

towns too, according the mahale/suburbs. As these overlapped with parishes, the priest had his reserved place, the eleven others being assessed by election. However, the law regulations were often broken as the practice of the elections was still at the beginning. Tafrova records the misuse of election rules which has been noticed by the official journal *Dunav* and by other newspapers. The Bulgarians succeeded yet to occupy important places in the administration. In fact, Tafrova says, the core issue is whether this native 'bureaucracy' had as incentive its own self interest or they acted to the well of the public interest.

The subject of the building up of the Bulgarian nation, although it is not openly expressed among the theoretical premises of the book, is so fundamental that, at least here and there it is present. We know the misrepresentations that were brought up by the intersection of the contrasting topics of Ottoman legacy and Bulgarian national movement⁴. Notwithstanding, the present book is a serviceable work concerning the local history of Northern Bulgaria. It continues the worthy tradition of Bulgarian historians like Strashimir Dimitrov, Hristo Gandev, and more recently Slavka Draganova or Teodora Bakurdjieva. Last but not least, the parameters set out by Tafrova would be useful for a comparative approach to cross border areas like the Danube valley region or Dobroudja, bringing thus one important contribution to the Balkan studies.

Stelu Șerban

Petar PETROV, Katerina GEHL, Doroteija DOBREVA, Klaus ROTH, Gabrielle WOLF, *Nashata Evropa. Bulgarski predstavi za svoeto i chuzhdoto 1870–1945*, Sofija, Ciela, 2011, 361 pp.

The volume is the outcome of a research project financed by the German Agency for Scientific Research. The project took place between 2001 and 2006 at the Munich University and a German version of the book was published in 2007. Professor Klaus Roth records all these details in the short introduction. The research plan developed around the multiple images of 'Europeanization' in Eastern and South-Eastern countries, with emphasis on Bulgaria, in the years that followed the gaining of independence. Europe as divided between centre and periphery is present in those 'Europeanization' images. The original feeling of an exotic periphery overlaps with the backwardness, the rurality, and the reluctance to change that ordinary people in these countries have shown and still show (as it can be seen in the case of Greece despite the 25 years of her belonging to European Union, Roth notices). However, the core issue of the project does not regard such outsiders versus insiders interpretations of the European model, but the dissents and everyday prejudices that the Europeanization planted in the modernizing countries. In the case of Bulgaria for instance, the hasty modernization at the end of 19th century led to the birth of an urban culture in towns like Ruse, Shumen, Sofia, and Plovdiv, isolating them from the vast majority of the population, rural and 'backward'. That culture showed the multifaceted images of country Europeanization. Its 'pop' expressions, like theatre plays, caricatures, daily press, are described by the authors of other articles collected in the volume.

The content of the volume is quite unbalanced. Three articles that cover more than 200 pages are authored by Petar Petrov with Katerina Gehl, whereas they sign separately other two articles. George Bernard Shaw and his 'imagined Bulgaria' are the subject of two articles. In the first one, Petrov and Gehl are fully occupied with the context and circumstances of two of the plays written by Shaw. These are *The Arms and the Man*, and *Androcles and the Lion*. Both plays, when they were represented as well as long time later, did hurt the national pride of the Bulgarians who answered with sharp criticisms. *The Arms and the Man* humorously evoke the Bulgarians' involvement in the 1885 war with Serbia, when Eastern Rumelia was united to Bulgaria. The play was first put on the stage in

⁴ Karpat H. Kemal, "Introduction", in Kemal H. Karpat (ed.), 1990, *The Turks of Bulgaria*, ISIS Press, Istanbul, pp. 1–22; Maria Todorova, "Bulgarian Historical Writing on Ottoman Empire", in *New Perspectives on Turkey*, vol. 12, 1995, pp. 97–118.

1894, in London, but the echoes rapidly spread in Bulgaria and Shaw was accused to have blackened the national history of Bulgaria. The premiere of the second play took place thirty years later in Sofia and it was perceived like the playwright's excuse for his previous gaffe. Petrov and Gehl comment with details the enmities these plays stirred and emphasize the 'Balkan' identity stereotypes and prejudices included in the polemics.

