of Sabri Pasha, the Commandant of Nish. The Russian representative was the Senator Kodinetz, chosen at the suggestion of the Emperor Nicholas I himself. France's commissioner was Blanqui, a member of the French Academy.

The European press opened its columns for the publication of reports on the Bulgarian rebellion covering the cities of Nish, Pirot and Leskovetz. It gave the number of the many burned and devastated villages, the number of people put to the sword and that of the women and young girls violated. In connection with the description of the Bulgarian horrors the press assailed the anarchical state of things existing in Turkey. The cause of Bulgaria was taken up by some of the best European publications, such as «Revue des deux Mondes», «Viestnik Evropi», and other periodicals and dailies.

As it would have been expected, the Polish and Magyar uprisings in Austria during 1846—1848 exerted a great influence on the Bulgarians, especially on the inhabitants of the Danubian regions whither fled thousands of Polish and Hungarian patriots in order to save themselves from the Russian punitive expedition sent to Hungary to suppress the revolution. [1]) Among the fugitives come to Viddin

[1]) R. Dmowski, *La question polonaise*, Paris, 1909, p. 52.

was found Kossuth, the leader of the Magyar insurgents, and Dembinski, the leader of the Polish. The presence and sojourn of these fiery chiefs among the Bulgarians injected into the latter courage and strong perseverence in their struggle for liberty. The Polish and Hungarian cause became dear to them. Everybody talked of the Polish and Magyar revolution, and of the martyrdom of thousands of patriots for the independence of their country. The cruelties and the barbarous way in which the revolted districts were treated by the Christian Government evoked the greatest sympathy in the hearts of the Bulgarians, themselves victims of a similar fate. It is asserted that the uprisings of Viddin, Belogradchik, Koula, Lom, and Berkovitza were inspired with the zeal with which the Bulgarians were incited by the impetuous Polish and Hungarian patriots after mingling with them. Cyprien Robert on this point says:[1]) «The arrival at Viddin of the defeated heroes of Hungary, Louis Kossuth and Dembinski, did a good deal in stirring up the Bulgarians. The people recalled the sad events of 1841 and the atrocities committed in their land by the Albanian hordes. In Viddin and Shoumen the Bulgarians took the Polish and Hungarian chiefs into their confidence and divulged to them their plans of action. They even proposed to the exiled officers to assume the command of the Bulgarian revolutionary forces held in readiness for a new uprising against the Turks. The emigrants, however, refused the honor on the ground that they did not wish to repay the hospitality of the Ottoman Government with ingratitude. Lacking officers, the Bulgarian insurgents were unable to continue the struggle long. The Poles, however, used their good officers in obtaining the permission of the Turkish Government for the return to their homes of the many Bulgarian families who had fled to

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. I, pp. 11, 14, 15.

Serbia and for an investigation of their wrongs. Slowly but gradually the national conscience of the Bulgarians grew stronger and stronger. The national spirit thus asserting itself began to manifest its power in well organized political and revolutionary movements at the head of which stood men of sound training and education, and ardent patriotism. The archapostle of the insurrection movements was Sava Rakovsky. He had received his schooling in Karlovo under Raino Popovitch, had studied in the Greek school at Kouru-Tcheshme, and finally rounded up his education in Athens and Paris. He, therefore, had a good knowledge of the world, and being a staunch Bulgarian in heart feeling and ideas, was an embodiment of Bulgaria's ideals and aspirations. As such, he could not help to view both Turks and Greeks as Bulgaria's blackest enemies. Rakovsky gave himself wholly to the revolutionary cause of his country which he served both with rifle and pen. He was a voyvoda in the mountains, editor in Belgrade and Novi-Sad, and historian and archeologist in Bucharest and Odessa. But no matter where he was and what occupied him, he always remained the unperturbable foe of Turks and Greeks whom he branded as Bulgaria's deadliest enemies, and though persecuted alike by Turks, Greeks, Roumanians, Serbians and even Russians, he never ceased exhorting his people to awaken to a new political and social life by constantly recalling to memory its glorious past, its culture and advancement; he persisted in organizing and commanding revolutionary bands and in every way possible prepared the way for his country's deliverance from a most degraded yoke and wretchedness. His life and actions were a most potent inspiration to all who came to know him. The great revolutionary voyvodas, Philip Totu, Panayot, Hadji Dimiter, Stephan Karadja and others were his worthy pupils and ideal coworkers. Leaders no more of hayduks,

but of well disciplined revolutionary bands, these mighty warriors dared to openly assail the Turkish *nizami* and often win signal successes over them. On account of their noble exploits and fearless stand against the Oppressor, the Bulgarian people idolized them and identified their names with the freedom they all yearned for. To the people Rakovsky was a sort of demigod. His fascinating personality continued to inspire them even after his death which but enhanced his popularity and influence. The revolutionary movement was taken up and continued by his followers all over the country. From 1862 on the number of insurgent bands both home and abroad increased with inconceivable rapidity. The Balkan mountains were infested with them who proved a terror to the Turkish garrisons and moving detachments. The most celebrated guerilla bands were those led by Hadji Dimiter, Stephan Karadja, Philip Totu and Panayot Hittoff. The band commanded by the first two chiefs counted some two hundred picked young men and in the sixties formed a contingent of the Belgrade legion. They were a well trained body of fighters and wore a uniform. They wroght havoc among the Turks and Circassians sent out to pursue them. The Porte was no less disquieted by the political and revolutionary upheavals daily assuming a threatening attitude, than by the growing discontent of the European cabinets, press and public opinion because of the utter mismanagement and disorder allowed to continue in Crete and Bulgaria. Unfortunately, however, one or another of the European countries moved by jealousy would always come to the rescue of the Sultan. At that juncture it was France who promptly took up the side of the Porte. The French Government instead of joining efforts with the other nations in forcing Turkey to introduce salutary and effective reforms within its domains, directed a very sharp note to Bucharest[1]) in which the Roumanian Government was openly accused of en-

couraging the formation of Bulgarian bands and of allowing them to make incursions into Turkish territory. The Cabinet of Bratiano answered without hesitation and delay that the assertion of the French Government concerning Bulgarian bands being formed in Roumania was not corroborated by facts. Thereupon the French Government dispatched a second note of a more stringent nature which induced Prince Carol himself to take part in the conflicts by writing a letter of explanation to the French Emperor. The question was even made an object for interpellation in the Roumanian Parliament, initiated by the national representative Corp with which started up his political career. Corp accused the Government of patronizing the incoming revolutionary movement in Bulgaria. President Bratiano rose up, denied all charges against this Cabinet, and expressed his greatest disappointment at seeing a Roumanian citizen so devoid of national patriotism and self-respect, and whose indiscretion might encourage foreign columnies against the Roumanian Principality.

The most energetic, fascinating, and successful of Rakovsky's followers was Vassil Levski, familiarly called the «Deacon». He was a true convert of the great Bulgarian revolutional apostle. His first training he received in Belgrade under Rakovsky, in connection with the revolutionary legion formed and maintained in the Servian capital. Levski, however, preached the gospel of revolution not through journalism and books, and from foreign lands, but by word of mouth and fiery eloquence, in the very heart of the Ottoman Empire. He would cross and recross Bulgaria, scour the country from one end to the other, mingle with the people in towns and villages, hold communion with the educated class or intellectuals to whom, after winning them over by his sincerity, zeal, and

[1]) Ed. Damé, pp. 16 and 168.

patriotism, he confided the secret of his plans for Bulgaria's future. He was a phenomenal organizer, a persuasive counsellor, an authoritative chief, a wise judge, and above all, a man of good common sense. A true child of his turbulent times, he would often resort to force where moral suasion failed. Vigorous, perspicacious, fearless to self-forgetfulness, firm as a rock, and indifferent to fate, he was an extreme enthusiast, and an worshipper of the sacred idea which animated his soul, of the Liberty he preached, of the spirit of self-abnegation which singled him out as a shining example. He drew the youth to him, hypnotized them as it were, inculcated his ideas into them, fired them by his resolutness, trained and moulded them into worthy co-workers in the great struggle against the centuries old tyranny. His name soon became the symbol of patriotism and self-sacrifice. All these wonderful qualities with which Providence had endowed him made of him a most deadly enemy of the Turkish dominion. His name was uttered with awe and dread by the Mohammedans, and with pious reverence by the Christians. It blended together the hearts of his people and inspired all into action. Levski was a prodigy for good in his day, he was a godsend to his ground-down race. Full many a year he toiled among his people, in the towns hunted down by the Turkish police and military authorities, and in the villages pursued by posses and gendarmes. How often the police would proclaim him cornered, arrested, imprisoned or shot down, nevertheless, the «Deacon» managed to escape even from the jaws of death and make his appearance in another locality to the great consternation and discomfiture of the authorities. Levski's phantom harrassed his enemies everywhere. But, alas, after years of most strenuous revolutionary efforts and exploits, Dyakon Levski, too, had to fall victim to treachery. He was finally caught and hanged in Sofia where the site of his martyr-

dom is to-day marked by a monument subsequently raised by his descendants, now a free and prosperous nation. Levski's death was felt as a terrible shock throughout the Country. The Cause of Bulgaria, indeed, received a severe blow by the sudden disappearance of the « Deacon », the soul of the Bulgarian revolutionary enterprize. But luckily for the Bulgarians, his place was soon filled by another apostle, who though the youngest of his compeers, nevertheless, quickly showed himself last but not least. Christo Boteff was no doubt not only the youngest, but the greatest of the revolutionary leaders of that rare epoch. Boteff is still considered Bulgaria's noblest patriot, ideal revolutionary chief, ablest writer and, above all, Bulgaria's greatest lyrical poet, the singer of the Bulgarian liberty, revolutionary life, and exploits. He, too, was fated to die young, but he also died fighting valiantly against superior forces who had succeeded in surrounding him with his band of trustied warriors at Vesletz, near Vratza, in 1876. The Bulgarian people learned of this its noblest revolutionary singer and apostle the doctrine so fervently preached by him in his immortal poems that « he that falls for his Country's freedom he never dies ». Boteff is the founder of Bulgarian brotherhood, the ideologue of Bulgarian liberty, equality, fraternity. The insurrection of 1876 was a far more mature undertaking than any previous attempts of this kind. In north Bulgaria the uprising spread in Gabrovo, Drenovo, Gorna Orechovitza, Vratza and other centres, while in South Bulgaria it covered Panagyurishty, Koprivshtitza, Klyssoura, etc. It was the insurrection of 1876 that shook the foundation of the Turkish Empire and made itself felt throughout Europe.

Another shining name in the history of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Period is that of Lyuben Karaveloff who proved a worthy successor of Sava Rakovsky, and for a score of years was the central figure of the Bulgarian

revolutionary organizations. All enlightened, wide awake, and public spirited Bulgarians grouped around him who justly represented the embodiment of their ideal. By means of his newspapers «Svoboda», and subsequently «Independence», he championed his revolutionary ideals among his countrymen both at home and abroad. In Bucharest his strong personality was animating and directing the activities of the Bulgarian secret societies there. In Bulgaria his views and principles were disseminated by the secret distribution of his journals. His name, organs, stories and poems were so popular with his people, as formerly used to be the name and writings of Sava Rakovsky whose paper «The Swan of Danube», and poem «Forest Traveller», were eagerly devoured by all. Karaveloff was noted for his sweet disposition, manly character, deep insight, and diplomatic vision. He was considered an idealist in so far as he stood for Balkan confederacy, particularly for an understanding between Serbians and Bulgarians. A staunch reporter of the same altruistic principle was his younger co-worker Christo Boteff who went even further as he preached a confederation of the nations. Vassil Levski was another social idealist since he was a warm partisan of a democratic Balkan republic. In the notions and conceptions entertained by these Bulgarians one sees the reappearance of the principles enunciated way back by the old Bogomils who were against all tyrannies, and whose ideal was, liberty for all, freedom for one's conscience. Boteff and Stambouloff, who held more extreme views, subsequently separated from Karaveloff.

The Bulgarians who fled or were driven away from their country soon rallied up abroad where they were able to develop their energies unobstructed, and a large number of them became opulent merchants and educated citizens. Out of the Bulgarian emigrants, fugitives, and exiles,

who settled in Roumania, Russia, Austria and even in Germany (Leipzig) were formed the first Bulgarian colonies. These settlements were noted for their examplary community, life, philanthropy, and patriotism. The most important of the Bulgarian colonies were those of Bucharest, Odessa, and Vienna. Large Bulgarian communities were found at Ploesti, Kraiova, Galatz, and Braila, in Roumania, and smaller ones at Belgrade in Serbia, and at Budapest, Temisvar, Lemun, and Cronstadt in Austria. Here it must be remembered, however, that at the very start the Bulgarian foreign colonies were devoid of national pride and self-consciousness. They passed for Christians, usually Greeks or Serbs. On this account the Bulgarians living in Vienna,[1] Leipzig, Zemun, Pesth, Cronstadt, Bucharest, Odessa, etc., constituted themselves into Greek parishes.[2] Nearly all the Odessa Bulgarians called themselves Nejina Greeks.[3] In due course of time, however, the race feeling could no longer remain stifled under the influence of the Greeks, and we see these same groups of exiled Bulgarians develop into flourishing, orderly, and enlightened centres. Because of the freedom and other advantages they enjoyed abroad, they became powerful independent agencies which never ceased to deeply interest themselves in the fate of their old Fatherland, and in the regeneration of their less fortunate kinsmen in the Balkans. They were, therefore, the early pioneers in the field of Bulgaria's intellectual and political awakening and advancement. It is interesting to notice that the national feeling was manifested much earlier in the smaller foreign settlements than in the big ones like those of Bucharest, Odessa, and Vienna. In 1822 while the

[1]) Dr. Iv. Selimski Library, V, p. 73.

[2]) G. Chassiotis, pp. 23 and 24.

[3]) *Sbornik statei* J. C. Ivanova o nyekotorich vidayoushtichsya sobitiyach o sovryemennoi jizni bolgar, Kishineff, 1896, p 53.

Bulgarians in these places passed for Greeks and showed little interest in their race, the Bulgarian community at Cronstadt already was in possession of a fine school entrusted to the care of an enlightened school board whose influence in educational matters was also felt throughout the Bulgarian lands in European Turkey. The initiative for starting a reform in Bulgaria came from the well known Bulgarian educator and philanthropist, P. Beron. His celebrated Primer or First Reader appeared in 1824. Beron was an admirer of the Ben Lancaster method, and his Primer was prepared in conformity with this system. He was induced to take up this responsibility upon himself in order to check the growing influence of the learned Plovdiv Greek, Cleobulos, who by word and pen was infusing new life in the Greek schools. Cleobulos obtained his training in Paris where he was especially interested in the reciprocal method according to which he subsequently got out a series of text-books which he introduced in Greece in 1820, and in Bucharest in 1822. Beron, however, in preparing his Reader followed the «inductive and vowel method», as we have already pointed out before. In order to make it more real and practical, he inserted in a good deal of Natural Science, Geography, and History. He was fortunate in securing the patronage of the rich Sliven merchant, Anton Iovanovitch, who gladly supplied the means for the publication of his work, and thus facilitated his mission of uplifting the Bulgarian school.[1]) Four years later, or in 1828, Photinoff, another admirer of the reciprocal method, introduced the same in the Smyrna Bulgarian school which was founded by him.

[1]) *A Reader Containing Miscellanious Lessons*, collected by Peter H. Berovitch, for the use of the Bulgarian Schools. Printed with the means supplied by Mr. Anton Iovanovitch, 1824. — Dr. Iv. Selimski Library, p. 28.

In 1834 V. Apriloff followed in the footsteps of Photinoff [1] and introduced it in Odessa where the works of the Bulgarian school reformer, Neophyte of Rilo, were widely utilized. At this point it was the Brassaw Bulgarians again who took the lead in a general decision of the Bulgarian colonies in Europe for the establishment of special funds for supplying the schools in Bulgaria with books and subsidies, as well as for founding of scholarships for young Bulgarians who wished to study in the Western universities. [2] The most ardent advocate of this measure was the same generous Brassaw business man, a native of Sliven, Anton Iovanovitch. It doesn't matter whether the initiative for this noble undertaking was wholly his own, it is sufficient for us to know that he was its greatest promoter and patron. It was he who had provided that two thousand piasters together with the needed supply of books be sent yearly to the Bulgarian school in his home town of Sliven, and it was he who gave the means for the support of the students Beron and Yanouli at the University of Munich, and Selimski at the University of Athens, all three subsequently becoming useful and efficient physicians in their land. Prince St. Bogoridi was another of the noted benefactors to the young Bulgarians of that period. It was he who supported Rakovsky in Constantinople, Athens, and Paris higher institutions, and Krustevitch in Constantinople and Paris. Later on, Apriloff and Palaouzoff of Odessa, and Denkoglou of Moscow showed themselves very generous in aiding Bulgarian schools, and in supporting many Bulgarian teachers wishing to complete their education in Russia. The first Russian graduates come from Bulgaria were able to obtain

---

[1] Dr. Z. D. Shishmanoff, *K. G. Photinoff, His Life and Work*, Ministerial Sbornik, IX, pp. 362—364.

[1] Dr. Zv. Selimski Library, VIII, pp. 31, 32.

a university training, thanks to the assistance given them by these philanthropic gentlemen.[1])

While with the death of Beron and Iovanovitch the interest of the Brassaw Bulgarian in the educational welbeing of their country diminished, in Odessa, on the contrary, it commenced to increase. From Odossa Apriloff and Palaouzoff directed the progress of the Bulgarian schools in their own Country and did all they could to advance the education and culture of their belated compatriots. They and their equally distinguished successors were Bulgaria's unofficial ministers of education.[2]) It was these exiled patriots who from afar devised means for the furtherance of the intellectual and social advancement of their Mother Country. It was they who worked out the curriculum for its institutions of learning, they who took care to provide them with the necessary school literature, text-books, appliances, and apparatus, they who chose and provided them with the teaching staff. Previous to the time when Constantinople was made the great educational and religious centre for all the Bulgarians under the Ottoman dominion, the Bulgarian communities, school boards, and notables referred themselves to Odessa for advice, teachers, and other aids. During this period of time it happened that Palaouzoff procured from the Novo-Rossiiski Governor-General at Odessa four scholarships for young Bulgarian students, two in the Risheleff Lyceum and two in the Theological Seminary of Cherson. In 1844 four more scholarships were opened to Bulgarians in the Odessa Seminary. Later on other schools in Russia showed themselves equally generous to ambitious Bulgar students of both sexes. Thus in 1847 in Kieff alone there were more than fifty Bulgarian students come from various parts of Bulgaria. Some of them attended the gymnasias, others

[1]) N. Vankoff, p. 109.

[2]) *The Gabrovo School and Its First Patrons*, pp. 19, 20.

the seminaries, and all of them the recipients of state scholarships. Among the most noteworthy of the scholarship holders were the future Bulgarian statesmen Dragan Tsankoff and J. S. Ivanoff. [1])

The number of the Bulgarian scholars in Russia and in the Western countries, as well as the number of the schools in Bulgaria increased every year. The management of the school interests soon constituted a ponderous responsibility which could no more be carried on by individuals.

There was needed a special body of men to perform this important duty and keep up the correspondence between the Bulgarian communities and the Russian schools. The notables of the Bucharest community first took the initiative for the organization of a society for the promotion of education and culture in Bulgaria. As early as 1853 the Bucharest Bulgarians had formed a sort of a similar organization called « Epitropia », and later on, « Benevolent Society ». The chief aim of the « Epitropia » was the collection of funds for the maintenance of the Bulgarian schools in Turkey and the support of promising young Bulgarians in the Western universities. Their example was followed by the Bulgarian settlement at Odessa. [2]) In 1854 they constituted a society under the appellation of « Bulgarian Board of Odessa ». The prime-movers in its organization were Palaouzoff, D. Toshkovitch, and the philologist Gheroff. Its end in view was educational and political: to acquaint the Russian Government and public opinion with the condition of their countrymen in Turkey, and to promote the cultural interests of their Fatherland. And, indeed, the Odessa Bulgarians did a great service in

[1]) J. S. Ivanoff, *Sbornik statei*, p. 3.

[2]) R. M. Karoleff, *N. H. Palaouzoff, Sketches from His Political Activity*, Pspissanie XI, p. 169.

both of these directions.[1]) They were very successful in obtaining from the Russian Government a large number of scholarships for Bulgarian students in various Russian gymnasias, seminaries, divinity schools, and universities. Many Bulgarian girls, too, were thus enabled to enlarge their store of knowledge in the higher institutions of learning in Odessa, Kieff, Petrograd, and other cities. It was at the request of the Odessa Bulgarian community that at Nikolaeff was opened the South-Slavic Boarding School. The Bulgarian notables of Odessa kept in close touch with the Russian authorities, thus acting as mediators between Russia and their brethren across the Danube. The one man most responsible for the unusual activity of the Odessa Bulgarians was Palaouzoff. He it was who regularly supplied the Russian Ministers of Education, Religion, and Foreign Affairs with carefully prepared reports on the school, church, and political changes taking place in Bulgaria, and on the plans that were to be adopted in order to facilitate the advancement of culture in his native country. One of his reports sent to the Chancellor Osten-Sacken accidentally caught the eye of Emperor Nicholas I to whom it made a deep impression.[2])

Private subscriptions and donations for the benefit of Bulgaria's cultural growth continued to be offered and with greater generosity. Patriotic Bulgarians gave or bequeathed various sums for the creation of funds at certain Russian and Western universities for the purpose of aiding young Bulgarians to obtain a thorough education. The list of such benefactors is a large one, and still more, that of their donations. In 1844 Ivan Denkoglou[3]) made a gift of 15,000 roubles to the Moscow University, and 10,000

[1]) **N. Barsoff,** *Tritzatilyetia dyeyatelnosti Odiesskago Bolgarskago nastoyatelstva,* **1895, Odessa, pp. 4, 5.**

[2]) **R. M. Karoleff,** *Pspissanie,* **XI, p. 169.**

[3]) **Sava Veleff,** *Zlatna Kniga,* **p. 240 and 241.**

roubles to the Risheleff Lyceum as funds, the interest of which to be used for the support of four young Bulgarians.[1]) In 1847 V. Apriloff[2]) bequeathed a sum of money out of the interest of which was established a scholarship for the support of a student in some higher institution of learning in Russia. In 1867 Cosma Tritchkoff[3]) of Vratza bequeathed several sums as funds for the maintenance of two young Bulgarians in the West. In 1867 the Bulgarians living in Bessarabia raised a fund of 60,000 roubles, the interest of which was employed for the support in Russian higher institutions of learning of four young Bulgarians, two of them to be from Bessarabia, and two from Bulgaria.[4]) Panaret of Pogonia created several scholarships for candidates wishing to prepare themselves for the ministry.[5]) Peter Kermekchieff bequeathed his entire fortune for the establishment of a fund with the interest of which to be created scholarships for encouraging young Bulgarians to obtain university training in some Western university or in Russia. Down to 1906 by means of the Kermekchieff fund alone seventy-seven young Bulgarians were enabled to specialize themselves in various universities, polytechnical schools, conservatories, art schools, etc.

The « Benevolent Society » of Bucharest patronized by Eulogius and Christo Gheorghieff, and P. Beron vied, in point of activity, personal initiative and zeal with the « Bulgarian Board » of Odessa. It was fortunate in drawing to itself not only the rich Bulgarians residing in Bucharest, but those living in other Roumanian towns. It exerted a great

[1]) Same pp. 32—84. — Tr. Dimitroff, *Ivan Nikolaevich Denkoglou*, Periodical of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, VIII, pp. 133—136.

[2]) Sava Veleff, p. 148.

[3]) Jove Titoroff, *Gheorghi Ivanovitch, Tzanko Kilchik*, Sofia, 17110, p. 24.

[4]) Sava Veleff, p. 107.

[5]) Same, pp. 92—95.

moral influence on all Bulgarians with whom it came in contact. It inspired them with a strong love for their Fatherland, eliciting from them a spirit of self sacrifice and patriotic generosity, thus inciting them into noble deeds and benevolent emulation for the intellectual and material uplifting of their enslaved brethren in the Balkans. V. Apriloff later on turned his attention not only to the elementary and gymnasia education in Bulgaria, but set aside a considerable sum for the establishment of a university. Eulogius Gheorghieff outstripped all his compatriots with his liberal gift, and rivalled some of the great benefactors of the world in point of personal sacrifice prudently directed and utilized. Besides his many gifts to various schools, hospitals, and other institutions, he bequeathed eight million francs for the creation of a Bulgarian university, and a school of technology.

The self-constituted communities in Bulgaria, on the other hand, showed themselves worthy of the benignant attentions manifested for their welfare by charitable and public spirited Bulgarians settled abroad. They not only tried to faithfully and profitably fulfil the wishes of the benefactors, but themselves encouraged local interest in behalf of the general cause. The natives did not wish to be found wanting in national patriotism, and there appeared not a few local donors and benefactors who gladly gave whatever they could spare for the promotion and encouragement of general literacy, learning, and culture among the people. The Parishes and the Reading Room Organizations vied with each other in facilitating the enlightment of their communities and the education of young men of talent in advanced institutions of learning abroad. Thus the Roustchouk Parish supported three students in Prague, that of Stara-Zagora — four in the above city, Plovdiv — one

[1]) N. Vankoff, pp. 111 and 112.

student in one of the Vienna pedagogical schools, etc.[1]) Nearly all the Bulgarian schools at that period were opened and maintained by private individuals or the parish community. The majority of the boys' and girls' gymnasias, the Commercial School of Svishtov, and the University of Sofia bear the name of their founders and benefactors, and are living witnesses of personal initiative and wonderful spirit of self-sacrifice. Personal initiative was a distinguishing characteristic not only of the wealthy Bulgarians of that epoch, but of the humble and poor representatives of the race, especially of the teachers and educators of the Country. The Pedagogical School of Shtip, the first of its kind in Turkey, was founded by Joseph Kovatcheff; the Commercial School of Svishtov — by D. Shishmanoff, (1874). The Bulgarian Pedagogical School preceded any of the Greek institutions of this type, the first being opened in 1868, while the original pedagogical institutions opened by the Greeks at Salonica and Serres date since 1874.[2])

The Bulgarian school, then, owes its existence and development to personal initiative revealed either by individual Bulgarians, or by private Bulgarian communities. The State not only did not show any interest in the education of its Christian subjects, but on the contrary tried to hinder it. Down to its liberation Bulgaria's institutions of learning come into existence were maintained and developed in the same way as national education grew in England and America.[3]) As in these two countries where for a long time there existed no Ministry of Education, the public education in Bulgaria under Turkish rule neither had nor could be allowed to have such a department. As was the case in both England and America, so in Bulgaria

[1]) «Tchitalishty», IV, N° 8, p. 120.

[2]) Chassiotis, pp. 387 and 390.

[3]) Bryce (James), *Americanskaya Respublika*, vol. II, p. 214. — Hipeau, L'Instruction publique aux Etats-Unis, 1869, Ch. II.

all Bulgarian schools were founded and supported by generous individuals, wealthy benefactors, parish communities, and various cultural organizations. The material aid consisted of funds created either by donations or by bequests of real estate, viz., houses, shops, lots, fields, etc. Thanks to this personal initiative, so extensively developed and so honestly employed, the Bulgarian School was enabled to survive all obstacles and difficulties placed in its way by Greeks and Turks, and to become an important and powerful popular institution.

Personal initiative was responsible for every line of work connected with education, viz., literature, printing-presses, publishing enterprize, etc. The books were published by being subscribed for in advance. In nearly all of the publications printed in the last century, there exists at the end of the volume a long list of the subscribers' names by means of which the sale of the book was thus guaranteed. The Bulgarian printing presses opened in Samokov, Vatosha, Salonica, Bolgrad, and Constantinople owed their beginning and life to the patriotic zeal and personal efforts of individual Bulgarians. In the same manner as the Bulgarian school and parish came into being before the Bulgarian people in Turkey received official recognition as such, so the Bulgarian printing presses were established before there existed a formal Bulgarian community. And it is a noteworthy fact that the studious Bulgar people though labouring under a most shameful and discriminatory rule, managed to set up a printing press at about the same time at which the Greeks established one in Athens, and the Serbians in Belgrade.

Books in Bulgarian were in the beginning published by private individuals abroad, at Rimnik, Budin, Bucharest, Belgrade, Kraguevatz, Novi-Sad, Vienna, and other towns.

Later on Bulgarian books began to be printed in Smyrna where the American Bible Society was in pos-

session of Bulgarian characters procured by it for the publication of the Scriptures. Still later on the same Society presented greater facilities to Bulgarian authors and publishers in Constantinople, its chief station in Turkey, where it had at its disposal a well equipped Armenian printing establishment richly supplied with Bulgarian types as well. Constantinople subsequently became an important centre of culture for the Bulgarians as it already was for Greeks, Armenians, and even Turks. Smyrna, however, preceded it as the seat of printing establishments and publication facilities. Down to 1832 no paper whatever was published in the Turkish capital. In 1811 during the Russo-Turkish war there came out for a time the war Bulletin which was edited in the French language and in limited copies as it was a private enterprize gotten out by the French Legation expressly for the various foreign representatives. The first newspaper in Constantinople was puplished in 1831 and again in French, and founded at the request of Sultan Mahmoud II himself. He called to be its editor a Frenchman, Alexander Black by name, who was for a number of years the editor of a French paper published in Smyrna and entitled «Spectateur de l'Orient». The «Moniteur Ottoman» commenced to appear in the Turkish capital some years later. In 1832 the first Turkish journal saw the light under the name of «Takvimi Vakai». It was but a Turkish translation of the French edition. After the introduction of the Hati-Sheriff of 1839, a number of papers made their appearance both in Smyrna and in Constantinople. In 1840 in Smyrna were published two newspapers in French, two in Greek, one in Armenian and one in Bulgarian, *Luboslovie* (book-loving), the editor and publisher of which was the well known Bulgarian patriot Photinoff.

[1]) Ireček, p 665.

[2]) Ubicini, *Lettres sur la Turquie*, vol. I, pp. 257—261.

The Hati-Sheriff of 1839 and the Hati-Houmayune of 1856, did most for converting Constantinople into a great centre of culture for Greeks, Bulgarians, Armenians, and other races. In the development of the Bulgarian settlement of Constantinople there are noticeable two periods: the first one begins with the year 1839, the birth year of the Hati-Sheriff, while the second commences with that of 1859, that is, the birth year of the Hati-Houmayune. Taking advantage of the new law which raised the Christians on an equal level with the Turks, the Bulgarian colony at Constantinople began to show signs of collective life and activity. The spirit of nationality began to awaken in the heart and mind of the Bulgarians, be they constant residents of the Capital, or frequent visitors as traders, artizens, students, or officials and state contractors. A number of Bulgarian offices blossomed up in the Turkish metropolis with Ball-Kapan as their headquarter, and gradually various guilds representing the native taylors, dealers, and manufacturers, the wheelwright industry, milk, bakery, fish, and other trade organizations began to make their appearance. Their membership comprized men from all parts of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. In Galata and Stamboul there was a street lined with *abadji* shops (for woolen cloths). Hundred of native Bulgarian taylors were employed by the state for the preparation of military uniforms. Many young Bulgarians entered the foreign schools, especially the celebrated Greek schools at Kourou-Tcheshmy and the Island of Chalkis. In 1848 at the suggestions and with the mediation of Prince Bogoridi was laid the corner stone for the Bulgarian Church in the Phanar quarter of the capital. The establishment of a Bulgarian parish followed immediately after this memorable event. In 1848 Dr. Iv. Bogoroff, the noted philologist, commenced the publication of «Tzarigradski Viestnik», (Journal of Constantinople), which was simply a conti-

nuation of its former edition published at Leipzig under the name of «Bulgarian Eagle». At that time, as we already remarked elsewhere, there were but very few papers gotten out in the Turkish capital,[1]) viz., there were only two newspapers published in Turkish, one each in Greek, Armenian, while four each in French and Italian.

After the era following the Crimean war and inaugurated by the promulgation of the Hati-Houmayune which guaranteed religious and race freedom to all subjects of the Sultans, the Bulgarians set to work in dead earnest for the regeneration of their people whose political self-consciousness was almost stamped out by conturies of Turkish misgovernment, and the religious tyranny of the Greek Patriarchy. Constantinóple hence became a most important educational and social as well as commercial centre. The sons and even the daughters of wide awake Bulgarians commenced flocking to the Turkish capital for higher learning, enrolling themselves as students in Robert College, the celebrated American institution of learning founded at Roumeli-Hissar, in the French College of the Lazarists situated at Bebek, in the Sultan's French Lyceum in the Galata-Sarai quarter, and in the Stamboul Medical School. In a few years at the Bulgarian Metochia was errected a Bulgarian school at the head of which came no less illustrious educators than Gregory Nemtzoff, later on Metropolitan of Dorostol and Tchervena, Iv. Naidenoff and others. Bulgarian intellectuals came to Constantinople from various parts of the Turkish Empire. There were to be seen Archimandrite Illarion, St. Michailovsky, later on, Makariopolski, the teachers of Slavic language and history at the Greek Theological School of Chalkis, namely, Neophyte of Rilo, Archimandrite Parthenius, subsequently Metropolitan of Nishava, Archimandrite Antim, later on

[1]) Ubicini, p. 261; Novina bulgarska

Metropolitan of Viddin and subsequently the First Bulgarian Exarch. Among the distinguished laymen were Dr. Iv. Bogoroff, Dr. D. Mouteff, Alexander Exarch, Dr. Stroumski, E. Bourmoff, N. Michailovsky, P. R. Slaveikoff, Dragan Tzankoff, Gavrail Krustevitch, D. St. Tchomakoff, later on, M. Balabanoff, L. Jovtcheff, later on Metropolitan of Lovetch and subsequently the second Bulgarian Exarch, T. Ikonomoff, Chr. Stoyanoff, Dr. Stambolski, professor in the Medical school, V. Neicheff, Dr. Vulkovitch and many others. In Constantinople soon rose the first Bulgarian merchants and business men, commercial houses, and important business establishments. The Bulgarian notables and heads of various firms enjoyed an enviable reputation both with the Turkish Government and abroad, chief among whom may he mentioned the brothers Tuptchileshtoff, Gheshoff, Mr. Zolotovitch, Mr. Moravenoff, and others. There were a good number of gifted Bulgarians whom the Porte called to high offices, such for example as Krustevitch, Pentchevitch, Tchaluoglou, D. Tzankoff, N. Michailovsky and others. Under the leadership and patronage of such able and renowned men the Bulgarian community of Constantinople soon became a very powerful organization which was called to take in its hands the management of Bulgaria's educational political and social interests which it continued to direct for years with aptitude, zeal, tact, and perseverence. Relying for its support to the various guilds and business establishments found throughout the Empire, it came out to be not only a patron and guide of Bulgaria's national destiny, but also its wielder and creator. The learned members of the community set to work with their pen. In 1848 Bogoroff laid the foundation of «Tzarigradski Viestnik». In 1859 there appeared «Bulgaria» with D. Tzankoff as editor. In 1863 followed «Counsellor» managed by Michailovsky, «Vremy» was begun in 1856 by Bourmoff. In 1861 P. R. Slavelkoff commenced «Pchelitza»,

then the humoristic edition called «Ghaida», and in 1867 «Macedonia». Iv. Naidenoff began his «Pravo» in 1867, N. Ghenovitch, the Government paper «Turkey» in 1864, later on the same Naidenoff started his «Napreduk», M. Balabanoff and Chr. Stoyanoff took up «Viek», Karapetroff, S. S. Bobtcheff and others ran «Den». About this time there was felt the necessity of founding a Literary Society which in 1858 came out with an organ of its own called «Bulgarian Knijitzu» (papers) under the editorship of Mouteff, Bogoroff, Krustevitch, and others. In 1870 the Constantinople Reading Room Association commenced the publication of its «Tchitalishty», edited in succession by Balabanoff, Jovtcheff, Slaveikoff, Tzankoff, and others. The Bulgarian students of Robert College, the French Lyceum and the Medical School laid the foundation of a strong Students Society. Under the direction of this society and with the cooperation of ambitious city clerks, and other young men amateur theatrical performances commenced to be given in the Turkish theater,[1]) Ghidik Pasha, in Stamboul, and in the American theater in Orta-Keuy on the Bosphorus. Another encouraging sign showing an intellectual growth of the Bulgarians in Constantinople was the formation of a typographical Association called «Promishlenie» (Provision), whose aim was the publication ot Bulgarian books.

In 1864 the hearts of the Eastern Christians were gladdened by the appearance of *Zornitza* (Morning Star), edited under the auspices of the Constantinople station of the American Board of Foreign Missions. Its founder was the talented scholar, Dr. Albert L. Long. The paper, which exists to this day and is considered the oldest Bulgarian publication of its kind, soon became the most popular and welcome companion of the Christian home throughout the

[1]) T. Athanasoff, *A Short History of Our Theater*. Pspissanie, LXX, band 5 and 6, pp. 375 and 394.

Balkans. Twenty-five years ago it was moved to Samokov, thence, in 1903, to Plovdiv. Among its other noted editors may be mentioned the names of Rev. Dr. T. L. Boyington, Mr. A. S. Tsanoff, a graduate of Amherst College, former deputy of the National Assembly, Mr. P. Demitroff, a graduate of Robert College, until recently Bulgarian diplomatic representative abroad and General Secretary of the Foreign Ministry, Rev. Mr. Robert Thomson of Scotland, a noted Biblical scholar, author of a Bulgarian Grammar, and others.

In connection with the Bulgarian Reading Room Association was founded a new organization called «The Macedonia Society», whose chief mission was to look after the educational interests of the Bulgarians in Macedonia. A similar Society already existed the attention and energy of which were devoted to facilitate the general culture and advancement of the Bulgarian population living in and about the Turkish capital. In short, the more enlightened and well-to-do members of the Bulgarian Communities in Constantinople opened its avenues of culture and civilization to all Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire. Thus the Bosphorus welcomes a Bulgarian collony of 40,000 souls in the same region which Mohammed II[1]) found deserted and caused to be repeopled by Greeks and Armenians brought over from Asia Minor, in the same manner in which he subsequently colonized with Asiatic Turks vast tracts of land in Bulgaria abandoned by the horrified population which fled to Roumania for safety. The Bulgarians now once more organized themselves into a large settlement in the heart of the very Turkish capital. And if Simeon the Great, their most glorious Tzar, was not favoured by fate to enter it with his might and main in the IXth century, the Bulgarian democracy, on the other

[1]) Ubicini, vol. II, p. 173. — See pp. 183, 223, 224, 226, 227.

hand, in the XIXth century not only penetrated into it by virtue of its sheer labour, industry, and ideas, but made it its most important centre of culture, and the seat of its National Church which it resuscitated.

But it must be borne in mind that this cultural success, the fruit of collective initiative, was due, to a great extent, to the intense efforts and activity manifested by the Bulgarian municipalities and parishes from the interior provinces of the Turkish Empire in Europe, at the head of which stood teachers, physicians, merchants, guilds, or the intellectual class of the Bulgarian people, and not to a small degree, to the foreign Bulgarian settlements which since 1860 grew in number and influence. Of the interior or home centres the most important was Plovdiv (Philippopolis). Prior to the creation of Constantinople as the seat of Bulgaria's religious and educational authority, it was Bulgarians of that city that led the rest from Thrace, Macedonia, and Bulgaria in the struggle against the Greeks. In Plovdiv were founded the first and best equipped publishing firms, as were, for example, those of Christo G. Danoff, with branches in Roustchouk and Veles, and D. V. Mancheff, with branches in Svishtov and Salonica. These two big firms and «Promishlenie» in Constantinople supplied the Bulgarian people with the best literature in the native tongue.

Of the exterior Bulgarian centres chief among them was that of Vienna. Though it came into existence much later than those of Odessa and Bucharest, it nevertheless, became very conspicuous for its educational initiative and strong patriotic tendencies. The pioneers of the Bulgarian cause in the Austrian capital were the well known business firms of Kisseloff, Panitza, Prancheff, Kovatcheff, Aneff Brothers, etc. The Vienna settlement soon provided itself with a printing press. In 1872 was founded the celebrated benevolent society «Napred» (Forward), which has done

so much in supporting Bulgarians in the local pedagogical schools. «Napred» was the work of enlightened men. It was organized at the initiative and idea of the distinguished Bulgarian statesman of a later day, Mr. D. Natchevitch, who was the brain of the Vienna colony. It was he who worked out its constitution. Owing to the influence and activity of the Bulgarian settlement, the Austrian Government decided upon the happy idea of sending the well known scholar F. Kanitz to Bulgaria with the Mission of studying up the condition of the Bulgarian people. As a result of his travels, Kanitz gave the world his authoritative book, «Danubian Bulgaria», and the Vienna Pedagogical School opened ten scholarships for Bulgarian students.[1]) In Roumania, besides Bucharest, Braila contained a strong wide awake and wealthy Bulgarian community.

That Society is a concrete expression of the personal initiative manifested by the Bulgarian men of education and commercial class.[2]) The men of letters consecrated

[1]) The Austro-Hungarian Government, in order to win the favour of the Bulgarians who looked on Russia as their protector, in 1873 proposed to the Bulgarian Exarch, Antim I, to open certain scholarships for Bulgarian students in its schools, to pay the salary of the Bulgarian bishops, and to supply the funds for the erection of a gymnasia. The Exarch, however, refused the offer. See Theodore Milkoff, *Antim I, First Bulgarian Exarch*, Plovdiv, 1899, p. 120.

[2]) Some of the Bulgarian leaders were unable to at once grasp the noble intentions of the younger and more enlightened Bulgarians who took their stand at the head of the «Literary society», and on that account treated it with a lack of confidence and even with hostility. That antipathy was largely due to a hasty statement made by N. Gheroff in regard to the character of its founders and its constitution (see T. Pancheff, «*Pages from the Archives of Naiden Gheroff*», published by the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, pp. 301, 303, 568).

their pen and learning to their fatherland, while the men of business came to their support by subscribing two hundred thousand francs as the original fund of the Society.[1]) In Moscow in 1860 a group of young men under the guidance of Ginzipharoff, Karaveloff, and K. Miladinoff published a paper called «Fraternal Labor», while in Bolgrad in 1867 D. Ikonomoff was the editor of another called «Common Labour».

Among the noted Bulgarian commercial establishments scattered in foreign countries were those of the Brothers Ghesholou of Plovdiv, with branches in Manchester and Vienna, of V. Domouschiolou of Varna with a branch in London, of Brothers Bobeff of Ochrida and Monastir with branches in Leipzig, of Avramovich of Svishtov and Turnovo, with branches in Vienna, Braila, Galatz, etc.

The Bulgarian home and foreign communities were in continual correspondence with the chief Bulgarian cultural centre established in Constantinople. Each community was free to give its opinion, recommend certain means for adoption, encourage the Constantinople pioneers in their work, and devise means for its support and more successful activity in the general effort to uplift the forelorn cause of their country.

All communities lived and worked led by the same idea, the same feeling and wish — to be useful to their Mother Country, and to do all they can for the intellectual elevation and national awakening of their countrymen. Though they were scattered and lived at a great distance from each other, their aim and ideals were one. They represented Bulgaria, and Bulgaria lived through them. They were the Government and Parliament of their fettered country. While in free Serbia, Greece, or Roumania the

[1]) Ireček, p. 709.

governments opened schools, printing establishments, encouraged the publication of books, periodicals and newspapers, granted scholarships to promising young men, in order to study abroad and perfect their learning in the Western universities, in enslaved Bulgaria this exalted office was performed by individual natives and by private communities. And if one should compare the number of Bulgarian books published prior to Bulgaria's liberation from the Turkish rule, that is in the period between 1806 and 1875, it will be found that it does not compare unfavourably with that of the books printed in the same duration of time in Greek, though the publication of the literature in these states was materially and morally backed up and even carried on in the Greek by the Greek Government and the Greek Patriarchy, and in the Serbian by the Serbian Government and the Karlovitz Patriarchy. Thus between the years 1806 and 1875 there were printed more than 800 Bulgarian books,[1]) while from 1800 to 1850 in Serbia and Austria (the Karlovitz Patriarchy) there were published 1400 books in the Serbian language, the larger part of which was the work of the Austrian Serbs. From 1832 down to 1850 in Serbia were printed in all 423 volumes, while in Austria 468.[2]) From 1807 to 1877 in Greece and Turkey (the Greek Patriarchy) there were printed 1472 books in Greek, a considerable part of which belonged to the Greek subjects of the Sultans. During the first quarter of the last century between 200 and 400 volumes appeared in the Serbian tongue.[4]). Many

[1]) Ireček, *Bibliography of the Neo-Bulgarian Literature*, 1760—1870.

[2]) G. Skerlitch, *Istoria nove srpske knijevnosti*, Belgrade 1912, pp. 79 and 80.

[3]) Novakovitch, *Srpska bibliographia za novijou knijevnosti*, Belgrade, 1869, pp. 164—554. — La Grande Encyclopédie, vol. XIX, p. 292.

[4]) G. Skerlitch, p. 81.

of the books published in Bulgarian counted as many as 2,000 subscribers.[1])

The Treaty of Paris created a new grouping of the European Powers, pointed out new international questions, and outlined new territorial designs. In the first place the Hati-Houmayune failed to effect any amelioration in the condition of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and, therefore, failed to realize the wishes of the Western Powers who had pledged to support the principle of the integrity of Turkey. The promulgated reforms provided for in that Imperial edict were not applied in practice. The Porte did not have the courage to introduce the principle of equality between Mussulmans and Christians. It was afraid to admit the Christians into the army and to entrust them with arms.

Speaking in general, the result from the reforms in the manner they were handled was very much unsatisfactory and disappointing. The lot of the Christian was not altered in the least for the better. The Hati-Houmayune was thoroughly miscarried in its aim.[2]) In 1857 an insurrection broke out in the district of Gabrovo. It was known under the name of « Uncle Nickola's Insurrection,»[3]) and was raised as a protest against the non-execution of the reforms contained in the Hati-Houmayune. The Great Powers called the attention of the Porte to this fact, and

[1]) Ireček, p. 675. — The book «*The History of Alexander the Great*», published in 1844, had 1585 subscribers.

[2]) In 1857 in the city of Svishtov the Turks attacked and demolished the belfry of the Christian church because they could not bear the sound of a Christian bell. At another place a Turkish mob rushed into the church and placing a dead dog upon the holy seat of the altar cried to the Christians: «There is your Hati-Houmayune,» see N. Mathieu, *La Turquie et ses différents peuples*, vol. II, p. 264.

[3]) Kissimoff, *Historical Facts*, part. III, p. 64.

once more advised her to hasten with their application. The latter promised to give the matter her most serious consideration. Russia, however was not satisfied with mere promises, but insisted on the appointment of inquiry commission in order to investigate the measures taken for the execution of the reforms. The rest of the Powers approved in principle of the inquiry to be made, but at the suggestion of England the Grand Vizier Mehmed Kubrazli was charged with making it. Since the discontent and complaints came mainly from the Bulgarians, the Vizier commenced his investigalion with the Bulgarian provinces. He thereupon made a tour through Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. The inhabitants came out to meet him and throughout deputations were sent to present to him the grievances and complaints of the people. In Svishtov and Viddin the notables declared that they did not wish anything more than what was stipulated in the already promulgated scheme of reforms,[1]) which, unfortunately, were not tried and put into practice.

The Bulgarians everywhere insisted that the Christians, too, be allowed to participate in the public administration of their land.

[1]) At Viddin the notable Ilia Spassoff in the presence of the Governor presiding over the provincial council declared: «If we now are all equal and have the same rights why the laws are not translated in our tongue in order that I may know according to the law whether the decision of my colleagues is just and legal. Why the Bulgarians too are not allowed to serve the state as officials when even the Jews who are a drop in the ocean among us are permitted to occupy high posts, and their opinion is given heed to on affairs that are alien to them.»

The Pasha interrupted him saying: «You stop there, it is useless to recount to me what is contained in the Hati-Houmayune. You certainly have been influenced by the example of the Svishtov people, but that is of no consequence.» The Svishtov citizens made a copy of the Hatt-Houmayune wrapped it up in an atlas wrapper and handed over to the Vizier saying: «Here is written all that we desire.»

Europe raised her voice against the Porte who had failed to execute the reform plan specified by the Royal decree.[1]) Unfortunately at this juncture a political rivalry rose between France and Russia who tried to checkmate each other's influence in Constantinople. The Russian Ambassador, Prince Lobanoff, proposed that a new project of reforms should he worked out, to which the French Government answered negatively.[2]) It declared the reforms guaranteed by the Hati-Houmayune to be sufficient: the plan and desire of the French Government was to blend all races and religious communities throughout Turkey in one homogeneous Ottoman Empire. The Russian Government, on the other hand, continued to insist on the necessity of a new reform scheme granting and guaranteeing greater and well defined rights to the Christian elements in the Turkish Monarchy. These new reforms were to be prepared and given by the Great Powers themselves, and to be put into execution by their organs since Turkey had clearly demonstrated its utter inability to do so. In 1866 General Ignatieff, who superseded Prince Lobanoff in the Ottoman Capital, declared that the Hati-Houmayune was contrary to the Koran and that as such it was an impossibility to have it executed by Turks. The Koran expressly emphasize the unequality between Christians and Mohammedans, while the Hati-Houmayune was explicitly for equality of all races before the law. Should the latter be applied in practice, it would create a wider breach between Christians and Mussulmans, so that instead of grouping and strengthening the Empire, would prepare the way for its dissolution. General Ignatieff summed up the policy of Russia in these two words: *Autonomy* or *Anatomy*. The Vienna Cabinet, though concurring with

[1]) Ch. Seignobas, *Histoire politique de l'Europe contemporaine*, Paris, 1899, pp. 599 and 600.

[2]) Albéric Cahnet, p. 201.

the opinion of the Russian representative, took the side of France. Prussia and Italy, on the other hand, expressed the opinion that a European conference be convoked to decide what steps should be taken to aleviate the unbearable lot of the Christians. The French-Prussian war in 1871, however, interfered with such a plan. Should the projected conference have taken place, the affairs in the Near East, in all probability would have assumed an entirely different aspects.

The Bulgarians who at this moment were already in possession of their own schools, educated class, and communities, even though not yet officially recognized, felt keenly disappointed and discontented. For they were the worst oppressed and most wronged people in the whole Empire. This terrible state of affairs, naturally, greatly facilitated the work of the secret Bulgarian revolutionary Societies. Such organizations existed both in the Empire and out of it. The Central Revolutionary Committee at that time was found at Bucharest, in Roumania, where it carried on its propaganda unhindered, had its well established office, published its own papers, pamphlets and other kind of literature, and had its various organs centered there. Of the discontent of the Bulgarians, of their revolutionary plans and activities the European press promptly apprized the world. The Bulgarian people, until then unknown to Europe in general, and treated neglectfully by the Powers attracted an unusual interest throughout the continent, especially after the Crimean war in which they took a very active part. Their military efficiency in that struggle created them a very favourable reputation abroad and thence the countries interested in the Orient began to look upon them as an important factor in the future solution of the Balkan problem. In Russia, in particular, the exploits of the Bulgarian volunteers wrought a great change in favour of the Bulgarian people. The name of the «Little

Brothers » of the Balkans became extremely popular. After the Crimean war the Bulgarians displaced the Serbians as the pet children of Russia. The latter found themselves on the background. It seems the Russian Government was very much dissatisfied with Serbia's conduct during that war. The Serbians loyalty was already under suspicion because of their choice of Prince Alexander Karagheorghevitch whom Russia considered an Austrian protégé. His election, it will be recalled, though sanctioned by a berat from the Sultan, was declared unlawful by Russia. A second election was called forth, and though Russia this time was obliged to acquiesce and give ascent to it, she, nevertheless, remained always distrustful of the Prince. The Crimean war increased her distrust of him, since Serbia through the influence of Austria remained neutral throughout the conflict, for which the latter had promised her the territory comprising the corner of St. Nickolas and the cities of Viddin and Lom.[1]) Russia's displeasure at the disclosure of Serbia's perfidy turned into bitter enmity.[2]) « Russia », writes Ristitch, « was never able to forget this conduct of Alexander of Serbia towards her, and towards her Balkan policy. At Petrograd, in the Foreign Ministry, Russia's hostility towards the Prince was considered as a matter of fact. » In 1857 Budberg, the Russian Ambassador at Vienna, was unable to conceal his country's antipathy for Serbia. « Russia », once remarked the diplomatist, « sooner or later will avenge herself on Prince Alexander for his behaviour during 1853—1855. »[3])

The Serbian Government became cognizant of the change that had taken place in Russia towards the Serbian people. It felt the coldness of its former protectress

[1]) Ilia Tsanoff, pp. 87 and 88.

[2]) Jovan Ristitch, *Spolashni odnoshaji Srbije u Beogradu*, vol. II, p. 230.

[3]) Same, pp. 226—231.

more keenly as the Bulgarians, their neighbours, profited by this turn of events. Russia's sympathy for them was daily increasing. Her threats, indeed, came out too true. In 1858 Prince Alexander was dethroned.

The old Prince Milosh [1]) was elected in his stead because of his tried friendship to Russia. In 1860, after his death, he was succeeded by his son Michael. Michael's ascension to the Serbian throne laid the foundation of a new national policy both home and abroad. It was his ambition to get rid of the Turkish garrisons still doing duty at the Belgrade and other Serbian fortresses, and extend the boundaries of his State. In order to effect this, he sought the help of the Serbs living abroad and the cooperation of the Bulgarians. He tried to draw them together by his plan of establishing an «Illirian Empire», an idea conceived by Napoleon and taken up by Dossitea Obradovitch, Vouk, and Gai, who dreamed of founding a great «Yougoslavia». In the state aimed at were to enter Chorutania, Goritza, Istria, Kraina, Styria, Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Doubrovnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina, [2]) Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria, and lower Hungary. That Slav Empire in South-Eastern Europe was to be swayed by the scepter of Michael Obrenovitch. And the political state of affairs in Europe looked favourable to such an enterprize. Austria was constrained to accept the idea of Baist and renounce the principle of the integrity of Turkey. She now began to show great interest in the condition of the Christians under Ottoman rule and in a policy of territorial extension towards the Balkans. But since her loss of Lombardy in the French war of 1859 she was not in a position to enter into another conflict

[1]) Ch. Seignobos, p. 627.

