

# New Europe College

## *Europa* Program

### Yearbook 2006-2007



---

STEFAN DETCHEV  
SVETLANA DONCHEVA  
ALEXANDER MAXWELL  
MIHAIL NEAMȚU  
SIMINA RADU-BUCURENCI  
RĂZVAN SEBASTIAN STAN  
SMARANDA VULTUR

---

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College  
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College  
Str. Plantelor 21  
023971 Bucharest  
Romania  
[www.nec.ro](http://www.nec.ro); e-mail: [nec@nec.ro](mailto:nec@nec.ro)

Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



## **STEFAN DETCHEV**

Born Gabrovo, Bulgaria, in 1963

Ph.D., University of Sofia, 2004

Dissertation: *Russophile and Russophobic Ideologies in the Bulgarian Press:  
1886-1894*

Assistant-Professor, South-West University, Blagoevgrad

Nuffic Fellowship, Institute Oost Europa, Universit t van Amsterdam, 1997

AECI Fellowship, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2001-2003

Fellowship at the Central European University, Budapest, 2002

Fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study, Sofia, 2003-2004

HESP Fellowship, Curriculum Resource Center, Central European University,  
Budapest, 2004-2005, 2005-2006

Fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study, 2004-2005

Fellowship at Collegium Budapest, Institute for Advanced Study, 2005

Participation in international workshops and conferences in USA, Great Britain,  
the Netherlands, Spain, Hungary, Greece, Turkey, Romania, Croatia, Bulgaria



# DRESS, FOOD, AND BOUNDARIES. POLITICS AND IDENTITY (1830-1912) The Bulgarian case

This article is a first attempt in Bulgarian historiography to go beyond the history of clothing and food and aiming to investigate their appropriation in political debates on the construction of national ideology, as well as the identity discourse. In this regard, I will concentrate on the images of internal political adversary and the Balkan neighbor as a part of shaping the modern Bulgarian national identity in the period of the 1830s until 1912. This was part of an ongoing process of classification in political discourse on social and national lines based on *cuisine* and dress. For this reason the project will try to put forward an all-embracing view of society. Moreover, the topic is not as narrow as it might appear since cooking and clothing have a lot to do with “the serious” things in life. Besides, as contemporary anthropological and other social studies have shown, there is too much of symbolism attached to food<sup>1</sup> and dress<sup>2</sup> and they say a lot about a society’s attitudes and characteristics.

Food and dress have not been a major theme in scholarship that covers exactly Bulgarian political culture and nationalism. However, the Bulgarian historiography has already shown that for a very long time “Bulgarian” cookery was characterized by uniformity and simplicity and it was not specialized. In the everyday practice the consumption of bread, hominy (*kachamak*), bean, cabbage, peppers, garlic, onions, broth (soup), and stew (*jahnia*) saliently prevailed.<sup>3</sup> The scholars have emphasized the strong influence of Turkish kitchen (a mixture of Arab, Persian, Indian, Mediterranean, Greek, and Egyptian influences) and dress for the high urban strata among Bulgarians, especially in the towns with Muslim, Armenian and Greek population. This tiny minority of affluent Bulgarian urban strata consumes grill meat (*kebab*), *pilaf*, meat ball (*kiufte*), stuffed cabbage or vine leaves (*sarmi*), stuffed peppers (*dolmi*), etc. Moreover, traditionally there were no sweets, instead the high Bulgarian strata borrowed Turkish confectionery (*baklava*, *kadaif*, *halva*, etc.) and sweet drinks (*sherbet*,

*boza*). Just during the feasts, the social categories mentioned above might have a loaf (*pita*), roasted meat, chops, a black-blood pudding (*karvavica*), wine, brandy (*rakia*), sweet pastry (*banica*). It is relevant that in most of the cases the Oriental or Ottoman kitchen was received first among the Bulgarian *chorbadzhii* and after that it was taken on by the urban families to become a “national kitchen”.

It is mainly for the period of the 1860s and the 1870s that the authors usually also highlighted the foreign European innovations like *macaroni*, vermicelli, ham, tomato puree, loaf of bread, goulash, oranges, sweets as well as newly introduced drinks as beer, imported wines, punch, rum.<sup>4</sup>

It was towards the end of the nineteenth century that some people began to drink coffee with milk in a “European manner”. In that way the culinary emerged as a one of the few spheres in which the Bulgarians really gained from the clash of the “European” and “Oriental.” In the 1880s beer became already a fashionable drink in the towns as well as cognac, liqueur, and vermouth. Lemonade began to substitute *boza* and *sherbet* even in the villages. At the turn of the century among the political and social elite, especially for feasts, it was fashionable to provide roe from Greece, wines from France, and sweets from Vienna.<sup>5</sup>

As far as history of dress is concerned we know from recent studies that the difference between rural and urban clothing became more visible about the middle of the nineteenth century. For a very long time the Bulgarian urban elite was under the influence of Turkish and Greek fashion. The Bulgarian urban women regarded Turkish dresses as fashionable and they covered themselves with *yashmak* and wore *shalwars*. The Bulgarian *chorbadzhii* wore *shalwars* as well. It was considered that a fur cap (*kalpak*) differentiated Bulgarians from other ethnic groups. However, from the 1830s onwards the *fez* became part of the urban fashion and the fur cap already converted itself in a symbol of a purely popular trace, but also backward one. Nevertheless, in the 1860s and the 1870s “Europeanization” became quite visible in the Ottoman towns. Whilst the older *chorbadzhii* carry on following the Greek-Turkish fashion and looking towards Istanbul and Damascus, the younger generation turned to “French” or “German” outfits through Vienna and Bucharest. Many authors paid some attention to social, professional and generational differences marked by dress as well as their social and national implications. However, the topic was still not a focus of investigation.<sup>6</sup>

From the very beginning Bulgarian nationalist leaders, politicians and journalists began to express their negative attitude towards modern fashion. In the 1860s on the pages of the newspaper *Dunavski lebed* a patriot like G. S. Rakovski expressed his special preoccupation with female fashion in the following way: “*We are talking about some places in Bulgaria where they have Europeanized, they have put on precious clothes and follow European fashion, and most of the female sex, from most refined European products.*”<sup>7</sup> It was 1863 when on the pages of the newspaper *Gaida* P. R. Slaveikov spoke in a similar manner: “*We live in Europe but we are not Europeans, or we have put on European clothes, but we have not taken off the jacket of ignorance, this is the truth.*”<sup>8</sup> As one can see, from the very beginning we have a deep anxiety among the Bulgarian patriots from different camps towards modern fashion that was considered in most of the cases as “French.”<sup>9</sup>

This article will try to go a step further beyond this broad description of general trends in the field of fashion and food, trying to reveal the political and geopolitical implications of clothing and culinary practices in the public sphere. Bringing together the history of culture and politics I will try to argue that sometimes the “languages” of food and dress had genuine political and national messages. Besides, I will attempt to examine the complex variety of political, social and national meanings attached to food and dress. It is possible that for the lack of space I will not be able to trace down the details of the political implications of *cuisine* within the broader context of agriculture, crafts, (proto)-industrialization, the development of social structure, the emergence of *leisure* class and the economy of waste, psychological assumptions and aesthetic values. It is true as well that specialization and differentiation in *cuisine* as well as important cultural borrowings are related with economic and social stratification, modern urban revolution and the development of the “civilizing process.”<sup>10</sup>

On a more concrete level, this article can contribute in revealing some aspects of everyday life including history of costume, history of the face, “gastronomic memory”, drinks, and especially the geopolitical and social implications of food and dress in the region.

