

II

**THE MACEDONIAN PEOPLE
AND
CULTURE**

The Macedonian National Development in the Typological Relations of Revival among the Neighbouring Peoples

The conditional term **revival** in the historiography of European peoples has highly varied meanings depending on the general development of specific peoples and distinct manifestations in their development processes. Whereas in Western Europe it was a concept characterized by the development of science, literature and art in the 15th and 16th centuries, in the Balkans, particularly within the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire, it was a movement conceived in the 18th and ending in the first half of the 20th century, which reflected the processes of socio-economic, cultural, national and socio-political development: from the awakening of national consciousness to the affirmation of state organization.

Even in the Balkans, however, revival took place in accordance with the specific historical development of the different peoples, both internally and externally. Despite the existence of identical lines of development which are common to different ethnic communities, in global relations we can divide them into **Christian** and **non-Christian** communities, and within the first group, there is the sub-division between **Orthodox** and **other Christian** peoples. On the other hand, there are differences in the development between **Slavic** and **non-Slavic** Balkan peoples, and owing to the different historical evolution in different state-political and socio-economic circumstances, there are essential differences between the development of Orthodox Slavic peoples under Turkish domination and those, mostly Catholic, peoples who were incorporated in the Hapsburg monarchy.

Confessional affiliation was particularly important in the case of Turkey, owing to the Shariah organization of life in the Empire. This, in turn, posed the question of the organization of church-educational life. Therefore it was very important to have one's own church institution, which embodied the prerequisites for the start of national and cultural development as such. In this respect, the position of the church towards the process of revival among the Balkan peoples was diametrically opposed to that of the age of the Renaissance in Western Europe.

On the other hand, the state-constitutional traditions under distinct names were of extreme importance in the process of national awakening and affirmation of the Balkan peoples. The difficult, gradual and impeded expansion of the Macedonian

national name brought about a prolonged and complicated process in its development as a whole.

As a result, although the process of revival among the Macedonians — as Krste Misirkov wrote as early as 1903 — was similar to those of neighbouring peoples, it nevertheless had many specific features which can be understood only in correlation with the processes of development of these neighbouring nations. And only in this way can it be regarded as a sufficiently autonomous and “natural process” whose outcome, in the contemporary constellation, will not incite discussions aimed at its denial, but only a serious scholarly dialogue based on a study of the routes and characteristics of that development. Hence we shall try to point to some of the characteristic features of the Macedonian national development (in correlation with those of the other neighbouring peoples), so that we can understand the basic reasons for the belated affirmation of the Macedonian nation as a socio-historical category.

There is no doubt that Macedonia’s geopolitical position is of considerable importance in the examination of these questions. Unlike their neighbours, the Macedonians found themselves in the central European part of the vast Ottoman Empire with no opportunities for direct contacts with the previously liberated nations, already constituted as states. This left them without the possibility of an easy transfer of ideas and organized communication with their expatriates. This situation prevented the foundation of colonies for unimpeded action along the borders. For instance, the Greek colonies in Western Europe and particularly those in the territories of Romania and southern Russia, thanks to the well-developed trade and navigation, became important focal points of national unification and consolidation. Moreover, precisely because of their outlying position, bearing in mind the long and jagged coastline of the Mediterranean, and as part of the interests of the great powers, as early as the second half of the 18th century the Russian naval units created a free Greek administration on some of the Greek islands in the Aegean Sea, which encouraged ideas for the restoration of the Byzantine Empire in the Balkans. The French conquest of the Ionian Islands and the subsequently established Ionian Republic under the protectorship of the Russian troops made it possible to build a small Greek state with its own administration, constitution, flag and diplomacy, and during the Russo-Turkish War of 1806-1812 a “Greek land army” was created, which was of comprehensive significance for the future final liberation of Greece.

In the case of Serbia, thanks to the Austrian involvement in the Balkans and the setting up of large colonies near the Austro-Turkish border, with the transfer of church administration to Sremski Karlovci and the spiritual unification of the Orthodox population numbering thousands within the frontiers of the Hapsburg monarchy, a free centre for Serbian national awakening, culture and education was

created which prepared the concept and practically helped Karadorde's liberation actions in the early 19th century. Thus, Serbian national revival also first developed and affirmed itself outside the borders of Serbia and, thanks to the powers and circumstances on the international scene (more or less independently of economic and social development), led to the ultimate affirmation of the Serbian nation.

Bulgaria, too, situated at the periphery of the Ottoman Empire, was several times occupied by Russian troops in the Russo-Turkish wars in the 18th and 19th centuries; Russo-Bulgarian administration was established and the idea of national freedom gained affirmation. With the withdrawal of Russian troops, large groups of volunteers and nationally-awakened people withdrew as well, inhabiting the border regions of present-day Romania and southern Russia. It was from there that the future liberation committees, detachments and military units were recruited; they later developed into a separate Bulgarian Army, with its own emblems and special tasks. Educational-cultural institutions were established in those large Bulgarian colonies; it was there that the first literary works and publications were created, it was there that the ideology of the Bulgarian national constitution and liberation was built. For purely formal reasons (and special interests) the beginning of the Bulgarian revival is considered to be Paissius's *History* (written in 1762, but corrected and published as late as the 19th century). The actual liberation and state constitution of Bulgaria was the result of Russia's military action of a later date.

Even Albania, as an outlying region of Turkey, having the rich and well-developed Arbresh colonies in Italy and in some other European centres, regardless of the special position of the Albanian Moslem population in Turkey had, until the 1870s (and perhaps even later), the opportunity of developing its national ideology on two fronts: in its colonies outside Turkey, and among the circles of the ruling Albanian class in the Ottoman oligarchy which gradually started distancing itself from the Turks, until a final breakup occurred between Albanian national interests and those of the Empire; the aim was the overthrow of the Sultan's state and the establishment of an independent Albanian statehood.

Macedonia, however, found itself in different circumstances. It had no colonies outside (close to its borders) and, with the exception of an earlier and limited action by Piccolomini, the Ottoman domination had never been replaced by a Christian authority, let alone by one created from Macedonia's own population. Even the Archbishopric of Ohrid, which provided some kind of continuity until 1767, uniting the congregation as a whole, was abolished, and the whole of Macedonia was incorporated within the system of the highly nationalistic Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. In spite of the relative growth of towns, trade and crafts, the development of the spiritual, educational and cultural life of the people as a whole was limited by several factors.

In the first place we must take into consideration the fact that the beginning of national awakening saw Macedonia without a widely affirmed ethnic designation, without state-constitutional traditions under its own appellation, regardless of the evident use of the Macedonian name since very early on. Only after the emergence of neighbouring aspirations to acquiring this territory, and only after its people's acquaintance with the character and traits of neighbouring cultures, did a process of differentiation ensue and the Macedonians develop a stronger sense of their identity. It was then that support was found in the national-romantic ideology of direct descent from the 'Slavic' ancient Macedonians of Philip and Alexander, and this name of national unification started to be affirmed more strongly, involving territorial differentiation from its neighbours.

As a phenomenon and process, the Macedonian case was not an exception. Several other peoples, who had also remained without state-constitutional traditions under their own appellations, such as the Slovenes, Slovaks, Ukrainians and Belorussians, found themselves in similar situations during their national revival. The case of Macedonia was unique because at the moment of its national awakening the national aspirations of the bourgeoisie of its neighbours — which had already been ethnically-aware or had already established their own nation-states — were strongly manifested and sufficiently organized. Furthermore, Macedonia's neighbours were either ethnically very close or religiously and culturally identical.

Aspirations for liberation from Ottoman domination were expressed in a series of actions and insurrections even in the period preceding national awakening. On each occasion, the people expected assistance from their neighbours and the interested great powers. A large number of Macedonians also took part in all the liberation movements and uprisings of their neighbours, hoping for their own freedom. This undoubtedly contributed to the growth of political and national liberation awareness among the Macedonian people.

Yet at the moment when Macedonia had free states as neighbours and when the Macedonians tried to establish their own liberation and revival centres on their own territory, they were faced with obstruction and a strong resistance that used all means. None of the neighbouring monarchies found forces or interest to aid the process of Macedonia's national liberation and constitution.

Macedonian national revival began, as was the case with many other peoples, in the early 19th century: formally with the publication of the first book in modern Macedonian (1814). This process developed steadily but was impaired by frequent disturbances, which was not the result of internal development processes, but mostly the consequence of strong and diverse external interference. It ended as late as the constitution of Macedonian statehood at the First Session of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia in 1944. This was

indeed the most delayed national recognition of a Balkan people who had for more than a century fought an armed struggle for its liberation.

The process of Macedonian national revival can be divided into three main periods: I. Cultural-educational and spiritual activities of the Macedonian people (1814-1870), II. Formation and public articulation of the Macedonian national liberation programme (1870-1903), and III. National-political maturation and affirmation of the Macedonian people (1903-1944).

The Emergence of Macedonian National Thought and the Formation of a National Programme (up to 1878)

The study of Macedonian national development began as late as the end of the 19th century, when the 'Macedonian question' emerged in all its sensitive sharpness — on both the internal and international scenes. Krste Misirkov,³⁴⁰ Dimitrija Čupovski³⁴¹ and Nace Dimov³⁴² accepted the work of Ćorgija Pulevski³⁴³ and his followers and generation with scholarly ambitions. Angel Dinev,³⁴⁴

³⁴⁰Krste P. Misirkov, as far as it is known so far, gave his first public address on December 18, 1897, before the Ethnographic Department of the Imperial Russian Geographic Society in St Petersburg. His paper was immediately printed in the mouthpiece of the Society, *Живая старина*, VII, 3 and 4, SP b., 482-485. But it was only in his book *За македонците и работите* (Sofia, 1903) that he largely succeeded in presenting the complex problem of Macedonian national development. Later, in the pages of his journal *Бордар* (Odessa, 1905), in *Македонский голосъ* (*Македонски глас*) (Petrograd, 1913-1914) and later in the Sofia newspapers *Илинден*, *20 юли*, *Пирин* and *Мир* (1922-1925), he developed and elaborated his views on the historical evolution and prospects of the Macedonian people. For more details see: D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Krste P. Misirkov (1874-1926). Prilog kon izučuvanje o na razvitoe na makedonskata nacionalna misla*, Skopje, 1966, 137-835; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската нација. Prilogi za razvitoe na makedonskata a kulturno-nacionalna misla*, II, Skopje, 1983, 197-438; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Krste P. Misirkov (1874-1926)*, Bitola, 1986; Krstev P. Misirkov, *Odbranite raniци*. Prilozhenie Blazhe Ristovski, Misla, 1991.

³⁴¹Dimitrija D. Čupovski gave his earliest public address on this subject at the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg in 1902, but he published his first articles in the pages of the Russian press (*Гражданинъ*, *Славянинъ*) and especially in the mouthpiece of the Macedonian colony in Petrograd, *Македонский голосъ* (*Македонски глас*) in 1912-1914, and also later in the newspapers *Новая Жизнь* and *Воля народа* (1917). For more details see: D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Dimitrija Čupovski (1878-1940) i Makedonskoto naučno-literaturno drugarstvo vo Petrograd. Prilogi kon izučuvanje o na makedonsko-ruskite verski i razvitoe na makedonskata a nacionalna misla*, I-II, Skopje, 1979.

³⁴²Blazhe Ristovski, *Нација Д. Димов (1876-1916)*, MANU, Skopje, 1973. Nace Dimov's paper to the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society was read on March 4, 1913, and was published the same year as a separate booklet: N.D. Dimov, *I. Istoričeskii očerokъ Makedonii i makedonskii xъ slavjanъ. II. Prilozhenie vozniknovenia četniceskago dvizhenia vъ Makedonii. III. Političeskii obzorъ Makedonii i makedoncevъ*, SP b., 1913.

³⁴³D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Ćorgija M. Pulevski i neizvite knižki „Samovila Makedonska“ i „Makedonska uesnaraka“*, IF, Skopje, 1973; Ćorgija M. Pulevski, *Odbranite raniци*. Redakcija, predgovor i zabeleški d-r Blazhe Ristovski, Skopje, 1974; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Prilozi i ugrofi od makedonskata a literaturna istoriја*, II, Skopje, 1982, 9-29; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската нација*, I, 302-393; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот фолклор и нацијалната свест*, I, Skopje, 1987, 43-59.

Vasil Ivanovski,³⁴⁵ Kočo Racin,³⁴⁶ Kosta Veselinov³⁴⁷ and Anton Popov³⁴⁸ developed it as part of the concept of the progressive movement, whereas Macedonian scholarly thought was only able to function normally after the liberation of the Vardar part of Macedonia and its constitution in 1944 as a nation-state within the federal community of the Yugoslav peoples. Even today, however, we cannot say that Macedonian scholars have fully succeeded in studying this very long and convulsive process. They have been handicapped, above all, by the inaccessibility of basic sources and the incomprehensible obstacles placed in the way mostly by neighbouring states, which control not only significant portions of the Macedonian ethnic territory but also of the existing archive materials.

Occupying the territory between the Slavic Serbs and Bulgarians, and the non-Slavic Greeks and Albanians, representing the southernmost fjord of the Slavic sea, on their road to national affirmation, the Macedonians have written a

³⁴⁴Angel ь Di nevъ, *Македонски т ъ славјани*, Sof i ò, 1938; Angel ь Di nevъ, *Et nozgrafskata a i dea na makedonski t ъ славјани*, Sof i ò, 1944; Angel ь Di nevъ, *Или нденската а ейојея (развоја на макед. освободи т елно дви жени е)*, I, Sof i ò, 1945. Dinev's periodical *Македонски vest i* (1935-1936) is of special significance. See also: D-r VI adi mi r Kart ov, *Ангел Ди нев — жи vot i дело*, Skopje, 1983.

³⁴⁵[Vasil Ivanovski], *Идеи т ъ i задачи т ъ на македонскот о ирогресивно дви жени е во Бъл- зария*, Bi bli oteka „Makedonsko zname“, ž 1, Sof i ò, 1933; Bi stri шки [Vasil Ivanovski's pseudonym], „Zaè o ni e makedonci te sme ot del na naci ò?“, *Трудова Македони я*, I, 6, Det roi t, Dekemvr i 1934, 4-5; Bi stri шки, *оџ. цџ.*, in: *Чет вѣрт и я конгрес на Македонски я Народно Сџюз в Амери ка. Резолуци и, Изложени я*, Det roi t, Mi ç., 1934, 42-55; Bi stri шки, *оџ. цџ.*, in: *Македонски глас*, br. 8-9, Buenos Aàres, 1936; [V. Ivanovski], *Македонски я вѣтрос в ми налот о i сега. Македонската а наци я i македонскот о наци онално сџзнани е*, r akopi s od Cent ral ni ot zat vor vo Skopje (manuscript from the Skopje Central Prison, 1942-1943), Ar hi v na Makedoni ja, Skopje, i nv. br. 8773.

³⁴⁶N.P., „Za pravilnije shvatanje nash prošlosti“, *Култура*, II, 7, Zagreb, 15.XI.1937, 1; K. Ri st ovi ç, „Seq ački pokret Bogoni la u sr edwem veku“, *Народна чи т анка i з науке i књи жеvnost i*, br. 7, Beograd, 1939, 20-24; K. Racin, „Razvitak i značaj jedne nove nash književnosti, *Раднички тједник*, I, 23, Zagreb, 25.X.1940, 5-6. See also: Kočo Raci n, *St i xovi i ироза*. Vt oro i zdani e. Ur edi l D-r Al eksandar Spasov, Skopje, 1961, 131-255; D-r Bl aže Ri stovski, *Кочо Раџи и. Ист ори ско-лит ерат урни i ст ражувања. При лози за развит окот на македонската а кул- т урно-наџи онална ми сла*, Skopje, 1983.

³⁴⁷Kosta Veseli novъ, *Наџи онално-игобені нагоди i наџи онални мали нst ва (Научно-соџи олоџи ченъ ет юдъ)*, Naci onal na-nauçna bi bli oteka „Кџл бо“ ž 1, Sof i ò, 1938; Kosta Ve- sel i novъ, *Вѣзгладанет о на Македони я i Или нденскот о вѣзst ани е*, Naci onal na-nauçna bi bli oteka „Кџл бо“ ž 2, Sof i ò, 1939; Kosta Veseli novъ, *Борџи за нагодна свобода Нр. Бот евъ, Гоџе Делчевъ, Любенъ Каравеловъ i Джузеџе Гари балди*, Naci onal na-nauçna bi bli oteka „Кџл бо“ ž 3, Sof i ò, 1940. His numerous articles in various Macedonian and Bulgarian newspapers and journals during the decade preceding the War (1931-1941) are of particular importance.

³⁴⁸Anton Popov, *Избрани ирои зведени я*. Podbor i predgovor Mi hai l Smat rakal ev, Sof i ò, 1960; Anton Popov, „Postoi li makedonska naci ja“, *Пирински глас*, II, 20, Skopje, 20.ř II.1950, 4; Anton Popov, „Od ‚Bura nad rodi nata‘ do ‚Çudna e Makedoni ja‘“, *Современост*, НННiř , 1-2, Skopje, 1984, 11-36; Anton Popov, *Одбрани т ворби*. Pri redil Gane Todorovski, Skopje, 1985; Anton Popov, *Одбрани т ворби*. Pri redil Vasil Tocinovski, Mi sla, 1994.

history which is also interesting for scholarship and its theories on nations in general. The processes of national integration of the Macedonians developed in the unique circumstances of the Europe of the time, where the Balkans played a central part. Internal and, more importantly, external, factors were relevant for the routes of their development. The geopolitical and geostrategic position of Macedonia, its social and economic development, cultural and educational conditions, confessional and political situation and the character of historical and state-constitutional traditions completed the mosaic of factors in the emergence and development of Macedonian national thought. As a result of all this, national revival³⁴⁹ in Macedonia took place over a period of a century and a half, from its first buds in the late 18th and early 19th century,³⁵⁰ up to the foundation of the modern Macedonian nation-state in 1944. The most significant and most interesting period in the development of this process was undoubtedly the time of cultural, educational, spiritual and political activity of the Macedonian people (1814-1870) and the years when the first national programme was drawn up (1870-1878).

1.

Independently of the degree of social and economic development of the Macedonian people and of the penetration of 'capitalistic elements' into this part of the Ottoman Empire,³⁵¹ and independently of the growth and ethnic structure of Macedonian towns, the process of the constitution of the Macedonian nation started with certain objective historical difficulties which later encumbered its entire development. Hence the completion of the constitution of the socio-historical category **people** in Macedonia seems to have coincided with the process of the establishment of the **nation**. The protracted and intermittent character of the first process brought about the complicated and lengthy development of the second. Whereas, for instance, the process of Greek national development started along a more or less straight line — inheriting the name and the past of the mediaeval state and swiftly advancing the idea of political liberation and state independence (and the same also refers largely to the development of the Serbs and even that of the Bulgarians) — in the case of the Macedonians this idea was advanced with a certain delay, in altered historical circumstances, without state-constitutional

³⁴⁹D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Македонски от нагод и македонската нација*, I, 119-280.

³⁵⁰The appearance of the first printed books in modern Macedonian in 1814 is taken only as the formal date of its commencement, as this process became apparent earlier, in the 18th century (D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *оџ. џџт.*, I, 155-162 and 188-189).

³⁵¹D-г Данчо Зографски , *Развитокот на кајит али ст ички т е елемент и во Македони ја за време на т урскот о владеење*, Скопје, 1967.

traditions under their own name in the Slavic period, without a single widely affirmed ethnic name and with the use of different ethnic, confessional and social appellations inherited from the mediaeval period and during the specific circumstances of Turkish domination.

Similarly to other 'non-historical' Slavic peoples, in the first half of the 19th century the Macedonians were faced with the following questions: who are we, what are we and where are we? Their first objectives were to outline their ethnic and geographical borders with regard to their neighbours and, using a distinct designation for themselves as a nation (which already had a long tradition) to define the programme tasks concerning their spiritual differentiation, linguistic unification, national affirmation and political liberation.

2.

Macedonia's geopolitical position within the Ottoman Empire made any direct contact with the already liberated and state-constituted social and national communities impossible, and greatly limited the transfer of ideas and organized communication with Macedonian expatriates, and hence prevented the organization of their own colonies which would take free and state-supported actions along the borders. As a result, in contrast to Bulgaria, for example, there was never (with the exception of the brief Austrian penetration led by Piccolomini) an infiltration of foreign armies on Macedonian soil and Turkish domination was not even temporarily replaced by any Christian rule. Macedonia was thus not in a position to have nationally-awakened and politically active émigré circles such as, for instance, the Bulgarians had, capable of setting up their own well-developed centres in neighbouring, territorially disinterested states, cherishing national revival ideas and organizing liberation actions.

The spiritual life of the Macedonians from the first half of the 19th century onwards was entirely in the hands of the Hellenized Oecumenical Patriarchate. Despite its considerable degree of Hellenization, until its abolition in 1767, the Archbishopric of Ohrid was the only institution in Macedonia uniting the Orthodox Macedonian Slavs and providing a better or worse continuity of the people's development within its diocese. After its abolition, the monasteries and churches remained shattered, constantly aiming to maintain contacts with Mount Athos and with their eyes turned, full of hope, towards Orthodox and Slavic Russia.

The spectacular opposition to the Greek clergy and the resistance of the Macedonian citizens against Greek influence, particularly in the church-school communities, reinforced the ambitions for the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid as the church of the already awakened Macedonian ethnicity. This initial

period was characterized by an incessant struggle for their own church, their own clergy, schools and teachers, their own language and textbooks, and self-government at community level. In a situation like this it was not too difficult to organize various 'religious' missions which, propagating Protestantism, Catholicism and in particular Uniatism,³⁵² began slowly to divide the single people into different 'faiths', which, in accordance with Shariah law in Turkey, were automatically designated as 'nationalities'. With the involvement of the national propaganda machines of its neighbours, the unity of the people in Macedonia was finally crushed, which led to a long and fierce struggle for a language and a church. Thus, in spite of the relative development and growth of towns, trade and the crafts, the still young Macedonian middle class was divided and any normal national development was significantly slowed down.

3.

In the first decades of the 19th century the main ethnic characteristic of the people in Macedonia was their Slavic roots ('Slavism'). This distinguished them from the Greeks and connected them to the 'Slavic tribe' which was often (and not only here) understood as a single people.³⁵³ Earlier, the Macedonians emphasized their official 'Greek' affiliation before foreign representatives, and now demanded their own name which had been alive in the churches and monasteries, but with the obligatory Slavic marking. Therefore even the titles of the publications by Joakim Krčovski and Kiril Pejčinovič (in the second decade of the 19th century) and their immediate followers said that the books were written in a "simple", "Slav-Bulgarian" language.³⁵⁴ Firstly, this meant abandoning the official Old Church Slavonic language, which in Macedonia had a full continuity of use, and introducing the vernacular in writing, and secondly, this was an act of declaring the general aspirations of the time to emphasize their Slavic affiliation.

Yet when, in the 1840s, the Macedonians came into direct contact with Bulgarian books and the Bulgarian language, when they saw the differences between themselves and those who also called themselves Bulgarians, the Macedonians had no alternative but to start a struggle for the affirmation of their own

³⁵²Bl aže Ri stovski, „Unijatstvo vo Makedonija“, *Razgledi*, II/III, 9, Skopje, 1960, 908-936; II/III, 10, 1960, 1005-1029; III/III, 1, 1960, 72-90; III/III, 2, 1960, 158-189.

³⁵³V.A. Džakov, D.F. Mar kov, A.S. Mi l Āni kov, „Nekotore uzlovene metodologičeske voprosi istorii mirovo slaviški“, in: *Istoriya, kul'tura, etnografiya i folklor slavjanski narodo v. VIII međunarodnyj s'ezd slavjstov*, Zagreb-Löblöna, Sentöbr 1978 g. Dokladi sovetško del egaci i, Moskva, 1978, 473.

³⁵⁴Bl aže Koneski, „Kiril Pejčinovič“, introduction to: *Kiril Pejčinovič, Sobrani tekstovi*. Priručnik Bl aže Koneski, Skopje, 1974, 12.

name, using all their forces. Rejecting the Bulgarian designation and faced with the impossibility of using only the name 'Slavic' (as ethnically insufficiently differentiated), they accepted the territorial Macedonian name which had always been widespread among the people, and particularly in Europe.³⁵⁵ When Greek propaganda put forward the theory of the 'Greek' origin of the ancient Macedonians, the Macedonians proclaimed these, too, as Slavs, and placed Philip and Alexander on their banner as symbols designating their national consciousness. The Russian Slavic scholar Viktor Grigorovich, who stayed in Macedonia for a considerable period in 1844/1845, was able to witness this personally, describing it authoritatively and vividly in his writings.³⁵⁶

The strict differentiation between Macedonians and Greeks and the emphasis on the Slavic origin of the former, and also on the glory of Alexander of Macedon, King Mark and Cyril and Methodius, were sufficient to establish clearly the idea of the homeland of the Macedonian people in the Balkans. This is expressed in a highly vivid way in the 1846 'records' by the Kriva Palanka teacher Ćorgija Makedonski³⁵⁷ and those of the priest Dimitrija from the same region about the events in 1848.³⁵⁸

All this is a clear illustration of the attitude of the emerging middle class towards national interests and of the degree of development of historical consciousness among the awakened circles of the people. It is important, as testified to by Grigorovich and confirmed by the documents quoted, that this ideology was developed by teachers and priests who inspired their students and disciples, but it is also important that their parents and the congregation accepted their teaching. It is not by accident that Grigorovich stresses the words "everybody knows", and it is also not by chance that the surname *Македонски* was often adopted at that time (and later) as a visible sign of distinction. It is also very important that this ideology was spread by priests, which explains the widespread demands for the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid as a Macedonian national church which would automatically give the people rights to their own churches, schools, communities and a separate *нѹѢс* ('population'). These were the basic contours of the

³⁵⁵D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, I, 57-74; D-r Al eksandar Mat kovski , *Гр бови т е на Македони ја (Пг и лог кон македонскат а хер алди ка)*, Skopje, 1970, 46-195; Вождар Finka, „Makedonsko ime u starijoj hrvatskoj kajkavskoj knjiĵevnosti“, *Македонски јазик*, НННП-НННП, 1981-1982. P osvet eno na akademi k Bl aĵe Koneski po povod 60-godi űni nat a, Skopje, 1982, 765-767.

³⁵⁶*Очеркъ ѹт ешеѢ вѢ Европейскоѹ Турциѹ (сѢ карт оѹ окрест ност ей Охридскоѹ и ПресѢанскоѹ озерѢ) Ви кт ора Гг и зорови ча*. I zdanie vt or oe, Moskva, 1877, 139.

³⁵⁷*Документ и за бор бат а на македонски от народ за самост ојност и за наци онална др жава*, I, Skopje, 1981, 182.

³⁵⁸*ИѢд.*, 204.

Macedonian national programme, expressed through the concept of the 1840s, which was to be ultimately defined three decades later.

4.

In the first half of the 19th century the not so numerous intelligentsia, clergy and craftsmen were mainly united in a joint front that reflected the common interests of the Macedonian middle class. The inhabitants of Veles, for example, were delighted with the opening of Jordan Hadžikonstantinov-Džnot's school in 1837,³⁵⁹ and the teacher Jovan Nešković testifies that from 1846 onwards Veles began "to wake up from the deep sleep", that "the divine feeling for enlightenment and study which had been absent in Macedonia for so many centuries, hindered by the Greek clergy" had already been sown. The wealthier citizens sent their children to study in Europe, and also helped less well-off children, which, according to Nešković, "awakened the feeling of their own ethnicity". The inhabitants of Veles ignored the demand of the Greek bishop for the "instruction in the Veles school to be carried out in Greek and not in Macedonian".³⁶⁰

This attitude spread in other towns in Macedonia. It was best expressed by Tode Kusev from Prilep in the Constantinople journal *Македонија* in 1867. He writes that the Greeks "have always fought for the Graecization of the Macedonians, destroying the Archbishopric of Ohrid — 'the Spark of our future'. Yet, however much they have struggled to prevent our advancement, they have not been able to uproot the feeling and prevent the Macedonians from being Macedonians." Kusev states plainly:

Not only in Ohrid, but throughout Macedonia, now everyone has woken up and is demanding their rights. Everyone is striving to open their own schools, to introduce church services in the Old Church Slavonic language, not to leave the schools and people's matters in the hands of one or two people who have come from other places, who in every possible way try to prevent everything that is popular. Tradesmen's ledgers are now everywhere beginning to be kept not in Greek, but in our mother tongue. Both young and old are now rejoicing under the great shadow of our enlightener, Sultan Abdul-Aziz, happy to have become aware of their own nationality.³⁶¹

³⁵⁹D-r Ri sto Kant ar xi ev, *Македонскот о ѿгеродбенско учи лишт е*, Skopje, 1965, 50-55.

³⁶⁰J.N., „I z Vel esa (U Makedoni ji)“, *Србски дневник*, br. 44, Novi Sad, 1858 — b.: Brani sl av Vranешеви ć, „Vojvodanska javnost o škol stvu Vel esa i Š ti pa u doba prepor oda makedon-skog nar oda“, in: *Školst vot o, űrosvet at a i култ урат а во Македони ја во времет о на ѿгеродбат а. Mat eri јали од si мѱзи умот одржан во Tit ов Vel es i Шт i ű од 22 до 24.III.1977*, MANU, Skopje, 1979, 320.

³⁶¹*Македонија*, I, 12, Саг егр адъ, 18.II.1867.

All this put forward the acute question of textbooks in these popular schools. The learned Mijak, Anatolija Zografski, tried to satisfy this need as early as 1838 with his textbook *Началное учение* (Primer), printed in the first Macedonian printing shop in Salonika.³⁶² Jordan Hadžikonstantinov-Džinov joined him with his handbook *Таблица първаја* (First Table).³⁶³ But the people increasingly demanded the use of pure vernacular in the Macedonian schools. The first more serious achievements in this area were made in 1857-1858 by Partenija Zografski (from Galičnik), who was also educated in Russia. He not only re-printed the earlier textbook of his compatriot Anatolija — entitled *Началное учение за децата* (Children's Primer), with improvements and additions, using a purer vernacular — but also published the first philological analysis of the Macedonian language (made by a Macedonian), outlining the basic problems and pointing to the main directions in the development of the literary standard. No doubt influenced by the Vienna Accord (1850) on the common literary language of the Serbs and Croats,³⁶⁴ Partenija Zografski spoke in favour of a common literary standard for the Macedonians and Bulgarians,³⁶⁵ although he clearly emphasized: “Our language, as is known, can be divided into two main dialects, one of which is spoken in Bulgaria and Thrace, and the other in Macedonia.”³⁶⁶ He wrote a grammar of this literary standard and was the first in Macedonia to point out that the “dialect” of “the south-western parts of Macedonia” should be taken as its basis, which was later accepted by Krste P. Misirkov (1903)³⁶⁷ and codified with our modern literary standard after the liberation (1945).³⁶⁸

Only a decade later Partenija Zografski had several followers who wrote textbooks, including Dimitar V. Makedonski,³⁶⁹ Dimitar H. Uzunov,³⁷⁰ Kuzman A.

³⁶²Simon Drakul, „Za namni ot prv pr er odbenski učebni kar“, *Современост*, НННН, 6, Skopje, 1982, 57-71.

³⁶³Prof. H. Polenakovski, „Nekolku istorisko-knjazevni priloga. 3) Izvorot na Tablica per vaja od Jordana Haxi Konstantinov (Xinov)“, *Нов ден*, If, 6, Skopje, 1948, 49-50; Simo Mladenovski, „Učitelot Kanče Nakov Pop-Angelovi negovata prosvetitel ska dejnost vos. Vatama, Tikvesko“, in: *Školst vot o, ūosvet at a i kulat yrat a vo Makedoni ja...*, 453-463.

³⁶⁴Blazhe Koneski, *Makedonski ot jazik vo razvojt na slovenski teleraturni jazici*, Skopje, 1968, 17. For these tendencies see also: Nikl Stančić, *Hrvatska nacionalna ideologija ūreūodnoū ūokreta u Dalmačiji (Mihovil Pavlinovič i ūeūov kruū do 1869)*, Zagreb, 1980, 91-119; Špiro Kulunčić, *O etnoūenези Црногорца*, Titograd, 1980; Savo Brković, *O ūostanku i razvoju црногорске нације*, Titograd, 1974.

³⁶⁵Blazhe Koneski, *Kon makedonskat a ūrerodba. Makedonski teleraturni učebni uč od 19 vek. Vtoro izdanie*, Skopje, 1959, 26-43.

³⁶⁶*Български книжци*, I, I, Carigrad-Galata, 1858, 35-40.

³⁶⁷К.Р. Misirkov, *Za makedončkit elerabot i*, Sofid, 1903, 132-145.

³⁶⁸*Makedonski ūravoi si zrabot en od Komisijat a za jaziki ūravoi suri Minist elst vot o za narodna ūosvet a*, Skopje, 1945; Blazhe Koneski, *Gramatika na makedonski ot literaturne jazik*, I, Skopje, 1952, 32-71.

Šapkarev,³⁷¹ Venijamin Mačukovski³⁷² and particularly the notable figure of the self-taught Mijak, Ćorgija M. Pulevski,³⁷³ even though all of them (with the exception of the last) still used the compromise Bulgarian designation for this language.

The Bulgarian teacher Najden Jovanovič saw the differences between the Macedonian and Bulgarian languages and corroborated them in practice in 1846, making and publishing the first translation from Macedonian into Bulgarian. It is significant that he called the Macedonian language *славенскій* (Slavonic), and the Bulgarian *славеноболѣарскій* (Slavo-Bulgarian),³⁷⁴ although the book itself, *Чудеса ѱресѱатија Божородици* (The Miracles of the Holy Mother of God) by Joakim Krčovski, says that it is written “in the Bulgarian language” (*на болѣарскій јазик*). Vuk Karadžić noticed these differences as early as 1822,³⁷⁵ but this became apparent to the public only after the boycott of Bulgarian books in Macedonia in the 1860s,³⁷⁶ when it was publicly declared that “the Bulgarians and the Bulgarian language were one thing, and the Macedonians and the Macedonian language another,”³⁷⁷ when warnings of the following type could be heard: “We are Mace-

³⁶⁹Вl аже Ri st ovski , „Di mi tar Vasi lev Makedonski (1847-1898)“, *Разглед* , I/III, 1, 1958, 69-83; Dragi Stef anija, „Okol u akt i vnost a na Di mi tar Vasi lev Makedonski vo Makedoni ja (1868-70) i negovi ot jazi k“, *Лит ерат урен збор*, Нр II, 6, Skopje, 1970, 10-20; Вl аже Koneski , „Eden učebni k od Di mi tar Makedonski“, *Нова Македони ја*, III, 4083, 11.Н.1957, 8.

³⁷⁰Македонија, I, 12, Car i gr адъ, 18.И.1867, 4; I, 13, 25.И.1867, 2; I, 50, 11.И.1867, 3; II, 8, 20.И.1868; Har al amp i e Pol enakov i k, „К.А. Š аркар ев за свои те учебни ци“, *Годи шен зборни к на Фи ло зопски от факулт ет на Уни верзит ет во Скопје*, Нр , Skopje, 1963, 320, заб. 4; Kuzman Š аркар ев, *За възгажданет о на българици нат а в Македони ја. Неи здадени записки и тii сма. Пр едговор Пет ър Ди неков, съставит ел ст во и редакци ò I li ò Todor ov [i] Ni kol аà Ž ечев, Sof i ò, 1984, 213; Gr i gor P ър li čев, *Избрани ѱрои звездени ја*, Sof i ò, 1980, 393.*

³⁷¹Вl аже Koneski , *Кон македонскат а ѱр еодба*, 44-86.

³⁷²Вl аже Ri st ovski , „Veni jami n Mačukovski vo makedonski ot kul tur no-naci onal en razvi t ok“, in: *Школст вот о, ѱросвет ат а и култ урат а во Македони ја...*, 569-603.

³⁷³See note 343; Вl аже Koneski , *Кон македонскат а ѱр еодба*, 87-97.

³⁷⁴Ivan Dorovský, „K nekterym ot I z k I m balkanského literárního procesu na počétku 19. století“, *Сборник праци филозофски факулту Бненски универзити*, D 23-24, Brno, 1977, 123-126.

³⁷⁵Вукова ѱреѱи ска, I, Beogr ad, 1909, 212. Little was known at the time not only about Macedonia, but also about Bulgaria, referred to solely as “a region lying between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains” (I .S. Dost òn, „Naci onal Āno-osvoboditel Ānoe dvi жени e ò жни h sl avòn i r usska ò obē est venna ò m i sl Ā per voà čet vert i НИH v.“, in: *Ист ори ја, култ урат а, эт нографи ја и фолклор славянски х наредов. VIII Международный съезд слави ст ов*, Zagreb–Lò bl òna, Sent òbr Ā1978 g. Dokl adi sovet skoà del egaci i , Moskva, 1978, 174).

³⁷⁶Вl аже Koneski , *Кон македонскат а ѱр еодба*, 49-50. This was actually the stage when “a centrifugal national synthesis of the national language, their history, folklore and ethnographic characteristics of national life, etc.” was carried out (S.V. Ni kol Āski à, „O nekot ori h zadačah i ssl edovani ò li ter at ur nar odov Central Ānoà i ě go-Vost očnoà Evr op i v arpu f or mi rovani ò naci à“, in: *Комплексные ѱроблемы наредов Цент ральной и Юго-Vost очной Евр ойи. Ит ози и ѱр сикет и вы и ssl edovani ѱ*, Moskva, 1979, 115).

