

***Carigradski Glasnik: A Forgotten Istanbul-based Paper in the
Service of Ottoman Serbs, 1895-1909***

By

Klara Volarić

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of History

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Tolga Esmer

Second Reader: Professor Noémi Lévy-Aksu

Budapest, Hungary

2014

“Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.”

Abstract

In this thesis I plan to analyze Serbian irredentist actions through the establishment of *Carigradski glasnik* (*Constantinople's Messenger*), an Istanbul-based Serbian periodical aimed at audiences in Ottoman Macedonia, a region which Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian countries claimed as their own national territory and which soon became a political arena for spreading national propaganda campaigns aimed at convincing the Slavic-speaking Orthodox population of their respective Greek, Serbian, or Bulgarian nationhood. However, the intention of Serbian diplomatic circles, and therefore of *Carigradski glasnik*, was not to undermine Ottoman sovereignty but rather to act in accordance with it. Unlike Bulgaria, which fostered revolutionary activities in the region from 1895 in order to sever Ottoman Macedonia from the Ottoman Empire and eventually annex it, Serbia calculated that it was in its best interest that Macedonia remain within the Ottoman Empire. Namely, Serbia as a latecomer had to consolidate its position in the region and for this needed an ally to keep Ottoman Macedonia within Ottoman borders.

The main aim of Balkan irredentist campaigns was to induce a sense of a nationhood into the local Slavic-speaking population. This was also the goal of *Carigradski glasnik*. This paper propagated Serbian nationhood and fought for the establishment of a Serbian millet and essentially it was inducing nationhood from above, propagating Serbianness as envisioned by its editors and Serbian diplomats. For *Carigradski glasnik* the presence and sense of Serbian nationhood among the local population in Ottoman Macedonia was well-defined. Namely, Ottoman Serbs knew they were Serbs. However, as many scholarly works on Ottoman Macedonia show, nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia was far from well-defined and the local population exhibited a-national and fluid identities. Nevertheless, I argue that this fluidity does not necessarily imply the lack of nationhood, as studies generally suggest. Rather, this depends on how nationhood is defined: as a substantial entity or a changeable form of practice.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter I. Literature Review, Theory and Methodology.....	8
1.1. Literature review	8
1.2. Theoretical considerations	12
Methodological considerations	17
Chapter II. Ottoman periodicals during Hamidian and early Young Turk Period (1876-1909)	20
2.1. Ottoman Periodicals and state regulations (1831-1909)	22
2.1.1. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: The Tanzimat period (1831-1878)	22
2.1.2. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: The Hamidian period (1878-1908)	27
2.1.3. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: early Young Turk period (1908-1909)	32
2.2. Periodicals - state relationship during the Hamidian and early Young Turk period	36
2.3. Periodicals and readers	41
Conclusion	45
Chapter III. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> and the Serbian struggle for the Ottoman Macedonia	48
3.1. Serbian diplomatic activities in the Ottoman Macedonia	50
3.2. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> : the “pen” fighter for the Ottoman Macedonia	61
Conclusion	74
Chapter IV. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> , Serbian nationhood, and facts on the ground.....	75
4.1. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> and Serbian nationhood during Hamidian and early Young Turk period	76
4.1.1. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> and Serbian nationhood during Hamidian period	76
4.1.2. <i>Carigradski glasnik</i> and Serbian nationhood during early Young Turk period	82
4.2. Facts on the ground: “reckless” Serbian propaganda and fluid nationhood	88
Conclusion	98
Conclusion	100
Bibliography.....	105

Introduction

According to mainstream historiography, Ottoman society was not united but was strictly divided into religious communities, that is to say, *millets*.¹ This interpretation sees religious communities within clear cut-lines and defined religious identities; a system where religious institutions operated within a set of privileges supposedly granted to them by the Ottoman governments. This set of privileges, the cornerstone of the millet system, essentially meant the right to independent communal affairs, for example a juridical or education system. Nevertheless, with the emergence of national ideas in the 19th century, defining Ottoman subjects in terms of religious affiliation was no longer adequate. The Rum millet under the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not just consist of the Orthodox Christians as its members became Orthodox Greeks, Bulgarians, or Serbs, just to mention a few. As Nathalie Clayer stated, nationalism became “a new motive of mobilization, a new way of identification, a new line of solidarity and a new expression of loyalty in Ottoman society.”²

In this era of nationalism, the question of millet privileges became one of the utmost importance. Specifically, Bulgarian and Serbian national elites started to perceive the Ecumenical Patriarchate as a *Greek* Patriarchate, and as İpek K. Yosmaoğlu points out, “education, and especially education in parish schools, had traditionally been under the control of the Patriarchate, which appointed the teachers and also provided the curriculum and instructional materials.”³ This meant that the Ecumenical schools all over the Ottoman Balkans were in essence Greek schools influenced by Greek national propaganda. In the context of rising Bulgarian and Serbian nationalism, the separation from the “Greek” millet

¹ See Stanford J. Shaw, Kemal Karpat, and Roderic H. Davison in whose works this notion is present.

² Nathalie Clayer, “The Dimension of Confessionalisation in the Ottoman Balkans at the Time of Nationalisms”, *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans* (H. Grandits et al., eds.), London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011, 89.

³ İpek K. Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties: Religion, Violence, and the Politics of Nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia, 1878-1908*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013, 51.

which began to be associated with a nation, led Bulgarian and Serbian elites to plead for recognition of their millet i.e. national status in the Ottoman Empire. This recognition also meant the right to lead their own educational and religious affairs where Bulgaria and Serbia could launch their own national propaganda campaigns in their respective, Slavic languages. While the Bulgarians secured *millet* status in 1870 when the Bulgarian Exarchate was established, the Serbs living in the Ottoman Balkans remained under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate until the very end of the Ottoman state in the Balkan Wars.

In this thesis I plan to analyze Serbian propaganda through the establishment of an Istanbul-based Serbian periodical aimed at audiences in Ottoman Macedonia⁴, a region which Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian countries claimed as their own national territory and which soon became a political arena for spreading national propagandas aimed at convincing the Slavic-speaking Orthodox population of their respective Greek, Serbian, or Bulgarian nationhood. As I will show, most of the scholars specializing in Ottoman Macedonia focus on Greek and Bulgarian irredentism and attempts to instill their respective national identities in the region through persuasion and coercion (e.g. guerilla groups) alike, thereby completely overlooking Serbian attempts to counter these activities. It is true that the Serbs were a latecomer in Ottoman Macedonia and did not claim the entire region, but their “official” efforts to mold a significant part of the population into Serbs after 1885, influenced the course of Greek, Bulgarian and even Ottoman action. In investigating Serbian activities in Ottoman Macedonia, I focus primarily on one aspect, the founding and operation of an Istanbul-based periodical called *Carigradski glasnik* (*Constantinople's Messenger*). This paper was published from 1895 until 1909 and was designed to promote Serbian nationhood in parts where Ottoman Serbs mainly lived (the northern parts of Ottoman Macedonia).

⁴ Ottoman Macedonia territorially corresponded to three vilayets/provinces: Kosovo, Bitola, and Salonika.

In this thesis I present two primary arguments. First, the intention of Serbian diplomatic circles, and therefore of *Carigradski glasnik*, was not to undermine Ottoman sovereignty but rather to act in accordance with it. Unlike Bulgaria, which fostered revolutionary activities in the region from 1895 in order to sever Ottoman Macedonia from the Ottoman Empire and eventually annex it, Serbia calculated that it was in its best interest that Macedonia remain within the Ottoman Empire. Namely, Serbia as a latecomer had to consolidate its position in the region and for this needed an ally to keep Ottoman Macedonia within Ottoman borders. This was the reason why the Serbian state supported and acted within Ottoman sovereignty: both these countries had the same aim – to preserve Ottoman Macedonia within the Ottoman Empire. For this reason, *Carigradski glasnik* operated fully in accordance with Ottoman press regulations. Moreover, it was published in Istanbul, under the strict surveillance of the Ottoman censors, and therefore the editorial staff went out of their ways to demonstrate Ottoman Serbs' utmost loyalty, commitment and "honest" intentions towards the Sultanate. Since *Carigradski glasnik* diligently propagated the image of the Ottoman state, on some occasions it was hard to believe that the paper was actually a product of Serbian irredentist plans in the region.

The second argument concerns nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia. As already mentioned, the main aim of Balkan propaganda was to induce a sense of a nationhood (for definitions and problems see the theoretical chapter) into the local Slavic-speaking population. This was also the goal of *Carigradski glasnik*. This paper propagated Serbian nationhood and fought for the establishment of a Serbian millet; essentially it was inducing nationhood from above, propagating Serbianness as envisioned by its editors and Serbian diplomats. In this respect, many articles were dedicated to Serbian Orthodoxy, education, celebrations, language, culture etc. However, for *Carigradski glasnik* the presence and sense of Serbian nationhood among the local population in Ottoman Macedonia was well defined. Namely, Ottoman Serbs knew

they were Serbs. In Serbian diplomatic circles, the struggle for recognition of the Serbian nation in the Ottoman Empire, known as the *нуфијско питање* (*niifüs question*), was therefore more of a practical nature: Ottoman Serbs wanted to enjoy *millet* privileges, namely the right to establish Serbian schools and to secure religious independence from the Greek Patriarchate.

However, as many scholarly works on Ottoman Macedonia show, nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia was far from well defined.⁵ In this aspect, I do not plan to show the fluid notions of nationhood among the rural population because this is already shown in these works. My intention is to show (and it is rather overlooked in the literature) that even the urban and educated national workers whose duty was to propagate Serbian nationhood, like the editors of *Carigradski glasnik*, showed this fluidity commonly attributed to Ottoman Macedonian peasants. In addition, I argue that this fluidity does not necessarily imply the lack of nationhood, as studies generally suggest. Rather, this depends on how nationhood is defined: as a substantial entity or a changeable form of practice.

The overall struggle for nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia can be divided into two phases. The first phase I describe as the “book and pen” phase, when all the Balkan states were trying to impose nationhood from above through religion and education. *Carigradski glasnik* pertains to this phase. The second phase, which can be best described as the “guerilla” phase, took place after the Ilinden uprising in 1903 when it became obvious that the Macedonian question would not be solved through education and religion (to which the local population proved to be immune), but through violence and coercion. As is well understood, this phase resulted in the Balkan Wars and the partition of Ottoman Macedonia. I do not plan to deal with this second phase as *Carigradski glasnik* only occasionally referred to guerilla bands, and this only started after the Young Turk revolution in 1908 when press regulations were

⁵ See Literature review section in the first chapter.

loosened. This was always done from the perspective of Ottoman Serbs' being victims of Bulgarian and Greek violence, whereas Serbian revolutionary activities were not mentioned at all. For the sake of the length and coherence of the thesis, I leave this topic aside. Thus, this thesis is about the "book and pen" fight for Ottoman Macedonia; this was the main tool that Balkan irredentism employed; after 1903 it existed in parallel with the second "guerilla" phase.

Regarding the sources and literature, this thesis is largely based on the analysis of primary sources. Aside from *Carigradski glasnik* whose volumes are accessible online in Serbian digital library, I built up an understanding of Serbian irredentist activities based on consular reports which were prepared and published by various Serbian scholars. In addition, smaller information extracted from the Archive of Serbia and Ottoman state archives are present in the work. Literature concretely dealing with Serbian propaganda is rare, but I use recently published studies of Bernard Lory on school propaganda in Bitola⁶, Tchavdar Marinov on Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian contributions to the emergence of Macedonian nationalism⁷, and Yosmaoğlu's new book on how religion and education, the major tools in imposing nationhood, ultimately failed and became replaced by coercion. These studies present good frameworks for dealing with contested regions as Ottoman Macedonia, especially when it comes to Greek and Bulgarian propaganda campaigns. However, since Serbian campaign is touched only briefly and occasionally, this thesis aims to begin filling this gap.

In the theoretical chapter, I analyze notions of nationhood relevant to my study. Many scholars tend to use this term causally without referring to what nationhood actually presents.

In this aspect I agree with Rogers Brubaker who challenges this notion of nationhood and

⁶ Bernard Lory, "Schools for the Destruction of Society: School Propaganda in Bitola 1860-1912", *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans* (H. Grandits et. al., eds.), London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011, pp. 46-63.

⁷ Tchavdar Marinov, "Famous Macedonia, the Land of Alexander: Macedonian Identity at the Crossroads of Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian Nationalism", *Entangled Histories of the Balkans* (R. Daskalov and T. Marinov, eds.), Vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 2013, pp. 273-333.

rejects its civic/ethnic division. While some theorists like Ernest Gellner emphasize this division and describes nationhood in the Balkans as ethnic and “bad” in comparison to civic and “good” nationhood in Western Europe, Brubaker questions the usefulness of this term. In addition, I also analyze the importance of the press in disseminating national ideas and in creating a sense of belonging.

From a methodological point of view, I attempt to analyze my main primary source *Carigradski glasnik* within the diplomatic, political and cultural contexts of the time. Various Serbian consular reports, accompanied with secondary literature, provide good insight into operation of the Serbian diplomatic circles. *Carigradski glasnik* itself is primary source which should not be taken for granted regarding the plausibility of the provided information. Thus, I found it necessary to place this periodical within the context of the Ottoman press, as well as Serbian diplomatic endeavors. In this respect, when dealing with nationhood on the pages of *Carigradski glasnik*, I confronted these findings with the one found in consular reports and secondary literature. In addition, when analyzing the weekly content of the paper when nationhood is not directly mentioned, the reproduction of the “banal nationalism”, as Michael Billig titled it, is more than obvious. Namely, *Carigradski glasnik* did not propagate Serbian nationhood just in special occasions like public celebrations, but this was also done in the content which seemingly reproduced only ordinary a-national news.

In summation, this thesis has two main goals. First, to present Serbia as an actor in the region that recognized and acted within Ottoman sovereignty because it was in Serbia’s best interests to preserve Ottoman Macedonia within Ottoman borders. Second, to analyze *Carigradski glasnik* as part of this action whose main aim was to cultivate Serbian nationhood and seek national recognition within the Ottoman Empire. In this respect, I hope to contribute to existing literature on Ottoman Macedonia in at least two ways. First, to show that, perhaps paradoxically, not all Balkan propaganda campaigns acted subversively against Ottoman

sovereignty. Second, to point out that schools, churches and finally violence in Ottoman Macedonia were not the only means in promoting nationhood: but there were periodicals too. In other words, relationship between Serbia and the Ottoman Empire in Macedonia can be best described as a symbiosis. On the one hand, Ottomans allowed Serbia to build its position in the region, but on the other, this position was built under Ottoman control. For instance, *Carigradski glasnik* promoted Serbian nationhood, but it also promoted Ottoman image in the region.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. In the first chapter I provide literature review and theoretical and methodological considerations. In the second chapter I present Ottoman press regulations and conditions under which Ottoman periodicals operated. Since *Carigradski glasnik* was after all an Ottoman periodical, it is essential to know the context within which it operated. The third chapter discusses the Serbian preparations and conductance of national propaganda in Ottoman Macedonia, part of which was the establishment of *Carigradski glasnik*. The fourth and last chapter focuses on Serbian nationhood, how it was propagated in the pages of *Carigradski glasnik*, and what this notion basically meant on the ground.

Chapter I. Literature Review, Theory and Methodology

In this first section I analyze literature that contributes to our understanding on Ottoman Macedonia. While most of the anthropological works stress the regional fluidity of nationhood in the region as well as its multicultural and multiethnic character, historians focus on Ottoman Macedonia as a “battlefield” of different national propaganda. In the second theoretical section I analyze theories on the tools that Balkan states employed in the creation of nationhood and importance of the press in this process. Furthermore, I analyze what nation/nationhood means for different theorists and what definition is appropriate when dealing with Ottoman Macedonia. At the end, I present methodological considerations, based on what Michael Billig has dubbed “banal nationalism”.

1.1. Literature review

The bulk of literature regarding Ottoman Macedonia does not need to be specifically emphasized or discussed here. The stances that traditional nationalist and revisionist literature take when dealing with Ottoman Macedonia is diametrically opposed. National historiographies, like the Serbian case, endeavor to prove that the Serbs living in Ottoman Macedonia were certain in their Serbian nationhood preserved through the Orthodox Church. Although all Orthodox Christians were part of the same *millet* under the Ecumenical Patriarchate, this nevertheless did not pose problems for their nationhood. For instance, the *History of Yugoslavia*⁸, published in 1974 in English and edited by Serbian historians like Vladimir Dedijer and Sima Ćirković, argued for Serbian distinctiveness and self-determination. Similarly Michael Petrovich stresses the importance of the Serbian Orthodox

⁸ Vladimir Dedijer et al., *History of Yugoslavia*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Church as the keeper of the nation, although as said, the Serbian *millet* and Church did not exist.⁹

On the other hand, most revisionist literature underlines how nationhood in this region was not clear and fixed but rather fluid and prone to negotiation. For example, this is done in Anastasia Karakasidou's *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*¹⁰, where the author argues that contemporary Greek Macedonians are not Greeks but have a multi-ethnic and multicultural background. A similar thesis is argued in two edited books published in 2000: Jane Cowan's *Macedonia: The Politics of Identity and Difference*¹¹, and Victor Roudometof's *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*.¹² Both of these works concentrate on Greek and to a less extent on Bulgarian Macedonia, while the Serbian endeavors in the region were not mentioned at all. In addition, since the Serbian part of Ottoman Macedonia conquered in the Balkan Wars now presents an independent state, most of the scholars focus on difficulties regarding nationhood in the FYR Macedonia and its issues with Greeks, Albanians etc.

A recent books on Ottoman Macedonia is İpek Yosmaoğlu's *Blood Ties: Religion, Violence, and the Politics of Nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia, 1878-1908*. It focuses on Greek and Bulgarian national propaganda campaigns in Ottoman Macedonia. Although leaving Serbian activities aside and focusing on Greece and Bulgaria as the largest players, Yosmaoğlu presents a valuable context on how religion and education, and later coercion, were used as tools to impose nationhood on the local population from above. Nevertheless, Yosmaoğlu's main intention was to investigate the responses of local population on this imposition, based

⁹ For more information on Serbian national historiography see Peter T. Alter, "Nineteenth-Century Serbian Popular Religion: The *Millet* System and Syncretism", *Serbian Studies*, Vol. 9, 1995, 88-94.

¹⁰ Anastasia Karakasidou's *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

¹¹ *Macedonia: The Politics of Identity and Difference* (Jane Cowan, ed.), London: Pluto Press, 2000.

¹² *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics* (Victor Roudometof, ed.), Boulder: East European Monographs, 2000.

on findings in Ottoman archives. Yet, it is doubtful in what extent the state elites can provide information on how exactly nationhood imposed from above was appropriated on the ground. Rather, she shows how education and religion, used as the most effective medium through which the gospel of nationalism could be preached to a skeptical audience”, turned to violence as “the ultimate catalyst in the process that would render free-floating allegiances hard and fixed.”¹³

In addition to Yosmaoğlu, Lory’s “Schools for the Destruction of Society” and Marinov’s “*Famous Macedonia, the Land of Alexander*” provide useful frameworks connected to Balkan propaganda in Ottoman Macedonia. Lory touches upon the importance of education in disseminating national propaganda, labeling teachers as “professional patriots” who in the first “book and pen” phase disseminated national propaganda, while he also addresses how in the “guerilla” phase schools recruited students for revolutionary national cause. However, Lory’s work is focused on education, thus, he omits commentary on other aspects such as religion. On the other hand, Marinov presents valuable insights into the working of Serbian propaganda entangled with Greek and Bulgarian propaganda. He argues that Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian propaganda contributed to the creation of Macedonian nationalism. Marinov also points out to the fluid nationhood of urban and educated Ottoman Macedonians, which in literature is usually attributed to the rural population. However, Marinov is more focus on how these Balkan propaganda efforts influence Macedonian nationalism, rather than on propaganda themselves.

Moreover, Serbian national activities in Macedonia have received limited interest in Serbian historiography. Serbian scholars do not go into analysis of the sources. Most of them rather publish consular reports and private letters of Serbian diplomats accompanied with brief introduction. One of the exceptions is Miloš Jagodić who wrote extensively on the position of

¹³ Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties...*, 5.

the Serbian nation in the Ottoman Empire, and also presented detailed outline of the Serbian policy shortly before engaging in Ottoman Macedonia in 1885. However, even in his works the Ottomans are presented in the stereotypical fashion, as those who want to “destroy” the Serbian nation.¹⁴

Carigradski glasnik also received the limited attention of the Serbian scholars. The most extensive account on this periodical was provided by Petar Mitropan in 1936, and this work served as a basis for all scholars who discussed the paper after him.¹⁵ Recently, works were published by Dragana Stojanović Novičić who wrote on musical articles published in *Carigradski glasnik*¹⁶ and Vladan Virijević who wrote on the position of Novi Pazar and its surroundings as described in the pages of this paper.¹⁷ However, the approach they use is descriptive in nature: it consists of a compilation of *Carigradski glasnik*'s articles and refers to literature published more than half a century ago. The role of *Carigradski glasnik* in Serbian irredentist activities remains uninvestigated, so I plan to fill this gap.

My plan is to present Serbian propaganda not as a minor player, but as player whose policies in the region determined the future course of events in Ottoman Macedonia alongside the policies of its Greek and Bulgarian competitors. In addition, the overlooked *Carigradski glasnik* played an important role as an Ottoman-Serbian periodical – it propagated Serbian nationhood and a sense of belonging among sparse Serbian community in the Ottoman Empire.

¹⁴ Miloš Jagodić, “Нүфүско питање: проблем званичног признавања српске нације у Турској, 1894-1910” (Nüfus Question: Problem of official recognition of the Serbian nation in Turkey, 1894-1910), *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 57, 2008, pp. 343-54.

¹⁵ Petar Mitropan, “Цариградски гласник” (Carigradski glasnik), *Јужни преглед*, Vol. 5, 1928.

¹⁶ Dragana Stojanović Novičić, *Napisi o muzici u Carigradskom glasniku* (Articles about Music in Carigradski glasnik), <http://www.riznicasrpska.net/muzika/index.php?topic=629.0>. Last accessed: May 30, 2014.

¹⁷ Vladan Virijević, “‘Цариградски гласник’ о Новом Пазару и околици крајем 19. и почетком 20. века” (‘Carigradski glasnik’ on Novi Pazar and surroundings at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century), *Новопазарски зборник*, Vol. 33, 2010, 111-23.

1.2. Theoretical considerations

The transition from *millet* to nation was a gradual and dynamic process which did not develop simultaneously and with the same intensity throughout the Balkans. For instance, Greece was first that gained independent status from the Ottoman Empire, while the others had to wait until the Berlin Congress (Serbia, Montenegro, and Romania) or the Young Turk revolution (Bulgaria) to obtain an independent statuses. Nevertheless, despite (semi-)independent statuses, all of these countries were engaged in conflicting nation-building processes and the creation of expansionist programs. Populations living within the Greek, Bulgarian or Serbian states had to be transformed from Orthodox subjects into national citizens. In doing so, these three countries employed primarily religion i.e. Orthodoxy, and education as main tools in shaping nationhood. As Paschalis Kitromilides has observed, “concepts of national identity originally devised by intellectual ‘vanguards’ were imprinted upon social groups whose ethnic definition might have evolved in a number of alternative ways.”¹⁸ This is to say, the only certain thing about these future national citizens was their religious affiliation. Thus in the nation building process, Balkan states took it as a milestone in creation of nationhood.

Lucian Leustean described how all Balkan states created and fostered political myths that combine Orthodoxy and nationhood, which connected past and present, and thus provided legitimacy to the state. These myths present their respective Orthodox Churches as keepers of the nation during the Ottoman period. Namely, during the “glorious” medieval past these states had autocephalous Churches which were acting with political leaders in “symphonia”. According to this term’s Byzantine roots, political and religious leaders acted in symphony while leading the state together. Namely, political leaders were in charge of administrative affairs while religious leaders provided spiritual guidance. In the Ottoman period Balkan

¹⁸ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “‘Imagined Communities’ and the Origins of the national Question in the Balkans”, *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 1989, 159-60.

political leaders were replaced with Ottoman ones. Nevertheless, religious leaders stayed intact within the *millet*, and Orthodoxy thus preserved the Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian nations.¹⁹ Balkan political elites regularly used and in fact still use this imagery in order to enhance cohesion and gain support. These myths usually revolve around glorious medieval pasts, national heroes etc. For instance, Serbian myths are based on the golden age of the Nemanjić dynasty, the cult of Saint Sava,²⁰ and the Kosovo myth²¹ which presented the perfect cohesion of Orthodoxy and politics that remind the nation of a past glory, while at the same time “political myths presuppose an actualization of the previous order in current political affairs.”²²

These political myths were not just used in the “domestic” nation building process, but were used in expansionist programs too. Greece, Bulgaria and later Serbia employed the same tools in shaping the nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia. However, this national building process that Greek, Bulgarian, and Serbian national elites envisioned as a viable plan to turn the local Ottoman Macedonian population into national citizens ultimately failed. Education and religion were not enough to create a sense of nationhood in the Slavic-speaking population because imposing this notion from above did not necessarily mean that it would be implemented and accepted on the ground. Even the religion which was for Benedict Anderson “the basis for very old, very stable imagined communities”²³ could not assure nationhood. As Yosmaoğlu pointed out, “in Ottoman Macedonia, elites and the peasants were brought together through the reappropriation of existing markers of collectivity, such as religion, and

¹⁹ Lucian N. Leustean, “Orthodoxy and political myths in Balkan national identities”, *National Identities*, Vol.10, No.4,, 2008, 421-25.

²⁰ Sava was the founder of the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Church and third son of Stefan Nemanja, with whose reign Serbian golden age is associated.

²¹ Kosovo myth is based on the battle at the Kosovo polje (Field of the Blackbirds) that took place in 1389 between Serbia and the Ottoman Empire. In Serbian mythology this battle marked the beginning of an end for the Serbian state. In the heart of the myth is so-called Prince Lazar’s Last Supper where Prince deliberately chose death and Kingdom of Heaven.

²² Ibid, 25.

²³ Cited in Sumit Guha “The Politics of Identity and Enumeration in India c. 1600-1990”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2003, 149.

through the politicization of those reworked differences through violence.”²⁴ In other words, religion was not such a stable basis for building nationhood, and Balkan myths on Orthodox Churches as the keeper of the nation were precisely this – myths. As Kitromilides noticed, the Orthodox Church was a supranational institution which preserved a sense of distinction towards other religious communities, but in essence this distinction was not national but religious. In other words, the respective states in the midst of nation building processes nationalized different versions of the Orthodox Church and used them in order to transform religious affiliation into national one.²⁵

The crucial notion around which revolves all propaganda campaigns in Ottoman Macedonia is nationhood. Therefore, what is nationhood? Lloyd Kramer stated that “historical writing about nationalism exemplifies both the cultural fluidity of historical realities and the endless attempts to reduce these realities to narrative order.”²⁶ According to this, there are as many definitions on nation/nationhood as there are theories on it. Most of the theorists argue that nationhood is the Western European construct which spread during the Industrial and French revolutions and were circulated and conveyed through modern communication means. For Anderson this modern conduit was the press. Concretely, periodicals allowed people to develop a sense of belonging to a certain community, and to imagine themselves as part of that same community. In other words, the press creates a nation: “reading the stories of their nation in schools, literature and newspapers, individuals came to identify with public communities that were vastly larger than the local worlds in which they lived their daily

²⁴ Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties...*, 4.

