

БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ ИНСТИТУТ ЗА ИСТОРИЧЕСКИ ИЗСЛЕДВАНИЯ	
Изходящ №	дата 201 г.
Входящ № 351	дата 30.05 2012 г.
София 1113, бул. Шипчански проход № 52, бл. 17 тел.: 02/ 979 29 98 ; факс: 02/ 870 21 81	

REVIEW FOR THE
PROFESSOR'S CONTEST

Field of higher education: The Humanities

Professional field 2.2. History and Archaeology

Scientific specialty: New and newest common history (History of the Slavic peoples, XIX — XX century)

THE CANDIDATE: Assoc. Prof. DSc Teodorichka Ilieva Gotovska-Henze

REVIEWER: Prof. DSc Zhorzheta Petrova Cholakova

University of Plovdiv "Paisii Hilendarski", Faculty of Philology, Department of Slavic Studies

1. General description of the materials submitted

The announced competition for professor is for the needs of the section "History of the world and international relations in a new and recent time" at the Institute for Historical Studies — BAS. The submitted application of Assoc. e.g. Teodorichka Ilieva Gotovska-Henze meets the minimum national requirements in the scientific field 2. The humanities sciences. Even under the groups of indicators D, E and E it significantly exceeds the required minimum, including the obtained scientific degree "Doctor of Sciences", defended by the candidate in 2020 with a dissertation on "Bulgarians in the Czech-Russian Literary Exchange (30s — 1960s)".

2. General characteristic of the applicant's scientific activity

The main problem in the research of T. Gotovska-Henze is related to the Czech-Bulgarian relations in the 19th and 20th centuries and in this sense fully corresponds to the scientific speciality announced in the competition. In this procedure she participates with habilitation work, a study published in German in a scientific publication referenced and indexed in Scopus and WoS (Bulgarian Historical Review), 10 articles and 5 studies (one in co-authorship) published in unrefereed journals with scientific review or edited collective volumes.

T. Gotovska-Henze is a scientist with productive and contributing scientific activity. She is one of the few Bulgarian historians who explored the evolutionary processes of Bulgarian-

Czech relations in the 19th and 20th centuries in different fields of socio-political and cultural life, summarising what other Bulgarian scholars had done and building on their achievements with new knowledge from the positions of historical science.

The habilitation work is the second chapter of the collective *monograph Sounáležitostí a soudržností k vzájemnému pozná(vá)ní. Sondy do kulturních vztahů mezi Čechy a Bulhary do vzniku CSR*, issued in 2021 by the Slavic Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences (ISBN 978-80-86420-66-0). (Several technical errors were made in formulating the title: *sounáležnost* instead of *sounáležitost* (“kinship”, “community”, “unity”) and the Bulgarian translation of the title proposed by the author — *with empathy for mutual knowledge. Probes in cultural relations between Czechs and Bulgarians until the establishment of the CSR* is not quite accurate, as it omits the word “soudržnost” meaning “solidarity” and preserves the Bulgarian sound of the Czech word “sondy”, which should be translated as “studies”, I note this fact because, unfortunately, the documentation presented gives the impression of insufficient concentration in its preparation. For example, annotations and texts were attached to only some of the published articles with which she participated in the competition; the CV is incomplete because it lacks information on the Doctor of Science degree, etc. Here are a few examples of inconsistencies:

A) Annotation and a copy of the study “Paul Joseph Schafarik and his relations with Croats and Bulgarians (30s-60s of the 19th century)” is attached, but this title does not appear in the table with scientific indicators.

B) The article “From their own to strangers”: touches on Czech-Bulgarian relations at the beginning of World War I (1914-1915)” is listed only in the table, but is missing both as a text and as an annotation.

C) Section D7 “Articles and reports published in unrefereed journals with scientific review or published in edited collective volumes” lists a total of 10 articles, but only 4 of them have been appended by annotations.

D) There is also no annotation for *Zwei Konzeptionen über die ursprüngliche Modernisierung des Schulwesens der untergebenen Völker in der Habsburgermonarchie und im Osmanischen Reich in 18. Und 19. Jahrhundert*”, presenting section D8 “Studies published in scientific journals referenced and indexed in world-famous scientific information databases”

E) In section D9 “Studies published in unreviewed journals with scientific review or published in edited collective volumes” there are 5 titles, but only 2 of them are annotated (one is co-authored).

The gaps and inconsistencies noted are of a technical nature. The attached copies of the publications described show their actual availability.

The habilitation work with which Assoc. Prof. Gotovska-Henze participated in the competition for professor, is an independent part of the above monograph. Of the total volume of the book edition, amounting to 766 pages, the author’s text of T. Gotovska-Henze- *Česko-bulharská spolupráce v oblasti vzdělávání a politiky (Czech-Bulgarian cooperation in education and politics)* is located on 126 pages (from 423 to 548). Given that this is a habilitational work for a professorship, it cannot help but impress with its relatively short volume.

Competently and analytically, the author outlines the Czech participation in the construction of the Bulgarian educational system, which began in the Revival. The efforts of both Czechs and Bulgarians were motivated by the cult of knowledge inherent in the pragmatic-rationalistic nature of the era, by the conviction of the utilitarian relationship between personal and social prosperity, by the conscious need to modernise the learning process, by the shared common values on which both national identity and Slavic reciprocity are built. However, the existence of similarities in the historical destiny and in some ideological attitudes presupposes that the specifics of cultural historical processes and specific educational practices should be highlighted, which the author does in the first chapter, entitled *Modernisation of Bulgarian Education in the Context of Slavic Exchange (until 1878)*. Pointing out that “the path of Bulgarians to modern education is different from that of the Czechs” (p. 427), T. Gotovska-Henze notes the fact that the first generation of Bulgarian national educators received education in neighboring Balkan countries, in particular in Greek and Serbian schools. As the author notes, Aprilov, as well as Ivan Bogorov, have the credit of informing authoritative representatives of the then Slavistics, including P. J. Šafarik and V. Hanka, about the rise of Bulgarian education, relying on the mediation of Russian Slavists. Given the complex nature of these first indirect contacts of Bulgarian intellectuals with some of the most authoritative representatives of Czech Slavicism, the author convincingly substantiates the thesis of Russian Slavicism as a “cross-border bridge”, through which the Bulgarian Revivalists came into contact with the Czech Slavic circles.

T. Gotovska-Henze examines the dynamisation of Czech-Bulgarian relations against the background of socio-political events and ideological dominants before and during the revolution of 1848, the expression of which was also the Slavic Congress held in Prague with the participation of representatives of Slavic peoples inhabiting the lands of the Habsburg Empire. The picture after the pogrom of the revolution and the subsequent repressive measures on the part of the government is compacted by observations of the contacts between Russian and Czech Slavicism and the first Bulgarian students in Czech schools. The author points out that this topic has been extensively studied in both Bulgarian and Czech Slavistics, but approaches it from the positions of a historian based on archive materials. In the exposition, however, the cited sources are published either in the periodicals or as independent books, which does not exclude the possibility that the Czech and Bulgarian archives were actually used, especially since they are mentioned on page 540.

The logic of the exhibition follows the chronology of events and proves that even in the 1950s a decisive role in the realisation of the Bulgarian-Czech contacts had once again Russian professors. For example, with the recommendation of Prof. Izmail I. