

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers

***In Russian, East European
and Central Asian Studies***

Literacy and Reading in 19th Century Bulgaria

By Krassimira Daskalova

**Paper No. 12
May 1997**

***The Henry M. Jackson
School of International Studies
The University of Washington***

Literacy and Reading in Nineteenth Century Bulgaria

By Krassimira Daskalova

The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies
University of Washington
1997

About the author of this issue.....

Krassimira Daskalova teaches the history of the book and reading at the Center for Theory and History of Culture, St. Kliment Ohridski University in Sofia, Bulgaria. She has published on different problems of the cultural history of Bulgaria: the role of intelligentsia (and teachers in particular), the education and literary activities of women, issues of literacy and reading, and other subjects.

ISSN 1078-5639

© Jackson School of International Studies

University of Washington, 1996.

Editor: Sabrina P. Ramet

Managing Editor: Joan McCarter

Assistant Editor: Charles Sabatos

Business Manager: Marion Cook

Editorial Council: Herbert J. Ellison, James R. Felak, Judith A. Thornton,
Daniel C. Waugh

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers in Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies provide a forum for the rapid dissemination of current scholarly research on the regions indicated by the title. Publications include papers from symposia and monographs that may be too long for most journals but too short to appear in book form. Subscriptions and special orders are available.

Submissions in the field of Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies are considered for publication. Articles should be of substantial length—approximately 40-100 pages, including endnotes. All transliteration should conform to Library of Congress rules. Submission on disk is requested upon acceptance. Submissions should be sent in triplicate to the address below, with attention to Sabrina P. Ramet, editor. Scholars interested in submitting works for consideration are asked to obtain a copy of the style guide before submitting their work.

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers
Jackson School of International Studies
Box 353650
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3650
(206) 543-4852
treadgld@u.washington.edu

About this series

The *Donald W. Treadgold Papers* publication series was created to honor a great teacher and great scholar. Donald W. Treadgold was professor of history and international studies at the University of Washington from 1949 to 1993. During that time, he wrote seven books, one of which — *Twentieth Century Russia* — went into eight editions. He was twice editor of *Slavic Review*, the organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, and received the AAASS Award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies, as well as the AAASS Award for Distinguished Service. Professor Treadgold molded several generations of Russian historians and contributed enormously to the field of Russian history. He was, in other ways as well, an inspiration to all who knew him.

The *Treadgold Papers* series was created in 1993 on the occasion of Professor Treadgold's retirement, on the initiative of Professor Daniel Waugh. Professor Treadgold passed away in December 1994. The series is dedicated to the memory of a great man, publishing papers in those areas that were close to his heart.

Sabrina P. Ramet
Editor

Preface

There have appeared, during the last 25-30 years, a number of historical works on literacy and on the modern transition to mass literacy in particular. The intensified interest in the history of literacy and of elementary education in general is largely due to the appreciation of its important links with social change and modernization. The publications on literacy result from either individual or team research and statistical analyses.¹ A variety of documents used in the pursuit of this research: brides' signatures on marriage records, signatures on wills, petitions, job applications and applications for the granting of pensions, documents of land transactions, military recruit records and criminal records, and the official census data of more recent times. Following the initial enthusiasm over this type of research, revisionist critiques of the "literacy myth" have appeared, pleading for a more critical attitude and specification of the social context of acquiring literacy and education, as well as for a closer relation between theoretical sociological reasoning and detailed historical research.² Research on literacy and education is associated with the interest in readers and reading, popular culture and literary history. Parallel research in these intertwined fields strives to create a more accurate picture of the level of education and the reading habits of the various social strata in different historical epochs and national contexts.

While Bulgarian historiography abounds in works on the history of education, research on the history of literacy is scanty. What is available is based upon a small number of sources and refers to limited geographic areas or particular communities.³ As far as the Bulgarian mediaeval kingdom and the Ottoman period are concerned, this omission may be attributed to the scarcity of sources. There is no valid reason for the subsequent period. Though official statistics about Bulgaria are available since the end of the nineteenth century⁴, no systematic research has been carried out on the level of literacy of the population and the connections between literacy and the demand for books (and the use of books). One may only point to the pioneering publications by Georgi Minchev and Kiril Popov, in which literacy was discussed in other contexts, but no one has followed up on these preliminary considerations.⁵

The present publication attempts to give a general outline of the level of literacy and the attitude toward books and reading

among various strata of the Bulgarian population during the nineteenth century. In surveying this subject, I draw upon available statistics as well as upon literary sources; the latter, though fragmentary and "impressionistic", contribute to creating a livelier picture of the issues under consideration.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, an economic and cultural renaissance began in the Bulgarian lands under Ottoman domination. It took place in the context of economic decay in the Ottoman empire and some attempts at reform, and was parallel with the accelerating movement for cultural and political emancipation of the other Balkan nations. For the Bulgarians, this was an epoch of national revival, initiated with an educational movement (for the opening of public schools and the secularization of education), and manifested further in the striving for emancipation from Greek religious and cultural authority, and, ultimately, in the struggles for the attainment of political independence.

Various factors were at work in the evolution of education and literacy in nineteenth-century Bulgarian society. The role of the Orthodox Church in stimulating literacy and education among the Bulgarians may not have been as great as that of Protestantism in the West, but it was considerable. In fact, during the first centuries of foreign domination, it was all-important. Religious institutions (monasteries and churches) were the preservers of the Slavic scriptural tradition. Their activity kept alive, though on a reduced scale, the written culture which was to begin a new life in the course of the nineteenth century. Moreover, the Orthodox Church in the Balkans (including the Bulgarian lands) promoted education, which it considered an important means for upholding the Christian faith under the Ottomans. The so-called cell-schools in churches and monasteries were the only centers of intellectual life during the first four centuries of Ottoman domination, while monks and priests in the role of teachers were, in fact, the only teachers available. Later, some nationalist Bulgarian priests were among the first to advocate Enlightenment ideas and to stress the need for educating "the people" in order to improve their general situation. Thus, for the Bulgarians, the Orthodox Church played a role similar to that of the Catholic Church in the early Middle Ages in the West.⁶ It was the only institution capable of transmitting the mediaeval written tradition through the ages of Ottoman domination.

The socio-economic preconditions rank first and foremost among the impulses for the development of education. A "bourgeoisie" of merchants and artisans made its appearance

and asserted itself with the flourishing of crafts in some Bulgarian towns, especially on the two sides of the Balkan mountains (Triavna, Gabrovo, Zheravna, Kotel, Koprivshitsa, Panagiurishte, Karlovo, Kalofer), and the expansion of trade to distant Ottoman (and European) markets. With economic development and the growth of towns, the necessity of rational (secular) knowledge came to be felt more strongly. The growing financial capacities of some prospering town communities translated into the willingness of the townships (and "nastoiatelstva", i.e. school supervising boards) as well as individual philanthropists, to promote education. To this one should add the important pioneering role of rich Bulgarian merchants in merchant colonies abroad (especially in Russia and Wallachia) in supporting education. In the absence of a national state, the Bulgarian town councils ("obshtini") were of primary importance in setting up and financing schools, in procuring teachers and supplying textbooks. (They even preserved this role for some time after the establishment of an independent Bulgarian state in 1878.) Contacts with the more advanced West also increased the perceived need for education; an example was set by more advanced neighboring nations, primarily the Greeks. On a "micro" level, attitudes of the parents were changing in favor of education of their offspring. Education came to be considered a precondition for economic prosperity in the spirit of utilitarian precepts such as: "one who learns will succeed." Unlike in the West, one cannot speak in the Balkans about vested interests in limiting literacy and withholding education from "the people."⁷ Rather, the opposite was true; the attainment of progress by "enlightening" and educating "the people" is a dominant idea of Balkan national revivals. Nationalism was a major stimulus for the development of the educational network. Schools were conceived by Bulgarian national leaders as an important means for achieving the double national goal of religious-cultural emancipation from Greek influence, and eventually attaining political independence.⁸ Among the favorable factors for the growth of literacy were the spread of book printing in the beginning of nineteenth century, and the appearance of periodicals in Bulgarian (in the 1840s).

Literacy

Generally speaking, literacy emerged early in the agrarian epoch, but the transition from restricted literacy to mass (popular) literacy occurred during the industrial period (seventeenth to the nineteenth century), when education became a major precondition for national homogenization and centraliza-

tion of the nation-state.⁹ Because of the fragmentary character of the sources, one can judge literacy in different historical epochs and different geographical areas only in indirect ways. To a certain extent, the level of literacy of the population can be established on the basis of the ability to sign official documents. What is understood under "literacy" also varies. In more recent times, literacy is the ability both to read and to write. As demonstrated by the historians of education, for a long time the abilities to read and write were not acquired simultaneously, but one after the other, and a reading ability did not necessarily entail the ability to write. Besides, there were levels in the mastering of both skills, and hence variations in the understanding and interpretation of texts by literate people. Literacy thus has both a quantitative and qualitative aspect, though the latter is difficult to measure, especially for distant historical epochs, for which data about reading and writing practices are rarely preserved.

A few words about what will be understood as "literacy" in the following exposition: The use of the terms literate/illiterate in Bulgarian has the same implications as that of the Greek terms *grammatos/agrammatos*.¹⁰ As in Greek and Latin, the terms have a narrower and a wider meaning. One is said to be literate if he/she knows the letters and how to use them, i.e., knows how to read and write. While "illiterate" means just the opposite, it also means in a figurative sense an "uncultured person" (with a negative value connotation). In spite of the existence of a written language and the growing system of public schools, Bulgarian society was characterized by a predominantly oral, "folk" culture, even in the nineteenth century. In this context, a literate person meant someone who could read but not necessarily write. For someone to be considered literate, it was practically enough that he/she could read "a little" and recite passages from the Holy Scripture or another (primarily religious) book. In a milieu of illiterate people, memorization and recitation in public were considered equivalent to literacy; thus a semi-literate person could be considered as "*okat*" (literally, "seeing"). The word is characteristic in that while literally it refers to the ability to see, it has come to mean figuratively someone who is knowledgeable, this being expressly connected with the ability to read (as opposed to being able to write). Initially the terms for literacy were restricted to the literate meaning, connected with reading and writing, while the wider figurative meaning (of "uncultured") developed only later, when the stratum of literate persons, or intelligentsia, became wider, and a sort of class division of the society along

educational lines occurred.¹¹ People who belonged to the educated stratum could now look down upon the illiterate majority and consider it as deficient not only in literacy, but also in accomplishment and "culture" in general.

Within the prevailingly traditional Bulgarian society of the initial centuries of the Ottoman domination, opinions were voiced about the necessity for education and the civilization of manners. The so-called *damaskins*¹² of the time contain arguments about the utility of education and even appeals for teaching in the vernacular (instead of Old Church Slavonic and Greek). It was argued that this would free the people from ignorance and from the miserable state in which they were plunged, and would earn them a place among the "civilized" peoples. One of the most ardent advocates of these ideas during the eighteenth century was Iosif Bradati. In a number of adaptations and appendixes to books translated from Greek, he promoted the idea of the spiritual life to be found in books and reading.¹³ In his *Istoriia Slavianobolgarskaia* (*History of the Slav Bulgarians*) which contained the first Bulgarian national "program" (1762), Father Paisii of Khilendar exhorted the Bulgarians to read the old chronicles and thereby enrich their knowledge and cultivate their minds. He pointed to mass illiteracy as one of the reasons why the few educated were ashamed of their Bulgarian origin and their language.¹⁴ Sofronii of Vratsa noted some decades later that even priests were illiterate and knew little, and that they envied him because he was "learned."¹⁵ Most of the Bulgarian national revival activists pointed to illiteracy, ignorance and lack of "enlightenment" of the Bulgarian people as reasons for their "slave" condition within the Ottoman empire. Thus Neofit Bozveli expressed his wish to save his people from "misleading superstition" and "tartar-dark ignorance", and to show them the way to "redemptive, immortal, blissful Enlightenment." He advised Bulgarians not to waste time but to follow the example of the enlightened peoples.¹⁶ In general, the advocates of popular education saw literacy and education as a means of national self-assertion and a sign of equality with other societies.

During the initial centuries of Ottoman domination, there were only cell-schools in the monasteries, rooted in the mediaeval tradition.¹⁷ Then, in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, an extension of the cell-schools developed in *metohs* (outlets of the monasteries in towns), and in the churches in towns and villages; monastic education thus went out of the monasteries and was extended to the laity.¹⁸ Private cell-schools

were also opened in the seventeenth and the eighteenth century, where some laymen (craftsmen, icon-painters, etc.) were teaching alongside priests. The first communal cell-schools appeared toward the end of the eighteenth century; their number grew in the first decades of the nineteenth century, attesting to a tendency of transformation of the schools into public institutions. By examining the curricula and the teaching materials and taking a look at the teachers, one can discern a tendency for the secularization of education. It was already under way in the seventeenth century, to judge from the already-mentioned expansion of education among townfolk and the rural population in accordance with the needs of the urban guilds and the rural corporations.¹⁹ While the *taxidiot-teacher*²⁰ and Church priest-teacher were dominant during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the figure of the lay teacher became more common in the first decades of the nineteenth century. This was most often a person with another occupation (e.g. icon-painter or artisan, often a tailor) that could be combined with school teaching. In the poorer and more backward regions of the country, cell-schools continued to exist as an educational institution until quite late. In total, 384 schools of the cell-type left a trace in the historical records prior to the establishment of the Bulgarian nation-state in 1878.²¹

In order to obtain an idea about the kind of literacy received by the common Bulgarian of the national revival epoch, one has to consider the elementary schools, especially what was taught there and the effectiveness of teaching. In the cell-schools the pupils acquired the ability to read. Church books—the Book of the Hours, the Psalm-Book, the Deeds of the Apostles, the Prayer-book, etc., but also *damaskins* and *sborniks*²²—were used for educational purposes. It often happened that the pupils only learned to recite by heart passages from the various religious texts, whose meaning they did not actually understand. They were often trained to give ready answers to standard questions by consulting the Holy Scripture. Education was thus based upon memorization of texts in the main, in accordance with the oral culture which had prevailed in the Bulgarian lands throughout the eighteenth century and which lasted even into the nineteenth century. Starting from the end of the eighteenth century new subjects were introduced in the curricula, first arithmetic, then (in the first half of the nineteenth century) history and geography, and in some cases grammar, “good manners,” and elementary natural science.²³

The extent of literacy received in the cell type of school

(prevalent until the 1840s) is not easy to assess. If one may credit the opinion of Petur Beron, author of the first Bulgarian secular primer, the "poor children" could hardly read a few passages from the Holy Scripture even if they had passed 6-7 years in the cell-school.²⁴ One can read similar pronouncements in other sources of this epoch;²⁵ thus Iliia Bluskov, who was a teacher for many years, wrote that until the appearance of Petur Beron's "Fish primer" (called so after the picture of a fish on the cover), the cell schools had only Russian primers (*Chervenoslóvi*) at their disposal, and the children could only learn from them a few sentences of religious instruction (like "Be God-abiding") or of the "good manners" type. To cite Bluskov: "There was nothing interesting, nothing attractive in them, that could provoke the curiosity of the pupil. Literacy was regarded as a routine work and the primers were like a lifeless word; the pupil could learn from them only how to write his name and that sufficed."²⁶ The small achievements of the cell school were due not only to the religious contents of the school books and the deficiencies of the teaching method, but more importantly, to the fact that reading was practiced in Old Church-Slavonic²⁷ or Greek, not in the Bulgarian vernacular. Yet, as pointed out before, *damaskins* in the vernacular were also used in the cell-schools, probably for advanced-level students.²⁸ The role of the *damaskin* literature (and of Josif Bradati in particular) in the propaganda of the vernacular for the teaching and the writing of books, stands out graphically in this context. The early apostle of the Bulgarian national revival—Sofronii of Vratsa—also advocated the idea of education in the "simple Bulgarian language" and stressed how important this was for the "spiritual advance" of the "simple-minded and ignorant Bulgarian people."²⁹ However, thirty years later, the language of teaching in the Bulgarian schools was still problematic judging from the fact that in the Foreword to his "Hristoithia ili blagonravie", published in 1837, the famous Bulgarian Hellenist Raino Popovich still felt the need to argue the advantages of secular education and the use of the native language, parallel with Greek.³⁰ In spite of the generally small achievements of cell-school education, it formed the first generation of Bulgarian revival activists, including figures like Paisii of Khilendar and Sofronii of Vratsa, who did, of course, make great progress by way of self-education.³¹

Starting from the second decade of the nineteenth century, many Bulgarians attended the Greek and Helleno-Bulgarian schools with a general humanist orientation. The interest in

Greek schools and education continued until the 1840s and was in line with the general orientation of the contemporary Bulgarian society toward Greece.³² The Greek schools played an important, though somewhat ambiguous, role in the education of the Bulgarians.³³ In the absence of good secular education in vernacular Bulgarian, the Greek education was the only alternative, and served as a transmitter of modern western ideas. But literacy in another language could not be achieved as easily and effectively as literacy in one's own language. Thus, Liuben Karavelov, one of the most prominent Bulgarian revivalist intellectuals—writer, journalist and revolutionary—reminisced about the way teaching was conducted in the Greek school in Plovdiv: "Of course, none of us understood what he was compelled to learn by heart. . . . The teachers themselves did not require much from the pupils."³⁴ Most important, the Bulgarian national activists saw in Greek education and cultural influence in general a threat to the burgeoning national feeling. On the other hand, and quite paradoxically, Greek education transmitted the national idea to the Bulgarians; the first generation of the Bulgarian nationalist intelligentsia was largely educated in Greek schools. And it was from these schools that some Bulgarians took over the Bell-Lankaster (or allilodidactical, or "mutual") system of education (well-suited for popular education with minimal means) and developed a new type of school – the so-called new-Bulgarian or "mutual" schools.³⁵ The Gabrovo school, opened in 1835, seems to be the first Bulgarian school of this type, though the teaching method had been in use in some Helleno-Bulgarian schools before. The Gabovo school was established with the financial support of Bulgarian merchants from the émigré colonies in Odessa (Vassil Aprilov, N. S. Palauzov) and Bucharest (the Mustakov brothers); Neofit Rilski learned the allilodidactical method in Bucharest and prepared the necessary teaching materials (wall-tablets, etc.) to become the first new-Bulgarian teacher.³⁶ The school became a place for the preparation of teachers in the mutual method (and for further education of teachers from *daskals*).

Elementary (of the "mutual" type) education in the nineteenth century could continue more or less years, varying especially between urban and village elementary schools. In urban schools as well as in better equipped village schools, it continued for three to five years. But in most of the village schools it lasted only two years.³⁷ Though the curricula differed and the teachers had an uneven preparation, the elementary schools of the "modern" (mutual) type succeeded on the whole in giving the

pupils literacy of an elementary kind. Secular knowledge was taught in these new-Bulgarian elementary schools: reading, writing and arithmetic; in some of the schools some history, geography and Bulgarian grammar were also on the curriculum.³⁸ This is how one of the best-educated Bulgarian teachers of the time—Sava Filaretov—formulated the goal of the elementary education in a program for a village school in 1859: “In the first three years the pupil will be taught to read fluently and to write correctly, so that, when he/she leaves the mutual school, he/she will be prepared for the more advanced school.”³⁹ The Teachers’ Assemblies, organized at a later date by the Bulgarian Exarchate (i.e. the supreme body of the independent Bulgarian Church) tried to unify the curricula of elementary schools and to introduce educational qualifications for teachers.⁴⁰ The curriculum adopted by the Assembly in Shumen in 1873, for example, envisioned a year of elementary education with teaching of the following characteristic mixture of religious and secular subjects: “writing in the vernacular, history of the Holy Lands, Bulgarian history, the four arithmetic operations, general notions about geography, reading in [Old Church] Slavonic, prayers, exercises in writing, the foundations of Bulgarian grammar, and Church singing.”⁴¹

In reconstructing the state of the education and its problems, one may cite some contemporary opinions. According to the highly critical opinion of Liuben Karavelov, “We still do not have an adequate system of teaching,” especially as “various sorts of systems [are being introduced]; one imitates the Greeks, the French, and the Russians. Such subjects are being taught which were rejected by sound minds a long time ago.”⁴² The opinions of some teachers seem to be biased in exactly the opposite direction, when they eloquently spoke about their pedagogical efforts and the achievements of their pupils. The travelers who happened to traverse the Bulgarian lands and the foreign missionaries who worked there made quite favorable observations about the level of the Bulgarian schools and education, though one should not exclude the influence of low expectations upon their judgment.⁴³

Twenty-nine Catholic and several Protestant schools were opened after the Crimean war in 1853-1856 and also contributed to the elementary education of the Bulgarians.⁴⁴ Though the Catholic schools were several times more numerous than the Protestant schools, the Bulgarians considered the latter to be superior. Town notables from Eski Zaara (Stara Zagora), where a

Protestant school for girls existed since 1863, and Plovdiv, where a Protestant school for boys existed since 1859, preferred to send their offspring to them. More Protestant schools were founded later, including high schools, some of which continued to function in the present century. These schools used superior teaching materials and laboratory implements, and introduced the students to a different culture, broadening their horizon and understanding. The role of the American missionaries was great, and, in conditions of scarcity of books, much more so; this role included supplying textbooks and other materials for teaching purposes; translations and publishing of books in Bulgarian; promotion of Bulgarian education in Macedonia, etc.⁴⁵

The class schools, which built upon the mutual schools and had between two and five grades above them, were founded during the 1840s by the first generation of Bulgarians educated in Russia. These schools were the highest type of schools prior to Liberation in 1878.⁴⁶ In the more educationally advanced areas the "mutual" method was replaced by some school teachers in the end of the 1860s and the beginning of the 1870s with the so-called "sound" method.⁴⁷ The class schools received great material support from the public and attracted the best prepared Bulgarian teachers. A great many of the teachers in these schools were educated abroad, in high schools and universities in Russia, Greece, Romania, Serbia, Constantinople, as well as in Western Europe. Among the institutions where Bulgarians who would later become "class teachers" were educated, one should especially mention the American Robert College in Constantinople and the French Catholic Lyceum in Galata-Sarai as well as the College in Bebek and in Constantinople. The class schools with their well-prepared teachers should be especially noted for stimulating the reading habits of their students. In general, their tasks went far beyond the teaching of elementary literacy.⁴⁸

One may judge the level of literacy of the Bulgarian population in the nineteenth century (before statistics) from the number of schools and teachers, and from ratio between these and the population. There is, first of all, data about the number of villages and towns with secular schools (until 1878).⁴⁹

As can be seen from the table, from the time of the opening of the first secular schools until the establishment of the independent Bulgarian state in 1878, the school network grew more than sevenfold. Especially noteworthy was the growth of village schools. From this one can draw conclusions about the spread of educational activities over the territory.

Table 1

Year	Villages	Towns	Total
1835	175	33	208
1855	535	58	583
1860	740	67	807
1865	917	69	986
1870	1142	72	1214
1875	1435	72	1504

Though exact data on the number of schools are lacking, there were certainly more schools than communities with a school, as communities with larger populations had more than one school. According to the estimates of Angel Dimitrov, prior to Liberation the Bulgarians had about two thousand schools (excluding the forty-two schools of the Bulgarian emigration in Romania). Assuming that the whole population was about four million in the end of the 1870s,⁵⁰ the same author concludes that there was one school per two thousand Bulgarians. There were more schools on a per capita basis in the more advanced regions; thus, there was one school per five hundred forty-five inhabitants in Plovdiv and its surroundings, and one school per four hundred fifty inhabitants in the region of Shumen. The respective figures for Dobruja and the northwestern Bulgarian lands are six hundred and six hundred sixty. The figures are more unfavorable for Macedonia and some parts of Thracia, where the number of Bulgarian schools was much smaller.⁵¹ But it is better not to attribute too much importance to purely quantitative measures as they may refer to a very different state of education and conditions of the school network (e.g., a school may have existed for a short period of time, and may have had a small number of teachers and pupils).

It was very difficult for the Enlightenment idea of equality of the sexes to assert itself in the traditional Bulgarian society of the nineteenth century.⁵² The contemporary Bulgarian press is replete with passionate polemics for and against education for young girls. Thus, the influential newspaper *Makedoniia* and the journal *Uchilishte* ("School") published a series of materials on women, emphasizing their "miserable and debased situation" in public life, compared to men. It was remarked that the neglect of the intellectual advance of the women would create impediments to the progress and the welfare of the nation.⁵³ A number of articles in the revivalist press described the evolution of the idea of

women's emancipation in Western societies.⁵⁴ The movement for the setting up of universities for women in Russia was also mentioned with a remark, that in general "the education of women in the Eastern countries is making slow progress, as slow as the progress of the rest of their welfare in general."⁵⁵ Education and instruction were considered to be a major means for improving the situation of the women in the patriarchal Bulgarian society of the time.⁵⁶ The dynamics of Bulgarian women's education can be sketched thus: the first secular school for girls (of the mutual type) was founded in 1841; there were at the beginning of the Crimean War (in 1853) thirty-five such schools and ninety in 1878, when independence was attained as a result of a Russian-Turkish War. The first school for girls of the "class" type was established in 1856, and there were nineteen such schools in the eve of Liberation.⁵⁷

Besides the public (communal) schools, there existed Sunday schools and, starting from the mid-1890s, secular private elementary schools. The first Sunday schools were set up by American Protestant missionaries in the 1860s.⁵⁸ In fact, this was the most popular type of missionary education among Bulgarians; the number of Sunday schools (and the number of their students) was greater than the number of the regular Protestant schools.⁵⁹ To the possibilities of improving one's proficiency in reading and writing, one should also add self-education.

A new situation for elementary education arose with the establishment of an independent Bulgarian state. Article 78 of the very liberal Bulgarian constitution, adopted in 1879, stipulated the introduction of obligatory (and free of charge) primary education for the whole population of the Kingdom. Article 383 of the Organic Statutes made a similar provision for Eastern Rumelia.⁶⁰ But the burden of the support of the elementary schools was initially placed entirely upon the communities. It was only with the adoption of Zhivkov's law of 1891 (named after Georgi Zhivkov, Minister of Education at the time) that the Bulgarian state assumed responsibility for part of the support of the primary (elementary) schools.

Though the Constitution of 1879 proclaimed obligatory and free elementary education, there were great difficulties in the actual organization and support of the elementary schools, due to insufficient means of the communities responsible for them. Still, the school network made substantial progress during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. According to census statistics, there existed 2,747 popular (i.e., elementary) schools in school

year 1890/91; in 1895/96 there were already 3,140, plus 1,445 private elementary schools for a total of 4,585 schools; for 1900/901 the respective figures are 2,946 popular schools plus 1,533 private schools or 4,479 total.⁶¹ The curricula of these schools were not very different from those prior to the attainment of independence. They included primarily instruction in reading and writing, the basics of arithmetic and geometry, teaching of national history and geography, religion and a bit of "natural history."⁶²

Regarding literacy, one should note the following tendencies.⁶³ The initial process of spreading literacy took place in the framework of an overwhelmingly peasant society. Rural areas were as a rule more backward in education than urban ones, and motivation for education among the peasant was weaker. Attendance at schools in the villages depended strongly on the agrarian cycle. It decreased in the busy seasons, as children took part in agricultural work together with the adults. Attendance at the village schools was more regular in winter, but this applies mostly for the boys, while the girls were engaged in domestic work (especially spinning and weaving). In contrast, town schools were better attended by both boys and girls; hence the effectiveness of education was greater, at least until the incipient industrialization took its share of children's labor. The effectiveness of teaching depended also on preparation of the teachers. This varied significantly in the course of the nineteenth century: there were among the teachers autodidacts and those educated in the cell-schools, and people who held diplomas from the best European universities of the time. The average level of education of the teachers, however, was rather low; especially during the first half of the nineteenth century it was not much above the possession of elementary knowledge and teaching skills. Consistent with traditional "patriarchal" views, the communities that hired the teachers often demanded from them not so much good professional work, but rather "exemplary behavior", i.e., compliance with the norms of the local tradition and Christian morality. (The ability of the cell-teachers to sing was especially valued, sometimes even higher than their professional qualities, because they were expected to take part in Church services.) The Bulgarian national revival epoch in general can be grasped as an effort to raise the level of literacy by a sort of popular educational movement,⁶⁴ which started almost from scratch and proceeded at an accelerating pace, many of those who received education of some sort becoming in their turn teachers of others. The level of teaching itself gradually rose as more and more teachers acquired bet-

ter educational credentials (especially abroad) and established higher standards of teaching, making the older cell-educated teachers (derisively called "*daskals*") obsolete. This process made a big advance after the 1840s, when the first group of Bulgarians educated in Russia came back and established several class schools with more comprehensive curricula and modern pedagogical methods, including respect for the personality of the student and the abolishment of physical punishment.

In his well-known research on literacy and the advancement of the West, Carlo Cipolla established a correlation between the number of teachers and the level of literacy of the population. There is, according to him, a threshold of one to three teachers per 1,000 inhabitants, below which is underdevelopment, while above it development starts.⁶⁵ The historical sources document about 4,378 teachers in the Bulgarian lands from the beginning of the eighteenth century until 1878.⁶⁶ The gender distribution is as follows:

Table 2

	pre-1830			1840-1850s			1860-1870s		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
<i>Bulgaria</i>	461	15	476	1,082	71	1,153	2,742	359	3,101
<i>Bulgarian colonies abroad</i>	4	—	4	13	—	13	95	2	97
Total	465	15	480	1,095	71	1,166	2,837	361	3,198

While the proposed division in periods is certainly not the only one possible, it can be defended on the grounds that it corresponds to the general pattern of the evolution of Bulgarian education. The growth in the number of teachers is impressive; thus, one may see that since the opening of the first secular schools in the 1830s, the number of teachers grew 2.5-fold in just two decades, and it grew almost threefold in the next period, in line with the "awakening" of the Bulgarians to self-conscious national life.

As one may see from the table, there were 3,198 teachers in the Bulgarian schools in the 1860s-1870s. Assuming that the Bulgarian population was about 3.4 million during this period,⁶⁷ Cipolla's critical minimum was still not reached. However, one should note the extremely uneven economic and educational development of the various regions, populated with Bulgarians – on

the one hand, very well organized schools in the northeast and in the prospering small urban communities at the southern foot of the Balkans and in Thracia (which won the admiration of many West European travelers in European Turkey); on the other hand, regions with lagging education like Macedonia and Northern Dobruja.

Special mention should be made of the educational activities of foreigners in the Bulgarian lands. Most of the foreign teachers before independence were of Slav origin (Serbs, Czechs, Poles), and there were Greeks and Americans.⁶⁸ The foreign contribution to Bulgarian education continued after the establishment of the Bulgarian state. It culminated in the appointment of the Czech Slavist Konstantin Jireček as Minister of Education in Bulgaria during the 1880s.

According to the first systematic (census) statistical data, there were 4,260 teachers in the (popular) elementary schools in 1890/91. In 1895/96, there were 6,437 teachers in the public schools, and 1,836 teachers in the private schools, making a total of 8,373 teachers. The data for 1900/1901 show a certain decrease – 7,761 teachers (of them 1,961 in private schools and the remaining 5,800 in public schools).⁶⁹ The decrease has been explained with the lack of systematic and consistent state policies in the area of elementary education, with certain contradictions between the principle of obligatory elementary education stated in the Constitution, and the Statute, which regulated the organization of the elementary schools, etc.⁷⁰ In comparison with the pre-Liberation era, the growth in the teaching personnel was considerable.⁷¹

Using Cipolla's method, one can calculate that in the decade between 1890 and 1900, the number of teachers in Bulgaria was under 3 per 1,000 persons (around the critical minimum required according to him for "development"). Thus, within a population of 3,216,005 in 1890, the number of teachers (in the elementary schools) was 4,260, or approximately 1.3 teachers per 1,000 inhabitants. The population was 3,414,155 in 1895 and there were 8373 teachers, or 2.4 teachers per 1,000 inhabitants. The population reached 3,687,123 in 1900 while the number of teachers fell to 7,761, leaving only 2.1 teachers per 1,000 inhabitants. Cipolla's method⁷² gives a level of literacy of about 15 per cent at the end of the century, at variance with the official census figures which show much higher percentage of 23.87 per cent.⁷³ (This may be due to the fact that Cipolla's method was developed for earlier epochs with less effective teaching.)

The effectiveness of the educational system in reducing illit-

eracy depended largely on the qualifications of the teachers in the elementary schools.⁷⁴ There were considerable problems in procuring qualified teachers prior to independence, especially as the community councils seldom had the requisite means to provide wages.⁷⁵ The newly established Bulgarian state also had difficulties in procuring teachers for elementary schools. The better qualified teachers of the previous period went to secondary (middle and high) schools and the special (occupational) schools. Perhaps most important, the establishment of the independent state opened up new possibilities for the educated people. Many of the former teachers moved to better paid positions in the state apparatus or took up other prestigious and profitable professions (becoming, for example, notaries, defense lawyers, journalists, etc.)⁷⁶ Qualified and well-prepared teachers in elementary schools became scarce. One can even find in the reports of the school inspectors mention of cases of semi-literate teachers, especially in the more backward northwestern and western regions. At the same time, the tradition of taking good care of education continued in some (richer) urban communities; teachers here were more carefully selected and possessed the required qualifications; it was to these schools that most of the state subsidies were channeled, as well. The financial support of the state was unequally distributed among the urban and the village schools, neglecting the latter, the support of which was shifted to the peasants.⁷⁷ In general, the elementary schools in Bulgaria were in a rather miserable state until the end of the nineteenth century, and the teachers were poorly paid and, as attested in a number of official reports and in memoirs, had a hard time in making ends meet.⁷⁸ Under Stambolov's premiership a certain attempt was made to modernize Bulgarian education with the adoption of Zhivkov's Law in 1891. It centralized the system of elementary schools and imposed a certain obligation on the part of the state to contribute to their support. Still, it was generally acknowledged that elementary education was sadly neglected in favor of the middle and high schools. The latter created, according to some Bulgarian politicians, a proletariat of civil servants. To cite an imminent Bulgarian politician: "Our schools produce 'learned' people without a profession, so that they may just do harm. Their graduates are becoming the worse proletarians that may afflict the society."⁷⁹ Some blamed the general character of the middle schools for producing so many persons with education but without profession; voices were even heard for a reduction of the number of middle and high schools with a general humanitarian

profile, and it was argued that Bulgaria needed more vocational schools, preparing artisans.

Statistical data about the level of literacy in Bulgaria is available from the last decades of the nineteenth century onwards. With the establishment of the independent state in 1878, the authorities organized the systematic gathering of data on the number of teachers, pupils, and the conditions of the schools.⁸⁰ Retrospective data for 1887 show that only 10.71 per cent of the population at the time (children of pre-school age included) was literate; if we exclude the children of pre-school age, the percentage of literate people would rise to 14.5 per cent.⁸¹ Literacy was unequally distributed between men and women, 17.06 per cent of the men but only 4.12 per cent of the women being literate. The figures for 1892 are: 15.63 per cent literate people, 24.31 per cent of the men and 6.57 per cent of the women; in 1900, the general percentage of the literate (as part of the total population) was 23.87 per cent (36.03 per cent of the men and 11.21 per cent of the women). If children under 6 are excluded, the figures would rise by about 6 per cent. Starting from 1900, data were organized in this way as well, giving a level of literacy of 29.81 per cent (44.96 per cent of the men and 13.97 per cent of the women)⁸²; the figure for 1905 is 34.75 per cent general literacy (50.57 per cent of the men and 18.24 per cent of the women). There was, however, considerable discrepancy between villages and towns. Thus, in 1900 literacy in the towns stood at 54.04 per cent while in the villages it was only 23.42 per cent. (67.34 per cent of the urban men were literate and 38.94 per cent of the rural men; the respective figures for the women are 39.65 per cent and 7.41 per cent).⁸³ The lag in rural education and especially in the education of rural women is evident; it is characteristic of traditional societies in general. These figures, however, tell us little about the quality of literacy.

According to nineteenth century criteria, a person acquired minimal literacy (the ability to read and write) after attending one or two years in the elementary school. If the law on obligatory elementary education in Bulgaria had been strictly implemented, there would not have been illiterates in the age bracket between fourteen and twenty-four years by the beginning of the present century. However, the law was not implemented. The reasons were various, mostly having to do with inadequacies of the school system and the unavailability of the children for education. Data from the end of the nineteenth century show that about fifty per cent of those who had to attend school remained in fact illiterate.⁸⁴ Thus, as a contemporary researcher pointed

out with indignation, 700,000 Bulgarians who had "lived through the epoch of obligatory education did, in fact, remain illiterate" (and more than half of each subsequent generation remained illiterate). There were marked differences in the level of literacy between the various ethnic groups as well: literacy was higher among Armenians, Jews and Bulgarians, while Turks and especially Gypsies remained at a much lower level.⁸⁵

There were several reasons for evading the obligatory education. Among these one can mention the absence of motivation among the prevailing peasant population of the country,⁸⁶ the bad shape of the school system due to small educational budgets of the state (and of the communities), poverty of the parents, who could not afford to buy, for example, winter clothes and shoes for the pupils. In order to supplement insufficient incomes many poor parents preferred to send their children to work in workshops⁸⁷ and made extensive use of their labor in agrarian work.⁸⁸ Not the least, bad hygienic conditions in many of the schools were responsible for the numerous absences on the part of the pupils (due to illness), besides lowering the effectiveness of education.⁸⁹ The already noted fact that elementary school teachers were reduced to a rather miserable existence, dependent (until the 1890s) on the meager budgets of the local communities for salaries, and partly dependent on the number of their students, could not but affect negatively the quality of teaching.

It is interesting to compare the level of literacy in Bulgaria with some European states and with neighboring Balkan countries. According to data cited by Sundhaussen, in the beginning of the twentieth century literacy in Bulgaria was comparable to literacy in Serbia, Romania, the European part of Russia, and Portugal, all of which had 75-80 per cent illiterate populations. In contrast, illiteracy in the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Germany, followed by the Netherlands, England, Wales, and Finland, was reduced to 0-10 per cent.⁹⁰ In number of teachers per 1,000 pupils of school age (between five and fifteen years old), Bulgaria, with ten teachers per 1,000 pupils was nearer to the European standards than Serbia (3.2 per 1,000), Romania (about the same) and Greece (7.8 per 1,000). Still, there was a considerable lag in comparison to Switzerland, Sweden and Great Britain.⁹¹ Within the former group, however, there could be considerable variation on some indicators. Thus, Bulgaria compares favorably with Portugal which had eight teachers per 10,000 inhabitants in 1890⁹²; according to my calculations, there were thirteen teachers per 10,000 people in Bulgaria during the same year.

