CHAPTER TWO

Education and the Creation of National Space

ΕΛΛΗΝΕΣ ΚΑΛΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΟΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΗΣ ΗΜΕΤΕΡΑΣ ΜΕΤΕΧΟΝΤΕΣ
[ Greeks they are called those who assume our education.]
—Isocrates, Panegyricus, inscribed across the façade of Gennadius Library in Athens

The Museum of Macedonian Struggle in Salonika occupies an elegant neoclassical building that used to be the Consulate of the Hellenic Kingdom in Ottoman Selânik. The street in which the museum is located is named after Consul Koromilas, who was one of the most illustrious residents of the building and a chief facilitator of the Greek nationalist movement in Macedonia. Material and personal belongings of the heroes of the Greek struggle for Macedonia are kept and displayed here, much like relics in a shrine, as is an impressive collection of photographs from the era. Before a recent upgrade, the basement was dedicated to a permanent exhibition behind glass screens of dioramas that represented important scenes from the struggle. The combination of dimmed lights and the musty smell in the hall gave the place an eerie and bizarre feel, one reminiscent more of a taxidermy exhibit than a museum of national history, but this also contributed an unexpected charm to the somber atmosphere. As far as one can tell from the information website for the museum, the dioramas still stand, but the museum has acquired a more contemporary outlook with new lighting, flooring, and impressive photo-essays about the protagonists of the Greek struggle for Macedonia.

Except for a few stray foreign tourists who happen to stumble on the place by mistake, the Museum visitors are almost exclusively Greek, and a significant portion is under ten years of age. They are schoolchildren, some kindergarteners, whose teachers are presenting what is likely to be their earliest lesson in national history. One of the scenes they observe represents the classroom in village school in Macedonia. The keen interest with which the pupils appear to listen to their teacher suggests a degree of wishful projection. The effect, nevertheless, is quite impressive. The children staring into this time capsule may be too young to be subject to some of the more sophisticated tools of national indoctrination; they are years away from the
draft, hardly able to read newspapers, and placed in a playground of sorts. But, prompted by their teacher, they are able to make a connection between themselves and the figures in the box, just like other groups of kindergarteners and elementary schoolchildren before and after them. The diorama establishes a visible link between the schoolchildren and their predecessors a century earlier while enshrining the classroom in a special place in the collective memory of the nation. The dioramas represent critical moments during the national struggle for its rightful territory, and just like the legendary “secret schools” of the Greek revolution, the classroom in Macedonia symbolizes resistance against foreign domination and assimilation—a beacon of light showing the way to those who would follow it.

The schools that became the scene of violent opposition between the Greek Orthodox and Exarchist communities in the countryside carried little resemblance to the institution that the word school elicits in contemporary minds. They occupied either a small building or a few rooms of a relatively bigger structure, and they were each run by a couple of teachers—ideally one each for boys and girls—and enrolled ten to fifty students.\(^1\) In fact, even the diorama in the museum, which idealize the humble resources the Greek scholastic establishment had at its disposal—present a rather sterilized version of what an actual classroom in the Macedonian countryside would have looked like circa 1900. George F Abbott, who toured the region around that time, had a Greek schoolmaster as one of his travel companions. The schoolmaster, after having been removed from several positions due to his “arrogance,” was desperately looking for a new outlet for his nationalist fervor. They finally reached Tachino (district of Serres), where he had secured a position. Here, Abbott describes the idealist teacher’s post in his trademark sardonic style: “The school was in harmony with the sty aspect of the village. Repeated outpourings of ink had lent to the floor the appearance of a map of the world on a large scale, while the walls bore evidence of the \textit{cacoethes scribendi}, the characteristic malady of youthful scholars the world over. The schoolroom contained a dozen rows of decayed desks covered with initials carved deeply into them. I should not have been at all surprised had I found a class of young pigs ranged behind them. Above the master’s desk there hung an icon of Christ, and in the desk lay a register. . . .”\(^2\)

This register contained names of students, all boys, who had had to abandon their studies for various reasons, including, their parents’ whim. This was hardly the school environment that some nationalist visionaries yearned for, which would have been clean and orderly, with a map hanging beside (if not in lieu of) the icon of Christ, a refuge where all peasants’ children would be initiated into the national community by learning about its glorious past

\(^1\) Carte des Écoles Chrétiennes de la Macédoine (Paris, 1905).
\(^2\) Abbott, \textit{Tale of a Tour in Macedonia}, 244.
and heroic present and, more important, by learning how to write and speak its language.

If language is the most important indicator of cultural affiliation, the Greeks certainly started with a clear advantage in the Ottoman Balkans. Greek was the language of the Enlightenment in the Balkans in the late eighteenth century and continued to be so for most of the nineteenth. It was also the lingua franca of the “conquering Orthodox merchant” and the language of the high clergy and other learned classes. If language that one spoke at home, becoming a member of the nascent bourgeoisie meant learning to speak Greek in public. This was in large part a result of the domination of the Greek establishment over education in the Ottoman

---


4. By contrast, among the Greek bourgeoisie outside the Balkans (in Alexandria, for instance), no refined Greek would consider a language other than French to be the utmost indication of civilization.
By the first decade of the twentieth century, Greek had lost its cultural monopoly. Education, and especially education in parish schools, had traditionally been under the control of the Patriarchate, which appointed the teachers and also provided the curriculum and instructional materials. After the 1850s, however, the demand for Bulgarian schools—or at least schools where instruction was in Bulgarian—started to increase in the Macedonian provinces, and the trend was bolstered by the gains made in the north, in the Danube Province, during the Tanzimat. Vlach and Serbian schools constituted the secondary tier of competition to Greek Orthodox schools. Although the representatives of Greek national interests were vexed by the proliferation of Vlach schools, functioning almost exclusively courtesy of Romanian subsidies, they presented a negligible disturbance compared to the effects of the Bulgarian schools. The majority of Vlachs, either out of choice or exigency, still continued to identify as Greek Orthodox. 

Moreover,  

5. Gymnasium, teacher and students.


6. A Vlach teacher reportedly insisted on teaching Slavic-speaking children Greek to, in his words, “open up their eyes.” PRO, FO 193/1849, Samokov, December 11, 1894.
Vlach speakers were more scattered and less numerous than the Slavic speakers of the area. As for Serbian schools, they were more a nuisance for Bulgarian nationalists than for their Greek counterparts because they concentrated their propaganda efforts not in eastern and south-central Macedonia but in the northwest, a region in which Greeks did not have strong claims.

In November 1886, the French consul in Salonika called the proliferation of “Bulgarian schools” a “scholarly awakening” that checked the hegemony of the Greeks, who were used to a position of superiority in cultural matters thanks to their schools and the influence of the Greek Orthodox clergy. “Seeing reappear in Macedonia an element, which we would hardly pay any attention to in Athens fifteen years ago, would not be the least interesting spectacle of our times,” he wrote to the minister of foreign affairs. “[B]y this awakening, which did not surprise the literati, the Greeks were stopped in the tracks of an ethnic assimilation that promised to take Cineas as its guide.”

Less than two decades later, the Bulgarian side was so confident in the success of its challenge to Greek cultural hegemony that a pundit declared, “The century of Pericles marked the apogee of the Greek genius. Immediately after that was the decline. The Greek genius abandoned Athens. It made a few short appearances again in Byzantium. Then, it fell into lethargy … and since then, its slumber has rarely been interrupted.”

The Greek and Bulgarian educational establishments resembled each other in their reliance on the religious establishment, rather than secular institutions of learning, to reach the masses. In this respect, the rivalry between the two closely paralleled the uneasy relationship between the Exarchate and the Patriarchate that resulted in the schism in 1872, only two years after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate by imperial decree. Years later, the leading cadres of the Revolutionary Organization, founded in Salonika in 1893 with independence for Macedonia and Thrace as its aim, would come from among the products of the Bulgarian higher-educational establishment and would use their credentials as teachers to reach deep into the remote corners of the Macedonian countryside and enlist volunteers for their cause. The Greek side, for its part, enlisted the help of an Athens-based organization, the Society for the Dissemination of Greek Letters, to counter the efforts of Bulgarian activists and adopt the Patriarchate-dominated schooling system into its irredentist agenda.

