

I

**MACEDONIA
AND
THE MACEDONIANS**

The Macedonian People and Macedonian National Consciousness

The development of nearly all European peoples and nations has been accompanied by numerous and various historical and political difficulties and upheavals. Even in the case of some of the most highly developed modern nations of the European and other continents, history has dictated situations which are not too different from those of the Macedonian people: tribes and ethnicities have become mixed, languages and names have been borrowed, territories and state boundaries have been altered, faiths and cultures have intertwined with each other...

Let us take the example of France and the French. The ancient Gaul covered the territory of what is today northern Italy, France, part of Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands, and was populated by *Gauls*, a Roman name designating Celtic tribes. In the 1st century BC Julius Caesar conquered Gaul and it remained within the borders of the Roman Empire up to the end of the 5th century AD. This was a period during which a complex process of assimilation of the Gauls and Romans took place and when Vulgar Latin became the spoken language of the population. It was from this basis that later, influenced by the vernacular of some Germanic tribes, modern French developed. The present-day name of the French derives from the state of the Franks, a group of western Germanic tribes who lived around the River Rhine in what is today Germany and who, towards the late 5th century, conquered almost the whole of ancient Gaul and, by the end of the 8th century, most of Central and Western Europe. With the 843 Treaty of Verdun, however, the powerful and vast state of Charlemagne (Charles the Great, 768-814), composed of various peoples, split into three individual states: France, Germany and Italy. Following the 9th century the French gradually evolved as an ethnicity that constituted itself as the French nation in the late 18th century.

We can hence conclude that the modern French are the descendants of a Celtic tribe (that mingled with other tribes and peoples), speaking a Romance language and using a Germanic name. Can present-day Germans claim that the French were or are, perhaps, still Germans? Can the Italians, as the heirs of the old Roman Empire, assert that the French are Italians? And can anyone today refute the history and culture of the Belgians, Dutch and other former Gauls? Can anyone consider

the people of the Netherlands as being German because they, too, still call their language *Duutsch* (akin to *Deutsch*)?

Is there not a similar situation with the Russians who have taken the name of the present-day Ukrainians, and these, in their struggle for national affirmation in the 19th century, had to take the regional geographical designation as a national name in order to be constituted as a separate Slavic nation?

Did not the Turan-Mongol tribes of the 'proto-Bulgarian' khans conquer the territories of 'the seven Slav tribes' between Mount Stara Planina and the Danube, and create a single state with a Bulgarian name and a Slavonic language? Was not the Bulgarian people formed of the Turan-Mongol Bulgars and Lower Danube Slavs mixed with Vlachs, Thracians, etc., which in the 19th century constituted themselves as a separate Slavic nation?

On the other hand, the present-day Serbian nation draws its origins from mediaeval Serbia, even though this feudal Serbian state (not bearing even the Serbian name in the beginning) was conceived mainly on the territory of modern Montenegro and Kosovo. Even at the peak of its power it did not include the whole territory of present-day 'Central Serbia', whereas the modern capital of the Serbian nation, Belgrade, was to become 'Serbian' as late as the 15th century, and even then for only 23 years (1404-1427). In certain periods feudal Serbia controlled the territories of present-day Kosovo, Montenegro, Albania, Macedonia, part of Greece and even parts of Bulgaria and Bosnia, but can anyone today dispute the Serbian character of modern Serbia or of Belgrade?

Is not the development of the Greek nation highly illustrative? In various periods (after the age of 'Hellenism' and the conquest of the Greek *poleis* by Philip II, the King of the Macedonians), the borders of 'Greece' (in particular, later, those of the Byzantine Empire) encompassed almost all the peoples of the Balkan Peninsula, and even some outside it. The Greek language and the Greek alphabet from various phases of their development were used in all these territories, and the Greek name was also in use. But even though they have used a number of names in their history (as a result of their mediaeval state-constitutional traditions), the Greeks bore for a long time the Roman name *Romaioi* which was also used in our regions in the form of *Rum-millet* until the expulsion of the Turks in 1912, and the ethnonym 'Hellene' was long used by the Greeks themselves as denoting a pagan ('non-Christian'). Can we now claim that the countries of the Balkans and the Middle East are populated by Greeks and that they should be annexed to the Greek state only because they were once part of the Byzantine Empire, because there are today remains of the 'Greek' culture or because up to the 19th century most of these territories were under the domination of the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople, or because a large number of Greeks or at least Graecophiles lived in the major centres? Was it not the case that a Greek uprising was started in 1821

first in Wallachia and Moldavia, in what is today Romania? Or perhaps the modern Romanians are of Greek descent?

Hence, is it possible from a scholarly point of view, and can we still manipulate from a political point of view with the terms 'Greek lands', 'Bulgarian lands' or 'Serbian lands' as regards the territories which were once parts of mediaeval states bearing the present-day Greek, Bulgarian or Serbian names? These same territories in different periods used to have different masters and bear different names, and therefore Macedonia, for instance, cannot be a 'Greek', 'Bulgarian', 'Serbian' and 'Turkish' land at the same time. The feudal state paid no attention to the ethnic character of its subjects, but was only concerned with the greater wealth of the appropriate areas and with the expansion of its territory, on which its power and security depended.

Hence the only reliable and fair approach is to study the history of different peoples and cultures which were part of different states at different periods, and not to identify those peoples with the former feudal states whose borders often changed and were usually short-lived. Accordingly, we can speak of the history of the Greek, or the Bulgarian, or the Serbian people during their development over the centuries independently of whether these peoples sometimes found themselves within the state borders of other rulers. Following the same historical logic, we can speak of the historical development of the Macedonian people who very often had different rulers, but who developed an identity of their own, resulting in the birth of a more recent social and historical category, the nation.

The paths of this long process have not always been traced, but its result is already known to us.

After the downfall of ancient Macedonia and the partition of the Roman Empire, towards the early 7th century, the Slavs had already inhabited Macedonia, penetrating deeply into the borders of present-day Greece and Albania. They mingled with the natives from this part of the Byzantine Empire and gradually (owing to their geographical, economic, cultural, linguistic and even political individuality) started constituting themselves as a separate people with a Slavonic language and Macedonian-Slavic-Byzantine culture. The frequent changing of political masters and the long subjugation under Ottoman Turkey did not create conditions for the establishment of a definite ethnic name for this people which could later be used as a designation for the nation. As a result, the completion of the process of development of this people seems to coincide with the early stages of the process of formation of the nation in Macedonia. The long duration and erratic character of the former process resulted in a highly complicated and long process of national consolidation among the Macedonians. Closely connected with this is also the relatively late development of the idea of the independent political constitution of the Macedonian people. As far as the Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians

were concerned, their national development followed a more or less straight line, inheriting the names and the past of the corresponding mediaeval states and defining immediately the goals of political liberation and state-constitutional individualization. Among the Macedonians, however, these questions arose somewhat later, in different circumstances, in the absence of state-constitutional traditions under their own name, and even without a consistent ethnic name of their own, in circumstances of a complex mixture of ethnic, religious and social affiliations inherited from the mediaeval period and specific circumstances of development under Ottoman domination. At the time when the neighbouring peoples were fighting for or had already secured their political liberation, the Macedonians remained in the central part of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkans, without opportunities for true revival and without defined national ideals or concrete tasks, and became the target of various conflicting aspirations on the part of their neighbours in the period of their national romanticism. Hence the first questions to be raised in the 19th century by the more awakened Macedonians were: who are we, what are we, and where are we? It was first necessary to define the geographical and ethnographic borders vis-à-vis those of their neighbours. An ethnic 'birth' was necessary first; and only then could they raise the question of political liberation.

1. The emergence and development of the Macedonian people

With no ambitions to cover all the aspects of this problem — bearing in mind that there are still no generally accepted theoretical models in scholarship concerning the constitution of a people as a social and historical category — we shall concentrate on certain questions which seem more important to us and which have without doubt aroused great interest. This is even more important in view of the fact that some of these questions have already been analysed by certain historians from neighbouring nations, utterly ignoring the ethnic and cultural identity of the Macedonians. We shall pay particular attention to the period from the 7th to the 11th centuries, the time when certain significant processes relevant to the formation of the modern Macedonian people were completed or initiated.

Just like any other people, the Macedonian people was formed neither from a single tribe nor from a single ethnic entity in the broader sense of this term: during the centuries of development, it encompassed different ethnic groups that had lost their individuality, while leaving significant traces not only in history and archaeology, but also in the living spiritual and material culture of Macedonia. To believe that we are 'pure' Slavs means to follow the road of blind racism. True, it is very

likely that the large majority of the present-day Macedonian people are descendants of the Slavs, most of whom are assumed to have reached this part of the Balkan Peninsula from the 5th to the early 7th century, but (in spite of all pogroms) they certainly did not find this region utterly uninhabited. By absorbing parts of the peoples living there (ancient Macedonians, Illyrians, Thracians, Greeks, Romans, etc.), the Slavs also absorbed their culture, and in that amalgamation a people was gradually formed with perhaps predominantly Slavic ethnic elements, speaking a Slavonic language and with a Slavic-Byzantine culture.

Why, when and how has this people differentiated itself from the neighbouring Slav peoples?

An increasing number of Bulgarian scholars have been putting forward the thesis that the territory bordered by the Morava, the Danube, the Black Sea, Constantinople, the Aegean Sea, Central Greece and Albania up to the Šar Mountains was populated by a certain ‘Bulgarian group’ of Slav tribes,¹ whose basic (and only!) characteristic was the language, and its “most characteristic feature” was the article!² In his study entitled ‘The Bulgarian Nationality and the Work of Clement of Ohrid’ Prof. Dimit’r Angelov writes that all these Slav tribes, “regardless of some dialectal features, had a common language, and therefore they belong to one and the same group — the Bulgarian — in contrast to the tribes of the Serbo-Croatian group, which in the 7th century settled in the north-western regions of the Balkan Peninsula (parts of present-day Yugoslavia)”.³ Precisely because of the character of these Slavs, the entire period from the 7th to the 9th centuries was characterized “by a constant and increasingly strongly outlined tendency — namely the aspiration of the Bulgarian rulers gradually to include all the Slav tribes of the Bulgarian group within the territory of their own state”.⁴

Whether these and similar theories and assumptions have a serious basis can be seen from the following historical facts.

Firstly, even if we allow the retroactive meaning of a certain term which appeared considerably later, it is not true that there was a tribal unity of the Slavs that settled in this vast area (except if referring to the general unity of all Slavs). Before their arrival in the Balkans, the Slav tribes of the Slavini (Sclavini) and

¹ Di mi t ъг Angel ov, „B ъл gar skat a nar odnost i del ot o na Kl i ment Ohr i dski“, *Kl i ment Ohr i dski 916-1966. Сборні к от ст ат і і по случай 1050 годі ні от смърт т а ни*, BAN, Sof і я, 1966, 7. These views are also expressed in other papers by this author. We should mention his article „Р о в ърп osa za nasel eni et o v Makedoni я pr ez sr ednovekovnat a epoha (VII-ХIV v.)“ in the journal *Искус т во*, III, 4-5, Sof і я, 1962, and they are expounded in greater detail in his book, published later, „Obr azuvane na б ъл gar skat a nar odnost“ (Sof і я, 1971), covering the period to the 11th century.

² Di mi t ъг Angel ov, „B ъл gar skat a nar odnost ...“, 12.

³ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

Antians (Antes) lived separately. According to Emperor Mauricius (6th century), they had “the same way of life and the same customs”,⁵ and yet they were distinct Slav tribes and during their settlement they inhabited different territories in the Balkans. Whereas the Slavini settled Macedonia and parts of present-day Serbia, Greece and Bulgaria, the Antians settled mainly the territory of present-day Bulgaria. Even if we assume that the Slavinian (Sclavinian) and Antian tribes were of the very same stock, even if we neglect their subsequent historical fate in the Balkans, we shall have to admit that this ‘Bulgarian group’ must have involved the people living in a large part of what is today Serbia! In addition, it has to be underlined that the Bulgarian Slavs between the Danube and Mount Stara Planina mingled chiefly with the indigenous Thracians, Dacians, etc., and later with the newly-arrived Bulgars (a Turan-Mongol tribe that gave its name and state organization to the subsequently formed Bulgarian people).

Secondly, in the formation of peoples it is not the ethnic composition of the population which is primary, but the population’s historical development. The history of many European and non-European peoples can prove this. Likewise, this part of the Balkans saw the development of the Bulgarian, Serbian and Macedonian peoples.

Known facts on the Slav tribes in Bulgaria are more than scarce. Even though Bulgarian scholars speak of some tribal union which later concluded an alliance with the newly-arrived Bulgars, serious historical sources from that period do not confirm such assumptions. It is known with certainty that by 681 the Bulgars had already established a state organization controlling the Slavs from the Timok to the Black Sea and from the Danube to Stara Planina, which was recognized by the Byzantine Empire. It is also known, however, that as early as the late 6th century and the first half of the 7th century, on the territory between the rivers Volga and Dnieper there was an established tribal union of Turan-Mongol tribes calling themselves Bulgars, but that in 650 this state of Khan Kubrat broke down under the pressure of the Khazars, as a result of which Kubrat’s son Asparuh moved to the Balkans with a part of his people and there established his new state comprising (primarily) people of Slavic stock.⁶

⁵ P r o f . A л e k c a н д р ъ К . В у р м о в и Д о с . П е т њ р Н р . П е т р о в , *Xpист о м а т и я р о и с т о р и я н а Б њ л ѡ г а р и я*, I. *О т н а и - с т а р и в р е м е н а д о с р е д а т а н а X V I I I в е к*, S o f и я , 1964, 67.

⁶ The view of the Russian historian, Academician Nikolay Derzhavin, seems a rather interesting one; it is presented in the ‘abridged shorthand minutes’ of the lecture he delivered at the 6th Plenum of the Pan-Slavic Committee in Moscow, on October 16 and 17, 1943. It deals with a number of questions which concern and elucidate our subject. Derzhavin pays special attention to the Antians, their movement to the south of the Balkans and their relations with the Proto-Bulgarians, but he also expresses his views on the composition of Asparuh’s company in moving to what is today Bulgaria, which may be relevant for further research („I s t o r и ч е с к и е о с н о в ы д р ѡ ж б ы r u s s k o g o и б о л - g a r s k o g o н а р о д о в “ , *С л а в я н е*, № 11, Moskva, 1943, 30-31).

It must be noted, however, that this was not the only Bulgarian state at that time. Another Bulgarian tribe (the Kotrags) crossed the Don and arrived at the Volga where, together with the local tribes, they established another Bulgarian state which existed up to the 13th century, when it was destroyed by the Tartars. The fourth Bulgarian state (if we consider Kubrat's Bulgaria as the first one!) was founded by Kubrat's eldest son, Batbayan, in the territory lying between the River Kuban and the Sea of Azov. Even though it was soon subjugated by the Khazars, its remains could be found for several centuries after that.

Trying to prove not only that the Bulgarian Slavs mingled with the Turan-Mongol tribe, but that Bulgars came also to Macedonia, leaving there their own blood and their own name and culture, Bulgarian historians very often underline the significance of a certain company of Asparuh's brother Kuber, who came to the Bitola and Salonika regions and remained there. Yet there are still no reliable sources supporting this. It is true, Bulgars are mentioned in connection with the attacks against Salonika in the 7th century, but only as one of the many allies of the Macedonian Slav tribes, such as the Avars or Kumans, most of which moved back. Even if we suppose that they remained in Macedonia, owing to their insignificant number they could not have changed the general ethnic character of the Macedonian people. There were also Bulgars across the Danube, even in some parts of Croatia, and it would really be difficult to put forward similar claims concerning the Bulgarian character of the people or territories there.

While the Bulgarian state of Asparuh and his heirs constantly expanded and grew stronger, gradually forming one people of the various ethnic elements of its population, as early as the beginning of the 7th century, i.e. before the foundation of the Bulgarian state, the Slavs in Macedonia had already established a tribal union and acted quite independently in the wars against the Byzantine Empire in the siege of Salonika. This tribal union, named Slavina (Sclavinia), existed for about six decades and marked the beginning of the formation of the Macedonian people. But the military power of the Byzantine Empire, putting Macedonia under its control, prolonged the process of this formation, although individual Slav tribes continued their half-independent development.

It is important to note at this point that while the various ethnic groups in Bulgaria melted together under the name 'Bulgars', and that they are referred to in the sources only under that name, in Macedonia they blended using the name *Clavini* (*Claevini*) or *Clavs*, and the older ethnic groups are not mentioned. The life and development in two states with different levels and characters of culture gradually differentiated the Macedonians from the Bulgarians. This situation continued for more than two and a half centuries, a period sufficient to bring about the formation of two ethnic individualities, which had absolutely no material or spiritual contacts during that period.

Thirdly, there were no aspirations — and there could not be any — on the part of the Bulgarian khans and princes towards the unification of “all Slav tribes of the Bulgarian group”, because for a long time those heading the Bulgarian state were non-Slav leaders who simply could not nourish aspirations for a Slavic-centred policy. Furthermore, it is well known from history that Bulgarian expansion took place to the north and the east rather than the south-west. It is interesting that the first territories to be conquered were those of present-day Romania, Serbia and parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and only later the territory of Macedonia, whose conquest lasted for nearly a century. How can these “aspirations” of the Bulgarian khans and princes be linked with the “Bulgarian Slavic group” only within the boundaries of “Moesia, Thrace and Macedonia” when it is a well-known fact that in the 9th and 10th centuries Bulgaria included the territories of Romania, parts of Ukraine and Hungary, Serbia, Montenegro, Albania, Macedonia (without Salonika) and parts of Bosnia and Croatia? These lands were not populated solely by Slavs, and they certainly cannot be included in the “Bulgarian group”. Moreover, strong resistance is mentioned in the sources on the part of the Slavs against Bulgarian conquests; there were fierce conflicts, for instance, between Krum or Omurtag and the subjugated Slavs. Military alliances were also concluded between Bulgaria and the Byzantine Empire and the Franks against the Slavs, and bloody military campaigns were fought by the Bulgarian leaders against the Slavs in Paeonia, Moravia, Thrace and Macedonia.

Fourthly, and no less importantly, the language of the Slavs of that “Bulgarian group” was not particularly different from the language of the other Slavs at that time, nor can we speak of some article form in those centuries, as this was the result of the subsequent development of the Macedonian and Bulgarian languages in the Balkan environment. To confirm this it is sufficient to mention that the language of the Macedonian Slavs from the Salonika region, which Cyril and Methodius took as the literary standard in the 9th century, was also fully understandable to the Greater-Moravian Slavs, and that the language or the written records, at least up to the 11th century, showed no article forms in either Macedonia or Bulgaria or Thrace. Attention must also be paid to the fact that the article form has never appeared (and will probably never appear) in the language of the Serbian Slavs who, however, were incorporated into the Bulgarian state much earlier and remained a part of it longer than Macedonia.

If one has to seek any differences between the Bulgarian and Macedonian peoples as early as that period, one should pay attention not only to the ethnic composition, but above all to the historical development as well as the individuality and character of the cultures of these lands. The independent life in two different environments (one pagan, the other Christian) created two different cultures: a **Slavic-Bulgarian pagan** culture in Bulgaria and a **Macedonian-Slavic-Byzan-**

tine Christian culture in Macedonia. This is so in spite of the fact that even today the Macedonian language is the closest to Bulgarian, in the same way that Slovenian is the closest to Croatian, Slovak to Czech and Ukrainian or Belorussian to Russian.

2. When did Macedonia come under Bulgarian rule and for how long did that rule last?

The first incursions of Bulgarians into Macedonia were recorded around 789 when a Bulgarian detachment entered the area around the River Struma, but had to withdraw immediately. In 805 Khan Krum annexed the lands of Banat, Transylvania and the region west of the River Timok together with Belgrade. In 809 he destroyed Sofia, and somewhat later he conquered it, but the whole of Macedonia continued to remain outside the Bulgarian borders. In 807 some Bulgarian detachments again penetrated into the Struma region, but were unable to remain there. There are also highly unreliable sources from which some assume that during the time of Khan Pressian (836-852) the khagan Izbul conquered the Western Rhoodopes and the region between the rivers Struma and Mesta, and that in this period “the whole of Central Macedonia together with a part of Southern Albania” was conquered, as (allegedly) confirmed by a special accord towards the mid-9th century.⁷ Bulgarian scholars assume that, as there are no data relating to the conquest of Macedonia, this automatically means that the Macedonian Slavs were “voluntarily” annexed to Bulgaria. But known instances of resistance and rebellions against the Bulgarian conquerors confirm that the Macedonian Slavs were far from pleased with the new conquerors. What can be accepted with certainty is the fact that in 864, following the peace accord with the Byzantine Empire, Prince Boris (852-889) received a part of Macedonia as a reward for accepting Christianity from the Constantinopolitan Church.

Thus the struggle for the conquest of Macedonia by Bulgaria continued for nearly a century, but Bulgaria’s full control of the land lasted less than half a century. Following the attack of the Russian Prince Svyatoslav against Bulgaria in 968 and after the occupation of the whole of Danube Bulgaria in the following year, during the next few years battles were fought between the Russians and Byzantines, after which the Bulgarian state collapsed and was included within the Byzantine Empire.

In 969 there was an organized insurrection in Macedonia headed by the four sons of Prince Nicholas, which finally led to the establishment of the vast Empire

⁷ *Историја на Българія*, I, София, 1954, 93.

of Tsar Samuel (Samoil), whose centre and capital was Prespa and Ohrid. This first state of the Macedonian Slavs succeeded in expanding its territory over a large part of the Balkans, but kept it only up to 1018.

This marked the beginning of a new, two-century-long subjugation under the Byzantine Empire, disturbed by powerful insurrections and short-lived autonomies of some Macedonian feudal lords. Among the most significant in this period were the uprisings of Petar Deljan (1040) and Ćorĳi Vojteh (1072) and the autonomous regional administrations of Dobromir Hrs (1185-1202) in the Strumica region and of Aleksij Slav (1207-1230) in the Melnik region. The Crusades incorporated Macedonia for a brief period into what was known as 'the Latin Empire', and the Bulgarian Tsar Kaloyan succeeded in occupying parts of it. Yet this Bulgarian reign of Macedonia, too, lasted for no more than two or three years, as following Kaloyan's death (1207) Macedonia once again fell under Byzantine rule.

Of particular significance is the emergence of new independent feudal lords in Macedonia, among whom the most important was Strez (1207-1214) in central Macedonia. His rule saw a continuation of its statehood in some way, but after his death the Epirote despot Theodorus Comnenus took control of Macedonia. In 1230 the Bulgarian Tsar Ivan Asen II once again incorporated Macedonia into Bulgaria, but this reign, too, lasted for only 11 years; after his death (1241) Byzantine rule continued.

In 1282 the Serbian King Milutin began the struggle for Serbian control of Macedonia and this process was completed by Tsar Duĳan in 1345. During the reign of the latter, for a certain period Macedonia even became the centre of the Serbian state, the seat of the Tsar and the Patriarch. It is important to note that Duĳan retained the autonomy of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, even though he somewhat decreased its competencies. In addition, the regional feudal lords in Macedonia under Duĳan enjoyed a special status and were granted a great degree of autonomy. As a result, following Duĳan's death (1355), the Dejanovci and Mrnjaĳevci families established fully independent feudal rule. Around 1365 Volkaĳin proclaimed himself "the King of the Serbs and the Romaioi" and ruled independently until the year 1371, when in the battle near the River Marica, fighting against the Turks, he was killed together with his brother, the despot Jovan Ugleĳa. Volkaĳin's son, known as King Mark (Marko), had to acknowledge Turkish rule after 1390, whereas Konstantin Dejan recognized the supreme authority of the Turks earlier and became a Turkish vassal, continuing, as it were, the semi-independence of that part of Macedonia. It was only after the battle near Rovine (1395), in which both of them were killed, that the Turks were able to establish full control not only of Macedonia, but almost of the whole of the Balkans. The long period which ensued (lasting up to 1912) was the darkest subjugation of the

Macedonian people, when Macedonia experienced stagnation and decline, although it was also a period of popular resistance expressed through mass insurrections.

Bearing in mind all these facts, we can draw the following conclusions:

(1) The Slavic character of the main ethnic group is of considerable importance for the history of the Macedonian people, but we cannot and should not overlook the significance of the ancient Macedonians, who gave this people its territory, name, culture and blood. If the history of the Turan-Mongol Bulgars is considered as an inseparable part of the history of the modern Bulgarian people, why should not the Macedonians respect the past, glory and culture of their own land, their own name and part of their own blood? For, as Dimitar V. Makedonski said in 1871, “the earth did not gape open to swallow” those ancient Macedonians;⁸ they melted into the mass of the people.

(2) The people of Macedonia, in the course of some 13 centuries (after the arrival of the Slavs in the Balkans), mostly lived together in the same state, sharing the same economy and culture; Macedonia was nearly always incorporated as a whole into the different territories of neighbouring states and sustained common influences, which undoubtedly contributed to the formation of this people’s individuality.

(3) Under the feudal system, at least as far as the Balkan region is concerned, most of the states were not states of peoples but of territories; hence the borders of the Byzantine Empire, Bulgaria, Serbia, and even Turkey, comprised different peoples which later secured a completely independent popular and national development.

(4) During its history from the beginning of the 7th century up to 1912, the Macedonian people invariably came under the control of four principal powers: for more than four and a half centuries it was under Byzantine rule (7th-9th, 11th-13th); slightly more than a century under the Bulgarians (9th-10th, 13th); nearly a century under the Serbs (13th-14th), and five centuries under the Turks (14th-20th). Even if we exclude these five centuries when Macedonia was under Turkish domination, as were the neighbouring peoples, if we take only the period from the 7th to the 14th century, it follows that (during these eight centuries) Macedonia was under Bulgarian rule for no more than 110 years. Bearing in mind that other Balkan Slavic and non-Slavic peoples also came within the Bulgarian borders, that there were no means of mass communication, that the Macedonians had no contacts with the Bulgarians beyond Mount Stara Planina, and that the foreign military-administrative authorities could not exert any stronger influence on the broad masses of the Macedonian population — it can be safely assumed

⁸ D.V. Makedonski à, „P o makedonskÿàt ò vÿpr osò“, *Македония*, V, 7, Сar egr adò, 16.II.1871.

that it was impossible that only the populations of Moesia, Thrace and Macedonia formed a single people, without those of the other regions of the state which came for even longer within the boundaries of Bulgaria. For example, the Romanians (they chose this name as late as 1862, following the unification of Wallachia and Moldavia, which became the national name of the unified *Роман* people!) were under Bulgarian rule uninterruptedly from the 7th to the 10th centuries, and even later they remained under the strong influence of the Bulgarian state. The Albanians, too, were under the authority of the Bulgarians at least as long as the Macedonians. But if these peoples were not 'Slavic', then why did the Serbs, Montenegrins and part of the Bosnians and Croats not become and remain Bulgarians?

(5) In the course of their history, the modern Macedonians formed their own state-political organizations more than once, but these were either not fully developed or remained restricted to smaller territories and were not recognized by others, or bore foreign names, as a result of which contemporary historians included them within pages dealing with other peoples. As early as the 7th century the Macedonian Slavs founded a state organization of their own which was of no lower level than the state organization of the tribal unions of the Serbs and Croats in the 9th and 10th centuries. The constant struggle and insurrections against the Byzantine Empire united the Macedonian Slavs as a community and resulted in that popular unity finding its expression in the first state established by the Slavs in Macedonia headed by Samuel, which, just like any other feudal state, later expanded its borders over a large part of the Balkans. That this state was basically a state of the Macedonian Slavs is confirmed by the historical fact that following its collapse (1018), Basil II made Macedonia a separate theme (*thema*), giving it the name which was probably used by both the state and its church.

In spite of the complications with the designation, it was in the state of Samuel that the Macedonian people began its affirmation as a people: it formed a state-political whole; it introduced an official standard literary Slavonic language with Ohrid as its cultural and literary centre; it created an autonomous church organization with the elevation of the Bishopric of Ohrid to the rank of patriarchate; it also grew as a single economic entity and its towns experienced great progress, developing the Slavic consciousness of its people, although under a dual appellation: under the popular name 'Slavs' and the state name 'Bulgars'. The development of Macedonia in the following two centuries as a Byzantine administrative territory whose inhabitants were designated as 'Bulgars' increasingly replaced the popular name which was retained only in the language of traditional literature and in the vernacular of the neighbouring Albanians, resulting in the widespread use of the appellation 'Bulgars', which in the meantime disappeared in the Danube Region theme (or at least it is not mentioned in the surviving written sources from

these centuries). The fall of Macedonia under Serbian rule brought about further obfuscation of the popular name. The result of the long Ottoman subjugation and the specific political, social and religious position of the Macedonian people (when the usual terms of address were 'raya', 'kaurin' (non-Moslem), 'Christian', etc.) was a process of obliteration of the ethnic designation, which took place very slowly and was not completed, as in the 19th century it was superseded by a new process in the nation's formation, which in turn created new problems as a result of the aforementioned historical development of the Macedonian people.

(6) It is also important to mention that the Balkan 'Slavic' Orthodox peoples constituted themselves and managed to survive the mediaeval period and right up to the 19th century thanks, to a considerable degree, to the church organizations of their own which guided their spiritual and educational life, regulated the judicial and family relations and united the people under the symbol of their own name. The Archbishopric of Ohrid as an autonomous church organization in Macedonia for eight whole centuries, although retaining the Bulgarian name in its title, maintained a sense of the popular and territorial unity of Macedonia.

There is no doubt that, for instance, the Serbian people was able to fully constitute itself and survive only after the establishment of its own church. It was only thanks to the expansion of the jurisdiction of this church to the territories of Šumadija, Belgrade and Vojvodina that the Serbian people — and, subsequently, the Serbian nation — was able to form its state within the present-day borders. The same refers to Bulgaria, which as early as the second half of the 9th century gained its own church organization, losing it in the 10th century to restore it in the 13th century, and losing it once again in the next century after the country's conquest by the Turks. But precisely because of the emergence in the mediaeval period of two autonomous churches bearing the Bulgarian name amidst the Slavic world in the Balkans (whose existence was interrupted in the 14th and 18th centuries), during the age of national revival, in the 19th century, a struggle began for the appropriation of the mediaeval past "under its own name", resulting in the well-known conflicts and complications which have lingered to this day. How great the significance of the church was in this period can be seen by the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate in 1870, whose eparchies were also taken as the basis for drawing the ethnographic borders of the Bulgarian people, creating political aspirations which have remained alive up to the present day.

If three peoples and three nations (Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians) developed from the core of the 'Russian' Church, if two peoples and two nations (Serbs and Montenegrins) emerged in their historical development from the 'Serbian' Church, why should not two peoples and two modern nations (Bulgarians and Macedonians) develop from the population under the jurisdiction of the

Ohrid and Trnovo (Turnovo) Churches in the mediaeval period when the entire historical evolution dictated precisely such development?

3. Some basic components of the culture of the Macedonian Slavs

Krste P. Misirkov was the first to pose the question of the independent Macedonian culture as early as 1903, but 20 years later, in 1923, when Macedonia's subjugators used all methods and means for genocide and denationalization⁹ of the Macedonian people, Misirkov once again felt responsible to declare before the whole world:

There used to be and there still is an independent Macedonian culture, and it has been the strongest weapon in helping the Macedonians to preserve their present-day cultural matrix and survive all the reversals in the history of their fatherland: not Byzantium nor Bulgaria nor Serbia, nor Turkey, could make changes in the character of the Macedonians of such a nature as to destroy their individuality and estrange them from their Slavic forefathers.¹⁰

And since these claims were refuted by both Sofia and Belgrade, Krste Misirkov offered a more elaborate answer to the question "Is there indeed a Macedonian national culture and Macedonian national history?" He wrote:

Fortunately enough, we can give an affirmative answer: yes, there is a Macedonian culture and Macedonian national history, distinct from those of the Serbs and Bulgarians, even though they have so far not been the object of extensive and impartial study: the Serbs and Bulgarians have one-sidedly and with a strong bias chosen from Macedonian culture what glorifies their own national name, ignoring questions of capital importance only because they do not concern them or contradict the national aspirations of the choosers and their compatriots.

Unfortunately, the independent study of Macedonian history is only beginning now, [carried out] by those same Macedonians who towards the end of the past century started disbelieving Belgrade and Sofia scholars, who had almost unanimously declared that during the Middle Ages the Slavs were a disorganized people, without national [sic!] consciousness, who were saved from Greek assimilation only thanks to the establishment of the state of the Turan Bulgars, and later of the state of the Nemanja dynasty...

We, Macedonians, believe this to be an erroneous idea as a result of which the Bulgarians and Serbs have wrongly understood not only the history of the Macedo-

⁹ The terms *denationalization* and *denationalize* are used throughout this book with the meaning of 'obliterating the national (i.e. ethnic) character of a people with the purpose of assimilation' (translator's note).

¹⁰ К. Ми с и р ковъ, „Makedonska kul t ur a“, *Пи р и нь*, I, 2, Sof и я, 21.Н.1923, 2.

nians and Macedonia in the Middle Ages, but also the very history of the Serbs and Bulgarians.

Offering an answer to the question of the significance of Macedonian national culture and Macedonian national history, Misirkov concluded:

The sum total of the centuries-long efforts towards cultural growth and national self-preservation of the Macedonians, starting 400-500 years prior to the emergence of the Serbian state of the Nemanja dynasty and continuing during its rise and decline, together with the similar efforts on our part to win church and political freedom in the 19th century, constitutes our Macedonian national culture, our Macedonian history.¹¹

With justified reason Misirkov concentrates on those “saints” and heroes, Macedonians “by birth and deeds”, such as Cyril and Methodius, Clement and Naum, Tsar Samuel, Strez, King Volkanin and King Mark, as well as on the Archbishopric of Ohrid, on “the pleiad of Macedonian writers in the Middle Ages and in the 19th century” and on the pleiad of legendary heroes killed in the struggle for freedom in the past 30 years. Accepting this basic idea of Misirkov’s, we believe that the formation of the Macedonian people cannot be understood if we do not consider some of the basic components of Macedonian culture since the mediaeval period which has been either usurped or obscured up to the present day.

(a) When were the Macedonian Slavs converted to Christianity?

The question of the Christianization of the Macedonian Slavs¹² is undoubtedly one of the most important where Macedonian culture is concerned. The first and rarely categorical answer to this question can be found as early as the end of the 9th or beginning of the 10th century, in the oration of Chernorizec Hrabar, and the first analysis of this problem among the Macedonians was made a millennium later by Krste P. Misirkov in his book *Za makedonskite raboti* (On Macedonian Matters, 1903). As these documents are used in the analysis of other components of culture, we shall here quote them in greater detail. Chernorizec Hrabar writes:

In the past, however, the heathen Slavs had yet no books, but read and told fortunes using lines and notches. And when they received Christianity they had to write Slavonic words with Roman and Greek letters, without a standard. But how could you write **dobro**, **bogъ** or **жi vot ъ** or **уѣlw** or **сгъквѣ** or **чловѣкъ** or **ми rot a** or **цедрот ѣ** or **юност ѣ** or **ѣдѣ** or **ѣзыкѣ** or **ѣдѣѣ** and other words similar to them? And thus it continued for many years...

¹¹ K. Misirkov, „Makedonska kul tura“, *Mi рѣ*, HHH, 7155, Sof i я, 19.IV.1924, 1.

¹² For more details see: D-r Bl aze Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ i македонскат а насi ja*, I, Mi sl a, Skopje, 1983, 88-116.

Then man-loving God... had mercy on the Slav people and sent Saint Constantine the Philosopher, called Cyril, a righteous and true man, who created 38 letters for them, some after the example of Greek letters, and others after Slavonic speech.¹³

If Чernorizec Hrabar (St Naum?), as an authority and contemporary, appears as a witness to the emergence of Macedonian literacy and culture, and simultaneously as the author of its first periodization, Krste Misirkov is its first theoretician, understanding and expounding the laws of this process. Writing about the alphabet and orthography of a new literary standard, he also deals with that initial process when a foreign script may be used for writing in one's own language, saying:

But if his own language contains sounds which are not present in the language from which the alphabet is borrowed, the borrower of the foreign alphabet will make certain modifications and amendments to it to mark the differences in the sounds between the two languages. This borrowed and reconstructed alphabet is handed down from generation to generation and is thus changed and adapted to the features of the borrowers' language. So, gradually and imperceptibly the alphabets of less cultured peoples are made in the contact with more cultured ones. But this gradual process is justified only if two neighbouring peoples are in politically unequal circumstances, namely if one of them, i.e. the more cultured one, rules, and the other one, the less cultured one, is subjugated, or at least deprived of full political freedom... Thus Christianity and literacy took root among us, the Macedonians, earlier than among any other Slav people. They spread over the centuries, moving gradually in an upward direction. Hence history says nothing about the conversion of our people to Christianity. But literacy always comes along with Christianity. By hushing up our adoption of Christianity, the process of the formation of our literacy is also hushed up.

Accordingly, our spiritual revival and the enlightenment in this land, and even the development of our literacy, owing to the geographical and historical circumstances, took a different course in the first millennium AD from that of the other Orthodox Slavs. In this land the process was gradual and imperceptible, while among the others it was swift and comparatively clearly defined.¹⁴

These two extensive and very important quotations may successfully lead us to the clarification of the puzzles of that distant age when some process crucial to the development of Macedonian literacy and culture and also to the Macedonian people in general was completed. They illustrate what the process was and how it was carried out, but not when it took place. For instance, they do not mention **when the Macedonian Slavs were converted to Christianity.**

There is no doubt in Misirkov's assumption that the adoption of Christianity in Macedonia took place slowly, silently and continually, because the people were subjugated and lived within the frontiers of stronger and culturally more developed

¹³ I ванъ Дуа̀чевъ, *Изъ ст арат а бѣл гьарска кнѣ жнѣ на*, I, Sof і я, 1940, 65-66.

¹⁴ К.Р. Ми si rковъ, *За македонски т е работ и*, Sof і я, 1903, 142-143.

rulers. This process, however, could have started sometime in the 6th or 7th century and been completed by the 9th century at the latest. It was certainly aided by the fact that the native Macedonian Christian population in this part of the Balkans continued to develop unhampered in the Slavic environment and in the Byzantine state, thus exerting influence on the Slavs as well. On the other hand, the constant wars and uprisings and the disobedient heathen Slavs made the Byzantine administrators use the strongest means at the time for neutralizing and attracting them: Christianity. That Christianity in Macedonia developed uninterruptedly since the missionary activity of St Paul is also confirmed, in addition to the archaeological finds and the Bible, by some historical sources.

Whereas Christianity was fiercely persecuted in pagan Bulgaria, in the Byzantine province of the Macedonian Slavs there was not only a numerous Byzantine Christian administration, but Christian education was spread among the Slav masses, as a result of which the tribes increasingly melted into each other and mingled with the indigenous Macedonian population; instead of the former tribal princes, regional administrators were instituted. This, in turn, created the preconditions for the establishment of a single ethnic mass which gradually built its individuality as a people.