²⁵ Kitromilides, “‘Imagined Communities’ and...”, 178-179.

²⁶ Lloyd Kramer, “Historical Narratives and the Meaning of Nationalism”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 58, no. 3, 1997, 527.

lives.”²⁷ In this context, nationhood could be defined as a sense of belonging fostered with novelties of the modern world.

Additionally, Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm see the origins of national ideas connected with economic structure and industrialization.²⁸ However, this notion does not explain the growing nationalism in the Balkan states which were far away from being perceived as industrial and capitalistic centers. Hobsbawm rightly noticed that this approach in studying nation/nationhood from above “cannot be understood unless also analyzed from below, that is in terms of the assumptions, hopes, needs, longings and interests of ordinary people, which are not necessarily national and still less nationalist.”²⁹ I would add that this appropriation should not only refer to ordinary people like peasants, but it also has to be applied on what I call national workers – urban and educated middle and upper class – who act as disseminators of national ideas.

This approach in studying nationhood from above was criticized also by Rogers Brubaker in *Nationalism Reframed*. According to Brubaker, the foundations which theorists use when conducting analysis concerning nationalism are essentially wrong:

Most discussions of nationhood are discussions of *nations*. Nations are understood as real entities, as communities, as substantial, enduring collectivities. *That* they exist is taken for granted, although *how* they exist – and how they came to exist – is much disputed.³⁰

To understand nationhood, Brubaker asserts, the nation should be seen as a category of practice, and not a substantive entity. In this respect, nationhood has to be seen as a political and cultural form which is institutionalized in accordance to state practice and state system. Therefore, nation/nationhood depends on the practice of the state and is subjected to change:

²⁷ Ibid, 529.

²⁸ Ibid, 530.

²⁹ Cited in Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*, Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press, 2004, 2.

³⁰ Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 13.

nationhood is applied and appropriated differently. For this reason, we are not dealing with a substantive entity but rather with, as Brubaker said, a changeable form of practice.³¹

Brubaker further elaborated this statement in *Ethnicity without Groups* where he argued that terms like nation, ethnicity, race etc., which he calls “bounded groups”, are not expressing social reality and should not be used as a basis when analyzing nationalism. This implies that language used in such analysis is often taken for granted. In other words, scholars refer to “bounded groups” without questioning their meaning and existence.³² I noticed this in literature on Ottoman Macedonia where scholars overwhelmingly use collective identities, fluid nationhood, confronting ethnicities etc. without defining it and taking it for granted. In this respect, Yosmaoğlu refers to nationhood as “a basis for collective identity” without providing what collective identity means in this case.³³ In order to avoid it, Brubaker suggests to develop ways of analyzing nationalism without referring to “bounded groups.”³⁴ For instance, when dealing with nationhood which is commonly based on civic/ethnic distinction, Brubaker asserts that such distinction is highly problematic and “it is expected to do too much work.”³⁵ For this reason, he proposes state-framed and counter-state nationhood in order to avoid ambiguities. Although Brubaker does not elaborate in detail state-framed and counter-state nationhood, based on the few examples he provided, it could be concluded that those who categorize themselves as Serbs and not Ottomans in the Ottoman state are expressing counter-state nationhood.³⁶ Nevertheless, if *Ottomanism* as state ideology did not exclude the possibility that someone can be a Serb and an Ottoman at the same time, this suggests that individuals in the Ottoman Macedonia could have state-framed; counter-state; and as third

³¹ Ibid, 16-21.

³² Brubaker, *Ethnicity without...*, 2-3.

³³ Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties...*, 4.

³⁴ Brubaker, *Ethnicity without...*, 4.

³⁵ Ibid, 146.

³⁶ Ibid, 144-46.

possibility state-framed and counter-state nationhood at the same time. This again does not say much on nationhood itself, except that it can be defined in many ways.

1.3. Methodological considerations

My thesis is based on the primary source *Carigradski glasnik*, accompanied with additional archival materials comprised of consular reports. These types of sources together with secondary literature provide grounds for understanding Serbian activities in Ottoman Macedonia and the related process of establishing an Ottoman-Serbian paper in Istanbul whose aim was to promote the Serbian community in the Ottoman province. Consular reports consisted of private correspondence between consulates and the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs which provide insight into problems that Serbian irredentist activities faced in Ottoman Macedonia. Unlike *Carigradski glasnik* which had a specific role in Serbian propaganda, consular reports reveal a larger array of diversities that existed in Ottoman Macedonia. More concretely, they highlighted chronic problems with disorganized Serbian agendas, interplays between Ottoman and Balkan states, and the inability to imbed *Serbianess* into the local population.

On the other hand, *Carigradski glasnik* as both an Ottoman and Serbian propaganda tool represented more wishful thinking of both these states than facts on the ground. Nevertheless, it still provides useful commentary on how Serbian intellectuals defined nationhood, and what it meant to be an Ottoman Serb. Nationhood was not just propagated on special occasions when it was directly stressed, like in Saint Sava celebrations when they glorified the founder of the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Church. It was also propagated on ordinary days.

In 1995 Billig published a study on what he called “banal nationalism”, i.e. on common and banal forms of nationalism that became part of daily life and penetrated into routines: thus,

are unnoticed but reminded continuously.”³⁷ As Billig stated, it is not a flag which has been consciously waved; it is rather a flag attached to public buildings that pass unnoticed because people got accustomed to them. Hence people are constantly reminded on symbols of nationhood without even being aware of it.³⁸

Inspired by this study Aynur Köse and Mustafa Yılmaz examined how this “banal nationalism” was reproduced in the Turkish daily press. These authors chose an ordinary day in Turkey, February 3, 2010 when there were no holidays or festivals that reproduced “direct nationalism” and examined the content of 36 daily Turkish papers published on this day. In doing so, they came to conclusion that 94% of the examined material was in connection to Turkey. Their analysis revealed that despite being an ordinary day, “nationhood was reproduced via both nationalist language forms and classifications of ‘us’ and ‘them’, praise of the nation/country, and the emphasis on common interests or common history.”³⁹

In addition, John Connell conducted a similar case study in Fiji, examining the daily *Fiji Times*. Unlike Turkey, Fiji represents a very diverse society without a clearly defined nationhood. Connell examined columns on the everyday lives of ordinary citizens who have inspiring life stories and came to the conclusion that this periodical engaged in the creation of a desired Fiji nationhood. In other words, *Fiji Times*’ columns on brave and determined local people entailed how ideal Fiji nationhood should be constructed.⁴⁰

As will be shown in next chapters, *Carigradski glasnik* also employed “banal nationalism”. Authors of this periodical covered topics primarily connected with Serbs; “we” and “others” discourse was regularly used; the Serbian nation was constantly praised; predominantly

³⁷ Aynur Köse and Mustafa Yılmaz, “Flagging Turkishness: the reproduction of banal nationalism in the Turkish press”, *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 40, No. 6, 2012, 909

³⁸ Ibid, 910.

³⁹ Ibid, 909.

⁴⁰ John Connell, “The *Fiji Times* and the Good Citizen: Constructing Modernity and Nationhood in Fiji”, *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2007, pp. 85-109.

Serbian writers, tradition and culture were covered in articles etc. Thus, ss Köse, Yılmaz and Connell analyzed, “banal nationalism” in the press is adominant discourse whose main aim was cultivating nationhood even when there was no explicit cause and need for it.

To conclude, recent theorists on nationalism like Brubaker question the notion of nationhood, which proved to be problematic term. Nevertheless, as Brubaker is also aware, it is difficult to avoid it. He proposes alternative to avoid ethnic/civic clashes, but his state-framed and counter-state nationhood also do not provide much. In spite the difficulties to define nationhood, we have to accept that nationhood is part of the everyday discourses, as Billig has shown in his study on “banal nationalism”. It is also certain that *Carigradski glasnik*, which had its own definition of nationhood, extensively used “direct” and “banal” nationalism to propagate it. As we will see in the next chapter, same mechanism was employed in the Ottoman press, where readers were constantly reminded on the presence of the Ottoman state and the Sultan.

Chapter II. Ottoman periodicals during Hamidian and early Young Turk Period (1876-1909)⁴¹

In comparison to the leading European states, the Ottoman Empire introduced the publication of periodicals, especially newspapers, quite late. In 1831 when the first official Ottoman-Turkish newspaper appeared, Europe had already passed through different processes associated with monitoring periodicals, censorship being the most important.⁴² From the start it was clear that the whole notion of the freedom of the press would be quite abstract concept for the Ottomans. This was clear in the earlier periods when the Ottomans perceived public spaces such as coffeehouses as a threat that needed to be curtailed. Spreading rumors was seen as a potential threat to the social order so it was not surprising that Süleyman I banned the coffeehouses in several occasions, while his later successor Murat IV even destroyed them with fire. In the 19th century, with the appearance of the first Ottoman periodicals, the coffeehouse-state relationship was brought to a different level. Coffeehouses were rarely banned, and the state sent spies in order to collect information and “capture the public opinion” rather than to persecute providers of rumors. In other words, periodicals that were

⁴¹ In this part the press coming from abroad will not be discussed. Foreign press was also subjected to regulations and examinations that was conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ottoman embassies abroad. However, the Ottomans were never able to put it under control because due to capitulations foreign post offices were exempted from Ottoman legislation. For more information see Fatmagül Demirel's *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür (Censorship during the period of Abdülhamid II)*. Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007.

⁴² For instance, the Russian Empire that resembled to the Ottoman Empire in many ways passed earlier through almost identical path as the Ottoman Empire when it comes to the press affairs. Namely, as soon as the first private periodicals appeared, the censorship was immediately introduced. Moreover, 1865 press law was based on the same French model as it was the case with the Ottoman press regulation issued in 1864. The only major difference was that, unlike the Ottomans whose censorship was arbitrary, the Russians issued censorship statute and hundreds of circulars on particular issues that left almost no room for arbitrariness of the censors. In addition, the 1905 revolution did not bring complete freedom of the press which was the case with the Young Turk revolution as well. For concise information on the press in the Russian Empire see Paul Foote, *Censorship Practice in Russia: Circulars of the Directorate of Censorship 1865-1904*, http://web.princeton.edu/sites/english/csbm/papers/censorship/censorship_russia.pdf. Last accessed May 21, 2014.

read and commented in coffeehouses became larger threat than rumors in the eyes of the authorities.⁴³

Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, the Ottoman state was looking for the best way to deal with periodicals. As they evolved, the state regulations tried to curb their evolution so as to insure that publishing houses were not disseminating subversive news and ideas. The only period when freedom of the press was introduced was more a consequence of the specific historical context than an actual intent, since 1908-1909 could be seen as an experimental year for the new Young Turk regime that was still looking for the best way to govern. The conversation between a British politician and the Ottoman ambassador in London illustrates this general Ottoman stance. When a British politician told the ambassador that “in Britain the freedom of the press meant that British politicians had to put up with the most vulgar lampooning,” the ambassador replied “public morals are seen very differently in the Ottoman state, and attacks on the August Person are very dangerous.”⁴⁴ In this light the freedom of the press was granted by the regime in 1908, but the Young Turks apparently did not consider criticism of their regime as falling within that freedom.

In this chapter I will deal with Ottoman periodicals during the Hamidian and early Young Turk regime. My argument is that neither of these periods can be seen as an isolated case in the Ottoman press. The Hamidian era was not simply a period marked by strict censorship when periodicals were put to sleep, and the early Young Turk regime did not have full freedom of the press, as was often suggested in conventional historiography (e.g. Paul Fesch’s *Constantinople aux derniers jours d’Abdul-Hamid*). It was a complex state-press relationship where the real nature of this relationship cannot be reduced to the state regulations on the

⁴³ Uğur Kömeçoğlu, *Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boğaziçi University: Institute of Social Sciences, 2001, 63-74. For more details on the coffeehouses-state relations in the 19th century see Cengiz Kirli, “Coffeehouses: Public Opinion in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire”, *Public Islam and the Common Good*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

⁴⁴ Selim Deringil, *Well-Protected Domains*, London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998, 143.

press, but the collaboration between the Sultan and periodicals also needs to be taken into account. Thus I divided this chapter into three main parts: the first presents the evolution of state regulations through the Tanzimat, Hamidian, and Young Turk eras, the second focuses on state-press relations behind the official regulation scene, and the third part focuses on the Ottoman audience, the consumers of the Ottoman press to whom publications were targeted.

I build on recent literature which deconstructs this period by pointing out that the initial scholarship on the Ottoman press which actually perpetuated the notion of the oppression of the Hamidian regime and the freedom of the early Young Turk regime, was created in the post-Hamidian period where anything that was connected with Abdülhamid's rule was used as a tool to delegitimize that period. Namely, as Donald Cioeta, Yosmaoğlu, and Ebru Boyar have argued, the well-known portrayal of the vagaries of Hamidian censorship were not the result of the state intervention to the content of publications, but of both periodicals themselves and post-Hamidian literature. Therefore approaching these two periods by reducing them to strict censorship of the former or complete freedom of the press in the latter regime has more to do with the politics of the period and is not, therefore, a good approach to the period as a whole.

2.1. Ottoman Periodicals and state regulations (1831-1909)

2.1.1. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: The Tanzimat period (1831-1878)

While printing houses were founded in the Ottoman Empire from the late 15th century onwards by Jews emigrated from Spain, the Muslim press, particularly periodicals, was only introduced to the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century. Because the Ottomans were not interested in publishing periodicals, the first to appear on Ottoman soil was the French paper *Bulletin de Nouvelles*, published by the French embassy in 1795. This French endeavor came to an end in 1798 when Napoleon occupied Egypt and the French embassy was closed. That

the press can be useful and dangerous at the same time was realized by the Ottomans during the Greek war for independence when the French paper, *Spectateur Oriental*, which propagated a pro-Ottoman stance contrary to the mainstream flow of the European press that supported the Greek cause. The Ottomans were paradoxically forced to close this pro-Ottoman paper because of pressure from the French embassy which appealed to the capitulations as grounds to shut down the paper.⁴⁵

Since this kind of periodicals could only survive in accordance with the policy of their respective states, so the Ottomans began to entertain the idea of establishing a periodical that would bolster the image of the Ottoman state. Since there was no existing periodical that could serve this goal, the Ottomans decided to create their own official publication. In 1831 at the initiation of Sultan Mahmud II, the first multi-lingual Ottoman periodical called *Takvim-i Vekayi (The Calendar of Events)* was published in French, Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Greek, and Bulgarian. Because it was an official periodical it did not receive the desired attention; therefore, the Ottomans decided to also discretely convert an Englishman's privately published paper *Ceride-i Havadis (Register of News)* into a state periodical. The Ottoman government believed that since the periodical's owner was a foreign citizen, it would enjoy attraction larger readership in Europe and among non-Muslim communities in the Empire.⁴⁶

Following an increase of publishing activity in the 1840s, both of periodicals and books, the Ottoman state implemented the 1857 printing house regulation (Matbaa Nizamnamesi) to control the content of publications. According to this regulation, anyone who wanted to open a printing house had to obtain a license from the Council of Education, which also gave permission for and monitored publishing materials. Venues that were classified as dangerous

⁴⁵ Demirel, *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür*, 26-28.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 29-31.

and harmful would not obtain permission for printing and publishing. If materials were published without the permission of the council, the police would collect the publications, the printing house would be closed, and a fine would be imposed.⁴⁷

Since the printing house regulation did not imply that private persons cannot open printing houses and publish material, in 1860 the first series of privately owned periodicals began to appear. Because some of these periodicals were not issued by a state and tended to criticize the actions of the government, the latter started to impose the first measures and regulations concerning periodicals. The first serious press regulation (Matbuat Nizamnamesi), inspired by the 1852 French model, was issued in 1864. According to this regulation the press office, established in 1862 (Matbuat Müdürlüğü), was part of the Ministry of Education, but was transferred to the Ministry of Interior in 1888,⁴⁸ and became the crucial body that monitored and censored printing activity. If an applicant were an Ottoman citizen, he had to submit an application to the Ministry of Education regardless of the language of publication, whereas, if an applicant were a foreign citizen, he had to submit an application the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Applicants also had to disclose what sort of content the periodical would cover. After the inquiry of respective bodies, the press office would issue a license. In addition, every copy of a periodical signed by the owner or director had to be given to the press office in Istanbul or to the provincial governor if the periodical were issued outside Istanbul. If periodicals published anything against the state, the Sultan, the Sultan's family or Ottoman allies, they were subjected to a penalty that could result in a fine, suspension of the periodical or even imprisonment. It is important to note that this press regulation remained active until 1909 when it was replaced by the press law (Matbuat Kanunu). This means that the widely known

⁴⁷ İpek K. Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913", *The Turkish Studies Association Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 1-2, 2003, 15-17.

⁴⁸ During the Hamidian period the censorship office was scattered through three Ministries. Ministry of Interior became central place for the domestic periodicals. Ministry of Education was in charge of books, while Ministry of Foreign Affairs dealt with foreign press.

censorship of the Hamidian period was based on the press regulation which was issued long before, and more interestingly, was based on the French model. Moreover, the 1865 press law issued in the Russian Empire was based on the same French model. This suggests that Hamidian censorship was far from being exception when dealing with periodicals in the European world.⁴⁹

It is not hard to notice that the 1864 press regulation was quite widely defined. Namely, it only stated that texts that criticized the state and the Sultan would be punished and that both periodical and printing houses that did so risked being closed and fined. However, it did not concretely state what kind of texts were offensive to the state, so this led to censorship's arbitrary decision-making. It is not surprising that the first periodicals were closed quite soon, although when it happened is a matter of dispute. Yosmaoğlu states it was *Muhbir (The Informer)* that was closed in 1867 because of a reader's letter (that was actually written by the chief editor Ali Suavi) on the concession of the Belgrade fortress.⁵⁰ Yet, Olga Borovaya mentions the Ladino paper *El Lunar* as the first known victim of the 1864 press regulation. This periodical was closed in 1865.⁵¹ Cioeta on the other hand states that it is possible that the first banned periodical in the Ottoman Empire was an Arabic paper banned in 1856, even prior to the press regulation. Cioeta cites the introduction of the telegraph during the Crimean War and consequently the easy access to foreign news through Reuters as a source of problems for printing houses. Since the foreign press often criticized the Ottoman Empire it is likely that this Arabic paper published an offence piece from Reuters.⁵²

⁴⁹ Demirel, II. *Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür*, 30-34; 43-44; Foote, *Censorship Practice in Russia...*, 4.

⁵⁰ Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word...", 18-19.

⁵¹ Olga Borovaya, *Modern Ladino Culture*, Bloomington-Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012, 62.

⁵² Donald J. Cioeta, "Ottoman Censorship in Lebanon and Syria, 1876-1908", 168-169.

In 1867 press regulation was supplemented by a government decree (Ali Kararname) issued by current grand vizier, Ali Paşa, in which the government reserved the right to close any suspect periodical immediately without providing reason and following the procedure of the 1864 press regulation. This was particularly directed against Young Ottomans, like Namık Kemal, who after such a decree was introduced were forced to leave the country and continue their publications abroad. Even after the death of Ali Paşa, the strict measures continued and in 1876 another government decree was issued. By this decree pre-publication censorship was established, and now every periodical before publishing had to be examined and put under the surveillance of press office. A few months later, in December 1876, the newly inaugurated Sultan Abdülhamid II proclaimed a novel constitution (Kanun-ı Esasi). Article 12 of the constitution stated that the press would be free in the limits of the law. Because in essence these limits were the 1864 press regulation and government decrees following it, the grand vizier, Midhat Paşa, also known as the father of the constitution, was ready to change the regulations and liberalize the press. However, once the Russo-Ottoman War started and Abdülhamid was not keen on loose press regulations, the whole process was abolished. Moreover, in 1877 a new government decree was issued by which offensive and critical periodicals would not just be closed, but the writers would be sent into exile.⁵³ Abdülhamid explained it with the following words, where his resistance to the press can also be detected:

In the past, when there were no periodicals, the rumors circulated only orally. In these days, the coming rumor is published as a fact. Everyone assumes that all the texts that appear in the periodicals are true. Because of that, fallacies that came up in the past are very important. On the behalf of the state, the following government actions are announced to the public in advance. Those who use language against government will be counted as plotters and against writers of such texts will be taken necessary severe legal measures.⁵⁴

⁵³ Demirel, *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür*, 34-39; Hamza Çakır, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002, 52-53.

⁵⁴ "Eskiden gazeteler yokken dedikodular yalnızca ağızlarda dolaşırdı. Şimdi herkes geleni birer gerçekmiş gibi yayınıyor. Gazetelerde çıkan yazıları da herkes tümüyle gerçek sanıyor. Bu yüzden ortaya çıkan yanlışlar eskiden çok önemlidir. Hükümetin icraatı aleyhine dil kullananların fesatçı sayılacağı ve bu çeşit yazıları yazanlara karşı gereken şiddetli kanuni tedbirlerin alınacağı herkesçe bilinmek üzere devlet adına bu durum şimdiden ilan olunur.", Çakır, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri*, 54-55.

Soon after the Russo-Ottoman War, the parliamentary regime was abolished and the Sultan embarked on a path of autocratic rule.

2.1.2. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: The Hamidian period (1878-1908)

It's obvious that the establishment of state control over periodicals was a gradual process. State measures were *ad hoc*, adapting to each new situation. Before the 1860s there was no press regulation because periodicals were only at the beginning of their development. As soon as the first independent papers emerged, state regulations immediately followed. In this sense Abdülhamid was not the first, and as will be seen in the example of the Young Turks not the last, to impose strict state control over the press. However, what distinguishes him in historiography from the previous Tanzimat period (although if the Hamidian regime really meant the end of the Tanzimat is debatable), and from his successors the Young Turks, was the censorship that in the literature took gigantic proportions. Thus it is surprising to note that only a few press regulations took place during this 30 year regime and none of them concerned periodicals directly. The 1864 press law and previous government decrees regarding periodicals were all valid during this regime. However, based on the 1864 press regulation which supposed post-publication censorship, and on the 1876 government decree that introduced pre-publication censorship, Ottoman periodicals during the Hamidian period were subjected to double censorship examination.

This transformed the Ottoman press office into a systematic administrative organization that on the one hand reduced the possibility of being banned, but on the other hand placed owners and editors of periodicals into a difficult position. Periodicals depended entirely on the censors and their interpretation of what was harmful to the state and what was not. A case from the Arab provinces, namely from Beirut, provides a good example of how Ottoman censorship worked. Although differences between the provinces and politics varied depending on the censor and provincial state structures, probably the procedure was similar in all parts.

Hence, before publication two copies of the coming periodical issue were printed and delivered to the press office. An official would read the copy and mark questionable parts whether to be deleted or rewritten. Then these reviewed copies were sent to the mektupçu (main censor in the provinces) for approving or rejecting the clerk's marks. After that, one copy was returned to the periodical, and the other was kept for comparison. When editors made suggested changes, they again printed the copies and sent them to the press office. The whole procedure was repeated over and over again until the whole issue was approved. When the issue was published, a few copies were sent again to the press office for comparison to see if editors additionally added some parts after the censorship was over (which occasionally was the case). This same issue was then forwarded to Istanbul where it was submitted for post-publication censorship procedure.⁵⁵

The same procedure was valid for *Carigradski glasnik* which was nevertheless published in Istanbul. This was a wise move from its establishers who assumed that because of the rigorous press regulations it would be better if the paper was published in Istanbul. In this case the director of *Carigradski glasnik* had to present the periodical two days before the publication to the censors, then again the next day in order to check whether the criticized parts were rewritten or removed. Finally, the editors were forced to finalize the whole procedure before 9 a.m. on the day of the publication otherwise the paper would be suspended for a month. As *Carigradski glasnik* was published regularly we might assume that all its responsibilities were on time or this information was exaggerated.⁵⁶

Although periodicals went through time-consuming and rigorous examinations of content, this pre-publication censorship did not guarantee that periodicals were safe from being banned. One reason lies in the post-publication process in which Istanbul censors could detect some

⁵⁵ Cioeta, "Ottoman Censorship in...", 170-172.

⁵⁶ Petar Mitropan, "Цариградски гласник" (*Carigradski glasnik*), *Јужни преглед*, Vol. 5, 1928, 23.

fallacies which were not perceived or characterized as dangerous by their pre-publication colleagues in the provinces. The other reason is the actual disobedience of the editors who did not follow the censors' advice. For example, in the period between 1876 and 1908 in Beirut 97 warnings and suspensions were issued, out of which 46 were banned because periodicals were not submitted for censorship or contained material that was deleted by the provincial censor. This refutes the general assumption that periodicals were completely obedient to the state regulations and censorship. As seen, editors could risk publishing a paper without going through the pre-censorship process.⁵⁷ This sort of disobedience was also present in Russian Empire where such periodicals were subjected to suspension and fine. Nevertheless, Russian Empire exercised post-publication censorship rarely and throughout the period preliminary censorship prevailed.⁵⁸

In principle, since regulations did not determine what should and should not be banned, the complete censorship process depended on these state officials (not just censors but also valis or other higher ranking officials who controlled censorship), and the daily running of the state. For example, in the situation of state crisis or war, censorship machinery had to be much stricter than usual. The arbitrary situation in the censorship procedure was not remedied even when the Sultan issued the new 1888 and later 1894 printing house regulations which were supposed to clarify existing regulations and decrees. These regulations set out printing houses work, so they indirectly touched the publication of the periodicals as well. However, the most important element - procedures that censorship should follow in determining dangerous texts, were not specified. This means that the censorship procedure remained arbitrary. The censors interpreted regulations based on what they perceived as imminent, so the everyday functioning of the periodicals depended both on the context of the day and current mood of

⁵⁷ Ibid, 178.

⁵⁸ Foote, *Censorship Practice in Russia...*, 5.

the main censor.⁵⁹ However, this was not the case with the Russian Empire. Censors were constantly controlled by the Directorate of Censorship and although censorship also varied on everyday context, the state assured to issue censorship statute and numerous circulars on particular issues. This arbitrary censorship was nonexistent in Russia.⁶⁰

Again using the example of *Carigradski glasnik* and Beirut we see everyday situations with which editors had to cope. For a certain text one censor could suspend a periodical, while the other would issue just a warning. When desperate editors finally asked for concrete guidelines just to be on the safe side, the censor allegedly tapped his head and replied that the guidelines were in his brain. Furthermore, some editors stated that they could not even predict which texts would be approved and which would be rejected because their censors were so moody.⁶¹ On the other hand, *Carigradski glasnik* collaborated with the censor who was allegedly an Islamized Bulgarian from Eastern Rumelia who was responsible for both Serbian and Bulgarian periodicals in Istanbul. For this reason it would be interesting to register his attitude toward Bulgarians, and whether the fact that he was an Islamized Bulgarian played a role in the process. Kosta Grupčević, the second owner of the *Carigradski glasnik*, in one occasion expressed his disappointment with the fact that although he was the owner and main editor of the paper he nevertheless could not publish what he wanted.⁶² However, animosity between periodicals and censors was not *sine qua non*, as demonstrated by Greek periodicals in Izmir and their censor. After twenty years of service the above mentioned censor retired, so the director of the Greek periodical *Amalthea* suggested organizing a banquet in the censor's honor and handing him a memorable present, which was reportedly euphorically welcomed

⁵⁹ Ebru Boyar, "The Press and the Palace: the Two-Way Relationship between Abdülhamid II and the Press, 1876-1908", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 69, No. 3, 2006, 422-23

⁶⁰ Foote, *Censorship Practice in Russia...*, 5-15.