---
7. MAE, vol. 7, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salonika, November 30, 1886.
The Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate

On September 16, 1872, the Local Synod, convened in Constantinople at the behest of Patriarch Anthimos VI (Koutalianos) declared the newly formed Bulgarian Exarchate to be schismatic by reason of committing the heresy of ethnophyletism⁹ despite the ongoing efforts by several clergymen, diplomats, and politicians to forge a reconciliation of the dispute between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Bulgarian Exarchate.¹⁰ The decision was a turning point not only in terms of the relationship between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Exarchate but also the intercommunal relations of Christian Orthodox communities in the Ottoman Balkans. We could also argue that the Church schism indirectly—but profoundly—affected the evolution of Greek nationalism by compounding its emphasis on a collective consciousness defined and reinforced by membership in the Greek Orthodox Church.¹¹

An imperial ferman issued on March 12, 1870, had recognized the establishment of a semi-autonomous Bulgarian Church in Constantinople, with an Exarch, a rank that fell somewhere between Archbishop and Patriarch in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The ferman was the culmination of a protracted struggle that had started in the late eighteenth century, led by influential lay members of the Bulgarian community in Istanbul and by clergy frustrated by what they perceived to be an openly Greek bias and domination in the church organization. This particular cause of discontent with the Patriarchate was also duly noticed and exploited by Catholic and Protestant missionaries, who played a significant role in the evolution of Bulgarian nationalism throughout the nineteenth century.¹² These missionaries recruited increasing numbers of converts by taking advantage of Ottoman Bulgarians’ desire for an independent church.¹³ Encouraged and financed in large part by France

---

⁹. This is a specific form of nationalism based on race, declared heretical in 1872.
¹⁰. The Ecumenical Patriarch had convened in Constantinople the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria; the archbishop of Cyprus; and several bishops; A. Ischirkoff [Anastas Ishirkov], La Macédoine et la Constitution de l’Exarchat bulgare (Lausanne, 1918), 28; Thomas A. Meininger, Ignatiev and the Establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, 1864–1872 (Madison, 1970), 181–89.
¹². Victor Roudometof, Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy, the Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans (Westport, 2001); 133.
and also supported by Austria, the Uniate movement, which professed canonical communion with the Roman Apostolic See, started to make modest but considerable headway in the Ottoman Balkans.\footnote{MAE, vol. 7, Salonika, May 23, 1885, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.} In fact, conversion to Catholicism of the Eastern rite continued to be a viable option for some Bulgarian communities wanting to sever their ties with the Patriarchate even after the establishment of the Exarchate, despite the growing antagonism of local clergy and civil administrators, but this option lost momentum after the church struggle spread into and concentrated in Macedonia during the first decade of the twentieth century.\footnote{MAE, vol. 7, Salonika, September 14, 1881, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, concerning the activities of Lazarists and the conversion of the Bulgarian community of Goumendje (in Yenice-Vardar) into Catholicism, and threats from the Ottoman police and bishop of Vodena.}

Protestant missionaries, on the other hand, who were relatively late additions to the religious rivalry in the Balkans, created an alternative to the Uniate movement by emphasizing the reformation of preexisting beliefs and practices.\footnote{They actively pursued the mission of “reforming” the Greek Orthodox Christians of Asia Minor; Gerasimos Augustinos, “‘Enlightened Christians and ‘Oriental’ Churches: Protestant Missions to the Greeks in Asia Minor, 1820–1860,” Journal of Modern Greek Studies 4, no. 2 (1986): 129–42.} Although the Evangelical Alliance faced an uphill battle in spreading the gospel and “reforming” the Slavic-speaking Orthodox into a Protestant Church, the Bulgarian nationalists made apt use of the missionaries’ presence when mustering up diplomatic support for their cause, especially from Britain and later from the United States.\footnote{James Baker, who resided in Macedonia in the 1870s claimed that “In 1874 the Bulgarians in Macedonia, in their religious struggles, actually petitioned the British embassy to interfere in their behalf, and to have them placed under the ecclesiastical rule of the Bulgarian Exarch! They even went so far as to ask whether, in the event of their becoming Protestants, the British Government would watch over their interests!” Turkey in Europe (London, 1877), 57.} Even though a proponent of the Bulgarian national movement has given credit to U.S. missionaries for contributing more directly—if unintentionally—to the creation of an independent Bulgarian Church by publishing the first bible in modern Bulgarian (Eastern dialect) in Istanbul in 1871, the Exarchate preferred Old Church Slavonic for the liturgy.\footnote{Clarke, Pen and the Sword, 290.}

The establishment of the Exarchate is viewed, with good reason, as the outcome of the Bulgarian community’s frustration with its subjugation by the Patriarchate and with Bulgarian clergy’s inability to participate in the higher church hierarchy. The Bulgarian community, constrained by the “double yoke” of the Patriarchate and the sultan, followed through with its plans for independence by, first, throwing off the former in preparation for throwing off the latter. The Exarchate, briefly put, is considered a
direct product of the culmination of Bulgarian nationhood.\textsuperscript{19} Although this statement is largely accurate, at least as far as the Bulgarian clergy and intelligentsia of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are concerned, the events and personalities involved in the establishment of the Exarchate were so complex that this proposed linear connection between Bulgarian nationhood and the formation of the Exarchate as its utmost expression is inadequate. In fact, the most recent revision of this consensus argues that the establishment of the Exarchate should be seen as part of a broader process of secularization that transformed the Patriarchate in the second half of the nineteenth century; that the movement for the Exarchate was a product of the same process; and that the Exarchate cannot be viewed as an entity entirely separate from and antagonistic to the Patriarchate, even after the Schism of 1872.\textsuperscript{20} This, I must add, speaks more to the motivations of the Greek clergy and lay elite in finally coming to terms with the establishment of an autocephalous church than to the desire of the Bulgarian side to undermine the influence of the Patriarchate (and, by implication, Greek cultural hegemony) over what they viewed as their own turf.\textsuperscript{21}

During the second half of the nineteenth century the Ottoman imperial capital, rather than areas with large Bulgarian-speaking populations in the Balkans, hosted the most influential elements of Bulgarian nationalism.\textsuperscript{22} The first concession that the Bulgarian community obtained from the Sublime Porte was the right to build a church in Istanbul in 1848 that would still be ecclesiastically subject to the Patriarchate but also serve as an “advisory body for Bulgarian communities everywhere in the Empire.”\textsuperscript{23} The lay elite of the Bulgarian community of Istanbul assumed most of the responsibility in the church struggle, and their leadership would greatly influence the

\vspace{1em}

\textsuperscript{19} See, for instance, Ishirkov, \textit{La Macédoine et la Constitution}. The classic work on the formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate published in Bulgarian is Zina Markova, \textit{Bulgarskata Ekzarhiya, 1870–1879} (Sofia, 1989). An early classic, first published in German, is Richard von Mach, \textit{Der Machtbereich des bulgarischen exarchats in der Türkei} (Leipzig, 1906); this was published in English: \textit{The Bulgarian Exarchate: Its History and the Extent of Its Authority in Turkey} (London, 1907).

\textsuperscript{20} Dēmētrios Stamatopoulos, \textit{Metarrythmísē kai Ekkosmikeúsē: Pros mia Anasythesë tēs Istorias tou Oikoumenikou Patriarcheiou tou 19o Aióna} (Athens, 2003).

\textsuperscript{21} In fact, the first instance of an autocephalous church sparking tensions within Greek Orthodoxy was the formation of the National Church of Greece; Paraskevas Matalas, \textit{Ethnos kai Orthodoxia: Oi Peripeties mias Schésis apo to “Elladiko” sto Voulgariko Schisma} (Irákleio, 2002).

\textsuperscript{22} Ishirkov notes that, although there were highly educated Bulgarians in the service of the governments in Russia, Romania, Greece and Turkey, one of the most striking elements of the “Bulgarian renaissance” was the sheer number of Bulgarian periodicals appearing in Constantinople in the mid-nineteenth century; \textit{La Macédoine et la Constitution}, 8–13.

\textsuperscript{23} Roudometof, \textit{Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy}, 133. According to Ishirkov, Sultan Abdülmejid, after listening to the complaints of his Bulgarian subjects during his tour of the “Bulgarian provinces” (presumably referring to his tour of Rumeli in 1846), asked the Patriarch to defer to their wishes, again to no avail; \textit{La Macédoine et la Constitution}, 10–11.
unfolding of this bitter quarrel within the Orthodox hierarchy. The Patriarchate agreed to a few more concessions in 1858 and 1859, such as the permission to use Slavonic in liturgy in certain regions and to name Ilarion of Macariopolis “Bishop in partibus (without seat) of the Bulgarian Church” in Constantinople. The council convened by the Patriarchate deemed these concessions sufficient for the time being, and after deliberations that continued from October 1858 to February 1860, the council refused further concessions, including a proposal to grant parishioners the right to elect their bishop and to require bishops to speak the language of their congregations.