Reading

More than a quarter of a century divides the studies by Richard Altick⁹³ (about the English reader) and Rolf Engelsing⁹⁴ (on literacy and reading in modern times) from the more recent collective volumes under the direction of Roger Chartier and Hans-Eric Boedecker.⁹⁵ The history of the book as a scholarly discipline was not only born during this time but it matured and historians even began to speak about a "new" history of the book, and about a field of research, where the very act of reading surfaces as an object of research.⁹⁶ The "history of reading" has made great progress since the beginning of the 1980s.⁹⁷ It is on its way to becoming a separate subfield or even an autonomous discipline; already there have appeared critiques on its "myths." Work on the transmission of the text (interpretation, "misreading," etc.) was stimulated by the research of D. F. McKenzie,⁹⁸ which brought the social and cultural context of reading into the picture. Historians and theoreticians of literature developed a different view of reading. For the former, the reader exists exclusively outside the texts and can be approached through the study of the circulation and the consumption of printed materials. For the latter, the reader is constructed in the process of reading of the literary oeuvre.⁹⁹ The awareness is gaining ground that the history of reading can only profit if a way is found to combine both approaches. (A "third generation" of reading history turns to the "history of audience."¹⁰⁰) To these developments one may add the second wave of feminism and the history of women, which posed the question of the relationship between the spread of the novel and (the history of) women's reading.¹⁰¹

Bulgarian historical scholarship ignored until recently (the history of) reading as an object of research. Only in some general works of literary historians are the reader and his/her role in the consumption of the printed text mentioned.¹⁰² If following the development of the discipline abroad, the history of reading in Bulgaria has to answer the question of "the what" of reading first and then of "the how" of reading; however, it seems best to try to make up for the absence of both occurring at the same time. When considering the issues of reading, several questions spring to the foreground. First, what part of the population possessed the necessary minimal reading skills at a given time, which I addressed in the first part of my exposition, dealing with the problems of literacy and education. Secondly, it is necessary to study the availability of books and the physical access to books (and to

printed matter in general) of the public, and to trace the channels through which printed materials reached their readers.¹⁰³ Thirdly, it is important to consider the problem of economic access to printed materials. Lastly, I will deal with the question of how one read and the reader's tastes and preferences.

Although the literate tradition was preserved in the monasteries,¹⁰⁴ the propagation of reading practices became possible only with the upsurge of popular education and of book printing in the Bulgarian language at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Bulgarian "literary" language itself was formed only gradually, on the basis of the eastern vernaculars.¹⁰⁵ The co-presence of texts in various (though similar) vernaculars and in the obsolete, and, for the majority, less comprehensible Old Church Slavonic throughout the nineteenth century, constituted an obstacle to the widening of the reading public. It has been pointed out, for example, that the quaint language of the first Bulgarian journal "Liuboslovie", edited by Konstantin Fotinov in Smirna (in Asia Minor) in the 1840s, was an important reason for its tepid reception by the reading public.¹⁰⁶ Let us consider first what was available for reading in the Bulgarian society of the time. One may try to answer this question on the basis of the available bibliographies of the publishing output, by using data about private and public book collections, and by consulting the opinion of contemporaries (both common readers and literary critics) on what was read at the time.

Alexander Teodorov-Balan's bibliography ("Bulgarian Books for 100 years: 1806-1905"), contains about thirteen thousand items, and presents us with the most exhaustive data on printed books in the period.¹⁰⁷ Most of the publications are brochures of a smaller size (with several dozen pages) and may be classified as pamphlets;¹⁰⁸ many are translations or adaptations and the majority have little intrinsic value. Under the rubric "belles lettres" (stories, dramas and novels) 2,121 titles are listed. Second in number come the books and brochures in law and administrative science (published mostly after the establishment of the independent state)—a total of 1,740 titles; there are 1,595 books in theology, 873 in history and mythology, 871 in natural sciences and mathematics, 780 in military sciences, 568 in medicine, 560 in philology and literature, 545 in household-keeping, agriculture and forestry, 520 calendars and almanacs, 446 titles in geography, ethnography and culture, 305 in trade, politics and communications, 203 in education and instruction, 179 in art, 169 in architecture and engineering, 148 encyclopedias and mixed volumes.¹⁰⁹

Eighteen hundred Bulgarian books and translations (textbooks included) were published from 1806 until independence was achieved in 1878. For Bulgaria, this is the period of the "incunabula" ("*staropechatni knigi*", i.e. old imprints).¹¹⁰ The publishing business developed at accelerated rate: eighty to one hundred books were published annually in the 1870s, three hundred around 1885, and four hundred around 1890. Some 703 items were published in 1895, 844 in 1897, 933 in 1898, 769 in 1899, and 709 in 1900.¹¹¹ Compared with the 1880s, twice as many books were published during the last decade of the nineteenth century. The exuberant growth of the publishing output in the last two decades of the century can be attributed to the establishment of a national printing industry (both public and private) based in the country, to the freedom of the press and the vigorous political life.

The periodical press is another problem. From 1843, when the first Bulgarian newspaper "Bulgarski orel" ("Bulgarian Eagle"), was published in Leipzig by Ivan Bogorov, until liberation in 1878, a total of one hundred periodicals (newspapers and magazines) appeared in Bulgarian (some of them very short-lived, though). There were a lot of obstacles in the way of the periodical press. For example, the distribution was extremely irregular until the end of the Ottoman domination and the subscribers did not always pay on time. All this shortened the life of the newspapers and journals to an average of one to one and a half years, while some appeared in just a few issues. During the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878, the two Protestant "Zornitsas" reached a combined circulation of thirty-nine hundred, which put them ahead of all Bulgarian newspapers (a position they held until the 1890s). According to Nikola Nachov, Bulgarian newspapers before Independence attracted nine hundred to one thousand subscribers at the most.¹¹²

Constantinople was the major publishing and cultural center for the Bulgarians under Ottoman domination, especially in the third quarter of the nineteenth century, when the Bulgarian colony there reached twenty thousand people.¹¹³ The Bulgarian emigrant colonies in the Romanian principalities were also important publishing centers, especially for the radical revolutionary press.¹¹⁴ With the establishment of the Bulgarian state and the beginning of independent political life, the periodicals grew at a very rapid pace, "mushrooming" in the country; 119 newspapers and 53 journals were published in 1900, more than during the whole pre-liberation epoch.¹¹⁵ In Bulgaria as elsewhere, the peri-

odical press formed an interest toward issues transcending the local; toward national, European and "world" events, and thus contributed to the politicization of the population.¹¹⁶

A substantial part of the publications both prior to liberation and afterwards (until the end of the nineteenth century) was geared toward educational needs—of the elementary schools as well as of middle and special ("professional") schools. The official publications of the state administration came second in number, a new "genre" connected with the establishment of an independent state. The publications in history, religion, geography, and philology traditionally attracted the interest of the Bulgarian reading public. Among the works of fiction, translations prevailed. "Sensational" novels such as *Rocanbol* were very popular in the 1890s; and just like the pre-liberation sentimental stories, they captured the interest of the mass readers. Worried by the prevalence of second-rate literature, the Ministry of Education was prompted to take action and introduced classical authors belonging to world literature in the school curricula. Works by William Shakespeare and Alexander Pushkin were translated and published in the 1890s. Alongside the still prevailing translations and adaptations, a substantial number of original works of fiction by Bulgarian authors appeared. Certainly the most popular was the founder of the Bulgarian novel, Ivan Vazov; thirty-four of his books were published in the last decade of the century, among them novels, collections of short stories and poetry.¹¹⁷ Alongside works of good quality, a great many inferior works (what Zakhari Stoyanov derisively called "intellectual bran"¹¹⁸) were created, especially during the 1880s, when a real graphomania set in.

It should be noted that a great part of the Bulgarian intelligentsia knew foreign languages and read foreign books and newspapers.¹¹⁹ Research did establish that as many as fifty per cent of the Bulgarian intelligentsia of the national revival epoch (i. e., prior to 1878) knew at least one foreign language; it is possible that some of the remaining fifty per cent knew a foreign language as well, though data about this is missing.¹²⁰ Of these about ten per cent knew French, eight per cent knew Greek, 7.5 per cent knew Russian, 7.3 per cent Turkish, four per cent classical languages, four per cent Romanian, 2.6 per cent German, 1.5 per cent Serbian, 1.3 per cent Czech, 1.1 per cent English, and 0.5 per cent Italian. The wider knowledge of French was due to the fact that a number of people graduated French Universities or the French Lyceums (Galata Sarai and Bebek, both in Constantinople) or the Military Medical Academy in Constantinople; some

received education in the French Catholic schools in Bulgaria.¹²¹ French was mostly taught in the Bulgarian class (*klassni*) schools and in the foreign educational institutions attended by Bulgarians (mostly Russian institutions but also in the American Robert College in Constantinople¹²²).

Initially the role of the Greek language was very great because, as already mentioned, a number of Greek schools were functioning in the Bulgarian lands until the middle of the nineteenth century, and a considerable part of the first generation of educated Bulgarians passed through the Greek educational system. Besides, until the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, Church services in Bulgarian (Orthodox) churches had to be conducted in Greek. The knowledge of Russian was also widely spread among the educated as a result of intensive Bulgarian-Russian contacts, including educational Russian grants for Bulgarians,¹²³ and because of the closeness between the two Slavic languages.¹²⁴ As for Turkish, the language of the rulers, one can assume that most of the literate people knew it (at least the spoken language), but it would have been of little help in the educational efforts of the Bulgarians, because of the religious nature of Ottoman education and its very backward state.

A great many translations were made from foreign languages into Bulgarian. During the first half of the nineteenth century, translations of textbooks for the elementary schools were especially needed, to be used instead of the liturgical books in Church Slavonic, which had been in use in the cell schools; it should also be remembered that the assurance of adequate supplies of books in new-Bulgarian was a precondition for the success of the struggle against Hellenism. Subsequently, the need arose for translations of popular and entertainment readings. The available data shows that most of the translations until 1878 were made from Russian, Greek, and French: 243 translations from Russian; 162 from Greek; fifty-two from French; twenty-eight from Old Church Slavonic; twenty-two from Turkish; seventeen from Serbian; sixteen from English; twelve from German; ten from Romanian; four from Polish; three from Latin; two from Italian, and two from Arabic. It should be noted that part of the translations were made not from the original but passed through another language. Thus, writings by Western authors reached the Bulgarian reader in translation from Greek and Russian, as well as Serbian or Romanian.¹²⁵ Some of the most eminent Bulgarian intellectuals emphasized the importance of making translations of works by famous authors in stimulating the interest in

reading and cultivating a good taste among Bulgarian readers.¹²⁶

The idea of copyright could not assert itself in Bulgaria until almost the end of the nineteenth century; translators did not even feel obliged to point to the name of the author and the original title. In trying to make the contents more understandable for the readers, they abridged and simplified the text and some even added their own comments and thoughts.¹²⁷ Translators justified their arbitrariness in altering the original texts as regard for the reader, whom they wanted to help in the process of reading and making sense of the text.¹²⁸ This very curious phenomenon of adapting literary works in the process of translation in a way that would conform to the expectations, experiences, and sensibilities of the Bulgarian readers, is known as "*pobulgariavane*" (i. e. "Bulgarianization").¹²⁹ By comparing originals with translations and by studying the various means through which translators tried to make foreign and distant realities sound closer and more familiar, one may infer differences in culture and everyday life, which the translators tried to reduce or "bridge." This can provide an important (and so far neglected) key to popular Bulgarian culture at the time.

The rather fragmentary data on private book collections during the pre-liberation period confirms the existence, during the nineteenth century, of wide contacts on the part of Bulgarian readers with the outside world. The Bulgarians educated abroad possessed books mostly in the language of the country where they had studied. In general, books in Greek, Russian, Serbian and French prevailed (just as with translations).¹³⁰ The books ranged from luxury (expensive) editions of the Greek and the Roman classics (Aesop, Demostenes, Lucian, Strabo, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch) to classical and contemporary Western authors (Shakespeare, Cervantes, Balzac) and Russian authors (Dostoevski, Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev). Books in Greek prevailed in book collections dating from of 1830s and 1840s, books in Serbian (a language very close to Bulgarian) prevailed in collections from the 1850s and 1860s, while Russian books were better represented in later collections. To cite the words of a contemporary: "every more or less educated person possessed a library of a sort—some had bigger libraries, others had smaller ones."¹³¹ Most of the collections belonged to teachers, and, as is to be expected, consisted mostly of school-books and scholarly literature.¹³² Even people with a very modest (cell-school) education possessed books, especially such that had to do with teaching (descriptions of the earth, arithmetic, grammars, etc.) and single

issues of various periodicals, often damaged from frequent use.¹³³ As is to be expected, religious literature—The Psalms, descriptions of the lives of Saints, The Book of the Hours, The Bible, The Deeds the Apostles, Books of Prayers, etc.—prevailed in home libraries of priests and khadzhi (i.e., those that had made a pilgrimage to the Holy Lands). Some of them, educated in the first half of the nineteenth century, knew Greek (the official language of Church service at the time) and possessed books in Greek and Greek grammars (some even had works by ancient Greek authors).¹³⁴

The collections of the public libraries reveal something about the readers' tastes and preferences, especially if one may note which books were borrowed most often. Research has shown that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century works by William Shakespeare, Jonathan Swift, Sir Walter Scott, Lord Byron, Charles Dickens, Moliere, Stendhal, Francois- Rene de Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, Alexander Dumas the younger, Eugene Sue, Francois Rabelais, Miguel Cervantes, Dante Aligieri, Knut Hamsun, Gotthold Lessing, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Friedrich Schiller, Hermann Sudermann, Nikolai Gogol, Ivan Krilov, Aleksandr Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, Ivan Turgenev, Fedor Dostoevski, Adam Mickiewicz, Henryk Sienkiewicz, et al. were most often borrowed from the school libraries. Ivan Vazov, Todor Vlaikov, Stoian Mikhailovski and Aleko Konstantinov were favorite Bulgarian writers.¹³⁵ One should note, however, that the interest in some of these authors was stimulated by their being included by the Ministry of Education in the school curricula of the middle and high schools. Part of the books in school libraries were in Russian, because collections were often supplemented with Russian donations; some students learned Russian by reading books borrowed from school libraries.¹³⁶

Turning to the question of book-trade and the supplying of books, books reached the Bulgarian reader with great difficulties before liberation. "You want to buy it [a book] but it is not available for sale. You want to procure it, but you don't know in what town to look for it and even if you knew, you couldn't procure it as the post service did not deliver books."¹³⁷ There were (since the middle of the nineteenth century) bookshops only in several Bulgarian towns; the best-known were those of Khristo G. Danov (the first Bulgarian book publisher and book-seller) in Plovdiv, Russe and Veles, of Dragan Manchov in Plovdiv, Svishtov, Bitolia and Thessaloniki, of Stoian Tabakov and Nikola Vardev in Sofia.¹³⁸ In the late 1860s, Pandeli Kissimov and Ivan Momchilov

started business with books in Turnovo. In 1872, the printing company "Promishlenie" opened a big bookshop in Constantinople and smaller ones in Kalofer, Samokov, Kazanluk, Iambol, Odrin, Lozengrad, Shtip, Bitolia, and in the village Biala Cherkva. Peddlers travelled across the Bulgarian territories and visited communities at irregular intervals.¹³⁹ One could also buy books, textbooks, and other printed materials at the great annual fairs—in Uzundzhovo and in Eski-Dhsumaia (now Tŭrgovishte), also in Sliven, Prilep, Seres, but this, too, could not satisfy the growing demand for books. Some authors and publishers took upon themselves the task of promoting the circulation of books; they published information in the periodicals about their collaborators and agents in localities where one could buy a newly published book. Another channel for the supply of books, albeit irregular and haphazard, was the merchants from the economically advanced towns, who brought back home from their business journeys books and periodicals as presents to their children and to the local schools.

The Bulgarian schools were supplied with teaching materials also by way of donations, made by philanthropic organizations, Russian charity funds, Bulgarian and foreign merchants or intellectuals, often with the mediation of Bulgarian patriotic intellectuals. Among the most active middlemen for the supply of schools with books during the national revival epoch were Zakhari Kniazhevski, Zakhari Krusha, and Alexander Exarch.¹⁴⁰ On several occasions, donations to the schools were made by Bulgarian translators, authors, and publishers. For example, Petur Sapunov donated 800 copies of his translation of the Gospels (published in twelve hundred copies in Bucharest in 1828) to his native town of Triavna.¹⁴¹ Georgi Busilin, a student at the Moscow University, published a Bulgarian primer (in 1844) under the condition that it would be donated to the Bulgarian schools in dozens of villages (of all 3,470 copies, one thousand were designated especially for Bulgarian schools in Macedonia).¹⁴² The "Bulgarian Society for the Dissemination of Useful Knowledge" in Bucharest published the brochure "Cyril and Methodius—Bulgarian Educators" in 1875 and donated more than two thousand copies to about thirty communities (one thousand copies to the Bulgarian colony in Constantinople; two hundred copies to each to the towns of Edirne, Burgas, and Sopot, one hundred copies to the town of Kazanluk; fifty copies to each of the towns Bucharest, Braila, Shumen, and Svishtov; thirty copies to each of the towns of Giurgiu and Stara Zagora; twenty copies

to each of the towns of Oltenitsa, Triavna, and the village Salmantsi, near Shumen; ten copies to each of the villages of Müglizh and Erina, etc.).¹⁴³

A very common way to deal with the problem of book scarcity and high cost was to borrow books and textbooks; in fact, books circulated regularly within a given community. This was still more the case with newspapers, which passed from person to person. Nikola Nachov tells in his memoirs about the keen interest in newspapers in Kalofer: "When there was an important news in the newspaper (as, for example, about the invention of the balloons or the battles in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870), it changed hands and passed from one house to another, until finally it got crumpled or went to pieces. It was read by women and girls as well."¹⁴⁴ Here is another testimony by the already-mentioned Iliia Bluskov who acted as a distributor of the newspaper *Pravo* and the Protestant newspaper *Zornitsa*: "When it was passed around that the newspaper of a subscriber had arrived, everybody would leave his job, and his occupation, and his shop, and would run to see what news there is."¹⁴⁵

The lists of subscribers present an important source both for the history of the book trade and the history of reading.¹⁴⁶ They prove that the books did actually reach different social strata: townspeople and peasants, men and women, teachers and students, priests, traders and craftsmen, even shepherds. Curiously, one may find religious books going to not quite religious people while some priests took an interest in comedies.¹⁴⁷ It is interesting to note that the same books circulated in different social and professional milieus; the social differentiation of reader tastes and readerships was underdeveloped. Prior to 1878 various editions reached by way of subscription 1,078 Bulgarian communities (924 villages, 126 towns and twenty-eight monasteries). But even the books with largest number of copies (and between one thousand and 3,400 subscribers) reached no more than fifty or sixty communities on the average.¹⁴⁸ Hence, a large number of subscribers is not equivalent with coverage of the whole territory.¹⁴⁹ The textbooks could not satisfy the needs of all elementary and class schools in the Bulgarian lands and there was a growing interest in entertainment fiction.