[2]) Ch. Seignobos, *Histoire politique de l'empire contemporaine*, Paris 1899, p. 627. — Stanoevitch, p. 304. — Marko P. Tzemovitch, *Sovremennia slavyanskia problemi*, Petrograd, 1915, p. 27.

soon. The interior state of affairs in Turkey, on the other hand, was growing worse. Both the Greeks and the Bulgarians were barely able to check their hostility and ire to the Turkish misrule and unbridleness. Russia, who at that moment felt recuperated from the effects of the Crimean war, was getting ready to raise her fist against the Treaty of Paris. Prince Michael of Serbia, therefore, thought the times very propitious for administering a final blow to the Turkish garrisons and authority that still harrassed his domain. Before embarking into such a risky undertaking he sounded the Governments of Russia and France. Both of them assured him that they would not interfere in case of a conflict between him and Turkey.[1])

Prince Michael, thereupon, set at work for a war with Turkey. He thought it advisable to change the policy of his predecessors towards the Bulgarians. Instead of working among the mass of the people through political agents and thus incite them to revolt, he decided to rather approach its leaders and representatives, its notables and intellectual class with a view to winning them to his cause. His predecessors taking advantage of the hard oppressed and discontented Bulgarians inhabiting the border districts of Turkey easily induced them to rise in revolt against the common tyrant. They promised them arms and military assistance as soon as hostilities opened against the Ottoman forces. But, unhappily, the Serbian Government allured the Bulgarians to action with the only purpose of furthering their own end. As soon as the latter took arms, the Serbian boundary line was hermetically closed to them. In so doing the Serbian Government gained the favour of the Sultans, and paved the way for interceding in behalf of the rebelled districts. For these services the Sultans granted the Serbian new Hati-Sheriffs by which

[1]) Stanoevitch, p. 305. — Ch. Seignobos, p. 754.

they extended their rights, privileges, and territory. Thus the Serbian Government acted as the ally of the Turks during the Pirot and Nish uprisings of the Bulgarians in 1841, and the Viddin revolt in 1851. It is interesting to read what Cyprien Robert says on this point.[1]) «Without any doubt,» says he, «the Serbian Principality played the chief part in the Bulgarian insurrection (of Viddin). The moment it was declared large groups of insurgents ran up to the Serbian border to procure arms even by offering gold for them. The boundary line, however, was suddenly closed and not a single rifle was allowed to change hands. All the appeals for help on the part of the unfortunate Bulgarians were in vain, and they felt greatly disappointed at the flat refusal of Prince Alexander to take part in a precipitate war which would surely have created an European complication. For that reason the Bulgarians found themselves compelled to accept the offer of the Belgrade Cabinet to act as their mediator before the Sultan, and simultaneously Serbia's hospitality proferred to all refugees fled across the frontier for safety. Under these circumstances Omer Pasha was enabled with dignity and generosity to propose to the defeated insurgents full amnesty and favourable terms.» Prince Michael continued the same selfish policy towards the Bulgarians now very skilfully and diplomatically handled. The idea of a Balkan federation acted as a magnet upon the enlightened Bulgarians in the realization of which they saw their own salvation. In order to countercheck the Russian influence exerted upon the Bulgarians, the Serbian Government opened wide its doors to Bulgarian emigrants and particularly to the Bulgarian revolutionary leaders at the head of whom stood Sava Rakovsky himself. The Serbian schools were thrown open to the Bulgarian youth, and many scholarships were placed at the disposal of Bulgarian

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. I, p. 15.

students at the Belgrade Gymnasia and Seminary. And yet in unison with the Russian foreign diplomacy the Belgrade Cabinet had espoused a Slavic policy in the Balkans. Serbia assumed the part of Piedmont in South-East Europe. The chief promoter of that policy was Prince Michael, with Ilia Garashanin as his assistant and co-worker. The prelude of the grand movement was the formation of the celebrated Bulgarian legion at Belgrade in 1861. In it were enrolled some three hundred Bulgarian revolutionaries, whose soul was the same Rakovsky. The financing of the legion as well as the support of the Bulgarian students in Serbia were not derived from Serbian sources only. « The grand foreign policy of Russia, » write Voukichevich and Semiz, [1]) « coincided with the national aspirations of the Balkan peoples. Russia found in Prince Michael a man not only able to revive the Eastern Question, but also to give it a push into a direction leading to its final solution. In Garashanin, too, it discovered a wise statesman who succeeded in becoming the genius of the projected federation of the Balkan races, and the pillar of the political aspirations of Prince Michael .... Belgrade became the centre of action, unity, and liberation of the Southern Slavs. Russia commenced to encourage and support that policy in all its phases, with all means available, especially after Garashanin's success in winning her favour and confidence. The Government of the Great Slav Empire subsequently delegated a number of its officers to inspect the Serbian army and to get acquainted with the Serbian topography .... Every Slav who turned to Russia for information in regard to her Eastern diplomacy was referred to Belgrade. Thanks to Russia's influence, the negotiations with Greece and Montenegro were brought to a successful issue. » A united blow was being prepared

[1]) *Serbi i Bolgari*, pp. 183 and 184. — Stanoevich, p. 307.

and levelled at the Ottoman Empire. In the allied action a place and part were reserved for the Bulgarians also, as is vouched by the Serbian Minister Pirochanatz, a colleague of Garashanin. «The Cabinet of Prince Michael,» writes he, «did all it could to gain the Bulgarians to the common cause concerted against the Turks. In its estimation the winning of Bulgaria was no less important than the participation of Bosnia, Hercegovina and Old Serbia. The Bulgarians, though enduring an unbearable foreign yoke, were, nevertheless, considered an important factor by virtue of their compactness, democratic spirit, agricultural pursuits, and industry. The educated and non-educated members of the Bulgarian community formed the same unit and shared all vicissitudes of life alike. In respect to the position we occupy as well as to our past experience and future destiny we and the Bulgarians are foreordained one for another .... The Government of Prince Michael set its foot on a solid ground. Already a circle composed of the leading Bulgarian patriots in the home districts was formed while the revolutionary organization spread its influence beyond the boundaries of the Empire. Serbia reached an understanding on most points with the Bulgarian representatives in respect to a joint action against the Turks. It was concluded that the brunt of the struggle was to be borne by Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro.» [1]) Pirochanatz speaks the truth when he asserts that the idea for the establishment of a Southern Slav Kingdom was accepted by the Bulgarian leaders and notables. This fact is confirmed by the programme worked out and approved at Bucharest on April 5th, 1867, at a meeting, at which participated some of the most distinguished Bulgarians. That was the first Bulgarian political

[1]) M. C. Pirochanatz, *Knyaz Michail zajednichka rodna balkanskih naroda*, Beograd, 1895, pp. 32—39. — P. Milyukoff, *Srubsko-bulgarskite otnoshenia*, etc., Bulgarski Pregled, vol. V, N° 9—10, pp. 58—66

conference held during the last century. It was attended by seventy delegates representing the bigger Bulgarian towns in Turkey, and the Bulgarian colonies in Roumania and Russia. The programme of the meeting was found by Iv. Ev. Gheshoff in the archives of the great Bulgarian benefactor and patriot Eulogius Gheorghieff.[1]) It consists of twelve points and bears the signatures of such noted Bulgarians as Evloghi Gheorghieff and Christo Gheorghieff of Bucharest, Shopoff of Ismael, Nicholai Mironovitch, Toshkoff, and V. Rasheeff of Odessa, Colonel Kessyakoff of Petrograd, Metropolitan Panaret of Pogonia, and Paskal Kantardjieff of Tirnovo, Michael Koloni of Sliven, Stephan Beron of Braila, etc., etc. The meeting was called at the initiative of Offenberg, the Russian diplomatic representative at Bucharest, and Magazinovitch, the Servian diplomatic agent. The most salient points contained in the programme were these: the second one which explained that the South-Slav Kingdom was to be made of Serbia and Bulgaria, namely, Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia; the fifth in which was stated that the two languages to be officially employed were to be both the Serbian and the Bulgarian; and the ninth which defined the character of the ministry to be established. The Bulgarian people at a general meeting chose a committee which was empowered to carry out the programme. Through a special deputation the programme was presented to Prince Michael who charged his minister Garashanin to express his satisfaction and gratefulness to the Bulgarian representatives who took part in the Bucharest conference. The gratitude of the Serbian Prince was the end of the scheme for the creation of a South-Slav kingdom. Pirotchanatz, besides the programme, publishes a formal treaty concluded between the

[1]) Iv. Ev. Gheshoff, *Evloghi Gheorghieff, Sketches from his Life* Pspissanie, LXI, pp. 8—15

Serbian Government and the Bulgarian delegate authorized to do so by the committee chosen by the popular assembly in Bulgaria, but he does not give the names of the signatories, which makes people believe the document apocryphal or at least a draft. One thing in the treaty which attracts the attention of the readers is that in it no mention is made of the essential feature contained in the second point of the programme, namely, nothing is said of the provinces of which Bulgaria consists. The members, however, of the Bulgarian Committee had no authority to sign a treaty which was not explicit on this point. The Serbians, as early as 1867 when seeking alliance with Bulgaria, considered Macedonia Servian.[1]) Though the Serbian ministers made no objection to the Bulgarian programme, they were dissatisfied with its contents. Such a feeling was manifested even in 1867, at the time of Prince Michael, when the Serbian Government, true to its traditions, turned on the side of the Turks, drove out the Bulgarian students from its schools, and disbanded the legions which had dealt the Turkish forces the worst blow at Belgrade in 1862.[2]) Prince Michael himself proved disloyal to the South-Slav idea.[3]) After his assassination in 1868, the Austrian influence was renewed at the Serbian Capital. Russia then renewed her suspicions of the Serbians and turned her attention to the Bulgarians.[4])

Both the Serbian and the Roumanian Government exploited the Bulgarian revolutionary organizations and their leaders for the realization of their own interests and plans. They thought it to their advantage to encourage the Bulgarians to resort to revolts and thus place Turkey in an em-

[1]) Prof. M. Voukitchevitch and D. Semiz, p. 183.

[2]) St. Novakovitch, *Srpska Kniga*, Beograd, 1900, p.

[3]) *Is Archiva na Naiden Gheraff*, vol. I, p. 284.

[4]) Prof. Voukitchevitch and D. Semiz, p. 193.

barrassment [1]) which often compelled her to seek Serbia's and Roumania's aid and cooperation in stamping them out, in return for which services Turkey made them concessions. By this means, gradually the Roumanians and Serbians hoped to redeem their independence so fervently desired by both Prince Michael and Prince Carol. [2]) In 1862 Belgrade was evacuated by the Turks, and by direct negotiations Michael succeeded in causing the withdrawal of all the Turkish garrisons found in Serbia. [3]) The Roumanian Government made use of the Bulgarians particularly after the dethronment of Prince Couza. It organized the Bulgarian emigrants and sent them across the border to fight the Turks. Fearing that the Turkish Government might oppose by force any attempt to unite the two Principalities, as well as the recognition of Prince Carol on the Roumanian throne, and believing that the Turkish army might easily dash from Roustchouk to Bucharest in order to defend the Sultan's suzerainty, the Roumanian liberal Cabinet whose head was Bratiano thought it an admirable policy if the Empire of the Turks would be kept continually destracted by home troubles caused by Bulgarian uprisings, for example. Having this end in view, secret agents of the Liberal Party, or the so-called Party of the Red, were continually kept busy in encouraging and organizing Bulgarian revolutionary bands and sending them over to Turkey. In 1867 there were two committees in Bucharest, one Roumanian, the other Bulgarian, between which was concluded an understanding for a concerted action. A treaty of alliance was worked out, but though it was accepted by both sides it was never signed by the Roumanians. The latter acted in this respect as the Serbians. As the

[1]) Frédéric Damé, *Histoire de la Roumanie contemporaine*, Paris, 1900, p. 188.

[2]) Same, p. 187.

[3]) Ch. Seignobos, p 627.

Serbians after the expulsion of the Turkish garrisons from Belgrade turned their back to the Bulgarian volunteers, so the Roumanians after the recognition of their union and of Prince Carol changed their tactics against the Bulgarian revolutionaries. The Roumanians subsequently thought it to their interest to give preference to a rival Bulgarian Committee, known under the name of «The Central Bulgarian Secret Committee», composed of young Bulgarians. The organization of this Committee caused the Serbians to suspect the Red Liberals of Roumania. It was believed in Serbia that the Roumanian alliance with the new Bulgarian clique aimed at the creation of a Wallacho-Bulgarian state hostile to the idea of a South-Slav Kingdom advocated by the Serbians and the Old Bulgarian Committee.[1]) This fact explains the origin of the two Bulgarian revolutionary Committees existing in Bucharest at that period. The Bulgaro-Roumanian Treaty so-called «A Sacred Coalition Treaty between the Roumanians and the Bulgarians» (Act de coalitiunea sacrâ intre Rumanii si Bulgarii), consists of seven articles. Article VII, the most important of them all reads: «The aim of the above-mentioned Committees (Bulgarian and Roumanian) as well as of the central and the succursal, is to prepare the people for a united action against the common enemy of the Christian races in Turkey. The signal of revolt in Bulgaria will be given by the Central Bulgarian Committee, in accordance with the plans of the Roumanian Committee, as soon as the rebellion breaks out in the neighbouring lands, viz., Roumania, Serbia, Montenegro, Hercegovina, Epirus, and Albania, which together with Bulgaria are desirous of forming antonomous and independent states united in a Confederacy. The Rouma-

[1]) Pirotchanatz, p. 40.

[2]) Dr. N. Kassaboff, *Moite spomeni ot vuzrajdaneto na Bulgaria s revolutzionni ideali*, Sofia, 1905, p. 60—95.

nians did as the Serbians, they avoided to sign the treaty. Subsequent events came out to show that the idea for federation with the Bulgarians was only a cloak under which both Roumania and Serbia masked their national policy of territorial expansion. That is corroborated also by the treaty concluded in the same year between these two Principalities. Whether authentic or apocryphal, this treaty brought to light by the French diplomatist Ed. Engelhardt, a friend of Serbians and Roumanians, reveals the secret designs of Serbia and Roumania towards Bulgaria in these days. The Treaty was originated by Serbia, and in the disguise of the high-sounding name of «Balkan Confederacy», which the document advocated, and which was to include Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro, and Greece, it actually aimed at a conquest of Bulgarian lands to be divided between Serbians, Roumanians, and Greeks, as was evidenced by their secret negotiations. «A great noise as to the end of the negotiatiens was raised in some foreign offices,» writes Engelhardt, «which, though kept out of public gaze, nevertheless, attracted the attention of more than one government. The Divan even is sure that it has succeeded in procuring an approximate if not an actual copy of the act concluded at Bucharest. Though apocryphal, the treaty which reached the court of the Sultan in March 1868, was a true reflection of the views attributed to the two signatory states.» [1]) In it the articles six, seven, and eight are secret. [2]) The true designs of Serbia and Roumania may well be detected in the eighth article which reads: [3]) «Should Providence bless their (Serbian and Roumanian) efforts, and permit them to become masters of the territories delivered from the Otto-

[1]) Ed. Engelhardt, *La Confédération balcanique*, Revue d'histoire diplomatique, 1892, I, pp. 1—55.

[2]) Same pp. 35 and 36.

[3]) Same p. 38.

man dominion, the two contracting parties would execute the following decision reached by them: they would add and annex to Roumania for all times the islands forming the delta of the Danube and the Eastern part of Bulgaria included between Roustchouk and Varna on one side, and the Black-Sea on the other. To Serbia will be annexed for all times Old Serbia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, and Bulgaria, with the exception of that district which is ceded to Roumania.»

The existence of such a compact was not denied by the Government of Prince Carol. When interrogated on the subject, it informed the foreign representatives as well as the correspondents of many papers, that an alliance[1]) with Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro, in its opinion, was the only means for bringing about a practical solution of the Eastern Question. It is beyond all doubts that during 1867 a treaty between Serbia ano Roumania did exist, but according to some, it was merely a commercial understanding. Ed. Damé, however, the author of the above cited historical datas, explicitly asserts that the treaty concluded between Roumania and Serbia was a treaty of alliance, and that is was first proposed by Serbia. «On January 20th,» says he, «Prince Carol had a lengthy conversation with the Serbian diplomatic agent concerning the alliance treaty proposed by Serbia, and on the next day the document was signed.»[2]) The truth is that in 1868 a discussion for a treaty did exist between the two Principalities, but it was simply for a friendly rapprochement, and it originated from Roumania, and, therefore, could not have been the treaty spoken of by Engelhardt and Damé. In the Stroudza's Memoirs of Carol I we find the following allusion touching this point: «The Serbian Consul Magazinovitch is received by the Prince to discuss a treaty of friendship which was

[1]) Same p. 89.

[2]) Ed. Damé, *Historie de la Roumanie contemporaine*, p. 187.

proposed at Belgrade by the Roumanian representative. It consists of four articles. » [1])

The idea for the creation of a Balkan Confederacy is older than the treaty pointed out by Engelhardt. It was a simultaneous product with the first revolutionary movements in Serbia and Greece. The scheme was most sympathetically treated and received in Bulgaria, where were found its most ardent and sincere promoters and apostles. Without stopping to investigate what state it originated from, it may safely be asserted, that the Bulgarians were working for it before Serbians and Roumanians, Greeks and Turks turned their attention to it. That is corroborated by a series of official documents which have been preserved. The Bulgarians always believed that whenever fighting side by side with their Christian neighbours, they were shedding their blood for a federation of Serbia, Greece, and Roumania, and were sure that by so doing they were toiling for their own freedom. But, unhappily, they always found themselves deceived by the governments of these states. After the Crimean war, the Bulgarians came forward as a nation, with problems of their own to solve. Their participation in that war, as we saw, rendered them conspicuous and made them a factor in the Balkans. Their greatest advantage consisted in the fact that they dominated the Balkan Mountains which are the key to Constantinople and the Aegean. France had at once grasped this truth and was greatly interested in the Bulgarian people, which had already attracted the attention of Russia and Austria who had begun their historical struggle to eclipse each other's influence in the South East of Europe. The wish of France was to draw them away from their aggressive policy in the Orient, and to create

[1]) Demeter A. Stroudza, *Charles Ire, roi de Roumanie, chronique, actes, documents,* 1865—1885, Bucharest, 1899. — St. Stanoevitch, p. 307.

a closer unity between Turkey and her Christian provinces with a view to strengthening and consolidating the Ottoman Empire.

Hence the reason for her proposed series of reforms in Turkey, which in unison with England resulted in the promulgation of the Hati-Sheriff, Tanzimat, and Hati-Houmayune. Already in 1840 she sent her agents in the Ottoman Empire to preach the confederation idea to Serbians, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Turks, and thus resist the encroachment of Russia and France who were resolved to conquer the Balkans and devide them between themselves. Cyprien Robert [1]) as early as 1841 writes that a coalition of Bulgarians, Serbians, and Turks would be in a position to check an invasion undertaken by Austria or Russia, and gives the number of the forces which it could place on the field. Serbia could muster 30,000 men, Montenegro — 20,000, Bosnia — 40,000, and Bulgaria — 80,000. Blanqui, another contemperary, presents almost the same statistics. «All of these peoples,» says he, «Wallachia, Moldavia, Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria, so long held in bondage, would clasp each other's hand and form a great country, a mighty confederacy.» [2]) And indeed since the first half of the last century the Balkan races began to be animated by the grand idea of a Balkan confederacy. The Bulgarians were its most zealous votaries and made the greatest sacrifice for its realization. They gladly died in the revolutionary struggles for the freedom of Serbians, Greeks, and Roumanians. The Bucharest Conference convoked for working out the programme for an alliance between Serbia and Bulgaria, and the treaty concluded between the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee at Bucharest and the Roumanian Government are important historical evidences of the readiness and sincerity of the Bulgarians in pledging

[1]) *Les Slaves de la Turquie pendant l'année 1841*, Paris, pp. 403—406.
[2]) *Voyages en Bulgarie pendant l'année 1841*, Paris, 1845, p. 252.

their support for the Confederacy utopia. Written documents exist showing that attempts at such a change were made also between Bulgarians on one side, and Greeks and Turks on the other. The earliest one of them dates from the times where yet no political committees were in sight. It is the petition[1]) presented to the Sultan by the Bulgarian notables in behalf of the Bulgarian people, in 1856 immediately after the proclamation of the Hati-Houmayune. After pointing out the hard conditions in which the Bulgarian people lived, the incessant persecutions to which six and a half millions of Bulgarians were exposed at the hands of Greeks and Turks, and after showing that such a state of things was the cause for the flight out of the country of the enlightened and educated members of their compatriots, and that already two million Bulgarians were scattered throughout Bessarabia, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Greece, the signers of the petition asked the Sultan to favour them with a church, and civil and political rights.

A second document extant is the memoir sent in 1867 to Sultan Abdul Azis by the Bulgarian Revolutionary Committee of Bucharest. It may be considered as a counter-project to the Roumanian-Serbian treaty which aimed at the seizure of the Balkan territories by these two countries. In the memoirs the Bulgarian Committee, after the example of Austro-Hungary, proposed to the Sultan the formation of a dualism between Turkey and Bulgaria. According to it, Bulgaria was to be made a kingdom under the supreme authority of the Sultan[2]) who was to wear the title King of Bulgaria. The new Bulgarian state was to be ruled by a Christian vice-king, and was to be provided with a national assembly, national church, native

[1]) Serpski Dnevnik, Novi Sad, July 17, 1856.

[2]) P. Kissimoff, *Istoricheski Raboti*, part. III, pp. 46—61 — Dr. J. Kassaboff, pp. 80—93. — Ireček, p. 698. — Ed. Engelhardt, p. 49. — I. C. Ivanoff, p. 107.

army, etc. A third document was occasioned in 1862 by the proposition of the Bulgarian people's representatives to the Constantinople Patriarchy. It contained a request of the Bulgarian people for the creation of a Church Confederacy. The petition asked that the Bulgarian Church be made an autonomous institution in which the ecclesiastical authority would be administered both by Greeks and Bulgarians; an equal clerical representation of the two races be made eligible to the Patriarchal Synod,[1]) and the Mixed Council also be thrown open to both Greek and Bulgarian laymen. That Church Confederacy which the Greeks rejected would have extended and included all the peoples in the Balkan Peninsula. Such a project if realized might have been followed by a political federation which is the salvation of the Balkan races. The Central Bulgarian Committee was always for a confederacy. Vassil Levski, one of the pillars of the Bulgarian regeneration and revolutionary movement, was an ardent apostle of Balkan Confederacy. «We Bulgarians,» he argued,[2]) «desire to live fraternally with all our neighbours and particularly with the Serbians and Montenegrins who understand our ideals, and with the Roumanians with whom our destiny is closely connected, and would wish together with them all to form a federation of free states.» All these and other historical documents show how popular and widely spread the federation idea was among the Bulgarians many years before it became in vogue among Serbians, Roumanians, or Greeks.

The friends of the Balkan inhabitants continue to this day to recommend them the federative form of government as the «only guarantee for their liberty and national self-preservation». «By means of a voluntary Confederation,» says Poinsard, «the Balkan States may best safe-

[1]) Teploff, p. 45. — T. St. Bourmoff, p. 215.
[2]) Zaimoff, *Minalo*, III, p. 91.

guard their future .... The confederation idea is based on justice.

Every one of the four states would be able to maintain its autonomy, legislature, finances, and army. The Confederacy of these states would form a political unit comprizing from twelve to fourteen million inhabitants, would create a useful element for the preservation of the balance of power in the East, and would guarantee its members strength and prosperity. Unfortunately, this plan is still a dream. It is balked either by the energy of some, or the jealousy or extreme and fantastic ambitions of other of the interested factors, though it is generally conceded that it corresponds to the conditions, character, and interest of those small states peopled by races identical in social and political views and tendencies. We think it but natural to see spring up in the Balkan Alps a confederacy reminding one of that other one of the Western Alps which came into existence after a painful and protracted struggle. Such an alternative is to be preferred by the Southern Slavs than a fusion with any of the great stormy and unsettled countries which surround them. This is the inevitable conclusion derived from a scientific investigation of the facts.»[1])

The Bulgarians, then, were not devoid of a strong wish to federate, and often tried to come to an understanding with their neighbours for the purpose of realizing their hope for a Balkan confederacy, but, unhappily, they found neither followers, nor support from abroad.

The revolutionary struggle among the Bulgarians commenced in 1819 and interrupted by long intervals was fervently espoused by the youth. The mass of the people, however, remained indifferent. The enlightened part of the people was for a long time powerless to move it to action.

[1]) Léon Poinsard, *La Production, le Travail et le Problem social dans tous les pays au début du XXme siècle*, Paris, 1917, p. 388.

The political movement in Bulgaria, nevertheless, though slow, was simply postponed for a more opportune day. The minds of the Bulgarians in the meantime, were taken possession of by another agitation which had a numerous following and more convincing pioneers, namely, the Church agitation. Both of these movements, the political and the religious, were noted for the zeal, stubbornness, and patriotism of their leaders. Though not growing simultaneously, they did not exclude each other, on the contrary, they supplemented one another. In the East religion is inseparable from politics; it is clad in the latter which in Turkey is taken for granted. The two causes, indeed, differed in name, but were identical in point of contents and practical purposes. The apostles of the political movement strove, after the example of their neighbours, to obtain freedom through revolutionary methods, while those of the church movement, through evolutionary process. Both of these movements created their own centres, stations, organs, and organizations, and their own literature. It often happened that their central authorities came into conflict with each other, but it should be borne in mind that the conflict arose out of a divergeance of opinion in regard to the means and methods employed than to the aim pursued. The chief seat of activity of the political propaganda was Bucharest, of the Church — Constantinople. The organs of the first were «Dounavski Lebed», «Otechestvo», «Svoboda», «Nezavissimost», «Zname», etc., while those of the latter were, «Tzarigradski Vestnik», «Sovetnik», «Bulgaria», «Vremje», «Pravo», «Napreduk», «Tourtzia», «Viek», «Den», «Bulgarski Knijitzi», «Tchitalishty», etc. The religious movement, though of a later date, found a richer soil for development and the right psychological moment for its extention. Out of it grew the great Church Question, the salution of which was imposed both upon the Porte and

the Greek Patriarchy. Its stimulations like those of the political movement, were largely economist — the abuses, extortions and tyranny of the Greek clergy. Slowly but steadily the religious regeneration and struggle of the Bulgarians blossomed up into, perhaps, the greatest national ideal — that of an independent Bulgarian Church — an idea first conceived by Father Paissi in the XVIIIth century, but almost lost in oblivion for lack of general interest and a deeper appreciation of its importance.

It were the Bulgarian revolutionary leaders in the Nish insurrection of 1840 [1]) and of the Viddin rebellion of 1850 [2]) who first protested before the Turkish Government

[1]) Cyprien Robert, vol. II, p 318, says, «The Porte at once dispatched its commissary, Tewfik Beg, to the district of Sofia, in order to investigate the causes of the disorders, find out whether the complaints of the people were just, and see to it that the requests of the people were granted The nature of the complaints were easy to formulate; the insurgents asked for elders chosen by the people, just taxation, abolition of abuses and shameful practices, expulsion of the Armenian farmers who plundered the country in the name of the Pashas; *they also asked for such bishops who at least understood their language.*»

[2]) Same, vol. I, p. 14: « Introduction nouvelle sur la situation des slaves en Turquie pendant et depuis leurs insurrections de 1849, 1850 et 1851. The Bulgarians of Viddin, Belogrodchik, Berkovitza, and Lom gave a clear description of their complaints to Riza Pasha who was delegated to investigate them ». The insurgents declared that they preferred to die rather than abandon their wives and children to the lust of the Spahis who were the greatest obstacle to the application of the reforms granted by the Sultan. Since the tithes commenced to be paid in cash and not in kind they were increased tenfold, because the Soubashi (tax collectors) apprized the crops according to prices of grain existing in Constantinople where they were always ten times as high as they were in Bulgaria. The Bulgarians wished to pay their tithes in kind as was the custom to do so in the past. They demanded that taxation be commensurated with the land owned and the ability of every tax-payer, and the taxes be paid at regular instalments announced in advance. They further demanded a national clergy understanding their tongue in

against the abuses and avarice of the Greek bishops and state officials, and raised the question of their replacement by Bulgarians.