It is important to note, first, that this council, which was known, somewhat anachronistically, as the first Ethnosyneleuse (National Assembly), was a response to the demand of the Sublime Porte, from the heads of the millets, in accordance with the 1856 Islahat Fermânı, to form representative councils. More important, the work of this assembly between 1858 and 1860 resulted in instituting the participation of lay representatives in the election of Patriarchs and the establishment of a permanent Diarko Ethniko Symvoulio (Mixed Council), whose members included lay elements and had control over the Patriarchate’s administration. This council later played a great role in curbing the powers of the Holy Synod and became instrumental in unseating Patriarchs who did not agree with the influential members’ agendas, bringing the networks between powerful members of the lay community, called the Neophanariots; representatives of foreign powers; and the clergy directly into ecclesiastical politics. The Mixed Council, according to Anastas Ishirkov, included only four Bulgarian members, three of whom, in protest over the council refusal to take up the issue of administrative changes in dioceses with Bulgarian populations, did not participate in the final sessions of the council. When Stephanos Karatheodori, a prominent Phanariot and the sultan’s physician, issued an angry statement concerning Bulgarian demands, it triggered a response, composed in Greek, from Gâvril Krastević. Krastević was a protégé of Stephan Vogoridis, a prominent

24. Tozer notes that in certain districts “as for instance, in the neighborhood of Ochrida, permission has been given within the last few years to introduce the Slavonic tongue ... but these are quite exceptions.” Henry F. Tozer, Researches in the Highlands of Turkey (London, 1869), Vol. 1: 182. It seems that the use of Slavonic, although not officially condoned by the Patriarchate, had made its way into a few churches, at least for nonliturgical purposes out of local exigencies, much earlier than the 1860s; Cousinéry, for instance, notes that all the archbishops in Vodena had to learn Bulgarian even if they were of Greek descent if they wanted a good level of donations to the church in their diocese; E. M. Cousinéry, Voyage dans la Macédoine, contenant les recherches sur l’histoire, la géographie et les antiquités de ce pays (Paris, 1831), 77.


27. Ibid., 121.

28. The response was presented under the name of Hatzı Nikolas Mintzoglou, the Bulgarian representative from Tırnovo, according to Ishirkov, La Macédoine et la Constitution, 15.
Phanariot who was, just like Krastević, of Bulgarian origin. Although Krastević, unlike his patron, was quite far from being entirely Hellenized, his close relations with other Phanariot families even after the establishment of the Exarchate, in which he had played an important part, is one among many examples that underscore the important role played by extremely complicated power, social, and political networks that had nothing to do with nationalism in shaping the relationship between the two rival Orthodox churches.  

On Easter Sunday 1860, Ilarion of Macariopolis performed a highly symbolic act of protest by omitting the name of the Patriarch from the liturgy, which earned him his excommunication from the Church and established him as one of the bravest voices against the hegemony of the Church elders. Four years later, Nikolai Ignatiev, arguably the most influential Russian ambassador to the Sublime Porte in the nineteenth century, arrived to take up his post. After 1872 Ignatiev directed his energies to the mending of the division in the Orthodox oikoumene, to which he felt he had partially and unwittingly contributed.

Although the separation of the Exarchate had been in the works long before Ignatiev set foot in the Ottoman capital, his meddling in the affairs of the Church, including the election of Patriarchs, and the ties he cultivated with Ottoman statesmen that allowed him to exert just the right amount of pressure both on the Patriarchate and the Bulgarians, did contribute to the schism that occurred in 1872. The initiative he took to reconcile the two churches had to strike a very fine balance between catering to the desires of Bulgarians on the one hand and not alienating the Patriarchate on the other—and it was doomed to failure for the same reason. Ignatiev could not have lived to see the schism eliminated, which happened only in 1945.

The **ferman** that established the Exarchate was promulgated on March 12. The text was based loosely on an earlier blueprint drawn up by a Bulgarian council consisting of lay notables as well the clergy. It granted the Exarchate complete autonomy in administrative matters while preserving its ecclesiastical subordination to the Patriarchate. The Exarchate, in other words, was neither independent nor autocephalous but was granted fifteen dioceses, almost all of which were in Danubian Bulgaria. In this form, it far from satisfied the demands of the more ambitious nationalists in the Bulgarian

---

29. For a summary of Krastević’s career and other examples of such complicated networks, see Demetrios Stamatopoulos, “The Splitting of the Orthodox Millet as a Secularizing Process,” in *Griechische Kultur in Südosteuropa in der Neuzeit*, edited by Maria A. Stassinopoulou and Ioannis Zelepos (Vienna, 2008), 243–70. The competing influences of Russia and Britain should not be overlooked in determining the outcome of power struggles within the Patriarchate; Christine Philliou, *Biography of an Empire: Governing Ottomans in an Age of Revolution* (Los Angeles, 2010), 143–44.

side but it was acceptable to the moderates and—with reservations—even to the Patriarchate. There were two major “time bombs” planted in the text, however, and these two issues would thwart all future actions taken to lift the schism. The first one was the location of the Exarch’s seat in Constantinople, which was a disturbing but not extremely egregious decision to the Greek side when there was as yet no Bulgaria in existence. Yet many Greeks wondered why the Exarchate had not been located in Tarnovo, where Tsar Ivan Asen II had revived the Bulgarian Patriarchate in 1235. The second issue was even more menacing in terms of its long-term consequences: this was the clause sanctioning that, after a plebiscite, if two-thirds or more of the population of a given district voted in favor of it, the Exarchate could establish a diocese in that district.31

Immediately after the promulgation of the ferman, the Bulgarian community started to organize its own council of lay and clerical leaders to finalize a governing statute. Among the delegates who arrived in Constantinople for the occasion were those from Macedonian provinces, none of which was included in the jurisdiction of the Exarchate. A new demand emerged, namely, the official recognition of Bulgarian dioceses in Macedonia. This was not a matter that could simply be brought before the Ottoman government because the ferman clearly stated that the Exarch had to be recognized by the Patriarch. The efforts of Ambassador Ignatiev, Greek Ambassador Alexandros Rizos Rangavis, and the moderates on both sides to find a compromise seemed within reach, but the extremists on the Bulgarian side, such as Stoian Chomakov, who were not willing to settle for a solution that left out Philippopoli, Strumitza, Moglena, and Monastir (Bitola), went against the instructions of the Patriarch and celebrated Epiphany on January 6, 1872, with a ceremony conducted by the bishops of Makariopolis, Philippopoli, and Loftzo. As a result, the last two bishops were dismissed from their duties, whereas Ilarion of Makariopolis, having already received this distinction, was excommunicated.32 The Ottoman government tried to placate the Bulgarian side by approving the election of an Exarch, and Bishop Anthimos of Vidin received the title after the other four candidates were eliminated. He was presented to the sultan during a ceremony in Dolmabahçe Palace on April 12—but without the approval of the Patriarch.33 Subsequent attempts by Anthimos, who, unlike the other candidates to the position, had kept his ties to the Patriarchate,34 to earn the Patriarch’s endorsement were all turned down. The weakening ties between the Patriarchate and the new

32. Ilarion (Stoianov Michailovski) and Stoian Chomakov had both trained at the school of Theophilos Kairis, the Greek theologian. Matalas, *Ethnos kai Orthodoxia*, 89–193.
33. Ibid., 297–99.
34. Anthimos had remained as the director of the Theological Seminary in Halki; ibid., 298.
The autocephalous church finally broke completely after the Exarch, along with the three (by now notorious) bishops, Panaretos, Ilarion of Loftza, and Ilarion of Makariopolis, celebrated mass on the day of saints Cyril and Methodios, and declared the independence of the Bulgarian Church on May 11, 1872. On May 13, the general synod convened by the Patriarchate defrocked the former bishop of Vidin, excommunicated Panaretos and Ilarion of Loftza, and anathemized Ilarion of Makariopolis, condemning him to eternal hell. The Local Synod convened in Constantinople officially declared the Bulgarian Church schismatic on September 16.

At first, it seemed that the schism was not final; lay and clerical actors on both sides of the split worked for a reconciliation until well into the first years of the twentieth century. After the settlement in 1878, all the dioceses originally recognized by the ferman of 1870 within the jurisdiction of the Exarchate fell outside the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Between the schism and 1876, when insurrectionary activity in the Danubian provinces soured the relations between the Sublime Porte and the Exarchate, the Bulgarian Church had secured several concessions and expanded its jurisdictional reach to include Skopje and Ohrida. The Russo-Ottoman War reversed these gains and left the Bulgarians in a precarious position until the 1890s, when the Sublime Porte finally approved the berats (licenses), first for the dioceses of Ohrida and Skopje and then for Veles (Köprülü) and Nevrekop.

Patriarch Ioachim III, who ascended the throne for the first time in 1878 (his second term was from 1901–1912), now faced the daunting task of preserving the Orthodox oikoumene that remained in the Ottoman lands. Maintaining the schism and further antagonizing Slavophone Christians, Exarchist or Patriarchist, against the Patriarchate would not be conducive to this end. Ioachim’s conciliatory attitude toward the Exarchate was inspired by this concern. However, the loss of territory also resulted in a sudden loss of revenue, which forced the Patriarchate to accept financial assistance from the Greek government, weakening its institutional position and establishing an external dependency. Financial support from the Greek government compromised the Patriarch’s credibility vis-à-vis his goal of mending the schism and reasserting his role as the head of the imperial Orthodox community. He astutely tried to circumvent this problem by enlisting the help of wealthy Greek Orthodox families in Istanbul, which did not sit well with the Greek government. In the end, Patriarch Ioachim III’s efforts proved

37. Another source of conflict between Ioachim III and the Greek government was the increasing Russian influence in Mount Athos, which the Greek nationalists viewed as a bulwark against Slav encroachment on Macedonia. Ioachim III’s views on how to deal with this issue were again conciliatory, which the Greek side took as “anti-national.” Ibid., 115–16.
insufficient to, on the one hand, counteract the divergent positions of the Patriarchate and the Greek irredentists and, on the other, reconcile the differences between the Patriarchate’s and the Exarchate’s visions for the future of Macedonia.