⁶¹ Cioeta, "Ottoman Censorship in...", 173.

⁶² Arhiv Srbije (AS), SN, 1285, Letter of Kosta Grupčević to Stojan Novaković, 1902.

by journalists. A similar case could be tracked in Beirut as well, where for a period of time the censor Khalil al-Khuri and Arabic papers successfully collaborated.⁶³

Finally, one of the most repeated topics in the Ottoman publishing world were the words and phrases such as “nose”⁶⁴ which were supposedly forbidden by Abdülhamid II. Accordingly, they represent not just the severity and the absurdity of the censorship, but of the Hamidian regime as a whole. However, recent scholarship suggests that this censorship was not something that was introduced by Abdülhamid himself but rather by the periodicals based on experiences they had with their changeable censors. We have seen that the state regulations were very ambiguous and did not provide clear instructions to censors so it is hard to believe the state entertained making such official lists. It is likely that forbidden words and phrases began as an informal list conducted by writers who wanted to avoid problems with censors. Supposedly, these informal lists were based on the writers’ experiences with censors and as soon as a particular word or sentence was banned, it was written down in lists by journalists. Thus, endless lists of words like revolution, constitution, liberty, Armenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, bomb, assassination, insanity, reform, homeland etc. surfaced, but none of these words are backed by the concrete examples. Moreover, some of these lists were published after the Young Turk revolution when the Sultan was delegitimized. However, certain words indeed became undesirable during specific periods of time, but they were not banned during the whole Hamidian period. The only word which was constantly not mentioned in the press, at least after the late 1880s, was the word assassination because of Abdülhamid’s fear of it.⁶⁵ In *Carigradski glasnik* we can track words like Macedonia⁶⁶ (after

⁶³ Cioeta, “Ottoman Censorship in...”, 172.

⁶⁴ Abdülhamid had distinctive nose so allegedly censors forbade using this word because it could associate readers to the Sultan’s face.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 174-178.

⁶⁶ Macedonian name was not mentioned during Hamidian period because it reportedly associated readers on Bulgarian pretensions in this region. *Carigradski glasnik* started to use the name only after the Young Turk revolution when it even discussed topics on whether Slavic Macedonians were Serbs or Bulgarians. See “Jecy

the Young Turk revolution) Armenians, Bosnia and Herzegovina, reforms, and even bomb⁶⁷, but the word assassination was not mentioned. When the King of Serbia was assassinated in 1903 *Carigradski glasnik* simply informed that King Aleksandar died and focused attention on events that followed.⁶⁸ Similarly with the attempted assassination of Abdülhamid II during Friday Prayers in 1905, only the official notification was published, while the Friday Prayer was described as if nothing unusual happened.⁶⁹

2.1.3. Ottoman periodicals and state regulations: early Young Turk period (1908-1909)

The Young Turk revolution finally took place after the Young Turks spent almost 20 years fighting for the re-proclamation of the constitution and parliament in opposition to the Sultan. Nevertheless, the aftermath of the revolution brought much instability and strife mainly because the Central Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) did not seize *de facto* power but remained in Salonika from which it tried to control the old government in Istanbul. Adding to these two centers of power was a third one, namely the palace with Sultan Abdülhamid still on top, it is evident that the Ottoman Empire was passing through, as Hasan Kayalı called it, crisis of authority. Since there were no clear cut boundaries between these three hubs of power, the first year after the revolution represents a sort of an interregnum period: in this short period of time, five governments collapsed, a counter-revolution took place and a wide array of opposition group and parties was established. Given the circumstances, it is not difficult to see how the periodicals could use this lack of control in every possible way.⁷⁰

ли Македонски Словени Срби или Бугари?“ (Are Slavic Macedonians Serbs or Bulgarians?), *Carigradski glasnik* (CG), no. 52, 1908, 2.

⁶⁷ Most of these allegedly forbidden words were used in *Carigradski glasnik* throughout Hamidian regime. For example, on one occasion CG informed that Armenians who set the bombs were arrested. Generally CG lengthily reported on Armenian question, publishing news from other periodicals and official notifications. For example, see CG, no. 44, 1895. Bosnia and Herzegovina was also regularly mentioned. For example, see notification on published grammar book of the Bosnian language, which for the authors of *Glasnik* was actually Serbian language. “Босански 'Турски учитељ'“ (Bosnian 'Turkish teacher'), no. 21, 1896, 4.

⁶⁸ “Двор и јавни послови у Србији“ (The court and public affairs in Serbia), CG, no. 24, 1903, 1.

⁶⁹ “Селаблик“ (Friday Prayer) CG, no. 29, 1905, 1.

⁷⁰ Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks*, Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997, 56.

Shortly after the news of the re-proclamation of the constitution and the introduction of a parliamentary regime proved to be true, journalists gathered and decided to abolish censorship by refusing to submit periodicals for review. Freedom of the press was proclaimed by the Young Turks as well; however, this was not legislated since the elections for the parliament were in the process.⁷¹ The first months of the new Young Turk period met public expectations. As mentioned, censorship was abolished, elections for parliament announced, and political prisoners set free. What is more, periodicals went through a new revival. Reportedly, only in the first month following the revolution in Istanbul 353 periodicals published and 200 new licenses were granted.⁷² This is to say, at the beginning of the year 120 periodicals were published in the entire Ottoman Empire and after the revolution that number increased to 730 (in the first seven months of the Young Turk regime). Similarly in Istanbul from a starting point of 52 periodicals at the beginning of the year, the number increased up to 377.⁷³

However, this generous act of the new regime did not mean that the periodicals would by any means be favorable to the new power. As Palmira Brummett showed in her book on the revolutionary press, the favorite targets of satirical periodicals, were expectedly individuals from the former Hamidian regime, relations with the Great Powers and, of course, the new regime. A favorite target was related either to the minister of finance (who held the most difficult position in the government) or the new parliament where deputies were presented as lazy and exceedingly bored individuals who cried to themselves “Mercy (*Aman*), these deliberations...it’s impossible to sleep!”⁷⁴

⁷¹ Yosmaoğlu, “Chasing the Printed Word...”, 32-33.

⁷² Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks*, 55.

⁷³ Yasemin Doğaner, “Hürriyet ve Modernleşme Enstümanı Olarak Osmanlı’da Basın” (The Press in the Ottoman Empire as an Instrument of Freedom and Modernization), *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 29, No.1, 2012, 119.

⁷⁴ Palmira Brummett, *Image and Imperialism in the Ottoman Revolutionary Press, 1908-1911*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000, 141.

The Young Turks, like the Hamidian regime, were not prone to receive the tirades of their critics gracefully, but there is one veritable point of contrast. The Hamidian regime acted transparently, namely by imprisoning or exiling of critical writers, or prosecuting them visibly in public, but the Young Turk regime even in its earliest phase showed a lack of transparency, preferring stealth on such occasions. On the surface everyone enjoyed the fruits of revolution and freedom, but behind the scenes the Committee of Union and Progress acted like a paramilitary party manned by armed volunteers who liquidated the opponents of the regime, among whom were journalists who wrote under the proclaimed freedom of the press but were assassinated in the middle of the street. Such was the case of the owner of *Serbesti* Hasan Fehmi who was murdered as he crossed the Galata Bridge in Istanbul in 1909. Although it was well known that the CUP stood behind these politically motivated assassinations, they could not be accused of it because all their dirty work was carried out by elusive organization of so-called volunteers.⁷⁵

As soon as the situation in the state normalized after the counter-revolution in April 1909 when Sultan Abdülhamid was deposed (and the public cynical regarding the grandiose promises of the new regime), the question of the press came to be among the first issues that were to be resolved. In April 1909, the constitution passed through several modifications, among them the previously mentioned Article 12. The clause which stated that the press was free under the limits of the law was still valid, but to this another clause was added. Namely, the periodicals would no longer be subjected to the examinations that anteceded the publication process. In other words, the pre-publication censorship was abolished. A few months later this was confirmed by the new 1909 press law. It was generally viewed as the regime's first step to gradually strengthening control over periodicals. This law covered

⁷⁵ Fatma Müge Göçek, "What is the Meaning of the 1908 Young Turk Revolution?", *Istanbul University Political Science Faculty Journal XXXVIII*, 2008, 204-06.

several areas such as legal requirements and penal descriptions. According to it, every periodical had to name the editor-in-chief who had to meet certain conditions and who became the main person responsible in the command chain. This editor had to be an Ottoman citizen, over 21 years of age, fluent in the language of the publication, and had to have no criminal record. Regarding the granting of the license application, certain information such as the personal data of editor, as well as title, language, location and focus of the periodical had to be provided. The Ministry of Interior became a centralized institution related to the press issues so any questions regarding the press were processed here. Further, penalties were to follow if the offense related to any of the named categories like publishing information contrary to courts (such as information from closed sessions), offences against any religion or ethnicity, and publishing false information. In addition, provoking or supporting crime against the government was also punishable. Critics were tolerated as long as they did not commit offenses and attack the personal integrity of the statesmen. Despite the Hamidian regime, the responsibility for the periodical was not just on editors and writers; it was on anyone who participated in the publication process, including printers and the newsboys, essentially anyone except the reader. Hence following the constitutional modifications and the press law, pre-publication censorship was abolished, which was not necessarily a good thing for periodicals. That is to say, publications once published and left to circulation might be recalled. This risked incurring high costs for the periodicals, since no one guaranteed that the issue would not be withdrawn.⁷⁶

In general, the Young Turks were much more decisive in creating a successful administrative apparatus than was the case in the Tanzimat and Hamidian periods. Only in the case of censorship was it clear that despite the regulations both systems were more or less flexible and arbitrary in nature. This was not the case with the new regime. Once freedom of the press

⁷⁶ Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word...", 34-36.

came to an end after the counter-revolution in 1909, periodicals were faced with the new, much stricter and impersonal regime which in the following years gradually increased the censorship regulations.⁷⁷

2.2. Periodicals - state relationship during the Hamidian and early Young Turk period

Press regulation and related decrees can only provide us one side of the story; they do not reveal what the actual relationship was between the press and the state during the Hamidian and early Young Turk periods. The press regulations can only suggest that the periodicals during the Hamidian regime were not allowed to move without the censors' consent, while on the other hand, after the Young Turk revolution and up to April 1909 when the Young Turks began to seize power, the periodicals were absolutely free from any restrictions. However, as mentioned earlier, political assassinations of the writers who dared to criticize the Young Turk regime provided another side of the story. In other words, there might have been no legal restrictions on the freedom of the press, but the political assassinations suggest that writers were not entirely free concerning their expression of thoughts. The same was valid for the Hamidian period. Namely, the restrictions put on the press did not mean that the periodicals were motionless for 30 years. The reports on the complex relations between the Sultan and the periodicals suggest otherwise. Thus, it is worth investigating what was actually going on behind the state regulations.

During the Hamidian period, the press was not just seen as a dangerous tool which was perfect for disseminating subversive ideas which were undermining the Ottoman state's legitimation. The press, especially the periodicals, was also seen as a good way to do the opposite – to bolster the state's legitimation by propagating a good image of the state and the Sultan. This meant paying meticulous attention to the coverage of the important dates like the

⁷⁷ Ibid, 37-38.

Sultan's birthday, inauguration celebrations and Friday Prayers when representation of the state's legitimation was at its height.⁷⁸ Hence for the Sultan the periodicals were perfect as long as they were controlled. There were various means to control the press, not just through censorship but through more subtle means employed by Abdülhamid when dealing with the press. Namely, the state sent official notifications to the periodicals as a way to communicate with or inform the public, it ordered texts from the journalists or provided its own materials that were meant to respond to the state's critics coming from the foreign press.⁷⁹

On the other hand, individuals working in the press machinery had to earn their living so they went with the flow rather than against it. For such an attitude they were also generously awarded. For example, on important days such as Friday Prayers the periodical's owners and journalists received medals as a gift from the state. There were also various means to extract money from the state and the Sultan in order to survive and invigorate their position on the market against the other competing periodicals. These means were mainly receiving subsidies from the state, governmental printing jobs, occasional grants, and even technical support. In obtaining all these financial help, periodical's owners were employing various strategies. For instance, owners sought assistance from the state to cover publication expenses because the government brought notifications when machines had already printed the issues that now consequently needed to be destroyed. Other owners complained about the high price of the stamp tax, while some pointed out that they had the biggest periodical circulation which should be therefore supported by higher subsidies.⁸⁰ Subsidies were indeed given to most of the periodicals, not just those that published on Ottoman-Turkish issues but to those that were published in other languages as well. What is more, the subsidies of periodicals that were shut

⁷⁸ How these days were extremely important can be seen on the pages of *Carigradski glasnik*. There was not a single week in which Friday Prayer was not covered, and to celebrations of Sultan's birthday and inauguration to the throne was devoted special attention. Naturally, these events were covered in pompous style.

⁷⁹ Boyar, "The Press and the Palace...", 424-26.

⁸⁰ Ibid, 428-31.

down by the state often still made its way to the editors. For example, the Istanbul based French paper *Levant Herald* which was more often closed than open, still received subsidies from the state. In 1890 it got 100 000 kuruş, which was substantially more than the subsidies which other French periodicals received.⁸¹

The owners even wrote petitions to the Sultan when they were closed. Usually they stated that their periodicals could not afford to be suspended for a long time because journalists had to earn a living. Petitions often claimed that they had been loyal to the Sultan for so long and that one small unintentional mistake should be pardoned. Petitioners even complained about censorship, of the ignorance of the censors and their endeavor to make the publication process extremely difficult. One even wonders if “we have been working for years against the state as traitors who now, having lost the opportunity to do harm thanks to the censors, have to be loyal to the state?”⁸² The editor of one of the most popular Ottoman-Turkish dailies *Sabah (Morning)* complained about the penalty even stating that he as an Armenian received threats from his compatriots because he favorably wrote about the state and was always willing to do so because he was loyal to the Sultan.⁸³

Of course, the content of these documents should not be taken for granted. Petitioners used various narrative strategies and ruses in order to convince the authorities to cancel suspensions, and applicants for subsidies might have also exaggerated the costs of the production or circulation numbers in order to extract more money from the state. The narrative strategies that appeared in all these requests either asking for cancellation of suspension or for granting subsidies, was loyalty. Namely, to survive politically in the Hamidian regime the only thing that a person had to do was to express continuously loyalty towards the Sultan. As Yosmaoğlu states, the political environment was such that “earning the

⁸¹ Çakır, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri*, 63.

⁸² Boyar, “The Press and the Palace...”, 428.

⁸³ Demirel, *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür*, 34-39; Çakır, *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri*, 78-80.

favor and blessings of the sultan was seen as a zero-sum game, where one person's gain would mean another's loss, and it was not possible to escape this morally ambiguous competition through neutrality; one was either with the sultan or against him."⁸⁴ While in the Young Turk period merit was (at least officially) seen as the only way to someone's promotion, in the Hamidian regime what propelled people forward was loyalty. Thus if periodicals wanted to survive they had to adapt to this political culture. The usual mechanisms which periodicals employed while assuring the state of their unconditional loyalty were imposing self-censorship and serving as the Sultan's spy, i.e. providing information to the palace about possible threats, less loyal subjects and periodicals.⁸⁵ This type of discourse in which loyalty took the central position was not something characteristic for the Ottoman state but it could be traced in other, especially autocratic regimes, like Russia or Austria-Hungary. For instance, the Russian Empire, particularly during the reign of Nicholas I, propagated "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality" doctrine and hence the press had to operate within this framework as well.⁸⁶

Self-censorship consisted of the aforementioned informal lists which periodicals compiled in order to ease their work with the censors. Countless anecdotes⁸⁷ on forbidden words and phrases such as censoring a piece that cited the Bible because a phrase from Paul's epistle "O you foolish Galatians!" might offend the inhabitants of the Istanbul quarter Galata; or any chemical formula containing letters A and H (e.g. AH=0) because it was associated to Abdülhamid's name was banned. However, Cioeta and Boyar suggested that these ridiculous examples of censorship were productions of post-Hamidian period in order to delegitimize the previous regime, while Yosmaoğlu points that these absurdities might be the production of especially ambitious journalists and censors who by banning any possible words that could be

⁸⁴ Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word...", 22.

⁸⁵ Idem.

⁸⁶ Foote, *Censorship Practice in Russia...*, 2-3.

⁸⁷ For example, literature on the period of the Russian *Tsar* Nicholas I was full of those press anecdotes.

connected with the Sultan, increased their chances in career promotion, assuring higher subsidies from the state, or simply survival in such a competing political atmosphere.⁸⁸ To this practice had to be added the spying activities of owners and journalists who in this way expressed their loyalty as well as discrediting other competing periodicals. Providing information on possible subversive actions and persons was a good way to succeed in the Haimidian regime.⁸⁹ *Carigradski glasnik* operated entirely within this official discourse of self-censorship. Loyalty was continuously expressed especially during the times of unrest. Armenian massacres and many other for the Ottoman state offensive articles that were published in the foreign press, *Carigradski glasnik* used as a way to express enormous loyalty of the Ottoman Serbs to the state. When needed, *Glasnik* also published official notifications of the state when they completely (at least officially) agreed with their content: "Every behavior which is against the will of His Magnificence Sultan, who is the father of all his subjects, has to result in punishment in this as well as on the other world."⁹⁰ Since *Carigradski glasnik* managed to keep this discourse throughout, it is no wonder that it was not suspended a single time in the Ottoman Empire.

On the other hand, the political atmosphere in the Young Turk regime changed. The interaction with the press became much more formal, strict and impersonal. While state-press relations during the Hamidian period were described as a father-children relationship, the state-press relationship in the Young Turk period became bureaucratic. For example, subsidies were common in the previous period, but were not so common in the Young Turk regime. This certainly contributed to the shutdown of *Carigradski glasnik*. Many owners petitioned the Ministry of Interior for some sort of financial help but with only limited

⁸⁸ Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word...", 23.

⁸⁹ Boyar, "The Press and the Palace...", 426-27.

⁹⁰ "Свако понашашње противно вољи Њ. Ц. В. Султана, који је отац свију његових поданика, мора дати за последице казну како на овоме, тако и на ономе свету.", "Проглас" (Proclamation), CG, no. 49, 1895, 4.

success. The same was valid for the suspension of a paper. If the paper were shut down, it remained as such for an appointed period of time. Because of these strict measures and decisiveness in administration, many people started to express nostalgia for the old regime.⁹¹

2.3. Periodicals and readers

From the previous statement summarizing Abdülhamid's stance toward the press I cited earlier (see page 26), one can infer that the Sultan saw the press as a dangerous tool that could be used against himself and the state because readers did not realize that not everything published in periodicals was *a priori* correct. This quote provides insight into how the Sultan actually perceived his Ottoman subjects and how this insight did not differ from other 18th and 19th century imperial states. European autocratic rulers under the influence of the Enlightenment presented themselves as paternalistic figures toward their subjects who were naive children who needed to be educated as well as protected from any subversive ideas. With this in mind, the Ottoman state promoted education more vigorously from the 1860s onwards. In 1869 the state issued a regulation on public education inspired by the French secularist model. Abdülhamid continued to propagate modern public education subjected, nevertheless, to state censorship. Behind this 1869 regulation was not just the need to enlighten subjects, but the need to bring together various Muslim and non-Muslim communities of the Empire and transform them into loyal and educated Ottomans through joint strictly controlled public education. According to Selçuk Somel, public schools were a tool of social discipline and modernization which experienced its zenith precisely during the Hamidian period.⁹² Although the project ultimately failed to achieve this goal, the fact that literacy increased among the Ottoman population is very important in terms of creating a veritable audience for Ottoman periodicals.

⁹¹ Yosmaoğlu, "Chasing the Printed Word...", 40.

⁹² Selçuk Somel, *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908*, Leiden-Boston-Koln: Brill, 2001, 4-13.

Thus the emergence of the press, especially periodicals, should be seen in light of the modernization and propagation of state ideals which aimed at fostering the creation of a literate and modern Ottoman population. Periodical production experienced its boom precisely with the first serious attempts to introduce mass education in the Ottoman Empire. This process started from the 1870s onward when the press managed to stabilize, and in this period some periodicals emerged which lasted for several decades. The reason lies not only in the financial support of the state, but also in increased numbers of readers. Hence the owners of the periodicals, who were educated (some of them abroad) took the task to inform and enlighten their readers in the name of progress and modernization.⁹³

But who were the Ottoman readers? Can we speak of Ottoman literacy or is this literacy divided along ethnic borders where one “nation” produced and read only its own national language? The problem of defining the Ottoman Empire among ethnic and border lines blurs the fact that communities were not strictly divided, but rather mingled with one another. Along these lines, the consumers of Ottoman periodicals did not have to fit into one single category. For example, educated Ottoman Jews, Greeks, or Serbs who were mostly multi-lingual, did not have to read only periodicals in their mother tongues. They likely read other periodicals as well, like prominent Ottoman-Turkish dailies or French periodicals. For instance, biographies of the owners of *Carigradski glasnik* suggest that besides Serbian these Ottoman citizens knew other languages as well. As Strauss states, “many readers were also only familiar with one single language, but there were many channels of transmission and works which attracted a readership within all communities.”⁹⁴ Thus the sole language of the publication does not reveal much. For instance, although Sephardi Jews had few Ladino

⁹³ Yvette Bürki, “The Ottoman Press at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century Through the Salonica Newspapers *La Epoca* and *El Avenir*”, *European Judaism*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 2010, 103-07.

⁹⁴ Johann Strauss, “Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th-20th centuries)?”), *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2003, 40.

periodicals, Sam Lévy, editor of *La Epoka* and *Le Journal De Salonique* stated that around 1898 more than 50% of the Sephardi Jews living in Salonika were illiterate. By that he meant that they were unable to read Ladino press but were probably able to read periodicals in French since the instruction in most Jewish schools were performed in that language.⁹⁵

Who then was the audience of the Ottoman periodicals, what was their profile? Partly the answer to this question can be found in the periodicals' content where the readers' letters (if there were any), subscription lists, covered themes, used language, and even advertisements might suggest the type of audience consuming it. There were also specialized periodicals aimed at women, merchants etc. so it was clear they had a specific public⁹⁶ Unfortunately, it is hard to predict which periodicals were the most consumed. It might be expected that the Ottoman-Turkish periodicals like *Sabah* had the highest circulation, but this also depended on the fact that they were aimed at the educate population of the Empire. The Ottoman periodicals did not contain information on circulation because the state did not require it to do so; hence it is hard to estimate the concrete numbers of circulated papers and by that estimate their popularity. Borovaya for instance states that the Ladino periodicals, taking into account the number of the Jewish population based on the Ottoman official census from 1910, never had more than few hundreds of copies, despite some owners indicating that their papers had more than a thousand copies. The same was true for Greek and Armenian communities who, according to the same census, each numbered around 70-80 000 inhabitants in Istanbul. Consequently their periodicals could not exceed 4-5 000 copies if we take into account the population and other rival periodicals available on the market.⁹⁷

Thus, the smaller the community, the lower the circulation, and presumably the higher production costs were; although this did not have to reflect in the prices of the periodicals.

⁹⁵ Borovaya, *Modern Ladino Culture*, 50.

⁹⁶ Brummett, *Image and Imperialism...*, 43-46.

⁹⁷ Borovaya, *Modern Ladino Culture*, 52-55.

Most of them during the Hamidian period received a subsidy from the government. This was the case for all Ottoman-Turkish periodicals and for most non-Turkish ones published in the Empire. The periodicals could also be privately sponsored and receive money from subscriptions, advertisements and of course, sold copies. However, it is hard to predict how much the running of periodicals was a successful business venture, especially running periodicals for small communities. One of the editors of the Ladino periodical *El Tiempo* stated that he was “director-administrator-accountant-secretary and editor in chief” at the same time because the owner could not afford more employees. Hence their circulation was presumably low but that does not mean they did not have readers.⁹⁸

Literacy growth did not necessarily mean increased number of sold periodicals. Despite mass education and topics adjusted for the masses, readers preferred to share subscriptions with friends and neighbors rather than buying an issue or subscribing on their own. This suggests that low circulation does not have to be immediately explained in terms of low literacy, poverty or cultural backwardness. The collective readings and sharing of the periodicals, especially during the long winter evenings when people usually gathered together, need to be taken into consideration. Sharing subscriptions was also useful in the sense of the affordability of the periodicals. The prices of periodicals depended on a few factors like number of copies, subscribers, even the place of living because the further someone lived from the periodicals’ publishing houses the higher the cost of transportation was. For instance, the issue of *Carigradski glasnik* could only be bought in Istanbul; in Ottoman Macedonia it was sent exclusively only through subscriptions. In addition, socioeconomic conditions in the regions varied. This is why the periodicals’ prices and especially subscriptions were prone to change.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Ibid, 47-49.

⁹⁹ Brummett, *Image and Imperialism...*, 40-41.

In the first few months after the revolution there was literally an explosion of the new coming publications. However, since the state no longer tended to give subsidies, the periodicals were left to open market competition and consequently many of them were closed. The situation further deteriorated after the counter-revolution in April 1909 when regulations limiting the freedom of the press slowly started to be introduced. Since censorship was gradually imposed, many papers were banned without the possibility for negotiation about canceling the penalty. Furthermore, pre-publication censorship was abolished thus many papers were withdrawn from the markets after they had already begun to circulate. All these reasons led many periodicals to cease publication and certainly affected the fate of *Carigradski glasnik*.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

The Ottoman press evolved gradually while adjusting itself to present circumstances and supplementing existing regulations with new clauses. The Hamidian period does not fundamentally differ from the previous Tanzimat period because both the 1864 regulation and the 1876 government decree were issued before Abdülhamid's autocratic rule. However, 1876 decree made operation of the press extremely difficult since periodicals were subjected to both pre- and post-publication procedure. Hamidian strict censorship could not be excused by arbitrary and moody censors and the competitive political atmosphere because in the end, the main responsibility lay with the Sultan. Many in the present Hamidian revisionist literature tend to justify his actions by explaining censorship in paternalistic discourse in which Abdülhamid, as the father who is responsible for his naive subjects, needs to protect and educate them from subversive ideas disseminated by the foreign press. In a sense it is understandable that the press in the context in which Ottoman legitimation was constantly challenged by foreign humiliations, wars and uprisings played a crucial role. Abdülhamid used any means possible to counter the foreign press and states' attacks by propagating a

¹⁰⁰ See Boyar and Yosmaoğlu's works.

positive image of the Ottoman Empire. Whether it was only an available option or not is another story.

