

BULGARIAN REVIVAL CULTURE - AN AXIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE IN THE TEXTS OF JANUARIUS MACGAHAN AND STANISLAS ST. CLAIR

Zhivko Hristov

New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria

Abstract

Analyzing the vocabulary and the stylistic techniques in the works of the two authors, dedicated to Bulgaria, the article aims to contribute to a change of the two seemingly contrasting attitudes in their Bulgarian reception. The first is the implicit attitude to MacGahan as a "dangerous" author whose work is not even published with its true title - "The Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria". The focus of the analysis are the passages that deal with the Bulgarian material culture and education, as well as their axiological charge. The second is the negative value-based perception of the Bulgaro-phobic texts of St. Clair, an author obviously considered ineligible for translating into Bulgarian. However, his work might be a valuable source of knowledge about the culture of the Bulgarian national revival, provided that our reception remains neutral and unaffected by his derogatory language.

Key words: translation equivalence, connotation, axiology, irony, value-oriented motivation

Article history:

Received: 24 April 2015;

Reviewed: 23 November 2015;

Revised: 26 November 2015;

Accepted: 21 December 2015;

Published: 31 December 2015

Zhivko Hristov has an MA in Philosophy with a minor in English from St Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia, Bulgaria. In 2001 – 2013, he taught English for International Relations and Psychology at Varna Free University. In 2014, he started his doctoral studies in Linguistics and Theory of Translation at New Bulgarian University. Zhivko has published many translations from Bulgarian into English in the field of Bulgarian cultural heritage and archaeology, Bulgarian translations of fiction, as well as one sociological treatise. His research interests are in the area of semantics and the reception of specialized translation.

Email: zhristov@nbu.bg; hur_1961@yahoo.com

MacGahan and St. Clair, the forgotten and the unfamiliar

It was during the quest for public support by the West in relation to the "Eastern Question", on the eve of the Bulgarian national liberation, that two Anglophone political writers - Januarius MacGahan and Stanislas St. Clair - published their texts, dedicated to Bulgaria. MacGahan published his reports in the "Daily News", issued later under the title "The Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria" (MacGahan, 1876; MacGahan, 1880). Seven years earlier, St. Clair had released "A residence in Bulgaria, or notes on the resources and administration of Turkey", co-authored by Charles Brophy (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869).

Albeit for entirely different reasons, most texts of both authors are difficult, almost prohibitive for reading by a recipient with a Bulgarian national consciousness. The purpose of MacGahan, which is the truth, fully justifies his monstrous naturalism; however, when being quoted by the Bulgarian writer Stefan Tsanev, the latter warns his readers "to skip a dozen pages and then read on 'if they are easily unsettled by nature'" (Tsanev, 2007, p. 302). It is also an indicative fact that MacGahan's reports were published in Bulgarian with their true title "The Turkish atrocities..." for the first (and last) time in 1880. As for St. Clair's descriptions of the Bulgarians and their way of life, they are so far-fetched and derogatory as to border on the absurd and grotesque. Whereas MacGahan has scarcely been published in Bulgarian, St. Clair has not been translated at all. Actually, a native speaker of Bulgarian would hardly engage in such an undertaking.

The contribution of MacGahan's ominous reports from the centres of the April uprising for triggering debates in the British Parliament as well as public support for the Bulgarian national cause has been widely acknowledged. But although the words on his tombstone read "Liberator of Bulgaria", analyses and comments on his texts are almost entirely absent in Bulgarian literature. Bulgarian letters are in debt to his memory not only because he described the atrocities of the oppressor; it also presents an overview, albeit brief, of the spiritual and material development of Bulgaria in this period. Below, I will attempt to analyze the axiological perspective of the vocabulary in his texts and in the translation of Stefan Stambolov.