The seat of the Exarchate in Istanbul became an extremely important bone of contention, especially after the formation of the Bulgarian principality in 1878 and the unification of the principality with Eastern Rumelia in 1885. The Exarchate was not the first Orthodox Church to become independent of the Patriarchate without the Patriarchate’s approval; even the Church of Greece, which was established in 1833 and actually had served as a model for the Exarchate, had not been recognized by the Patriarchate until 1850. The Exarchate was exceptional, however, in the sense that church autonomy had preceded political independence from the Ottoman Empire.\(^{38}\) This meant that the rival Church in Istanbul challenged the Patriarchate’s authority within the Empire. After the formation of Bulgaria under Russian patronage, the Exarchate could not be marginalized outside the borders of the Empire, despite efforts to do so, because the Bulgarians were unwilling to give up the central position of the Exarch’s seat in the imperial capital and the rights grandfathered in with the plebiscite clause. As the influence of nationalists on both sides drowned out the dissenting voices of the moderates, the schism was gradually accepted as a permanent situation. Even as late as 1901, when Ioachim III came into his second term as Patriarch, the views of the Patriarchate on the issue of an autonomous Bulgarian Church were not definitive, and they clearly acknowledged the need for special arrangements for “Bulgarian” speakers in Macedonia.\(^{39}\) This is in striking contrast to the attitude and actions of the representatives of the Great Church in Macedonia only a few years later, including Ioachim III himself, when refusing peasant demands for priests who could understand their language became a matter of course. Even though the dominant opinion among lay and clerical members of the leadership in Istanbul seemed to favor the possibility of a reconciliation with the Exarchate, this opinion lost its relevance as the struggle for Macedonian dioceses transformed from ecclesiastical rivalry into armed warfare. It seemed that the ties between the two churches were now cut off for good. By this time, the schism was no longer an issue originating and contained within the capital, but had spread and mutated into a relentless struggle that claimed the lives of Macedonian peasants by the thousands.

\(^{38}\) The Serbian Church, which was restored in 1557, was abolished again in 1766.

The Growth of Bulgarian Schools

Köprüülü (Veles), Kukliš (Koukoush), and Cuma-i Bâlâ (Gorna Djoumaya) were the earliest among the districts of Macedonia to acquire Bulgarian schools. The Bulgarian nationalist intelligentsia of Constantinople viewed the new schools with enthusiasm and raised funds for their support and maintenance. In May 1858, for instance, an article in Bulgarski Knizhitsi reported the introduction of Bulgarian into the churches and schools in Koukoush, replete with allegories of awakening and quenching the thirst for hearing “the word of God in their native tongue” following a period of sadness. The author warned the readers that a sorry state of affairs was still the case in many dioceses: “Ohrid, Bitola, Kostur, Moglena, Voden, Stroumnitza, Polyano (Doyran), Melnik, Serres, Drama, and a few more, where the inhabitants intermingle with Greeks.” Not surprisingly, this list overlapped with the dioceses, where the “interests of Hellenism” should be protected through schools, according to the Athens-based Society for the Dissemination of Greek Letters (Syllogos pros Diadosin tôn Ellinèkôn Grammatôn; henceforth, Syllogos). We must note, however, that some of the schools described as “Bulgarian” were officially under the control of the Patriarchate, and in many cases Bulgarian was taught or used in church services (Slavonic, in this case) without the knowledge of the local Greek Orthodox bishop.

After the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, the number of communities demanding instruction in Bulgarian started to increase. In 1895, an irâde placed Bulgarian schools under the authority of the Exarchate, following the existing model for Greek Orthodox (Rum) schools. According to this, teachers would be appointed directly by the Exarchate, subject to the approval of local authorities. As the conflict in Macedonia crystallized around the Exarchist-Patriarchist division, schools, like church buildings, came to represent entities much larger than themselves.

The irâde of 1895 that placed Bulgarian schools officially under the authority of the Exarchate was in accordance with established imperial procedure and required a protocol of scrutiny over their activities. The Exarchate would present a list of appointed teachers to the local civilian authorities,
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41. “Report from Koukoush,” Bulgarski Knizhitsi, no. 10 (May 1858), cited in ibid., 149. (All citations from this source are transliterated as in the original.)
43. Russian Consul in Manastir, M. A. Hitrovo to Ignatiev, August 6, 1864, cited in Macedonia, Documents and Material, 212–14.
44. MAE. vol. 39, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salonika, February 6, 1904.
who would then perform a background check to see if the teachers were “trustworthy” individuals. Textbooks were subject to inspection by an office specifically created for this purpose, namely, the inspector of Bulgarian schools. After the Ilinden Uprising, the level of surveillance increased significantly. The inspector kept detailed registers of Bulgarian teachers, including their names, places of birth, past appointments, and any information on their ties to the “Committee,” which were then presented to the Inspectorate. If the administrative council of a village could not vouch for the character of a teacher and report his or her whereabouts, the teacher would be denied permission to work and confined to his or her place of birth.

During the early stages of the Bulgarian educational project in Macedonia, a mix of local communal support and donations from wealthy patrons elsewhere financed the schools. The latter category included members of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie in the imperial capital, who established nationalist civil organizations such as the Macedonian Society of Constantinople. Support from Russia, which the Greeks found so irritating, did not come until later, in the 1860s, along with support for the Church movement in response to the increasing influence of the Uniate movement, which the Patriarch of Moscow perceived as a threat to Eastern Orthodoxy. The Russian consuls in Macedonia actively sought information on the state of the Bulgarian schools in the area and reported on their need for support by the Russian government. Another important link to Russia at the time was the Russian-educated nationalists of Macedonian origin. Many of them had completed their education thanks to scholarships provided by the Moscow Benevolent Society and by the Russian Embassy in Istanbul. They replaced the earlier generation that had studied in Greece, and they usually returned to Macedonia as teachers and to raise consciousness for the Bulgarian national cause. Finally, commercial guilds made important contributions to the educational effort in the region. Funding Bulgarian education was a mark of social distinction, and failing to do so might cause considerable damage to one’s social capital; periodicals announced the names not only of the benefactors but also of their less generous compatriots to the community.

45. Ibid.; BOA, TFR.I. SL 14/1381, Director of Educational Affairs [Maarif Müdürlüğü] to the Inspectorate, Salonika, July 12, 1903.
46. BOA, TFR.I.SL 144/14331, Inspector of Bulgarian Schools, Salonika, May 19, 1907.
47. Jelavich and Jelavich, Establishment of the Balkan National States, 133; Macedonia, Documents and Material, 186.
49. All but one of the six teachers cited in the Russian consul’s report on Bulgarian education in Macedonia had been trained in Russia; Macedonia, Documents and Material, 298.
50. The first Bulgarian schools were founded in commercial centers. Some of the communities that later sent financial contributions to Bulgarian schools in Macedonia were also important trade towns such as Plovdiv, Pazardjik, and Kalofer; “Report from Nevrokop,” Tırtısa, June 20, 1865, cited in ibid., 219.
An article published in the newspaper *Turtsiia*, January 8, 1866, praised the kindness of those notables who were participating in the efforts to provide Bitola (Monastir) with a Bulgarian school and berated those “who still tarry and keep aloof,” identifying the members of this category by name in the hopes that “God will enlighten and strengthen them.”

The Greek state was actively interested in raising national consciousness in the “enslaved lands,” including Macedonia, even before the Exarchate’s sphere of influence had started to spread through the few dioceses it was originally granted. As early as 1871, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had identified, in a circular to the consulates, the need for more schools because nothing would “support Hellenism and national sentiment like Greek education and language.” After the Greek state and literary societies started to appreciate the significance of the scholastic rivalry and the influx of funds from Russia and independent Bulgaria into Macedonia, they increased their financial assistance to the Macedonian schools and sought further funds. Syllologos, after 1869, and the Committee for Support of Greek Church and Education, after 1886, were the two proxies through which the Greek state lent support for the cause of Hellenism in the “enslaved lands.” By the 1900s, when the struggle with the Exarchate reached its zenith, the efforts of these organizations were combined with those of the Patriarchate, and a full counteroffensive was launched against the proliferation of Bulgarian schools. According to Captain Leon Falconetti, who was with the French gendarmerie in Serres, the Greek government had spent 1.5 million drachmas in 1906 from its meager budget just for this purpose. In this later part of the counteroffensive, the Patriarchate and Greek learned societies (which, despite having joined forces tactically, were at odds with each other more often than not) benefited from the Ottoman authorities’ somewhat justified distrust of the Bulgarian educational establishment.