The approach here will be historical and anthropological, aiming at examining continuity and change over time. I will rely on the methodology already developed in several interdisciplinary studies with an emphasis on nationalism studies, urban history, history of popular culture, social anthropology, intellectual and literary history, but also cultural and

economic history. I will try not to ignore the social and cultural context that gives the objects and practices their meanings; to combine time dimension and looking in a concrete and contextual way coming from history with theoretical and generalized ways of a scrutiny coming from anthropology. Very special attention will be paid to borrowings and inventions and I will try to distinguish between them. I will make an attempt to reveal that South-East European societies were not that different as many people have thought, however, recognizing the differences alongside similarities.

### **Dress and Political Affiliation**

As a result of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 a modern Bulgarian state was established in 1879. A new national state provided a much wider array of career paths open to younger generation and middle-class men. In fact, the “civilizing process”, including efforts to follow the “correct” dress, was inseparable from fashioning and self-fashioning of the modern “*gospodin*”. In this regard, adopting the dress and “gentlemen’s clothes” were part of the requirements for an “honorable” career. Many contemporaries complained that Bulgarian men were following male fashion and were involved in wearing “*tail-coats*”, “*neckties*” and “*fashion*”. Even in the discourse of the political journalism the feasts (*guljai*) organized for the political class were associated with “tail-coats” and “gowns” (*frakove* and *roklî*).<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, the strong female energy in society to follow the fashion brought to male preoccupation and negative attitudes towards urban female consumption – “*luxury*”, “*elegant clothes*”, “*dresses*”, “*corset*”, “*face-powder and make-up*”, “*hats*”, “*fashions*”, “*fashionable journals*”.<sup>12</sup> Even one of the women translators of books about marriage complained that young Bulgarian women followed the fashion in “*baby dress*” but not in modern “*child breeding*” in which they were ignorant.<sup>13</sup> This new type of femininity, at least within urban life and culture, had no essential social and cultural barriers. That is the reason why the above-mentioned preoccupation of Bulgarian males towards female fashion, carry on a vivid expression. In May 1893, the official newspaper *Svoboda* (*Liberty*) proclaimed with trouble:



*“Minister’s wife, merchant’s wife, some small officials’ wife, gendarmes’ wife, hairdresser’s wife – all of them overdressed in the same way and there is no difference between them...”<sup>14</sup>*

As a result, even according to the critical language of *Svoboda*

*“man tends to cease being anymore householder and father while the woman tends to cease being housewife and mother”.*<sup>15</sup>

The above-mentioned preoccupations about fashion outfit, new model of life and increasing expenditures were combined with sayings as: *“Bad time to be a husband”* or *“Difficult time to be a parent”*.

However, despite the dominance of the above-mentioned anti-bourgeois and anti-aristocratic type of rhetoric the new cultural models overwhelmingly entered the whole *“society”* starting with the *“officers and high officials’ spouses”* and conquering later the *“lower officials’ spouses”* and the *“female urban population in the bigger cities”*.<sup>16</sup> Conspicuously, one of the reasons for this strong male preoccupation was the great attractiveness of the new type of culture and way of life that forged new female identities. Therefore, in different moments in the period there was a preoccupation in Bulgarian society with female *“coquette”*<sup>17</sup> and urban female consumption including *“luxury”, “elegant clothes”, “dresses”, “corset”, “face-powder and make-up”, “hats”, “fashions”, “fashionable journals”*.<sup>18</sup>

Moreover, the differences in dress could separate along social and even political lines and function as social and political markers. Wearing some garments could have at some instances a pure political message. Often the representatives of the liberals, radical populists and nationalists associated their political adversaries – the young conservatives - with *“white gloves”, “perfumes”,* cosmetic *“powder”* and *“corsets”* and ridiculed them as *“elegant”*. This picture contained the connotation that those politicians from the conservative political camp were incapable to serve to their *“fatherland”*. In the beginning of 1881 the young conservatives were depicted as educated in universities, theological schools, and other schools and receiving *“sophisticated white-glove”* education. The newspaper *Rabotnik* explicitly spoke about *“a retrograde, with white-gloves education”*.<sup>19</sup> Otherwise, the old conservatives were portrayed as *“paunchy blood-sucker chorbadzhi”* wearing *“foxy fur-coats”*. The journalists did not miss to mention that they carried also

a “*thick amber chibouks*” (“*debeli kehlibareni chibuci*”).<sup>20</sup> Similar to the young conservatives in the Bulgarian principality, even on the eve of Bulgarian Unification on 6 September 1885, the Bulgarian former revolutionary activists, journalist and writer, member of the radical circles of the Liberal Party, Z. Stoyanov associated the leaders and activists of the adversarial Popular Party in the autonomous province of Eastern Rumelia with a “*mirror*”, “*dye for small mustaches*”, and “*white gloves*”.<sup>21</sup> In that way, using the clothing description, he tried to ridicule them in the predominantly plebeian popular Bulgarian culture and to represent them as somehow feminine and incapable to lead a national policy that would bring the Bulgarian Unification.

Even the differences in smoking habits were marked in the discourse of the political journalism. Whilst in the first years after the establishment of Modern Bulgarian state authors often mentioned smoking *narghile* as a typical sign for former *saltanat* culture in the Ottoman Empire, later it was already tobacco rolled up as a cigarette.<sup>22</sup> About the end of the century more often a “*cigarette-holder*” (“*cigare*”) appeared on the pages of political journalism as a symbol of delicate, unmanly femininity or claims for aristocratism of the ruling Popular (conservative) Party.<sup>23</sup>

There were some changes in social and national meaning of such signs as a mustache and a beard. One should remember that in the beginning of the Tanzimat period (after 1839) every Bulgarian had had a mustache and the beard was a typical only for the clergy and old people. However, after the 1850s many young people began to have beards as well with a clear political message. In the late 1880s and the beginning of the 1890s the beard became a sign of some socialist and populist thinkers. Nevertheless, it was more a fashion of the time and many political activists had their beards. The mustaches were in fact obligatory as a sign of manliness. Z. Stoyanov describes clerks that follow the orders of their bosses like persons whose “*small mustaches are always in order.*”<sup>24</sup>

## **Dress and Ethnicity**

Besides these social and political boundaries, in the following years clothing very often served to symbolize ethnic and national boundaries as well. Moreover, during the period under consideration there were attempts to delineate – following geopolitical, cultural and national lines –

among the peoples in South-East Europe as far as clothing was concerned. Sometimes dress was even involved in crossing the boundary between social criticism and ethnic prejudice.

In fact, the political and national importance of dress was not unknown for the population and the Bulgarian political and church leaders. It was still in the beginning of the 1870s when they were not afraid that much of the possible schism with the Orthodox Patriarchy in Istanbul than of the possible change in the attire of the future priests in the Bulgarian Exarchate. According to the leadership of the Patriarchy the uniform of the Bulgarian priests should be changed in order to express externally the separation between the “schismatic” Exarchate clergy, on the one hand, and the clergy of the Orthodox Patriarchy, on the other.<sup>25</sup> However, the Bulgarian ecclesiastical and secular leaders knew very well the symbolic importance of dress in the political and cultural domains. They realized that priest without beard or without traditional Orthodox costume could look very ridiculous in the eyes of the ordinary flock. Moreover, perhaps they were not sure whether the ordinary congregation would prefer to join the “Bulgarian” church with that kind of strange and ridiculous priests or the “Greek” church with traditionally dressed ones. Besides, trying to make pressure on the Ottoman authorities, the Bulgarian leaders of the struggle for ecclesiastical independence pointed out that in this case they could receive the clothes of the Russian Orthodox clergy.<sup>26</sup> In this regard, the Ottoman authorities were wise enough to understand the risks of the possible kind of symbolism.