On the other hand, the Young Turks were attempting to legitimize their rule as well. Firstly they accomplished this by delegitimizing and distancing themselves from the previous regime by proclaiming freedom of the press and other liberal measures. However, as soon as CUP seized power it put the press under control too. However, they did not grant licenses to periodicals for being good servants to the state. The Ottoman press profited during the Hamidian period in the sense that helping to bolster the state's image, owners and journalists were graciously awarded. In the early Young Turk period during the short lived freedom of the press periodicals significantly increased the market, however, they could not survive in such competitive circumstances without financial aid from the state. Once the freedom of the press came to an end after the counter-revolution in 1909, periodicals were faced with a much stricter and impersonal regime which generally neither granted subsidies nor cancelled imposed suspensions. Put simply, the Young Turks were much more decisive in creating a successful administrative apparatus and applying Tanzimat reforms than was the case in the Tanzimat and Hamidian eras. Thus there was not much room left for the press to bargain with the state.

In the following chapters I focus on how these press regulations from both Hamidian and Young Turk period affected functioning of *Carigradski glasnik*, an Istanbul-based periodical aimed at Ottoman Serbs. Namely, how the periodical, which was part of the Serbian propaganda campaign in Ottoman Macedonia, could successfully operate within Hamidian double-censorship examination. In the political atmosphere of the Hamidian period, periodicals were forced to promote Ottoman interests and bolster the image of the state; in other words, *Carigradski glasnik* could not only conduct Serbian propaganda but it also had to promote Ottoman positive image. On the other hand, during the early Young Turk period this

periodical also operated within specific discourse where freedom and equality were emphasized. Thus, in the next chapter, before focusing on the establishment of *Carigradski glasnik* and its functioning under the press regulations, it is essential to contextualize Serbian propaganda in Ottoman Macedonia in order to understand how could this periodical promote Serbian and Ottoman interests at the same time.

Chapter III. *Carigradski glasnik* and the Serbian struggle for the Ottoman Macedonia

Based on the general condition of the Ottoman press described in the previous chapter, one might get the impression that periodicals, especially those published during Hamidian period, did not have any option but to conform to the rules of the regime in order to survive. It was obvious that the opposition was not tolerated and censorship was introduced precisely with the intention to keep and propagate the interests of the state. Periodicals which were not in accordance with these rules were banned, and in special situations such as a state crises or war, journalists were even imprisoned and persecuted. For this reason, it is hard to imagine that *Carigradski glasnik*, a periodical which was designed as a Serbian propaganda machine in a sensitive area like Ottoman Macedonia managed to survive Hamidian regime for fourteen long years without being suspended a single time. It is even harder to imagine this knowing that Ottoman Macedonia was a virtual war zone claimed by Bulgaria, Greece, as well as Serbia who joined the struggle over Macedonia following the 1878 Berlin Congress.

Although from late 1860s Greece and Bulgaria engaged into intensified struggle over this region; Serbia, which had irredentist claims on northern Macedonian parts, turned its attention to it only after the Berlin Congress and loss of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Because Serbia was a latecomer, it spent next few years elaborating plans for national action. However, in 1885 Bulgaria violated the Berlin Congress and annexed autonomous Eastern Rumelia which was in Serbian circles interpreted as a step toward Bulgarian annexation of Ottoman Macedonia. This reasoning led Serbia into a war with Bulgaria in which Serbia was defeated, and this caused immediate Serbian engagement in Ottoman Macedonia. The defeat in the war with Bulgaria certainly shaped Serbian action in the Ottoman Empire. Its diplomatic circles realized that in comparison with Greece and Bulgaria, Serbia's position was weak. In this

sense, Serbia decided to collaborate with the Ottoman Empire and advocate the status quo in Ottoman Macedonia – namely, to recognize Ottoman sovereignty in this region in order to keep it within Ottoman borders. For this reason it advocated rather peaceful propaganda based on religion and education that was bolstered through *Carigradski glasnik*, an Istanbul-based periodical aimed to Ottoman Serbs living in Ottoman Macedonia.

Thus, in this chapter I argue that *Carigradski glasnik* was a direct product of Serbian diplomatic circles in Istanbul. The owners and editors were native Ottoman Macedonians familiar with the region and local population, and all of them were connected with the Serbian diplomatic circles. Since Serbs decided that their interests could be best achieved through collaboration with Ottoman authorities, this meant that *Carigradski glasnik* was published and distributed under strict Ottoman surveillance, namely in Istanbul. In such a case the utmost loyalty that this periodical expressed toward the Ottoman state was not just result of the political atmosphere and strict censorship, but it was also ultimate strategy of the Serbian diplomatic circles. The Serbian state kept this stance until 1903, when after the Ilinden uprising and increasing appearances of guerilla bands it became obvious that the Macedonian question would not be resolved through the “book and pen,” but through coercion. Because of this, Serbian diplomatic circles started to support Serbian guerrilla activities in the region. Nevertheless, *Carigradski glasnik* remained a “pen” fighter acting in accordance with Ottoman sovereignty and press regulations. This meant that during Hamidian period increasing guerilla activities were almost never mentioned. For instance, one of the biggest events in Ottoman Macedonia – the Ilinden uprising in 1903 – was not mentioned at all.

This chapter is divided into two parts: in first section I present the attempts of Serbian diplomatic circles to engage with the already advanced struggle for Ottoman Macedonia between Bulgarians and Greeks; in the second section I focus on the establishment of *Carigradski glasnik*. As mentioned in the literature review, the scholarship on Balkan

propaganda in Ottoman Macedonia usually revolves around Bulgarian and Greek propaganda campaigns, leaving Serbian as well as Ottoman activities aside. For this reason, the first section on Serbian propaganda is entirely based on Serbian consular reports and recent works of Serbian scholars like those of Miloš Jagodić or Slavenko Terzić. The section on *Carigradski glasnik* is, accordingly, mainly based on *Carigradski glasnik* itself. Serbian scholarship on this periodical is rare and is based on reproduction of the periodical's content and reference on old Serbian historiography. Thus the connection between *Carigradski glasnik*'s owners and editors is mentioned in Petar Mitropan's work from 1930s and correspondence between Serbian diplomats. In addition, materials of Stojan Novaković located in the Archive of Serbia also provides useful information.

3.1. Serbian diplomatic activities in the Ottoman Macedonia

The 1878 Berlin Congress brought official independence to the Serbian state, but on the other hand it put its expansionist program known as *Greater Serbia*¹⁰¹ (*Velika Srbija*) into question. Bosnia and Herzegovina represented one of the essential parts of this *Greater Serbia*, but since Austria-Hungary's bid to occupy the province at the Congress was successful, Serbian statesmen turned their attention to the south, namely to the *Old Serbia*¹⁰² (*Stara Srbija*) and northern Macedonia which they claimed to be their right from the medieval period onward. However, though the Serbian state did not take action immediately in Ottoman Macedonia, its Ministry of Foreign Affairs nevertheless expended great effort in elaborating plans and projects on Serbian politics and activities in this region from 1878 until 1885. This was understandable considering the actions taken in Ottoman Macedonia prior to 1878 were very

¹⁰¹ *Greater Serbia*, territorial expansionistic program officially created in Ilija Garašanin's *Начертаније* (Draft) in 1844. Includes neighboring countries such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Old Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro and parts of Croatia.

¹⁰² *Old Serbia*, region that was used to be part of medieval Serbia, now part of the Ottoman Empire. Includes provinces of Kosovo, Metohija, Sandžak and northern Macedonia.

limited¹⁰³ and many Serbs, including politicians and intellectuals, did not know much about either this region or about the local population living there. Slavenko Terzić sees the reasons in “leading politicians who neglected and misunderstood the importance of these areas, who were preoccupied with personal property and vehement fights between political parties as well as internal frictions, which were all barriers to more active and united national politics.”¹⁰⁴

After the Serbian declaration of war against the Ottoman Empire in 1876, all of the very limited Serbian activities in the *Old Serbia* were nevertheless interrupted. Serbian societies were abolished; schools were closed; and teachers were forced to migrate. Therefore, Serbia after 1878 did not have well developed starting points in the region from which it could start operating and as a consequence, the Serbs clearly understood that the Bulgarians were well-poised to take over what few Serbian schools remained in the Ottoman Balkans. During and after the war many Ottoman Serbs migrated to Serbia, while the Ottomans deliberately settled Muslim populations coming from other parts of the Balkans into what Serbia began to fashion as its ancestral homeland, southern Serbia. For the Serbian state this meant losing an already thin Ottoman Serb population and thus making its politics in the region more difficult.¹⁰⁵

Many Serbian politicians immediately started to warn that something needed to be done in the Ottoman Macedonia because *Old Serbia* and northern Macedonia became the focus of Bulgarian, Greek and even Austria-Hungary propaganda. They all agreed that certain activities should be conducted in order to embed in the local population “a Serbian

¹⁰³ An exception was opening of the theological-educational gymnasium in Prizren in 1871.

¹⁰⁴ “Томе су доприносили и небрига и неразумевање значаја ових земаља доброг дела водећих политичара, њихова заокупљеност сопственим иметком, али и жестоки међустранички обрачуни и унутрашње трзавице које су биле препрека активнијој и јединственијој националној политици.”, Slavenko Terzić, “Конзулат Кралјевине Србије у битолју (1889-1897)” (Consulate of Kingdom of Serbia in Bitola (1889-1897)), *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 57, 2008, 328.

¹⁰⁵ Miloš Jagodić, “Планови о Политици Србије према Старој Србији и Македонији (1878-1885)” (Plans on Serbian Policy Towards Old Serbia and Macedonia (1878-1885)), *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 60, 2011, 436-38.

consciousness and desire to unite with Serbia.”¹⁰⁶ However, proposed plans and elaborations from the part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs materialized very slowly with little effect due to the volatile political situation in Serbia exacerbated further by the lack of funds required to launch a viable program which could effectively counter the irredentist campaign of its rivals. What led the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to take direct action in Ottoman Macedonia belatedly in 1885 was the unification of Bulgaria with autonomous Eastern Rumelia followed immediately by Serbia’s declaration of war against Bulgaria, a declaration that resulted in a humiliating defeat for the Serbian government. Hence during this seven year period several proposals had been made, but only the last plan, made by the Prime-minister who was also the Minister of Foreign Affairs Milutin Garašanin, was accepted.¹⁰⁷

All these plans were regularly proposed by the former national workers in Old Serbia who were well familiar with the present situation. All these workers had several common points which, according to them, were necessary for forging a successful Serbian policy in the Ottoman Balkans. These common points referred to the establishment of Serbian consulates which would coordinate national action; gaining some sort of ecclesiastical autonomy from the Patriarchate in order to lead independent religious and educational affairs; and to establish Serbian printing houses, bookstores, as well as periodical aimed at Ottoman Serbs. In addition, some plans required that the whole national operation has to be conducted by the Serbian state (which was accepted in Garašanin’s plan), and not by informal societies. Interestingly, all of them advocated that Serbian policy should be implemented so as to not arouse the suspicions of Ottoman authorities. Namely, all these points, including the

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 439.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 441-42.

establishment of an Ottoman Serb periodical, should be conducted with the approval of the Ottoman state and in accordance with Ottoman law.¹⁰⁸

As will be mentioned below, Serbia strongly advocated good relations with the Ottoman Empire. The reason was that the Ottoman Empire was not perceived as a serious enemy, unlike Bulgaria. In several documents Bulgaria was described as the main enemy because, unlike Greece, it claimed much of the Ottoman Macedonian parts (especially their southern Slavic populations). Serbian diplomatic circles were in constant fear of San Stefano Bulgaria and in their opinion the best way to curb the Bulgarians was to collaborate with the Ottomans and even with Greeks as well. After all, Serbia was aware that the Ottomans knew its intentions and that expressed loyalty to and affections for the sultanate were suspect.¹⁰⁹

As was expected, the collaboration with the Ottomans was extremely slow as the Ottomans were naturally in no hurry to conclude the convention. Aware that Ottoman Macedonia was claimed by all of its neighbors in the Balkans, the Ottomans applied the *divide et impera* method which proved to be quite a successful strategy in dealing with the inchoate inexperienced governments in these Ottoman successor states. One of the best illustrations of the success of this method was mentioned in a private letter dated from March 1908 that Bogdan Radenković, the leader of the Serbian revolutionary organization (*čete*) sent to Milan Rakić, at that time vice-consul at Skopje. In the letter Radenković requested Rakić to ask for permission from Ottoman authorities for two or more Serbian teachers to work in Štip, commenting that “they cannot have anything against this entirely cultural game that we have with Bulgarians. (...) After all, you also remember how two years ago Turks were encouraging us to firm our positions in Štip.” However, in a letter dated from August 1908 Radenković mentioned that things were not going so smoothly with the authorities in Štip.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid, 458-460.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, 448; 457.

The Ottomans forbade the opening of Serbian trade because, according to Radenković, the authorities did not understand that there was anything wrong in the peaceful economic rivalry between Serbs and Bulgarians.¹¹⁰

In any case, Serbian activities in Ottoman Macedonia began in 1885, after the Serbo-Bulgarian war and as soon as Garašanin's plan for action came into being. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs established a special branch designed exclusively for coordinating its diplomatic strategies in *Old Serbia* and northern Macedonia, thus consolidating all of its actions in these contested territories under the administration of the Serbian state.¹¹¹ Stojan Novaković, a well-known Serbian intellectual and politician, was in charge of implementing the whole project and was therefore appointed as the Serbian envoy in Istanbul. Novaković would soon prove to be *spiritus movens* concerning the building Serbian policy in the Ottoman Empire.¹¹²

It was expected that most of the educational and cultural work will be implemented by the Society of Saint Sava, Serbian non-governmental organization which was established especially for this mission in Belgrade in 1886. However, the real coordinator was the above mentioned envoy in Istanbul who managed to persuade the Porte to allow the Serbian state to establish consulates in these contested territories. In 1886 the first two consulates were opened in Skopje and Salonika, and in 1889 another two in Pristina and Bitola. The main job

¹¹⁰ "...они не би требали имати ма шта против ове наше сасвим културне утакмице са Бугарима. (...) Ви се и сами сећате како су нас Турци још пре две године туткали на Штип.", Biljana Vučetić, "Извештаји обавештајца дипломати. Писма Богдана Раденковића Милану Ракићу (1907-1912)" (Report of an Intelligencer to a Diplomat. Letters of Bogdan Radenković to Milan Rakić (1907-1912), *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 29, 2008, 159.

¹¹¹ Jagodić, "Планови о Политици Србије према...", 458.

¹¹² Stojan Novaković, active in politics from 1873 when became Minister of Education. In 1884 was minister of internal affairs, and from 1885 until 1892 performed as envoy in Istanbul. After the return to Serbia, he became minister of foreign affairs, and soon after prime-minister. From 1897 until 1900, he was again envoy in Istanbul. Until retirement in 1905 he obtained diplomatic posts in Paris and Saint Petersburg. He reactivated during annexation crisis when he again became prime-minister. He also led Serbian delegation in London during the Balkan Wars. Novaković was also recognized scholar. Extracted from "Stojan Novaković", *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 6, 1965.

of these consulates was to coordinate Serbian cultural and educational work in this part of the Ottoman Empire. Namely, by opening schools, finding teachers and agents for spreading Serbian propaganda, establishing religious-educational communities, opening bookstores and spreading Serbian books and periodicals, and educating Ottoman Macedonian students in Serbia in order to prepare them for their work in the region.¹¹³

The main goal of the Serbian mission in Istanbul was to curb Bulgarian propaganda in northern Ottoman Macedonia as well as to convince the Great Powers, especially Russia and Austria-Hungary who considered Ottoman Macedonia as a their zone of interests, that Serbian intentions, unlike those of Bulgaria, did not jeopardize the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. As mentioned previously, the Serbian general stance was that the best way to secure Serbian interests in the Ottoman Empire was to maintain good relations with the Ottomans. After the Serbo-Bulgarian war, Serbia became well aware that its position in Ottoman Macedonia was weak and that it was not in a position to exercise power. According to Novaković, the best way to consolidate Serbian presence in the region was through rational political action and the “book and pen” – not through guerilla bands that the Bulgarian state started to send in 1895 in order to break Ottoman sovereignty in the region. Serbian diplomatic circles, at least those earliest ones, strongly advocated preserving Ottoman Macedonia within Ottoman borders. Serbia neither supported autonomy, nor reforms in this region. Serbian diplomats feared that reforms in Ottoman Macedonia would lead to an autonomous status that could result in Bulgaria’s successful annexation of this region. Diplomats based this argument on Bulgaria’s annexation of autonomous Eastern Rumelia that in 1885 which resulted in a Serbian defeat in the war.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Terzić, “Конзулат Кралјевине Србије...”, 328.

¹¹⁴ Ristović, “Реферат Јована Јовановића о односу Србије према реформској акцији у Солунском, Битољском и Косовском вилајету” (Jovan Jovanović’s Expert Opinion on the Position of Serbia Regarding the Reform Action in the Vilayets of Salonika, Bitola and Kosovo), *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 31, 2010, 340-41.

Novaković was on good terms with the Ottomans as can be seen in the Porte's quickness in giving the Serbian government permission to open consulates in the Ottoman Balkans. During his diplomatic stay in Istanbul he also tried to solve the ecclesiastical matter and persuade the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul to appoint Serbian priests in Macedonian dioceses as well as to allow the opening of the Serbian schools and establishing Serbian religious-educational communities in order to bolster Serbian propaganda in these areas. For this reason, Novaković started to negotiate with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and with Greek diplomatic circles, given that both Serbian and Greek diplomacy was working on countering Bulgarian propaganda which was aimed towards creating San Stefano Bulgaria. Thus, establishing close cooperation was not so difficult, especially once Serbia and Greece entered negotiation on dividing spheres of interest in Ottoman Macedonia.¹¹⁵ As following quote will show, Greek diplomatic circles were much more pragmatic and prone to meet Serbian interests than was the case with the Ecumenical Patriarchate. From this purely pragmatic point of view, one Crete-based Greek periodical published an article on granting ecclesiastical positions to Ottoman Serbs, which *Carigradski glasnik* also communicated to its audience.

The hesitation of the grand Mother-Church to meet the justified demand of Serbian nation cause an unpleasant impression everywhere. The wish of the Serbs to have their own metropolitan by origin and by language is completely legitimate. This wish does not offend anyone, especially because this eparchy does not collide with Greek interests. It would be good to pay attention to the fact that meeting the demands of Orthodox Serbs would be of direct benefit for the Mother-Church in her dispute with the Bulgarian Exarchate. There is no doubt that one Serb, appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Prizren, would be much better than someone else. Due to his nationhood and language, the Greek metropolitan would not be able to keep his spiritual superiority, which is so necessary to his church. (...) This stance of the Ecumenical Patriarchate is harmful and might cause the creation of an independent Serbian Exarchate, like the Bulgarian one.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Terzić, "Конзулат Кралјевине Србије...", 329-30.

¹¹⁶ "Устручавање велике Матере-Цркве да задовољи праведне захтеве српског народа, произвело је свуда непријатан упечаток. Жеља Срба, да имају митрополита по пореклу и по језику Србина сасвим је оправдана. Та жеља не вређа никога, пошто је та јепархија ван обима грчког. Добро би било да се обрати пажња на то, да би задовољење захтева православних Срба било од посредне користи по Матеру Цркву у њеном спору са бугарском јексархијом. Нема спора да је један Србин, постављен од стране Васељенске Патријаршије у Пизрену, бољи, него неко други. Својом народношћу као и својим језиком, митрополит Грк неће моћи да одржава своју духовну надмоћност, која је тако потребна његовој цркви. (...) Ово држање Васељенске Патријаршије њој шкоди и повлачи као последицу то, да се створи самостални

This passage reveals the common interests of the Greek and Serbs as opposed to the Bulgarians, but it also reveals an unfounded belief about the possibility to establishing a Serbian Exarchate. It is indeed true that Serbs have entertained with such idea, but Serbs were also well aware of their overall diplomatic standing in the Ottoman Empire. Thus, this idea was considered more as a dream than as a reality.

Regarding education, for the Serbian state there existed two ways for opening Serbian schools: one was to apply to Ottoman authorities, which was not so simple given Ottoman efforts to enforce state education and abolish religious-educational privileges; the other way was to apply to the Ecumenical Patriarchate to grant permission for opening the Serbian schools under the rubric of the Greek Church. For the Serbs, the latter seemed the easiest path; however, despite Novaković's diplomatic efforts the situation was quite different on the ground. This was especially the case in the Bitola and Salonika vilayets, which the Greeks also claimed and which therefore refused to confirm Serbian demands. For this reason, the Serbian strategies of appointing Serbs on metropolitan positions, opening Serbian schools, and establishing religious-educational communes depended on the personal will of the metropolitan in charge as well as the Ecumenical Patriarchate.¹¹⁷ The first Serbian religious-educational commune was therefore established in Bitola in 1890, and Serbs were appointed for metropolitans only years later: in the Raška-Prizren diocese in 1896; in Skopje in 1897; and in Veles and Debar in 1910.¹¹⁸ To this should be added that all dioceses were in the Kosovo vilayet (with the exception of Debar which was part of the Bitola vilayet) so it is understandable that Serbian metropolitans were appointed only in the areas where Ottoman Serbs mainly lived. In addition, the Kosovo vilayet was not particularly part of the Greek zone

српски јексархат, као што већ постоји бугарски." "Срби и Васељенска Патријаршија" (Serbs and Ecumenical Patriarchate), *CG*, No. 43, 1895, 1.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, 338-40.

¹¹⁸ Jagodić, "Планови о Политици Србије према...", 459.

of interest, so appointing Serbian metropolitans to positions there was a good Patriarchal counterbalance to the Bulgarian aspirations which also conflicted with Greek interests in the south.¹¹⁹

Serbian policy in the Ottoman Empire generally remained the same, at least until 1903. This meant advocating Ottoman sovereignty in the Ottoman Balkans and bolstering good relations with the Ottomans. However, this approach was not popular among all Serbian diplomatic circles. For example, it was strongly criticized by Jovan Jovanović-Pižon, one of the diplomats who also served in Istanbul and who later contributed to the organization of the Serbian guerrilla bands. Jovanović-Pižon considered supporting Ottoman sovereignty in the region as doing nothing to improve conditions for the local population and thus losing potential Serbian citizens who could be convinced that they were Bulgarians given that conditions in Ottoman Macedonia were deteriorating. Many officials reported about increased enmity and violence between Muslims and Christians, i.e. Albanians and Serbs¹²⁰ in *Old Serbia*, while the southern areas were subject to constant attack and harassment by disparate guerilla bands, many of which had their own material interests and multiple loyalties to the various Balkan capitals. However, instead of supporting necessary reforms, Serbian diplomacy appealed to the local population to be loyal subjects of the Ottoman state, while it also appealed to the Ottomans to keep peace and order in the region. This view was reflected on *Carigradski glasnik* as well. Although the paper was a direct product of Serbian diplomats, it was also a public periodical subjected to strict Hamidian censorship. In this case, the editors rarely called on Ottoman authorities to enforce peace and order, although utmost loyalty was stressed in every occasion, not just when it came to official celebrations such as Sultan's

¹¹⁹ "Срби и Васељенска патријаршија" (Serbs and the Ecumenical Patriarchate), CG, no. 43, 1895, 1.

¹²⁰ For instance, see Vesna Zarković, "Извештај Богдана Раденковића о боравку Виктора Машкова у Косовској Митровици, Ибарском Колашину и Новом Пазару 1901. године" (The Report of Bogdan Radenković on the Visitation of Viktor Maškov in Kosovska Mitrovica, Ibarski Kolašin and Novi Pazar in 1901), *Мешовита грађ*, Vol. 33, 2012, 365-385.

birthday or inauguration day but for everyday occasions as well. For instance, in all articles regarding education and schools, Abdülhamid was praised as an enlightened master to whom the “Serbian nation in [the] Ottoman Empire pray constantly to God for long life of His Royal Magnificence the Sultan, great benefactor of national education and progress.”¹²¹ This and similar narratives were constant and represent a typical manifestation of “banal nationalism”.

By the beginning of the 20th century the difficult situation in Ottoman Macedonia began to be reflected in the situation of the Serbian state.¹²² Oppositional parties used the inert Serbian policy in Ottoman Macedonia as a pretext to confront with King Aleksandar Obrenović whose unpopularity reached a peak during demonstrations in Belgrade in March 1903, demonstrations which escalated and culminated with his assassination a few months later on. Indeed, the King’s perceived mismanagement of *Old Serbia* seems to have served as a rallying point for his assassination. Čeda Popović, one of the leaders of the organization *Ujedinjenje ili Smrt (Union or Death)* that plotted and carried out the assassination stated that “the endeavors of the last Obrenović were reduced exclusively on inner political bickering aimed at strengthening the dynasty, and whereas, fighting for national interests was completely neglected.”¹²³

This 1903 assassination followed by the Ilinden uprising by the Macedonian autonomous organization VMRO two months later, informed a veritable shift in official Serbian policy toward the Ottoman Macedonia. Serbia, under the new king Petar Karađorđević, began to strongly advocate the need for reforms in Ottoman Macedonia and in 1904 also began to send guerilla units (so called *četniks*) into region. In doing so Serbia emulated the tactics of the

¹²¹ “српски народ у Отоманској Царевини моли се толико Богу за дуг живот Њ. Ц. В. Султана, великог добротвора народне просвете и напретка.”, “Српске школе у Турској” (Serbian Schools in Turkey), *CG*, No. 28, 1896, 1.

¹²² Ristović, “Реферат Јована Јовановића о односу Србије...”, 336.

¹²³ “да је рад последњег Обреновића сведен искључиво на унутарњу политичку борбу, у циљу учвршћивања династије, а да је сасвим запостављена национална акција.”, Jaroslav Valerijanovič Višnjakov, “Македонски покрет и преврат у Србији 29. маја 1903” (The Macedonian Movement and the Upheaval of May 29, 1903 in Serbia), *Tokovi istorije*, Vol. 3, 2010, 21.

Bulgarian and Greek governments. In this way, 1903 did not just represent a shift in the internal politics of the Serbian state, but also a shift in Serbian diplomacy conducted in the Ottoman Empire. Serbian revolutionary organization became the main preoccupation of the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs because it became obvious that the Macedonian question would be resolved only through warfare. Nevertheless, “book and pen” tactics continued to play an important role throughout the period, although after 1903 they became incorporated into guerilla action in the region.¹²⁴

Bernard Lory describes teachers as “‘professional patriots’ who earned their livelihoods by convincing the denominational community that employed them, that it was in reality a national community.”¹²⁵ At first this was done through the “book and pen”, but, he asserts, as soon as it became obvious that the Macedonian question could only be resolved through coercion, the teachers as ‘professional patriots’ became participants and even leaders of the guerilla bands who acted as recruiters of school boys for national cause.¹²⁶ Although prior to 1908 *Carigradski glasnik* rarely referred to guerilla bands in the region¹²⁷, in 1897 it published a column received from one of its correspondences from Veles, on a Bulgarian teacher closely connected with “bandits dressed in Albanian suits”. This teacher, in agreement with the bandits, delivered them a child from wealthy parents from whom they would ask high compensation. In this case Ottoman authorities reacted promptly – they found a child and caught the bandits along with the teacher.¹²⁸ There is no doubt that this and similar columns on bandits were published only because the Ottomans reacted successfully. Nevertheless, it provides good example on how national workers like teachers and priests became involved

¹²⁴ Valerijanovič Višnjakov, “Македонски покрет и преврат у Србији...”, 20-21.