When a community could not agree on the medium of instruction, disputes arose over the use of the school building, very similar to those arising regarding the use of church buildings. In fact, in many cases, the disputes involved both the church building and the school building, if there was one, because the latter was seen more or less as an extension of the other. Just as in the disputes concerning the use of church buildings and newly appointed priests, in solving problems relating to the schools the authorities usually sided with the Greek Orthodox Metropolitan. Problems did occur frequently, especially when communities that were at least nominally under

---

the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate demanded Bulgarian-speaking teachers. Even though authorities usually attributed this “extraordinary” demand to the pressures of armed bands in the area, it was equally, if not more, likely that the demand for a Bulgarian-speaking teacher was motivated by more practical concerns, such as the desire to have the children learn to read and write in their native tongue or, more precisely, in an idiom closer to it than Constantinople-approved Greek. Note that these communities were not exclusively those that wanted to sever their ties with the Patriarchate. In April 1883, a scandalized Greek consul in Monastir reported to the president of the Syllogos in Athens that not only the “schismatic but also some Bulgarianophone Orthodox communities” supported Bulgarian schools with “monies from the church fund and monastic revenues.” He blamed the bishops for this outrage because, although it was actually within their authority to forbid the use of church money for such purposes, they did not do so for fear of alienating the population that they depended on for their own living.54

Some clergymen’s tendency to accommodate and appease the locals, as opposed to the “take-no-prisoners” approach of action-minded consuls and other representatives of the Greek national intelligentsia, was a recurring source of tension. The conflict between the lower clergy in Macedonia and the Greek national elites in the Hellenic kingdom as well as the Ottoman Empire became more pronounced, particularly with regard to the language of instruction in parish schools during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, when there still seemed to be a chance to mend the schism. The Ecumenical Patriarch Ioachim III (who had ancestral roots in Macedonia), for instance, was in constant conflict with Athens, specifically with representatives of the Syllogos, during his first term as Patriarch between 1878 and 1884 over the need to reconcile with the Exarchate. Leaders such as Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos viewed the schism as beneficial for the interests of Hellenism in Macedonia, whereas Ioachim III was convinced otherwise.55 Likewise, even a Patriarch such as Anthimos VII (1895–1897), who was thought to be much less lenient toward Bulgarian demands for ecclesiastical authority, criticized the actions of the Greek government during a visit to the Hellenic embassy in Constantinople and defended a policy of appeasement toward the “fellow Orthodox,” especially the Serbs, to overcome the “isolation” that the Greek Orthodox were mired in. The views of His All Holiness were not welcome by Mr. Zalokostas, the secretary of the Syllogos, who rebutted that as long as the Serbs did not limit themselves to their logical “ethnological boundaries” there would be no use in a reconciliation, and

54. AYE, fak. 1883, Consul Dokos to President of the Society for the Dissemination of Greek Letters, Monastir, April 1883, in Vouri, Περιγίγ περί Ιστορία τῆς Μακεδονίας, 46.
that they were trying to overthrow a status quo in the church, which it was in the interests of the Greek nation to preserve.\textsuperscript{56}

The most common method of resistance that Slavic-speaking villages displayed against Greek-speaking teachers was to prevent the newly appointed teachers from taking up residence. An angry Metropolitan of Vodine wrote to the Inspectorate in September 1904 that this was exactly what was going on in several villages under his jurisdiction. According to the Metropolitan, the behavior of the villagers was the result of threats by “Bulgarian brigands” who had been circulating the vicinity, telling people “you are Bulgarians, you will read Bulgarian, don’t accept the Rum teachers sent to your villages.”\textsuperscript{57} On receiving the letter, the Inspectorate warned the local authorities about the Metropolitan’s concerns and ordered that they provide the Rum teachers with all the protection they needed to assume their positions because such “harassment” and the intervention of Bulgarian priests and teachers in these villages were utterly “inappropriate.” The village councils were duly warned to properly welcome the new appointees because they would be held personally responsible for the safety and well-being of the teachers.\textsuperscript{58} When the Inspectorate was flooded with angry petitions from Greek Orthodox bishops in the area about similar cases of resistance, as happened often, they routinely demanded from local authorities that the Greek Orthodox Metropolitans’ concerns be fully addressed. Some officials carried out their assignment with exceptional zeal, not only giving a warning to the village heads and notables but also ensuring that they were detained and duly reprimanded by the Greek Metropolitan himself.\textsuperscript{59} Having been berated by the Metropolitan and roughed up by the gendarmes, it was then the villagers’ turn to send protest telegrams to the authorities.\textsuperscript{60} It is hard to tell whether the children received any schooling at all in either language after such heated exchanges among their parents, the Metropolitan, the insurgents, and the government.

**Higher Education for Higher Classes**

Schools of higher learning, the gymnasia and secondary schools that served the important mission of training teachers, proliferated in Macedonia

\textsuperscript{56} AYE, fak. 1895, Ambassador Mavrokordatos to Minister Deliyianni, Istanbul, March 11, 1895, in Vouri, Πέσες για την Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας, 269–70.

\textsuperscript{57} BOA, TFR.I.SL 53/5289, Metropolitan of Vodine to the Inspectorate, September 4, 1904.

\textsuperscript{58} BOA, TFR.I.SL 53/5289, Inspectorate to the Kaymakamlıkt (Prefecture) of Yenice Vardar and Vodine, September 6, 1904.

\textsuperscript{59} BOA, TFR.I.SL 53/5204, Inspectorate to the Prefecture of Vodine, September 26, 1904.

\textsuperscript{60} BOA, TFR.I.SL 52/5186, Telegram to the Inspector, September 1904.
after the 1890s. The graduates of these schools spread the national gospel to their less unenlightened brethren in the countryside. By 1905, according to D. M. Brancoff (Dimitar Mishev) there were thirty-seven Bulgarian (and one Bulgarian Uniate) and twenty-three Greek secondary schools in the province of Salonika; the numbers of these schools in Monastir were sixteen and twelve and in Kosovo eighteen and two. Although there were, in fact, only a couple of large gymnasium in centers such as Salonika, Serres, and Monastir, and Mishev’s numbers included any institution slightly more sophisticated than a parish school with one or two teachers, he was correct in noting a trend to augment the capacity of national schools in Macedonia belonging not only to Greeks and Bulgarians but also to Vlachs and Serbs.

The town of Salonika hosted the best-known gymnasium, while a majority of provincial centers had at least one, and as many as five, secondary schools by 1905. In 1882, however, according to a report of the French consul in Salonika, the Bulgarian community had one high school and the Greek community one école normale, both exclusively for boys. Higher education for girls was not offered. The consul noted the great importance for Greek national interests of the école normale, which trained the teachers that were to staff the village schools in Macedonia, a task that had become even more critical in the face of growing competition from the schools of other groups. All students enrolled in the school received a monthly stipend for food and lodging, but the school did not have boarding facilities.

The curriculum of the Greek école normale concentrated on history, mathematics, and philosophy. It was among the best, according to the consul, except for language instruction, which was limited to ancient and modern Greek. The duration of studies was six years, and there were six classes. The consul also noted that Greeks were exceptionally quiet about the activities of the school, especially concerning its finances. The annual costs were estimated at 70,000 French francs; instruction was free in principle, except for a small entry fee, so most of this amount was covered by donations from well-to-do families and other philanthropic benefactors.

According to the same report, the Bulgarian high school in Salonika was the top such institution in Macedonia in terms of its quality of instruction, and the administration had plans to turn it into a gymnasium. There were three classes, and all students learned Bulgarian, French, and Turkish. Most
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61. Unlike the primary schools, which were scattered around the countryside and consisted of a room, a teacher, and a few students, it was more difficult to manipulate number of secondary schools. For this reason, the “Greek” and “Bulgarian” sets of statistics published by Mishev concur on the number of secondary schools in the vilâyet (province) of Salonika; La, Macédoine et sa Population Chrétienne, 240–41, 260–61.

62. MAE. vol. 6, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salonika, May 30, 1882.

63. Bernard Lory notes that the school was founded in 1880; “Soloun, Ville Slave?” in Salonique, 1850–1918: La “Ville des Juifs” et le Réveil des Balkans, edited by Gilles Veinstein (Paris, 1993), 133. However, there had been a Bulgarian school in Salonika since 1870, which had operational difficulties because it did not have a stable residence. The Vuzrozdeni (Revival)
of them came from the interior of the province, and the demand for enrollment was so high that the school was forced to turn down some of the candidates. The student body was all boarding, and they also received a yearly stipend of 345 French francs. Fifteen of the students were on scholarships from the Exarchate. The state-of-the-art facilities included, among other things, fully equipped chemistry and physics laboratories and a biology hall (complete with a grand taxidermy collection), which apparently served double duty as an entertainment center for the town.

The Ottoman authorities and members of the rival sects alike loathed secondary schools of this kind because they were seen as indoctrination centers dispensing hatred rather than enlightenment to young minds. The Bulgarian school in the town of Serres, for instance, was continuously the target of the wrath of the Serres Greek community. In July 1873, final exams in the school were interrupted by a Greek mob that stormed into the building, cried “Damnation to all Bulgarians,” and ran away. They were followed by Greek students, who “noisily climbing the stairs ... began stamping with their feet and hooting at those present.” Following this incident, local Greeks reportedly harassed the schoolteacher and his wife whenever they walked about town, swearing and throwing stones at them.