As an epilogue, Petar Petrov is discussing the fate of Shaw's play, *The Arms and the Men*, after 1990. In 1995 Nikolai Polijakov, who is scene director at the Youth Theatre in Sofija, put the play on the stage at the Municipal Theatre of Vratsa, but he did not succeed to move the play representation in Sofija. Only in 2010 he was invited to put the play on the stage of the Municipal Theatre in Ruse. Petrov argues the resistances to the Polijakov representations unveil the remnants tensions and crisis of the Bulgarian national identity. Despite Bulgaria's entering in the European Union and the enthusiasm raised by this event, the things are very likely as they happened one century ago.

A second article by Petar Petrov and Katerina Gehl deals with the printed political caricature in the interwar period in Bulgaria. Several illustrated journals imitating the western models of *Il Papagallo*/*Le Perroquet*/*The Parrot*, forced their satirical views on the First and Second World Wars, international peace conferences, international treatises. Sava Zluchkin was the mastermind and relentless editor of those *Bulgarski*, *Balkanski*, and *Svetoven Papagali* which covered two decades (1910–1930; see the table with the various series of Papagali political caricature in Bulgaria, 1892–1961). The authors report on the *Balkanski Papagal* which in its twelve years of apparition (1915–1927) reflected the resentment provoked by the First World War with the dramatic defeat of Bulgaria after the ambitious hopes which played so notably a part in the country's foreign policy. The caricatures ranged from Bulgaria's image as actor of international politics (including the frustrating dependence to the 'Great Powers') to the reciprocal stereotypes: Bulgarian images of neighbouring countries, Turkey, Greece, Serbia, and Romania. After Zluchkin died (1930), this type of political caricature failed to keep the public's interest. In 1935, Nikola Bonev tried for the following ten years to start again the work which had once been performed, but it was confronted to another world war.

In their third article, Petar Petrov and Katerina Gehl accumulate information on the confrontation native/original vs. foreign/outside patterns as it emerged from press writing. Petrov and Gehl have chosen to discuss the impact of two plays about journalists. By the end of 1899 the play of the German writer Gustav Freitag, *The Journalists*, was put on the stage in Sofia. The play was a failure as there were two representations only, but some Bulgarians critics stressed the inability of the actors and gave their advice against the audience's lack of taste. The influent Bulgarian writer Ivan Vazov, however, claimed that neither the actors, nor the public were guilty. The intrigue of the play had nothing to do with the Bulgarian way of writing the press, Vazov declared, and, for justifying his opinion, he wrote up another play about a newspaperman. The authors argue that the polemics enacted two styles of understanding the civic space. They take their stand on Norbert Elias' works about the civilizing process. Thus they show how a rational, balanced and self-controlled pattern of behaviour, which was drawn from the Western civilization, opposed to the emotional and wild conduct.

This last article somehow generalizes the analysis of the two other articles written by Gabrielle Wolf and Katerina Gehl. Both of them deal with the theatre as a space apt to shape the civil society. In her article, Gabrielle Wolf aims to scrutinize and take lessons of the former experiment to expand the national network of popular theatres in Bulgaria by the beginning of 20th century (pp. 241–266). She takes up Holm Sundhaussen's perspective on the activating the civil society in South East Europe after 1990, and argue that this sort of social project has occurred much earlier too. Sundhaussen's perspective proves to be fruitful thus. Though, Wolf doubts that experiments like the 'free theatres' at the beginning of the 20th century in Bulgaria contributed to develop an associative life. Katerina Gehl records the list of German plays that, being translated into Bulgarian, were partly put on the stage in Bulgarian theatres at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th one. Their translation was inspired by the impetus to modernize the social life in Bulgaria.

The topic of Doroteja Dobрева's article is the participation of Bulgaria to the Paris International Exhibition in 1900. It is about images and self-images too, though they were built up outside the national space. Dobрева is contrasting the expectations of the Bulgarian 'young' nation

and the modest impression Bulgaria's performance made. Beyond this yet, some efforts were made to express some distinct features of the national character, in the painting, the architecture, and not the less in the popular/peasant culture and national history. For instance, the wish to set one national style in the architecture led one of the factors of Bulgaria's participation to the Paris exhibition, Anton Mitov, to conceive a project to found the Museum for Bulgarian Resurrection. The architecture of that museum, which was not built then, had to recompose the Byzantine style.