These conclusions are also supported by the fact that the Slavonic educator Methodius himself was for ten whole years, up to the year 850, the administrative head of the Bregalnica region, while his brother Constantine at the same time, in the same region, still converted Slavs to Christianity; he had created “Slavonic letters” for them and wrote “books in the Slavonic language”.¹⁵ And that the Christian faith was widespread or perhaps the conversion to Christianity in Macedonia was already completed (although the hagiographies of Clement say that there were still heathens) is indirectly confirmed by the following two arguments. Following the Church Council of Constantinople in 870, when the Bulgarian Church was recognized and Joseph, a Greek, was appointed Archbishop, eight dioceses were recognized or created, of which only two were in original Bulgaria — to the far north, in Silistra (Durostorum) and Ovech (Provadija) — while all the other six remained in Byzantine territories and were gradually (chiefly in the 9th century) annexed to Bulgaria: Philippopolis (Plovdiv), which lay within the theme Macedonia and developed within the sphere of Byzantine culture with continuous Christian life; Sredec (Sofia), which came within Bulgaria’s borders as late as 809; present-day Serbia — Belgrade and Morava (somewhere around the mouth of the River Morava), which were conquered by

¹⁵ Emil Georgiev, „Kiril i Metodii i razvitiето na bŭlgarskata kulturna“, *Xiljada i stozodini slavjanska pismenost 863-1963. Sbornik v chest na Kiril i Metodii*, BAN, Sofia, 1963, 27.

the Bulgarian state in the early 9th century (but before the capturing of Sofia), while two dioceses were recognized on the territory of the newly-conquered Macedonia: Ohrid, and the Bregalnica region. It is also known that at the 'False Council' of Patriarch Photius in 879 one of those taking part was Bishop Theotistus of Tiberiopolis, whose seat is believed to have been in Strumica. These data confirm that preconditions had been created earlier for a widespread spiritual activity in the territory of Macedonia, as illustrated by the facts in the charters of Basil II of 1019, 1020 and 1025, written immediately after the destruction of the state of the Macedonian Slavs, and testifying to the much more developed spiritual life in Macedonia as compared with Bulgaria. These documents point to the existence of the following dioceses in the Devol *komitat*: Ohrid, Kostur, Glavinica, Meglen and Bitola, while the *komitat* covering the region between the rivers Vardar and Mesta involved the dioceses of Strumica, Morozdvidz, Velbužd and Sredec, whose south-western gravitation was beyond any doubt at the time.

Accordingly, even on the basis of these few facts we can conclude that the conversion to Christianity in Macedonia was completed by the 9th century, a process which took place gradually and without shocks, before Macedonia found itself within the borders of Bulgaria, while the conversion of the Bulgarian people to Christianity was carried out only after 865, using force and bloody reprisals, events which were reflected in written records and documents concerning the relations between Byzantium, Bulgaria and Rome. On the other hand, this is an illustration of the character of the culture in these two regions: while a pagan Bulgarian-Slavic culture with Thracian elements was created in Bulgaria, a Christian Macedonian-Slavic-Byzantine culture (with elements of all the native peoples and ethnic groups) developed in Macedonia, which undoubtedly, as testified to by Černorizec Hrabar (and confirmed by Misirkov), gave rise to the development of literacy.

(b) When did Slavonic literacy develop in Macedonia?

Literacy appeared largely as a result of Macedonia's conversion to Christianity.¹⁶ Hrabar recorded this fact, and it is also mentioned by Misirkov. There are no concrete data as to the time when this took place, although we can fully accept the periodization of Černorizec Hrabar: by the early 10th century literacy in Macedonia had already passed through three stages.

¹⁶ Bl aĵe Ri stovski , „Nekoi prama va okol u pojavat a na hr i st i janst vot o i pi smenost a kaj Sl oveni te vo Makedoni ja“, in: *Ki pi l Col unski . Ci mpoz i um 1100-zodi uni na od smpt t a na Ki pi l Col unski* , kni ga 2, 23-25 maj 1969, Skopje-Š ti p, MANU, Skopje, 1970, 319-337.

The first stage was the period when the Slavs were still not converted to Christianity and when they “read and told fortunes using lines and notches”. This was probably the period before they arrived in the Balkans and immediately after their arrival. It is difficult to say how long this stage lasted, because there are shepherds even today in some areas of Macedonia who cut various lines (*ραβουί*) on their sticks, using them for taking notes and counting. We believe that Hrabar is right when he says that this “literacy” was used at the time when the Slavs were still heathens, and yet we do not know when exactly their conversion to Christianity started, nor do we know for how long this process lasted.

The second stage involved a considerably higher form of the Slavonic written culture, when foreign scripts — Latin and Greek, as scripts of a more developed culture — were used for writing in the Slavonic language. This process started with the conversion to Christianity, but even though we do not know when it began or for how long it lasted, its conclusion is nevertheless marked by the ‘invention’ of the Slavonic alphabet by Constantine (Cyril) the Slav. The practice of using the script of a more cultured environment for a Slavonic language is not unknown even up to recent times, but it was not only the privilege of the Slavs: for a long time the Greeks themselves wrote using the Phoenician script, the Armenians used the Syrian script, and until the creation of their own alphabet, the Georgians wrote in the Armenian script. The fact that these foreign symbols were used for writing Slavonic texts in the period of conversion to Christianity points to the fact that some church literature in the Slavonic language had already been created, and that conversion to Christianity in Macedonia was carried out in the vernacular language.

This course of development is not impossible. The Byzantines saw their interest in converting the Slavs to Christianity, as this would provide opportunities for holding them in subjection within their empire, particularly at a time when Rome was making efforts to retain and expand its influence in the Balkans, and especially among the Slavs. On the other hand, it is very interesting that in all the hagiographies of Cyril, Methodius, Clement and Naum the dispute concerning the three languages takes place between the Slavonic educators and the Latin clergy, not the Greeks, with the exception of the oration of Chernorizec Hrabar, which could also be a reflection of the position of the Greek clergy in the Bulgarian state. The Greeks certainly fought to secure domination against the Slav clergy who had already been established, particularly within the Ohrid literary school. In principle, the Constantinopolitan Church was not against the introduction of vernaculars in the preaching of Christianity, even though there was, in certain periods, a tendency for the texts which dealt with the essence of Christianity, texts of strictly dogmatic character (the Gospel, Acts of the Apostles, Symbol of Faith, etc.), to be in Hebrew, Greek or Latin, because, it was believed, there was a danger of inaccurate

translation, or incorrect interpretation of the Christian doctrine. In the Byzantine Empire itself, church books were translated into Gothic in the 4th century, in Armenian in the 5th century, and from Armenian into Georgian. As early as the 4th century, however, the Goths were proclaimed heretics. At this point let us mention that the other churches preaching in vernaculars were proclaimed as adherents to various heresies and schisms: the Syrian Chaldean church was Nestorian, the Syrian Jacobite, the Coptic and Armenian churches Monophysitic, and the Gothic church was Arian.¹⁷ The position of the Constantinopolitan Church in the 9th century was clearly defined by the famous statesman and patriarch Photius, who in his work *On the Franks and Other Latins* accused the Latins of adhering to the principle of trilingualism and expressed the view that God could be worshipped in other languages as well, and not only in Hebrew, Greek or Latin.

We can hence conclude that the Macedonian Slavs, after receiving Christianity, were given the basic books in their own language, thus also receiving the Christian culture of the contemporary civilized Graeco-Roman world. That this is close to the truth is confirmed by the excerpts already quoted from the hagiographies and from Hraban's oration, to which we can add that part of the letter of the Greater-Moravian Prince Rostislav where, among other things, he writes:

For our people who have given up heathendom and received Christianity we do not have such a teacher who will preach the true Christian faith in our own language, so that when other lands see it they may follow us. Therefore, O ruler, send us such a bishop and teacher!¹⁸

This quotation points to the possibility that Rostislav already knew that there were Christianized Slavs within the borders of the Byzantine Empire and that they had teachers and priests using the Slavonic vernacular. Is it possible that, as is described in the hagiographies, Cyril and Methodius were able in such a short time (half a year) to create the alphabet, translate and copy the principal church books, and prepare other teachers to go to Moravia, if there had not been an already established written tradition, a fixed terminology and a well-developed style of use of the vernacular? Both the alphabet and language of Cyril and Methodius testify to the existence of a fully established literary language and a perfect script which corresponded to the phonetics of the Slavonic dialect in the Salonika region. This can by no means be an accidental result of the circumstances of the time.

Accordingly, there is no doubt that Christianity in Macedonia was preached and spread prior to 864 (when the Bulgars started receiving Christianity) and that the Macedonian Slavs had an already well-developed Slavonic written culture.

¹⁷ Ку̀ало М. Кув, *Черно̀ри зес Хра̀бър*, ВАН, Со̀ф и я, 1967, 83.

¹⁸ А1. Теодор овъ-Вал анъ, *Кѝрѝл ѿ̀и Мѐт одѝ ѱ*, I, Со̀ф и я, 1920.

The only question that remains to be answered is: **what script did that literature use?**

First of all, the old dispute as to what alphabet Constantine (Cyril) created is still very much alive. The majority of scholars, however, believe that it can be safely assumed that it was Glagolitic. But two other very important questions automatically arise here: **how did Cyrillic develop and when was Glagolitic created?**

From what has been said so far it is obvious that the first alphabet for the Slavs in Macedonia was created long before the mission of Cyril and Methodius to Moravia, that it was built mainly on the basis of the Greek alphabet and that it was probably closest to modern Cyrillic. Чрноризец Hrabar himself writes that this alphabet was used for Slavonic sounds, but that it could not suitably render Slavonic phonetics, as a result of which Constantine (Cyril) designed an alphabet in accordance with the phonetics of these Slavs. This allows the possibility that Cyrillic, “without a standard” (i.e. without the symbols for the characteristic Slavonic sounds, as quoted by Hrabar) was used in Macedonia even before 862.

At this point we are faced with the question: **when did this process start?** This is indeed only a single component in the whole process of conversion to Christianity and civilization of the Macedonian Slavs. Many scholars do not consider it a mere fantasy that such Slavonic literacy existed as early as the 7th century. Relying mainly on the Salonika Legend, the Ascension of Cyril the Philosopher, the Life of the Tiberiopolis Martyrs, a record in the Kastamonia monastery on Mount Athos, two surviving chronicles and other written records, the Bulgarian scholar Jordan Ivanov in 1906 concluded that for a whole 200 years before Cyril and Methodius “there was a man who tried to give an alphabet to the Slavs in Northern Macedonia” and that that man was Cyril of Cappadocia who worked in Syria and Egypt.¹⁹ A similar view was put forward somewhat later by his younger colleague Emil Georgiev, who believes that Cyrillic was created earlier than 863, and that its creation was a continuous and gradual process. Georgiev writes: “Even before Cyril, the Slavs used to have books written in Cyrillic, but they were of local significance and did not spread to a wider area, and besides, which is more important, they were not accepted by the official church.”²⁰ In another text on this question, published in 1966, Georgiev states his views even more precisely:

Jordan Ivanov allowed the possibility that the alphabet of Cyril of Cappadocia was Glagolitic. Yet it is considered a proven fact that Glagolitic was the work of Constantine-Cyril the Slav. Hence it cannot be excluded that Cyril of Cappadocia may have taken part in the creation of Cyrillic, which was created before Glagolitic

¹⁹ Йорданъ I вановъ, *Съверна Македоні я*, Sof і я, 1906, 70.

²⁰ Еми I Георгі ев, *Славянская рі сътенност ь до Кириллі и Мефоді я*, Sof і я, 1952, 84.

and in which the Semitic symbols *III*, *II* and *Ч* were used; coming from the east, Cyril of Cappadocia could have introduced these symbols into Cyrillic. These same symbols, as they were not Greek and did not provoke the discontent of the Roman Catholic Church, were later introduced by Cyril of Cappadocia into his alphabet – the Glagolitic – adapting them in style and form to the rest of the Glagolitic letters.²¹

We can thus conclude that the Slavonic language written in Greek script was used in Macedonia; that it was only a cultural, and not literary language, as it was not the language of a specific state or specific church, and that this situation continued “for many years”. The first recognized Slavonic language and the first Slavonic alphabet (for precisely these reasons) reached that degree only when they became the alphabet and the language of the Greater-Moravian state and its church, even though they were built on the basis of the vernacular of southern Macedonian Slavs.

The third stage in the development of literacy and Christianity in Macedonia, as underlined by Hrabar as well, started at the moment when Cyril and Methodius designed the Slavonic alphabet and translated the religious books into the language of the Salonika Slavs, which had already been established as a literary one.

Scholars have long been debating these questions: **when, why and what alphabet did they create?**

The hagiographies usually state that it was only after Rostislav’s letter to Michael III that work on the preparation of the mission to Greater Moravia started, meaning that the alphabet was created at that time. The same sources give indirect indications that Cyril and Methodius worked even earlier on this task. We have already pointed out that even before the brothers went on their state and diplomatic missions among the Arabs and Khazars, Methodius had been the *stipiteus* of the Bregalnica region for ten years, that his brother Constantine came there, converting many Slavs to Christianity, creating an alphabet and writing books for them. It is also mentioned that in 851, almost simultaneously, the two brothers went to a monastery on Olympus (Asia Minor) where they “talked to the books” for nearly ten years. Chernorizec Hrabar writes that Constantine designed the alphabet in 855, no doubt after many years of work. Even though there are arguments disputing this, if we accept this date, it seems that in the Bregalnica region Constantine spread Christianity and Slavonic literacy using Greek and Roman symbols, i.e. a Cyrillic alphabet “without a system”. Perhaps it is for this reason that this alphabet bears his name up to the present day, if it is not connected with the name of Cyril of Cappadocia.

²¹ Prof. dr Emil Georgiev, *Lit erat ura na izost reni borbi v srednovekovna Bŭlgarija*, BAN, Sofia, 1966, 315.

The hagiographies also state that in 859/860, when Cyril and Methodius departed on their new mission among the Khazars, their work in the Polychron monastery was continued by their disciples, which is not only a confirmation that the alphabet was already prepared, books were translated and copies made, but also that the brothers had their own disciples who were actually those companions on their journey to Moravia. As a result, Rostislav knew what to ask for and where to ask, and Michael III was able to send people with the necessary qualifications, who would nevertheless know how to protect properly Byzantine state and church interests in Central Europe.

At this point let us answer the question concerning **the character of the Salonika brothers' mission to Moravia.**

There is certainly no doubt that, being Byzantine state-political and church dignitaries of the highest rank, Cyril and Methodius did not depart only on a formal church-religious mission; it was a purely state, political and strategic mission, and they remained, until the end of their lives, faithful to the highly complex task they had undertaken. The result of that mission, however, was of invaluable significance for the entire Slavic world and in particular for Slavonic literacy and culture, although later it did have negative repercussions on the Byzantine Empire's aspirations in the Balkans.

(c) What political and strategic moments dictated this Byzantine mission and what were relations with Bulgaria like?

The moment of sending the mission was determined by purely political and military-strategic factors. By the year 861 the relations between Moravia and the Germans had been strained for a long time and were characterized by permanent wars and tension. Nearly always Bulgaria was the ally of the former state of the Franks, and later of that of the Germans, actually fighting against the Slavs in Moravia. This traditional Germanophile policy of Bulgaria since those early centuries was also the result of the constant military conflicts with Byzantium, at whose expense Bulgaria expanded its territories. In 862 Louis the German sent his own mission to the Bulgarian Prince Boris to negotiate a war against Slavic Greater Moravia, and perhaps proposing to him the conversion of the Bulgarian state to Christianity through the Roman rites. At the same time, in order to thwart the new war and hamper the Germano-Bulgarian military alliance, knowing of the attitude of the Byzantine Empire towards Bulgaria, the Greater-Moravian Prince Rostislav sent a mission to Constantinople and asked for direct military assistance in political alliance with Byzantium, as well as preachers and teachers in the Slavonic language, to protect Greater Moravia from the subversive actions carried out by

the German Roman clergy, who supported the Germano-Bulgarian alliance. The result of all these military, strategic, political and other combinations was the mission of Cyril and Methodius to Greater Moravia in 862/863. To understand better the anti-Bulgarian character of Cyril and Methodius's mission it is sufficient to mention that in 863 the Bulgarian Prince Boris, together with Louis the German, waged a war against Greater Moravia and against Louis's disloyal son Carloman, while in early 864 the Byzantine Empire attacked Bulgaria and compelled Boris to break up his alliance with the Germans, and, among other things, to receive Christianity through Constantinople.

***(d) What was the language of Cyril and Methodius:
Old Bulgarian or Old Macedonian?***

Slavistics most often designates the language of Cyril and Methodius as 'Old Slavonic' or 'Old Church Slavonic', but in the works of the majority of Bulgarian scholars and a number of German and other Slavists we can also find the term 'Old Bulgarian'. More recently we have seen the designation 'Old Macedonian' being increasingly used, although it is of a fairly limited character, as even we in Macedonia nearly always use the designation 'Old Slavonic'. At the beginning of this century, in the works of Krste P. Misirkov (1903 and 1905) and in the journal *Македонскиј Голос (Македонски Glas)*, 1913-1914, we can find the designation 'Old Macedonian', but this term was soon suppressed with the suppression of Macedonian scholarly thought.

We do not consider the term 'Old Slavonic' to be incorrect, as it, too, originates from the Slavic name borne by the Slavs in Macedonia, but it is likely that the designation 'Old Macedonian' will be increasingly used in the future, in contrast to 'Middle Macedonian' (15th-18th centuries) and 'New Macedonian' (19th-20th centuries).

But is the term 'Old Bulgarian' justified?

There is no doubt that the language of all the Slavs in the 9th century was similar and comprehensible to all of them, but it is also beyond any doubt that even then there were individual variants and tribal dialectal differences which have been retained to a large degree up to the present day. Yet to claim that only the Macedonian and Bulgarian Slavs had one and the same language which was already different at the time from the languages of all nearby peoples (in present-day borders), means to lose the sense of reality. It is true that Bulgaria was predominantly populated by the Slavic tribes of the Antians, and Macedonia and a part of Serbia with the Slavini (Sclavini), but it was the historical development of the peoples following their arrival in the Balkans — bearing in mind all the

elements examined above — that subsequently determined the development of the language, which adopted a large number of Balkanisms, particularly prevalent among the Macedonians and Bulgarians. The second half of the 9th century already saw the creation of Old Bulgarian literacy and the initial formation of the Old Bulgarian language, but this can by no means refer to the language of Cyril and Methodius, even though this language was indirectly introduced into Bulgaria, exerting a decisive influence on Bulgarian culture. Mutual relations, such as these between Macedonia and Bulgaria, were also to remain unknown and unstudied in the subsequent period.

In a written record from the 7th century ('The Miracles of St Demetrius'), in connection with an attack of the Avars and an insignificant group of Bulgars as allies of the Macedonian Slavs in the siege of the city of Salonika, a counsellor to the Bulgarian Kuber is mentioned as speaking Greek and the languages of the Romans, Slavs and Bulgars.²² This indirect and highly unreliable piece of information is today used for assuming that the language of the 'Proto-Bulgarians' was "fairly spread" in both north-eastern Bulgaria and southern Macedonia as early as the 7th century, neglecting the fact that even here a strict ethnic differentiation is made between the Bulgars and the Slavs (i.e. Macedonian Slavs) and that it was quite possible that the counsellor spoke all these language, as a man can speak several languages, but is it possible to assume that the people in Macedonia could have learnt or needed to learn or even master the language of the 'Proto-Bulgarians' during the brief and insignificant visit of Kuber's company to the territory of Macedonia?

On the other hand, with what right can the Slavs from the Salonika region be called 'Bulgars' or 'Bulgarian Slavs' bearing in mind that they had never come into longer contact with the Bulgars and that they constituted an inseparable part of the people of the Macedonian Slavs which subsequently formed the Macedonian nation?

Accordingly, in the third period of the development of Macedonian written culture, the Slavonic script, the Slavonic language and Slavonic translations and original literature were created on the basis of the Macedonian language and were carried to Greater Moravia and later brought back. Although it is very likely that Cyril's script was Glagolitic, designed perhaps specially for the needs of the Moravian Slavs, but on the basis of the Old Macedonian vernacular from the Salonika region (as the Cyrillic script already used might have been too reminiscent of the Greek alphabet, creating political difficulties in the implementation of the mission in the realm of Roman influence), this does not imply that the older Cyrillic literacy did not continue to develop in Macedonia; it was later adopted

²² *Гръска и звори за бъл гарскат а и ст ори я*, III, S of i я, 1960, 111-157.

(with small modifications) as the standard state script of the Bulgarian court in Preslav.

The time in which Černorizec Hrabar lived, which is not mentioned in his periodization, and the period up to the 14th century, constitutes the fourth stage of the development of written culture in Macedonia, when Cyril and Methodius's disciples Clement and Naum established the Ohrid Literary School, which, to quote Blaže Koneski, "stands out by its clearly outlined physiognomy",²³ with characteristics of the Glagolitic traditions of Cyril and Methodius which can be found in Macedonia as late as the 14th century. It is important to mention that following 886 an exceptionally rich cultural, educational and spiritual life developed in Macedonia, which undoubtedly had many common elements and intertwinement with the Bulgarian centre at Pliska and later in Preslav and Trnovo. At the same time, however, it built numerous independent traditions, which certainly contributed to the formation of the Macedonian people and Macedonian culture: the establishment, in Macedonia, of what is considered the first Slavonic university; the first Slavonic bishop in the entire Bulgarian state (and probably the only one in the Slavic world at the time); the construction of a large number of churches and monasteries, and a whole complex of related subjects, among which the development of the arts and architecture deserves particular mention.

From what has been established so far concerning this early period, we know that Clement's Literary School in Ohrid used exclusively the Glagolitic script as an alphabet designed by Cyril and Methodius, although it is very likely that Clement added several new symbols for certain sounds; he used their translations and preserved and developed their language — in contrast to the Preslav Literary School, which developed on the basis of the Cyrillic alphabet and made modifications in the language in accordance with the characteristics of the Bulgarian vernaculars of the time, also carrying out modifications of the translations and church books or making new translations. It is also important to mention that Clement, less than a year after his arrival in the Bulgarian capital, left it and came to Macedonia, as did Naum a few years later. Even though the sources — which are, however, of a considerably later date — offer explanations of these facts (exploited extensively by Bulgarian scholars), it seems that this question will preoccupy serious researchers of these problems for a long time to come.

There is practically no doubt that both Clement and Naum were from Macedonia. The following facts confirm this assumption.

It is known that in the 11th to 13th centuries Macedonia was a Byzantine administrative region (theme) which bore the name 'Bulgaria'. The surviving

²³ Blaže Koneski, „Ohr i dskata kni žovna škol a“, *Lit epat uren zbor*, III, 1, Skopje, 1956, 17-18.

sources do not confirm whether the terms ‘Bulgar’ or ‘Bulgarian’ were used to refer to north-eastern Bulgaria, but underline that these designations were quite normal in this period for the inhabitants of Macedonia. And as the names *Bulzapia* and *Moesia* were identified with each other, a new distinction was beginning to be made between these two territories: ‘Upper Bulgaria’ and ‘Lower Bulgaria’, i.e. ‘Upper Moesia’ and ‘Lower Moesia’. This is reflected in the various hagiographies from that period of Byzantine domination in Macedonia, where we can come across the following interesting details.

The Shorter [version of the] Life of Clement written by the Archbishop of Ohrid Demetrius Homatian in the first decades of the 13th century says that Clement “devotedly studied the Holy Scriptures, translated, with the help of God, into the local Bulgarian dialect of Cyril, a true godly-wise and apostolic father, and he was from the beginning, together with Methodius, the eminent teacher of piety and Orthodox faith of the Moesian people”.²⁴ As in Clement’s time the church was still not divided into the Catholic Church (Rome) and the Orthodox Church (Constantinople), these commentaries are obviously made by Homatian in the 13th century. That the terms ‘Moesi’ and ‘Moesian’ was not a synonym for the general designations ‘Slavs’ and ‘Slavic’ is also shown by other references. For example, Homatian continues by writing that Clement since “his young age” had already “become the driving force of the leaders and a leader of the entire Moesian people in piety”.²⁵ “This great father of ours and the beacon of Bulgaria,” says the hagiography, “was by birth from the European Moesians, usually known among the people as Bulgars”.²⁶ The Second Life of Naum asserts that “Naum originated from Moesia”,²⁷ while the other hagiography points out that he was “a friend and fellow-sufferer of Clement’s”.²⁸ If we add the assertion of Theophylact of Ohrid (the Archbishop of Ohrid, two centuries after Clement’s death) that Clement knew the life of Methodius “like no one else,... as since his early and young years he has accompanied him”, we can draw the conclusion that both Cyril and Methodius, and Clement and Naum, came from the same land, Moesia, i.e. from the theme subsequently called ‘Bulgaria’, i.e. present-day Macedonia; it was from this same Moesian (i.e. Bulgarian, i.e. Macedonian) people that they came, travelling the same road to Moravia. Perhaps all this, in addition to some of the older political

²⁴ Александр Милев, *Жития на св. Климент Охридски*, София, 1961, 127.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 128.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 127.

²⁷ Петър Нр. Петров, „Климент Охридски и неговата епоха“, in: *Климент Охридски ...*, София, 1966, 42. See also: *Български стипни и зъ Македонија, Събрани и обяснени от ъ проф. Йорданъ Ивановъ*. Уторо, дорънени здание, ВАН, София, 1931, 312.

²⁸ Петър Нр. Петров, *op. cit.*, 42; Проф. Йорданъ Ивановъ, *op. cit.*, 360.

associations concerning the Moravian mission, was one of the reasons for their abandonment of the Bulgarian capital.

The high level, the deep foundations and the broad sway of Christian Slavonic culture in Macedonia can also be seen in the fact that the Slavonic written and literary tradition in Macedonia never ceased to exist, even though this land was occupied by numerous and different conquerors, whereas in the only recently Christianized Bulgaria it died down immediately after the fall of the Bulgarian Empire (11th-12th c.) and was briefly restored during the Second Bulgarian Empire (13th-14th c.). It was directly dependent on the existence of church independence: whereas in Macedonia this tradition existed and developed uninterruptedly up to 1767, in Bulgaria it appeared twice, only to disappear soon.

Let us mention another detail. The famous Council of Simeon in 893 in Preslav²⁹ is believed to have adopted the following four principal decisions: (1) the capital of Bulgaria was moved from Pliska to Preslav; (2) Simeon was proclaimed the Prince of Bulgaria; (3) Slav priests were instituted in place of the former Greek clergy, and (4) Slavonic was introduced as the official state and literary language instead of the former Greek language, and Cyrillic was adopted as the official script after specific symbols for the characteristic Slavonic sounds had been added.

Here we must point to some not insignificant differences which are confirmed by these decisions: whereas in Bulgaria the church was controlled by the Greek clergy who used the Greek language (both in church services and administration up to the year 893), in Macedonia, even before the time of Cyril and Methodius, Slavonic was used in written records, and after the coming of Clement in 886 to the Ohrid region, on the basis of the Slavonic language and the Glagolitic script, a large number of teachers and native priests were educated, firmly taking the church into their own hands. This was particularly reflected somewhat later, after the elevation of the Bishopric of Ohrid to the rank of patriarchate by Samuel, and even after the downfall of his state.

The further development of Macedonian culture was characterized by huge oscillations, but also by an uninterrupted line which was ultimately to lead to its full affirmation. The cultural individuality of Macedonia in the period of the new Byzantine bondage and during the reign of the Serbian state did not lose its character, and developed even further. It became an important part of the overall culture of the Orthodox Balkan Slavs.

²⁹ Петър Нр. Петров, „Исторически теми на Кирил и Методиевото дело“, in: *Хиляди и стотини години славянска писменост 863-1963*, София, 1963, 90; Влажке Конаски, *op. cit.*

4. The name of the Macedonian people

Since we know that we took the Macedonian name as the name of our nation as late as the middle of the 19th century, two questions are of paramount importance: **what was the Macedonian people called up to that period, and how come that they took the Macedonian name?** Both questions are of crucial significance for the formation of the Macedonian people and the emergence and development of the Macedonian nation.

From the existing historical sources it can be seen that the names of the native peoples in this part of the Balkans were lost after the arrival of the Slavs. The inhabitants of the Bulgarian state accepted the Bulgarian name, and in the written sources we can find them only under that designation, whereas the inhabitants of Macedonia are mentioned under the names *Славини (Сславини)* or *Слави*. By the 9th century specific tribal Slavic names were in use in Macedonia, but later, after its division into regional (and not tribal) administrative units, these names disappeared almost completely. It is interesting to note one fact which is often not mentioned, namely that up to the 10th century we find the Slavic name as designating almost exclusively the Macedonian Slavs; the claims that there was some kind of 'mixing' of the Slavic and Bulgarian names as both referring to the 'Bulgarian people' are absolutely incorrect. Dimit'r Angelov acknowledges that in Bulgaria after 681, "in the course of time, even before their conversion to Christianity, there had been a certain intermingling between the religions of the Slavs and Proto-Bulgarians, an intermingling which could also be seen in the field of material culture". The author considers that "certain customs, beliefs, cults", even before the conversion of Bulgaria to Christianity, were "spread not only among the Proto-Bulgarians, but also among the Slavs, and they represented, as it were, one common spiritual possession of these two ethnic elements".³⁰ The same also referred to the language. As Greek was used in Bulgaria as the language of the state, and Slavonic prevailed as the language of the people, there are two possibilities: either the Proto-Bulgarians received the language of the Antians as early as the period when they were living as neighbours, before they came to the Balkans, or this took place during the process of intermingling in the Balkan region, where the much more numerous Slavic tribes imposed their own language. The aforementioned Bulgarian scholar confirms this, writing: "When Slavonic literacy was created and our first literary works appeared, the influence of the

³⁰ Di mi t' r Angel ov, „Възглед за народност и делото на Климент Охридски“, in: *Климент Охридски 916-1966. Сборник от статии по случай 1050 години от смъртта му*, BAN, София, 1966, 10-11.

Proto-Bulgarian (Turan) language was quite negligible, and there remained almost no traces of it to influence the language of our writers towards the end of the 9th and beginning of the 10th century.”³¹ And because the language of the Thracians and their name in Bulgaria totally disappeared, with the exception of certain toponyms, some conclude that the process of the creation of the Bulgarian people within the borders of the Bulgarian state (perhaps even before its conversion to Christianity) was completed. Motivated solely by their desire to amalgamate the Macedonian and Bulgarian peoples, Bulgarian scholars claim that, for instance, the Byzantine historian Theophanes (8th c.-818) still mentioned “‘Bulgars’ and ‘Slavs’ separately as two components of the Slavo-Bulgarian state in this period”.³² The document Theophanes has left us explicitly states: “This year [i.e. 688, Blaxe Ristovski] Justinian started a campaign against Slavinia and Bulgaria [i.e. two distinct and different regions, B.R.]. He repelled the Bulgars who intercepted him at that time [moving from Constantinople towards Bulgaria and Macedonia, B.R.], and attacking them as far as Salonika, he captured a great multitude of Slavs”³³ (from Macedonia!). Thus Theophanes clearly differentiates between the Bulgars (subjects of the Bulgarian state, recognized by Byzantium, who had already been accepted as the Bulgarian people) and the Slavini (Sclavini) who lived in Macedonia, called Slavinia (Sclavinia) at the time. The same source quotes that “the lord of Bulgaria sent a twelve-thousand-strong army and noblemen to enslave Berzitia [part of Macedonia, B.R.] and make it a part of Bulgaria”, but that the Byzantine emperor found out about this plan and destroyed the Bulgarian troops. Accordingly, Theophanes is consistent in differentiating between the Bulgars and the Macedonian Slavs.

Bulgarian scholars also claim that the Byzantine sources from the 7th and 8th centuries “often speak of individual Slavic tribes”, quoting the Greek word *ethnoi* (the plural form) and mentioning the names of the tribes [Brzaci (Brsjaks, Brzaks, Berziti), Rinhini (Rinhins), etc.], but that in the second half of the 9th century, i.e. when Macedonia, too, was incorporated into Bulgaria, “the word *ethnos* in the singular form appeared more and more often in use, meaning ‘people’ and designating the entire population of Bulgaria”.³⁴ These conclusions, however, are incorrect.

Firstly, individual Slavic tribes are mentioned only when referring to Slavic tribes in Macedonia, as confirmed by the quotation of the names of Brsjaks and

³¹ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

³² *Ibid.*, 15.

³³ *Гръцки і звори за бъл гарскат а і ст опі я*, III, 1960, 265.

³⁴ *Di ni t ъг Angel ov, op. cit.*, 14.

Rinhins. Secondly, at that time these tribes were still not part of the Bulgarian state. Thirdly, and most importantly, the designations *ethnoi* and *ethnos* in the Greek sources are used side by side even before the settlement of the Slavs in the Balkans, and continued to be used indiscriminately in the following period: “the Slavic people” (John of Ephesus, 584); “the people of the Slavs” (Theophylact Simokata, early 7th c.), and the designation “Slav people” for the Macedonian Slavs can be found as early as the 7th century in many sources, while, for instance, the Miracles of St Demetrius of Salonika, where the allied attackers of Salonika in 622 are even specifically mentioned (“countless army of all the Slavs, Bulgars and other countless peoples”) speak simultaneously of the whole “Slav people” and of “the tribes of the aforementioned Slavs, namely Strymons and Rinhins, as well as Sagudats”, of “the princes of the Dragovit tribe”, etc. All this unequivocally shows that it is difficult to draw conclusions with full reliability upon mediaeval sources as regards the categories ‘tribe’ and ‘people’, and that the assumptions of Bulgarian scholars suggesting a unity in terms of ethnicity and name of the people in Bulgaria and Macedonia cannot be taken seriously.

From what has been said above we can see that the first name of the Macedonian people was *Славѣни* (*Славѣни*) or *Слави*, this form being retained up to the 11th century,³⁵ independently of the imposition of other, foreign names through administrative means. It is interesting that the Slavic name referring to the Macedonians has been preserved in the neighbouring Albanian language up to the present day.

Although the Macedonian people later received different names, there is no doubt that the Bulgarian name has left the most permanent and significant mark. For this reason, we shall elaborate this question in greater detail.

As we have already pointed out, the first contacts of the Macedonian Slavs with the Bulgaro-Slavs were made as late as the second half of the 9th century, after the departure of Cyril and Methodius to Moravia, when the multiethnic Bulgarian state incorporated Macedonia. On the other hand, the Браничево and Srem regions, together with present-day Belgrade, came within Bulgaria’s frontiers half a century earlier than Macedonia. So **why was the Bulgarian name retained the longest in Macedonia, and not in Belgrade** (which is now the centre of the distinct Serbian nation)?

³⁵ This is mentioned by Prof. A. Burmov in the quoted work, *Християнството в България*, I, 425. Here we must underline that most of the tribal names of the Slavs in Macedonia which can be found chiefly in Byzantine sources were most probably received from the Byzantines, generally according to the place of settlement: the Strymons were given their name according to the River Strymon, the Rinhins according to the River Rinchos, etc. We still do not have reliable information whether they themselves used these names. It is interesting that, of all these, only the names of the Mijaks and Brsjaks have been retained to this day, the etymological origins of which appear not to have such roots.

Even though all the ethnic entities which were formerly part of the Bulgarian state later changed numerous masters, they nevertheless, in the course of time, established states under their own names, which in turn founded church organizations under their own names, being the basis for their designations when they subsequently developed as nations. Hence the Bulgarian name was retained among these peoples as long as the frontiers of that Bulgarian state and church lasted.

Macedonian history is different in this respect from the history of the other Balkan Orthodox Slavs. It is true that the Macedonian Slavs succeeded in establishing a strong state towards the late 10th and early 11th century, but its founder was crowned with the Bulgarian imperial crown and received the Bulgarian name for his state, as even earlier the Macedonians had been Bulgarian subjects for some time; he elevated the Bishopric of Ohrid to the rank of patriarchate, so that during their existence, both the church and the state bore Bulgarian appellations. This phenomenon was quite usual in the mediaeval period and in all feudal states: for instance, the most powerful European emperors — those of the Byzantines and Franks — proclaimed themselves successors to the Roman crown and proudly called themselves Romans!

Of crucial importance for **the strengthening of the Bulgarian name in Macedonia**, however, was another factor which we have already mentioned: following the downfall of Samuel's state, the Byzantine emperor Basil II, in accordance with the usual practice in the empire, divided the newly-conquered territories into themes, and thus Macedonia, as the centre of the destroyed 'Bulgarian' state, became a theme bearing the name 'Bulgaria'. At the same time he gave the name 'Paristrion' (the Danube region) to the territory of Bulgaria; the Thracian coast became known as the 'Strymon' theme, and the region between Adrianople and Constantinople as the 'Thrace' theme. It is of particular significance to mention that as early as 802 the continental part of present-day Thrace, with its centre at modern Plovdiv, can be found as a theme bearing the name 'Macedonia'.³⁶ In addition, Basil II immediately demoted the Patriarchate of Ohrid to the rank of archbishopric, but left it as an autocephalous church which, nevertheless, until its abolition in the 18th century, retained the Bulgarian appellation in its title. Highly illustrative in this respect is the report concerning the patriarchal thrones and their subordinate dioceses made by Archimandrite Nilus Doxopater by order of the Sicilian King Roger II in 1143. This is what it says with regard to the autocephalous Archbishopric of Ohrid: "The Bulgarian Church is like the Cypriot Church: independent and subordinate to none of the supreme thrones, but autonomously governed and consecrated by its own bishops. **In the**

³⁶ Ди мѣ т ъ р Ангел ов, *Ист ори я на Ви зант и я*, София, 1965, 295.

beginning it was not called Bulgarian, but later, as it came under the control of the Bulgars, it received the Bulgarian name. It also remained independent when it freed itself from the Bulgarian hand and did not join the Constantinopolitan Church.³⁷ Somewhat later the Archbishopric of Ohrid was made subordinate only and directly to the Oecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, its former eparchies were curtailed and its jurisdiction was reduced mainly to the territory of Macedonia.

The long Byzantine domination in Macedonia (over two centuries, 11th-13th c.), together with the administrative division and conservatism of church traditions described above, was accompanied by a highly developed economic and, in particular, cultural life of the Macedonian Slavs. It is a period from which a large number of cultural and historical written records — in the Slavonic and Greek languages — have been preserved. In all these documents Macedonia is invariably referred to as the theme *Bul̄garia*, and the former Slavini (Sclavini) are now described under the administrative appellation *Bul̄gares*, while the Macedonian language is called *Bul̄garian*. The same applies to the various hagiographies and orations connected with Clement and Naum, and even those with Cyril and Methodius, where the nomenclature is in full accord with the administrative division. This is understandable as the majority of historical texts were written by Greeks.³⁸ Using these appellations as ‘arguments’, Bulgarian scholars stress the “Bulgarian character” of Macedonia and use the designations which were the result of a situation in the 12th and 13th centuries to draw conclusions relating to issues from earlier periods. At the same time **they forget that during the same period, when we can find Macedonia referred to under the Bulgarian name, the Bulgarian name is absent in the written records relating to Bulgaria and the Bulgars!** It is curious (which has long been and still is the cause of dispute between Bulgarian and Romanian historians) that even the founders of the ‘Second Bulgarian Empire’, the brothers Ivan and Peter Asen (1185-1197), did not use the Bulgarian name. Instead, the sources mention ‘Wallachians’, ‘Moesi’, Scythians, etc.³⁹ As late as the early 13th century, Ivan and Peter Asen’s heir, Kaloyan

³⁷ *По̀зл ѐди*, IV, 3, Skopje, 1967, 110.

³⁸ With the exception of Haralampie Polenakovič’s chapter entitled „Kliment Ohridski – жи vot i dejnost“ (in: *Кни за за Kliment Ohridski*, Skopje, 1966, 5-68) and Branko Panov’s article „Kliment Ohridski“ (*Ist opija*, III, 1, Skopje, 1967, 32-53), we have yet no detailed account of these hagiographies that are full of contradictory and very interesting data. Written considerably later, mostly by Greeks within and outside Macedonia, they present sufficient reasons calling for a critical survey which will provide important information — both for us and for others.

³⁹ Bori slav Primon, „Sъzdavaneto na Vtorata bulgarska dъrжавa i учastieto na vlastete“, in: *Бългaрско-рутѣнски връзки i от ношени я през векови т е*, *Изсл едвани я*, I, (III-III v.), BAN, Sofija, 1965, 9-53.