The same importance of dress and uniform was to demonstrate its importance after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 when the Modern Bulgarian state was established together with the autonomous province of Eastern Rumelia that was left within the borders of the Ottoman Empire. Meanwhile we notice that Ottoman culture was not related in the Bulgarian political and national discourse symbolically to food or even dress but to religion and a particular culture of hygiene. Almost common Ottoman dress influenced ethnic stereotypes in the previous decades. For long the religious turban (“*chalma*”) was the only differentiation marker and it had been considered as a sign of Turkishness and Ottomanness. However, at that period it was the *fez* that became a symbol of the non-national, Ottoman rule and domination. In 1878, according to the Treaty of Berlin, Eastern Rumelia was set up as an autonomous province within the Ottoman Empire. There were Bulgarians, Greeks and Ottoman

Turks and Muslims who populated the province that was supposed to be ruled by a Governor-General. On March 13, 1879 with the protection of Russia and with the consent of the Great Powers Aleko (Alexander) Bogoridi was appointed as a first Governor-General. For a long time Aleko Bogoridi was an Ottoman statesman of Bulgarian origin, but coming from a Fanariot family he did not speak Bulgarian language at all. He was the son of the influential Stefan Bogoridi and a brother of Nicolae Vogoride, a prominent Moldavian politician. Aleko Bogoridi received his education in the Great School of Istanbul, in France and also studied State Law in Germany. He held different high-ranking positions in the Ottoman Empire. Because of the Bulgarian majority in Eastern Rumelia it was considered as very important what kind of cap Aleko would wear at the moment of his reception at the Plovdiv railway station. If he had *fez*, it would mean that he was more inclined to play a role of Ottoman administrator. However, if he would wear a fur cap it would mean that he was to follow the feelings of the Bulgarian majority in the autonomous province. As Simeon Radev wrote:

*"In the good feelings of Aleko pasha nobody had any doubts, but with what kind of instructions he would have come from Istanbul? How he would enter Rumelia – as a head of one, in fact, free province or as a Turkish vali. The population asked itself the question in a more concrete way; it asked itself: whether he would come with a fez or with a fur cap (kalpak). It had never been so crucial what a person had put on his head..."*<sup>27</sup>

In this case the fur cap, that had been considered for a long time a symbol of a lower social status, somebody "uncivilized" and backward,<sup>28</sup> it became a symbol of the Bulgarianness of the Governor-General and the province itself. Moreover, the *fez* loosed its meaning of fashionable urban clothing and was considered as a sign of Ottoman domination and rule. That is the reason why on his departure from Istanbul, together with the *fez*, Aleko Bogoridi took also a *fur cap*. When he got out of the train at the Plovdiv railway station the powerful cheering came from the crowd. And as S. Radev noted: *"In this fur cap Rumelia saluted the symbol of its liberty."*<sup>29</sup>

One should keep in mind that protesting after the establishment of Eastern Rumelia against sending Ottoman troops to the Balkans and against the flag with a half-moon, the prevailing Bulgarian public opinion

was also against different “*pashas*” wearing “*red fez*”.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, the Ottoman rule or government carried on to be embodied discursively in the symbol of “*chalmi*” (turbans) and “shaved heads” as well.<sup>31</sup> Even later the newspaper *Plovdiv* describes picturesquely how the “Russian government” put on “*bigger turban even than the Turkish one, forgetting about Orthodoxy, and Slavism...*”<sup>32</sup>

Besides the fur cap (*kalpak*) very often “sandals” (“*tzarvuli*”) and “dirty sandals” were represented as embodiments of something popular, considered as typical in national (Bulgarian) and social terms at the same time. Z. Stoyanov juxtaposed to the clerks and government officials in Eastern Rumelia the “*dirty sandals*” of an ordinary man. Moreover, in April 1886 the Bulgarian journalist, the politician and the future Prime-Minister D. Petkov underlined how the “democracy” for which at the moment they were fighting in Europe was inscribed on the “*sandals and the fur cap of every Bulgarian.*”<sup>33</sup> Therefore, together with the fur cap “*the sandals*” became an important element of the Bulgarian national costume at the time. Despite their striving to follow modern European fashion, the Bulgarian patriots, the representatives of the Bulgarian political class or intelligentsia, although distancing themselves from the traditional peasant costume, they used its elements (like in the case of the fur cap and the sandals) to embody or symbolize what was the meaning of Bulgarianness and Bulgarian clothing.

As far as ethnic and national boundaries are concerned the “*white gloves*” carry on being the symbol of Russian, nationally and socially alien aristocratic life in Petersburg.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, influenced by Russian populism and socialism, the Bulgarian students in Russia were depicted by their political adversaries in Bulgaria as “*naked and shabby students*”, “*with red shirts, torn high boot and coats without buttons*”, “*with long hair and dirty shirts*”, with “*miserable dress, long uncombed hair, wide caps, cynical behavior in society*”.<sup>35</sup> Otherwise, the Bulgarian students from the West were depicted with “*cylinders*” and “*expensive and elegant clothing.*”<sup>36</sup> Those images and the way of gazing to national clothes reflected how the differences between what was considered Bulgarian culture or way of dressing, and the alien, Russian one, were viewed most of all in the fields of differences based on Russian aristocracy and Russian “nihilists” appreciated as different from what was supposed to be Bulgarian – more ordinary, plebeian, urban and peasant middle class as well as reasonable.

## Food and Political Affiliations

It is evident that food and culinary were part of the political discourse as well. To illustrate the interconnections and interdependence between culinary and politics it deserves mentioning that one of the bestsellers at the time written by M. Grebenarov was entitled "*About economic and sad Macedonia. About the killed consulates. Advices how to prepare baklava and rahat-lokum*". It deserves also mentioning that "bread" itself was part of important political slogans in the future. Many examples could be given how even the striving for political power was very often described exactly in culinary terms as a combat for a "bone".<sup>37</sup> Moreover, the very pre-election campaigns often involved food and drink. As the Bulgarian lawyer, writer, journalist and a member of the Democratic Party Aleko Konstantinov wrote in one of his feuilletons, the election campaign was accompanied with "*barrels with wine*" ("*bachvi s vino*"), "*barrels with fat cheese*" ("*kaci s tlasto sirene*"), and "*bakery of bread*" ("*furna hljabove*").<sup>38</sup>

It should be emphasized that some of the Bulgarian national customs concerning food and culinary practices were adapted in the period even after 1879. One of these "inventions of traditions", using E. Hobsbawm's term,<sup>39</sup> was the reception of guests with bread and salt. As again S. Radev wrote it was "*a Slavic custom transmitted by the Russians in Bulgaria*" during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78 when the Bulgarians had to receive the Russian troops. In that way some important guests in the future begun to be received with "*bread and salt on one silver dish, artistically manufactured*."<sup>40</sup> In the very beginning this custom was considered even foreign and that was the reason why Z. Stoyanov spoke many times about "*hlebosolie*" as something more Russian than Bulgarian.<sup>41</sup>