This review it should recognize the lack of theoretical perspective of the volume. Despite the big amount of data and details about Bulgaria on the eve of 20th century, the conclusions are rather scarce. However, as the bricks of erecting the Bulgarian national imagery are the stereotypes, the comparison alongside the same analytical premises with other nations in the Balkans would make things balanced and induce to more conclusive statements.

Stelu Șerban

Rumena KONEVA, *Ivan Schischmanoff i obedinena Evropa (Ivan Schischmanoff et l'Europe Unie)*, Ed. Gutenberg, Sofia, 2011, 235 pp.

Il s'agit d'un mouvement intellectuel, l'*Union Paneuropéenne*, fondée en Autriche en 1922, à laquelle ont adhéré des personnalités célèbres de l'intelligentsia européenne, mais aussi plusieurs autres de l'espace culturel balkanique. Après 1933, l'Union fut anéantie par les nazis. Les archives de Vienne de cette organisation, récupérées, semble – t – il, à la fin de la guerre par l'armée soviétique, se trouvent à présent à Moscou. Le savant bulgare I.D. Schischmanoff avait adhéré au mouvement dès qu'il prit connaissance de son existence.

Le livre de R. Koneva a deux points de convergence, ainsi que le titre nous l'indique: *Ivan Schischmanoff et l'Union Paneuropéenne*. Il commence par la biographie d'Ivan Schischmanoff, personnalité complexe et brillante du mouvement intellectuel bulgare et balkanique de modernisation et d'européanisation de la société balkanique. Il fut un de premiers professeurs de l'Université de Sofia (fondée en 1888), l'initiateur d'une riche activité de recherche ayant pour but la récupération de l'histoire culturelle de la Bulgarie et de la culture slave, fondateur de la recherche comparée de la culture populaire, mais aussi des littératures modernes des Balkans, dans leurs rapports avec les littératures européennes. I.S. est le modernisateur de l'enseignement bulgare (en tant que ministre de l'enseignement), diplomate, ensuite professeur à la Université de Freiburg (où il a fondé la chaire d'études slaves).

À Vienne, poursuivant le trajet intellectuel de I.S., la recherche de Koneva s'est portée sur l'activité du fondateur de l'*Union Paneuropéenne*, le comte autrichien Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove – Kalergi. R. Koneva valorise les dimensions de ce mouvement, le symbole lancé dans la pensée politique européenne, l'importance qu'il a représenté pour les intellectuels de l'Europe Centrale et, surtout, pour ceux de Balkans, où il fut connu justement grâce à Ivan Schischmanoff, devenu collaborateur et ami du comte Coudenhove-Kalergi. Après son adhésion, I.S. a fondé dans sa propre maison de Sofia une filiale de l'*Union Paneuropéenne* qu'il dirigea jusqu'à sa mort en 1928, tandis que d'autres filiales ont été créées en Grèce et en Yougoslavie. J'ajoute la Roumanie, où il y a eu une correspondance entre Coudenhove-Kalergi et N. Iorga, en 1934.

Le point de convergence du livre se déplace sur le sujet de l'*Union Paneuropéenne* dont l'existence, l'importance et l'impact sont mis en lumière historiographique par Koneva 70 ans après sa fondation. Pratiquement, l'*Union Paneuropéenne* fut le premier concept de l'*Union Européenne* de nos jours. Le livre ramène dans la mémoire historiographique un grand mouvement intellectuel d'envergure européenne des années 1920–1930: l'*Union Paneuropéenne*. Il est une contribution à l'histoire de mouvements intellectuels européens du XX^e siècle. A présent, quand la plupart de pays ex-communistes de l'Est et du Sud-Est ont rejoint l'Union Européenne, le livre revêt aussi une grande actualité. Le réflexe d'intégration dans l'Union Européenne est né de nos jours après une grande secousse, la chute de l'empire communiste; l'*Union Paneuropéenne*, qui se disait appelée à défendre l'âme européenne contre deux dangers, le bolchévisme et l'américanisme, fut créée après un autre