(1197-1207), proclaiming himself “the Emperor of the whole of Bulgaria and Wallachia” and demanding recognition from the Roman Pope, in his letters writes, among other things, that he found in old books that in the past the Bulgars used to have glorious empires and emperors, whose “legitimate” heir he is.⁴⁰ Yet he succeeded in conquering and controlling a part of Macedonia and Serbia for only two or three years, and this (like the subsequent short-lived incursion of Asen II) could not leave very great imprint on the overall development of Macedonia.

The not so brief rule of Serbian feudal lords in Macedonia could not erase the Bulgarian name as the Archbishopric of Ohrid constantly used it not only in the eparchies of Macedonia, but also in those outside its present-day borders. Hence it is not surprising that, for instance, Evliya Ėelebi **found Bulgars in the 17th century in Belgrade and other places which were under the jurisdiction of the Ohrid Church**. Only after the establishment of the independent Serbian Church were conditions created for the formation of the Serbian people, because the state and the church symbolized the boundaries of an individual people in feudalism, which was later used in the delineation of national borders. Up to the present day we still do not have an objective scholarly work examining the character and mutual relations between the three independent Orthodox Slavic churches in the Balkans, but they undoubtedly developed into churches of the three Slavic Orthodox peoples: the Archbishopric of Ohrid (as the oldest church, with the longest continuity of development) for the Macedonian people, the Patriarchate of Peĥ for the Serbian people, and the Patriarchate of Trnovo for the Bulgarian people. Regardless of the degree of overlapping in their titles and organizational territories, they nevertheless led to the development of three closely related and yet individual cultures.

The complications in these relations arose only after the national delineation of the 19th century, when a people’s designation was considered of prime importance.

The arrival of the Turks led to the suppression of popular names, as the subjugated peoples were classified in accordance with their religion and social position (Christians and *пaчa*), but the Bulgarian name was still retained and propagated in the churches and monasteries under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ohrid. With the strengthening of Russia (particularly in the 18th and early 19th century) and **with the arousal of interest in the Slavic world and in the Old Slavonic language and its original homeland, the Bulgarian name once again started to be used through inertia for Macedonia as well, because**

⁴⁰ *Годѝ шни къ на Софѝ ѝски я Уни верси т ет ъ, Ист ори ко-фѝ l ol оѝи чески факул т ет* , НННVII, Sof ѝ я, 1942, 21-66.

the researchers found it in old documents written in the Slavonic and other languages. Therefore it was not surprising that in the *Dictionarjy oŭFour Lan-
zuażes* (1802) of the Moskopole teacher Daniil the Macedonian language ap-
peared under the Bulgarian name and that Hristofor Жѳaroviч from Dojran on
occasion declared himself to be a Bulgarian, amongst other things. It is in this light
that we must understand the statements of some Macedonians before Vuk
Karadžiч, in the early 19th century, that they were Bulgarians, as well as the
writings of the first literary figures of our more recent history that their language
was “Slavo-Bulgarian”. The title of Kiril Pejчиnoviк’s *Ozledalo* (Mirror), where
he says that the book is written “in the ordinary and non-literary Bulgarian
language of lower Moesia” is a good example of this.

Such or similar statements are to be found among all our writers and cultural
workers from the first half of the 19th century, and even later. This, however, should
not be explained as the result of Bulgarian propaganda, as we can speak of such
propaganda only after the late 1850s, in the 1860s and especially in the 1870s,
when the process of Bulgarian national revival was more or less completed and
when the rise of national romanticism demanded the restoration of the former
borders of Simeon’s Bulgaria. Up to this period it can be assumed that the same
name was used for two peoples who were no closer than the Czechs and Slovaks,
or the Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians, and who during their history had
much less in common than the peoples mentioned above. Just as the Slovaks,
Slovenes, Belorussians and Ukrainians took their present-day national names only
after the process of becoming nationally aware in the 19th century — without any
links to the mediaeval period — so too the Macedonian people, in this same 19th
century, raised their historical and geographical name to the degree of national
name, formally attesting its independent existence.

Thus the Bulgarian name was used continually in Macedonia, but without
awareness on the part of the people of any ethnic or cultural unity with the
Bulgarians, from whom they were separated both geographically and historically
as well as economically and commercially. This does not imply that other names
were not used for this purpose during that long period; numerous examples can be
given of the use of the Slavonic, Serbian, Greek and, certainly, the Macedonian
name for the designation of the people. But it was not until the historical conditions
were fully mature that the Macedonian name developed as a national name as well,
this time regionally, culturally and historically defined and sufficiently clearly
distinguishable from the national names of the neighbouring peoples and territo-
ries which had become established earlier.

*(a) Why did the Macedonian name appear
as late as the 19th century?*

The present-day Macedonian name originates not only from the geographical term **Macedonia**, but also from the name of an ancient people, **Macedonians**, because in the acceptance of this name by both foreigners and the Macedonian Slavs, the latter were considered not only successors to the territory of the Macedonian state of Philip II and Alexander the Great, but also descendants of the ancient Macedonians, who were proclaimed the oldest Slavs in the Balkans. Yet all this was a development of the ensuing centuries, largely following the 16th century. This view first appeared and developed mostly outside Macedonia, and was only later accepted by the Macedonian Slavs themselves. Of course, during the settlement of the Slavs they already had their **Slavic** name and hence it was not by chance that when they established semi-state communities of their own they were called **Slavinias**. No one ever thought, nor it was possible to think, of a full correspondence between the borders of the Slavic settlers and the former borders of the state of the ancient Macedonians. On the contrary, the Slavs spread all over the area, coming as far as Peloponnesus. In the course of time, the broad but not very well delineated ethnic boundaries gradually narrowed, mainly in favour of the Greeks and later of Albanians. The course of history thus formed an ethnic community which gradually developed into an individual **Slavic** people and later into the individual Slavic **Macedonian** nation.

As early as 1903, on the basis of original studies and logical conclusions, Misirkov established that “our first popular name was the name Slav”.⁴¹ Our ancestors used this name at least up to the 11th century, even though foreigners used the Bulgarian name for them as early as the 10th century. We should certainly not overlook the fact, and it was not by chance, that St Clement of Ohrid never signed his works as ‘*Bulḡarian* bishop’ (even though he could have done so, as he worked within the frontiers of the then vast Bulgarian state and should have been subordinated to the Archbishop of Bulgaria), but he most often signed them as ‘*Slavic* bishop’. Later, however, the Slavic name utterly disappeared as an exclusive popular name for the Macedonian Slavs, acquiring a broader, all-Slavonic meaning. This is the reason why we cannot find it as a designation for the people even during the process of the birth and development of the Macedonian nation, especially in view of the fact that it had already been used by the Slovaks and Slovenes.

Misirkov is right when he concludes that “the Greeks also gave us, the Macedonians, the name Bulgars. But this renaming,” continues Misirkov, “was

⁴¹ К.Р. Мисирковъ, *За македонските работи*, София, 1903, 116.

not the only one. The Serbs, too, renamed us as Serbs.”⁴² As we have already explained in detail how the Bulgarian borders expanded to include Macedonia and how the Bulgarian name was introduced and became established in a certain period, let us now examine the use of the Serbian name. Once again we can quote Misirkov to illustrate our point:

The Serbs were the principal military power opposing the Byzantines. Our ancestors were their allies. The Byzantines called all their opponents Serbs, i.e. both the Serbs and us. Little by little they renamed us from Bulgars into Serbs. The same was also the result of the recognition of Dušan’s sovereignty over Macedonia and of the role of our leading men in his state. We became Serbs to the external world; then we appeared as Serbian subjects and later the name Serb came to designate a Macedonian, not a Greek, Vlach or Arnaut.

[...]

So, before the arrival of the Turks in our land we were renamed three times: 1. Slavs, 2. Bulgars, 3. Serbs.⁴³

Under Ottoman rule, as “the Turks did not recognize ethnicities in their state, they called us an ‘infidel’ [*καυρήν*] people and ‘raya’, terms based on our low status before the Turks, on the religious differences between us and themselves and on our social position”.⁴⁴ But Misirkov notes that “apart from the Turks, after losing our freedom, the Greeks became our ‘educators’ and masters”,⁴⁵ who, in addition to identifying us with themselves as ‘Christians’, thanks to the state-constitutional and church traditions with ‘Bulgarian’ designations, restored the Bulgarian name for us and formally identified us with the Bulgarians. At that time the inhabitants of Serbia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina were no longer designated as Bulgarians, because in these states the names of other states had already become established, and — which is particularly important - they had long since ceased to come under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, and mainly gravitated around the church of the mediaeval Serbian state, as a result of which Belgrade no longer bore Bulgarian characteristics. In this way we were once again nominally identified with the Bulgarians, although the Macedonians themselves had almost no links with, and not even an idea of, the Bulgarian people or Bulgarian culture. As a result, in the 19th century there was resistance against Bulgarian penetration into Macedonia, when our people called themselves “pure Bulgarians” and used the name *Ilbpi* for the Bulgarians, as the Macedonians knew no other peoples living much further than the land of the *Ilbpi*. Yet because the Bulgarians

⁴² *Id.*, 117.

⁴³ *Id.*, 120-121.

⁴⁴ *Id.*, 122.

⁴⁵ *Id.*

succeeded in proclaiming their historical and national programme earlier, because their revival started earlier and was also completed earlier, our people, refusing to accept the proclaimed 'unity' of Macedonia, Thrace, Bulgaria and parts of Serbia, and making a strong distinction between themselves and the Bulgarians, rejected the Bulgarian and accepted the already well-developed **Macedonian** name.

(b) Why was it the Macedonian name that was accepted?

When the Slavs settled in Macedonia, the Macedonian name was considered rather vague, although many traditions and legends were still alive among the local population. It is also important to mention that there is a written records dating from as early as 802 in which West Thrace is designated as the theme of Macedonia. The Macedonian name became more and more established with Plovdiv as its centre. In addition, starting from 867 and during the following two centuries, the Byzantine Empire was ruled by the Macedonian dynasty whose founder was Emperor Basil I the **Macedonian** (867-887), born in the vicinity of Adrianople. The naming of **Thrace** as the theme **Macedonia** was also not incidental, as the ancient Macedonian state was originally organized along the lower course of the River Marica, and only later, during the time of Philip II, did it incorporate the territory of present-day Macedonia with its seat at Pella. Bulgarian control and the long-standing Byzantine administrative organization of Macedonia as the theme 'Bulgaria' developed side by side with the existence of the theme 'Macedonia' in Thrace.

Serbian and Turkish conquests and the fall of the Byzantine Empire created a new situation. The development of humanism and the Renaissance in Western Europe and the cult of the ancient world and classical culture exalted the glory of the ancient state of Philip II and Alexander the Great (of Macedon).

At the same time, particularly with the development of navigation, cartography began to grow rapidly. On the basis of the maps and 'geography' of the Alexandrian geographer and astronomer Ptolemy (2nd century) and on the basis of the 'traveling maps' which were engraved in the squares of Roman towns in the 3rd and 4th centuries, where the borders of Macedonia were fairly accurately delineated, from the 12th century onwards, copies started to be made, and after the 15th century (when Gutenberg invented the printing press), there began the printing of various maps which spread and disseminated knowledge about the world and history. In 1490 Ptolemy's maps were redrawn and printed, and, towards the mid-16th century, the founder of modern scientific cartography, Gerhardus Mercator (1512-1594), made the first more accurate map of Macedonia, printed in Duisburg in 1589 and reprinted separately in Amsterdam in 1628, showing the towns of

Salonika, Prilep, Stobi, Skopje, etc. With the progress of scholarship and technology, these maps spread even farther and became a part of the body of material studied in Europe. The name and borders of Macedonia became more and more established in the mind of the civilized world. By the 19th century a large number of such maps had been printed, which had undoubtedly reached Macedonian merchants and literate people maintaining contacts with Western Europe. The contribution of merchants from Dubrovnik, who were among the most numerous in Macedonia, was certainly the greatest.

At the same time various copies and reprinted editions of the mediaeval romance of Alexander the Great spread more and more widely. The ancient glory of the Macedonian state and culture stirred the imagination not only of the Europeans but also of the inhabitants of Macedonia. More and more songs about Alexander the Great began to be sung and more and more legends describing his campaigns were retold. This led to the emergence in this region of what is known as *Damaški* literature. Our 'literate' people accepted all this. The former geographical borders, now defined with the development of cartography, gradually acquired ethnographic characteristics and a consciousness of the Macedonian origin of the Slavs in Macedonia began to be formed.

We can use the development of Slavic heraldry as a good illustration for and a proof of this extremely significant process. No doubt under the direct influence of the Italian Renaissance and European heraldic literature among the Balkan Catholic Slavs, the idea of the unity of all Balkan Slavs and of resistance against the subjugators — Turkey and Austria — began increasingly to develop. As a result, the first coats of arms of the individual Slavic lands and peoples on the Balkan Peninsula were created.

All this evolved under the wing of what was known as the Illyrian Movement, which was strongest in Dubrovnik, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Croatia, when the term *Илyриан* was identified with *Балкано-Славic*. Of about 70 Macedonian coats of arms discovered so far by Dr Aleksandar Matkovski, the oldest dates from 1595. Up to that time Europe knew only the boundaries of Macedonia, most often considering it as a 'Greek land'. Yet with the appearance of the coats of arms of South-Slavic peoples, including those of the Macedonian people, the Slavic character of this part of European Turkey was represented for the first time. This completed the picture of the boundaries of Macedonia and the character of its population. Hence Leopold I in 1690 addressed "the Macedonian people", and the documents of the Russian Imperial Office from the 18th century mention the following: "The Orthodox peoples, the Serbs, Macedonians, Bulgarians and Wallachians, want to serve Her Imperial Majesty with blood and arms... In

peaceful times that corpus of Serbs, Macedonians and Bulgarians, Orthodox peoples of the same stock as ours...”, etc.⁴⁶ It is also important to mention that, as Dr Matkovski points out, “the Macedonian coat of arms appeared at the same time, at the same place and was produced by the same people as the Serbian and Bulgarian coats of arms and those of the other South Slavs”.⁴⁷ The inclusion of the Macedonian coat of arms in the common coat of arms of the South Slav peoples confirmed the separate character, individuality and equality of the Macedonian people with regard to the rest of the South Slav peoples.

All this spread in Macedonia itself, although with difficulty and slowly. Perhaps the statements of Athanasius, the Archbishop of Ohrid, are of particular significance in this respect. The trend gained in strength especially after 1601, when Mavro Orbini from Dubrovnik published his important work *Илирадеџли Цави* (The Empire of the Slavs), where the Macedonian coat of arms was printed for the first time; a text on the Macedonian people was printed below. Yet this South Slav ideology experienced its greatest expansion after the publication of the *Gemma-tographia* by Hristofor Жѣфаровиѿ from Dojran in 1741; it was prepared on the basis of Orbini’s work, but was printed in the Slavonic language and Cyrillic script. The Macedonian coat of arms is given here side by side with the Serbian, Bulgarian and other South Slavic coats of arms, and below it is said that Macedonia lost “her honour” under the Turks, yet nevertheless she holds it dearly. The *Gemma-tographia* spread throughout Macedonia and had an immeasurable influence on the strengthening of the Macedonian ethnic, historical and national consciousness. It was not by chance that the Macedonians who took part in the First Serbian Uprising put a lion on their banner with the inscription ‘Macedonia’. Nor is it a coincidence that we find the same symbol on the banner of the 1876 Razlovci Uprising and even on the flags of some detachments in the 1903 Ilinden Uprising. It is even less coincidental that the portal of the Rila Monastery (1834-1860) includes the Macedonian coat of arms, in addition to the Serbian, Bulgarian and Bosnian ones, as representing four mediaeval states and four independent Orthodox Slavic churches, i.e. four individual and neighbouring Slavic peoples. The significance of this fact is even greater if we bear in mind that the masters who

⁴⁶ For more details concerning these questions see: Aleksandar Matkovski, *Македонски от полк во Украјина*, Мисла, Скопје, 1985. Starting from 1751, the Macedonians were registered as a distinct people vis-à-vis the Orthodox Serbs, Bulgarians, Romanians and Greeks, and were entered in the registration form as “i z makedonskoà naci eà” (“of the Macedonian nation”, pp. 177, 184-187, 259).

⁴⁷ Д-р Aleksandar Matkovski, „Star i ot makedonski grb“, *Нова Македонија*, Скопје, 10.III.1968, 9. The same author later published a separate book entitled *Грбовите на Македонија (Прилог кон македонската heraldика)*, Скопје, 1970, where he made a detailed analysis of all the Macedonian coats of arms with reproductions in colour, shedding a different light on the entire problem.

painted the icons and did the woodcarving belonged to the then famous three schools — those of Samokov, Bansko and Debar.

But here too, as in some other cases, there are certain complications. Even though the lion represents a number of lands as a symbol in heraldry (Russia, Bulgaria, Romania, Austria, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, and even the Serbian reigning family of Brankoviĥ), there was a mixing of the characteristic signs between the Bulgarian and Macedonian coats of arms which was a consequence of the old confusion resulting from the use of the Bulgarian name. Macedonian symbols were increasingly suppressed with the emergence and development of the Bulgarian revival, when Bulgarian champions announced their intention of establishing a greater Bulgarian state within the borders of Simeon's Empire. Although these developments had more impact within Macedonia than outside its borders, the awakened representatives of our revival emphasized the Macedonian ethnic individuality and the Macedonian name, starting a long and extremely difficult struggle for Macedonian national affirmation.

Accordingly, from the historical facts concerning the development of the Balkan Slavs, given here in the most general manner, we can conclude that the Macedonian people started to be formed as early as the period between the 7th and 10th centuries, but that owing to the concurrence of historical events, this process was not fully completed until the 19th century, when the struggle of the Macedonians for the affirmation of the new social and historical category — the nation — began. The apparent evanescence of the Macedonian people after the 11th century was mainly of a formal character; it was the result of a nominal confusion with the surrounding peoples, which was resolved only after the emergence of the nation. In spite of all historical conquests and border changes, inhabiting this territory, sharing the same historical destiny, living a common geopolitical, economic and cultural life, with distinct characteristics in its language and literacy, the Macedonian people — as a distinct ethnic entity and culture — has built its individuality with proven vitality and self-preservation. This is shown by the ultimate strengthening of the Macedonian national name. There is also the fact that the Macedonians looked for and found a way of expressing their historical evolution which was not too different from the evolution of the other 'non-historical' nations in the Slavic world such as the Slovenes, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Belorussians and Lusatians. This does not mean that we should overlook the considerable ethnic and historical closeness between the Macedonian and surrounding Slavic peoples, but this is, however, no greater than the closeness between the Czechs and Slovaks, between the Ukrainians, Belorussians and Russians, or between the Slovenes and Croats.

5. The national revival of the Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians and conditions for the development of Macedonian national consciousness

Not only in the past but even today Bulgarian scholars like to claim that “the cradle of Bulgarianism” was in Macedonia and that “the Bulgarian revival” started here. In order to understand better why this is a wrong assumption and also to understand the Macedonian revival, we shall briefly examine the revival of the Serbs, Greeks and Bulgarians in connection and interdependence with which the Macedonian revival developed.

A general characteristic of all these neighbouring peoples (which were more or less in the same position as Macedonia was within the frontiers of the Ottoman Empire) was that cultural and national revival among all of them began and developed first in colonies outside Turkish (Ottoman) territory, where the necessary conditions had been created for the unimpeded progress of educational, cultural and spiritual life and the affirmation of national thought. As a result of the central position it occupied in European Turkey, the Macedonian people did not have that advantage. When it tried to establish such colonies in the neighbouring, already liberated, states new historical circumstances had been created there in which aggressive aspirations towards Macedonia were already strong and any expression of Macedonian national thought was most closely followed and nipped in the bud.

The Serbian revival and the Serbian nation appeared and developed not “in the then illiterate Serbia”, as Ђ. Jovanoviћ says, but in what was then southern Hungary, or present-day Vojvodina, where the Serbs had almost complete cultural, spiritual and political autonomy. The towns there were highly developed both economically and culturally and, in the second half of the 18th century, some of them (Novi Sad, Sombor, Subotica, Timisoara) were proclaimed “free royal towns” with full rights to self-rule.

Even though there was a certain Serbian population in Vojvodina as early as the 13th and 14th centuries, it grew considerably in the 15th century, after the flight of many Orthodox Bosnian and Serbian feudal lords into the Hungarian Kingdom, and in particular with the great migration following the 1690 Austro-Turkish War, when some 60-70 thousand people fled there, most of whom were craftsmen, merchants and priests, headed by the Serbian Patriarch Arsenius III Čarnojević. The ensuing Austro-Turkish wars in the period 1699-1739 fixed the Austro-Turkish frontier extending along the rivers Danube and Sava, and passing near the fortifications of Belgrade. The Serbian population in this territory developed in an entirely different way from the Serbian people under the Turks. Even Emperor

Leopold I (1690-1691) issued special 'Privileges' for the Serbian settlers, according to which they were placed under the protection of the Emperor and enjoyed free confession of faith, church autonomy and the right to elect their own Orthodox metropolitan, who was in fact a political representative of the Serbs in Austria and who, among other things, acted as a judge in civilian lawsuits, punished those found guilty, confirmed the statutes of guilds, appointed Serbian officers, etc. Greatly contributing to the national and political development of the Serbs in Vojvodina were also the popular-church councils which resolved important issues ranging from the election of a metropolitan, the opening of schools and organization of church administration, to protecting the people from the pressure of the authorities and feudal lords. Following the introduction of Maria Theresa's reforms, after the establishment of the Illyrian Court Commission (1745) and the Illyrian Court Office (1747), as well as the *Režulament* (1770) and *Declapatorium* (1779), political autonomy was considerably restricted, but full rights of the people to autonomy in religion and schooling were retained, which helped the process of national revival and the affirmation of the Serbian nation. The popular uprisings of the Vojvodina Serbs, the actions of Pera Segedinac, etc., greatly contributed to the development of political consciousness and indirectly prepared for the Serbian Uprising of 1804, which led to the establishment of the free Serbian state and ultimately accomplished the process of Serbian cultural, social and economic revival. All this, however, took place outside that part of Serbia which came within the frontiers of Turkey.

Accordingly, the Serbian revival and the Serbian nation were conceived in the 18th century within the borders of Austria (and Hungary). The nation finally became established in the early 19th century in Serbia itself.

* * *

The evolution of the Greek revival was not essentially different. Greek education was directly controlled by the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Phanariotes in the Turkish capital. In addition to Constantinople, there were Greek schools on Mount Athos, in Jannina (IoInnina) and other towns in the Balkans, where the Balkan 'upper class' studied the Greek language and proudly adopted Greek culture. There were also Greek schools supported by the free principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, in Bucharest and Jassy. Many Greek scholars and thinkers earned fame in the world, but neither Constantinople nor Jannina were to become the centre of Greek revival. In Greece, just as in the case of Serbia, the main characteristic of the revival was the introduction of the vernacular as a literary standard instead of the archaic Byzantine Greek standard. In the 1760s, Iosipos

Myssiodakas (c. 1730-1800), influenced by the French Encyclopaedists, came out in favour of opening schools instead of churches (Dositelj Obradoviĥ later promulgated the same ideology). The most glorified Greek learned man in the 18th century, Eugenios Voulgaris (1716-1806), founded the Mount Athos Academy, which became known throughout the Balkans and grew into a symbol of the struggle for education, although he was soon forced to leave Greece, finding support in Russia. Adamintios Koras (1748-1833) takes a special place in the cultural and national revival of the Greeks; at first he looked to France to liberate the Greek people, and later he stood at the head of the popular educational movement which developed chiefly outside Greece — in Vienna, Bucharest and Jassy — and on some Greek islands.

Of crucial significance, however, for the development of the Greek revival and national awakening was the increasingly important role of Russia in the settlement of Balkan questions, as a result of which many Greeks were warmly accepted at the Russian Court as well as at the courts of the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. The political content of the *Mezali Idea* was based on Catherine the Great's idea of "the re-institution of the ancient Greek Empire". The ideas of the French Revolution were most practically reflected in the activity of Rhigas Velestinlis (1757-1798). He wrote his Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Constitution of a Balkan Republic, and prepared a large historical "map of Hellas" which was in fact a map of the whole of the Balkans. Although he propagated liberty, fraternity and equality for all the peoples living in this territory, at the beginning of his Declaration, Velestinlis underlines that under this Balkan Republic he understands "the people, descendants of the Greeks, inhabiting Rumelia, Asia Minor, the Mediterranean islands, Wallachia-Moldavia and all others groaning under the most unbearable tyranny of the most abominable Ottoman despotism".⁴⁸ This *Mezali Idea* was also reflected in his 'Combat March' which became the ode of the Greek national liberation movement in the early 19th century. All his works mention only Greeks, Bulgarians, Albanians, Vlachs, Armenians and Turks, and there are no Macedonians. This is understandable as the Greeks even then believed that the ancient Macedonians had been Greeks, and hence Macedonia was a Greek land.

⁴⁸ For more details in connection with Rhigas Velestinlis and his Declaration, his map and his march, see: A. Daskalakis, *Les oeuvres de Rhizos Belestinlis*, Paris, 1937; N. Botzaris, *Bisions Balkaniques dans la preparation de la Revolution grecque (1789-1821)*, Genĭve-Paris, 1962; G.A. Arsh, „K vorposu obi deanomvozdeast vi i Vel i koa Fr ancuzskoà revol iuci i na bal kanski e nar ody (Nei zvest - nya tekst konst ituci i i ‚Voennogo gi mna‘ Ri gasa Vel est i nl i sa)“, *Французски ѱ ежеодни к*, 1963, Moskva, 1964; Nikol aà Todorov, *Fil i ki et epi a i bŭl zapi t e*, BAN, Sof i a, 1965, 108-120.

The successful end of the Serbian Uprising (1804) and the Russo-Turkish War (1806-1812) created conditions for the easier development of the national liberation movements of the peoples living in European Turkey, whose centres became Romania and Russia, where, among other things, armed units composed of various peoples were created, chiefly under Greek command.

Despite the fact that the Greek ethnic entity was mainly protected and developed through the church, which enjoyed uninterrupted evolution and hence had no problems in the process of development of the Greek nation, Greek national liberation thought was for the first time and most strongly expressed in the anonymous book entitled *Lawful Rule, or Thoughts of Freedom*, published in Italy in 1806. We should also mention that, as well as other national and liberation movements in the Balkans, the Greek movement was conceived and developed chiefly abroad, and not internally. As in the case of the Macedonians, the main role in the awakening of Greek national liberation thought was played by various societies founded abroad. The first to appear was The Hotel of Those Who Speak Greek, in 1809 in Paris; it was followed by the Greek-Dacian Literary Society founded in 1810/1811 in Bucharest, and 1813 saw the establishment of the Society of Lovers of the Muses, the first to develop such a cultural and educational activity inside Turkey. In addition, this process was aided by the publication of printed mouthpieces: *Ep̄mis o Lōios* appeared in Vienna in 1811, and three years later the daily *Greek Telegraph* began to be printed in the same city.

The great powers, however, still refused to recognize officially the Greek nation. The following example is highly illustrative. When at the 1814 Berlin Congress the prominent Greek leaders who lived in Russia, Kapodistrias and Ypsilanti, submitted a request for the liberation of Greece, the proposal was not even accepted for discussion, and von Metternich said: “[T]here is no Greek people and the Turkish state does not recognize any nationalities other than the Turkish one.”⁴⁹ This was precisely the reason for the foundation, in the same year, in Odessa, of the *Philiki Etaireia* (*Philikê Xetaipia*) secret revolutionary organization, which successfully organized the Greeks in their colonies in Romania, Russia, Bulgaria and Greece itself; in 1821 it started the Greek Uprising in Wallachia and Moldavia, transferring it to Greece, and in 1827 ultimately succeeded in winning national freedom for its homeland.

Thus the Greek revival, too, developed outside Turkey, and one of the basic characteristics of its ideology was the *Mezali Idea*, according to which the Macedonian people were considered “descendants of the Greeks”. Subsequently this idea was to be fully developed by the liberated state of Greece and used in the struggle against the development of Macedonian national thought.

⁴⁹ Ni kol aà Todor ov, *op. cit.*, 42.

* * *

Bulgarian national awakening took place considerably earlier than that of the Macedonians, owing not so much to economic development as to the unique geopolitical circumstances in which Bulgaria found itself in the 18th and 19th centuries. Of prime importance for the national awakening of the Bulgarian people were the Russian aspirations towards the Bosphorus. From the second half of the 18th century onwards, Russian troops crossed the Turkish frontier several times, establishing a Russo-Bulgarian military-administrative authority on the territory of Bulgaria. This was the crucial element instigating popular action whose ultimate aim was the liberation of the land from Ottoman domination. Moreover, after the withdrawal of the Russian troops from Bulgarian territory, hundreds of thousands of the most awakened and ardent Bulgarians crossed the Danube, settling in the border regions and enlarging the existing Bulgarian colonies founded by refugees fleeing from the ravages of the Turkish irregular soldiery. These Bulgarian colonies, which developed in full national and political freedom and among which Bulgarian patriotism was systematically encouraged for use in the imminent battles with Turkey, became the decisive military, moral, political and material force in the future struggle for political liberation and “national unification of the Bulgarian people” within the borders of Simeon’s mediaeval empire. The Bulgarians in Wallachia, Moldavia, Bessarabia and Southern Russia had their own military (as part of the Russian army), their own system of schools and boarding schools, their own churches and monasteries, their own scholarly and literary societies, revolutionary committees and other national bodies that nourished national, political, educational and spiritual activities, generously supported by the Russian government.

Accordingly, the Bulgarian educational, cultural, national and political revival, too, started and developed outside Bulgaria, just as in the case of the Serbs and Greeks: the first books and newspapers in the Bulgarian language were printed abroad, financed mainly by external sources, and it was abroad again that the revolutionary detachments were formed; these were later fully armed and transferred to the territory of Bulgaria, with the purpose of preparing the ground for revolutionary activity. It is interesting to note here that, like the Greek *Etaireia* committees, in the subsequent years, Vasil Levski’s committees were intended only for the territory of Bulgaria, and not Macedonia!

It should also be noted that the elementary schools and boarding schools later received children sent from both Bulgaria and Macedonia. Over 200 students from Bulgaria, and also from Macedonia, were enrolled from 1854 to 1857 in various Russian schools and faculties through the Board of Odessa Bulgarians in Odessa

alone. And how many were enrolled through the mediation of the Slavic Charitable Committee in Moscow from 1858 onwards?

Russian scholars and journalists took part in the awakening of the Bulgarian spirit by placing Macedonia at the centre of the Bulgarian ethnographic element and outlining the borders of the future San Stefano myth.⁵⁰ In 1829 in Moscow the first printed history of Bulgaria appeared, by Yuri Venelin, in which Macedonia was presented as the largest of the three parts of “Bulgaria”.⁵¹ Aprilov and Palauzov were brought up as national activists using Venelin’s numerous books (published by the Russian Academy of Sciences) as a guide, and the most glorious figures of more recent Bulgarian history — Rakovski, Karavelov, Levski, Botev and Karadžata — grew in the spirit of the same ardent national romanticism. Macedonian intellectuals were also recruited in this environment on an ongoing basis; there they were brought up and instructed in the same spirit, and later became disseminators of conscious Bulgarianism among the masses of the people.

We should also mention the activity of the powerful Bulgarian colony in Constantinople, which managed to exert a considerable influence on the local Macedonian migrant workers, and took ‘Bulgarian matters’ into their own hands, carrying out widespread legal national activity among the ‘Bulgarian’ people in Turkey, particularly with the help of its well-developed journalistic and publishing activity.⁵²

Accordingly, the Bulgarian revival and the Bulgarian nation, too, developed outside the borders of Bulgaria. But this development was considered a continuation of the past designated by the Bulgarian name; the national ideology was built on these foundations and was later consciously and persistently spread among the Bulgarian masses in Turkey. The books, textbooks and periodicals which were printed abroad became the basis for the education in the schools that began to be used in Bulgaria following 1835.

⁵⁰ Вл аже Ри ст овски , „P r i l o g k o n m a k e d o n s k a t a l i t e r a t u r n a i s t o r i j a , M a k e d o n s k i o t j a z i k v o l i t e r a t u r n a u p o t r e b a i l i t e r a t u r a t a n a M a k e d o n c i t e n a t u f i j a z i c i “ , *Современост* , HIV, 4, 1964, 404-405.

⁵¹ In addition to the two editions of his voluminous work *Древние и нынешние Болгаре въ роит и чesкоть, народорі шноть, і st opі chesкоть і pel і žioзноть і ъъ от ношеніи къ Россіянать* (1829 and 1856), Yuri Venelin published many other booklets in Moscow dealing with these problems. Of particular interest among them are the data he quotes in his publication entitled „O zar odyшъ novoа bol gar skoа l i t e r a t u r i ы“, № 1, 1838, where on page 7 the author writes that he managed to collect information that 750,000 Bulgarians lived in Bulgaria, 600,000 in Thrace, 195,000 in various other areas, whereas as many as 1,000,000 Bulgarians lived in Macedonia alone. The degree to which he and the general public were uninformed is best illustrated by his assumptions that Karlovci, Prizren, Koprivnica, Kalofer, the Rila Monastery and other places were part of Macedonia.

⁵² *Ist opі я на бъл гарскат а l i t e r a t u r a*, 2. *L i t e r a t u r a на възражданет о*, BAN, Sof і я, 1966, 182-220; Д-г Маъо Ст оянов, *Бъл гарска възрожденска кнї жнї на. Анаl і t і чен репер-т оар на бъл гарскі т е кнї ži і реpі оді чнї і зданї я 1806-1878*, I, 1957, II, 1959.

There is no doubt, however, that the various churches which were officially recognized by the Turkish authorities as Bulgarian also played an important part in the development of Bulgarian national consciousness. Thus, for example, as early as 1850 the Sultan recognized the Protestant Bulgarian Church in Constantinople, and 15 years later an individual Bulgarian Uniate Church, headed by Archbishop Josif (Joseph) Sokolski, was also instituted.⁵³ Moreover, there was a pro-Bulgarian catholic mission which developed extensive activities in Bulgaria, but also exerted its influence in Macedonia. Nor should we overlook the protection which was offered to the adherents of the individual churches by the sponsors of religious propaganda, as in this way a *millet* was provided which guaranteed protection from Turkish violence and Greek self-will. We must also point to an extremely important moment which played a crucial role in the development of this “gathering of the Bulgarian people”: as early as 1847 the foundations were laid in Constantinople of the Bulgarian Church in Phener, instituted by the Bulgarian champions living in Constantinople, who inspired it with the Bulgarian national idea. In spite of some resistance it encountered in Macedonia, the Bulgarian Church gradually became a factor with which the Porte had to reckon, and it spread its influence in Macedonia as well, laying the foundations of the Bulgarian Exarchate which was recognized in 1870 and whose eparchies were considered to delineate, for both the Turkish authorities and foreign observers, the ‘ethnographic borders’ of the ‘Bulgarian people’. Furthermore, in addition to the numerous societies and committees abroad, various national institutions began to be established in Turkey as well, acquiring to a certain degree the character of authorities. Thus, for instance, even before the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the Bulgarian Reading Club was founded in Constantinople (1866), which started the publication of its mouthpiece *Читалище* (Reading Club), printing articles by many Macedonian activists as well. The Bulgarian Charitable Society *Просвещение* (Education) was formed soon after (1868); its only task and goal was to direct the ‘Bulgarian cause’ in Macedonia and Thrace. The same role was later assigned to the Macedonian Society (1872), established as a counterpart to the Greek Macedonian associations, i.e. as an institution of the already fully established Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia.⁵⁴

As in Shariah Turkey faith was a substitute for ethnicity, the Bulgarian Exarchate appeared as the most important implementer of this propaganda; it enjoyed

⁵³ For more details on this matter see: Bl ake Ri stovski , „Uni jat st vot o vo Makedoni ja“, *Razl edi* , II, 9, Skopje, 1960, 908-936; II, 10, 1005-1029; III, 1, 72-90 and III, 2, 158-189.

⁵⁴ Bl ake Ri stovski , „Uni jat st vot o vo Makedoni ja, III. Makedoni sti cko-separati sti ckot o dvi jewe od 1873/74 godi na i nat amouni ot razvi tok na uni jat st vot o do deneska“, *Razl edi* , III, 1, 1960, 78-79.

all the legal rights to administer not only the churches and monasteries in the subordinate eparchies, but also the educational institutions: it appointed and dismissed teachers and opened and closed schools where the instruction was carried out in the Bulgarian language, using the Bulgarian name and the Bulgarian national ideology, as they were actually recognized by the Turkish authorities. In this way, Bulgaria (which was still not liberated) exerted its authority over the spiritual and educational life in Macedonia, especially if we bear in mind that the Exarchate gradually succeeded in taking over the majority of church-school communities, also exerting control over the administrative local authorities and thus acquiring the right to interfere in the Turkish councils, defending the interest of its adherents. Thus Bulgaria's liberation by the Russian troops did not result in any important changes for Macedonia, except in creating new and efficient methods and means which helped the strengthening of Bulgarian propaganda. Its 'trade agents' and the School Department of the Exarchate constituted a real authority which acted almost independently of the Ottoman administrative and political authorities in Macedonia.

If we bear in mind the fact that at that period (up to 1878) only neighbouring Bulgaria and Macedonia remained within the frontiers of Turkey as entirely Orthodox Slavic territories (which, moreover, still had some unresolved historical problems), we can understand the relative success of the Bulgarian national idea in some circles of the Macedonian middle class, which also found economic interest in the advancement of that propaganda. This element alone is sufficient to explain the motives for the expansion of the national propaganda of the rest of Macedonia's neighbours; it was responsible for the paralysis of any thought of an independent national existence and development of the Macedonian people.

From what has been described above we can see that (even though they stood higher, culturally and economically, than the Serbs and Bulgarians and not much lower than the Greeks) the Macedonians did not have the historical and geopolitical preconditions which had led the revival movements of their neighbours to ultimate national affirmation. Remaining in the central part of the Ottoman Empire, without organized colonies of its own abroad, and even without a single and definite regionally specific name for its people, Macedonia developed in an entirely different way from its neighbours. Theories on the ethnic character of the Macedonians began to be expounded outside Macedonia (without the participation of the Macedonians themselves) as late as the mid-19th century. Until then the Macedonian population was mainly designated as Bulgarian in the Orthodox world, increasingly as Macedonian in the Catholic world, and as far as Turkey was

concerned it was described chiefly by its religious and social characteristics such as 'Christian', 'heathen', 'Orthodox', 'raya' and very rarely, 'Slavic'.

As for the expansion of the Bulgarian name in the first half of the 19th century we cannot overlook the three very important arguments put forward by Misirkov in his journal *Вардар* (1905), which actually brought the Macedonian problem onto the international scene: "(1) the reform of the orthography and literary language among the Serbs; (2) the inquiry into the question of the homeland of the Old Slavonic language — the language of the translations of Ss Cyril and Methodius in connection with the development and study of the Slavic entity; (3) the travels across the Balkan Peninsula up to the last Russo-Turkish War, partly with scientific aims and partly with the aim of analysing the revival of the Slavs, which was ascribed to the activity of the Pan-Slavists, who were the cause of uneasiness for many in Europe."⁵⁵ All this encouraged the Bulgarian aspirations to create 'Bulgarians' in Macedonia, which met with resistance on the part of the more awakened Macedonians, encouraging the process of the birth and affirmation of Macedonian national consciousness.

The Macedonian national awakening, however, coincided with the initial actions of external religious and national propaganda in Macedonia, which considerably postponed the completion of the process of Macedonian national revival.

What in fact constituted the Macedonian Revival?

The Macedonian Revival, just like the revival of many other peoples, can be divided into two periods: one involving the period of enlightenment and cultural growth, which could be called **the cultural revival**, beginning in the early 19th century and continuing up to the mid-century, and the second period, which started with the resistance of the Macedonian people against foreign encroachments in Macedonia, with clearly defined Macedonian national characteristics, starting towards the mid-19th century and lasting up to the establishment of the free state of the Macedonians.

We cannot speak of a true **national** revival until the emergence of a clearly defined ideology using the Macedonian name.

The large number of Macedonian activists up to the 1850s and 1860s, despite all their merits and the use of a 'pure' or 'blended' Macedonian language in their literature, remain above all **cultural revivalists**, as they appeared chiefly under

⁵⁵ Д-р Блаже Ристовски, „Вардар“. *Научно-литературно и општествено-политичко списание на К.П. Мисирков*, I MJ „К. Мисирков“, Posebni izdani ja, kn. 4, Skopje, 1966. Photographically reproduced issue of the journal *Вардар*, 12.

the Bulgarian name and had no clearly defined and affirmed national programme of their own involving a national ideology. What is particularly important is that the revival of the Macedonians was not carried out on the basis of the former Slavic past, i.e. what had been born in the process of the formation of the Macedonian people was not 'reborn' (as there was a confusion surrounding its name), but **our revival was founded on the past and the glory of ancient Macedonia and the ancient Macedonians, who were proclaimed "the oldest Slavs on the Balkan Peninsula"**. For this reason we can find Alexander the Great (Alexander of Macedon) as the symbol of the Macedonian national struggle among all our early national revivalists.⁵⁶ The impossibility of proving the Slavic character of the ancient Macedonians actually complicated and prolonged the process of Macedonian national affirmation, but this process continued even after historical evidence had been studied, because a regionally specific name had already been chosen, a name which was different from all other surrounding peoples and which could secure national unity and win freedom for its people.

⁵⁶ Dragan Tashkovski, *Razawet o na makedonskat a naci ja*, Skopje, 1966, 163-181.

The Reasons for the Return of Clement of Ohrid from the Bulgarian Capital to Macedonia

On the basis of existing sources and the extensive literature available, we have already tried to summarize some facts⁵⁷ demonstrating that prior to the Moravian mission and prior to the expansion of the Bulgarian state into this area, in the course of at least two centuries, a Slavic-Macedonian-Byzantine culture gradually developed in the territory of Macedonia — a Christian civilization and culture — which differed considerably from the Proto-Bulgarian-Slavic and chiefly pagan culture created within the domains of Bulgarian khans and princes.

1.

We shall now try to answer the question of why Clement and Naum abandoned the Bulgarian capital and went to the most distant area of the then vast Bulgarian state, to Macedonia?

The studies dealing with this question mainly rely on what is said in the surviving hagiographies of these two Ohrid saints, in particular those of Clement, which are more extensive and detailed. Yet, even we accept that Clement's hagiographies were written by the Ohrid archbishops Theophylact⁵⁸ and Homa-

⁵⁷ Bl аже Ri st ovski , „Nekoi prašawa okol u pojavata na hri sti janst vot o i pi smenosta kaj Sl oveni te vo Makedoni ja“, in: *Ci trozi um 1100-godi ūni na od smrt t a na Ki pi l Col unski* , kn. 2, Skopje, 1970, 319-337; D-r Bl аже Ri st ovski , *Македонски от народ i македонскат а нас i ja. При l ozi за разв i t okot на македонскат а кул t ирно-нас i она на м i sl а*, I, Skopje, 1983, 15-116.

⁵⁸ In connection with Archbishop Theophylact of Ohrid and the various views on his authorship of the Longer [version of the] Life of Clement see: Aleksandър Mi l ev, *Ж и t i я на св. Kl i ment Ohri dski* , Sof i я, 1961, 29-68; Aleksandър Mi l ev, *Двет е зръски ж и t i я на Kl i ment Ohri dski* , in: *Kl i ment Ohri dski. Сборни к от st at i i po sl ичай 1050 годи ni ot смрт t a на*, Sof i я, 1966, 143-155; I van Duàчев, „Kl i ment Ohri dski i negovoto del o v naučnat a kni ж ni na. Kri t i ko-bi bli ograf ski pregl ed“, in: *Kl i ment Ohri dski ...*, 416-424; P r of . d-r Eм i l Георг i ev, *Li t epat ира на i zost рен i борби в средновековна Бъл гари я*, Sof i я, 1966, 32-38; Bранко P anov, *Теоф i л акт Ohri dski како i звор за средновековнат а i st opи ja на македонски от народ*, Skopje, 1971, 11-45; I. Snegarov, „Les sources sur la vie et l'activitÈ de ClÈment d'Ochrida“, *Будантинобулгарика*, I, Sofia, 1962, 79-119; I . Snegarov, „F ot okopi e ot ohri dski я (moskovski я) p р epi s на P r ost r anot o жи t i e на Kl i ment Ohri dski “, in: *Kl i ment Ohri dski ...*, 173.

tian,⁵⁹ we must bear in mind that this was made (even though perhaps on the basis of Slavic sources) a whole two or three centuries after the death of this Ohrid saint,⁶⁰ in entirely new and different historical circumstances and relations,⁶¹ long after the schism of the Eastern and Western Churches,⁶² and that it was the work of high Byzantine officials, although they were based in Ohrid.⁶³ In spite of all this, even in this form, we find them only in late copies⁶⁴ and, inevitably, with new additions and modifications determined by the changing needs and circumstances of the time. And finally, these were literary texts (and not historical documents) intended to serve specific aims and were made in conformity with the well-known canons of the Byzantine church tradition.

Regardless of whether Clement, Naum, Sava and Angelarius (as far as Sava and Laurentius, and even Gorazd, a Moravian, are concerned, we do not know very much) set off for Macedonia on their return from Moravia, as some believe,⁶⁵ or for Bulgaria, as many have written,⁶⁶ they arrived almost without clothes in

⁵⁹ In connection with Archbishop Homatian of Ohrid and his Shorter Life of Clement of Ohrid (*The Ohrid Legend*) see: I van Duàčev, „Kliment Ohridski i negovoto delo v naučnat a knižni na...“, 424-428; I van Duàčev, „Kratkot Ohridskoto životie ot Dimitrià Homatian“, in: *Kliment Ohridski ...*, 161-164; Aleksandър Milev, *Žitija...*, 121-131; Aleksandър Milev, *Dvet egrьски žitija...*, 155-160; Prof. d-r Emil Georgiev, *Lit epat ura na izostreni borbi ...*, 38-40.

⁶⁰ In addition to Cyril and Methodius, Clement became the third Slavic saint of the Archbishopric (Patriarchate) of Ohrid as early as the 10th-11th centuries (Bl aže Koneski, „Kanoni zaci ja na slovenski svetci vo Ohridskata crkva“, *Prilozhi*, I, 1-2, MANU, Skopje, 1976, 65); Božidar Raàkov, „Ranni kalendar ni vesti za Kliment Ohridski“, in: *Kliment Ohridski ...*, 321-325.

⁶¹ If the author of the Longer Life is Theophylact of Ohrid, it was written either at the end of the 11th century or by 1107-1108 at the latest, when this archbishop died. Homatian could have written the Shorter Life probably between 1216 and 1234. Historical circumstances at the time of Clement (AD 916) were very different from those at the time of Theophylact, when Macedonia (after Samuel) once again came under the domination of Byzantium, and even more different at the time of Homatian, when the Latins ruled in Constantinople, and the Archbishopric of Ohrid strove towards full autonomy and independence from Constantinople (Cvetan Grozdanov, „Najstari te portreti na Kliment Ohridski“, in: *Kliment Ohridski. St udi i*, Skopje, 1986, 246).

⁶² The final break occurred in 1054, after the discrediting letter from the Ohrid Archbishop Leon and the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Michael Cerularius to Pope Leo IX and the sending of papal legates for the trial of the two signatory prelates (Mar i nъ Dr i novъ, *Съчи ненi я*, II, Sof i я, 1911, 60-61). At the council held in Dalmatia in 1060, church services using Slavonic books written by “some heretic called Methodius” were banned (*ibid.*, 47).

⁶³ We must also bear in mind that at the time Macedonia was still designated as the theme *Bulgaria*, and that the two archbishops were Greeks who had Greek interests in mind, although Homatian wrote the text in circumstances of an increasing Latin influence in the Orthodox East. We can also assume that they used older (and probably also Slavonic) sources in writing their hagiographies.

⁶⁴ We can date the Longer Life (in 5 copies) as late as the 15th (or, at the earliest, the 14th) and 16th centuries, whereas the earliest copies of the Shorter Life can be found in the 13th and 14th centuries.

⁶⁵ Борђе Sp. Radoji чи h, „O Konstantinu-Firilui Metodiju i o ročeci našlovenske pismenosti“, in: *Ci trozi um 1100-godišni na od smrt a na Kiril i Colinski*, I, Skopje, 1970, 213.

Belgrade,⁶⁷ which at the time formed part of Bulgaria. It is very difficult to believe, taking into consideration the descriptions in the hagiographies, that they could have brought any books and translations from their already well-developed church and educational activity in Moravia and Pannonia, even though this does not mean that such books and copies had not already been brought to these Balkan areas — through Kocel's Principality,⁶⁸ through the Roman missionaries in the Slavic regions⁶⁹ or, finally, through Methodius himself during his visit to Constantinople in 881.⁷⁰ We must not, however, overlook the fact that these men could have made translations with some Moravianisms even after their arrival in Bulgaria, or Macedonia, in an already canonized church language, which they had used for more than two decades.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Житията...*, 95; Di ni tъr Angel ov, „Възгарската народност и делото на Климент Охридски“, in: *Климент Охридски. Сборник от статии...*, 19; Emil Georgiev, „Oхридската книжовна школа“, in: *Климент Охридски. Сборник от статии...*, 55; Надежда Драгова, *Климент Охридски*, София, 1966, 68, etc.

⁶⁷ Even in Moravia, the hounded disciples “were dragged naked across thorn fields”; they crossed the Moravian-Bulgarian border “with no food and clothing” and arrived in Belgrade, crossing the Danube on “three tree trunks tied with linden bast fibre” (Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Житията...*, 91, 95 and 97) and were barely able to carry any manuscripts or books (Ivan Snegarov, „Черногорицкият абат“, in: *Хиляда години славянска писменост 863-1963. Сборник в чест на Кирил и Методиј*, ВАН, София, 1963, 318).

⁶⁸ This must have been much easier, if we take into consideration not only the closeness between Moravia and Pannonia but also the affiliation of Illyria (*Illyricum*) to the Roman Church, and in particular considering the fact that “Macedonia has been loyal for a long time to the Apostolic Seat”, “as late as the early 13th century” [Leszek Moszyński, „Żywy po jedenastu wiekach. W 1100 rocznicę śmierci nauczyciela i pierwszego arcybiskupa Słowian, wspólnego patrona Europy — świętego Metodego“, *Gwiazda Morza*, No. 7 (36), Gdańsk, 31.III and 7.IV.1985], although it came within the borders of different (mostly Orthodox) states.

⁶⁹ As the Pope probably consecrated the Slavonic books as early as 869, they could be freely transferred by the Roman missionaries not only to the western regions of what, much later, was to become Yugoslavia, but must have reached even Macedonia, which was regarded as being under Roman jurisdiction. We must also not forget the fact that it was the Roman clergy who laid the foundations of the Bulgarian Church at that time (866-870).

⁷⁰ During the visit of Archbishop Methodius and his followers to Constantinople (881-882) they must have brought some Slavonic manuscripts with them which were later to become the basic written literature for the circle frequented by the young Simeon. Considering all the circumstances and relations in Europe and the Balkans, it is indeed difficult to suppose that Methodius could have met Prince Boris (V.N. Zlatarski, „Vel'ki Morava a Bulharsko v II storochi“, in: *Ritm Bel'kotoravski*, Praha, 1933, 275-288), but there is no doubt that Constantinople was not delighted with the fact that Methodius was ordained bishop and instituted as archbishop by the Pope, and in particular with the fact that he was given “certain church rights over the Illyrian territories considered to be Byzantine” (Климент Охридски, *Събрани съчинения, III. Пространи жития на Кирил и Методиј*. Подготвил за печат Воню Ст. Ангелов и Христо Кодов, София, 1973, 210), a view put forward, for instance, by František Dvorník (*Les Claves, Byzance et Rome au IX siècle*, Paris, 1926, 271-272).

⁷¹ Glagolitic was preserved in Macedonia up to the 13th century, when the Constantinopolitan Church finally and entirely placed this province under its jurisdiction together with “the Old-Macedonian centre of literacy in Ohrid” (Leszek Moszyński, *op. cit.*, 5.).

Furthermore, after being brought to the court of the Bulgarian Prince Boris, the newcomers were placed in some kind of isolation. If, thanks to the haloes which they had according to the hagiographies, they could visit the homes of some Bulgarian noblemen only with a special permit from the Prince, it is clear that their freedom of movement was restricted.⁷² The hagiographer says that from Moravia they departed for Bulgaria, as they hoped that “Bulgaria would give them peace of mind”.⁷³ Obviously, their hope was unjustified.

The available sources do not say in which capital Boris received the newcomers (Pliska or Preslav), but in all probability it was Pliska.⁷⁴ In any case, it was still an unfriendly environment, still inhabited by a large number of Proto-Bulgar noblemen, where the Proto-Bulgarian language was spoken, whereas the Greek language and the Greek alphabet were still in official use in the Bulgarian Church, established a short time earlier, (as well as in the Bulgarian state itself), and even a Greek archbishop stood at the head of that Bulgarian Church.⁷⁵ Radojičić is

⁷² Нарал апи е Pol enakovi ќ, „Kl i mēnt Ohr i dski . Жi vot i dejnost“, in: *Кни за за Kl i mēnt Ohr i dski*, Skopje, 1966, 16. Even though the hagiographer tries to present the high esteem they enjoyed at the Bulgarian Court, he nevertheless writes the following (perhaps influenced by an older source): “The Saints, avoiding the multitude of people and at the same time trying to please the prince, decided not to visit the homes of many, with the exception of those whom the pious prince permitted them to visit” (Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жi t i я...*, 99).

⁷³ Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жi t i я...*, 95.

⁷⁴ Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Двет е гръски жi t i я...*, 147 (“Pliska was probably still the capital then”); Ivan Bogdanov, *Kl i mēnt Ohr i dski . Ist ori чески очерк с научен комент ар*, Sof i я, 1966, 103 (“Pliska was the capital of the first Bulgarian state up to the year 893”). Emil Georgiev („Sъst oяни е на научнат а probl emat i ka oko l o l i чnost t a i deānost t a на Kl i mēnt Ohr i dski“, in: *Kl i mēnt Ohr i dski . Mat epi al i за неговот о чест виване по sl учай 1050 годi ni ot стърпт т а ми*, Sof i я, 1968, 54-55) is categorical in his claim that Boris received the disciples in Preslav (although this is not mentioned anywhere in the hagiographies), because “Pliska has no records of the written culture whose proponents Methodius’s disciples were” and because “the change of a capital is the result of some major event” such as the conversion to Christianity in Bulgaria. But are not the changes of 893 such an event, and could not the brief stay of the disciples in this capital have left traces of these circumstances? As a matter of fact, during Boris’s long vacillation between Rome and Constantinople, the coming of the ‘disciples’ to Bulgaria was an appropriate ‘middle-of-the-road’ solution — neither Greek nor Latin — befitting his relations with both Rome and Byzantium as well as with the Franks (František Dvornik, *Byzantské misie u Slovānū*, Vyuhrad–Praha, MCMLII, 251).

⁷⁵ The first archbishops of the Bulgarian Church were the Greeks Joseph and George (R. Kar ol evъ, *Урoci po бъл гарскат а черковна i st ori я*, Car i гр адъ, 1873, 16). This was perfectly understandable, bearing in mind that the young Simeon was educated in Constantinople, in the Byzantine spirit, even though a “Slavonic School” in the Byzantine capital is mentioned after the arrival of Archbishop Methodius (probably after 882), in which, in addition to Simeon, there were the bishop Constantine and the monk Tudor, while after the release of the Slavic disciples from Moravia and Pannonia (886), their number increased. It is believed that the Preslav Literary School was established following the arrival of Bishop Constantine in Bulgaria (together with some of his disciples); it developed the Cyrillic alphabet, to quote the view of Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 254-257), on the basis of the Greek uncial script. He believes that Cyrillic could have been an acceptable compromise solution as a Slavonic script for Byzantium as well, as Glagolitic, although it “perfectly suited all the characteristics of the spoken Slavonic vernacular... looked very complex and alien to the Bulgarian Slavs” (255). Emil Georgiev (*Начал о на sl авянскат а pi стеност ъ въ Бъл гарi я*, Sof i я, 1942, 30-32), however,

probably right in his conclusion, making the good point that when Boris accepted Christianity and worked on the organization of the church in Bulgaria, he thought “only of the Proto-Bulgars”,⁷⁶ and hence not a single one of Boris’s 106 questions to the Pope (in connection with the acceptance of Christianity and the organization of the Bulgarian Church) was related to the Slavs.⁷⁷

It is quite understandable that in such an environment there was no place for Glagolitic,⁷⁸ and not even perhaps for the Slavonic language which they spoke. But is it possible, as suggested by Vondrĭk,⁷⁹ Ilyinsky⁸⁰ and others,⁸¹ that the main reason for the departure of Clement, and later of Naum, from the Bulgarian capital could have been the question of the alphabet alone?

The hagiographies say that Clement was sent by Boris to Kutmičevica to be a teacher (even though he was given a house and rest homes). The region of Kutmičevica is described as having 10-12 eparhies and comprising almost the whole of Macedonia,⁸² but nothing is mentioned as to whom Clement was

points out that “the source of Cyrillic is not the Greek uncial script of the 9th century, but the Greek uncial script of an earlier date: since the earliest records, the Cyrillic script has clearly borne the characteristics of the Greek uncial script of the 7th century”, even though he allows the possibility that “the Greek uncial script of the 9th century exerted a great influence on the Cyrillic script”, and that this was owing to the increasingly strong translation activity in Greek at the time.

⁷⁶ Ђорђе Ср. Radojičić, *op. cit.*, 213.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ This is true regardless of the fact that some traces of Glagolitic have been found at Preslav (Kr. Mičev, „Si meonovata sьr kvа vь Preslavъ i neani ятъ ери графски мат ери алъ“, *Бъл гларски прегл едъ*, 1, Sof i я, 1929, 112; I van Gošev, *Ст аробъл гларски гларол и чески и кирилски надрици от IX и X в.*, Sof i я, 1963; I van Gošev, „Razviti e na negrъskite kirilometodi evski bukveni znaci v t. nar. kirilica“, in: *Xil яda i st o zodi ni sl авянскари стеност ...*, 274-286). Thus, even Emil Georgiev (*Начал о на sl авянската ари стеност ъ вь Бъл гари я*, 14-15) admits the force of V. Vondrĭk’s view that “Clement, as a sign of protest, moved to Macedonia”.

⁷⁹ V. Vondrĭk, „Studie z oboru cirkevniĚslovanskĚho pisemnictvi“, *Rozpravy Ceské akademie ved*, 20, Praha, 1903, 124.

⁸⁰ G.A. Ilyinskiĭ, „Gde, kogda, kem i s kakoiu cel ъю glagolica byl a zameņena ‚kirilica‘“, *Byzantinoslavica*, III, 1, 1931, 79-88.

⁸¹ Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 255) also believes that the question of the alphabet was one of the main reasons for Clement’s departure from the Bulgarian capital. He points out that Chernorizec Hrabar, too, wrote his polemic text in or after 893 and that it was not directed against Greek influence and the Greek opponents of Slavonic literacy, but represented a defence of the Glagolitic script against Simeon and the Cyrillic he had “composed”. Dvornik (257) also writes that the priest Gregory in Preslav made a new translation of some books of the Old Testament which was actually “a revision of Methodius’s translation”, i.e. a “Bulgarization of the Macedonian and Moravian expressions used in the original translation”. Mihail Vojnov („Pronat a v bьlgar o-vi zant i aski te ot nošeni я pri car Si meon“, *Izvest i я na Inst it ut a za ist ori я*, 18, Sof i я, 1967, 151) also lucidly remarks that for the author of *O pismeneh* the protection of the Slavs and the Slavic world took first place and that as far as he was concerned “both the Byzantine emperor and the Bulgarian prince were still heads of the states where they, the Slavs, lived”.

⁸² Al eksandr Mičev, *Жит и я...*, 100; Георги Валасчев, *Климент ъ, ери скоръ sl авянски и sl авят а ти ро ст аръ sl авянски преводъ*, Sof i я, 1898, ННН-ННН; *Kirilo-metodi evska*

subordinated to in terms of organization, and why only to Administrator Dometa (Dobeta),⁸³ as the state administrator. Were there not metropolitanates and metropolitans, or bishoprics and bishops?⁸⁴ Even when Clement was appointed bishop in 893 by the prince (an act which was indeed canonically impossible), he entirely accepted the Velika Bishopric as late as the year 900, after seven whole years,⁸⁵ and once again he was subordinated to no one from the appropriate Bulgarian church authorities. During the whole period he was in Macedonia, Clement never and on no account communicated with the legally appointed head of the Bulgarian Church — the Greek archbishop in the capital — but always and only directly with the prince.⁸⁶ Even when Clement submitted his resignation, he again went directly to the prince (who refused to accept it), and not to the archbishop, as one might expect considering the hierarchy.

Furthermore, while in 893 Simeon introduced the Slavonic language into official use by decree, and Cyrillic (already “composed”) became the state script,⁸⁷

енци кл ореді я в т р і т о м а, I, Sof і я, 1985, 58. Pet’r S. Koledarov („Kl і ment Ohr і dski , р р ъ в і е р і s k o p н а б њ л г а r s k і e z і k ’ н а d r a g o v і t і t e v S o l u n s k o і н а V e l і k і я в z a p a d n і t e R o d o p і “, in: *Ko n s t a n t і n - K і p і l F і l o s o ф . Ю б і l e e n с б о р н і к р о s l u ч а й 1100-г о д і ш н і н а t a o t с т ѣ р т т а м и*, Sof і я, 1969, 141-167) stretches Clement’s eparchy as far as the West Rhodopes. The hagiographies, however, do not mention whether, or where, there was a metropolitanate, who was the bishop and what Clement’s relations with him were. Indeed, could a ‘teacher’ rule (spiritually) so many eparchies? Or perhaps “the Velika Bishopric was specially created for him”, as Ilyinsky proposes, and as accepted by Влаж Koneski („Ohr і dsk a t a k н і ж o v n a ш k o l a“, in: *K н і з a z a K l і m e n t O h p і њ s k і , 77*)?

⁸³ Aleksandър Milev, *Жит і я...*, 100; I van Venedikov, „Kl і ment Ohr і dski і Dobeta“, in: *Kl і ment O h p і њ s k і 916-1966*, 307-319.

⁸⁴ If Prince Boris built “seven cathedrals” in Bulgaria, this means that there must have been higher clergy. If there is indeed “dependable evidence for three of Boris’s seven cathedrals: in Ohrid, Devol and Bregalnica”, and it is assumed that the others may have been located at Preslav, Silistra, Belgrade and Skopje (Aleksandър Milev, *Жит і я...*, 110) — meaning that there were possibly only two cathedrals on Bulgarian territory — which of the other five were located on Clement’s territory? On the other hand, does not the exemption of Clement’s disciples “from all the taxes to the state”, as quoted by the hagiographer, support the thesis that they were actually not regarded as coming under the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Church?

⁸⁵ A. Milev (*Жит і я...*, 105) translates the procedure concerning this ‘appointment’ as “he proposed him as the bishop of Drembica and Velika”, but also states that *pr oba l a m a i ** also means ‘appoints’. If Clement accepted the whole of the Velika Bishopric as late as 900 and built himself a monastery in Ohrid, does it mean that he was only a vicar, and not a *куриархос*? And how could he have been “the Bishop of Drembica and Velica” when there had already been a bishop heading this bishopric? Was this not also a reflection of the situation of relations with Rome?

⁸⁶ Even though there are certain differences in the hagiographies, it is interesting that neither of the two available hagiographies mentions any contacts with the Bulgarian archbishop or with any other dignitary of the Bulgarian Church.

⁸⁷ Perhaps František Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 256) is right in suggesting that in 893 it was still impossible to proclaim and practise the Slavonic liturgy in the churches of Bulgaria as there was still an insufficient number of trained Slavonic clergymen. Dvornik believes that the council in Preslav was convened by Boris, and that the Slavonic liturgy was introduced gradually during the reign of Simeon. There are

Clement continued to spread Glagolitic in Ohrid and created an enormous written literature for the time with an imposing number of disciples and followers, consecrating readers, priests, deacons and subdeacons, and building a special church centre⁸⁸ which a century later, under Samuel's empire, developed into the Archbishopric of Ohrid (with the mediation of Rome) as an individual and independent Slavonic Orthodox Church, which was active in the course of the following several centuries.

Here we must not overlook the fact that at the time, when there were five (or seven) bishoprics in the entire Bulgarian state, only two (or three) of them were located outside Macedonia. In fact, in the centres where ethnic Bulgars lived Christianity was still poorly developed, the church was still inadequately organized — and under Greek control at that — and education was still very limited and was mainly carried out in the Greek language. As a result these two environments were fundamentally polarized, which became even more apparent in the ensuing period.⁸⁹ Of course, it would be far from the historical truth to look for, or discover, two already established and different peoples or nationalities; these were simply two ethno-cultural entities, still in the process of formation, which became differentiated in the course of subsequent historical development.

It is indeed not essential whether Clement modified Glagolitic by inventing several designs of letters (or added several letters or signs),⁹⁰ nor is it essential for our analysis that Samuel was later to accept Cyrillic as the inherited **state script**, tolerating Glagolitic as the **sacral script** (as was also the case in Moravia), although the 'more difficult' Glagolitic was later, gradually but steadily, fully superseded by Cyrillic. It should be noted, however, that extensive and varied

other scholars who assume that Clement took part in this council, but that he left it in indignation, taking his brother Naum to Ohrid with him.

⁸⁸ L. MosziŃki (*op. cit.*, 5) designates it as "the Old Macedonian centre of literacy in Ohrid", whereas Milivoj PavloviŃ („Struktura i stilovi sokog ranga u staromakedonskom kwi Ńevnom jezi ku Konstantina i Metodija Solunski h“, in: *Kipil Colunski*, 2, 281-288) calls the language of Cyril and Methodius "Old Macedonian" or "Slavonic-Old-Macedonian translation".

⁸⁹ The polarization was based on the antecedent development of these two regions in the Balkans, when the predominantly Christianized Slavs in Macedonia (within its contemporary boundaries) still came within the state frontiers of the Byzantine Empire, and pagan Bulgaria lived as an independent state for the course of nearly two centuries (see: Bl aŃe Ri stovski , „Nekoi pr aŃawa okol u poŃavat a na hr i sti janst vot o i pi smenost a kaj Sl oveni te vo Makedoni ja“, in: *Ci tpozi um 1100-Ńodi uni na od smrt t a na Kipil Colunski*, kn. 2, Skopje, 1970, 319-332).

⁹⁰ This is indicated only in the Shorter Life (AleksandŃr Mi l ev, *Ńit i ja...*, 130). For more details concerning this question see: Geor Ńi Val ashevŃ, *op. cit.*, LVIII-LIIVIII; Vasil Ńl . Ki sel kovŃ, *Slavjanski t Ń prosvet it eli Kipil Ń i Metodij*, 152-161; Pet Ńr Hr . Petrov, „I sto r i Ńeski te osnovi na Kirilo-metodi evot o doba“, in: *Ńil ja da i st o Ńodi ni ...*, 89; AleksandŃr Mi l ev, *Dvet e ŃrŃski Ńit i ja...*, 159; Emil Geor Ńi ev, *ŃŃst ojni e na na i Ńnat a p robl eta-t i ka...*, 62-63.

literary and cultural activity developed in Macedonia at the time of Clement — to be found mainly in the churches and monasteries as the main centres.⁹¹

It is significant that in the year 893, when Simeon replaced his blinded brother Vladimir⁹² on the throne, he convened a council and **appointed** Clement bishop (he did not ordain him to that rank), and sent Naum to Clement (or perhaps Clement took him himself) to carry out his work. The available sources do not clarify Naum's status in Moravia, Pliska or Ohrid.⁹³ We do not even know (as we do not know in Clement's case either) when he received the name under which we know him today, and when and what *schēma* he received. The sources are unreliable or even contradict each other.

At this same period Simeon moved the capital from Pliska to Preslav and created a Slavonicized centre that built and affirmed the famous Preslav Literary School as the Bulgarian cultural and literary centre, separate from and independent of the Ohrid Literary School.⁹⁴ This situation is reflected in the text entitled *O pismeneh* by Chernorizec Hrabar, which is considered by some to be the pseudonym of Naum of Ohrid himself,⁹⁵ but is certainly the expression of the Ohrid Literary

⁹¹ All Clement's 3,500 disciples were in Macedonia, and even the churches and monasteries were most numerous in Macedonia (*Kipilo-met odi evska enci kl opedi ja*, I, 292). In connection with the alphabets, precious information can be found in Blaga Aleksova's work *Epi skopi jat a na Brezal-ni sa prv slovenski crkoven i kulturno-prosvet en cent ar vo Makedoni ja*, Pri l er, 1989, presenting the newly-discovered graphemes and letters of both the Glagolitic and Cyrillic.

⁹² The hagiographer mentions the death of Vladimir after his four-year reign in Bulgaria (Aleksandър Milev, *Жити я...*, 104), but he does not mention that he was forcibly deposed by his father and blinded and replaced by his younger brother, Simeon. In fact four important events took place in 893: the capital was moved from Pliska to Preslav, Simeon became the Prince of Bulgaria, the Byzantine clergy began to be replaced by Slav clergymen, and Slavonic became the official language of the state using the Cyrillic alphabet as a compromise solution (Петър Нр. Петров, *op. cit.*, 9). The capital was moved with the purpose, among other things, of isolating the Proto-Bulgar aristocracy and upholding the new rule after Vladimir's deposition.

⁹³ Naum of Ohrid is treated only as presbyter and under the name he also retained as a monk. Ivan Snegarov („Черног и зец Храбар“, in: *Xiljad a i st o godi ni ...*, 309) allows for the possibility that, upon entering the monastic order, he accepted “a new name which, however, did not replace his former name, and hence the hagiographer does not mention it”. Yet if, like Cyril and Clement, Naum too chose celibacy and built himself a monastery, whose abbot he probably also was, we must assume that he had entered the monastic order earlier. Even Clement, as a bishop, could not have lived for ten years among monks without being a monk, and therefore the hypothesis seems acceptable to us that he had entered the monastic order as early as his youth, perhaps on Olympus, together with Methodius (Душан Глумац, „Нешто за житот на НаумОхридски“, in: *Naum Ohridski*, Ohrid, 1985, 21-22).

⁹⁴ Вл аже Конески, „Охридската книжовна школа“, in: *Кни за за Климент Охридски*, 69-87; Воряна Велчева, „Глаголицата и школата на Климент Охридски“, in: *Климент Охридски 916-1966*, 133-141; Емил Георгиев, „Състояниенанаучнатапроблематикаокололичността на Климент Охридски“, in: *Климент Охридски. Материали...*, 55-58.

⁹⁵ MilomWeingart, *Bulgava Цариград pVed tisciletim*, Praha, 1915, 9; AndrÈMazon, „Le moine Crabre et Cyrille“, in: *Сборни къ въ чест ъ на Василиѣ Н. Златапски*, София, 1925, 119-122; Rajko Nahtigal, „Nekaj pripomb k pretresu Hrabrovega spisa o azbuki Konstantina Cirila“, *Славистична ревija*, Ljubljana, 1948, 5-18; Fr. Grivec, *Слованска благовестника св. Ципил и Метод, 863-1963*, Celje, 1963, 197; Вл аже Конески, *op. cit.*, 80; Душан Глумац, *op. cit.*, 22-23.

School and the status the Macedonian eparchies enjoyed within the frontiers of Bulgaria amidst the aggravated misunderstandings and struggle for domination between the Eastern and the Western Church.⁹⁶

2.

Only those data which have suited, or at least not contradicted, the conceptions of the selectors have been singled out in the various interpretations of the hagiographies and sources. This is best illustrated by the distrust shown concerning some parts of the Shorter Life of Clement.

Theophylact and Homatian certainly did not write their texts without some sources available to them.⁹⁷ But they used only what suited the understanding and needs of the historical moment. Obviously, during the selection some data were omitted, and others reformulated. Hence interpretation and a search for the truth are possible only in a broader historical context and by using various comparative contemporary materials.

The ordination of the Slavic enlighteners and their disciples by the Pope in Rome in 869 is an important event for our study. Thus, for example, the Life of Cyril says: "And the Pope, having received the Slavonic books, consecrated them and left them in the Church of Saint Mary (the Virgin), which is called the 'Crib'. Then the Pope commanded the two bishops, Formosus and Gauderich, to consecrate the Slav disciples. And when they had consecrated them, they immediately held a liturgy in the Church of the Holy Apostle Peter using the Slavonic language..."⁹⁸

⁹⁶ The dispute in the Bulgarian state between the 'Hellenists' and 'Slavists' was largely a dispute between adherents to the Glagolitic and Cyrillic scripts, which also had regional characteristics. The Roman Church was most probably also involved in the dispute. These 'disputes' continued without interruption and, in a way, have persisted up to the present day. For a certain period following the Crusades there were no significant activities of the Roman Church in Macedonia, but after the Council of Trent (1545-1563) it restored its activity and catholic archbishops were regularly appointed in Ohrid and Skopje regardless of the number of believers (Bl аже Ri st ovski , „Uni jat st vot o vo Makedoni ja, I. Bel emki za kat ol i ci zmot i uni jat st vot o vo Makedoni ja do pol ovi nat a na HИH vek“, *Razl ed i* , II/III, 9, Skopje, 1960, 908-936; see also: N. I . Mi l evъ, *Kat ol i шkat a ppopaгaнда въ Бъл гaри я ppъзъ XVII въкъ. Ист opи чesкo i zsl eдвaнe съ ppi l oжeнi я*, Sof i я, 1914; Jovan Radovi h, *Ri тска кипi ja i jижноsl овeнске зeтq e oд XVI до XIX века*, S ANU, CLV, Beogr ad, 1950).

⁹⁷ Almost all researchers agree that Theophylact had a hagiography of Clement written by a contemporary of Clement's at hand, as confirmed in paragraph 58 of the Longer Life (Aleksandъr Mi l ev, *Жi t i я...*, 102-103). In addition to older sources, Homatian no doubt had access to Theophylact's Longer Life.

⁹⁸ Kl i ment Ohri dski , *Събpaнi съчи нeнi я*, III, Sof i я, 1973, 140.

In the Life of Methodius, however, the Pope is still Nicholas I, and thus it says there: “He blessed their teaching, placing the Slavonic books on the altar of the [shrine of the] Holy Apostle Peter and consecrated his beatitude Methodius into a spiritual dignitary... But the Pope... commanded a bishop who was infected with the trilingual disease to ordain three of the Slav disciples priests and two readers.”⁹⁹

The Longer Life of Clement says: “Then the Pope ordained into the priesthood some of the companions of the holy men, of whom the teachers testified that they had sufficient knowledge in Slavonic letters and were adorned by a pious life, and gave others the offices of deacon or subdeacon. And the Pope personally ordained the great Methodius Moravian Bishop in Pannonia, although he declined resolutely and refused to accept it...”¹⁰⁰

Each of the three sources interprets the same event in Rome in a different way. They only agree on the fact that the disciples, too, were consecrated. Everything else is interpreted differently. But the differences are even more pronounced in the Second Life of Naum: Pope Adrian received the Slavonic teachers and their disciples with great honours, and once “the divine liturgy” was sung, “he gave Constantine the Philosopher the tonsure of monasticism and named him Cyril, and he ordained Methodius Archbishop of Moravia and the whole of Pannonia. After the completion of the liturgy of all the books, translated from Greek into the *Bul̄arian* language, he showed them to all, because the books themselves unfolded and revealed themselves... Hence he also ordained Clement and Naum, together with the others, priests and deacons, and ordered that all the ceremonies be performed, both the evening and morning, written in *Bul̄arian*, within the great shrine of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and indeed all this took place...”¹⁰¹

After all these versions comes the Shorter Life of Clement, written by Homa-tian, which expressly states: “When the blessed Cyril moved into his better life — thenceforward conferring his apostolic services and the advancement of the talent entrusted (Matthew ЦЦIV, 15-30) to Adrian, the Pope at Rome, and Methodius was appointed Archbishop of Moravia and Bulgaria by this same Pope — then Clement, too, was raised to the bishop’s throne when he was appointed by Methodius as the bishop of the whole of Illyria and of the Bulgarian people who ruled the land.”¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Ibid., 199. Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 147) concludes that the brothers Cyril and Methodius actually did not depart for Rome but for Constantinople, taking with them “one or more of their disciples as candidates who wanted to be consecrated as bishops”.

¹⁰⁰ Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жит и я...*, 74-75.

¹⁰¹ Г ван Ду̀ачевъ, *Изъ ст ара т а бъл̄ зарска кнѣ жнѣ на, I. Кнѣ жовнѣ и и ст ори ческѣ памет нѣ сѣ от ъ Първот о бъл̄ зарско царст во*, Sof и я, 1940, 62-63. The use of Bulgarian designations in this hagiography is the result of the concepts of its copier of a later date.

¹⁰² Al eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жит и я...*, 128. The majority of researchers agree that Constantine had the office of a priest even before the Moravian mission, but there is an interesting piece of information

The widely accepted view is that the latter source does not reflect the historical truth, because at that time Methodius was still not appointed archbishop, nor was Clement appointed bishop, but that he was “proposed” by Simeon as “the Bishop of Drembica and Velika”.

given by a chronicler from around 1038, where he says that St Procopius knew the Slavonic script invented by “sanctissimo Ljirillo episcopo” (Emil Georǵiev, *Kipil i Metodii osnovoroženi si na slavjanski e lit erati ri*, Sofia, 1956, 111). Of special significance is Methodius’s ordination as bishop and his appointment as the Archbishop of Moravia and Pannonia. Pope John VIII, in his letter to Methodius dated June 14, 879 — in which he invites him to come to Rome to answer the accusations that he taught improperly and used the Slavonic language in liturgy — uses the following words: “To the most worthy Methodius, Archbishop of the Pannonian Church (Peter Ratkoц *Пратене к дејинт Бел’кеј Мораву. Друће оррвенé а розширенé вудание*, Bratislava, 1968, 174). In his letter to the Greater-Moravian prince Svatopluk (Svĭtopluk, Svetopolk), bearing the same date, the Pope demands from the prince the sending of “Methodius, your archbishop, instituted and sent to you by our predecessor, i.e. Pope Adrian” (*ibid.*, 175). If we bear in mind that Pope John VIII came to the Apostolic Seat in 872, we must assume that Methodius had become archbishop earlier, but after the death of Pope Nicholas I (November 13, 867). In all probability Methodius was ordained bishop by Pope Adrian towards the end of 869, after which he was sent “as the papal legate among all the Slavic tribes in Moravia, Slovakia and Pannonia” (Kliment Ohrĭdski, *Събрани съчинения*, III, 207). This can also be inferred from Chapter VIII of the Life of Methodius, where Pope Adrian II dispatches a special letter to Rostislav, Svatopluk and Kocel, saying that he has decided to send Methodius “ordaining him together with his disciples” (*ibid.*, 200) which is not too different from the letter written by John VIII to the Freising Bishop Anno in the year 873 (*ibid.*, 207). The *Malian Legend* says that when Cyril and Methodius received the invitation from Pope Nicholas I to go to Rome, they “set off immediately and took with them some of their disciples whom they considered worthy of the bishop’s office” (Aleksandър Milev, *Жития...*, 150). F. Grivec, however, believes that the disciples who were brought to Rome were not deemed worthy of the bishop’s office and were ordained only priests and deacons, but he also allows for the possibility that the brothers took candidates for those ranks („Vitae Constantini et Methodii“, *Acta Academiae Belehradensis Olotucii*, 1941, 38). If such candidates were indeed presented, is not the most acceptable hypothesis that Clement and Naum were among the first, bearing in mind, in particular, that Clement bore the name of the Roman pope whose relics had been brought to Rome on the first visit? So, if Methodius was ordained bishop during his first visit to Rome (869), and was appointed archbishop on his second visit (869 or 870), is it not possible that during his third visit to Rome, Clement was appointed by Methodius “Bishop of the whole of Illyria” and “of the Bulgarian people who ruled the land”? In this respect, the bull of Pope John VIII to Prince Svatopluk, dated June 880, is of considerable significance; there he informs him of the arrival of Archbishop Methodius in Rome and the new confirmation of his privileges as archbishop, as well as of the ordination of Wiching as “the Bishop of the Holy Church of Nitra” (whom Svatopluk had sent), and writes the following: “Et volumus, ut pariter cum ipsius archiepiscopi consensu et providencia et alterum nobis apto tempore utilem presbiterum vel diaconem dirigas, quem similiter in alia ecclesia, in qua episcopalem curam noveris esse necessarium, ordinemus episcopum, ut cum his duobus a nobis ordinatis episcopi prefatus archiepiscopus vester iuxta decretum apostolicum per alia loca, in quibus episcopi honorifice debent et possunt existere, postmodum valeat ordinare” (Peter Ratkoц *op. cit.* 432-433). Whether a second candidate was sent to Rome as well, and whether he was also ordained bishop, is still unknown to us. But if such a candidate was sent and perhaps ordained, is it not possible that Methodius could have given Clement this honour and appointed him “Bishop of the whole of Illyria” at the moment of his departure for Constantinople (881)? Is this not possible even if we exclude the possibility of Clement being ordained bishop (of the Slavs in Illyria under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church) at the moment when the Roman envoys Euthymios and Theognostos departed for Constantinople, where they arrived on December 11, 868, and Bulgaria accepted the Greek clergy as late as 870 (František Dvornik, *Byzantské misie u Slovānů*, 160-161).

It is extremely difficult, however, to accept that Constantine was admitted to the monastic order¹⁰³ only shortly before his death in Rome, and that Methodius was ordained priest by the Pope as late as that, especially if we take into consideration Rostislav's request from Emperor Michael (in the Life of Cyril): "send us such a bishop and teacher..."¹⁰⁴ Besides, who ordained these dignitaries: the bishops Formosus and Gauderich, only one of them (Formosus), or Pope Adrian (or even Nicholas) himself? The next question is: how many and who of the disciples were ordained in the year 869 in Rome? And finally, was Methodius ordained bishop only or also appointed Archbishop of Moravia?

The authors of the sources quoted must have asked themselves these and many other questions (if these versions indeed represent the authors' authentic texts at all). But there is no doubt that the social, military, political, ethnic, religious and historical interests at the moment of writing (or copying) these texts were of crucial significance for the final formulation of the different accounts and testimonies concerning historical events and persons at the time of Clement. Hence the account given in the Shorter Life of Clement regarding the bishop's office given to Clement by the Pope in Rome, in the light of other relevant facts, seems largely authentic to us. It can also resolve the mystery around Clement's return to Macedonia.

3.

When was Methodius appointed archbishop by the Pope?¹⁰⁵

If we allow the possibility that Methodius was first ordained bishop and later appointed archbishop (which is quite possible and logical), then we can assume that it was Clement who was first ordained to the office of priest. But we do not know his secular name, since he is presented under that name from the beginning.

¹⁰³Kl i ment Ohr i dski , *Събрани съчи нени я*, III, 159. Dvornik writes (*op. cit.*, 155) that, according to Byzantine practice, the monk, on receiving the solemn *schēma*, had to adopt a new name beginning with the same letter as his Christian name; hence Constantine took the name 'Cyril'.

¹⁰⁴Kl i ment Ohr i dski , *op. cit.*, 136.

¹⁰⁵In his letter to Bishop Paul of Ancona, written prior to May 14, 873, Pope John VIII writes, among other things, that the Apostolic Seat had full authority "not only in Italy and other western states, but also on the territory of the whole of Illyria", and hence "if Alvin and Hermanrich want nonetheless to bring our Methodius to trial, tell them, says the Pope, that „Vos sine canonica sententia dampnastis episcopum ab apostolica sede missum, carceri mancipantes et colaphis affligentes et a sacro ministerio separantes et a sede tribus annis pellentes. Apostolicam sedem per ipsum triennium plurimis missis et epistolis proclamantem non estis ad iudicium convenire dignati, quod profecto semper subterfugere curastis..." (Peter Ratko *op. cit.*, 431). If we subtract the three years of the banishment of Methodius from the bishop's throne, it appears that he was ordained bishop sometime in the spring of 870, and if we suppose that he had perhaps held that throne for some time, it is possible that Methodius was ordained bishop as early as 869, whereas soon afterwards (on his second visit of Rome) he was appointed archbishop as well.

Bearing in mind that the brothers from Salonika (together with their disciples, including Clement) brought the relics of the Roman Pope Clement on their first visit to Rome, and that Clement took the exact name of the former Pope,¹⁰⁶ we should allow for the possibility that he was ordained, if not at Olympus, at least as early as 869. Once Methodius became the Archbishop of the Moravian Church, he must have had bishops heading the subordinate dioceses of that church. If we take into consideration the account occurring three times in the Longer Life of St Clement of Ohrid that Gorazd and Clement were the speakers on behalf of Methodius's disciples in the disputes with Wiching's and Svatopluk's opponents,¹⁰⁷ we must accept that they were Methodius's bishops: Gorazd as (most probably) a Moravian, and Clement as a man who had accompanied him all his life in the various Byzantine missions¹⁰⁸ remaining his faithful companion and fellow combatant to the end. As a matter of fact, there is proof that Clement had the bishop's office even in Moravia in Du Cange's list 'The Archbishops of Bulgaria', where Clement is (incorrectly) mentioned as one of the archbishops, but as previously appointed "Bishop of Tiberiopolis or Velika".¹⁰⁹ Let us also quote the account written in the *Синодѣсон* of Tsar Boril (1211) that Clement was "the bishop of Greater Moravia".¹¹⁰ Both documents are isolated testimonies of a later date, but they must have been based on certain older sources.

If we have already accepted that Clement was ordained bishop by the Pope in Rome, then we must also pose the question of his eparchy (diocese). What was its territory? Scholars have written a great deal on this question,¹¹¹ and yet only a few

¹⁰⁶As it is not a coincidence that Constantine/Cyril wrote texts on Clement of Rome, and afterwards (on Methodius's insistence) he was buried in the Church of St Clement in Rome, and even the cathedral church of Gauderich in Velletra bears that name (Frantisek Dvornik, *op. cit.*, 153-157), it is certainly not a coincidence that it was for him that Clement of Ohrid wrote the largest and probably one of the best of his works, entitled *Пraise фp the Holy Цлeмeнт, Патрiарх офRome* (Kl i ment Ohr i dski , *Събрани сьчи нени я, томъ ръгъ vi* . Obrabot i l i B.St. Angel ov, K.M. Kuev, Hr . Kodov, Sof i я, 1970, 301-304), a copy of which was recently discovered in Struga (Mi hajl o Геор ги evski , „Napi sano Kl i ment om epi skopom“, *Македонѣ ја, НННН, 370, Скопје, 1984, 29*). In connection with changing his name see: I van S negar ov, „Чер нор ѣ zec Hr abъr“, in: *Xi l яда ѣ st o годѣ ni ...*, 308-309; Чл .-kor . Емѣ l Геор ги ev, „Съст ояни е на научнат а пр obl emat i ka okolo l i чност т а ѣ deãnost т а на Kl i ment Ohr i dski“, in: *Kl i ment Ohr i dski . Mat epi al i ...*, 53-54.

¹⁰⁷А l eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жѣ t ѣ я...*, 86, 89 and 90.

¹⁰⁸А l eksandъr Mi l ev, *Жѣ t ѣ я...*, 107. Emil Georgiev (*op. cit.*, 52-53) concludes that as early as the time of the Khazar Mission, when the relics of the Roman Pope Clement were found, Clement was with the brothers Constantine and Methodius — as their first assistant and interpreter. This is also accepted by Haralampie Polenakoviќ (Har al amp i e P ol enakov i ќ, „Kl i ment Ohr i dski . Жѣ vot ѣ dejnost“, in: *Кни га за Kl i ment Ohr i dski* , Скопје, 1966, 11).

¹⁰⁹Р of . Йор данъ I вановъ, *Бъл гarski st ap i ni ѣ zъ Македонѣ я*. Vt or o dorъl neno ѣ zdani e, Sof i я, 1931, 565.

¹¹⁰M.G. P оргуженко, „Si nodi къ саг я Bor i l a“, *Бъл гarski st ap i ni* , VIII, Sof i я, 1928, 77.

¹¹¹Of the extensive bibliography see: Томо Томоски , „P r i l ogkon t opogr af ѣ jat a на Kl i ment ovat a epar hi jat a“, in: *Kl i ment Ohr i dski . Ct udi ѣ* , Скопје, 1986, 204-209; Чл .-kor . Емѣ l Геор ги ev,

of them have examined the possibility that Clement's diocese might have come under the jurisdiction of the Apostolic Seat.¹¹² According to the conclusions of the Photian Church Council of Constantinople, when the Bulgarian Church was established (879-880), eastern and western Illyria were still under the jurisdiction of Rome, regardless of whether they came under the authority of Byzantium or Bulgaria. As a result, a large part of Macedonia (including Ohrid) came within this territory, within that "one third of the Bulgarian Empire, i.e. from Salonika to Ierikho and Kanina or (and) Thassipiat", which was later given to Clement to oversee it.¹¹³ Thus it is quite possible that Bishop Clement was appointed by Archbishop Methodius "as the Bishop of the whole of Illyria and of the Bulgarian people who ruled the land", because at that time Macedonia had already come

op. cit., 57-58; I van Snegarov, „Р о в ъ р о с а з а е п а р х и я т а н а К l i м е н т О h r i d s k i “, in: *K l i м е н т О h r i d s k i 916-1966*, 291-305; Петър Коледаров, „К l i м е н т О h r i d s k i , р ъ г в и е р и с к о р н а б ъ л г а р с к и е з и к ‘ n a d r a g o в и т и т e v S o l u н s k o i n a V e l i k i я в Z a p a d n i t e R o d o p i “, in: *K o н с т а н т и н - K i p i l F и л о с о ф . Ю б и л е е н с б о р н и к . . .*, 141-167.

¹¹²In all probability Frantisek Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 146-152) is not far from the truth when he supposes that in 866 Cyril and Methodius decided to leave Greater Moravia and go to Constantinople to try to secure, once again through the mediation of Byzantium, a bishop who would be independent of the Frankish church hierarchy in Rostislav's state. This was the result of the rejection of Rostislav's proposal for the ordination of a bishop by Pope Nicholas I. Therefore the brothers, together with their disciples, went through Pannonia to Venice and Southern Italy (which was then under the jurisdiction of Constantinople), as they could not travel via the territory of hostile Bulgaria, which at the time inclined towards Louis the German, and he had already sent the Passau bishop Hermanrich with a group of missionaries to the Bulgarian capital. Dvornik believes that in those circumstances Rostislav once again came closer to Constantinople and requested a bishop who would establish an independent church. It was at that moment that Cyril and Methodius "chose from their disciples one or several candidates whom they wanted to propose for ordination as bishops". In order to prevent that, Pope Nicholas I, as soon as he heard that Rostislav's missionaries were waiting for a ship to Venice, invited them to Rome (in the winter of 867). Owing to these purely political reasons, they came to Rome at the moment when Pope Nicholas I died, and the new pope, Adrian II, was enthroned at the time when changes were taking place in Constantinople — the death of Emperor Michael III and the fall of Patriarch Photius; in this way Cyril and Methodius's mission in Rome acquired a quite different, friendly character. Hence it is not surprising that the Pope consecrated the Slavonic books (even though such books were supposed to be read in the churches in Latin), and moreover, he ordained Methodius (after the death of his brother, Cyril) as the Moravian Bishop, and Clement and the rest to other ranks. On his return via Kocel's Principality, Methodius was summoned back to Rome and appointed Archbishop. As the Life of Cyril says that the Pope ordered the bishops Formosus and Gauderich to consecrate the Slav disciples (and we know that one bishop was enough for the consecration of a priest), we can assume that a bishop was also ordained. On the other hand, that Clement of Ohrid continued to follow the tradition of the Roman Church is confirmed by the fact that, in addition to the Joint Sermon on the Apostles Peter and Paul, he wrote a special *Oration in Praise of the Apostle Paul* (K l i м е н т О h r i d s k i , *С ъ б р а н и с ъ ч и н е н и я , t o m v t o r i . O b r a b o t i l i B . S t . A n g e l o v , K . M . K u e v , H r . K o d o v , K l . I v a n o v a , S o f i я , 1977*, 416-417), thus respecting the tradition of the Roman Church for a separate celebration of the days of the two apostles.

¹¹³Ргоф . Йорданъ I вановъ, *op. cit.*, 565. We should point out that at the Church Council called by Photius there were representatives of the following Bulgarian eparchies existing at the time: Ohrid, Bregalnica, Morava and Provat.

under the control of the Bulgarian state, and Rome considered it to be under its jurisdiction with regard to ecclesiastical questions.

Is it not thus logical to assume that after his arrival at Pliska, being a Moravian bishop of the Roman Church — in conditions when the church in Bulgaria was held by Greek priests and prelates, when the Greek language and the Greek alphabet were used, and Glagolitic was not accepted at the Bulgarian court — Bishop Clement came back in 886 not only (and probably) to his own people and his own homeland, but also to his own diocese? Is it not possible that Naum, who was perhaps indeed his brother in blood,¹¹⁴ did the same at the moment when Simeon carried out such decisive and significant changes in the state and the church?

Another element supporting this is the fact that after his arrival in Macedonia, Clement never (as might have been expected) requested anything from his superior Bulgarian Archbishop, but always and for every purpose addressed his requests to the Bulgarian Prince.¹¹⁵ Clement recognized the authority of the Bulgarian state, but refused to recognize the authority of the Bulgarian church hierarchy. We find no contacts whatsoever with Greek bishops who were also active in this part of Macedonia.¹¹⁶ The thesis that Clement's diocese came outside the competencies of the Bulgarian Church is also supported by the views that there were "two fully isolated church territories, even two separate and differentiated church individualities",¹¹⁷ even though it was still not the time of the final and official schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. Therefore R. Ljubinkovič is perhaps right when he concludes: "Whereas the Preslav prelate, together with his Synod, administered the territory of his own church: two thirds of Boris's state [?], the

¹¹⁴Vj. Štefaník, „Prvobitno slovensko pismo i najstarija glagoljska epigrafika“, in: *Clavis slavica . 1050-rodni uini na na Kliment Ohridski*, Narodni muzej, Ohrid, 1966, 13; Haralampi Polenakovič, *op. cit.*, 9 and 17; Ivan Venedikov, „Kliment Ohridski i Dobeta“, in: *Kliment Ohridski 916-1966*, 309; Чл.-кор. Емил Георгиев, „Състојанието на научната проблематика...“, 55 ("perhaps a spiritual 'brother', and perhaps a 'brother' in blood"); Борјан Радјичић, *op. cit.*, 206.

¹¹⁵The question is still insufficiently explained as to how Clement could have founded a monastery as a 'teacher', giving it the same name — St Panteleimon — as Prince Boris's Monastery in Preslav. For this monastery see: Димитрие Кочо, „Klimentovi monastiri“, *Sv. Pantelimon i raskopkata pri Imaret vo Ohrid*, in: *Knizata za Kliment Ohridski*, 129-171.

¹¹⁶There were such eparchial centres in Ohrid, Bregalnica, Skopje, Niš, Belgrade, Sredec, etc. (*Kipilometodi evska enciklopedija*, I, 291). If, according to František Dvorník (*op. cit.*, 171), it was possible for Agathon to be appointed a Greek archbishop in Serbia (in the town of Morava), within the borders of the Bulgarian state — independent of the Bulgarian Archbishop and subordinated only to the Patriarch of Constantinople — why could not it have been possible for Clement to be a bishop in Macedonia (which was considered to come under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church), independent of the Bulgarian Archbishop, spiritually subordinated directly to the Pope and maintaining contacts only with the Prince as the head of the state in which he was active?

¹¹⁷Radi voje Ljubinkovič, „Ordo episcoporum y Paris gr. 880 i arhiereskia pomen-lista u Sionikonu cara Borila“, in: *Kipil Colonuski*, I, 142, zab. 40.

ruler, as the symbol of supreme state authority and state unity, also organized the religious and church life on that territory [= one third of Bulgaria] which did not come under the jurisdiction of his primacy.”¹¹⁸ But, Ljubinkovič continues, “in order to do that, the ruler must have the appropriate authorization of the interested and competent church institution. It is known that Illyria was a territory under the jurisdiction of the Apostolic Seat.” The conclusion is that there must have been open or tacit consent on the part of the Apostolic Seat.¹¹⁹ This is indeed confirmed by the relations between Rome and Constantinople at the time.

Closely connected with our question is the ‘resignation’ Clement submitted to the Bulgarian Prince (and not to the Bulgarian Archbishop). The reasons for this act are completely altered in the hagiography.¹²⁰ It could be logically assumed that such an act on the part of Clement might reflect his dissatisfaction with the military actions conducted by Simeon in the territory under the jurisdiction of Clement, i.e. Rome,¹²¹ but it could also be linked with Clement’s dissatisfaction with the policy of the Bulgarian Prince Vladimir, who tried to negotiate with the German delegates and return Bulgaria to paganism.¹²² Both events were utterly unacceptable to Bishop Clement. The dethronement and blinding of Vladimir (by his father Boris) and the coming of the young Constantinopolitan student Simeon to the Bulgarian throne created a new situation with new conditions which might also have been acceptable to the Ohrid bishop, especially when Naum, too, abandoned the Bulgarian capital to join Clement in Ohrid.¹²³

¹¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹¹⁹*Ibid.* This was so even though, in the view of Marija Pantelič („O Kijeuskim i Sinajskim listihima“, *Слово*, 35, Zagreb, 1985, 5), “the territory of Western Illyria (between Dalmatia and Macedonia with its seat at Salonika) was severed from Rome and annexed to the Patriarchate of Constantinople” as early as the middle of the 8th century.

¹²⁰Александър Милев, *Жития...*, 112-114.

¹²¹Влаж Koneski („Ohr i dskata kni zovna škol a“, in: *Кни за за Kliment Ohridski*, 86), relying on I. Pastuhov’s writings (*Бългърска и сторија*, I, Sofija, 1942, 238-239), believes that the reason for the resignation of the aged Clement was the military actions undertaken by Simeon in the area of Salonika and Dyrrachium, as they “upset both the people and its shepherd” in the eparchy. But in the same place Koneski continues by quoting Emil Georgiev’s view (*Начало на славянската писменост във Българска и сторија*, Sofija, 1942, 44-45) concerning the alphabet as the main reason for the departure of “Cyril and Methodius’s disciples” for Macedonia.

¹²²In 888-889 Prince Boris ceded his throne to his son Vladimir and retreated to a monastery (‘St Panteleimon’?), but his son began to renounce Christianity, relying above all, in the words of Dvornik (*op. cit.*, 253), on the boyars of Turi origin, “all of whom were still pagans”, and this began to be felt in Clement’s eparchy as well, as a result of which the latter stood on the side of Boris in Vladimir’s deposition and the enthronement of Simeon (893), when his episcopal title was officially recognized and the Velika Bishopric was assigned to him for administration, after which he took his brother Naum with him to Ohrid. (Archbishop Theophylact later used older sources and data very selectively.)

¹²³It is a highly curious fact that neither of the two hagiographies of Clement mention anything of Naum of Ohrid, nor do they connect him in any way with Clement’s activity. It is indeed strange how the hagiographer missed the opportunity of describing Naum’s funeral and Clement’s outstanding partici-

Thus we can assume that the main reason for Clement's return (and indeed that of Naum) to Macedonia lies in the ordination of Clement as a bishop by the Pope and the appointment of the Archbishop Methodius as the prelate of the territory which came under the state authority of the Bulgarian Prince, but under the church jurisdiction of the Roman Pope. Only in this way can the alphabet be accepted as an additional reason and the language as the motive for the abandonment of the Bulgarian capital and church seat, and Clement's (and Naum's) return to Ohrid.¹²⁴

pation in it. It is, however, mentioned in both hagiographies of Naum, even though there it is treated in a different way. Blaž Koneski („Kanoni zaci ja na sl ovenski svet ci vo Ohr i dskata cr kva“, *Pri l ozi* , 1, 1-2, MANU, Skopje, 1976, 66) is right in pointing out that Naum's cult had already been created in the 10th century, and yet there is no dispute around the fact that Naum is missing in the *synaxarium* of the Assemani Gospel (as are Cyril, Methodius and Clement), that Naum cannot be seen among the frescoes of the 1295 Church of the Holy Mother of God ('Perivlepta') in Ohrid, and that, according to Cvetan Grozdanov („P ortret i te na Kl i ment Ohr i dski i Kl i ment Ri mski “, in: *Ki pi l Col uiski* , 1, 105), the earliest “known portrait” of Naum is that in the narthex of the Church of St Sophia in Ohrid — dating from as late as the 14th century. If we also bear in mind that the earliest transcription of the Life of Naum dates from the 15th century, we must accept Koneski's view that the cult of Naum was revived in Ohrid only after the arrival of the Turks, when St Clement's monastery was turned into a mosque, and St Naum's monastery came to prominence as a cult site. As a matter of fact, the hagiographies make almost no references to Clement's activity in Greater Moravia and Pannonia, and deal with his stay in Rome in the most cursory manner; indeed, even what is said is expounded mainly from the aspect of Byzantine state policy and the policy of the Constantinopolitan Church.

¹²⁴For more details on this subject see: Blaž Ri stovski , „Nekoi pr amawa okol u pojavata na hr i st i janst vot o i pi smenost a kaj Sl oveni te vo Makedoni ja“, in: *Ki pi l Col uiski* , 2, 319-337.

The Tradition of Cyril and Methodius in Macedonian Cultural and National Development in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century and the First Half of the Twentieth Century

The national awakening of the Slavic peoples and the development of Slavonic studies as a scholarly discipline and Slavophilism and Pan-Slavism as policies gave a significant impetus to the cult of Cyril and Methodius and their disciples and followers. The revival of this cult was most strongly expressed in the largest Slav state, Russia, free since its victorious war against Napoleon in the early 19th century. The movement of Pan-Slavism developed as a reaction to Pan-Germanism, and the number of its adherents in other Slavic countries and peoples increased. The interest in the study of Old Church Slavonic written records and in the Old Slavonic language led to the study of their history and the homeland of Slavonic literacy. The study of the lives and work of Cyril, Methodius, Clement and Naum posed the question of 9th-century Macedonia before the scholarly world, and this in turn increased the interest in the contemporary circumstances of the Slavs in what was at that time a Turkish province. Various travellers and researchers came to Macedonia, finding (and taking away) a large number of old manuscripts from the early period of Slavonic literacy. The history, culture, art, language and literacy of the Macedonians became the object not only of scholarly study but also of politics. This had a positive effect on the awakening and strengthening of Slavic consciousness among the Macedonian people and stimulated the struggle for emancipation and affirmation. Cyril and Methodius and their disciples became the emblem of that Slavic consciousness, the symbol of the Slavic awakening and its romantic ideas related to the historical cultural heritage of Macedonia.

There is no doubt that the tradition of Cyril and Methodius continued uninterruptedly and was the longest and most developed in the homeland of Cyril and Methodius and Clement and Naum, concentrated in the three leading centres of Salonika, Ohrid and Mount Athos. If Salonika gave birth to Cyril and Methodius, Ohrid was to produce the first Slavic bishop, who developed the first Slavonic university and established the Archbishopric of Ohrid, which, as an autocephalous church, was probably the first to carry out a canonization of the Slavic saints.¹²⁵ Through the *synagarium* of Slavonic manuscripts they started to be used in the

service of all the churches under the jurisdiction of this spiritual institution — their full continuity was also maintained by the radiant light of the Mount Athos Slavonic Orthodox monasteries during the centuries of subjugation. The Ohrid Literary School¹²⁶ with its large number of manuscripts, which were also read and copied in other centres of Macedonia, preserving and spreading the tradition of Cyril and Methodius's mission, was also well received in places far from the Slavonic Balkans.¹²⁷ The large number of churches and monasteries in Macedonia with compositions showing the Slavonic Holy Seven Saints (*Седмочисленци*) and other artistic representations,¹²⁸ in particular the churches and relics of the most prominent disciples and followers of Cyril and Methodius, cherished by the Archbishopric of Ohrid near Lake Ohrid,¹²⁹ produced and supported strong traditions which became even more invigorated during the period of national revival and in the fierce struggle for cultural and national affirmation.

¹²⁵Вл аже Koneski, „Kanonizacija na slovenski svetci vo Ohridskata crkva“, *Pri lozi*, MANU, Oddelenie za lingvistička i literaturna nauka, I, 1-2, Skopje, 1976, 63-72; Vasil Sl. Kiselkov, „Kirilometodievski kult v Vьlgarija“, in: *Xiljada i stozodini slavjanska pristenost 863-1963. Sbornik v chest na Kiril i Metodij*, Sofia, 1963, 339-340. This canonization of the Slavic saints was accepted and supported by the Roman Church (especially after the fall of Constantinople to the Crusaders in 1204), but not by the Patriarchate of Constantinople (*op. cit.*, 342-349).

¹²⁶Вл аже Koneski, „Ohridskata knjovna skola“, *Literaturni zbornik*, II, 1, Skopje, 1956, 1-19.

¹²⁷An interesting illustration in this respect is the ensemble of frescoes in Cyril's Church in Kiev (12th century) composed solely of saints from Macedonia (Cyril and Methodius, Clement of Ohrid, John of Macedonia, Joseph of Salonika, etc.) which used to be called *Makedonski űzal* for centuries, although now in this part of the church there is a sign reading *Balkanűski űzal*, and the guide interprets it to the visitors as *Bolgarski űzal*. These Kiev frescoes have still not been fully published, just as the entire monument has still not been studied or made accessible to the scholarly public (D-r Kostalabanov, „Kirilovskata Rusija i kulturnite centri vo Makedonija vo HI-HII vek. Kultot na slovenskite prosvetiteli Kiril i Metodij i nivite uceniűi“, *Glasnik na UNESSKO*, HHHV, Skopje, April 1982, 39-40; N.B. Sal'ko, *Živopis' drevnej Rusi XI-nacel a XIII veka. Mozajki - freski - i kony*, Leningrad, 1982, 105-109).

¹²⁸Ди мче Koco, „Trikonhalni crkvi vo Klimentovoto vreme“, in: *Slovenska pristenost. 1050-godini na Kliment Ohridski*, Narodni muzej, Ohrid, 1966, 91-100; Cvetan Grozdanov, „Ohridskoye sliskarstvo od HIV vek“, *Kulturno-istorisko nasledstvo vo CR Makedonija*, HH, Skopje, 1983, 199-228; Cvetan Grozdanov, „Jovan Vadi slavipredstave Sedmochisljenika u makedonskoj umetnosti HVIII-HIH veka“, *Zbornik za likovne umetnost*, 19, Novi Sad, 1984; Cvetan Grozdanov, „Živopisot na grobnopotparaklisa na Sveti Naum Ohridski“, in: *Naum Ohridski*, Ohrid, 1985, 85-97; Petar Miqkoviќ-Pepek, „Nekoi pogledi vrzarhitekturnata manastirskata crkva Sv. Naum kaj Ohridskoto Ezero“, in: *Naum Ohridski*, Ohrid, 1985, 65-82.

¹²⁹Ди мче Koco, „Klimentovot manastir Sv. Pantelimon i raskopkite pri .I mart' vo Ohrid“, *Godišen zbornik na Filozofski ot fakultet*, I, Skopje, 1948, 129-180; Ди мче Koco, „Novi podatoci za istorijatana Klimentovot manastir Sv. Pantelimon vo Ohrid“, *Godišen zbornik na Filozofski ot fakultet*, HHH, 1967, 245-255; Ди мче Koco, „Proučuvavai arheološki i spituvaana crkvata na manastir ot Sv. Naum“, *Zbornik na Arheološki ot muzej*, II, Skopje, 1958, 56-58.

Of considerable significance were also the hand-written or printed texts and artistic representations in the subsequent centuries. Thus the appearance of, for instance, the *Gemmatographia* by Hristofor Жефарович from Dojran, with its special emphasis on Slavonic history and culture in Macedonia, was not accidental.¹³⁰

This was also reflected in the various historical manuals such as those by Mavro Orbini, Jovan Rajih or Paissius of Chilandar,¹³¹ which were certainly available to the literate Macedonians who maintained regular contacts with Mount Athos and could be found as far as Central Europe. Of no lesser importance were the numerous manuscripts kept in Macedonia, which were available not only to church and monastery people but also to others; they included a large number of historical texts, hagiographies, services, laudatory orations and eulogies which dealt with

¹³⁰Изображениј ориџинил и писански — Станат ографија. Reza li u bakru Hristofor Жефарович и Тома Mesmer. Fototipska izdawa, Matrica srpska, Novi Sad, 1961. In addition to the copper engravings depicting the holy Methodius, Archbishop of Moravia; Clement, Archbishop of Ohrid; and Naum, the Miracle Worker from Ohrid, Жефарович grouped the following around the Ohrid Church: the holy David, Tsar of Bulgaria; and Theoctistus; Nicodemus the Fragrant (Myroblitis, 'Myrrh-emanating'), buried in Berat, Albania; Arsenius, the Miracle Worker, the Archbishop of Bulgaria; Theophylact, the Archbishop of Bulgaria; John Vladimir the Fragrant (Myroblitis), buried in Elbasan, etc. It is interesting that Жефарович, in accordance with the historical beliefs of the time, links Bulgarian tsars with the Ohrid saints; according to legend, they were connected with Ohrid and Macedonia, and there is not a single representation of a Bulgarian ruler or saint who is not connected with this Macedonian spiritual and political centre. Thus, for instance, according to the 'information' in *Исторја Савјаноболгарскаја (Саво-Булгарјан Хисторија)* by Paissius (Paisij) of Chilandar, "the Holy King Trivelia, known as the Monk Theoctistus", lived in AD 703 and was the first "to receive the holy Baptism, and the whole Bulgarian people was converted to Christianity in his kingdom", but "after a while he abandoned the king's authority and worldly glory, he built himself a monastery near Ohrid and in this monastery he received the status of a monk... and presented himself to God in that monastery" (Paisij Hilendarski, *Савјаноболгарска историја*. Редакција на Петър Динков. Второ издание, София, 1942, 107-108). In the same fashion, "the holy Tsar David", it is said, "relinquished his empire voluntarily to his brother Samuel, went into a monastery and received the status of a monk", but soon died and "his imperishable relics were taken from there and moved to Ohrid" (*ibid.*, 108). "The holy Tsar John Vladimir, the son of Aaron" is said to have "ruled as a tsar in Ohrid for three years", but he was killed by his wife and his brother-in-law and "his imperishable relics have hitherto stayed on Elbasan land" (*ibid.*, 108-109). "The Holy Nicodemus the Fragrant" is described as "being on Ohrid land", where he lived and died. "His relics were later moved to Albanian Berat" where they "still provide great healing" (*ibid.*, 112), etc. Even though the *Gemmatographia* of the "all-people's fresco-painter" Hristofor Жефарович was published 21 years prior to the completion of the *Хисторија* of Paissius of Chilandar, it is obvious that they used the same sources in drawing their historical conclusions. It is important, however, that Жефарович was closely connected throughout his life with his homeland of Macedonia and made a number of engravings for Macedonian churches and for merchants. (A. Matkovski, "Hristofor Жефарович", *Историја*, VIII, 1, Скопје, 1972, 149-150; A. Matkovski, *Србовите на Македонија (Прилог кон македонската епиграфика)*, Скопје, 1970, 124-125).

¹³¹The cult of Cyril and Methodius is also reflected in a number of early printed books (Воню Ст. Ангелов, "Кирил и Методиј во славјанските печатни книги од HV-HVII в.", in: *Хиландар и стогодишната славјанска пиетност ...*, 358-375).

the Slavonic Holy Seven Saints and in particular with the life and work of Cyril and Methodius.¹³²

The romantic return to the past, which was also felt in Macedonia, in particular through people who had the opportunity of travelling outside the borders of Turkey, contributed significantly to the strengthening of the cult of the Slavic past and especially of the Slavonic Holy Seven Saints and their followers. In the Macedonian circumstances of the time this involved a return to the Slavic roots, symbolized by the continuity of the Archbishopric of Ohrid and the traditions of its Slavic founders, Clement and Naum.

The significance of folk tradition was substantial in this respect. Its full continuity was made possible primarily through physical monuments — churches, monasteries and, above all, the saints' relics which were kept near the shores of Lake Ohrid itself.¹³³ They have always kept the spirit of this people awake, and hence the large number of various traditions and legends connected with the lives and work of Clement and Naum and their specific cult, which has survived up to the present day, are not surprising.¹³⁴ Even though Methodius is largely known as the Archbishop of Moravia through artistic representations, it is through the frescoes, in particular those of Clement and Naum, and also of the other Slavonic Holy Seven Saints, that the memory of the lives and work of the Salonika brothers, Cyril and Methodius, has been kept alive.¹³⁵

¹³²Prof. Ѓордан Ѓ Ivanov, *Български светици и църкви в Македонија*. Vtoro dorabeno izdanie, Sofia, 1931; B. Koneski i O. Jashar-Nasteva, *Македонски текстови од 10-20 век*, Skopje, 1966; *Страници од средновековната книжевност*. I zbornik redakcija, predgovori i zabelenki Vera Antik i Haralampi e Polenakovi k, Skopje, 1978; *Klement Ohridski, Zhitija, slova, pouki*. Predgovor: Haralampi e Polenakovi k. I zbornik, prevodi komentari: Radmila Ugrinovska-Skalovska, Skopje, 1974; Donka Petkanova-Toteva, „Kiril i Metodii v nekoj legendarni knizovni pametnici“, in: *Konstantin-Kiril Filosof. Jubileen sbornik po sluchaj 1100-godishinata ot smertta mu*, Sofia, 1969, 75-94.

¹³³See note 128.

¹³⁴Cvetana Romanska, „Klement i Naum v narodnite predanija“, in: *Xiljadistogodini slavjanska pristenost ...*, 377-382; Vera Stojchevska-Antik, *Klement i Naum Ohridski vo narodnata tradicija*, Skopje, 1982; Vera Stojchevska-Antik, „Klementovata Naumovata tradicija denes“, *Kulturen zivot*, HV, 7, Skopje, 1970, 17-20; Milko Matichetov, „Priznata za Naumovata mecha AT 1910“, *Македонски фолклор*, VIII, 15-16, Skopje, 1975, 129-147; Naum Celakoski, „Narodni predanija za Klement Ohridski“, *Kulturen zivot*, HV, 1-2, 1974, 21-24; Naum Celakoski, „Narodni predanija za Grigor Prlichevi Klement Ohridski“, *Razvitok*, III, 2, Bitola, 1974, 171-173; Naum Celakoski, „Predanijata i stari te recatiana manastirgot „Sv. Naum“, *Lihnid, Ohrid*, 1983, 13-25; Tome Szadov, „Narodnite predanija za Naum Ohridski“, in: *Naum Ohridski*, Ohrid, 1985, 117-123.

¹³⁵Asen Vasilev, „Obrazi na Kiril i Metodii v chuzdoto i nameto izobrazitelno skustvo“, in: *Xiljadistogodini slavjanska pristenost ...*, 393-488; Irina A. Vasileva, „Kumvzrosata za obraza na Konstantin-Kiril Filosof“, in: *Konstantin-Kiril Filosof ...*, 419-424; Svetan Grozdanov, *Poptpetina svetitelite od Maqedonija ...*, 199-228; Svetan Grozdanov, „Odnosot mefuportretite na Klement Ohridski i Klement Rimski vo zhivotot od prvata polovina na HIV vek“, in: *Kiril Colinski. Citrozitum 1100-godishinata od*

On the other hand, the struggle for an individual church, which gained in strength particularly after the 1840s,¹³⁶ turned the eyes of awakened Macedonians towards Ohrid and Salonika. The need was felt for a spiritual and cultural centre of a people which was still not fully aware of its national identity. A particular difficulty was the nominal confusion which was further emphasized by the newly-aroused interest in Slavonic studies, as in the old manuscripts and other surviving material the Slavic scholars most frequently found Bulgarian, and sometimes Serbian designations. This gave the Macedonians the impetus to look for facts confirming their individuality and distinctiveness from the neighbouring peoples, above all from the Bulgarians. Differences were primarily sought and found in ethnic origin, and the Bulgarians were often simply designated as “Tartars and who knows what”,¹³⁷ whereas the Macedonians were directly linked to the ancient Macedonians who were considered Slavs, an ideology which was also extant outside Macedonia.¹³⁸

At the same time language was to prove in the most obvious manner the independence and distinctiveness of the Macedonian people. Hence shortly after the first contact with Bulgarian writings, the Bulgarian language was labelled *Шьпски*,¹³⁹ it was regarded with condescension, while Macedonian was designated as the true legacy of Cyril and Methodius, being the closest to the “Slavonic books” produced by the Salonika brothers.¹⁴⁰

српска на Кирил Колунски, kni ga 1, 23-25 maj 1969, Skopje-Š tip, MANU, Skopje, 1970, 99-108; Kost a Balabanov, „Slovenski te prosvetiteli Kiril i Metodi vo delata na makedonski te ikonopisci od XIX vek, in: *Kiril i Metodiuski. Ci trozi um 1100-zodi umi na od srpska na Kiril i Metodiuski*, kni ga 1, 43-64; Niko P. Tozi, „Kiril i Metodiuski vo tvorbite na makedonski te korani čari“, in: *Kiril i Metodiuski. Ci trozi um 1100-zodi umi na od srpska na Kiril i Metodiuski*, kni ga 1, 245-247.

¹³⁶Документ и за борбата на македонскиот народ за самост ојност и за насі она на држава, I, Skopje, 1981, 182 and 203-204; D-r Bl aže Ri stovski, *Македонскиот народ и македонската а насі ја. Прилози за развјт окот на македонската а култ урно-насі она на тисла*, I, Skopje, 1983, 193-204.

¹³⁷P. R. S1 aveakovъ, „Makedonskiat ъ vъpг osъ“, *Македония*, V, 3, Car egr adъ, 18.I.1871, 2.

¹³⁸At least after the publication of *И Režno dežli Slavi* (1601) by Mavro Orbini from Dubrovnik the idea of the Slavic origin of the ancient Macedonians became extremely popular among many prominent Slav activists, although it had been widespread in Europe even before. The learned Serbian geographer Jovan Draganić, before becoming inveigled by Greater-Serbian ideas, at several points in his textbook *Географја за средније школе (Географу фр Сесондару Schools*, Belgrade, 1871), offers a detailed elaboration of the Slavic origin of the ancient Macedonians, which he considers to be a well-known truth, whose direct descendants are the contemporary Slav inhabitants of Macedonia. This was not only the result of the influence of the ‘Illyrians’ such as Gundulić or Pribojević, since similar beliefs were widespread among the people, so the views of Jordan Hadžikonstantinov-Джнот, Ѓорѓија М. Pulevski, Isaija R. Мајовски and others in 19th-century Macedonia are not incomprehensible.

¹³⁹К.А.Р. Š аркаевъ, *Наръчно св. бл азовъст вованіе і і Сборъ от ъ Евангелски т ъ чт енія...*, Car i gr adъ, 1869, 3; Bl aže Koneski, *Кон македонската а преродба. Македонски т е ичебни сї од 19 век*. Vt o r o і zdani e, Skopje, 1959, 57 and 59.

¹⁴⁰Ђорђе М. Пуевски, *Речни к от т рї jezi ка s. македонски, арбански і т ирски*, II, u Beogradu, 1875, 42; *Македония*, II, 14, 2.III.1868; II, 33, 13.VII.1868, 3, etc.

That is how the myths of the Slavic origin and culture of the Macedonians — as an individual and distinct people in the Slavic world — developed. That is how Macedonian national thought with Macedonian characteristics was conceived and developed in the 1840s; it came to prominence in the 1860s and 1870s, and was highly advocated towards the end of the century and in particular in the early 20th century. Yet Macedonia was to be constituted as a state only after what became known as the ‘National Liberation War’, or the ‘Second Ilinden’, in the Second World War.¹⁴¹ The process of de-mythologization of Philip and Alexander was slow and difficult, while the mythologization of Cyril, Methodius, Clement and Naum continued to develop and became even more established.

There were several reasons for these developments. As the homeland of the Slavonic script, and also of the Slavonic literary language, together with the aura of the establishment of the first Slavonic university and the appointment of the first Slavic bishop in the Balkans, as the land with the largest number of surviving churches and monasteries, manuscripts and other monuments that maintained the traditions of the Slavonic educators, Macedonia became the object of extensive studies — first by foreigners, and later by the Macedonians themselves. It is important to point out that there was practically no Macedonian Revival activist who did not take part in the search, discovery and collection of old Slavonic manuscripts and in the recording of old icons, frescoes and other monuments in our churches and monasteries. All this significantly intensified with the preparations for and the great celebration of the Moravian Mission as well as the anniversaries of the deaths of Cyril and Methodius (1863, 1869 and 1885). In this context we should mention the various foreign ‘travellers’ in Macedonia with “partly scholarly purposes, and partly with the purpose of becoming acquainted with the birth of the Slavic world”,¹⁴² such as Viktor Grigorovich or Aleksandr Gilyferding. Among them the comprehensive activity of Stefan Verkovič was of particular significance.

Thus the 1860s became the cornerstone of the organized cultivation of old traditions.¹⁴³ The celebration of May 11th as the Day of Cyril and Methodius¹⁴⁴ marked the start of the public events which were reflected in the periodicals of the

¹⁴¹D-r Bl aže Ri st ovski , *op. cit.*, I, 119-280.

¹⁴²К. Ми си р ков, „I zni knuvain’et o i r azbor na bugar ckata i sr pcka te ori i i za nar odnost a na mak’edonci te“, *Вардар*, I, 1, Odesa, 1.И.1905, 12 (D-r Bl aže Ri st ovski , „*Вардар*“. *Научно-лит ерат урно и ориут ест вено-пол и т и чко спр сани е на К.П. Ми си р ков*, I МЈ, Ф от от и рно и здани е, Скопје, 1966).

¹⁴³Vasi l S l . Ki sel kov, *op. cit.*, 339-345.

¹⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 349-357. The Bulgarian press in Constantinople published the requests and proposals for this celebration in 1857. Such events were already organized at that time, but they largely became a May 11th tradition in Macedonia after the 1860s.

time.¹⁴⁵ Attempts were made at opening churches and schools bearing the names of Cyril and Methodius, as well as the names of Clement and Naum, moves which the Patriarchate of Constantinople strongly opposed.¹⁴⁶

The tradition of the cult of Clement and Naum was particularly prominent in Macedonia. This is confirmed, among other things, by the exceptionally large number of these names in the region of Ohrid. The celebration of the name-day of Clement (Kliment) and Naum has always been a celebration of the saints themselves.¹⁴⁷ There were massive celebrations which were nourished uninterruptedly for centuries; they further strengthened the popular tradition and also aroused and maintained the people's awareness of their Slavic past. Although the tradition of Cyril and Methodius had been alive even before, it was considerably strengthened after the start of widespread popular celebrations of Ss Cyril and Methodius Day, making the use of the names of these saints as Christian names even more frequent.

The public word was still another element. Solemn speeches were delivered on the occasion of all public events, accompanied by special programmes dedicated to the saints.¹⁴⁸ How strongly these events were felt and how these speeches were

¹⁴⁵In Prilep, for instance, Ss Cyril and Methodius Day was celebrated for the first time on May 11, 1866 (Raako Ži nzi f ov, *Publ i ci st i ka*, I. S ъst avi l i Cvet a Undži eva i Dočo Lekov, Sof i я, 1964, 256); in Salonika this took place two years later (*Македония*, II, 27, I.VI.1868); in Bitola it was celebrated as late as 1871 (*Македония*, V, 21, 25.V.1871), etc.

¹⁴⁶According to the journal *Бъл гария* (II, 63, Саг i г адъ, 4.V.1860, 147), guild members in Bitola wished to open a school and a church bearing the name Cyril and Methodius, but the Patriarchate prelate opposed this as these patrons were not included in the list of saints of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Nevertheless, a marble inscription reading *ѣУчи l i це „Св. Ки p. i Met .“ Kouii ца Ohpi ѓ з. 1861. Май 6-и љ* was to be seen above the entrance door to the school in the *Коишца* quarter in Ohrid (P r of . Йор данъ I вановъ, *op. cit.*, 46). On the seal worked out by the Ohrid goldsmith Hristo Cvetku for this school, however, a print of which was found among Dimitar Miladinov's documents upon his arrest in Struga on February 16, 1861, there were only the following words: *Ѣчи l . Бъл gar. Бъ oh. ul i c. Коишца* (Br а т я Mi l adi novi , *Препи ска. I zdi ri l , koment i ral i redakt i ral N. Traakov, Sof i я, 1964, 172* — a letter by Mitra D. Miladinova to the Robev family of March 2, 1861). That the school in Ohrid did indeed have these saints as patrons is confirmed by the icon by Dičo Zograf dated February 20, 1863, which he painted in Ohrid, where Cyril and Methodius are portrayed as holding the Slavonic script; between them is Clement (larger in size, with a mitre on his head and a sceptre in his right hand), while the inscription of the fresco-painter mentions the school in *Коишца*, the Metropolitan Meletius and the citizen Hristo Zlatar (Kost a Bal abanov, *op. cit.*, 46, and the attached reproduction of the icon).

¹⁴⁷Although the Patriarchate did not recognize them as saints, as a legacy from the *сунацаріум* of the Archbishopric of Ohrid the people continued the centuries-old tradition and regularly celebrated the days of Clement and Naum in Ohrid.

¹⁴⁸A report by “a Salonika citizen, one on behalf of all” („Sol unec edi n za vsi чки t e“, *Македония*, II, 27, I.VI.1868, 3) mentions that after the festive celebration of Ss Cyril and Methodius Day in the Church of the Mother of God in Salonika and after “the test has been carried out in a pure Macedono-Bulgarian language, our school, newly inaugurated and humble; [and] after the girls clad in white had sung the song about the Sultan, the antiphons to our saints and various folk songs suited to the occasion”, the people enthusiastically prepared a request to the Salonika Metropolitan to be assigned one of the thirteen churches in the city. In addition, from the mid-19th century onwards a number of songs were composed (mainly in Bulgarian) which were widely sung at celebrations in Macedonia as well — in the schools and at church meetings (Стоян Петров, „Del ot o на br а т я а Ки ril i Met odi à i

received is perhaps best illustrated by Grigor Prličev's speech in the Ss Cyril and Methodius Exarchal Grammar School in Salonika in 1885.¹⁴⁹ Of particularly great importance was the role of the press, which swiftly developed inside the borders of Turkey and was widely read in Macedonia as well. Although most of the periodicals were Bulgarian, Macedonian developments and events were also reflected on their pages, especially after the establishment of the Bulgarian state. There were numerous articles on Cyril and Methodius, and the idea of the Bulgarian character of the work of Cyril and Methodius was becoming more and more established.

Of special significance were the textbooks used in the schools throughout Macedonia, in which a place of honour began to be given to the Salonika brothers and their disciples. The textbooks "in the Macedonian dialect" by Parteniija Zografski,¹⁵⁰ Dimitar V. Makedonski¹⁵¹ and Kuzman Šapkarev¹⁵² also increasingly

бъл гар skat a muzi ka", in: *Xi l jada i st o žodi ni sl avjanska pi stenost ...*, 490-509). J. Grujev's song *I sl ed t i sjaца žodi ni ...*, which was also sung by our teachers, achieved great popularity (*Македонија*, V, 31, 3.VIII.1871).

¹⁴⁹K.G. P r l i č e v ъ, „Къпъ har akt eri sti kat a na Gr .S. P r l i č e v ъ (po spomeni , svedeni я i dokument i)“, *Македонски прегледъ*, IV, 2, Sof i я, 1928, 116-118; Geor gi St . Kandi lar ov ъ, *Бъл гарски т ъ gi mazi i i osnovni чи li ца въ Сол инъ*, Sof i я, 1930, 32-35; Geor gi St rezov ъ, „P r l i č e v ъ st ъrki na Sol unskata gi mazi я“, in: *Сброни къ Сол инъ*. I zdani e na възpri t at el i t ъ i възpri tani ci t ъ ot ъ sol unski т ъ бъл гарски gi mazi i , Sof i я, 1934, 289; *Жи t i e на Иоана Крајни чанскога 1869-1942 год.*, Oddel eni e za dokument aci ja na Insti tut ot za naci onal na i stori ja vo Skorje, sl. IV, 165, str. 12-13; Voi slav I . I l i k ъ, „Ki rilometodi evskata tradi ci ja vo dve besedi na Gri gor P r l i č e v ъ“, in: *Ki ril Col unski ...*, I, 113-120; Bл же Ri stovski , „Kon prouчuvaweto na sol unski te godi ni na P r l i č e v (G. P r l i č e v vo oči te na P . Draganov i J. Kr ajni čanec), in: *Жи vot ot i del ot o na Сри žор P r l i č e v* (Si nprozi um posvet en na жи vot ot i del ot o na Gri gor P r l i č e v, 10-11 maj 1985 na Filol oшки ot fakul tet vo Skorje), Skorje, 1986, 60-72.

¹⁵⁰Parteniija Zografski was certainly the best informed Macedonian in Macedonia at that time concerning the question of Cyril and Methodius (H. Pol enakov i k ъ, „Bel emki za ki rilometodi evskoto prашawe kaj Makedonci te vo III vek“, *Gl asni k na ИНИ*, VII, 1, Skorje, 1963, 170-172). In addition to his famous articles in the Constantinopolitan press and praises in honour of the Slavonic educators, Zografski included some basic information on them in his textbook *Krat ka svящena i st ori я* (1857), which was used widely in the Macedonian schools. He was also the first to publish Archbishop Theophylact's Life of Clement in his native tongue (1858).

¹⁵¹In his work *Krat ka svящenna i st ori я za чи li ца-t a ро Македонж (на македонско нарѣчје)*, Саг i гра дъ, 1867, where he undoubtedly relies on facts from *Царст венни къ li i Ist ori я Бол - гарская* od P . Hi lendar ski , u Budi mu, 1844, Dimitar V. Makedonski writes about the work of Cyril and Methodius (p. 24) and also about the Archbishopric of Ohrid (pp. 27-28).

¹⁵²Among other things, in the textbook quoted, *Нарѣчно св. благовѣст вованіе il i Сборъ ot ъ Евангел ски т ъ чи ения...*, 1869, K.A.P. Šapkarev gives the services for Cyril and Methodius in the months of May (p. 121), in June for St Naum of Ohrid (122), in July for the Slavonic Holy Seven Saints (125) and also for Clement of Ohrid and St Panteleimon (126), repeating the service for St Clement in November (109). Among the large number of writings affirming the history of Cyril and Methodius and their work and of the Archbishopric of Ohrid, in a polemical article of 1870, Kuzman Šapkarev writes that at one time Cyril and Methodius "translated the holy writings and established literacy not in the Moesian or Thracian B. dialect, but in their own, now despised [?] Macedono-Bulgarian dialect, in which they were born and brought up..." (Bл же Koneski , *Кон македонскат а преродба*, 65).

Rajko Žinzifov¹⁵⁸ Grigor Prličev,¹⁵⁹ Ćorĳija M. Pulevski,¹⁶⁰ Marko K. Cepenkov,¹⁶¹ Trajčo Kitanĳev¹⁶² and others) contributed significantly to the development and spread of this tradition.

family of the Reverend Naum of Ohrid” for the Shroud sent, which,” Dimitar wrote, “reminds us of the devastated precious treasures of the once glorious but now impoverished fatherland. This sacred gift reminds every compatriot of the ancient Slavic brilliance and incites every sensitive soul to go back to his true mother and draw his mother’s sweet milk.” He informed him that “on this November 25th, when the holy memory of St Clement is celebrated, a dazzling and solemn service was held in the Metropolitan Church, and during the conveyance of the immaculate secrets the glorious names of the Slavic benefactors were mentioned, and one of the priests delivered an appropriate eulogy in the Bulgarian language during the service,” but “[i]n order to fulfil better the amiable hopes cherished by the Slavic saints, Clement, Naum, Cyril and Methodius, we appointed a teacher in our revived mother tongue...” (*Препи ска*, 105). Miladinov not only had close contacts among prominent figures in the areas of science, politics and publishing (Aleksandr F. Gilyferding, Viktor Grigorovich, Stefan Verkovich, Yakov O. Orel-Oshmyantsev, Aleksandr V. Rachinsky, E. Yuzhakov, Petr I. Sevastyanov, Pavel I. Sevastyanov, Mikhail A. Hitrovo, Aleksand’r Egzarh, etc.), but he also maintained direct contact with all the more important persons in Macedonia at the time and with various institutions and organizations inside the country and abroad, which was of exceptional significance for the enhancement and expansion of his views and actions. On the other hand, Konstantin Miladinov, possessing a profound knowledge of the Slavic heritage in Macedonia, not only fought together with his brother, but also had the opportunity of attending Parteniĳa Žografski’s lectures in the Žograph (Žographou) Monastery, and also of listening to the lectures of the most prominent Russian Slavic scholars of the time and of following numerous publications dealing with the subject of Cyril and Methodius. He was well acquainted with the work of “our educators, Cyril and Methodius”, he examined the old manuscripts in the Žograph Monastery, where he copied three bulls, one of which (on the Archbishopric of Ohrid) he published, remarking that the first “Bulgarian bishop, according to Theophylact’s testimony, was the Reverend Clement in Belica or Dremvica”, and that “His epitaph still stands in the cathedral church in Ohrid” (*Konstantin Miladinov, I zbor i predgovor Gane Todorovski, Skopje, 1980, 60-64*).

¹⁵⁸Rajko Žinzifov emerged as the most active Macedonian in the Slavic Committee in Moscow, but he had brought the traditions of Cyril and Methodius from Macedonia, in particular after his association with Dimitar Miladinov. His poems, articles and speeches (H. P ol enakov i ĳ, *op. cit.*, 173-176) were not only well received among the pupils and students from Macedonia in Russia, but also had a significant impact on certain groups of people in Macedonia itself.

¹⁵⁹Grigor Prličev, having rejected his earlier Hellenistic views, embarked on a serious study of the old Slavonic culture in Macedonia, and it was not only with the popular poem *the Seap 1762*, but also through his orations on Clement, Cyril and Methodius that he made a tremendous contribution to the affirmation of that past and to the cultural and national awakening of our people, particularly in the struggle for the restoration of the Archbishopric of Ohrid. Having rejected his Greek orientation and unable to defeat Bulgarianism, Prličev started along a line of ‘Macedonism’, writing a short grammar, with obvious efforts to establish a continuity with the Old Slavonic era of Cyril and Methodius. It was certainly not by chance that Prličev gave the name Kiril (Cyril) to his only son.

¹⁶⁰Ćorĳija M. P ul evski , *Одбрани ст рани ци* . I zbor , redakci ja, predgovor i zabel enki d-r Bl aĳe Ri stovski , Skopje, 1974, 98-100 and 254-255.

¹⁶¹Marko Cepenkov also acknowledged his debt to the work of Cyril and Methodius and contributed to its affirmation. In 1896 he published his ode to the Salonika brothers entitled *Mojata pesna (Gl asъ Makedonski* , III, 51, Sof i ja, 28.V.1896, 4), and in his not completely known *Prilepski letopis* (I 1. I v., „Pr i l ep ski l et op i sci “, in: *Pr i l ep њ p re di 100 ĳodi ni . V ъz ro pen at el en њ l i st њ ro sl uĳai st o ĳodi ni ot њ osv eĳavan et o na p ri l ep sk at a с ъ рк ва „Св. Bl aĳoveĳe ni e“ – 7.IV.1838–7.IV.1938, Sof i ja, 7.IV.1938, 8), among other things, he wrote that in 1885 in Prilep “a garden [was made] specially for Ss Cyril and Methodius in memory of the 1000th anniversary of St Methodius’s death” (Mar ko K. Cepenkov, *Makedonski narodni umot vorbi vo deset kni ĳi, 10. Mat epi jal i – l i t e rat u r ni t vorbi* . Redakt i r al d-r Bl aĳe Ri stovski , Skopje, 1980, 395).*

In spite of the many difficulties in making their works accessible to people in general, a number of intellectuals managed to come into contact with this literary production, and it exerted its influence. The appearance of certain songs about the Slavic brothers,¹⁶³ however, and their widespread distribution, in particular through the schools and public performances, was an important element in the process of national awakening.

Finally, the opening of the Exarchal Grammar School in Salonika which took the name of Cyril and Methodius¹⁶⁴ played a significant part in this history.¹⁶⁵ The birthplace of the brothers increasingly affirmed itself as the future centre of Macedonian culture and the prospective state, and was turning into a centre of events which marked Macedonian history. The nation needed this and created such ideas.

As a result of these cultural and national developments, it was natural for the revolutionary movement in Macedonia, from its very first days, to place the cult of the Salonika brothers as Slavonic and Macedonian educators high on its banner. Various societies, reading clubs and committees adopted the names of the Salonika brothers and their disciples. As early as 1872 we find the St Clement Reading Club,¹⁶⁶ which later (in 1885) became a highly active society with the same patron,¹⁶⁷ and in 1894 it notified the public that “the Ohrid Sunday School will be a continuation of the former ‘St Clement’ and ‘Arsenius’ and will be named

¹⁶²Тр а̀чо Ки т а̀нчевъ, *Съчи нени я*, Sof і я, 1898, 120-122; [Горче Petrov], „Pr azdnuvani et o na Sv. Kir il і Met odi à. Dopі ska ot ъ Sol unъ“, *Bal канъ*, I, 23, Sof і я, I.VI.1883, 9-10.

¹⁶³Some hymns, odes and other songs dealing with Cyril and Methodius were made highly popular through the Exarchal churches and schools in Macedonia as well (St ef an P. Vasi lev, „Kir il і Met odi à във възрєvі te на бъл gar ski te poeti“, in: *Xil яda і st o годі ni sl авянска рi стеност ...*, 383-390; St oян Pet roв, „Del ot o na br at яt a Kir il і Met odi à і бъл gar skat a muzi ka“, in: *Xil яda і st o годі ni sl авянска рi стеност ...*, 489-514).

¹⁶⁴The Ss Cyril and Methodius Boys' Grammar School in Salonika was opened in 1881 (P r of . I v. Sn ъgar онъ, *op. cit.*, 166 and 184), and the seal put on the 1870 letters from the Salonika Community (written by Venijamin Mачukovski) shows only the words *Бъл гарска сърковна общі на въ Сол инъ*, but in the middle of the seal there are engravings of the figures of the Salonika brothers (*ibid.*, 235 and 237). Were not these seals perhaps added later?

¹⁶⁵Petar D. Draganov, a teacher in the Salonika Exarchal Grammar School, in 1885/86 held a 'private' course entitled 'The Activity of Cyril and Methodius' (K.L. St r ukova, „I z epі st ol яr nogo nasl edі я P. D. Dr aganova“, *Совет ское sl авяноведєні е*, 4, Moskva, 1970, 44), and after his return to Russia (1887) he started preparing (in the Russian Academy of Sciences in St Petersburg) the first complete *Всеобщая Kir il lo-Мефоді евская бi бл і ографі я* in four extensive volumes (D-г Bl аже Ri s- to vski, *Македонскі от народ і такедонскат а насі ја*, I, 435-454).

¹⁶⁶*Право*, VII, 12, С ar і gr adъ, 29.V.1872, 4; V, 28, 18.IH.1872, 4; *Свобода*, II, 52, Вукр ещъ, 10.VI.1872, 420.

¹⁶⁷А. Кескар онъ, „P r ed t eчi на геvоl юсi onnat a ор gani засі я въ Ohr і dsko“, *Ил юст pacі я Ил і нденъ*, VI, 1, Sof і я, 1934, 10-13; *Оhr і д і Оhr і dsko, кні за вт ора. Од ра̀awet о род остaнл і ска вл ast до крајот на Прват а свет ска војна*, Skopje, 1978, 177-179. The Society opened a Sunday School for Adults bearing the name of the latest Ohrid Archbishop, Arsenius.

‘St Clement’”.¹⁶⁸ There was a number of similar actions in the ‘Lozar’ period, and this cult was also adopted during the Ilinden period; it was not by chance that there were proposals that the Ilinden Uprising start on Ss Cyril and Methodius Day.¹⁶⁹

Perhaps the best example of this is the patronage of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg. In his book *Za makedonskite raboti* (On Macedonian Matters), published in December 1903, Krste Misirkov writes that the Society’s name is ‘St Clement’,¹⁷⁰ and Stefan J. Dedov from Ohrid says the following in his journal of November 21, 1904: “On 25th of this month, the St Clement Macedonian Student Society in St Petersburg will celebrate its patron’s holiday.”¹⁷¹ Yet in the ‘Constitution’ of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society, adopted by its members (in Misirkov’s absence) on December 16, 1903, and submitted for confirmation to the Council of the St Petersburg Slavonic Charitable Society on the 20th of the same month, the last article, 21, expressly states the following: “The Society has the Holy Slav Apostles Cyril and Methodius as its patrons.”¹⁷² We find the same in other surviving documents. There were obvious disagreements with regard to the patronage between Misirkov and Dedov on the one hand, and Чуповски, as the president of the Society (and perhaps other members), on the other. It is interesting that the Slav-Macedonian National-Educational Society (1912)¹⁷³ and the Russian-Macedonian Charitable Society (1913)¹⁷⁴ bore the name of Ss Cyril and Methodius, and the journal *Македонскиј Голос* (*Македонски Glas*), 1913-1914, constantly insisted on “the activity of the holy brothers Cyril and Methodius”.¹⁷⁵

Even in June 1917, under the text of the Programme of the Macedonian Revolutionary Committee in Petrograd concerning the Balkan Federal Democratic Republic, the head Dimitrija Чуповски put the signatures of the three institutions: *Македонскиј Революционнуј Комитет. Македонско Дриџарство имени Кипила и*

¹⁶⁸Архи в на Народниот музеј во Охрид, Ф. Митрополитја: Издвојува книга на Охридското Неџлоучило ише „Св. Климентъ“, стр. 14; *Новини*, V, 19, Сариградъ, 25.ИИ.1894, 4 (the same can be found in the following number).

¹⁶⁹Горче Петров, *Спомени – Кореспонденција*. Вовед, коментари редакцијата проф. Љубен Лапе, Скопје, 1984, 179.

¹⁷⁰К.Р. Мисирковъ, *За македонските работи*, София, 1903, IV, 1, 45, 67 and 68.

¹⁷¹*Кипиеръ*, I, 14, София, 21.ИИ.1904, 4.

¹⁷²Д-р Владе Ристовски, *Димитрија Чуповски (1878-1940) и Македонското научно-литературно дрџарство во Петроград. Прилози кон проучивањето на македонско-руските еврски и развитоко на македонската националност*, I, Скопје, 1978, 246.

¹⁷³*Ibid.*, II, 16. We find the same title in the monogram on the emblem of this society (*ibid.*, 17, and also on the colour photograph preceding page 289).

¹⁷⁴*Ibid.*, II, 153.

¹⁷⁵Д. Чуповскиа, „Македонија и Македонцы (Културно-исторически обзоръ Македонии)“, *Македонскиј голос* (*Македонски glas*), I, 1, С.-Петербургъ, 9.V.1913, 7-8. All the numbers of the journal present “the first Slav teachers” as the symbol of Macedonian national culture.

Мефѡдија. Редакција „Македонскаѡ Golosa“.¹⁷⁶ Throughout the war years, when the fate of the Macedonian people was being decided, the Macedonians firmly insisted on the Salonika brothers and the Ohrid saints and educators in order to show the individuality and continuity of Macedonian culture and history to the world.

This cult, not without romantic ingredients, grew steadily in the period between the two world wars. Nikola K. Majski,¹⁷⁷ Milan Ѓ. Vojnicalija,¹⁷⁸ Radoslav Petkovski,¹⁷⁹ Hristo Popsimov,¹⁸⁰ Dimче Malenko¹⁸¹ and many other writers also expressed their feelings towards the first Slav teachers in verses written in their mother tongue. The indefatigable Misirkov demonstrated the same position in nearly all of his works. In his series of articles in the Macedonian and Bulgarian press (1923-1925) he pointed out that “the Holy Cyril and Methodius spread the *Macedonian word and script* among all Slavic peoples”¹⁸² and that they “are our prophets, saints, educators and representatives of the Macedonian national spirit, of Macedonian national culture”.¹⁸³ Yet he did not forget to emphasize that “the Slavs in Macedonia, which laid the foundations of national education and culture among almost all the Slav peoples — both western and eastern Slavs — through the activity of the holy Cyril and Methodius and their Macedonian disciples, have seen nothing good or beneficial for themselves from these Slavs”.¹⁸⁴

This tradition was developed and supported in particular by the progressive Macedonian national, cultural and literary activists in the 1930s. The press of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (United), and also the Macedonian People’s League of America (in the United States and Canada), copiously used and affirmed the work of Cyril and Methodius and their disciples.¹⁸⁵ They

¹⁷⁶D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *op. cit.*, II, 262-263; *Bol я народа*, 43, Р ет р о г р а д ъ , 18.VI.1917, 2.

¹⁷⁷D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Македонски от ст и h 1900-1944. Ист р аж и в а в а и м а т е р и ј а л и*, I, Скопје, 1980, 116-117.

¹⁷⁸His daughter Pavlina Apostolova, living in Скопје, had a large collection of 48 songs and poems by Milan Ѓ. Vojnicalija, dedicated by the author to Trajko Kratovaliev on November 21, 1938 (two months before his death), where the first poem, *Ot eчeст во* (1927), has the dedication “to Cyril and Methodius”.

¹⁷⁹D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Македонски от ст и h 1900-1944*, I, 207-208.

¹⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 230-231. Hristo Popsimov’s position on the work of Cyril and Methodius can be seen from his surviving preface to the unpublished collection of poetry entitled *Луда крв (Bild Blood)* by Voislav Илиќ, dating from 1935 (D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Пројави и ррофи ли од македонската а л и т е р а т и р н а и ст о р и ј а. При л о ж и з а р а з в и т о к о т н а македонската а к у л т у р н о - н а с и о н а л н а т и с л а*, II, Скопје, 1982, 230; D-г С т о ј а н Ри ст ески , *Л и т е р а т у р н и и с п и т и в а в а*, Скопје, 1983, 85).

¹⁸¹D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски , *Македонски от ст и h 1900-1944*, II, 97.

¹⁸²К. Ми си р ков ъ , „Кр а л и М а р к о“ , *И л и н д е њ*, III, 12, С о ф и я , 25.III.1923, 2.

¹⁸³К. Ми си р ков ъ – македонец ъ , „Шце успеат ли ?“ , *Ми р ъ*, ННН, 7147, С о ф и я , 10.IV.1924, 1.

¹⁸⁴К. Ми си р ков ъ , „Македони ја и р г а ж к и я к о н г р е с ъ“ , *20 Ј о л и ѝ*, I, 9, С о ф и я , 8.VI.1924, 2.

were paid particular attention in the journal *Македонски Вести* (Macedonian News, 1935-1936)¹⁸⁶ of Angel Dinev as well as in his prominent book *Македонските Словени* (The Macedonian Slavs, 1938).¹⁸⁷ This was an important breakthrough in the contemporary awareness of the Macedonian, which led first to the National Liberation War and somewhat later to our free national development. Кочо Рацин,¹⁸⁸ Nikola Vapcarov,¹⁸⁹ Kosta Veselinov,¹⁹⁰ Vasil Ivanovski¹⁹¹ and many others only strengthened this cult into a progressive line of our development, with a vision not too different from that we cherish today. If in 1936 the writer signing himself as “Nik. I-v” called “the Macedonian educators of the new era — Джитот, Theodosius of Skopje and the ‘Lozars’ — the advocates of making the *western* [Macedonian] dialect a standard, and others [...] worthy followers of the first Macedonian teachers, Ss Cyril and Methodius”,¹⁹² there was nothing more natural than that the Provincial Committee of the Communist Party of Macedonia addressed the Macedonians, in its mouthpiece *Искра* (Spark) of January 1941, in the following way:

Brothers!

You have your own language, your own culture, your own traditions, songs, etc. You have a glorious history and past. Cyril and Methodius were neither Serbs nor Bulgarians, but Macedonian Slavs who gave literacy and culture to all the Slavs...¹⁹³

¹⁸⁵It must be underlined that the tradition of Cyril and Methodius was also cherished among other Macedonian organizations in the United States and Canada. As early as 1907 in Granite City, for instance, a church community and a church bearing the name of Ss Cyril and Methodius were established, and there has been a similar church in Toronto since 1910 (*50-godišnica jubilej na almanah na Makedono-Belžarskata Pravoslavna Църковна Община „Св. Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Торонто, Канада, 1910-1960*).

¹⁸⁶„Дѣлото на двајцата Словенски браќа, *Македонски вестник*, I, 18, Софиа, 22.V.1935, 2; „Паметник на гавноарпостолите Кирил и Методиј“, *МВ*, I, 38, 30.II.1935, 8; A.D., „Затворањето на Мakedonskata nacionalnata kultura“, *ВМ*, II, 44, 19.II.1936, 5; Angel Dinev, „Veliki teli na makedonski jargon na vsi slaveni“, *МВ*, II, 55, 27.V.1936, 4; D.G. Zargov, „Sv. S. Kiril i Metodij“, *МВ*, I, 21, 12.VI.1935, 11, etc.

¹⁸⁷Angel Dinev, *Македонските словенци*, Софиа, 1938, 19-24 and 49-61.

¹⁸⁸Кочо Рацин, *Стини и проза*. Uredil dr Aleksandar Spasov, Skopje, 1966, 150.

¹⁸⁹Ni kol a Jonkov Vapcarov, *Сротени, риста, документ*, BAN, Софиа, 1953, 221.

¹⁹⁰Kosta Veselinov, *Възраждането на Македонија и Илинденското востание*, Софиа, 1939.

¹⁹¹In addition to other articles (published after 1934), Vasil Ivanovski is the author of the monographic manuscript „Makedonski jargon v nivalotosega. Makedonskata nacija i makedonskoto nacionalno sьznanie“, which he wrote in the Skopje Central Prison in 1943-1944 (Archives of Macedonia, Inv. No. 8773). Among other things, it pays special attention to the Salonika brothers and their disciples and followers. See: Vasil Ivanovski, *Zout o ni e Makedonskite smetoddel na nacija. Izbrani dela. Predgovor, izbor i redakcija Ivan Katarxiev*, AM, Skopje, 1995, 101-256.

¹⁹²Nik. I-v, „Pogovori na maked. sьznanie“, *Македонски вестник*, II, 66, 12.VIII.1936, 3.

¹⁹³*Il egalni ot pachat na КПЈ во Вардарска Македонија меѓу двете светски војни*. P odgotvil dr Ivan Katarxiev, t. II, kn. 2, Skopje, 1983, 207; *Искра*, VII, 1, [Skopje], Januar [1941], [6].

Immediately after the Bulgarian occupation of Macedonia, the Ilinden proclamation of the Provincial Committee of the Workers' Party in Macedonia stated: "Everything which is Macedonian and great in the Macedonian struggle and culture has been appropriated by Bulgarian fascists and presented as Bulgarian: Ss Cyril and Methodius, Goce Delчев, the Macedonian revolutionary struggle, the Macedonian language (our language was allegedly 'sweet and melodious Bulgarian')." ¹⁹⁴ This is repeated in the next year's Ilinden proclamation, ¹⁹⁵ and a leaflet from that period protests: "They have forbidden us to celebrate Ss Cyril and Methodius as Macedonian and Slavic apostles and teachers." ¹⁹⁶ The mouthpiece of the Macedonian Provincial Committee, *Bilten* (Bulletin), of March-April 1942, proudly writes: "Macedonia has borne two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, who have given the alphabet and written culture to all the Slavs. Every more cultured Macedonian knows that the disciples of these two brothers, headed by Clement, first went to Moravia (Bohemia), which groaned under the German yoke at the time, in order to preach in the Slavonic language." ¹⁹⁷ Similar articles appeared in many other periodicals during the National Liberation War. Hence it was natural that Cyril and Methodius's Day was proclaimed the holiday of education in free Macedonia, and it was no surprise that one of the first decisions of the Agency of People's Education (of the Presidium of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia) was its decision in favour of "the celebration of St Clement of Ohrid's Day, on December 8, 1944". ¹⁹⁸ He "was one of the greatest disciples of the brothers Cyril and Methodius", as "this son of Macedonia [...] is still today, as he was 1,000 years ago, the protector of our national whole and the patron of our entire national culture". ¹⁹⁹

Accordingly, the tradition of Cyril and Methodius is an indigenous tradition in Macedonia which has been constantly built up (by external factors as well) and has firmly evolved into a fundamental element of the process of affirmation of the Macedonian nation, culture and statehood.

¹⁹⁴ *Извори за Oслoбoди тeл нaт a вoјнa и рeвoлyцијaт a вo Mакeдoнијa 1941-1945, т. I. Дoкyмeнт и нa Кoтини ст и чкaт a рaрт и јa нa Јyгoслaвијa и Кoтини ст и чкaт a рaрт и јa нa Mакeдoнијa 1941-1945, кн. 1, I NI, Скопје, 1968, 31.*

¹⁹⁵ *Ид.*, 247.

¹⁹⁶ *Ид.*, 216.

¹⁹⁷ *Ист opи ски apхи в нa Кoтини ст и чкaт a рaрт и јa нa Mакeдoнијa, т. II. Ст aт и и oд вeснe cит e и cпи cанијaт a oд рepи oдoт нa Нaрoднo oслoбoди тeл нaт a бopбa вo Mакeдoнијa 1941-1944, кн. пpвa, 1941-1943, Скопје, 1952, 81.*

¹⁹⁸ *ACHOM (Aнт и фaши ст и чкo cбpaнe нa нaрoднoт o oслoбoди вaнe нa Mакeдoнијa). Дoкyмeнт и oд Пpвoт o и Bт opoт o зacедaнe нa ACHOM, т. I, кн. 1, AM, Скопје, 1984, 232-233.*

¹⁹⁹ *Ид.*, 339-341.

Traditional Contacts and Relations between Macedonia and Russia

It is indeed difficult to study the roots of mutual relations between the Slavs in Russia and those in Macedonia, as most scholars believe that the Macedonians are a part that was separated from the main Slavic stock living beyond the Carpathian Mountains. Furthermore, the settlement of the Slavs in Macedonia took place over several centuries, ending as late as the 7th century, involving the southernmost regions of the Slavic migration wave, but there are no Slavic written testimonies whatsoever dating from that period. Hence discussion of this subject can start only with the Slavs' conversion to Christianity and their literacy, which are linked with the mission of the Salonika brothers, Cyril and Methodius, and their disciples and followers.

Regardless of whether Cyril and Methodius, on their famous mission, found some "Russian characters",²⁰⁰ meaning "Russian" literacy, which they could somehow use in their subsequent activity, it is important that they themselves came to the Russian regions towards the mid-9th century.²⁰¹ But what has been known to scholarship for certain is the fact that by AD 863 at the latest, at the request of

²⁰⁰Клімент Охридски, *Събрани съчинения, III. Прост ранни жития на Кирил и Методиї. Родготвлия за речат Воню Ст. Ангелови Христот Кодов, София, 1973, 127 and 150.*

²⁰¹И.Ф. Оксюк, „Первые столетия христианства на Руси и Латинский Запад“, *Божественные труды*, 28, Москва, 1987, 194. It is suggested that as early as the second half of the 9th century and the early 10th century there was already a "Russian Metropolitanate" in Kievan Russia, which was listed in the catalogue of Emperor Leo VI as item 61, and in the survey of Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus as item 60 in the list of metropolitanates of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch (*ibid.*, 195; M.V. Levchenko, *Очерк истории и русско-византийских отношений*, Москва, 1956, 88). Even Princess Olga, the widow of Prince Igor, was converted to Christianity in the 950s, and there was already a Christian community in Kiev (И.Ф. Оксюк, *op. cit.*, 195). The 967 Bull of Pope John VIII to Boleslav the Czech decrees, among other things, that the religious service in the Bishopric of Prague "should by no means be carried out in conformity with the rites of the Bulgarian or Russian peoples", but in Latin (*ibid.*, 196-197). Some even allow the possibility that some of Cyril and Methodius's disciples might have reached Russia (after their banishment), so it was with their help that Christianity in Kiev took root and stood against the pressure of the pagan reaction. According to Russian chronicles, towards the mid-10th century the Christians in Kiev already had a church of their own, St Elijah the Prophet, where the Christians making the agreement with Byzantium took an oath of faithfully abiding by it, whereas Prince Igor and other delegates took an oath on the hill, where the idol of Perun stood. The "Russian bishop" Adalbert arrived in Kiev in 961 as the representative of Otto I and Pope John VIII, even though he had to leave Russia soon afterwards (*ibid.*, 196-197).

the Moravian Prince Rostislav, for purely political and strategic reasons, they obeyed the order of the Byzantine Emperor Michael III and, on the basis of the vernacular of the Slavs living around Salonika, created a special alphabet (Glagolitic) which was later adopted as the sacral and state script of the Moravian state and church. The foundations were also laid of general Slav education and culture which developed in the subsequent course of history to a great extent as a result of the establishment of Clement's and Naum's Ohrid Literary School in Macedonia, which became the principle literary centre where the largest number and the most important monuments and records of Slavonic literacy and culture have been preserved.²⁰²

The return of Clement and Naum to Macedonia, to the diocese which was still nominally under the jurisdiction of the Roman Church, provided a beneficial ground for the cultivation of Glagolitic literacy as a sacral script consecrated by the Pope and as the direct continuation of the traditions of Cyril and Methodius. Here we must not overlook the reference in Homatian's Life of Clement that Pope Adrian (in Rome) raised Clement "to the bishop's throne", and later appointed Archbishop Methodius "as the bishop of the whole of Illyria and of the Bulgarian people who ruled the land".²⁰³ Only in this way does it become understandable why Clement abandoned the Bulgarian capital almost immediately, in 886, and returned to his diocese, and why as a bishop he maintained contacts only with the Bulgarian state leader and not with the existing Bulgarian Archbishop, the head of the Bulgarian Church. It is in this way that it becomes clear why even after Simeon's reforms in 893, the Ohrid Literary School continued to use Glagolitic as its sacral script, despite the "composed" Cyrillic in Preslav, which brought about certain differences in linguistic and orthographic norms.²⁰⁴

As far as our subject is concerned, of essential significance was the historical fact that in 972 Bulgaria came under the control of the Byzantine Empire, and the territories of the Bulgarian Patriarchate were once again placed under the direct jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch. Only four years later the uprising of the *komitopouloi* in Macedonia broke out, and Samuel established his vast empire in the Balkans with its centre around the Ohrid Literary School. In all probability he proclaimed himself the heir to the Bulgarian crown through the mediation of the Roman Church; he adopted Cyrillic as the state script, but showed tolerance towards the sacral Glagolitic written tradition. It is of essential signifi-

²⁰² *Словенски ракопи си во Македонија*, I-IV, Скопје, 1971-1988; Vangelija Despodova – Lidiija Slaveva, *Македонски средновековни ракопи си*, I, Прилеп, 1988.

²⁰³ Александър Милев, *Житија на св. Климент Охридски*, София, 1961, 128.

²⁰⁴ Вл. аже Конески, „Охридската книжовна школа“, in: *Книга за Климент Охридски*, Скопје, 1966, 69-85; Д-р Вл. аже Ристовски, *Македонскиот народ и македонската писменост*, I, Скопје, 1983, 110-115.

cance that he raised (again with the mediation of the Pope) the Archbishopric of Ohrid to the rank of a patriarchate; being an internationally recognized state, his empire established relations with nearby and more distant countries and peoples.

Of paramount significance was the fact that at the same time when the only Slavic Orthodox state was Samuel's,²⁰⁵ in Old Russia the Russians were converted to Christianity and received Slavonic literacy (988).²⁰⁶ Hence in 1913 the Russian Slavic scholar M.D. Priselkov²⁰⁷ put forward the thesis about the role of the Ohrid Church in the constitution of the Russian church hierarchy. In the person of the said metropolitan John in the story of the canonization of the first Russian saints Boris and Gleb he sees the Ohrid Patriarch John who (later demoted to archbishop) died in 1037. So Blaže Koneski is right when he reminds the reader that Valery Pogorelov wrote that the Old Russian language was more influenced by the Ohrid Literary School than by the school at Preslav.²⁰⁸

These hypotheses have found full justification in the research work of Vladimir Moshin, who has established, on the basis of concrete data from written records, that there were well-developed links between Tsar Samuel and Prince Vladimir I

²⁰⁵We suppose that Samuel's state bore the Bulgarian national appellation because it was presented as a successor to the former Bulgarian empire, which was the necessary condition for receiving international state-constitutional recognition (by the Pope). Yet there is an interesting miniature published by Yeger Oskar (*Bseobicaia ist opia vь чет vьrehь t omahь*, 5-e izdanie, S.-Peterburg, 1896, between pp. 144 and 145), taken from the collection *Evanġel i ski чет i va*, which belonged to Emperor Henry II (1002-1024), from the time when the only Slavic empire was Samuel's Empire (existing up to 1018). This miniature shows, allegorically, four Graces ('countries/peoples') offering gifts of gratitude to the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, dressed in imperial clothes and with imperial crowns on their heads, with clearly written signatures above their heads: *Roma, Gallia, Germania, Sclavinia*. This last Grace (Sclavinia) holds a golden globe in her right hand, which is a symbol of the sun and of light, and points with her left hand towards the sky. It is shown as a blonde girl dressed in white, with characteristic Slavic embroidery around her neck and bosom, and there is a dark-cherry (purple?) cape put over her dress — as a sign of imperial greatness. She wears a crown on her head in the form of a battlemented tower which differs from all other crowns in the miniature (Protogerà Lev Lebedev, *Kрещени e Rusi 988-1988*, Moskva, 1987, 8-10). Can we thus assume that Samuel's state bore the name *Sclavinia* (Sclavinia)?

²⁰⁶Although there are different views concerning the time of the Russians' adoption of Christianity, it is believed that Prince Vladimir I himself was baptized in 988 in Chersonesus (Korsun), and that afterwards the whole of the country was gradually converted to Christianity.

²⁰⁷M.D. Priselkov, „Očerki po serkovno-političeskoà istorii Kievskoà Rusi“, *Zapiski Istoričeskogo fakul'teta S.Pb. uni vьrsiteta*, SPb., 1913, 23-76. We must note, however, that Priselkov's opinion (that the Russian Metropolitanate was dependent on the Archbishopric of Ohrid from the very beginning and that it was as late as 1037, after the death of the Ohrid Archbishop John, that the 'Greek' Metropolitanate of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was established in Kiev) is bluntly rejected (as being unfounded) by a number of researchers (see: M.V. Levčenko, *op. cit.*, 373, etc.; A. Poppe, „Russkije mitropolii Konstantinopolskoà Patriarhii v Nizolozii“, *Византизм и восток*, 28-29, Moskva, 1968-1969; Mitropolit Minski i Beloruski Filaret, „Крещение святаго князя Владимира i Russkoà zemli, *Božoslavski e trudy*, 28, Moskva, 1987, 71, etc.).

²⁰⁸Blaže Koneski, „Kanonizacija na slovenski svetci vo Ohridskata crkva“, *Ppilozi*, MANU, I, 1-2, Skopje, 1976, 63.

at the time of the Russians' conversion to Christianity and the organization of the Slavonic religious service in the Russian church. Moshin says: "In the widespread network of international relations at the time, of particular significance were the relations with the West over the question of the establishment of an independent Patriarchate of Ohrid, on the one hand, and the relations with the other Slav countries, on the other, especially those with the Russian Prince Vladimir at the time of Russia's conversion to Christianity and the organization of the church there."²⁰⁹ Elsewhere Moshin points out that it was from Macedonia that "Slavonic priests with Slavonic books were sent to the Eastern-Slav brothers in Christ".²¹⁰ Relying primarily on the oldest surviving Cyrillic musical document, the Novgorod (Kiprian's) folios, in the words of Dr Sotir Golaboski,²¹¹ Moshin writes: "The Novgorod folios, as a Macedonian text from the end of the 10th century, still carry the tradition of the systematic use of the Greek ephonic notation of the time, and in the Russian Ostromir Gospel, from the mid-11th century, Deacon Gregory uses only the signs written within the text as punctuation, with rare instances of the use of diacritical marks after the example of the Macedonian manuscript in red ink."²¹²

Studying the oldest Russian records and determining their origin, Mikhail N. Speransky had spoken early of their "Bulgarian-Macedonian origin".²¹³ Moshin, however, goes even further, specifying that "the definitive affirmation of the South-Slavic influence on the Russian church coincides with the time of the conversion of Russia to Christianity and is connected with the diplomatic relations between Prince Vladimir and Samuel of Ohrid".²¹⁴

Unfortunately, the relations between Samuel and Vladimir have remained as yet unstudied, as has the entire diplomatic activity of the Ohrid ruler. In connection with our subject, we would like to quote the highly provocative remark of Viktor B. Shklovsky in an interview that "the wife of Vladimir the Great was from Ohrid".²¹⁵ The corroboration of this account may shed more light on the relations between Ohrid and Kiev at the time, as this might have been one of the 'political marriages' of the Kievan Prince. Thus the act of Christianization and the organi-

²⁰⁹Vladi mir Moshin, *Сротени си за средновековната и роновата и сторија на Македонија* (Predgovor), Skopje, 1975, 11.

²¹⁰Vladi mir Moshin, *Словенски ракопи си во Македонија*, 1, Skopje, 1971, 7.

²¹¹D-r Sotir Golaboski, „Moshin za rusko-makedonski tevrski za vreme na pokrstuvaweto na Rusite“, *Kultiprenjivot*, NHHIII, 1-2, Skopje, 1988, 14-16.

²¹²Vladi mir Moshin, „Novgorodskite lichiwa – ostatok od car Samoilov kodeks – inivnata ekfonetskanotacijata“, *Македонска музика*, 5, Skopje, 1983, 13.

²¹³D-r Sotir Golaboski, *op. cit.*, 14.

²¹⁴Vladi mir Moshin, *op. cit.*, 13.

²¹⁵Чедо Cvetkovski, „Razgovor sa Viktorom Borisovičem Šklovskim“, *Okо*, Zagreb, 21.III.1984.

zation of the Russian church, and especially the introduction of Slavonic literacy among the Russians, become more understandable as both state-diplomatic and cultural-civilizational acts. Yet the sources from this period are neither clear nor accurate. Let us pose the following question: when, how and why was there such a ‘political marriage’?

Nikolay M. Karamzin points out that “even before Vladimir, polygamy was not considered illegal in pagan Russia”,²¹⁶ and then goes on to write that this did not stop Vladimir from “manifesting a noble devotion towards the pagan gods”, erecting silver statues of the God Perun and offering blood sacrifice— perhaps to appease his conscience and pacify the gods “irritated by his fratricide”. “But,” Karamzin writes, “this piety of Vladimir’s did not prevent him from sinking into sensual pleasures. His first wife was Rogneda, the mother of Izyaslav, Mstislav, Yaroslav, Vsevolod and of two daughters; having killed his brother, he took his pregnant sister-in-law as a hostage, who gave birth to Svyatopolk; by his second legal wife, a Czech or Bohemian, he had his son Vysheslav; by his third — Svyatoslav and Mstislav; *by his fourth wife, born in Bulgaria — Boris and Gleb*. In addition, if we are to believe the chronicle, he had 300 hostage wives in Vyshegorod, 300 in present-day Belogorotka (near Kiev) and 200 in the village of Berestovo. Every pretty woman or girl was afraid of his passionate eyes; he scorned the sanctity of marriage ties and innocence. In a word, the chronicler calls him the Second Solomon in love of women.”²¹⁷

These data, drawn from Nestor’s chronicle *Повѣстъ вѣременныхъ лѣтъ*²¹⁸ and his *Сказаніе о Борисѣ и Глебѣ*²¹⁹ show that Prince Vladimir indeed had several wives and twelve sons by them; that these wives came from various states and nationalities; that he concluded and broke marriages just as he concluded and broke international accords with various rulers; that his fourth wife was “from Bulgaria”²²⁰ and that he had by her his sons Boris and Gleb, who became **the first Russian saints** in the church history of Russia. Of course, at least from the time of Vladimir’s conversion to Christianity (988) to his death (1015) there was no Bulgarian state or church, but probably it was Samuel’s state that bore that name (even though this question requires more detailed study),²²¹ and in all probability the reference is to that wife of Vladimir’s from Ohrid, to use the words of Shklovsky. When and how did this happen?

²¹⁶N.M. Karanžin, „Istorija gosudarstva Rossijskogo“, Moskva, 2, Moskva, 1988, 120.

²¹⁷*Ibid.*, 121.

²¹⁸*Памятнікі літєратуры древней Руси XI–начало XII века*, Moskva, 1978, 94.

²¹⁹*Ibid.*, 278.

²²⁰In the sources: „ot bogaryni – Borisa i Gleba“ (*Povest*, 94); „otъ bylgarynъ Borisa i Gleba“ (*Sказаніе*, 278).

²²¹See note 205.

There are still no known direct references, but we can draw some conclusions from indirect accounts. According to the Armenian historian of the time, Asohik, Samuel made unsuccessful attempts “at becoming related to Basil”,²²² but failing to do this, in August 986 he attacked Byzantium and, in the battle near Ihtiman, Emperor Basil narrowly escaped, saving his head. Samuel’s enlarged state reached the shores of three seas and his contacts with Kievan Russia were now maintained easily. It is highly probable that the political marriage with Vladimir took place at that time. Engaged in difficult internal strife with Bardas Phocas, Basil II demanded help from Vladimir. Vladimir gave him 6,000 soldiers,²²³ but the Byzantine emperor had to give Princess Anne (Basil’s sister) as a wife to Vladimir, once the latter adopted Christianity. Prince Vladimir fulfilled his promise: he sent his soldiers and in the first months of 988 he was baptized, but the Byzantine emperor failed to abide by the agreement. Then Vladimir surrounded the town of Chersonesus (Korsun) and after a six-month siege captured it and issued an ultimatum to the Byzantine emperor, demanding that he send his sister as Vladimir’s wife. Under pressure from Samuel’s attacks and unrest in Asia Minor, Basil II fulfilled the agreement, and Vladimir married Anne in Chersonesus.²²⁴ Then Vladimir returned the town to Byzantium and went back to Kiev together with his new wife.

Regardless of the fact that the chronology of events is not clear nor sufficiently accurate, it is certain that the conversion to Christianity took place sometime in 988, and with the participation of Constantinople at that. Vladimir Moshin, however, writes that after Vladimir captured Chersonesus, “he sent an envoy to Samuel of Macedonia with a proposal for an alliance and a request for the organization of a Christian church with a Slavonic service. All this was fulfilled by the dispatching of Bishop Leon to Russia, taking the post of Russian Metropolitan, who set off to take up this duty together with many missionaries — priests and deacons — and carrying a large number of Slavonic religious books. The Russian chronicle of the Novgorod prelates of 991 says: ‘The Beatific Vladimir adopted Christianity... and he brought the Metropolitan Leon to Kiev, and Joachim of Korsun to Novgorod’.”²²⁵

This was certainly possible, but probably only after Vladimir’s adoption of Christianity. It is not insignificant that Prince Vladimir assumed the name Basil²²⁶ upon his baptism, and that the metropolitans in Kievan Russia were for a long time appointed by the Patriarchate of Constantinople.²²⁷ But it is still not sufficiently

²²²*Всеобщая історія Сербаноза Таранскаго, Асохі ка ро прозванію*, Москва, 1864, 175.

²²³According to the sources, this ‘Russian’ unit consisted of Varangians.

²²⁴*Памятнікі і історіа цркви древноей Руси XI–начало XII века*, 124–126.

²²⁵*Владимир Мономах*, „Novgorodski tetivčivak...“, 11–12.

²²⁶*Протоиерей Лев Лебедев, op. cit.*, 108.

clear what the relations between the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Archbishopric of Ohrid were like in this period. Ioann Belevcev writes that the new “Russian Orthodox Church was subordinated, in terms of administration, to the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, and in terms of organization was one of the metropolitanates of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.”²²⁸ On the other hand, I.F. Oksiyuk points out that “the wise Prince Vladimir conducted a policy of his own and preferred to remain loyal to his alliance with Byzantium, through unity with the Slavonic Orthodox Archbishopric of Ohrid in Bulgaria”, as the church was still not divided at the time.²²⁹

Another view which deserves attention is the highly disputed opinion of M.D. Priselkov, dating from 1913, that the Russian Church “received its hierarchy not from Constantinople or Rome, but from the Patriarchate of Ohrid”.²³⁰ In connection with this question, Lev Lebedev observes that “enlightenment in Russia started immediately in the Old Church Slavonic language, and that Byzantium sent to Russia, together with Princess Anne, not Greek, but Bulgarian clergy and religious books in the Old Church Slavonic language”.²³¹ Lebedev also says: “there are even views that the Russian Church was canonically, in principle, subordinated to the Bulgarian Church”, although immediately afterwards he adds that “these views are disputable”. This, however, does not prevent him from pointing out that the newly-arrived priests in Russia could have been called “Greek” or “Tsaritza’s” “because of their canonical affiliation with the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and not in terms of their nationality”. In conclusion he writes: “Joachim’s chronicle and some hagiographies of Prince Vladimir say that the newcomer to Chersonesus and administrator of Russia’s conversion to Christianity, the Metropolitan Michael, was a Bulgarian, whereas in the Nikon chronicle he is called a Syrian, and in other sources — a Greek. But probably in the right are those who believe that he was a Bulgarian”.²³²

The ‘Short survey’ of the *Xistopy ođthe Russian Opthodoų Lłhupch*, an official publication of the Patriarchate of Moscow, also confirms the fact that “teachers of the Christian faith who had a good command of the Old Church Slavonic language” were invited by Prince Vladimir “from Korsun and the Balkan lands”, and thus

²²⁷The Russian church was dependent on Constantinople as late as 1448 (P r o t o i e r e à I o a n n B e l e v c e v, „O b r a z o v a n i e R u s s k o i à p r a v o s l a v n o à c e r k v i “, *Božosl ovski e t p u d b i*, 28, 1987, 84).

²²⁸*Ibid.*, 83.

²²⁹I . F . O k s i y u k, *op. cit.*, 201.

²³⁰B l a ž e K o n e s k i, „K a n o n i z a c i j a n a s l o v e n s k i s v e t c i v o O h r i d s k a t a c r k v a“, 63; M . D . P r i s e l k o v, *op. cit.*, 109.

²³¹P r o t o i e r e à L e v L e b e d e v, *op. cit.*, 109.

²³²*Ibid.*, 159.

“established sound foundations for the development of the Russian Church”. Furthermore, the following is admitted from the most official instance: “Modern historiographic data allow us to believe that the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Ohrid, the Bulgarian, was accepted under Prince Vladimir.” Here it is not so important that the authors call the Patriarch of Ohrid a ‘Bulgarian’, as this indeed was a part of his title (a historical relic), but it is much more important that there is another confirmation below: “In 1037, under Yaroslav Vladimirovich (the Wise), owing to the vacancy of the Bulgarian Patriarchate, the Russian Church came under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as one of its Metropolitanates.”²³³

Thus at the time of Tsar Samuel the diocese of the Archbishopric/Patriarchate of Ohrid included the Russian church (even after the conquest of Macedonia by the Byzantine Emperor Basil II). The demotion of the Patriarchate of Ohrid to the rank of archbishopric, and in particular the vacancy of the Ohrid see, was used to incorporate the Russian church under the direct jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. If we do not know precisely when the jurisdiction of Ohrid over Kiev was extended, it has been firmly established that its jurisdiction was revoked in 1037. This means that the relations between Macedonia and Russia were very strong and comprehensive for about four decades. Vladimir’s marriage with the woman coming from Samuel’s court in Ohrid could only facilitate and encourage these relations.

In conclusion, there is no doubt that Slavonic literacy was brought to Russia through the Archbishopric of Ohrid, because it was impossible to bring it from any other place at that time. The influence must have been strong even later, but it was prominent from the very beginning. Ioann Belevcev writes: “The conversion of Russia to Christianity — it was the day of the birth of the Russian Orthodox Church, for whose establishment all the necessary conditions were fulfilled: a large flock was formed, bishops from Byzantium appeared here headed by the metropolitan, priests came from Bulgaria with religious books in the Slavonic language, churches were built, religious schools were opened.”²³⁴

Examining the religious and educational activity of the missionaries and the Novgorod School of Russian literacy, where precisely this ‘adaptation’ of South-Slavonic manuscripts into the North-Russian variant was carried out, and analysing Speransky’s arguments concerning the two Novgorod copies of the South-Slavonic Psalter (the Evgenii, 11th century, and the Tolstov, 11th or early 12th century), Vladimir Moshin concludes that “palaeographic linguistic and orthographic analysis has undoubtedly established the origin of their example as being the Ohrid-Macedonian literary school. This analysis also confirms the Macedo-

²³³*Русская Православная Церковь, Издания Московского Патриархата, Москва, 1980, 9-10.*

²³⁴Professor protoiereà Ioann Belevcev, *op. cit.*, 78.

nian origin of the Novgorod folios, which are thought to be the remainder of a Macedonian imperial codex from the late 10th century, which in 991 was sent together with Joachim of Korsun to Novgorod and there, towards the mid-11th century, helped the deacon Gregory and his associate in the preparation of the Ostromir Gospel”.²³⁵

Блаже Конески quotes other examples illustrating the Macedonian influence on old Russian literacy. He points to Ohrid as the first religious and cultural centre of the southern and eastern Slavs at the time of Clement’s Ohrid Literary School, whose activity became particularly strong during the time of Tsar Samuel, when the Patriarchate of Ohrid was instituted with the help of Rome (it is not incidental that the frescoes in the Church of St Sophia in Ohrid include the portraits of six Roman popes,²³⁶ which is a unique case in Slavonic fresco-painting), when, at least according to tradition, there was already the Zograph Monastery on Mount Athos, founded by Samuel, as the first Slavonic monastery in the “Monastic republic”.²³⁷ This was undoubtedly the second religious and cultural centre in the Slavic Balkan south, which was also significant because of its relations with Russia and Russian literacy. The Russian *skite* monastery of Ksilurg (Kylourgos) was built there (sometime after 1016) “which is traditionally connected with Yaroslav the Wise, and even with Prince Vladimir”.²³⁸ Considerably later, in 1169, the second Russian monastery, St Panteleimon, was founded on Mount Athos, and it was as late as 1198, after the strengthening of the Serbian state in the Balkans, that the Serbian monastery of Chilandar was founded. This established an entire Slavonic Orthodox community maintaining all kinds of contacts which were not limited only to the areas of religion and culture. After the collapse of Samuel’s state, the reputation

²³⁵According to D-r Sotir Golaboski, *op. cit.*, 15; Vladi mir Momini, „Novgorodski listi hi i Ostromirovo jevanĝeje“, *Apheozpafski ppi lozi*, 5, Beograd, 1983, 7-14; Vangelija Despodova – Lidija Slaveva, *op. cit.*, I, 62. There is an interesting view proposed by Cvetan Grozdanov (Cvetan Grozdanov, „Ornamentikata narascvetanilija vo umetnostana Ohridvo HI-HII vek“, *Lihui d*, 6, Ohrid, 1988, 11-20)) that the ornamentation of blossom and leaves could be a relevant element in the determination of monuments and records, but only as a possibility, without specific answers. The absence of such ornamentation is still not a proof that it was not present in Ohrid during Samuel’s rule, especially when we know that Cyrillic was the state script in his state as well, and yet there is no surviving document from that time.

²³⁶Petar Miqković-Pepek, „Materijali za makedonskata srednovekovna umetnost. Freskite vo svetilnistetona crkvata Sv. Sofija vo Ohrid“, in: *Zbornik na Arheol oshki ot muzej*, Skopje, 1956, 22, tabl i HH-HHI.

²³⁷Блаже Конески, „Sveta Gora i staroslavenski terakopisi“, in: *Kliment Ohridski i ulozata na Ohridskata knjevna shkola vo razvitokot na slovenskata prosveata*. Materijali od nauchensobir odrgan vo Ohrid od 25 do 27 septemvri 1986 godina, MANU, Skopje, 1989, 97; Блаже Конески, „O Marijinskom jevanĝeju“, *Juznoslovenski filoloz*, HLI, Beograd, 1986, 68; Йорданъ I вановъ, *Български стари ни и зъ Македония*, Sofija, 1931, 537-546.

²³⁸Блаже Конески, „Sveta Gora i staroslavenski terakopisi“, 97; Vladi mir Momini, „Russki ena Afone i rusko-vizantijski etnonimeni я v HI-HII vv.“, *Byzantinoslavica*, IH, 1947, 57.

of the Russian monastery of Ksilurg grew substantially as it enjoyed the support (material and political) of the by now powerful Principality of Kiev.²³⁹ This was already a period of reciprocal Russian influence in the Slavic south, although earlier links in the areas of language and orthography continued. A well-known historical situation was gradually created where Glagolitic records were being transliterated into Cyrillic, and, as these were mostly from Macedonia, they exerted a significant influence as basic patterns in the establishment of the Old Church Slavonic standard, which was to become the general Slavonic literary standard in the East Orthodox Slavonic world over the coming centuries.

In several of his works, Блаже Koneski points to the presence of monks from Macedonia in the Russian monastery of Ksilurg, and also to the fact that the monks of Mount Athos had closer contacts with the Sinai monastery of St Catherine — starting from the earliest centuries. Koneski quotes the example of the arrival of the Serbian religious figure and educator St Sava at the same time as the Georgian poet Shota Rustaveli was staying in the monastery. Such “monastic itineraries” were still frequent in the subsequent centuries; hence it is no chance that we find Hristofor Жѣfarович from Dojran there in the 18th century, and the first Macedonian printer, in the 19th century, Teodosija Sinaitski, was even the abbot of St Catherine’s Monastery on Sinai (from which he received his surname).²⁴⁰

Accordingly, Sinai was another centre of mutual Slavonic contacts — not only in the spiritual sphere — lying relatively close to Mount Athos, i.e. to the Macedonian cultural region. In the course of time many Russian manuscripts came to the monastery libraries on Mount Athos, which certainly exerted an influence on the writing activity in the Macedonian cultural and literary centres. This closeness between Russia and Mount Athos is also confirmed by the fact that the Monastery of the Annunciation (*Благовѣщенскы*) near Bialystok was built in the late 15th century for monks coming from Mount Athos.²⁴¹

There are already serious research works dealing with the Russian influence on South-Slavonic texts from the 12th to 14th century. In Macedonia it is once again Блаже Koneski who pays special attention to this question. He points not only to the attractiveness of Mount Athos for Russian monks when the Russian state was still powerful, but also to the large-scale forced emigration of monks and literate Russians following the Tartar invasion in the first half of the 13th century. There were Russian monks who came not only to the court of Stephen (Stefan) Nemanja and his funeral on Mount Athos, but they were to be found in what was

²³⁹Bl a же Koneski , „O Mar i ji nskom jevan ђeq u“, 69.

²⁴⁰Bl a же Koneski , „Svet a Gor a i star osl ovenski t e r akopi si“, 99.

²⁴¹*Ibid.*, 100; G I I Ь i nskià, „Значение Аф она въ i st or ii sl авянской рi същности“, *Журнал ъ МНП*, HI, SP b., 1908, 14-15.

then Sredec and in eastern Macedonia, in the already well-developed literary and transcription centre in the monastery of Lesnovo. The Kratovo hagiography of St Gabriel (Gavril) of Lesnovo from the Stanislav Prologue (1330), and also a longer text dealing with the life of this saint in a late transcription (1868), even though referring to tradition, speak of migrants from Russia to the monastic environment who “could have also contributed to the spreading of Russian influence on South-Slavonic literacy at a period when there was need to fill the stock of books in South-Slavonic lands”.²⁴² Koneski demonstrates this in a highly illustrative manner by quoting examples drawn from the Macedonian Gospel of Priest John (Pop Jovan) and from the Stanislav Prologue.²⁴³

Finally, the specific cult of saints is not without significance for the Slavonic cultural affirmation. There is a vast and representative gallery of Slavonic saints from Macedonia — in the period between the 9th and 18th centuries.²⁴⁴ In this respect, of particular interest is the canonization of the first Russian saints Boris and Gleb. M.D. Priselkov points out very early that Metropolitan John, who is mentioned in the story of the canonization of these first Russian saints, was actually the Ohrid Patriarch (later Archbishop) John (of Debar) who “also came to Russia in the line of duty”.²⁴⁵ All this makes us re-think some aspects of Macedonian-Russian relations in the 10th and 11th centuries.

First of all, it is striking that Prince Vladimir’s sons by his “Bulgarian wife” from Ohrid bore the Christian names Roman (Boris) and David (Gleb),²⁴⁶ and these were names taken directly from Samuel’s family, perhaps on the insistence of the children’s mother. Thus, in the light of this fact, it now becomes more clear why Metropolitan John was present at their canonization after their death, when they were killed by Svyatopolk — the son of Yaropolk and the Greek nun — who was full of hatred towards Vladimir I because he had killed Svyatopolk’s father (his own brother) and taken his pregnant widow as a hostage.²⁴⁷ It would certainly not be insignificant (if supported by additional historical facts) that the first Russian saints were related by blood with Ohrid and Samuel, and spiritually with the Ohrid church as a Slavonic (and already Orthodox) church.

²⁴²Bl аже Koneski, „Za ruskoto vlijanije v z južnoslovenskite tekstovi od IIII-IV vek“, in: *Opuscula Bulono-Slavica. Minera linguistica Stanislao Urbanzyuk dedicata*, Wrocław, 1979, 176.

²⁴³*Ibid.*, 176-177; Bl аже Koneski, „Ruskoto jazično vlijanije v z makedonskite tekstovi od IIII-IV vek“, in: *Referat i na makedonskite slavisti za IX mežnarodен slavistički kongres vo Kieв*, Skopje, 1983, 25-28.

²⁴⁴Cvetan Gozdanov, *Portret i na svetite elite od Makedonija od IX-XVIII vek*, Skopje, 1983.

²⁴⁵Bl аже Koneski, „Kanoni zacija na slovenski svetci vo Ohridskata crkva“, 63 — according to M.D. Priselkov, „Očerki ...“, 39-43.

²⁴⁶*Памят никелитерат иры древней Руси XI-начало XII века*, 280 and 454.

²⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 88-94.

Making certain comparisons within the general Christian history may also be relevant for our subject. For instance, St Clement of Ohrid is not only connected with the character of the activity of the Apostle Paul — who spread Christianity in Macedonia — but links may also be traced back to the Apostle Peter — through the activity of his brother, the Apostle Andrew.

It is known that the Macedonian tradition abundantly uses the Apostle Andrew not only in written monuments, but also in sacral places of historical interest. We now know that Naum of Ohrid wrote a service for the Apostle Andrew,²⁴⁸ and we cannot forget that Cyril and Methodius served a liturgy in the Slavonic language in the Church of St Andrew in Rome.²⁴⁹ This is also reflected in the oldest fresco-paintings in Macedonia. For example, in the 13th-century Ohrid Church of the Holy Mother of God Peribleptos (Sv. Bogorodica Perivlepta, Sv. Kliment Novi), on the right side of the altar, the Apostle Peter is depicted as supporting Christ's Church on his shoulder; beside him is his brother, the Apostle Andrew (opposite the frescoes on the other side of the altar), and there are the figures of the Ohrid Archbishop Constantine Kablilas (as a counterpart to the Apostle Peter) and of St Clement of Ohrid (as a counterpart to the Apostle Andrew), emphasizing the significance of those who were active in Ohrid, and strengthening the early Christian heritage and tradition in Macedonia.²⁵⁰

That the cult of St Andrew was also alive in Macedonia in the course of the ensuing centuries is shown by the Church of St Andrew (Sv. Andreja) near Matka, erected by Andrejаш— King Mark's brother — in the 14th century.²⁵¹

According to tradition, however, the Apostle Andrew spread Christianity not only in Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly and other regions of present-day Greece, where he was crucified, but he also appointed the first bishop of Constantinople, as a result of which his relics were moved to this city in the 4th century.²⁵² Yet it is of particular importance for us that, according to *Пъвет времьнух лет*, the Apostle Andrew preached on the shores of the Black Sea, in Sinope (Sinop) and Chersonesus (Korsun), along the Dnieper up to the location of the subsequent Kiev, and “he came to the Slavs, where Novgorod now stands”, in order to arrive in Rome, where he spoke of his achievements, and then returned to Sinope. This account of

²⁴⁸Stefan Kожуharov, „Pesennoto tvorcestvo na starobългарски knižovnik Naum Ohridski“, *Liternata i storija*, 12, Sofia, 1984, 3-19.

²⁴⁹Kliment Ohridski, *Събрани съчинения*, III, 140.

²⁵⁰Blaze Koneski, „Kulturna svetitelitelislovenskatekulturena afirmacija“, *Pilozima*, MANU, OLLN, H, 2, Skopje, 1985, 7; Cvetan Grdzanov, *Poptpetina seetitelite od Makedonija*, 53-54.

²⁵¹Cvetan Grdzanov, *op. cit.*, 86-87.

²⁵²Blaze Koneski, „Kulturna svetitelitelite...“, 6.

Nestor's has been the object of recurrent debates over the past centuries, and special attention was paid to this question at the International Scholarly Church Conference in Kiev held July 21-28, 1986. In his extensive discussion entitled *Установление християнства на Руси*, the Metropolitan of Minsk and Belorussia, Philaret, quoted new information which indicates that the Apostle Andrew did indeed preach on Russian soil, introducing Christianity at the time of its inception.

Of course, it is now very difficult for serious scholars to rely on such arguments, but tradition has nourished certain ideas among the people for centuries, creating cults which have played an important part in history. Therefore it was not mere chance that as early as the 11th century the grandson of Prince Vladimir received the name of the Apostle Andrew as his Christian name, while at the time there were at least three shrines in Russia (in Kiev, Pereyaslav and Novgorod) bearing the name of this apostle.²⁵³ Hence these words ascribed to Ivan the Terrible may become more understandable: "We received the Christian faith at the commencement of the Christian church, when Andrew, the brother of the Apostle Peter, came to these regions on his way to Rome; in this manner we in Moscow received the Christian faith at the same time as you did in Italy and since then we have kept it sacrosanct."²⁵⁴

Accordingly, it was not only Cyril and Methodius, and Clement and Naum, connecting the Southern Slavs and the Russians by way of their cults. In many respects, Macedonia was the focus of Slavonic literacy and Christian culture, and its more comprehensive and more profound study may open new horizons to scholars in getting to know the ancient history of Slavonic culture and its civilization better.

But while we are still on the ground of Macedonian-Russian contacts at that important period of development, we must also mention the relatively little known Cyril's Church in Kiev, built and painted in the 1170s with the participation of fresco-painters from Macedonia as well. The ensemble of frescoes in the northern apse, in the words of N.B. Sal'ko, are "closely connected with the South-Slavonic fresco-painting school in the Balkans".²⁵⁵ In fact, this composition in Cyril's Church consists **solely** of "Macedonian saints", including Cyril and Methodius, Clement of Ohrid, John of Macedonia and Joseph of Salonika.²⁵⁶ The citizens of

²⁵³*Ibid.*, 36.

²⁵⁴Ві аже Копескі, „Кул то т на свєт і тєл і тє...“, 8 — according to D.S. Лї начєв, *Насї онал њное самознанїє дрєвнєй Русї*, М.-Л., 1945, 100.

²⁵⁵N.B. Сал њко, *Жї ворї сь Дрєвнєй Русї XI-начал о XIII вєка. Мозаї кї – Фрескї – Иконь*, Лени нград, 1982, 105-109. The author underlines: "In the 1170s the church walls were covered by frescoes. A clearer figure of Archangel Michael was depicted in the northern apse, and in the three zones there are the figures of twenty-five Balkan saints" (108-109).

Kiev called this apse *Македонскиј зал* (Macedonian Hall) for centuries, but when we visited this church in 1983 there was a sign reading *Балканскиј зал* (Balkan Hall), and the chief guide explained it to us as *Болгарскиј зал* (Bulgarian Hall). This is just another example how some realities have been revised over time which now obscure our perspective of the past!

Unfortunately the fresco-paintings in Cyril's Church have still not been fully studied and presented to the public, and its significance is yet to be assessed in a scholarly manner, particularly from the aspect of Macedonian-Russian and Macedonian-Ukrainian cultural links.

One thing is, however, certain: the Russian and especially the Ukrainian people maintained an extremely clearly defined awareness of Macedonia, and also of the Macedonians, which was reflected in their rich epic folklore — in Ukrainian words which can still be heard accompanied by the bandora.²⁵⁷ Of special significance in this respect was the formation of hussar regiments in Ukraine, which included the Macedonian Regiment in the 18th century, reflected in the toponomastics of a fairly wide belt in Ukraine up to the present day.²⁵⁸

The links of Ohrid and Mount Athos with Kiev, Novgorod, Vladimir, Suzdal, Zagorsk and Moscow were maintained without interruption for centuries. It was not by chance that in 1905, in his journal *Вардар* Krste P. Misirkov singled out the role of Slavonic studies in the identification of the Macedonians and the national awakening in Macedonia,²⁵⁹ and the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg, as early as its second session, on December 29, 1902, with a visibly strong enthusiasm in thought and action, passed a protocolar decision to work on the writing of a parallel four-language dictionary, with a view to informing the Russian public not only that Macedonian was an individual Slavonic language, but also that it was even closer to Russian than to Serbian or Bulgarian.²⁶⁰

With these few extracts from the history of Macedonian-Russian links and relations in the early mediaeval period we only wish to point to the significance Macedonia had in the history of the Russian church, of the Russian state and in

²⁵⁶D-r Kost a Balabanov, „Ki evska Rusi ja i kulturni te centri vo Makedoni ja vo HI i HII vek. Kultot na slovanski te prosvetiteli Kiril i Metodi ja i ni vni te ucheni ci“, *Gl asni k na УНЕСКО*, HHHV, April, 1982, 40.

²⁵⁷The versified speech of the Zaporozhians to the Turkish Sultan of 1679, among other things, mentions *македонски ѝ кол есни к* (Vol odomi r Gol obovcъki, *Готи н, зоти н ро дїбрави*, Ki iv, 1968, 174).

²⁵⁸Al eksandar Matkovski, *Македонски от пол к во Украї на*, Skorje, 1985.

²⁵⁹K. Mi si rkov, „I zni knuvain'et o i razbor na bugar ckat a i sr pcka teor i ii za nar odnost a na mak'edonci te“, *Вардар*, I, 1, Odesa, 1.IH.1905, 8-16.

²⁶⁰D-r Bl a же Ri stovski, *Di mi t pi ja Чировски (1878-1940) i Македонскот о научно-лит ерат ирно друшарст во во Пет роград. При лоzi кон проочивавет о на македонско-руски те рски i развїт okot на македонскат а насї онал на ми сл а*, I, Skorje, 1978, 202.

particular, of Russian literacy and culture. All this resulted in the establishment of a common standard of all Orthodox Slavs, which, with negligible variations, was long cultivated in the churches and monasteries, and not only there. This, in turn, can only help and facilitate the understanding of the role Russia played in the historical evolution and cultural development of Macedonia in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Alexander of Macedon in the Historical Consciousness of the Macedonians in the 19th and 20th Centuries

The essential question of the historical consciousness of the Macedonians has as yet been insufficiently studied from a scholarly point of view.²⁶¹ Still less has it been studied in terms of the consciousness of Macedonian writers, particularly in the 19th century. Yet in the development of the historical consciousness which was built among the Macedonian people there appeared two tendencies of fundamental importance which ultimately merged into a single idea of the historical past of Macedonia and which moulded Macedonian national consciousness: the ancient **Macedonian** and the more recent **Slavonic** tradition. The first was handed down chiefly by oral tradition and was sustained indirectly or by way of external factors, amply drawing on various manuscripts and, later, printed texts dealing with the ancient Macedonian rulers, in particular those dealing with Alexander of Macedon (circulating at certain periods outside the institutions of the church) and mainly covering the period until the arrival of the Slavs. The second (Slavonic) tradition reflected the Slavic period; it spread and was maintained mainly through the churches and monasteries (in written form, but also by oral tradition and folklore), presenting the historical past of the Slavs through outstanding figures and significant events (Cyril and Methodius, Clement and Naum, Samuel and Mark; Ohrid, Prilep, Belasica, Marica, etc.).

Although chronologically of later date, it is interesting that Bulgarian and Serbian mediaeval state traditions in Macedonia were much less common. In fact, it was only as late as the 18th century, chiefly under external influence, via personal contacts and writings, that certain folk-coloured tendencies of Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian folk traditions began to penetrate Macedonia. This was the period of the initiation of modern historiographic thought in these regions: the history of Jovan Rajiћ,²⁶² and even that of Paissius of Chilandar (Paisij Hilendarski),²⁶³ were

²⁶¹В. Ристовски, „Формированието и афирмацията на историческата мисъл на македонците в XIX и XX век (в контекста на балканските отношения)“, *Документи V-го международного конгреса по иследованието на югоизточната Европа...*, Скопје, 27-30.

²⁶²И. Раичић, *История разных славянских народов на берегах Балгарь, Харватовъ и Сербовъ...*, I-IV, Вѣдѣнѣ, 1794-1795.