Typical for the modernization process was that beer became also part of everyday life of the clerks in the towns. However, especially in the first years after the establishment of the modern Bulgarian state, typical Ottoman *saltanat* carried on being part of political discourse especially in order to describe some representatives of the older generation of *chorbadzhii* connected with the Conservative Party. On the eve of the Unification between the Bulgarian Principality and Eastern Rumelia on September 6, 1885 vivid description was represented on the pages of the newspaper *Borba*. It told the story how high members of the Popular Party in Eastern Rumelia drank brandy (*rakija*) listening at the same time the

noise of the dice of the backgammon they were playing.<sup>42</sup> Some Bulgarian or Eastern Rumelian statesmen were depicted with rosaries in their hands as well.<sup>43</sup> In a rhetoric that was hostile towards Bulgarian *chorbadzhii* and their behavior in the years before the establishment of the Bulgarian state very often they were depicted as drinking *mastika* (anise-flavored brandy) together with some Greek bishops or Ottoman officials.<sup>44</sup> All these cases testify how this *saltanat* culture so inherent to the tiny Bulgarian affluent strata in the Ottoman Empire and the members and followers of the Conservatives Party after the establishment of the modern Bulgarian state was a combination of modern and Oriental or Ottoman. However, in the following years, the new type of culinary was used in the political discourse in order to describe the affluent table of the Bulgarian political class or at least the new dreams among the political class what did it mean a rich table. It included already different “refreshments” (*zakuski*) like “*roes*”, “*pates*”, “*sausages*, *Bordeaux*, *cheeses*, *pine-apples*, *champagne*”.<sup>45</sup> It seems also that it was typical for the person with a lower social rank to send postcard or “*slivovica*” (plum brandy) to some high official for some special occasions like New Year or a saint’s day.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, even the discourse of the political journalism reflects that beer became a normal drink of the modern urban everyday life.<sup>47</sup>

It should be added that within the Bulgarian social and cultural context every culinary symbol had sometimes not just national, but social “reading” as well. It seems that the Bulgarian culinary practices continued the old traditions of the great social contrasts between the ordinary peasant population and the tiny minority of the affluent urban strata. On the eve of the Bulgarian Unification of September 6, 1885 Z. Stoyanov juxtaposed the popular, plebeian meal of the ordinary people “*peppers without vinegar*” (“*piperki bez oacet*”) to the governmental circles in Eastern Rumelia around the Popular Party and their supposed rich table.<sup>48</sup>

It should be remembered that for a very long time tea did not become part of the Bulgarian culture of drinking. Moreover, it was considered that only someone who was ill could drink tea.<sup>49</sup> One can come across many examples when tea culture was used in the political discourse to draw social and political boundaries as well. Tea was regarded as a pointless demonstration of elegance or as a political sign for Russophiles or young Bulgarian students influenced by Russian socialism.<sup>50</sup> In Eastern Rumelia drinking tea in the town hall (“*konak*”) with a Governor-general became a sign of collaboration with authorities and high position or ranking.<sup>51</sup>

Later invitation for “tea” was to be considered again as an unnatural, pointless demonstration of aristocratism, a custom that was alien for ordinary Bulgarians.<sup>52</sup> Even in the mid 1890s Aleko Konstantinov made in a feuilleton an irony with an imaginary Russian journalist invited to the Bulgarian court to drink “tea” with Prince Ferdinand.<sup>53</sup>

On the contrary, coffee seems to be politically a sign of pleasure, of everyday life that was part of a broader urban culture, typical for conservatives, liberals and radically oriented.<sup>54</sup> After the establishment of modern Bulgarian state coffee begun to spread even among broader urban strata.<sup>55</sup> In this case important in the political discourse was not whether you drink coffee but with whom you drink your coffee. Whether you drunk it with the Governor-generals like Aleko Bogoridi or Gavril Krastevich or not.<sup>56</sup>

### **Food, Politics and Ethnicity**

It is interesting to emphasize how Bulgarians mapped different neighboring nations using the prejudices concerning culinary and food. In this regard there were some relationship between supposed “national kitchen” and ethnic stereotypes. Since the 1880s the Serbs often began to be depicted in the Bulgarian political press as eating pigs and drinking plum brandy (*slivovica*).<sup>57</sup> It is true that most of the Bulgarians usually drunk grape brandy (*grozdova rakia*), but in the Balkan mountain area plum brandy (*slivova*) was part of the everyday life as well. Romanians were sometimes described in the political discourse as “hominy eaters” (“*mamaligari*”)<sup>58</sup> but again despite the fact that the Bulgarians very often put just corn on the table too. Nevertheless, the image of Romanians as “*mamaligari*” could be seen as an embodiment of the very idea that Romania is still a country with bigger social contrasts. In fact, the image of Romanians as “*mamaligari*” and the association of Romania with “*mamaliga*” or “*sacred mamaliga*” were very strong and persistent during the whole period.<sup>59</sup>

Using the same discourse of culinary and food the Bulgarians mapped some more remote nations as well. Englishmen were associated with *beefsteak* and the Italians with *macaroni*. For a very long time the Germans were accompanied by images of beer and potatoes (“*beer drinkers*”, “*potato heroes*”). In this regard, one should keep in mind that until the 1880s beer



was not very popular in Bulgaria. The same is true about potatoes as well. First potatoes were received among the Bulgarian population about the 1820s through Romania around the town of Ljaskovec and through Serbia and Greece about 1847. However for a long time even after 1877-78 they were not very popular. As latecomers they became more a symbol of the modernization of Bulgarian agriculture in the coming years.<sup>60</sup> It was even before the establishment of Modern Bulgarian state when a Bulgarian politician, revolutionary leader and journalist like Liuben Karavelov wrote about "*German bear-drinkers*"<sup>61</sup> or "*German potato hero*".<sup>62</sup> Even in the late nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century there was somewhere still suspicion towards potatoes.<sup>63</sup>

The newspaper *Tyrnovska konsttucija* blamed *Independence* for ridiculing the Russian bell since the Englishmen had "beefsteak", the Italians "macaroni", but the Bulgarians "wooden wine vessel". In this regard *Tyrnovska konstitucija* wrote the following:

*"The Russians have bell, tea-urn, the Bulgarians wooden wine vessel, the Englishmen beefsteak, the Italians macaroni, but neither the bell, nor tea-urn, or macaroni have done something so far, that a person could donkijotnichi with them. Every people is worthy of himself; every government is worthy of his people."*<sup>64</sup>

To this Z. Stoyanov answered: "*Yes, that is true, but neither the English, nor the Italians, want to impose on foreign heads their own beefsteak and their macaroni, when in Russia it is the opposite – which Russia 'T.K.' knows.*"<sup>65</sup> One should add that even in the mid 1890s in the political journalism "beefsteak" carried on to be a symbol of Englishness.<sup>66</sup>