³⁷⁷Вl аже Koneski , *Кон македонскат а ѱр еодба*, 71.

donians, we are not Bulgarians” and “We have barely freed ourselves from the Greeks, should we now become *Илѣи*?!”³⁷⁸

Even the leader of the Bulgarian national revival in Constantinople, Petko Račev Slavejkov, in early January 1871 publicly admitted that he had heard this ideology “as early as some ten years ago from some people in Macedonia”, which had now grown into “a thought that many would like to put into effect”. He confirmed that he had “many times” heard from “the Macedonists that they were not Bulgarians but Macedonians, descendants of ancient Macedonia... *Тхеу аге цомѣлѣте Маѣдонианс*... they are pure Slavs, and the Bulgarians are Tartars and who knows what”. These “Macedonists” boldly declared before him: “We broke off from the Greeks, should we now fall under others?”³⁷⁹

This means that at this point “scholarly propaganda of national development” in Macedonia had already been completed. It was followed by a “period of national agitation,”³⁸⁰ which permeated the broad mass of the people and penetrated deeply into their minds. This was a stage of Macedonian national integration, when the historical consciousness of the Macedonians³⁸¹ was strongly engaged in the articulation of ideas for liberation.

5.

It is noteworthy that all this developed in Macedonia itself, within the boundaries of Turkey, without significant response from the European public. As far as Europe was concerned, Macedonia was still an insufficiently known land inhabited by an even less studied people, which was first automatically linked to the Greeks, and later almost unanimously to the Bulgarians. This is how Macedonia was seen by foreign travellers, and the same views were accepted by the first Slavic scholars, even though none of them (with the exception of Grigorovich) had ever set foot

³⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 67. Of great significance here was the emergence of the strict ethno-cultural opposition *не-уоу*. See also: A.S. Mi l Āni kov, „K voprosu o f or mi rovani i naci onal Ānogo samosoznani ė v peri od skl ad ėvani ė naci ė v Cent ral Āno ė i ė go-Vost očno ė Evr ope“, in: *Формировани е наци љ в Цент ральной и Юго-Вост очной Европе*, Moskva, 1981, 240-441., and for more details concerning this problem see: A.S. Mi l Āni kov, V.I . Fr e ė dzon, „F or mi rovani e naci ė v Cent ral Āno ė i ė go-Vost očno ė Evr ope v H ė III-IIIИ vekah“, *Војносы и ст ори и*, ž 8, Moskva, 1987, 60-78. On the understanding of the name ‘Bulgarian’ in the 1840s see: *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 2, Paris, 1842, 890-891; Marco Dogo, „Risveglio nazionale e questione della lingua nei Balcani: la generazione tormentata dei separatisti macedoni“, *Лугадерни Гуглани ди Гогри*, 1, Trieste, 1984, 12.

³⁷⁹„Makedonskġat t ė v ġ pr os t ė“, *Македония*, ř , 3, 18.I.1871, 2.

³⁸⁰Miroslav Hroch, „Oblikovanje modernih nacija i nacionalni pokret 19. stoljeća“, *Часопис за сугремену љосијест*, XI, 1(29), Zagreb, 1979, 27.

³⁸¹Miroslav Hroch, „Úvodem“, *Аѣта Университатис Царо.ġнае — Пѣки.рсоѡхѡѡиѡ et xistoriѡѡ*, 5, 1976. *Studia Historica*, XV: Úloha historickġho povedomġ v 19. stoletġ, Praha, 1976, 7-14.

on Macedonian soil.³⁸² Moreover, Macedonia was treated in the same way by the great powers, which had special interests in the Balkans. This only complicated and greatly encumbered the affirmation of the Macedonian people as a subject in international relations. This in turn contributed to the hampering and complicating of Macedonia's internal development and facilitated the actions of neighbouring national propaganda machines, which were becoming an increasingly real danger not only for the liberation of the land but also for its integrity and the survival of the people as a whole.

But the public participation of the Macedonians in the press and the clear propagation of their ideas among the people, which even Slavejkov had to admit ultimately in his newspaper (although for ten whole years he had tried to prevent the public dissemination of Macedonian national ideology at all costs), fixed the basic contours of the Macedonian national programme which already had a history of its own and was threatening with its plans for the future. Despite the strong national romanticism of its proponents, it was actually the first public statement of the 'Macedonian question'. This took place exactly at the time of the foundation of the first Slavic Orthodox church in Turkey, which was given the name **Bulgarian Exarchate**. This was to draw the boundaries of the '**Bulgarian nationality**' for the first time in an official manner; this was later accepted by the cartographer Heinrich Kiepert and taken for granted in the text of the preliminary San Stefano peace treaty (1878).

The Macedonians, however, immediately saw the possible consequences and the historical risk to their future development. The resistance was strong: as early as 1873 six large Macedonian eparchies abandoned not only the Oecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, but also the newly-founded Bulgarian Exarchate, and made a serious attempt to find a permanent solution to the Macedonian national question with the help of Protestantism and the Uniate Church. The seriousness of the situation was apparent to Russian politicians and also to the Bulgarian Exarch, who immediately sent Slavejkov personally on a secret mission to Macedonia, to try to undermine the Macedonian movement with his great authority. His reports from Salonika, dated January, February and March 1874, offer a most complete and accurate picture of the character and proportions of what was a genuine national liberation movement, outlining the basic elements of the Macedonian national programme.

³⁸²Вl аже Rl st ovski , „Makedonskata opшт est vena ml sl a vo prv ot per i od na naci onal nat a prer odba (vo korel aci ja so razvi tokot na sl avi st i kat a i na opшт est venat a ml sl a kaj sosedni te sl ovenski nar odi)“, in: *Реферат и на македонски т е слави ст и за IН меѓународен слави ст ички конгрес во Ки ев*, Скопје, 1983, 155-159; D-р Вl аже Rl st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, I, 204-210.

Slavejkov's mission was important for a number of reasons. He arrived in Salonika on the evening of January 14, 1874, and immediately met with the main actors in the union in order to assess the situation and learn their plans. In his letter sent to Exarch Anthimus (Antim) sometime in January, Slavejkov first describes "in brief the history of everything preceding all this and its consequences today, which are the existing turmoil and movement."³⁸³ This means that the movement was not born unexpectedly and without inner foundations, but that it already had a history of its own. In order to understand all the circumstances mentioned by the Exarch's envoy, we shall quote a part of this letter.³⁸⁴

It can be seen that even before the question's solution, after the initial awakening of the population from these lands, owing to the unreasonable preaching of the local narrow and short-sighted patriots, a certain discontentment among the local Bulgarians has been created towards the Bulgarians from the Danube and Ohrid³⁸⁵ vilayets and a certain envy because of their earlier awakening and the visible predominance of their language in literature.

The one-sided, at first glance, solution to the question in favour of the Danube and Thracian Bulgarians alone further encouraged their discontentment, and by ignoring the circumstances which led to this not entirely satisfactory solution to the question, the said discontentment has easily turned into mistrust towards those working on the question and has given birth among local patriots to the disastrous idea of working independently on the advancement of their own local dialect and what's more, of their own, individual Macedonian hierarchy – Bulgarian – idea,³⁸⁶ unfortunately reinforced, as far as I could hear, by the excessive zeal of one of our own bishops,³⁸⁷ who in his desire to be useful and make use of this, imperceptibly, and perhaps deliberately, encouraged it even more and allowed the emergence and spread of these disastrous ideas side by side with the awakening of the people in these lands. It is Article 10 of the firman that has somewhat hampered the outbreak of a public disruption and has so far suppressed any disturbances.

[...] It is clear that it was in a small and secret circle in Constantinople that this broken and now stinking addle egg was initially laid and its nest can be found among that small number of persons who were anxious to promote Father Hariton as a bishop.³⁸⁸ Desperate to see their candidate a bishop through the mediation of the

³⁸³Соочо Биџорски – ИлидоПасков, „Писма на Петко Рачев Slavejkov по униџта в Makedoniџ през 1874 г.“, *Вековe*, Hf III, 1, Sofиџ, 1989, 68.

³⁸⁴Dr Slavko Dimevski's 'Dve pi sma na Petko Račev Slavejkov za makedoni zmot' (Two Letters by Petko Račev Slavejkov on Macedonism) (*Раззлeдџи*, XIV, 5, Skopje, 1972, 557-566) are rendered incorrectly and cannot be used for scholarly purposes.

³⁸⁵There was no *Oxrid* vilayet; this is an error and the reference is clearly to the Adrianople (*Odrin*) vilayet.

³⁸⁶Judging from the way it is written, it is clear that the word *Булџарџан* was added later, making this part of the manuscript rather obscure.

³⁸⁷This is a reference to Natanail (Nathaniel) Kučevџki, Metropolitan of Ohrid.

³⁸⁸The priest Hariton (Chariton) Angelov Karpuzov (from the village of Libjahovo, Nevrokop region; Boris Sarafov's grandfather) emerged as one of the chief leaders of the population from the whole of eastern Macedonia. As the president of the Nevrokop Exarchal Community (1871-1873), he was

Exarchate, Father Hariton's adherents, with his knowledge or perhaps permission – I cannot confirm the latter – started making deals with the discontented in these lands to take another kind of action and demand his appointment by means of a union with the Catholic church; this took place in Constantinople and here, but rather secretly, before Mr³⁸⁹ Nil was sent here.³⁹⁰

The sending of Mr Nil to these lands has put an end to the secret and underground actions of the said partisans, but his senseless denunciation and tactless encouragement have seriously shattered the confidence of the population in the Exarchate and have estranged them from it. In the beginning, too, when he still acted on behalf of the Exarchate, he imprudently greatly undermined its influence, which strengthened even more the rumour spread by Hariton's adherents concerning the agreement³⁹¹ and, as he wanted to become the favourite and beloved of the locals, he presented the Exarchate as indifferent and useless for the deliverance of the Macedonian population from the oppression of Graecism; and later he contributed a great deal more to their alienation from it, when he started claiming that the Macedonian Bulgarians have been betrayed by the Exarch and by the other bishops installed for the recovery of their eparchies; and, of course, the mistrustful will easily believe such rumours.

It is probably difficult to follow and know whether Mr Nil, before his departure, had any arrangements with some of our people there and whether he had special instructions concerning the movement to which he had given rise; but it is no secret that his refusal to obey the Exarchate's command to return was the result of the instructions of some of our Orthodox bishops there,³⁹² and unfortunately even now you can feel similar relations; they speak openly about Father Hariton's agreement with Mr Nil, and that efforts are being made, they say, in favour of his ordination [and appointment], through the union, to the regions of Seres and Melnik, and for that of Mr Nil to the regions of Salonika, Kukuš-Strumica and Voden.

This is how things stood and have been standing in general up to the present day. The particular course of events concerning particular local matters stands like this for the time being.

Even though you can say that there is no union in Salonika, or that it has been put on the back-burner in case of necessity, I can also state that if such a demand arises because of the enthusiasm of others after Mr Nil's return, it can be suppressed if one acts wisely, as matters are in the hands of people on whom we can successfully exert our influence, although you will now see almost everyone inclining towards that spirit, even the Paunčev brothers,³⁹³ who were at first against the movement, but

proposed by the people as Metropolitan of Nevrokop, but the Bulgarian Exarchate refused to accept him and he lost even his presidential post. Hariton appeared as one of the most decisive advocates of the union as a means for resolving the 'Macedonian question'.

³⁸⁹The title *Mister* and its prefix *Mr* (*Γοσϋοδιη* and *Γ.*) are often used with the names of church dignitaries in Slavonic ecclesiastical forms of address (translator's note).

³⁹⁰The Uniate Bishop Nil (Nilus) Izvorov was a Bulgarian, a former Exarchate prelate, who was used by the Macedonian Uniates as a means for the institution of a Macedonian spiritual-national hierarchy.

³⁹¹This is a reference to the **agreement** between the Bulgarian Exarchate and Constantinopolitan Patriarchate concerning the eparchies in Macedonia.

³⁹²This is a reference to Natanail (Nathaniel) of Ohrid and Dorotej (Dorotheus) of Skopje.

are now thought to be among the proselytes.³⁹⁴ Only Mr Bubotinov³⁹⁵ is allegedly Orthodox, and I can assure you of this, for no other reason but sheer interest, and because he is excluded and cast out by the other activists and also by the said community. [...]

Kukuš comes at the head of the movement, supported quite strongly by the as yet sleeping Dojran, and Strumica with Maleševo and Voden participate there openly. Following them there limp the Salonika villages and those around Seres, Melnik and Drama. For the time being, anyone looking around might think that he sees nothing but smoke; but this smoke shows the presence of a fire which is starting to burn, because everyone expects the return of Monsignor Nil with fervent impatience, and there is no doubt that the fire will blaze up.

The letters of M[onsignor] Nil are full of hope and they are delivered everywhere through the agents of the union who maintain contacts with the surrounding places. In his first letter, written after his arrival in Constantinople, he promised to return in 15 days' time with the Sultan's decree. In his second letter he said that, as soon as the new Greek Bishop of Salonika, Joachim, departed for Salonika, he, the Monsignor, would be on the same steamship and arrive here. The last letter which has come with today's mail is even more encouraging. Everything is ready and prepared, he says, and the letters are written and waiting only to be signed; and, they write, they are also asking for money from here for their return; therefore Dimitri Maleševski³⁹⁶ has gone this morning to Kukuš to collect the money and send it to them. The leaders of the movement are thrilled.³⁹⁷

Obviously, Slavejkov was well acquainted with the real situation in Macedonia; he also had original materials from the union's activists in his hands, and could objectively see both the reasons and the actions, and also assess the consequences for the 'Bulgarian cause' in Macedonia. The large scale and the clear platform of the movement left no place for doubt as to the seriousness of the threat to the

³⁹³Dimitar and Nikola Paunčev from Ohrid were prominent activists in Salonika, and the former was also the president of the Salonika Exarchal Community and belonged to the 'circle' of 'Macedonists'.

³⁹⁴The newly converted.

³⁹⁵Mihail G. Bubotinov (a Bulgarian from Sofia) was the Exarchate representative in Salonika as a teacher; he was also an associate of the Russian Consul General in this city and an outspoken opponent of the Macedonian national movement, and accordingly, of the union.

³⁹⁶Slavejkov's letters are a confirmation that Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski was one of the main leaders of the 'third' Uniate movement in Macedonia. At the time he was in Salonika clandestinely, making the preparations for the Razlovci Uprising. On March 24, 1875, he wrote the following to Stefan Verković from Salonika: "I am here, but as our imprisoned men are still not set free, I am compelled to enjoy the general justice in a hidden shelter, i.e. not free. We are not losing hope that things will one day be better for us as well, but now the greatest evil is in Maleševo, which is by no means a result of the Exarchate's heedlessness and is yet to spread elsewhere." Due to this situation, he asks Verković "to send the letter under a French inscription 'To his Grace, Mr Bonetti, Apostolic Missionary of the French Church to Salonika'" (*Документ и за българскот о възгаждане от Архиепископ на Сѣфан И. Верковиќ 1860-1893. Съставили и подготвили за печат Дари на Велева и н.с. Трифон Вълков под редакцијата и предговорот њл. кор. Христијано А. Христијанов, Софија, 1969, 558, док. з. 463*).

³⁹⁷Соџо Билџовски – Илиџовски, *оп. цит.*, 68-70.

Exarchate's position, as a result of which Slavejkov continued his letter to Exarch Anthimus as follows:

Your Beatitude,

After everything that I have seen and learnt, without taking into account unfounded rumours, I can frankly say to you that if M[onsignor] Nil returns here with a firman and remains anywhere in these lands, not only will the Poljanin eparchy accept him, but it will be joined by the Strumica and Voden eparchies and by many of the villages around Salonika, Drama, Seres, etc., and moreover, all other Macedonian eparchies will be shaken. You must bear in mind that the first to break up will be the Veles eparchy, from which certain persons even now are taking not a small part in the tumult. That eparchy, dissatisfied with its bishop, on the one hand, and, on the other, the inhabitants of Veles driven by their characteristic craving for power and aspirations to control southern Macedonia in religious affairs, are supporting that movement, which will later have clearly very different consequences from those by which they are now enticed, but the important thing is that they, too, now add fuel to the flames. The agitation to expand the eparchy through the union is an open Chimera; yet the imaginative inhabitants of Veles, as good speculators, which is obvious, do not let that speculative undertaking slip out of their hands, and while working on it, they seem to spread even more the disastrous idea of salvation through the union among the oppressed population.

The renewed persecution on the part of Greek prelates has greatly helped the spread of the Uniate infection. [...] As they have no Greek population on which they can rely following the splitting off of the Bulgarians, and as they fear more their being joined to the Exarchate, seeing that in this way they will be left without a flock whatsoever, they may be wrong or right in thinking that they will profit more from the Bulgarians joining the union, because they hope that the majority of the population, held back by fear of an alien faith, will not throw themselves into the arms of the union, and that thus, on the one hand, they will have more adherents and followers and, on the other, all restless minds and more active men and patriots, as it were, will go along with the Uniates and, preoccupied with the debates concerning the organization of the new community, will not disturb the rest of their believers that much; and thirdly, and most importantly, they think that in this way the influence of the Exarchate among the population will be paralysed, this being their prime aim, as all their fears are there. Guided by these considerations, they work on the swifter development of this comedy and therefore, while earlier they were indifferent and even rather lenient, and in the case of H[is] Exc[ellency] Midhat Pasha³⁹⁸ more cautious in their actions, they are now pressing the population more,

³⁹⁸The Young-Turk leader Midhat Pasha was appointed as the Vali of Salonika on November 3, 1873, but he remained in Salonika only until February 11, 1874. During this brief period, he made it clear, with a number of actions, that he was in favour of the equality of the nationalities living in the vilayet, and even supported the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid as the Macedonian church. P.P. Karapetrov, a Bulgarian, offers rather curious testimonies in this regard: "Midhat Pasha tried to persuade some of the more eminent Macedonian Bulgarians that they were not Bulgarians but Macedonians; that they were a people distinct from the Bulgarians, as proven by their language (dialect), which was different from Bulgarian, that it would be good if they dissociated from the Bulgarians in the Danube and Adrianople regions (Moesia and Thrace) and that thus they would also have an independent church

using the influence of their agent among the local authorities, K. Logadi, *politike meemuru* [political agent].

[...]

It seems to me that the advocates of the agreement have been guided by similar considerations to a certain extent; they wrongly believe that the union will not take large proportions and that only a small number of people will become separated under the union, and that the rest will remain with the Greeks, considering this advantageous to their plan to paralyse the influence of the Exarchate in these places, to discourage them and compel them to accept agreement to their measure. The truth, however, is that they are not working in this way to anything but the sheer detriment of Orthodoxy, as there is no doubt that if there is still any hope in the preservation of Orthodoxy, this hope is in the joining of the Exarchate; if this hope is frustrated, may everyone working in this spirit know that the incorporation of the Macedonian Bulgarians within the Roman Church will be an accomplished fact, not only partially but entirely, and that they will aim to resurrect the Archbishopric of Ohrid, with which they now entice the inhabitants of Ohrid, saying that they, too, like the inhabitants of Skopje, have apparently accepted the idea and will wait patiently until their hopes in the Exarchate are resurrected; if an amendment is not made to Article 10 – farewell, Macedonia!³⁹⁹

Slavejkov gives a reasonable assessment of the position of the Greek Patriarchate towards the union and towards the Exarchate, but what is extremely important is his testimony that both Ohrid and Skopje were inclined towards the Uniate idea, hoping that the Archbishopric of Ohrid would only be restored in this way, because it had absolutely no chances of being established as an **Orthodox church** within Turkey side by side with the existence of the **Slavic Orthodox Bulgarian Exarchate**. This is still another confirmation of the large proportions the Uniate movement took and the threat it posed in late 1873 and early 1874. By Article 10 of the Sultan's Firman, only the Veles eparchy was given to the Bulgarian Exarchate, while the rest were supposed to vote in a referendum as to whether they wanted to remain under the Greeks or join the Exarchate. In such circumstances, all propaganda machines were employed to the utmost in their mutual struggle in Macedonia. Hence this is what Slavejkov wrote to the Exarch:

The monsignors here are working actively and say that if Mr Nil, owing to some obstacles, fails to return shortly to Salonika, on Easter Day they will invite M[onsignor] Rafail,⁴⁰⁰ and intend, in the case of any other setback, to come out personally (the Catholic priests here). The inhabitants of Poljanin and Maleševo have

with the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, and other similar things" (P. P. Karapetrov, *Сбирка отъ статии*, Сгѣдесъ, 1898, 91).

³⁹⁹Соѡо Вилѡрски – Илиѡ Попов, *оѡ. ѡѡ.*, 70-71.

⁴⁰⁰Rafail (Raphael) Dobrev Popov was a Bulgarian, Uniate bishop from 1864 and the leader of Bulgarian Uniates based in Adrianople.

expressed their wish to receive them even now, but those living at Kukuš have agreed to wait until Easter, so that their presence may not upset the general movement.⁴⁰¹

The struggle between the different propaganda machines was closely followed by the Turkish authorities, and they, too, added their share to the spectrum of repression against the Macedonian population. But in spite of all, the movement flared up. Petko Slavejkov frequently visited the first men of the Macedonian towns and convinced them not to yield to Uniate propaganda. On February 19, 1874, he wrote a second letter to the Exarch from Salonika (with a note added on the next day that he had left for Veles), in which he informed Anthimus in detail concerning the situation in Macedonia, giving very important information on individual activists in the movement. Among other things, Slavejkov wrote:

Your Beatitude,

[...] The Hydra does not control a single place only so that we can defeat it and keep it away from that place, which would be rather easy, but it is active in many places. Therefore I have limited myself to investigating matters and, compelled by the shortage of money, I was about to return yesterday; but I decided to wait and receive at least one letter from Your Beatitude, and see what your opinion concerning the future is; if you would write, please address your letter to Father Averkij [Abercius] Zografski.⁴⁰² Here in Salonika there is no work in this regard, or if there was, I hope I have completed it. Following your orders, I did not deem it wise to remove the priest Petar,⁴⁰³ as we can do more harm than good with such a move. I acted in a quite different way and I think I have achieved better results, as things may subsequently show. The priest Petar remains under our banner, but secretly, until the appropriate moment, and the same applies to Father Averkij, who, duped by Nil, started pressing things indirectly; but when I explained to them how disastrous the movement was for the people's general interest, they repented. I have reasons to believe Father Averkij's repentance. Even if I have some doubts about the priest Petar, I am still calm, because his soul is in the hands of Father Averkij, and I can say that there should be no fears if the two of them remain loyal, as Averkij is influential among respected people and the priest Petar among all the ordinary people. Since my arrival the name of Your Beatitude has been mentioned in the chapel. If you deem it necessary to act, as far as Salonika is concerned, there is no other person than Father Averkij; you can write to him. Please bear in mind that, in addition to Nil, it

⁴⁰¹Со̀чо Бѝлòрски – Ѝлѝò Пaskov, *où. ujt.*, 71.

⁴⁰²The Mount Athos Archimandrite Averkij Zografski was the head of the Zograph monastery estates (*metoux*) in Salonika and one of the most agile activists of the Uniate movement, but after Slavejkov's threats, he drew back and started cooperating with the Exarchate.

⁴⁰³The priest Petar (Peter) Dimitrov (Volovarov), from the Salonika village of Zarovo, was at first the Patriarchate's priest in Seres, but after 1872 he went over to the Bulgarian Exarchate and became the president of the Exarchate community and even the Exarchate representative in the Salonika vilayet. He was one of the most agile activists of the movement, but he too, influenced by Slavejkov, gave up the idea of the union, even though we later find him in the **secret circle** in Salonika around Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski, who prepared the Razlovci Uprising.

was reverend Natanail⁴⁰⁴ who instructed, to a certain extent, Father Averkij to help the Uniates indirectly, with the intention that everything would turn out well; at least this is what I could understand from his words; but I hope that I was able to make this otherwise good old man understand how misled he had been. As for the priest Petar, he maintains contact with the Skopje prelate, and before my arrival he was notified from Constantinople that they had decided to remove him from the church and put Avramij [Abramius] in his place. But I concluded that the priest Petar should not be removed but should be won over, and therefore I acted and am still acting in this spirit, and I recommend the same to Your Beatitude, as this is no time for multiplying our enemies, and even less giving away people who can be helpful to them instead of being helpful to us.

The greatest busybody in the movement in Constantinople is Sarafov.⁴⁰⁵ He confounds the hesitant, he reveals the secrets which he steals from the scatter-brained prelates, he has contacts with the main leaders here, i.e. Dimitri Maleševski and the Dojran representative, Nikola G. Ahazarov. Dimitri went to Kukuš and the one who remained here was Nikola, with whom I made close contact. He is a young man, rather disorganized.

The contents of my second letter are fully accurate and the movement is indeed serious and dangerous, but this does not discourage me as I know and feel that the power of conviction with which we can act is much greater than that of our opponents; they will have to go upstream, and we ourselves downstream; only money and work is needed. The eparchies of Strumica, Voden, Poljanin, Drama, Seres and Melnik have to be visited once or twice. It is also necessary to go to Veles, Skopje and Ohrid to remove some prickles there and demand from those communities that they do not lend wings to the unreasonable desires of the aforesaid eparchies, but stand upon their feet and oppose the spread of the union by themselves. Our man in Veles⁴⁰⁶ has set up his still to prepare himself delicious mastic brandy in his metropolitanate and has no idea whatsoever of the fire which is burning amidst his neighbours and which will first scorch him.

If you intend to send other clerical personnel, which must be done by every means when M[onsignor] Nil sets out this way, be careful not to send persons who might be attracted to the idea of becoming bishops more easily through the union, because they are dangerous, they could be infected rather easily. Even if you send bishops, do not send such as have not proven themselves in their eparchies, as you cannot have full confidence in them and they can rather easily take the opposite road and cause greater evil.

[...] The best means to prevent the spread of the union now, if you cannot send bishops, is to give hope to the local population that they could appoint representatives before the local authorities, as the greatest evil in the troubled eparchies

⁴⁰⁴Natanail Kučevinski (Zografski) had only recently been appointed as the Metropolitan of Ohrid, and was one of the main representatives of the Bulgarian Exarchate, but also one of the instigators of the union in Macedonia.

⁴⁰⁵The representative of the Drama eparchy in Constantinople (1869-1872), Kosta V. Sarafov, went to the Turkish capital to act in support of the priest Hariton's election as Exarchal Bishop, but as the proposal was not accepted, Hariton joined the Uniates.

⁴⁰⁶This is a reference to the Exarchate metropolitan in Veles, Damaskin, who originated from Macedonia.

is that the representatives are elected by the Greek bishops, which alienates them from us; if we can offer them hope in the blissful future of their aspirations and turn their attention to such actions, we shall take the strongest weapon out of the hands of the Uniate advocates. For they have turned to the union for no other reason than their belief that they could put their own men in the councils more easily through the alien faith.

[...] My last point is that if you cannot send bishops, be careful not to work with any other means on the destruction of the union, as thus you would only upset and weaken your influence in case of a suitable opportunity. Do not listen to many people, and especially not Bubotinov, who has greatly discredited the influence of the Exarchate with his ambition for power.⁴⁰⁷

In the period from February 20 to March 4, 1874, Slavejkov was in Veles and Strumica. In his autobiography he later writes that “the discord” was “the greatest and most dangerous” in Veles, adding: “I had the utmost pleasure in reconciling the citizens of Veles, after which I visited some of the surrounding villages.”⁴⁰⁸ But he does not mention the resistance he met with in Veles, when, for example, D.P. Karanfilovič rose and roared at him at the general meeting that “nobody invited him, nor had anyone asked him for advice, so he could keep the advice for his own *Љби*, as the citizens of Veles knew better than him how they should organize their own general matters”.⁴⁰⁹

That the citizens of Veles were among the most awakened people in Macedonia is also confirmed by the Austrian consul Lippich in his letter to Minister Andrassy, in which, among other things, he writes:

We should at least bear in mind the situation that Skopje Bulgarians have started considering themselves a section apart from the whole of the nation, distinct from the true Bulgarians, a tendency which is strongly prevalent in the intelligent Veles, from where it is spreading vigorously.⁴¹⁰

The question of “*Българизъм анд Македонизъм*” in Veles at the time was the object of bitter polemics on the pages of Bulgarian periodicals in Constantinople, and the dispute about the language in Macedonian schools was renewed.⁴¹¹ Accordingly, the Uniate movement was only a form which could secure the road towards the objectives of the Macedonian national movement.

⁴⁰⁷С оџо Ви л џ р ски – И л и џ Р асков, *оџ. џџ.*, 71-73.

⁴⁰⁸Р . R. S l a v e џ k o v, *С џ ч и н е н и я*, II. *П р о з а и ч н и т в о р б и*, S o f и џ , 1969, 91.

⁴⁰⁹N. G. E n i џ e r e v џ , *В џ з џ о м и н а н и я и б џ л џ ж к и*, S o f и џ , 1906, 177.

⁴¹⁰Д - г џ Р . N i k o v џ , „A v s t r и џ s k и т џ k o n s u l и в џ T u r c и џ џ z a б џ л г а r и т џ в џ M a k e d o n и џ џ , *М а к е - д о н с к и и р e г л e д џ*, I, 5-6, S o f и џ , 1925, 114.

⁴¹¹Д - г џ В л а ж е R i s t o v s k и , *М а к е д о н с к и о т н а р о д и м а к е д о н с к а т а н а џ и џ я*. *П р и л о ж и з а р а з в и - т о k o т н а м а к е д о н с к а т а к у л т у р н о - н а џ и о н а л н а м и с л а*, II, S k o p j e , 1983, 37-38.

Another confirmation of all this is Slavejkov's letter to the *ἑπρωτοσύνη* of the Exarchate, Archimandrite Josif (Joseph, the subsequent Bulgarian Exarch), written in Salonika (a day after Slavejkov's visit to the Veles and Strumica regions), on March 5, 1874.

Petko Slavejkov obviously showed great diplomatic tact towards the movement and patiently strove to undermine the foundations of the people's aspirations. His letters are a summary of the most essential elements which characterized the movement of the 'Uniates' in Macedonia at that moment and connected it directly with the Razlovci Uprising which was prepared and later started as a **popular and liberation** (not **peasant**) movement. It was no chance that one of the main proponents of this movement was Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski (Malevski), the ideologist and leader of the Razlovci and Kresna uprisings. When all data are combined, it turns out that the movement was **not instigated from outside**, but that it was indigenous; it was **not chaotic** but **organized** and had a **revolutionary-liberation character**. The name of Dimitar Robev from Bitola must also be included among the adherents of the Uniate movement, as he was undoubtedly one of the most respectable and influential Macedonian citizens and tradesmen of the time, a member of the well-known Robev Brothers firm, which also had links and representative offices outside Turkey, in Europe. Hence Slavejkov tried to find the reasons for the movement's emergence in the influence of foreigners who started to travel throughout Macedonia, especially after the construction of the railway line to Salonika. He writes:

A great contributing factor was and still is that following the proclamation of the schism and the attitude of the Greeks towards the Bulgarians as schismatics, people have started scorning the scarecrow of the alien faith and are becoming insensitive to all nicknames and reproaches for apostasy and utterly indifferent to being called Uniates or Papists. [...] Another contributing factor has been the scattering of Austrians, Germans and Catholic Slavs along the railway line, who have also propagated it to a certain degree by means of direct communication with the people in the villages and towns; hence the mitigation of religious disturbances among the local population will be rather difficult without certain appeasement. Is it not surprising that even our (brother) Robev, a man from Monastir [Bitola], whom I have met here in Salonika, has become convinced that there is no other salvation than the union?

Slavejkov also discovers one of the reasons in Nil and his role in the Uniate movement in Macedonia, but of particular significance is his acknowledgement of the existence of a **Macedonian national ideology** and **historical consciousness**, no matter how small was the number of Macedonian activists who manifested a distinct **Macedonian patriotism** and respect for their own tongue. He once again confirms, as he did in early 1871 in his journal *Μακεδονία*, that the Macedonians

do not consider themselves to be Bulgarians but Macedonians who stand much higher than Bulgarians, as they draw their roots from the ancient Macedonians and consider themselves to be direct “descendants of Alexander”. Here it is not important that Slavejkov regards all that as the result of the activity and influence of Serbian and Greek propaganda in Macedonia, as something brought from outside. It is more important for us that he acknowledges the fact of the existence of a **Macedonian consciousness**, which was expressed through a widespread and organized popular movement at a given historical moment. Slavejkov’s direct testimony deserves to be quoted. He says:

The shrewd and unscrupulous preaching of M[onsignor] Nil, the stupid perseverance of the Orthodox people here, the schism, the said uninvited (preachers) are the pillars of the movement; but the worst enemy is this: In addition to those few petty ambitious Bulgarians from Macedonia, whose narrow love of their homeland and unreasonable preference for their native tongue have made them work on its predominance, there has recently come the propaganda of the Serbs and Greeks, who, concealing their ulterior motives from the population, imbue them with disastrous ideas: for instance, that they are not Bulgarians but Macedonians, i.e. something higher than the rest of Bulgarians (Alexander’s descendants!), that they can and should be the leaders and champions of the Bulgarian people, because even the Bulgarian hierarchy was and is theirs; with such preaching by foreigners, supported by some of our own foolish men, which has excited the population, they have now managed to spread enough of such ideas to lead them to the disastrous path of separation, and *the first fruits of this preaching are: mistrust in the Exarchate and secret counteractions to its striving to unite them in ecclesiastical terms.*

Slavejkov is right in pointing out Veles as the centre of these Macedonian actions. He came to know personally the people there and their aspirations. He connected all this with the presence of a Serbian teacher in one section of the town and the incompetence of the Exarchate’s Bishop, but he had to admit that the main culprit was the “ideas” which had taken root among the citizens of Veles, even though the town may have been divided into two parties. It is not accidental that among the Macedonian activists he mentions “The Drandar Sons”; this was a trading firm which had excellent connections not only within Turkey, but also with many European centres, and one of the sons had already issued his own publications (in French), in which he described Macedonia, its situation and future.⁴¹² Explaining the “disastrous path” of the citizens of Veles, Slavejkov writes:

⁴¹²The Veles merchant Hadži Georgi Drandar, privileged by the Sultan, had two sons: Konstantin Drandar, fighter in the voluntary Macedonian detachments, and Anton Drandar, the author of a large number of historical, journalistic and other articles, a significant figure in Macedonian development from the second half of the 19th century (Hristo Andonov-Poljanski, *Одбрани дела, III, Македонскот о прашање*, Skopje, 1981, 269-284).

The nest of this revolting and disastrous idea is at present Veles, which I have left with rather disturbing and sad impressions. The citizens of Veles resemble the type and character of the place where the town is built. Proud, rigid and haughty as the towering stairs which surround them, but likewise fruitless and inaccessible, narrow-minded and short-sighted, like the horizons stretching from their place, and swift-flowing like the waters of the Vardar, when they froth, trying to push forward and force their own ideas, like its waters in the gorges, always divided like the town and always hostile one against another; they have done and will still do great harm as proponents of these ideas. After my arrival in Veles I helped in the removal of the Serbian teacher and the reconciliation between Popov⁴¹³ and Kovačev,⁴¹⁴ but the letters I have found here tell me that all the schools in Veles have been closed and that the Serbian teacher has returned from Skopje and wanted to go to Salonika, where the proponents of Serbian propaganda, Drandar's sons, have arranged for him to be accepted! As ill luck would have it, not only is he not where he should be, but... I do not know what to say any more.⁴¹⁵

Slavejkov's last letter to Josif from Salonika is not dated but was written shortly after March 5, and by March 9, 1874 at the latest, when he had already returned to Constantinople. Here, too, this missionary and diplomat makes significant conclusions about the movement in Macedonia and the means for its eradication and also about the headstrong inhabitants of Malešvo and Kukuš who persistently defended the Macedonian idea and who were to bear such figures as Dimitar Berovski and Goce Delčev. He admits the efforts he had to go through in order to isolate the people of Kukuš making personal contacts with the leaders of the movement, even with Dimitar Malešvski and the Dojran teacher, Nikola G. Ahazarov. Slavejkov writes:

For reasons which I had to consider during my actions in that situation, I established very close relations with the Uniate leaders, D. Maleševski and N. Poljanski, which had a purpose of its own; guided by the same reasons, my first task was to destroy the redoubts from outside and leave the Kukuš people alone, who are the main proponents of all this; I can assure you that I have succeeded in this, and Kukuš has remained intact for reasons which I can explain to you only in a conversation because of the great length this may take; hence I cannot describe them in a letter, but I believe that after I present my reasoning, you and the Exarchate in general will approve them.

⁴¹³N. Popov(ič), the Bulgarian teacher in Veles.

⁴¹⁴Josif A. Kovačev from Štip was a prominent Macedonian pedagogue and educator, writer of textbooks and reformer of the schools in Macedonia. Educated in Russia and Serbia, in 1869 he organized a pedagogical and theological school in his native town. After Slavejkov's intervention, Kovačev was unable to stay in Veles as teacher. Invited by the Prilep church-school community, he was the chief teacher in the four-form school there from 1874 to 1877, when he published his well-known primer in "the *libuski* dialect", as unifying for Macedonians and Bulgarians.

⁴¹⁵Cočo Bilòrski – I li ò P askov, *ou. ujt.*, 73-74.

Here, somewhat as the result, let me say, of my suggestions, but more due to the complications around Monsignor's arrival, the wings of the Uniates have been weakened considerably, and patience and determination is the predominant idea among the earlier enthusiasts. The leaders of the union last night even started negotiating, but this morning they are again encouraged by the arrival of Hadži Georgi Dramski, a teacher in Prosočen, who has brought some better hopes with him not only from the monsignors but also, as I can feel, from some of our own pious men, who, acting in this spirit, apparently with the purpose of using the course of events to their advantage, and being not very well acquainted with the situation and their position here and to what point they can stretch their arms, have actually stimulated the movement and undermined their own position, helping more their opponents than themselves. This must be taken into account and, if possible, you must make them understand this without considering it a disclosure, because I believe that any intelligent person will know how to assess the situation and will aim to use it to his own advantage, whereas exaggerated zeal produces opposite results; and you know that foolishness in action is not too far from crime. Please make them understand this if you can, so that they can stop acting in this manner; it is not important just to show interest; everyone shows interest in these matters, everyone who has the prosperity of the people on his mind must above all pay attention to not saying anything before men like Kusev, Sarafov and others; the proverb says: "Tell the fool to fart and he will shit"; a similar thing is taking place here. They tell them there is nothing wrong with it and who knows what, and these, in order to help them, as it were, and to show them that they are doing them a favour, would go to much greater lengths than that; once you lose hold of the horse's mane, you will never stop him by holding his tail. I do not know whether Hadži Georgi has brought any letters, but he has openly said that our bishops have supported and sponsored the union. I really do not know how good and sound this is, but I know it can be devastating for anything that common sense can achieve.