¹²⁵ Lory, “Schools for the Destruction...”, 53.

¹²⁶ Ibid, 59-63.

¹²⁷ *Carigradski glasnik* up to 1908 occasionally mentioned guerilla activities in the region and this was the case only when Ottoman authorities successfully intervened. In addition, there was no mention of Serbian official or unofficial guerilla activities in the region. As said, after 1908 these bandit activities were more mentioned but again only to represent Ottoman Serbs as victims.

¹²⁸ “Наши дописи, Велес” (Our Correspondences, Veles), CG, No. 22, 1897, 3.

into guerilla bands and how after 1903 first “book and pen” phase became integrated into “guerilla” phase.

In the next section I will introduce *Carigradski glasnik*, a direct product of those earliest Serbian diplomats in Istanbul who believed that Serbian firm position in the region could only be established through political action based on collaboration with Ottoman authorities and “intellectual” endeavors like schools and printed materials. *Carigradski glasnik* remained faithful to this mission even after 1903 when new Serbian diplomacy took a more radical stance toward the Macedonian question. Following the Young Turk revolution and regime changes that brought a new political environment to the Balkans, *Carigradski glasnik* ceased to exist. According to new circumstances, it was replaced by *Vardar* - Serbian periodical based in Skopje and led by Serbian revolutionary circles.

3.2. *Carigradski glasnik: the “pen” fighter for the Ottoman Macedonia*

As demonstrated in the previous section, all the proposed plans for the Serbian action in Ottoman Macedonia advocated the establishment of a Serbian printing house and a periodical, with the blessing of the Ottoman state. The initial plan was to publish a periodical in “Serbo-Macedonian” before gradually adapting it to standard Serbian.¹²⁹ Different places were proposed for these activities, although Novaković advocated Istanbul as the most convenient place; firstly, because the periodical could be distributed to Ottoman Macedonia; and secondly, because it could be easily checked by the Ottoman censorship located directly in Istanbul. As mentioned before, good relations with the Ottomans were a must so that all Serbian published activities targeted towards communities in the Ottoman Balkans were not subject to the aforementioned cumbersome and costly double-censorship procedure. The same procedure was valid for the books and various educational materials which were supposed to be used in the Serbian schools. These proposals were accepted in Garašanin’s plan and came

¹²⁹ More about this in the next chapter.

to fruition after 1885 when Serbian officials realized that they needed to establish a periodical for Ottoman Serbs in Istanbul.¹³⁰

As the Serbian state was late in entering the irredentist competition for Ottoman Macedonia, Greek and Bulgarian periodicals distributed in the region already existed. In the 1860s there existed many Bulgarian periodicals which even received Serbian financial help in Istanbul, like the periodical *Bjek (Vjek)*. This Slavic collaboration was aimed against the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its insistence on Greek language in churches and schools.¹³¹ This was possible at that time because Serbian irredentism focused on Bosnia and Herzegovina rather than the smaller, less significant parts of Macedonia.

The first serious action regarding the paper took place at a conference of Serbian intellectuals organized in Istanbul in 1892. There Milojko Veselinović, a Serbian diplomat in Istanbul and later consul in Bitola, composed the program of the future periodical. Veselinović proposed that the periodical be published weekly and bilingually in Serbian and French; it should bring daily news primarily from Istanbul, based on the Ottoman-Turkish papers and other periodicals; and also, that it should contain an appendix on Serbian folklore and tradition by emphasizing Serbian customs, celebrations of saint days, publishing novels and poetry from the Serbian writers etc. The biggest emphasis would, however, be on the Serbian schools and churches, especially in Ottoman Macedonia. In other words, its content was designed to bolster Serbian nationhood in the Ottoman Balkans.¹³²

Although Nikodim Savić, the first owner and main editor of the periodical appealed to the Ottoman Ministry of Internal Affairs in 1893¹³³, the decision was delayed because Ottoman officials wanted a bribe for their permission to start the periodical. In fact, the requested

¹³⁰ Jagodić, "Планови о Политици Србије према...", 450-57.

¹³¹ Petar Mitropan, "Цариградски...", 18.

¹³² Mitropan, "Цариградски...", 19.

¹³³ Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA), DH.MKT 316-38 5, Letter of Nikodim Savić to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1893.

amount was not small – 400 golden liras, and because of this, publication of *Carigradski glasnik* was delayed.¹³⁴ This testifies the correspondence between Mihailo Ristić, an official of the Serbian mission in Istanbul and the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1894. At that time, Ristić still inquired about the situation regarding the periodical, and the whole matter was settled only in 1895, when the first issue of the *Carigradski glasnik* was printed.¹³⁵

Technically, *Carigradski glasnik* was not the first Serbian periodical in the Ottoman Empire. In 1871-72 the weekly publication *Prizren* was published in that town. However, because this was the official paper of the vilayet of Kosovo, most of the traditional and recent Serbian scholars did not consider it a true Serbian paper. Because of these reasons, *Carigradski glasnik* was considered to be *de facto* the first Serbian paper in the Ottoman Empire.¹³⁶ As expected, the editorial board of *Carigradski glasnik* worked in close connection with the Serbian diplomatic mission in Istanbul. The editors received content from Serbian diplomatic circles and it was under their control. The Serbian diplomatic circles also provided subsidies to the paper, but because *Carigradski glasnik* had financial problems later, I assume this material help was eventually shifted to *Vardar*. As mentioned, Serbian diplomacy became more radical following 1903 and it found it more convenient to finance *četnik* papers than the relatively mild *Carigradski glasnik*. In addition, the new Young Turk regime stopped providing subsidies to periodicals, as it was the case in Hamidian regime. Furthermore,

¹³⁴ Vladan Virijević, “‘Цариградски гласник’ о Новом Пазару и околици крајем 19. и почетком 20. века” (‘*Carigradski glasnik*’ on Novi Pazar and surroundings at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century), *Новопазарски зборник*, Vol. 33, 2010, 111.

¹³⁵ Biljana Vučetić, “Писма из Цариграда Михаило Г. Ристић – Светиславу Симићу (1894)” (Letters from Constantinople Mihailo G. Ristić to Svetislav Simić (1894)), *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 33, 2012, 339.

¹³⁶ Ljiljana Čolić, “‘Цариградски гласник’ национални и просветни путовођа Косметских Срба” (‘*Carigradski glasnik*’ National and educational leader of the Kosmet Serbs), *Косово и Метохија*, Vol. 5, 2010, 165.

constant problems with subscribers who did not pay their subscriptions on time also contributed to financial difficulties of the paper.¹³⁷

The three owners, who also comprised the editorial board, were in charge of running *Carigradski glasnik* throughout this fifteen year long period: Nikodim Savić¹³⁸ (1895-97), Kosta Grupčević¹³⁹ (1897-1907), and Temko Popović¹⁴⁰ (1908-09). All three of them were born in the Ottoman Macedonia (Savić in Peć, while Grupčević and Popović in Ohrid) and they all spent a certain period of time in Belgrade where they established contacts with the Serbian diplomatic circles. Namely, Serbian diplomatic circles would rather employ native Ottoman Macedonians than Serbian citizens as their national workers in the region. In their opinion, natives were familiar with the situation in the region and were expected to influence more the local population than national workers from the Serbian state.

The first issue of *Carigradski glasnik* finally materialized on January 14/26, 1895, written only in standard Serbian with the Cyrillic script (the original bilingual plan of Milojko Veselinović obviously failed). It was published on the day of the greatest Serbian saint, Saint Sava:

¹³⁷ Aleksa Jovanović, "Споменица двадесетпетогодишњице ослобођења јужне Србије"(Memorial on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the liberation of the South Serbia), Skopje, 1937, 892; Mitropan, 22.

¹³⁸ Nikodim S. Savić (1865-1897), born in Peć to a well-known merchant family, finished Italian school for trade and commerce in Salonika, where he learned Greek, French and Italian language. One period of time he also spent at the gymnasium in Belgrade, where he started to write for different periodicals and became an editor of one of the papers for commercial affairs. It is likely that during the stay in Belgrade, he connected with the Serbian diplomatic circles and became engaged with *Carigradski glasnik*. He died in 1897 from tuberculosis. Extracted from Vladimir Cvetanović, "Никодим Савић" (Nikodim Savić), *Девет приповедача Косова и Метохје*, Belgrade: Književna zajednice Zvezdara, 1992, 22-28.

¹³⁹ Kosta Grupčev(ić) (1848-1907), born in Ohrid in a rich tailor family where he finished Greek-speaking school. More about his life will be mentioned in the next chapter since he spent a period of time in Sofia where along with another owner and editor of *Carigradski glasnik* established anti-Bulgarian Macedonian Secret Committee which was under Serbian influence. After he was released from Bulgarian prison, he moved to Istanbul, where he kept close connections with Serbian diplomacy, especially with Stojan Novaković. Extracted from Petar Mitropan, *Први интелектуалци на југу* (First Intellectuals to the South), Skopje: Južna Srbija, 1936, 4-18.

¹⁴⁰ Temko Popov(ić) (1855-29), born in Ohrid, educated in Athens, worked as teacher in Bulgarian schools from which he was eventually expelled because of pro-Serbian propaganda. In Sofia he participated in above mentioned Macedonian Secret Committee, he moved to Belgrade where he was well connected with the Serbian diplomatic circles. After the Young Turk revolution he was Serbian deputy in the Ottoman parliament, as well as the last owner of *Carigradski glasnik*. Extracted from *Македонска Енциклопедија* (Macedonian Encyclopedia), MANU, Skopje, 2009, 1189.

The day of the first Serbian enlightener and teacher, the day of the first archbishop and Serbian Saint Sava Nemanjić, whose day is celebrated anywhere where there lives at least one Orthodox Serb, this year was celebrated precisely on the day the first issue of our paper was published. Our Serbian compatriots celebrated it gloriously here.¹⁴¹

Nevertheless, *Carigradski glasnik* was also an Ottoman periodical published in Hamidian era so tribute was given also to the Sultan. If one flips over official front page bedazzled with large letters stating “Long Live Our Great Padishah!”¹⁴² followed by flaming praise for “Our Generous Master”¹⁴³; one sees the much more interesting “Program of Our Paper.” According to their initial mission statement, the editors claimed that the aim of their publication was “to benefit and help readers to respond to the majestic will of our merciful Sultan who strives to help his subjects strive towards progress and a brighter future (...) but that does not just depend on us but also on our readers who will embrace our paper and subscribe for it.”¹⁴⁴ In other words, the aim of the paper was completely practical in nature and everything concerning progress in economics, education and similar fields would find its place in the paper. Political issues on the other hand were planned to be covered as much as editors found it useful for their readers.¹⁴⁵

International and internal political topics were usually covered on the front page. These topics were not researched, but were usually articles that *Carigradski glasnik* summarized or copied from other periodicals. This seems to be common practice in Ottoman press; Ottoman periodicals borrowed articles from each other, and quoting the international press, especially from Germany or Austria-Hungary, was also not an exception. This meant playing it safe – in

¹⁴¹ “Дан првог српског просветитеља и учитеља, дан првог архијепископа српског Светитеља Саве Немањића, који се прославља свуда, где год има ма и једног православног Србина, који је ове године пао баш на дан, кад је угледао света први број нашега листа, прославили су наши сународници овде на врло торжанствен (sic) начин.”Цариградске вести, Свети Сава” (News from Istanbul, Saint Sava), CG, No. 2, 1895, 4.

¹⁴² “Живио Наш Велики Падишах!”, CG, No. 1, 1.

¹⁴³ “наш Велкиодушни Господар”, Ibid, 1895, 1.

¹⁴⁴ “..бити од стварне користи и да ће им бити искрени путевођа да одговоре узвишеној вољи нашега Премилостивога Султана, која се састоји у томе, да његови поданици греду оном стазом, која води напретку, великој и срећној будућности. (...) то не зависи само од нас, но и од читатеља, који, прихватајући наш лист, треба што изобилније да се одазову са претплатом.”, Ibid, 3-4.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 1-3.

Hamidian censorship political issues were the most dangerous ones, therefore the safest way was to publish an article on political nature that was already published in other Ottoman periodicals. *Carigradski glasnik* used as reference a variety of periodicals: Ottoman-Turkish dailies *Sabah* and *İkdam* were most quoted ones. Others were mainly French periodicals published in the Empire, like *Orient*, *Stamboul*, and *Levant Herald*. Editors also occasionally quoted Armenian periodicals published in Turkish, then Greek and Bulgarian periodicals, and also Serbian ones. Although discussions between Ottoman periodicals were frequent, *Carigradski glasnik* very rarely engaged in them. For this paper it was more common to negate some information than to engage into discussion. For instance, when French *Orient* published an article on an inquiry that the Ecumenical Patriarchate conducted in Prizren, *Carigradski glasnik* briefly stated that their French colleague was misinformed. According to *Glasnik*, the Ecumenical Patriarchate did not conduct any inquiries regarding its priests in past forty years, so it is hard to believe that it was doing it now.¹⁴⁶

The usual columns appearing in *Carigradski glasnik* were *Цариградске весту* (*News from Istanbul*), news that consisted of the Sultan's activities and administrative changes and replacements. This meant informing on Friday Prayers, the Sultan's generosity, the promotions and deaths of Ottoman officials, and publishing state notifications. In other words, this column served to bolster Sultan's image. *Домаће весту* (*Domestic News*) was design to bring news from the Ottoman Empire. However, the Arab provinces were never mentioned and this news essentially meant news from Ottoman Macedonia. This was also general news consisting of visits of Ottoman officials, occasional disasters such as floods, fire, or disease. *Стране весту* (*News from abroad*), alias news from Russia, Serbia and Montenegro also brought dull news on these countries such as appointments and promotions of state officials, official travels from their rulers etc.

¹⁴⁶ "Васељенска Патријаршија" (The Ecumenical patriarchate), CG, No. 26, 1895, 2.

Other columns which followed were *Преглед итамне* (Press outline) which provided interesting articles mostly from French pieces published in the Ottoman Empire. *Дописи* (*Correspondence*), meaning news from the Ottoman Macedonia sent by correspondents of the paper, usually brought news on religious or school celebrations taking place in a specific city. These correspondences were a perfect example of “banal nationalism” wherein these short columns comprised of the usual praises of both the Sultan and Ottoman Serbs. One such event was a service performed at the Serbian mythical Hilandar Monastery and dedicated to Abdülhamid.¹⁴⁷ In *Школа и настава* (*School and education*) topics concerning education and guidelines for teachers were published with *Поука* (*Lesson*) articles concerning religion or pedagogy. These were regular columns which were occasionally supplemented with other materials concerning finances, agriculture, trade etc. Who the correspondents and authors of the articles, especially of *Correspondence*, were remains unknown because texts were almost never signed.

The last page of Carigradski glasnik was reserved for advertisements, death announcements and *Јавне благодати* (*Public benefactions*). *Public benefactions*, concerning financial contributions for Serbian education and poor students, namely support for the national cause, was very important. As Yosmaoğlu pointed out, “commercial guilds made important contributions to the educational effort in the region. Funding Bulgarian education was a work of social distinction, and failing to do so might cause considerable damage to one’s social capital; periodicals announced the names not only of the benefactors but also of their less generous compatriots to the community.”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ “Наши дописи, Хилендар” (Our Correspondence), CG, No. 34, 1906, 3.

¹⁴⁸ Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties...*, 62.

Although Carigradski glasnik did not announce the names of those Serbs who were expected to give contributions, it nevertheless emphasized the names of those who did. It also regularly informed about parties and gatherings which aimed to financially support poor students, provide books etc. Even more, *Carigradski glasnik* was socially engaged; this periodical tried to mobilize Serbian communities and wealthier compatriots to establish funds for those less fortunate: “helping the school fund we know for sure that we are helping children in need who will in future be useful participants of the community and society.”¹⁴⁹

Carigradski glasnik was published at Gerard’s or at Zelić’s printing house once a week, usually on Thursday or later on Friday, although other days were not great exceptions. At first it was published in a smaller format, so first number had 12 pages, but starting from January 1896 it was published in larger a folio format. Regularly it had around four pages but considering the amount of information it provided, it could have also six to eight pages. As mentioned, its target audience was the Ottoman Macedonian population, although the information gathered in the paper followed events concerning Serbs all around the world.

Although it was mentioned that this periodical received material help from the Serbian diplomatic circles, nevertheless in every issue they asked their readers to find new subscribers not just to survive but also in order to keep bi-weekly permission from Ottoman authorities. The owners were obviously hoping to attract enough subscribers to publish the periodical twice per week, so in this hope they applied to the Ottoman authorities seeking bi-weekly permission. Although teachers in Ottoman Macedonia were forced to subscribe to the paper and even those who were married needed two subscriptions,¹⁵⁰ this periodical had major problems with subscribers who obviously did not pay on time. An editorial note in 1899

¹⁴⁹ “Дајући у школски фонд знамо за извесно да потпомажемо сиротну децу, која ће, када одрасту бити корисни чланови општине и друштва.”, “Заснивање фондова за сиротне ученике” (Establishing a funds for students in need), CG, No. 10, 1896, 1.

¹⁵⁰ “Ожењеним учитељима” (To married teachers), CG, No. 1, 1908, 2.

describes how desperate the situation was for *Carigradski glasnik* while commenting the suspension in Montenegro (the reasons for suspension were not stated). The editors claimed that losing Montenegro was a positive financial development because of the eighteen subscribers from this state, only three of them actually paid for their subscriptions.¹⁵¹ Obviously *Carigradski glasnik* did not obtain enough subscribers, so it remained weekly until its termination. Although the Ottomans granted the requested bi-weekly permission and this bi-weekly idea never materialized; *Carigradski glasnik* was forced from time to time to publish additional materials otherwise its permission for this would become invalid.¹⁵²

An issue of *Carigradski glasnik* could be bought in Istanbul because it was published there, so distribution was not a financial burden there. It was distributed at a few locations in the town, mostly around Galata (*Carigradski glasnik* was located at Kule Kapı 2), in addition to where other Ottoman periodicals were found. These distributing places were a bookstore of L. Krstić, in printing house of A. Zelić & sons, in the shop of N. Gavrilović, and in two tobacco stores located in Galata.¹⁵³ In Istanbul each issue cost 20-30 *Paras*, which was, surprisingly, completely in keeping with other Ottoman-Turkish daily periodicals. All the other issues had to be distributed through a subscriber list. The subscriber points were in Salonika, Skopje, Prizren, Pljevlje, Berane and Peć. We also know that the persons who were mediators between paper and subscribers were mainly teachers, with exception of few priests. Available subscriptions were for 3 months for 10 *Kuruş*, 6 months for 20 *Kuruş*, and 12 months for 40 *Kuruş* within the Ottoman Empire. These prices were adjusted to *Dinars* for the Serbian market, and for all other countries it was converted into *Francs*, but the overall prices remained the same. Except in Istanbul and Ottoman Macedonia, the paper was distributed

¹⁵¹ "Напомена" (Announcement), CG, No.1, 1901, 4.

¹⁵² BOA, İ.DH 1374-19 2, Letter of Kosta Grupčević to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1898.

¹⁵³ "Напомена" (Notification), CG, No. 3, 1895, 12.

outside the Ottoman Empire – in Serbia, Montenegro, and Austria-Hungary (including Bosnia and Herzegovina).¹⁵⁴

Despite the censorship, *Carigradski glasnik* could be divided into three phases, each depending on the policy of the editor. While Savić's editorship was entirely pro-Ottoman, probably because the paper had just started being published, after his death in 1897 and under Grupčević's editorship, a more explicit pro-Serbian perspective took shape. For instance, news from Serbia switched from the *News from abroad* to *Domestic news* and in addition a new appendix named *Српски гласник* (*Serbian messenger*) which covered mainly cultural activities of the Serbs around the world, was eventually introduced. After Grupčević's death in January 1907, *Carigradski glasnik* was closed for a year because of ownership difficulties. Namely, according to Ottoman regulations, the papers were considered as the private property of the owners. In this case *Carigradski glasnik* stayed within Grupčević's family, but with the intervention of the Serbian diplomatic circles in front of the Ottoman authorities and with agreement of Grupčević's son Dimitrij, the owner and main editor became Temko Popović, Grupčević's close associate.¹⁵⁵

Thus the third phase, under the ownership of Temko Popović and main editorship of Stojan Kapetanović, took place in January 1908 and continued until closure of the periodical in October 1909. Only during the Second Constitutional period certain freedom was visible for writing openly about issues that Ottoman Serbs/Macedonians had to face with. In such cases the content of *Carigradski glasnik* revolved around the difficult situation of Ottoman Serbs and the harassment of Bulgarian *komitadji* in the Kosovo, Bitola and Skadar vilayets¹⁵⁶ or about the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Novi Pazar.¹⁵⁷ However, the major stir which

¹⁵⁴ The prices were listed at the front page of each issue.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 34.

¹⁵⁶ "Насртај на српске манастире" (Attack on Serbian monasteries), *CG*, No. 7, 1909, 1.

¹⁵⁷ "Наши дописи" (Our Correspondence), *CG*, No. 52, 1908, 4.

lasted for several months was the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina when *Carigradski glasnik* conducted anti-Austrian propaganda.¹⁵⁸ By the end of 1908 the articles that appeared in the paper discretely showed disillusionment with the Young Turk revolution, with the situation in the Ottoman Macedonia, with the Serbian representation in the Ottoman parliament, and generally with the overall position of Ottoman Serbs. This will be discussed in the next chapter.¹⁵⁹

Naturally, because of the inability to write directly about the problems of the population in Ottoman Macedonia, *Carigradski glasnik* acquired an educational and religious character; with hundreds of articles being published about education and religion.¹⁶⁰ In truth, *Carigradski glasnik* in the time of its establishment did not need more than that. It was envisioned as a paper that would express the utmost loyalty to the Sultan and the Ottoman state. On the other hand it would engage in a religious and educational struggle, encouraging articles and correspondences of the readers in that direction. As said, religion and education was the first tools that Balkan propaganda campaigns employed in spreading Greek, Bulgarian, or Serbian nationhood. In this context, *Carigradski glasnik* acted as an educational and religious mobilizer:

The teachers are now becoming important players not just in enlightening the entrusted youth, but also in the role of national workers and initiators of everything that is aimed to prosper and progress of Serbian school communities. All the attention should be devoted to the teachers because they are the foundation on which rests the building of our national and educational progress. Teachers and priests are the first, most competent, and most suitable carriers of national characteristics and of our progress.¹⁶¹

Hence, even out of their main and special mission and devoted performance of entrusted service in school and church, they have many other duties. They are almost the only

¹⁵⁸ CG, no. 40, 1908, 1.

¹⁵⁹ "Неправда спрема Срба у Турској" (Injustice toward Serbs in Turkey), CG, no. 50, 1908, 1.

¹⁶⁰ Čolić, "'Цариградски гласник'...", 221.

¹⁶¹ "Учитељство сада постаје важна чињеница не само у просвећивању поверене му младежи, већ и у улози народних помоћника и покретача свега што се клони добру и напретку српских школских општина. Њему треба поклонити сву достојну пажњу, јер оно је темељ на коме почива зграда народног и просветног напретка нашег.", "Искрена рећ" (Honest word), CG, No. 26, 1897, 1.

national educators who, in direct touch and communication with nation, could influence and contribute to the improvement or decline of the national life in all spheres.¹⁶²

In addition, the paper was filled with texts on the Saint Sava celebrations, happenings and events that took place throughout Serbian religious-educational communes in Ottoman Macedonia. Lots of space was devoted to the activities of the Serbian metropolitans – their tours around dioceses were described and their speeches were transferred. By this *Carigradski glasnik* created sense of belonging among the local population and fostered Serbian identity and culture, although someone could say, within the Ottoman borders. Indeed, basing the premises solely on the texts in *Carigradski glasnik*, one could conclude that Serbs had absolutely no irredentist claims. Even on the occasion of the first Ottoman Serb metropolitan Dionisije being appointed in the Macedonian diocese in 1896, he asserted in his speech that Ottoman Serbs are the most loyal subjects in the Ottoman state:

The grace of God and good will of our divine and most enlightened Master, His Royal Majesty Sultan Abdul Hamid Han II, which from that happy day when he sat on blessed Throne of His glorious ancestors started to spread on all His subjects without difference; it spread richly on our Serbian nation, His most loyal subjects in His great Empire. Beside other benefactions, the wish and need of Serbian nation in Raška-Prizren diocese to have an Archbishop of Serbian nationhood is met. We are going into congregation which know us and which we know: into this nation which is well-known for its great loyalty, great devotion and love towards Orthodox Church and its nationhood; which is also well-known for its humble loyalty towards our merciful Master.¹⁶³

Only after the Young Turk revolution *Carigradski glasnik* wrote more openly on the overall situation in the Ottoman Macedonia and the problems that local population had to face. However, since the new circumstances brought new flows and new papers, *Carigradski glasnik* continued to be perceived as a Hamidian paper, located in Istanbul and somehow cut

¹⁶² “Дакле, и ван круга њиховог главног, специјалног позива и савесног вршења поверене им службе у школи и у цркви, имају они много и других дужности, у улози скоро јединих народних васпитатеља, који, у непосредном додиру и општењу с народом, могу много да учину и допринесу унапређењу или назадку народног живота у свим областима.”, “Утувимо” (Let’s remember), CG, No. 38, 1898, 1.

¹⁶³ “Милост Божја и благовољење нашег узвишеног и високопросвећеног Господара, Љ. Ц. В. Султана Абдула Хамида хана II, која се од онога срећнога дана, кад је Он сео на пресветли Престо Својих славних предака, почела изливати в на све Његове поданике без разлике, обилно се излила и на наш српски народ, Његове најверније поданике у Његовој великој Царевини. Јер се поред других благодати, и жеља и потреба српског народа рашко-призренске јепархије, да има духовног архипастира своје народности, задовољена. Идемо у средину пастве која нас познаје и коју познајемо: у средину овога народа, који је добро познат са своје велике поданичке верности, велике привржености и љубави према православној вери и својој народности, који је добро познат са своје велике поданичке верности према нашем милостивом Владару.”, “Архипастирска посланица” (Archbishop’s epistle), CG, No. 9, 1896, 1.

off from Ottoman Macedonian reality. The last issue was published on October 10/23, 1909 with the editors providing the following reasons for suspension:

With this number we are suspending further publishing of our paper because of technical difficulties that could not be resolved. When we resolve these difficulties, *Carigradski glasnik* will again be published since the paper ownership did not renounce its right in front of the state that, with permission that it had, the paper can be publish again.¹⁶⁴

The reasons for closing the paper after a long fifteen years were hardly of a technical nature, but as mentioned, most probably lay in the overall context after the Young Turk revolution. The liberalization of the Ottoman press market resulted in *Carigradski glasnik* ceasing to be the only Serbian paper in the Ottoman Empire. Starting from September 1908, another paper called *Vardar* was established in Skopje. It was founded by the leaders of the Serbian revolutionary organization and hence it was no surprise that this paper defended Serbian interests in Ottoman Macedonia more strongly and energetically.¹⁶⁵ In addition, we saw that *Carigradski glasnik* had continuous problems with finances because subscribers did not pay regularly. Regarding the fact that the main subscribers of the *Carigradski glasnik* were teachers, and they subsequently became involved in the revolutionary organization, it is likely that even they stopped paying subscription. In addition, after 1903 we saw that Serbian state also took different position towards Ottoman Macedonia, and although it still advocated loyalty to the Ottoman Empire and importance of religion and education in the national fight, it was obvious that Serbian diplomacy supported and turned to revolutionary organizations. This might resulted with the smaller subsidies for *Carigradski glasnik*, knowing that the Serbian state always had problems with the budget.