It is extremely interesting that some nations like Turks and French were not usually associated with food and drink. By and large, one can make a conclusion that probably because of the common cooking habits of the Balkans there was not that much pejorative language as far as *cuisine* was concerned. The boundaries between Ottoman or Turkish culture, on the one hand, and the Bulgarian one, on the other, concerned more the specific culture of "splendor" ("*saltanata*"), "ablution pitchers" ("*ibricite*"), religious circumcise ("*sjunetat*"), "the harems" ("*haremite*") and religious holidays as "the bayram" ("*bajrama*"), "Ramadan" ("*ramazana*") and others, but not the products of food and culinary.<sup>67</sup> It is especially visible with the case of the Russians when we have a great variety of Bulgarian

images concerning food and drinks as “*samova*” (tea-urn), “tea”, “acorn”, “yeast” (*kvas*), *vodka*, fish, *borshch*, *soleti*, etc. In fact, despite common Orthodoxy and Slavism, because of the different cultural zones in which the Bulgarians and the Russians lived, food and culinary became important tools for drawing boundaries between what was “Bulgarian” and what was “Russian.” Sometimes even with strong irony and sarcasm authors like Z. Stoyanov spoke about “tea”, “vodka”, and “seledka” emphasizing products that were considered typical for the Russian culture and cuisine and alien to the Bulgarian one.<sup>68</sup> In the beginning of 1891 the official newspaper *Svoboda* (“Liberty”) expressed its certainty that the other Great powers would not permit Russia “*to sip us like sour borshch...*”<sup>69</sup> Even in the mid 1890s Aleko Konstantinov associated the Russian culinary with “*blinami*” as well as “*aubergine paste, and cream, and salmon, and anchovy...*” (“*ikra, i smetana, i semga, i anchosi*”).<sup>70</sup> He also drew boundaries between *vodka* that was drunk by the Russians, on the one hand, and *rakia* (“brandy”) drunk by the Bulgarians, on the other.<sup>71</sup> In fact, “*rakia*” came in Bulgaria about the end of the fourteenth century with the invasion of the Ottoman Turks.<sup>72</sup> A special emphasize was put on the food of the Russian peasant that was associated with low quality as “*mekina instead of bread*”,<sup>73</sup> “*instead of bread acorn and mekina*”.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, it was the Russian peasant who very often was depicted as drinking and associated with “*vodka*”.<sup>75</sup>

Despite this opposition on the level of Russian peasant there was another one on the level of Russian aristocracy when together with the “white gloves” special importance was given to the powerful images about the “*steam of the lovely tea*” and “*tea of prekuska*”.<sup>76</sup> It is known that drinking tea in a Russian way was something very specific. For the Russian tea table tea-urn was obligatory and it should be put on the left side of the householder. In the nineteenth century in the Russian noble families’ tea was served with rum, cognac, liqueur and wine.<sup>77</sup> In this regard, the contrasts between the Bulgarians and the Russians, as far as drinking tea was concerned, were unavoidable. It deserves mentioning that tea was not part of the traditional popular culture among Bulgarians. It was normal a person to drink tea just in case that he or she is ill. Otherwise people normally did not drink tea. That was the reason why drinking tea became important element in drawing social and ethnic boundaries. One of the articles of the Bulgarian journalists that were directed against the Russian interference in the Bulgarian internal affairs

was called “*Demokrat with a bell on his head and tea-urn in his hands*.”<sup>78</sup> Even later “tea” (“*chaj na prekuska*”) carried on to be represented as an embodiment of Russian aristocratic life in Petersburg.<sup>79</sup> The connotations here were clear. It was emphasized what was considered as overtly female and pointless elegance typical for the Russian aristocracy through the eyes of the Bulgarian traditional popular culture. In the opposition to the Russian aristocratic women drinking “tea” Z. Stoyanov depicted with a proud plebeian discourse the image of Bulgarian “old-ladies” associating them with “*grate radish*”.<sup>80</sup>

Generally speaking, all the time in the Bulgarian nationalistic and anti-Russian discourse it was possible to mention that the Bulgarian did not drink that much as Russians; he did not drink “*vodka*” and he did not eat “*seledka*”, but different kinds of wine and worm-wood wine with “*fresh kebab with salt and black pepper*”; he did not have “*tea-urn*” and he did not drink “*tea with prekuska*”; he did not eat “*balik*” cut in special “plate” (“*tarelka*”), “*varene ot malini*” and “*soletki*”; did not consume “*sour borshch*”. In this regard, I would like to make two comments. Some scholars have already noticed that in the folklore the mentioning and usage of wine clearly prevailed that of *rakia*. According to them this means that different wines were better known to the Bulgarian mentality.<sup>81</sup> As one can also see here we have salient Oriental dishes as *kebapi*. It is clear that this habit is before the diffusion of sunflowers and sunflower oil that appeared on the eve of the First World War and brought in the following years to mass cooking with thickenings (*zaprazhki*).<sup>82</sup>

Within some junctures there were attempts to construct or to rely on common Balkan identity based on Ottoman heritage and habits like eating and drinking because the Bulgarians and the Turks “*used to eat and drink together...*” During the political crises of 1886-87 the Bulgarian journalists and later politician and a Prime-Minister D. Petkov wrote: “Despite that we are bad infidels, we are not as much as the Russians are because we are regarded as “*toprak kardashlar*”. We have eat, we have drunk, we have grown in one land.”<sup>83</sup> The common culinary practices and dishes have been noticed by many observers who emphasized the similarities in cuisine and drinks among Bulgarians, Turks, Greeks, Serbs, Romanians, etc.<sup>84</sup> What I would like to stress here is that sometimes they were used in the national political discourse in order to justify certain foreign political orientation as well.

Different kinds of food products and dresses became also symbols of Bulgarian identity and habitus.<sup>85</sup> In that way it was based on the whole rhythm and culture of everyday life evolved from the agrarian system in the Ottoman Empire [barn (*hambar*) with “food”, flat earthen baking dish (*podnica*), or basement (*maaza*) with wine and old wormwood wine (*pelin*); bread, white and red wine, old wormwood wine (*pelin*), “fresh grill meat with black pepper”, wooden wine vessel (*baklica*), “sandals and a fur cap” (“*tzurvuli and kalpak*)”].<sup>86</sup> There was also a kind of idealization of the Bulgarian home with its “basement” (“*izba*”), “stables” (“*jahari*”) “small garden” (“*gradinka*”), “small vines” (“*lozici*”), “courtyard” (“*dvor*”).<sup>87</sup> Z. Stoyanov created the image of the “happy Bulgarian” whose “barns are full with wheat, rye, barley and millet”, who has “lying in the flat earthen baking dish several barrels with wine, one white, other red, in the third old wormwood wine etc.”<sup>88</sup> Even in 1887 Z. Stoyanov again, writing about the Bulgarian riot in 1876 and the efforts of the Bulgarian revolutionary leaders to convince the Bulgarian peasants to burn their villages, emphasized the following: “*The Bulgarian cannot be cheated. It is death for him every freedom, which is not connected with home, furniture, cornfield, vineyard, and old wormwood wine.*”<sup>89</sup> In this regard Z. Stoyanov definitely appropriated an old discourse. It was still 1859 when G. S. Rakovski wrote: “*It is rare in Bulgaria to have Bulgarians without vineyards. The peasant regards himself as unhappy and it is a shame for him if he has no vineyard.*”<sup>90</sup> Moreover, he also emphasized the following: “*It is rare a Bulgarian peasant family that does not drink wine, which it has at home from its own vineyard.*”<sup>91</sup> The same was confirmed about the 1880s by a Czech observer saying: “*Everyone, even the poorest has its own vineyard.*”<sup>92</sup>