Most subscriptions (hence most of the copied sold) came as a rule from the locality of the author or editor, or from the place of publishing. In the absence of a well-developed national book-trading network, it is only to be expected that personal connections of the author or editor, most of them in his/her community,

would be of decisive importance. Thus, as confirmed by hundreds of examples, if a teacher was the author of a textbook or a book, many of the parents of her/his pupils would purchase it, and be its potential readers.¹⁵⁰

The subscribers' lists throw some light on the social characteristics of the readers. The positioning of the subscribers in the lists according to professions is revealing of the social hierarchies in the community. The fact that priests and teachers are listed first attests to the growing prestige of the "intellectual" professions, especially in matters of reading and education, where they set the taste. Next come the names of the traditional community notables and local authorities—*kmets* and *mukhtars* (mediating between the Bulgarian population and the Turkish government) and then the rest: craftsmen, shopkeepers, peasants, while pupils (still without distinct social status) ended the list.¹⁵¹ The subscribers' lists attest to the progress of education and literacy, as manifested (indirectly) in the growing public demand of books, though there may have been illiterate subscribers, interested in just seeing their names in print. They also demonstrate the development of the printing and book-selling business. One can infer a clear tendency of widening of the Bulgarian reading public to judge from the number of subscribers (but also the books ordered by one subscriber, a sign of enduring interest in reading) and the quantity of the copies sold.¹⁵²

The establishment of the independent Bulgarian state in 1878 created new and more favorable conditions for the development of the book-printing and book-trade. To begin with, the publishing industry could now be based on sovereign territory. A number of printing-houses were set up, of which the largest were Durzhavna pechatnitsa (State printing-house), the Royal printing-house, the District printing house in Plovdiv and the private printing-houses of (the already-mentioned) Khristo G. Danov and Dragan Manchov. The number of printing houses grew very fast; there were already eighty-seven in 1891, and 150 in 1900. Initially peddlers continued to function as the main distributors of books, but stationary book-selling in bookshops quickly replaced them. Some of the peddlers from the 1880s set up their own bookshops in the 1890s (e.g. Ivan Ignatov in 1890, Todor F. Chipev in 1891). At the turn of the century, there were bookshops in almost every Bulgarian town. The publisher-bookseller now replaced the printer-publisher as leading figure of the publishing business. The path of the book from the publisher to the consumer was shortened and the books could find

their readers more easily.¹⁵³

Let us now turn to the question of the economic accessibility of the books. Were prices such that the "average" Bulgarian could afford to buy a book or a newspaper? The information that can throw light on this question is scanty and unsystematic. Still, it is certain that under conditions of scarce money and largely subsistence agriculture, a very small part of the peasants, who were the vast majority of the Bulgarian population in the nineteenth century, could afford to buy books or subscribe to periodicals. Even for the teachers, who received their salaries mainly in cash, this was a considerable expense. That this was so can be seen by comparing prices with wages. I considered this question at more length elsewhere.¹⁵⁴ Suffice it to say here that the elementary school teachers (by far the majority of all teachers) received a salary that was only one-third to one-half that paid to the teachers in the class schools. Their annual salaries depended on the economic prosperity of the community which employed them, varying between five- and fifteen hundred grosha during the period 1850-1878. The salaries of the teachers in the class schools were between two thousand and four thousand grosha, and in certain cases went up to ten- or twelve thousand (a very substantial amount of money at the time). The gender of the teachers was also relevant; as a rule, women teachers received much less than men even if they had the same education and taught at the same school level.

The prices of books varied largely. Here are some examples. A top-selling book (with 1,456 subscriptions) as Sava Dobroplodni's *Mikhail* was sold for three grosh in 1853. In 1857, the book *Adelaide, an Alpine Shepherd*, translated by Krüstiü Pishurka, sold for ten grosh. A French-Bulgarian vocabulary printed in Constantinople sold for twelve grosh in 1858. In 1859, one could buy the *Short Holy History* (translated from Russian by Venko Bŭrnev) for eight grosh. The annual subscription for the newspaper *Bulgaria* was 150 grosh in Constantinople (where the newspaper was published) and 180 grosh elsewhere. The "Bulgarian popular calendar for 1862," published in 1861 by Dragan Manchov sold for just two grosh. The *Short History of the World*, translated from Russian by G. Ioshev and published in 1861 in Belgrade, was sold for twenty-five grosh. In 1869, *the Description of the Earth for Elementary Schools* sold for ten grosh, while *Ilovaiski's Short History of the World* sold for twenty-five grosh (both published by Dragan Manchov in Vienna). The price of the best-selling Bulgarian almanac *Letostrui*, published by Khristo G. Danov, went up from

eight to ten grosh in the period 1869-1876. *Momina Kitka*—a Bulgarian adaptation by Krūstiu Pishurka, published in Belgrade in 1870, was priced at twenty-five grosh. Lamartine's *The Life of Madame de Sevigne*, translated by Bogdan Goranov and published in Russe, sold for seven grosh in 1871. *The Geometry of Lines*, translated by Nestor Markov from French, sold for twenty-one grosh. *Telemach's Adventures* by Fenelon, translated by Nikola Mikhailovski, sold for twenty grosh in 1872. Raicho Karolev's *Lessons in Bulgarian Church History*, published in Constantinople, sold for twelve grosh. The textbook *A Short Elementary Geometry* by Ivan Giuzelev, published in 1873 in Prague, was priced at 10.5 grosh.¹⁵⁵ As one can see, the prices varied greatly, and, as we do not know the prices of the paper and the printing services, it is difficult to judge about the guidelines of the pricing policy. But it can be granted that, given the modest means of the vast majority of the population, cheaper books sold better. Thus Neofit Rilski's translation of the *New Testament* sold in 1840 at the Uzundzhov Fair "like hotcakes," both because of the scarcity of books in Bulgarian, and because of the discount made.¹⁵⁶ This might have been one of the reasons for the great interest of the Bulgarians toward the Protestant editions, which were cheaper and affordable.¹⁵⁷ And, as popular taste seemed to have favored literature of a "low" type (almanacs, sentimental stories, etc.) and school textbooks, their sales increased, making prices affordable.¹⁵⁸

Let us now turn to the act of reading itself (and the reception of the text). One should note that elementary literacy, though very important, is only a precondition. The vast majority of people did not continue to practice reading and writing after leaving school, and the effect of their education could be entirely lost in the course of time. This was especially so for the children of poorer families who could not afford to buy books and periodicals.¹⁵⁹ As reading habits and the need for communication with texts were obtained mainly in middle and high schools,¹⁶⁰ their growth was an important factor for the spread of a "culture of reading." Lastly, and perhaps most important, the growth of the number of highly educated people and professionals, who felt a deeper need to consume knowledge (also of a professional type) contributed to the widening of the Bulgarian reading public.¹⁶¹

In a predominantly illiterate society, the ability to read was highly respected. In his memoirs, the teacher Iliia Bluskov wrote the following:

Literate people were very rare to find then, but when some-

body appeared they [the peasants] would welcome him and accommodate him as a most treasured guest. And were he to open a book and begin reading from it what was agreeable and useful for the listeners, they would surround him and listen with a wide-opened mouth, making efforts to remember everything, so that they may retell it afterwards to others. And they would regard such a learned person as God-sent. The book was a sacred object for the illiterate while for the literate it was something which illuminated them by revealing new knowledge, which they shared with their fellows with pleasure.

And somewhat further: "Our people of the old times respected the book as they respected the bread. Were they to see a crust of bread on the ground or a piece of paper from a printed book, at this time mostly Church books and *Chervenoslovi*, they would piously bend to take it and would then put it on a place higher up. It was considered a sin to tramp upon bread or upon a book."¹⁶² The book itself became a sort of sacred object, especially in the earlier times of scarcity of books and almost general illiteracy. To cite just one example, Nikola Nachov remembers in his memoirs how his grandfather kept Sofronii's *Nedelnik* ("Sunday Book") "as a sacred object in the shelf beneath the Cross and took it in his hands with reverence."¹⁶³

One may read about cases of illiterate craftsmen hiring somebody literate to read to them aloud during work in the work-shop. Zakhari Stoianov (a well-known Bulgarian author and national revolutionary) recollected from his experience of living with shepherds near the town of Triavna, that one could find in almost every mountain hut a few books, while, according to him, this was not the case with craftsmen doing needlework, who did not have time to read.¹⁶⁴ The appetite for reading could lead to curious outcomes, as revealed in the following episode, narrated by the same author. A young artisan who subscribed to a Constantinople newspaper advised his friends not to waste their money on newspapers, because one could not understand anything from them; as it turned out, for several months he was reading the newspaper not by columns but horizontally—from the beginning to the end of the line. Amidst the general laughter he explained that he could not figure out that "the small sticks" were put to divide the text into columns.¹⁶⁵

The design of the book was of utmost importance, as typography (including eventually illustrations) could facilitate the reading and comprehension of the text.¹⁶⁶ Editions designed for

"mass" readers were made, the same as popular editions in Western Europe,¹⁶⁷ with short and well-formed, clearly separated paragraphs, and were published in large characters. Again Illia Bluskov says: "... the intriguing narrative of *Alexandria*, its comprehensible language, as well as its printing in large characters attracted the readers and their listeners so much, that I can say that the book *Alexandria*, though expensive, sold like hotcakes."¹⁶⁸

Where was reading practiced? First of all—in the school. Especially in the elementary (mutual) schools, pupils had to read aloud together; one can imagine the noise produced by several dozen pupils reading aloud. Reading took place in the schools also on holidays. In many communities the teacher would open the school on Sundays after the Church sermon and read aloud the news from the recently arrived newspapers for those gathered around, or deliver a speech on issues of local concern or more general interest. This practice was especially characteristic of the 1860s and the 1870s, when people began to take an interest in, and wanted to be informed about, the development of the Bulgarian Church struggle and other political affairs. The reading for an audience reinforced the feeling of communality and solidarity of the people in the epoch of the national revival, besides presenting them with a subject for reflection.

The role of public libraries was especially great in arousing curiosity toward outside events and the cultivation of reading habits. Such libraries existed in some schools and in special reading-clubs. With the spread of the secular elementary schools, school libraries increased in number.¹⁶⁹ It has been estimated that between 1836 and 1876 there were between 130 and 200 public libraries.¹⁷⁰ (The opening of new middle schools and high schools after liberation was accompanied by a manifold growth of the number of school libraries.¹⁷¹) The *chitalishta* ("reading clubs") were set up on the Greek example and partly under the influence of Polish and Hungarian emigrants who came to some Bulgarian towns in the 1850s. Most of the reading-clubs possessed few books and often of poor quality. New books were rare, and the old books often lagged behind the interests of the new times, leaving the more advanced readers unsatisfied. As a Bulgarian national activist put it, these books "are not a suitable diet for the new times; at most they can serve as a seasoning to the food but not as the food itself."¹⁷² In fact, most often newspapers were preferred reading material. It should be noted that besides space and books for reading, reading-clubs housed the first amateur theater. This is how an article in the newspaper *Makedoniia* de-

scribed the activity of the Kalofer reading-club: "The reading-club was crowded with numerous visitors, most of them young people, and D. Fingov [the teacher] started by reading aloud from the newspapers. He read in a loud voice and distinctly, often interrupting the reading to give his excellent explanations and comments. Some of the more advanced visitors interjected their comments."¹⁷³ People not only read or listened to others reading, but tried to interpret what they read or heard by discussing it and forming their own opinion on issues of local or national significance. The reading-clubs thus went beyond purely educational goals; they served as elementary schools for citizenship.¹⁷⁴ They preserved their functions in independent Bulgaria and only with the raising of the general educational level in the course of the twentieth century did they become obsolete.

Reading was also important in the family milieu, especially during the long winter evenings. A literate person—most often the father or some of the sons or grandsons—would read aloud for his illiterate kin and visiting neighbors.¹⁷⁵ Reading made people hear about things far away from their immediate experience, thus enlarging their intellectual horizon; the reader acted as an agent of change in a traditional milieu.

Some scholars have asserted that the so-called silent reading, the visual perception of a text, is a comparatively novel practice; the transition towards this kind of reading in Western Europe began in the Middle ages.¹⁷⁶ In Bulgaria as well, initially reading aloud predominated. To read aloud was a difficult exercise, requiring considerable effort, so that sometimes the readers were (literally) sweating on the forehead in the effort to grasp the sense. This was especially the case with pupils in the elementary school but also with already literate adults. To read for a public was a kind of test, especially for the newly literate, or when reading poetry, and the readers prepared beforehand in order to capture the attention of their audience. The already-mentioned Iliia Bluskov says the following *a propos* reading for an audience: "I have to say beforehand that most of the teachers who did the reading (including me) could not read fluently. And the incorrect reading and the stumbling of the reader caused the interested listeners to yawn. To gratify one's audience with one's reading, the teacher thus had to rehearse the reading in advance, and achieve a better understanding of the meaning for himself before rendering it to others."¹⁷⁷ The same author describes the intense reaction that reading aloud in public provoked among illiterates: "You see that the blacksmith has left the hammer, the shoemaker

the leather, the tailor the needle, the shopkeeper the clients, the peasant his cart, and all of them are bending toward you with an air of tense curiosity expressed on their grinning faces, and all are watching you with an open mouth and in silence, so that they may not miss a word from what you are reading, in order to be able to pass the news to whomsoever they meet afterwards."¹⁷⁸

While it can be expected that even before the nineteenth century some literate Bulgarians (especially in the monasteries) communed with books in silence, this practice spread only later, with the development of a lay "intelligentsia" of people in intellectual professions toward the middle of the nineteenth century. Reading alone (whether at home or in reading-clubs), in silence and with greater concentration, became more common. It presupposes a higher degree of literacy, longer sitting at the reading and an interiorization of the act of reading to an extent that one may enjoy spending his free time in this way and even feel a necessity for reading.¹⁷⁹ The educated middle-class Bulgarian intelligentsia of the second half of the nineteenth century arranged for itself special rooms (studies) for reading and writing at home. Seclusion with the printed text was a precondition for deeper reflection and more intensive intellectual pursuits.¹⁸⁰ This "privatization" of reading (as Philip Aries put it) was among the major cultural developments of modernity.¹⁸¹ Communication with books without mediators and interpreters cultivated the inner life of the reader.

A further distinction, not coinciding with that between silent reading and reading aloud, is that between intensive and extensive reading. Intensive reading was dominant in times when books were rare and expensive, so that even literate people could not afford possessing many books, and libraries were absent or inaccessible. In particular, it implies a lower degree of literacy and the reading of the same book (often aloud) for a long time, and then over and over again. The contents would be remembered and narrated afterwards, and serve as a topic of discourses and reflection. While in the West intensive reading was mostly practiced until the end of the eighteenth century,¹⁸² in Bulgarian conditions it lasted (as a typical phenomenon) almost until the end of the nineteenth century. Especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, printed materials were rare, and they were accordingly treasured and reread. Some textbooks, as the very popular *Fish primer* by Petur Beron, looked worn out (and as contemporaries say, virtually torn to pieces) by continuous rereading; historical works such as the *Tsarstvenik* by Khristaki

Pavlovich (a printed version of Father Paisii's *Istoriia Slavianobolgarskaiia* [History of the Bulgarian Slavs]), Yurii Venelin's *Drevniie i nineshnie bolgare*,¹⁸³ *Alexandria*, depicting the life and deeds of Alexander of Macedonia (translated from Greek) and Khristo Danov's *Almanacs*, were all read over and over again. Throughout the period intensive reading was practiced with religious books and various almanacs—an extremely popular reading among Bulgarians in the 1860s and 1870s, which continued to capture the readers' interest well into the present century.¹⁸⁴ Intensive reading assumed yet another form with the beginning of Bulgarian literary criticism; it became then professional reading of texts and reflection upon them.

Extensive reading, on the other hand, is characterized by an easy passage from one text to another. In the West, it was largely stimulated by the appearance of the periodic press, especially daily newspapers.¹⁸⁵ It is closely connected with the spread of the novel during the nineteenth century, and, together with it, the spread of reading for pleasure.¹⁸⁶ The transition toward extensive reading in the Bulgarian society was a slow process and, single personalities apart, had to wait until the attainment of greater technical proficiency in reading. In fact, the two manners of reading coexisted, depending on the fluency in reading or the reason for reading (education, entertainment, professional reading, etc.). It is possible to compare the Bulgarian situation at the turn of the century, especially in the towns, with what Rolf Engelsing, speaking about reading in Germany in the late eighteenth century, called the "revolution of reading,"¹⁸⁷ i.e., the popularization of reading in conditions of abundant printed matter and greater number of literate people, who enjoyed reading; this led to the "profanation" of the text and of the act of reading.

The fact that nineteenth century Bulgarian society was predominantly rural and economically rather homogeneous did not preclude the existence of different reading tastes. As Roger Chartier justly notes, cultural differentiation does not follow automatically the existing social differences.¹⁸⁸ There developed in the Bulgarian context the usual opposition between "high" and "low" culture, reflected in the taste for books in particular. Books of fortune telling, the interpreting of dreams, folk cures, superstitious beliefs, etc. represented the "low" type of literature. One can read in the introduction to one such book (*The Adventures of Saint Theodora*) that "one should have this book handy regardless of whether one can read or not, because it has the power to prevent an illness, to guard against a bullet or against bad encounter,

etc."¹⁸⁹ Another such book promised access to Paradise to whoever read it.¹⁹⁰ Judging from sales, it seems that many Bulgarians were seduced by books about interpreting signs, dreams, and the like. The mass reader was especially fond of calendars and almanacs which advised, among other things, how to interpret "signs" (*trepetnitsi*, *vrachovnitsi*), besides containing folklore (folk songs, proverbs, sayings and riddles) and edifying texts by contemporary Bulgarian authors on various topics.¹⁹¹

The better educated were quite unanimous in condemning this sort of book which, according to them, did not contribute to the "enlightening" of the people but inculcated ignorance and numbed the mind. Far from sharing the enthusiasm in reading whatever was handy, they put forth higher requirements as regards the quality of the books read. Regretting the good sales of popular low-quality books, the advocates of "high culture" thought that what mattered was not just reading books, but reading good and useful books.¹⁹² As a famous Bulgarian national activist put it: "When a people awakens to life, it does need healthy and pure food, not books about dreaming and fortune telling. . . . We are now in need of scientific knowledge—positive, live and humane knowledge."¹⁹³ The first Bulgarian literary critics saw as their major task to warn against the pernicious effects of "bad works of fiction", which, according to them, abounded in the new Bulgarian literature.¹⁹⁴

An important question when considering reading practices is how the texts were understood and interpreted. Not only literary critics but many well-educated Bulgarians seem to have believed that reading could exert a direct and profound moral influence upon readers. This was held to be the case especially with more "inexperienced" readers, who "because they are less advanced, believe in all they read in the books." The influence was figuratively imagined by P. R. Slaveikov as a relation between souls: ". . . when this soul [of the writer of the book] thinks and speaks between the lines of the book, it acts upon those who read it, in much the same way as the living person would have acted upon them."¹⁹⁵ What follows from such a "theory" is that the reading of bad books may spoil the reader; thus Slaveikov was concerned about the influence of love novels upon the "hypersensitive girls, who think they have achieved the goal of their life when abandoning themselves to tenderly sighs for the unending object of their love."¹⁹⁶ In a still more moralistic vein Marko Balabanov attacked the contemporary foreign novels, which "blemished morally so many a pure and innocent soul."¹⁹⁷

The pupils in particular were generally expected to find "valid truths" and edification in the books, and, furthermore, to learn to orient their behavior according to written precepts. Indeed, one may also read the advice to reflect critically upon the books.¹⁹⁸ The burgeoning Bulgarian literary criticism subscribed to the view that the books should give "knowledge and instruction, from which each reader could draw strength for his goals." Novels and stories must edify, by showing the good and the bad aspects of life, of the human soul and the human passions. The major goal of a literary work is, according to this opinion, "to guard the person against error and to show her or him how to evade it."¹⁹⁹ It seems that in general, books were considered a force, capable of exercising strong influence upon the life of the readers.