Obviously, the situation with the rumours concerning the agreement between the Exarchate and Patriarchate was significant for the movement as well, as was also the official acceptance of Nil as a Uniate Bishop. The Macedonians actually wanted to make use of the situation and obtain a hierarchy for themselves as well as independent life and development, even under the formal leadership of a Bulgarian. Hence it is not surprising that the Austrian Consul General in Salonika, von Knappitsch, writes on March 23, 1874, to Count Andrišsy about the existence of a certain special "committee" in Salonika, something like the true leadership of the movement, while "the Reverend Bishop [Nil] plays not so much the main role of a leader, but rather that of one led, and as far as his so-called adherents are concerned, it is a fairly unconscious and hesitant mass, which is in the hands of a small number of leaders, but which," the consul assesses, "as matters are standing at this moment, will follow the suggestions of the latter".⁴¹⁶ That is why Slavejkov

⁴¹⁶Кирил Патриарх Вългарски, *Принос към българския църковен въпрос. Документ і от Австрийскот о консулт во в Солун*, София, 1961, 92.

quotes the peasants' demand that the Uniate Bishop Rafail Dobrev Popov be sent in case Nil is not allowed to come. Popov was the leader of Bulgarian Uniates based in Adrianople, and it did not matter which of the two Bulgarians would come at the head as long as the aim was accomplished. In this connection, Slavejkov writes:

As I hear, Reverend Nil's hopes for his arrival have been frustrated, as today they are sending *mahzars*⁴¹⁷ demanding Rafail's arrival; the *mahzars* have been signed only by the Kukuš eparchy. The Poljanin representative, who is here, has refused to put the stamps of the villages that have joined him; at least this is what he says to me, but he does not know for sure. [...]

For the time being, only Kukuš is sincerely in favour of the union, as is also Maleševo, which listens to Dimitri, to whom they have entrusted their stamps. I have him nearby and I believe that the last blow can be dealt at the appropriate moment, provided that my absence and information from your city [Constantinople] do not complicate matters later.⁴¹⁸

Even though Slavejkov had to return to Constantinople, his intensive activity in Macedonia was not without benefits for the Bulgarian Exarchate. It must be noted that these activities were greatly aided by official Russian policies through the Russian Consulate in Salonika, which maintained constant links with the Bulgarian teacher in this city, Mihail G. Bubotinov,⁴¹⁹ against whom the Salonika Community fought so persistently, opposing the activity which he carried out in line with the recommendations of the Bulgarian centre in Constantinople, aimed against any tendencies towards Macedonian independence.⁴²⁰ Even Slavejkov's secret mission to Salonika did not take place without the suggestions of the Russian diplomatic representative in Constantinople, Ignatiev, who in late December 1873 paid a visit to Exarch Anthimus "to be informed on the situation and also to acquaint the Exarch with the information he had received from the Salonika Russian Consulate".⁴²¹

There is no doubt that the rumour concerning an agreement between the Patriarchate and Exarchate at the expense of the Macedonian eparchies was the immediate cause of the eruption of this third union in Macedonia. Of considerable significance were also the actions of Natanail and Hariton in settling their personal

⁴¹⁷*Mahzars*, written requests by the population to the supreme Turkish authorities.

⁴¹⁸Со̀о̀о̀ Вѣлѣ̀рски – Илѣ̀рски, *о̀ѣ̀ ѣ̀т.*, 74-75.

⁴¹⁹Кѣ̀рѣ̀лѣ̀ Пѣ̀трѣ̀рѣ̀ Вѣ̀лѣ̀рски, *Екзарх Анѣ̀м (1816-1888)*, 541.

⁴²⁰Due to his "improper" behaviour towards the Uniates, through its Macedonian Society in Constantinople, and looking for "a suitable teacher in Salonika" who would also be its "secretary in the places there", the Exarchate indeed dismissed Bubotinov and appointed Stefan Zahariev from Tatar-Pazardjik in his place (Prof. I. V. Snōgarovъ, *Солунъ въ бѣ̀лѣ̀рскѣ̀ а̀ духовна кулѣ̀тѣ̀ у̀ра. Истѣ̀рѣ̀ ѣ̀ски очѐрѣ̀кѣ̀ ѣ̀ документѣ̀ ѣ̀*, Sofiѣ̀, 1937, 133).

⁴²¹Кѣ̀рѣ̀лѣ̀ Пѣ̀трѣ̀рѣ̀ Вѣ̀лѣ̀рски, *Екзарх Анѣ̀м (1816-1888)*, 541.

problems within the Exarchate hierarchy. But it is no less true that all this was only a precondition for the flaring up of the fire which had its own internal reasons, with a clear Macedonian national perspective and concept, regardless of the modest number of such ideologists and adherents. Bishop Nil was used only as a means to accomplish the basic objective, as he was a Uniate representative of Rome in Turkey, in spite of the fact that the Exarchate itself tried to use precisely his presence there as a Bulgarian. That this movement seriously threatened “the Bulgarian cause in Macedonia” is confirmed by the Consul von Knappitsch, who quotes the opinion expressed by Slavejkov himself before his departure from Salonika that “if the movement in the mixed eparchies is not halted, the Bulgarian population in these eparchies will probably be lost for the Exarchate”.⁴²² Likewise, regardless of the use of traditional nomenclature, after Slavejkov’s departure from Salonika, the Gumendџe Exarchal Community wrote to the Bulgarian Exarchate on March 10, 1874:

If you think that our eparchy, like the other Macedonian eparchies, is inhabited solely by a few yoghurt and boza⁴²³ makers, whose unification with the Exarchate does not deserve the efforts which it had to make for the accomplishment of that aim, a view expressed by some of the Exarchate’s counsellors, and, moreover, that their rights were in your hands... you are wrong... we are not your acquired property you can sell and bargain with, but a people who demands justice.⁴²⁴

The Bulgarian Patriarch Cyril, analysing two of Slavejkov’s letters (sent from Salonika to Exarch Anthimus, one between February 15 and 19, and the other on February 19, 1874) which were by then in private ownership,⁴²⁵ makes a brief paraphrase of their contents and concludes:

In their letter to the Salonika eparchy representatives, the agents and adherents of the union mentioned settling the “Macedonian question” through the union. In order to take the utmost advantage of the disappointment in the Macedonian eparchies, they reinforced their accusations against the Exarchate which had appeared in some Bulgarian newspapers in Constantinople. They indeed spoke about the Macedonian question on a church basis, but this nourished the old separatist tendencies, perhaps not fully in the spirit of Midhat’s plans for the differentiation of a new ethnic territory. As the agents of the union prepared, in 1860, by means of the newspaper *B’lgarija*, a cultural-national programme for the liberation of the Bulgarian people from the Patriarchate through the establishment of the union, so too they now proposed a clear programme for spiritual and national liberation of Macedonian eparchies through the union. The current political language of the

⁴²²†Кирил Патриарх Вългарски, *Принос...*, 93.

⁴²³An acidulated fermented drink made from millet, maize or wheat flour (translator’s note).

⁴²⁴†Кирил Патриарх Вългарски, *Екзарх Антим (1816-1888)*, 549.

⁴²⁵*Ibid.*, 542.

Macedonian activists of the time already spoke of 'a Macedonian movement', which implied independent church liberation. Here there is a moment, however, of significant political character: separatism was expanded from a church to a broader national basis.⁴²⁶

6.

Of special significance in all these documents is the leading role of **Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski (Makedonski, Maleševski)**. A student in Odessa and Belgrade, a participant in the 1862 action in Belgrade against the Turks, receiving military training in a military academy, but also politically mature in his permanent contacts with Macedonian expatriates in Russia and Serbia, Berovski also emerged as the main inspirer and organizer of this third union in Macedonia, a movement which most strongly emphasized the independent Macedonian component. True, he also maintained links with representatives of Serbian propaganda dating from the time of his stay in Belgrade, but there is also no doubt that Berovski did all this in a calculated spirit, and he did the same in his contacts with Russian and Bulgarian representatives, trying to look for and find paths for his ideas. His correspondence with Stefan Verković, a Serbian secret agent in Macedonia, is an opportunity for us to get a clearer idea of this.

Following his return to his native Berovo, Dimitar took part in a large number of activities. Stefan Verković informs the Serbian government:

In B[erovo] I saw D. M[akedonski],⁴²⁷ for whom I sent a special man to B. to bring him to me. He comports himself honourably and well, and it is much better and more useful for our cause that he is here rather than staying there. He has been so successful in using his abilities that he has succeeded in founding a party, with which after a lot of pain and effort, he ousted the Graecophiles not only from the Council, but also from the administration in community matters, who together with the Strumica Bishop oppressed and pillaged the poor in that district, whom the people from the popular party immediately took in their own hands, whose head he himself is. He is also a member of the Council, and the popular party does not take any action without his knowledge and consent. His influence begins to spread slowly in neighbouring districts, i.e. those of Pijanec, Radoviš and Strumica.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁶*Ibid.*, 549-550.

⁴²⁷In his correspondence with Verković up to 1865 (while he was in Belgrade) he used the signature *Д. Македонски*. Later he was also known in Belgrade under that name.

⁴²⁸*Mi hai l Ar naudov, Verkovi č i Veda Slovena. Pri nos kŕm i st ori jat a na bŕlgarski j folklor i na bŕlgarskot o vŕzraždane v Makedoni j, s nei zvest ni ũi sma, dokladi i drugi dokument i ot 1855 do 1893 z.*, SbNU, III, Sof i ð, 1968, 311, dok. ŕ 25.

Much earlier we learn that Verković persuaded Dimitar Popgeorgiev Makedonski to cooperate with him. In one of his letters (September 3, 1872),⁴²⁹ he notifies the responsible people in Belgrade of his tour of Macedonia, writing:

From Štip, through Radoviš, in one day I came to Novo Selo, which lies halfway between the towns of Strumica and Petrič. It was on the eve of the feast of the Virgin Mary. Several years ago a Bulgarian popular school was instituted in the said village, and the church service is held in Slavonic. A teacher in the said village is a native of Maleševo, born at the village of Berovo, a very diligent and honest man; I met him and established communication with him. He will represent our interests in the Strumica, Petrič and Maleševo areas.⁴³⁰

Verković points out that in these three districts (*nahiyes*), unlike those of Štip, Prilep and Bitola, “courage and pride has not been quenched”, adding:

There is not a single house in the said three nahiyes without weapons. Despite their great impoverishment due to the excessive taxes — so that there is not even enough bread in the house — in spite of all that, there is not a single house which does not keep at least a few cartridge belts in its bags. Reliable people have told me that they are eagerly waiting for Serbia to start a war against Turkey and cross the border with its army. As soon as this happens, they say that the aforesaid three nahiyes will rise en masse against the Turks. The same applies to that of Nevrokop.⁴³¹

This hope for assistance from Serbia was both natural and understandable in view of the fact that it was the only Slavic and Orthodox state in the neighbourhood, in whose liberation Macedonians had also played part. Therefore Verković writes:

Everyone thinks that the sun will shine from A. [Serbia], and as far as the B[ulgarian] secret committees in Romania are concerned, the ordinary people in these regions do not even know that they exist at all.⁴³²

Verković surely acted with this in mind and tried to convince Dimitar of the same:

I persuaded him to be cautious against the harmful aspirations of the Secret B[ulgarian] C[ommittee] in Romania, with many ill consequences for the B[ulgarian] people. He accepted my observations and remarks as very appropriate, convincing me that he would pay great attention and make efforts to protect the people of the surrounding areas from the harmful influence of the agents and apostles of

⁴²⁹The letter bears the date “Sept. 3, 1862”, but most of the documents in the section on Stefan Verković in the Archives of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia have had their years altered, and hence we believe that here the correct year is 1872.

⁴³⁰Mi hai 1 Ar naudov, *oŭ. ūt.*, 299.

⁴³¹*Id.*

⁴³²*Id.*, 311, dok. ž. 25.

Romanian committees who roam on Bul[garian] territory aiming to beguile the Bul[garian] people, putting them on the wrong track. He believes that the best and safest means for the protection of these regions from the influence of those committees would be if several young people from these regions were sent to A. [Serbia] for education, as, he says, no one could better persuade the people from these Mac[edonian] regions of the sincerity, righteousness and fidelity of Ser[bian] intentions than their own children.⁴³³

7.

The circumstances described above were the cause for the Herzegovina Uprising and the Serbo-Turkish War, which stirred up many of the hidden hopes of the Macedonian people. The Malešvo region had already shown revolutionary tendencies. The clash between Dimitar Berovski and the Greek Metropolitan Hierotheus (Jerotej) in Strumica, and the expulsion of the latter from Berovo in 1874, led to many Turkish brutalities in the Malešvo region, which forced Berovski to flee first to Constantinople and from there to Salonika, where he lived illegally and made preparations for a popular liberation insurrection. Here is what he wrote somewhat later:

Here [in Salonika] I had the opportunity of receiving detailed information on the actions of the Herzegovina Uprising. The circumstances, too, helped me in following all the movements of Turkish troops on land and sea when they arrived and left by railway via Mitrovica to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The strongest movement of troops for Bosnia and Herzegovina could be seen towards the end of 1875 and beginning of 1876.⁴³⁴

The Razlovci Uprising is often described as a **peasant social uprising** or **rebellion**. Yet, regardless of whether it had direct links, and to what degree, with the rebels in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and regardless of whether Serbia had any influence in its outbreak, it is a fact that it was an **organized Macedonian national liberation uprising**, which was not a reflection of the April Uprising in Bulgaria, but a link in the chain of popular resistance by the subjugated peoples in this part of Turkey. Can we talk of any coordination between these actions at all? Here is the testimony of the then still young Teodosija Gologanov, who, after completing the course of education at the Greek grammar school, was sent as a *υποτροφια* to Herzegovina, where he learnt the language and became acquainted with the situation:

⁴³³ *Ibid.*

⁴³⁴ Mi hajl o Mi noski „Novoot kr i eni dokument i za revol uci oner nat a dejnost na Di mi tar P op Geor gi ev–Ber ovski “, *Гласни κ, I NI*, Hř I, 3, Skopje, 1972, 145, dok. br. 1.

Two years later an uprising started in Herzegovina; Montenegrin and Serbian newspapers described the heroic acts of the Bulgarian rebels around Kazanlık in an exaggerated manner. The Herzegovina voivodes, most of them priests, confided to me some of their plans, suggesting that I set off for Macedonia and Bulgaria, meet the rebels and let them know of the plans. Young as I was, 23-24 years of age, excited with passionate fire and with yet undeveloped spiritual forces, I set off for Macedonia via the Adriatic and the Aegean and went to Salonika, and from there to Seres. The Turkish authorities caught me immediately and threw me into jail...⁴³⁵

Even Dimitar Berovski himself tells us that the assessment of the general political situation in European Turkey and the mood among the Macedonian population encouraged him to start the uprising:

The news of the Herzegovina actions, the movement of the Turkish troops, and my own position became equally unbearable for me. Impatience grew in me with each day passing, and in the month of December 1875 I decided to organize an uprising in Macedonia, which would help the Herzegovina Uprising by holding a part of the Turkish troops here...⁴³⁶

Among other things, he “gave a picture of an uncrowned lion to Slavka Karaivanova and her mother Nedela to embroider a flag on a golden silk ground, with the lion in red silk and the inscription *Македонија*” which was to be “a secret to everyone”.⁴³⁷ He assured his confidants that “the time has come to free ourselves from the Turkish yoke and [that] our uprising will be successful and aided from where it should be...”⁴³⁸ Hence it is not surprising that a witness of these events writes that “the priest Stojan and D. Berovski jumped on their horses, unfurled their flag and set off for the Malevo region”,⁴³⁹ and Dimitar’s brother, Kostandija Popgeorgiev, cried to the Turks:

We have come to gather the peasants and read them a letter which was sent to us from Russia, and after we have read it we shall return the weapons to you and we shall go on to read it in the Pehčevo *müdürlük* [council] as we have in Razlovci.⁴⁴⁰

Russian archives should offer a clearer picture of Berovski’s links with Russia (probably via the Russian Consulate General in Salonika), but even the available facts that in August and September 1876 statements were made through the

⁴³⁵Архив на БАН, София (Archives of BAN, Sofia), фонд 1071. Библиографија за изборот на Теодосија Голганов како член на Бугарското книжевно друштво на 9 јули 1912.

⁴³⁶Мислата на Мироски, *оу. уџт.*, 145, док. бр. 1.

⁴³⁷*Ид.*, 146, док. бр. 1.

⁴³⁸*Ид.*

⁴³⁹Согласно со Кубен Лапе, *Разловечкот о востание од 1876 година и личността на неговите организатори* или *Димитар Попгеоргиев Беровски*, Скопје, 1976, 71.

⁴⁴⁰*Ид.*, 72.

Russian Consul General in Salonika⁴⁴¹ show that such links may have existed, especially bearing in mind that he was also educated in Odessa and such channels were not unknown to him.

It is very important that fifteen Malenovo rebels — “leaders” — later, on November 24, 1878, also gave a written statement (on behalf of the Malenovo population) to the British Consul General in Salonika (when he visited Gorna Džumaja) which clearly expressed the **historical** and **national consciousness** of the rebels and the **character** of the uprising. They wrote of “good hopes for us, Macedonians, the inhabitants of the Malenovo district”, and mentioning their cables sent in 1874 to the British representative in Constantinople, continued:

The endless murders, imprisonment, unjustified punishment, the oppression of our religious conscience, the molestation of our wives, daughters and sisters, was something like a habit for the satisfaction of the Turk! We could not confide this secret and pain on our consciousness except to the British consul in Salonika; his altruistic advice was our last hope giving us courage to fill the *hükümet*s with countless applications and protests, but our gratification has always been retaliation as ungrateful *kaurins*; therefore in 1876, on May 8, we were impelled to protest before the whole world with arms in our hands to attract the attention of the Turkish government, hoping that they would ask themselves what evil had made us so desperate and offer our last drop of blood as a sacrifice before the European altar!!! [...] This protest of ours did not attract the attention of the Turkish government with the intention of satisfying us, but instead it sent twelve thousand men of the regular army and many bashibazouks who committed what the human conscience cannot express in words, even when it refers to the male sex, too! Massacres were a commonplace.

The signatories, relying on the Macedonian ideology prevalent at the time of their direct descent from the ancient Macedonians, stated:

Will our Macedonian blood, the blood we have resolved in our distress to shed, this blood of that Macedonia which was mercilessly condemned and despised two thousand years ago, put an end, under the present European ruling nations, to the revenge for the great and former glory!!! [...] Asiatic peoples, in keeping with their old traditions, may perhaps wish the eradication of the name Macedonia in the world! But does enlightened Europe have any reasons for this and has it not yet borne a saviour to deliver us from the sin of our forefathers?⁴⁴²

From what has been said above, it is clear that the Razlovci Uprising had both a **Macedonian** and a **national liberation** character. Moreover, it was not of minor

⁴⁴¹*Ibid.*, 43.

⁴⁴²*Освобождени е Болгари и от т урецко̀го и ѝа. Документ и в т rex t омах*, III, Moskva, 1967, 325, dok. ž 205.

proportions, even though neighbouring historiographers have so far paid little attention to it.

On the other hand, it is important that there were contacts with the European great powers of the time, and also with neighbouring Serbia, although these have still not been sufficiently studied. The statement that “the rebel Mičo Ljubibratić has made a deal in Belgrade that an uprising be started in Macedonia as soon as the same happens in Herzegovina”⁴⁴³ corresponds with Teodosija Gologanov’s testimony, and we must also bear in mind Dimitar Berovski’s remark that the uprising was to be “aided from where it should be”.

We still do not know much about that “popular party” in Salonika mentioned by Verković or about the “secret revolutionary committee which maintained links with the leaders of the Malešvo revolutionary movement”,⁴⁴⁴ or about that “circle” which, among others, included “Kostandija, the priest Ivan and the priest Aleksija Popgeorgiev, Stojan Cocov, Goge Širtov, the priest Petar Solunski, grandmother Nedela and her daughter Stanislava Karaivanova and the Evrov brothers”.⁴⁴⁵ Stefan Verković is likely to have been informed of these organizations, and here is what Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski wrote to him on February 19, 1876, from Salonika:

As it seems, we shall have to leave our lawsuits before the court pending, and we believe they are more likely to be finally resolved in Malešvo.⁴⁴⁶

8.

It is clear that the Uniate idea among the Macedonians, and even that of Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski, was not of a **religious**, but primarily of a **national character**. Hence the clash between the citizens of Veles concerning their teachers and the joining of the Uniate movement should be seen in this context. Petko Račev Slavejkov himself admitted:

On my recommendation, in Veles they hired N. Popovič against whom later part of the population rose, favouring Josif Kovačev.⁴⁴⁷

Slavejkov himself felt the bitterness of this clash during his visit to Veles, and the Veles-Strumica Bishop, Damaskin, wrote on July 6, 1875, to Dr Stojan

⁴⁴³Vasa Čubrilović, *Bosanski ust anak*, Beograd, 1931, 38.

⁴⁴⁴*Албум Македонија*, София, 1931, text below the photo of the teacher Stanislava Karaivanova, 5.

⁴⁴⁵Quben Lape, *ош. џџ.*, 68 – extracts from K.P. Stojanov’s recollections concerning the preparations and course of the Razlovci Uprising.

⁴⁴⁶*Документ и за бългaрскот о възгaждане от Архиватa на Стефан И. Верковић*, 574, dok. ž 480.

⁴⁴⁷P.R. Slavejkov, *Съчиненија*, II. *Прозаичните работи*, 91.

Čomakov: “May someone from the Exarchate come here to learn the truth, but if he is like Slavejkov or can be bribed, he will bring poison instead of balm.”⁴⁴⁸

And indeed, by that time the commotion in Macedonia was clearly visible. The Constantinopolitan newspaper *Ден* (Day) once again wrote that the question of “*Byzarianism and Maqedonism*”⁴⁴⁹ had appeared afresh “in reality”, and that “*some ideas* preached in those areas by some of our *Byzarian* compatriots” such as Kuzman Šapkarev, were spreading there, and also wrote that “rare are the people who oppose him, who scold him”.⁴⁵⁰ After the reply of a citizen of Ohrid that “Mr Šapkarev wants nothing else except that the basic school books which are sent into our lands be written in the local dialect, because the children will thus understand them more easily and will not waste as much time as they are doing now with *Бащин Јазик* (Father Tongue) and other similar books”, the editors of *Ден* reacted sharply and uncompromisingly:

Is there any other worse thought that Mr Šapkarev could have? He knows where he is poking. Today a primer, tomorrow other textbooks and next you’ll see him producing and devising a history of the Macedonian people, etc. etc.⁴⁵¹

Such was the degree of development of Macedonian national consciousness at the time of the Razlovci Uprising. It was reflected in this achievement of the people at Razlovci and the surrounding area. It is also important that Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski’s detachment continued to move through the villages and mountains until the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), when it received messages from Iljo Malevski and took active part in protecting the Pijanec region. There it established and maintained **popular authority for two whole months**, a kind of a free republic which was crushed only after the decisions of San Stefano and Berlin. It was Berovski once again who made all the necessary preparations and probes and started the Kresna Uprising, which had a clearly defined Macedonian national liberation character, although the young Bulgarian state (not without the help of the Russian occupation authorities) managed to smash this popular effort. Macedonia remained under the authority of the sultans, striving, within the framework offered by the international acts of Constantinople and Berlin, to win its **autonomy** and gain **cultural and national affirmation**. The Macedonian national programme was already fully defined and now included the concept of **Macedonian statehood** and **political freedom**.

⁴⁴⁸А. Š оровъ, „Д-гъ St оѡпъ Čomakovъ. Ź i votъ, дѡ ѡnostъ i ar hi va“, *Сбогні къ на БАН, НII*, 8, Sof i ѡ, 1919, 179, dok. Ź 114.

⁴⁴⁹*День*, I, 18, Car i gr adъ, 9.ř I.1875, 7.

⁴⁵⁰*День*, I, 19, 16.ř I.1875, 7.

⁴⁵¹*День*, I, 21, 30.ř I.1875, 7.

The Development and Affirmation of Macedonian National Thought from Kresna to Ilinden (1878-1903)

The development of Macedonian national thought between the two most significant attempts to win a Macedonian state in a revolutionary manner (the Kresna Uprising, 1878-1879, and the Ilinden Uprising, 1903) was a time of consolidation of Macedonian national thought. This was a period when Macedonia was physically separated from its Slavic neighbours that had formerly lain within the borders of Turkey and when the groundwork of political and ideological movements was built in Macedonian society (within the land and among the already well-developed émigré circles), and also when the organized expression of national-political action by the Macedonian people reached its apogee.

This period can be divided into two stages with clearly defined characteristics: (1) years of a **homogenization of integrative national consciousness** and of the **initial affirmation of national thought on the internal and external plane** (1878-1893), and (2) a decade of **affirmation of the political component of organized Macedonian consciousness as a dominant element with a definition of the initial practical implementation of the Macedonian national programme**.

If we assume that the early 1870s were the key stage in the process of definition of the Macedonian national entity, and hence in the building of the national programme; if the year 1878 saw the affirmation of the revolutionary national liberation movement which, two years later, was to promote the first National Assembly of Macedonia, the Macedonian Provisional Government and the first Constitution of Macedonia; if in the late 1880s and early 1890s Macedonian national thought experienced its first public clashes on the road to affirmation on the Balkan and international European scene; if 1893 was the year of the secret foundation of the revolutionary liberation movement along horizontal and vertical lines, then the year 1903 certainly marked a historically crucial stage in Macedonian national and political constitution and affirmation: during the Ilinden Uprising, the broad layers of the people willingly accepted armed struggle as the only way to win national freedom and establish a state of their own (provisionally in the form of autonomy within the borders of Turkey). The struggle for Macedonian

statehood, without any support and assistance from neighbouring countries or the European great powers (and in spite of all the obstacles on their part), had both theoretical foundations and practical results which considerably excited the international public. This marked the crossing of the crucial threshold in the process of Macedonian national development, which opened the path for Macedonian cultural and national affirmation. Yet it was also to engender an organized and combined obstruction by the interested neighbouring monarchies.

1.

The early 1870s saw the start of an open struggle against the aspirations and actions of foreign propaganda in Macedonia, and this only reinforced the process of Macedonian national differentiation. While Greek national propaganda was already losing its formerly established position, Bulgarian propaganda (particularly after the foundation of the Bulgarian Exarchate) was severely intensified, having the official Turkish authorities on its side. By opening and controlling churches, schools and communities of its own, and especially through its propaganda with the help of the well-developed Bulgarian press in Constantinople as well as with the actions of the various official 'societies' and 'church-school departments', the Bulgarian Exarchate was virtually transformed into an official and legal Bulgarian 'Ministry of Faith and Education', not only in the territory of Bulgaria but also in all the areas of European Turkey inhabited by Orthodox Slavs.

The joining of this struggle for the control and distribution of spheres of interest in Macedonia by state-organized Serbian propaganda further complicated the process of affirmation of the Macedonian national entity. Rivalry between the different propaganda machines, however, to a large extent reoriented the struggle of Slavism against Hellenism and led to a more marked differentiation of Macedonian national interests.

The propaganda of the various religious missions (mainly Uniate and Protestant) became a means used not only by the great powers and neighbouring states, but also by the indigenous Macedonian movement.

In this spectrum, Romanian national propaganda in Macedonia was of limited extent and potential and did not essentially influence the development of Macedonian national affirmation.

The complicated situation was further aggravated by the notorious fact that Turkey, in accordance with Shariah law, did not recognize **nationality (ethnicity)** but only **faith (religion)**. As a result, the church appeared as the basic factor in the affirmation of a particular nationality (ethnicity). Following the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate it was impossible to form another **Slavic Orthodox**

Conference (1877) — where Macedonia would finally become “a free kingdom” (or republic), outside Turkey, but under the protectorship of Russia. A similar variant was indeed discussed in the higher circles in St Petersburg, as well as in Vienna and Budapest.⁴⁵⁹

The Congress of Berlin, however, established a vassal Bulgarian Principality and an autonomous East Rumelia, while Macedonia was returned to the Sultan without a clearly defined future. This was to lead to the start of the greatest insurrection to date, the Kresna (Macedonian) Uprising (1878-1879), which put forward the first constitutional project for the long-awaited Macedonian free state (December 1878).⁴⁶⁰

The Insurgent (Uprising) Committee codified its position not only as regards the struggle and liberation, but also towards Macedonia’s neighbours (at that moment and in the future), towards the churches and towards the great powers as well, putting emphasis on the right of the Macedonian people alone and the Insurgent Committee to fight and control their struggle, but also to make use of their freedom.

In this way the Macedonian national-cultural programme was now complete and included the **revolutionary-liberation component**. The Macedonians emphasized their state-constitutional legitimacy and created a **Macedonian Army** as the principal factor of their liberation struggle. At the same time, however, a new factor, known as *Brxobism*, emerged in the Macedonian movement; it was an external (foreign) factor serving hegemonist aspirations in the settling of the “Macedonian question”.⁴⁶¹

Subsequent development proceeded in a convulsive manner, primarily owing to constant and organized interference by Macedonia’s neighbours. The main obstructive factor became the free neighbouring monarchies of Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece. Yet the tendency towards an independent, internal and self-governing settlement of the question of Macedonia’s liberation continued to be expressed uninterruptedly.

The Kresna Uprising failed because it ran contrary to the interests not only of Macedonia’s small neighbours, but also of the major European powers, above all those of Russia, which carefully protected the integrity of Turkey as in their own interest and also the status of the Berlin decisions on the Balkans. In this situation, Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin became an international guarantee of the justness of the struggle of the Macedonian people for effectuation, which was to continue

⁴⁵⁹D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Македонски от нагод и македонскат а наци ја*, I, Скопје, 1983, 378-293.

⁴⁶⁰*Прави лат а-Уст авот на Македонски от вост ани чки ком и т ет во Кресненскот о вост ани е*, Скопје, 1980.

⁴⁶¹D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *ош. иjt.*, 386-387.

up to the year 1912. Only after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire did the great powers lose their acquired right to interfere in the internal matters of this part of the Balkans. Yet the interference continued even after the First World War, although in other forms and using new methods.

3.

Controlled from outside and limited by the international accords, the actions of the Macedonian insurrectionists in the Kumanovo, Kriva Palanka and Kratovo regions were not more successful either. While as far as the Kresna Uprising was concerned, the newly-established Bulgarian state invested all its efforts in obstructing the independent development of the movement, in this case a similar role was played by the Principality of Serbia, which persistently strove, if not to expand its territory to the south, then at least, to secure good prospects for such an action.⁴⁶² This rivalry had disastrous effects on all attempts at unification of the Macedonian forces into a joint front for liberating the land or at least for gaining autonomy. The picture will be complete if we also take into account the actions of the Greek government for securing its own sphere of influence and a stronger position in the partition of the territory of European Turkey. The attempts of the founders of the Military Committee for the Liberation of Christians in the Ottoman Empire, and those of Leonidas Voulgaris's Slavo-Macedonian Committee in Athens, at establishing links with Serbia and the Macedonian leaders there as well as with the Macedonian champions in Bulgaria, i.e. East Rumelia (and also with all Macedonians from around the land), are the best illustration of this.⁴⁶³

All this impelled the Macedonians to work secretly vis-à-vis the propaganda of the three neighbouring nations. For example, in April 1880 there was an important meeting between Leonidas Voulgaris (originating from the Pijanec region), his old fellow fighters from the Slavo-Macedonian Committee in Athens and the prominent leader in the Kresna Uprising, the priest Kostadin Bufski, in Gremen-Teke, southern Macedonia (Ostrovo district). The two commanders and

⁴⁶²J. Haxi Vasi q evi ć, „Ust anak Sr ba u Kumanovskoj i P al anačkoj kazi 1878 god.“, *Brast vo*, NI, Beogr ad, 1906, 150-204; D-r Q ubi sha Dokl est i K, *Cr ũsko-makedonski t e odnosi vo NIIH-ot vek do 1897 žodi na*, Skopje, 1973, 144-157; Kl i ment Xambazovski , „Odbor ot za St ar a Sr bi ja i Makedoni ja i makedonskot o pr ašawe od 1877-1881 g.“, in: *Makedoni ja vo Ist ochnat akri za 1875-1881*, MANU, Skopje, 1978, 341-344.

⁴⁶³I v.B. Š umkovъ, *Pat ri ot i ceski i nasъrdči t elni razkazi ... Avt obi ografi jat ana Ivanъ B. Š umkovъ*, Sof i ò, 1907, 154-165; Tane P ò evъ, „Bъl gar ska legi ò vъ Gъr ci ò prežъ 1877 g. (I zvadki i zъ moi t ò spomeni)“, *Makedonski i vežledъ*, III, 4, 1927, 30-44; Ri st o P opl azar ov, *Oslobodit elni t e voorужeni borbi namakedonski ot narod vo ieri odot 1850-1878*, I NI , Skopje, 1978, 242-247.

their detachments agreed on the basic concepts of the struggle for liberation: the establishment of an **independent state** of Macedonia, or **autonomy** within Turkey, provided that spiritual unity of the Macedonian people was guaranteed, the actions of the neighbouring national propaganda machines prevented and the support of the great powers secured. In order to achieve these objectives they decided to convene a **National Assembly of Macedonia** with democratically-elected delegates from all the “religious-national” entities and ethnic groups, who were to decide the future of the Macedonian state.

On May 21, 1880, with its Act No. 3 issued at Gremen-Teke, the Provisional Government of Macedonia informed the Russian Consul in Salonika that on the same day a decision had been passed by the Provisional Assembly of Macedonia (enclosed in the letter) with a request that it be forwarded to the Russian government. The letter was signed by the president of the Provisional Government of Macedonia, Vasil Simu, its members Anastas Dimitrievič and Ali Efendi, and by its secretary, Nikola Trajkov, and validated with the Government’s seal.⁴⁶⁴

The decision of the Provisional National Assembly itself is validated by four different seals⁴⁶⁵ and signed by the heads of the appropriate departments.⁴⁶⁶ The document states that the assembly of “provisional representatives from different eparchies, provisionally elected by the population of Macedonia”, examined the political situation and “the means for fulfilling the wishes of the Macedonian nationalities” and that “by general consent of the members of the Macedonian National Assembly” a resolution was passed “on behalf of the Macedonian people-population” with the following demands:

- (a) To impart the justified demands of the Macedonian people-population to the Sublime Porte through the mediation of the governor-general in Macedonia, so that the Porte may speed up the implementation of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin and convene legal representatives from Macedonia for the examining and amending of the Organic Constitution.

⁴⁶⁴A VP RI , Moskva, f . P os-st vo v Konst ant i nopol e, 1880, d. 2276, l . 208. The Russian translation (l . 203) mentions neither the reference number 44, nor the word *Ενωσις* which is to be found in the seal of the Provisional Government of Macedonia. The letter is hand-written in Greek (in ink) on a sheet of paper with a printed letterhead (also in Greek). The signatures of *Βασίλως Σίμος*, *Αναστάσος Διμίτριεβιτς* and secretary *Νικόλαος Τραϊκόβ* are in Greek, and that of *Αλί Εφενδι* in Arabic. In the translation, the president is rendered as *Βασίλγ Σίμου*, while the secretary’s signature is not mentioned at all.

⁴⁶⁵The protocolar decision of the Provisional National Assembly is also hand-written in Greek on four pages of ordinary paper. On page 1, to the left of the title, there is a seal reading *Αδμίνιστράτιον οργάνισεδ φρ τχε λβεράτιον οφβαρίογς τριβες ιν Μαυεδονία*, “*Σαυρεδ Γρυζζλε*”, and to the right there is a seal reading *Μαυεδονία, Πανδία, Ευίργς, Τχεσσαυ*. The same numbers, 3 and 44, appear there, but there is also the signature of the sender: the secretary, Nikola Trajkov. The last page contains two more seals, *Νεαδ Οφφχε οφτχε Μαυεδονίαν Αδμίνιστράτιον* and *Πομμάνδ οφτχε Μίλίταρυ Φορτες οφ Μαυεδονία*, with the appropriate signatures of their heads.

⁴⁶⁶The signatures (in Greek) are illegible.

(b) To send this decision to the representatives of the European powers, signatories to the Treaty of Berlin, with a request that they forward it to their respective governments and demand that they intervene with the Porte for an unimpeded implementation and fulfilment of the decisions of the aforementioned treaty related to Macedonia.

(c) To send special persons to do the same in Constantinople.

(d) For the implementation of the decisions passed today we have elected a Provisional Macedonian Government consisting of the following: Vasil Simu, Anastas Dimitrievič and Ali Efendi (Albanian).

(e) The Provisional Macedonian Government is entrusted with carrying out the following:

a. To secure in a fully secret manner assistance from the European Powers for the unimpeded implementation of the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin relating to Macedonia.

b. To appoint military commanders for the fulfilment of the wishes of the Macedonian population, in the case of failure, by arms.

c. If the Provisional Government finds that the Sublime Porte is conducting a policy of delaying the settlement, then it would demand, with a decisive proclamation, armed help from the Macedonian people-population, calling them to arms so that they themselves can take up the struggle for survival.

d. With a like proclamation the Provisional Government will ask for help from the governments interested in the rebirth of old Macedonia, and also help from all freedom-loving people.

e. The Provisional Government is entrusted to carry out the provisional organization of military and civil authorities, to find the means for the fulfilment of the aforesaid decisions, the symbol of the Macedonian flag, seals and for everything which is related to the establishment of a provisional administration.⁴⁶⁷

The great powers, however, were not interested in hearing the voice of Macedonia, nor were Macedonia's small neighbours ready to forego their own aspirations.

4.