In the mid 1890s on the eve of the Paris world fair Al. Konstantinov, under the pseudonym “Shtastlivec”, was looking for “*something originally ours, something purely Bulgarian*”.<sup>93</sup> That is why he depicted with irony an imaginary ordinary poor Bulgarian “*rural house*”, in his own words “*maison bulgare*”, symbol of peasant poverty. Among different things inside he mentioned explicitly food products and dishes like “*hotchpotch*” (“*giuvech*”) as well as “*three strings of peppers and three plaits of garlic*” (“*tri naniza chushki i tri splita chesan*”). To this picture the author added the “*cellar*” (*zimnik*) with a “*keg with sour cabbage*” (“*kache s kiselo zele*”), “*earthen jar with pickled vegetables*” (“*delva s turshija*”), an “*earthenware pot with cheese*” (“*garne sas sirene*”). According to the author’s idea in the

room was supposed to situate two “*paysans de Danube*” with “*glaze by the time fur-coats*” (“*gledzhosani ot vremeto kozhusi*”).<sup>94</sup> Aleko Konstantinov even stated out explicitly, again with irony, that it would be difficult to organize this section of the exhibition that would cover “*Bulgarian culinary art*”. In this regard he wrote:

*“Bulgarian kitchen – here is one question! That is the question! – would say Shakespeare. Let just for an attempt to make here a list of Bulgarian “manji”, but really (hasyl) Bulgarian, not invented and stolen ones. I begin: sop (popara), chutney (liutenica), leek pasty (zelnik), pumpking-pastry (tikvenik) ... O, gentle Lord Creator, help me! No, no, no, seriously, is there anything more! Men and women cooks, philologists and collectors of popular proverbs, save the honor of Bulgaria!”*<sup>95</sup>

As one can see the deconstructivist approach towards “national kitchen” was not the priority of the modernist scholars working on nationalism from the 1970s onwards. There were some contemporaries who also noticed some traces of the processes of appropriation, domestication, adaptation, construction and invention at the time.

## Conclusion

In fact, food and culinary terminology was not that much central in the “purely” political and national discourse. Of course, there were some stereotypes but they were not in the core of it and crucial for its structuring. In my opinion, in most of the cases culinary and clothing rhetoric just underpinned the discourse. One of the possible explanations is that for long time economic issues or starvation were not part of the political debates. It is also clear that in the political discourse the usage of the great variety of dishes was avoided. One can hardly find in it dishes like jerked meat (*pastarma*), flat sausage (*lukanka*, *sudzhuk*), but only *kebab*. That means that they were not very often on the table and because of this it was impossible to have such a deep symbolic meaning. In the case when the difference was more visible, the Bulgarians – like many others – were disposed to make judgments and conclusions that were not always correct. However, the specific influence of different historical, social, political and cultural factors brought to different types of *habitus* that was impossible to be essentialised. Moreover, the lack of usage of many dishes in the

political discourse shows that they were not used every day, perhaps even by the richer Bulgarians too.

Despite the poverty according to many foreign criteria, the great majority of the Bulgarian peasants were relatively satisfied until the end of the nineteenth century. For a long time the peasantry was not a real challenge for the political authorities. That was the reason why there was opportunity to see the peasant life as an ideal one at the same time. It is not by accident that in the nationalistic discourse the juxtaposition was normally searched in the relation to Rumanian or Russian peasants having in mind the severe agrarian problems in those countries.

The political and national discourse clearly demonstrated the profile of predominantly rural society in the Bulgarian principality. It also shows how Bulgarian peasants were people with relative wealth, not rich but with lower expectations from life. Moreover, Bulgarian society was with a tiny urban strata and even tinier affluent minority. It is clear that in the Bulgarian case we have insignificant leisure strata as well. The discourse concerning food and dress is a reaction of the transition that took place from predominantly Ottoman *saltanat* culture of the affluent part of the Bulgarian society to a more "European" one as a result of the ongoing "modernization" process that had its traces on the consumption of food, drinks, and way of smoking.

From the examples presented here one can draw some conclusions concerning national kitchen and national costume. In both cases it is not necessary to be very clever in order to put them on deconstruction. In the period under consideration the national costume included "*kalpak*" and "sandals". It means that despite the fact that the representatives of the Bulgarian political class and intelligentsia followed more European fashion and never wore those kinds of dress they used traditional Oriental clothes to represent what was specifically Bulgarian. One can add here that full-bottomed or tight legged breeches ("*poturi*") were very similar to Ottoman *shalvars*. Moreover, as Al. Vezekov emphasized the very word "*kalpak*" was Turkish as well and wearing *kalpaks* the Ordinary Bulgarians look after more to the Crimean Tatars than to the Ottoman elite officials.<sup>96</sup> According to him, it also deserves mentioning that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk gave order to wear exactly *kalpaks* or as it was said in his law "*shapka*" (tur. *şapka*) instead of *fez*.<sup>97</sup> It is strange that in their desire to make clear boundaries between what was considered Ottoman and what was considered Bulgarian, the contemporaries preferred a national

uniform that would have some elements of the costume of the Crimean Tatars or Chirkasians but not close or similar to that of the Ottoman officials like the *fez* they usually put on their heads.

As far as national kitchen is concerned, in most of the cases the Oriental or Ottoman *kuisine* was received first among the Bulgarian *chorbadzhii* and after that it was widespread among the urban families to become or at least to be received as a “national kitchen” later. It deserves mentioning that some of the “national” dishes from nowadays are very late “inventions” or cultural borrowings, like, for example, *shopska salad*. Moreover, as the Bulgarian historian Alexander Vezenkov has emphasized with irony in one recent article on Turkish borrowings in the contemporary Bulgarian language present-day “Bulgarian” dishes serves in the traditional Bulgarian “*mehana*” includes *kiufteta*, (tur. from pers.. *köfte*), *kebabcheta* (tur. from armen. *kebab*) and *shishcheta* (tur. *şiş*) as well as *giuvecheta* (tur. *güveç*), vegetables and meat on *sach* (tur. *saç*), *chevermeta* (tur. *çeverme*) and other specialties of the house and the “national kitchen.”<sup>98</sup> However, even in our period – apart from *kebab* – this rhetoric was not yet part of the Bulgarian “national” kitchen. Moreover, those dishes were definitely not part of the everyday life of the Bulgarian urban middle class and peasant majority. There was still some work left for those who were supposed to construct and invent what was supposed to be “national”.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> See for example Goody, J. *Cooking, Cuisine, and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982; Pilcher, Jeffrey, M., *Food in World History*. New York: Routledge, 2006; Civitello, Linda, *Cuisine and Culture: A History of Food and People*. Hoboken, N.J., 2004; Wiley; Belasco, Warren; Scranton, Philip (eds), *Food Nations: Selling Taste in Consumer Society*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- <sup>2</sup> See for example Perrot, Phillipe *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie: A History of Clothing in the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- <sup>3</sup> It was still 1553 when a French traveler noticed: “Bulgarians do not take great care for their stomach and for food they are pleased with bread, salt, garlic, onion, and yoghurt.” Tzvetkova, B. (ed.), *Frenski patepisi za Balkanite XV-XVIII vek*, (French travel writings about the Balkans) vol. I, 1975., 130. With the exception of the holidays the things were not that different in the nineteenth century as well.
- <sup>4</sup> Gavrilova, R. *Koleloto na zhivota. Vselidnevieto na balgarskija vazrizhdenski grad*. (The Wheel of Life. The Everyday Life in the Bulgarian Revival Town) Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski”, 1999., 111-127.
- <sup>5</sup> Ilchev, Ivan, *Mezhdeno vreme ili balgarinyt mezhdy dve stoletija*. (Interstice Time or the Bulgarian between Two Centuries) Sofia, Kolibri, 2005, pp. 204, 206.
- <sup>6</sup> Gentchev, N. *Francia v bylgarskoto duhovno vyzrazhdane*. (France in the Bulgarian Spiritual Revival) Sofia, Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohrodski”, 1979., 369, 384-412.; Gavrilova, 1999, 128-167.
- <sup>7</sup> Rakovski, G. S. *Sachinenija*, vol. 2, Sofia, 81.
- <sup>8</sup> Slavejkov, P. R. “De sme I kak sme” (Where we are and how we are), *Gajda*, III, No. 7, 1.04. 1863.
- <sup>9</sup> How this phenomenon was part of broader European model of nationalist reactions towards fashion see Maxwell, Al. *Sartorial Nationalism and Symbolic Geography*, unpublished paper under Europa Fellowship Program at NEC, Bucharest.
- <sup>10</sup> Elias, Norbert *The Court Society*, vol. 2 *The Civilizing process*. New York: Pantheon, 1982.
- <sup>11</sup> *Mlada Balgaria*, I, No. 30, 25.10. 1895.
- <sup>12</sup> Debe, D-r A. *Filosofia na braka. Liubovta, shtastiето, sypruzhskite simpatii i antipatii*. (Philosophy of the marriage. Love, happiness, conjugal sympathies and antipathies,) Prev. T. N. Popova. Varna, pechatnica L. Nitche, 1885. 100–101; *Svoboda*, VII, 15 01 1893., No. 1006. D. Levov. *Neshto za prostitucijata*, (Something about prostitution) 2-3. 21 05. 1893., No. 1103. *Nashite obshetstveni i semejni jazvi*, (Our social and familiar ulcers) 2-3.; VII, 22.05. 1893, No. 1104., 2.; Vazov, Iv. *Sabrani sychinenija*, vol.. VII, C.,