This was not the only instance in town when the Greek community creatively used schools and their pupils to stage a protest against their Bulgarian neighbors. In November 1905, students of the Greek Orthodox gymnasium in Serres marched around the Bulgarian establishments in the town, loudly singing songs that seemed to have been written precisely for the purpose. The lyrics, far more graphic in their violence than the usual marching song, a genre not known for its subtlety, were:

It is my duty to declare
the Bulgarians schismatics
arsonists and murderers
as well as savage and bloodthirsty
Being merciful to murderers
is not philanthropy
it is an outrage

Society of Salonika was raising funds for a new school building in May 1873; Macedonia, Documents and Material, 292.

64. MAE. vol. 6, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salonika, May 30, 1882.
and a crime against God
For the vile and cruel enemies
of the glory and honor of my country
for the arsonists and authors of all our troubles
a bitter hatred is a hard thing
Divine punishment and the world’s opprobrium
will be the bloodthirsty savages’ punishment
and if ever the history of this country is written
a dark page will open for them68

Another marching song of Greek schoolchildren recorded by a French
gendarmerie officer in Serres suggested “setting the Bulgar on fire,”69 and
apparently this is exactly what some Greek activists in the town attempted
to do to the Serres Bulgarian gymnasium in May 1907 before their plans
were foiled.70 The Greek family renting a building to the Bulgarian school
was not spared either; Colonel Vérand seized a threatening letter sent to the
family by “the Invisible Macedonian Committee.”71

Regardless of the background of a pupil who attended one of the distin-
guished secondary schools, such as the gymnasia in Salonika and Serres,
by the time of graduation he would have taken the first steps in joining the
national elite of his community, instilled with a sense of distinction that set
him apart not only from the members of the other community but also from
the uneducated youths of his own, who, in their backwardness occupied a
different temporal space. This notion continued to hold sway in much later
accounts of national awakening. James Clarke, for instance, denies the peas-
ants “coevalness,” to paraphrase Fabian,72 even as he notes that the edu-
cated few and the peasants both carried nationality, albeit in different ways:
“At almost any time in the last two centuries the educated few were closer
to Europe than to their own simple peasant, whether he was Albanian, Bul-
garian, Greek, Romanian or Serb. Conversely, the peasants remained in the
Turkish era... long after political Europeanization.”73

That there was a conceived difference between the elite and the peas-
ants in terms of their intellectual proximity to Europe and, hence, national
consciousness hardly needs an explanation. What is more interesting is how
some of the national elites applied this principle to their ambitious enter-
prise of spreading national sentiment through schools, for what we see here

68. MAE, vol. 147, Serres, November 29, 1905.
69. Ibid.
70. PRO, FO 195/2263, Vice Consul Bosanquet to Consul Graves, Serres, May 30, 1907.
71. MAE, Turquie, Question de Macédoine, Gendarmerie Internationale, vol. 416, Colo-
nel Vérand’s report, Paris, July 2, 1907.
72. Johannes Fabian, Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object (New
York, 1983).
73. Clarke, Pen and the Sword, 52.
is entirely different than the educational policy of the modern nation-state, whereby the ideal is to create a common denominator for the model citizen that goes across class lines, at least in principle, if not in practice. On the contrary, the scholastic mission of nationalist visionaries in Macedonia was a two-tiered process that aimed, through village schools, to recruit foot soldiers for the struggle from among the peasantry and, through institutions of higher learning, to train the children of the middle and upper classes, who would lead the way for their underprivileged co-nationals.

It is important to note that the Greek government under Trikoupis had signed an agreement with the Syllogos, essentially outsourcing the application and oversight of Greek educational policy in Macedonia to this organization. The Syllogos was extremely active and influential in furthering the Greek claim on Macedonia through cultural, ethnographic, and educational channels. While the Patriarchate had no serious disagreements with the Syllogos educational agenda, relations at the local level seem to have been less than harmonious. The representatives of the Syllogos were unhappy with what they perceived to be an unwillingness to cooperate with the national mission, and they demanded more direct Greek government control over the religious establishment in the Ottoman Empire while the local bishops, in their letters to the Patriarch, revealed what Evangelos Kofos describes as a patriotism “imbued with the ethnarchic mission of the church.”

The subtlety in this patriotism was apparently lost on the more zealous members of the Syllogos.

In a report addressed to the Greek minister of foreign affairs in 1883, Paparrigopoulos and G. I. Zolotas, the president and secretary, respectively, of the Syllogos, discussed the relative advantages of the dimotika (primary schools) and gymnasia for the national cause to determine how limited funds could be allocated most efficiently. The former category targeted a larger segment of the population and required more modest resources, whereas the latter demanded more investment, both human and financial, from the Greek state through the agency of the Syllogos. While the ministry was in favor of more impact with less immediate investment, favoring the proliferation of the dimotika instead of the dedication of precious resources to the gymnasia, Paparrigopoulos and Zolotas insisted on striking a balance because, they argued, “however extensive and well-organized our primary education became, if this primary education did not get refined both in heart and in spirit via the establishments where the youth of the middle classes, who in fact, hold the future of external Hellenism in their hands, study, this [primary] education would not only collide with the centuries-old national tradition, it would also become leaderless.”

75. ΑΥΕ, fak. 1883, K. Paparrigopoulos and G. I. Zolotas to Kontostaulos, Athens, October 13, 1883, in Vouri, Πέγες για την Ιστορία της Μακεδονίας, 88.
Like the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Patriarch Ioachim III was also of the opinion that small grammar schools rather than extravagant high schools in urban centers were more appropriate for the educational mission of the Church in Macedonia. At this point, there seemed to be a consensus among the Greek national elite that the elementary schools in the Macedonian countryside and their pupils had special needs that could not be met through curricula or material appropriate for schools in Greece or even other parts of the “enslaved lands.” Most of these needs stemmed from the facts that, in large parts of the area where they sought to Hellenize the population, demotic Greek was not the spoken language and that there was little, if any, familiarity with *kathareusa* (the version of Greek that was taught in secondary schools), even among the priests and teachers serving these regions. Some of the schoolteachers had only a rudimentary knowledge of Greek in any form. This was recognized by some of the Greek consuls in Macedonia, who argued that establishing schools in rural areas inhabited by Bulgarophone communities, although having potential in the long run, was not an efficient policy for the time being. Unlike their more urbane neighbors, who traveled around for commerce—and hence appreciated the importance of speaking Greek—these communities consisted of “peasants who cultivate the land and never move around.” The only feasible method for coopting these communities, then, was not through education but with the help of “zealous and influential priests.”

What James Clarke defines as “remaining in the Turkish era” was seen to be the lot of the peasants, who were to be included in the national community not through modernizing institutions such as schools but through more traditional means found appropriate for their standing, such as the village church. The logistical difficulties of convincing Slavic-speaking peasants to send their children to Greek schools notwithstanding, there was also an element of *bon pour l’orient* in the Greek intelligentsia’s attitude concerning the rural masses. In their opinion, given the insularity and backwardness of these communities, it sufficed to instill only an elemental sense of nationhood in their children rather than aiming for full-scale socialization. At this point, they differed from the Patriarchate’s educational ideals. For instance, Ion Dragoumis, reporting to Athens in his capacity as a member of the Committee for the Support of Greek Church and Education (Επιτροπή προς Ενίσχυση τῆς
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Ellēnikēs Ekkλēsias kai Paideias; EEEP), complained about the hopeless situation in the schools, not because the teaching departed from the centralized curriculum, as we might expect, but because it did not. In his complaint was also a frustration with the old-fashioned and Orthodox-centered methods of the Patriarchate, which sent the same primers to all the schools, but his real concern was that peasants’ children needed more “simple” material. “Very rarely do teachers understand what they should not teach,” he wrote, and, “they try to infuse the peasants’ children hard-to-digest and useless or even redundant courses in syntax and [make them] parrot analytical grammar always in accordance with the curricula from Constantinople instead of teaching them how to more fluently use Greek in a simple form. … The primers in use are rarely well-chosen and they usually contain material that is useless or very heavy for villagers’ kids and they are written in a difficult and scholarly language.”

In other words, sophisticated articulations of what it meant to be “Greek” were neither necessary nor useful for the peasant masses. This and the other consul’s remarks reveal that socialization into the national community was seen to require a different process for peasants’ children than for middle- and upper-class urbanites; the former were expected to contribute to the cause as its human weight, or “in bulk,” whereas the latter were to distinguish themselves as the leaders of the crowd.