As data on the reception of texts hardly exists, it remains an open question how books were actually understood and to what extent were such expectations met or such advises followed. We have the general assertion of Iliia Bluskov that in the largely illiterate Bulgarian society people believed strongly in the truthfulness of the printed word.²⁰⁰ One can also find scattered remarks about the impression texts made on readers (or audiences, if they were performed). Liuben Karavelov describes ironically the impression French novels made on some inhabitants of the town of Plovdiv in the middle of the nineteenth century. The readers chose some literary hero and "assumed his name and character;" thus the son of a rich Plovdiv merchant called himself Monte Cristo, another one Henry IV, while one of the women-readers cast herself as Queen Margo. Then "all these copies tried in all earnest to imitate their originals and committed some feats that made people speak about them."²⁰¹ The lack of distance between artistic depiction and reality and the absolute identification with the problems and emotions of the literary characters are manifested in the naive reactions of the audiences of amateur theater performances.²⁰² The actions of the actors on the scene were discussed (in a loud voice) by the audience and elicited a clear and strong moral stand.²⁰³

Speaking about the impact of books upon the society, the connection between the printing press and the spread of national consciousness is a very direct one in the Bulgarian case. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the printing press and especially periodicals became really "an agent of change",²⁰⁴ which in this case was the formation of national consciousness and a growing desire for liberty. Every historical work on the national history was especially valued reading and contributed enormously

to the creation of a sense of national identity and a feeling of national belonging. In fact, the Bulgarian national revival was heralded by the history book *Istoriia slavianobolgarskaiia* [History of the Bulgarian Slavs] by Fr. Paisii of Khilendar. One may safely spell out the hypothesis, that its rather limited circulation and the lag in its popular reception and appreciation may be attributed to the fact that it was not printed at the time; had it been printed, it might have exerted a stronger and more immediate impact on the formation of national sentiments and on popular mobilization towards independence. This hypothesis can be tested on the history of the reception of the book. Several dozen anonymous copies were made in manuscript and circulated before its first printed edition in 1844 (still without Fr. Paisii's name).²⁰⁵ We have the testimony of Georgi S. Rakovski, the Bulgarian writer and revolutionary, that one of these copies (the one made in Zheravna in 1772) circulated for many years and was read in several communities in the eastern Bulgarian parts. The numerous remarks in the margins attest to keen interest in the book, which, had the book been printed and circulated in many copies, might have formed many patriots at an earlier date. One of the prominent Bulgarian national activists, Petko R. Slaveikov, described its effect on himself: "Until then I thought only how to save my own soul but after reading this history I set myself the goal to save my people, to inspire it with patriotic feelings. Reading and copying this history gave my wishes and activities another direction."²⁰⁶

The revolutionizing effect of the printed word can be gauged from the following example. After the Russian-Turkish war of 1853-1856, when Bulgarian hopes for liberation were frustrated, there appeared the brochure *Predvestnik Gorskago putnika* [A Herald of the Forest Traveler] by Georgi S. Rakovski, the influence of which is described by a contemporary in the following way: "This was a flying brochure, I would say, as it flew from one town to another, from one village to another and circulated without anyone knowing who distributed it and spread it. There were then teachers in almost every village. They summoned the peasants on holidays in the school and without anybody suspecting them, read with ardor this almost insurgent booklet."²⁰⁷ The role of periodicals for the spread of the national idea and the radicalization of the Bulgarian society since the middle of the nineteenth century can hardly be exaggerated. The following testimony illustrates the significance of the radical newspapers: "The issues of the newspaper *Zname* [i.e. "Banner"—a newspaper published

by the Bulgarian national revolutionary and great poet Hristo Botev] filled us with feverish expectations. . . . We secretly read the rare issues of this and other newspapers. . . we avidly swallowed them, we believed in everything written therein and thought that the end of the yoke was approaching."²⁰⁸ In fact, without this powerful means of propagation of ideas and information, changes would have been much slower and maybe altogether impossible. The direct ideological impact of the printing press on the Bulgarian society probably was diminished with the establishment of an independent nation-state, and, with the proliferation of competing ideas, may have become more diffuse and indirect. But again, as with the Enlightenment and nationalist ideas before, the printing press served as a vehicle for the introduction of new social and political ideas (liberal, socialist, etc.) and was a major medium of public debate.

Conclusion

By way of a conclusion, I shall try to weave the various threads of this admittedly somewhat heterogeneous essay together. To begin with, it has been shown that since the beginning of the nineteenth century, a sort of popular educational movement started among the Bulgarians under Ottoman domination, supported by an advancing (commercial and artisan) economy, and building upon the script tradition of "mediaeval" (monastery) cell-education. The propagation of literacy acquired a momentum of its own and became self-propelled and accelerated, the first educated people serving as teachers of others. While the Bulgarian activists of the time and some national historians later spoke about an "Enlightenment",²⁰⁹ the word is misleading as it undervalues the broad base of the process (mass education) and overvalues the impact upon it of Enlightenment ideas proper. As a result of this process, from perhaps the most illiterate people in the Balkans at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Bulgarians became among the most literate at the end of the century. Modest as the results may seem, compared to the most advanced states in the West, this is a singular phenomenon, a sort of quiet revolution, and a sure advance of "modernization", whatever the ambiguities of this phenomenon in the European periphery. One may perhaps affirm that this is the sphere, where the Bulgarians, at a disadvantage in the Ottoman empire in many respects, achieved their greatest success. When an independent Bulgarian state was established in 1878, it had a considerable number of educated people for the state administration and other fields.

Secondly, the development of education/literacy among the Bulgarians stood in direct connection with the burgeoning national consciousness: it both helped to form it, and was spurred by it. Education was promoted in view of the national goals: the raising of self-consciousness and the creation of a sense of identity (hence, the outstanding role of history, language and ethnography), cultural emancipation from the Greek influence, and, finally, rejection of the Ottoman domination. The national orientation of education is evident in its decisive turn toward spoken new-Bulgarian language, instead of Old Church Slavonic (and Greek) and in the patriotic contents of the teaching (of national history, language, etc.).

A social effect (more precisely, an accompanying phenomenon) of the development of education was the formation of a national elite of educated people, the so-called "intelligentsia." This type of elite-formation on the basis of education and by sharing a common culture (the sense of a mission, among other things) is specific for East European conditions in general, and, given the weakness of economic elites, would have rather ambiguous consequences in the subsequent developments. In this context suffice it to say that during the national revival epoch, the intelligentsia, supported by some rich individuals and groups, was a spearhead of the national struggles.

During this period the transition from predominantly oral culture to written culture (if not general, in any case, broad enough) took place. Moreover, unlike the monastic scriptural tradition, the culture transmitted by the new education was of a modern, secular type, and contained ideas of the dynamic civilization of the West (liberalism, utilitarianism, nationalism, etc.). The impact of printed matter: books, newspapers, magazines, and of the concomitant culture of reading upon the Bulgarian society was really revolutionizing. The printing press, especially periodicals, became a vehicle of modern (secular) ideas and an instrument in shaping the nation, both directly and through cultural homogenization. Another outcome of the widening of the reading public was the advancing politicization of the society, which became available for political mobilization by political parties and movements.

Notes

¹ Carlo Cipolla, *Literacy and Development in the West* (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969); Lawrence Stone, "Literacy and Education in

England 1640-1900," in *Past and Present*, No. 42, February 1969, pp. 69-139 and others. See also the papers in Norbert Reiter und Holm Sundhaussen (Hersg.) *Allgemeinbildung als Modernisierungsfaktor: zur Geschichte der Elementarbildung in Südosteuropa von der Aufklärung bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Berlin: Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin, 1994. (*Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen*, Bd. 23) Team research was conducted in France under the influence of the "Annales" school. See Francois Furet and Jacques Ozouf, ed., *Lire et écrire: L'Alphabetisation des Français de Calvin a Jules Ferry* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1977), translated in English as: *Reading and Writing: Literacy in France from Calvin to Jules Ferry* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982) Some of the researchers on literacy make use of comparative methods, giving a better idea of the level of literacy attained in individual European states during a certain epoch. See, for example, Etienne François, "Alphabetisierung und Lesefähigkeit in Frankreich und Deutschland um 1800," in H. Berding, E. François, H.-P. Ullmann, eds., *Deutschland und Frankreich im Zeitalter der Französischen Revolution* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1989). For American studies on literacy see: David Hall, "Les lecteurs et la lecture dans l'histoire et dans la théorie critique: un exposé sur la recherche américain," in Roger Chartier, ed. *Histoires de la lecture. Un bilan des recherches. Actes du colloque des 29 et 30 janvier 1993*, Paris. (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1995), pp. 165-179.

² Harvey J. Graff, *The Literacy Myth: Literacy and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century City* (New York: Academic Press, 1979); and Brian V. Street, *Literacy in Theory and Practice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

³ See for example Vasil Giuzelev, "Образование и грамотност в България през XIII-XIV век," in *Istoricheski pregled*, Vol. 38, No. 5 (1983), pp. 21-44; and Iordan Aleksiev, "За грамотността на населението в Turnovo," in *Srednovekovniat bulgarski grad* (Sofia: Bulgarsko istoricheskoto druzhestvo, 1980), 205-213.

⁴ The first data of this kind was published in *Statisticheski godishnik na Kniazhestvo Bŭlgariia. Kniga Purva*, (Sofia: N.P., 1909), pp. 57-59, 66-69. Indirect evidence about literacy can be found in the same volume of *Statisticheski godishnik*, pp. 419-420, 426-427, 434-437, 446-447, 454-461.

⁵ Kiril G. Popov, "Osnovnoto obrazovanie v Bŭlgariia prez uchebnata 1894/95 g." IV. Razkhod, in *Uchilishten pregled*, Dec. 1897, pp. 1429-1469; Georgi Minchev, *Zadŭlzhitelnoto uchenie v Bŭlgariia. Fakticheskoto polozhenie, usloviia na prilagane i opitvane v izsledvaneto mu* (Sofia, 1906); and Kiril G. Popov, *Stopanska Bŭlgariia* (Sofia: Pridvorna pechatnitsa, 1918).

⁶ Cipolla, *Literacy*, p. 39:

⁷ Lawrence Stone points especially to the apprehensions and fears of the

aristocracy if the poor in England were to receive education. The plantation owner of the American South reacted in a similar way to the eventual education of the slaves. See Stone, "Literacy and Education," pp. 84-85. For the controversial points in interpreting literacy see: Claude Levi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques* (New York: Atheneum, 1972), pp. 292-293; Jack Goody (ed.), *Literacy in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); and, Street, *Literacy in Theory and Practice*, pp. 1-16, 19-65, 95-131.

⁸ Such is the interpretation of the role of the schools during the national revival epoch of Angel Dimitrov in *Uchilishteto, progresiut i natsionalnata revolutsiia*, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1987). See also: Thomas Meininger, *The Formation of a Nationalist Bulgarian Intelligentsia, 1835-1878* (New York: Garland Pub., 1987).

⁹ Ernst Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).

¹⁰ See about the use of these terms in the antiquity William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 5-7.

¹¹ For a general discussion of the term intelligentsia and the peculiarities of the Bulgarian intelligentsia, see Roumen Daskalov, "Transformations of the East European Intelligentsia: Reflections on the Bulgarian Case" in *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Winter 1996) pp. 46-84.

¹² In the end of the sixteenth century the *damaskins* were manuscripts with writings of Damaskin Studit. The Bulgarian manuscript tradition of a later period (the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries) understood under *damaskins* collections with mixed contents, of which the writings of Damaskin Studit formed only a part (or were even entirely absent). About this see Donka Petkanova-Toteva, *Damaskinite v bulgarskata literatura* (Sofia: Bulgarska akademiia na naukite, 1965).

¹³ Boniu St. Angelov, *Suvremennitsi na Paisii*. Vol. 1 (Sofia: Bulgarska akademiia na naukite, 1963), pp. 157-175, 201-206.

¹⁴ Paisii of Khilendar, "Iz 'Istoriia slavenobolgarskaia'," in *Vuzrozhdenski stranitsi. Antologiiia*. Vol. 1 (Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1969), pp. 32-33.

¹⁵ Sofronii of Vratsa. *Zhitie i stradanie greshnago Sofronia*. (Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1966).

¹⁶ Neofit Bozveli, "Mati Bolgaria," in *Vuzrozhdenski stranitsi: Antologiiia*. Vol. 1 (Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1969), pp. 128-129.

¹⁷ About this period, see Vasil Giuselev, *Uchilishta, skriptorii i biblioteki v Bulgariia XII - XIV vek* (Sofia: Universitetsko Izdatelstvo "Sveti Kliment Okhridski," 1990).

¹⁸ Dennis Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century: Slavic Or-*

thodox Society and Culture under Ottoman Rule (Jefferson, N.C. and London: McFarland, 1993), p. 105.

¹⁹ Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 195.

²⁰ The *taxidiots* were travelling monks who collected funds for the monastery they represented. They often opened schools to the *metohs* of the monasteries in different localities; they also worked as copyists.

²¹ Nikolai Genchev, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska inteligentsia* (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," 1991), p. 75.

²² The *sborniks* and *damaskins* are collections of the same sort of religious and secular texts: didactic or moralistic works of various kind (hagiographies, sermons, and, sometimes, apocryphal or historical writings). The *damaskins*, unlike the *sborniks*, were written in new Bulgarian and were thus oriented toward a wider public. See Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 120-127, 143-182.

²³ Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 25.

²⁴ Petŭr Beron, *Bukvar s razlichni poucheniia*. Brashov, 1824, p. 2.

²⁵ See: Rumiana Radkova, *Neofit Rilski i novobŭlgarskata kultura: Pŭrvata polovina na XIX vek* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1975), pp. 59-60.

²⁶ Iliia Blŭskov, *Memoari* (Sofia: Otechestven front, 1976), p. 126.

²⁷ The restricted use of the primer, published in 1792 in Vienna with the support of Marko Teodorovich from Razlog, was due to the fact that it was in Old Church Slavonic.

²⁸ About such practice in the seventeenth century, see Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 148.

²⁹ See: Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 27.

³⁰ James F. Clarke, "The First Bulgarian Book," in Dennis P. Hupchick, ed., *The Pen and the Sword: Studies in Bulgarian History*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), p. 202.

³¹ To cite James Clarke: "Because of the primitive conditions prevailing in much of the Balkans, the educational process at the outset was often an individual struggle like that experienced by an earlier Lomonosov or a later Lincoln." See James F. Clarke, "Education and National Consciousness in the Balkans," in Hupchick, *The Pen and the Sword*, p. 25.

³² Greece exerted a sort of cultural superiority which made many Bulgarians, especially some rich notables, try to hide their Bulgarian nationality (being ashamed of it) and present themselves as Greeks. Thus, Vasil Aprilov, a Bulgarian from Gabrovo, who became a rich vodka merchant living in Odessa, was initially an extreme Hellenophile, before becoming an ardent patriot and philanthropist, having read the works of Yurii

Venelin, and especially his history book "Drevnite i dneshni bolgari" ("Ancient and Present-day Bulgarians"). Similar is the case of Ivan Seliminski. See James F. Clarke, *Bible Societies, American Missionaries, and the National Revival of Bulgaria*. (New York: Arno Press, 1971), p. 201.

³³ Bulgarians educated in the Greek schools wrote their works and letters in Greek. With the establishment of an independent Greek state and the rise of Greek chauvinism this practice was abandoned, especially as many Bulgarians were discovering their Slav origins. However, some Bulgarians never broke their ties with Hellenism; thus Dr. Nikola Pikolo, who began his scholarly career as a Professor of Philosophy on the Island Corfu, spent the second half of his life in Paris, engaged in work on classical Greece, and serving with equal success the interests of the Bulgarian and the Romanian causes, of classical and modern Greece, and of the French scholarship. See James F. Clarke, "Father Paisii and Bulgarian History," in Hupchick, *The Pen and the Sword*, pp. 90-91.

³⁴ Liuben Karavelov, "Iz 'Zapiski za Bulgaria i bulgarite'," in *Vŭzrozhdenski stranitsi: antologia*. Vol. 1 (Sofia: Bŭlgarski pisatel, 1969), p.602.

³⁵ About the transfer of the allilodidactical (mutual or monitorial) instruction from Britain to the Balkans, see Clarke, *Bible Societies*, pp. 204-210.

³⁶ Neofit Rilski was the author of one of the first grammars of the new-Bulgarian language, and translator of the *New Testament* into Bulgarian, published by Protestant missionaries in the 1840s.

³⁷ Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, pp. 89-90.

³⁸ Radkova, *Neofit Rilski*, pp. 62-67.

³⁹ *Tsarigradski vestnik*, No. 453, 27 June 1859.

⁴⁰ The first such Assembly was summoned in 1870 under the auspices of the independent Bulgarian Exarchate. The latter assumed the functions of a first institution on a national level prior to the establishment of the independent Bulgarian state. See Velko Tonev, "Uchitelskite sŭbori prez Vŭzrazhdaneto," in *Bŭlgariia 1300. Institutsii i dŭrzhavna traditsiia*. Vol. 2, (Sofia, 1982), pp. 475-480.

⁴¹ *Chitalishte*, 1874, No. 18 (cited in Genchev, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska inteligentsiia*, p. 76).

⁴² Liuben Karavelov, "Bŭlgarskite uchilishta triabva da imat svoia narodna sistema, dukh i napravlenie," in *Svoboda*, II, No. 32, 22 January, 1872; Iliia Bluskov, *Material po istoriata na nasheto vŭzrazhdane* (Shumen: Shumensko gradsko upravlenie, 1907).

⁴³ According to American missionaries there were in the 1860s probably

"half a million, if not two thirds, who can read among the Bulgarians." Tatyana Nestorova, *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians: (1858-1912)*. (Boulder, Colo: East European Monographs, 1987), p. 60.

⁴⁴ Nikolai Genchev, *Frantsiia v bŭlgarskoto dukhovno vŭzrazhdane*, (Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sveti Kliment Okhridski," 1979), pp. 245-273; Clarke, *Bible Societies*, pp. 200-224; Nestorova, *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians*, pp. 56-107; and Khristo Khristov, "Protestantskite misii v Bŭlgariia prez XIX vek," in *Godishnik na Dukhovnata Akademiia "Sveti Kliment Okhridski,"* Vol. 26, 1976-1977, No. 3, 1981.