The perspective from which Stanislas St. Clair presented Bulgaria in his study "A residence in Bulgaria, or notes on the resources and administration of Turkey" is quite different (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869). In present-day texts on the Internet, the author is labelled a "Bulgarophobe" and "monster" (internationalist, 2012), but to those who have read his work these epithets might sound too weak (Hristov, 2014a). After the Liberation, he organized the so-called "St. Clair's riot" in the Rhodopes, crushed by Captain Petko Kiriakov with Russian help. However, unlike MacGahan, St. Clair knew in detail many aspects of the everyday life, folklore, traditions and superstitions of the Bulgarian people. He had spent three years in a Bulgarian village, being the British consul in Varna. I will attempt to analyze the axiological thinking behind a part of his texts (not translated into Bulgarian), and assess the source value they may have for our cultural heritage - no matter how difficult an unbiased view could be on what he wrote about the Bulgarians.

MacGahan on Bulgaria

I will not dwell on the passages of his reports, describing the atrocities of Turkish bashibazouks (irregulars) in many Bulgarian towns. They dominate the reports in both volume and the suggestive power of the text; they are so shocking that publishing them as part of his historical "poem", Stefan Tsanev apologizes to the reader for having the "misfortune" to read them (Tsanev, 2006, p. 314). I will only mention in passing that characterising the Turks, MacGahan uses no contemptuous or derogatory vocabulary nor spiteful irony, which predominate in St. Clair's texts on Bulgarians. T. Stoicheva, in a study on the reception of the Bulgarian identity from the perspective of culturology, observes that MacGahan makes it a point that the language he uses "is neutralized and cleared by rhetorical layers and extrinsic surpluses, to be turned into an impeccable mediator" (Stoicheva, 2007, p. 91).

On the other hand, in the text of MacGahan there are several, albeit brief descriptions of the National Revival material and spiritual culture of the Bulgarian people, which clearly demonstrate his axiological attitude. They are among the few direct foreign accounts of the cultural heritage from the Pre-liberation period. It can be assumed that the undeniable thinking in terms of values in these texts can also justify a serious reassessment of our present-day approach to the national heritage, as well as of the language we use when presenting it to the world.

One of the most frequently quoted passages of MacGahan can be found in his report from Batak of 2 August (MacGahan, 1876, pp. 24-25). If we summarize, the correspondent of "Daily News" opposes a positive picture from Bulgaria against the existing public opinion about the country (and his own preliminary attitude) expressed by the phrase "mere savages". In his translation from Russian, St. Stambolov uses the Bulgarian derogatory "диваци" as an equivalent. However, some of the connotations or the source language are absent: in English they are in the semantic of the adjective "mere," which is difficult to render, as well as the indicative pronoun in "these Bulgarians". Perhaps the choice of Stambolov as a translator depended not only on the fact that he was not familiar with the text in English, but on his value-determined attitude as well; MacGahan's rhetorical technique may have seemed to him an unnecessary overstatement (MacGahan, 1880, p. 11).

We will look at some concepts from this well-known paragraph that characterize the Bulgarian attitude towards education, the National Revival architecture, as well as the brief description of our ethnicity. MacGahan is "astonished, as I believe most of my readers will be" by the "very flourishing condition" of the Bulgarian schools. In the Stambolov translation, the author's astonishment is emphasized by a question "What was my astonishment when..." ("Какво беше моето удивление, когато..."). We also have at our disposal later correspondence on the traditions of Bulgarian education by MacGahan, which, regrettably, were not included in the English edition of 1976.¹ Although we can only make conclusions on the basis of the translated text, MacGahan's vocabulary in his description of the schools in Sliven is equally value-oriented. The girls' school there is a "nice new wooden house" with "numerous and large windows," "large rooms and spacious halls," surrounded by "shady trees" ("нов хубав дървен дом", "многобройни и големи прозорци", "с големи стаи и обширни зали", "сенчести дървета"); the boy's school is "full of cheerful, bright children's faces" and the children regard "their occupation as a most honorable and noble one" ("пълно с весели, блестящи детски лица", "на занятието си, като на най-почтено и благородно") (Ibid, pp. 55-56).

¹ The original English text of these later reports is not available on the Internet. Therefore, I will back-translate Stambolov's text and give the Bulgarian passages in brackets. The vocabulary consists mostly of realia, which will favour equivalency in our case.

The connotation of MacGahan's epithets is completely different in the same report, when mentioning the "numerous difficulties caused by the authorities" (back-translated from Stambolov's "многочислените затруднения, създавани от властите"). In the author's English text it is not simply the authorities that cause difficulties but the "the perversity of Turkish authorities". Judging by the translator's general adherence to the equivalence of translation, this omission might be due to the mediation of the Russian "interlinear gloss".

In the same passage, the American journalist provides a description, even though very brief, of the buildings in the Bulgarian villages and the Bulgarians themselves. What was burnt down were "solid stone houses", not "several worthless small houses" (back-translated from Stambolov's "няколко малоценни къщици"). In this contrasting description, MacGahan actually uses "mud huts", an epithet used some years earlier by his antagonist St. Clair, which, as we will see below, is probably not mere coincidence. For the translator Stambolov, however, the equivalent translation here seems to be undesirable; the reason being his axiological, value-based attitude (Bulgarians do not live in huts, let alone mud huts). Stambolov translates more accurately the short characteristic of the Bulgarian people (back-translated: "hard-working, enterprising, honest, educated, and peaceful"; in MacGahan: "hard-working, industrious, honest, civilized, and peaceful people"). It is interesting whether his translation of "civilized" - "educated", is a result of the interlinear Russian translation, or "civilized" in the Bulgarian Revival discourse, which is equivalent to "educated" (MacGahan, 1876, p. 25; MacGahan, 1880, p. 11).

MacGahan uses similar contrastive and value-laden vocabulary in the detailed characterization of Rayna Knyaginya (Princess Rayna), whom he visited in prison and helped with her release, with E. Schuyler, then Consul-General of the USA in Constantinople. After the description of her appearance, the "slight, graceful form" (where the rendering is close to equivalent), the translation refers to the "enraged" and "bloodthirsty" soldiers, whose most "rude" ridicule she was forced to endure. MacGahan's characterization, however, is somewhat different: in his words the soldiers are not exactly "bloodthirsty"; they are rather "cowardly brutal soldiery".

However, for Stambolov, the national revolutionary, these epithets are probably not strong enough. On the one hand, MacGahan seeks to somewhat downplay the military aspect of the April Uprising (in order to put a stress on the unnecessary cruelty of its suppression); on the other hand, Stambolov, who is himself a participant in it, tends to think in heroic categories. MacGahan describes the villains (including the Ottoman administration) as pusillanimous, cowardly, devious and hypocritical. For Stambolov the enemies of the Bulgarians need characteristics that might present them as formidable adversaries as well. Perhaps that is why he restricts the translation of "vilest epithets and insults" (the words with which the soldiers scoff at Rayna) to "most rude" ridicule ("най-груби подигравки"). Meanings such as "mean, sneaky, nasty" rather than "rude" dominate in the connotation of "vile" (MacGahan, 1876, pp. 34-38; MacGahan 1880, pp. 16-17).

I will not analyse in detail the description of Rayna Popgeorgieva Futekova (Princess Rayna) made by J. MacGahan. I will only mention some of the epithets which themselves are evidence of his value-based attitude: "favourite of the people", "veritable marvel", "intelligence and beauty", "esteem and respect"; in the Bulgarian translation: "всеобща любимица", "истинско чудо", "ум и хубост", "общо уважение". The equivalence of translation is indisputable here - the axiological attitude of Stambolov and MacGahan fully coincide. To describe Rayna, the reporter of "Daily News" even uses the hyperbole "being of a superior order", which Stambolov translates "висше същество" (Ibid).

It is also interesting to note the hesitation of the author in designating a concept without a precise denotation in English; we can assume with high probability that this is actually "chitalishte", the traditional community cultural club in Bulgaria (see Христов, 2014b). MacGahan uses "a kind of a village literary club" and "literary society" to refer to the respective institution in Panagyurishte, which supported Raina financially for her education in the American College of Stara Zagora. Stambolov translates both as "книжовно дружество" ("literary society"). I attribute this rendering to the absence of denotation for "chitalishte" in Russia, respectively, the absence of a relevant term in the Russian language, which is interlinear for Stambolov's translation. Actually, it is not a genuine "literary society" that is envisaged here; this is clear from the necessary additional clarification: "a kind of" "literary club", and a "village" one (!) at that (MacGahan, 1876, pp. 36-38; MacGahan, 1880, pp. 16-17).

St. Clair on Bulgaria

It is difficult to determine the genre of the book "A residence in Bulgaria, or notes on the resources and administration of Turkey" by Stanislas St. Clair, co-authored by Charles Brophy, published in 1869 in London.² It is on the border between a detailed political analysis, a travelogue, and a religious and ethnological study. Its pathos is not only fiercely anti-Bulgarian: it is also directed against Russia and all Eastern Christianity; on the other hand, it is a passionate defence of the traditional values of the Muslim population in the Ottoman Empire as opposed to the corruption in its administration. In the European polemic about the fate of the Balkan peoples in the Ottoman Empire, the book was a response to the advocacy for their independence by W. Gladstone and authors such as the travellers Georgina Mackenzie and Adeline Irby (Mackenzie & Irby, 1983), whose travelogue "Travels in the Slavonic provinces of Turkey-in-Europe" had been published two years before "A residence in Bulgaria".

The work of St. Clair has not been translated into Bulgarian, so we can analyse the axiological attitude of his commentators, not of the translator. The style of the original text is pretentiously Victorian, full of rhetoric and tropes, as well as unconcealed malicious irony towards Bulgarians and Orthodox clergy. According to M. Kirova, the author's observations are based on an "ideological", imperially-colonial motivation and a teleological approach, in which the result determines the methodology (Кирова, 2014). I believe that we may also add the axiological, value motivation of St. Clair, for whom Russia and Orthodoxy are not only a political but a personal enemy as well. Being a Polish aristocrat by his maternal ancestry, Stanislas was disinherited after a war with Tsarist Russia; he refers to Bulgarians ironically as "the immaculate pets of Russia" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 2).

St. Clair on the Bulgarians: implications of irony

Below we will adduce a few examples, which do not exhaust the pejorative connotation of St. Clair's narrative, part of which is referring to Bulgarians (and all

² I will quote the text of St. Clair and C. Brophy with reference to respective chapters (1, 2...) because of the available format on the Internet.

Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire) by the derogatory Arabism "rayah" (herd): he does not attempt to use an English equivalent. But we can briefly analyze the use of ironic tropes such as "the immaculate pets of Russia" that abound in his text. St. Clair comments on the relations between the Bulgarians from the village of Derekyoy (today Konstantinovo near Varna) and the Muslim Gypsies, temporarily practicing there "the universal gypsy trades of begging, basket-making, tinkering, and forging iron". "The Bulgarians said", St. Clair remarks, "that they added in an especial degree that of thieving, but this accusation is probably due in a great measure to the fact that two of a trade never agree." According to the author, in the spring, when the Bulgarians no longer have "pecuniary advantage" from their temporary neighbours, an "assembly of the notables" in the village decides that "it would be well to give them a hint to quit." The hint is "conveyed in the most delicate manner by burning their houses over their heads one night" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 1).

It is apparent that the demonization of the Bulgarian population is a presupposed goal of the author, and the technique of irony discloses his psychological motivation. But an ignorant reader from the Empire of Queen Victoria would perceive other tropes in the text as an undeniable truth, especially the hyperbolization of the backwardness of the Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the author specifies that there is "not a single instance of mere hearsay", nor have they (the co-authors) "received the allegations of either Mussulman or Christian without inquiring into and satisfying themselves of their accuracy". (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, Preface).

The negative hyperbole is to be found in all aspects of St. Clair's depiction of the Bulgarian people - their appearance, language, folklore and superstitions, morality and lifestyle. Bulgarians look "strongly but heavily built", with "a walk like that of a bear, coarse and blunted-looking features, a heavy moustache (...), a beard shaven once a week, and little twinkling eyes, which, whilst always avoiding to meet your own, give a general appearance of animal cunning to the face". St Clair completes the description with an ironic remark about the love of "All-Mother-Russia" to these "offshoots". The use of the participle "blunted" is quite unusual in this context, probably aimed to emphasize his personal negative assessment among the prevailing clichés (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 2).