In this same period, a draft Law for the Vilayets of Turkey in Europe, prepared by the Sublime Porte in the spirit of the Treaty of Berlin, was circulated for discussion. On April 5, 1880, representatives from the Bitola, Prilep, Ohrid, Veles and Lerin church-school communities, joined by the communities of Resen and Gevgelija, gathered in Bitola. They examined the draft reforms and sent a detailed request to the European Commission for Reforms in Constantinople, specifying their remarks and proposals on all issues in 24 items.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁷AVP RI , f . P os-st vo v Konst ant i nopol e, 1880, op. 517/2, d. 2276, 11 . 209-219 s ob [overleaf].

At the same time Macedonian émigrés in Bulgaria continued their revolutionary activity, preparing themselves for new armed actions. The former volunteers in the Russo-Turkish War and the activists of the Kresna Uprising had been scattered all over the Bulgarian state in order to prevent their joint organized action. But as early as the end of 1879, in the distant town of Ruse (on the Danube), a Macedonian league for the liberation of Macedonia was set up. Following the intervention of the Bulgarian authorities, it was renamed as the ‘Bulgarian-Macedonian League’. The League’s secretary, using the pseudonym of Mavro, called on the Macedonian émigrés to support the action financially and announced that ten Macedonian commanders were ready to depart for Macedonia with their detachments.⁴⁶⁹ In the spring of 1880 one detachment was defeated in a battle with the Turkish authorities, and memoirs were found among the killed addressed to the great powers, demanding the autonomy of Macedonia.

The largest number of refugees from Macedonia were concentrated in western Bulgaria. In order to organize the struggle and return to their homeland, they associated in various societies. Thus, for instance, in Dupnica, a Macedonian Charitable Society was established which, in July 1880 (during the passage of the Bulgarian prince through the town), presented a petition to Alexander of Battenberg, demanding that the Bulgarian authorities did not scatter them in distant places throughout Bulgaria, as they had no intentions of staying in that country. A similar petition was submitted by a delegation of refugees from the Seres sanjak.⁴⁷⁰

After a longer period of internal upheaval, volunteers from the Russo-Turkish War took over the leadership of the Ruse League and resolutely demanded the implementation of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin and the establishment of an autonomous Macedonian state through the mediation of the European Commission for Reforms. Yet this was precisely the reason why, after the intervention of the Bulgarian authorities, the League ceased to exist.⁴⁷¹

On the other hand, there were about 1,800 Macedonian fighters in Sofia, among them some fifteen commanders from the Russo-Turkish War and the Kresna Uprising. Together with the numerous Macedonian intelligentsia there, they founded a new ‘Bulgarian-Macedonian League’. After establishing contact with

⁴⁶⁸ *Зорни ца, њ*, 21, Сaрi гpaдъ, 20.њ.1880; *Македонi я*, ВАН, Софi ò, 1978, 365-367. The same document (in a slightly modified version, mentioning *Трiлѹ* instead of *Трiдѹина*, was published in *Македонскат а ли ља...*, 347-349.

⁴⁶⁹ *Слaвjaнi нъ*, II, 19, Русљукъ, 18.Н.1880, 148-149.

⁴⁷⁰ *Македонскат а ли ља...*, 117-129.

⁴⁷¹ *Ибiд.*, 125-127. For more details concerning the League see: †Кi рi л Рaтrи aрh Въл гaр ski, *Бългaрскaт а eкзaрxi я в Oдrи нскo i Македонi я слeд Oсвoбoди т eлнaт a вoйнa (1877-1878)*, I, 1, Софi ò, 1970, 460; Kоnстaнтi н Рaндeв, *Нaљи oнaлнo-oсвoбoди т eлнoт o двi жeнi e в Македонi я i Oдrи нскo 1878-1903*, Софi ò, 1979, 40-41; Дoàнo Дoàнoв, *Кoмитeтe „Eдi нст вo“*. *Рoлaт a i ѹрi нoсът i м зa Съeдi нeнi eт o 1885*, Софi ò, 1985, 288-291.

the leader of the suppressed uprising, on May 2, 1879, on Mount Maleš the League issued a proclamation calling for a new uprising in Macedonia.⁴⁷² The question of the name of the League, however, became crucial for these fighters. They wanted it to be called simply ‘Macedonian League’, while the intellectuals supported the name ‘Bulgarian-Macedonian League’. After three founding assemblies, a compromise was reached that the organization be called ‘Macedonian-Bulgarian League’. Yet the commanders continued to insist on their preferred designation, as the basic slogan of the Macedonian League was ‘Freedom for Macedonia or Death’.⁴⁷³

At the same time, the League took on the task of reworking the ‘Organic Constitution for the Future State Organization of Macedonia’, whose basic version had already been accepted by the Ruse League. Yet long disputes ensued on this issue, too. The representatives of the Macedonian intelligentsia in Bulgaria insisted on concentrating the entire political power in their own hands, leaving the military command to the commanders. They demanded that, in conformity with this division of powers, the Provisional Government of Macedonia be formed of civilians alone, under the presidency of Vasil Dijamandiev. But the commanders rejected the demand, and it was decided through compromise that political and military powers should not be divided until the liberation of the land. Vasil

⁴⁷²†Вългарски Патриарх Кирил, *Съборот и ват а срещу Берлински я договор. Кресненскот о вѣст ани е*, Sof i ò, 1955, 235-236, dok. 115. There are certain omissions at places in the text which might explain the essence of the document. In the lithographed copies of the Appeal, the **Macedonian Insurgent Committee** proclaims:

“Macedonians,

“Our mother Macedonia is moaning and crying bitterly under the Turkish fire and yataghan; our suffering and bleeding parents, sons and brothers are calling us to arms against our torturers and tyrants of five centuries, and our molested mothers, wives and sisters, with bitter tears in their eyes, are groaning under the filthy and inhuman Turkish despotism around our devastated homes, waiting to hear their voice.

“Macedonian and Bulgarian heroes! Our glorious lion is roaring in our Macedonian forests and valleys, mountains and deserts, calling all of us to arms.

“Where are you, hasten, let us gather with arms in our hands to liberate the innocent victims of this filthy and disgraceful molestation. Bear in mind that our fathers and grandfathers fought and shed their blood for Greek and Serbian freedom..., think now and recall the earlier years and you will see that they did not spare their blood for the freedom of all. With hope in God and in the justice of the Treaty of San Stefano, let us show that we are all true descendants of our fathers and grandfathers and worthy members of our generation.

“Macedonians! Now is the time to convince our enlightened traitors that, even now, after being enslaved for five centuries, Macedonia has given birth to and has hero sons!”

As in Ğorĝija M. Pulevski’s songbooks, here too, Macedonians called upon the preliminary San Stefano peace treaty, as an act sponsored by Russia, in the hope that this might be a way of freeing themselves from Turkish domination, within the boundaries of a possible dual monarchy, **Bulgaria-Macedonia**. This was obviously not in line with the concepts the Provisional Government of Macedonia, but the document was written at a time when this government had not yet been formed and when the League was still a ‘Bulgarian-Macedonian League’.

⁴⁷³*Македонскат а ли џа...*, 127-129.

of the status that this body enjoyed at that stage of organization of the Macedonian state.

In accordance with this Constitution, the Military Staff of the Macedonian League for the Liberation of Macedonia prepared special “Military instructions for the organization of the Macedonian Army in the Autonomous State of Macedonia”, which consisted of two parts. The first part was prepared in the town of Ruse and bears the date April 12, 1880; it was entitled “Military instruction for the organization of the Macedonian Army in the Autonomous State of Macedonia”⁴⁷⁶ and defined the organization of the Macedonian Army following the liberation of the land and the constitution of the state. The second part bears the title “Provisional military instructions for action of the Macedonian Army”,⁴⁷⁷ passed by the Military Staff of the Macedonian Army on May 6, 1880, specifying no place of issue.

It is of particular significance that the second act, whose preamble expressly states that “the European Commission for conducting reforms in the vilayets of Turkey in Europe and for the establishment of a single Macedonian vilayet has so far paid no attention, at its sessions, to the memoirs sent to it for the appropriate implementation of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin and granting political autonomy to Macedonia by preparing an organic constitution for Macedonia”. The Turkish representative in the Commission, however, proposed a draft for an organic constitution which envisaged “only administrative decentralization in the Macedonian vilayets” to preserve the integrity of the Turkish state. As a result, the Military Staff of the Macedonian League stated:

Interpreting the aspirations of the Macedonian people to liberation, the Macedonian League is convinced of the untenability of the signed Peace Treaty of Berlin, and, in addition to the political action for the implementation of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin in the European regions of Turkey, is determined to continue its armed struggle for the liberation of Macedonia and the establishment of a Macedonian state, as it considers the administrative autonomy of Macedonia a stupid cliché of European and Turkish diplomacy. Enslaved Macedonia naturally wants the same rights as free Bulgaria. The Macedonians do not want to bow their heads in slavery and therefore have taken up arms. The movement of insurgent detachments in Macedonia, however, has lately appeared to be more of an armed demonstration than a major insurrectionist movement. In order to unite all the detachments in Macedonia into a single whole and towards a single goal – the establishment of a free

⁴⁷⁶ *Id.*, 262-291. Dojno Dojnov (*ou. út.*, 289), however, confirms the accounts of Kiril (*ou. út.*, 460) and Pandev (*ou. út.*, 41) that “the military instructions” of the Staff, prepared by Commander Walter, had 264 paragraphs, while neither version of these instructions, as they were transmitted to the Macedonian League, contains so many articles. D. Walter was a former captain who took part in the Kresna Uprising; he was persecuted by the Austrian authorities and also became an activist in the Macedonian League (*V. Di amandi ev, Avt obi oğrafi ja*, 1. 121, ob. 122).

⁴⁷⁷ *Македонската а ли џа...*, 292-312.

Macedonian state – the Military Staff of the Macedonian League for the Liberation of Macedonia has undertaken the preparation of this Provisional Military Instructions for Action of the Macedonian Army.⁴⁷⁸

The Macedonian League issued a number of other documents of exceptional significance. In addition to the memoir to the members of the European Commission in Constantinople (Ruse, April 14, 1880),⁴⁷⁹ on June 23, 1880, the Provisional Administration of Macedonia sent from Mount Pirin Planina another memoir to the ministers of the great powers — Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary and Italy — as well as to the Commission of the European powers for reforms in European Turkey, in Constantinople,⁴⁸⁰ appending the Constitution of the State Organization of Macedonia to the document. It offered a detailed explanation of all the efforts of the Macedonian people for a just implementation of Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin and expressed a strong protest against the draft constitution already prepared by the Porte for reforms in the vilayets and against the make-up of vilayet commissions.

This document also quoted a large number of requests and complaints by the Macedonian population from all over Macedonia addressed to the European Commission and to the Porte demanding the delineation of the borderline between Macedonian and other vilayets in European Turkey and the establishment of a single Salonika vilayet for the whole of Macedonia. Yet there was no reply.

On April 17, 1880, the Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs invited the signatories to the Treaty of Berlin to examine and adopt the newly-prepared regulations, and the Salonika vali had already started implementing these regulations — which had not yet been approved — in his vilayet, even before the European Commission could have examined them. To check the arbitrariness of the Turkish authorities, prior to the convocation of the European Commission in Constantinople, 102 representatives of the Macedonian population submitted a memoir to the European powers, demanding once again a single Macedonian vilayet and the preparation of an organic constitution for Macedonia similar to the Cretan one. Yet this memoir, too, remained without an answer.

The Macedonians who lived in Constantinople immediately submitted a request with 200 signatures, stating the same demands, and “the Macedonian representative Karandžulov, together with 12 delegates” was received by the British representative in the European Commission, Lord Fitzmaurice, who promised that their request would be forwarded to the Commission. But there was still no answer. Furthermore, the European Commission accepted the draft constitution

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 292.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 315-319.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 320-325.

of the vilayets with an explanation that the Organic Constitution of Crete could be applied to Macedonia, as “the population that lives there is ethnically diverse”.⁴⁸¹

In early June the General Staff invited Vasil Dijamandiev, as the president, to come from Plovdiv to Mount Pirin Planina, where on June 29, 1880, it issued an important document, “Manifesto of the General Staff of the Macedonian Army”,⁴⁸² for the preparation of a general insurrection. This manifesto also reached the leader of Macedonian detachments in south-western Macedonia, Leonidas Voulgaris, who in mid-July, “together with Vasil Simon, a certain Tiko and two other unknown people”, as representatives of the “Provisional Government of Macedonia — Equality”, met Dijamandiev, bringing their own documents, and reached an agreement on joint insurgent action. They agreed that the Provisional Government of Macedonia should be the public proponent of the uprising, and that the Macedonian League and the General Staff should take the military command. They also agreed that the former should use the protection of the Greek government, and the latter that of the Bulgarian government, but only until the liberation of the land and the establishment of the Macedonian state. Dijamandiev acquainted the delegates coming from the south with the prepared Constitution and Military Instructions and then, at the proposal of the delegation of the Provisional Government, another article was added — on the rights and duties of the nationalities in Macedonia.⁴⁸³

Following the talks in Plovdiv, the delegation of the Provisional Government went to Pirin Planina and met the chief commander of the General Staff, Iljo Maleševski, while Vasil Dijamandiev informed the Bulgarian Minister of the Interior of all these activities.⁴⁸⁴

In Voulgaris’s diary, in the section referring to the talks with the representatives of the Macedonian League, we can read, among other things, that “the old *ajdyk* Iljo Maleševski, little educated and almost illiterate, has a much broader understanding of the future of Macedonia than Vasil Dijamandiev, an educated and learned person”. The following section of Voulgaris’s notes on the talks on Pirin Planina is very interesting:

Commander Iljo was delighted with our presence and spared no effort to arrange for us to come to this village house on Mount Pirin. He accepted the agreement with Dijamandiev, but there was a conspicuous frown on his face concerning the patronage of Bulgaria and Greece. What would happen if we were to add the patronage of Serbia;

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 323.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, 326-327.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, 329-331.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 330-331.

he said that we were going back to the old ways. Leave all those who stir our waters aside, he said. Who will believe us that we are fighting for the freedom of Macedonia when these patrons want to dismember it? We fully agreed with him and decided to work in secret from both the Bulgarians and the Greeks.⁴⁸⁵

These were indeed the most critical moments in the activity of the Provisional Macedonian Government and the Macedonian League. Detachments were constantly sent to Macedonia and they were active over almost all the territory of this Turkish province. Major armed actions were taken by the police and military authorities against the detachments,⁴⁸⁶ and as the movement did not enjoy the support of any state in the Balkans or in Europe, it remained of a fairly limited character. It could even be said that everyone was against it; even the diplomatic representatives of the great powers acted as informants for the Turkish authorities in the liquidation of the armed movement.⁴⁸⁷

Yet it is very important that on April 11/23, 1881, a letter (in French) was sent from Kjustendil to the Russian diplomatic representative in Constantinople, General Nikolay P. Ignatiev,⁴⁸⁸ in which the Provisional Government of Macedonia asked him to forward the enclosed “Manifesto of the Provisional Government of Macedonia” (also in French) to the Russian government. It is interesting and significant that this letter, bearing the same four seals affixed a year ago, was signed by the president of the Provisional Government, Vasilos Simos, by the four members of the Government (the first signature is illegible, the second in the Cyrillic script is that of Petro Jovanov, the third is that of Kostas, although the surname is not clearly written in the Greek alphabet, and the fourth signature is that of Hriste Ćorgov), while Nikolaos Trajkov once again signed the letter as secretary. These were actually all the members of the Government, whose function and fate has still been insufficiently studied.

The Manifesto of the Provisional Government of Macedonia⁴⁸⁹ contains the signatures of its president and secretary, validated by two seals, and it, too, was adopted in Kjustendil on April 11/23, although the document is actually a certified copy made on Mount Dospat on April 18/30, 1881. The Manifesto, among other things, declares the following:

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁴⁸⁶ A VP RI , f . P os-st vo v Konst ant i nopol e, 1880, op. 517/2, d. 2276.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸⁸ CGAOR, Moskva, f . 730, op. 1, ž 79, l. 1.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 11 . 2-3 s ob. We find a nearly identical version in *Македонската а ли за...*, 356-357. Yet we can also find the same initial text in the **Appeal of the ‘Macedonia to the Macedonians’ Society** in Constantinople, dated April 15, 1891 (D-r Vl adan Đor devi ć , *Cr bi ja i Gr čka 1891-1893. Pri lož za i st ori ju sr ũske di ũlomaŭi je ũri kraju XIX века*, Beograd, 1923, 95-96). This text is also ascribed to Leonidas Voulgaris, who lived in Athens at the time.

True Macedonians, faithful children to your fatherland!

Will you allow our dear country to be ruined? Look how, in this slavery, she is covered with wounds inflicted by the surrounding peoples. Look at her and see the heavy chains imposed upon her by the Sultan. Being in such a helpless position and all in tears, our dear Macedonia, our dear fatherland, is calling upon you: You who are my faithful children, you who are my descendants, after Aristotle and Alexander the Great, you in whose veins Macedonian blood flows, do not let me die, but help me. What a sad sight it would be for you, true Macedonians, if you became witnesses of my burial. No, no, here are my dreadful bleeding wounds, here are my heavy chains: break them, heal my wounds, do everything in your power that the words "A single and united Macedonia" will be written on the banner I will raise! Having done this courageously, banish from your land these murderers who carry the flag of discord in their hands and inculcate antagonistic ideas, dividing you, my children, into innumerable nationalities; then, having gathered under the banner of Macedonia as your only national distinction, raise that glorious banner high and make it ready so that you can unanimously write on it: Long live the Macedonian people, long live Macedonia!

We do not know what the effect of these appeals and proclamations was. There is no doubt that they were accepted by the people of Macedonia, but it is also likely that they worried those who aspired to this Turkish province. Hence they took every possible measure and used every possible means to neutralize not only the effect of such appeals and proclamations but also the revolutionary movement in Macedonia itself. They soon managed to break the unity within the leadership of this movement. As part of these actions, Voulgaris was denounced and arrested in Salonika on his return following the meetings with the representatives of the Macedonian League. Only an energetic intervention by Russian diplomacy saved him from jail. He withdrew to Athens, not abandoning, however, the ideas he had proclaimed earlier. At the same time Vasil Dijamandiev was placed under investigation and was conducted by the police from Plovdiv to Sofia, and the Bulgarian government took all the necessary measures to close its border with Turkey to Macedonian armed detachments, a measure also taken by the Greek government.

The split within the movement is also confirmed in report No. 211 of June 14, 1881, by the head of the Russian Consulate General in Macedonia (Salonika) to the Russian ambassador in Constantinople, in which he reminded the ambassador of his report sent a year earlier "on the emergence here of what is known as the Provisional Macedonian Government", and continued:

Since then no one had heard anything about that Government. It seemed to have sunk in eternity and my recollections of it remained in my mind as an unsuccessful attempt of naïve political agitators.

But on June 12 this year I unexpectedly received a letter from a certain Baron Gundlas, in which he proposed to give me certain information about the Provisional Macedonian Government.

Succumbing to my inclination to curiosity, I invited this without doubt unreliable person, not so much hoping to receive precise information, but rather as an opportunity to meet the new type of political spy.

A very decent young man presented before me, evidently flustered because of his intent.

He began with the recommendations of his personality, which was allegedly known to Count Gatsfelyd and Radolinsky in Constantinople, to our military attaché in Plovdiv, to Captain Eku and Adjutant General G. Glinka, whose grandson he was.

When I saw that he hesitated to state the reason which had made him turn to me and knowing from experience not to trust in appearances only, I hurried to warn him that if he had come to demand material assistance, then he did not need tell me his secrets and that I, in my turn, would keep his call a secret.

In reply, Baron Gundlas told me that he needed no money, but that he only wanted revenge and to unmask the intentions of his enemy Leonidas Voulgaris, whose secretary he had been and who had allegedly expelled him from his post.

He then told me that the representatives of the provisional Macedonian Government, Messrs Simos, Voulgaris, Tiko, etc., after sending the circular to Salonika, had gone to Plovdiv, from where they conducted their illegal activities.

Their entire activity over the past year consisted of forming as many outlaw gangs as possible in Macedonia. With this purpose in mind, they sent agents throughout the land who spread among the population, in every possible way, a feeling of discontent with the existing order and proposed that they overthrow it by force.

The gangs were formed one after another and were armed with the support of the Provisional Government, which allegedly had and still has a large arms depot in Varna.

Having no opportunity of corroborating the truth of what has been said to me, I feel obliged to confirm to Your Excellency the fact of a real growth of outlawry, which is constantly augmented from among the rural population and armed in ways which are unknown to anyone.

As far as the final objective of all the endeavours of the Provisional Government is concerned, according to Mr Gundlas, it consisted of the simultaneous movement of all outlaw gangs, of fires, explosions in state powder magazines, a general revolutionary movement, of expelling the Turkish authorities, etc., etc.

It is planned that all this be carried out in the course of this summer, and the Provisional Government has already moved its residence here, to Ostrovo, close to Voden.

Simos, Taki and others, together with their adherents, have already passed through Salonika, but they are still waiting for Leonidas Voulgaris, because he is late due to his arrest by the Turkish authorities, from whom he has nevertheless managed to escape.

The signal for general action will be an explosion in the Salonika powder tower, and several sinister persons have already arrived for this purpose.

Baron Gundlas also told me a number of other details, but I will not occupy the attention of Your Excellency any more, as they are not helpful in the explanation of matters at all.

In order to give a better idea of the position of the Russian Consul General towards these activities and understand his role in the obstruction of this action, we shall quote the end of his report:

Not fully trusting the whole story, just in case I nevertheless warned the local authorities, giving some comments about the possible development of matters, and they have strengthened police control almost everywhere. I told them that I had received this information from an anonymous letter and that in all probability it was a sheer mystification.

At the same time, herewith enclosing Baron Gundlas's original letter, I have the honour of courteously asking Your Excellency to order me to request the opinion of the German Embassy concerning the personality of the baron, and if it is positive, to let me send a secret agent to the vicinity of Voden to keep an eye on the wrongdoers who, by their criminal activities, will, in all likelihood, bring disaster on the Macedonian Christian population which is already suffering badly.⁴⁹⁰

That there was indeed a highly developed insurgent movement in Macedonia in 1880 and 1881 is confirmed by several sources. As early as August 18, 1880, the Salonika Russian Consul Nikolay Skryabin, in his report No. 697, informed Evgeny Petrovich Novikov that "the leaders of the Greek outlaw detachments, Katarahja and Kalogiros, who have so far hidden out in the mountains of Olympus, have now abandoned Thessaly and moved to Macedonia via Gevgelija. They have chosen Tikvenand Veles as their new residences and have started holding negotiations with the local Bulgarian outlaws for the alliance of Bulgarian and Greek forces. It is still unknown whether the negotiations have been successful, but the appearance of the new uninvited guests has already been marked by the killing of five Turks on the outskirts of Veles, and the local population is now in terrible fear." The consul continued by asking himself: "How can this unexpected Bulgaro-Greek association be explained — I do not know. Some evil tongues have called it a Bulgarian movement and casually mentioned the memorandum printed in the newspaper *Heo.v̄z̄os* which contains a project for the partition of Macedonia. Others say that the Provisional Macedonian Government is again stepping up its activity, concerning which I had the honour of informing Your Excellency in my report No. 659."⁴⁹¹

On August 27, 1880, Skryabin notified Novikov that what he had written of the "outlaws" Katarahja and Kalogiros was true, but that this had not happened "these days", but that "Katarahja left the surroundings of Veles even before August 15 and moved to the Bitola district. Here, in the village of Malovinte, he marked his presence by major outlawry and then hurried on to Mariovo, which is situated in the vicinity of Prilep. And Kalogiros remained in place to carry out his actions

⁴⁹⁰AVP RI , f . P o l i t a r h i v , op. 482, 1881, d. 1124, 11 . 188-191 s ob.

⁴⁹¹AVP RI , f . P o s - s t v o v K o n s t a n t i n o p o l e , 1880, op. 517/2, d. 2276, 11 . 236-237.

between Veles and Tikveš. Their relations with the local Bulgarian outlaws brought about the persecution of the unfortunate peaceful population by the Turkish authorities who have already detained 75 innocent Bulgarians in Veles.”⁴⁹² On August 27, Skryabin reported on a sensitive inclination towards “Graeco-Bulgarian rapprochement” in Macedonia, even though he had never heard of such a readiness, as he says, “from the Bulgarian side”, as there was great fear of the Greeks.⁴⁹³ The Russian consul regularly referred to the Macedonians as “Bulgarians” and to the revolutionaries as “outlaws” or “gangs”. It is interesting that he found a well-developed revolutionary movement in almost all the regions of Macedonia, as a result of which major pogroms were carried out among the population. Thus, for example in his report No. 714 of September 2, 1880, Skryabin wrote:

The attempt of Greek outlaws at uniting with Bulgarian ones, the killing of five Turks on the outskirts of Veles (report No. 697 of August 18), and also the refusal by the Bulgarians to help the Albanian League (report No. 708 of August 27) – all this has put the Bulgarian inhabitants of Veles into an extremely difficult situation. Aware of their powerlessness, the Turkish authorities, whose suspicion exceeds the limits of any logic, instead of coldly investigating matters, have been acting under the influence of slanders and capturing innocent Bulgarians solely on account of information by their enemies. Over 150 people have been detain up to the present day. All of them are in jail with no hope that they will ever be released, as the Turkish authorities have given their fate to the justice of the judges, and these are filled with the hatred of one person, a certain Hamid-Pasha, who had been a friend of three of the aforementioned five Turks who were killed...⁴⁹⁴

The reports from Macedonia constantly emphasized a movement of detachments and the suffering of the population from the Turks. On September 9, Skryabin warned about a large-scale movement of “outlaw detachments” in Macedonia,⁴⁹⁵ while in his extensive report No. 770 of October 11, 1880, he described the activities of the detachments of Ajada, Zarkada, Katarahja, Panajot Kalogiros and other commanders whose number increased daily and warned of the “danger” of their association, because the demoralized, underpaid and hungry Turkish troops would in that case be unable to deal with them.⁴⁹⁶ On October 27 he wrote about new acts of “violence” carried out by the detachments of Kamaka, Zarkada and Kalogiros,⁴⁹⁷ and on November 8 about a large number of interned

⁴⁹² *Ibid.*, I . 240 s ob.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, II . 241-242 s ob.

⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, II . 243-244 s ob.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, II . 245-247 s ob.

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, II . 299-301 s ob.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, II . 321-322.

men, women and children who were close to the Macedonian “outlaws” Dimo, Petru and Pano Samardžiev and others. He gave details of these commanders: Dimo is described as coming from the village of Vetersko; two years ago he had gone to Bulgaria together with his wife; Petru came from the village of Rudnik and was in Kjustendil at the time; Pano Samardžiev was from the village of Podles, in the Tikveš region, who “after the Easter holidays left for Bulgaria”, while Janko from the village of Guzemelci went to Serbia “as early as 12 years ago” and, as of the rest, nobody has heard anything of him.⁴⁹⁸ The families and relatives of all these migrant workers were interned or arrested, even though they had no links with nor activities in the revolutionary movement. This was not the case in the Veles and Tikveš regions alone. Skryabin’s report from Salonika of November 16, 1880, spoke of new internment of the Macedonian population from Kočani to Skopje, etc.⁴⁹⁹

Assistance and protection were sought not only from the foreign consuls in Macedonia, but also from the neighbouring states, and even from the Bulgarian Exarchate.⁵⁰⁰ For instance, the cable to the Bulgarian Prime Minister sent by the families interned in Salonika, among other things, stated: “The local authorities, considering as outlaws/revolutionaries our relatives who have long ago moved to Bulgaria and Serbia and are there engaged in trade, have detained us for no real reason, and amidst this winter weather too, and have sent us under guard from Veles to Salonika and Kessendra together with our families, all in all 163 persons.”⁵⁰¹

Such and similar news filled the newspapers of the time. Even Vasil Dijamandiev himself declared that the moment had come for insurgent action and called the Macedonians to organized resistance against the Turks.⁵⁰² Towards the end of

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 11. 337-343.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 11. 347-348 s ob.

⁵⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 1. 367 s ob.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 1. 365 s ob.

⁵⁰² *Македонецъ*, I, 1, Russe, 1.HI.1880, 1. Significant information on the establishment and activity of the Macedonian League in Ruse can be found in the *Aytobiozratixy* of its president, Vasil Dijamandiev (from Ohrid), who, among other things, writes:

“Up to the beginning of 1883 I was a member of the Ruse Court of Appeal, and in 1880, together with Georgij A. Georgov, we founded a league under my presidency, while Georgov himself was elected its treasurer. The league was composed of five members: one president, one treasurer, one secretary and two councillors. This ‘league’ was founded according to my plan taking the ‘Irish League’ as its basis, which was said to number about 40,000 members at the time. I assumed that in the Principality of Bulgaria there were more than 100,000 Macedonians, who, if they joined it as sworn members and supporting members, would make the Macedonian League larger than the Irish League and present a great fear for the Turks. In addition, our five-member league which was based in Ruse was considered authorized to act within the Principality of Bulgaria with unlimited rights — such as it would deem it necessary to use as an independent body of the existing main league in Macedonia under the name ‘Pirin Planina’ and under the leadership of seventeen commanders. In the relations with its

1880, in Ruse, more concrete actions were taken by the ‘Bulgarian-Macedonian League’, with Dijamandiev as its president, and Georgij A. Georgov, principal of the Agricultural School in this town, as its secretary.⁵⁰³ The joint struggle of the nationalities living in Macedonia against the centuries-old enemy caused anxiety among the neighbouring aspirants and they took concrete steps to destroy it. Much later, recalling this period, the editor of the semi-official mouthpiece *Свобода*

members, the Ruse League used papers headed with the slogan ‘Pirin Planina Macedonian League under the leadership of seventeen commanders’. Above the slogan there was a Macedonian lion crowned with a triple crown, treading with two feet on the Turkish crescent and all military attributes, in its right paw it holds a sword and roars, and below it is written: ‘Freedom or Death’. On such paper we submitted a request to the Ambassadorial Conference in Constantinople through Mr Hitrovo, and later also to the Berlin International Conference dealing with the Greek-Thessalian question. These two memoranda contained sharp warnings that in the case that the conferences paid no attention to them, the League had the right to start an uprising of as yet unseen horror and terror. Instead of a constitution, the league had Instructions consisting of a few articles in the following spirit: ‘Every Macedonian living in the Principality of Bulgaria should consider himself a sworn member and supporting member and should unconditionally obey the Ruse league. For all those Macedonians who dare reject this, the least punishment is death. This rule is not imposed upon the Moesian and Thracian Bulgarians, but they too are bound to help no less than the Macedonians in the liberation of Macedonia.’ [Авт обі озрафи я, Del I, Вългарски исторически архив при Народноабиблиотеката „Кирил и Методиѝ“, Sofia, f. 577 (Vasil Dijamandiev), a.e. 1, l. 120, ob. 121].

In the newspaper *Българи нъ* (If, 320, Ruse, 21.III.1880, 2), Vasil Dijamandiev and Georgij A. Georgov published a longer letter entitled ‘Our Diplomats’ in which they wrote that “our diplomats have started furiously cursing and intimidating the members of the Macedonian League, and have sent them a circular imparting to everyone that if they participate in the Macedonian League, they will be dismissed from service”. At the same time Dijamandiev and Georgov published letters by the editor of the Ruse newspaper *Македонецъ*, Nikola Živkov, and his anti-Macedonian activity and defended the policy and goals of the League.

The French newspaper in Constantinople, *Ikare du Bosphore*, published interesting information, printing the text of the Salonika correspondent of *Correspondance politique*, where he wrote that on August 6, 1880, one of the League’s detachments, on whose banner was written ‘Freedom or Death’, was seen on Pirin Planina, and that eight battalions of Turkish troops were immediately sent after it (*Зорница*, 34, Сариградъ, 19.3.III.1880, 134). On July 29, 1880, a ‘new manifesto’ with the signatures of eight commanders and the president of the League, Dijamandiev, was sent to the newspaper *Българи нъ*, announcing insurgent actions in Macedonia (*Зорница*, 35, 26.3.III.1880, 140).

⁵⁰³*Македонецъ*, I, 17, 5.I.1881, 67-68. The figure of Georgij A. Georgov (Georgiev) still remains insufficiently studied, even though he was one of the more important national activists towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. He was a teacher and the principal of the Agricultural School in Ruse, but later we also find him close to various societies of the Macedonians in Sofia and around the Young Macedonian Society, while in April 1910 he appears as the treasurer of the *Аутономоус Македониа* Committee in Sofia (*Македония*, ННП, 1, Sofia, 28.I.1910, 1). It is highly important that we find his name among the signatories to the **Memorandum of the Macedonians to the Governments and the Public Opinion of the Balkan States** of June 7, 1913, in *Македонский гласъ* (*Македонски глас*), I, 1, S.-Peterburg, 9.I.1913, 17-20, as the author of significant articles in the Slavophile mouthpiece *Славянскія і звьст ія* (3.1913, 175-177 and 3.1913, 257-260), and as one of the three representatives of the Macedonians (together with Dimitrija Čupovski and Nace Dimov) in St Petersburg, presented in the documentary film *Свицъ Албум* as “a Macedonian, a former Bulgarian member of parliament” [Д-р Влостовски, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940) и Македонскот о научно-литературно друштво во Петроград*, II, Skopje, 1978, 72-78].

warned with unconcealed gall: “We can solemnly conclude that if there were any Macedonian leagues, detachments, societies, newspapers, etc. in Bulgaria, each one, pursuing its own interests, inflicted a great evil rather than good upon their brothers in Macedonia.”⁵⁰⁴

But the insurgent detachment movement in Macedonia was not fully paralysed. In June 1881 many arrests were made in connection with what was to become known as the ‘Ohrid Conspiracy’,⁵⁰⁵ and the creation of new rebel detachments was expected in the following year. The Macedonian League and the Provisional Government of Macedonia were unable to continue their activities, but Macedonian national consciousness strengthened the awareness among the people that a struggle for freedom and a state of their own was inevitable.

A large number of societies were founded in Macedonia and among the émigrés, and as early as 1885 a secret revolutionary Macedonian committee was set up in Sofia, whose core consisted of “some twenty young people from Macedonia”. Yet the Bulgarian authorities smashed this organization as well, and its more prominent activists moved to Belgrade, where Serbian propaganda welcomed them and gradually succeeded in using their activity for the goals of Serbian greater-state policy.⁵⁰⁶

We have examined the revolutionary component of the Macedonian movement in greater detail because Macedonian national and political consciousness was expressed most strongly in the period immediately following the Congress of Berlin and because the facts presented above are a clear illustration of the very clearly defined Macedonian national-liberation concepts in the popular movement.⁵⁰⁷

⁵⁰⁴Свобода, III, 280, Sof i ò, 1.ř II.1889, 3.

⁵⁰⁵I .G. Senkevi č, „Novì e dokumentì ob osvoboditel Ànoà bor Àbe v Zapadnoà Makedoni i i Kosove v konce 70-h — naçal e 80-h godov NIIH v.“ in: *Славянское i st очни коведени e. Сборни к st at eù i mat eri алов*, Moskva, 1965, 274-284.

⁵⁰⁶D-г Kl i ment Xambazovski , *Култ урно-ошут est венит e врски на Македонци t e со Срби ја во t екот на IIIH век*, Skopje, 1960, 162-171; D-г Q ubi ша Dokl est i K, oñ. цт., 304-308.

⁵⁰⁷Particularly strong revolutionary actions were taken in the turbulent year of 1885, after the ‘unification’ of East Rumelia with Bulgaria and following the Serbo-Bulgarian War. Organizers and whole armed detachments were sent to Macedonia in an organized way, mainly across the Bulgarian border, but once again the Macedonian liberation struggle was offered no support from any side (AVP RI , f . Konsul Ђst vo v S al oni kah, op. 565, 1885, d. 512, 11 . 30-31, s ob, 53, 55, 57-60 s ob, 63-65 s ob, 67-69 s ob, 78-79 s ob, etc.).

5.

Developments in Macedonia were accompanied by the simultaneous demonstration of Macedonian national consciousness and actions for cultural and national affirmation.

Thus, for instance, as early as the time of the Kresna Uprising, Commander Ćorgija M. Pulevski published his revolutionary poem 'Samovila Makedonska' (Macedonian Sprite); somewhat later he printed two booklets under the common title *Македонска њеснарка* (Macedonian Songbook, 1879),⁵⁰⁸ and as the question of the Macedonian literary language once again became crucial in the Macedonian liberation struggle, he also published the first part of his extensive grammar *Слѡниџа речовска* (Reka Wordbook, 1880).⁵⁰⁹ To affirm Macedonian historical consciousness and support the national consolidation, Pulevski wrote his comprehensive *Славјанско-македонска оуџа историја* (Slavonic-Macedonian General History),⁵¹⁰ which, though remaining in manuscript, marked the beginning of modern Macedonian national historiography. Even though he was not adequately prepared for the task, he also 'compiled' a number of other textbooks for Macedonian schools in the vernacular, but of these only two dictionaries were published in Belgrade.⁵¹¹ The extensive collections of folklore, on which he persistently worked, gathering materials from Macedonian émigrés in Sofia, also remained in manuscripts.⁵¹² In order to make a more organized contribution — in an institutional manner — to cultural and national affirmation, Pulevski founded a Slavonic-Macedonian literary society in Sofia (1888),⁵¹³ but the authorities soon suppressed it, too.

This was already a time of intensive and state-organized action by the neighbouring national propaganda machines in Macedonia and at the same time of a strongly pronounced resistance on the part of the Macedonian people. The Mace-

⁵⁰⁸D-г Вl аже Rl st ovski , *Ѓорѓија М. Пулевски и неговите кнѣшки „Самовила Македонска“ и „Македонска њеснарка“*, Вl bl i ot eka na spi sani et o *Македонски фолклор*, 1, Скопје, 1973.

⁵⁰⁹G.M. P ul evski , *Славјанско-населѣни ски-македонска слоџниџа речовска за и сѣравување итавословки -јазі ческо-џи сани е, III кнѣга. Основана на III.т о оделѣни е учі љи шт ко...*, Р љ vi del љ , Sof i ð , 1880; Ćor ģ i ja M. P ul evski , *Одбрани ст раниџи*. I zbor , redakci ja , predgovor i zabel eшki D-г Вl аже Rl st ovski , Скопје, 1974, 157-181.