⁴⁵ While the Protestant missionaries hoped to achieve the evangelization of the Bulgarians through the spread of education, they were to find out that the Bulgarians were interested primarily in receiving better education, not in the religious ideas of Protestantism.

⁴⁶ Social and natural sciences as well as mathematics were taught in them. But, due to the absence of central educational agencies and unified school policies until 1878, the class schools made use of a variety of curricula and teaching methods, which reflected most often the personal preparation and preferences of the teachers.

⁴⁷ In the economically and culturally backward regions, this was the time when the transition from cell-schools to mutual schools was taking place.

⁴⁸ Until liberation in 1878, some special schools were opened in the Bulgarian lands - a pedagogical one, a commercial one and a seminary for the education of priests, while two of the class schools were extended to complete high schools. However, this goes beyond the scope of elementary education and I will not consider these institutions here.

⁴⁹ Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 97.

⁵⁰ According to *Statisticheski godishnik na Kniazhestvo Bŭlgariia: Kniga Pŭrva* (Sofia, 1909), p. 17, the population of Bulgaria (Kingdom Bulgaria plus Eastern Rumelia) was 2,823,211 in 1881. The Bulgarians under Ottoman domination in Macedonia and Southern Thracia are not included in this figure. While there are no reasons why we should exclude them from the consideration of the pre-liberation period, when national processes were going on in these lands as well (and Bulgarian schools were opened there), the figure of the Bulgarian population, estimated by Angel Dimitrov, still appears to me unrealistic.

⁵¹ Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 100.

⁵² In Western Europe as well, the idea of women's education met public resistance for a long time; and the opinion was widely held that "reading girls were wicked women." See Roger Chartier, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 155.

⁵³ Among the contributors on the issue of women's education, there were a few women; especially noteworthy among them were the women teachers Stanka Nikolitsa Spasso-Elenina, Ivanka Zolotovich, Slavka Dinkova, Anastasiia Tosheva, Eka Karaminkova, Evgeniia Kisimova and Maria Runtova. See Krassimira Daskalova, "Obrazovanie na zhenite i zhenite v obrazovaniето na vuzrozhdenska Bulgaria," in *Godishnik na Sofiiskiat Universitet-Tsentŭr po kulturoznanie*, vol. 85, 1992, pp. 5-18.

⁵⁴ See for example: *Liuboslovie*, Vol. 2, 1846, No. 13, No. 21; *Tsarigradski vestnik*, Vol. 8, No. 355, 1857; *Pravo*, Vol 4, No. 47, 1869, Vol. 8, No. 5, 14 April 1873; *Makedoniia*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 7 December 1868; Vol. 3, No. 10, 1 February 1869; No. 11, 8 February 1869; No. 12, 15 February 1869; No. 13, 22 February 1869; No. 35, 26 July 1869; Vol. 4, No. 25, 1870; Vol. 5, No. 14, 1872; *Svoboda*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 7 November 1869; *Chitalishte*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1872; *Uchilishte*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 15 June 1875, No. 9, 15 September 1875; *Znanie*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 15 March 1876.

⁵⁵ *Makedoniia*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 7 December 1868. About the movement for women's education, see also Virzhinia Paskaleva, *Bulgarkata prez Vŭzrazhdaneto*. 2 ed. (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Otechestveniiia front, 1984); and, Margarita Cholakova, *Bulgarskoto zhensko dvizhenie prez Vŭzrazhdaneto, 1857-1878* (Sofia: Albo, 1994).

⁵⁶ The movement for emancipation of the Bulgarian women was supported by special journals on women, the first one entitled *Ruzhitsa ili red knizhki za zhenite* (published by Petko Slaveikov in Constantinople in 1871). Its goal was formulated as follows: "To contribute as it can for the promotion and the advance of the weaker sex among us Bulgarians." *Ruzhitsa ili red knizhki za zhenite*, Vol. 1, 1871, No. 1, p. 1. Though conducted mostly by men in men's terms, the propaganda for women's emancipation through education gradually gained ground among the patriarchal but otherwise democratic Bulgarian society of the time.

⁵⁷ Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 92.

⁵⁸ In contrast to England, where the Sunday schools were designed for the education of children engaged in factory work during the week, in Bulgaria they served mostly the purpose of elementary education (or further education) of adults. In this goal they were quite similar to the reading-clubs. About the attempt of the teachers from Shumen to set up a Sunday school in 1862 (following the example of the American missionary Brettman, whose activities they counteracted as dangerous for "our faith and our nationhood") see Iliia Blŭskov, "Protestantskite misioneri" and "Vecherni i nedelni uchilishta," in *Memoari*, pp.142-143, 141.

⁵⁹ Nestorova, *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians*, p. 71.

⁶⁰ After 1878 the Bulgarian lands were divided into Kingdom Bulgaria, with Sofia as capital, and the autonomous region Eastern Rumelia, with

Plovdiv as administrative center (they fused in 1885). Part of the Bulgarians remained under Ottoman domination in Macedonia and parts of Thracia.

⁶¹ See *Statisticheski godishnik*, pp. 436-437.

⁶² *Istoriia na obrazovaniето i pedagogicheskata misl v Bŭlgaria*. Vol. 2 (Sofia, 1976).

⁶³ These observations and data about the teachers are based on my PhD thesis, to be published by Sofia University Press, *Uchiteliat prez Bŭlgarskoto vŭzrazhdane*, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Sofiiskiat universitet "Sv. Kliment Ohridski," forthcoming).

⁶⁴ See Peter Sugar, "The Enlightenment on the Balkans. Some Considerations," in *East-European Quarterly*, Vol 9, No. 4 (Winter 1985), pp. 499-507.

⁶⁵ Cipolla, *Literacy and Development*, p. 26.

⁶⁶ The data comes from the most comprehensive research on the Bulgarian intelligentsia of the national revival epoch, conducted in the Center for History and Theory of Culture of the Sofia University in 1982-1988 under the direction of Nikolai Genchev. The research is based upon a huge amount of primary sources: personal and township archives, books and periodicals, memoirs, diaries, and relevant secondary sources. The results were published in Nikolai Genchev and Krassimira Daskalova, eds., *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska inteligentsiia*, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo "Petur Beron," 1988); Genchev, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska inteligentsiia*; Daskalova, *Uchiteliat prez bŭlgarskoto vŭzrazhdane*; and Miglena Kiuumdzhieva, *Intelektualniiat elit prez Vŭzrazhdaneto*, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Sofiiskiat universitet "Sv. Kliment Okhridski," forthcoming).

⁶⁷ As I mentioned before, I think that Angel Dimitrov overestimated the Bulgarian population in the 1870s (the figure given by him is four million). See Dimitrov, *Uchilishteto, progresŭt*, p. 100. Taking as a point of departure the figure 3,216,005 in the census of 1890 and allowing for the population growth which took place between the 1870s and the 1890s, I propose the figure 3.4 million (where the Bulgarians in Macedonia and Thracia are included) as a more realistic assessment. My subsequent calculations are based on this figure.

⁶⁸ Daskalova, *Uchiteliat prez bulgarskoto vuzrazhdane*; Daskalova, "Obrazovanie na zhenite," pp. 8-10; and Genchev, *Bulgarska vŭzrozhdenska inteligentsia*, pp. 251-252.

⁶⁹ *Statisticheski godishnik*, pp. 436-437.

⁷⁰ To cite Georgi Minchev "Our statesmen, especially in the 1890s, seem to have played with the educational system; they opened and closed schools, giving and taking away the key to civilization and education to

many villages." See Minchev, *Zadŭlzhitelnoto uchenie v Bŭlgariia*, pp. 52-53. Nikola Aleksiev, the greatest authority on the early decades of Bulgarian educational policies, also pointed to the political instability (the frequent change of governments and ministers) as a major reason for the critical state of Bulgarian education. According to his estimations, during the initial 33 years of independent political life, there were 36 ministers of education with almost as many projects for reforming the school system. See Nikola Alexiev, *Nashata uchilishtna politika: Istorichsko izsledvane* (Sofia: N.P., 1912), p. 285.

⁷¹ The number of the population according to the censuses was the following: in 1890 - 3,216,005 persons; in 1895 - 3,414,155 persons; in 1900 - 3,687,123 persons. See *Statisticheski godishnik*, p. 17.

⁷² Cipolla, *Literacy and Development*, p. 27.

⁷³ *Statisticheski godishnik*, p. 57.

⁷⁴ The Teachers' Assemblies in the 1870s dealt with this question for the first time. For this see Tonev, "Uchitelските sŭbori," p. 476. Carlo Cipolla mentions similar problems with the qualification of the teachers in some schools in London and Manchester, attended by children of workers' background during the first half of the nineteenth century, where the teachers were persons "whose only qualification for this employment seems to be their unfitness for every other." Until the mid-nineteenth century in the state of Pope "indigence was a sufficient qualification for being appointed as a teacher." In southern Italy until the end of the last century "the conditions of elementary education are bad not for the scarcity of schools but for the poor quality of the teachers." But the teachers in Prussia and the Netherlands seem to have been as a whole well prepared during the same epoch. See Cipolla, *Literacy and Development*, pp. 31-32.

⁷⁵ About the educational qualifications and preparation of the Bulgarian teachers during the national revival period, see Krassimira Daskalova, "Образование на възрожденикѝа учител (по резултатите от изследването 'Бŭлгарска възрожденикѝа интелигенция)," in *GSU - Tsentŭr po kulturoznanie*, T. 80-81, 1987-1988, pp. 43-56. Concerning teachers' salaries, see Krassimira Daskalova, "Materialnoto polozhenie na възрожденикѝа учител," in *GSU - Tsentur po kulturoznanie*, T. 82, 1989.

⁷⁶ More than half of the Bulgarian pre-liberation intelligentsia were teachers. Concerning the distribution according to professions; see Genchev, *Bŭlgarska възрожденикѝа интелигенция*, pp. 280-287; Nikolai Genchev, *Ochertsi: sotsialno-psikhologicheski tipove v bŭlgarskata istoriia* (Sofia: Durzhavno izdatelstvo "Septemvri," 1987), pp. 154-155, 164-168. About the bureaucratization of the national intelligentsia after the Liberation see Krustiu Krŭstev, "Бŭлгарската интелигенция," in *Misul*, 1898,

No. 1, pp. 5-7. About the involvement of the teachers in partisan political struggles see Todor Vlaikov, "Nashata inteligentsiia po odnoshenie na narodnoto ni obrazovanie," in *Misul*, 1893, No. 1, pp. 7-23; [Stoletov] "Narodniiat uchitel i narodnoto obrazovanie," in *Misul* 1896, No. 1, pp. 60-61, as well as my book *Daskalova, Uchiteliat prez bulgarskoto vuzrazhdane* (especially the last chapter on the teachers after 1878).

⁷⁷ Popov, "Osnovnoto obrazovanie v Bŭlgaria," pp. 1429-1469.

⁷⁸ Konstantin Jireček, "Glavno izlozhenie do Negovo Vissochestvo kniazza vurhu polozhenieto na uchebnoto delo v kniazhestvo Bŭlgaria," p. 376, 387-388; and Ioakim Gruev, "Raport do N.S. Glavnii upravitel na Iztochna Rumelia od Direktora na Narodnoto Prosvetenie," p. 415, in *Iz archivata na Ministerstvoto na Narodnoto Prosvetenie* (Sofia: N.P., 1905).

⁷⁹ Ivan Geshov, "Chinovnicheskiiat proletariat," in *Periodichesko spisanie na Bŭlgarskoto Knizhovno Druzhestvo*, 1888, No. 19-20, pp. 118-133.

⁸⁰ Before that, such information was published in a more or less haphazard manner in the periodical press, mainly in the 1870s.

⁸¹ Tsvetanka Donova, "Obrazovatelnoto ravnishte na naselenieto v Bŭlgariia," in *Statistika*, 1968, No. 6, pp. 25-33.

⁸² That is, in 1900, 70.19 per cent of Bulgarians were illiterate. One year earlier (1899), according to the data of the first more trustworthy census in Romania, cited by David Mitrany, 78 per cent of the Romanian population was illiterate (90 per cent of the women). See: David Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 509.

⁸³ *Statisticheski godishnik*, p. 57.

⁸⁴ The Serbian and Romanian educational systems encountered similar problems. The state of affairs in Serbia was especially bad, and the system of elementary schools was created and regulated by law even later. Obligatory elementary education was introduced in Serbia in 1888, but 20 years later the law was still largely ineffective with less than 50 per cent school attendance, especially in the villages. (Attendance was even lower for girls.) The new law of 1898, which prescribed strict measures against parents who did not send their children to school, was also not strictly enforced due to the lack of school buildings in many of the communities. See about this Ruth Trouton, *Peasant Renaissance in Yugoslavia: 1900-1950* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1952), pp. 98-117. The situation in Romania was not much better. Although the principle of obligatory elementary education was written down in the Constitution of 1866, it remained a good intention. The law could not guarantee the building of enough suitable buildings for schools and the preparation of a sufficient number of teachers. See Mitrany, *The Land and Peasant in*

Rumania, p. 510.

⁸⁵ Minchev, *Zadulzhitelnoto uchenie*, pp.14-15.

⁸⁶ In 1900, Bulgaria had a population of 3,744,283 persons - 4/5 (2,998,723) lived in villages and only about 1/5 (745,560) lived in towns. See: *Statisticheski godishnik*, p. 57.

⁸⁷ As Lawrence Stone put it: "Universal elementary education would only become possible when child labour had been made illegal or had become unprofitable, or both." See his "Literacy and Education," p.117. The introduction of labor laws (protecting women's and children's labor) in Bulgaria in 1905 did not raise the school attendance substantially; in fact, this was not due so much to ineffective implementation but rather to the small number of industrial workers with industrialization still in its beginnings.

⁸⁸ For information on the use of women's and children's labor, see Minchev, *Zadulzhitelnoto uchenie*, pp. 101-107; Iliia Ianulov, *Sotsialnata politika v chuzhbina i Bŭlgariia: prichini, razvitie, sistema* (Sofia: Pechatnitsa Radikal, 1924); *Razvitie na sotsialnoto zakonodatelstvo v Bŭlgariia* (Sofia, 1939); Stoian Kutinchev (former inspector-in-chief on labor), *Usloviata i zashtitata na truda v Bŭlgariia: inspektsii i anketi*, (Sofia, 1919).

⁸⁹ About the effect of bad conditions on the pupils see Minchev, *Zadulzhitelnoto uchenie*, pp. 112-124. The author cites distressing data from teachers' inquiries on nutrition and the conditions in households in which their pupils lived. He established a link between the decrease of the number of pupils in the elementary schools and the bad harvest years and economic crisis in Bulgaria between 1896 and 1901.

⁹⁰ Holm Sundhaussen, "Alphabetisierung und Wirtschaftswachstum in den Balkanländern in historisch komparativer Perspektive," in Norbert Reiter und Holm Sundhaussen (Hrsgs.) *Allgemeinbildung als Modernisierungsfaktor*. Berlin: Osteuropa-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin, 1994, (*Balkanologische Veroeffentlichungen. Bd. 23*) p 28.

⁹¹ For this calculation see Sundhaussen, "Alphabetisierung und Wirtschaftswachstum," p. 25.

⁹² Cipolla, *Literacy and Development*, pp. 28-29.

⁹³ Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader; a social history of the mass reading public, 1800-1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

⁹⁴ Rolf Engelsing, "Die Perioden der Lesergeschichte in der Neuzeit: das statistische Ausmass und die soziokulturelle Bedeutung der Lektüre," in *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, Vol. 10, 1969-70, pp. 945-1002; *Alphabetentum und Lektüre. Zur Sozialgeschichte des Lesens in Deutschland zwischen feudaler und industrieller Gesellschaft*. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1973) and *Der Bürger als Leser: Lesergeschichte in Deutschland, 1500-1800*.

(Stuttgart: Metzler, 1974).

⁹⁵ Roger Chartier, ed., *Histoires de la lecture: une bilan de recherches: actes du colloque des 29 et 30 janvier 1993*. (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1995); and Hans-Eric Boedicker, ed., *Histoires du livre* (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1995).

⁹⁶ David Hall, "The History of the Book: New Questions? New Answers," in *Journal of Library History*, Vol. 21, 1986, pp. 27-36.

⁹⁷ To cite just a few from the more important: Paul Saenger, "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society," in *Viator*. Vol. 13, (1982), pp. 367-414; Reinhard Wittmann, *Buchmarkt und Lektüre im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zum literarischen Leben 1750-1880. Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur 6* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1982); Roger Chartier, ed., *Pratiques de la lecture*. (Marseille: Rivage, 1985); Roger Chartier, *Lectures et lecteurs dans la France d'Ancien régime*. (Paris: Seuil, 1987); Alain Boureau and Roger Chartier, ed., *Les usages de l'imprime (XVe-XIXe siècle)* (Paris: Fayard, 1987); Lydia G. Cochrane, trans., *The Culture of Print: Power and the Uses of Print in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989); Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987); Reinhard Wittmann, *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels* (München: Verlag C. H. Beck 1991); Roger Chartier, *L'ordre des livres. Lecteurs, auteurs, bibliothèques en Europe entre XIVe et XVIIIe siècle* (Aix-en Provence: Alinea, 1992); and, Lydia G. Cochrane, trans., *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe Between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1994). Especially stimulating for the development of the history of reading is Henri-Jean Martin's "Pour une histoire de la lecture," in Henri-Jean Martin, *Le Livre Français sous l'Ancien Régime*. (Paris: N.P., 1987); also Robert Darnton, "First Steps Toward a History of Reading," in Robert Darnton, *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990), pp. 107-135; Robert Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982); Robert Darnton and Daniel Roch, eds., *Revolution in Print: The Press in France, 1775-1800*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). As far as Bulgarian culture and reading during the nineteenth century is concerned, I find especially relevant works which treat the relation between reading and popular culture like those written by Roger Chartier, Carlo Ginzburg and Peter Burke. See: Carlo Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermi. Il cosmo di un mugnaio del'500* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1976), in English: *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980); Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: New York University Press, 1978). For the American perspective see: David D. Hall and John B. Hench, *Needs and*

Opportunities in the History of the Book: America, 1639-1876 (Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1987); David D. Hall, "Les lecteurs et la lecture dans la theorie critique: un exposé sur la recherche americaine," in Chartier, Roger, ed., *Histoires de la lectures. Un bilan des recherches* (Paris: IMEC Editions, 1995), pp. 165-179; and William Gilmore, *Reading Becomes a Necessity of Life: Material and Cultural Life in Rural New England, 1780-1835* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989).

⁹⁸ See his: *Bibliography and Sociology of Texts. The Panizzi Lectures* (London: The British Library, 1986). See also his: *Oral Culture, Literacy and Print in early New Zealand: the Treaty of Waitangi* (Victoria University Press: Alexander Turnbull Library Endowment Trust, 1985).

⁹⁹ David D. Hall, "The History of the Book in the United States: Prospects and Perspectives," in Hans-Eric Boedecker, ed., *Histoire du livre* (Paris: IMEC, 1995), pp. 54-55. Until 1980s (when Henri-Jean Martin and Roger Chartier started publishing the "Histoire de l'édition française"), even in France the history of reading was dependent on the old history of literature, which treated texts and reading practices as abstractions, without historical reference. Roger Chartier, "De l'histoire du livre a l'histoire de la lecture: les trajectoires françaises," in Hans-Eric Boedecker, ed., *Histoire du livre*, p. 27.