The demands of the revolutionary chiefs of the insurrection of 1841 had their effect. The Turkish Government called the serious attention of the Greek Patriarchy and took steps for the establishment of some control over the conduct and acts of the Greek higher clergy. Since no perceptible amelioration followed and the church abuses continued as before, rendering the condition of the Bulgarian Christians more desperate, as Sultan Medjid was able to witness with his own eyes during his visit to Bulgaria in 1844, the Porte in 1847 appointed by decret [1]) three laymen to act as controlling committee of the Greek Patriarchy. These persons were the Great Logothetos Aristarchi, former Governor of Samos, Prince Bogoridi, and Psychiaris. Besides the other prerogatives with which they were invested, they had the right to participate in the meetings of the Patriarchy. The Greek spiritual Chief and his Synod showed a bitter opposition to the intrusion of laymen in their religious matters which they argued to be contrary to the canons of the Patriarchate. The first two protests sent out from Nish and Viddin were a direct manifestation of the Bulgarian people. It was driven to this subterfuge not through any exterior influences, but principally on account of the abuses, avariciousness, and

---

place of the Greek bishops and priesthood who did not know a single word in Bulgarian, but were familiar with the language of hand cash. In order to be in a position to defend the honour of their wives and daughters they asked to be allowed to carry yataganes and pistols in their belts as the Turks were permitted to do. And, lastly, in order that the execution of the reforms granted by the Sultan be guaranteed, they insisted that the Divan controlled every one of the local authorities against which the peasantry could prefer no complaint without the risk of one's life.»

[1]) Ubicini, vol. II, p. 130.

extortionary methods resorted to by the Greek bishops and priests. As soon as he felt his economical interests badly affected, he reacted, spontaneously gave vent to his feelings, and demanded of the Porte the expulsion of all alien spiritual leaders and their satelites.

The legal struggle, however, between the Bulgarian people and the Greek Patriarchy actually commenced after the proclamation of the Hati-Sheriff. Now it is taken up under the leadership of its own religious, educational, and political pioneers, true disciples of Father Paissi's idea for a free and independent Bulgarian Church. Archimandrite Neophyte Bozvelli was the first to open the eyes of his countrymen in regard to the rights and privileges which were assured to them by the Hati-Sheriff,[1]) and the foremost of his compatriots to institute a bitter campaign against the Greek usurpers. Curious enough, Bozvelli, like Paissi and Illarion Makariopolski, was a member of the Chilender Monastery. Mount Athos is the birthplace of many of the most zealous and fearless spiritual reformers of Bulgaria. All this shows what a great influence the Academy of Bulgaris had exerted on the inmates of Mt. Athos in instilling in them the ideas of the new epoch. While the monks of the Rilo and other convents gave themselves to the quiet pursuits of life, to religious work and education, looking with resignation at the destructive activity of a foreign clergy, those of Mt. Athos, on the contrary, were conspicuous for their love of both civil and religious freedom, their public-spiritedness and patriotism, and an unbounded hatred for the Greek religious oppression. Neophyte Bozvelli went from town to town instructing and enlightening the people, giving his advice to all in religious and political matters, and encouraging the opening of new Bulgarian schools. He never ceased preaching, no matter where he was, and

[1]) M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 190.

in his sermons he spoke furiously of the impious practices and abuses perpetrated by the Greek bishops, though he was very careful not to offend the Greek Patriarchy directly. He taught the people to rise against their false religious leaders, demand their ejection, and ask the Government to be allowed to replace them with native pastors selected for their virtuous life and love of their exalted calling. His discourses made a deep impression upon his hearers who were easily won for his cause. It was under his guidance that the Bulgarians from various eparchies formulated and presented to the Sultan their complaints against the Greek clergy. Those were the first written documents of the Bulgarian people directed against the Greek bishops and priests. The Patriarchy, however, highly resented the audacity of Neophyte and left no stone unturned until it finally prevailed upon the Turkish authorities who exiled him. This brutal measure in driving him away from his people made him still more undaunted and energitic. At the termination of his banishment he settled in Constantinople. Here he resumed his vigorous labours among his countrymen, infused life into the Bulgarian guilds, helped them build a church of their own, and establish a Bulgarian parish in the Ottoman capital itself. The Bulgarian guilds, backed by his directing influence, knowledge, and tact, began to open their eyes and look upon things from a Bulgarian point of view. Petition after petition was presented to the Greek Patriarchy to grant its assent for the erection of a Bulgarian church. The astute stubbornness of the Patriarchate was finally mollified. In 1848 at the advice of Prince Bogoridi, a Government member of the Patriarchal Council, the cornerstone of the Bulgarian Church in Constantinople was laid in the Phanar Quarter and upon a lot bequeathed by Prince Bogoridi himself. By suffering the structure to be erected, the Patriarchy made a tacit recognition of the

Bulgarian community and the Bulgarian nationality. That was the first signal victory of the righteous cause of the Bulgarian people. It was mainly due to the courage and ability of Neophyte Bozvelli, the generous support of the Bulgarian guilds, and last but not least, to the great influence and diplomacy of Prince Bogoridi whose heart and soul remained true to his race to the end. Bogoridi's popularity both in social and official circles was so great that even the Patriarch was unable to withstand the fascinating eloquence of his noble character, his genial disposition, and unobtrusive talents: the Greek religious chief himself consecrated the newly founded religious edifice, from which in 1872 was proclaimed the independence of the Bulgarian National Church. But ere this success was won, Neophyte Bozvelli, together with his disciple Archimandrite Makariopolski, was repeatedly exiled in various monasteries, until he died a martyr's death in 1849 in one of the underground cells of the Chilender convent. Archimandrite Neophyte worked for the enlightenment of the Bulgarian religious leaders. He considered the restoration of the Tirnovo Patriarchy a premature undertaking. He urged the people to limit its demands to what was most feasible and inoffensive, and which the Greek Patriarchy would not easily deny. Educated as Orthodox, he remained to the end true to the Orthodox Church. In his fight against the Greek hierarchy he always made a distinction between the Oecumenical Church and the corrupted and degenerated Greek priesthood. And the louder he thundered in his sermons against the abuses and misdeeds of the latter, the more ardently he advised his people to hold fast to the Orthodox faith. There, of course, existed special reasons which invited discreetness in what he said and did. Just about this time the Catholic Propaganda was laying in wait for the discontended followers of the Patriarchy with a readiness to do all it could to alienate them from

the Orthodox Church. The Catholic emissaries promised the Bulgarians to grant them a full religious and educational autonomy, besides a foreign protectorship against the encroachment and lawlessness of the civil authorities. In 1843 when Archimandrite Neophyte was led out in chains for his trail, the agents of the Catholic Propaganda made all efforts to win him on their side. They resorted to bribery and persuasion, but in vain. The noble monk remained firm and imperturbable. He worked and struggled not for gold, but for the good of his people.[1]) The Latin emissaires,» writes Goloubinski, « did all they could to gain Neophyte and with him a considerable following of his people who hold him in highest esteem .... Neophyte not only gave no ear to their advances, but from Mt. Athos, his place of exile, sent an epistle to his countrymen in which he fervently warned them to beware of wiles and temptations that were threatening them.»

Archimandrite Neophyte was not the only victim of the pernicious influence of the Constantinople Patriarch. Long is the list of the martyrs who found their death in exile or in various prisons, all at the instigation of the Greek bishops. However, neither persecution nor torture was able to discourage the Bulgarians. On the contrary, the Turkish discrimination and misrule on one side, and the tyranny of the Greek Patriarchy on the other, incited them to a greater unity and resoluteness in the struggle. The Bulgarians throughout Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia now began openly to protest and complain against the intrusions, iniquities, and cruelties of the Greek clergy, and to clamour for Bulgarian pastors instead. The Patriarchy took all these popular manifestations very ill at heart, and ordered more severe measures to be taken against all those Bulgarians who demanded the introduction of

[1]) E. Goloubinski, *Kratki otcherk istorii pravoslavnich tserkve 'bolgarskoi, serbskoi, i roumyenskoi.* Moscow, 1871, pp. 193, 164.

their tongue in the schools and churches. The repressive measures of the Greeks had but temporary success. A popular cry arose against them whenever opportunity presented itself. Thus in 1844 when Sultan Medjid, after the example of his father Mahmoud II, undertook a journey through his Empire, he was overwhelmed with petitions and deputations sent to him to protest against the encroachments and vicious treatments to which they were exposed at the hands of the Greek Patriarchy and its representatives in Bulgaria, and to entreat him to protect his Bulgarian Christians from the degradations and wiles of their religious leaders. A lengthy and well worded protest which voiced the sentiment and wish of the entire Bulgarian people was presented to the Sultan in the town of Roustchouk. A copy of it was handed over also to General Gramer, the Russian envoy, sent by his Emperor to greet the Sultan for the occasion. But as was always the case, no good came out of Sultan Medjid's personal visit to the discontented provinces, and the Bulgarians once more were convinced that if any substantial relief was to be obtained, it was to be wrested and imposed by force. The people daily wronged and goaded to desperation hence threw themselves openly into the conflict with their spiritual oppressors. Mobs thronged the cities and rushed into the churches and bishops' residences, ejecting from them the Greek bishops. Serious riots took place in Tirnovo, Lovetch, Svishtov, Veles, Skopie, Prizren, and other towns.[2]) In many places the authorities were compelled to use military force in order to disperse the crowds. At Viddin the assembled multitude was driven away at the point of bayonet.[3]) A number of the participants in the riot was

[1]) Dr. Iv. Selimski Library, I, pp. 68—72.

[2]) Milan Radivoeff, *Vreme i jivot na tirnovskia mitropolit Illarion Makariopolski*, Sofia, 1912, pp. 78—91.

[3]) Tchitalishty, IV, p. 453.

handled very brutally, and some eighty of the citizens were interned in Roustchouk as political exiles.

The struggle against the Greek bishops was resumed in every Bulgarian town and eparchy. Though as yet unorganized, it nevertheless was carried on by all and with a fierce determination. It was soon felt, however, that it needed to be centralized and directed from one place. Constantinople proved the most suitable place for such a centre. Soon after the erection of the Bulgarian church and the establishment of a Bulgarian parish in the Turkish capital, it naturally followed that the organized Bulgarian colony should have a spiritual chief of its own. Bishop Stephan of Laodicea was its first religious head. Then came Archimandrite Illarion Stoyanovitch who was recalled from his exile in Mt. Athos. The Patriarchy ordained him in 1858 Hierarch of the Bulgarian Church at Phanar under the name Bishop Makariopolski. Though president of the Bulgarian community, he was subordinate to the Greek Patriarch and had no right to have any direct dealing with the Porte, for the Bulgarian community was not officially recognized.

Bishop Makariopolski is one of the great pioneers of the Bulgarian renaissance period, and particularly in the long struggle for the independence of the Bulgarian Church. When still a young lad he left his native town Elena for Arbanassi, whither he hastened in order to attend the school there. Thence he went to Mt. Athos led to it by the spirit of Paissi, the renown of Neophyte Bozvelli, and his intense patriotism. His love for study drove him from Elena to Arbanazzi, Chilender Monastery, the Greek School of Kourou-Tcheshmy, and finally to the University of Athens. But no matter where he went, he remained the same independent mind, and like a busy bee, gathered only what was good, elevated, and ideal in learning, out of which he forged his life's shield which

he wielded so effectively in defending his nation's cause. At the Island of Andros he was fascinated by the learned Greek scholar Chairi whom he admired for his lectures on the glory of Hellas, and the love for one's country. What he learned from his distinguished Greek professor and patriot he eagerly preached to his comrades and people on returning to his native country. Patriotism was one of his most favorite themes. At Andros and Athens he was not the only Bulgarian student come to seek higher education. Dr. Tchomakoff, Panaret of Plovdiv, Dr. Mishaikoff, Dr. Selimski, Dr. Stroumski and other Bulgarians of future fame wore among his school fellows there. Sympathetic, public-spirited, and of great erudition, Bishop Illarion was able to grasp the crying needs of his time and the necessity for declaring war against some traditions and prejudices of the age. At Phanar in Constantinople he proved a godsend for the Bulgarian cause, where, though a stranger, reminded one of the scriptural saying that «the stone which the builders refused is become the head.» He came back from the Chilender convent a man with sound ideas, strong convictions, and tried principles. Providence could select no worthier person to take up the cause of the down trodden Bulgarian Christians in Constantinople, to stand up boldly against the Greek Patriarchy, champion justice against injustice, defend historical truths against falsity and shame, raise the standard of true Orthodoxy against the errors, delusions and wiles of the Greek Patriarchy — in a word, to lead the entire Bulgarian people in a death grapple with the religious tyranny of Phanar. All Bulgarian eparchies were enkindled by the religious and educational spark emanating from Constantinople, and the struggle against Hellenism became universal. The conflict was gradually

---

[4]) Dr. Iv. Selimski Library, No. 4, p. 7.

transformed from mythological to an epic and real strife in which the opposing sides were two nations — Greeks and Bulgarians. The war was led by the ablest and most patriotic members of each people. The chief weapons of the combatants were the Gospels, science, history, and logic. The struggle was carried on for the freedom and rights of the Bulgarian people usurped by the Greek patriarchs of Constantinople. The war was stimulated by a feeling of intense hatred for wrongs committed during centuries. The Greeks, on one side, did all they could to maintain their absolute religious control over the Bulgarians; the latter, on the other hand, had resolved once for all to get rid of a most shameful spiritual servitude. The Bulgarian struggle for religious and educational independence begun by the leaders of the revolutionary movements of 1840 and 1850, and continued with undiminished interest and vigour, was finally, after a period of thirty years, brought to a successful issue, to the triumph of the Bulgarian just claims.

But the Bulgaro-Greek religious conflict was not an isolated strife between Greeks and Bulgarians. Not only the Ottoman Government, but also foreign cabinets and alien religious organizations stepped in and interfered or watched its progress with keenest interest. Foreign interference became particularly aggressive after the treaty of Paris in which the signatory Powers declared that they had taken cognizance of the Hati-Houmayune granted by Medjid. The hostile relations between the two belligerent parties reached their most critical stage after the promulgation of the celebrated decree of the generous Ottoman ruler. Availing themselves of the friendly attitude and interest of the Great Powers, the Bulgarian people was emboldened in its decision to assert its rights specified in in the imperial document. The Bulgarians, thereby, led by the resolute Viddin citizens turned to the Sublime Porte and

insistently asked that the bishops be paid by the state, and the future religious heads be selected from among the Bulgarians themselves. The example of Viddin was soon followed by the inhabitants of Tirnovo, Plovdiv, and other towns. The city of Ochrida begged the Porte to send them one of their three distinguished Bulgarian prelates, Illarion Makariopolski, Auxentius of Veles, or Archimandrite Antim, subsequently Bishop of Viddin. The petition of the Viddin citizens was supported by the Russian representative at Constantinople. But notwithstanding the interference of the latter «the Patriarchy not only stubbornly evaded the execution of the Porte's recommendation for satisfying the wishes of the Viddin people, but succeeded in influencing the Ottoman authorities against the Bulgarians, in consequence of which the signers of the petition were cast in prison.» [1]) Two of the unfortunate men were later on exiled to Broussa. The same fate awaited the signees of the Ochrida petition. Instead of appointing the persons disignated in the petition, the Patriarchy had her own way in sending as bishop of Ochrida the Greek Metropolitan Miletius who not long ago had heen forcibly ejected from his diocese at Veles because of his avidity and cruelty. The people of Ochrida too, however, expelled him from their city and ceased to mention the name of the Patriarch in Church service. [2]) The Constantinople Bulgarian notables, leaders, and guilds came to their support. In the name of the entire Bulgarian nation they petitioned the Porte for the application of article third of the Hati-Houmayune, and thus save the Bulgarian Christians from the spiritual bondage of the Greek Patriarchy. The Sultan thereupon transmitted to the latter a written order prescribing to it the convocation of a national Con-

[1]) Teploff, *Greco Bolyarskii voprosa*, Peterburg, 1889. — Ireček p. 685. — Tchitalishty, IV, p. 453.

[2]) Same, p. 39.

ference which in conformity with the Hati-Houmayune to bring about the necessary reform in the Church. In the Conference were to participate delegates from all Christian provinces of the Empire together with a number of prelates designated by the Patriarchy. The order of the day was, «A General Discussion of the Question of the Privileges of the Patriarchy», and «Introduction of a New Constitution for Church Administration». The Conference was solemnly opened in October 1859 under the presidence of the Patriarch. It was attended by seven metropolitans, and thirty-eight representatives, ten from Constantinople and twenty-eight from the eparchies. There were only four Bulgarian delegates out of thirty-six Bulgarian eparchies, Illia H. Petroff of Viddin, Dr. St. Tchomakoff of Plovdiv, P. R. Slaveikoff of Sofia, and Hadji Nickola Mintcheff of Tirnovo. At one of the meetings the Bulgarian delegates made a written proposition for the restoration of the ancient Bulgarian churches. «As the Great Church,» the Bulgarians argued, «did not condescend to give ear to the earnest and often repeated prayers of the Bulgarians for the selection of Bulgarians or at least men understanding Bulgarian at the head of the Bulgarian eparchies, and since this Conference, too, looks with indifference upon this question so vital to the interests of the Bulgarian people, on this account, in order that the sores created by the past Church Administration might be cured, and the injustice done to a whole people be rectified, it is necessary that the once independent Bulgarian church seats — those of Ochrida and Tirnovo abolished by the Oecumenical Patriarchy, be restored to their former state.» [1]) The Patriarchy rejected the proposition of the Bulgarian delegates not in the name of the Church canons, but in virtue of the Imperial berats of

[1]) Pravo, 1870, Nos 4, 5 and 6.

1768 obtained through extortion from Patriarch Samuel's inferiors, and through deception of the Turkish Government.

In consequence of the rejection of their request, three of the Bulgarian representatives, after duly protesting, left the conference. The Tirnovo delegate alone remained to the end thinking it his duty to do so. In vain he raised his voice against the illegality of the elections, the injustice of barring Bulgarian prelates from occupying the post of Metropolitan, and the monstrous measure of interdicting the use of the Bulgarian language in the Bulgarian schools and churches. He pleaded for the right of the eparchies to choose their own metropolitans, the Patriarchy reserving for itself only the privilege of confirming their election. The Greek bishops and representatives, however, wouldn't allow even the mention of any concessions made to Bulgarians, for, according to them, no Bulgarians existed in the Empire. The insults to which the Bulgarian people was exposed at the Conference were most humiliating. The Greeks did not think it derogatory to their high vocation to mock at any motion made by their Bulgarian colleagues, at their history, language, and nationality strange to say. The bitterest enemy to Bulgarian was Karatheodori in whose veins ran Bulgarian blood. At the last meeting of the Conference, February 16th, 1860, he concluded the discussions by giving vent to the following rancorous invectives: «The Bulgarians,» he said, «are very foolish if they should think that an assembly of Greek representatives would be willing to have its attention called to questions concerned with the interests and rights of the Bulgarian people. The Church recognizes no difference of nationalities, and as to the proposition that the metropolitans be chosen by the eparchies themselves, that is an unheard of stupidity!»

[1]) Teploff, p. 38. — Irečėk, pp. 686 and 687.

The speech of Karatheodori delivered, as it was, at the Oecumenical Council presided by the Patriarch himself, was not only highly offensive to the Bulgarians, but it was a public mockery at the Hati-Houmayune on which the Bulgarian delegates based their demands. The whole Bulgarian nation felt grossly insulted by this incident. N. Hadji Mincheff published a pamphlet in Greek in answer to Karatheodori's speech in which he refuted his statements in a convincing manner. But the most crushing answer to the contumacy of the Greek Patriarchy was given two months later. On the 1st day of Easter, April 3, 1860, as Bishop Makariopolski, while saying mass in the Bulgarian Church at Phanar, was about to mention the name of the Patriarch according to the custom in vogue, the Bulgarian congregation raised up a deafening cry of protest. In order to avoid serious disorders the Hierarch in the nick of time, instead of the Greek Patriarch's name, muttered «every Orthodox Episcopacy». With that incident was put not only an end to an odious tradition, but also, to all further relations between the Bulgarians and the Greek Patriarchy. That was the most important and decisive step taken by the Bulgarian in the long Greco-Bulgarian religious conflict. For the first time in the protracted struggle the Bulgarians felt sure they were marching safely to their goal — the independence of their Church. Bishop Makariopolski next time officiated on the day of Pentecost, this time assisted by Bishop Auxentius of Veles. At this occasion, too, the name of the Patriarch was omitted. The act of the 3rd of April was received with great approval and enthusiasm in every Bulgarian eparchy. The citizens of Plovdiv were the first to follow the example of their Constantinople compatriots. The Plovdiv Metropolitan, Paissi, a Greek by origin, but a man of strong character, piety, and erudition, was exceedingly disappointed at the decisions taken by the Oecumenical Council.

In order to show his dissatisfaction, as well as that of his Bulgarian flock, on the following Sunday omitted to mention the name of the Patriarch in his prayers and immediately after mass an act was drawn up in which was declared the separation of the Bulgarian Church from the Constantinople Patriarchy. Bishop Paissi took that resolution because he knew the cause of his Bulgarian congregation was just, and he stuck to it to the end of his remarkable career. By that epochal event the city of Plovdiv which together with Tirnovo and Viddin [1]) took the most prominent part in the regenerating process of the Bulgarian people, now assumed an undisputed leadership in the management of all national affairs. That was chiefly due to the public zeal, education and ability of the Plodiv people and not a little to their most worthy leader, Dr. St. Tchomakoff, who after the secession stepped to the front and became the soul of the great struggle.

The memorable act of April 3rd which revealed the united strength and determination of the Bulgarian people was a surprize not only to the Patriarchy and the Porte, but also to the foreign representatives in Constantinople. Once that religious coup d'état became an accomplished fact, its authors abandoned their wonted cautiousness and reserve, and resorted to an outspoken aggressiveness. The Bulgarian Cause from religious turned to political. The change, however, rendered it a more complicated affair. The struggle hence had to be carried on not only against the Greek Patriarchy, but also against the Turkish sovereignty. There, too, had to be taken into consideration the interests of the Great Powers which were believed to he affected by the new phase reached in the Bulgaro-Greek historic conflict. Of the European countries, Austria, France, England, and Russia, in particular, showed a

[1]) Iv Ev. Gheshoff, *Spomeni*, Sofia, 1916, pp. 12 and 13.

keener watchfulness over the important changes taking place on the Balkan Peninsula.

Notwithstanding the Occumenical Council's decision which was contrary to the letter and spirit of the Hati-Houmayune, and derogatory to the prestige of the Countries signatories to the Paris Treaty, the Great Powers, contrary to what was to be expected, showed themselves very indifferent. The Russian Ambassador, after the Treaty of Paris was signed, continued to uphold the old policy of maintaining the homogeneity of the Orthodox Christians in Turkey and of safeguarding it against the Catholic and Protestant propagandas. That meant allowing the Greek Patriarchy full jurisdiction over all Orthodox peoples in the Ottoman Empire. An Orthodox homogeneity meant to the Bulgarians the loss of their individual character and nationality. That was the aim of Orthodoxy. The Catholic and Protestant propagandas, on the other hand, had this aim in view: to snatch away the Orthodox Bulgarian from the bosom of the Patriarchy, and indirectly from the influence of Russia, the greatest patron and protector of the Orthodox Christians in the Near East. Of the many Russian ambassadors at Constantinople during the second half of the last century, only one of them had taken pains to closely familiarize himself with the Bulgaro-Greek Question, and it was he who had advised his Government to revise its Balkan policy. That diplomatist was Prince Lobanoff Rostovski. His predecessors, as well as General Ignatieff who succeeded him, failed to get at the bottom of the actual facts existing in the Balkans, and on that account their diagnosis of the condition of things in the Ottoman Empire was superfluous, and the measures recommended by them were mere paliatives. The desease, however, of which Turkey was suffering needed a radical treatment. An operation was necessary for the separation of two living organisms drawn up together by an un-

natural union. The short-sighted Russian statesmen believed that since the Bulgarians complained only of the abuses and extortions of the Greek bishops, if the causes of their grievances were removed they would have no objection in remaining under the scepter of the Patriarch, in which case, the unity of Orthodoxy would be preserved. On that account their efforts were directed toward a reconciliation of the Greeks and Bulgarians and thus they believed to win them both on Russia's side. The policy of the Sublime Porte, however, was just the opposite. It was convinced that the interest of the Empire demanded the existence of a constant jealousy and enmity between the races. Austria, France, and England, too, concurred with the Porte on this question. Prince Lobanoff on the other hand pertly informed the Petrograd Government that Russia must choose one of the two alternatives: either with the Greeks, or with the Bulgarians. But unhappily his advice was paid no heed in his country. «They expected,» he wrote to Petrograd,[1]) «that the reforms would reveal a new era in the life of the Church. If those hopes failed to be realized, it was chiefly due to the fact the new reforms in doing away with many wrongs, satisfied only the negative demands of the Slavs, while their positive wants and requests were left in the background. The decisions of the Conference (Oecumenical Council in 1859) not only failed to bring in any spirit of reconciliation in the life of the Church, but evoked a greater disappointment among the discontented, compelling them to look for another road by which they could reach their historical goal — a church autonomy and political emancipation. The Patriarchy, of course, was unwilling to recognize the legal and just claims of the Bulgarians, and was, therefore, always hostile to any national movement

[1]) Prince Gr. Troubetzkoi, *Rossia i Vselenskaya Patriarchia*, Viestnik Evropi, 1902, N° 6, p. 501.

on their part. It continued to justify its stand from a purely juridical point of view, declaring that it could not swerve from its canonical course of action. Russia found herself at a dilemma. Until then the great Slav Empire acted as the Protectress of the Orthodoxy as a whole, i. e., focussed its care principally on the religious side of the race conflict raging in the Balkans. Now she had to choose one of the two belligerent parties both of which were firm supporters of the Orthodox faith. She could not very well show its fist to the Patriarchy, the embodiment of the Orthodoxy with which she was allied by so many historical bonds and traditions. Neither could she have the heart of estranging from herself a kindred people whose influence and power were daily increasing and who was promising to play an important part in Russia's policy in the Balkan Peninsula. How could two such entirely antithetical tendencies be brought to a safe issue? . . . A few years ago, in 1860, when we begged of the Patriarchy to favour the Bulgarians by sending them men of their own race for bishops and by permitting the liturgy to be officiated in the Slavic tongue, we then stood at the head of the movement. The events since then, however, have gone against us. Though the Bulgarian movement is due to the awakening of the national self-consciousness in the Bulgarian people, nevertheless, if the Patriarchy had manifested a more benignant spirit and had acceded to our request, the Bulgarian nationality, meeting no hindrance from its religious Chief, would have devoted its whole attention to its political cause, and would have continued its growth under the patronizing surveillance of the Great Church . . . . At this juncture it is too late to think of reconciliation, and should we wish to retain our political prestige with the Bulgarians and be their guardians in their future progress, then we must dispense with the illusory idea of playing friends of both the Greeks and

the Bulgarians at the same time. We must declare our stand either for the former or for the latter, either for the separation of the Bulgarians from the Church, or for the unity of the Orthodoxy. Any attempt on our part to court the favour of both sides would render us an object of suspicion to all. Our course of action would have been more easily taken if we had been free from the fear that if we espouse the cause of the Bulgarians we would lose the sympathy of the Greeks, — I understand the clergy and the laymen both in Turkey and the Greek Kingdom. We should have in mind that the evil has already been committed, and that the partisans of the Western influence in Greece continually point at Russia as the protector of the Slavs, and the enemy of Greek liberty.»