⁵¹⁰Ѓор ģ i ja M. P ul evski , *оџ. џит.*, 213-257.

⁵¹¹*Речни кѡ от љ чет и ри језі ка...* Skrojena i napi sana ot љ Ѓor ða M. P ul ð vski , ar hi tekt a u Ćal i ĉni k okr uџи je di br ansko 1872. godi ne, I-va ĉast , Beogr ad, 1873; *Речни к от т ри језі ка s. македонски , арбански и т yrски* , kwi ga II. Napi sao Ѓor ðe M. P uq evski , mi jak gaq i ĉki , u Beogr adu, 1875; Ćor ģ i ja M. P ul evski , *оџ. џит.*, 33-153.

⁵¹²D-г Вl аже Rl st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наџи ја*, I, 355-362.

⁵¹³Upr avda [D. Ćupovski], „Кемѡ би l а Bol gar i ð dl ð Makedonii , *Македонскиџ голосѡ (Македонски џлас)*, I, 5, 5.IH.1913, 77.

donians saw the need not only to know their historical roots, but also to seek means for the further development of the Macedonian nation and culture. The struggle to preserve the autonomy of the church-school communities became particularly intense in the 1880s. Various societies were founded in towns all over Macedonia which according to their official, and especially unofficial, programmes were of predominantly Macedonian character. They included: the St Clement Cultural-Educational Society in Ohrid (1872-1890 and later),⁵¹⁴ the *Развиток* (Development) Educational Society in Skopje (1877-1885), the *Братство* (Brotherhood) Society in Bitola (1880-1885) and the Christian Charitable Society in Salonika (1882-1883).

Attempts were made to open a printing shop and print textbooks for the Macedonian schools as well as a number of special editions.⁵¹⁵ This was a trend which was strongly reflected in the ideas and activity of Anatolija Zografski, Partenija Zografski, Teodosija Sinaitski, Kirijak Držilovič, Georgi Dinkata, Marko Cepenkov and others. The power of the printed word was clear to everybody, but the opportunities for its free dissemination were becoming more and more limited over the years.

After the decision of the Bulgarian Exarchate, in particular, to take all the church-school communities in Macedonia into its own hands, there was a spontaneous and powerful agitation among the teachers against interference from outside. Once again large teachers' meetings were organized in Prilep (1891)⁵¹⁶ and Voden (1892), which adopted important resolutions on the protection of the schools and teachers there, and also firmly raised the question of church-school autonomy with the Archbishopric of Ohrid as the national church and Macedonian as the standard.

At about the same time (1891-1892), the Skopje Exarchate Metropolitan Teodosija (Theodosius) Gologanov⁵¹⁷ openly rejected the Bulgarian Exarchate,

⁵¹⁴D-r Blаже Ristovski, *Krst e П. Misiрков (1874-1926). Прилог кон игоучувањет о на газвѣт окол на македонскат а национална мисла*, Skopje, 1966, 721-722; D-r Blаже Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонскат а нација*, I, 298-301; A. Кескар овъ, „Предтечи на Revoluцiонната организација во Охридско“, *Илюстрацијата Илинден*, I, 1, София, 1934, 10-13; D-r Stojan Risteski, *Две македонски судбини Арзир и Тома Марииче*, Ohrid, 1988, 36-56.

⁵¹⁵D-r Boro Mirov, *Збор, печат, време. Зборник трудови од историчката а на македонскиот печат*, Skopje, 1987, 87-95.

⁵¹⁶The first known teachers' meeting in Macedonia was held in Prilep as early as August 3, 1871 (*Право*, I, 29, Carigradъ, 14.II.1871; *Македонија*, I, 37, 14.II.1871; *Новини*, I, 36, Carigradъ, 28.I.1894, 3; I, 37, 14.II.1871; *Новини*, I, 36, Carigradъ, 28.I.1894, 3; I, 37, 1.II.1894, 3; I, 54, 1.I.1894, 1; I, 81, 8.II.1894, 2; I, 92, 19.II.1894, 1; N.G. Enichev, *Спомени и бължжкѣ*, 135-139; I v.B. Šunkov, *оу. цѣт.*, 357-364; D-r Boro Mirov, *оу. цѣт.*, 78-84).

⁵¹⁷D-r Slavko Dimitovski, *Mitropolitскоуски Теодосиј — живот и дејност (1846-1926)*, Skopje, 1965; D-r Blаже Ristovski, *Krst e П. Misiрков (1874-1926)*..., 120-124.

and voicing popular demands, tried to secure, first through the Protestants and later with the mediation of the Uniates, the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, which would have the right, as a national autocephalous church, to guide spiritual and educational matters, and as a result, national and political life in the land as well. Yet the powerful propaganda machinery of its neighbours and the total corruptibility of the Turkish authorities again prevented the normal development of the Macedonian nation.

6.

As the Greater-Serbian propaganda was the weakest in Macedonia and had almost no support among the people, prominent Serbian ideologists of the greater-state idea tried to use the legitimate aspirations of the Macedonians for the affirmation of their mother tongue in schools and literature, and prepared and published special “Macedonian” textbooks for “the popular schools” in Macedonia (several large editions of a primer, a reader and the *Голуб* Calendar with texts in the “Macedonian” language). It was actually some kind of Macedonian-Serbian amalgam, and the printing and free distribution within the borders of the Sultan’s Empire was given approval by the relevant Turkish authorities. Despite its being awkwardly assembled, this language was exuberantly accepted in Macedonian circles as it nonetheless differed from both Bulgarian and Serbian. At that time Stojan Novaković proposed to the Serbian government that a full translation of the Holy Bible into Macedonian be made, but it was immediately assessed that this would play a crucial role in the affirmation of the Macedonian language and Macedonian national individuality, and the proposal was rejected. Serbian propaganda soon saw that by pursuing such a policy it only further stirred up Macedonian national feelings and strengthened Macedonian national consciousness. As a result, it discarded that approach of penetrating into Macedonia and started, by using the Serbian language and a clearly defined Serbian national programme, to set up Serbophile oases inside European Turkey.⁵¹⁸

Side by side with these actions, in order to undermine the foundations of Bulgarian propaganda, Serbian propaganda used the frequent rebellions of Macedonian pupils in the Exarchal schools in Macedonia, and by generous promises attracted a large number of young intellectuals, inviting them to study in Serbia. But when these Macedonian pupils and students saw that neither their language

⁵¹⁸D-r Blaže Rištovski, *оу. уџт.*, 46-63; D-r Kliment Xambazovski, *Крат урно-оџут ест бени е ерски на Македониџте со Србија...*, 249; D-r Qubiша Doklesti K, *оу. уџт.*, 347-370; Trajko Stamatovski, „Makedonski bukvari vo osumdesettite godini na devetnaesettiot vek“, *Литературен збор*, HHH, 3, Skopje, 1983, 59-69.

nor nationality were respected in Belgrade, they started a major rebellion there as well. After long negotiations, many of them accepted the promises of the Bulgarian diplomatic agency in the Serbian capital and demonstratively left Belgrade, going to Sofia (1890).

Yet even with their first steps on Bulgarian soil, the young Macedonians realized that the agreement reached was once again not observed, and there was a strong reaction: some returned to Macedonia, some went back to Belgrade, and others remained in Bulgaria, aiming to develop and strengthen, through organized forms, the Macedonian national idea and liberation action.⁵¹⁹

7.

Macedonian national thought continued to develop in the circles of Macedonian émigrés in Sofia. The newspapers *Македонскиј Глас* (1885-1887) and *Македонија* (1888-1893), and later *Глас Македонски* and others, prepared a firm ground for further action. In fact, various Macedonian associations started developing immediately after the suppression of the Macedonian League. For instance, the **Bulgarian-Macedonian Charitable Society** was founded in 1882 in Sofia,⁵²⁰ and the next year saw the establishment of the **Macedonian Society**, a modification of the former,⁵²¹ as well as the **Society for Helping Impoverished Macedonians**.⁵²² The **Alexander of Macedon Bulgarian-Macedonian Charitable Society**⁵²³ was founded towards the end of 1884 in Ruse, and the secessionist **Iskra Bulgarian-Macedonian Revolutionary Committee** was set up soon afterwards.⁵²⁴ The **Macedonian Society for Collecting Assistance for the Suffering Macedonians** was founded in early 1885 in Plovdiv, but shortly thereafter a Bulgarian counterpart was formed: **Central Committee Fighting for the Liberation of Macedonia from Turkish Slavery**.⁵²⁵ Thus Macedonian societies emerged in various Bulgarian and East-Rumelian centres, even professional ones, such as the **Macedonian Guild Society** in Plovdiv.⁵²⁶

⁵¹⁹D-r Blažer Stovskij, *Македонскиот народ и македонската нација*, I, 469-590.

⁵²⁰*Съединение*, I, 35, Plovdiv, 1883; Konstantin Pandev, *Национално-освободителният комитет в Македония и Одринско 1878-1903*, Sofia, 1979, 42.

⁵²¹L. Kasabov, *Енциклопедията на македонските гетини*, I, Plovdiv, 1899, 389-390, according to Konstantin Pandev, *ош. цит.*, 42-43.

⁵²²*Търновска конституция*, I, 11, Sofia, 8.II.1884, 4.

⁵²³Doano Doanov, *Комитетът „Единство“*. *Ролата и инициативата на Съединение от 1885*, Sofia, 1985, 296.

⁵²⁴Konstantin Pandev, *ош. цит.*, 47-49; *Глас Македонски*, II, 49, Sofia, 19.II.1895, 4.

⁵²⁵Kiril Patriarh Vylgarski, *Българската емиграция в Одринско и Македония след Освобождителната война (1877-1878)*, I, 2, Sofia, 1970, 521; Doano Doanov, *ош. цит.*, 296.

Sofia, however, was the centre of the Macedonian émigré community. As a result, immediately after the “Macedonian meetings”, the *Makedonski Glas Society* was founded in late 1884, which started printing its own mouthpiece of the same name.⁵²⁷ Macedonian manifestations of considerable interest ensued on the unification of East Rumelia and Bulgaria, the Serbo-Bulgarian War (1885), the dethronement and abdication of the Bulgarian Prince Alexander of Battenberg (1886) and especially after the coming of the notorious Macedonophobe, Stefan Stambolov, to the head of the Bulgarian government. After some stormy meetings and conferences of the Macedonians in the Bulgarian capital, a new organization, bearing the name *Makedonsko čitalište* (Macedonian Reading Club), was established in 1889.⁵²⁸ The end of the same year saw the foundation in Sofia of a **Macedonian Savings Bank** whose official name was *Zaemo-spestovna kasa na Makedoncite* (Loan-Savings Bank of the Macedonians).⁵²⁹

However, all these and other Macedonian associations and institutions were viewed with suspicion by Stambolov and he brutally suppressed all of them. Pulevski’s aforementioned Slavonic-Macedonian Literary Society was formed at about the same time, but it, too, had to cease its activity soon. This was supervened by the journeys of Macedonian pupils and students via Belgrade to Sofia. The Macedonian question had already entered upon a new stage of development. The polemic started over Petar Draganov’s articles and *Тхе Етхноѡгаѡиѡу Маѡ оф Сивониѡ* *Nationalities* of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society. Karl Hron published his book *Тхе Natiоналѡу офтхе Маѡедониан Сѡвс*, and the first doctoral dissertation on the Macedonian language, by Leonhard Mazing, was defended and later published in two volumes in the Russian capital. New attempts were made at reaching a Serbo-Greek agreement on the division of Macedonia into spheres of influence, and Sofia succeeded in sending its own, already appointed, bishops to Macedonia.

Among the Macedonians, the generation of Delčev and Misirkov emerged on the scene. Revolutionary action had already been oriented against the activities of foreign propaganda in Macedonia. The danger of Macedonia’s dismemberment hung in the air. The end of 1890 saw the foundation, in Dame Gruev’s and Dimitar Mirčev’s flat in Sofia, of a secret ‘private’ society, composed mainly of defectors from Belgrade.⁵³⁰ But just when this association had prepared a ‘Constitution’ for

⁵²⁶*Македонѡ я*, I, 25, Sof i ð, 2.ř I.1889, 98-99.

⁵²⁷*Гласъ Македонски*, II, 49, 19.НI.1895, 4.

⁵²⁸*Македонѡ я*, I, 45 and 46, 5.Н.1889, 180; II, 1, 5.НI.1889; *Гласъ Македонски*, II, 5, 23.НII.1894, 1; II, 50, 26.НI.1895, 4.

⁵²⁹*Македонѡ я*, II, 5, 24.НI.1889, 3-4; *Гласъ Македонски*, II, 5, 23.НII.1894, 1; II, 51, 3.НII.1895, 3; *Македонѡ я*, I, 1, Russe, 20.I.1902, 3; *Македонѡ я*, ННIII, 9(497), Sof i ð, 6.НI.1910, 4; *Бюлет ѡ ньъ*, ž 8, Sof i ð, 1919, 3.

itself, there occurred the murder of the Bulgarian Minister Belčev (March 1891) and this event was used to arrest the society's chief initiators, after which they were expelled (or escaped) to Macedonia.

One of the results of these painful experiences of the Macedonian intelligentsia in emigration was the establishment of the **Young Macedonian Literary Society** in Sofia (1891) which, from January the following year, began printing its mouthpiece *Лоза*, after which the whole movement was called 'Lozars'.⁵³¹ Even though the journal was published only in a slightly Macedonianized variant of the Bulgarian language, but in phonetic ('Macedonian') orthography, it heralded an ideology which was not unknown to Bulgarian politics and propaganda, resulting in the strongest reaction in the Bulgarian public up to that time against "Macedonian national separatism". After its fourth issue, *Лоза* was banned and the principal members and leaders of the Society were arrested, persecuted, interned or mobilized in the Bulgarian Army (despite being Turkish citizens), while some of them managed to flee to Macedonia, where they started the secret organization of the Macedonian liberation cause, laying the foundations of the **Secret Macedonian-Adrianople (or Macedonian-Adrianopolitan) Revolutionary Organization (TMORO)**. This organization was to prepare and carry out the most glorious and yet tragic popular achievement in more recent Macedonian history — the Ilinden Uprising. Precisely at the time when the core of this organization was being shaped in Salonika (1893),⁵³² the **Macedonian Socialist Group** was set up in Sofia,⁵³³ the **Vardar Macedonian Student Society** was founded in Belgrade,⁵³⁴ and the **National Committee for the Autonomy of Macedonia and Albania**,⁵³⁵ which had previously begun the publication of its newspaper *Абано-Македонија* in Bucharest, started its activities in London.⁵³⁶

⁵³⁰ *Гласъ Македонски*, II, 5, 23.III.1894, 2; II, 51, 3.III.1895, 6; *Македоно-Одигински Пръзледъ*, II, 30, Sof i ò, 11.III.1907, 467-468; *Бюлет и нъ*, 8, 1919, 3; *Илюст раци я Илинденъ*, I, 1, Sof i ò, 1927, 7-8.

⁵³¹ D-r Bl aže Ri st ovski, *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, I, 469-602.

⁵³² *Ist ori ја на македонски от народ*, II, Skopje, 1969, 157-165; D-r Di mi tar Di nski, *Македонскот онаци оналноослободит елно дви жење во Бит олски от ви лает (1893-1903)*, Skopje, 1981, 137-147.

⁵³³ D-r Dančo Zograf ski, *Jуџословенски т е соци јали ст и за македонскот о ирашање*, Skopje, 1962, 7-60; D-r Or de I vanoski, *Балкански т е соци јали ст и и македонскот о ирашање од 90-т и т е год и ни на НИН век до создавањет о на Трет а т а инт ернаци онала*, Skopje, 1970, 66-70; Lazar Mojsov, *Пошледи во ми нат от о бли ско и далечно*, Skopje, 1977, 99-103.

⁵³⁴ D-r Bl aže Ri st ovski, *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)...*, 126-136; D-r Bl aže Ri st ovski, *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, II, 9-23.

⁵³⁵ *Л Аутономие*, I, 4, Londres, I.VII.1902, 2.

⁵³⁶ *Абано-Македонија*, I, 2, [București,] 25/6.I.1894, 1-2; *Л Аутономие*, I, 4, Londres, I.III.1902, 1-3; *Гласъ Македонски*, I, 10, 30.I.1894, 4; *Југо-Западна Българ и я*, I, 22, Sof i ò, 7.II.1894, III-Iř .

There were also new currents in the émigré circles. In February 1894 a new Macedonian society, called *Tatkovina* (Fatherland),⁵³⁷ was founded in Sofia, and in May of the same year a renewed **Young Macedonian Society** (no longer ‘Literary’) appeared and tried to continue the publication of the journal *Лоза* (in the standard Bulgarian orthography and language); yet only two more issues were printed.⁵³⁸ Vojdan Černodrinski’s **Macedonian Accord** (*Македонски зговор*) started its remarkably significant theatrical and literary activity under the auspices of this Society.⁵³⁹ Following the resignation of the Bulgarian Prime Minister Stefan Stambolov and his liquidation shortly thereafter, the Society set up a large number of regional branches throughout Bulgaria.

Soon, however, an initiative was taken for the merging of the **Young Macedonian Society** and the **Brotherly Alliance**, an organization consisting of pro-Bulgarian Macedonian émigrés in Sofia. On December 27, 1894, the Constitution of the **Macedonian Committee** was finally adopted and its management elected, headed by Trajko Kitančev. The polemic between the Society’s mouthpiece, *Глас Македонски*, and the mouthpiece of the Brotherly Alliance, however, continued in yet harsher and harsher tones.

On March 19, 1895, the foundations were laid for what was to become the **Supreme Macedonian Committee** in Sofia. At this First Macedonian Congress discussions concentrated on one crucial question: should they seek autonomy for Macedonia or its unification with Bulgaria? The majority voted in favour of autonomy.⁵⁴⁰ Although the organization continued to call itself simply the **Macedonian Committee**, it soon became ‘Supreme’ (*Врховен*), an event which marked the beginning of the history of what is known as ‘Vrhovism’ in the Macedonian liberation cause.

As this committee gradually turned into an unofficial instrument of the Bulgarian court, an ‘uprising’ was improvised that same year (1895) in eastern Macedonia and large waves of emigration were provoked, aimed at demonstrating to the world the ‘Bulgarian character’ of the Macedonian people. Yet this could not prevent the growth of the national idea of the Macedonians of freedom and an independent state.

⁵³⁷ *Юго-Западна България*, I, 24, 20.II.1894, III.

⁵³⁸ *Гласъ Македонски*, I, 24, 8.ř .1894, 4; I, 25, 5.ř .1894, 1.

⁵³⁹ Sr. p. Petrov, „Makedonskoto delo predi i prez 1895 g. vь Vьlgari ò“, *Илюст рација Илї нденъ*, ř I, 7(57), Sof i ò, 1934, 7-9.

⁵⁴⁰ Konstantin Pandev, *oй. цїт.*, 91-92; Sr.p. Petrov, *oй. цїт.*, 9; Dr Ivan Katarxiev, „Sozdavaweto na Makedonski ot komitet vo Sof i ja i negovata akci ja vo 1895 godi na vo I st očna Makedoni ja“, *Гласні к на ИНИ*, IH, 2, 1963, 77-112; *Ist ori ja na македонски ot nar од*, II, 165-170; *Гласъ Македонски*, II, 22, 7.ř .1894, 2-3; *Право*, I, 25, Sof i ò, 9.ř .1895, 3-4.

8.

In the meantime the international public was already acquainted with the essential points of the 'Macedonian question'. The truth about the Macedonian people, their history, ethnography, folklore, language and culture continued to spread all over the world. Prominent European journalists, writers and Slavic scholars published major books and articles on the ethnic individuality of the Macedonians. For example, **Petar Draganov**,⁵⁴¹ a Bulgarian from Bessarabia and a distinguished Russian Slavic scholar, who studied Macedonian matters on the spot as the Exarchate teacher in Salonika, started publishing, in 1887, a series of scholarly papers in St Petersburg and Warsaw on the language, ethnography, folklore and history of Macedonia. The year 1894 saw the printing of the first part of Draganov's three-volume ethnographic, folklore and philological collection containing the texts of Macedonian folk songs together with ample commentaries, and also with an extremely important introduction which offered a faithful picture of the state of Macedonian national consciousness and culture at that time. This was the first collection of Macedonian folklore to be presented and at the same time analysed from a Macedonian national point of view.⁵⁴²

At approximately the same time the Austrian journalist **Karl Hron** published a series of articles and polemics in daily newspapers on the nationality (ethnicity) of the Macedonians, and in 1890 his book, *Тхе Nаtіоnаlіtу оf тхе Маџедоnіаn Сubs*,⁵⁴³ stirred up the 'ethnographic dispute' of the Balkan aspirants even further.

In that same year, the Estonian linguist **Leonhard Mazing** defended, in the Russian capital, the first doctoral dissertation dealing with the Macedonian language, and in 1890 and 1891 he printed it in the form of two serious scholarly publications (in German) on the Macedonian accent and the Macedonian language in the Slavic world.⁵⁴⁴ His teacher and colleague, the Polish linguist and university professor in Russia, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay,⁵⁴⁵ made a distinction, in his

⁵⁴¹D-r Bl aże Ri st ovski , „P et ar Dani i l ovi č Dr aganov (1857-1928)“, *Македонски фолклор*, II, 3-4, Skopje, 1969, 495-528; D-r Bl aże Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ і македонскат а наџи ја*, I, 408-466; D-r Bl aże Ri st ovski , *Македонски от фолклор і наџи оналнат а svest* , II, Skopje, 1987, 73-89; Gane Todorovski , „Stranici za edno makedonofilstvo“, *Годишен зборник на Филозофскиот факултет на Универзитетот во Скопје*, 22, Skopje, 1970, 167-190.

⁵⁴²P . Draganovъ, *Македонско-Славянскій Сбогникъ*, I, S.-P et er bur gъ, 1894.

⁵⁴³Karl Hron, *Narodnost a na Makedonski t e Sloveni* . Redakcija i komentari : D-r Hristo Andonov-Poljanski , Skopje, 1966.

⁵⁴⁴R. Bulatova, „Leongard Gotthilf Mazing (1845-1936)“, *Tarty ulkol ajaloo küsimusi*, I (Trü ajaloo komisjoni matjalid), Tartu, 1975, 142-158; R.V. Bulatova, „Pervii ài ssl edovat el Àdži ka makedonski h sl avon L.G. Mazing (1845-1936)“, *Македонски јазик*, НННН-НННН, Skopje, 1982, 63-73; D-r Bl aże Ri st ovski , „Poti k za razvojot na makedonistika“, *Нова Македонија*, НЗ , 13392, Skopje, 5.ř .1984, 5.

lectures, between the Macedonian and Bulgarian languages, publishing a number of contributions in this spirit.

At the same time, in the reprinted *Етноѡ гаѡхиѡ Маѡ од Сивониѡ Nationalities* for the 1890 Calendar of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society, the Macedonian people was shown, for the first time, in a different colour, as an individual people in the Slavic world. This was in fact the first official recognition of the Macedonian national (ethnic) identity — although only at the Slavic level.⁵⁴⁶

Scholarly debates on this question were further encouraged by the printing of the first edition of the collection of folk songs and customs by **Ivan Yastrebov**, (1886)⁵⁴⁷ which, with the support of Serbia, also appeared in a second edition (with additions) in St Petersburg (1889). All this raised the ‘Macedonian question’ onto the international scene and it became an object of general interest for scholarship, and also for politics and propaganda.

Macedonians themselves were prompt to react. As early as 1890, in Sofia, Georgi Balasčev, a member of the journal *Лоза*, printed the first book in his native tongue,⁵⁴⁸ heralding the ‘new movement’ in Macedonian history. It was at that moment that the ‘secret’ student circle (‘society’) was established in the Bulgarian capital, which, in spite of persecution, was to become the core of the foundation of the **Young Macedonian Literary Society** in Sofia (1891-1892), famed for its mouthpiece *Лоза*. The reactions of the semi-official newspaper *Свобода* only served to help the clearer definition of the aims of the Macedonian movement.⁵⁴⁹ When the renewed **Young Macedonian Society** was joined by **Macedonian Accord**, an association of the young Macedonian intellectuals headed by **Vojdan Černodrinski**,⁵⁵⁰ the Macedonian language emerged on the theatrical stage through plays written mostly by the leader of the Accord. This was a new impulse to the creation of a literature in the native tongue and a fresh support in the affirmation of Macedonian liberation thought.

⁵⁴⁵D-г Вl аже Rі st ovski , *Македонски от народ і македонскат а наѡ ја*, II, 395-406.

⁵⁴⁶Gane Todorovski , *Прет ходні ѡт е на Ми сі рков*, Skopje, 1968, 166; Gane Todorovski , *Трактат і за сонѡљубі ві т е (Esei і заѡ сі на македонски т емі)*, Skopje, 1974, 164; D-г Вl аже Rі st ovski , *Ді мі т рі ја Чуѡовски (1878-1940) і Македонскот о научно-лі т ерат урно другарст во во Пет розрад*, II, Skopje, 1978, 272; D-г Вl аже Rі st ovski , *Македонски от народ і македонскат а наѡ ја*, I, 474 and 530-531.

⁵⁴⁷I .S. ö st rebovъ, *Обычаи і ѡьсни т уреѡкі хъ сербовъ въ Прі зрѡнь, Иѡекъ, Морава і Ді бръ*, S.-P et er bur gъ, 1886 (2nd edition 1889).

⁵⁴⁸*Нъколко крат кі лът оѡі сні бълъжкі ѡо съст ояні ет о на заѡадні т ѡ Македонѡі за ѡтграт а чет і рі deset ѡ і пет ѡ годі ина еѡоха на наст ояѡі въкъ. I zvl ѡкъл ѡ, nar edі l ѡ і рг ѡvel ѡ от ѡ гр ѡски učeni ka Ezer ski , Sof і ѡ, 1890.*

⁵⁴⁹D-г Вl аже Rі st ovski , *Македонски от народ і македонскат а наѡ ја*, I, 490-506.

⁵⁵⁰Al eksandar Al eksi ev, *Основоѡложні ѡі на македонскат а драмска лі т ерат ура*, II dopolnet o і zdani e, Skopje, 1976, 29-38.

Here we must also add the appearance of a whole series of collections of Macedonian folklore, such as those by **Kuzman Šapkarev**,⁵⁵¹ **Vasil Ikonov**⁵⁵² and **Naum Tahov**,⁵⁵³ and especially the folklore and ethnographic materials which started filling the pages of the distinguished *Сборник за народни умотворенија, наука и книжевина* (1889), where the accounts and texts by **Marko Cepenkov**⁵⁵⁴ occupied a prominent place, contributing significantly to the affirmation of the Macedonian language in a written form and arousing interest in Macedonian culture and the Macedonian past.

Hence it was not surprising that ‘Macedonian speech-forms’ was introduced as a subject in the St Petersburg Faculty of History and Philology in the academic year 1900/1901, taught by Professor **Petr A. Lavrov**. In 1900 the young Slavic scholar **Krste Misirkov** (who had still not completed his studies) wrote the first study in his native tongue,⁵⁵⁵ which his teacher, Lavrov, proposed that it should be printed and published by the Russian Academy of Sciences.⁵⁵⁶

This was not only the beginning of the new century but also of a new stage in Macedonian cultural and national history. It was not by chance that in 1900 Boris Sarafov’s Supreme Macedonian Committee in Sofia commissioned and printed the play *Прѝлѝ Сaints* by **Anton Strašimirov**⁵⁵⁷ — based on material by Marko Cepenkov, who had offered it (for a modest remuneration) to the editorial board of the Committee’s mouthpiece *Реѝрми*⁵⁵⁸ — written in a Macedonianized variant (with Ćorĉe Petrov’s help).⁵⁵⁹ Thanks to the great interest in this Macedonian play

⁵⁵¹Сборни кѝ от ѝ бѝлѝарски народни умотворенија..., I-II. Сѝбрал ѝ и здава К.А.Šаркарев, Софиѝ, 1891-1894.

⁵⁵²Al eksandar Matkovski, „Книжевна та и просветна дејност на учителиот Vasil Ikonov od Lazaropole“, *Просветно дело*, Н, 1-2, Скопје, 1954, 61-74; Ćigor Todorovski, „Некои нови материјали од жиѝот на учителиот Vasil Ikonov od Lazaropole“, *Просветно дело*, Нѝ, 5-6, 1959, 278-285; Ćigor Todorovski, *Малогекански от ѝредел. Оѝшт ест вено-економски и ѝпросветни ѝргилики во ѝери одот од 80-те години на XIX век до крајот на Првата светска војна*, Скопје, 1970, 162, etc.; D-г Вл аже Ристовски, *Vasil Ikonov (1848-1934). Прѝлог кон ѝроучувањето на македонскиот култ урно-наѝонален развѝт ок*, I NI, Скопје, 1985; Vasil Ikonov, *Старонародни ѝесни и обиѝаи од Западна Македонија*. Редакѝја д-г Кирѝленушки, д-г Вл аже Ристовски, д-г Вл аже Петровски, I F, Скопје, 1988.

⁵⁵³Наумѝ К. Таховѝ, *Сборни кѝ от ѝ Македонски бѝлѝарски народни ѝесни*, Софиѝ, 1895.

⁵⁵⁴Marko K. Cepenkov, *Македонски народни умотворѝи во десет книги*. Редакѝја: Кирѝленушки, Вл аже Ристовски, Томе Саздов, I F, Скопје, 1972 (2nd revised edition 1980).

⁵⁵⁵ААН СССР, Лениград, ф. 284, оп. 3, ѝ. 81.

⁵⁵⁶Д-г Вл аже Ристовски, *Македонскиот народ и македонската наѝија*, II, 214-234; Д-г Вл аже Ристовски, *Македонски лет оѝи с. Раскоѝки на лиѝерат урни наѝионални теми. Прѝлози за развѝт окот на македонската култ урно-наѝионална миѝла*, I, Makedonska kniga, Скопје, 1993, 153-163.

⁵⁵⁷Соѝо V. Bilorski, „Протоколиѝта на Вѝрховниѝот македонско-одрѝински комѝтет меѓу ѝ II и ѝ III конгрес (1900-1901)“, *Известѝија на дрѝжавниѝте архѝиви*, 51, Софиѝ, 1986, 120.

⁵⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 132.

among the Macedonian émigrés, all 3,000 printed copies were sold out within a month.⁵⁶⁰ For this reason, on December 16, 1900, the Supreme Macedonian Committee supported (with 100 lev) the printing of Vojdan Černodrinski's revolutionary play *Македонска крвава свадба* (Macedonian Blood Wedding),⁵⁶¹ which was to become the most famous play in the history of Macedonian literature and drama, and continues to be performed in Macedonian theatres up to the present day. The combination of all this reflected the establishment not only of Macedonian scholarly thought but also of modern Macedonian literature and a Macedonian national theatre, whose foremost aim was to support the Macedonian liberation cause.

9.

The organization and swift development of the Macedonian revolutionary liberation movement attracted the attention not only of Balkan politics and diplomacy, but also of the European political and diplomatic institutions. Speculations began concerning an imminent uprising. The affirmation of the national entity of the Macedonians became the imperative of the day.

As early as 1901, Macedonian émigrés in Belgrade started gathering on a national basis, and in the summer of the following year a special **Macedonian Club** with a **Reading Room** was founded, which immediately began publishing its mouthpiece (in Serbian and French) *Балкански Гласник* (Balkan Herald).⁵⁶² The pages of this newspaper brought the first more detailed formulation of the Macedonian national liberation programme of the 'new movement', and Macedonian was proclaimed the literary language of the Macedonians (using phonetic orthography). However, when the prepared memorandum was supposed to be submitted to the signatory powers of the Treaty of Berlin, there was a great uproar among the Serbian public and the Club was closed, the newspaper banned, and the chief organizers and its editors, **Stefan Jakimov Dedov** and **Dijamandija Trpkov Mišajkov**, had to leave Serbia.

Through the mediation of the Russian diplomatic representative in Belgrade, Dedov and Mišajkov arrived in St Petersburg and there, together with people who shared the same ideas, such as Krste Misirkov, Dimitrija Čupovski, Gavril Kon-

⁵⁵⁹Или нденъ, I, 25, Sof i ò, 27.II.1908, 1.

⁵⁶⁰Со оџо V. Bi l òr ski , оџ. џџ., 127.

⁵⁶¹Иџџ., 149.

⁵⁶²D-г Bл же Ri st ovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)...*, 200-223; D-г Bл же Ri st ovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуџовски (1878-1940) i Македонскот о научно-лит ерат урно друџарст во во Пет роџрад*, I, 110-130.

stantinovič, Milan Stoilov, Risto Rusulenčič and certain other Macedonian students and émigrés, on October 28, 1902, they officially founded the **Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society**⁵⁶³ which was to play the role of a Macedonian cultural centre for a considerable period. In the application to the Council of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society (SPSCS), the nineteen signatories (headed by Misirkov) emphasized “the necessity for an exchange of ideas among ourselves, so that we can become acquainted with our fatherland, its present, past and future through joint efforts”, so that everyone could see “the damage of being divided into various groups” and avoid “the sad results of that division and have an opportunity of uniting ourselves on the basis of the unity of our fatherland, our same origin and future, and also on the basis of joint research into our fatherland from historical, ethnographic, folklore and linguistic points of view”. They united into a single society and applied for permission to hold their meetings on the premises of SPSCS “on the same basis as such meetings of the Czech, Bulgarian and Serbian young people studying in St Petersburg are held”.⁵⁶⁴

On November 12, 1902, Stefan J. Dedov and Dijamandija T. Mirajkov, on behalf of the Society, submitted to the SPSCS Council and also to the Russian government, a *Меморандум он тхе Македониах Љуестиах*, which was undoubtedly the fullest exposition of the Macedonian national liberation programme.⁵⁶⁵ The document demanded the recognition of the Macedonians “as a distinct people with a distinct literary language which, together with Turkish, will become the official language in the three vilayets of Macedonia”. It also demanded “the recognition of its independent church”, a governor-general “of the majority nationality in the three vilayets”, and a “regional elective popular assembly” with an “organic constitution of Macedonia”, guaranteed by the great powers. This was in fact the minimal programme at that historical moment, but, as the memorandum stated, “such a free Macedonia in its political, national and religious aspects will aim to attract the neighbouring states to it in a federation” so that it can become the “Piedmont for the unification of Balkan Slavdom and Orthodoxy”.

The SPSCS Council supported the programme⁵⁶⁶ and thus the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society gained official recognition with opportunities for the development of national and cultural activities on the premises of *Савјанскаја Беседа* in the Russian capital, on equal terms with the other similar recognized societies of Slavic peoples. Although only at the Slavic level, this was an extremely

⁵⁶³Q uben Lape, „Dokument i za f or m i r a w e t o n a S l a v j a n o - m a k e d o n s k o t o n a u č n o - l i t e r a t u r n o d r u g a r s t v o i n e g o v i o t u s t a v “, *Македонски јазик*, Hf I, Skopje, 1965, 193-194; D-r Bl a ж e R i s t o v s k i , *Д и м и т р и ј а Ч у њ о в с к и (1 8 7 8 - 1 9 4 0) . . .*, I, 138-140.

⁵⁶⁴*Ibid.*

⁵⁶⁵D-r Bl a ж e R i s t o v s k i , *Д и м и т р и ј а Ч у њ о в с к и (1 8 7 8 - 1 9 4 0) . . .*, I, 180-189.

⁵⁶⁶Ар х и в А Н Р А Н , С . - П е т е р б у р г њ , ф . 241, оп. 1, д. 29, л. 60 об.

important recognition of the national entity of the Macedonians, which met with varied reactions in the world, and particularly in the Balkans and among the Slavs.

At the Society's second session (December 29, 1902)⁵⁶⁷ special gratitude was expressed to the Council of the SPSCS and letters were sent to the other Slavonic societies in St Petersburg (Bulgarian, Serbian and Czech) notifying them of the foundation of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society; the "borders of Macedonia" were defined, and an important decision was passed on the collection of "characteristic Macedonian words" which the Society's secretary would write down "in a special book with pages divided into four sections: Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Russian", in order to demonstrate to the Russians that the Macedonian language was distinct and different from the rest of the Slavonic languages and thus capable of independent literary development.

In spite of all the obstacles, intrigues and intimidation on the part of the interested aspirants to Macedonia, the Society held its sessions regularly, and in December 1903, after the suppression of the Ilinden Uprising, when the people most straightforwardly expressed their determination to win national freedom and a state of their own, the Society adopted a 'Constitution' which was submitted for approval to the SPSCS Council on December 20, 1903.⁵⁶⁸

The first president of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society was **Dijamandija T. Mišajkov**, but in early 1903 the post was given to **Dimitrija D. Čupovski**, who retained it to the end of the existence of this national association and institution — until the October Revolution (1917).

The Society achieved highly significant results in the implementation of the Macedonian national programme. For instance, it was within this Society that **the first book in modern Macedonian** was written and, by its decision, published as a practical application of Article 12 of the Constitution (*За македонските работи*, by Krste P. Misirkov).⁵⁶⁹ It was here, too, that the **elementary textbooks in Macedonian were prepared for the envisaged Macedonian schools in Macedonia**, including one **primer**, which was sent to be printed in New York.⁵⁷⁰

In December 1903, during the printing of his book in Sofia, Misirkov founded a similar Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in the Bulgarian capital.⁵⁷¹ With the purpose of preparing the ground for a similar association among the Macedonian émigré community in Belgrade, he went to the Serbian capital. There he managed to deliver a single but memorable lecture in the hall of the Higher

⁵⁶⁷D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)...*, 229-230.

⁵⁶⁸D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Ди ми т ри ја Чушовски (1878-1940)...*, I, 241-250.

⁵⁶⁹К.П. Ми си рков, *За македонски т е работ и*, Соф и ђ, 1903.

⁵⁷⁰D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Ди ми т ри ја Чушовски (1878-1940)...*, I, 270-297.

⁵⁷¹*Ibid.*, 258-260.