¹⁰⁰ Jonathan Rose, "Rereading the English Common Reader: A Preface to a History of Audiences," in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (1992), pp. 47-70.

¹⁰¹ See for example: Cathy N. Davidson, *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Cathy N. Davidson, ed., *Reading in America: Literature and Social History* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); Elizabeth A. Flynn, Patrocínio P. Schweickart, eds., *Gender and Reading* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); and Marie-Claire Hoock-Demarle, "Reading and Writing in Germany," in Genevieve Fraisse and Michelle Perot, eds., *A History of Women in the West. Vol. IV. Emerging Feminism from Revolution to World War* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 145-165.

¹⁰² Authors who take an interest in these issues are Ani Gergova, *Knigoliubieto na vŭzrozhdentsite* (Sofia: Respublikanski sthuvet na dvizhenieto "Priiateli na knigata," 1985); *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite. 19 - nachaloto na 20 vek* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1991); Docho Lekov, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska literatura.: problemi, zhanrove, tvortsi. Vol. 1-2* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1988), especially the parts entitled: "The Role of Translation in the Public Life and the Artistic Sphere of the Bulgarians During the National Revival," Vol. 1, pp. 96-113 and "The

Reader in the Creative World of the Revivalist Writer," Vol. 2, pp. 301-317.

¹⁰³ The Ottoman authorities did not allow book-printing in Bulgarian in the Bulgarian lands and the attempts to set up printing houses in Thessaloniki and Samokov were unsuccessful. Almost all Bulgarian books and periodicals were published abroad - in foreign printing-houses in towns with big Bulgarian colonies (Constantinople, Bucharest, Braila) or in foreign printing-houses in the well-known European centers of the publishing industry such as Vienna (until 1878 more than 300 Bulgarian books were published in the printing-house of Leopold Sommer), Belgrade (in the Royal Serb Printing house), in Constantinople (in several printing-houses, belonging to Armenians) or in printing-houses which belonged to Bulgarians (in Constantinople, Braila, and Bucharest). A small number of the books were printed in the printing-house of the Danubian vilayet (i. e. administrative region) in the town of Russe, where the vilayet newspaper "The Danube" was also printed (in Bulgarian and Turkish). Though similar vilayet printing-houses existed in Odrin and Thessaloniki, no Bulgarian books were printed there. Cyrillic characters and clichés for illustrations could not be cast in the Ottoman empire, a fact which created additional difficulties for the printing and added to the publishing expenses (and the price) of the Bulgarian books. For more information see Petur Atanasov, *Nachalo na bulgarskoto knigopechatane* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1959). One should especially note the role of Protestant printing and publishing in Smirna and Constantinople for the supply of the Bulgarian schools with books and materials in the vernacular at affordable prices.

¹⁰⁴ Dennis Hupchick argues that already during the seventeenth century there was "a wider reading public," due to the propagation of education outside the confines of the monasteries. See Hupchick, *The Bulgarians in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 124. In this period of restricted literacy, however, compilers and authors (if this term is appropriate) typically addressed their public as: "readers and listeners" (e.g. Paisii of Khilendar in the Foreword to his "Istoriia Slavianobolgarskaiia"); thus one may better speak of wider audiences, rather than a wider reading public.

¹⁰⁵ On the debates over the literary languages in various Balkan countries see Stavro Skendi, "The Emergence of the Modern Balkan Literary Languages: A Comparative Approach," in his *Balkan Cultural Studies* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), pp. 3-21 (on Bulgaria pp. 9-12).

¹⁰⁶ Alexander Burmov, "Uvod," in Maniu Stoianov, *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska knizhnina, vol. 1* (Sofia, 1957), p. vi. See also James F. Clarke, "Konstantin Fotinov, *Liuboslovie* and the Smyrna Bulgarian Press," in Hupchick, *The Pen and the Sword*, p. 326. In fact, many of the

materials in the journal were direct translations from a similar journal, published in Greek, with the assistance of the American Protestants. For more information, see Clarke, *Bible Societies*, p. 258.

¹⁰⁷ I am presenting them in the way they were grouped by the author of the bibliography. See Teodorov-Balan, *Bŭlgarski knigopis za sto godini; 1805-1905* (Sofia: Dŭrzhavna pechatnitsa, 1909).

¹⁰⁸ These originated in Church struggles against the Greek Patriarchy in Constantinople, as in Luther's Reformation.

¹⁰⁹ Teodorov-Balan, *Bŭlgarski knigopis za sto godini*, pp. 1436-1645

¹¹⁰ There are no incunabula proper in Bulgaria, i.e. printed books from the fifteenth century. The first book to be published in new-Bulgarian language was *Kiriakodromion ili Nedelnik* (in translation: "Sunday Book"), known popularly as "Sofronie," after the name of the "author" - Sofronii of Vratsa. In fact, the book is a collection of 96 Sunday and Saints' Day sermons (extracted from the *Bible* and published in the vernacular). It was published in 1,000 copies, in *quarto* of 543 pages, and is the biggest new-Bulgarian book, prior to the *Bible* edition in 1871. The many editions that this book underwent attest to its popularity. Clarke, *Bible Societies*, pp. 67-68.

¹¹¹ Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, p. 174, 208.

¹¹² Nestorova, *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians*, p. 94.

¹¹³ For its cultural role for the Bulgarians, see Nikola Nachov, *Tsarigrad kato kulturen tsentŭr na bŭlgarite* (Sofia, 1925).

¹¹⁴ Elena Siupur, *Bŭlgarskata emigrantska inteligentsia v Rumŭniiia prez 19 vek* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1982). Also Nikolai Zhechev, *Bukuresht, kulturno sredishte na bulgarite prez Vŭzrazhdaneto* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1991); and Nikolai Zhechev and Veselin Traikov. *Bŭlgarskata emigratsiia v Rumuniia, XIV vek-1878 godina i uchastieto i v stopanskiia, obshtstvenopoliticheskiia i kulturniia zhivot na rumŭnskiia narod*, (Sofia: Izdatelstvo "Nauka i izkustvo," 1986).

¹¹⁵ Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, pp. 141, 174, 208.

¹¹⁶ The politicization of everyday discourse in the cafés, reading-clubs and other public places is colorfully described by the patriarch of the Bulgarian novel—Ivan Vazov—in *Under the Yoke* (at the "Gankinoto kafene"). In just a few decades the Bulgarians were transformed from a humble and deferent audience that silently listened to the few literate "authorities," into self-confident commentators and judges of what was happening in the world. The keen interest in distant events (such as the Anglo-Boers War) was satirized by Ivan Vazov in the drama *Vestnikariat* [The Newspaperman]. About similar processes of the "politicization of

popular culture" in Western Europe (between 1500-1800) see Peter Burke, *Popular Culture*, p. 259.

¹¹⁷ Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, pp. 175-176.

¹¹⁸ *Rabotnik*, No. 23, 8 April 1881 (cited in Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, p. 142).

¹¹⁹ Karavelov, "Nashata knizhevnost," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981), p. 118.

¹²⁰ See the results published in Genchev, *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska inteligentsiia*, pp. 241-250.

¹²¹ For the role of France in Bulgarian education see: Genchev, *Frantsiia v bŭlgarskoto dukhovno razvitie*, pp. 245-273.

¹²² Ilchev, Ivan. "Robert kolezh i formiraneto na bulgarskata inteligentsiia," in *Istoricheski pregled*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1981), pp. 50-63. See also George Washburn, *Petdeset godini v Tsarigrad* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Otechestveniiia front, 1980).

¹²³ Russia increased its educational grants for the Southern Slavs after the Crimean war in 1853-1856, to counteract the increased cultural presence of France and the Protestant mission on the Balkans.

¹²⁴ For Bulgarian-Russian cultural relations see Nikolai Genchev, *Bŭlgaro-ruski kulturni obshtuvaniia prez Vŭzrazhdaneto* (Sofia, 1975).

¹²⁵ Genchev, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska inteligentsia*, p. 246.

¹²⁶ Nesho Bonchev, "Klassicheskite evropeiski pisатели na bu lgarski ezik i polzata ot izuchavaneto na suchineniia im," in *Periodichesko spisanie na Bŭlgarskoto Knizhovno Druzhestvo*, Vol. I, 1873, No. 7-8.

¹²⁷ Karavelov, "Nashata knizhevnost," p. 119; Mikhail Radoslavov, "Prevodite po naroden dukh li sa?," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981), p. 226. See also Lekov, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska literatura*, Vol. 1, pp. 96-113.

¹²⁸ In the contemporary discussions on translation and Bulgarianization, two opinions were voiced: according to the first, the translator is free to "correct" the imperfections and mistakes of the original; according to the second, he has to respect even the mistakes in the original - see Angel Piskiuliev, "Niakolko rechi za prevozhdaneto," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981), p. 134. The two opinions on translation were described as between "a person, who knows only to read" and "a person who knows to read but also wants to know what it means to compose," (the claim being that he may take part in the writing of the text).

¹²⁹ Similarly, during the eighteenth century, German translators and scholars made changes in the originals while translating them, as

pointed out by Bernhard Fabian. For example, whole parts were added while translating the *Universal History*, a deed which would now be seen as a corruption of intellectual property. But, as international copyright did not exist in the eighteenth century, such acts did not have judicial consequences. See Bernhard Fabian, *The English Book in Eighteenth-Century Germany: The Panizzi lectures* (London: The British Library, 1991), pp. 90-91.

¹³⁰ While no monographic study on book collections in nineteenth century Bulgaria is available, some data are presented by Gergova, *Knigoliubieto na vŭzrozhdentsite; Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, pp. 119-127 and also in Daskalova, *Uchiteliat prez bŭlgarskoto vŭzrazhdane*, pp. 154-165. There is information on the private book collections of Petur Beron, Emanuil Vaskidovich, Khristaki Pavlovich, Neofit Bozveli, Neofit Rilski, Vasil Aprilov, Spiridon Palauzov, Ivan Seliminski, Nikola Pikolo, Ivan Shopov, Ivan Denkoglu, Zakhari Kniazhevski, Naiden Gerov, Petko R. Slaveikov, Liuben Karavelov, Khristo Botev, Krustiu Pishurka, Dobri Voinikov, Marin Kalugerov, Atanas Cholakov, Pavel Chuklev, Iordan Dzhinot, Georgi S. Rakovski, Dimitŭr Miladinov, Konstantin Velichkov, Marin Drinov, and Iliia Blŭskov.

¹³¹ Dimitŭr Dushanov, *Spomeni. Pisma i dokumenti. Publitsistika* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Otechestvenia front, 1989), p. 17.

¹³² Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, pp. 120, 123.

¹³³ Marko Markovski, *Spomeni i ochertsi za bulgarskite revoliutsionni dvizhenia* (Sofia: N.P., 1976), p. 32.

¹³⁴ Dushanov, *Spomeni*, p. 19.

¹³⁵ Elena Kirova, "Uchitelските библиотеки в България през периода 1878-1917," in *Godishnik na Sofiiskaia Universitet - Filisofsko-Istoricheski Fakultet* (from now on: *GSU-FIF*) Kniga III. (Sofia: Durzhavno izd-vo "Nauka i izkustvo," 1966), pp. 261-308. Judging from the data on students' libraries between 1878-1914, it seems that outside the school curricula the pupils liked to read mostly Mayn Reid and Mark Twain. See: Elena Kirova, "Uchenicheskите библиотеки в България (1878-1914)," in *GSU-FIF*. Kniga III. *Istoriia*, 1968, pp. 393-445.

¹³⁶ For this see the memoirs of the Bulgarian poet Kiril Krustev, *Zatrupana Sofia* (Sofia: N.P., 1943).

¹³⁷ Blŭskov, *Memoari*, p. 129.

¹³⁸ Angel Dimitrov, *Knizhariat, kogoto narichakha ministŭr*. (Plovdiv: Izdatelstvo "Hristo G. Danov," 1988); Gergova, *Knizhninata i bŭlgarite*, p. 136

¹³⁹ Petŭr Parihzkov, ed., *Vŭzrozhdenski knizhari* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1980).

¹⁴⁰ For their role see my book, *Uchiteliat prez bŭlgarskoto vŭzrazhdane*, pp. 145-153.

¹⁴¹ Clarke, "The First Bulgarian Book," p. 202.

¹⁴² Stoianov, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska knizhnina*, p. 38.

¹⁴³ *Znanie*, Vol. I, 1875, No. 12, p. 192.

¹⁴⁴ Nikola Nachov, *Kalofer v minaloto* (Sofia: Zemizdat, 1990), p. 398.

¹⁴⁵ Bluskov, *Memoari*, p. 138.

¹⁴⁶ These were lists of the persons (mostly teachers, priests, petty traders), who paid authors in advance for their books. This practice helped in raising the necessary funds for printing, especially as it was done outside the Bulgarian lands, making the editions more costly. More than 180 books (about 1/10 of the books printed before 1878) were printed in this way. A list of subscribers was published for the first time in the first new-Bulgarian printed book - *Nedelnik* by Sofronii of Vratsa. This method of raising funds was used by 2/3 of the authors for the purpose of printing various materials: textbooks and teaching materials, fiction, calendars, collections of songs, religious literature, etc. See Maniu Stoianov, "Spomoshtestvovatelite," in Parizhkov, *Vŭzrozhdenski knizhari*, pp. 338-348. In Western Europe and America the method of subscription was used mostly for publishing expensive books. See Bill Katz, ed., *Dahl's History of the Book*. Third English Edition. (Metuchen, N.J. and London: The Scarecrow Press Inc, 1995), p. 192.

¹⁴⁷ Thus in 1835 five monks from the Kilifarevo monastery and four monks from the Kapinovo monastery ordered Sava Dobroplodni's book *Mikhal*. Stoianov, *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska knizhnina*, pp. 540, 541.

¹⁴⁸ Of the 180 books published by subscription before Liberation, 42 titles recruited more than 1,000 subscribers; 16 books were ordered by 800 to 1,000 potential readers; 36 had between 500 and 800 subscribers; 20 books had between 250 and 500 subscribers. The rest of the books had less than 250 subscribers (most often between 100-150 subscribers). I made these calculations using data from Stoianov, *Bulgarska vŭzrozhdenska knizhnina*.

¹⁴⁹ Here is more information on subscriptions: *Dve sovetovatelni slova Plutarkha Heroneia o vozpitanii detei i Isokrata Ritora o blagonravii iunosti* published in 1845 (M. Stoianov, 7399), recruited 2,543 subscribers in sixty communities; *Razgovor mezhdu dvama khristiani*, 1862. (M. Stoianov, 7191) had 2,500 subscribers in eighty-three communities; *Mesetsoslov ili kalendar vechnii* by Hristodul Kostovich (Sichan-Nikolov) in 1840 (M. Stoianov, 6732) had 2,392 subscribers in forty-five communities; *Venets azbuchnii ili nraostveni nastavenia po azbukveno. Iz suchineniata na Sv. Dimitŭr Rostovski*, 1863 (M. Stoianov, 1154) was ordered in 2,255 copies

from ninety communities; *Pravoslavnoe uchenie ili skkrasteno khristiansko bogoslovie*, 1844 (M. Stoianov, 3220) - 2,212 books for forty communities; *Razkazi za vodata i neinite svoistva*, 1875 (M. Stoianov, 8762) - 2,143 copies in twenty-two communities; *Za vŭzduhut i negovoto vliianie na zhivotnite i rasteniata*, 1872 (M. Stoianov, 3945) - 2,088 copies in twenty-one communities; *Aritmetika ili nauka chislitelna*, 1833 (M. Stoianov, 5840) - had subscribers for 991 copies in twenty-four communities, but 2,000 copies were published; *Pismenik*, 1853 (M. Stoianov, 1749), - 1,988 copies in thirty-four communities; *Istoriia blŭgarska, sochinena ot Gavrila Krŭstevicha*, 1869 (M. Stoianov, 4858) - 1,874 copies in forty-four communities; *Dodatutsi na Zlatnia izvor ili razlichni ekonomicheski, pouchitelni i mnogopolezni nastavlenia po domostroitelstvo, gotvarstvo i lekarstvo*, 1874, (M. Stoianov, 7180) - 1,853 copies in fifty-six communities; *Igionomiia, sirech pravila za da si vardim zdravieto*, 1846 (M. Stoianov, 1746) - 1,759 copies in thirty communities; *Istoriia na velikii Alexandra Makedontsa*, 1844 (M. Stoianov, 944) - 1,604 copies in thirty-seven communities; *Mikhal* by S. Dobroplodni, 1853, (M. Stoianov, 1748) - order of 1,456 copies from forty-two communities; *Kratko zemleopisanie*, 1856, (M. Stoianov, 3102) - 1,432 copies in twenty-seven communities; *Povest ili pouchenie khristianskoe*, 1855 (M. Stoianov, 1526) - 1,414 books in fifty-four communities; *Hristoitia ili blagonravie*, (M. Stoianov, 6302) - 1,393 copies in thirty-five communities; *Zaradi vurazhdaneto na novobulgarskata slovestnost*, by Iu. Venelin, (M. Stoianov 4608) - 1,329 copies; *Neshtastna familia*, 1873, (M. Stoianov, 1842) - 1,292 copies in thirty-six communities; *Sredstva za predvarvanie za zara-viane na mnimoumrelite*, 1858, (M. Stoianov, 4633) - 1,280 copies in twenty-three communities; *Maika kŭshtovnitsa*, 1875, (M. Stoianov, 782) - 1,272 copies in eleven communities; *Zhitie na Sv. Grigorii*, 1852, (M. Stoianov, 7372) - 1,271 copies in seventy-two communities; *Naruchni apostolski chetenia*, 1870, (M. Stoianov, 7961) - 1,270 copies in fifty-five communities; *Mesetzoslov*, 1853, (M. Stoianov, 4747) - 1,233 copies in five communities; *Skkratena Osmanska istoriia*, 1871, (M. Stoianov, 409) - 1,198 copies in thirteen communities; *Mineinik*, 1869, (M. Stoianov, 2937) - 1,189 copies in seventy-eight communities; *Zlochesta Krustinka*, 1870, (M. Stoianov, 339) - 1,170 copies in thirty communities; *Turgovsko rŭkovodstvo*, 1858, (M. Stoianov, 1351) - 1,149 copies in forty communities; *Pisma za sluzhbata bozhiiia v pravoslavnata tsŭrkva*, 1858, (M. Stoianov, 1071) - 1,140 copies in forty-nine communities; *Sveshtena istoriia*, 1854, (M. Stoianov, 2903) - 1,083 copies in twenty-four communities; *Kutkudiachka*, 1871, (M. Stoianov, 6153) - 1,092 copies in eighty-two communities; *Pismenitsa na slavianskiia ezik*, 1847, (M. Stoianov, 5322) - 1,086 copies in thirty-six communities; *Bulgarski naroden zbornik*, 1872, (M. Stoianov, 7917) - 1,076 copies in thirty-six communities; *Opelo na Isussa Khrista*, 1869, (M. Stoianov, 6146) - 1,061 copies for six communities; *Momina kitka*, 1870, (M. Stoianov, 6147) - 1,060 copies in seventy-nine communi-

ties; *Nedelnik*, second edition in 1856, (M. Stoianov, 7186) - 1,021 copies in sixty-six communities; *Kratka vseobshta istoriia*, 1858, (M. Stoianov, 1417) - 1,003 copies in twenty-three communities; *Vodachlüt*, 1870, (M. Stoianov, 4819) - 1,001 copies in thirty-one communities.