¹⁶⁴ "Овим бројем обустављамо даље излагање нашега листа и то због техничких тешкоћа, које се нису могле уклонити. Кад те техничке тешкоће буду уклоњене, ЦАРИГРАДСКИ ГЛАСНИК ће опет излазити, пошто се власништво листа пред властима није одрекло свога права да, по дозволи коју за излагање има, лист може поново покренути.", "Цариградски гласник престаје излазити" (*Carigradski glasnik stops being published*), CG, no. 42, 1909, 1.

¹⁶⁵ Jovanović, "Споменица...", 893.

Conclusion

The Serbian state engaged in Ottoman Macedonia when there already existed a religious-educational struggle between Greeks and Bulgarians in full swing. Serbia was in the most unfavorable position, mainly because it was latecomer and had to establish its firm position in the Ottoman Balkans, like Bulgaria and Greece did. Many plans for irredentist action in Ottoman Macedonia were proposed to the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in all of them was emphasized the need to collaborate with Ottomans in order to curb primarily Bulgarian propaganda, and to establish Serbian periodical which would advocate Serbian interests, in addition to operating in completely legal terms. This meant that the paper should definitely conform to the Ottoman press regulations. Namely, the periodical had to operate in the political atmosphere where loyalty to the state was expressed through constant loyalty to the Sultan. Because political news was reduced to the interests of the Ottoman state, many periodicals engaged mostly with cultural topics. This was the case with the *Carigradski glasnik* as well, although covering religious and educational subjects imbedded with the Serbian national propaganda was the precise role of this Serbian periodical.

Many articles were written on Serbian education and religion with the concrete goal of animating Serbian teachers and priests to act as good national workers for the Serbian cause. However, *Carigradski glasnik* only suggests Serbian wishful thinking, with the clear sense of the Serbian nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia. Although here and there *Carigradski glasnik* alluded to the problem concerning the Serbian propaganda and national workers, it nevertheless did not provide the most important thing – an idea of how Serbian nationhood which was so much propagated in the paper, was exercised on the ground; namely, did Macedonian population located in northern Macedonia develop Serbian nationhood. This will be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter IV. *Carigradski glasnik*, Serbian nationhood, and facts on the ground

As seen from the previous chapter *Carigradski glasnik* was a direct product of Serbian diplomatic circles engaged in Ottoman Macedonia. In 1895, when the periodical finally started, the main goal was to promote Serbian language and culture, as well as to create a venue in which Ottoman Serbian intelligentsia and elites could come together by fostering and developing Serbian nationhood. These intelligentsia already shared a sense of *Serbiness* promoted through the Serbian educational system in Belgrade or in a few Ottoman Serbian educational centers like the one in Prizren; or they simply developed a sense of *otherness* while being educated in Patriarchal Greek schools in Ottoman Macedonia. As this Greek education could result in the hellenized population in the Ottoman Macedonia, on the other hand, this same education could develop the feeling of the *otherness* among the Serbian and Bulgarian intellectuals. These intellectuals accepted Greek language as *lingua franca* but this did not imply necessarily their Greek nationhood.

In this chapter I argue that *Carigradski glasnik*, as the paper of Serbian diplomatic circles, promoted Serbian nationhood as a stable, fixed and clear entity which exists from time immemorial and which distinguishes Serbian nation from all the other nations in the Ottoman Empire, especially from the Slavic Bulgarians. Thus, the main mission of this periodical was first to convince the readers that shared features like language and specific celebrations point to their Serbian nationhood, and second to point to the existence of the loyal Serbian nation in the Empire in order to obtain millet status. Furthermore, I argue that the two owners and editors of *Carigradski glasnik* did not represent such a strict and well defined Serbian nationhood but rather exhibited fluid sense of national identity which was quite common among the Macedonian local population. Nevertheless, unlike most the recent scholarship on

Ottoman Macedonia (e.g. Jane Cowan's or Victor Roudometof's edited volumes on Macedonia) who even when looking at how the nationhood was appropriated below, they approach to it from above, that is, from the perspective of state elite's that propagated clear and fixed nationhood, as *Carigradski glasnik* did. In this sense, I do not interpret fluid nationhood as a-national but rather as changeable form of practice.

This chapter is divided into two sections: in the first section I analyze how *Carigradski glasnik* define and propagated Serbian nationhood through Hamidian and early Young Turk periods, in the second section I focus on fluid nationhood exhibited by Kosta Grupčević and Temko Popović, the last two owners and editors of *Carigradski glasnik*. The first section is almost entirely built on my findings in *Carigradski glasnik*, while the second section is based on the secondary literature, mostly on works from Tchavdar Marinov, Bernard Lory, Paschalis Kitromilides, Victor Friedman and the others, who touch upon some aspects of nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia, and Balkan state's related spread of it.

4.1. *Carigradski glasnik* and Serbian nationhood during Hamidian and early Young Turk period

4.1.1. *Carigradski glasnik* and Serbian nationhood during Hamidian period

Ottoman Serbs were not recognized as a *millet* in the Ottoman Empire, but from the 1776 abolishment of the Peć Patriarchate onwards, Ottoman Serbs again became part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate where they remained until the end of the Ottoman Empire. For the Ottoman Serbs, not being recognized as *millet* presented certain difficulties in the sense that they were deprived of the religious and educational autonomy. This was an aggravating circumstance given that Bulgarians, characterized as the worst enemy of both Serbs and Greeks, obtained Exarchate status in 1895, granting them complete jurisdiction over its own religious and educational affairs. Yet another problem which was especially serious in the context of the Greek-Bulgarian-Serbian war of statistics - where nationhood quantity meant

more than nationhood quality - was the fact that the Ottoman Serbs officially did not exist in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁶⁶ This was the result of the 1881 and 1903 Ottoman censuses based on denominations, i.e. on *millets*. As the Ottoman Serbs were not recognized as a *millet*, and *millet* was seen as a basis for counting “collective consciousness”, as Yosmaoğlu states, this meant that Ottoman Serbs were not officially recognized in the Empire. Rather they were registered accordingly as part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate or even the Bulgarian Exarchate. In addition, because these censuses were seen as the basis upon which Balkan irredentist claims were tested, the Greeks and Bulgarians challenged the Serb’s right to legitimate territorial claims in the region.¹⁶⁷

Nevertheless, this problem, known as нуфијско питање (*nüfus* question) in Serbian scholarship, was seen as two-sided. Namely, many Serbian diplomats, including Stojan Novaković, thought it was useless and even counterproductive to insist on solving the *nüfus* question because it would result in the real number of the Ottoman Serbs would be revealed, and perhaps the results would not be in the interest of the Serbian state. In their opinion, Serbian nationhood was *de facto* recognized because Serbia could more or less equally participate in the struggle for the Ottoman Macedonia through Serbian consulates, schools, and churches, and this was what mattered to them.¹⁶⁸ However, generally the Serbian government did not share this opinion and on a few occasions it tried to solve this problem. *Carigradski glasnik* was employed in this matter too because it was charged with constantly emphasizing the Serbian presence in the Ottoman state, and to propagate and define Serbian nationhood in the Empire: “If the nation wants to be preserved as a nation, then it should have

¹⁶⁶ Basil C. Gounaris, ‘Social Cleavages and National ‘Awakening’ in Ottoman Macedonia’, *East European Quarterly*, 1994, 5.

¹⁶⁷ Yosmaoğlu, *Blood Ties...*, 149.

¹⁶⁸ Miloš Jagodić, “Нуфуско питање: проблем званичног признавања српске нације у Турској, 1894-1910” (*Nüfus Question: Problem of official recognition of the Serbian nation in Turkey, 1894-1910*), *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 57, 2008, 345-48.

its own church and school. This is especially necessary here, where one nation lives together with other nations”¹⁶⁹, *Carigradski glasnik* stated.

Naturally, this periodical did its mission within Ottoman press laws and procedures as well as the political atmosphere of this period. During Hamidian period in which *Carigradski glasnik* spent most of its publishing years, the constantly repeated loyalty to the Sultan was the must-have in order to survive. Not only did the Ottoman state demand such behavior from this paper, but Serbian diplomatic circles also came to the realization that Serbian national goals could only be achieved by siding next to the Ottoman Empire. The loyalty towards the Sultan was usually expressed in following words:

The Serbian nation in His vast Empire is well-known for its humble loyalty, every time and in every occasion warmly prays to Mighty Lord for the good health of its Master, who also cares about His subjects.¹⁷⁰

This day in the hearts of all loyal subjects of the Ottoman Throne raises great joy, especially in the heart of Serbian nation. This is a chance for the Serbian nation to express its greatest love towards its Divine Master, as well as gratitude for all the benefactions and mercifulness with which He lavishes his faithful Serbs.¹⁷¹

That loyalty towards the Sultan and bolstering of the image of the Ottoman Empire was carefully monitored in publications like *Carigradski glasnik* can be attested in the press collection found in the Yıldız Palace archive, which, according to Selim Deringil, ranged from well-known publications like *The Times* to “obscure Serbian or Bulgarian publications.”¹⁷² However, no matter how obscure *Carigradski glasnik* might be for the Ottomans, the fact that it was not just read in an inflamed Ottoman Macedonia but also

¹⁶⁹ “Народ ако хоће да се одржи као народ, треба да има своју цркву и школу. Особито је то нужно овде, где један народ живи у друштву са другим народима.”, “Леп пример” (Nice example), CG, No. 6, 1899, 1.

¹⁷⁰ “Српски народ у његовој пространој Царевини, који је добро познат са своје поданичке верности, свагда и у свакој прилици топло се моли Свемогућем за повољно здравље свога Господара, који и њему поклања своју високу пажњу.”, “19. август 1903. године” (August 19, 1903), CG, No. 34, 1903, 1.

¹⁷¹ “Овај дан који у срцима свију верних поданика Османског престола побуђује велику радост, особито је подгрева у срцима српског народа, јер се њему овом приликом указује прилика да изрази како своју превелику љубав према свом Узвишеном Господару, тако исто и захвалност према свима доброчинствима и милостима, којима своје верне Србе Он обасипље.”, “7. Децембра” (December 7), CG, No. 50, 1899, 1.

¹⁷² Deringil, *Well-Protected Domains*, 136.

outside the Ottoman Empire was grounds enough for the Ottoman image management teams that Deringil describes to pay special attention to the content of this paper.

Due to the meticulous examinations of Ottoman censorship, *Carigradski glasnik* during the Hamidian period more resembled an Ottoman than Serbian propaganda paper. It operated within the bounds of Ottoman press regulations and imperial sovereignty which demanded the utmost loyalty to the Sultan who was lavishly portrayed as the benevolent father who took care of his good-hearted and naïve children in papers that thrived during his reign.¹⁷³ Throughout the Hamidian period, *Glasnik* operated according to these rules. Although violence was constant fact of life in Ottoman Macedonia, until the Young Turk revolution and the liberalization of the Ottoman press this paper usually wrote about Ottoman Serbs as the most loyal subjects of Sultan Abdülhamid. The paper particularly stressed its loyalty during the Armenian massacres. Oddly enough, Armenian publications did the same thing. *Carigradski glasnik* did on few occasions published notes on articles appearing in Armenian periodicals, where these periodicals during 1896 constantly emphasized Armenian loyalty towards Sultan, distancing Armenian population from the troublemakers.¹⁷⁴ Here are examples of how Abdülhamid was portrayed during this period, especially when it came to public celebrations like commemorating yearly anniversaries of Sultan's accession to the throne:

So that in this occasion (the inhabitants) can express their enormous love, endless loyalty and true affection. It has been twenty years since He, governing from that famous Throne, lavish with fortune His numerous subjects in His immense and powerful Empire. Every year is a line of those happy events, which source is the great mind and divine wisdom of His Magnificence. Long Live His Magnificence SULTAN GAZI ABDÜLHAMID HAN THE SECOND!¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ See the first chapter on the Ottoman press, concretely the second and third sections, 15-20.

¹⁷⁴ "Јермени" (Armenians), CG, No. 35, 1896, 1.

¹⁷⁵ "Да му том пригодом изрази своју превелику љубав, бескрајну оданост и искрену приврженост. Ево је двадесета година, како је Он, владајући са тога славног Престола, обасипље сретом Своје многобројне, поданике у Његовој неизмерној и моћној Царевини. Свака је година нис тих сретних догађаја, којима је извор високи ум и божанствена мудрост Његовог Царског Величанства. Живело Његово Царско величанство СУЛТАН ГАЗИ АБДУЛ ХАМИД ДРУГИ!", "19 Август" (August 19), CG, no. 31, 1895, 1.

On this day thirty years ago His Imperial Majesty Sultan Abdul Hamid Han II sat on famous Ottoman throne. Year after year, on this day, His entire vast Empire is filled with joy and numerous nations and denominations express humble loyalty. Serbian nation in Turkey never missed to express its humble loyalty too. Thankful for educational and other rights that it enjoys from the time when His Imperial Majesty Sultan sat on the throne of his grand ancestors, Serbian nation in this occasion in front of imperial throne brings its warm wishes for long life and health of His Imperial Majesty.¹⁷⁶

Carigradski Glasnik used every opportunity to praise devoted Ottoman Serbs in the contrast to the other, disloyal Christian communities of the Empire and represent themselves as subjects, who in turn deserved to be recognized as a *millet*. The usual tropes which were employed perpetuated the notion that Ottoman Serbs were one of the rare nations who had to fight and endure bad fate throughout its existence, but despite all their obstacles, they always managed to survive and preserve the Serbian name and nationhood.

There is no nation under the sky which has passed through harder and more horrible times than the Serbian nation. Every Serb who has even minimally investigated the past life of his nation, will know what were, when, and how hard were these troubles. In addition, there is not many nations like Serbian one, which have amazingly resisted their ill fate; with great faith in the Lord and Holy Orthodoxy, and with great pride in its name and nationhood.¹⁷⁷

Expectedly, contributors to *Carigradski glasnik* claimed that it was only during the years of the Hamidian reign that Ottoman Serbs finally met prosperity because they were allowed to bolster their nationhood and freely proclaim it in the Serbian schools, which were seen as battlefields of nations. Certainly, this alludes to the “book and pen” struggle in Ottoman Macedonia where religion and education bolstered nationhood. For this reason, it is not surprising that *Carigradski glasnik*’s call for school more resembled a call for war.

¹⁷⁶ “На данашњи дан је пуних тридесет година од како на славом увенчаном, отоманском престолу седи Њ. И. В. Султан Абдул ха,ид Хан II. Из године у годину, на данашњи дан, цела пространа Његова Царевина плива у радости и у доказивању поданичке верности, српски народ у Турској није никад изостао иза другин народа. Захвални за ово просветних тековина и права што их ужива од како седи на престолу својих славних предака Њ. И. В. Султан Абдул Хамид, овамошњи српски народ , и овом приликом, пред царско престоле подноси своје топле жеље за дуг живот и здравље Њ. И. В. Величанства”, “19. Август” (August 19), CG, No. 34, 1905, 1.

¹⁷⁷ “Нема ваљда да под капом небеском народа, који је пролазио кроз тежа и мучнија времена од народа српскога. Сваки Србин који је ма и најповршније проучавао минули живот свога народа, знаће у чему су, када и колико биле те недаће. Али, исто тако, и мало народа који је, као српски, необичном издржљивошћу одолевао мало наклоњеној судбини својој, те живом вером у Господина Бога и Свето Православље, а поносан именом и народношћу својом.”, “Реч у своје време” (Word in its own time), CG, No. 2, 1898, 1.

Run to school, you little Serb! This call is aimed to you because you have great and divine duties for your name. Nowadays nations are competing on the field of cultural progress. Instead of a battle of swords, we have a battle of minds. This battle decides upon the survival or decline of the individual and the nation. School is the one that will prepare you for this cultural game. So go to school, you too little Serb. School is this sacred duty that will prepare you for cultural work and game on this field on which you, want it or not, have to show yourself. The Serbian nation showed that it has enough abilities and requirements which are necessary for culture. In school you will strengthen your mind and raise your heart. Without this one cannot be a Serb.¹⁷⁸

It is interesting how excerpts from articles show how *Glasnik's* writers discussed nationhood as something timeless and unchanging:

Nationhood cannot be lost even when deceived individuals take different names or when different names are imposed upon them forcefully. The armor of our nationhood is our past, language, folk songs and customs and above all *slava*¹⁷⁹ - the service – and many other characteristics that distinguish Serbian nation from the others.¹⁸⁰

Slava, this is our national characteristic. *Slava* is the most distinguished feature by which we differ from other Slavic nationhood. Language, customs, tradition, folklore, even physiognomy is what also differentiate us from them.¹⁸¹

This notion of clear-cut lines between ethno-religious communities of the Ottoman Empire served *Carigradski glasnik* to separate the Serbian nationhood from all others. This “separate existence” and celebrations of exclusive Serbian saints, like Saint Sava was meant to contribute to the preservation of Serbian nationhood among the local population in Ottoman Macedonia. For *Carigradski glasnik* Serbian nationhood in the Ottoman state was clear – it did not have to be imposed upon the local population but only developed and preserved from

¹⁷⁸ “Стога похитај у школу, и ти Српче драго! Тебе се особито тиче тај позив јер те очекују велике и свете дужности према имену твоме. На пољу културнога напретка данас се надмећу народи. Место мачем и коњем дошла је борба умом, борба, која је одлучнија за живот, за опстанак или пропадање било појединца, или народа. За ту културну утакмицу спремиће те школа. Па хајде у школу, и ти Српчићу. Школа је тај свети задатак да те спреми за културни рад и утакмицу на томе пољу на коме се ти, хтео не хтео, мораш показати, а српски народ је показао да има свих способности и услова који су потребни за културу. У школи се челичи ум и облагорађава срце. Без тога Србин не може бити.”, “Пред школским пратом” (In front of school doors), *CG*, No. 33, 1897, 1.

¹⁷⁹ The *Slava* is a family religious celebration that takes place in Serbia and denotes celebrations on the day of the specific saint who was chosen as a protector of a family. Every family has its saint protector that is inherited from father to son. Unlike other Orthodox countries where saint days are not associated with family celebrations, in Serbia this custom was present from the Middle Ages and is considered to be a specifically Serbian tradition.

¹⁸⁰ “А народност се у суштини не губи чак ни онда, кад заведени појединци друго име узимају, или им се оно намеће. Народности нам је штит прошлост, језик, песме и обичаји, а нарочито слава – служба – и много других одлика које српски народ оштро од других народа разликују.”, “Реч у своје време” (The word in its own time), *CG*, no. 2, 1898, 1.

¹⁸¹ “*Slava*, то је наче народно обележје. Слава је најистакнутија особина по којој се ми разликујемо од осталих народности словенскога стабла. Разликују нас од њих и језик, и обичаји, и предања, и ношња, па и сам изглед лица.”, “Слава” (*Slava*), *CG*, No. 50, 1895, 1.

the Bulgarian, Greek or even Ottoman attempts to curb and even denounce the Serbian nation. For this reason, *Carigradski glasnik* paid pedantic attention equally to the celebrations of such occasions, like the *slava* or Saint Sava as to the yearly inauguration celebrations of the Sultan. The subscribers were encouraged to send descriptions of these celebrations that were taking place throughout areas where the Ottoman Serbs lived in order to bolster and even more stress the clear uniqueness of Serbian nationhood in comparison to *others*.¹⁸² Even more, such occasions like celebrations of Saint Sava's day fosters Serbian "imagined community":

The entire scattered Serbian nation will be on Sava's day united in their thoughts, and all those thoughts concentrates around defender of the Holy Orthodoxy and the Serbian name; around the revivalist of Serbian education and progress; around saint Sava - the grandest of the grandest among Serbs. There is no Serbian pupil who does not know of his enlightener; there is no Serb who would not pay adequate respect to those who set the foundation of Serbian education.¹⁸³

Hence, although operating within Hamidian censorship and political atmosphere where loyalty to the Sultan had to be constantly stressed, *Carigradski glasnik* managed to promote Serbian nationhood even on the occasions such as the Sultan's birthday or anniversaries of ascension. In all these occasions it used "we" and "them" discourse in order to distance Ottoman Serbs from the others, and to show that Ottoman Serbs were separate *millet* indeed.

4.1.2. Carigradski glasnik and Serbian nationhood during early Young Turk period

Only after the Young Turk revolution and looser press regulations did *Carigradski glasnik* begin to advocate Serbian interests more openly. Immediately following the revolution very little changed in the discourse: Abdülhamid remained untouchable, and the proclamation of the constitution was entirely attributed to him. The following passage points to how the

¹⁸² Alter, "Nineteenth Century...", 88-91.

¹⁸³ "Цио раштркани српски народ биће на Савин дан уједињен мислима, а све те мисли концентришу се око браниоца св. Православља и српског имена, око препородитеља српске просвете и напретка; око највећег међу највећим Србима – Св. Саве. Нема тога српског ђађета које не зна за свога просвјетитеља; нема тога Србина који не био одао достојно поштовање ономе, који постави чврсти темељ просвете српске.", "Мисли у очи светосавског славља" (The thoughts around Saint Sava's celebration), CG, No. 2, 1904, 1.

Ottoman Serbs and other communities actually did expect meaningful changes from the Young Turk regime.

Sweet months of His Rule were accompanied by harsh fate. Reformed glorious Turkey had to save the country from danger that was threatening from the outside. This attempt was stopped by the evil will of the Sultan's advisors, whose personal interest was more important than the public one. In their irresponsibility they brought the country to the edge of doom. The voice of suffering and exhaustion of the people reached the Throne of our Almighty. On June 11 our divine Ruler made an end to these intrigues. June 11 is a day of freedom, a day of progress, a day of a rejuvenated Turkey! In the rejuvenated constitutionally free Turkey the Sultan Abdülhamid celebrates the thirty-third year of his coming to the Ottoman Throne. This thirty-third year is the most glorious in the reign of our divine Sultan. That is the beginning of the renaissance of our homeland based on the equality and brotherhood of all the Ottoman nationalities with the protection of civil freedom and safety. With him begins the Resurrection of our native land in all possible cultural directions. Live Constitutional Sultan Abdülhamid II! Live!¹⁸⁴

These lines were written only a month following the revolution so some big changes in the discourse, at least regarding Abdülhamid, could not be perceived. However, the reserved and loyal stance toward the Sultan remained until the very end, that is to say, until the counterrevolution and Abdülhamid's deposition in April 1909. That could not be said for some other periodicals, like the satirical press which was banned during Hamidian era but resurrected after the Young Turk revolution and started to criticize the Sultan.¹⁸⁵

Although Glasnik regularly reported on the events regarding the counterrevolution, the role of the Sultan in these events was not mentioned at all. Namely, we do know whether or not *Carigradski glasnik* sided with the Young Turks, but even their reports on the role of the Sultan in the counter-revolution remained quite ambiguous. The only report regarding Abdülhamid II was that the Sultan had taken into consideration the rebels' demands,

¹⁸⁴ "Медене месеце Његове Владавине пратила је тешка коб. Реформисана славна Турска требала је да спасе земљу од опасности које јој с поља претиле. покушај је насео на злој вољи саветника Круне којима је лични интерес био пречи од општега народнога. У својој неодговорности они су земљу били довели готово до ивице пропасти. Глас напаћеног и измученог народа дорпо је и до престола Свемогућњега. Једанаестог Јула наш узвишени Владар учинио је крај вршању сплеткама. Једанаести јуна је дан слободе народне, дан напретка, дан подмлаћене, васкрсле Турске! У подмлаћеној уставној слободној Турској Султан Абдул Хамид прославља по тридесет и трећи пут дан свог ступања на Престо Османа. Тридесет и треће лето је најславније у Владавини нашег узвишеног Султана. Оно је почетак препорођаја наше домовине на основи једнакости и братства свих народности Отоманске Империје уз заштиту личне слободе и сигурности. С њим почиње Васкрс нашега завичаја у свим могућним културним правцима. Живео уставни Султан Абдул Хамид Хан II! Живео!", "19 Август", CG, no. 34, 1908, 1.

¹⁸⁵ Brummett, *Image and Imperialism*...66-67.

pardoning them from any punishment.¹⁸⁶ However, when the outcome was known, i.e. when Abdülhamid was dethroned, *Glasnik* commented the dethronement as

...what should and must have happened, happened. The army, to whom our Fatherland has to thank for the constitution and civil rights, again acted and by hard fight preserved the constitution from the opposition.¹⁸⁷

So this time it was not the Sultan (as it was mentioned in earlier issues), but the army which re-proclaimed the constitution. The dethronement of the Sultan was seen as an “historical act” in which the Ottoman Empire got rid of a despot comparable to Caligula or Nero. This suggests that *Carigradski glasnik* was playing it safe, waiting until the very dethronement of Abdülhamid became a done deal. Only then, after fifteen years, *Carigradski glasnik* changed the rhetoric on Abdülhamid, transforming him from an adored patriarch into a monster:

...and exiled Abdul Hamid, intellectual culprit not just for the bloody rebellion in the army and its consequences, the blood fight in Istanbul on April 11 – but also for all the evils and misfortunes that our Fatherland was passing through during the 33 years of his calamitous and bloody governance. Abdul Hamid, the main obstruction towards progress and prosperity of the Ottoman Empire, is removed from our way.¹⁸⁸

What is more however, is that after the Young Turk revolution the Sultan did not become the only monster; gradually the state was also portrayed as a monster as well. Like other communities in the Ottoman Empire, the Ottoman Serbs expected too much from the Young Turk regime. When the expectations desired from the new regime were not met, euphoria was replaced with disappointment.¹⁸⁹ This was because in the new circumstances when Hamidian

¹⁸⁶ “Велики догађаји у Царевини” (Great events in the Empire), CG, no. 14, 1909, 1.

¹⁸⁷ “Оно што се морало и требало догодити, догодило се. Војска, којој се има захвалити, што је у Јулу 1908. г. наша Отаџбина дошла до Устава и грађанских слобода, поново се је zaloжила и крвавом борбом успела да спасе уставност од покушаја реакције.”, “Промена на престољу” (Alteration on the throne), CG, no. 16, 1909, 1.

