

Eleonora Naxidou

Mobile Intellectuals as Agents of Nationalism in the 19th-Century Balkans

Abstract: Within the context of migration studies, this article examines a specific category of modern migration in Europe, that of the revolutionary-intellectual, focusing on the 19th-century Balkans and the Bulgarian paradigm. It employs the biographical method in studying the careers of two distinguished protagonists of the Revival, Georgi Rakovski and Liuben Karavelov, placing emphasis on the interrelationship between mobility and ideological orientations. It is in this light that their life courses, itineraries, social backgrounds and ideological profiles are examined. Their middle-class origins and education steered them away from their native villages in their quest to have careers as teachers, newspaper editors, writers etc. Being continuously on the move, they adopted and propagated through their writings modern ideologies, namely liberalism and federalism interrelated with nationalism, and organised armed uprisings against Ottoman rule.

Key Words: migration, revolutionary-intellectual, 19th-century balkans, nationalism, Karavelov, Rakovski

1. Introduction – Theoretical Background

This article considers the complex issue of migration, which refers to a vast category of population movements characteristic of human activity over time.¹ In particular, it aims to examine a specific type of modern migration in 19th-century Europe, that of the intellectual-revolutionary, focusing on the Balkans and the case of Bulgaria.

Accepted for publication after external peer review (double blind)

Eleonora Naxidou, Department of History and Ethnology, School of Classical Studies and Humanities, Democritus University of Thrace, Kosmiou 13, 69133 Komotini, Greece, enaxidou@otenet.gr, enaxidou@he.duth.gr

1 Jan Lucassen/Leo Lucassen/Patrick Manning (eds.), *Migration History in World History. Multidisciplinary Approaches*, Leiden/Boston 2010.

The first thing the term migration usually brings to mind is the unidirectional exodus of an individual, family or group of people from their homeland to another country in order to improve their standards of living. However, migration is a complicated, multi-faceted and diverse phenomenon encompassing a great variety of different types of mobility with regard to motives or push and pull factors (economic, political, national, educational etc., voluntary or forced), the strategies, the itineraries (long distance, short distance, circulation and/or back and forth movements), the duration (permanent/long-term, semi-permanent/temporary/short-term, seasonal), the agents (individual or family), the migrants' status (legal or undocumented), profile (asylum seekers, refugees, low or highly-skilled workers, academics etc.), and impact on both the place of departure and the final destination (cultural, social, economic, political, ideological) and so on. Because of this heterogeneity, historians and social scientists are not only unable to agree on a generally accepted definition and typology of migration,² but also use different terminology and employ various qualitative and/or quantitative methodological approaches in order to elucidate different aspects of this intricate mobile behaviour.³

It is within the abovementioned conceptualization, which mostly refers to migration in the course of modernity,⁴ that migratory flows in Europe in modern times have attracted scholarly attention.⁵ Intertwined with crucial economic, social, and political changes and new ideological trends related to Enlightenment, liberalism and nationalism, they contributed to the creation of the modern European identity.

Against this background, revolutionary-intellectuals emerged as a distinct type of emigrant in 19th-century Central and Eastern/South-eastern Europe. Although relatively small in number, they not only produced arguments for, but also partici-

2 For example Colin Pooley and Jean Turnbull perceive migration in a broad sense as “all changes of normal residence, irrespective of the distance moved or the duration of stay at an address”: Colin Pooley/Jean Turnbull, *Migration and mobility in Britain since the 18th century*, London/Bristol Pennsylvania 1998, 7. Takeyuki Tsuda et al. define migration “as the movement of people across significant *socio-cultural, political, or environmental boundaries* that involves uprooting and *long-term* relocation”: Takeyuki Tsuda/Brenda Baker/James F. Eder/Kelly Knudson/Jonathan Maupin/Lisa Meierotto/Rachel E. Scott, *Unifying Themes in Studies of Ancient and Contemporary Migrations*, in: Brenda J. Baker/Takeyuki Tsuda (eds.), *Migration and Disruptions. Towards a Unifying Theory of Ancient and Contemporary Migrations*, Gainesville/Tallahassee Florida 2015, 19.

3 For example Michael Samers surveys ten different theories of international migration: *Migration*, London/New York 2010, 53.

4 It has been argued lately, however, that there is no clear-cut distinction between past and modern migratory patterns. See: Patrick Manning, *Cross-Community Migration: A Distinctive Human Pattern*, *Social Evolution and History*, 5/2 (2006), 24–54; Baker/Tsuda (eds.), *Migration*, 2015.

5 Some indicative studies on modern European migration: Leslie Page Moch, *Moving Europeans. Migration in Western Europe since 1650*, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2003; Agnieszka Weinar/Saskia Bonjour/Lyubov Zhyznomirska (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of the Politics of Migration in Europe*, London/New York 2019; *The Atlas of Migration in Europe. A Critical Geography of Migration Policies*, London/New York 2019.

pated in the fight for the creation of independent nation-states, either through unification, as was the case with Germany and Italy, or through the disintegration of the Habsburg, Ottoman and Russian Empires.⁶ They formed a liberal diaspora elite which, despite divergences, shared ideals such as individual liberty and national sovereignty. Being continually on the move, they spread modern ideas, at the same time preparing plots with the intention to overthrow the old regime and establish a new political order consistent with their beliefs. In this way, it can be argued that they formed a network, not in the sense of having personal contact and collaboration, but because of their ideological affinity and similar methods of putting their plans into practice.⁷ More specifically, being convinced that it served the interests of the people, this radical intelligentsia sought to inspire the passive masses with revolutionary zeal in order to mobilise them against the status quo. At the same time, they were, to a great extent, imbued with a spirit of universality and solidarity; in other words, they perceived their revolutionary endeavours as part of an overall venture on a transnational level and not merely limited to a specific territory or nation. Moreover, organizing secret societies appears to have been a favourite *modus operandi*.⁸ In sum, radical intellectuals ‘in exile,’ among whom the Italian Giuseppe Mazzini stands out, were the main agents of the endemic revolutionary movement in Europe.⁹ In the Balkans, many protagonists of the national movements match the profile of the itinerant revolutionary-intellectual. Georgi Rakovski and Liuben Karavelov (who are discussed in this paper), Vasil Levski (1837–1873) and Hristo Botev (1847/48–1876) in the Bulgarian case; Rigas Pheraios (1757–1798), and two founders of the revolutionary organisation *Philiki Etaireia* (Society of Friends), Emmanuil Ksanthos (1772–1852) and Athanasios Tsakaloph (1790–1851) in the Greek case; Alexandru Ioan Kuza (1820–1873) and other leaders of the 1848 revolution in the Danubian Principalities, to mention a few indicative examples.

In this context, a very important aspect in the shaping of their worldviews was the role played by their migrations, which, however, has not been well studied. In order to shed light on this somewhat neglected issue, the paper addresses questions such as migration motives and influence of migrations on their mind-set, focusing on the Ottoman-ruled Balkans in the second half of the 19th century and the

6 In the nation states already established in Western Europe such as France, the revolutionary intelligentsia fought for the people’s right to self-rule.

7 On the profile of this diaspora elite see: Isabella Maurizio, *Risorgimento in Exile. Italian Émigrés and the Liberal International in the Post-Napoleonic Era*, Oxford 2009, 21f.

8 Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, New York 1996, 115.

9 *Ibid.*, 109.

paradigm of revolutionary-intellectuals of the Bulgarian Revival¹⁰ (*Vǎzrazhdane*).¹¹ Using the biographical method, the careers of two distinguished protagonists of the Revival, Georgi Rakovski and Liuben Karavelov,¹² are described with emphasis placed on the interrelationship between mobility and ideological orientations, and not merely viewed from the angle of their contribution to the national movement, which has so far drawn the bulk of scholarly attention. It is from this perspective that their life courses, itineraries, social background and ideological profiles are examined. Sons of middle-class entrepreneurs, with higher than average education, they moved around, in and out of the Balkans in order to study and/or make careers as teachers, newspaper editors, writers etc. They endorsed and disseminated through their writings modern ideologies such as liberalism and federalism embedded in nationalism, and prepared armed revolts against Ottoman rule.

More specifically, the paper deals with the following issues: the motives for their migration each time they moved to a different location; their migratory patterns in relation to their social status, intellectual and national/revolutionary activities; and their modes of interaction with the cultural, political and ideological environment in the places where they settled for shorter or longer periods of time. The analysis is based on the biographical approach, which I consider the most appropriate method for dealing with such a research topic, since it is both qualitative and individualist, employing in-depth biographical or life histories and/or narratives.¹³

2. The Peripatetic Life of Georgi Rakovski

The first prominent figure of the Revival within the research scope of this paper is Georgi Rakovski (Kotel 1821–Bucharest 1867). An intellectual and revolutionary, he was an advocate of Bulgarian ecclesiastical emancipation from the Patriar-

10 I transliterate Cyrillic script to Latin as follows: ъ -ǎ, ш -sh, щ -sht, ц -c, я -ia, ж -zh, ч -ch, ю -iu, ѝ -i.

11 The *Vǎzrazhdane* has been adopted by Bulgarian historiography to denote not only the socio-political, economic and ideological process of the formation of the Bulgarian nation, but also the period of modern Bulgarian history during which this nationalizing process took place, i.e. the last 100 years of the Ottoman dominion in the Bulgarian lands, although there is no consensus as to its exact beginning and end. However, the main phase of the Revival is usually thought to have started after the Treaty of Adrianople (1829). See: Rumen Daskalov, *The Making of a Nation in the Balkans. Historiography of the Bulgarian Revival*, Budapest/New York 2004, 11f.

12 Rakovski and Karavelov are chosen as representative because they are two of the four leading revolutionary-intellectuals of the Revival (the other two being Vasil Levski and Hristo Botev) who best fit the revolutionary-intellectual profile.

13 Samers, *Migration*, 2010, 105f.; Keith H. Halfacree/Paul J. Boyle, *The Challenge of Facing Migration Research: the Case for a Biographical Approach*, *Progress in Human Geography* 17/ 3 (1993), 343–344.

chate of Constantinople and, above all, a pioneer of political nationalism, that is, a staunch proponent of the creation of a Bulgarian nation-state through revolution. For Rakovski, Turkish rule was a brutal yoke.¹⁴ He claimed that no other race had caused greater suffering, more human disasters or devastation, nor treated the people they had conquered more mercilessly than the Turks. It is difficult to find words to express the horror at the magnitude of the Turks' malice when the blood of innocents shed or the grave ills inflicted on the people they had subjugated in Asia, Africa and Europe are brought to mind, he asserted.¹⁵ Convinced that the Ottoman Empire could not be transformed into a modern European state,¹⁶ he believed that revolution was the only way to overthrow Ottoman rule. For this reason, he not only propagated this idea throughout his life, but he also continually made revolutionary plans and strove to put them into practice, albeit in vain. In order to achieve his goal, he also sought cooperation with or assistance from the Russians or the neighbouring Balkan Christian nations, the Serbs and the Greeks, who had already acquired political sovereignty. However, he did not propose any form of political structure after liberation, and in his work, he only vaguely alluded to the merits of freedom as such. His ideological profile was formed, to a significant extent, under the influence of the various stimuli he received in the course of his migration.

2.1. Migration Motives

The motives that led Georgi Rakovski to take his initial migratory steps were educational. Having completed primary education in Kotel, he departed for Karlovo for the first time in 1834 at the age of fourteen, in order to continue his schooling in Greek under the tutelage of Raino Popovic, a renowned Bulgarian educator.¹⁷ His decision was consistent with the social patterns of his era. Being the eldest son of a wealthy tailor and textile merchant, it was possible for him to further his instruction in Greek, a common practice and marker of social status for middle-class male children of Bulgarian origin, who, in this way, were expected to become better qualified entrepreneurs. Only Rakovski was neither in a hurry nor very enthu-

14 The perception of Ottoman rule as the 'Turkish yoke' that is, a time of oppression and decline due to Turkish backwardness and barbarism, was adopted by the Bulgarian national activists of the diaspora who espoused political emancipation mostly by means of armed revolt. See: Mary Neuburger, *The Orient Within. Muslim Minorities and the Negotiation of Nationhood in Modern Bulgaria*, Ithaca/London 2004, 24–25.

15 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, *Săchineniia*, vol. 3. [Works], Veselin Traikov (ed.), Sofia 1984, 400.

16 Rakovski, *Săchineniia*, vol. 3, 1984, 334.

17 Veselin Traikov, *Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. Biografii*. [Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. Biography], Sofia 1974, 62.

siastic about the idea of following in his father's footsteps. It was his inclination for learning that drove him to Constantinople in 1837 after a two-year stay in Karlovo. With the aid of some compatriots from Kotel, mainly Gavril Krăstevic,¹⁸ he persuaded his father to enrol him at the famous Greek Great National School in Kuru Cesme (Ksirokrini) in the suburbs of the Ottoman capital.¹⁹

Rakovski's next migratory destination was the town of Braila in Wallachia, where he arrived in the summer of 1841. The reasons for his departure from the Ottoman capital and the choice of Braila as his new place of residence are directly related to his rebelliousness and nonconformism,²⁰ which he channelled into nationally-oriented revolutionary activity, but which also got him into financial difficulties. On the one hand, there were his surmounting debts and the defiance he showed his protector and financial supporter in Constantinople, Stefanaki Bogoridi, concerning his career (a disagreement which turned into outright hostility), and on the other hand, there were his contacts within the revolutionary circles in Constantinople, through which he had been informed that a Serbo-Bulgarian insurrection was being prepared in Braila.²¹ By the time he arrived in that city, however, the uprising had already been suppressed.²² Far from being discouraged, Rakovski, overflowing with enthusiasm, began planning another revolt on a Balkan scale, which was the reason for his forced migration from Romania. Rakovski was arrested, tried and sentenced to death, after his plot had been uncovered and the attempt crushed at its very inception.²³ However, he managed to save his life because he held a Greek passport. Instead of extraditing him to Greece to be executed, the Greek consul in Bucharest helped him flee by ship to Marseille.²⁴ From there, he returned to Kotel

18 He was a moderate protagonist of the Bulgarian fight for ecclesiastical autonomy.

19 This information derives from a letter written in Greek which Rakovski sent to Raino Popovic in January 1838, signing with the Greek name of Savvas Stephanidis: Arhiv na Rakovski. Tom 1. Pisma i Răkopisi [Archive of Rakovski. Vol. 1. Letters and Manuscripts], Mihail Arnaudov/D. Dmitrov/Petar Dinekov/D. Kosev/L. Stoianov (eds.), Sofia 1953, 3.

20 As a child, Rakovski was disobedient and misbehaved, with an explosive temper. From the memoirs of one of Rakovski's acquaintances, we learn that his father had treated everyone to drinks because his son had not got into trouble for the whole day (Traikov, Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, 1974, 62). Rakovski displayed the same behaviour while studying in the Greek Great National School. Provoked by the arrogance and contempt of his Greek schoolmates towards Bulgarians, Rakovski often ended up in fights with them. Moreover, he was disobedient to his teachers and neglected his homework commitments (Mari A. Firkatian, *The Forest Traveller. Georgi Stoikov Rakovski and Bulgarian Nationalism*, New York 1996, 24–25). Rakovski admired his uncle Georgi Stoikov Mamarchev, who, after fighting in the Russo-Turkish wars in 1806–1812, organised unsuccessful uprisings in the area of Silistra (Firkatian, *Traveller*, 1996, 22).

21 Firkatian, *Traveller*, 1996, 49–50.

22 Konstantin Veliki, *Brailskite Buntove (1841–1843) [The Uprisings in Braila]*, Sofia, 1968, 50–82.

23 *Ibid.*, 83–84.

24 Veselin Traikov, *Rakovski i Balkanskite Narodi [Rakovski and the Balkan Peoples]*, Sofia, 1971, 319–333.

in 1843 or 1844, after short stopovers in Athens and Constantinople,²⁵ having been unable to fulfil his dream to study in Paris as he had not been able to find a willing sponsor to pay the high costs of such an education.

Rakovski's stay in Kotel was cut short due to another act of involuntary migration. The reason this time was a combination of arrogance, open disdain for the villagers, and contemptuous disregard for the local elite. Having been accused of rebellious behaviour on account of his provocative stance and involvement in a community conflict concerning the misappropriation of funds by certain *chorbadzhi* (notables), he was arrested, together with his father, in 1844 and sentenced to seven years in a prison in Constantinople.²⁶ Released from prison in 1847, Rakovski tried to earn his living in the Ottoman capital by practising law, and starting various business projects which failed, leaving him with accumulating debts.²⁷

Rakovski's next migration motive was related to his revolutionary pursuits, which he had the opportunity to put into practice after the outbreak of the Crimean War (1853–1856). He initially managed to be appointed chief translator to the Ottoman forces stationed in Northern Bulgaria, in order to spy on them and provide information to the Russians. However, his movements were uncovered and he was arrested.²⁸ Having escaped punishment in a rather ambiguous way,²⁹ his next project was to form an armed group (*cheta*) of twelve men, with the intention of joining the Russian army when it crossed the Danube, which, however, never eventuated.

Having lived in hiding in Kotel for a few months and then in Wallachia until the end of the Crimean War, he departed for Novi Sad in Austria in 1856, motivated by his new ambition to make a career as a newspaper editor and writer, and at the same time, instruct his people and propagate his ideas. Realising that his people were not educated enough to respond to his call for liberation, he acquired an additional goal, that of putting his pen in the service of his nation as a newspaper editor, journalist, historian, translator, ethnographer and linguist.³⁰ His initial aim was to publish his epic poem *Gorski Pătrnik* (*The Forest Traveller*), which he composed from the inspiration he had gained on his previous unavailing wanderings with his band through the Bulgarian mountains.³¹ His hasty departure, however, may have been due to his

25 On the dates see: Traikov, Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, 1974, 83.

26 Firkatian, Traveller, 1996, 33–35.

27 Rakovski admits his failures in business in a letter to his father in 1851: Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 34f.

28 Ibid., 491.

29 Firkatian, Traveller, 1996, 42f.

30 Rakovski notes in the Outline of his Life after the events of 1855: “My initial and final decision is for an open fight against the Turkish government through the press and with the sword”: Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 497.

31 Ibid., 492.

having killed a customer in a bar after a quarrel escalated, as one of his biographers reports.³²

Being expelled from Austria by Ottoman demand in late 1857 led Rakovski to the Principalities, Galati and Iasi and then to Odessa. Unable to find a job to support himself or obtain permission to publish a newspaper (which was granted to him only after he had left Russia),³³ and being unwelcome in both the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires,³⁴ Rakovski departed for Belgrade at the end of 1859, in search of more favourable conditions to fulfil his personal and revolutionary goals. There, he was involved in the plans of the Serbian prince Michael Obrenovich (1860–1868) to establish friendly relations with Bulgarian national activists in the context of forming a Balkan alliance against the Ottoman Empire. More specifically, Rakovski was given permission and financial aid to publish a newspaper called *Dunavski Leded* (*Danube Swan*),³⁵ as well as form and train a legion of Bulgarian volunteers in the summer of 1862 with the purpose of being ready to invade Bulgarian territory. However, the legion was disbanded a few months later because of the amelioration of Serbo-Ottoman relations.³⁶

Disappointed with the outcome of his cooperation with the Serbs, Rakovski left for Bucharest in September 1863, his motive being to promote both publishing tasks and revolutionary activities, with very little success however. Publication of the joint Bulgarian-Romanian newspaper *Bădushtnost/Viitorul* (*Future*), which he had initiated in March 1864, ceased two months later after only ten issues. Moreover, the four small bands that he had prepared crossed the Danube in the spring of 1867 without him, as he had fallen seriously ill with tuberculosis. He died in Bucharest in October 1867 at the age of 46.³⁷

Obviously, the motives for Rakovski's continual migrations were varied and intertwined with both personal and national aims, the former being his desire to study and his ambition to make a career, the latter included his efforts to enlighten his people, disseminate his ideas through the pursuit of writing and publishing, and to organise an armed uprising for political independence. At the same time, his private and national aspirations coincided to a great extent, because it was through his manifold national mission that his personal plans could be accomplished as well. His failing to find suitable conditions to fulfil his goals, together with the forced migra-

32 Firkatian, Traveller, 1996, 57. In the Outline of his Life Rakovski admits that he left Wallachia in a hurry, without explaining why however: Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 497.

33 Traikov, Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, 1974, 153.

34 Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 493–494.

35 The first issue was published in September 1860. Rakovski stopped the publication abruptly in late 1861 in order to become involved in revolutionary preparations.

36 Traikov, Rakovski i Balkanskite Narodi, 1971, 73–74.

37 Firkatian, Traveller, 1996, 85–93.

tions, which also impeded many of his plans, determined Rakovski's lifelong mobility. Last but not least, his migratory behaviour corresponded to his impulsive and rather eccentric character.

2.2. Migration, Intellectual Development and Revolutionary Activity

Having lived in many countries for longer or shorter periods of time (the Ottoman Empire, the Principalities/Romania, France, the Habsburg Empire, Russia and Serbia), where he became acquainted with many people of different ethnicities/nationalities, and being Greek educated, one might assume that Rakovski would have been imbued with a spirit of cosmopolitanism. This, however, was not the case. Rakovski developed and nurtured a strong sense of Bulgarian identity, which was the cornerstone of his worldview and fuelled his zeal to fight for Bulgarian political independence his whole life through. His nationally-oriented way of thinking was due to many factors, most of them related to his itinerancy. At first, Rakovski chose as migratory destinations mainly cities that hosted a significant Bulgarian diaspora, as it is only natural for someone to seek a better future abroad among co-nationals. Given that emigrant communities, together with the Bulgarians in Constantinople, played a leading role in the Bulgarian national movement in the course of the 19th century, Rakovski was certainly influenced by their ideas and initiatives of a national character.³⁸ Moreover, at a time when nationalism was prevalent in the Balkans, causing turmoil and threatening the political status quo, Rakovski was exposed to this subversive ideology at every migratory step.

More specifically, during his first stay in the Ottoman capital (1837–1841), Rakovski was introduced to the Bulgarian demand for ecclesiastical autonomy. Under the strong influence of Neofit Bosveli and Ilarion Makariopolski,³⁹ two radical protagonists of the ecclesiastical movement, he started to form a negative attitude towards the Patriarchal high clergy, the Phanariot clergy, as they were usually called, who were often of Greek origins and instruction. In a letter to Raino Popovic in June 1839, he called them obscurantists (*photosvestas*) who hindered Bulgarian

38 The Bulgarian Revival was initiated by a small number of intellectuals, mostly from the diaspora, in the form of cultural activities such as the establishment of schools, the cultivation of the written Bulgarian language (until then the educated used Greek) and the publication of Bulgarian newspapers and magazines together with historical, ethnographic, folkloric, and linguistic studies. These activities aimed to reveal the distinct Bulgarian ethnic character. See: Nikolai Genchev, *Bălgarskata Văzrozhdeska Inteligenciia* [The Bulgarian Intelligentsia of the Revival], Sofia 1991; Eleonora Naxidou, *The Routes to the Bulgarian National Movement. Simultaneously Homogenous and Polymorphous*, *Adam Akademi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 2 1(2012), 28–30.

39 Traikov, Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, 1971, 65–67.

enlightenment, afraid of losing their ability to milk the poor Bulgarians, like sheep, in order to spend vast amounts of money and live like satraps. “The time will come when we will free ourselves from these obscurantists and encroachers on the rights of the Bulgarian people!” he exclaimed.⁴⁰

From that time on, Rakovski became a fervent supporter of the Bulgarian claim for the creation of a separate national church, although he did not participate actively in the ongoing struggle. In his later writings, he continued to make similar accusations with the same degree of sharpness. In line with most protagonists of the Revival, Rakovski described how the Phanariot hierarchy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople imposed their ecclesiastical yoke on the Bulgarians during the period of Ottoman rule after they had abolished the Medieval Bulgarian Patriarchates of Tarnovo and Ohrid. He stressed the fact that Bulgarian high clergy had been replaced by Phanariot-Greeks, and the Bulgarian language by Greek in church services. He later added that Greeks tried, especially after 1821, to eradicate Bulgarian nationality, which they considered barbarian, and Hellenise the Bulgarians through education in order to accomplish the Greek Great Idea.⁴¹

Moreover, the unpleasant experience of his imprisonment in 1844 increased his antipathy towards the Phanariot high clergy – two metropolitans had signed the letter against him addressed to the Ottoman authorities – and strengthened his belief that Bulgarians should be released from their hegemony. His critique of the latter clearly reflects his personal experience. Rakovski claimed that metropolitans had a lot of power and lived in luxury like Turkish pashas. Anyone who dared to raise any objection or go against their wishes was imprisoned; if the dissenters happened to be more influential persons, they were promptly handed over to the Ottoman administration for disobedience to the Sultan or as insurgents, and were escorted in chains to Constantinople.⁴² He also maintained that the Bulgarians were the victims of the Phanariots’ economic exploitation, being forced to contribute to repayment of the enormous ecclesiastical debt resulting from the mismanagement and abuses of the high clergy, who were also responsible for the financial administration of the local Orthodox communities. According to Rakovski, the Bulgarians had absolutely no blame in the creation of this economic deficit, nor did they benefit from any facilities provided by the communities, which served only Greek interests. While being

40 Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 13.

41 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. Razgovor o Bălgarskomu Svestenomu Văprosu [Deliberation on the Bulgarian Ecclesiastical Issue], in: Traikov (ed.), Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, Săchineniia, vol. 3, Sofia 1984, 259–270.

42 Ibid., 271.

coerced into supplying large funds for church and community functions, they never profited from them.⁴³

Due mostly to the incident of his incarceration, Rakovski developed strong feelings of hostility towards the *chorbadzhi* as well. He claimed that they had attained their social status not because they were descended from the Medieval Bulgarian aristocracy, but because they were the heads of the local communities, designated by their compatriots to represent them and to collect taxes for the Turkish authorities. Although initially the *chorbadzhi* had been respected members of their society, he condemned them for having gradually become avaricious and corrupt, exploiting their brethren – especially the poor, simple villagers – for their own profit; as organs of the Turks and lackeys of the Greek high clergy, they had further drained the already impoverished simple folk.⁴⁴ Rakovski recounted numerous instances of their injustice on various occasions.⁴⁵

If Rakovski's stance on the ecclesiastical issue had its roots mostly in his acquaintances in Constantinople and his clashes with the local elite, his political/revolutionary nationalism, in conjunction with his idea of Balkan collaboration against Ottoman rule, was definitely a product of his interaction with the Bulgarian diaspora and Serbian nationalistic circles that were imbued with similar ideals, reinforced by the insurgent atmosphere in the Balkans fostered by Russian aggression towards the Sultan. The Serbo-Bulgarian insurrection in Braila served as a paradigm for his future rebellious activity, while the Crimean War proved to be a more constructive circumstance for Rakovski to realise his plans for Bulgarian revolt. His stay in Belgrade (1859–63) also had a very significant impact on him. His arrival in the Serbian capital coincided with the initiation of the national policy of the Serbian prince, Michael Obrenovich (1860–1868), who, encouraged by the Russians, sought Balkan collaboration with the aim of staging a united confrontation with the Ottomans. For this reason, Obrenovich finalised alliances with Montenegro, Greece and Romania, and contacted Bulgarian national activists, enabling them to use Serbia as their centre for promoting national activities.⁴⁶ In this context, Rakovski was able to publish his *Dunavski Leded* and form a Bulgarian legion when Serbia came to the brink of war against the Ottoman Empire on account of a conflict in which the former sought the withdrawal of Muslim residents and Ottoman military guards from Serbian soil. After the disbanding of the Bulgarian military corps when the belligerent countries

43 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. Glas Ednogo Bălgarina [The Voice of One Bulgarian], in: Traikov (ed.), Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, 1984, 152–156.

44 Bălgarska Dnevnică, 9 October 1857, 16.

45 See for example: Bălgarska Dnevnică, 21 August 1857, 9; 28 August 1857, 10.

46 Leften Stavros Stavrianos, Balkan Federation. A History of the Movement toward Balkan Unity in Modern Times, Hamden Connecticut 1964, 84–122.

started negotiations to settle their dispute,⁴⁷ Rakovski was sent to Athens to conduct discussions with Greek statesmen on the possibility of an agreement for united Balkan action against the Ottomans, which did not produce any results.⁴⁸

Finally, in his decision to engage in writing and journalism in order to awaken his people and propagate his ideas, Rakovski followed the example of nationalist intellectuals, who assumed leadership of the Balkan national movements seeking to promote the distinct national character of their people through language, history, ethnology, customs and traditions – in a nutshell, cultural traits. In this context, three of Rakovski's migratory stations played a principal role: Constantinople,⁴⁹ Novi Sad and Odessa.⁵⁰

In Novi Sad (1856–57), Rakovski became associated with the Serbian emigrants who sought to preserve their distinct national character in the Habsburg Empire, and in particular with Dr. Danilo Medakovic, an ardent writer, publisher and owner of a printing house who strove to raise the national spirit of his people. It was under their influence and with the significant aid of Medakovic that Rakovski published his *Gorski Pătnik* and eighteen issues of the newspaper *Bălgarska Dnevnică* (*The Bulgarian Daily*) from July 1857 until the November of the same year, when he was expelled from the country, as related above.⁵¹

In Odessa (1857–59), Rakovski dedicated his time to writing essays on various topics, presenting his views on historical, linguistic, and current issues concerning the Bulgarian people.⁵² Relating Bulgarian to the earliest written languages in Mesopotamia through an etymology of his own invention, he showed how Bulgarians

47 Traikov, *Rakovski i Balkanskite Narodi*, 1971, 73–74.

48 Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 401–408.

49 Constantinople (Carigrad) was the Bulgarian intellectual centre in the Ottoman Empire during the Revival. See: Plamen Bozhinov, *Carigradskite Bălgari mezhdu Reformite i Revoliuciiata 1875–1877* [Bulgarians in Carigrad between Reforms and Revolution 1875–1877], Sofia 2012.

50 The Bulgarian colony in Odessa was among the most active with regard to the national movement. In 1854 they formed the *Odesko Bălgarsko Nastoiatelsvo* [Odessa Bulgarian Representation], a pro-Russian committee with cultural activity which was also involved in the ecclesiastical conflict and supported revolutionary initiatives. See: Nikolai Genchev, *Bălgarsko Văzrazhdane* [Bulgarian Revival], Sofia 2010, 362–364; Janette Sampimon, *Becoming Bulgarian*, Amsterdam 2006, 209–215.

51 Arhiv na Rakovski 1, 492–493, 498; Firkatian, *Traveller*, 1996, 57–59. Most of the articles in Rakovski's newspaper were translations from the Serbian newspaper *Srbski Dnevnik*, which was published by Medakovic.

52 Some of the most important essays that Rakovski wrote during his stay in Odessa are: *Iztuplenii dervish ili vâstochinii vâpros* (*The exultant dervish or the eastern question*); *Glas ednogo Bălgarina* (*The voice of a Bulgarian*), in which he exposed his views on the Bulgarian ecclesiastical issue; *Niakolco rechi o Aseniu pârvmu, velikomu cariu bălgarskomu i sinu mu Aseniu vtorumu* (*A few words on Asen the First, the great Bulgarian tsar and his son, Asen the Second*); *Kliuch bălgarskago iazika* (*Key to the Bulgarian language*); *Kratko razsăzhdenie vărhu tămniia i lâzhovniia nachiala, na koih e osnovna stara povestnost vseh evropeiskih narodov* (*A short deliberation on the dark and false beginnings on which the ancient history of all European peoples is based*). Rakovski also published the *Pokazalec* (*Indicator*) on the methodology of historical research.

descended directly from the ancient peoples of central Asia, where in his theory human civilisation initially emerged. In this way, he attempted to prove that the Bulgarians were a more ancient and distinguished people than the Greeks.⁵³

At the same time, not having abandoned his ideas for Bulgarian liberation through revolution, he composed *Poziv kăm rodoliubci Bălgari za osvobozhdeniia Bălgarii* (*Appeal to the Patriotic Bulgarians for the Liberation of Bulgaria*), in which he called on Bulgarians to rise up for freedom, and drew up a plan for the preparation of an armed uprising in cooperation with the Greeks, Serbians and Montenegrins.⁵⁴ In an impassioned manner, Rakovski stressed that without civil rights, a man is not a man in the image of his creator, since God created him to be free and independent, and with the might of his mind, to dominate all other creatures on Earth. He went on to bemoan that a man who does not know freedom is equal if not inferior to animals, which, unable to speak out, labour in misery in servitude to their masters. He therefore urged the Bulgarians to take up arms in order to regain the precious freedom that their ancestors had enjoyed, and restore their celebrated name.⁵⁵ These lines best summarise the worldview he held and disseminated throughout his life.

In sum, the development of Rakovski's personality and ideological profile was largely affected by the interplay of the various cultural, political and intellectual milieus he was acquainted with during his long migratory course. Although it is difficult, or even next to impossible, to trace such interactions in every detail, it is possible to detect the most significant factors that contributed to the formation of his worldview. His strong Bulgarian feelings were furthered under the influence of the emerging national awareness among Bulgarians in Constantinople and diaspora. His inclination towards revolutionary activities was related to his rebellious spirit, his lifelong contacts with radical and revolutionary circles, which dated back to the years of his studies in Constantinople, the warlike and insurgent atmosphere in the Balkans, which was mainly due to the Crimean War, and the Serbian endeavours for the conclusion of a Balkan offensive alliance.

As regards his hostility towards the Patriarchal high clergy, coupled with his positive stance towards the Bulgarian demand for a national church, these derived from his relationship with the leading figures in the struggle for ecclesiastical autonomy during his first stay in Constantinople, his information on the initiatives taken by the Bulgarian communities for this cause, and his personal experiences. His aspiration to enlighten the Bulgarian people and inspire national ideals in them was stim-

53 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski, *Săchineniia* [Works], vol. 4, Svetla Giurova (ed.), Sofia 1988, 143–189.

54 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. *Săchineniia*, vol. 3, 1984, 461–465.

55 Georgi Stoikov Rakovski. *Săchineniia*, vol. 3, 1984, 461–462.

ulated by the cultural and educational undertakings of the Bulgarian intellectuals in Constantinople and abroad, and the similar initiatives of the national intelligentsias of the other Balkan peoples.

3. The 'Itinerant' Liuben Karavelov

Liuben Karavelov (Koprivshtica 1834–Russe 1879), intellectual and revolutionary, is the second protagonist of the Bulgarian 19th-century national movement whose migratory life history is analysed in this paper. Karavelov was mainly a proponent of political nationalism, although he did also argue for the Bulgarian demand for church autonomy. He not only emphasised the hardships endured by the Bulgarians during the long lasting 'Ottoman yoke,' but also elaborated his own theory of the political future of the liberated Bulgarian nation. In sum, he combined national and liberal ideals with federalism. Being a keen adherent of co-operation between the Christian Balkan peoples against the Turks, Karavelov fervently promoted the idea of the creation of a liberal Balkan federation which would ensure the individual liberty and the national rights of all members. The various ideologies he was exposed to during his continuous migrations played a decisive role in the formation of his worldview.