¹⁵⁰ Thus the book *Maika klištovnitsa* published in 1875 by Parashkeva Boiadzhiev - a teacher in Russe - had the largest number of subscribers from Bucharest (251) and from Russe (220) (it also sold 100 copies in the neighboring town of Svishtov). The books of Krustiu Pishurka - a teacher from Lom - had the greatest support among the population of the same region (the northwestern Bulgarian lands); the writings of Dobri Voinikov, Sava Dobroplodni and the Blüskov's family got support from the town of Shumen (where they were employed) and the neighborhood; Emanuil Vaskidovich had most subscribers from Svishtov (where he was a teacher), Todor H. Stanchov - in Russe, etc. When in 1871 Stefan Bobchev published *Sokratena Osmanska istoriia* in Constantinople, 329 subscribers from a total of 1200 came from Constantinople. See Stoianov, *Bülgarska vüzzrozhdenska knizhnina*.

¹⁵¹ See Stoianov, *Spomoshtesvovatelite*, p. 343. For a vivid description of the various social strata in the nineteenth century Bulgarian society see Genchev, *Ochertsi. Sotsialno-psikhologicheski tipove*.

¹⁵² Stoianov, *Spomoshtesvovatelite*, p. 345.

¹⁵³ Gergova, *Knizhminata i bülgarite*, pp. 138-141, 166-170. During the first centuries of book-printing in Europe, printers were also publishers. After the seventeenth century the same people were often book-sellers and book-publishers. See: Katz, *Dahl's History of the Book*, pp. 194-201. R. Chartier points out that book-publishing as an autonomous profession and the modern publisher appeared in France only around 1830s. See Chartier, "De l'histoire du livre a l'histoire de la lecture," pp. 35-36. In Bulgaria this occupation became independent from book-selling and developed as more intellectual and artistic in the first quarter of the twentieth century.

¹⁵⁴ For this problem see my book *Uchiteliat prez bülgarskoto vüzzrazhdane*.

¹⁵⁵ I took all above cited prices of books from Stoianov, *Bülgarska vüzzrozhdenska knizhnina*.

¹⁵⁶ Clark, "Education and National Consciousness in the Balkans," p. 48.

¹⁵⁷ Nestorova, *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians*, pp. 84, 86.

¹⁵⁸ See Dimitrov, *Knizhariat*, p. 234.

¹⁵⁹ Hence, when considering the issue of reading in these social milieus, one should pay special attention to the circulation of printed matter at affordable prices. As Roger Chartier put it (for the case of eighteenth century France), "... the most important point is perhaps not so much

the overall rise in literacy. . . as the increasing evidence of printed matter in social milieus, where people formerly owned few books." See Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991), p. 69.

¹⁶⁰ The first Bulgarian University was established only in 1889.

¹⁶¹ See Krüstiü Dimitrov, *Bülgarskata inteligentsiia pri kapitalizma* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1980). Even such "exogenous" circumstances do affect the reading habits as the weather and temperatures—it is an established fact that the northern Europeans read more than the Mediterranean nations. See Roger Chartier, "The Practical Impact of Writing," in Philippe Aries and Georges Duby, eds., *A History of Private Life*. Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap-Harvard, 1989), p. 118.

¹⁶² Bluskov, *Memoari*, p. 125. The pious attitude of the Bulgarians toward the book, education, and literate people (and the resulting cleavage between educated and illiterates) are noted by the well-known American Bulgarianist James Clarke: "In fact, there was a cult of education, especially in Bulgaria, even over-education (hence, overprivilege) in the middle layer, and underdevelopment at the bottom. At the top the prolonged stress on European education led to an almost denationalized cosmopolitanism." See Clarke, "Education and National Consciousness in the Balkans," p. 53.

¹⁶³ Nikola Nachov, "Spomeni," in *Sbornik "Kaloferska Druzha"* (Sofia: Pechatnitsa i lit. na Grigor T. Paspalev, 1908), p. 212.

¹⁶⁴ Zakhari Stoianov, *Zapiski po bulgarskite vustaniia* (Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1981), p. 51.

¹⁶⁵ Stoianov, *Zapiski*, p. 51. As Chartier notes, knowing how to read is something different from the ability to operate with the meanings of the text. The latter requires greater scriptural culture and ease in the manipulation of abstract meanings. See Chartier, *Cultural History*, 1988, p. 158.

¹⁶⁶ As pointed out by Roger Chartier, when a text is accompanied by illustrations, its understanding is similar for the fluent reader and the one who can hardly read; conversely, when text and illustrations are separated, more independent and differing "readings" are possible, depending upon the previous experience and knowledge of the readers. See Chartier, "A Comment on Mr. Grimsted's Paper," in *Needs and Opportunities*, p. 229.

¹⁶⁷ Such is the case of the French "Bibliothèque Bleue" in the eighteenth century. Chartier, *L'Ordre des livres*, p. 15. The growth of the number of highly educated people within the Bulgarian intelligentsia in the second half of the nineteenth century lead to an increasing cleavage between the reading of the "common" and hardly literate people, and of those engaged in mental occupations. This is what Chartier had in mind when

he differentiated between "lecture lettre" and "lecture populaire" - see Roger Chartier, "De l'histoire du livre a l'histoire de la lecture: les trajectoires francaises," p. 38.

¹⁶⁸ Bluskov, *Memoari*, p. 129.

¹⁶⁹ Elena Kirova, "Purvite Bulgarski obshtestveni biblioteki prez Vŭzrazhdaneto," in *GSU-FIF*, 7, 1963, pp. 3-101.

¹⁷⁰ Stoian Sirakov, "Narodnite chitalishta i bibliotechnoto delo," in *Bibliotekar*, 1977, No. 1, pp. 40-42.

¹⁷¹ See the papers of Kirova, "Uchitelskite biblioteki," pp. 261-308 and "Uchenicheskite biblioteki," pp. 393-445.

¹⁷² Todor Ikonov, "Putni vpechatleniia" in Svetla Giurova, ed., *Pŭtishta i pŭtешestvenitsi. XIV-XIX vek* (Sofia: Bŭlgarski pisatel, 1982), p. 359, 390.

¹⁷³ *Makedonia*, Vol. 4, No. 43, 21 April 1870.

¹⁷⁴ Stilian Chilingirov, "Vŭzrazhdane chrez chitalishtata," in *Bŭlgaria 1000 godini, 927-1927*, (Sofia: 1930), 669-670.

¹⁷⁵ See, for example, Nikola Nachov, "Spomeni," in *Sbornik "Kaloferska družba"*, (Sofia: Pechatnitsa i lit. na G. Paspalev, 1908), p. 212; Grigor Pŭrlichev, *Izbrani proizvedenia*, (Sofia: Bulgarski pisatel, 1980), p. 254.

¹⁷⁶ According to Saenger, the transformation took place first in British and then in continental monastic scriptoria from the ninth to the eleventh century; then in the thirteenth century it spread to the scholarly world and in mid-fourteenth century to lay aristocracy. See: Saenger, "Silent Reading: Its Impact on Late Medieval Script and Society," pp. 367-414. Roger Chartier is skeptical about this periodization. According to him, silent reading was a more common practice in Greece and Rome than P. Saenger believes. On the other hand, one can encounter the practice of the reading aloud also in the twentieth century. Chartier, "De l'histoire du livre a l'histoire de la lecture: Les trajectoires francaises," p. 30.

¹⁷⁷ Blŭskov, *Memoari*, p. 127.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

¹⁷⁹ Decisive for the transition from reading aloud to silent reading (in loneliness) from the Middle ages onwards were factors such as the format of the book (scroll or codex), the distribution of the text (the lack of intervals between the words, of punctuation, etc.) and the type of script (alphabetical, syllabic, etc.) However, this does not apply for the period under consideration because the books were already made in the modern way. Still, the typographic outlook could facilitate the understanding of the text or make it more difficult (as nowadays).

¹⁸⁰ The data comes from biographical sources, as well from the history of

architecture.

¹⁸¹ Cited in Chartier, "The Practical Impact of Writing," p. 124.

¹⁸² Engelsing, "Die Perioden der Lesergeschichte in der Neuzeit," pp. 958-966, 983-997.

¹⁸³ Anastas Kipilovski wrote that he had read it six times. See James F. Clarke, "Serbia and the Bulgarian Revival (1762-1872)," in Hupchick, *The Pen and the Sword*, p. 226.

¹⁸⁴ See Teodorov Balan, *Bŭlgarski knigopis za sto godini*, pp. 1625-1632. As regards Khristo Danov's almanac in particular, we know from Liuben Karavelov that "it is read both in the villages and the towns" though, according to the highly critical opinion of this author, the people did not get useful knowledge "from this garbage," but rather "sheer sottishness and ignorance, a darkening of the human reason." See Karavelov, "Nashata knizhevnost," p. 122.

¹⁸⁵ Despite the fact that first Bulgarian daily newspaper appeared in the mid 1870s, this kind of newspaper became widespread only after the independent Bulgarian state was established.

¹⁸⁶ The first Bulgarian novel appeared in 1880s, but prior to that Bulgarian readers were able to read translations of foreign novels (published in parts in the newspapers).

¹⁸⁷ Engelsing, "Die Perioden der Lesergeschichte in der Neuzeit," pp. 945-1002.

¹⁸⁸ Chartier, *L'ordre des livres*, p. 17-18.

¹⁸⁹ Dimcho Velikov, *Kniga naritsaemaia mitarstva* (Ruschuk, pechatnitsata na Dunavskata oblast, 1868), p. 2.

¹⁹⁰ Dimo Kazassov, *Niakogashnite nashi gradove* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Otechestvenia Front, 1975), p. 11.

¹⁹¹ Docho Lekov, "Chitateliiat v tvorcheskiiat sviiat na vuzrozhdenskiiat pisatel," in his *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska literatura*, Vol. 2, pp. 301-317.

¹⁹² Liuben Karavelov, "Kratki nachala ot npravstvenata filozofia," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska kritika*, (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981), pp. 148-150.

¹⁹³ Karavelov, "Nashata knizhevnost," p. 121.

¹⁹⁴ Vassil Drumev, "Za kritikata," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bulgarska vuzrozhdenska kritika* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981), pp. 123-133.

¹⁹⁵ Petko Slaveikov, "Knigite i vestnitsite imat dusha," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika*, p. 168.

¹⁹⁶ Petko R. Slaveikov, "Shto e roman?," in Georgi Markov, ed.,

Bŭlgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika, p. 152.

¹⁹⁷ Marko Balabanov, "Bulgarskiiat napreduk," in *Chitalishte*, Vol. I, No. 11, 1 March 1871, pp. 321-330; No. 12, 15 March, 1871, pp. 353-361.

¹⁹⁸ Vassil Drumev, "Za kritikata," in Georgi Markov, ed., *Bulgarska vŭzrozhdenska kritika*, p. 124.

¹⁹⁹ Karavelov, "Nashata knizhevnost," p. 118.

²⁰⁰ "Let me say by the way that our people in the old times did believe the written word very much," Blŭskov, *Memoari*, p. 129.

²⁰¹ Liuben Karavelov, "Iz 'Zapiski za Bulgariia i bulgarite'," in *Vŭzrozhdenski stranitsi: antologiiia*. Vol. 1 (Sofii: Bŭlgarski pisatel, 1969), p. 591-592.

²⁰² The naively responsive behavior of the first theater performances is depicted, for example, in the novels of Ivan Vazov *Pod igoto* [*Under the Yoke*] and *Nemili-nedragi*.

²⁰³ Todor Ikonov, "Pŭtni vpechatleniia," p. 390; Stilian Chilingirov, *Bulgarskite chitalishta predi Osvobozhdenieto: Prinos kum istoriata na Bŭlgarskoto Vŭzrazhdane*, (Sofii: N.P., 1930), p. 502.

²⁰⁴ For the role of the printing press in Western societies see Elizabeth Eisenstein, *Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communication and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*, Vol. 1-2 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979-1980). About the discussion on the role of books in revolutionizing the public opinion see Roger Chartier, "Do Books Make Revolutions?," in his *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, pp. 67-91; Robert Darnton, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers in Pre-Revolutionary France*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995). In my opinion, the effects of printed materials on the public opinion in Bulgaria were even bigger and more direct, as what was involved in this case was a struggle against foreign domination.

²⁰⁵ Boian Penev, *Istoriia na novata bŭlgarska literatura*. Vol. 2 (Sofii: Ministerstvo na nar. prosvieshtenie, 1932), pp. 204-331.

²⁰⁶ See S. Baeva, "Paisievata 'Istoriia Slavianobolgarskaiia' i Petko Slaveikov," in *Izvestiia na Instituta za literatura*, Nos. 18-19, 1970, pp. 191-204.

²⁰⁷ Blŭskov, *Memoari*, p. 132.

²⁰⁸ Pavel Peshev, *Istoriicheskite sŭbitiia i zhivota mi v navecherieto na Osvobozhdenieto ni do dnes* (Sofii: N.P., 1925), p. 34.

²⁰⁹ Characteristically, there is in Bulgarian a word, "prosveta" derived literally from "Enlightenment," but meaning actually the outcome of an educational process, which does not go much further than obtaining lit-

**Contributors to the Publications Fund of the
Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies Program of the
Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies**

Patrons - \$1,000 or more
Sponsors - \$500 - \$999

Donors - \$100 - \$499
Supporters - \$99 and under

1993 - 1994

Sponsor:

Alexander Muller

Donors:

Imre & Elizabeth Boba

John Budlong

Robert Byrnes

Thomas Hanks

Deborah Hardy

Dawson Harvey

John Headland

Richard & Kathleen

Kirkendall

Mary Mann

Gloria W. Swisher

G. L. Ulmen

Daniel C. Waugh

Eugene Webb

Supporters:

Burton Bard

Walter W. Baz

Arthur & Dorothy Bestor

James & Edith Bloomfield

Boeing

John Phillip Bowen

Patricia A. Burg

Robert Croskey

Douglas Daily

Ralph Fisher

Anne Pietette Geiger

Rev. Paul Grivanovsky

James & Patricia Hamish

Donald Hellman

Henry & Trude Huttenbach

Martin Jaffee

Douglas Johnson

Richard Johnson

Rodney Keyser

Elsa G. Kopta

Joel Migdal

Sergei Mihailov

W. J. Rorabaugh

H. Stewart Parker

Helen K. Pulsifer

Joel & Vivian Quam

Peter F. Sugar

Eric & Barbara Weissman

Seung-Ham Yang

1995

Patrons:

The Henry M. Jackson
Foundation

Donors:

John Berg

D. R. Ellegood

Herbert J. & Alberta M. Ellison

Tsuyoshi Hasegawa

Robert Heilman

Donald C. Hellman

David Hsiao

Ronald M. & Margaret S. Hubbs
David A. & Catherine J. Hughes
Jerome Johnson
Law Office of Lane, Powell,
Spears, & Lubersky
Joel & Abby Li
Lucile Lomen
Mary Earl Maltman
William L. Maltman
Margaret Nicholson
Stanton R. Pemberton
Peter F. Sugar
Alva G. Treadgold
Robert G. and Joan C. Waldo
Robert L. Walker
Daniel C. Waugh
Jun-Luh H. Yin

Supporters:

George N. & Lorna D. Aagaard
Franklin I. & Helen C. Badgley
Abbie Jane Bakony
Irwin S. & Freda R. Blumenfeld
Louise R. Bowler
Patricia A. Burg
Robert J. C. Butow
Mary P. Chapman
Luxar Corporation
Gerald & Lucille Curtis
Charles F. & Eugenia R. Delzell

Jean S. Fisher
Katherine Huber
Cathy Kawamoto
Bettina Kettenring
Elsa G. Kopta
H. G. & Estelle C. Lee
Jean Maulbetsch
Marion Osterby
Donna M. Poreda
Douglass A. & Katherine L. Raff
Sabrina P. Ramet
John S. Reshetar, Jr.
Joel & Nanci B. Richards
Nancy Robinson
John & Venus Rockwell
Harold J. & Betty Runstad
Barbara R. Sarason
Suzanne E. Sarason
Michael C. Schwartz
Stuart W. Selter
Thaddeus H. Spratlen
Donald & Gloria Swisher
Grace Tatsumi
Helen Louise Thwing
Natalie Tracy
The Fred & Steve Treadgold
Families
Annie T. Warsinske
Robert A. & Juanita Watt
David E. Williams

1996

Patrons:

Allen W. & Laura T. Puckett
Alva G. Treadgold

Sponsors:

Herbert J. & Alberta M. Ellison

Donors:

Kent R. Hill
Sabrina P. Ramet

William Ratliff

Floyd & Barbara Smith
Peter F. Sugar

Supporters:

Dagmar K. Koenig
Lewis O. Saum
Glennys J. Young

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers

In Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies

Available Papers

- No. 1:** **Law In Russia - Essays by Theodore Taranovski, Peter B. Maggs, Kathryn Hendley, and Steven A. Crown (\$5.25)**
- No. 2:** **Religion in Imperial Russia - Essays by Robert L. Nichols and Henry R. Huttenbach (\$5.25)**
- No. 3:** **The Fate of Russian Orthodox Monasteries and Convents Since 1917 - Charles Timberlake (\$5.25)**
- No. 4:** **The Mennonites and the Russian State Duma, 1905-1914 Terry Martin (\$5.25)**
- No. 5:** **Corporate Russia: Privatization and Prospects in the Oil and Gas Sector - Leslie Dienes (\$5.25)**
- No. 6:** **Post-Communist Transitions: The Rise of the Multi-Party Systems in Poland and Ukraine - Andrii Deshchytisia (\$5.25)**
- No. 7:** **Russian Banking: An Overview and Assessment Kent F. Moors (\$5.25)**
- No. 8:** **Nationalism and Religion in the Balkans since the 19th Century - Peter F. Sugar (\$5.25)**
- No. 9:** **Modes of Communist Rule, Democratic Transition, and Party System Formation in Four East European Countries Grigorii Golosov (\$5.25)**
- No. 10:** **The Politics of the Domestic Sphere: The Zhenotdely, Women's Liberation, and the Search for a *Novyi Byt* in Early Soviet Russia - Michelle V. Fuqua (\$5.25)**
- No. 11:** **Ethnic Bipolarism in Slovakia, 1989-1995 - David Lucas (\$6.45)**

**No. 12: Literacy and Reading in Nineteenth Century Bulgaria -
Krassimira Daskalova (\$5.25)**

Coming soon:

German-Bashing and the Breakup of Yugoslavia - *Daniele Conversi

Bosnian War and Critical Theory - *Tom Cushman

To order: Make checks payable to the *University of Washington* (international orders add \$1.00 per issue, WA residents add 8.2% sales tax). A ten issue subscription is available for \$45. Orders and subscriptions should be directed to the managing editor at the following address:

Donald W. Treadgold Papers
HMJ School of International Studies
Box 353650
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3650

Tel: (206) 543-4852
Fax: (206) 685-0668
E-mail: treadgld@u.washington.edu

ISSN 1078-5639

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers
In Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies

Jackson School of International Studies
Box 353650
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3650