St. Clair on the Bulgarian language and religion: dialect and shamanism

With the confidence of a military captain, St. Clair declares that he is familiar with all the Slavonic dialects. He defines the Bulgarian language as a Slavonic dialect, and claims that the population in the Black Sea region speaks a "corrupt" dialect of the latter, reiterating that Bulgarian is "itself only a dialect" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 1, 7). Judging from the transliteration in Latin, which he applies on a chant from the Bulgarian wedding ritual - "Pak jede i pije" ("And he eats and drinks": according to the author, this is "the constant chorus" even "in the songs about" Bulgarian "great heroes"!), St. Clair did indeed listen to the sound of the Bulgarian language. He also translates a lamentation over death, but without translating the exclamation "God! God!"; it is only transliterated "Boze! Boze" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 5). Had he known the Bulgarian "Slavonic dialect", he would have understood this vocative exclamation as well, all the more so because it is the same in Russian, a language so close to his native Polish. In fact St. Clair denies any religious feeling, let alone Christian consciousness to the Bulgarians; therefore "God!" must remain just an interjection for the recipient of his text.

St. Clair mentions the songs and lamentations in the context of his comments on the Bulgarian "superstitions", to which he devotes two chapters of the book. Of course, he does not conceal his contemptuous attitude here either. Commenting for example on eight great "sins" (actually eight social taboos), he pays particular attention to the ban on bathing a child until the seventh year, or the prohibition to visit the village fountain after dusk. St. Clair sees a surviving pagan tradition here, as well as in many traditional church holidays, and rightly so. But his pathos is actually blaming the Bulgarians for their inability to adopt the dogmas of true Christianity. The main culprit for this, however, is the priest, the "Papas", who is the leading defender of superstitions and even the author of new taboos (e.g. the prohibition to give alms to non-Christians). Because of his own lack of faith, he even concludes "a compact of mutual aid and toleration" with the village witch (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4). In St. Clair's perception, an Orthodox priest can belong to no other ethnicity but Greek. Even if he had known about the Bulgarian movement for church independence, which had already achieved the appointment of Bulgarian priests in many settlements, he would not have mentioned it for the world.

St. Clair on Bulgarian folklore: hesitation in the value perspective

The attentive reader will note that the language of St. Clair undergoes a noticeable change, when the author attempts a quite detailed description of folk beliefs: it becomes much more neutral. Actually his spite is transferred here towards the Orthodoxy. I will list only a few of the topics he examines by adducing many examples: the belief in various spirits, exorcism, treasure hunting as a magic ritual, witchcraft and vampirism. Leaving aside the ironic remark that what the Greek priest cannot cure is within the power of the Hodja or of St. Clair himself in the role of a paramedic, we have to admit the worth of his folkloristic observations. In addition to the above topics, the author also analyzes some very popular feasts from the church (people's) calendar such as Annunciation, St George's Day, St Demetrius's Day, Christmas, All Souls' Day, as well as beliefs associated with the mythical figure of Grandma March (Baba Marta). The popular Bulgarian name of All Souls' Day, "Zadushnitsa", is transliterated by the "Bulgarian dialect" "expert" St. Clair as "Dusz Nitza"; Baba Marta as "Baba Mart". (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4, 5).

It would be reasonable to view the two chapters on traditional beliefs from an axiologically neutral perspective: despite their pejorative heading "Bulgarian superstitions", they are actually a valuable firsthand source for Bulgarian folklore. The Bulgarophobe St. Clair is a witness to the endangered national cultural heritage, and at that in a field that is difficult to interpret by means of a foreign language. He is himself aware of its value, because in the West it was systematically annihilated by the Church, which "banished the memories, of the ancient gods" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4). The axiological charge of St. Clair's text actually often changes its polarity here: the example above is not a glorification of the civilizational tradition of the West.

Despite the axiological "hesitation" in the text of these chapters, the main pathos of St. Clair remains debasing the image of the Bulgarian nation before the English recipient. Superstition, which the author equals to a lack of Christian faith, is the basis of the imagined moral degradation of the people:

Is the Bulgarian ill, he sends for the witch; has he lost some money, he sends for the witch; is he going to give a feast or to die, he sends for the witch; does he require a philtre, he sends for the witch; does he wish to get rid of an enemy, the witch is still his resource. (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4).