¹⁸⁸ “...и отеран у изгнанство Абдул Хамида, интелектуалног кривца не само за крваву војничку побуну и њене последице, крваве борбе у Цариграду 11 априла, већ и за сва зла и недаће, које су нашу Отаџбину снашле у току 33 године његове несрећне и крваве владавине. Главна сметња Абдул хамид уклоњен је с пута, који води напредку и преображају Отаџбине.”, “Хоћемо праву слободну и потпуну једнакост!” (We want real freedom and complete equality!), CG, No. 18, 1909, 1.

¹⁸⁹ The euphoria about the new regime which was gradually replaced by the disappointment and discontent was well documented in the scholarly works. For example, see Vangelis Kechriotis, “The Modernization of the Empire and the Community ‘Privileges’: Greek Orthodox Responses...”. See also first chapter, subsection on the early Young Turk regime, 11-14.

patrimonial discourse was replaced by *Ottomanism*, namely the Ottoman population from loyal subjects of the Sultan became Ottoman citizens equal in their rights with the others, everyone expected that at least part of their problems will be solved. As *Carigradski glasnik* wrote, the news concerning the re-proclamation of the constitution was happily welcomed, especially because the Ottoman Serbs believed that the anarchical situation in Ottoman Macedonia would come to an end, and even more importantly, that Serbian nationhood would be finally recognized in the Ottoman Empire.

In all the places where Serbian nation lives, the proclamation of the constitution was welcomed exceedingly, enthusiastically and gladly. The new days after the constitution were welcomed by the Serbian nation with same feelings as all the other nations in the Empire. If anyone earlier suffered and struggled, it was the Serbian nation. It hoped that once this would come to an end, that the days of freedom would come when life would be guaranteed, if anything else. Earlier its nationhood was not recognized. As some little foster in folk tales, it was placed a bit here, a bit there; it was added to the Patriarchate, then to the Christians, sometimes it was part of the Exarchate; but no-one wanted to recognize its nation, as was the case with Greeks, Bulgarians and the rest of the population. Its schools and churches were often closed, teachers and priests were sent to prison, and it just patiently waited and hoping that the better and nicer days would come.¹⁹⁰

Nevertheless, *Carigradski glasnik* soon realized that these new circumstances were not always valid. The paper stressed that the Ottoman Serbs were certainly among the firsts to salute the Young Turk changes because they were expecting that the proclaimed liberty and equality will be introduced into provinces where the Ottoman Serbs mainly lived. Nevertheless, soon after *Glasnik* expressed disappointment with the fact that none of these promises were introduced to the Ottoman Macedonia, the paper warned that guerilla bands were still the masters in the region, sometimes even backed by the representatives of the Ottoman authorities. For instance, in February 1909 Ottoman Serbs from Prilep defended two

¹⁹⁰ “На свима странама, где живи српска народност, воспостављење устава дочекано је и бурно и одушевљено и радосно. Нове дане после устава српски је елеменат дочекао са оним истим осећањима која су обузела и остале народности царства. Ако је ико раније патио и мучио, то је био он. Надао се да ће и том једном доћи крај, да ће доћи дани слободе кад ће бити сваком зајемчен бар живот, ако ништа друго. Раније му није била призната ни народност. Као како пасторче у народним причама, њега су туткали час овамо, час онамо те је придодаван патријаршистима, те придодаван хришћанима, неким делом убрајан у егзархисте, али никако му се није хтело да призна, да он има своју народност, као што је то било случај са Грцима, Бугарима и осталима. Затварали су му школе, цркве, терали у апсане учитеље и попове, и он је све мирно сносио увек у нади да ће синуги и њему бољи и лепши дани будућности.”, “Српска народност после устава” (Serbian nationhood after the constitution), *CG*, no. 31, 1908, 1.

Serbian monasteries from Bulgarian bands, and on this occasion sent a letter to Ottoman authorities, including the parliament, in which they demanded the defense of their rights. In the following passage I provide the complete letter because first, it illustrates disillusion with the new regime which was common to all the Ottoman communities, and second, it also provides an example on how Ottoman Serbs portrayed themselves and what tropes they used while addressing Young Turk authorities. Namely, they accepted the “official” discourse of the regime: Ottoman Serbs were not operating within loyalty anymore; the key terms became freedom and equality.

The Ottoman Serbs from Prilep and surroundings gathered today at the national assembly to protest that the Bulgarian attacks on Serbian property are tolerated. They protest because Ottoman authorities protect Bulgarians and therefore cause damage to the Serbian nation and its property. They express their dissatisfaction that the Ottoman authorities allowed the Bulgarian entrance into distinctly Serbian monasteries: Zrze and Slepče; and not only that they allowed it, but that the gendarmerie offered it for the sake of the peace and order. Zrze and Slepče are villages inhabited by Ottoman Serbs and their monasteries are financed by entirely Serbian villages, which also provided them with estates. Bulgarians have no rights on them, and will not have them because now our Fatherland is under peace and order. There are no Bulgarian villages near by these monasteries; therefore Bulgarians have no legitimate right to claim them.

We are protesting against the terror which Bulgarian bands are exhibiting and which is tolerated when they walk armed through our villages and forcing villagers to be Bulgarians, which was the case in Dolman and Dabnica; while Serb is not tolerated even when he is unarmed.

The Serbian nation is deeply saddened when in the times of freedom and equality, Ottoman authorities treat it unjustly and separate it from the other nations. For example, while Greeks and Bulgarians have the bells on the churches, to Serbs this is strictly forbidden, and even police comes to take the bells down, as it was the case here in Prilep.

The Ottoman Serbs from Prizren and its surroundings legitimately demand back the monastery in Treskavac because it is situated in the middle of the Serbian population who also kept and financed it. Bulgarians violently – with the help of their bandit tropes – took the monastery and now it is illegitimately in their possession.

The Ottoman Serbs from Prilep and its surroundings are always prepared to give their lives for the happiness and progress, as well as for the preservation of the Ottoman Fatherland; they do not want what is not theirs, however, they will defend what it is theirs until the last breath.¹⁹¹

¹⁹¹ “Срби Османлије из Прилепа и околине, скупљени данас на народном збору, протестују што се дозвољава, да Бугари насрћу на њихову имовину. Протестирају што се од стране власти Бугари протежирају на штету српског народа и његове имовине. Изјављују своје негодовање што су државне власти допустиле да Бугари уђу у чисто српске манастире Зрзе и Слечче, па не само што су их пустиле, већ су им и жандарме, ради веће сигурности, дале. Зрзе и Слечче села су насељена Србима Османлијама и манастири њихови издржавани су од села чисто српских, која су им и непокретна имања поклањала, те Бугари никаква права на њих немају, нити ће моћи имати, пошто је у нашој отаџбини завладао ред и поредак. Бугарских села нема у околини оних манастира и толико је од њих далеко, те никаквог

Although the dissatisfaction about the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was expected - *Carigradski Glasnik* published the article under the symbolic title *Српска голгота* (Serbian Golgotha);¹⁹² the major discontent actually took place after the elections of the senate and parliament. Namely, of 40 senators elected by the government, 30 of them were Muslims, one was Jew, while the rest were Christians. Among those Christians, all the communities were represented except the Ottoman Serbs. This obviously signaled that the Ottoman Serbs were not going to be recognized as a nation, which was accompanied with the general frustration about the Ottoman Serbian position in the Empire.

Injustice toward the Serbs in Turkey! Is this so horrible and so new? Is this the first, or it will be the last injustice to Serbian nation in Turkey so that we are now wondering and writing about it! We do not know for anything else but for injustices which are coming one after another since the time immemorial.

The Serbian nation, which consists of two million people in Turkey, is not represented in the Senate. On the other hand, Jews have their representatives although they do not live compactly as a nation but only as trade colonies; Bulgarians are represented, although they only live in Edirne vilayet and not in other parts of Turkey (because Slavic Exarchists in Salonika, Kosovo and Bitola vilayets we cannot consider as Bulgarians) – even Macedonian and Epirus Romanians who barely have 200 000 people, only the Serbs from the Government did not get a single senator.

Will they defended themselves by saying that there are no Serbs in Turkey, or that Serbian nationhood is not recognized in Turkey? But Serbs are in Turkey, the election for the national deputies has shown it. The three Serbs elected as national deputies from the Kosovo and Bitola vilayets, have shown to the Bulgarians and all the others who say there are no Serbs in Turkey. (...) It is the duty of these Serbian deputies to discuss this issue in the parliament and to categorically insist on solving this injustice toward Serbs.

законског ослонаца не могу имати, да својину манастира себи протежавају, пошто ту немају свога елемента.

Протестујемо против терора који врше бугарске чете, којима се кроз прсте гледа кад иду по српским селима наоружани и сељане терају да буду Бугари, као што је скоро случај био у Долману и Дабници, док се Србину на пут стаје и не наоружаном.

Српски народ налази се ожалошћен, кад и му у времену слободе и једнакости власти неправду чине и од других га народности одвајају, као на пр. Док Бугари и Грци по црквама могу слободно звона подизати, дотле се Србима и њиховим црквама забрањује да им силом чак полиција скида звона, као што је случај овде у Прилепу био.

Срби Османлије из Призрена и околине с правом траже, да им се преда манастир Трескавац, јер се налази у средини српског живља који је тај манастир за толико стотина година чувао и издржавао. Бугари насилним путем 'помоћу њихових разбојничких чета овај су манастир отели и данас га незаконито пригежавају.

Срби Османлије у Прилепу и околини биће увек готови за срећу и напредак, као и за очување, Османске Царевине живот и све жртвовали, али тако исто изјављују: да туђе неће, а своје ће до последне капи крви бранити. ", "Настрај на српске манастире" (Attack on Serbian monasteries), CG, no. 7, 1909, 1.

¹⁹² "Српска голгота" (Serbian Golgotha), CG, no. 13, 1909, 1.

How is this going to be resolved is the matter of the Government, who after all did this injustice.¹⁹³

Throughout this interregnum period until December 1909 when *Carigradski glasnik* was closed, the early euphoria about the new regime was replaced by the frustrated articles on unrecognized Serbian nationhood and the “sale” of the Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria-Hungary. In short, “we do not know the justice, but we are tired of injustice”¹⁹⁴ became the favorite Ottoman Serbian motto after the Young Turk revolution.

4.2. Facts on the ground: “reckless” Serbian propaganda and fluid nationhood

Although operating within different Hamidian and Young Turk frameworks, *Carigradski glasnik* managed to successfully propagate Serbian nationhood. This propaganda was accompanied by the utmost devotion to the Ottoman state considering this devotion was not just a tactic that allowed *Carigradski glasnik* to be published continuously, but was also a framework advocated by Serbian diplomacy. What could be noticed from the sections above was the clarity and decisiveness through which this paper discussed the Serbian nationhood. Ottoman Serbs were well defined and separated from the other Ottoman communities, despite the fact that they did not have religious or educational autonomy. Nor were the Ottoman Serbs recognized as a nation in the Empire. What can be concluded from studying *Carigradski glasnik* is that its editors were not fighting for the implementation of Serbian nationhood

¹⁹³ “Неправда Србима у Турској! Зар је то тако страшно и тако ново? Зар је то прва, или ће бити последња, неправда српском народу у Турској, те се сада ишчуђавамо и о томе пишемо! Ми и не знамо за ништа друго, него само за неправде, које се нижу једна за другом, од како нас је.

Српски народ, који у Турској броји два милијона душа, није заступљен у Горњем Дому Парламента наше Отаџбине, а заступљени су Јевреји, који нигде не живе компактно као народ, него само као трговачке колоније; заступљени су Бугари, који сем у једренском вилајету и нема у садашњим границама Турске (јер ми Словене егзархисте у солунском, косовском, и битолском вилајету не можемо сматрати за Бугаре) – заступљени су македонски и епирски Румуни којих једва има 200,000 душа, само Срби нису добили од Владе ни једног сенатора.

Хоће ли се онда бранити тиме што ‘Срба нема у Турској, или што српска народност није призната у Турској? Али Срба има у турској, показали су то избори народних посланика. Три Србина, изабрана народна посланика из косовског и битолског вилајета, запушили су уста Бугарима и многим странцима који веле да нас нема (...) Дужност је Срба народних посланика да ово питање покрену у Скупштини и да категорички траже да се та неправда учињена Србима, санира. Како ће се то учинити, то је ствар Царске Владе, која је ту неправду и учинила.”, “Неправда спрам Срба у турској” (Injustice towards Serbs in Turkey), CG, no. 50, 1908, 1.

¹⁹⁴ “Ми за Правду не знамо, а неправде смо сити.”, Idem.

within the local Ottoman Macedonian population (because it was obviously implemented), but were rather fighting for the right to exercise this nationhood. Nevertheless, nationhood on the ground in Macedonia was not well-defined, even if Carigradski glasnik suggested otherwise.

Serbian diplomatic circles did not have clear idea who was actually living in *Old Serbia* and northern Macedonia, both regions that the Serbian state claimed. We saw that Stojan Novaković, the leader of Serbian diplomatic circles in Ottoman Empire, was even against the recognition of the Serbian element in the Empire because no-one knew how many people represented themselves as the Ottoman Serbs. For this reason the creation of established and elaborated Serbian diplomatic action which would infuse Serbian nationhood into local population was of the utmost importance. However, neither Serbian diplomacy nor Serbian national workers acted together smoothly on the ground in Ottoman Macedonia.

For instance, the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs managed to open four consulates in Pristina, Salonika, Bitola, and Skopje charged with implementing Serbian national action, i.e. spreading Serbian nationhood through religion and education on the ground. Yet remarkably, these four consulates barely communicated with each other. For instance, Branislav Nušić, the Serbian consul in Pristina in a 1894 letter wrote to the Serbian Ministry stated that he might even be exaggerating when saying that consulates exchange more than two letters per year. Even more, these institutions were spending excessive amounts of money even though Serbia always complained about the budget, and many projects were halted for this reason. As expected, the Serbian administration in the Ottoman Empire suffered from sluggishness and ineffectiveness. According to Nušić, Serbian consulates were the only ones in Ottoman Macedonia that were composed of consuls, vice-consuls, correspondents and translators. In some consulates, like in Skopje, the vice-consul sat at home all day long because he did not

have anything to do in the office.¹⁹⁵ Indeed, complaints about the conduct of Serbian policy in Ottoman Macedonia were not rare. For instance, in another letter that same year Ristić reported to Belgrade that the Society of Saint Sava which was in charge of cultural matters like printing and spreading books in Ottoman Macedonia did more harm than good, and it would be no surprise if the Ottomans cause problems for Serbs in the region. Ristić concluded that “Serbia today looks like a race of the most selfish demands, the country is completely disorganized and the foreign press is well justified to speak about Serbia with detest.”¹⁹⁶

A report written by the Russian consul in Prizren almost ten years after Nušić and Ristić’s complaints shows how the professional propagandists, as Lory describes teachers and priests, did not always acted as such. Namely, on several occasions in 1903, the mentioned Russian consul wrote to the Serbian Ministry of Foreign Affairs informing it that the Raška-Prizren’s metropolitan Nićifor is everything but popular among the local population. According to the Russian consul the Serbian policy in Ottoman Macedonia was reckless:

Serbia here conducts propaganda and spends 100.000 Francs per year to obtain the love of the populace (*narod*). However, it constantly angers them and spreads embarrassment and disunion here. Rather than acting for the interests of the community, it only creates intrigues and damage, which should not be tolerated. First of all, it is reckless to support the consul Avramović whom people loathe, and the silly metropolitan (*vladika*) Nićifor. Recently they organized an orgy in the Gračanica monastery where Serbs even beat up Avramović. This was even reported by “the press”. Metropolitan Nićifor does not behave as a pastor, but as an evil demon of the people. In Peć the metropolitan’s regent, Obrad the priest, defended Albanian criminals in front of Ottoman authorities, and as a result, people in Peć no longer invite him to their homes. In Đakovac for a long time the Serbs have not been in good relations with their priest. However, Nićifor does not care. In Prizren he does not recognize the municipality, and he does not engage with national work. The population of Prizren asked me several times to protect them from such a metropolitan. Someone should open Serbia eyes to its flawed policy here. It should be forced to stop thinking, and rather start working in consent with its people and with our support.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁵ Miloš Jagodić, “Извештај Бранислава Нушића о путовању из Приштине у Скадар 1894. године”(Report of Branislav Nušić on journey from Pristina to Skadar in 1894), *Мешовита* грађа, Vol. 31, 2010, 281-84.

¹⁹⁶ “Србија данас изгледа као тркалиште најсебичнијих прохтева, земља потпуно дезорганисана и туђинска штампа има разлога кад о њој говори и с презирањем и с претњом.”, Vučetić, “Писма из Цариграда...”, 341-42; 346.

¹⁹⁷ “Србија овде води пропаганду и траћи до 100.000 франака годишње да би придобила љубав народа, међутим она стално срди народ и сеје међу њима смутњу и раздор. Уместо да се усклади с бољом народа, она само ствара интриге и штети народу што се не сме допустити. Пре свега, безумно је подржавати конзула Аврамовића кога народ мрзи и шашавог владика Никифора. Недавно су направили пијанку у манастиру Грачаници при чему су Срби пребили Аврамовића, о чему је писано у „Штампи“.

The authors of *Carigradski glasnik* pieces likewise warned that even the lower Serbian clergy were lazy national workers. In an article dated from 1897 the periodical mentioned that in the remote villages where schools were not established, the priests were the only national workers, but instead of engaging with illiterate peasants and reading *Carigradski glasnik* to them, these priests were rather content with performing mere ceremonies, taking their wages and then leaving the villages immediately afterwards.

In the Pristina, Novi Pazar and Peć sanjaks there is no-one in the villages. The priest comes, finishes his ceremonies, takes what is his, and leaves. And this is repeated continuously. On the other hand, we imagine that the task of a true Serbian priest is not just to finish ceremonies, charge and leave – no! We imagine, as this means being a priest, that he should pause and educate villagers about religion, virtues and something similar. Further, the priest should inform peasants about the news regarding agriculture. We are writing pieces on agriculture, but not for the citizens because this is not their concern; we are writing it for peasants, and as they are illiterate – as we know very well – we were counting and we are counting on priests and teachers, but especially on priests because the other ones cannot reach as far as priests can.¹⁹⁸

With the teachers the situation was not much better, since *Carigradski glasnik* again reported that some teachers spent more time in the local bars than in schools, or were acting violently.

In the first place, we have to emphasize unpleasant fact that some places from the heartland inform us, and we know it from the personal experience, that a worm of suspicion erodes relations between the teachers. The teachers working together within the same school and within the same community should live together in brotherhood and harmony - like priests in the temples of education and like national intelligentsia; instead, in most of the cases, they slaughter each other like yellow crazy ants, complaining against each other, conspiring low intrigues to destroy each other; in one word, they are

Митрополит Никифор се не понаша као пастир, већ као зли ђаво народа. У Пећи је намесник митрополита поп Обрад заступао Арнауте зликовце пред турским властима. Пећанци га више не позивају к себи. У Баковцу Срби одавно нису у добрим односима с свештеником. Ипак, Никифор се не осврће на то. У Призрену не признаје општину и не бави се народним пословима. Призренци су ме више пута молили да их заштитим од таквог митрополита. Треба Србији отворити очи о њеној политици овде. Натерати је да не митингује, већ да ради у корист своју и народау сагласности с народом и нашом подршком.“, Jaroslav Valerijanovič Višnjiakov, “Македонски покрет...”, 19.

¹⁹⁸ “У приштинском, новопазарском и пећком санцаку по селима нема никога. Осим тога, парох дође, сврши обреде, добије његово па оде. И то тако непрестано бива. Ми пак замишљамо, да задатак правога свештеника Србина није само да сврши обред, да се наплати и да иде – не! Ми замишљамо, и то као нераздвојно са свештениковом службом, да свештеник треба да стане, па да укућанима и њиховим гостима да који зрео савет о вери, о грађанским врлинама и томе слично, а осим тога да их упозна са новостима из пољопривреде. Ми што доносимо чланчиће о пољопривреди, не доносимо их за грађанство, кога се они ништа не тичу. Ми их доносимо за сељаке: а пошто су они неписмени – то је нама добро познато тамо – рачунали смо и рачунамо на свештенике и на учитеље, али нарочито на свештенике, јер они други не могу да допру донде докле могу свештеници.“, “Свештеницима” (To the priests), CG, No. 7, 1897, 1.

disgracing their holy educational mission, as well as their positions as national workers.¹⁹⁹

Along with the (dis)organized Serbian propaganda, the results concerning the spread of Serbian nationhood were equally ineffective on the ground. However, this was not something associated strictly with Serbian activities because even the more elaborate and aggressive Bulgarian propaganda which employed guerrilla activities and coercion faced the same problem. In fact, Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian elites had to apply many tools, including coercion in order to create a sense of nationhood among the local Christian population in Macedonia. Jovan Jovanović-Pižon, who was in charge of the consular affairs in the Ottoman Empire asserted that Serbia should support the Slavic local population, be sensitive to their needs and not be violent, but rather full of appreciation. Only through this would the “amorphous and nationally hermaphrodite mass start to have trust in national workers who represent Serbian national thought there. Only in areas where we have devoted and skillful national workers, will our national cause developed.”²⁰⁰ According to Jovanović-Pižon, it was natural to assume that they were the ones who were most interested in educating and spreading “Serbian national thought” in Ottoman Macedonia. None-the-less, unlike Nikodim Savić who was the first owner and undoubtedly felt like a Serb, the other two owners exhibited more fluid understandings of nationhood, which was characteristic for the Slavic population of Ottoman Macedonians.

¹⁹⁹ “Морамо да на првоме месту истакнемо немилу чињеницу, како нам из неких места из унутрашњости јављају, а и сами из сопственог искуства знамо да црв неслоге подгриза у неколико наше учитељство. У месту да учитељи који служе у једној школи, у једном месту, живе братски и другарски, како би доликовало њима, као свештеницима у храмовима просвете, као народној интелигенцији, они се, у већини случајева кољу као жути мрави, негодују један против другог, прибјегавају ниским интригама, да би један другог скрхали, једном речју, раде онако како је зазорно и за њихов свети положај наставнички, и за особни позив и положај њихов као народних васпитача.”, “Искрена реч” (Honest word), CG, No. 26, 1897, 1.

²⁰⁰ “аморфна и у погледу националних осећања хермафродитска маса становништва почне с поверењем гледати на људе, који у тим странама представљају српску народну мисао. У којим смо крајевима имали раднике вештије и послу преданије, тамо је наша народна ствар и напредовала.”, Ristović, “Реферат Јована Јовановића о односу Србије...”, 366.

Both Kosta Grupčević and Temko Popović were born in Ohrid and represented Ottoman Macedonian upper-middle class intellectuals who were educated in Greek schools. According to Lory's assertion that school teachers were professional propagandists in the service of the Balkan states and in charge of spreading national ideologies,²⁰¹ it is quite surprising that Greek education did not manage to infuse in Grupčević and Popović the feeling of *Greekness*; for Kitromilides that is to say "a voluntary identification [that] had to be instilled and cultivated through a crusade of national education."²⁰² Instead, Greek education developed a vague feeling of *Macedonianess* which Marinov identifies as supra-national identity "intended to bring together - under the common denominator of 'Macedonian people' - members of different ethnic, confessional and national groups."²⁰³ In other words, *Macedonianess* is direct consequence, or better to say, construct of the competing Balkan ideologies. Marinov provides few examples on how this *Macedonianess* was exhibited; nevertheless, from all these examples the conclusion is the same - it is not quite clear what *Macedonianess* means because all the Macedonian intellectuals defined it and expressed it in a different way, including Grupčević and Popović.

According to Marinov, "there are historical personalities from late Ottoman Macedonia whose identity largely 'floated' between the Serbian and the Bulgarian national option",²⁰⁴ and between them appeared the third Macedonian option which was used by Serbian diplomatic circles as "a possible counterweight to Bulgarian influence in Macedonia."²⁰⁵ Stojan Novaković concretely assumed it would be much better to use the already present vague sense of *Macedonianess*, and turn, harness and mold it to Serbian advantage in contrast to imposing

²⁰¹ Lory, "Schools for the destruction...", 53.

²⁰² Kitromilides, "'Imagined Communities' and...", 169.

²⁰³ Tchavdar Marinov, "We, the Macedonians: The Paths of Supra-Nationalism (1878-1912)", *We, the People: Politics of National Peculiarity in Southeastern Europe* (D. Mishkova, ed.), Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009, 111.

²⁰⁴ Marinov, "Famous Macedonia...", 315.

²⁰⁵ Ibid, 317.

Serbian nationhood directly upon Macedonians.²⁰⁶ This was obviously the case with the two owners of *Carigradski glasnik* who from received Greek education and vague sense of *Macedonianess* turned to Serbian nationhood.

When precisely Grupčević and Popović came into contact with Serbian diplomatic circles or an official Serbian “state”-agenda is unknown. The first trace of their pro-Serbian activities dated from 1886 when both of them, along with Naum Evro and Vasil Karajovov, established the anti-Bulgarian secret Macedonian Committee in Sofia. Probably around this time they came in contact with Serbian circles because they moved to Belgrade as soon as Bulgarians discovered their activities.²⁰⁷ In 1887 Grupčević and Novaković were trying to publish a paper *Македонски глас* (Makedonski glas) in Istanbul in a Macedonian dialect but they never got permission to do so. However, they clearly expressed their intention to start a paper in Istanbul that would promote Serbian interests.²⁰⁸ The fact that this paper, the harbinger of *Carigradski glasnik*, was meant to be published in the Macedonian (probably Ohrid) dialect confirms that Novaković intended to gradually bring that dialect closer to the Serbian language. Although this paper was never published, we can trace this idea in the work of Temko Popović who in 1887 published the anti-Bulgarian pamphlet on Macedonian dialect and Serbian orthography.²⁰⁹ When did Grupčević and Popović, along with Novaković, abandoned this idea remains unknown, but what is certain is that in 1888 Popović sent a letter to Despot Badžović in which he stated that,

...the national spirit in Macedonia has attained such a state that Jesus Christ himself, if he were to descend from heaven, could not convince a Macedonian that he is a Bulgarian or a

²⁰⁶ Ibid, 315-317.

²⁰⁷ Victor A. Friedman, “The Modern Macedonian Standard Language and its Relation to Modern Macedonian Identity”, *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics* (Victor Roudometof, ed.), New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, 185.

²⁰⁸ AS, SN, 128, Letter from Novaković to Ristić, 1887.

²⁰⁹ Marinov, “Famous Macedonia...”, 318.

Serb, except for those Macedonians in whom Bulgarian propaganda has already taken root.²¹⁰

However, ten years later Grupčević and he were involved with *Carigradski glasnik*, the paper which was published in standard Serbian and which clearly advocated Serbian ideas. Obviously their *Macedonianess* turned into *Serbiness* which demonstrated that fluid nationhood was not something reserved for illiterate peasants in the Ottoman Macedonia but even urban intellectuals acting as Serbian national workers.