In Bulgarian institutions of higher learning such as the gymnasium in Salonika, the student body came from geographically diverse areas in the countryside, and it consisted not only of the children of the Bulgarian-speaking middle and upper classes but also youths of more modest means. But what we might today celebrate as diversity was not a quality that impressed the (pro-Greek) anonymous author of *The Population of Macedonia, Evidence of the Christian Schools*, who held that Greek schools were genuine centers of learning, whereas Bulgarian schools were simply propaganda tools. The fact that they offered tuition waivers and free food and lodging was proof of this according to the author: “the place of origin of the pupils is important, not only from an ethnological point of view, but also from the point of view of its social consequences. The fact of filling the colleges with lads who attend them only because they find material advantages there, has really created an intellectual laboring class, which has become a charge on


81. Greek high schools were not entirely inaccessible to children of the lower classes. Many of the philanthropic organizations in Greece and the Ottoman Empire, such as the Ellēnikos Philologikos Syllogos Kōstantinoupoleōs [Greek Literary Society of Constantinople] ensured that scholarships were provided to needy children; Chares Exertzoglou, *Εθνική Ταυτότητα στήν Κωνσταντινούπολη του 19ο Αιώνα: Ο Ελληνικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπολεός, 1861–1912* (Athens, 1996).
the government that has encouraged it. ... The case of Greek schools is quite different. There, only young men in comfortable circumstances and those who feel themselves really capable of carrying on superior studies become bachelors.”

Even though Dragoumis’s, Dokos’s, or the anonymous author’s hardly concealed condescension and patronizing attitudes may appear cynical, we should not lose sight of the fact that they were not only idealists, who presumably subscribed to notions of national brotherhood, but also realists, actively working to attain results for a cause with an uncertain outcome. The transition to nationhood could not occur as the result of a uniformly applicable process under the prevailing circumstances. In the absence of the resources that a modern state could mobilize to ensure attendance, ideological content, and centralized curriculum and method in schooling, a one-size-fits-all education policy was impossible to sustain, and even counterproductive as far as the elite leadership was concerned.

For the Slavic-speaking community, the relationship of higher education to class differentiation was more complicated, given the historical role that Greek educational institutions played as the vehicle for upward social mobility for Greek and non-Greek speakers alike. Traditionally, acceptance into the upper classes implied a certain degree of (if not complete) assimilation into the Greek linguistic community and culture, but with the establishment of Bulgarian high schools that could easily rival their Greek counterparts with their modern facilities, young and energetic faculty, and European-inspired curricula, refinement and enlightenment were no longer the exclusive domain of Greek institutions. The establishment of these schools and the spread of literacy among Slavic speakers in the Macedonian countryside were the culmination of a process that had started to bear fruit, as we have seen, in the mid-nineteenth century. This process naturally required the material support of a rising middle class, which it had, but the sense of distinction between the rural and urban, and the upper and lower classes, in terms of their contribution to the national cause was not as keen among the Bulgarian intelligentsia as it was among their Greek counterparts. We may attribute this to a number of factors, principal among them the definition of Bulgarian nationalism from its beginning as the fight of the doubly oppressed people (by the “Turks” and the “Phanariots”) and its championing of the simple but hard-working peasant as the real and deserving owners of Macedonia.

The pursuit of knowledge despite all obstacles was a sentiment proudly espoused by the Bulgarian national intelligentsia, such as Grigor Purlichev, or the Miladinov brothers, the pioneers and heroes of Bulgarian education in Macedonia. Purlichev and the Miladinov brothers had been educated in

Greece, and they had utmost facility with literary Greek, which was not atypical of young Bulgarian nationalists in mid-nineteenth-century Macedonia.\textsuperscript{83} Instead of Hellenizing the Miladinovs and Purlichev however, the Athens experience had actually aroused a more conscious sense of being Bulgarian—and different—in them. Purlichev wrote in his autobiography that he had worked hard to raise the money necessary for his training in Greece. He had enrolled as a medical student but continued to compose poetry, which was his real passion. In fact, his poem “Amartôlos” won first place in 1860 at a poetry contest in Athens, where he competed against acclaimed poets and philology professors. Purlichev’s reminiscence of his victory exuded not so much of elation as bitter redemption:

We, Bulgarians, have been so abused and despised by other nationalities that it is high time we regained our dignity. When one reads our folk songs, in which every beauty is called a Greek woman, then one will instinctively conclude that wretched self-contempt is a national characteristic of the Bulgarian. It is high time we prove ourselves men among men. Bulgarian industriousness is rarely to be found among other nationalities; it has ennobled us, and it will be our salvation. . . . Having listened to the abuses heaped upon all the Bulgarians, I have lived all my life with the idea that I was a nonentity. The same thought has kept me away from the highest circles of society without which no one has ever become a famous citizen, or a man of letters. It is true that a proud man comes to no good, but it is also true that he who despises himself is a suicide \textsuperscript{sic}.\textsuperscript{84}

Purlichev, in describing his encounter with Rangavis, the head of the organizing committee and renowned man of letters, emphasized Rangavis’s apparent scorn for his decision to donate only half, not the entire amount, of the monetary prize he received. When he told Rangavis “the other half I need for myself, I am not rich,” Rangavis was clearly displeased with his answer, or so Purlichev reported. In either case, we can sense the assumption, likely but not necessarily on Rangavis’s part, but certainly on Purlichev’s, that composition of fine poetry was a vocation normally reserved for the well-off and not for poor students from the Macedonian countryside.

Despite the Bulgarian intelligentsia’s vehement desire to teach their national brethren to celebrate their differences from the Greeks, we can wonder to what extent they had subconsciously internalized philhelle notions about the superiority of certain cultural traits and were competing with

\textsuperscript{83} Dimitar Miladinov penned his opinions about the need to educate children in their mother tongue (i.e., Bulgarian) entirely in Greek; Miladinov to Alexander Exarch, Bitola, August 20, 1852, \textit{[The Miladinov Brothers Correspondence]} (Sofia, 1964), cited in \textit{Macedonia, Documents and Material}, 143–47.

\textsuperscript{84} Grigor Purlichev, \textit{[Selected Works]} (Sofia, 1939), cited in \textit{Macedonia, Documents and Material}, 401–2.
Greek nationalism within these accepted, externally set parameters. Bulgaria nationalists often complained about the lack of enlightenment among their co-nationals in Macedonia, which also happened to be a favorite theme of Greek propagandists. For instance, a notable from Pripet, trying to convince a teacher to accept a post in his town, wrote in June 1865 that “Here, as almost all over Macedonia, learning, as well as national consciousness, are still in their infancy. Therefore, a good and capable educator is needed to bring up the new generation properly. But such educators are scarce and costly, and our compatriots, apart from the fact that they do not know where to search for such, what is worse, they are not yet used to offering what they would describe as huge salaries. . . . They are not, however, against learning or slow in understanding, but only ignorant, and at first they find it strange to offer a high salary.”

That most people did not appreciate the importance of training in their mother tongue and the need to provide financial support to that end was a common source of grief among the Bulgarian intelligentsia during the formative years of Bulgarian nationhood in Macedonia. This point is significant because of the disputes between the two communities concerning how the schools were to be financed. The nature of that support presumably determined which movement was “authentic,” and because this was understood to be a winner-take-all situation, the possibility that both could be “authentic” was not one that was entertained often. Despite both parties’ insistence that theirs were the “authentic” educational institutions, functioning due to great sacrifices on the part of their respective communities, both sets of schools were assisted by extra-communal benefactors.

Education and Cultural Superiority

Not surprisingly, each side claimed that its schools were better institutions of academic excellence. In addition to sources of funding, which presumably constituted a measure of “authenticity,” the location of schools, the numbers enrolled, and the teachers were all taken as indications of one movement’s dominance over the other. Even more striking were the comparisons made on the basis of the methods of teaching, which revealed the self-image

---

85. Desislava Lilova argues that European cultural superiority was internalized by the Bulgarian intelligentsia, who also saw themselves at a disadvantage in terms of the Europeans’ regard for their culture as opposed to that of Greeks, which was considered part of a universal cultural heritage; “Barbarians, Civilized People and Bulgarians: Definition of Identity in Textbooks and the Press (1830–1878),” in We, the People: Politics of National Peculiarity in Southeastern Europe, edited by Diana Mishkova (Budapest, 2009), 181–206.

86. Kouzman Shapkarev to Georgi Ikonomov, Pripet, June 8, 1865, cited in Macedonia, Documents and Material, 217.

87. See also “Report from Veles,” Tsarigradski Vestnik [Constantinople Newspaper], no. 7, October 28, 1850, cited in Macedonia, Documents and Material, 142–43.
as a nation of each side. These self-images were clearly influenced by accepted and generalized notions of each nation’s characteristics—characteristics originally observed by a western gaze, articulated in a rich literature of travel writing and fiction as well as ethnographic and geographical works. The characteristics then found their way into the national elites’ definitions of their own community and perceptions of what made that community different from the other.

In Greek-Bulgarian polemics concerning schools and learning, the vestiges of these deeply engrained notions are hardly disguised. Bulgarians emphasized the industrious and humble nature of their nation, in line with the commonly accepted stereotype of the Bulgarian as a simple, honest peasant, and based their arguments of scholastic superiority not only on having successfully taught peasants how to read and write in their “mother tongue” but also on having raised a new generation through a rigorous but practical system of education. On the opposite side, Greek nationalists invoked their special connection to the heritage of antiquity, the very source of western civilization and higher culture as the world knew it. It was not sheer quantity but quality that mattered, and the Greeks were the sole bearers of that quality.