In his work, St. Clair repeatedly uses the fictional poisoning as a main argument for the moral inferiority of Bulgarians, "a people with whom roguery is the rule, honesty the exception" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 1). He can provide, however, only one example (albeit reiterated in several chapters): the gossip, told "as an interesting piece of information", about a certain woman, "Tranitza or Kaloushka, whom you see quietly chatting with her neighbours", "known ... to have poisoned her first husband in order to marry a second" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapters 1, 5).

For St. Clair, the Christian "civiliser", living paganism is at the heart of yet other characteristics of "the Rayah" - the gluttony and especially the "avarice", so much hated by him. He is displeased by the allegedly unfair price for an overnight accommodation in a Bulgarian house:

The wine you have drunk, the chickens you have cooked, the bread you have eaten, the corn for your horse - all is counted up with an accuracy of mental arithmetic highly creditable to the financial abilities of the Christian peasant: if your host is not avaricious he only multiplies the sum total of the value by three. (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 2)

Describing Bulgarian funeral rites, he disdainfully comments on the custom of placing food on the graves: "In short the Bulgarian mind seems to be capable of conceiving the disembodied soul only as something possessing still grosser appetites than its fleshly covering (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4). The negative hyperbolizing and the analogy with the "uncivilized" savages lead him to the conclusion that the pig is a sacred animal for the Bulgarians, "the animal sacred to the Rayahs" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4).

Had there been no other English language accounts of the Bulgarian lands at the time, St. Clair's "unbiased" analysis might have convinced many of the subjects of Her

Majesty that these areas were inhabited by semi-animals, to whom the Sublime Porte had granted undue rights. Regrettably, public opinion in Britain seems to have a tendency for assimilating radical views on "others": the attitude of Prime Minister W. Churchill might be looked upon as a recurrence of St. Clair's view in a later era.

It takes a considerable emotional effort on the part of the readers to free themselves from value-oriented thinking and look impartially upon the ethnographic data provided by St. Clair. It is, indeed, "in sharp dissonance with the romantic mythology of the patriarchal way of life, established for more than two centuries" (Kirova, 2014). In my opinion, his information about the Bulgarian national costumes and the household arrangements, for example, merit making this effort. The author describes them conscientiously and in detail, not failing, however, to maintain the pejorative connotation of his narrative:

The dress of the men admits of but little variety, being always sombre in colour, a circumstance which has given rise to the epithet of Kara (black) Giaour occasionally bestowed upon them by the Turks, who are fond of light tints in their costume... The women's dress is usually simple, except on feast days, when they display a perfectly bewildering amount of embroidery. (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 2)

The absence of any snub whatsoever is obvious in this last description. Perhaps the omnipresent derogatory attitude of the author towards Bulgaria is self-imposed to a certain degree: the reason being not only his personal hatred, but also a misunderstood duty to public opinion in the British Empire. So much so, that it seems impossible to conceive the existence of a people described by such vocabulary: "sordid and avaricious" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 4), "brutish, obstinate, idle, superstitious, dirty, sans foi ni loi - in short, the degraded being" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 26). The reception of this description is not necessarily unequivocal; on the contrary - as we shall see, it might have evoked a response opposite to the one sought by St. Clair. It would not be a compliment to the English reading public if it had taken these epithets at face value.

Conclusion

Is there a causative relationship between the works of St. Clair and MacGahan?

St. Clair cannot distinguish one Bulgarian village from another. They are all "a mass of cottages apparently thrown together without order or arrangement, built of mud and rudely thatched with reeds, upon which great stones are sometimes placed... to prevent the roof being carried away by the wind" (St. Clair & Brophy, 1869, chapter 1).