3.1. Motives for migration

Like Rakovski, Karavelov's first motive for migration was educational. Having attended local schools, where he was mostly taught in Bulgarian, he took his first migratory step in 1850, at the age of sixteen, in order to study at the Greek high school in Plovdiv. This was mainly on account of the decision by his father, who, being a wealthy livestock dealer, thought that it was time for his eldest son to learn Greek, the lingua franca of commerce, in order to become a successful merchant.⁵⁶ However, dissatisfied with the curriculum and disconcerted by the arrogance of both his teachers and schoolmates, after two years Karavelov opted for the newly founded Bulgarian Provincial School, which he attended for another year.⁵⁷

Karavelov's mobility during the next seven years was related to his quest for a profession that would match his skills. His first destination was Edirne (Adrianople), where he was sent by his father in 1853 to work as a tailor's apprentice. However, he was not at all enthusiastic about the prospect of making a career as a craftsman or

⁵⁶ Liuben Karavelov, *Zapiski za Bălgariia i za Bălgarete* [Notes on Bulgaria and Bulgarians], Sofia 1930, 27.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 96–106.

businessman. Indeed, having no inclination at all for tailoring, he was dismissed by his master. Then, his father took him on a business trip in another fruitless attempt to find his son a suitable job.⁵⁸ After that, Karavelov migrated to Constantinople, where he worked in a company office for a year (1855–1856). He was then attracted to the idea of becoming an officer in the Russian army and applied for entry to a military school. While waiting for a response, he departed for Russia in 1857, his first stopover being Odessa. En route to St. Petersburg, however, he was informed that his application had been rejected. Readjusting his plans, he chose Moscow as his place of residence (1857–1867) with the intention of studying at the University. Although he failed the entrance exam, he was allowed to attend classes at the Department of History and Literature as an auditor. While enhancing his knowledge through avid reading, Karavelov published short stories and wrote articles for various Russian newspapers and periodicals, the main aim of which was to inform the Russian public about the Bulgarian people, their culture, their current situation, and the ecclesiastical issue.⁵⁹

After a ten-year stay in Moscow, Karavelov again took to the migratory route in the spring of 1867, his destination being Belgrade. The motives for his departure were his inability to become accustomed to the Russian way of life,⁶⁰ his economic difficulties, and his quest for better opportunities to practise journalism. In Belgrade, in the post of correspondent for a few Russian newspapers, mainly *Golos*,⁶¹ he soon started publishing articles in the Serbian press as well.⁶²

Once in the Serbian capital, Karavelov was also influenced by the ongoing attempts to create a Balkan Christian alliance. At the same time, his siding with those opposed to Prince Michael resulted in his being expelled from the country twice. Both times he resided in Novi Sad in Austria-Hungary, where he was arrested by the police during his second exile in 1868, being suspected of having participated, together with anti-regime Serbs, in the plot which culminated in the assassination of Michael Obrenovich. He was released at the beginning of 1869, since the accusation against him could not be proven.⁶³ The time had come for him to continue his migratory course and find a more hospitable place to settle in.

58 Ibid., 11–12.

59 Mihail Arnaudov, Liuben Karavelov. *Zhivot, Delo, Epoha. 1834–1879* [Liuben Karavelov. *Life, Activity, Era*], Sofia 1964, 86–87.

60 *Iz Arhiva na Liuben Karavelov. Răkopisi, Materiali i Dokumenti* [From the Archive of Liuben Karavelov. *Manuscripts, Materials and Documents*], Docho Lekov/Liliana Minkova/Cveta Undzhieva (eds.), Sofia 1964, 228.

61 *Publicistikata na Liuben Karavelov* [The Published Works of Liuben Karavelov], vol. I, Mihail Dimitrov (ed.), Sofia 1957, 17.

62 Ibid., 26–28.

63 Arnaudov, Liuben Karavelov, 1964, 250–258; Liuben Karavelov, *Săbrani Săchinieniia* [Collected Works], vol. 4, Cveta Undzhieva/ Dogo Lekov/Petko Totev (eds.), Sofia 1984, 502–503.

This turned out to be Bucharest, where Karavelov arrived in the spring of 1869, having received an invitation by the Benevolent Society to assume the position of editor of the newspaper they intended to launch, *Otechestvo* (*The Homeland*). However, he withdrew from the agreement before the first issue had appeared because he realised that his views were too radical for the project's moderate sponsors.⁶⁴ Shortly afterwards, with the intention of propagating his ideas, Karavelov started publishing his own newspapers, *Svoboda* (*Liberty*), which was replaced by *Nezavisimost* (*Independence*) and then by the literary journal *Znanie* (*Knowledge*). As far as his migration motives are concerned, it was his involvement in the *Bălgarski Revolucionen Centralen Komitet* (*Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee*) that led to his temporary fleeing to Belgrade in 1873.

During the last years of his life (1876–79), Karavelov was constantly on the move. Although he did not participate in the Bulgarian uprising of April 1876, he was not indifferent to the eruption of the Balkan crisis. Moving around Serbia, he served as war correspondent for various Russian newspapers, as well as the Bulgarian diaspora press in Romania. Through his articles, he also urged his compatriots to rise against the 'Ottoman yoke.' In the meantime, he made trips to Romania to recruit Bulgarian volunteers for the Serbian army. In 1877, together with other prominent Bulgarians, Karavelov, in an advisory role, accompanied the high command of the Russian army, which cut across Romania in order to invade the Ottoman Empire. When the Russian forces entered Tărnovo, Karavelov settled there and resumed the publication of his journal *Znanie*. Soon afterwards, in his pursuit of journalism, Karavelov moved to the more cosmopolitan city of Ruse, most probably because it would have been difficult for him to reach as wide an audience in a small provincial town such as Tărnovo. In January 1879, he died in Ruse of tuberculosis at the age of forty-five.⁶⁵

In sum, the motives for Karavelov's migrations are varied and related to both his private life and national activities. His eagerness to continue his studies, his father's attempts to find him a craft or line of work, his ambition to become an army officer, and finally his decision to build a career in journalism in order to disseminate his ideas and inform his readers about the Bulgarian people and their national aspirations, led him to migrate. The difficulty in finding a favourable place to realise these plans made him itinerant. Additionally, some of his movements were not of his own accord. He faced expulsion more than once due to his radical, anti-regime views, which he expressed in his articles or through his involvement in revolutionary plots.

64 Karavelov resigned when he found out that the article he had sent for publication had been tampered with. See: Narodnost, 6 July 1869, 31; Edgar Anthony Zaharia, Liuben Karavelov. Bulgarian Apostle of Balkan Federation, PhD thesis, University of Arizona 1984, 149–161.

65 Arnaudov, Liuben Karavelov, 1964, 778–794.

3.2. Migration, Intellectual Development and Revolutionary Activity

Karavelov's nationally-oriented intellectual profile was certainly a product of his continuous migrations. In the first place, his stay in Plovdiv played an essential role in the consolidation of his Bulgarian identity. The reason was the outbreak of severe conflict of a national character between the town's Greek and Bulgarian inhabitants, which led to the split of the Orthodox community a few years later.⁶⁶ It was under the influence of this tense atmosphere that Karavelov fully developed his 'Bulgarian awareness,' and at the same time began fostering hostile feelings towards the Greeks, whom he accused of despising their fellow brethren, the Bulgarians, and trying to Hellenise them.⁶⁷

In Moscow, Karavelov began his career as author and journalist, which were to become his life-long occupations, while at the same time being introduced to the theoretical reflections of the Russian intelligentsia. Not only was he associated with distinguished academics, Slavophiles and Panslavists, such as Osip Bodianskii, Vladimir Lamaskii and Michael Pogodin,⁶⁸ but he was also acquainted with the political and social theories of significant left-wing thinkers and reformers, such as Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Chernishevski, as well as the radicalism of the revolutionaries Michael Bakunin and Sergei Nechaev. Of all these trends, Karavelov was most inspired by the idea of Slavic unity, shared by almost all the above circles, federalism, and the merits of revolution. More specifically, a Slavic federation under Russian patronage which would also include some non-Slavic peoples of Eastern Europe (the Magyars, Greeks and Romanians) was the political system proposed by prominent Panslavists such as Nikolai Danilevski.⁶⁹ Herzen and Bakunin also propagated the federal organisation of the Slavs, albeit in a different context. The former envisioned Slavic unification in the form of a federation of free and autonomous peoples, claiming that federalism was inherent to the Slavic character;⁷⁰ the latter

66 Nikolai Genchev, *Vázrozhdenskiiat Plovdiv [Plovdiv in the Revival]*, Sofia 2007, 165–166; Andreas Lyberatos, *Oikonomia, Politiki kai Ethniki Ideologia. I Diamorfosi ton Ethnikon Kommaton stin Philippoupoli tou 19ou Aiona [Economy, Politics and National Ideology. The Formation of National Parties in 19th-Century Philippoupolis]*, Heraklion 2009, 353–354, 380, 532.

67 Karavelov, *Zapiski*, 1930, 90–91.

68 Panslavism was the ideological trend which developed in Russia after the Crimean War (1853–1856) based on the ideas of Russian Slavophilism. It aimed to promote the cultural, and later the political unity of the Slavs, stressing their common origins and culture. The most significant Panslavists were Michael Pogodin, Ivan Aksakov, Vladimir Lamaski, Nikolai Danilevski, Yuri Samarin and Alexander Hilferding. Panslavist circles were mostly engaged in charitable and cultural-educational activities. Their political programme was neither systematic nor homogenous. See: Michael Boro Petrovich, *The Emergence of Russian Panslavism 1856–1870*, New York/London 1956.

69 Nikolai Danilevkii, *Rossia i Evropa [Russia and Europe]*, Petersburg 1895, 423–424.

70 Alexander Herzen, *From the Other Shore* (transl. from the Russian by Moura Budberg) and *The Russian People and Socialism. An Open Letter to Jules Michelet* (transl. from the French by Richard Wollheim), London 1956, 172–177.

advocated for a Slavic federal union based on the principles of the French Revolution – equality, freedom and fraternity.⁷¹

Karavelov's Belgrade period provided him with more ideological and political stimuli and inspiration. He arrived there at a time when the Benevolent Society, (*Dobrodetelna Druzina*), founded in Bucharest in 1862 by the conservative pro-Russian section of the Bulgarian community,⁷² was involved in the aforementioned plans for Balkan cooperation against the Ottomans pursued by Michael Obrenovich. The Bulgarian committee put forward a proposal for the creation of a Serbo-Bulgarian (or Bulgaro-Serbian) state under the rule of the Obrenovich dynasty, which was approved by both an assembly of Bulgarian delegates in Bucharest and the Serbian government, which, however, refrained from signing and promoting it.⁷³ Although Karavelov was initially positive towards this approach, he soon became critical of it, mainly because he was opposed to Prince Michael's autocratic methods of governance and began to elaborate his own federal plans. He accused the prince of disrespecting the will of his people, as well as the National Assembly, having anti-Russian inclinations and succumbing to Western, especially French, influences.⁷⁴ Karavelov's stance derived from his liberal views, which he developed further through his affiliations with the United Serbian Youth (*Omladina*)⁷⁵ and the Serbian Liberal Party. Karavelov was also inspired by the federal ideas of Vladimir Jovanovic (1833–1922), the most prominent Serbian liberal ideologist of the 1860s, who played a leading role in both the abovementioned political associations.⁷⁶ Jovanovic proposed the creation of an independent confederation of free nations (Serbs, Croats and Bulgarians) on the Lower Danube such as that of Switzerland and the United States of America.⁷⁷

Stimulated by the abovementioned ideological milieu, Karavelov formulated his own plan for the transformation of the Balkan status quo, which can be summarised as follows. First of all, he was convinced that the Bulgarians could never develop friendly relations with the Turkish authorities, as the wellbeing of the former

71 Edward Hallett Carr, Michael Bakunin, New York 1961, 166–167.

72 Genchev, *Bălgarsko Văzrazhdane*, 2010, 359–360.

73 Vladimir Peev, *Dobrodetelnata Druzina i Pregovorite sās Sārbiia prez 1867–1868 g.* [The Benevolent Society and the Discussions with Serbia in 1867–1868], in: Plamen Mitev (ed.), *Vremeto na Levski*, Sofia 2010, 88–144.

74 Liuben Karavelov, *Sābrani Sāchineniia* [Collected Works], vol. 11, Cveta Undzhieva (ed.), Sofia 1989, 14–15, 92–93, 98.

75 The United Serbian Youth (Ujedinjena Omladina Srpska), known as *Omladina*, was a political organization active from 1866 until 1872. Founded in Novi Sad in the Habsburg Empire it had national-liberal orientations and advocated South Slavic unity. See: *Ujedinjena Omladina Srpska*, Zbornik Radova, Novi Sad 1968.

76 Gale Stokes, *Legitimacy through Liberalism: Vladimir Jovanovic and the Transformation of Serbian Politics*, Seattle and London 1975.

77 Vladimir Jovanovic, *The Emancipation and Unity of the Serbian Nation or The Regeneration of Eastern Europe by the Reconstitution of the Nationalities*, Geneva 1871, 146–147, 150.

depended on the discontentment of the latter.⁷⁸ At the same time, he believed in the sacredness of both individual and national freedom.⁷⁹ For him it was through liberty that humans attained the highest level of civic life, self-respect, and enlightenment.⁸⁰ For this reason, Karavelov envisioned a liberated Bulgarian state that would be both prosperous and progressive, organised on the basis of one nation or at least one race that had common ethics, customs, traditions and religion, and governed by liberal principles, as was the case with [the United States of] America, Switzerland and Belgium.⁸¹ Opposed to the monarchy, he claimed that all royals – the Sultans included – were tyrants and enemies of the people who only looked after their own interests.⁸²

At the same time, Karavelov advocated co-operation among the Christian Balkan peoples against the Ottoman Empire through a united revolutionary movement and the subsequent creation of a liberal Balkan federation in which all members would participate on equal terms and enjoy autonomy. With their own judicial system based on national ethics and traditions, their own education system and their own literature, they would also be represented in the Supreme Federal Parliament.⁸³

As for the participants of this political union, Karavelov initially opted for a South-Slavic federation which would include the Bulgarians and the Serbs, together with the Montenegrins and the Slavs of the Habsburg Empire.⁸⁴ Soon afterwards, he added the Romanians and the Greeks to the Danubian Federation, as he renamed his multi-national association.⁸⁵ However, Karavelov was sceptical about the inclusion of the Greeks. Finally he excluded them in 1873 because of his personal attitude towards them and due to Greek consent to the Patriarchate of Constantinople's proclaiming the newly established Bulgarian Church (1870) schismatic, as well as the outbreak of the conflict between the Greeks and the Bulgarians over the future political control of the territories of Thrace and Macedonia. In this context, he considered the Greeks national enemies and accused them of anti-Bulgarian policies and fanaticism against the Slavs.⁸⁶

Finally, Karavelov's stay in Bucharest was crucial for his initiation into the Bulgarian revolutionary movement. While publishing his newspaper, *Svoboda*, he was involved in the planning of revolutionary activity by the *Bălgarski Revolucionen*

78 *Svoboda*, 2 July 1872, 1.

79 Liuben Karavelov, *Săbrani Săchineniia* [Collected Works], vol. 12, Petko Toshev (ed.), Sofia 1992, 7.

80 *Ibid.*, 10.

81 *Svoboda*, 16 September 1870, 42.

82 Karavelov, *Săbrani Săchineniia*, 12, 11–13.

83 *Svoboda*, 13 March 1871, 11.

84 *Publicistikata I*, 247–248.

85 *Publicistikata I*, 511–512.

86 Eleonora Naxidou, *Ethnic Relations vs. National Interests: Liuben Karavelov and the Greeks*, in: *Treti Mezhdunaroden Kongres po Bulgaristika, Sekciia 'Istoriia i Arheologiiia'* [Third International Congress for Bulgarian Studies, Session 'History and Archaeology;], Sofia 2014, 74–80.

Centralen Komitet (Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee), which he founded together with Vasil Levski, another protagonist of Bulgarian political nationalism and apostle of liberation. The Committee aimed to prepare the ground for an uprising in Bulgarian lands under Ottoman rule.⁸⁷ While Karavelov was the mastermind and advocate of the venture, Levski was the man of action who entered Bulgaria in order to coordinate the practical side of the plan. Uncovered, however, Levski was arrested and executed by the Turks, whereas Karavelov evaded capture by fleeing to Belgrade. When the situation normalised, he returned to the Romanian capital in 1873 and resumed his task of publishing, changing the name of his paper to *Nezavisimost (Independence)* so as to avoid trouble, since *Svoboda* had been the organ for the propagation of revolution. Shortly afterwards, the Committee was reorganised under new leadership, and Karavelov was marginalised.⁸⁸ Gravely disappointed by such disagreeable developments and faced with serious financial problems, he stopped publishing *Nezavisimost*, replacing it with *Znanie (Knowledge)*, a literary, academic, and educational journal which was issued throughout 1875. Having abandoned his aspiration to imbue his people with the idea of national liberation through revolution, Karavelov undertook a new mission, that of enlightening them.

All in all, Karavelov's intellectual profile was without doubt a product of the ideological capital that he accumulated through his migratory course. In this context, his stay in Russia and Serbia/the Habsburg Empire were the most significant periods in his life. In Moscow, the young Bulgarian with an inquisitive mind was greatly influenced by an ideological environment rich in both conservative and radical views related to Panslavism, socialism, radicalism, and anarchism. It was there that he became familiar with the notion of Slavic cultural and political unity, diverse versions of federalism, criticism of despotism, and the ideals of the French revolution, all of which formed the basis for the development of his own worldview. On account of his liberal background, Karavelov was associated with the opposition to Prince Michael and began to criticise the autocratic method of governance of the Serbian ruler upon his arrival in Belgrade. While staying in Belgrade and Novi Sad, new influences helped crystallise his beliefs on the reformation of the political situation in the Balkans. There were, on the one hand, the stimuli he received from Serbian liberalism and the promotion of South-Slavic unity, and on the other, the initiatives of the Serbian ruler to create a Balkan alliance against the Ottoman Empire and the agreement, at least on paper, between the Serbian government and the Bulgarian *Benevolent Society* for the establishment of a Serbo-Bulgarian state.

87 Alexandar Burmov, Liuben Karavelov i Săzdavaneto na Bălgarskiia Revoliucionen Centralen Komitet v Bukuresht [Liuben Karavelov and the establishment of the Bulgarian Revolutionary Central Committee in Bucharest], in: *Izbrani Proizvedeniia v tri toma*, vol. 2, Sofia 1974, 219–236.

88 Arnaudov, Liuben Karavelov, 1964, 354–395.

Karavelov was also imbued with revolutionary spirit through his contacts outlined above. Although he was certainly not a man of the sword, he became convinced that revolution was the only possible means of casting off the 'Turkish yoke' and founding the Balkan federation he envisioned. He thus became involved in revolutionary preparations on his arrival in Bucharest, where circumstances were more opportune for such an endeavour.

Finally, an additional factor has to be taken into account if we are to understand Karavelov's ideological inspirations: namely, his contacts with the Bulgarian communities of the diaspora and their nationally-driven cultural, ecclesiastical, and political activities. Within this framework he acknowledged the importance of journalism for the dissemination of both national ideals and the need for Bulgarian ecclesiastical autonomy, which he also supported through his articles.

4. Conclusions

Georgi Rakovski and Liuben Karavelov belong to the Balkan branch of the 19th-century network of European revolutionary-intellectuals 'in exile.' By means of their continual migrations, they became familiar with national, liberal, and federal ideas, which they transferred to the Bulgarian context, thereby championing Bulgarian political independence and advocating for cultural and ecclesiastical nationalism. More specifically, in their writings, they both characterised Ottoman rule as a cruel yoke and called for national liberation through revolution in collaboration with the other Balkan Christian peoples. However, while Rakovski was not concerned with the form of governance of the liberated nation-state, Karavelov elaborated and propagated a plan for the creation of a liberal South-Slavic or Danubian federation.

Moreover, both Rakovski and Karavelov found an outlet in journalism as a way of communicating their ideas and enlightening their compatriots, the difference being that Rakovski further sought to stimulate Bulgarian national pride by writing historical, ethnographical and linguistic essays which aimed to show that Bulgarians were an ancient and remarkable people. Meanwhile, both men became involved in preparations for armed uprisings, albeit each in his own way. Rakovski could be described as more of a revolutionary, whereas Karavelov was more of an intellectual. Being all for action, the former was involved in several plans for revolt, while the latter attempted mostly to incite his compatriots to rebellion and was only once engaged in revolutionary preparations, even then serving as the theoretical mind of the endeavour. All in all, because of their significant contribution to the advancement of the Bulgarian national movement, they were recognised as two of the most eminent figures of the Revival.

Migration, another significant characteristic that Rakovski and Karavelov have in common was instrumental to the development of their personalities and *Weltanschauung*. It was their life-long migratory courses that gave each man the opportunity to make contacts within the various socio-political and ideological milieus, establish relations with several Bulgarian diaspora communities, and participate in their particular national plans, as well as have access to books and become well-informed about the current situation, not only in the Balkans but also in wider Europe. To put it another way, had they stayed in their native places for their entire lives, they would not have become revolutionary-intellectuals.

Besides the decisive impact that mobility exerted on each of them separately, their migratory behaviour also bears similarities. In the first place, the motives that drove them to change places continually are comparable. It was a combination of ambitious personal and national goals based on their middle-class social background and high level of education, together with their unwillingness to follow business careers that instigated their voluntary departures. On the other hand, they both faced expulsion more than once as a consequence of their anti-regime or rebellious activities. Although a harsh experience, it impelled them to explore new environments and at the same time strengthened their determination to fight for their ideals. Furthermore, it appears that both moved pretty much in the same places, the only considerable difference being that Rakovski never settled in Moscow. Yet another commonality is the short duration of their stay in each location, with the exception of Karavelov's ten-year residence in Moscow.

In this way, it can thus be assumed that their movements follow a common migratory pattern which is unique in that it does not correspond to any of the specific types of modern migration mentioned in the theoretical section of this paper. Rather, it seems to combine features from several different categories with regard to the push-pull factors (both economic, educational and national, sometimes voluntary, sometimes forced), duration (both long-term and short-term), itineraries (both long-distance, short-distance and circulatory), status (sometimes legal, sometimes illegal), profile (both intellectual and revolutionary) etc.

All in all, the peripatetic lives of Rakovski and Karavelov are illustrative of a distinct model of migration, namely that of the Balkan revolutionary-intellectual of the 19th century.