This is one of the many examples that recent historiography draws on Macedonia, always with the same conclusions that Macedonians had no sense of nationhood but rather expressed blurred and fluid identities that were, as Marinov showed, shaped and created under the influence of the Balkan ideologies. However, expressing multiple national identities does not necessarily mean that these persons were a-national simply because they did not represent “the existence of some ‘genuine’ or ‘proper sense of national identity’ that all the members of a certain well-bound collectivity or ‘group’ are equally, absolutely and constantly aware of.”²¹¹ In Brubaker’s fashion we can rather say that they exhibited nationhood as a form of practice that changes and adapts to different circumstances. In this sense Grupčević and Popović did not represent a-national blur and fluid character as studies on Macedonia suggest; but rather they represented nationhood as different form of practice. Thus, their nationhood was not fixed, but it was also not a-national or fluid; rather, it was response to the interplay of different factors depending on the current Macedonian context.²¹² In other words, “these elites formed a kind of ‘middle class’ which adopted discourses and strategies linked to changes in

²¹⁰ Temko Popov -letter, <http://documents-mk.blogspot.hu/2011/01/temko-popov-letter.html>. Last accessed May 17th, 2014.

²¹¹ Marinov, “We, the Macedonians...”, 108.

²¹² Ibid, 129.

their political and social positioning, as well as to their search for power or their efforts to remain in power.”²¹³

Grupčević and Popović’s case brings us to the problem of the appropriation of nationhood. Namely, how nationhood tends to be researched from above i.e. how Balkan states imposed it on the local population, and the how local population showed a fluid and a-national sense of nationhood. Even when scholars are investigating this appropriated nationhood on the ground, they approach to the problem from an “imperial” perspective. That is, defining nationhood as fixed substantial entity envisioned by state elites and like it was presented in Carigradski glasnik, and not as a discourse prone to change. Jovanović-Pižon noted well that the Macedonian question and the implementation of nationhood could not be solved through religion or education because populations were looking for alternatives which would solve their everyday problems.²¹⁴ As Basil Gounaris has shown on the Patriarchate-Exarchate race for the local Christian population, the battle for new members was not based on religious rhetoric but rather on the personal, economic or simply pragmatic concerns local peasants thought would fulfil their immediate interests.²¹⁵ Lory also stresses that the local inhabitants in Macedonia “gave free rein to the propaganda programs that they considered advantageous to them, in that provided free education. We are struck by the very short term vision with which educational issues were treated. Only the families of major merchants had any genuine educational strategies for their offspring. Trades people, who were more numerous in Bitola, were very vulnerable to economic fluctuations and to life’s misfortunes such as illness, deaths, or fires.”²¹⁶

²¹³ Hannes Grandits et al., “Introduction”, *Conflicting Loyalties...*, 10-11.

²¹⁴ Ristović, “Реферат Јована Јовановића о односу Србије...”, 345.

²¹⁵ Gounaris, “Social Cleavages...”, 5-7.

²¹⁶ Lory, “Schools for the destruction...”, 54.

In other words, mainly pragmatic and not idealistic factors determined nationhood. Branislav Nušić, the vice-consul in Bitola in 1892, vividly described what Greek, Bulgarian, and Serbian propaganda yielded among the local population of one entirely Slavic-speaking village:

The church is Greek, the school is Exarchal, two priests are “Serbomans”²¹⁷... In the house of Vandel - the priest - Serbian books are hidden in a basement; periodicals from Sofia are on the table; one son is a student in Belgrade; the second son is Exarchal teacher in Skopje; the third son is a former student of the Austrian Catholic mission; and two children are attending Exarchal elementary school. Priest Vandel holds in his house even a han.²¹⁸

Nevertheless, we should not make generalizations by saying that the entire Macedonian population expressed multiple identities and was pragmatic regarding nationhood. Although it is difficult to discuss how *Carigradski glasnik* was appropriated on the ground and how it was accepted among the local population as opposed to professional propagandists like priests or teachers, we still can assume that it created “imagined community” by allocating the people around shared characteristics which *Carigradski glasnik* described as the features of Serbian nationhood (see page 81). As Jon Fox and Cynthia Miller-Idriss stated, “nationhood is also implicated in the choices people make. People ‘choose’ the nation when the universe of options is defined in national terms. Reading a nationalist newspaper or sending one’s child to a minority language school can thus be defined and experienced as national choices.”²¹⁹

²¹⁷ *Serboman* is a pejorative term used by Bulgarians for Slavic-speaking person in (Ottoman) Macedonia who claim to be of Serbian ethnicity, who supports Serbian national ideas or simply refuses Bulgarian national ideas.

²¹⁸ “Црква је грчка, школа егзархијска, два свештеника су “Србомани”...У кући свештеника – поп Ванђела – српске књиге скривене у подруму, софијске новине на столу, један син питомац српски у Београду, други егзархијски учитељ у Скопју, трећи бивши питомац аустријске католичке мисије, а два детета посећују егзархијску основну школу. Поп-Ванђел држи у својој кући и хан”, Slavenko Terzić, “Конзулат Кралјевине Србије...”, 338-39.

²¹⁹ Jon E. Fox and Cynthia Miller-Idriss, “Everyday nationhood”, *Ethnicities*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 2008, 542

Conclusion

Although Serbia engaged in the battle for Macedonia only in 1885, approximately ten years later it managed to achieve its main goals: opening Serbian consulates, promoting Serbian priests into higher ecclesiastical positions, opening schools and Serbian societies in Ottoman Macedonia, and finally establishing a Serbian paper that would propagate Serbian interests in the region within the limits of Ottoman press regulations. This indeed seems impressive on the paper, but as we saw in this chapter, the situation on the ground was far too unwieldy for these strategies to work effectively. The Serbian state spent a considerable budget on a rather disorganized propaganda campaign, national workers often did not work in a professional or coordinated manner, consulates were unaware of each other's activities despite a rather close distance between them, and a great gap between Serbian national workers and local population was not bridged well.

It seems that in these circumstances only *Carigradski glasnik* diligently completed its mission. However, because of Ottoman press regulations it was forced to present a euphemized reality that local readers simply did not buy into. In spite of these facts, this paper managed to bring its readers – Serbian national workers, educated and the illiterate population to whom *Carigradski glasnik* was read - together, focusing on topics that, according to this paper, constituted Serbian nationhood – language, celebrations, folk songs and customs. In this sense *Carigradski glasnik* certainly propagated Serbian nationhood in a way how Serbian elites and intelligentsia envisioned it.

As we saw, it was a “war of statistics”, as Gounaris has called it, where quantity was much more important than quality. This was a reason why certain Serbian diplomatic circles were terrified of solving the *niifüs question*. The urban intelligentsia from the region sometimes displayed multiple and shifting loyalties despite the efforts of the schools they attended. The

case of Kosta Grupčević and Temko Popović illustrates this well. Although they attended Greek schools they did not become hellenized Macedonians at best, they gradually became (Macedonian) Serbs. On the other hand, the illiterate rural population did not have time to contemplate nationhood. Only coercion or pragmatic interests yielded the results. However, what kind of results this was, best illustrates the above quotation of Branislav Nušić. Namely, only in one family three seemingly different propaganda came together. It was an entangled Balkans indeed.

Conclusion

In this thesis I investigated *Carigradski glasnik*, an Istanbul-based periodical operated by Ottoman Serbs, as a direct product of Serbian diplomatic circles in Istanbul which was created to promote Serbian nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia. Furthermore, I argued that these diplomatic circles, the leaders of the Serbian state's irredentist action in Ottoman Macedonia, acted within Ottoman sovereignty. Namely, it was in Serbia's interests to keep the territory it claimed in Ottoman Macedonia within Ottoman borders because Serbia was not powerful enough to perform aggressive politics in the region.

From the 1870s, after the establishment of the Bulgarian Exarchate, the struggle for Ottoman Macedonia intensified. Bulgaria and Greece emerged as the most serious pretenders who, parallel with Ottoman Macedonia where they promoted Bulgarian and Greek nationhood, led the nation-building process within its own borders. Each of these countries tried to legitimate their claims in Ottoman Macedonia by asserting the region as their national territory, inhabited by people of their nationhood. Nevertheless, the Berlin Congress in 1878 put the Greek-Bulgarian struggle into question because some decisions made at this Congress affected the situation in Ottoman Macedonia. Namely, beside the fact that Ottoman Macedonia became an international problem and region that needed to be reformed; Serbia, after the loss of Bosnia and Herzegovina, also decided to build its position there.

As the Serbian state was a latecomer, it had to elaborate a plan and program that would establish its firm position in order to claim northern Macedonia. A few years after the Berlin Congress, Serbian elaboration was still in the progress, although Bulgaria and Greece did not waste their time. San Stefano Bulgaria became the final goal of Bulgarian irredentist action, and the first step was annexation of Eastern Rumelia in 1885. For Serbia, this annexation meant one step closer to the annexation of Ottoman Macedonia and hence, this led the two

countries into war. The defeat that Serbia experienced was so humiliating that it was forced to realize that its position and power was so weak in the region that it could not resist Bulgarian claims in northern Macedonia alone, it needed an ally.

Rather paradoxically, this ally was the Ottoman Empire and to a lesser extent Greece, whose sphere of interests did not include northern Macedonia. Although the Ottoman Empire was aware of Serbian irredentist claims to the region, it was also aware that the Serbian position in the region was so weak that its irredentist claims in the current constellation of power could not be realized. Thus, Serbia and the Ottomans decided to collaborate against Bulgaria which was seen by both as the most dangerous and aggressive player in Ottoman Macedonia. Hence, while on the one hand the Ottomans allowed Serbia to build its position in the region and promote Serbian nationhood up to a point which could be tolerated, on the other hand the Ottomans used Serbia against Bulgarian and Greek actions in Ottoman Macedonia.

In this context, the earliest Serbian actions were performed within Ottoman sovereignty and laws. In a rather short period of time Serbia managed to engage in educational and religious competition with Bulgarians and Greeks, as education and religion were seen as the most suitable means for imposing nationhood onto the local population. Aside from schools and churches, the other means of accomplishing this was periodicals. As Lory asserted, “periodicals once introduced, started to be means of mass communication, providing information to readers and basically bringing the population together.”²²⁰ In other words, periodicals were a perfect means for disseminating nationhood, and for this purpose Serbian diplomatic circles founded *Carigradski glasnik*. This periodical was created to promote Serbian nationhood through direct and “banal” nationalism in order to define and emphasize the difference between Serbs and others, and to legitimize and foster the Serbian position in

²²⁰ Lory, “Schools for the destruction...”, 52.

the region. Nevertheless, because *Carigradski glasnik* operated within Ottoman sovereignty and press regulations, it was also forced to promote Ottoman interests and bolster the image of the Sultan. Serbian nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia was promoted always within the Ottoman, and not the Serbian state. Hence, *Carigradski glasnik* could not advocate Serbian irredentist claims, but it could contribute to the creation of the Serbian nation in the region.

This was how state elites envisioned Serbian nationhood being imposed from above in these specific circumstances, but as Fox and Miller-Idriss note, “people reproduce nationhood not according to elite designs but according to their daily lives.”²²¹ In other words, even if *Carigradski glasnik* reproduced nationhood as it was envisioned within Serbian circles and the intelligentsia connected to them, this does not mean that it was appropriated as such. Namely, how can we be sure that the readers of *Carigradski glasnik* envisioned themselves as part of the Serbian “imagined community” and that even more, the direct and “banal” nationalism which promoted Serbian nationhood affected them? How can we be sure that nationhood that was defined on the pages of this periodical corresponded to the national ideas of the local population?

These are some of the questions that are raised in the last chapter. Although the first chapters summarized above are important because they provide information on how the Ottomans planned to bolster the state image through the periodicals; or how Serbian intelligentsia and diplomats defined nationhood and through which means they planned to impose it “below”; this nevertheless does not say anything about how this Ottoman image or Serbian nationhood was appropriated and understood among the local population. For this reason, the recent works of Rogers Brubaker are important because Brubaker does not just challenge this notion of nationhood imposed from above, but nationhood itself.

²²¹ Fox and Miller-Idriss, “Everyday nationhood”, 553.

In short, he asserts that nationhood is not a substantial entity but a rather a form of practice. This means that universal nationhood does not exist, but only nationhood that was differently created, promoted, and understood among different groups. So nationhood that was created within state elites does not have to correspond to the understanding of nationhood among the intelligentsia or rural population. Following this reasoning, Marinov effectively notes that the a-national and fluid Macedonian nationhood which has become a repetitive repertoire among recent scholarship does not imply that Macedonians were indeed a-national and that nationhood had to be imposed on them by coercion. Rather Macedonian local perception on nationhood differed from strict and fixed nationhood created within the Balkan state elites. In this context, the Balkan states did not try to impose nationhood on a-national population, but rather they tried to replace local perceptions of nationhood with fixed and strict state nationhood. At first Balkan propagandists did so through religion and education, and when that failed, through coercion.

Thus, I argue that Serbian diplomatic circles along with *Carigradski glasnik* created and promoted a well-defined and fixed Serbian nationhood which differed from Greek or Bulgarian nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia. However, on the ground the situation was different and I used the examples of two owners of *Carigradski glasnik* to show that nationhood was conceptualized and developed differently even among local intelligentsia which were employed like professional propagandists. Kosta Grupčević and Temko Popović at first exhibited Macedonian nationhood, which Marinov describes as mini-*Ottomanism*. Gradually this supra-national *Macedonianess* developed into the state-created Serbian nationhood which was expressed on the pages of *Carigradski glasnik*. However, this fluidity does not mean that Grupčević and Popović were a-national but rather, as Brubaker asserts, they exhibited nationhood as changeable forms of practice.

At the end, I would like to make two points. First, it is interesting that in the revisionist scholarship on Ottoman Macedonia almost all scholars without exception point to Ottoman Macedonia as a perfect example of fluid and a-national identities, while on the other hand they do not take into consideration that Ottoman Macedonia was not an exception in the Balkans. As Marinov stated, Balkan state elites' had the same problems with appropriating fixed nationhood within their own national territories. Yet somehow, scholars assume that the Serbian or Bulgarian local population was more "national" than the local population living in Ottoman Macedonia.

Second, the problems regarding the imposition of the fixed and stable nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia did not finish with the Balkan wars in 1913, but it rather continued to the present day. This is especially visible in FYR Macedonia whose elites embarked on the process of antiquization in order to prove that Macedonian nationhood as a stable and fixed entity existed from the time of Philip II and Alexander the Great. Interestingly enough, these elites use the same tools that almost one hundred years ago Greece employed in Ottoman Macedonia to convince local population in their Greek nationhood.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Arhiv Srbije (AS)

AS, SN, 128, Letter from Novaković to Ristić, 1887.

AS, SN, 1285, Letter of Kosta Grupčević to Stojan Novaković, 1902.

Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi (BOA)

BOA, DH.MKT 316-38 5, Letter of Nikodim Savić to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1893.

BOA, İ.DH 1374-19 2, Letter of Kosta Grupčević to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, 1898.

Carigradski glasnik

- “Цариградске вести, Свети Сава” (News from Istanbul, Saint Sava). No. 2, 1895.
- “Напомена” (Notification). No. 3, 1895.
- “Васељенска Патријаршија” (The Ecumenical patriarchate). No. 26, 1895.
- “19 Август” (August 19). No. 31, 1895.
- “Срби и Васељенска патријаршија” (Serbs and the Ecumenical Patriarchate),. No. 43, 1895.
- “Проглас” (Proclamation). No. 49, 1895.
- “Слава” (Slava). No. 50, 1895.
- “Архипастирска посланица” (Archbishop’s epistle). No. 9, 1896.
- ”Заснивање фондова за сиротне ученике” (Establishing a funds for students in need). No. 10, 1896.
- “Босански 'Турски учитељ ’” (Bosnian 'Turkish teacher'). No. 21, 1896.
- “Српске школе у Турској” (Serbian Schools in Turkey). No. 28, 1896.
- “Јермени” (Armenians). No. 35, 1896.
- “Свештеници” (To the priests). No. 7, 1897.
- “Наши дописи, Велес” (Our Correspondences, Veles). No. 22, 1897.

- “Искрена реч” (Honest word). No. 26, 1897.
- “Пред школским пратом” (In front of school doors). No. 33, 1897.
- “Реч у своје време” (The word in its own time). No. 2, 1898.
- “Утувимо” (Let’s remember). No. 38, 1898.
- “Леп пример” (Nice example). No. 6, 1899.
- “7. Децембра” (December 7). No. 50, 1899.
- “Напомена” (Announcement). No.1, 1901.
- “Двор и јавни послови у Србији” (The court and public affairs in Serbia). No. 24, 1903.
- “19. август 1903. године” (August 19, 1903). No. 34, 1903.
- “Мисли у очи светосавског славља” (The thoughts around Saint Sava’s celebration). No. 2, 1904.
- “Селамлик” (Friday Prayer). No. 29, 1905.
- “19. Август” (August 19). No. 34, 1905.
- “Наши дописи, Хилендар” (Our Correspondence). No. 34, 1906.
- “Ожењеним учитељима” (To married teachers). No. 1, 1908.
- “Српска наредност после устава” (Serbian nationhood after the constitution). No. 31, 1908.
- “19 Август” (August 19). No. 34, 1908.
- “Неправда спрема Срба у турској” (Injustice towards Serbs in Turkey). No. 50, 1908.
- “Јесу ли Македонски Словени Срби или Бугари?” (Are Slavic Macedonians Serbs or Bulgarians?). No. 52, 1908.
- “Наши дописи” (Our Correspondence). No. 52, 1908.
- “Настрај на српске манастире” (Attack on Serbian monasteries). No. 7, 1909.
- “Српска голгота” (Serbian Golgotha). No. 13, 1909.
- “Велики догађаји у Царевини” (Great events in the Empire). No. 14, 1909.

- “Хоћемо праву слободну и потпуну једнакост!” (We want real freedom and complete equality!). No. 18, 1909.
- “Промена на престољу” (Alteration on the throne). No. 16, 1909.
- “Цариградски гласник престаје излазити” (*Carigradski glasnik* stops being published). No. 42, 1909.

Jagodić, Miloš. “Извештај Бранислава Нушића о путовању из Приштине у Скадар 1894. године” (Report of Branislav Nušić on journey from Pristina to Skadar in 1894). *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 31, 2010, pp. 259-288

Ristović, Aleksandar. “Реферат Јована Јовановића о односу Србије према реформској акцији у Солунском, Битољском и Косовском вилајету” (Jovan Jovanović's Expert Opinion on the Position of Serbia Regarding the Reform Action in the Vilayets of Salonika, Bitola and Kosovo) *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 31, 2010, pp. 325-386.

Temko Popov -letter, <http://documents-mk.blogspot.hu/2011/01/temko-popov-letter.html>. Last accessed May 17th, 2014.

Vučetić, Biljana. “Извештаји обавештајца диполмати. Писма Богдана Раденковића Милану Ракићу (1907-1912)” (Report of an Intelligencer to a Diplomat. Letters of Bogdan Radenković to Milan Rakić (1907-1912) *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 29, 2008, pp. 153-169.

Vučetić, Biljana. “Писма из Цариграда Михаило Г. Ристић – Светиславу Симићу (1894)” (Letters from Constantinople Mihailo G. Ristić eto Svetislav Simić (1894). *Мешовита грађа*, Vol. 33, 2012, pp. 337-348.

Secondary literature

Alter, Peter T. “Nineteenth-Century Serbian Popular Religion: The *Millet* System and Syncretism.” *Serbian Studies*, Vol. 9, 1995, pp. 88-103.

Borovaya, Olga. *Modern Ladino Culture*. Bloomington-Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Boyar, Ebru. “The Press and the Palace: the Two-Way Relationship between Abdülhamid II and the Press, 1876-1908.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 69, No. 3, 2006, pp. 417-432.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism Reframed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Brummett, Palmira. *Image and Imperialism in the Ottoman Revolutionary Press, 1908-1911*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Bürki, Yvette. "The Ottoman Press at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century Through the Salonica Newspapers *La Epoca* and *El Avenir*." *European Judaism*, Vol. 43, No. 2, 2010, pp. 102-116.

Clayer, Nathalie. "The Dimension of Confessionalisation in the Ottoman Balkans at the Time of Nationalisms", *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans*, edited by Hannes Grandits, Nathalie Clayer, and Robert Pichler. London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011, pp. 89-109.

Connell, John. "The *Fiji Times* and the Good Citizen: Constructing Modernity and Nationhood in Fiji." *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2007, pp. 85-109.

Cvetanović, Vladimir. "Никодим Савић" (Nikodim Savić). *Девет приповедача Косова и Метохје*, Belgrade: Književna zajednice Zvezdara, 1992.

Çakır, Hamza. *Osmanlıda Basın-İktidar İlişkileri (Ottoman Press-Government Relationship)*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 2002

Čolić, Ljiljana. "‘Цариградски гласник’ национални и просветни путоводитељ Косметских Срба" ('Carigradski glasnik' National and educational leader of the Kosmet Serbs). *Косово и Метохја*. Vol. 5, 2010.

Demirel, Fatmagül. *II. Abdülhamid Döneminde Sansür (Censorship during the Period of Abdülhamid)*. Istanbul: Bağlam, 2007.

Deringil, Selim. *Well-Protected Domains*. London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 1998.

Doğaner, Yasemin. "Hürriyet ve Modernleşme Enstümanı Olarak Osmanlı'da Basın" (The Press in the Ottoman Empire as an Instrument of Freedom and Modernization). *Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol. 29, No.1, 2012, pp. 109-121.

Enciklopedija Jugoslavije (Encyclopedia of Yugoslavia), Vol. 6. Beograd: Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod, 1965.

Foote, Paul. *Censorship Practice in Russia: Circulars of the Directorate of Censorship 1865-1904*. http://web.princeton.edu/sites/english/csbm/papers/censorship/censorship_russia.pdf. Last accessed May 21, 2014.

Fox, Jon E and Miller-Idriss, Cynthia. "Everyday nationhood." *Ethnicities*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 2008, pp. 536-563.

Gounaris, Basil C. 'Social Cleavages and National 'Awakening' in Ottoman Macedonia.'" *East European Quarterly*, 1994, pp. 409-427.

Friedman, Victor A. "The Modern Macedonian Standard Language and its Relation to Modern Macedonian Identity." *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*, edited by Victor Roudometof. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, pp. 173-201.

Göçek, Fatma Müge. "What is the Meaning of the 1908 Young Turk Revolution?." *Istanbul University Political Science Faculty Journal XXXVIII*, 2008, pp. 179-214.

Grandits, Hannes, Clayer, Nathalie, Pichler, Robert. Introduction to *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans*. London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011, pp. 1-13.

Guha, Sumit. "The Politics of Identity and Enumeration in India c. 1600-1990." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2003, pp. 148-167.

Jagodić, Miloš. "Нуфуско питање: проблем званичног признавања српске нације у Турској, 1894-1910" (Nüfus Question: Problem of official recognition of the Serbian nation in Turkey, 1894-1910). *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 57, 2008, pp. 343-54.

Jagodić, Miloš. "Планови о Политици Србије према Старој Србији и Македонији (1878-1885)" (Plans on Serbian Policy Towards Old Serbia and Macedonia (1878-1885)). *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 60, 2011, pp. 435-460.

Jovanović, Aleksa. "Споменица двадесетпетогодишњице ослобођења јужне Србије" (Memorial on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the liberation of the South Serbia). Skorje, 1937.

Kayalı, Hasan. *Arabs and Young Turks*. Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M. "'Imagined Communities' and the Origins of the national Question in the Balkans." *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 19, 1989, pp. 149-192.

Kömeçoğlu, Uğur. *Historical and Sociological Approach to Public Space: The Case of Islamic Coffeehouses in Turkey*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Boğaziçi University: Institute of Social Sciences, 2001.

Köse, Aynur and Yılmaz, Mustafa. "Flagging Turkishness: the reproduction of banal nationalism in the Turkish press." *Nationalities Papers*, Vol. 40, No. 6, 2012, pp. 909-925.

Kramer, Lloyd "Historical Narratives and the Meaning of Nationalism." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 58, no. 3, 1997, pp. 525-545.

Leustean, Lucian N. "Orthodoxy and political myths in Balkan national identities." *National Identities*, Vol.10, No.4, 2008, pp. 421-432.

Lory, Bernard. "Schools for the Destruction of Society: School Propaganda in Bitola 1860-1912", *Conflicting Loyalties in the Balkans*, edited by Hannes Grandits, Nathalie Clayer, and Robert Pichler. London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011, pp. 46-63.

Македонска Енциклопедија (Macedonian Encyclopedia). Skorje: MANU, 2009

Marinov, Tchavdar. "Famous Macedonia, the Land of Alexander: Macedonian Identity at the Crossroads of Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian Nationalism", *Entangled Histories of the Balkans*, edited by Roumen Daskalov, and Tchavdar Marinov, Vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, 2013, pp. 273-333.

Marinov, Tchavdar. "We, the Macedonians: The Paths of Supra-Nationalism (1878-1912)." *We, the People: Politics of National Peculiarity in Southeastern Europe*, edited by Diana Mishkova. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2009, pp. 107-138.

Mitropan, Petar. "Цариградски гласник" (Carigradski glasnik), *Јужни преглед*, Vol. 5, 1928.

Mitropan, Petar. *Први интелектуалци на југу* (First Intellectuals to the South). Skopje: Južna Srbija, 1936.

Somel, Selçuk. *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839-1908*, Leiden-Boston-Koln: Brill, 2001.

Stojanović Novičić, Dragana. *Napisi o muzici u Carigradskom glasniku* (Articles about Music in Carigradski glasnik). <http://www.riznicasrpska.net/muzika/index.php?topic=629.0>. Last accessed: May 30, 2014.

Strauss, Johann. "Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th-20th centuries)?" *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2003, pp. 39-76.

Terzić, Slavenko. "Конзулат Краљевине Србије у битолју (1889-1897)" (Consulate of Kingdom of Serbia in Bitola (1889-1897)). *Историјски часопис*, Vol. 57, 2008, pp. 327-342.

Virijević, Vladan. "'Цариградски гласник' о Новом Пазару и околици крајем 19. и почетком 20. века." ('Carigradski glasnik' on Novi Pazar and surroundings at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century). *Новопазарски зборник*, Vol. 33, 2010, pp. 111-23.

Višnjakov, Jaroslav Valerijanovič. "Македонски покрет и преврат у Србији 29. маја 1903" (The Macedonian Movement and the Upheaval of May 29, 1903 in Serbia). *Tokovi istorije*, Vol. 3, 2010, pp. 6-22.

Zarković, Vesna. "Извештај Богдана Раденковића о боравку Виктора Машкова у Косовској Митровици, Ибарском Колашину и Новом Пазару 1901. године" (The Report of Bogdan Radenković on the Visitation of Viktor Maškov in Kosovska Mitrovica, Ibarski Kolašin and Novi Pazar in 1901). *Мешовита грађ*, Vol. 33, 2012, 365-385.

Yosmaoğlu, İpek K. *Blood Ties: Religion, Violence, and the Politics of Nationhood in Ottoman Macedonia, 1878-1908*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Yosmaoğlu, İpek K. "Chasing the Printed Word: Press Censorship in the Ottoman Empire, 1876-1913." *The Turkish Studies Association Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 1-2, 2003, pp. 15-49.