School on the contemporary situation and the necessary and possible solution of the Macedonian national question, which caused a public reaction in the Belgrade press,⁵⁷² involving behind-the-scenes intrigues about the author and his published work.⁵⁷³ As a matter of fact, he was able to feel all that for himself in his numerous contacts with prominent Serbian scholars and social, political and public figures.⁵⁷⁴

All this was synchronized with the performances of plays in the Macedonian language by Černodrinski's **Macedonian Theatre Group** in Belgrade and Serbia,⁵⁷⁵ and with the visit of the **Sloboda** (Freedom) **Theatre Group** which also gave performances in Macedonian.⁵⁷⁶ After that a tour of America was planned for the Macedonian expatriates there.⁵⁷⁷

This was a time when the Macedonian language and Macedonian literature emerged on the scene quite normally, when the public started speaking of a 'new' South-Slavonic literature,⁵⁷⁸ and when the selections of Slavonic poetry allotted a special place to Macedonian poetry.⁵⁷⁹

In general, a large number of theatrical and other performances in the native tongue were prepared within the émigré community (not only in Sofia but also in all other centres of Macedonian émigrés in Bulgaria). This was strongly reflected in Macedonia itself,⁵⁸⁰ and important works of poetry,⁵⁸¹ prose⁵⁸² and drama⁵⁸³ in Macedonian were printed.

⁵⁷² *Ibid.*, 263-264; D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)*..., 317-320.

⁵⁷³ D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)*..., 330-333.

⁵⁷⁴ *Авт ономна Македони ја*, I, 24, Sof i ò, 14. III. 1903, 4; *День*, I, 37, Sof i ò, 3. I. 1904, 2; D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)*..., 312-320.

⁵⁷⁵ D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)*..., 311-320; D-г Voi sl av I . I l i k, *Ли це и маска (Кни за за Чернодринаски)*, Skopje, 1988, 395-463.

⁵⁷⁶ D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , „Makedonskata teatar ska grupa „Sloboda“, *Нова Македони ја*, ННН, 6655, 25. I. f . 1965, 7; D-г Voi sl av I . I l i k, *ош. цит.*, 465-509.

⁵⁷⁷ Vojdan Černodrinski, *Собрани дела, IV. Секавања, документи, st at i i*, Priredil Aleksandar Aleksi ev, Skopje, 1976, 56-57.

⁵⁷⁸ And. Gavrilovič, „Predčetvrtomkni ževnošču“, *Бранково коло*, H, 17, Sremski Karlovci, 29. I. f (12. f). 1904, 513-517.

⁵⁷⁹ *Словенски Јуз*, I, 8, Beograd, 25. III. 1903, 6.

⁵⁸⁰ A characteristic example is the transferral of poems from Černodrinski's play *Meeting* performed in Bulgaria to performances in Macedonia: D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Прогави и трофили од македонската алтеративна угнаисторија. Прилози за развитокот на македонската културно-национална мисла*, 2, Skopje, 1982, 53-80; D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Македонскиот фолклор и националниот аспект*, I, 245-255.

⁵⁸¹ D-г ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , *Македонскиот стих 1900-1944. Истажувања и материјали*, I, Skopje, 1980, 47-125.

⁵⁸² ВЛ аже Ри ст овски , „Идејте на „Балкан“ и „Балкански гласник“ и обидот да се создава литературна македонски јазик во 1903 година“, *Разглед*, I, 7, 1964, 706-713.

⁵⁸³ A. Strashiņirov, *Прилушки светци. Трагическа игра во три дъста вјасъ еи лоџа (Изъ македонски ја животъ)*, Sof i ò, 1900; V. Černo-Drinski, *Македонска крвава свадба*.

The role of the periodicals was not peripheral in this situation. The newspaper *Балкан* deserves special mention; it was published (now in Sofia) by **Stefan Jakimov Dedov**, as a kind of continuation of the Belgrade *Балкански Гласник* and an unofficial mouthpiece of the St Petersburg Society.⁵⁸⁴ At the same time Dedov's friend and fellow fighter, **Dijamandija T. Mišajkov**, went to Bitola to test the ground for **education in Macedonian**, which was expected following the insurgent action.⁵⁸⁵ In fact, 34 villages in Macedonia demanded this in writing, and the Society sought to satisfy their demands.⁵⁸⁶

The year 1903 demonstrated the greatest achievement of the Macedonian national liberation idea and was a crucial stage in its national and political consolidation. The Macedonian masses unreservedly and enthusiastically accepted armed struggle as the only means of gaining national freedom, though perhaps in the form of a limited autonomy for a certain period. The struggle for Macedonian statehood already had theoretical premises and had shown practical results, and had, moreover, greatly excited the international public.⁵⁸⁷

But all this frightened and upset Macedonia's neighbours, and they hurried to prepare the ground for its partition. Thus, for example, under the disguise of Serbo-Bulgarian student agreements and cultural events, in the background, secret treaties and conventions were signed for the conquest of Macedonia, still a Turkish province at that time.⁵⁸⁸ In addition, they took all measures possible to paralyse and disorient the Macedonian liberation struggle. Armed detachments of the neighbouring monarchies entered Macedonia; this was the start of what is known as the 'detachment actions', whose only aim was to undermine the independence of the Macedonian national liberation movement.⁵⁸⁹

Трагеди я въ V дѣѣст вѣ я на македонски говоръ, Sof i ò, 1900; V. Čer nodr i nski à, „Maàst ori . E dnoakt na sc ò na i zъ makedono-odr i nski жи vot зъ na mak. говор зъ“, *Авт ономна Македони я*, I, 1, 5.ř II.1903, 3–I, 12, 21.IH.1903, 2-3 (except in No. 8, 23.ř III.1903!); Mar ko K. C õpenkovъ, „C зъ ne voàvoda. I st ori i česka pi esa въ pet Àakt a i zъ makedonski ò жи vot na mak. говор зъ“, *Авт ономна Македони я*, I, 13, 28.IH.1903 – I, 25, 21.III.1903, 3.

⁵⁸⁴*Балканъ*, I, 1, 5.Iř .1903 – I, 12, 4.ř .1903. Red.-i zd. S. Dedov. It was printed in Bulgarian (with editorials in Russian as well) and included material in Macedonian.

⁵⁸⁵D-г Вl аже Ri st ovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)...*, 241-253; D-г Вl аже Ri st ovski , „Ul ogat a i mest ot o na Di jamandi ja Mi šajkov vo makedonskat a kul tur no-naci onal na i st ori ja“, in: *Научна ми сла – Би т ола 1980*, Би т ола, 1980, 383-401; D-г Вl аже Ri st ovski , *Портрет и од македонскат а лит ерат угна и наци онална i st ori ja*, II, 66-88.

⁵⁸⁶D-г Вl аже Ri st ovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуѣовски (1878-1940)...*, I, 278 and 284-285.

⁵⁸⁷Hr i st o Andonov-P ol janski , *Или нденскот о вост ани е и меѓународнат а јавност* , Skopje, 1985.

⁵⁸⁸D-г Вl аже Ri st ovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)...*, 303-310; Hr. Si l ònovъ, *Освободи т елнит ъ борби на Македони я*, II, Sof i ò, 1943, 321-323.

⁵⁸⁹D-г Gl i gor Todorovski , *При лози за ср ѣско-македонски т е односи во ми нат от о*, Skopje, 1987, 70-91.

At this historical point, the Macedonian national idea was the greatest obstacle to the achievement of the aspirants' plans. This explains why the struggle against this idea was extremely well-organized and coordinated. The Macedonian people found themselves in a limbo of external factors, and even the international programme of reforms in European Turkey remained without real prospects of being implemented.⁵⁹⁰ The Young Turks only confirmed the impossibility. Obviously, the wars over Macedonia's partition had been carefully prepared. A new period in Macedonian history ensued.

⁵⁹⁰D-r Gli gor Todorovski , *Реформите на големи е европски сили во Македонија (1829-1909)*, III, Skopje, 1984, 12-30.

The National Programme of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg

A large number of programme documents were formulated and published in the historical development of the movement for the cultural and national emancipation and social and political affirmation of the Macedonians. Yet we still do not have a thorough scholarly analysis or a comprehensive survey of these events and processes in Macedonia in the 19th and 20th centuries. This is mainly the result of a situation in which perhaps the most important documentation about this period is still outside our country and remains inaccessible to us. According to the information we have gathered so far, however, the programme concept of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg was the first complete and detailed national programme of the Macedonians, formulated as early as its foundation in 1902 and developed and adapted in accordance with historical realities up to the First Session of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia in 1944.

1.

The Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg was established on the basis of the historical experience of the Macedonian people in the preceding period, but in origin and ideologically it was based on the heritage of Pulevski's Slavonic-Macedonian Literary Society (1881),⁵⁹¹ the journal *Лоза* in Sofia (1892)⁵⁹² and the *Bardar* Macedonian Student Society in Belgrade (1893),⁵⁹³ and directly on the publicly proclaimed concepts of the Macedonian Club in Belgrade and its periodical *Балкански Гласник* (1902).⁵⁹⁴

⁵⁹¹Upravda [D. Ćupovski], „Кепъ би л а Бол гар îò dl ò Makedonîi , *Македонскій гласъ* (*Македонски глас*), I, 5, S.-Peterburgъ, 5.II.1913, 77.

⁵⁹²D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наџ ја*, I, Skorje, 1983, 469-602.

⁵⁹³D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926). При лоџ кон иџоучувањет о на газвџт окот на македонскат а наџ онална ми сла*, Skorje, 1966, 126-138; D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наџ ја*, II, 9-23.

⁵⁹⁴D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Krst e П. Ми си рков (1874-1926)...*, 200-223; D-r Bl aĵe Ri st ovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуџовски (1878-1940) и Македонскот о научно-лит ерат ужно друѓарст во во*

The programme principles of the Macedonian movement had been laid down mainly from the mid-19th century onwards, but they were somewhat incomplete and most often remained without public affirmation. In as early as the 1840s some teachers and priests in Macedonia started working on the concept of distinct Macedonian national and cultural interests depending on the stage of development of historical consciousness and the socio-political, economic, social, cultural, educational and ecclesiastical and spiritual situation of the people.⁵⁹⁵ But the first public demonstration of this consciousness was made in 1859 with the Kukum Union,⁵⁹⁶ although it involved compromises in terms of the formulation of the national aims and tasks. In this way, two national-political concepts in the Macedonian movement became established and developed side by side (with a certain intermingling) until the affirmation of the Macedonian nation-state (1944), although some atavisms have not fully disappeared even up to the present day.

Some may be surprised to hear that the monistic platform, which started from the distinct cultural and historical entity of the Macedonians, preceded, as a concept, the dualistic one, which favoured mutual support together with other cultural and national entities in the struggle for affirmation. The Kukum Union backed Parteniya Zografski's dualistic platform, based on the Macedonian-Bulgarian association in the anti-Hellenic struggle and on projected future developments, and not without regard to the already concluded Serbo-Croatian Vienna Agreement (1850) as a model. In so doing, the Macedonian side stressed its individuality in terms of cultural and historical development, preferring the 'Macedonian dialect' in the envisaged joint literary standard, but accepted the name *Българин* as a *националдезиѝ nation*, even though it tried to make a distinction through the formula 'Macedonian Bulgarians'. This dualistic concept was promulgated through the legalized Bulgarian Exarchate as the national church of all Orthodox Slavs in the Ottoman Empire (1870) and enabled Bulgarian national propaganda to use official institutional forms. The process involved lavish support coming from the powerful Bulgarian national centres in Turkey and abroad, which succeeded in disseminating printed works in Bulgarian at an early date and in propagating their cause through a large number of newspapers and journals, collections and calendars, and also by printing complete textbooks. The foundation of the Bulgarian state following the Russo-Turkish War (1878) further strengthened and intensified this

Пет гоѓрад. Прилози кон истражувањет о на македонско-рускиот етврски и развѝт окот на македонскат а наѝ онална ми сла, I, Скопје, 1978, 110-130.

⁵⁹⁵D-r Bl aĝe Ri stovski , *Македонскиот народ и македонскат а наѝ ја*, I, 194-210.

⁵⁹⁶D-r Sl avko Di mevski , *Македонскат а борба за црковна и наѝ онална самост ојност во XIX век (Унијат скот о дѝ ѝење)*, Скопје, 1988; Bl aĝe Ri stovski , „Унијат скот о дѝ ѝење во Мakedонија (II). Kukumskat а унија од 1859 година.“, *Разгледѝ* , II/III, 10, Скопје, 1960, 1005-1029.

dualistic concept aimed at the effective and swift elimination of the Macedonian component in the initial dualism. Yet even the Ilinden Uprising was mainly carried out under the banner of that concept, with consequences which Krste P. Misirkov was able to predict even then.⁵⁹⁷

The dualistic concept was not a phenomenon involving only the Bulgarian element, as there were similar concepts connected with the Serbs and Greeks. The development of foreign nationalistic propaganda resulted in a split in the single Macedonian people, even with regard to the dualistic concept. It is important, however, that this concept nearly always envisaged the establishment of a distinct state entity for Macedonia as well — within a federal or confederal (South-Slav or Balkan) framework. In this respect, of special interest are the activities in the 1880s and 1890s of Spiro Gulapčev in Bulgaria,⁵⁹⁸ of Paul (Panagiotis) Argyriades in France,⁵⁹⁹ of the insufficiently studied Stefan Damčev Makedon in Athens, Bucharest, Paris and London (and in particular his National Committee for the Autonomy of Macedonia and Albania),⁶⁰⁰ of Leonidas Voulgaris and his Committee for a Balkan or Eastern Confederation in Athens,⁶⁰¹ etc.

That is how the concept of Macedonian ‘political separatism’ was built and gained strength. This was expressed primarily in the various Macedonian societies and committees of the Macedonian émigré community in Bulgaria, in the Macedonian Socialist Group in Sofia and especially in the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization. Here we must emphasize that, while seeking a solution to the ‘Macedonian question’, even some Bulgarian activists and revolutionaries repeatedly came out in favour of that concept of ‘political separatism’, but preferring the Bulgarian national designation for the Slavic population of Macedonia. For instance, all the members who founded the **Macedonian Secret Committee** in Geneva (1898) were ethnic Bulgarians; they advocated “a Macedonian people”, but composed “of various nationalities”, a Macedonian state using the Bulgarian language and church and with Bulgarian education.⁶⁰² The same spirit and the same tendency is predominant in the programmatic ‘Open Letter’ by D. Vihrov,⁶⁰³

⁵⁹⁷К.Р. Ми сирковъ, *За македонци т е работ и*, Sof i ð, 1903, ř I, etc.

⁵⁹⁸Spi ro Gul abčev, *Едѝ н оꝗлъд ѝо ет ноꝗрафѝят а на Македонѝ я*, Gabr ovo, 1887, 32-311.

⁵⁹⁹Hri sto Andonov-P ol janski , *Одбрани дела*, 3. *Македонскот о ѝгашање*, Skopje, 1981, 190-207.

⁶⁰⁰*Абано-Македонѝа*, I, 2, Bucureşti, 25/6.I.1894; *Ј Аутономѝе*, I, 4, Londres, 1.VII.1902, 1-3; *Гласъ Македонски*, I, 10, Sof i ð, 30.I.1894, 4; *Юго-Зайадна Бълѝгарѝ я*, I, 22, Sof i ð, 7.II.1894, III-Iř ; *Съгласѝ е*, I, 42, Sof i ð, 16.III.1895, III.

⁶⁰¹*Свобода*, I, 83, Sof i ð, 12.IH.1887, 1-2; II, 116, 13.I.1888, 3; II, 118, 20.I.1888, 3-4.

⁶⁰²Соѝо V. Bil ðr ski , „Dokument i i mæteri ali na Makedonski ð tæen revol ô ci onen komi tet (.Ž enevska grupa)“, *Извест ѝ я на дъꝗжавнѝ т е архѝ ви*, 72, Sof i ð, 1983, 185-253; Dančo Zogr af ski , *Македонски от т æен революѝци онеген комѝ т ет ѝ* „От м'ит ени е“, Skopje, 1954.

⁶⁰³D. Vi hr ovъ [Di mо Ni kol ov], *От вогено ѝѝ смо до македонски т е революѝци онегѝ*, St ar a Zagor a, 1899; *Vt or o i zdani e*, Gabr ovo, 1901.

who was also a Bulgarian from Kazanl'k. Even the incorporation of the Adrianople region (and not Kosovo) into the organizational territory of the Supreme Macedonian-Adrianople Committee and the Secret Macedonian-Adrianople Revolutionary Organization⁶⁰⁴ was deliberate and obvious, and the participation of Bulgarian revolutionaries such as Mihail Gerджиков, Peju Javorov and Hristo Ćernopeeв only strengthened that tendency in the Macedonian movement.

2.

The first programme platform based on the monistic concept in the Macedonian movement was described by the Bulgarian national activist, Petko Raĉev Slavejkov in early 1871 in his newspaper *Македонија*, first in general terms,⁶⁰⁵ and later, in 1874, in greater detail in his letters to the Exarch from Salonika.⁶⁰⁶ For the first time there was an account of a Macedonian 'national separatism' with a clear platform: Macedonians as a distinct nation; Macedonian as a distinct language in the Slavic world and a literary standard for the Macedonians; restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid as a Macedonian national church with its own clergy; Macedonian schools and teachers in their mother tongue, and finally, autonomous administration of Macedonia within the borders of Turkey. This was the programme platform upon which Macedonian 'national separatism' continued to develop without interruption, although sometimes with varying amplitudes in its development.

We also find this concept in writing (although not in the form of programme documents) in the works of Ćorgija M. Pulevski (from 1875,⁶⁰⁷ 1878,⁶⁰⁸ 1879,⁶⁰⁹ 1880⁶¹⁰ and 1892),⁶¹¹ in spite of the fact that, relying on the decisions of the

⁶⁰⁴Si meon Radev, *Ранни сѹоменѹ*, Sof i d, 1967, 266-267.

⁶⁰⁵[P .R. Sl avejkovъ], „Makedonski ѱt ѹ v i pr osъ“, *Македонѹ*, ѹ , Car egr adъ, 18.I.1871, 2.

⁶⁰⁶Co o Bi l d r ski , I l i d P askov, „P i sma na P et ko Raĉev Sl avejkov po uni d t a v Makedoni d pr ez 1874 g.“, *Векове*, Hѹ III, 1, Sof i d, 1989, 68-75.

⁶⁰⁷Ђor de M. P uq evski , *Речни к ot t ri jezi ka s. македонски , арбански i t yrски* , kwi ga II, u Beogr adu, 1875, 40-42.

⁶⁰⁸ĆĂM.P ., *Самовѹ ла Македонска*, Sof i d, y.a.; D-r Bl aje Ri st ovski , *Ćor ѹi ja M. Пулевски i неговѹ т e кнѹи шкѹ* „Самовѹ ла Македонска“ i „Македонска ѹеснарка“, I F, Skopje, 1973, 39-43.

⁶⁰⁹*Македонска ѹеснарка* ot ѹ Ćor gĂa P ul Ăevski , b.v.m., [I], Sof ѹ, 1879; *Македонска ѹеснарка*. Ot ѹ Ćor gĂa P ul Ăevski , b.v.mi .m, II, Sof ѹ, 1879.

⁶¹⁰ĆĂM. P ul Ăevski , *Славянско-населѹени ски -македонска слоѹни ца речовска за i сѹравување ѹгавословки -язѹи чesко-ѹи sani e. Основана на III.t o одељни e учѹи ѹи т ко*, P ѹг v i del ѹ, Sof i d, 1880.

⁶¹¹Ćor ѹi ja M. P ul evski , *Одбрани st rani ѹи* , I zbor , r edakci ja, pr edgovor i zabel emki D-r Bl aje Ri st ovski , Skopje, 1974, 213-257.

Constantinople Conference, he also came out in favour of a dualistic monarchy of Macedonia and Bulgaria, but with Macedonia as a kingdom which would represent the embodiment of the one-time classical glory of Alexander.

In a substantially clearer form this concept was also expressed in the unofficial programme of the **Secret Macedonian Society** in Sofia (1890),⁶¹² and attempts were made at its affirmation within the **Young Macedonian Literary Society** in Sofia (1891-1892) and also within the **Vardar Student Society** in Belgrade (1893-1894), but it was only after early July 1902 that the newspaper *Балкански Гласник* published the true concepts of the monistic Macedonian national programme by the group known as ‘national separatists’, based around the **Macedonian Club** and the **Macedonian Reading Room** in the Serbian capital. The chief organizers of this activity, Stefan J. Dedov and Dijamandija T. Mirajkov, after their expulsion from Belgrade, wrote that the goal of *Балкански Гласник* was “to defend the interests of the Macedonian Christians not only from the subjugation of the Turks, but also from the various kinds of propaganda, and to stand up for an independent Macedonia in the political, national and spiritual respect”.⁶¹³ They also said that even before the appearance of the newspaper *Балкански Гласник* “we tried to found, in the form of a literary club, a circle whose aim would be to unite the Macedonian intelligentsia in Serbia into a single whole, regardless of convictions, and which would see to the establishment of unity of thought among the Macedonian population”.⁶¹⁴

The first issue of *Балкански Гласник*, among other things, stated: “If there is a people which is in the most unfortunate situation on the globe, it is the Macedonian people. History does not recall another similar example where one and the same people in terms of tradition, language and faith has been divided into various opposing parties, each more estranged than the other; and if we add the lack of personal safety and safety of property, and the corrupt Turkish administration, which in its own turn encourages the partition and subjugation of the people, you can imagine what a dark picture is that of Macedonia, where different aspirants see their power and greatness.”

⁶¹²К. Ѓаховъ, „Pazete se makedonci otъ i zmana i bi dete bl agor azumni !“, *Гласъ Македонски*, II, 5, 23.III.1894, 2; P. p. Arsoвъ, „Proi zhotъ na revolъci onnoto dvi жени e i ръг vitō st Ī pki na Solunski ò, Komi tet Āza pri dobi vane pol i ti česki tō prava na Makedoni ò, dadeni i otъ Birli nski ò dogovorъ“, *Бюлет и нъ*, ž 8, Sof i ò, 1919, 3; D-гъ Lō b. Mi l et i čъ, „Dame Grueвъ. Kratki bi ogr af i česki bōlōжки за жи vota i deòt el nost Ā a mu“, *Македono-Òdri nski Прегледъ*, II, 30, Sof i ò, 11.III.1907, 467-468; D. Mi r čevъ, „Dame Grueвъ (Edi nъ vel i čavъ jestъ)“, *Илюст раци я Ил и н денъ*, I, 1, Sof i ò, 1927, 7-8; Slavko Dimovski, „Dame Gruev i makedonskot o naci onal no prашawe do sozdavawet o na TMORO“, in: *При лози за Даме Груев. Mat eri jali od t rкалезнат а маса за Даме Груев...*, Bitola, 1983, 65-68.

⁶¹³D-гъ Bl a же Ri stovski, *Димитри ја Чуповски (1878-1940) i Македонскот о научно-лит ерат урно дгугарст во во Пет роград*, I, 180-182.

⁶¹⁴*Ibid.*, 182.

“Yes,” continues the editorial, “if there is a means for uniting or disuniting the Orthodox East and the Slavic Balkans, we are pointing to it — it is the future of our fatherland, Macedonia. If the Macedonian question is resolved so as not to leave any traces of the national aspirations in the Orthodox East and the Slavic Balkans, this will help them unite in a political, and perhaps religious way, and, vice versa, if such traces remain, they will be disunited. In a word, Macedonia is the spring which pushes the Orthodox East and the Slavic Balkans towards friendship or hostility.”

“All Macedonians,” concludes the newspaper, “will bless their present-day benefactors if they change the methods of their work, or will curse them, if they become the cause of the perpetuation of the present situation, curses which will sooner or later bring misfortune to them, just as the curses of our parents have brought misfortune to us, and we are now wandering undesired and unwelcome across foreign lands, seeking a remedy for our ailing soul, imperceptibly caught in their claws, returning to our fatherland not as the advocates of progress, brotherhood and freedom, but of corruption, hostility and slavery.”⁶¹⁵

The newspaper also gives a clear answer to the question of whether the Macedonians are “Serbs or Bulgarians, or are a distinct group among the Slavic peoples”. “Everyone who has had the opportunity of visiting this unfortunate brother land,” writes *Балкански Гласник*, “has, we believe, seen that the main body of the people is Slavic, which, according to its customs, tradition and past, represents a single ethnic whole, but which, regrettably, is now divided into several parts... In these thirty years the Bulgarians have been unable to make the population in Macedonia Bulgarian, and we believe that the other nationalities cannot succeed in this either.”⁶¹⁶ The newspaper concludes: “In the interest of Slavdom in the Balkans, we hope that everybody will work on obtaining autonomy for Macedonia and acknowledging its Slavonic Macedonian dialect.”⁶¹⁷

The national programme presented in this way was supplemented by the Macedonian Club in Belgrade recommending combined efforts by Bulgaria and Serbia so that “Macedonia can be granted autonomy, with its local Slavonic language-dialect, and be neutral, a vassal to Turkey and commercially free to both Serbia and Bulgaria”.⁶¹⁸ The newspaper wrote that as far as the Balkan peoples were concerned, “their most sacred duty obliges them to stop sowing intrigues of discord, unrest, etc. and start conscientiously working on the neutralization of the controversial Macedonian question so that it can be resolved on the basis of

⁶¹⁵*Балкански гласник*, I, 1, Beograd, 7. j. II.1902, 2.

⁶¹⁶*Балкански гласник*, I, 4, 28. j. II.1902, 2.

⁶¹⁷*Ibid.*

⁶¹⁸*Балкански гласник*, I, 5, 4. j. III.1902, 2.

елуалту and *индейнденце*, considering the future decentralization of the Balkans, at least of those regions whose inhabitants are one and the same people, who have one and the same faith, the same customs, spirit, character, etc., and particularly those who speak one and the same language,”⁶¹⁹ because a stop should be put to the struggle “for domination over the people of Macedonia, who have their own individual dialect that can use the phonetic orthography”.⁶²⁰

Accordingly, the programme of *Балкански Гласник* envisaged the recognition of the Macedonians as a distinct Slavic nation, raising the Macedonian language to a literary standard (with phonetic orthography), in the future autonomy of Macedonia, “under the suzerainty of the Sultan, free in terms of commerce with Serbia and Bulgaria, and under the guarantee of the great powers”, within a Balkan association, where “each province would retain its autonomy (internal independence), and all of them together represent a single neutral federal state under the guarantee of the great powers”.⁶²¹

The programme also involved the principle of gradual independence for Macedonia, which they called “the evolutionary path”, because the crucial element for them at that moment was not so much liberation from Turkey as protection from foreign propaganda. In this envisaged “autonomous Macedonia, bearing in mind the neutral Balkan federation, there would be no place for fear that the Macedonians would start revolutions and roam across the free brother states, but all provinces would dedicate themselves to their own peaceful, cultural, commercial, economic and financial interests.”⁶²²

Because of this programme, at the moment when the Regulations of the established Macedonian Club and Reading Room were submitted for approval to the responsible authorities, and when they announced the prepared “memorandum (complaint) which will soon be presented to the representatives of the Great Powers — signatories of the Treaty of Berlin”,⁶²³ mentioning the possibility that a delegation might leave for Europe in order to “describe the intolerable situation of their compatriots”,⁶²⁴ the newspaper was banned. The Club and the Reading Room were closed, and their chief activists were expelled from Serbia. Yet the Macedonian national programme found its way to the European public in printed form and won a large number of supporters both within the land and abroad. The programme was accepted as an authentic expression of the Macedonian people.

⁶¹⁹*Балкански гласник*, I, 3, 21.р II.1902, 2.

⁶²⁰*Ibid.*

⁶²¹*Балкански гласник*, I, 7, 18.р III.1902, 1.

⁶²²*Ibid.*

⁶²³*Балкански гласник*, I, 8, 25.р III.1902, 3.

⁶²⁴*Ibid.*

3.

Notwithstanding all these activities, we believe that the first comprehensive and decisive Macedonian national programme elaborated in written form was created with the foundation of the **St Clement Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society** (which later adopted the name Ss Cyril and Methodius). The first known founding act dates from October 28, 1902 (The Application to the Council of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society with the 19 signatures of its founders),⁶²⁵ and the last extant document is from June 18, 1917 (Programme for a Balkan Federal Democratic Republic, published in the main Russian newspapers in St Petersburg).⁶²⁶ In these fifteen years of activity, the Society appeared under different names: the **St Clement Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg**,⁶²⁷ **Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society**,⁶²⁸ **Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian National-Educational Society**,⁶²⁹ **Ss Cyril and Methodius Russian-Macedonian Charitable Society**,⁶³⁰ **Macedonian Colony in Petrograd**⁶³¹ and the **Macedonian Revolutionary Committee**.⁶³²

The most active organizer and leader of this Society, Dimitrija Čupovski, writes the following, among other things, in his short *Aytobioz raūxy* (1933):

From the very first year of my arrival in [the] [former] St Petersburg it became imperative to organize, among the Macedonians who were here, a revolutionary-oriented association under the name 'Slavonic-Macedonian Society', a single national-political union in Russia based on the ideational foundations of the 'Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization', which proclaimed the slogan 'Struggle for the independence of Macedonia'. In the course of 17 years (from 1900 to 1917), the Macedonian Society founded in Leningrad had the honour of carrying that banner,

⁶²⁵Q uben Lape, „Dokument i za f or mi rawet o na Sl avjano-makedonskot o naučno-l i t er at ur no drugar st vo i negovi ot ust av“, *Македонски јазик*, Нр I, Скопје, 1965, 193-194.

⁶²⁶*Воля народа*, ž 43, P et rogr adъ, 18.ř I.1917, 2; *Новая жи знь*, ž 52, 18.ř I/1.ř II.1917, 2.

⁶²⁷К.Р. Ми си r ковъ, *оџ. џџ.*, 1, 45, 67 and 68, and also: „P et rogr adckot o Makedoncko Sl ovencko Naučno-l i t er at ur no Drugar st vo „Sv. Kl i mēnt ‘ (Iř)““, in: *Балканъ* (I, 1, Sof i ò, 5.ř .1903, 1), and also in: *Славянскій Вѣкъ* (III, 62, Vōna, 15/28.II.1903, 431) and *Авт ономна Македоні я* (I, 20, Sof i ò, 16.II.1903, 3). The Society is sometimes also mentioned with the additional adjective *Студент*.

⁶²⁸Q uben Lape, *оџ. џџ.*, 198-202; D-r Bl aже Ri st ovski , *Ді ми t ri ja Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, I, 241-246.

⁶²⁹D-r Bl aже Ri st ovski , *оџ. џџ.*, II, 6-23.

⁶³⁰*Љид*, II, 143-156.

⁶³¹This name appeared officially in public for the first time in the Memorandum on the Independence of Macedonia of March 1, 1913, and was used until the last number of the journal *Македонскій гласъ* (*Македонски глас*), dated November 20, 1914.

⁶³²D-r Bl aже Ri st ovski , *оџ. џџ.*, II, 267-268.

paying no attention to any intrigues or intimidation by its enemies. The mottoes 'Macedonia to the Macedonians' and 'A Balkan Federal Republic', ingrained in the foundations of the Macedonian programme, drove all pseudo-Slavophiles mad...⁶³³

The Society's activities before October 28, 1902, remain still unknown, not taking into account the foundation and activity of the Secret Macedonian-Adrianople Circle (TMOK) in St Petersburg, which was set up on November 12, 1900⁶³⁴ (where Čupovski's membership is not confirmed), and whose dualistic platform was based on that of the Secret Macedonian-Adrianople Revolutionary Organization (TMORO). The Circle was considered a TMORO Russian branch, even though in the foundation of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society some of its first members were TMOK activists. But regardless of whether the Society was in fact active for 17 or only 15 years, its national programme remained the same and was adapted only in accordance with the new historical realities following Macedonia's partition in the Balkan Wars.

– The first concept of this Macedonian national programme was announced in the Society's founding act of October 28, 1902, but it can be found in its integral form in the *Меморандум* to the Russian government and to the Council of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society of November 12, 1902, signed by the principal activists of the Macedonian Club in Belgrade, Stefan Jakimov Dedov and Dijamandija Trpkov Mirajkov.⁶³⁵ All the aspects of the 'Macedonian question'

⁶³³*Ibid.*, I, 99-100.

⁶³⁴D-р Bl аже Ri stovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)*..., 159-186.

⁶³⁵D-р Bl аже Ri stovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуповски (1878-1940)*..., I, 180-189. Another document describing the Macedonian national programme of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society is certainly the Report P. No. 193 of November 22, 1902, by the envoy extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Serbia to the Russian capital, Academician Stojan Novaković, who had first-hand information on the concepts and actions of the Society. Among other things, he writes:

"Macedonian separatism, according to their theory, would aim at a separate political and cultural organization of Macedonia, independent of the cultural and political centres of both Sofia and Belgrade. Were Macedonia to be granted certain autonomous rights, they believe that they should be extended to the secession of the church from the Bulgarian Exarchate in Constantinople, the organization of a separate church authority under the protection of the Constantinopolitan Church, such as was the case in Serbia and Romania prior to the Treaty of Berlin, and the raising of the Macedonian dialect to official and literary use, with phonetic orthography, in order to avoid the use of the Bulgarian language. The future autonomous organization of Macedonia, according to their idea, should be based on these three cornerstones: a separate church, a separate language and a separate autonomous organization, under the protection of the Sultan and Patriarch."

Novaković continues by giving information on the response these ideas met with in the Russian society, and also among young Macedonians (primarily university students) who were studying in St Petersburg and had links with Sofia or Belgrade:

"The Russian Ministry has so far not interfered in this matter at all. The literary and political circles here, on the other hand, most often react with sympathy and natural curiosity to all this, considering the present situation in Macedonia. Yet as the majority in these circles have become used to consider the Macedonians as part of the Bulgarian people, these separatist Macedonian theories are regarded as a novelty and have aroused suspicion in some that they may be of Austrian origin, as Austria usually

at that moment are described, and the aspirations of the Macedonian people in their long struggle for national liberation are presented in sixteen large hand-written pages. It is a concept which fully corresponded with that published in *Балкански Гласник*, but systematized in an official act whose fundamentals did not remain unknown to the wider European public.

– The third official act of the Society was the brief original minutes of its “regular session” of December 29, 1902,⁶³⁶ taken by the Society’s secretary, Milan Stoilov, when its Administration was constituted. This document contains the following points: “the borders of Macedonia” on its ethnic territory were defined; it was decided “to thank the Sl[avonic] Ch[aritable] Society as it has allowed our society to hold meetings in their salon” (which was still another official acknowledgement of Macedonian national individuality at the Slavic level), and finally, with regard to the question of the individuality of Macedonian in comparison with other Slavonic languages, it was concluded that its members should write down characteristic Macedonian words in a book with pages divided into four sections: Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Russian, to show to the Russian public that Macedonian was no closer to Bulgarian or Serbian than to the Russian language.

– The fourth document arising from the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg was published (unsigned) in Vergun’s *Славјанскиј Век* in Vienna on February 15 (28), 1903,⁶³⁷ where the entire Macedonian national

protects Slavic separatist ideas and the division of languages and dialects, and Russia is more inclined towards centralization.

“The great majority of young Macedonian people studying here are with the Bulgarians. They have welcomed this movement with sympathy, because Macedonians willingly accept ideas of a separate organization for their fatherland, even though sometimes they oppose it in favour of Bulgarianism. Young Bulgarians, on the other hand, are totally opposed to this, fearing that they will thus lose Macedonia. Our young people are rather sympathetically inclined, because with the foundation of a separate Macedonian group among the young people here, the Bulgarians would lose the most, and it is all the same to us, as only two or three Macedonians who are now with our people would leave.

“When the aforementioned Macedonians, Mr Jakimov and Mr Trpković, addressed the ‘Slav. Charitable Society’ with a request to allow the holding of sessions for young Macedonians as well, as they have allowed for the Bulgarians and Serbs, they had two meetings and decided to allow the holding of Slavic-Macedonian meetings. The Bulgarian Agency was against this, but was unable to prevent it and at present is trying to put obstacles in the way of Macedonian separatism by other means.” [Arhiv Srbije, Beograd (Archives of Serbia, Belgrade), MI D, P P, f. HII, 1903. Materials from different years].

In fact, the main decision on the recognition of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society by SPSCS was passed on the meeting of its Council of November 1, 1902, where Protocol No. 13 stated that they had examined the request by the Society “to be allowed to assemble for lectures and addresses on the premises of” SPSCS and decided “to allow it on days which would be determined by the Schedule Commission” (D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Portret i iurocesi od makedonskata aliteraturna i naučnolna istorija. Prilozi za razvitokot na makedonskata a kulturno-naučnolna misla*, II, Skopje, 1989, 208-209).

⁶³⁶ *ibid.*, 202.