It is an interesting fact that in his depiction of Bulgarian houses, St. Clair uses the same terms which MacGahan later cited as a false picture imposed in Britain, "mud houses, or rather huts". Besides, "the Bulgarian cottages are distinguished by the entire absence of windows or of any substitute for them, the only media of light and ventilation being the large chimney and the chinks and crannies of the ill-joined door", so that on a moonless night, the villages are "dark and gloomy as the night" and a traveller will not even notice them (Ibid). The obsessively frequent analogy between Bulgarians and the savage tribes of Africa and America aims to expose the "otherness" of the Bulgarian people, which does not belong to the civilized world and is almost impossible to be cultivated. The same analogy, though only as a reference, is present in the text of MacGahan as well:

I have always heard them spoken of as mere savages, who were in reality not much more civilized than the American Indians; and I confess that I myself was not far from entertaining the same opinion not very long ago. (MacGahan, 1876, p.24)

The terminological coincidences above presuppose the high probability for MacGahan to have read the text of St. Clair. This can be one of the reasons for the pathos of the Bulgarophile MacGahan. He is everything that St. Clair is not: an ordinary citizen of a former colony, not an aristocrat; defender of the downtrodden rather than of imperial interests; writing without irony and without the pretentious style of the highly educated Englishman. In a sense, the contemptuous narrative of St. Clair might have contributed to the work of MacGahan - as a motivation to oppose an obviously exaggerated lie. Is this not the dialectic in the public function of the text: perhaps MacGahan's astounding reportage would not have existed without St. Clair?

References

- internationalist. (2012). *Stanislas Senkler - bǎlgarofob i rusofob!*. Retrieved from <http://internationalist.blog.bg/history/2012/11/30/stanislas-senkler-bylgarofob-i-rusofob.1026184>
- MacGahan, J. (1876). *The Turkish Atrocities In Bulgaria, Letters of the Special Commissioner of the "Daily News" J.A. MacGahan, Esq., with An Introduction & Mr. Schuyler's Preliminary Report*. London: Bradbury, Agnew, & Co. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/MacGahanTurkishAtrocitiesInBulgaria>
- St. Clair, S. G. B., & Brophy, C. (1869). *A residence in Bulgaria, or notes on the resources and administration of Turkey*. London: John Murray. Retrieved from <http://www.promacedonia.org/en/sc>
- Kirova, M. (2014, January 14). Vǎobrazenata Bǎlgarija: britanskijat kolonialen diskurs ot včera i dnes [Bulgaria imagined: the British colonial discourse in the past and today]. *LiterNet*, 1(170). Retrieved from <http://litenet.bg/publish2/mkirova/britanski.htm>
- MacGahan, J. (1880). *Turskite zverstva v Bǎlgarija - pisma na specialnija korespondent na Daily News Dž. Makgahana* [The Turkish Atrocities In Bulgaria, Letters of the Special Commissioner of the "Daily News" J.A. MacGahan]. Sofia: Skoro-Pečatnica na Ja. S. Kovačev. Retrieved from http://ebooks.ucoz.com/beseda/Turskite_zverstva.pdf
- Mackenzie, G. & Irby, A. (1983). *Pǎtuvanija iz slavjanskite provincii na Evropejska Turcija* [Travels in the Slavonic provinces of Turkey-in-Europe]. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na OF.
- Stojčeva, T. (2007). *Bǎlgarski identičnosti i evropejski horizonti* [Bulgarian identities and European horizons]. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad.
- Hristov, Ž. (2014a, November). *Semantika na cennostnoto mislene v tekstove na bǎlgarski avtori za Džanuariás Makgahan i Stanislas Sejnt Kler* [The semantics of axiological thinking in texts about Januarius MacGahan and Stanislas St.Claire by Bulgarian authors]. Paper presented at the science conference "Humanities today", Sofia. (forthcoming publication)
- Hristov, Ž. (2014b). Institucionalnite ponjatija na bǎlgarskoto Vǎzraždane "čitalište" i "nastojatelstvo" v tekstovete za bǎlgarsko kulturno nasledstvo na anglijski ezik [The institutional concepts of the Bulgarian National Revival "chitalishte" and "nastoyatelstvo" in texts about the Bulgarian cultural heritage in English]. In D. Yankova (Ed.), *Cross-linguistic interaction: Translation, Contrastive and Cognitive Studies* (pp. 563-571). Sofia: St Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Tsanev, S. (2007). *Bǎlgarski hroniki* [Bulgarian chronicles], vol. 2. Sofia: Trud.