The Bulgarian Church Question was not clear not only to the majority of Russian diplomats, but to the Russian press in general. Graf Ignatieff who had spent most time on it had come to Constantinople to continue Russia's former policy — the homogeneity of the Orthodox Church. Indeed, he did not strictly follow the directive given him from Petrograd, but all his efforts were concentrated towards a harmonization of the Greek and Bulgarian ideals with the hope of preserving the unity of their common religion. His inferiors in the Embassy entertained even a stricter view of the question. Their conception of it was bureaucratic, for they identified the homogeneity of the Orthodox Church with their own career. Burning with the ambition for speedy promotion, they took great pains to zealously execute all the instructions forwarded by their Government. Hence their displeasure whenever the Bulgarians felt irritated and offended by the stubbornness of the Patriarchy and rebelled at the stiffness of the Phanar despotism. Hence the unfriendly atmosphere in the embassies towards the Bulgarians. Hence the fre-

quent altercations between the Russian and Bulgarian clerks connected with the Russian Legation.[1]) The same difference of opinion made its way in the Russian literature and public sentiment. «Both in our public opinion and in our literature,» writes P. Tessovski,[2]) «there exist two very different and even hostile views on the Balkan problem. There are some who, being favourably disposed towards the Greeks, openly declare themselves against an autonomous Bulgarian Church, arguing that the religious welfare of the Bulgarians was possible only under the condition that the Bulgarian Church remained subordinated to the Constantinople Church. There are others, on the other hand, who plead for the creation of an independent Bulgarian church. Among the promoters of the former class may be mentioned the name of T. Philippoff whose theory on the mooted question he tried to formulate in his lengthy articles published in book form in *Journal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshtenia*. Here he has collected all evidences and arguments he could find in order to show the advantage for the Bulgarians if remaining within the pale of the Greek Patriarchy.»

Some of the Western Powers, too, looked upon the Bulgarian religious agitation with equal disfavour. Austria and France in the meanwhile took advantage of the Greco-Bulgarian Church antagonism, and pushed their propagandas abroad among the Bulgarian people.[3]) Their aim was, as already pointed out, to alienate them from Russia. The French Government resorted to the services of Count Vladislav Zamoiski, and Prince Tchartorijki, while the latter relied for support to the Polish emigrants and the Lazarists in Constantinople. England, on the other

[1]) *Archiva na Naiden Gheroff*, vol. I, pp. 253—257.

[2]) P. Tessovskago, *Greco-Bolgarskii Voproso*, Petrograd, 1871, pp. 7 and 18.

[3]) Ch. Seignobos, pp. 622—633. — T. St. Bourmoff, pp. 185—191.

hand, encouraged the work of the Protestants among the Bulgarians. The Protestant propaganda was labouring under most difficult conditions. The Patriarchy was point blank against the Bulgarians, the Russian stood between Greeks and Bulgarians trying to conciliate them in the name of the Mother Church; all the Catholics and Protestants cared for what was to enhance their influence among the discontented Bulgarians, while the Turkish Government looked upon the increasing hostility between two of its most troublesome elements with cynical satisfaction because that gave it an opportunity of playing the arbiter between the two. The Catholic Propaganda directed by Boré, the Superior of the Lazarists, and a man versed in the Bulgarian language and history, began energetically to work for a union with Rome, and soon in Constantinople there appeared their organ «Bulgaria» by means of which it disseminated its views among the Bulgarian people. At the very start the Catholic cause was able to win on its side no lesser a Bulgarian personage than the well known Bulgarian political leader of a future day, Mr. Dragan Tsankoff.[1]) He joined the Catholic Propaganda not through any religious conviction, but purely out of diplomatic and political considerations. He was entrusted with the editorship of «Bulgaria», which office he filled from 1851 to 1861. The new paper preached the advisability of embracing the Catholic faith and making common cause with Rome as the easiest road to the creation of an independent Bulgarian Church. Allied with the Holy See, the Bulgarians were bound to enjoy the patronage of the Western Powers, France and Austria in particular. A number of the Constantinople Bulgarians were thus gained for Catholicism. The abuses and persecutions of the Greek Bishop Miletius in Koukoush greatly facilitated

[1]) St. Bourmoff, *Bulgarsko-grutzkata tserkovna rasspra*, Sofia, 1900, pp. 176–179. — Goloubinski, pp. 194 and 195.

the conversions to the Western Church among the inhabitants of that district. The Patriarchy in order to stop a further activity on the part of the Roman propaganda sent to Koukoush in succession the Bishops Illarion Makariopolski, Parthenius of Nishava, and Antim Preslavski. These noble and influential Bulgarian prelates succeeded for a time to calm the excited inhabitants and to win back to Orthodoxy a considerable number of the prozelytes. But the Patriarch, notwithstanding the repeated advices and exhortations of these godly pastors, did not recall the offensive and discredited Bishop Miletius. His decision created a keen disappointment among the Bulgarians of Koukoush who hence turned to Catholicism. Their example was followed by their compatriots of the Adrianople, Malko-Tirnovo, and other districts.

In Constantinople was subsequently opened a *Uniate* (Catholic) Church and was established a Uniate Parish. In Rome Pope Pius IV ordained Archimandrite Sokolski, the Abbot of the Gabrovo Monastery, as Bishop and Patriarch of the Bulgarian Uniates. Bishop Sokolski was a good Bulgarian patriot, but a man of small learning, in whom the Catholic emissaries discovered a ready but staunch convert. In order to preserve the unity of their National Church, the Bulgarian foremost men decided to act with promptness and firmness. Why should they be begging for their rights on which they had perfect claim and could wrest back from their usurpers? Why should they resort to historical and canonical evidences to prove them when they are an inalienable prerogative of every people wishing to lead an independent religious and civil existence? People's rights are born out of man's love for freedom and order. These are the great world principles which were proclaimed by the French Revolution. Inspired

[1]) Prof. Ishirkoff, *Zapadnite kraishta na bulgarskata zemya.* — T. St. Bourmoff, p. 173.

by them, the Constantinople Bulgarian community declared to the Porte in 1861 that the Bulgarians desired to form a separate Church organization independent of the Greek Patriarchy.[1]) The Porte refused to accede to their request by answering that they were at liberty to join any of the recognized religious denomination, but not to found a new sect.

The Uniate and the petition of the Constantinople Bulgarians alarmed the Patriarchy and opened the eyes of the Russian diplomacy. The Greek Patriarchy sent in 1861 a circular letter to the Bulgarians whom it administered to beware of the foreign propaganda, simultaneously informing them of its decision to make them concessions on fifteen points. In doing this the Patriarchy was so much anxious of solving the question as of leaving a record to show that it was ready for an amirable settlement of the Bulgaro-Greek dispute but that the Bulgarians invested by ambitious prelates remained deaf to its conciliatory attitude. The refusal of the Ottoman Government and the proposition made by the Greek Patriarchy induced the Constantinople Bulgarians to call a national Conference at which those vital questions were to be taken up and decided. At the appointed date there arrived twenty-eight delegates representing various Bulgarian eparchies carrying with them credentials and petitions to the Government of Constantinople. Their papers contained an authorization on the part of the eparchies to work within the sphere of law and justice. The delegates were empowered to use their efforts for the restoration of Bulgarian National Church, and for the preservation of Bulgaria's religious privileges. The Turkish Government recognized the delegates as official representatives of the Bulgarian people which fact was considered by all Bulgarians as a signal gain. For up to that day both the Turkish authorities and the Greek Patriarchy had done all they

could to suppress the national existence of the Bulgarians. The Greek Church made all efforts to show the world that such a thing as Bulgarian people did not exist in the Ottoman Empire. At this moment, however, the Porte gave an official sanction of the claims of the Bulgarians that they are a distinct Orthodox nation. The representatives of the Bulgarian eparchies at the Constantinople Conference were the most enlightened and influential men that could be selected. Among them were found teachers, physicians, jurists, merchants, etc. The foremost champion of his people's rights of the day was Dr. St. Tchomakoff, the venerable delegate from Plovdiv. The Turkish authorities had a great respect for him. His influence with the Turkish Government was augmented by the presence in the Ottoman Empire of many Polish emigrants with whose leaders like Count Zamoiski and Prince Tchertorijki he had formed a close friendship while in Paris. Since then he always kept in touch with them who admired him for his patriotism and sterling qualities. Tchomakoff's name was a by-word with all the Bulgarians in whose leadership and counsel they had implicit confidence. He loomed up as the greatest embodiment of his nation's ideals. He represented the newer and progressive movement started up by his compatriots. Bishop Panaret of Plovdiv was one of his most energetic and faithful supporters and coworkers. But though he was a great patriot and vigorous nationalist, that did not prevent him from maintaining correct and friendly relations with the Porte which considered him as the spokesman of his race. His ability and tact had won for him a high reputation both among Turks and Bulgarians. The doors of the Porte, and of the foreign embassies, [too, were open to him. The English Legation, especially, gave him a warm reception. His countrymen throughout Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia were elated over his public successes and were unani-

mous in having him represent and plead their cause. In short, he was in the true sense of the word a tribune of his people. He was the soul of the Bulgarian Church Question.

Of him Krustevitch says: «Tchomakoff was the most prominent figure among the representatives, and without him no serious question could have been decided.»[1]) But if Tchomakoff was the soul, Krustevitch was the brains of the Bulgarian religious movement. The first was conspicuous for his indefatiguable energy and resourcefulness, the — latter for his learning and erudition. The two supplemented each other. The truth is, that if the Bulgarian National Church owes its restoration to the extraordinary personal qualities and energy of Tchomakoff, to Krustevitch it owes its reorganization and consolidation.

The Bulgarian delegates convened in Constantinople defined in plain terms the substance and scope of the Bulgarian Church Question, and the wishes of their people. The Church Question contained two salient points or demands: 1) An Independent Bulgarian religious organization extending within the ethnical boundaries of the Bulgarian nation. 2) Recognition of Bulgaria's Spiritual Head as its political representative before the Sublime Porte, as were the Greek and Armenian patriarchs. The Oecumenical Patriarchy, as was to be expected, rejected both propositions in a disdainful manner. It declared that the Bulgarians should remain as heretofore subordinate to the Greek Church, and their religious as well as political interests intrusted to the care of the Greek Patriarch who was to represent them both before the Porte and the World. The Greco-Bulgarian conflict raged over these two points. The Bulgarian people resumed the historical struggle for a church hierarchy of its own to comprize

[1]) Speech of Krustevitch, *Protocoli na bulgarskia naroden subbor v Tzarigrad prez 1871*, published by the Holy Synod, Sofia, 1911.

all the lands inhabited by Bulgarians. The ethnical boundaries of the Bulgarian race were long been outlined and specified. First they were clearly designated by the Bulgarian plow. Then came Father Paissi with his history in which he urged his compatriots to wake up and vindicate their ethnical and political rights. Subsequently the extent of the territories inhabited by the Bulgarians was made evident by a strong popular movement for the opening of Bulgarian schools and churches. Paissi's history was very explicit on pointing out the exact geographical names of the Bulgarian provinces together with the names and number of the towns contained. Thus he gives Moesia [1]) with thirty four towns, Thrace with forty Macedonia with thirty-seven, and Dardania with thirty-one. These are the ethnical boundaries of Bulgaria — they are Bulgaria. The Bulgarian representatives at the Conference based the claims of the Bulgarian people on historical, geographical, and juridical grounds, and from 1861 down to 1870 the struggle between Greek and Bulgarians continued unremittingly. During that period, nevertheless, the Patriarchy made certain compromises in favour of the Bulgarians. Thus from 1861 on all separate or mixed committees of Greeks and Bulgarians held their sessions at the Porte under the presidency of the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha. All pamphlets and books dealing an the Bulgaro-Greek Conflict began to discuss freely the demands of the Bulgarians in the original two points mentioned above. The greatest concessions made by the Patriarchy to the Bulgarians were the permission granted to the latter to send two bishops to the Patriarchical Synod, and the admission of either Bulgarians or Bulgarian-speaking Greeks as bishops of the Bulgarian eparchies. But all told, the Patriarchy offered fifteen concessions to the Bulgarian

[1]) Father Paissi, see the *copy* of his History found at Zmeevo, Stara-Zagora, pp. 82 and 83.

representatives. The latter in answer presented a counter proposition containing eight points, in which they insisted on the establishment of a religious federation of Bulgarians and Greeks consisting of a General Synod composed of six Bulgarian and six Greek bishops, each nationality, however, was to have a separate religious head to represent it before the Ottoman Government and the foreign Powers, separate lay councils, separate metropolitans for the Greek and Bulgarian bishoprics, separate episcopacies for the minorities, and separate schools for each nationality. This counter-project of the Bulgarian delegates, introducing dualism in the Church, was extremely objectionable to the Patriarchy and was, therefore, rejected by it. The position taken by the Greek Patriarchy at that juncture was very clearly expressed by Patriarch Gregory VI who declared that the Patriarchy in principle was not opposed to an autonomous Bulgarian Church, it, however, was against a delimitation of its ethnical boundaries. On the 2nd of May, 1867, he handed to General Ignatieff a plan for the solution of the Greco-Bulgarian religious controversy, a copy of which was later on officially sent to the Sublime Porte. To the Russian Ambassador he had said, «I have with my own hands built a bridge for the political independence of the Bulgarians.» The Greek scheme contained a clause according to which the Bulgarian were allowed to create an autonomous religious unit under the name of *Exarchy*, but it was to include under its control only these eparchies which extended to the Balkan mountains, viz., Viddin, Nish, Kiustendil, Vratza, Sofia, Lovetch, Samokov, Tcherven or Roustchouk, Tirnovo, Preslav, Silistra, and Varna. There were the «maximum concessions the Greek Patriarchy was constrained to make,» so declared Rangabe, the Athens minister in

[1]) Gregory Troubetzkoi, pp. 12 and 13.

Constantinople to General Ignatieff. «It is necessary,» asserted the Greek minister, «that the Bulgarians extend to the Balkan Mountains only. The present project affects most seriously the future of Greece. The struggle is between Slavdom and Hellenism. We can not yield.»

Notwithstanding the fact that the scheme in question provided for an amputation of Thrace and Macedonia from Bulgaria, General Ignatieff believed it would be accepted by the Bulgarians. And he at that moment sent the following telegram to his Government; «If the Bulgarians possess a whit of political wisdom and a particle of devotion to Orthodoxy, they would hasten to avail themselves of this unexpected success which will put an end to a problem considered insolvable.» [1]) But contrary to the opinion of the noble Russian General, the Bulgarians demonstrated their political perspicacity in rejecting this offer of the Patriarchy. The strongest protests against its acceptance came from the Macedonia eparchies.[2]) The inhabitants of Skopie, Dibra, Veles, Stroumitza, Prilep, Bitolia, Ochrida, and other cities, overwhelmed the Government with petitions demanding an independent church administration for the Bulgarians.

The perseverence of the Bulgarian people in standing firmly for their ethnical union was facilitated by the events which occurred in 1867, 1868, and 1867. In 1867 the Cretan insurrection broke out. The inhabitants of the Greek Kingdom were filled with excitement over it and the Cretan Question became once more an international affair. The Porte found itself on the eve of war. In 1868 the Balkan Mountains were infected with Bulgarian revolutionary bands. The great insurgent leaders Hadji Demeter and Stephan Karadja had raised the flag of freedom. They

[1]) Same, p. 12.

[2]) St. Bourmoff, p. 355, «Pravo», 1867, N° 33.

had crossed the Roumanian border with a numerous and well organized band of warriors made up mostly of members of the Belgrade legion. The note of these two famous Bulgarian voyvodas sent to the diplomatic representatives of the Great Powers at Constantinople explained that one of the causes of the revolt of the Bulgarians was the unwillingness of the Porte to solve the Bulgarian-Greek Church conflict. The constant entreaties of the Bulgarian people for the recognition of its native religious institution had, for the last eleven years, been treated with disdain.[1]) The Sultan was alarmed by the declarations of the revolutionary chiefs and took steps for the appeasement of the agitated spirits of the Bulgarians. The Grand Vizier Ali Pasha was instructed to inform the Bulgarian deputation that the Turkish Government was ready to recognize the Bulgarians as a distinct people.[2]) The Porte, thereupon, appointed a mixed committee of six laymen chosen from the most prominent representatives of the two contending nationalities — three Greeks and three Bulgarians. The Greeks were Alexander Karatheodori, Photiadi Beg, and Christo Viko, and the Bulgarians — Stoyanovitch, Hadji Ivantcho Pentchovitch, Member of the State Council, and Gavril Krustevitch, Member of the Supreme Court. This noted body of men was charged by the Porte to work out a project for the solution of the Greco-Bulgarian religious question. Krustevitch was entrusted with its preparation, after he had obtained the assent of Graf Ignatieff. The scheme was discussed during two sittings of the Committee presided by the Grand Vizier at the end of which it was accepted by both sides. Out of the seventy-four eparchies which fell under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchy, twenty-five of them were de-

[1]) Dr. N. Kassaboff, *Moite spomeni ot vuzrajdaneto na Bulgaria i revolutzionni vdei*, Sofia, 1905, p. 118. — M. Drinoff, vol. II, p. 190.

[2]) Gregorij Troubetzkoi, p. 15.

clared subordinate to the newly created Bulgarian Church, eight of them were pronounced mixed and were, therefore, to be divided equally between the two contending Churches, while the other eparchies, thirty seven Greek, and four Serbian remained under the old Patriarchal regime. The seat of the Bulgarian Synod was stipulated to be established out of Constantinople, the Head of the Bulgarian Church, however, had the right to reside in the Ottoman Capital, after the example of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. «Everybody was filled with joy,» writes Troubetzkoi. «After a struggle which continued for centuries, the rival races reached a happy solution of their difficulties which was ratified both by the Porte and the Russian Embassy.» But Patriarch Gregory refused to sanction this settlement of the conflict. The Ottoman Government, however, stuck to its decision. Subsequently Ali Pasha made another attempt at winning the approbation of the Greek spiritual Chief, by preparing two new projects which were a compromise between the scheme worked by Patriarch Gregory and the two devised by the Committee. The Patriarchy, notwithstanding, rejected this too. It was encouraged in its boldness by a change for the better in the Greco-Turkish relations which were at the point of breaking. The Porte dropped the Bulgaro-Greek religious question from the order of the day to the keen disappointment of the Bulgarian nation. Once for all times it was convinced of the fact that nothing was to be expected of either the Patriarchy or the mixed Committees. Its wishes, however, were not to be trifled with. Canonical or not, that did not concern the vital interest of the Bulgarians. No one had the right of preventing them from instituting an autonomous Church of their own. As a nation they had the unalienable privilege of establishing their own religious

[1]) Gregory Troubetzkoi, pp. 24 and 52.
[2]) Same, pp. 27 and 28.

administration, educational institutions, and native literature. Their devotion to this principle was so powerful, that they were willing to go to Rome even if Rome would grant them what the Patriarchy was never prone to bestow. Finally General Ignatieff was appealed to once more and was plainly told that the long-mooted question could be solved and disastrous consequences averted if Russia earnestly interfered in behalf of the Bulgarians. « A propos the question of the Uniate, » writes Troubetzkoi, « the Russian diplomacy very soon became a plaything in the hands of the progressive element of the Bulgarian people. The fears evoked by the activity of the foreign missionaries, the inveterate hatred of the Greeks, the suspicion of the higher Greek clergy, — all these things exerted not a small influence upon the course of the Russian Balkan policy, and gradually Russia's attitude towards the Church Conflict suffered a change. » In 1869 new international complications and troubles arose which distracted the attention of the Ottoman Government, rendered the Porte's position vulnerable and thus worked for the benefit of the obstinate Bulgarians. The uprisings in Bosnia and Hercegovina had their effect in Montenegro. The Egyptian Question, too, was put on file. Early in 1870 by order of the Bulgarian representatives in Constantinople there began to pour into the Turkish capital petitions after petitions sent from all parts of Bulgaria, Thrace, and Macedonia. The Bulgarian prelates and representatives made a good use of them just at the proper time. In presenting them to the Porte, they called its attention to the discontent and exasperation caused by the protraction of the Church Question. All petitions clamoured but for one object — the resuscitation of the National Bulgarian Church. And, *mirabile dictu*, on February 28, 1870 (v. s.), the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, surprized the Bulgarian representatives with the celebrated Firman by virtue of which was established

an independent Bulgarian Church to be known under the name of *Bulgarian Exarchy*.[1]) The tenth article of the document gave out the ethnical boundaries of the Bulgarian race. That was Bulgaria's grandest victory during the XIXth century. It was a triumph of the Bulgarian Democracy.

The First National Church was the work of Simeon the Great, the Seconds of John Assen II, the Third — of the Bulgarian People. As soon as the Firman was promulgated, there was formed a Provisional Council composed of ecclesiastics and laymen which was officially recognized hy the Turkish Government. The spiritual members of the Council were the bishops Illarion Makariopolski, Paissi, Panaret of Plovdiv, and Illarion of Lovetch. The lay members were Gavril Krustevitch, Dr. St. Tchomakoff, Chr. Taptchileshtoff, and others. The guiding spirit of the Provisional Council as well as of the National Religious Conference subsequently instituted was Gavril Krustevitch, a great jurist and a man of large experience. He was the ideologue of the Bulgarian Church movement; he it was who directed every detail and inspired all to action. The working apparatus of the Exarchy was devised and set in motion by him; the rubric of the Church was his creation. Though a conservative by nature and leader of the conservative element, his sound judgement and good common sense gained him the glad support of all and greatly facilitated the democratization of the Exarchy. His arguments in favour of allowing the Bulgarian representatives from Macedonia to participate in the Conference prior to taking the consent of the people according to article ten of the Firman were irresistible, «what it to become of the Macedonian delegates,» he asks in his magisterial speech. Were not the interests of the Macedonian

[1]) Same, p. 28.

eparchies always considered identical with the others by the pioneers of the long struggle? Are they to be excluded from the bosom of the Exarchy? It is more than logical, therefore, that we should allow our Macedonian brethren to sit side by side with us. Their rejection would enhance the influence of the Catholic Propaganda. Have we the heart to deny them our hospitality? Once come to us how can we think of asking them to go their way? *(One of the representatives applauds.)* The People will censure us for such a conduct. They, too, are Bulgarians and should take part in this Conference. The very fact they have come to it shows they are Bulgarians. It any one should assert the contrary we would answer him. 'Here they are.' To-morrow when the Government learns of this we will inform it that their presence is sufficient evidence that they are Bulgarians. I myself shall explain the matter to the Grand Vizier if it should be necessary. I ask you, therefore, to accept them. *(The whole Conference applauds and shouts, bravo.)*

The Bulgarian Church Organization is most democratic, and closely resembles the original or the Apostolic form of government. It is a typical people's production, a beautiful republican institution. It is administered conjointly by a Synod and Lay Council under the presidency of an Exarch. All the higher officers, beginning with the Exarch himself, the metropolitans, lay councillors, and priests, are elective.[1]) In like manner the ecclesiastic and

---

[1]) *Protocoli na bulgarskiat naroden sobor v' Tsarigrad pres, 1871,* Sofia, 1911. 3rd session, pp. 16 and 17. The Macedonian delegates were T. Koussevitch of Bitolia, now Metropolitan of Stara-Zagora, G Gheorghieff, S. Kostoff, and Father Gheorghii of Skopie, M. Mantcheff of Ochrida, C. Gogoff of Vodena, K. Saraphoff of Nevrokop, etc.

[2]) Mr. Krustevitch was against the periodicity of the Exarch's office, see *Protocoli na bulgarskiat naroden sobor v' Tsarigrad pres 1871,* 23rd session, pp. 137—140, Sofia, 1911.

lay boards instituted at every eparchy are elective. Here the Metropolitan of the episcopacy presides. The Exarch is invested with a periodical mandate,[2]) is elected for a period of four years only. The Exarchical Council made up of its president or the Exarch, the Synod, the Mixed Council, and eparchical delegates is the highest religious authority. It is a great National Conference which is convoked every four years in order to pass judgement on the previous administration and to its account books. It is endowed with legislative functions: it can revise or amend the rubrics and rules of the Exarchy, whenever it deems it necessary. National education and finances fall under the jurisdiction of the Exarchical Council. The constitution of the Bulgarian Church guarantees both freedom of religious conviction and of speech to the alien minorities found within its domains.[1]) The Bulgarian schools passed under the control of the Exarchy for five years, 1872—1878, but their autonomy was not interfered with.

The Constantinople Patriarchy declared itself against the Firman. Its Head, Gregory VI, was constrained to resign. He was succeeded by Antim VI, who ascended the Patriarchal throne now for the third time. He displayed a more conciliatory spirit. Though the Bulgarian bishops were interdicted by his predecessor, he condescended to pay them a visit. The Russian Embassy on this account laid great hopes on him for the betterment of the Greek-Bulgarian relations. The new Patriarch prepared a new project which provided for more extensive privileges to be accorded to the Exarchy. He conceded to the Bulgarians also the eparchies of Nish, Skopie, Ochrida, and North Bitolia. The Bulgarian, nevertheless, remained firm

[1]) Christo Tantcheff, *Exarchiiski oustav*, Sofia, 1904, pp. 3 and 4.

[2]) Same, p. 13; article 5, p. 63; Chapters 3, 4, 5, 35; article 79, p. 219; article 164.

to their demands of obtaining the eparchies already designated by them which comprized nearly the whole of Macedonia. Antim VI, on the other hand, declared he could make no more concessions. To the Russian Ambassador he had said, «They want of me more than I am in position to give, more than what is reasonable. And if in granting it I should go beyond the limits considered reasonable by the Greeks, neither side would be the gainer.» From that juncture on, however, the Church Question changed its character. From religious it became a political issue. With the Sultan's Firman and the convocation of the Bulgarian National Conference, both of which came into being mainly through the efforts of civilians, it passed from the hands of the ecclesiastics and was taken up by the laity. It reverted to its original form; it again became a race and cultural question. During the time of the two Bulgarian Kingdoms it was a purely ethnical issue and was fought time and again both on the battlefield and in the literature of the contending peoples.