The first modern Bulgarian schools were the result of the efforts of Vasil Aprilov, who founded a school in Gabrovo in 1835. Aprilov’s school followed the Lancaster model. Its popularity aside, the Lancaster model was a perfect fit for the Bulgarian scholastic movement, which was defined against the hegemony of the Patriarchate, just as Joseph Lancaster had been driven by his isolation from the English educational establishment because of his Quaker faith. The model was emulated by many small schools opening up in Macedonia, and Bulgarian schools came to be known for their emphasis on practical knowledge such as language and vocational training, whereas the majority of their Greek counterparts continued to teach a classical curriculum. The relative merits of these two approaches differed considerably, depending on the referee’s subjective notions of what constituted superior national education.

88. Jelavich and Jelavich, Establishment of the Balkan States, 131. Mishev dates the first school to 1821; Brancoff [Mishev], La Macédoine et sa Population Chrétienne, 53.
89. This was also mentioned in the French consul’s report in 1882; MAE, vol. 6, Consul to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salonika, May 30, 1882. The Bell-Lancaster method was originally not used solely by the Bulgarian community. In 1830, before the emergence of a scholastic rivalry between Greeks and Bulgarians, the first school was established for the Christian community of Monastir, Greek was the medium of instruction, using the Bell-Lancaster method; Lory, “Schools for the Destruction of Society,” 50. The heyday of the method was the beginning of the nineteenth century in Europe, and the Greeks in Chios, the Ionian islands, and Jassy were among the early adopters, even though the Church viewed the method with suspicion; Christina Koulouri, Dimensions Idéologiques de l’Historicité en Grèce, 1834–1914: Les Manuels Scolaires d’Histoire et de Géographie (Frankfurt, 1991), 38–41.
90. See, for instance, Victor Bérard’s evaluation of Bulgarian and Greek schools in Macedonia, cited in Brancoff [Mishev], La Macédoine et sa Population Chrétienne, 77.
functional education favored by the Bulgarian gymnasia. For the defenders of the Greek educational establishment, institutions of higher education were not simply vocational training centers; they were representative bodies of a national cultural heritage and civilization. Greek nationalist discourse adopted and nurtured this position, eventually integrating it into the official historiography of the era as exemplified by Douglas Dakin: “Greek communities and wealthy Greeks of Macedonian origin had built up a relatively large educational system. Greek education, however, did not altogether meet the requirements of a modern age, and in some respects Bulgarian education which, though of poorer quality, emphasized languages and useful knowledge, had in some quarters the stronger appeal: nevertheless Greek education had social standing and maintained in vigorous existence that culture, that ecclesiastical rule and that way of life which we call Hellenism.”

Going back to the period in which this discourse was being established, we must also note the importance placed on the way Hellenism was represented outside the Hellenic world. In this respect, educational institutions, and especially those of higher learning, were yet another indicator of the superiority of that culture. In the words of Paparrigopoulos and Zolotas, the president and secretary of the Syllogos: “to those from abroad who study the national struggles in the East, institutions of such caliber inspire a belief in the vital powers and the superiority of the nation that sustains them.”

This belief in the ultimate role of schools as the face of Greek civilization to the rest of the world was a corollary to the elite discourse on the hierarchical order of nations and Greek superiority within that hierarchy. Less conspicuous within that discourse was also a conviction that some kind of “civilizing mission” was accorded to the Greek nation, which it was to perform through institutions of learning and culture. One of the instances when that conviction revealed itself was a July 14 celebration performed by Greek schoolchildren in Serres. According to a Piraeus newspaper, a student of the gymnasium delivered a speech in French that compared the civilizing missions of the Greek and French nations. The lecture was meant to make an impression on Captain Lamouche, chief of the French gendarmerie in the Serres sector, who had been invited to the school for the occasion. Alas, Lamouche (whom the newspaper repeatedly referred to as ‘M. Mouche’) proved to be a complete disappointment and disgrace to the finest Gallic tradition of discourse, according to the paper, and delivered “a few banalities, such as saying that France cares about the people of the Orient and has their interests in mind.” He did not “even deign to take to his bulgarophile lips a statement of courtesy with regard to the Greeks.”

---

town were apparently offended but also bemused by Captain Lamouche’s behavior. A representative of French civilization, who, by definition, should have appreciated Greek culture and been favorably disposed to the Greek position in Macedonia, had completely let them down by his indifference.

The Greek side was quite correct in suspecting that Captain Lamouche’s aloofness was a result of his personal sympathy for the Bulgarian side; Lamouche was later appointed “honorary consul” of Bulgaria because of his conduct during the Macedonian conflict, and he later wrote a book that narrated the events in Macedonia from a pro-Bulgarian viewpoint. It seems that the captain, adding insult to injury, not only displayed a blatant indifference toward the July 14 celebration of this Greek school but made a point of paying special attention to the Bulgarian schools in the area. Greek protests against Captain Lamouche were not limited to this newspaper article. Minister Theodoros Deliyannis’s office expressed the discontent of the Greek side through higher diplomatic means, such as notes to Paris. According to anonymous reports, Lamouche was not happy when Greek teachers paid him a visit and told him that they spoke Greek at home and at school in those parts. Nor did he express any interest when the teachers explained to him that Romanian and Vlach were different languages and that the Vlachs declared themselves to be, and therefore were, Greeks. Finally, during a visit to a Greek school, he greeted the students in the “Bulgar manner,” and even though his salutation was reciprocated in Greek, he continued to speak in Bulgarian. He insistently asked what language was spoken “within families,” and without waiting for a response, he continued to talk to the students in Bulgarian. The teacher told him that the students were Greek but they also spoke Bulgarian. “So they are Bulgarians,” he commented, and the teacher said, no, “they are not schismatic Bulgars, they call themselves Greeks, go to Greek Church and follow the Patriarchate.” The captain’s response, apparently, was “an ironic smile.”

Lamouche’s own recollection of these events was naturally quite different: “The Greeks in Serres as in all of Macedonia, were extremely fanatical and intolerant,” he wrote in his book. “From the time we arrived, they claimed monopoly over our relations and were offended by the slightest interest that we might offer to anyone other than themselves. Even though I always tried hard to maintain the impartiality that my position required, I could not sacrifice the causes that years of study had already had proven just to me, for the friendship of Greeks.”

The French captain’s conduct, which made no secret of his sympathy for the Bulgarian side, was not atypical of the foreign officers sent to Macedonia, who were viewed by the local population as representatives of the

94. Lamouche, Quinze Ans d’Histoire Balkanique.
95. MAE, vol. 416, Confidential Note, November 9, 1904.
96. Lamouche, Quinze Ans d’Histoire Balkanique, 56.
Great Powers sent to save them from their misery. They were also seen as the potential arbiters of an ultimate resolution of the “Macedonian problem,” which made it important to appeal to their personal opinions. As the case of Captain Lamouche demonstrates, such opinions were often formed before the officers’ arrival at their posts and were a result of the ways that Europeans conceived of peoples of the Ottoman Empire since the “discovery” of Eastern Europe.97 Winning the fight required not only numerical superiority but also, and arguably more important, the establishment of a morally superior position that would win foreign public opinion. The assertion of cultural superiority, therefore, was not a supplementary but a fundamental component of this competition. In a pamphlet intended for a francophone audience, Ioanna Stephanopoli asked, “Is it to this rebellious, factional, barbarian minority [i.e., Bulgarians] that we are to sacrifice a race that is counted among the greatest contributors of European civilization?”98 The question was meant to convey the message that not only were the Bulgarians a numerical minority but that they were also qualitatively dwarfed compared to the great civilization they were up against.

The distance covered by Bulgarian academic institutions in the second half of the nineteenth century was impressive. The new schools directly contributed to the emergence of a political movement demanding the independence of Macedonia from the Ottomans by training the leadership cadres of IMRO, an outcome not necessarily foreseen by the Bulgarian upper classes who pioneered the scholastic leap forward. IMRO would become one of the principal political forces leading the insurgency against the Ottoman Empire and would maintain its influence (and retain its violent tactics) during the interwar years. Nearly all the founders of IMRO—Damian Gruev, Andon Dimitrov, Ivan Hadzi Nikolov, Hristo Batandzhiev, and Petûr Poparsov—were schoolteachers, trained either in Bulgaria or Macedonia. Duncan Perry, in his work on the early years of the Macedonian liberation organizations, argues that the sociological base for the revolutionary movement evolved because as “schools flourished, graduates multiplied and became teachers, little changed on the socio-economic front, and thus restlessness and dissatisfaction with the status quo ultimately fed a steady stream of students, graduates and teachers into revolutionary circles and later into guerrilla bands.”99 Although the IMRO ideological direction and strategic planning did come from its educated leadership, the movement also blended the well-established haidut (bandit) tradition into its organization, enlisting the aid of several “social bandits” in the region.

---
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