- 1976., 191.; See also “Medicinska beseda”, II, ed. d-r Vitanov, 1895-96., *Vredata ot noseneto na korseta*, (The harm from the wearing of corset), d-r Sprjakov, 338-342.
- 13 Debe, 1885, 75.
- 14 Svoboda, VII, 21.05. 1893., No. 1103., 2-3.
- 15 *Ibid.*
- 16 *Medicinska beseda*, *Op. cit.*, 338.
- 17 Rodoljubec, I, 18.01. 1890., No. 39. *Koketnichestvo* (Coquetry), 5-6. Vazov, *Iv.* vol. VII, 1976., 191. Literature on “new woman” was to appear some years later. Bois, Jules *Novata zhena*. Prev. ot fren.. Sliven, pechatnica “Balgarsko zname”, 1899. See for example also the response in *Misal*, IX, Dec., No. XII, C., 1899., 558-560.
- 18 Debe, 1885., 100–101; Svoboda, VII, 15 01. 1893., No. 1006. D. Levov. *Op. cit.*, 2-3. 21 05 1893., No. 1103., p. 2-3.; VII, 22.05. 1893, No. 1104., 2.; Vazov, vol. VII, 1976., 191.; See “Medicinska beseda”, *Op. cit.* 338-342.
- 19 Rabotnik, I, No. 7, 21.01. 1881.
- 20 Rabotnik, I, No. 9, 07.02. 1881.
- 21 Stoyanov, Z. Sachinenija, vol. 3, Sofia: *Balgarski pisatel*, 1983., 123.
- 22 *Mlada Balgaria*, I, No. 36, 27. 10. 1895.
- 23 Konstantinov, Al. *Razni hora, razni ideali* (Different people, different ideals) – Konstantinov, Al. Sychinenija, v.. 2., Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1974., 156.
- 24 Borba, I, No. 1, 28 05. 1885
- 25 Markova, Z. *Balgarskata Ekzarhija 1870-1879*. Sofia: Balgarska akdemija na naukite, 1989., 53.
- 26 Markova, Z., 1989., 5
- 27 Radev, S. *Stroitelji na syvremenna Balgaria*. vol. 1, Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1990, 141.
- 28 Recent analysis of “kalpak”, in my opinion, without much historical context see in Radev, R. *Ot kalpaka do carvulite*. (From kalpak to the sandals) Varna, 2002.
- 29 Radev, S. , vol. 1, 1990, 142.
- 30 Statelova, El. *Iztochna Rumelija (1878-1885)*. *Ikonomika, politika, kultura*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Otechestvenja front, 1983.
- 31 Rabotnik, I, No. 1, 1.01. 1881.
- 32 Plovdiv, 12.08. 1890., No. 61. *Bylgarskoto preselenie v Rusia*. (Bulgarian migration to Russia), 1.
- 33 Nezavisimost, I, 5.04 1886, No. 9. *Literaturna letopis*, 4.
- 34 Stoyanov, Z. *Dokumenti po prevrata na 9 avgust*. S., 1887, 7.
- 35 Nezavisimost, No. 4, 15.03 1886. Z. Stoyanov “*Demokrat*” s kambana na glavata I samovar v rycete, 1.; I, 28.06 1886., No. 30., 3.; Svoboda, No. 112, 24.12. 1887., Z. Stoyanov *Socializmyt v Balgaria*, 2.; No. 113, 31.12 1887., 2-3.; V, 23.02 1891., 2.; VI, 11.06. 1892., No. 832., 1.

- 36 Svoboda, VI, 11.06. 1892., No. 832., 1.  
 37 Borba, I, No. 4, 18.06. 1885., Stoyanov, Z. Sachinenija, vol. 3, 118, 127.  
 38 Zname, I, No. 43, 20.01. 1895.  
 39 Hobsbawm, Er.; Ranger, T. (eds.) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983  
 40 Radev, S., vol. 1, 1990, 167.  
 41 Nezavisimost, I, 2.04.1886, No. 8. Z. Stoyanov. Do Georgja Kardzhiev, redactor na v. "Napred", 2.; 12.04 1886., No. 11. Z. Stoyanov, *Slanceto sprjano!*, 1-2.; I, 28. 05. 1886., No. 22., 3. Svoboda, No. 43-44, 2 04. 1887. Z. Stoyanov *Prikaz po vojskam.*, 1-2.; Svoboda, No. 37-38, 14.03. 1887. Z. Stoyanov. *Ruskite vestnici*, 1-2.  
 42 Stoyanov, Z. Vol. 3, 125.  
 43 *Ibid.*, t. 3, p. 135.  
 44 Zname, II, No. 22, 9. 11. 1895.  
 45 *Mlada Bulgaria*, I, No. 30, 25.10. 1895.  
 46 Konstantinov, Al. *Razni hora, razni ideali ...*, 149.  
 47 *Ibid.*, 150.  
 48 Stoyanov, Z., 1983, vol. 3, 117.  
 49 Sedefcheva, V. *Travestijata na chaja. – In: Trapezatas v kulturata na balgari i sarbi*. Veliko Tarnovo: Univesritetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodij", 2004, 101.  
 50 Ilchev, Iv. *Mezhdeno vreme ili balgarinyt mezhdu dve stoletija*. Sofia: IK "Kolibri", 2005.  
 51 Stoyanov, Z. *Sachinenija...*, vol. 3, 119.  
 52 Nezavisimost, I, No. 11, 12. 04. 1886.  
 53 Konstantinov, Al. *Torzhestvuiustaja Bolgaria* (Triumphant Bulgaria) – Konstantinov, Al, vol. 2., 1974., 108.  
 54 This is my impression from its usage in the political journalism. In the beginning of the 1870s it is somehow confirmed also by T. Ikonov who considered the coffee among the drinks of the middle class people - neither affluent people nor the poorest ones. See Ikonov, T. *Filosofski i sociologicheski sachinenija*. Sofia, 1983, 125.  
 55 Georgiev, G. *Osvobozhdenieto i ethnokulturnoto razvitie na balgarskja narod 1877-1900*. (The Liberation and the ethno-cultural development of the Bulgarian people) Sofia, 1979., 168.  
 56 Borba, I, 28.05. 1885.  
 57 Svoboda, IV, 15.02. 1890., бр. 339. Za "brachata", 2.; IV, 15.09. 1890., No. 395., 1.; Svobodno slovo, I, 25.03, No. 17.  
 58 Savremennik, No. 2, 1889, Razgrad.  
 59 Konstantinov, Al. *Occupatiunea Bulgariei de la armata nostra. – Zname*, I, 26.07. 1895.