⁶³⁷ „Makedonskoe obščestvo vъ S.-Peterburgъ“, *Славянскій Вѣкъ*, III, 62, 15/28.II.1903, 431-432.

programme was presented in eight elaborated items. The Society's aim, according to this document, was "the spiritual unification and unity of our fatherland, the study of Macedonia from historical and ethnographic points of view, acquainting the Russian public with the true situation of the Macedonians in the past and now". Of particular importance was the fact that, for the first time, it included the following clause: "The members of the Society will speak among themselves only in the Macedonian dialects, and not in Bulgarian or Serbian, as has been the case so far, depending on the place of education." The Society established links with the Belgrade *Балкански Гласник*, as its editors were also members of this society in St Petersburg and as it expressed "the view that the Christian population is divided into three hostile camps — Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek (rich people, Graecophile Slavs)", as a result of which "it is necessary to raise one of the four main Macedonian dialects... to the level of a general Macedonian literary standard", where "the most suitable seems to be the south-western Mijak-Brsjak dialect". Of considerable interest is also the classification of the four main dialects in Macedonia: "(1) Highland: Skopje, Kumanovo; (2) Mijak-Brsjak, in the Pelagonija Plain: Bitola-Ohrid, Prilep; (3) Enidže-Vardar: Voden; (4) Nevrokop," where "the vowel shift and the topographic basins" were taken as the criteria for classification. It was of special significance that the future Macedonian literary standard was to be taken from the west-Macedonian "Mijak-Brsjak" dialect with its centres at Bitola, Ohrid and Prilep, which is virtually identical with the determination of Misirkov's "central dialect" and with the basis of our modern literary standard, except that Veles is not mentioned as one of the starting points of Misirkov's concept. (We must point out that by that time Krste P. Misirkov was a grammar school teacher in Bitola, but maintained contacts with the members of the Society, regularly sending a part of his salary for its activities).⁶³⁸ The document continues: "The fact that Serbian propaganda is not restricted to Skopje and that there are also Serbian schools in Bitola, Voden, Salonika, Enidže-Vardar and Kukuц and until recently there was a Serbian school even in Seres, and also the fact that Bulgarian propaganda has also spread throughout Macedonia, is the best proof of the unity of the Macedonian language, folk customs, character, traditions and everything which may be encompassed under the notion of nationality." The Society believes that "the attainment of this idea, 'Macedonia to the Macedonians', could, with the establishment of a Macedonian standard", even prove desirable for all the actors interested in the 'Macedonian question', enumerating them: "(1) For the Bulgarians, because they could hope that with the return of Macedonian émigrés brought up in the Bulgarian spirit the land would acquire a Bulgarian character; (2) for the Serbs, because this would put an end to Bulgarian

⁶³⁸Централен државен исторически архив, София, ф. 246, оп. 1, арх. ед. 533, л. 283.

propaganda and thwart the danger of having a strong Bulgarian state to the south; (3) for the Romanians, because they would not have to deal with a powerful Bulgaria to the south; (4) for Russia, because the establishment of the autocephalous Macedonian church could weaken the significance of the pan-Hellenic Patriarchate and impel it to consent to the elective principle for the oecumenical patriarchal throne, which would be an opportunity for the election of a Russian candidate to the Oecumenical Cathedra; (5) for Austria, because with the establishment of the Macedonian standard it could win the sympathies of the population and prepare the ground for occupation; (6) for the Pan-Slavs, because this would put a stop to the antagonism between the Bulgarians and Serbs (Pan-Bulgarian and Pan-Serbian ideas) and the unification of Serbia and Montenegro would become possible, providing the Serbs with an outlet to the Adriatic Sea, and because the small states in the Pan-Slavic alliance would need the support of Russia; (7) for the Turks, because this would bring about the cessation of all types of current political and religious propaganda; (8) for Greece, because the hopes for the restoration of the former rights of the patriarch in church and school matters would be reinvigorated.” Finally (as *Балкански Гласник* had emphasized earlier, as stated in the Memorandum of November 12, 1902, and as Misirkov wrote in 1903 and 1905), this document, too, explicates: “During the formation of the Serbian and Bulgarian literary standards, the regions of eastern Serbia, western Bulgaria and the whole of Macedonia were ignored, and the present elevation of this language to a level of higher literacy, could represent a unifying link for the Slavs of the entire Balkan Peninsula.”

– The fifth official act of the Society we know of is the Request to the Council of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society of December 20, 1903,⁶³⁹ in which a brief account of the work during the past year is given and the Constitution of the Society is submitted for approval.

– The sixth document is the aforementioned “Constitution of the Slavonic-Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg under the patronage of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society” of December 16, 1903,⁶⁴⁰ where the objectives of the Society are defined: “(a) to develop national awareness among the Macedonian colony in St Petersburg; (b) to study the language, songs, customs and history of Macedonia from their ethnographic and geographical aspects; (c) to reconcile and unite all Macedonians, regardless of their education and conviction, in the name of their common descent and the unity of their fatherland; and (d) to spread all the aforesaid among Macedonians in Macedonia and outside its borders (abroad).”

⁶³⁹D-г Bl аже Ri st ovski , *оџ. џџ.*, 226-229.

⁶⁴⁰*Љџџ.*, 241-246.

The Society planned to attain these objectives by: “(a) organizing assemblies and lectures; (b) reading papers, short stories, poems, etc.; (c) collecting folk literature (folklore) and works of historical interest on Macedonia; (d) spiritual support for our compatriots, especially upon their first arrival in Russia, and (e) helping and developing mutual relations with the other Slavonic societies and circles, and also with individual Slavic activists.”

Of particular significance for Macedonian history and culture is Article 12 of this Constitution, which says: “Conversation in the Society will be carried out in the Macedonian (Slavonic-Macedonian) language; all papers and protocols will also be written in this language.” This, as far as we know, is the first introduction of the Macedonian language into official use, and was repeated in Article 31 of the Constitution of the Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian National-Educational Society of June 27, 1912.

– The seventh document is Krste Misirkov’s book *За македоникјате работи* (On Macedonian Matters), which was written under the auspices of the Society (on its recommendation) and printed towards the end of 1903 in Sofia, the centre of Macedonian émigrés in the post-Ilinden turmoil. This was in fact a practical application of the Constitution’s codification and the first standardization of the modern Macedonian literary language using a modern Macedonian alphabet. Misirkov, as a Slavic scholar and on the basis of the Macedonian national programme already defined during the previous year by the Society, analysed all ‘Macedonian matters’ at that historical moment, assessed all current events and worked out certain programme points in accordance with the new historical circumstances in Macedonia — with the experience gained after the Ilinden Uprising. This was the first book in a modern Macedonian literary language and orthography, which provided both a theoretical basis and a historical survey of Macedonian national development. Basic textbooks for the envisaged Macedonian schools were also prepared,⁶⁴¹ but the opening of such schools in Macedonia was not allowed, and the printing of the textbooks proved an impossible task. The aspirants acted in accordance with Misirkov’s predictions in his book.

– The eighth document in order of significance was the letter by the Society’s president, Dimitrija Čupovski, sent from St Petersburg on February 17, 1904, to Nikola Ničota, a Society member in Moscow,⁶⁴² which contains important information on the activities of the Society and its links and relations with the Balkan states, the great European powers and Turkey itself.

⁶⁴¹D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)...*, 295-29; D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, I, 253 and 284-285.

⁶⁴²D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, I, 273-277.

– In addition to the large number of Misirkov's programmatic letters addressed to various persons and institutions,⁶⁴³ we should mention, as the ninth document in terms of significance, the Programme for the publication of the “*Barðar* monthly scholarly and literary journal”, formulated by Misirkov in Berdyansk on October 11, 1904,⁶⁴⁴ and approved by the responsible Russian authorities on March 1, 1905.⁶⁴⁵ This was a programme meticulously worked out in the spirit of the programme principles of the Society and in accordance with Articles 1, 2 and 12 of its 1903 Constitution.

– And finally, the tenth official programme document of significance was the first (and the only) printed issue of the pioneering scholarly, literary and socio-political journal in the modern Macedonian literary language and orthography, *Barðar*, which appeared in Odessa on September 1, 1905.⁶⁴⁶ It represented the full practical application of the provisions contained in the Society's constitution concerning the publication of a periodical in the native tongue.

4.

Of the Society's documentation of programmatic character available to us concerning the first three years of its extensive activity, however, a special place and significance must be given to the aforementioned *Меморандум* of November 12, 1902, as an **act with the most complete definition of the Macedonian national programme until Macedonia's partition.**

The essential demand in the document is the **autonomy** of Macedonia within the borders of the Ottoman Empire, as a provisional status, and **federation** with its neighbours (with Macedonia as the ‘Piedmont’) as the next step. The Society put forward the following programme demands for such an autonomy:

1. Recognition by Turkey of the Macedonian Slavs as a separate people.
2. Recognition of the distinct Macedonian language as literary and its status as official language, together with Turkish, in the three vilayets: Kosovo, Bitola and Salonika.

⁶⁴³D-r Bl aæe Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, II, 197-416; D-r Bl aæe Ri st ovski , „Š kol uvawet o na Kr ste Mi si rkov vo Rusi ja (Novi podat oci i soznani ja za f or mi rawet o na Mi si rkovat a mi sl a)“, *Гласни к*, НННН, 1-2, Скопје, 1985, 105-144.

⁶⁴⁴D-r Bl aæe Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ и македонскат а наци ја*, II, 271-273.

⁶⁴⁵D-r Bl aæe Ri st ovski , „*Barðar*“. *Научно-лит ерат урно и оишт ест вено-полит ичко сии сани е на К.П. Ми си рков*, I MJ Скопје, 1966, 73-74; S.B. Вер ншт еан, „И зистори и македонского л итер ат ур нот о ðи ка. *Var dar* ‘К.Р . Ми си ркова‘“, *Славянская фи лологи я*, Sbor ni k st at еà, вè p. т р ет и à, Moskva, 1960, 71-72.

⁶⁴⁶Photographically reproduced edition in the book: D-r Bl aæe Ri st ovski , „*Barðar*“ ..., 85-116.

3. Recognition of the Archbishopric of Ohrid as an independent Macedonian church.
4. Appointment of a governor-general in the three vilayets from the majority nationality and a deputy from among the less numerous nationalities.
5. A regional elective popular assembly of Macedonia.
6. Granting of an Organic Statute to Macedonia by His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.
7. Guarantees by the great European powers for the implementation of the rights granted by the Sultan. Etc.⁶⁴⁷

This **minimum programme**, as a **provisional status**, was accompanied by detailed and substantiated explanations. What first strikes the reader is the fact that this whole large text mentions neither the Adrianople region nor ‘Old Serbia’ (Kosovo), but deals only with Macedonia within its contemporary ethnic borders. Another fact which must be pointed out is that the text gives special emphasis to and offers a scholarly interpretation of the language question in Macedonia. The philological analysis contained in the Memorandum was obviously not made without the direct participation of the best qualified Macedonian Slavic scholar at the time, a postgraduate student at St Petersburg University, Krste P. Misirkov. We can read virtually the same formulations a year later in his book *За македонците работи*.

The essential question in the Memorandum is the emphasis on the **Macedonians** as a **separate people**, leading to the plea “*φρ α Μακεδονία φρε, nationa.μν, πολιτια.μν and εκκlesiastiα.μν*”. The authors say that this “may seem like a utopia; it may seem that we are trying to create in an artificial way something which does not exist, that we want to create an ethnic concept from the geographical concept of Macedonia, or, in other words, that we are trying to create a Macedonian nationality artificially. But matters are indeed otherwise.”

Statistical data are given on the population in Macedonia within the borders defined by the Constantinople Conference, indicating that of the total of 2.5 million inhabitants, there was a Slav population of between 1.2 and 1.5 million, followed by the Turkish “with an imposing number of 600 to 800 thousand” inhabitants (which undoubtedly referred to all Mohammedans in Macedonia, including Albanians and Macedonians), whereas the rest of the inhabitants were Greeks, Vlachs, Jews, etc. Hence the conclusion that “in the future Macedonia, free politically, nationally and spiritually, the most important role in the socio-political life of the land will belong to the Slavic element, which is now, regrettably, being divided firstly into three ethnic groups and then, in religious terms, into the following groups: Patriarchists, Exarchists, Catholics, Protestants and Mo-

⁶⁴⁷D-г Вl аже Rl st ovski , *Ди ми т ri ja Чyиoвски (1878-1940)*..., I. All subsequent quotations are from the same document.

hammedans". In this division of the Macedonian population "the Church serves as a tool to diverse propagandas" to recruit followers.

Schools in Macedonia are used in a similar way, as "instead of spreading knowledge and enlightening the people, they sway them in favour of this or that Balkan nationality, instil sympathies for one propaganda and nationality and hatred for others", and have thus become "the enemy of their own fatherland". Therefore the authors of the Memorandum believe that the unification of the Macedonians with their own forces is hindered and blocked by the propaganda machines, and also that unification cannot be carried out by any of the neighbouring states, as they are directly opposed to each other.

The Memorandum also takes a position with regard to the Revolutionary Organization in Macedonia, which is almost identical to that of Misirkov a year later. The authors write: "It is true, the Macedonian intelligentsia, brought up in the Bulgarian national spirit, is fighting to obtain autonomous rights for Macedonia, but this activity of theirs is constantly paralysed by the activity of other Balkan states, so that all attempts at effecting a general uprising in Macedonia have not achieved the desired results, attempts which have, however, cost the population dearly. Besides, the Serbs, the Greeks, and even the Romanians, by force of certain higher state interests, will never allow the achievement of Macedonian autonomy without a prior accord with the Bulgarians." This view was certainly the result of the real situation in Macedonia and the Balkans, but it also paid attention to Russian state policy which was sensitive to any revolutionary action and disturbance of the status quo maintained by Russia and Austria-Hungary together.

If it is impossible to provide political freedom for Macedonia at this moment owing to all these powerful factors, the authors of the Memorandum believe that it is possible to provide "national freedom for the Macedonians", and this means: "removal of national propagandas from Macedonia and the introduction, instead, of one of the Macedonian dialects at the level of a general Macedonian literary standard". Here, too, the question of the language in Macedonia and its relations with the languages of the Bulgarians and Serbs are analysed in detail (from the philological and political aspects). The authors conclude that "there is ethnic and linguistic unity in Macedonia and that it is disputed only by the adherents of greater-Serbian and greater-Bulgarian ideas". Therefore, they believe that "the interests of the Slavic population of Macedonia *цан бе сафѣуардед* in the future destiny of this land *онѣ тхорѣх тхе девелѣмент оѣа цоммон Савиц национал ањаренесс амонѣ а.пМаѣдоніан Савс*", and hence, "it is in the interest of the latter to eliminate Serbian and Bulgarian propaganda in the spirit of their native tongue, their common past and common future". And because "there is national unity in Macedonia in the sense that all Macedonian dialects constitute a single whole", it is necessary "to raise one of the Maced. dialects to the level of a literary

standard”, and hence “the necessity of eliminating Serbia’s and Bulgaria’s aspirations in Macedonia, of eliminating national propaganda which demoralizes the Macedonian population, and of unifying the Slavic element in Macedonia with the purpose of preserving its predominant significance for the future of Macedonia”. The same emphasis on the linguistic question in Macedonia can be found in Misirkov’s book *За македонските работи*, as one of the most powerful means for Macedonian national unity and freedom from propaganda activities.

Yet the authors of the Memorandum ascribe no lesser significance to the question of “the position of the church in Macedonia”, and hence, among other things, they conclude and envisage: “In order to frustrate the religious partition of Macedonia and eliminate the various types of interference by the enemies of Slavdom and Orthodoxy, *не деем тхе сүүириталунифицицион од тхе Слэвс ин Македонија инто а синглэ њхолэ ас нецессари* so that they can be ready in any given instance to offer resistance to external incursions. In saying this, we have no intention of creating a new church in addition to the existing ones, but we would like to act in a legal and diplomatic manner wherever this proves necessary for surmounting the schism and transferring the Bulgarian Exarch from Constantinople. In addition, we would like Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian clerics in Macedonia to be replaced by clerics from among the local inhabitants who would be subordinated to the Patriarchate through their own archbishop, whose canonical relations with the Patriarchate would be approximately the same as are, for instance, the relations within the existing autocephalous Orthodox churches. In this way the Oecumenical Patriarchate will lose its pan-Hellenic significance and will only acquire its true oecumenical significance when all autocephalous churches are able to take part in the election of the patriarch. And this can be achieved only if the Macedonian church, too, is made autocephalous.”

In conclusion, the Memorandum states that “no revolutions are needed” for the national and spiritual unification of the Macedonians, and puts forward the naïve belief that “it would be enough if Russian public opinion, together with Russian diplomacy, urges the Balkan states in this respect so that the latter can renounce their policies of conquest and halt their propaganda in Macedonia; and if they wanted, from a humanitarian point of view, to help their brothers (as they have now become accustomed to call them), a thousand other ways could be found to express their brotherly feelings. By halting propaganda,” the authors hope, “the antagonism among the population will cease, the Slavic population will become united into a single compact mass and will always be able to withstand all anti-national currents.”

This programme, however, is planned to last only “until the Albanian question matures politically and nationally” and until “a decision is made on who will rule the Dardanelles”. In the meantime, “Macedonia *нолэнс волэнс*, by necessity, should

remain a constituent part of the Ottoman Empire, because the result of any uprising will only be the extermination of the Slavic population, and this can be desired only by the enemies of Slavdom and Orthodoxy.”

At this point the Society offers its minimum programme of seven items as the “minimum rights and reforms which can be demanded and which can be achieved in the existing political circumstances, to preserve the integrity of Turkey, guaranteed by the great powers, which is necessary for the preservation of European peace”. Only in this manner, gradually, can Macedonia emerge as the “Piedmont” and attract the neighbouring states in a federation for “the unification of Balkan Slavdom and Orthodoxy”.

The fundamentals of this Macedonian national programme remained unchanged until the overthrow of Ottoman rule in Macedonia and Macedonia’s partition. This is confirmed in the programme concept of “the separatist circle in Bitola” in its letter dated August 15, 1912, shortly before the proclamation of the First Balkan War, presented succinctly in the following demands:

1. Energetic intercession by brotherly Russia in favour of the Macedonians.
2. Destruction of Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek propaganda in Macedonia.
3. Opening schools in the Slavonic-Macedonian language.
4. Restoration of church independence (autocephalous Slavonic-Macedonian Church in the [town] of Ohrid).
5. Free development of national awareness, i.e. of the awareness that *Slavonic Macedonians are a single and inseparable people*.

In the interest of the preservation of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish government should aid with all cultural measures the spread of this propaganda which already has thousands of followers both in Macedonia and outside it.

6. In the name of humanity, human dignity and love for their fatherland, the Macedonian intelligentsia should once and for all put an end to the shameful sale of their conscience and honour in the Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek markets.
7. Broad internal self-government for Macedonia.⁶⁴⁸

5.

The same concepts are expressed in the programme acts of the Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian National and Educational Society in St Petersburg (1912-1913),⁶⁴⁹ in the memoranda of the Macedonian Colony in the Russian capital of March 1 and June 7, 1913,⁶⁵⁰ in the journal *Македонскиј Голос* (*Маке-*

⁶⁴⁸Ггаждани нъ, ж 37, S.-P et er bur гъ, 16.ИИ.1912, 5.

⁶⁴⁹Д-г Вл аже Ri st ovski , Дi мi t ri ja Чуиовски (1878-1940)..., II, 5-25.

⁶⁵⁰Македонскиј гoлoсъ (Македонски глас), I, 1, 9.ї I.1913, 17-23.

донски Глас), which was actually the mouthpiece of that Society,⁶⁵¹ in the numerous articles in the Russian press⁶⁵² and memoranda to the Russian government,⁶⁵³ to the governments and public opinion of the Balkan states,⁶⁵⁴ in the appeals to the Macedonians within the land and in emigration,⁶⁵⁵ etc. The national programme was constantly adapted in accordance with the new historical realities, and following the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest, in accordance with the international sanctioning of Macedonia's partition and the new paths of struggle for liberation and unification of the land and the people.

As Russian politics was directly involved in the events in the Balkans, it did not allow the legal activity of the renamed **Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian National and Educational Society**, not even after the amendments which were subsequently made to its Constitution.⁶⁵⁶ Hence, immediately following the Peace Treaty of Bucharest, the members of this Macedonian association in St Petersburg tried to obtain a permit for the foundation of a **Ss Cyril and Methodius Russian-Macedonian Charitable Society**.⁶⁵⁷ Despite the signatures of two distinguished Russian activists and only that of Dimitrija Čupovski on the part of the Macedonians, this society, too, was not accepted by those responsible in the City Administration. Macedonian national subjectivity was not allowed to appear before the Russian public with the approval of the Russian authorities, even though its aims and tasks were nearly the same as those we find in the 1903 Constitution of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society.

Following the start of the First World War, the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society once again presented its programme through the official acts of the Macedonian Colony, published in its printed mouthpiece and also in the special Memorandum to the Russian government.⁶⁵⁸ Yet under pressure from Serbia and

⁶⁵¹*Македонскиј глас* (*Македонски глас*). *Орган на њиговање и на независна Македонија 1913-1914. Фото и илустрации*, I NI, Skopje, 1968.

⁶⁵²D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, II, 62-119.

⁶⁵³*Ид.*, 221-226.

⁶⁵⁴*Македонскиј глас* (*Македонски глас*), II, 11, 20. HI. 1914, 199-201.

⁶⁵⁵*Македонскиј глас* (*Македонски глас*), II, 10, 13. III. 1914, 6-10 and 20-21; II, 11, 20. HI. 1914, 201-203.

⁶⁵⁶D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, II, 20-22.

⁶⁵⁷*Ид.*, 143-156.

⁶⁵⁸In the extensive and well-substantiated Memorandum to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, of August 1914, the signatories Dimitrija Čupovski and Krste Misirkov (in the capacity of representatives of the St Petersburg Macedonian colony and the Odessa and South-Russian Macedonian colony), among other things, wrote that "the most equitable solution to the Macedonian question would undoubtedly be the establishment of an independent kingdom headed by a monarch of Slavic origin and of the Orthodox faith". Assessing the historical moment after the start of the First World War in which Russia, too, was taking part, the signatories to the Memorandum declared the following: "We would like a Macedonian king from Great Russia. We must rectify our mistakes from the past and

Greece, and owing to the bartering negotiations with Bulgaria, Russian policy suppressed *Македонскиј Голос* (*Македонски Глас*) as well.

6.

Unable to appear openly before the world with an official association, the Macedonians made attempts to use the existing Russian and Slavic societies in order to make their views known and influence the final settlement of the question of Macedonia following the War. As a result, Dimitrija Čupovski became vice-president of the **Society for Assistance to Beginner Writers, Actors, Artists and Scientists** in Petrograd,⁶⁵⁹ and it was not surprising that its mouthpiece *Славјане* (*Slavs*, 1915) re-printed Krste Misirkov's article 'The Struggle for Autonomy'.⁶⁶⁰

When this society, too, was banned by the authorities, the representatives of Macedonia became members of the **Society for Slavonic Mutuality** (1915), and a special commission was formed within the Council of the Society for Slavonic Mutuality, composed of Russians, Serbs, Bulgarians and Macedonians. On June 8, 1915, it elaborated a very important *Резолуџион он тхе Македониап Љуестион*, which was separately published by the Editorial Board of *Македонскиј Голос*. The first item of this document said: "The most equitable solution to the question would be the establishment of an integral independent Macedonia by taking those parts of Macedonia from Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria which were captured by them in 1913. In this way, a single integral state will finally be established from this long-suffering partitioned land, which will be able to develop freely and exist independently."⁶⁶¹

instead of looking for support among Balkan states, we should look for it and would certainly find it in the person of the great liberator, Slavic Russia. We believe that the best and most equitable solution to the Macedonian question would be if all Macedonian territories which constituted the three former Macedonian vilayets were seized from the Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians, and a new Slavic, fully independent Balkan Kingdom of Macedonia were established, headed by one of the great princes of the Russian imperial house, at the royal choice of His Imperial Majesty, the Great Emperor. In exchange for the Macedonian territories seized from Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria, the first can be rewarded at the expense of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the second at the expense of Epirus, and the third at the expense of Dobruja or Thrace." The Memorandum also suggested enticing prospects for Russian Balkan policies: "The establishment in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula and on the borders of Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, Albania and Greece of an independent Macedonian kingdom headed by a king of the Russian imperial house will complete the liberation by Russia of all Balkan peoples and thus the unification could commence of all Balkan Orthodox lands into a single whole under the sceptre of the Balkan branch of the Romanov imperial dynasty." (D-r Rastislav Terzi oski, „Ruski dokument i za posebnost a na makedonski ot nar od“, *Нова Македонија*, ж, 16972, 22.Ир. 1994, 12).

⁶⁵⁹D-r Blazevič, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940)*..., II, 227-239.

⁶⁶⁰К. Релџкиџа, „Ворџба за автoномiџ“, *Македонскиј џолосъ* (*Македонски глас*), II, 11, 20.ИЛ.1914, 205-207; К. Релџкиџа, *Славјане*, ж 5, Петроградъ, 1915, 60-62.

7.

The First World War, however, affected the whole of the Balkans and the destiny of Macedonia became even more uncertain. As a result, in August 1915, Dimitrija Čupovski sent a cable, on behalf of the Macedonians, to the president of the Serbian National Assembly which was then in session:

At this moment when Serbia is deciding the question which determines the future destiny of long-suffering Macedonia, we, the Macedonians, express our ardent conviction that the brotherly Serbian people will resolve the Macedonian question in full conformity with the rightful national aspirations of the Slavonic Macedonians, a huge part of whom are now fighting together with the Serbs in the name of Slavic freedom and Slavic happiness. An equitable decision by the Serbian Assembly will not mean a new partition of Macedonia but the restoration of its unity, recognized by item two of the Serbo-Bulgarian Accord of February 29, 1912, which envisages the establishment of an autonomous Macedonia.⁶⁶²

8.

When Dimitrija Čupovski's attempt (1916) to come to Macedonia and coordinate the actions deciding the postwar fate of Macedonia failed, a **Macedonian Revolutionary Committee** was founded in Petrograd, headed by Čupovski himself. As part of its activity, on June 18, 1917, immediately after the February Revolution and long before the October Revolution in Russia, this committee published, among other things, a *Программе фр а Балкан ФедералДемоџратиџ Реџублицџ*⁶⁶³ printed in the central Russian newspapers under the slogan "The Balkans to the Balkan peoples. Full self-determination for each nation". This was a programme in full agreement with that proclaimed 15 years earlier. The published document had three signatories: The Macedonian Revolutionary Committee, The Cyril and Methodius Macedonian Society and The Editorial Board of *Македонскиј Глас*.⁶⁶⁴ This was at the same time the last known official document signed by the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in Petrograd (St Petersburg) that presented the programmatic base of the liberation concept of the Macedonians.

⁶⁶¹D-г В1 аже Ристовски, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940)*..., II, 242.

⁶⁶²*Ibid.*, I, 42-43.

⁶⁶³*Ibid.*, II, 266-269.

⁶⁶⁴The three signatories appear below the text in the newspaper *Воля народа*, ž 43, 18.ř I.1917, 2., and we also find them in transcription (copy) by Čupovski himself, among the personal property he left (D-г В1 аже Ристовски, *ош. цит.*, II, 263). This surviving original mentions only *Македонскиј Револуџионниј Комитетъ*, and the published version in the newspaper *Новая жиэнь*, ž 52, 18.ř I/1.ř II.1917, 2, indicates only *Следуют подписи* ("Signatures follow").

Emphasizing that the raging war “is bringing freedom and self-determination to many peoples”, the Programme pointed out:

Macedonia has fought for centuries and shed streams of blood for this freedom and independence, but it was treacherously, unfairly dismembered by the nefarious chauvinism and by the greed of the bloodthirsty dynasties of surrounding states. The results of this unprecedented plunder in history have been the cause not only of mutual extermination of the Balkan peoples, but also of a hitherto unseen world war. Now, when a huge part of the Balkan Peninsula is in ruins and the rest of its peoples remain under heavy Austro-German slavery, we, the Macedonians, who have suffered more than anyone else, are calling upon all of you, Balkan peoples, to forget the disputes of the past and unite and join our pan-Balkan revolutionary programme in a joint and persistent struggle for the establishment of a Balkan Federal Democratic Republic.

The Programme was presented in 11 explicit items:

1. All the Balkan peoples are bound to overthrow the existing dynasties and introduce a republican form of government.
2. Every Balkan republic should be fully independent in its internal life.
3. All the Balkan republics will constitute a general Balkan Federal Democratic Republic.
4. The Balkan Federal Democratic Republic will consist of the following republics: Macedonia, Albania, Montenegro, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovenia and Thrace.
5. Not only ethnically homogeneous states are recognized as independent republics in the Balkans, but also those regions with mixed populations, whose vital interests are closely connected with the geographical, historical, political, cultural and economic conditions.
6. Autonomous districts and municipalities can be established in the republics with mixed populations, where every nationality will enjoy full freedom of its native tongue, faith and customs.
7. The official language of each republic will be the language of the majority.
8. Each individual republic will send its own authorized representatives to the general Federal Parliament of the Balkan Federal Democratic Republic.
9. A Federal Government and a Council which stands in the stead of the President of the Federal Republic will be formed from among the authorized representatives.
10. The Federal Government and the Council will be composed of an equal number of persons from each federate republic.
11. The Federal Government and the Council will control all general federal internal and foreign international affairs of the Balkan Republic.

This Programme was a genuine expression of the legitimate aspirations of the Macedonian people and of their traditional concept of the liberation struggle, best represented, at that period, by the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in Petrograd. The progressive movement among the Macedonians between the two world wars grew as a natural continuation of this concept that was to reach its peak in the Second Ilinden, in 1944.

The Affirmation of the National Identity of Macedonia and the Securing of its Territorial Integrity (1912-1913)

The Macedonian liberation movement started as *цугуѓаланд национал* (from the 1840s onwards), continued as *националанд револуционару* (1876-1892), evolved into *политицаланд револуционару* (1893-1903) and affirmed itself as a *националанд политицал* movement in the period between the two Ilinden landmarks (1903-1944). During these extremely important years, however, the continuity of development and affirmation of the Macedonian national idea and action was never interrupted, even though this was a crucial and dramatic period for the Balkans and a time full of arduous and convulsive processes. Indeed, mutually opposing ideas and actions by foreign actors in Macedonian developments frequently came to the surface, in particular after the violent clashes between the organized neighbouring propaganda machines with clearly defined platforms of aggressive aspirations towards the European territories of feudal Turkey, but this was also the result of the unique evolution of the Macedonian people in the mediaeval period and the geopolitical position of Macedonia in the years when most of the Balkan nations and nation-states were established. The study of the historical truth about Macedonia and the Macedonians as a distinct entity has begun only in recent times, in circumstances of still vigorous throwbacks to the former greater-state mythologies, adapted to the new historical conditions and modern methods in the Balkan environment.

1.

Despite its being understood in different ways in different periods of the Macedonian liberation movement, **autonomy** was not accepted as mere tactic,⁶⁶⁵ but as a permanent programmatic principle to preserve the independence and integrity of Macedonia, and later also to unite the already divided Macedonian people. Hence it was not surprising that the Macedonians so tenaciously insisted (starting from

⁶⁶⁵The attempts at presenting it in this way reflect a recognizable tendency: Ди мит њр Г. Гочев, *Идеят а за авт ономи я кат о т акт и ка в њроѓамит е на наци онално-освободит елнот о дџи жени е в Македони я и Одринско (1893-1941)*, София, 1983.

the 1880s) on obtaining autonomy within a wider community of peoples,⁶⁶⁶ as a federation⁶⁶⁷ or confederation,⁶⁶⁸ within the boundaries of Turkey or of an Eastern community, or within a Balkan,⁶⁶⁹ South-Slav⁶⁷⁰ or Yugoslav⁶⁷¹ framework. This was the imperative for the Macedonians dictated by the history, geography, ethnography and politics of this part of the Balkans. Until the Balkan Wars it was a means of neutralizing the danger of partition by its neighbours, and later was the only possibility for the liberation and unification of the dismembered people. It was these same circumstances and external factors that contributed to the Macedonians joining the Yugoslav federation following their struggle for liberation in the Second World War.⁶⁷²

In seeking a solution, especially in the period between the two world wars, there were even concepts for the autonomy and independence of Macedonia as a buffer state with the purpose of neutralizing revanchism and maintaining peace in the Balkans,⁶⁷³ but it soon became clear that the Macedonians were not the Swiss and that the internal federation of its “nationalities”⁶⁷⁴ guaranteed no good pros-

⁶⁶⁶Spiri o Gul abčev, *Един оглед по етнографијата на Македонија*, Сабр ово, 1887, 32-111.

⁶⁶⁷D-r Dančo Zograf ski, *Одбрани дела*, 6. *Македонскот оѓрашање и историските раслика*, Скопје, 1986, 105-127; D-r Orde Ivanoski, *Балкански етнологијски и македонскот оѓрашање од 90-тите години на XIX век до создавањето на Третата интернационала*, Скопје, 1970, 126-147; D-r Manol Pandevski, *Политичките партии и организациите во Македонија (1908-1912)*, Скопје, 1965, 135-152; Aleksandar Hristov, *Создавање на македонската држава 1878-1978. Националноослободителното движење и барање облик за конституирање на Македонија како национална држава*, I, Скопје, 1985, 252-270 and 340-354; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940) и Македонскот научно-литературно друштво во Пет разглед. Прилози кон истражувањето на македонско-руските верски и развитако на македонската национална мисла*, II, Скопје, 1978, 252-270.

⁶⁶⁸Hristo Andonov-Poljanski, *Одбрани дела*, 3. *Македонскот оѓрашање*, Скопје, 1981, 190-207; *Свобода*, I, 83, Sofi do, 12.II.1887, 1-2; II, 116, 13.I.1888, 3; II, 118, 20.I.1888, 3-4; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската национала*, II, Скопје, 1983, 73-144.

⁶⁶⁹D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската национала*, II, 101-138; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940)...*, II, 252-270 and 319-330; D-r Mihajlo Minoski, *Federativnata ideja vo makedonskata politička misla (1887-1919)*, Скопје, 1985, 21-277.

⁶⁷⁰D-r Mihajlo Minoski, *op. cit.*, 279-295; Aleksandar Hristov, *op. cit.*, II, 81-92.

⁶⁷¹D-r Mihajlo Minoski, *op. cit.*, 301-305; Ivan Katarhiev, *Поврвците на македонската историја*, Скопје, 1986, 242; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската национала*, II, 537-541; Aleksandar Hristov, *op. cit.*, II, 93-104.

⁶⁷²Blazhe Ristovski, „Diskusija“, in: *ACHOM vo создавањето на државата на македонскиот народ*, MANU, Скопје, 1987, 442-454.

⁶⁷³This concept was advocated by the revolutionary organizations not only prior to the First World War, but also between the two world wars and was supported even by Krste Misirkov in some of his articles [D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Krste P. Misirkov (1874-1926). Pri loz kon istražuvanje o na razvitaokot na makedonskata nacionalna misla*, Скопје, 1966, 610].

⁶⁷⁴Even Sandanski's federalist concept following the Young Turk Revolution and that of the “federalists” of the 1920s did not envisage a distinct Macedonian people, a distinct Macedonian nation, but

pects for either Macedonia or the Balkans. As a result, following Macedonia's partition, the Macedonian liberation movement swiftly oriented itself towards the progressive forces in the world and looked for the solution to the historical reality in concepts proposing a federation of Balkan states and peoples — with Macedonia as an equal member.⁶⁷⁵

The Macedonian revolution in the Ilinden period was characterized by two essential components, inseparable and compatible in their parallelism, but sometimes confronted from outside. There is no doubt that the unmistakable mass character of the **armed revolutionary component** with politically clear aspirations towards securing a state-constitutional affirmation for Macedonia bore the legitimacy of a struggle for freedom.⁶⁷⁶ Yet the absence of a publicly defined national, and not only political, platform,⁶⁷⁷ the incorporation of the Adrianople region within the Organization's territory,⁶⁷⁸ and the acceptance of occasional and conditional support mainly from one of the interested parties,⁶⁷⁹ resulted in the Macedonian Revolutionary Organization making certain compromises and creating an impression before the largely uninformed world as if it wanted to build its own state — with an alien people! The genuine endeavours of the organization to present its independence and 'internal nature' were more or less successfully exploited and used by the interested external actors. Precisely because of the vague national programme of the revolutionary movement, the Ilinden Uprising was used by those actors, even though the uprising was a historic popular achievement, as

manipulated with representatives of the neighbouring nations in Macedonia and sought a solution by means of a kind of cantonal constitutional system after the example of Switzerland.

⁶⁷⁵This option was embraced even by the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (IMRO, VMRO) of Aleksandrov, Protogerov and Čaulev, resulting in the May Manifesto [I van Kat ar xi ev, *ој. цѝт.*, 229-257; I van Kat ar xi ev, *Борба до љобѝда, 2. Време на згењѝе. Македонскот о наѝи онално љрашање међу двет е свѝт ски војни (1919-1930)*, II, Skopje, 1983, 240-307].

⁶⁷⁶Hr i st o Andonov-P ol janski , *Ил i нденскот о вост ани е i међународнат а јавност* , Skopje, 1985, 46-49; Dop. ѝл еn d-r Manol D. P andevski , *Ил i нденскот о вост ани е 1903*, Skopje, 1978; D-r Bl аже Ri st ovski , *Македонски от фолклор i наѝи оналната свѝст* , I, Skopje, 1987, 171-348.

⁶⁷⁷K.P . Mi si r kovъ , *За македонѝи t e работ i* , Sof i ѝ , 1903, 1-44 etc.

⁶⁷⁸S i мѝон Radev, *Ранни сѝомен i* , Sof i ѝ , 1967, 266-267. The Adrianople region was included because the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Exarchate encompassed the territories of Macedonia and the Adrianople region, and the Exarchate's entire activity was concentrated in these two regions of Turkey. Most of the more prominent activists of the Secret Macedonian-Adrianople Revolutionary Organization (TMORO) were officials of the Exarchate and worked in these two regions. This already had a tradition of three decades. Present-day Kosovo was not under the jurisdiction of the Exarchate.

⁶⁷⁹In this respect, it was not without significance that the 'Exarchists' formed the core of the Revolution, that the seat of the Organization's representative office was in Sofia and that all the information going out to the world passed through the Bulgarian capital, transmitted chiefly via the Bulgarian news agency and the Bulgarian press, while in Macedonia very often it was the Bulgarian church authorities and 'trade agencies' that carried the Organization's mail and communications. The 'support' of some Bulgarian governments and parties was also no secret.

Misirkov lucidly assessed it only shortly afterwards.⁶⁸⁰ Hence, the Young Turk Revolution, carried out basically as an anti-Macedonian act,⁶⁸¹ was fully used by the propaganda of the surrounding countries for legalizing their activities and for the final partition of Macedonia, first into spheres of influence, and then of its territory and people, which greatly encouraged the aggressive policy of the Balkan monarchies in the ensuing wars.⁶⁸²

The other component of the Macedonian revolution was the **authentic Macedonian national movement** which had deep roots⁶⁸³ in the ethno-cultural traditions and endeavours of the past. Adapting itself to the contemporary circumstances and possibilities, it defined the programme principles which were finally to bring national freedom. The foundation of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg,⁶⁸⁴ as the principal core guiding this movement,⁶⁸⁵ was not the work of a single man or of a group of Macedonian intellectuals, but the expression of an ideology which already had its own historical heritage, deeply rooted in Macedonia itself, and also supporters and followers within the Revolutionary Organization itself. According to its goals and tasks, and also its composition and activity, the Society was neither a simple student organization nor an isolated circle, but a general Macedonian popular, national, political, scholarly and cultural association. It developed along a road starting from Macedonia and going via Sofia and Belgrade to St Petersburg, and maintained regular contacts and coordinated its activities with the organized centres within Macedonia and abroad. At that time it indeed played the role of a central Macedonian association (*Matiца Македонска*) and it was no chance that it produced the first complete and detailed Macedonian national liberation programme (1902), the first book in the modern Macedonian literary language and orthography (*За македонските работи*, 1903), the first public introduction of this language and orthography into official use (Article 12 of the 1903 Constitution), the first textbooks for the envisaged Macedonian

⁶⁸⁰К.Р. Ми с и р ковъ, *оп. џт.*, 76.