The conciliatory attitude of the new Patriarch was not barren of good results. It succeeded in calming the spirits of the Conference held at Orta-Keuy, and in creating a more favourable atmosphere for work. The conservative members of the Bulgarian National *Sobor* thought it possible to come to an understanding with the Greek religious head. In this they were encouraged and supported by the Russian Embassy. The radical representatives at the Conference, however, showed a stubborn resistance in their stand for Bulgaria's most vital interests. Under these circumstances then followed a dead-lock in the pourparlers. Neither was the Patriarch willing to yield more, nor could the conservative element of the Sobor safely sacrifice some of the privileges already stipulated in the Firman. To do this would mean to go against their

[1]) Troubetzkoi, p. 38.

own mandate. They were sent to Constantinople to see the execution of the Firman, not to deviate from it. The Conservatives, though a majority in the Conference did not dare to press their point of view further for fear of being accused of non-patriotism. The Radicals, on the other hand, did all they could to neutralize the efforts of the Russian Ambassador, and to stifle every attempt at a reconciliation with the Patriarchy at the expense of Bulgaria's religious Cause which they asserted was being humiliated long enough. Having exhausted all peaceful and legitimate methods to enforce their demands, the Bulgarians finally resorted to their old-time desire and practice which always brought them success. They decided to solve the Question themselves. Thus on Epiphany, January 19, 1872, the Bulgarian Community in Constantinople led by Tchomakoff, Slaveikoff, and Taptchileshtoff, assembled at its church on Phanar where it had been arranged mass to be said by the Bulgarian bishops Illarion Makariopolski, Illarion of Lovetch, and Panaret of Plovdiv. The last two prelates together with several other notables first went to the Greek Patriarch to obtain his permission for holding the service. The latter, however, refused to grant them their request. The Bulgarian hierarchs, notwithstanding the interdiction of the Greek Patriarchy, returned to the waiting multitude of Bulgarians and said mass in which they omitted to mention the name of the Patriarch. On hearing of this, the Greek population grew furious. Antim VI was thereupon compelled to convoke a council of Greek notables authorizing it to pass judgment on the conduct of the insubordinate Bulgarians. Touching this incident General Ignatieff sent the following telegramme to Prince Gortchakoff:[1]) « From this moment on, the Patriarchy abdicates from its authority and invests

[1]) Same, p. 41.

it upon a sort of republican council.» The Greeks passed a resolution in which they condemned the bold act of the Bulgarians, and urged immediate steps to be taken against the transgressors. The Holy Synod expelled the bishops Illarion of Lovetch, and Panaret of Plovdiv, while Bishop Illarion Makariopolski who had been already dismissed, was excommunicated from the Church. In the meanwhile Patriarch Antim launched a protest with the Porte, demanding of her a *takreer* for: 1) the abolition of the uncanonical Bulgarian national Council at Orta-Keuy, 2) the banichment of the three disobedient prelates, and 3) the prohibition of Bulgarian clergy to officiate in the Church at Phanar. «The demands of the Greek Patriarch,» writes Troubetzkoi,[1]) «had been supported by the Russian Ambassador who did not conceal his disgust with the Bulgarian bishops. To Petrograd he telegraphed: «I entertain no illusions whatever about the future of a hierarchy in which will go as components such elements as manifested themselves before our very eyes. Bishops so unworthy as these cannot found an orthodox church deserving the name.» The three Bulgarian prelates were indeed banished by the Porte.[2]) By this act the Ottoman Government simply added oil to the fuel. The discontent of the Bulgarians in Constantinople and outside knew no bounds which in many places took the form of public protests and demonstrations. Thousands of them grouped around their leaders. P. R. Slaveikoff, and T. Ikonomoff appeared before the Sublime Porte and asked for the recall of their religious chiefs and the execution of the Firman. Similar protests and petitions were addressed to the Sultan from nearly every Bulgarian town. All Bulgarians clamoured for the return of their beloved pastors, and the application of

[1]) *Rouskata politika na Istok*, translated from the French by Al. D. Misheff, p. 40.

[2]) Illarion Makariopolski is sent in exile for the fourth time.

reforms so solemnly sanctioned by the Porte. The Turkish Government took alarm at the threatening popular agitation which was daily increasing, and in order to anticipate any serious outbreak hastened with bringing back the banished Bishops, and granted to the Bulgarian National Council the right of electing an Exarch. It, however, warned the Bulgarian representatives not to choose for that post Bishop Makariopolski. The Porte, evidently, disliked to see the Exarchical seat occupied by a man who as regards experience, ability, courage, and patriotism, was best fitted for the exalted office. Another very serious candidate for the high post was Bishop Paissi of Plovdiv. He, however, being of Greek descent, declined to run as such on the ground that his election would prove injurious to the Church Cause. Three distinguished prelates were pointed out as suitable to assume the dignity of Exarch, and they were Bishop Illarion of Lovetch, Bishop Panaret of Plovdiv, and Bishop Antim of Viddin. The last one was unanimously chosen and his election was immediately sanctioned by Imperial berat which the Grand Vizier himself handed to him on April 3rd. In this way the Bulgarian people, after a bitter struggle lasting for centuries, was finally enabled to restore its former religious independence and spiritual chief. In Antim I the Bulgarians saw not only their first Exarch, but their first and greatest religious and political representative before the Porte and the outside world. The Bulgarian Exarch by virtue of the state berat was accorded the same rights and privileges which were enjoyed by the Greek and Armenian patriarchs.

Antim I was considered the best educated man among the Bulgarian hierarchs. He had the reputation of being one of the most conspicuous and learned high priests of the Greek Patriarchy. The latter greatly appreciated his erudition and oratorical talent. On that account it had appointed him president of the Theological Seminary of

Chalkis. The Greeks admired him for his eloquence and flocked to hear Metropolitan Antim deliver his inspiring discourses. He was thereupon called the «New Chrysostom». [1]) As we pointed out before, he was one of the delegates of the Patriarchy sent to Koukoush and Visa to investigate the causes of the Anti-Greek disorders there. His services were repeatedly employed against the Catholic Propaganda in Koukoush, Adrianople, and Malko-Tirnovo. His noble personality and spiritual sermons did a good deal in checking the influence of the Romish agents. People received him with open hearts everywhere he went, and a large number of the Catholic converts was won back to the Patriarchy and Orthodoxy. As Metropolitan of Viddin, he was a member of the Provisional Bulgarian Synod which was composed of Illarion Makariopolski, Paissi, and Panaret of Plovdiv, and Illarion of Lovetch. Under the authorization of the Synod he visited all Bulgarian eparchies in order to get acquainted with their needs, and to stimulate their spiritual and intellectual growth. Thus all of Bulgaria had an opportunity of hearing this wonderful preacher. In many places people were thrilled not only by his pious eloquence, but also by the fact that they heard a Bulgarian sermon for the first time in their life. The Bulgarians were filled with pride in knowing that that phenomenal and most worthy pastor was one of their own. In Shoumen his discourses evoked an unheard of sympathy and popular outburst. His visit was considered a great event which was remembered for generations. In one of his addresses he touched upon the history of Bulgaria, recalled in vivid pictures its glorious past, especially the history of Preslav, the ancient Bulgarian capital. He called Preslav 'Bulgarian Zion' in which

[1]) *Rousski vestnik*, Moscow, 1882, the article of Mme Mouroumtzoff. — T. Milkoff, p. 22. — M. Radivoeff, pp. 388 and 389.

every stone was a chronicle. « If these stones could speak, » he said, « they would tell you of the glorious times when Byzantium trembled before Kroum and Simeon . . . . » After his tour he returned to Constantinople where he took part in preparing the Exarchical Statute. Shortly after he came back to Viddin as the Catholic Propaganda had reached even his diocese and was making fast strides there.

The personality and noble activity of Antim I shone forth with still greater splendour during his high career as Exarch. His energy, firmness, and discretion made him a very successful Head of the new Bulgarian Church, and one of the greatest personages in the history of his country. No sooner had he assumed the reins of the ecclesiastical ship, than the Bulgarians felt they had intrusted their spiritual, educational, and political interests in safe hands. Those who doubted his courage dispelled their scepticalness the moment they read his telegramme sent to Mr. N. Purvanoff, the Viddin delegate, who was authorized to inform him of his election to the exarchical seat, in which among other things he declared: « The papers inform us that the Committee had decided to request the Exarch to ask pardon from the Patriarchy and to enter into pourparlers as regards the application of the Firman. If this is true, tell the Committee that under such conditions I refuse the election. » These words of the future Bulgarian Exarch made a deep impression everywhere. They were the prelude of a most intense and useful activity. The public services of Antim I rendered to the Bulgarian people are many and of immense importance, the most valuable of which are his success in bringing about the enforcement of the Firman, and his exerting his influence both before the Porte and the Great Powers in behalf of his people which in 1876—1877 was threatened with annihilation. Immediately after entering upon his duties as

High Pontiff of the Bulgarian nation, he made an attempt to come into an amicable understanding with the Patriarchy. In order to obtain the good will and blessing of the latter, he sent to him several deputation. But all his efforts proved fruitless. He then thrice wrote the Patriarch asking for audience, his request, however, was flatly refused. His official correctness, nevertheless, gained him the approval of the Ottoman Government and the Orthodox world. The Patriarch's unpliant attitude, besides, freed the Exarch from the obligations imposed upon him by virtue of articles 3 and 9 of the Firman, in consequence of which on April 23, 1872, Antim I, assisted by two other Bulgarian prelates, solemnly said mass in the Bulgarian Church at Phanar. In the sermon which he delivered in the course of the liturgy, he declared that he considered the expulsion of the three Bulgarian prelates an unjustifiable act on the part of the Patriarchy, because it was contrary to the canonical laws. On May 11, the anniversary of the Slav reformers St. Cyril and St. Methodius, Antim I consecrated Archimandrite Dossitey, Metropolitan of Samokov, after which Bishop Illarion Makariopolski already ordained as Metropolitan of Tirnovo, read out the Act which decreed the independence of the Bulgarian Church. That Church service and that Act are great historical events. The Bulgarian Church was restored to life and commenced its activity and great mission anew. The Greek Patriarchy was frightfully alarmed at this audacity of the Bulgarian religious leaders. Powerless to undo the provisions of the Sultan's decree, and to check the growing prestige of the Bulgarian clergy, it resorted to the only means of self-defence left in its hands, viz., it deposed the Exarch, excommunicated from the Church Bishop Panaret of Plodiv, and Bishop Illarion of Lovetch, while Bishop Illarion Makariopolski was anathematized. The Bulgarian Exarchate, nevertheless, continued its work of reorganization. The

various eparchies had to be supplied with worthy and competent pastors. Archimandrite Victor was ordained Metropolitan of the Nish diocese — Archimandrite Simeon, of Varna-Preslav Episcopacy — Archimandrite Gregory, of Dorostol-Tcherven, etc. Then there came the demand for the application of article 10th of the Firman which decreed that the controversy between the Patriarchy and the Bulgarians should be determined by plebiscite. The Skopie and Ochrida districts were the first to avail themselves of this privilege settling their religious disputes with the Greeks. In both eparchies in which the majority of the inhabitants were Bulgarian the Exarchate gained a complete victory over its opponent the Patriarchy, in consequence of which the Bulgarians secured for themselves spiritual leaders of their own choice. Archimandrite Nathanael was elected Metropolitan of Ochrida, and Bishop Dorothey — Metropolitan of Skopie. The results of the plebiscite, so overwhelmingly in favour of the Bulgarian people, startled not only the Greek Patriarchate, but also the Ottoman Government. Seeing itself badly defeated and discredited in these two most important dioceses, the Patriarchy now hurried up with a proposition of convoking a Mixed Commission which was to solve the Bulgarian Church Question. The Porte, on the other hand, which during the days of Gregory VI would not give its consent for the calling of a œcumenical council, at this instance connived at the summoning up of a local one. From that moment on the relations between the Patriarchy and the Sublime Porte grew intimate again, and soon an understanding was concluded between them for discarding the plebiscite principle stipulated in the Firman. On September 16th, 1872, a Local Council was convoked in the Turkish Capital in which the Bulgarian Church was denounced as schismatical. The latter was accused of introducing a new doctrine in the Orthodox faith — the principle of filetism.

Though the members of the Council were all Greeks, and in spite of the pressure and threats of a secret committee directed and supported by the Athenian Government,[1]) the resolulion taken by the Council was not unanimous. The Church of Jerusalem, represented by Patriarch Cyril, and that of Antiochia, represented by its Synodal members, raised their voice against the Schism.

But not even the Schism, the last weapon of the Patriarchy, was able to disconcert the Bulgarians in their firm determination to carry their Cause through. On the contrary, this final act of the Patriarchy added new fervour in their hearts and mind, and instilled in them a stronger unity and resolution in defence of their Church and Exarchy. The universal support which the Exarchate found among the Bulgarians made its influence felt even in those districts where they were a minority. The promulgation of the Schism changed the course of action not only of Turkey, but also of Russia and the rest of the Great Powers in their attitude toward Greeks and Bulgarians. The Porte now openly declared the Firman of 1870 to be a state blunder and set at work for its annihilation. Russia had again to modify its policy in respect to the thorny Church Controversy. As it may be recalled, down to 1856 she championed the interests of Orthodoxy, considering the welfare of the Orthodox Slav races of secondary importance. From 1856 to 1872 she pursued a wavering policy characterized by an effort to conciliate the Slav peoples with the Mother Church in the hope of preserving the integrity of the Orthodox Faith. The Schism of 1872 which was affected contrary to her advice, placed her at a dilemmatic situation: she had to throw in her weight either with the Bulgarians — the oppressed, or with the Greeks — the oppressors. «The blending of the race and

[1]) Gregory Troubetzkoi, pp. 43 and 44.

the religious principles renders the history of the Bulgarian Church Question particularly interesting. The serious conflict caused by identifying creed and nationality created a new and very difficult task for the Russian diplomacy in the Near East. The public opinion in the great Slav Empire could not remain indifferent either. The Bulgarian Schism, therefore, attracted the keen attention of both the Government and the people in Russia. » [1]) Russia at that juncture had to decide whether to espouse the cause of the Patriarchy which was the embodiment of Orthodoxy, or that of the « Little Brothers of the East », the justice of whose claims was apparent. For a time she kept on vacillating, unable to decide which side to take — that of the flock, or that of its pastors. After the Schism, however, she clearly saw the conflict between Greeks and Bulgarians was not so much a question of religious principles, as of ethnical differences. The Patriarchy all the time preached and pleaded the non-existence of a such thing as race boundaries, the Bulgarians, on the other hand, daily asserted them, and demanded the recognition of a fact corroborated by their very existence. Once on the right track, the Russian Government corrected its former course of action, and now freed from dogmatic scruples, cast its support on the side of the Bulgarians struggling for independence. The Great Powers, on the other hand, and England in particular, tried to profit by the Schism in drawing the Bulgarians away from the Orthodox Church and from Russia, its mighty protector.

When the Ottoman Government recognized the belated Bulgarian rayhahs as a distinct nationality, it little imagined that they would manifest such buoyancy, such aptitude for progress and culture, and such a strong love

[1]) Gregory Troubetzkoi, *Rousskata politica na Istok*, p. 49.

[2]) Same, p. 51.

for civil and religious emancipation. The phenomenal growth of the Bulgarian schools and churches, and the fast strides the Bulgarian people was making in all directions were considered very dangerous signs for the Ottoman Empire. The Porte, therefore, took all precautions to retard, check, and suppress its intellectual and spiritual development. The inspirer of such a repressive policy was no other than the celebrated Turkish statesman and Grand Vizier, Midhat Pasha, the idealogue of the Young Turkish movement. Having been for many years Governor of Roustchouk, he was well acquainted with the character of the Bulgarians. The inhabitants of the Vilayet of the Danube long remembered him for his harsh and cruel administration. In 1867 the citizens of Svishtov were daily horrified at the dangling corpses of their fellow brothers, hung at his orders. By means of the gallows Midhat Pasha meant to stamp out every nucleus of culture, every idea of a better life, and every tendency toward self-assertion and freedom. His penetrative mind was not slow to grasp the meaning of Bulgaria's national awakening and advancement. The rapid regeneration of the heretofore stolid Bulgar alarmed him and filled him with jealousy and detestation. During one of his visits to Tirnovo he suddenly entered one of its schools where he found hundreds of pupils busily engaged upon their studies. Though he could not conceal his secret fears and hatred at witnessing such a splendid picture of Bulgarian studiousness and industry, he, nevertheless, was diplomatic enough to express his admiration of the eagerness of the young Bulgarians for education and learning. Thence he went to inspect the only Turkish school in the same town. To his utter disappointment there he saw but fifteen schoolboys in all. He was unable to restrain his disgust, and turning to the Turkish notable, he cried, «You, Turks, are unworthy of the name you bear; you are the ruling race,

but stand far below the giaours, Shame!»[1]) The perspicacious Turkish Governor considered the Bulgarian school more dangerous for his country than the Bulgarian revolutionaries. He was keen enough to see that education and culture instill patriotism and self independence. In order to stifle such ideas among the Bulgarians, he conceived the plan for the Ottomanization of all schools in his Vilayet. According to his project the Turkish language was introduced in all institutions of learning, even in the primary schools. In the normal and high schools all subjects studied were taught in Turkish. The project was sent to all the communities of the district. The Roustchouk Bulgarians were the first to raise their voice of protest against this measure which they stigmatized as a gross infringement upon their school autonomy. They declared that the education of their children could not be carried on in a tongue with which they are not familiar. They had discarded the study of Greek because it hindered the education of their sons and daughters. The Turkish language being more difficult would present a heavier burden to the school youth. The rest of the Bulgarian communities followed in the footstep of their Roustchouk fellow-citizens. T. Bourmoff in his paper «Vremy» came out with a series of strong leaders to defend the autonomy of the schools.[2]) «Tourtzia», however, wrote favourably of the innovation of Midhat Pasha, and opened its columns to all who supported it. Hadji Ivan Pentchevitch, a man in the service of Midhat, published a number of articles praising the project. The general opposition of the people was so bitter, that the patriotic Turkish Governor thought it best to withdraw his measure. Midhat Pasha, however, though giving in here, nevertheless, entertained great hopes

[1]) J St. Ivanoff, p. 156.

[2]) «Vremy», 1866, Nos 28—34.

in putting into practice his celebrated reform scheme which aimed at the Ottomanization of all races found in the Ottoman Empire. That idea, in reality, was initiated by Napoleon III, as the only safe policy for the radical solution of the Eastern Question. If in the olden days Picardians, Franks, Normans, Champagne dwellers, Bretons, and other races were united into one French nationality, in like manner Mussulmans and Christians could form one Ottoman people. But this larger and less obnoxious plan of the Turkish reformer proved equally unsuccessful among the Bulgarians. Happily for them, Midhat Pasha did not remain long enough on the Grand Vizier's post to see his cherished idea realized. But even during the short interval during which he stood at the head of the Ottoman Government he missed no opportunity of making his heavy fist felt by the untoward Bulgarians. Denouncing the Firman of 1870 as detrimental to Ottoman interests, and declaring the Exarchy's mission dangerous to the Empire, he determined to subject it to a radical revision, or abolish it altogether. At his bidding Halil Shereef, Minister of Foreign Affairs, commanded the Exarch to change the form of the cassock worn by the Bulgarian clergy because they were schismatics, in order not to be confounded with the Greek priesthood which was Orthodox. Antim I sent back an immediate reply stating that according to the Firman the Bulgarian Church was recognized as an Orthodox institution. The Minister thereupon insisted on a revision of the Firman. To this the Bulgarian diplomatic Chief Priest retorted that the Firman was the work of the Bulgarian people, and that he was entrusted with it to keep it and not to alter it. If it was not executed, not the Exarchy, but the Patriarchy was to be held responsible for it. Without the consent of his people he had no power neither to yield it, nor to introduce any changes upon it. The Porte having been

informed of the existence of a number of Bulgarians who were for a revision of the Firman, requested the Exarchy to convoke a national Conference of Metropolitans and parish delegates. From the very beginning of the sessions it became apparent that the members of the Conference were divided into two parties, the one led by the Exarch himself was for the integrity of the Firman, while the other headed by Dr. St. Tchomakoff stood for a revision. The majority of the delegates, however, were on the side of the Exarch. Dr. Tchomakoff and his following who down to 1872 worked for the Firman because article 10 of the document guaranteed the church union of the people, now changed their view because they claimed to see no such guarantee. There is no doubt that that divergence of opinion was due to the influence exerted upon its supportance by both the Porte and the English Embassy with which Dr. Tchomakoff was intimately connected. Both wings of the Conference unquestionably were animated by sincere motives and patriotism. The *Firmanists*, as the staunch supporters of the Imperial Decree of 1878 were called, strove to preserve the unity of the nation by virtue of the stipulations contained in this document, but within the pale of Orthodoxy. The *Anti-Firmanists*, or the opposition, also aimed at the same thing, only independantly of the Greek Patriarchy. The first represented the conservative opinion on the question, the latter — the liberal or radical. The former constituted the party of moderates[1]) or *the whites*, the second — the party of liberals or the *reds*. The *whites* were patronized by Russia, the *reds* by England and the Ottoman Government. The Conservatives traced the right of the people in history, canons, and Oecumenical councils, the Liberals, in the people itself, in its ability to work out

[1]) Tchitalishty, 1872, Nos 17, 18, 19.

its own destiny, in the creation of the Exarchy whose chief mission was to supply every Bulgarian community with a spiritual guide and leader. This doctrine was clearly delineated by T. Ikonomoff in an article entitled «One Step Ahead», which evoked a great outburst of protest by the Bulgarian Synod and the Reading Room Association Board of Constantinople. The polemics against the extremists was carried on by Archbishop Simeon, Gavrail Krustevitch, Archbishop Gregory, M. Balabanoff, Dr. Stambolski, and others. The reply of the Holy Synod was written by Archbishop Simeon. Gavrail Krustevitch, Dr. Stambolski, Dr. Tzankoff, M. Balabanoff and others were against a revision of the Firman. Dr. Tchomakoff and P. R. Slaveikoff were compelled to come out with a protest in their behalf and in behalf of Metropolitan Panaret, against all the journals which identified their names with the views propounded by Ikonomoff. It is known that P. R. Slaveikoff took a determined stand in his organ, «Macedonia»[1], against the designs of Midhat Pasha and his efforts to paralyze the national movement and the religious and ethnical unity of the Bulgarians. On account of his bitter criticism of the Grand Vizier's meanness, his paper was suppressed.

Midhat Pasha made one more attempt to destroy the Firman, this time resorting to the delicate tactics of diplomacy. He resolved to win the favour of Antim I by overwhelming him with dazzling privileges. He promised him that should he give his consent for the revocation of the Firman, he would become Patriarch and would be authorized to provide with bishops not only all Bulgarian bishoprics found in the Ottoman Empire, but also all Bulgarian colonies abroad. The Bulgarian religious

[1]) Macedonia, 1872, № 18

[2]) C. C. Bobtcheff, *P. R. Slaveikoff i edin negov ruckopis*, Sofia, p. 19.

Chief was too shrewd to be taken in by this allurement. The Sublime Porte, nevertheless, did not despair. Everything, of course, was in its hands. It now decided not to put the Firman into execution or leave things pending and thus starve the Exarchy by anæmia. The Bulgarian people, on the other hand, having grasped the secret intentions of the Turkish Government, rallied around its valiant leader and showed a more dogged determination to resist all attempts of depriving it of the rights and privileges accorded to it by the Firman. Seeing this, the Porte grew ugly and resorted to extreme measures. It conceived the idea of deposing Antim I, and rid itself of an insubordinate and dangerous man. In doing this the Turkish Government counted on the approval of the *Anti-Firmanists*. Just at this juncture there broke out the great Bulgarian insurrection during 1876, known as the «April Uprising». Inflaming first the towns of Panaghiurishty and Koprivshtitza in the Sredna-Gora Mountains, it soon spread in the Rhodope regions affecting Battak, Perushtitza, Bratzigovo, and passed over to Stara-Planina (the Balkan Mountains), arousing the towns of Gabrovo, Gorna-Orechovitza, Drenovo, Novo-Sello, etc. The Ottoman Government at once dispatched a large force of Circassians and irregulars [1]) to quell the disorders, for the army, it hastened to explain, was engaged in Hercegovina. The infuriated and blood-thirsty bashibozouks were only too glad to be let loose upon the defenceless Bulgarian settlements. Massacre and pillage followed in their footsteps. In a short time the flourishing Bulgarian towns of Panaghiurishty, Koprivshtitza, Klissoura, and particularly Battak, Peroushtitza, Bratzigovo, Boyadjik, and other places were plundered and burned down, while their inhabitants mostly women, children, and old men were put to the sword.

[1]) Ch. Seignobos, p. 601. — Albéric Cahnet, p. 375.

The irregulars were subsequently joined by the regular army equipped with field artillery. The Bulgarians were passing through a most critical phase of their existence. Antim I, through his position had become extremely precarious, rose to the occasion, and showed himself the intrepid and able diplomatist he really was. He repeatedly called the attention of the Turkish Government to the awful atrocities to which the Bulgarians were subjected at the hands of an unbridled and fanatical mob, and soldiery, and pleaded for protection before all the representatives of the European Powers to whom he gave full and firsthand information in regard to the heinous crimes committed against his defenceless people. He also sent a touching letter to Archbishop Issidor of Petersburg, fervently entreating him to intercede before the Emperor in behalf of the Bulgarian nation to which Slavdom owed its literature and enlightenment. He lost no opportunity of divulging to the world the horrible news of the whole massacres taken place in Bulgaria. The first intimation of the carnage was obtained from the Plovdiv and Sliven Metropolitans and the well known Plovdiv merchant Iv. Ev. Gheshoff.[1]) But the information these three gentlemen sent was scanty and hastily dashed off. The Exarch somehow managed to send several of his courageous subordinates to investigate the horrors on the spot. The datas thus obtained constituted the first authentic knowledge of the Turkish massacres. They were immediately translated into English by Prof. Panaretoff of Robert College, and through President Washburn and Vice-President Long of the same institution they were transmitted to Mr. Edwin Pears[2], an

[1]) Iv. Ev. Gheshoff, *Spomeni iz godini na borbi i pobedi*, Sofia, 1816, p. 68.

[2]) To Thrace he sent A. Shopoff, a medical student in Constantinople, and to Macedonia N. Shishedjieff, a schoolmaster. Clad in his university uniform, Shopoff was able to shun suspicion and

English lawyer in Constantinople, and correspondent of the *London Daily News*. Mr. Pears hurried up with apprizing his paper with the shocking story thus corroborated by so distinguished personages, stating to the editor that he guaranteed for the veracity of the facts. The illustrious American scholars, Dr. Washburn and Dr. Long, firmly convinced in the guileness of the Turkish authorities, and animated by a strong humanitarian interest in behalf of an oppressed and cruelly tried people, did all they could to let Europe and America get acquainted with the actual state of affairs in the Balkans. They had no confidence in any investigation committee officially appointed or delegated, and on that account they were anxious in securing the services of impartial witnesses.[8]) So when Mr. Baring, the English representative, departed for the scenes of devastation, they succeeded in persuading Mr. Eugene Schuyler, the American Consul at Constantinople, and Mr. G. A. McGahan, the well known American publicist, their special correspondent of the *London Daily News* and the *New York Herald*, in the name of humanity to venture a journey to the affected regions and verify on the very spot the facts which the Turkish Government was doing all it could to conceal or minimize.

Other events followed in the Balkans which rendered the conditions of things in Turkey very critical. The serious uprisings in Bosnia, Hercegovina, and Bulgaria, of course, greatly injured Turkey's prestige both at home and abroad. To make things worse, there occurred the

visit Panagiurishty and other devastated towns. He subsequently prepared a detailed statement concerning the massacres, giving a full list of the persons killed. (See *Rousski Vestnik*, Moscow, 1882, the article of Mme. Mouroumtzoff; also *Antini purvi, bulgarsk exarch*, by T. Milkoff, Plovdiv, 1899, p. 181.