- 60 Pavlov, Iv. *Prisastvija na hrankeneto po balgarskite zemi prez XV-XIX v.* Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo "Prof. Marin Drinov", 2001., 45-46.
- 61 Karavelov, L. Sachinenija, vol. 9, 38
- 62 *Ibid.*, vol. 9, 39.
- 63 Pavlov, Iv., 2001., 48-49, 55.
- 64 *Tarnovska konstitucija*, III, 29.03 1886., No. 18., 1.
- 65 *Nezavisimost*, No. 12, 19.04 1886
- 66 *Zname*, I, No. 58, 29.03. 1895.
- 67 *Dojde mu vremeto Ot R.K.* Sofia, 1886., 14-15.
- 68 *Svoboda*, No. 79, 29.08 1887. Z. Stoyanov. *Tablica na chernite*, 2-3.
- 69 *Svoboda*, V, 4.01 1891., No. 425., c. 1.
- 70 Konstantinov, Al., 1974., 108.
- 71 Konstantinov, Al. *Materiali dlja izuchenii Bolgarii – Konstantinov*, Al. Sachinenija, vol. 2., Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1974., 116.
- 72 Pavlov, Iv., 2001, 60.
- 73 *Svoboda*, No. 47, 15.04. 1887., Z. Stoyanov. *Slavjanofilite.*, 2.
- 74 *Svoboda*, No. 13, 13.12 1886. Z. Stoyanov *Ruskite slavjanofili*, 1-2.
- 75 *Svoboda*, III, 18.03 1889., No. 253. *Bylgarskija gravdanin i ruskija muzhik*, 3.; IV, 13.01.1890., No., 3.
- 76 Stoyanov, Z. *Dokumenti po prevrata ...*, 7.; *Svoboda*, No. 43-44, 2.04. 1886. Z. Stoyanov. *Prikaz ...*, 1.; No. 51, 29.04 1887. Z. Stoyanov. *Novite proizvodstva*, 2.
- 77 Sedefcheva, V. *Travestijata ...*, 2004, 100.
- 78 *Nezavisimost*, No. 4, 15.03 1886. Z. Stoyanov. "Demokrat" ..., 1.
- 79 Stoyanov, Z. *Dokumenti po prevratat ...*, 7.; *Svoboda*, No. 43-44, 2.04. 1886. Z. Stoyanov. *Prikaz ...*, 1.; No. 51, 29.04 1887. Z. Stoyanov *Novite proizvodstva*, 2.
- 80 *Svoboda*, No. 51, 29.04 1887. Z. Stoyanov. *Novite proizvodstva*, 2.
- 81 Pavlov, Iv. *Prisastvija...*, 61.
- 82 *Ibid.*, c. 96.
- 83 *Nezavisima Balgarija*, No. 60, 14.02. 1887.
- 84 A. Kiossev, "The Dark Intimacy: Maps, Identities, Acts of Identifications." In: Bjelic Dusan I., Savic Obrad (eds.) *Balkans as metaphor. Between Globalization and Fragmentation*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2002, esp. pp. 167, 169-170, 172. According to the Bulgarian historian Alexander Vezenkov the positive discourse on "the Balkans" is not only about underestimating or denying the Ottoman heritage but it is also about appropriating it, about "converting" it to "Balkan heritage". According to him a lot has been written about the use of the characterization 'Balkan' as a stigma, but the very same name 'Balkan' is also used as a euphemism to avoid terms such as 'Turkish', 'Islamic', 'Ottoman' or 'Oriental'. In this regard, according to Al. Vezenkov, 'Balkan cuisine' is a widely used

denomination for traditional Turkish and Oriental dishes and in many cases the same is valid also for 'Balkan music' and more generally for traditional 'Balkan culture'. See Vezenkov, Alexander "History against Geography: Should we always think of the Balkans as part of Europe?" - In: *History and Judgement*. A. MacLachlan, I. Torsen, eds. Vienna: IWM Junior Visiting Fellows' Conferences, Vol. 21., pp. 10-11.

- 85 Using the term *habitus* here I refer to those aspects of culture that are anchored in the body or everyday practices of different individuals and groups. It includes learned habits, different styles and tastes that "go without saying" for a specific group. Although it was developed still in Marcel Mauss and Norbert Elias, after 1960s the concept of habitus was developed and elaborated by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. He extended the scope of the term to include a person's beliefs and dispositions. An individual's disposition, according to Bourdieu, is predetermined by the social habitus. For more see Bourdieu, Pierre. *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Genève, Editions Droz. (éd. revue), Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1972.
- 86 Svoboda, No. 13, 13.12. 1886. Z. Stoyanov *Ruskite slavjanofili...*, 1-2.; Svoboda, No. 63, 10.06. 1887., *Syrbskata kriza*, 1-2.
- 87 Svoboda, No. 111, 20.12. 1887. Z. Stoyanov. *Socializmyt v Balgarja*, 2-3.; VII, 8.05. 1893., No. 1095., 2.
- 88 Svoboda, No. 13, 13.12. 1886. Z. Stoyanov. *Ruskite slavjanofilite...*, 1-2.
- 89 Quoted according to Stoyanov, Z. *Zapiski po balgarskite vastanija*, Sofia, 1976., 460.
- 90 Rakovski, G. S. Sachinenija. Vol. IV. Sofia: *Bylgarski pisatel*, 1988., 76.
- 91 Rakovski, G. S., 1988, vol. IV., 51
- 92 Quoted following Pavlov, Iv., 2001, 72.
- 93 Konstantinov, Al. *Skromna leptna na obshtija zhertvenik* – Konstantinov, Al. Sachinenija, vol. 2., Sofia: Balgarski pisatel, 1974., 162.
- 94 *Ibid.*, 164.
- 95 *Ibid.*, 167.
- 96 Vezenkov, Al. "Paradoksalnata upotreba na turcizmi v balgarskija nacionalen diskurs" – *Literaturen vestnik*, No. 17 / 3-9.5.2006, 10-11.
- 97 Vezenkov, Al. "Paradoksalnata upotreba...", 10-11.
- 98 *Ibid.*, 10-11.