⁶⁸¹Regardless of whether the expectations from the agreement between the sovereigns of Russia and Great Britain in Reval on the autonomy of Macedonia were realistic (and if so, to what degree), the Young Turk Revolution started earlier than envisaged, and in Macedonia at that, because the integrity of the whole Empire was endangered by the possible action of the great powers which might have involved, even temporarily, some kind of autonomy for this Turkish province.

⁶⁸²D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми с и р ков (1874-1926)...*, 467-489.

⁶⁸³D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Македонски от народ и македонската а наџ ја*, I, 119-602.

⁶⁸⁴D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуџ овски (1878-1940)...*, I, 130-179.

⁶⁸⁵A Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society was also founded in Sofia, in December 1903 [D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Krst e П. Ми с и р ков (1874-1926)...*, 298]. The following year Nikola Ničota made a similar attempt in Moscow [D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Ди ми т ри ја Чуџ овски (1878-1940)...*, I, 272-277], and in 1905, Krste Misirkov prepared the ground for the foundation of a similar society in Odessa as well (D-г Вл а же Ри ст овски , *Македонски от народ и македонската а наџ ја*, I, 383).

schools (1903-1905), the first journal in the modern Macedonian literary language and orthography (*Barðar*, 1905), the first map of Macedonia (within its ethnic borders) using the Macedonian language (1913), the first journal (in Russian) with a clearly defined Macedonian national programme [*Македонски Глас* (*Македонски Глас*), 1913-1914], the first special publications defending the Macedonian cause in the most critical historical moment, at the time of the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), and the first complete federal programme with modern concepts concerning the prospects of the Balkans (1917). All these achievements have secured this Society a special place in the history of the liberation cause of the Macedonian people, as an integral part of the Macedonian revolution.

2.

Bearing in mind all the manifestations of Macedonian national consciousness and the concepts of the Macedonian liberation idea in the period up to the Balkan Wars, we can conclude that the Slavic population of Macedonia was neither “ethnically heterogeneous” nor an “amorphous mass” which could be moulded according to the wishes of the conquerors, but a people with an already defined individuality, aware of its history and culture, and also determined to fight for its future. Accordingly, it was not and could not be a mere object, but aimed to act as a subject in the historical moments of Balkan history.

Thus, when rumours started spreading in the European public of new accords signed between the Balkan monarchies for war against Turkey, when the Kingdom of Serbia once again took the initiative in acquiring and dividing the Sultan’s ‘legacy’, and Bulgaria concluded that it had no chances of wresting the whole of Macedonia, the Macedonians saw the danger of partition and took steps to thwart these serious threats. It was not by chance that the “Russian Party”⁶⁸⁶ appeared in the Bitola region as early as 1910, and at the same period demands could be heard for the return of Metropolitan Teodosija Gologanov to Skopje, where he planned, together with Krste Misirkov and Petar Poparsov, to found the first Higher Teachers’ Training College in Macedonia.⁶⁸⁷ At the same time, the experienced activist Marko A. Muševič arrived in St Petersburg with a memorandum to the Russian government and the Holy Synod of the Russian Church demanding the

⁶⁸⁶D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Krst e П. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)*..., 465-466.

⁶⁸⁷D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Македонски от народ и македонската нација*, I, 596-602; D-r Slavko Dimovski , „Pri sustvoto na Teodosij Gologanov vo razvojt na makedonskata naci onalna mislavo epohata na naci onalno-revolucioner notodvi žewe“, *Гласник*, I NI , HH, 2, Skopje, 1976, 101-103.

establishment of a vocational school in the Macedonian language with a boarding house in the Žitoje Monastery, to produce trained staff for the future schools of Macedonia.⁶⁸⁸ It was quite natural that the memorandum was accompanied by Nace Dimov's signature and a conceptual programme which was in total contrast to the actions "of the political hacks in Sofia and Belgrade".⁶⁸⁹ We still do not know the details of Dimitrija Čupovski's mission to Macedonia in 1911,⁶⁹⁰ when he had important contacts with people sharing the same ideas and fighting for the same cause in connection with the dangers posed by the haggling policies of the neighbouring monarchies.

When it became obvious that war in the Balkans was imminent, an important letter arrived in St Petersburg (written in Bitola on August 15, 1912, long before the declaration of the First Balkan War), in which this national centre, continuously active from the 1890s onwards, defined, in seven points, the ways and means for the preservation of the integrity and the affirmation of the legitimate aims of the Macedonian people.⁶⁹¹

This letter, published in *Гражданин* of November 16, 1912, fully corresponded with the endeavours of the founders of the Ss Cyril and Methodius Slavonic-Macedonian National and Educational Society in St Petersburg, whose Constitution of June 27, 1912, codified the national programme of the Society in the new circumstances.⁶⁹² The founders aimed to secure the necessary legitimacy for themselves before the Russian authorities so that they could competently and responsibly represent Macedonian interests in the expected turmoil in the Balkans. The Society aimed "to help the spiritual rebirth and unification of the Macedonian Slavs and their free national-popular self-determination," acting "in the territories of the Russian Empire and Macedonia". The following activities were planned for the attainment of these goals:

- (a) to organize meetings, speeches, readings, addresses, public lectures, performances, concerts and literary evenings;
- (b) to collect and study the historical monuments and indigenous characteristics of the Macedonian Slavs;
- (c) to organize publishing houses and open libraries and reading rooms, in accordance with Article 175 of the Stat. on Cens. and Print., item XIV of the Code of Laws, to publish a periodical printed mouthpiece of its own, to organize

⁶⁸⁸Centralni i Gosudarstvenni i storicheski arhivi, S.-Peterburg (henceforth CGI A), f. 796, op. 191, ed. hr. 157, ot d. ř I, st. 1, l. 4; f. 797, op. 96, d. 250, ll. 1-5.

⁶⁸⁹CGI A, f. 797, op. 96, d. 250, ll. 1-5.

⁶⁹⁰*Сербо-българският споръ за обладание Македонией*, Petrogradъ, 1915, 112.

⁶⁹¹*Гражданинъ*, ž. 37, S.-Peterburgъ, 16.II.1912, 5.

⁶⁹²D-r Blazevič, *Dimitrija Čupovski (1878-1940)*..., II, 8-16.

competitions for the best scholarly and specialist works on the Macedonian question and to give awards and prizes to their authors;

(d) to assist the training and education of its compatriots in a genuine national spirit, offering them material and moral support;

(e) to open schools and reconstruct the destroyed Orthodox churches and monasteries in Macedonia;

(f) to support and develop mutual relations with all Slavonic societies and also with individual Slavonic scholars and social activists;

(g) to institute scholarships for children and orphans in various schooling institutions.⁶⁹³

Stressing that “regular members can be exclusively Slavonic-Macedonian men, Slavonic-Macedonian women and also the wives of Macedonians who agree with the specified basic provisions of this Constitution and who are prepared to help their implementation”, it expressly forbids: “*Македоніан мен анд Македоніан њомен оф Сивониц десцент њхо до нот љрофсс тхе дистинцт националунити оф тхе Македоніан Сивс, бут цам тхем селвес Сербс, Булѡarians or Греекс, цаннот бе реѡулар мембѡers оф тхе Соцјѡety.*”⁶⁹⁴ In addition, Article 31 is specific: “The Slavonic-Macedonian language is considered the spoken and written language among the members of the Society. For the purposes of spreading the idea of solidarity and spiritual unification of all Slavs, regardless of faith and nationality (Russians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, Bulgarians, Croats, Slovenes, etc.), the Slavonic-Macedonian Society will use, in its relations with other organizations and individual persons from Slavic countries, the *ѡан-Сивониц Руссиан ланѡуаѡе*; the documentation of the Society’s Administration will be kept *ин тхе Руссиан ланѡуаѡе анд ин Сивониц-Македоніан.*”⁶⁹⁵

At the moment when Russia was the catalyst of the Balkan Alliance against Turkey, the responsible authorities refused to register this society, because its aims and tasks ran contrary to the aims and tasks of the Alliance. The legitimate goals of the Macedonians were not permitted to reach the Russian and international public.

3.

Prominent representatives of the Society, even as members of the Macedonian Colony in the Russian capital, used the various ‘Slavic lunches’ on Mondays and Thursdays as opportunities to promulgate their views, inform the public on the

⁶⁹³ *Ibid.*, 8-10.

⁶⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁶⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 15.

situation in Macedonia and the Balkans, and to prevent the partition of their homeland.⁶⁹⁶ Thus, in early September 1912, the Macedonians declared:

Yes, the situation is critical: there is a smell of death in Macedonia... The victory of the Slavic alliance, if achieved, *is absolutely undesirable from a Slavic point of view*, as this will be a *requiem for the descendants of Cyril and Methodius*: Macedonia will be divided into three parts, there will be a temporary triumph over its body, but no one will be satisfied: a fight will unavoidably break out among those who dismembered it and there will be no bright day for the Slavs. *If Russia gives support to the Slavic alliance, which is hardly likely, then the outcome will inevitably be a European war and the partition of Macedonia.*⁶⁹⁷

This prediction was not taken seriously as a warning by the rapturous Slavophile circles in Russia, not even by the responsible Russian political circles. Dimitrija Čupovski, Nace Dimov, Dr Gavril Konstantinovič and other Macedonian activists were extremely worried and visited various Russian editorial offices and societies; they spoke and wrote about it, but the war in the Balkans broke out and the partition of Macedonia seemed inevitable. What was important at that moment was to act in the field, inside Macedonia, to organize internal resistance against the aggressors and provide popular representation prior to the anticipated peace conference. Therefore, Dr Konstantinovič enlisted as a volunteer in the Balkans, but he was sent to Montenegro as a physician.⁶⁹⁸ Krste Misirkov left for southern Macedonia in the capacity of a Russian military correspondent from Odessa.⁶⁹⁹ Nace Dimov went to Sofia to animate the Macedonian émigré circles,⁷⁰⁰ and his brother, Dimitrija Čupovski, travelled through Sofia and Skopje to Veles, where he arrived on November 21 (December 4), 1912. On the same day, in Angele Korobar's home, a general Macedonian conference was held with the participation of prominent Macedonian activists from all over the land to reach agreement on the necessary actions to be taken after the occupation by the various armies, and also on the sending of a Macedonian delegation to the London Peace Conference. In spite of the insistence of Petar Poparsov, Rizo Rizov, Alekso Martulkov, Angele Korobar and others, they were unable to adopt a joint resolution. It was decided, however, that Rizov should go to Salonika and then to Bitola, to meet their

⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 26-142.

⁶⁹⁷ *Ггаждани нъ*, ž 37, 16.IH.1912, 3-4.

⁶⁹⁸ Dančo Zografski, „Razvojni ot pat na Makedonecot d-r Gavri lo Konstanti novi K vo Okt omvri skata revolucija (Prilog kon proučuvaweto dejnosta na makedonskite progresi vni emigranti vo mīnatoto)“, *Glasni k na IHHI*, I, 2, 1957, 21; Central Ani à Gosudarstvenni à Voennno-i stor i česki à Arhi v, Moskva, f . 316, op. 66, d. 1239.

⁶⁹⁹ D-r Bl aže Ri stovski , *Krst e II. Mi si rkov (1874-1926)*..., 495-497.

⁷⁰⁰ According to the testimony of Marija Konstantinova, daughter of Nikola D. Čuparov, from Sofia.

adherents and act in favour of Macedonia's autonomy at the Peace Conference in London. Yet in Salonika he was strongly threatened by the Bulgarian emissaries that tongues would be cut and heads would roll for uttering the word *аутоному*.⁷⁰¹ Jane Sandanski heard the same language at the banquet of General Todorov in Salonika, when he drank a toast to the future autonomous Macedonia.⁷⁰² The old teacher and revolutionary Anton Keckarov from Ohrid had the same experience when he wrote in a letter to Sofia that autonomy should be granted to Macedonia, "and they answered him saying that he should never mention such a thing again, because he would be expelled and incarcerated in Kurt-Bunar. And therefore everyone kept a low profile, as it was war and everything was being done by force."⁷⁰³

At about the same time, the distinguished Russian politician, statesman and professor, Pavel N. Milyukov, who was already familiar with Macedonian matters, arrived in Salonika. In a comparatively long article in his newspaper *РЮ*, he writes that in December 1912 prominent Macedonian activists in Salonika handed "the first written protests" to the Bulgarian tsar and the heir to the throne, in which they demanded "a single autonomous Macedonia". Milyukov points out that they still did not know the agreement on Macedonia's partition — "or they officially ignore it". "For the people who have fought all their life for the Macedonian idea, it was obviously psychologically impossible in an instant to bow down before the accomplished fact and admit that their ideas were finally made null and void and consigned to the archives."⁷⁰⁴

All these reactions by the Macedonians confirm that there was resistance inside Macedonia as well against the aggressive appetites of its neighbours, but that the real power was on the side of the occupiers.

4.

All that Dimitrija Čupovski could bring from the conference in Veles was an **authorization** to represent Macedonia's interests before Europe through the activity of the Macedonian Colony in St Petersburg. As early as January 27, 1913, Čupovski published an article in the newspaper *Гражданин* in the form of a letter from Macedonia, where, after describing the history of Macedonia, its struggle

⁷⁰¹Д-р Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Ди ми т ри ја Чууповски (1878-1940)...*, II, 40-67.

⁷⁰²*Доброволец*, I, 11, Соф и ђ, 15.ї II.1945.

⁷⁰³*Македонско ѕъзнани е*, I, 8, Ви ена, 16.її .1924.

⁷⁰⁴*Ръчь*, ж 26, S.-P et er bur гъ. 27.I/9.II.1913, 2.

for freedom and the situation following the incursion of the Balkan armies, he wrote:

Now, when the action for Macedonia's liberation has been completed, i.e. the Turkish authorities have been driven away, and the allies have instituted their own occupation authorities instead, now the prospects for Macedonia's future seem even gloomier and sadder than before. From the attitude of the occupation authorities towards the Macedonian population it is clear that Macedonia's former slavery has been replaced by an even worse one, not only political, but also spiritual, and furthermore, a triple one. In the territories of Macedonia seized by the allies the situation has become unbearably difficult. Even before peace with Turkey is concluded, the occupation authorities are using draconian measures to deny the population their nationality, their name and their vows, in the name of which this people has fought for freedom.

To prevent information reaching the independent European press about the violence currently aimed against the Macedonian people, which may give rise to public protests against the purported liberators, the occupation authorities, have resorted to measures hitherto unknown in history: the entire population is condemned to internment and has no rights to travel not only outside the borders of Macedonia but also from town to town. Macedonian detachment heads – the commanders – and the fighters themselves, who until yesterday fought shoulder to shoulder with the allies against the common enemy, have now become the object of persecution by these same occupation authorities. For a single word uttered to anyone in favour of Macedonia's indivisibility and its political freedom, they are subjected to horrible persecution, torture and murder. All this is supported by hundreds of facts, many of which have been reported by correspondents of Russian and especially foreign newspapers.⁷⁰⁵

The eyewitness Čupovski also wrote about the relations between the conquerors themselves and forecast the likeliness of a mutual war:

Matters between the allied occupation armies do not stand any better either. There have already been open clashes between the Bulgarians and Greeks concerning the cities of Salonika, Drama, Kavalla and other populated centres in Macedonia. The same has been happening between the Bulgarians and Serbs concerning Bitola, Ohrid, Prilep, Veles and other towns. All that makes the allies hold back from mutual war is the conclusion of peace with Turkey. Therefore, in order to avoid these sad consequences which may discredit the best motives of the participants in the war, the Balkan allies should give Macedonia the right to self-determination; frustrating, in this way, any further mutual rivalry, they should be able to create solid and sound foundations for the continuous existence of the alliance. Internal Slavic discord is more dangerous for the Balkan states than the schemes of their numerous external enemies. Slavery under a kindred brother will for Macedonia be as difficult as slavery under an alien or people of another faith.⁷⁰⁶

⁷⁰⁵ *Ггаждани нъ*, ž 4, 27.I.1913, 14.

⁷⁰⁶ *Id.*

5.

The Macedonian activist Georgij A. Georgov (Stremjage) also used the pages of the Slavophile mouthpiece *Славянскія Известія* and in two articles (of February 3 and March 3, 1913) expounded the Macedonian position on Macedonia and the Macedonians, their aspirations and aims, and the situation following the Balkan War. In his article ‘A Dangerous Experiment’, its author warns that European and Balkan diplomacy have been preoccupied solely with the question of providing independence for Albania, but have forgotten the burning and “incomparably more important ethnographic, geographical, historical and political factor on the Balkan Peninsula — Macedonia and the Macedonians”. Even “the allies, intoxicated by success beyond their expectations, as can be seen from their entire activity, have rejected any thought of Macedonia’s autonomy and intend not only to amputate it as a living organism, but also to fully divide it among themselves, completely forgetting that, by carrying out such operations on geographical Macedonia, on its territory, this would in no way imply the killing and dividing of its soul — ethnographic Macedonia...”⁷⁰⁷

As the Bulgarophile editors and associates of *Славянскія Известія* reacted sharply against these views,⁷⁰⁸ Georgov published another article, ‘On Macedonia and the Macedonians’, in which he declared that “the Macedonians do not want and cannot be reconciled with any division”. He examined the history of the various propagandas in Macedonia and underlined that “the autonomy of Macedonia — this is the best and most equitable way of settling the Macedonian question, this is the common groundwork under the state buildings of Serbia and Bulgaria, the undermining of which will be equally dangerous for the independent political life of both Serbia and Bulgaria, and for all the Balkan peoples in general. We can sincerely welcome the ‘ninth great state’ only in the form of a ‘Balkan federation of the states of Bulgaria, Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Greece and Albania’, or at least of the first four, with joint, federal representative bodies, customs and railway tariffs and perhaps a monetary system and armed forces.”⁷⁰⁹

On March 4, 1913, in the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society, Nace D. Dimov held his lecture entitled ‘Macedonia in the Past, the Present and the Future’, later printed as a special publication, where the author demanded: “(1) The allies

⁷⁰⁷ *Славянскія Известія*, ж. 12(5), С.-Петербургъ, 3.ІІ.1913, 175-177.

⁷⁰⁸ N.E. Matvǎevъ, „Avтonomiâ Makedoniâ“, *Славянскія Известія*, ж. 13(6), 10.ІІ.1913, 200-201; N.I. Suripъ, „Avтonomiâ na Bal kanahъ“, *Славянскія Известія*, ж. 16(9), 3.ІІІ.1913, 261.

⁷⁰⁹ *Славянскія Известія*, ж. 16(9), 3.ІІІ.1913, 257-260.

should put a stop to their intense ambitions towards the Macedonian people; (2) Macedonia should remain a whole and indivisible Slavic unit; (3) Macedonia should participate in the Balkan Alliance as an independent Balkan state.”⁷¹⁰

6.

On March 1, 1913, the authorized representatives of the Macedonian Colony in St Petersburg, Dr Gavril Konstantinovič, Dimitrija Čupovski, Nace Dimov and Aleksandar Vezenkov, signed (in French and Russian) the Memorandum on the Independence of Macedonia, submitted by the Macedonian Colony in St Petersburg to the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, and to the ambassadors of the great powers to the Court in London, which was separately printed in Russian and French and published in whole or in part in a large number of Russian and other European newspapers. This was the first official action of the “authorized Macedonians” before the international public. After describing the struggle of the Macedonians for freedom and a state of their own, putting emphasis on the participation of the Macedonians in the First Balkan War as an equal side in the military actions, the document said:

The partition of Macedonia by its brothers is the most unjust act in the history of peoples, a violation of the rights of Man, a disgrace for the entire Slavdom. Turkish slavery is replaced by a Christian one, but that crucial hour is not far (it is approaching – Macedonian fighters have already confronted the enemies of their fatherland) when the Macedonians will openly say to the whole world: “We shall rather die for our freedom than live under slavery again.”

Therefore the following is demanded strongly:

(1) Macedonia within its geographical, ethnographic, economic and cultural borders to remain a single, indivisible, independent Balkan state; (2) In the shortest possible time, on the basis of a general vote, to convene a Macedonian National Assembly in Salonika for the purposes of detailed elaboration of the state’s internal organization and definition of relations with neighbouring countries.⁷¹¹

At the same time Dimitrija Čupovski prepared and published (in colour) a ‘Map of Macedonia according to the Programme of the Macedonian Populists’⁷¹² which was printed in the Macedonian language towards the end of March, and was

⁷¹⁰Вl аже Rl st ovski , *Haце Д. Дl мов (1876-1916)*, Skopje, 1973, 78.

⁷¹¹*Македонскiй гoлoсѣ (Македонскi глас)*, I, 1, S.-P et er bur гѣ, 9.ѣ I.1913, 23; *Рѣчь*, ѣ 66, 12/25.III.1913, 3.

⁷¹²D-г Bл аже Rl st ovski , *Дl мl t r i ja Чyпoвскl (1878-1940)...*, II, 271-283.

immediately sent, together with the Memorandum, to London — to the representatives of the great powers and Balkan states, as well as to the Russian press. They also announced in the press that the mouthpiece of the Macedonian Colony, *Македонскиј Глас*, would soon start publication.⁷¹³ In April 1913, the journal *Весь Мир*, under a photograph displaying Dr Konstantinovič, Dimov and Čupovski, announced that Čupovski would “personally go to Paris and London to propagate the independence of Macedonia”.⁷¹⁴ Yet this important task approved at the Veles conference was not accomplished, as Petar Poparsov was expelled by the Serbian military authorities and could not reach St Petersburg, whence both of them were to set off for the European centres as agreed.⁷¹⁵

7.

As the permit for the printing of their mouthpiece had still not been issued, the Macedonian Colony made efforts to use the pages of the Russian press to present Macedonian views. For instance, Dimitrija Čupovski, among others, published his article, ‘The Macedonian State’, in which he pointed out that the thinking in the Memorandum of the Macedonians “is the thinking of the entire Macedonian people”, that “Macedonia, however, from both historical and ethnographic points of view, represents a single entity and cannot willingly end its existence of many centuries, agreeing to dismemberment”, and that “the Balkan Peninsula is too small for several greater-state ideas to coexist peacefully. Only a federal state, consisting of all the Balkan peoples, which must include a Macedonia indivisible and independent as to its internal affairs, enjoying equal rights — only such a federation can secure peaceful coexistence and progress for the Balkan peoples. We believe,” concluded Čupovski, “that this will take place, but... it will be painful if they come to this conviction only by shedding new blood!...”⁷¹⁶

In his article ‘Mother and Stepmother...’, Čupovski used the anecdote of the judgement of Solomon and stressed that in Macedonia “the living body of a whole people is being cut into three or perhaps four parts”, and strongly condemned the Bulgarian government “which, obscuring and destroying for 35 years the national autochthonous spirit of the Macedonian people, and imposing an alien culture upon it, has now betrayed it and subjected it to dismemberment”.

⁷¹³*Славяни нъ*, I, 13, S.-P et er bur гъ, 28.III.1913, 6; I, 24, 12.ř .1913, 6.

⁷¹⁴*Весь Миръ*, ž 16, S.-P et er bur гъ, Apr õl Å1913, 5.

⁷¹⁵D-г Вl аже Ri stovski , *Македонски лет оиј s...*, I, 299.

⁷¹⁶*Славяни нъ*, I, 18, 21.Iř .1913, 3.

Responding to the Belgrade Professor Aleksandar Belić (who was in the Russian capital on a special mission for the Serbian government), in his article ‘Macedonia and Serbia’, Čupovski pointed out that “an independent Macedonia should be established, which would not be an artificially created state, because there are no Serbs, Bulgarians or Greeks in Macedonia, but a fully distinct people”, and because “[n]o agreements among the allies on the partition of Macedonia in this or that part can be binding upon the Macedonians, as Macedonia represents a single living body which cannot be amputated without resistance by the body itself...” The solution Čupovski proposed once again was the following: “If the allies do not wish a new and stronger conflagration to break out in the Balkans, if they do not wish a mutual fratricidal and bloody war, which is — unfortunately — very close indeed, if they do not wish to become, one by one, Austria’s booty — there is only one solution: an indivisible, independent Macedonia should join, with rights equal to those of the other states, the powerful Balkan federation.”⁷¹⁷

There were numerous appeals like this in the press and at the various public meetings in St Petersburg. The Macedonians and Russians also announced a joint “illustrated collection of articles” entitled *Иллюстрация оѢМакедония* in order “to demonstrate the necessity of establishing an indivisible and independent Macedonia, from both Macedonian and Russian points of view”.⁷¹⁸ In the meantime the permit for the publication of the journal *Македонскиј Глас* (*Македонски Глас*) was issued. Over a period of a year and a half, it became the most prominent and at that moment the only voice of the Macedonian people before Europe. Today it is regarded as a highly important collection of documents testifying to the true aspirations of the Macedonians at the crucial historical moment of the partition of their homeland.

The members of the Colony (Society) were not only the loudest and most prominent defenders of the integrity and advocates of the legitimate demands of the Macedonian people, but they also delivered their own lectures at meetings of distinguished societies in the Russian capital which aroused great interest. In May 1913, for instance, Dimitrija Čupovski delivered a notable lecture in the Lawyers’ Society with the unambiguous title ‘The indivisible and independent Macedonia’.⁷¹⁹

What makes a particular impression is the fact that the Macedonians at that moment had Russian public opinion on their side, resulting in the adoption of numerous resolutions in favour of Macedonian rights and freedoms and on the

⁷¹⁷*Славяни нъ*, I, 20, 28.лф .1913, 3.

⁷¹⁸*Славяни нъ*, I, 26, 19.лф .1913, 7.

⁷¹⁹*Славяни нъ*, I, 22, 5.лф .1913, 7.

future of Macedonia. Russian Social-Democrats were particularly active in this respect at the time, putting a strong emphasis on the aggressive character of the Balkan War and demanding a plebiscite in Macedonia.⁷²⁰

8.

On June 7, 1913, the “authorized persons” of the Macedonian Colony in St Petersburg, Dimitrija D. Čupovski, Georgij A. Georgov, Nace D. Dimov, Dr Gavril K. Konstantinovič and Chem[ical] Eng[ineer] I. Georgov, signed the **Memorandum of the Macedonians to the Governments and Public Opinion of the Allied Balkan States**, explaining once again the Macedonian national programme at that historical moment, shortly before the outbreak of the Second Balkan War between the “allies” (for the partition of Macedonia), with an appeal “for the immediate establishment of an independent Macedonian state”, as “the partition of Macedonia will create a new dependence for us, and the slavery of our blood brothers is no substitute for freedom”. The Memorandum strongly demanded:

In the name of natural law, in the name of history and in the name of practical appropriateness, we beg you, brothers, to bear the following in mind:

(1) Macedonia is populated by a homogeneous Slavic tribe which has its own history, its own tradition, its own former statehood, its own ideals, and hence has the right to self-determination.

(2) Macedonia within its ethnic, geographical, cultural and historical borders must be an independent state with a government responsible to a National Assembly.

(3) The Macedonian state should be a separate and equal unit within the Balkan Alliance with common customs boundaries.

(4) With regard to its church, in Macedonia it is necessary to restore the ancient autocephalous Ohrid Church, which would be in canonical relations with the other Orthodox churches: the Greek, Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Romanian and Syrian-Arabic.

(5) For the purposes of detailed elaboration of the internal organization of the Macedonian state, it is necessary, as soon as possible, under the sponsorship of the great powers, to convene in the city of Salonika a national representative body (National Founding Assembly) elected by a general vote.⁷²¹

Two days later the first issue of the most significant Macedonian national liberation periodical, *Македонскиј Голос* (*Македонски Глас*), appeared. It continued to be published (with interruptions) until the start of the First World War. Its 11 numbers, on 220 pages, have left a fundamental archive of the Macedonian

⁷²⁰Лучь, ж 150 (236), S.-P et er bur гъ, 3.ř II.1913, 2.

⁷²¹Македонскиј голосъ (*Македонски глас*), I, 1, 9.ř I.1913, 19.

national consciousness and action in the struggle for the integrity and freedom of Macedonia. In its programmatic editorial, in a visionary way, the editorial board pointed to the following:

At this moment the Macedonian question is being decided and many facts indicate that its solution will be final. Whatever destiny befalls this long-suffering land: will it fall, after a slavery of five centuries, only under the authority of a kindred state, will it be torn to pieces and divided among the Balkan allies, or will it at last gain its long-awaited autonomy or independence – the aim of its perennial aspirations – in both the first and the second as well as the third case, the question will be settled and will be forgotten, if not forever, then for a long period to come, in the course of which many things will be completely changed.⁷²²

Owing to all these and other circumstances, the editors believed, “the Macedonians themselves [should] invest all their efforts in the attainment of all their expectations and hopes during the long years of slavery and oppression, which helped them preserve their national features, their Slavic individuality and integrity”, and hence they tried to acquaint the Russian public “with our land, its need, interests and aspirations”.⁷²³

9.

This was the programme of Macedonia at the crucial moment and therefore its representatives used every opportunity to present their aspirations and rights. What is particularly significant is that they were always attentively listened to and most often unreservedly supported by the Russian scholarly and social circles, but not by official Russian policies involved in the Balkan events. Let us quote as an example the marathon-long discussion in the Lawyers’ Society in St Petersburg, where on June 24 and 27 and July 2, 1913, the representatives of the Macedonians took part in a violent debate, supported by the majority of distinguished Russian figures, and even by some Russian parties. As a reaction and in response to the Bulgarian representatives at the assembly (Ljubomir Miletič, I. Georgov, etc.) and also to the Serbian ones (Đorđe A. Genčić, Đurađ I. Semiz, Jeronim P. Taburno, etc.), the Russian press quoted the words of the Macedonians: “The next speaker,” writes the newspaper *Ден*, “was the Macedonian D. Čupovski, proponent of the theory: Macedonia to the Macedonians. He spoke with bitterness about the agreement which had been a secret from the Macedonians. The Macedonians considered the war a liberating one and had never suspected that Serbia and

⁷²²*Македонскиј глас* (*Македонски глас*), I, 1, 9. јуни 1913, 2.

⁷²³*Ibid.*

Bulgaria would aspire to divide their fatherland between themselves. The speaker was convinced that every Macedonian would defend its indivisibility and persuaded the assembly that peace in the Balkans was possible only through the autonomy of Macedonia, peace which is so necessary now for all the south-Slavic states.”⁷²⁴ Čupovski underlined that “Macedonia should be, above all, autonomous and that in the given case the strengthening of the Serbs in this territory is out of the question”.⁷²⁵ Furthermore, “D.D. Čupovski strongly reproached the present Bulgarian emissaries at the assembly, Professors Miletič and Georgov, because on their tours across Europe and during their addresses they convinced the public that the Macedonians wanted to join Bulgaria, while there was nothing such there.”⁷²⁶

The participation of Nace D. Dimov at this assembly followed the same line. The Bulgarophile mouthpiece *PIU* admitted: “The fervent speech of Mr Dimov met with strong approval; he tried to prove that the only means for putting an end to the present war and for establishing a healthy peace in the Balkans — was the recognition of the autonomy of the whole, single and indivisible Macedonia. Protesting against the attempts at Macedonia’s partition, devised treacherously by the former allies, without the knowledge of the Macedonian people, Mr Dimov, Čupovski and other Macedonians strongly insisted on hearing, through a plebiscite, the Macedonian population concerning its expectations and hopes.”⁷²⁷ At the same time, “N. Dimov refuted Semiz and Bryanchaninov, who maintained that Macedonia needed no autonomy, and on the basis of scholarly facts proved its right to independent existence; he then said that if Europe wanted peace in the Balkans it was obliged to grant Macedonia autonomy; otherwise this land would be the apple of discord between the Balkan states. The speaker said that, as a convinced pacifist, he was against the war, and as a Macedonian, against the partition of Macedonia.”⁷²⁸

The discussions were so passionate that the Serbian representative Jeronim Taburno died at the assembly. He was taken out of the room, and the assembly continued its work and voted on the three proposed resolutions: one by the Council of the Lawyers’ Assembly, another by the Russian Social-Democratic Party, and the third by the Party of the Populists. After the vote, they adopted the third resolution with added elements from the first two. The six items of this resolution, among other things, pointed out that the representatives of Russian social and

⁷²⁴ *День*, ž 171, S.-P et er bur гъ, 29.ř I.1913, 3.

⁷²⁵ *Новое Время*, ž 13.396, S.-P et er bur гъ, 29.ř I/12.ř II.1913, 13.

⁷²⁶ *Македонскій гласъ* (*Македонски глас*), I, 3, 14.ř II.1913, 56.

⁷²⁷ *Ръчь*, ž 179, 4/17.ř II.1913, 2.

⁷²⁸ *Македонскій гласъ* (*Македонски глас*), I, 3, 14.ř II.1913, 56.

political thought in the St Petersburg Lawyers' Assembly found "the reason for the raging war between yesterday's allies... in the cruel acquisitive aspirations of the dynasties and ruling circles of the corresponding Balkan states and in their mutual blind struggle for hegemony"; "that both the economic and political development of the Balkan peoples can be achieved only within the framework of a democratic federation of free Balkan states, not excluding Turkey"; that they considered "as the most equitable solution to the present conflict as regards Macedonia by the granting of autonomy to the latter, with the mandatory provision of the right to cultural and national self-determination of all the nationalities populating it", where "the plebiscite on this issue, in order to be authoritative, demands, in any case, guarantees for its being freely carried out by the entire Macedonian people", and that "the armed involvement of the neighbouring states... represents international outlawry". And finally, "the policy of Russian diplomacy is condemned; for certain reasons, it failed to take appropriate measures for frustrating the fratricidal war in the Balkans".⁷²⁹

10.

The Macedonian national programme was also presented in the Russian Parliament. On June 6 (19), 1913, in his speech, the Cadet Party leader, Pavel N. Milyukov, among other things, said:

Whatever nationality lives in Macedonia, it is a single and one nationality in the territory of the whole land, and to allow the possibility of dividing this living organism into parts, spans and ells, would mean to go back to the diplomacy identified with the measures of the Congress of Vienna 100 years ago. The most natural solution would be to give Macedonia full-scale autonomy. Unfortunately such a solution is now virtually impossible. An act of violence has been carried out in accordance with the agreement of February 29, an act carried out secretly from public knowledge on both sides. We should consider this violent partition as a fact, but at least do not go any further in this direction; cutting off Macedonia's north-western corner, do not cut it into two or three parts. It is not appropriate here to dispute what the Macedonians are and who controlled Macedonia earlier or longer. Let us leave this dispute to the ethnographers, historians and philologists. For the politician this is a question which can be decided by simple consultation: what, at this moment, do the Macedonians consider themselves to be?⁷³⁰

⁷²⁹*Славяни нъ*, I, 35, 7.ř II.1913, 6.

⁷³⁰*Русское Слово*, ž 130, S.-P et er bur гъ, 7/20.ř I.1913, 3.

The representative of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, the Georgian Arkady I. Chkhenkeli, replied to this speech in the Duma, extensively quoting the Memorandum of the Macedonians of March 1. At the time when the Second Balkan War was raging in the Balkans, Chkhenkeli pointed to the agreements by which Macedonia “was already torn to pieces and divided part by part among the individual states on the Balkan Peninsula”, which “carried out aggression, and are now fighting over the booty”. He sees “only one reasonable means, which is a plebiscite of the Macedonian people, leaving to it the right to decide its destiny alone”. Speaking in favour of the demands of the Macedonians for the independence of their fatherland, as the events indicated that it was no longer “a liberation of Macedonia, but a new subjugation of these Macedonians”, Chkhenkeli stated the position of his party on this question:

Gentlemen, we have always welcomed and are now welcoming the aspirations of Macedonia towards national freedom, but we decisively reject that this freedom should be imposed upon it through the partition of its territory among the acquisitive Balkan states. We have condemned and are condemning the Balkan war which has swallowed hundreds of thousands of young lives, which has brought ruin to the broad masses of the warring states, which has given over those masses to political and economic slavery of triumphant militarism and plutocracy. We support the autonomy of Albania and Macedonia and the establishment of a single democratic federal republic, created from the association of all nations and territories on the Balkan Peninsula. This view is shared not only by the Russian socialists, but also by the socialists of the Balkan states, including those of Macedonia and Turkey. This view, as you know, has become imperative for all socialists after the magnificent assembly of the International in Basel...⁷³¹

But the Russian Balkan policy refused to listen to the wishes and aspirations of Macedonia. The Balkan aggressors were also intoxicated by their victories and elated by their defeat of the enemy. The Peace Treaty of Bucharest, August 10, 1913, put an end to the integrity and unity of Macedonia and of the Macedonian people, but not to the struggle of the Macedonians for unification and freedom. Macedonia was to become the fate of the Balkans and of Europe as well.

Even this brief journey through the testimony of history shows us that at the time of the Balkan War the Macedonian people was already a single entity with a formed historical and national consciousness. During the Ilinden period the Macedonians were able to define the main points of programme action, but they did not have the power necessary to protect their territorial integrity in the face of the allied aspirants and their military actions. The Balkan War was even at the time

⁷³¹Лучъ, з 132 (218), 11.ф 1.1913, 1-2.

assessed as aggressive in character and destructive for Macedonia and the Macedonians. This was the fateful initial step in breaking the unity of this land and its people. Not only did it bring national disaster for Macedonia, but it also turned into a dangerous detonator threatening the peace and prosperity of the Balkans and the whole of Europe.