²⁶³*История славяноболгарская. Собрана и наредена Паисиемъ Иеротонахотъ въ лѣтъ 1762. Стѣпани за речатъ по рѣчь вообщи за Йор. Ивановъ, София, 1914.*

already creating ideas which were to have a significant role in subsequent developments; the *stemmaōzaphiae* (particularly that of Hristofor Жефарович)²⁶⁴ revived powerful symbols, while the swift development of cartography delineated ethnic territories which, together with the Macedonian tradition, gradually outlined the historical, cultural and geographic features of Macedonia.²⁶⁵

The beginning of the 19th century, however, saw Macedonia with the process of building an awareness of its own ethno-cultural physiognomy uncompleted and, moreover, without a single and generally accepted appellation of the people. At the same time, oral folk tradition constantly handed down reminiscences of the Macedonian historical past. The printing of the Slavonic versions of the history of Alexander of Macedon²⁶⁶ **further intensified the development of the Macedonian mythology which evolved side by side with the awakening of interest in printed books.**

Among the external factors, of particular importance were European scholars who encouraged a strong awareness of ancient Macedonia with a gradual but notable tendency towards ideas of the 'Slavonic character' of its population. This was particularly the case with the disciplines of history, geography, ethnography, philology and cartography. Illyrian ideology and Balkan heraldry differentiated the Macedonian coat of arms,²⁶⁷ and the formation of the Macedonian Hussar Regiment in Ukraine clearly set the Macedonians apart as a distinct Slavic ethnicity.²⁶⁸

The struggle against Phanariote supremacy encouraged exploration of the history of the Archbishopric of Ohrid and of the Slavic past. Macedonian aspirations towards writing in their native tongue cleared the way towards the study and

²⁶⁴Hristofor Жефарович, *Стема ография...*, Виџна, 1741.

²⁶⁵H. Andonov-Poljanski, „Makedonija vo karti (Od zbirkata na Britanski ot muzeji of icijalni ot Arhiv na Velika Britanija, 1491-1958)“, *Glasi i k*, II, 1, I NI, Skopje, 1965, 343-422; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, *Makedonski ot narod i makedonskat a nacija. Pri lozi za razviti okot na makedonskat a kult urno-nacijonalna misla*, I, Skopje, 1983, 70-71; Ilija Petrusevski, „Makedonija na karti od poznati kartografi“, *Kult urni život*, HHVII, 3, Skopje, 1982, 23-25; Ilija Petrusevski, „Kartata na Makedonija od 1791 godina“, *Kult urni život*, HHVIII, 4-5, Skopje, 1983, 31-33; *Makedonija na stari mapi*. Podgotvil Ilija Petrusevski, Det skaradost – Makedonija, Skopje, 1992.

²⁶⁶*Istoria na veliki Aleksandra makedonsca...* Prevede ot Grčki Karlovski Slavonovskijarski učitel Hristo P. Vasiljev Protoporovič ot Karlovo, Velgrad, 1844 (reprinted in 1851 and 1867); Vera Antić, *Od srednovekovna kniževnost*, Skopje, 1976, 148-161; Aleksandar Matkovski, *Ot ropot vo Makedonija vo vretet o na turskot ovladeewe*, II, Skopje, 1983, 132-137.

²⁶⁷D-r Aleksandar Matkovski, *Srbovite na Makedonija (Pri loz kon makedonskat a heraldika)*, Skopje, 1970.

²⁶⁸Aleksandar Matkovski, *Makedonski ot polk vo Ukraini*, Skopje, 1985.

understanding of Slavonic literacy, literature and culture, which were determined by scholarship to have originated from Macedonia, and the borders within which this language was spoken were gradually defined.²⁶⁹

The social, political and confessional status of the Macedonian people in Shariyah Turkey further reinforced the contrast between the oppressed *paуa* and *kaupins*, on the one hand, and the “true-believing” aghas and beys, on the other. This in turn aroused interest in the question and history of the Ottoman conquest of Macedonia, and animated the cult of King Mark’s kingdom in oral folklore. It was in the spirit of this mythology (developing not without outside influences) that Philip and Alexander of Macedon were presented as Slavs (also encouraged by the subsequent mystifications by Jovan Gologanov²⁷⁰ and Stefan Verkovich).²⁷¹ All this merged with the representations of Samuel, Strez, Volkain and Mark, and was naturally connected with the *ajduks* and comitadjis, who had already been fighting for freedom.

This process became particularly apparent from the 1840s onwards. It was not by chance that Ѓorѓija Makedonski, a teacher from the village of Radibuц in the Kriva Palanka region, said: “I learnt the Slavonic script from my father, Dimitrija Makedonski [Macedonian], who calls himself so because we are Macedonians, and not Greeks. [...] I also took the surname of Makedonski, and not that of my father or grandfather, so that it may be known that we are Slavs from Macedonia.”²⁷² The priest Dimitrija from the same region spoke in like manner in 1848: “Mr Mihail Makedonski was the one who interceded most in favour of my appointment, because I am a Macedonian by birth and hold the services in Slavonic. Such was the fate of my fatherland Macedonia, to suffer from the Greeks,

²⁶⁹Krste P. Misirkov saw these processes and explained them in his article „I zni knuvain’eto i razbor na bugarskata i srpska teorija za narodnosta na mak’edoncite“, *Вардар*, I, 1, Odesa, 1.II.1905, 8-16; D-r Blazhe Ristovski, „Вардар“. *Научно-литературно и ориентално-венополитичко списание на К.П. Мисирков*, I MJ, Posebni izdanija kn. 4, Skopje, 1996 (photographically reproduced edition).

²⁷⁰Gane Todorovski, „Osmi sluvawe namitot (Zamistifkacite na narodni pesni vo Makedonija)“, *Razladi*, III (III), 10, Skopje, 1961, 955-958; Gane Todorovski, „Jovan Gologanovi, Veda Slovena“, *Современост*, VII, 1, Skopje, 1967, 63; Gane Todorovski, *Веда Словена*, Skopje, 1979.

²⁷¹Ivan D. Šišmanov, „Franskata nauka i Veda Slovena“. S osoben ogledek kьmkritikatana Lui Leže (Stranici izistorijata na bьlgarskata folkloristika“, in: *Избрани съчинения*, II. Pod redakcijata na Georgi Dimov, Sofia, 1966, 216-269; Mihail Arnaudov, *Верковичи Веда Словена. Принос кьтistorijata na бьlgarskiya folklor i na бьlgarskotovъзраждане в Македонија s neizvestni pri smi, dokladi i drugi dokumenti ot 1855 do 1893 г.*, SбNUN, LI, Sofia, 1968; *Документ и за бьlgarskotovъзраждане от Стефан И. Верковичи 1860-1893. Съставили i podgotvili za речат Dari na Veleva i n.s. Trifon Velov pod redakcijata i spredgovor ot чл.-кор. Hristo A. Hristov*, Sofia, 1969.

²⁷²*Документ и за борбата на македонскиот народ за samost oјnost i zana si она на држава*, I, Skopje, 1981, 182.

dispute with the Greek as to whose Macedonia was, on the basis of Alexander's coins (August 19, 1865).²⁸⁰

The Bulgarian national figure and writer, Petko Račev Slavejkov, in his well-known article 'The Macedonian Question' (January 18, 1871), states with authority: "We have heard many a time from Macedonists that they are not Bulgarians but Macedonians, descendants of the ancient Macedonians, and we have always waited to hear some proof, but we have never heard it. Macedonists have never even explained the grounds for their view. They insist on their Macedonian provenance which they can never properly substantiate. [...] If the ancient Macedonians lived in this same territory, why should not its present-day inhabitants be of Macedonian blood? *They are complete Macedonians*, conclude the Macedonists, relieved by their great discovery."²⁸¹ Replying to Slavejkov, in an article with a similar title, 'On the Macedonian Question' (February 16, 1871), Dimitar V. Makedonski, among other things, writes: "The Macedonians have not disappeared from the face of the earth as some people allow themselves to claim, because, as far as we know, they have never sinned so greatly that the earth may have gaped open and swallowed them."²⁸²

This was an ideology which indeed fascinated Pulevski's generation and inspired the insurgents of the Macedonian Kresna Uprising (1878-1879); it was not foreign to the Ilinden revolutionaries either, and continued to be popular even in the 20th century. In the circumstances, national romanticism proved highly beneficial for Macedonia. Every layer of society was affected in some way and to a greater or lesser degree.

We shall here quote an illustrative example from the writings of Jovan Draganić, Serbian Professor of the Military Academy. In 1871, in Belgrade, he published a textbook entitled *Geography for Secondary Schools*, where he describes in great detail and most specifically the history and ethnic borders of Macedonia, including the ethno-cultural and linguistic characteristics of the Macedonian Slavs. Draganić underlines that "the Macedonians are the oldest Slavs on this Illyrian peninsula, and perhaps in Europe",²⁸³ and that "even now they have a distinct character and remain in the middle between the Bulgarians and Serbs" as "a separate Slavic group",²⁸⁴ with a distinct language and history;

²⁷⁹Документ и за бъл гарскот о възраждане..., 152.

²⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 182

²⁸¹В аже Koneski, *op. cit.*, 74-75.

²⁸²D.V. Makedonskià, „P o makedonskыà вьрг о сь“, *Македония*, V, 7, С арг адь, 16.II.1871.

²⁸³Dr agashevi h, *Географи ја за спедве школ е*. Преглед а и одобрил а школ ска коми си ја, у Београду у Др жавној шт апар и ји, 1871, 127-128.

²⁸⁴*Ibid.*

then he gives an elaborate account of the history of Philip and Alexander of Macedon.²⁸⁵

In the beginning of the following year, 1872, in Svetozar Marković's journal *Раџник* (Worker), a bitter debate began concerning this text dealing with the Macedonians. Professor Svetislav Niketiћ strongly opposed Draganiћ, emphasizing that the prospects of the Serbian idea for expansion to the south were thus being undermined and that what Draganiћ had written was not true. Draganiћ's reply is very important for us, because, among other things, he says: "I do not even believe your mistakes if I indeed did not know or do not know whether the Macedonians are a separate Slavic group. But, Sir, I have not sucked this out of my finger, but for each word I have asked people who actually know more than you and me."²⁸⁶

Who were these people in Belgrade who "knew more" at that time? We believe that it is not far from the truth if we assume that they could be the future ideologists and chief activists of the Kresna Uprising and of the Macedonian League. Special legions were also formed at that time in Belgrade, where the Macedonians had special tasks as part of Serbia's longer-term plans for the future of the Balkans. Among those who were active there were Dimitar Popgeorgiev Berovski, Iljo Markov, Ѓorѓija Pulevski, Stojan Vezenkov, Spiro Crne and others who expressed Macedonian aspirations.

It was then, in 1874, that Pulevski prepared his *Дикционару оѢѢрѢе ЛанѢиаѢес*, which was published in Belgrade in 1875, where the author very clearly stated that "Our fatherland's name is Macedonia and we call ourselves Macedonians",²⁸⁷ and that "the Macedonians, too, are a people and their place is Macedonia",²⁸⁸ that "Macedonia was praised at the time of Emperor Alexander the Great",²⁸⁹ and also that "the Macedonian language is most closely related to Church-Slavonic books, and it is Old Church Slavonic", and that hence we "call ourselves Old Slavs".²⁹⁰

This was the voice of the Macedonians themselves which Draganiћ had to respect. It is not surprising that at that time, in connection with Pulevski's dictionary, Ivan Aksakov writes: "Mr Pulevski's dictionary is of great interest in one's becoming acquainted with the language of the Macedonian population which

²⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 114.

²⁸⁶Dr Kliment Ѓambazovski, „Srpska socijalistiћka ииамра о makedonskom nacionalnom pitanju poslednjih decenija 1911 века“, in: *Почеси socijalistiћке ииамре на Балкани*. Међunarodni научни skup posveћен stogodиnjici izlaska „Radenika“, Beograd, 1974, 418.

²⁸⁷Ђорђе М. Пуевски, *Речни к от т ри јези ка с. македонски, арбански и т ирски*, кwi га II, u Beogradu, 1875, 62.

²⁸⁸*Ibid.*, 49.

²⁸⁹*Ibid.*, 67.

²⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 40 and 42.

the Serbs so tenaciously make a part of the Serbian people. In general, we should say that, for Slavic scholars, Macedonia is — if we can use that expression — an unknown land which awaits its explorers.”²⁹¹ Only if we bear in mind this reasoning of Aksakov’s can we understand his address to the Macedonians in Moscow: “Why should you not choose your Macedonian dialect as a literary language, which is richer than Bulgarian and closer to ours? This will bring us closer to each other and link us more strongly.”²⁹²

So, in spite of the wave of powerful propaganda, the Macedonians persistently built and affirmed their ideology. Ѓorѓija M. Pulevski appeared only as the best-known (to us) advocate of that idea which had a long and strong tradition among the masses of the people. It is no chance that in one of his manuscripts he recorded the traditions that the Mijaks in Macedonia were “the guardsmen of A. of Macedon”, while the Brsjaks, i.e. “Brzaks [according to popular etymology] were the swift army of Alexander of Macedon”.²⁹³ In the Mijak region even the celebrations of Ilinden (St Elijah’s Day), Petrovdan (St Peter’s Day), etc., were connected with the time of Alexander.²⁹⁴

Hence the words from the opening paragraph of the 1878 Rules/Constitution of the Macedonian Insurgent Committee sound so natural: “We rebelled as advocates of freedom. With the blood we shed all over the Macedonian fields and forests we serve freedom, as did the Macedonian army of Alexander of Macedon, with our slogan ‘Freedom or Death’.”²⁹⁵

We must not neglect the fact that Pulevski was one of the members of the uprising’s General Staff which worked out and adopted this text. And this ideology was particularly reflected in the Protocolar Decision of the Interim Macedonian Government (May 21, 1880)²⁹⁶ and its Manifesto of March 11/23, 1881,²⁹⁷ as well as in the Constitution of Macedonia²⁹⁸ and the Military Instructions of the Macedonian League from 1880.²⁹⁹

²⁹¹K.[uzman Š apkar ev], „Narodni rјsni i st ar i ni“, *Mari ca*, V, 378, P l ovdi vъ, 16.IV.1882, 2.

²⁹²D.T. Levovъ, „Loza‘...“, *Svoboda*, VI, 786, S of i я, 13.IV.1892, 3.

²⁹³D-r Bl a џe Ri st ovski , *Di mi t ri ja Чировски (1878-1940) i Македонскот о научно-лит ерат ирно друѓарст во во Пет роѓрад. При лоџи кон проучивањет о на македонско-руски т еврски i разв ит око т на македонскат а нас и она на ми сл а*, I, S kopje, 1978, 54 and 57.

²⁹⁴Dr Simon Drakul (D-r Si mon Dr akul , *Arhi mandri t Anat ol i j Зографски* , I NI , S kopje, 1988, 55) writes: “It is said that Alexander of Macedon came to rest himself at КарѠа...”.

²⁹⁵*Прав и л а т а-Уст авот на Македонски от вост ани чки ком ит ет во Кресненскот о вост ани е*, S kopje, 1980, 203.

²⁹⁶*Razl ed i* , HV (HHI), 1-2 (300-301), 1973, 173-175.

²⁹⁷*Документ и за борбат а на македонски от народ...*, 267-268.

²⁹⁸*Македонскат а л и џа i Уст авот за државно иредивање на Македони ја од 1880*, S kopje, 1985, 237-261.

²⁹⁹*Ibid.*, 262-312.

It was in this insurgent and revolutionary turmoil in Macedonia and among the émigrés that songs were sung about Europe as the “Babylonian whore” and about the fighters as the “glorious descendants of Alexander”.³⁰⁰ But as far the literary form is concerned, the most authentic example of this ideology was contributed by Ćorĳija Pulevski himself, who as early as 1878, in his poem ‘Samovila Makedonska’ (Macedonian Sprite), full of revolutionary pathos, describes the traditions and aspiration of his people:

Have you heard, Macedonians, the elders saying:
There were no braver men than Macedonians –
Three hundred years before Christ Tsar Alexander of Macedon
With Macedonians ruled the whole world.

(In a footnote, Pulevski states precisely: “It is shortened for the sake of the verse; this happened 338 years before Christ,” and then continues:)

Our King Philip was a Slav, Tsar Alexander – a Slav,
Our Slav grandmothers gave birth to them.
Macedonians, remember the Macedonian heroism,
and now follow the example of your ancestors!³⁰¹

We can find the same assertions in the first part of the poetry anthology *Македонска песнарка* (Macedonian Songbook, Sofia, 1879), where the poem ‘Makedoncim uv prilog’ (To the Macedonians) starts in this way:

This dear place is the fatherland of Macedonians,
it was a kingdom under King Philip,
it was the ancient empire of Tsar Alexander,
our tsar, a Macedonian, famous throughout the world, Alexander the Great.
He has left our empire on the Balkan Peninsula
to all mountain Slavs.³⁰²

Reacting against the decisions of the Congress of Berlin, when Macedonia was once again left under Ottoman control, Pulevski declared:

Hear us, brothers, European Christians,
we’ve had enough of this fate of ours
and we, too, want a fatherland for ourselves.
Today our brothers in the Macedonian kingdom complain

³⁰⁰This song is found in different versions and it is recorded in Bulgaria with a modified text: Ni kol aà Kauf man, *Бъл гарски градски песни*, Sof ia, 1968, 201 and 210.

³⁰¹Ѓб. М.Р. ., *Сатови ла Македонска*, речат ни са на В. Рг ошекъ въ Sof ia, b.g., Gosudar st vennая publ i чная bi bli ot eka i m Sal ti kova-Щedr i na, S. 29. 8, 103; D-г Вл аже Ri st ovski , *Ѓорĳи ја М. Пул евски и неговите книжки „Сатови ла Македонска“ и „Македонска песнарка“*, Bi bli ot eka na spi sani et o *Македонски фолклор*, 1, Skorje, 1973, 42.

³⁰²*Македонска песнарка* отъ Георгъа Рѣ ъевски , b.v.m., Sof ia, 1879, 5-6.

because it is only we who are being left in slavery,
so we, too, want a fatherland for ourselves!³⁰³

Hence Pulevski addresses his compatriots:

O, brothers, Macedonians of the Orthodox faith,
let us unite and fight bravely,
as our forefathers did under Tsar Alexander,
and leave a new memory of our name behind us!
Let us revive our ancient history,
and carry out this task now.³⁰⁴ Etc.

In this same spirit, on December 7, 1878, Pulevski wrote from the “Macedonian front” to his old acquaintance and compatriot Kuzman Badžoviĥ (in Serbia) about the plans for the Macedonian Uprising and, inviting him to join them, said: “With God’s help, this spring we are going against Turkey with all our Slavo-Macedonian sons. We shall either all die or restore the empire of Alexander of Macedon.”³⁰⁵

This ideology, reflecting the historical consciousness of the Macedonians of the time, is expounded in the greatest detail in the extensive *Славјанско-македонска општа историја* (Slavonic-Macedonian General History) by Āorĳija M. Pulevski (begun in 1865 in Belgrade and completed in 1892 in Sofia, but remaining a manuscript). There the author deals in great detail with the Slavic origin and language of the Macedonians, and with the history of the “Macedonian tsars”, which comprises one fourth of the whole manuscript.³⁰⁶ In Chapter IV, ‘On the Slavonic language (dialect) and its date’, Pulevski reacts to Jovan Rajiĥ’s writing and, among other things, says:

He mentions only Russians, Poles, Moravians, Illyrians, Serbs and Bulgarians in his history, but where are the Czechs, Slovaks, Kranjans [Slovenes] and Macedonians? At least he should not have called his history ‘A History of Diverse Slavonic Peoples’. And as the Macedonians are indigenous inhabitants of the peninsula and hosts to the Bulgars, Serbs and Greeks, and also to other nationalities, as well as neighbours of the Hellenes, therefore we have called this history a Slavo-Macedonian History, so that we may know when each one of the existing newcomers to the peninsula came.³⁰⁷

One of Pulevski’s close associates, and certainly not the only one, was Isaija Radev Maĥovski, who, on July 18, 1888, delivered in Kiev a patriotic speech based

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

³⁰⁵ *Razzl edi*, HIV, 10, 1972, 1131.

³⁰⁶ Āorĳija M. Pulevski, *Одбрани стпанци*. I zbor, redakcija, predgovor i zabeleĥki D-r Bl aĥe Ri stovski, Skopje, 1974, 254-255.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 221.

on the same ideology, and went into great detail about the ideas of the Macedonian past among the Macedonian people, and also among the Albanians.³⁰⁸ Grigor Prličev must have had personal contacts with Pulevski, as copies of both Pulevski's *Слоџница речовска* (Reka Wordbook) and *Македонска речнарка* have been found in his library. The learned "second Homer" (in the surviving manuscripts) writes in great detail about questions of ancient Macedonian history as a cultural-historical heritage,³⁰⁹ while in his 'address' on Cyril and Methodius delivered in Salonika in 1885 he said the following, among other things: "Our mother Macedonia is now so weak. Having given birth to Alexander the Great, having given birth to Ss Cyril and Methodius, our mother Macedonia has ever since been lying in bed seriously ill and deathbound. Who knows if the mother who has given birth to so great a son will be able to bear another?"³¹⁰

Another man who was very close to Pulevski was Kuzman Šapkarev, who even reprinted the whole of 'Samovila Makedonska' as early as 1882,³¹¹ and the aged Marko Cepenkov in a song which he wrote in 1889 said:

Think you, my dear children,
of the great Tsar Alexander
whom we celebrate to this day.³¹²

This historical consciousness was also cultivated by the 'Lozars' in the Macedonian movement. In Kosta Šahov's journal *Македонија* a certain G.K., in his extensive (untitled) article, among other things, writes:

[N]o doubt, our fatherland – *Macedonia* – also has a history of its past, where one can see its power, its greatness and also its political subordination under the authority of the then powerful Ottoman Empire.

[...]

Today, for instance, every Macedonian, when mentioning Alexander of Macedon, says: "We had Tsar Alexander the Great." With these words he reminds himself of the glorious period and the greatness of the Macedonian state. Alexander of Macedon stands as a national pride before the face of every Macedonian. That national pride today is of intellectual significance in the achievement of the idea of independence.

³⁰⁸Вжзроти нані я на Исайя Радев Мажовски ..., Соф і я, 1922, 14-27.

³⁰⁹D-r Kiri l Ķami lov, „Grigor Prličev kako kritičar na grčkata istorija“, *Современост*, V, 10-11, 1955, 900-912; D-r Kiri l Ķami lov, „G.S. Prličev za kul turata na El ada“, *Современост*, VI, 1-2, 1956, 75-96; see Prličev collections in the Archives of Macedonia and the Archives of the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje; D-r Stojan Ri steski, *Gri gor Prličev. Novi st rani ci*, Ohri d, 1989, 70-93.

³¹⁰K.G. P rličevъ, „Кътъ haakteri stikata na Gr.S. P rličevъ (po spomeni, svedeni я i dokumenti)“, *Македонски прѣздѣтъ*, IV, 2, Соф і я, 1928, 118.

³¹¹K.[uzman Š apkar ev], „Narodni рѣсни i stari ni“, *Мари са*, V, 377, 13.IV.1882, 5.

³¹²Marko Cepenkov, *Македонско народно т vorеuit во во deset t oта*, 10. *Mat еpi jal i – lit еrat ирni t vorbi*. Redakti gal D-r Bl aже Ri stovski, I F, Skopje, 1972, 246.

The great Macedonian state, in the person of Alexander, has done a great service to scholarship...³¹³

At a secret meeting of the Macedonian 'circle' around the journal *Македонија*, held on June 19, 1889 in the Concordia Hotel in Sofia, where 12 or 13 prominent Macedonian activists of the time were present (Kosta Šahov, Dimitar Makedonski, Georgij A. Georgov, Ivan Šumkov, Ножагов, the Ivanov brothers, Kuzliev, Mandunov, etc.), while discussing ideas for "organizing broader activity", they also spoke "about Alexander of Macedon".³¹⁴

Therefore, when the Young Macedonian Literary Society in Sofia was founded (1890) and when the very first number of its mouthpiece *Loza* (Vine, 1892) stated that the fatherland of the Macedonians is Macedonia and that it was "a separate Slavic state whose past is full of glory, in particular during the time of Philip and Alexander the Great, though it declined under their successors",³¹⁵ the reaction of the Bulgarian press was the strongest up to that moment; one newspaper, among other things, wrote that the Macedonians "are gradually preparing Bulgarian public opinion for Macedonia's separation from Bulgaria and will gradually introduce words from the Ohrid sub-dialect, which is to be the literary language of the future greater Macedonia headed by some of the editors of *Loza* in the capacity of Philip or Alexander!"³¹⁶

The 19th century ended with such a historical awareness of the ancient Macedonian state and the ancient Macedonians. Slavdom in Macedonia was believed to extend far back before the new era, and the Macedonians were considered to be the oldest people not only in the Balkans but also in Europe. But even when it became clear that the ancient Macedonians had not been and could not have been Slavs, when the ancient history of Macedonia was already known, as was also the history of the arrival of the Slavs in Macedonia, the phalanxes of Philip and Alexander and the glory of the ancient state and culture continued to play the role of an integrative factor in the Macedonian national development.

Anastas Jankov was not alone when he exclaimed in his 1902 proclamation to the Macedonian people, urging them to rise:

Macedonians! Remember the world victor, the world glory of Macedonia – the great Alexander of Macedon; remember the brave Tsar Samuel, the great Macedonian man, the wonderful King Mark, the glory of all the Slavs – that Macedonian blood

³¹³G.K., „Russe, 11 Noemvri à 1888 g.“, *Македонија*, I, 4, Russe, 11.HI.1888, 13.

³¹⁴*Свобода*, III, 278, Sof i я, 24.VI.1889, 3; III, 282, 8.VII.1889, 4; *Македонија*, I, 1, Ruse, 20.I.1902, 3.

³¹⁵Ezer ski , „Nekol ko bel eжки ...“, *Loza*, I, 1, Sof i я, 1892, 5.

³¹⁶*Свобода*, VI, 786, Sof i я, 13.IV.1892, 3.

flowed in their veins; they keep vigil from the heights of heaven and bless the cause we have initiated. Let us prove ourselves to be their worthy descendants.³¹⁷

Even Krste P. Misirkov, in his memoirs, writes about “the original and true Macedonia” and about “the capital of the ancient Macedonian state of Amyntas II, Philip and Alexander the Great,”³¹⁸ and shortly before his death, in his article ‘King Mark’, Misirkov summarizes:

King Mark is the son and pride of Macedonia and one of the three great conquerors who spread the name of their land far beyond its territories:

(1) Alexander of Macedon spread the *glory of Macedonia* as far as the Central Asian rivers of Amu Darya [Oxus] and Syr Darya [Jaxartes], and also to India and the Indian Ocean;

(2) The holy Cyril and Methodius spread the *Macedonian word and script* among all the Slavic peoples, and

(3) King Mark placed under his authority and under that of the *Macedonian muse* all popular singers and peoples on the Balkan Peninsula, including you, the descendants of his sworn enemies.³¹⁹

³¹⁷ „Rad makedonski h komi t et a“, *Брани κ*, HVIII, 131, Novi Sad, 26.IH/9.H.1902, 2. Hence during the days of the Ilinden Uprising, the unsigned author of the editorial of the journal *Авт ономна Македони ја* (I, 9, S of i ja, 30.VIII.1903, 1) states: “When they say to us that we should protect the oppressed Macedonians, we should gladly do so. We are here delighted to recall that Alexander the Great, that tsar of the universe, bore witness to the virtues of the Slavic tribe when he said that the Slavs had heroic hearts and hence deserved to bear the great name Slavs, that is *slavni* [glorious]. Before his death this man who has endowed us so greatly said that he cursed anyone who would ever speak ill of the Slavs. In recognition of their military abilities he bequeathed to them all the lands from the Adriatic to the ocean of eternal ice. Besides, he besought his heavenly patrons to protect them from ill fortune and always aid the twelve princes, descendants of his twelve friends. Now, if the Macedonians are in a situation to stop their extermination with their own hands and improve their destiny, then the Bulgarians, Serbs, Montenegrins and other Slavs are bound to help their brothers in blood and faith, those who are born of ‘majka doina’ [nursing mother] (Macedonia), from where, too, the most famous principles and luminaries have originated.”

In his poem ‘Tam!’ (There) (*Авт ономна Македони ја*, I, 13.IH.1903, 4), Petar Zagorov exclaims:
There, near Pindus and Шир, near the Strita and Вардар,
Нhere everything is covered with deep wounds,
Нorthy descendants of the Great Александер
Are bravely fighting the age-old tyrant!

These journals were read with particular attention by the Macedonian people in the days of the Ilinden achievement, and the writings about the former glory and greatness of Macedonia met with a tremendous response. These legends played a positive role in the strengthening of Macedonian national consciousness and in the spread of the struggle for liberation.

³¹⁸Kr ste P. Mi si r kov, *Одбрани ст рани ci*. P ri r edi l Bl аже Ri st ovski , Skopje, 1991, 483. In connection with the traditions of Alexander of Macedon in the Aegean part of Macedonia, see: Georgios Spyridakis, „Die Volksüberlieferung über Alexander den Grossen in Nordgriecheland (Makedonien und Thrakien)“, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, II, 1-2, München, 1973, 187-193, and the literature referred to there. It is not surprising that the Archives of the Skopje Institute of Folklore (ml . 977 and 1755) have records of traditions connected with Alexander from the Voden region (Tanas Vraxi - novski , „За nekoj par al el i vo makedonskat a usna pr oza i pr ozat a na nekoj i st očni nar odi za Al eksandar Makedonski — paper read at the congress of the Union of Associations of Folklorists of Yugoslavia, Hvar, 1982).

And finally, the president of the Macedonian Scholarly and Literary Society in St Petersburg, Dimitrija Čupovski, who was also a poet (writing in Macedonian and Russian), held a similar view concerning the question of ancient Macedonia. He also had the opportunity of meeting his compatriot Pulevski in Sofia, and he kept Pulevski's *Сознана рчовска* in his library with particular devotion.³²⁰ On more than one occasion he referred to the glory of Alexander of Macedon. When in 1913-1914 the "Macedonian flag" was worked out (published in the Macedonian and Russian press), there was Alexander the Great's horse, Bucephalus, standing as the symbol and basic emblem on a red background,³²¹ while Čupovski himself carried a silver piece with Alexander's image attached to his watch-chain until the end of his life.³²² Even his brother Nace Dimov, in his prominent book on Macedonia (1913), quotes the writing of the British historian Jacob Abbot on the ancient "Macedonians" (*Македонјане*) and their "Macedonian language", "unintelligible to the Greeks" (*неронјатнот дјја Греков*),³²³ etc.

These were the ideas prevalent in Macedonia concerning its history after the partition of its territory and people in 1913. Even the organizers of the National Liberation War, who won the present-day freedom, did not ignore the significance of Alexander as a major figure in the mobilization of the people's consciousness. A good example is the letter from Dr Trifun Grekov (Grecow) in Geneva (October 11, 1922) to the head of the Macedonian Federal Party in Sofia, Nikola Jurukov, in which he writes: "I have sent an article to *Автономна Македонија* on Alexander the Great to be published as a series; I am earnestly appealing for its publication. It is of paramount importance to link our cause with the ancient history of Macedonia."³²⁴ And indeed, the journal *Автономна Македонија* published several articles on these subjects written by him,³²⁵ and the Vienna journal *Македонско Сзнение* (Macedonian Consciousness, 1924) published a *БриџХистору оџМакедонија* (in instalments) by this same Dr Grekov.³²⁶

³¹⁹К. Ми си рковъ, „Крал и Марко“, *Ил и нденъ*, III, 12, Sof i я, 25.III.1923, 2.

³²⁰D-г Вл аже Ри ст овски, *Ди ми т ри ја Чировски (1878-1940) и Македонскот о научно-лит ерат ирно другарст во во Пет роград...*, I, 57-59 and 94-95.

³²¹*Ibid.*, 289-292 (with a colour facsimile of the flag).

³²²*Ibid.*, 293-294.

³²³Вл аже Ри ст овски, *Насе Д. Ди тов (1876-1916)*, MANU, Skopje, 1973, f ot ot i pno i zdani e на kni шkat a на N. Di тов, 65-66 (3-4).

³²⁴N. Ки ров Маџски, *В ст роя за Македони ја. Ист ори чески факт и, бел ежки и документ и*, I, Sof i я, 1957, 110a – г акорс во АО на I NI, S1. IV 192/I.

³²⁵D-г Т. Греков, „Александър Вел и ки и и deal а на makedonci те“, *Автономна Македони ја*, II, 76, Sof i я, 23.VII.1922, 2-3; D-г Т. Греков, „Някол ко думи вър hu makedonski я pr oi zhod на Ар и ст от ел я“, *Автономна Македони ја*, II, 91, 27.II.1922, 1-2; Dr T. Grecow, „Quelques notes sur l'origine macédonienne d'Aristote“, *Bulletin pour l'indépendance de la Macédoine*, I, 4, Gen'Ve, Janvier, 1922, 47.

The Alexandrian tradition was also very much alive among the Macedonian people in the 1930s, in all circles and in all regions. It was not by chance that 'Komitski', a Sofia émigré, in a letter to the Macedonian National Committee of December 27, 1932, recalls, among other things, that "once there was a glorious land with a brave people who gave birth to world rulers such as Philip and Alexander of Macedon".³²⁷

In general, these ideas among the Macedonian émigré community in Bulgaria were widespread and were often reflected in printed works. For example, Vasil Ivanovski (Bistrički), in his article 'Why We Macedonians are a Separate Nation', among other things, writes that "the Greek chauvinists" actually "falsify history proclaiming the tribe of the ancient Macedono-Illyrians, together with the leaders of that tribe — Macedon, Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great — as a constituent part of the ancient Greeks".³²⁸ This was analysed in greater detail by Angel Dinev in his pamphlet *Македонските Словени* (The Macedonian Slavs), where he writes that "After the death of Alexander the Great the universal Macedonian state collapsed,"³²⁹ and, relying on Dr Grekov's writings, says: "It is known that Macedonian art, even at the time of Philip of Macedon, surpassed Hellenic art. The triumph of Alexander the Great over the Hellenes was not only the result of fighting and technical power, but also of the power of a civilization which gave rise, in Alexander's consciousness, to the remarkable idea of organizing a world school, of a single world doctrine and the peaceful unification of mankind into a single whole. These were undoubtedly also the ideas of his teacher, Aristotle, who was not a Hellene, as alleged by some, but a Macedonian from the Chalcidice Peninsula, who lived in Athens as a passer-by, and only at the time when the Macedonophile party was in power. After the death of Alexander the Great and following the collapse of the Macedonian state, the Hellenes appropriated their art, and what could not be falsified was later destroyed by the Byzantines."³³⁰

The 'Reply to Professor Nikola Vulih's Article' (1940) also demands continuity from the ancient state and culture: "The geographical position of Macedonia is not a thing of yesterday, it dates back to the time before Christ, to the time of Philip and Alexander of Macedon."³³¹

³²⁶Д-р Т. Греков, „Кратка история на Македонија“, *Македонско съзнание*, I, numbers 2, 6, 7 and 9, Виена, 1924, 4.

³²⁷*Документ и за борбата на македонскиот народ...*, II, 272.

³²⁸*Четвртиот конгрес на Македонският Народен Съюз в Атери ка. Резолуции, Изложенија. Изданија на Македонският Народен Съюз*, Детройт, 1934, 51.

³²⁹Angel Dinev, *Македонските словени*, София, 1938, 30-31.

³³⁰*Ibid.*, 56.

³³¹Д-р Владе Ристовски, *Кочо Рацин. Историческо-литературни истраживања. Прилози за развита на македонската и културно-национална традиция*, Скопје, 1983, 130.

The cult of Alexander was cherished with particular reverence, for instance, in middle-class circles in Prilep. Here is the testimony of Dimče Adžimitreski: “We had an old book on Alexander of Macedon. It was locked in a drawer and my grandfather would often take it and read to us about the feats of Alexander of Macedon. That is how we were brought up. We considered him our king and we dreamt of such a kingdom as he had once created.” This ideology was also popular within the MORO organization in Skopje, whose head was Adžimitreski himself. One of the members of its leadership, Blagoja Dimitrov, in his recollections of this organization (1932-1934), says: “The main task was to speak Macedonian, to buy books; cells were formed of three members each, and every cell formed its own library (I remember, we also had books on Alexander of Macedon, and we considered all that as ours).”³³²

Progressive young people in Prilep also believed that they were descended from Alexander of Macedon. But when Borka Taleski delivered a lecture before one of these organized groups in which he shattered the myth of the direct descent from the ancient Macedonians, there was disappointment.³³³ The same happened in another progressive Prilep group, when in 1939 Dime Bojanovski-Dize, who had just returned from the Lepoglava prison, delivered a similar lecture on the Brdo (a hill in Prilep).³³⁴

Prilep was not an exception. Goce Miteski from the Ohrid region tells us that, before the Second World War, “the young intellectuals” from the Debarca region were fascinated by their ancestor Alexander the Great. “No one has ever contradicted me about this,”³³⁵ he says. In his poem ‘Robina’ (Slave), written in Ohrid on November 8, 1942, Miteski sings of Alexander and ends his poem with this call (as did Pulevski):

Rise, brothers, against the tyrant
and revive the glorious Macedonian name.³³⁶

In his poem ‘Goce Delčev’ (written in Ohrid on November 25, 1942), Miteski does not forget to link his legendary hero with the famed Alexander:

Alexander presented him with a ring
and told him he was now a worthy fighter.³³⁷

³³²*Ibid.*, 132.

³³³D-r Bl aže Ri stovski, *Пројави и профили од македонската литература и историја. Прилози за развiti okot на македонската акултурно-национална историја*, II, Skopje, 1982, 297.

³³⁴*Ibid.*, 305.

³³⁵D-r Bl aže Ri stovski, *Македонскиот стih 1900-1944. Ист ражувана и мат еријали*, II, Skopje, 1980, 405.

³³⁶*Ibid.*, 409.

³³⁷*Ibid.*, 413.

Miteski was greatly disappointed when at about the same time an older Ohrid student told him: “We are Slavs, and not direct descendants of the ancient Macedonians... For a whole week after that I was ill,”³³⁸ remembers Miteski.

And this was already the time when the National Liberation War was in full swing, when the foundations of the Macedonian state were laid. This tradition, however, is very much alive even today in some circles, and our overseas expatriates still worship the images of Alexander of Macedon in their churches and clubs.

In conclusion, in the historical consciousness of Macedonian writers and national figures of the 19th and even 20th century,³³⁹ Alexander of Macedon was a symbol that genuinely and essentially contributed to the Macedonian national integration and helped its affirmation considerably. Even though our modern scholars treat Macedonia’s past with the necessary scholarly objectivity and only register the deposits of national romanticism of the past century, we cannot overlook the fact that ancient Macedonia gave us its name, outlined our borders, bestowed a culture on us and without doubt poured some part of its blood into us. In the veins of the present-day Macedonian flows not only the blood of the Slavs, but also that of various other peoples and tribes that lived or crossed the Balkans over the centuries — in the same way every other people or nation has been created, and not only in Europe at that.

³³⁸*Ibid.*, 405.

³³⁹The tradition of Alexander the Great was not only popular in Macedonia, where physical monuments continue to maintain and encourage the consciousness of its former glory and greatness (A.S. Š of man, *Ist ori ja ant i čnoj Ma ked o ni i. Do al li ni st i česka ja Ma ked o ni ja, čast ь pe r va ja*, I zdat el ьst vo Ka zansko go uni ver si t e ta, 1960, 19), but we can also find it among the Albanians and Vlachs, as well as among the peoples of the Middle East and Asia. With his inclusion in the Koran in particular, legends and traditions dealing with Alexander have spread much more broadly and are widely reflected in literature and folklore (E.A. Kost ju hi n, *Al eksandr Ma ked onski à vl i t er at ur - no à i f ol ьkl or no à tra di ci i*, Moskva, 1972).