[8]) Svobodno Mnenie, Vol. III, № 7, p. 276. — Iv Ev. Geshoff, p. 68. — Same, pp. 276 and 68.

murder of the French and German consuls in Salonica which showed that the very representatives of the Great Powers were not safe in the Ottoman Empire. Then the Bulgarian massacres and the Serbo-Turkish conflict came in to make matters still more complicated. Europe now was given ample evidence of the unfitness and rottonness of the Ottoman rule.[1]) In 1876 Austria proposed to Turkey a set of reforms to be introduced in Bosnia and Hercegovina. The scheme, which is known under the name of «Count Andrassy's Note», was accepted by all the Great Powers, England included, but the insurgent leaders rejected it because they thought it contained no signal improvements and guarantees.[2]) The failure of Austria's measures emboldened Russia and gave her a good opportunity of interfering in behalf of the oppressed Balkan Christians. Unhappily, England stood in her way. As soon as Russia posed as mediator, and peace-maker, the English Government assumed a hostile attitude towards every attempt on the part of the Tzar to compel the Turkish Government to introduce some reforms for the betterment of the subjected Christian races.[3]) The massination of the consuls at Salonica constrained Europe to interfere with the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire. At the initiative of Germany, Russia, and Austro-Hungary, a memorandum of reforms was worked out which was expected to introduce an amelioration of the lot of the Sultan's non-Mussulman races. The document contained a clause which stipulated that the Powers should send their fleets to the Turkish waters for the enforcement of the proposed reforms. All European Governments, with the exception of the English, gave their sanction to the «Berlin Memorandum». The Foreign Office of Great Britain refused

[1]) Ch. Seignobos, p. 602.
[2]) Albéric Cahnet, p. 372.
[3]) De Martens, *La paix et la guerre*, p. 169.

to subscribe to it, argumenting that it affected the sovereignty of the Sultan. Lord Derby, who then was English Foreign Secretary, hastened to instruct Sir Henry Eliot, the English Ambassador at the Ottoman Capital, to inform the Sublime Porte that immediately after the Bosnian and Hercegovinian outbreak his Government «did its best to frustrate the concerted action of the other Powers directed against the Ottoman Empire.» That divergence of opinion taken up by England greatly strengthened the hands of the Sultan who once more saw that the safety of his Empire depended upon the disagreement of Europe. The Divan that time, however, had relied once too often upon this conviction. The Turkish haughtiness and insolence dragged the State into catastrophes. The friendly English Government, too, was exasperated by the Porte's dilly-dallying policy and contempt of European intervention. The public opinion on the Continent was so aroused against the barbarous régime in vogue in the Turkish Empire, that England could not remain a passive witness of the blood drama enacted before the very nose of Christendom. The ghastly truth discovered by the diligent investigation of the real facts made by Schuyler and McGahan sent a shock through all the world. The thrilling description of the demoniacal deeds of the Sultan's soldiery and agents in Battak, Perushtitza, and other Bulgarian towns, given by McGahan, which were published in the *London Daily News* and reprinted by the press of all nations, evoked a most intense indignation against the rule of the Turk, and the incapacity of European diplomacy. Gladstone's fiery speeches against the unspeakable horrors perpetrated by the Mohammedans over the Christians in the Turkish Empire under the secret orders of the Turkish Government itself elicited the greatest sympathies for the

[1]) Albéric Cahnet, p. 373.

unfortunate victims. The conscience of Europe was stung to the quick, Christianity and civilization felt all the opprobrium of the situation, and Russia, whose action in behalf of the oppressed Christians was heretofore impeded, felt her hands free. Meanwhile the Bulgarians did not remain idle. They had delegated D. Tzankoff and Marko Balabanoff, two of their ablest leaders, as their representatives before the European courts whither they were sent to intercede in behalf of their countrymen's rights. They urged upon the cabinets of the Great Powers the necessity of granting Bulgaria an autonomous government. Thanks to the tact, self-sacrifice, and fearlessness of the Bulgarian Exarch who first succeeded in interesting the Americans and Englishmen in Constantinople in the sad plight of his people, the blood of thousand innocent Bulgarians was not shed in vain. The services which Antim I thus rendered his country was incalculable in its good results. The venerable American citizens, President Washburn, Dr. Long, Mr. Schuyler and Mr. Mac Gahan believing in his sincerity and trustworthiness, were easily won over to the Bulgarian cause, and the secret and unofficial investigation of the massacres became an accomplished fact. The inquiry into the facts, made by so irreproachable and unbiassed men, revolutionized public opinion, especially in England and America, in consequence of which Turkey lost all support abroad. Hence it must be had clearly in mind that had it not been for the live interest shown by these illustrious Americans in finding out and putting to light the awful truth about the Balkan massacres, Gladstone would have had no facts to build his famous filippics upon, Alexander II would have been deprived of the support of Europe and America in his noble action undertaken for

[1]) D Tzankoff and D. Balabanoff, *Bulgaria*, London, 1876. — See the book, *Stranitzi ot politicheskoto mi vuzrajdane*, Sofia, 1904, pp. 139—150; 445—483.

the liberation of Bulgaria, and the martyr death of thousands of Bulgarians, the agonies and untold sufferings of hundreds of families would have remained unavenged and buried in oblivion. Happily for the Bulgarian people, the psychological moment was timely grasped. The press in general, and the London papers in particular, raised a loud cry against the Turkish mis-government. Hundreds of meetings in England, organized and stimulated by Gladstone, publicly condemned the bloody exploits of the «red Sultan».[1]) The revelations of Schuyler and McGahan dashed to the ground the idea of Turkish integrity and sovereignty. The popular indignation in Great Britain was so bitter against the Eastern policy of the Conservative Party, that the English Government had to give in and obey the dictates of the general public. The work of the noble investigators produced a miraculous change throughout. Eugene Schuyler made the inquiry into the Balkan atrocities not only in virtue of his office as an American Consul General, but also because he was a man who loved the truth above all things. The credit, therefore, for informing the world of the ghastly deeds committed by the Turks, as well as for shattering the principle of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, is due to the United States of America, whose representive Schuyler was. He and his comrades recognized no other doctrine except the doctrine of humanity, liberty, democracy, and justice. The popular disgust with the English diplomacy in Turkey was so great, that Lord Derby took immediate steps to modify it, and on September 5, he wrote to Sir Henry Eliot: «It is my duty to warn you that every trace of sympathy for Turkey has been completely blotted out in England, thanks to the sad events

[1]) W. E. Gladstone, *The Bulgarian Horrors and the Eastern Question*, also, «*Lessons From the Massacres and the Conduct of the Turkish Government towards Bulgaria.*» — Baring, *Blue Book*, Turkey, № 1.

taken place in Bulgaria.» [1]) The London Cabinet, though disinclined to make abrupt changes in its foreign policy had to take into consideration the wide and growing hostility of the people towards its traditional friendship for Turkey. Under these circumstances Russia saw her chance of taking the initiative in a radical solution of the Balkan Question. By order from his Government, General Ignatieff proposed to be convoked in Constantinople a Conference of representatives of the Great Powers to devise some plan for the betterment of the lot of the Christians in Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Hercegovina. England accepted Russia's proposition, and by a circular letter she called forth the Conference in Constantinople.

On October 29th, 1876, Alexander II, in his speech before the Moscow nobility declared that if at the incoming Conference no harmony between the Powers was attained, he had decided to act alone. [2])

The Conference convened. It worked out and accepted a project which provided autonomous rule for Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Hercegovina, under the authority of the Sultan. [3]) It was a sort of Balkan Confederacy of Christians and Mussulmans. It was decreed to obtain Turkey's sanction of the scheme, but should she reject it, the decision of the Powers was to be inspired upon her by force. Neither the one, nor the other thing happened, all because England proved insincere, and the Porte incorrigible.

The autonomy projects of the Constantinople Conference were strongly opposed by Midhat Pasha, the renowned Turkish reformer and leader of the Young Turks. Again called to the Viziership, and after he had caused the dethronement of Sultan Azis and his successor Sultan Murad,

[1]) Albéric Cahnet, p. 379.
[2]) Same, p. 381.
[3]) *Blue-Book*, Turkey, N° 2 (1878), p. 28.

and the enthronement of Abdul Hamid, the brother of the latter, Midhat Pasha set earnestly at work for the reformation of the Empire. His ideas were well known. His ambition was to othomanize all races comprized in the Turkish Empire by denationalizing the Christians. With this aim in view he hurried, while the Conference was still in session, to prepare a constitution which he solemnly proclaimed under a volley of cannons. [1]) The Constitution of this celebrated Ottoman statesman gave equal rights to all subjects of the Empire, who in the future were to be called by a common name *Ottomans*. In effecting this reform Midhat Pasha desired to emphasize the fact that the Turkish Government granted its citizens greater privileges than were stipulated in the schemes proposed by the Conference. While the Great Powers favoured only the Bulgarians, Bosnians, and Hercegovinians, Sultan Abdul Hamid II was equally generous to all peoples found in his dominions. That was Abdul Hamid's first diplomatic triumph over the chancellors of Europe. On January 5th, 1877, therefore, the European diplomacy suffered a signal defeat at the hands of two wise Turks. The Porte pointing to and relying on the Constitution boldly rejected the project of the Conference. And when Marquis of Salisbury, the first English Plenipotentiary at the Conference, and General Ignatieff protected and even threatened, Midhat Pasha simply rubbed his hands and cynically answered with the words *non possumus*. He declared that Turkey was a Constitutional Country, and that its parliament alone was competent to deal with such questions in which the Conference was interested. The Ottoman Parliament, when called in session, rejected the plan and decision of the Great Powers.

[1]) Ernest Lavisse et Alfred Rambaud, *Histoire générale du IVme siècle à nos jours*, Paris, 1901, vol. XII, p. 465—468.

The utter failure of the Constantinople Conference was mainly due to the duplicity of the English Foreign Office. While Lord Salisbury maintained in Constantinople a categorical language, such as was befitting the occasion, at the same time the second delegate of the Queen of England, Sir Henry Eliot, as well as Lord Derby himself, were assuring the Turkish Government that their refusal would entail no serious complications. It is known that on December 13th, before the plenipotentiaries of the Great Powers were called in session, Lord Derby had informed the Turkish Ambassader in London that the English Government would not participate in any compulsory measures against the Porte, [1]) nor would it approve of the employment of such. [2]) This declaration greatly strengthened the hands of the Sultan, and emboldened him to such a degree, that he not only showed an extraordinary stubborn spirit, but openly defied the will of the European Powers.

Having pledged his word in his speech before the Moscow citizens, the Russian Emperor Alexander II, decided, before resorting to force, to give the cabinets of the interested Powers another opportunity for bringing about a concerted action against the Turks through its representatives at the Constantinople Conference. With this end in view, he sent General Ignatieff to the European Courts before which he was instructed to use his influence in winning them over. The result of General Ignatieff's European tour was the historical «London Protocol», approved and signed by the Great Powers' representatives at the English capital. By it was decreed to be put into force the project of the Constantinople Conference under the supervision of the Powers. It contained the following memorable passage: «If the Powers find themselves once more deceived in their hopes, and if the condition of the

[1]) Albéric Cahnet, p. 383.

[2]) De Martens, p. 194.

Christian subjects of the Sultan is not bettered in such a manner as to exclude any future complications, which might again disturb the peace of Europe, the Powers think it their duty to declare that such a state of things is incompatible with their interests and the interests of Europe in general. Under such circumstances they reserve for themselves the right to devise the most expedient means which would guarantee the welfare of the Christian races and general security.» The Protocol from the very beginning lays stress upon the fact that full harmony existed between the plenipotentiaries of the Great Powers in the decisions taken. All this, however, was mere phrases as becomes apparent from the declarations of Russia and England: while the first is too categorical in its statement that she considers the Turkish promises as valid, and that in case the Protocol is not put in force she would resort to war, England, on the other hand, reserves herself the liberty to deem the Protocol null and void in case of an armed conflict between Russia and Turkey.[1]) The Sublime Porte rejected the decision of the Powers with such an arrogance as does not befit even the mightiest of nations. «The London Protocol,» writes Martens,[2]) «was received with an insolent refusal in which the boldness of the language corresponds to the absurdity of the arguments.» The haughtiness of the Turkish Government accelerated the course of events. It put and end to all further pourparlers. The public opinion in Russia was greatly agitated. Aksakoff's eloquent harangues in Moscow turned the attention of all Russia. Alexander II was compelled to declare war on Turkey in accordance with his pledges. The Russian Chancellor hastened, by means of a circular note, to inform the Ca-

[1]) *Documents diplomatiques*, pp. 349—351.

[2]) *La paix et la guerre*, p. 196. — *Document diplomatiques*, p. 372. — Albéric Cahnet, p. 389.

binets of Europe that his Emperor's armies had received orders to cross the Danube.

The Constantinople Conference was a great diplomatic success for Russia. The Conference, called to existence at the initiative of General Ignatieff had for its prime object the solution of the Bulgarian Question. It was occasioned by the Bulgarian massacres and the untold sufferings of the Bulgarian people for whom the Russians cherished a brotherly feeling. On the eve of calling the Conference to Constantinople General Ignatieff made terms with the Exarchy, and having been freed from the prejudices of the Russian diplomacy concerning the Church Question and his predilection for the Greek Patriarchy, he now was in perfect accord with the stipulations of the Firman in regard to the ethnical claims of the Bulgarian people. From the materials prepared by G. Tisheff, M. Koussevitch, and others, Graf Ignatieff, Schuyler, and Prince Tserteleff worked out a draft for an autonomous government and a map delineating the boundary lines of future Bulgaria, [1]) both of which, with slight modifications, were unanimously accepted by the representation of the Great Powers. Instead of one province as was stipulated in their project, the Constantinople Conferences divided Bulgaria into two, Eastern Bulgaria with Tirnovo as its capital, and Western Bulgaria with Sofia as its capital. The representatives of the Great Powers sanctioned Bulgaria's ethnical boundaries and recognized its people's right for political independence.

At the Conference of 1876, Europe virtually recognized the principles promulgated in the Exarchical Firman. The two antonomous Bulgarian provinces included Nish

[1]) Istoritcheskii Vestnik, 1914; *Zapiski Grafa N. P. Isnatyeva.* — *Blue Book,* Turkey, № 1, 2 (1877). — P. Milyukoff, *Evropeiskata diplomatsia,* pp. 10—11. — *Protocols of the Constantinople Conference.*

on the north-west, Bitolia and Castoria on the south-west, and the larger part of the Serres district on the south.

In its opposition to the decisions of the Conference, the Porte was supported by the Greek and Armenian Patriarchies, and even by certain Bulgarians in Turkish service, or members of the Turkish Parliament. At the instigation of the Porte, these Bulgarians prepared a memorandum which was presented to the Conference.[1]) In it they declared that the Bulgarian people was contented with the Turkish rule, and the reformes introduced by the Porte agents were sent throughout the Country to urge the inhabitants to follow their example, but their efforts in this respect proved abortive. In Plovdiv Dr. St. Tchomakoff, the leader of the Turkophiles, succeeded in winning over a few adherents, as did D. Pandouroff in Sofia and Kiustendil. Those citizens, however, who sided with them did so either out of respect for these men, or through fear of the Government authorities. But the conscience of the Plovdiv community was greatly disgusted with the conduct on the part of a few of its notables who showed themselves so faint-hearted, as to be easily constrained to sign an address to the European Conference stating in it that they were satisfied with the existing administration, when the bodies of thousands of their kinsmen, victims of the same administration, still lay unburied in their burned and plundered homes. As soon as Plovdiv people learned of the contents of the address, they immediately prepared a counter-address in which they protested against the action of a handful of their fellow-citizens in favour of a régime condemned by the European governments themselves.[2]) The counter-address was sent to the Constantinople Conference by a special delegate with instructions to

[1]) Svobodno Mnenie, p. 276. — Iv. Ev. Gheshoff, p. 70.

[2]) It was signed by Gheorgaki-beg, N. Michailovski, Kirosh, Karaghyogoff, Hadji Nikoli, Pandouroff, and others. — T. Milkoff, p. 135.

deliver it to Lord Salisbury, the English representative to the Conference. When Exarch Antim transmitted his circular letter to the Great Powers requesting them to use their good offices for the creation of an autonomous Bulgaria under the suzereignty of a Sultan, and at the same time delegated Dr. Tzankoff, and M. D. Balabanoff to Europe to plead for the cause of their country,[1]) a group of Bulgarians in the Turkish capital, mostly Turkish officials, appeared before him and urged him to join the Greek and Armenian patriarchs and publicly declare that his people have no grievances against the Ottoman rule, and that they were desirous of no change of the existing administration! The Bulgarian spiritual chief, however, who placed the interests and wishes of his flock above his exalted office, dignity, and privileges, not only refused to listen to such a monstrous proposition, but deflantly sent word that his duty as Bulgarian did not permit him to attend the meeting of dissenters called council by the Grand Vizier, Midhat Pasha, to discuss the practicability and advisability of the resolutions passed by the Conference of the Great Powers. In this firm stand he was warmly supported both by the Synod and the Lay Council. The conduct of Antim I was branded as vindictive and revolutionary. The Sublime Porte, failing to intimidate him into its way of thinking, and to compel him to resign, finally decided to forcibly eject him from the Exarchical post. Midhat Pasha conceived a deep hatred of him, for in him he saw the greatest Bulgarian patriot and nationalist, whose aim was to make of the Exarchy not only a powerful religious factor in the Balkans, but also a real national institution championing the rights of a most obstinate race, as he discovered the Bulgarians to be. He, however, wished to have nothing but *Ottomans* in the Empire. Matters came to such a pitch, that as the two

[1]) Iv. Ev. Gheshoff, *Spomeni*, p. 71.

dignitaries met on one occasion, the Vizier bluntly told him: «Your position is extremely precarious, Sir; the reports sent to the Porte about you are not at all encouraging. I hope the gallows may be spared.» The sturdy Bulgarian prelate, who was noted for his quick wit and self-composure, was equal to the emergency. «May your words come out true, your Excellence,» he responded, «when they hanged the Greek Patriarch Gregory IV, the consequences were the birth of a Greek Kingdom. Should God decree that the gallows be my goal, who knows, but that the world would be enriched by the appearance of a Bulgarian Kingdom!» To his Bulgarian opponents and enemies who accused him of meddling into politics, and of maintaining a revolutionary conduct, he proved overwhelmingly severe and dictatorial. On April 12th, 1877, Russia formally declared war on Turkey. On April 17th, five days later, Antim I was deposed and some time after banished to Angora in Asia Minor.

The Bulgarian people were fortunate to have in those trying times such an able and fearless man for their Exarch. Nothing was in a position to deter him from his determination to remain faithful to the difficult task with which he was entrusted by his countrymen. How could he be induced to disapprove the work of the European Conference, when the principles and rights for which the entire Bulgarian nation struggled, bled, and died were given a public sanction by the representatives of the European Governments? Was'nt the past existence of the Bulgarians a long and continued protest against Turkish misrule and shameful tyranny? What did the massacres of Battak, Peroushtitza, Bratzigovo, and other places, where the blood of the victims was still fresh all mean? And if the entire Bulgarian people had cried to God for the destruction of the unspeakable Turk, how could its spiritual leader be expected now, at the end of all their mighty

protests against its cruel oppressor, to turn traitor to their feelings and historical aspiration, and declare himself in unison with the hateful Turkish régime and in opposition to the resolutions of the European Conference called to existence by the repeated appeals, groans, and protests of the Bulgarian nation itself? That could not be. The Bulgarian Democracy together with its noble and energetic chief had to fight the battle to the end. The Bulgarians struggled not only for their rights and freedom, but for the political and social emancipation of all Balkan races, the Turks included. And Demolins, the French sociologist, was correct when in his great work he made this significant statement: «It is the Bulgarians who direct the movement in the entire Balkans against the Turkish dominion.» [1]) And indeed all insurrections in Bulgaria were the work of the Bulgarian peasantry, of the Bulgarian rural democracy. The few bureaucrats in their midst, who showed themselves hostile to the Constantinople Conference, were mistaken patriots who failed to grasp the secret of their people's strength and ideals. Midhat Pasha, too, proved a poor diplomat and reformer by his inability to comprehend what a new and powerful vigour would have been inculcated in the Ottoman Empire had the confederative principle advocated and sanctioned by the Constantinople Conference been accepted. Had he been more farseeing, the Russo-Turkish war would have been frustrated. And though he soon fell from power, the conflict could not be obviated. It became an accomplished fact, and ended with the utter defeat of the Ottoman arms and prestige, and the San-Stefano Bulgaria.

Demolins says that in Eastern Europe the name of the Bulgarian is synonimous with agricultural industry, and that no other Slavic people can compare with the Bul-

[1]) Edmond Démolins, *Les grandes routes des peoples.* Les routes du monde moderne, Paris, p. 201.

garian race in that respect. That people possesses a great inert power and vitality.

To what are due these extraordinary characteristics of the Bulgarians?

Demolins again gives us a very explicit answer: «to their agricultural proponsities.» [1])

The vitality, sacrifices, and the genius of the Bulgarian peasant democracy were the factors which preserved and regenerated the Bulgarian people. It was they who in the XIXth century created the pillars upon which was built the State of Bulgaria on the Balkans.

---

[1]) Same, p. 201.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Besides the works already cited the author had occasion to consult also the following authorities:

A. Gasquet, professeur d'histoire à la faculté des lettres de Clermont. — *L'Empire byzantin et la monarchie franque*, Paris, 1888.

Emile de Lavaleye, — *La péninsule des Balkans*, Paris, 1888.

Fustel de Coulange, — *La cité antique*, Paris.

Louis Léger, — *Le monde slave*, Paris; *Esquisse sommaire de la mythologie slave*, Paris, 1882.

Herzerberg. — *Istoria Vyzantii*, 1897.

Bryce James, — *The Holy Roman Empire.*

J. Pervolf, — *Slavyani, ich Vzaimnia otnoshenia i svyazi*, 1866.

A. Hilferding, — *Pissma ob istorii serbov i bolgar*, 1867.

V. G. Vassilevski, — *O philosophskom i bogoslafskom dvijenii o Vyzantii XI, XII, i YIV v. v.* (Journal M. N. Pr. centyabre i octyabre 1891, yanvar i fevral, 1892).

P. S. Smirnoff, — *Otcherk koultournoi istorii youjnich slavyan*, 1900.

D. Hesseling, — *Essai sur la civilization byzantine*, Paris, 1907.

Jossouf Fehmi, — *Histoire de la Turquie*, 1909.

N. Skabalanovitch, — *Vizantiiskoe gossoudarstvo i tserkov*, 1884.

Florinski, — *Ujnie slavyany i Vizantia v vtoroi tchetverti XIV v.* 1892

Popoff, J. A., — *Rossia i Serbia* (1806—56).

Ovsyani, N., — *Serbia i serbi*, 1898.

G. Rajitch, — *Istoria raznich narodov, naipatchy, Bolgar, Horvatov i Serbov*, 1794.

J. Ouspenski, — *Obrazovanie vtorago bolgarskago tzarstva*, 1879.

M. Bogdanovitch, — *Istoria tsarstvovania imp. Alexandra I i Rossia v ego vremya, Spb.*, 1864.

Ranke, — *Istoria Serbii*, 1861.

P. Sretkovitch, — *Istoria srpskago naroda*, 1884 i 1888.

S. Solovyeff, — *Imperator Alexander I*, 1877.

S. Tatishteff, — *Vnyeshnaya politica imperatora Nikolaya I.*

Stoyan Novakovitch, — *Srbi i tourtsi, XIV i XV veka*, 1893.

V. N. G. Medakovitch, — *Christiani na Balkanskom polouostrovou*, 1885.

V. N. Zlatarski, — *Studii po bulgarskata istoria*, 1902.

P. P. Karapetroff, — *Kratka istoria na bulgarskata tsarkva*, Sofia, 1894.

C. S. Bobtcheff, — *Pervii exarch novoi bolgarskoi tserkvi.*

V. D. Stoyaneff, — *Documenti za rousko-tourskata voina v' 1828—29*, Pspissanie No. 47 (XLVII).

N. H. Palaouzoff, — *Bulgarskitye kolonii v' Russia*, Pspissanie, No. 51 (LI).

G. Ivanoff, — *Bulgarsko-periodicheski petchat*, 1893.

S. S. Bobtcheff, — *P. R. Slaveikoff i edin negov rukopis*, 1900; *Illarion Michailovsky*, 1900; *Pregled na bulgarski petchat, 1844—94.*

D. Dimitroff, — *Kniajestvo Bulgaria*, Plovdiv, 1896.

V. Beron, — *Archeologicheski i istoritcheski izsledvania*, 1886.

J. P. Liprandi, — *Bolgaria, Iz zapissok*, Moscow, 1877.

S. Christoff, — *Pirotskia okrug i negovoto nasselenie*, Msb., No. XI.

Gabriel effendi Noradonghian, — *Recueil d'actes internationaux de l'empire ottoman*, Paris.

Kanitz, — *Conférence ethnographique, tenue dans la séance de la société géographique de Vienne, le 24 février 1883.*

Lamouche L. — *La Bulgarie dans le passé et le présent*, Paris, 1892.

Victor Bérard, — *La Turquie et l'Hellénisme contemporain*, Paris, 1904

A. Sorel, — *La question d'Orient aux dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, 1889.

Non-diplomate, — *La question des réformes dans la Turquie d'Europe*, Paris, 1903.

Gheblesco, S. K., — *La question d'Orient.*

Engelhardt, Ed, — *La Turquie et le Tanzimat*, Paris, 1882.

Hanotaux, G. — *Histoire de la France contemporaine*, Paris.

Spolaikovitch, — *La Bosnie et Herzégovine.*

G. Ristitch, — *Diplomatska istoria srcije; Posledniya godina spolyasknye politike Knaza Michaila.*

N. Popoff, — *Srbia poslye parizkago mira.*

N. Bogdan, — *Priatelskoe pissmo ot bulgarino k' gurkou*, v' Blatnoru Prazye; 1852.

G. P. Gheorghieff, — *Neophyte Bozveli Kato boretz za tserkovnata ni svoboda*, Stara Zogora, 1911.

W. Strashimiroff, *Istoria na aprilskoto vuzstanie*, Plovdiv, 1907.

Pierre Grenier, — *L'Empire byzantin*, Paris, 1914.

Jankovitch et Grouitch, — *Slaves du sud ou le peuple serbe*, Paris, 1853.

St. Grouitch, — *Statistika drjavi sussednich Balk. polouostrovou*, Belgrad, 1891.

Halil Ganem, — *Les sultans ottomans*, Paris, 1902.

INDEX

page

Aaron, Prince of Maldovia 227
Abdul Azis 395
Albert Korali 227
Alexander Exarch 370
Alexander of Macedon 93, 94, 100, 136, 165
Alexander, Ongro-Wallachian Voyvode 24
Alexander, Guardian 120
Alexander I, Emperor of Russia 275, 276
Alexander II, Emperor of Russia 453, 455, 457, 458
Alexander Karageorgievitch 381, 382, 389
Alexander Hadji Rousset 323
Alexius Commenus, Byzantine Emperor 80, 87
Alfieri 307
Ali Pasha, Vizier XVIth century 210
Ali Pasha, Vizier XIXth century 424, 427, 429
Ali Pasha of Jannina 238
Anastasius, Byzantine Emperor 18, 19, 21
Anastasius II, Byzantine Emperor 105
Andre 16
Andronicus, Byzantine Emperor 149
Andronicus Paleologus, Byzantine Emperor 162
Aneff, Brothers 378
Angelarius 33
Antim I, Bulgarian Exarch 330, 370, 409, 426, 438, 439, 445, 447, 448, 449, 455, 461, 462

page

Antim VI, Greek Patriarch 432, 433, 434
Apollo 3
Apriloff Vassil 196, 294, 295, 296, 359, 363, 364
Arcadius, Byzantine Emperor 393
Aristarches 400
Aristotle 8, 36, 37
Arnold, Catharist 80
Asparouch, Bulgarian Prince 20, 21, 123
Asen I, Bulgarian Tzar 153, 156
Athanasius the Great, Archbishop 36, 117
Augustus, Roman Emperor 123
Auxentius of Veles 409, 412
Avramovitch 375

Baba Novak 227
Bagshitch, Bogdan 188
Balabanoff Marco 326, 370, 371, 447, 453, 461
Baldwin, Watin Emperor 153, 154
Baring 450
Basil the Macedonian, Byzantine Emperor 14, 15, 115, 116, 145, 160
Basil II, Byzantine Emperor 26, 116, 133, 137, 141, 142, 144, 152, 160, 215
Basil, Patriarch of Tirnovo 27, 29
Basil, Disciple 92
Basil the Great 87, 80, 103, 107, 110, 117, 132, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140
Basil Loupa, Prince of Moldavia 51
Basil, Chief of the Bogomilians 79, 92

page
Bassarab, Mathew, Prince of Wallachia 231
Bernard of Clairvaux 88
Beron, Peter, Dr. 296, 311, 320, 321, 323, 358, 363
Beron, St. 387
Beron, V., Dr 324
Beyazid, Sultan 168, 221
Blacque, Alexander 367
Blagoeff, D. 315
Bluskoff, R Ilia 315
Bogdan, Prince of Moldavia 221
Bogomil, Father 60, 67, 68, 74, 84, 92
Bogoridi, St., Prince 304, 359, 400, 402, 403
Bogoroff, Iv., Dr. 313, 368, 370, 371
Boitcho, Voyvode 341, 345
Bontcheff, Besho 324
Boril, Bulgarian Tzar 30, 48, 82, 98
Boris, Bulgarian Tzar 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 52, 58, 135, 160
Boris II, Bulgarian Tzar 131
Boritakan, Voyvode 33
Botoff, Christo 325, 355, 356
Boutneff 336
Bourmoff, T. 310, 311, 318, 370, 474
Brankovitch 181
Bratiano 353, 389
Brochard 264
Budberg 381
Buzzico, Marshal 168

Calvin, John, Reformer 60, 85
Cantacuzene, Shterban, Prince of Wallachia 232
Cantacuzenus, Byzantine Emperor 167
Carol, Prince of Roumania 353, 389, 390
page
Carp, Peter 353
Catherine II, Empress of Russia 275
Charles the Great 37
Charles IV, Emperor of Austria 267
Charles V, King of Spain 265
Charles, Prince of Nevers 229
Chlore, Constance 1
Chosroes, King of Persia 107
Christo Ilinata 295
Christopher Lacapenus, Byzantine Emperor 15
Christovitch, Ilia 249, 313
Chrysant, Metropolitan of Plovdiv 298
Chrysostom, John 8, 36, 42, 89, 92, 103, 110, 117
Clement, Bishop 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 45, 49, 52, 73, 97, 117, 302
Constantine, Archbishop 36, 40, 94, 96
Constantine X, Byzantine Emp. 117
Constantine VI, Byzant. Emp 105, 114
Constantine VII, Byzant. Emp. 7, 8, 11, 120
Constantine XI, Byzant Emp. 102
Constantine Copronymus, Byzant. Emperor 111, 113, 114
Constantine the Great 1—6, 25, 101, 102, 113
Constantine Monomachus 152
Constantine of Kostenetz 45, 50
Constantine and Kara Theodori 304
Cyprian, Metropolitan of Kieff 45, 49
Cyril, Greek Patriarch 186, 441
Cyril, Metropolitan of Kieff 49
Cyril and Methodius, Slav Reformers and Educators 32, 33, 37, 38, 52, 97, 117, 489
Cyril Lukaris, Greek Patriarch 211

page
David, Abbot 181
David, Monk 181
David II 107
Damascenus, John 94, 103, 110
Damian, Patriarch of Ochrida 140
Danielis 145, 146
Danitchitch 322
Danoff, Christo 315, 323, 378
Darius 164
Dembinski 359
Demosthenes 8, 36, 165
Denkoglou, Iv. 359, 362
Deodatus, Archbishop of Tchiporovtzi 231
Derby, Lord 452, 454, 457
Dibitch 341
Dionysius, Abbot 191
Dionysius Ralli, Metropolitan of Tirnovo 228
Djordjevitch, Paul 227, 228
Dobrogost 15
Dobroman, Voyvoda 138, 170
Dobroplodni, Sava 310, 313, 315
Dominic, Archbishop 27
Domoustchiolou 375
Doncho, Vatach 346, 347, 378
Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Skopie 440
Dossitey Obradovitch 382
Dossitey, Metropolitan of Samokov 439
Dragshan, Voyvoda 138
Dramali Pasha 195
Drinoff, Marin 15, 30, 69, 70, 88, 177, 191, 322, 328

Elemag, Voyvoda 140
Eliot, Sir Henry 452, 454, 457
Eschylus 7
Eudoxie 15
Eugene Boulgaris 184, 186, 196, 216, 288, 290, 303
Euripides 8
Euthimius, Patriarch of Tirnova 45, 46, 50, 52, 173, 174, 175, 178, 211

Falke, Bishop 88
Francis I, French Emperor 265
Froujin 140

Garashanin, Ilia 385, 387
Gavril, Bulgarian Tzar 139
Gavril, Krustevitch, see Krustevitch
Gaya 382
Gennadius Scholarius, Greek Patriarch 171, 176, 177, 210
Germanus, Greek Patriarch 31
Gheorgieff, Christo 310, 363, 387
Gheroff, Naiden 310, 311, 313, 315, 322, 361
Gheshoff, Ev. I. 310, 326, 370, 387, 449
Ghesholou 375
Giuzeleff, Iv. 315, 324
Gladstone, William E 452, 453, 454
Gorasd 33, 38
Goushantzi, Ali Halil 298
Gramer 413
Gregory, Presbyter 36
Gregory V 432, 440
Gregory IX, Pope 82
Gregory the Theologian 92, 93, 103, 107, 110, 117
Gregory Nemtzoff, Metropolitan of Dorostol and Tcherven 369, 440, 447
Gregory XIII, Pope 227
Groueff, J. 313, 315, 322

Hadji Athanas 385
Hadji Christo 195
Hadji Dimiter 352, 426, 357
Hadji Ivantcho Pentchevitch 427, 444

page
Hadji Joachim Krutchovski, Monk 290, 319
Hadji Jordan 345, 346
Hadji Nikola Mintcheff 410, 413
Hadji Stoitcho 195
Hadji Stoyan 296
Hadji Vulko Tchaluckoff 295, 296, 297
Halil, Shereef Pasha 445
Hamid, Sultan Abdul 456
Handenberg 275
Henry, Latin Emperor 154
Heraclius, Byzantine Emp. 100, 110
Herodotus 8
Hesiod 96
Hiltchitzki, Peter 68
Hittoff, Panayot Voyvoda 351, 352
Hmelnitzki, Getman 231
Homer 8, 94
Hunyadi 169
Huss, Jan, Reformer 84, 85
Hussein Pasha 262, 264

Ikonomoff, T. 313, 370, 375, 435, 447
Ilitza, Voyvoda 138
Illarion Makariopolski, Metropolitan of Tirnovo 313, 369, 401, 403, 406, 409, 412, 420, 430, 434, 435, 436, 437, 439
Illarion, Metropolitan of Lovetch 192, 430, 434, 435, 436, 437, 439
Illavion, Metropolitan of Tirnova 191, 369
Innocent III, Pope 26—29, 44, 83, 153, 156
Ioan Alexander II, Bulgarian Tzar 43, 44, 82, 98
Ioan, Archbishop of Ochrida 26, 43
Ioan Assen, Bulgarian Tzar 30, 31, 81, 116, 156, 160, 430
Ioan, Exarch 37, 38, 40, 42
page
Ioan, Son of Tzar Simeon 132
Iovanaki 346
Iovanitza 346
Iovtcheff, Lazar, Bulgarian Exarch 326, 370, 371
Irene, Empress of the East 105, 114
Isaac Angelus, Byzantine Emperor 150, 152
Isidorus, Metropolitan of Petrograd 449
Ivan Grosni (the Ugly), Russian Tzar 222
Ivan Kapelan 27
Ivan Malaken 134
Ivan of Rilo 73, 181, 214
Ivan Shishman, Bulg. Tzar 44
Ivan Vladislav, Bulgarian Tzar 139, 140, 142
Ivanitza, Bulgarian Tzar 26, 27—31, 116, 126, 153, 154, 155, 156, 160
Ivatza, Voyvoda 138, 139, 140

Jeremiah, see Bogomil.
Jeremiah, Metropolitan of Tirnova 179
Jeremiah, Metropolitan of Sofia 202
Jeremiah, Metropolitan of Shoumen 228
Jeronim of Prague 87
Jijka, Jan 84
Jinziphoff 313, 375
Joachim, Metropolitan of Sofia 190
Joachim, Patriarch of Tirnova 31
Joachim of Ossigovo 73
John Chrysostom, see Chrysostom.
John Paleologus, see Paleologus.
John III Sobieski, of Poland, see Sobieski.
John Zimisces, Byzantine Emp. 74, 116, 130, 131, 160
Josaph, Metropolitan of Bdin 45
Joseph, Armenian Archbishop 220

page
Joseph, Archbishop of Preslav 33
Joseph Bradati 282
Joseph, Austrian Emperor 275
Joseph, Monk 181
Joseph Sokolski, see Sokolksi.
Joseph, Greek Patriarch 210
Julian, Apostate 6
Julian, Bishop 102
Justin I, Byzantine Emperor 14
Justin II, Byzantine Emperor 105
Justinian, Byzantine Emperor 8, 14, 18, 102, 106, 107, 110
Justinian II, Byzantine Emp. 18

Kaloyan, Bulgarian Tzar, see Ivanitza.
Kambourolou, A. Ivanovitch 320
Kantardjieff, Pascal 387
Kapelan 302
Kara-Feyzi 235
Kara Manaf Ibrahim 239
Kara-Moustapha, Grand Vizier 239, 266, 267
Kara-Osmanoglou 239
Karatheodori 304, 411, 412, 427
Karaveloff, Liuben 325, 326, 355, 356 375
Karoleff, R. 315
Kasimir, Jan, King of Poland 231
Keremektchieff 363
Kleobus 358
Komilovitch 227
Kossuth 350
Koussevitch, T., Metropolitan of Stara-Zagora 459
Kouza 389
Kovatcheff, Joseph 314, 373
Kovatcheff 365
Kraikoff, Jako 280
Krakra, Voyvoda 138, 140
Kroum, Bulgarian Prince 21, 22, 37, 58, 115, 160, 438
Krusteff, Naiden 262, 263, 264
Krustevitch 310, 313, 314, 322, 323, 359, 370, 371, 423, 427, 430, 447
Kulin, Ban of Bosnia 83
Kyutchuk-Ali 238

Lala-Shahin 246
Leibnitz 287
Leo, Diaconus 8, 138
Leo III the Isaurian, Byzantine Emperor 6, 111, 112
Leo V, Byzantine Emperor 14, 15
Leo VI, Byzantine Emperor 15
Leon, Cardinal 27
Leopold, Emperor of Austria 266
Lesnovski, Gavril 73
Lewis, German Emperor 32
Liloff, Ivan 287
Lim 307
Lobanoff, Prince Rostovski 379, 414, 415
Lock 287
Long, Dr. A. L. 371, 449, 450, 455
Louis XIV, King of France 266, 274
Luther, Reformer 60, 85

MacGahan, J. A. 318, 450, 452, 453, 454
Magazinovitch 387, 392
Mahmoud Roushatli 238
Mahmoud II, Sultan 239, 295, 334, 335, 367, 405
Malalla 36, 93, 94
Mamartcheff, George 341, 345, 346
Mancloff, An. 326
Mantcheff, D. 373
Manuel Comnenus 149
Manuel Corinthos 185
Marcian, Byzantine Emperor 101
Margaritha 151
Maria, Serbian Princess 131
Maria Theresa 267

page
Maria, Tzaritza 142
Markanik, Franko 230
Marko, Bogomilian, Bishop 77, 78
Marko, Boyar 195
Maxim 210
Medjid, Sultan 243, 335, 388, 400, 405, 408
Mehmed, Ali 385
Mehmed, Kabruzli, Vizier 378
Mehmed, Sokolovitch 182
Mehmed, Vizier (a Bulgarian) 182
Menshikoff, Prince 271
Methodius, Slav reformer 33, 38
Michael, the Brave 227, 228, 229
Michael, son of Tzar Simeon 130
Michael, Jupan 157
Michael, Prince 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389
Michael Paphlagonian, Byzantine Emperor 105, 152
Michael Slavesien 115
Michailoff, Stoyan 325
Michailovski, N. 310, 311, 313, 314, 315, 324, 370
Miladinoff, Constantine 303, 375
Miladinoff, Dimiter 303, 313, 314
Milosh, Prince 382
Miloutin, see Stephan Miloutin
Mironovitch, Nikolai 387
Mishaïkoff, Dr. 318, 407
Mithad Pasha 443, 444, 445, 447, 455, 456, 461, 463
Mohammed II, Sultan 9, 162, 168, 171, 177, 183, 203, 220, 222, 372
Moltke 289
Momtchiloff, Iv 310, 313, 315, 322
Moren 112
Moskopolites, Constantine 187
Mourad, Son of Medjid 167
Mourad, Sultan 169
Mourad II, Sultan 181, 455
Mouteff, D., Dr. 315, 324, 370, 371
Mouteff, Merchant 295

page
Naom 33, 38, 117, 187
Napoleon III 415
Natchevitch, Gregory 326, 374
Nathanael, Metropolitan of Plovdiv 440
Nazarius, Catharist Bishop 79, 89, 90, 93
Neitcheff, V. 326, 370
Neman, King of Serbia see Stephan Neman
Neophyte Bosveli 314, 401, 403, 406
Neophyte of Rilo 191, 294, 295, 296, 297, 302, 310, 311, 321, 324, 359, 369
Nestoritza Voyvoda 138
Nicephorus, Byzantine Emperor 126
Nicephorus Phocas, Byzantine Emperor 8, 15, 115, 116, 129, 130, 144
Nicholas the Mystic, Greek Patriarch 117, 120, 122, 124
Nicholas I, Tzar of Russia 342, 349, 362
Nicholas V, Pope 24, 25, 167
Nicholas, Saint 381
Nicholaus, Greek Patriarch. 80
Nikolitza, Voyvoda 138, 140
Nonos 112

Offenberg 387
Onogost 8, 50
Orchan, Sultan 183
'Osman, Sirdar 233
Osten-Sacken 362
Ourosh, King of Serbia, see Stephan Ourosh

Paissi, Chilendar Monk 216, 217, 225, 280, 282, 285, 287, 288, 289, 290, 302, 310, 311, 322, 399, 424, 430
Paissi, Metropolitan of Plovdiv 228, 412, 436, 437

page
Palaouzoff, N 359, 361, 362
Paleologus, John, Byzantine Emperor 167
Panaret, Metropolitan of Plovdiv 313, 407, 422, 430, 434, 435, 436, 437, 439
Panaret, Metropolitan of Pogonia 363, 387
Panaretoff, St 449
Pandouroff 460
Panitza 373
Partchevitch, Peter 230, 231
Parthenius, Greek Patriarch 213
Parthenius of Nishava 235, 369, 420
Paul, Jupan 157
Pasvanoglou 238
Peitchinovitch, Cyril, Monk 291, 319
Peretz, Chronicler 97
Pericles 103, 194
Peter and Azsen 74, 81, 152
Peter Bogdan 188, 230, 232
Peter of Amiens 60
Peter the Great, Russian Emperor 274, 278
Peter, Jupan 157
Peter, Bulgarian Tzar 42, 43, 58, 71, 72, 74, 82, 126, 130, 137
Petkoff, Botio 310—311, 313, 322
Petroff, H, Ilia 410
Peyatchevitch 232
Phidias 3, 8
Philibeli, Kara-Moustapha 239
Philaretoff, G. 318
Philip, Sakelarius 304
Philip, Totio 351, 352
Philipoff 418
Photinoff, D. 311, 324, 358, 367
Photius, Greek Patriarch 25
Phrynikos 165
Piccolo Nikola 303, 304
Pierre Bruis, Catharist 80
Pirochanatz 386, 387
Plato 37, 107
Popovitch, V 314
Popovitch, Raino 309, 351
Presiam, Prince 21
Proilo 187
Prantchoff 378
Psychiaris 400
Ptolemy 36
Purlitcheff 313, 324
Purvanoff, Nikola 322, 438

Rakovsky, Sava 191, 310, 322, 325, 344, 351, 353, 355, 356, 359, 384, 385
Rasheieff, V. 387
Radcliffe, Lord 338
Remus 1
Reshid Pasha 335, 336
Riggs, Dr. Elias 324
Romanus Lacapenus 14, 15, 26, 122, 125, 128, 145
Romanus III, Byzantine Emp 105 124
Romulus 1

Sabri Pasha 349
Sakoni Rheiner 76
Salisbury, Lord 456, 457, 461
Samuel, Bulgarian Tzar 43, 48, 72, 74, 81, 116, 126, 131, 132, 133 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 145, 160, 184
Samuel, Greek Patriarch 184
Sapounoff, Grand Master 250
Sapounoff, translator 324
Sava 33
Sava, Serbian Archbishop 50
Savarouna, Voyvode 15
Schuyler, Eugene 450, 452, 453, 454, 459
Sevelian of Cheval 37
Selim II, Sultan 182

page

Selim III, Sultan 186
Seliminski, Dr 263, 407
Shishmanoff, D 326, 365
Shishmanoff, Manol 262
Shishman, Great Boyar 131, 135
Shishman, Ivan, Bulgarian Tzar 44
Shishman III 229
Shopoff, Brothers 387
Shopoff, G 310
Sigismund 168, 169
Sigismund Batorius 227, 228
Sillagi 327
Simeon the Great, Bulgarian Tzâr 7, 23, 25, 34, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 52, 58, 70, 93, 96, 97, 113, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, 131, 134, 135, 137, 145, 160, 372, 438
Simeon, Metropolitan of Varna and Preslav 440, 447
Sirmanoff, S. 313
Slaveikoff, P R. 314, 315, 324, 325, 370, 371, 410, 434, 435 447
Sobieski, John, King of Poland 266
Soimirovitch, Francesco 189, 238
Sokolski, Joseph 420
Solon 8
Sophia 15
Sophocles 8
Sophronius of Vratza 202, 205, 290, 303, 304, 319, 331
Spiridon Father 195, 290
Stambolski, Christo, Dr. 370, 447
Stambouloff, Stephan 326, 356
Stantchoff, George 264
Stephan Bogoridi, see Bogoridi.
Stephan Dragoutin, Serb King 158
Stephan Doushan, Serbian King 158, 160, 246
Stephan Karadja 351, 352, 426
Stephan Karatheodori, see Karatheodori 302

page

Stephan Lazarevitch, Serbian King 169, 179
Stephan Miloutin, Serbian King 158, 160
Stephan Neman, Serbian King 157, 158, 160
Stephan Petrash, Prince of Moldavia 231
Stephan Prvoventchani, Serbian King 158, 160
Stephan Ourosh, Serbian King 160
Stephan of Bourbon 90
Stephan of Laodicea 406
St. Marc de Giraudin 271
Stoyanoff, Christo 326, 370, 371
Stoyanoff, Vassil 328
Stoiko, priest, see Sophronius of Vratza.
Stroudza 392
Stroumski, Dr 370, 407
Svetoslav, Russian Prince 129
Suleyman, Sultan 265

Tales 37
Taptchileshtoff, B. 384
Taptchileshtoff, Christo 480
Tchaluckoff St. 262
Tchalioglou 370
Tchapanoglou 238
Tchartorijki 418, 422
Tchernoovitch, Patriarch of Ipek 252
Tchernorizetz, Chrabre 37, 40, 41
Tcheslav, Jupan 128, 129, 157
Tchomakoff, St, Dr. 313, 370, 407, 410, 413, 422, 423, 430, 434, 446, 447, 460
Theodore, Emperor of Epirus 156
Theodore, Balin 228
Theodosius of Tirnovo 45
Theodosius I, Byzantine Emp 102
Theodosius II, Byzantine Emp 101

page
Theocritus 37
Theophanes, Monk 181
Thucydides 8, 57
Timotheus, Greek Patriarch 210
Tisheff, G 459
Toshkoff, merchant 295, 387
Toshkovitch, merchant 295, 361
Touvenet 271
Trebbel, Bulgarian Prince 21
Tritchkoff, Cosmas 363
Tsamblack, Greogory 45, 49
Tsankoff, Dragan 322, 361, 370, 371, 419, 447, 458, 461
Tserteleff, Prince 459

Vambas, director 187
Vakhin, Jupan 158
Valkan, Jupan 157
Vardalakos, director 187
Vaskidovitch, Emanuel 302, 309
Vatatzes, Emperor of Nicaea 31
Vazoff, Iv., poet 325
Veleff, Philip 324
Velitchkoff, Constantine 325
Venelin, Uri 292, 293, 321, 322
Victor, Metropolitan of Nish 440
Vitanoff 313, 324
Vladimir, Jupan 24

page
Vlad V, Prince of Roumania 220, 222
Vladimir, Bulgarian Prince 57
Vladimir, Russian Prince 48
Vladislav, King of Hungary 169
Vladislav IV, King of Poland 231
Voinikoff, D P. 313, 322, 326, 327
Voloff 360
Voltaire 307
Vovos 134
Vouk 382
Vsegord 15
Vulkovitch, Dr 370

Washburn, Dr., George 450
Wycliffe, John, English Reformer 84, 85

Yakoff, Stamat, Metropolitan of Moldavia 307

Zachari, Jupan 157
Zamoiski, Vladislav 418, 422
Zenon, the Isaurian 6
Zlateff, Tsv. 314
Zoe, Byzantine Empress 105, 121
Zographski, St 315, 326
Zossimos 302

ERRATA

Page		
17	greek	Greek
	given, away	given away
18	greek	Greek
	in known	is known
19	turkish	Turkish
20	on the Severiani	or the Severiani
	etablished	established
21	Kroums	Kroum's
22	Slaws	Slavs
	were	was
	Empires	Empire's
23	bulgarian	Bulgarian
	emperor	Emperor
	patriarph	Patriarch
	greek	Greek
	roman	Roman
24	slav	Slav
	great, Jupans	Great Jupans
	chereei	*Chereei*
25	aprehensive	apprehensive
	slavic	Slavic
	trough	through
	Simeons	Simeon's
26	greek	Greek
	european	European
	would regain	might regain
	greek	Greek
28	loeding corre- spondence	leading corre- spondence
	Romes	Rome's
	whowever	whoever
	french	French
	Innocents	Innocent's
	Saint-Siége	Saint-Siège
29	„ Tirnova »	« Tirnova »
	enthousiastic	enthusiastic
30	England thother side	England, on the other side
	trough	through
	greek	Greek
31	unanimonsly	unanimously
	turkish	Turkish
32	doncieved	conceived
	safety; but	safety, but

Page		
35	war to able win	was able to win
	tranlations	translations
36	wiston	writers
	Syllogisnis	Syllogisms
	Chrysostom both	Chrysostom, both
	authors	author's
	compared of selections	compiled from selections
37	Bulgarias	Bulgaria's
	countrys	country's
	Simeons	Simeon's.
	relatee	related
38	St. Navum	St. Naoum
	Simeons	Simeon's
	slavic	Slavic
	Gilferding	Hilferding
	Gecheskaga	Grecheskaya
39	Simeons	Simeon's
40	greek	Greek
	te names	the names
41	Simeon	Simeon's
42	is he best carac- terism	is the best charac- terization
	ward of reproach	word of roproach
44	Caloyans	Caloyan's
	whe shall	we shall
	compited	compiled
45	Mitropolitan	Metropolitan
	Marter	Master
	panages	passages
	cendered	rendered
46	greatfulness	gratefulness
	Kistorii	*Istorii*
47	Poyars	Boyars
	in gold; whose	in gold, whose
48	prevoiled	prevailed
	be Slavic litera- ture	become Slavic literature
49	books, the re- quest	books. The re- quest
	Allkussian	Allrussian
	refrains	refrain
	firmly	firmly

Page		
49	is not derived	is not denied
50	a groat from Ochrida take rize	a great deal from Ochrida lake rise
	la litérature	*la littérature*
51	Xenopal	Xenopol
52	thirty five	thirty-five
53	undeviable	undeniable
54	languge. The nucleus	language - the nucleus
55	tho world modeled panagyrics	the World modelled panegyrics
56	peoples assembly Zeta Rascia	people's assembly Zeta, Rascia
57	Slaws Presla ancient-Bulgarian	Slavs Preslan Ancient Bulgarian
58	befound	be found
59	sectariars churches, teachings	sectarians churches; the teachings
	disappointments	disappointment
	slavic	Slavic
	result is all that	result is that all that
60	userpers forrunner	usurpers forer unner
61	creater be endowed brothers goodness	Creator He endowed brother's goodness
	République Italiennes	Républiques Italiennes
62	thirly-five	thirty-five
63	alured Lords Prayer	allured Lord's Prayer
64	souls prison mans passions Slaves	soul's prison man's passions slaves
	Feachings	*Teachings*
65	the were the allowed they would to them	they were they allowed they bowed to them
66	thrifly	thrifty
	indespensable	indispensable
67	delinate	delineate
68	doctrin. » [1]	doctrine. » [1]

Page		
69	invertigaters mans mind	investigators man's mind
	NewTestaments	NewTestament's
	lifes theory	life's theory
	mythes	myths
	mans	man's
	is such	*in such*
70	it was anti-national	it was not anti-national
	slavic	Slavic
	panages	passages
71	wo hao profital ofits Byzantine degnity	who had profiting of their Byzantine dignity
72	Bulgarias devired	Bulgaria's derived
73	Simeons them could write	Simeon's them who could write
74	mans fellowers Peters	man's followers Peter's
75	*dependus préservés d'Hérésie*	*défendus préservés de l'Hérésie*
76	he Macedonian specially	the Macedonian especially
77	discerned Sombardy,	discussed Lombardy
78	reetablishment	re-establishment
79	for zeal	for their zeal
80	o bowing	ot bowing
81	Samuels admunating Nothing said	Samuel's culminating Nothing is said
82	fo immediatly nov Borilo	of immediately nor Boril
83	Hesychats teaching compened	Essichati teachings confessed
84	Bogomils flog of freedom indirekt	Bogomil's flag of freedom indirect
85	payed Thest rongest source otfait Vesselovski	paved The strongest source of faith Vassilovski

Page		
85	that is forgot	that it forgot
88	them Achille	them. Achille
	worm out	worn out
	datos	datas
89	Bulgarias	Bulgaria's
90	italian	Italian
	listners	listeners
	ones	one's
92	Cæserea	Cæsarea
93	christian	Christian
	then heroes	their heroes
	in unknown	is unknown
94	resurrection of the dead	of the resurrection of the dead
	Malallas	Malalla's
95	lifes	life's
	Kings	King's
	sons	son's
96	weathers	weather's
	calender	calendar
	Simeons	Simeon's
	singspraises	sings praises
97	Luitpand	Luitprand
98	become	became
	fasts	feasts
	obstained	abstained
	extensibely	extensively
	Corma	Cosma
	Borils	Boril's
	as that in the	as that of the
99	Rome and abroad	home and abroad

Page		
100	Samuels Plan	Samuel's Plan
101	Nicea	Nicæa
	decissions	decisions
	Occommenical	Oecumenical
102	prosey	proxy
103	Thraccians	Thracians
	impoint	imprint
104	homogenity	homogeneity
	homogenious	homogeneous
	archons	archonts
	archtons	archonts
105	Empires triumphes	Empire's triumphes
106	focused	focussed
	Championsship	Championship
	againsti ts	against its
	economys	economy's
	thether	thither
	Empires	Empire's
108	pray to them, worship them as to God.	worship them, pray to them as to God
	after posing	after losing
109	~~corporations~~ the	~~corporations~~ The
	Gods	God's
110	enemys	enemy's
	ecclesiartical	ecclesiastical
111	Archon	Archont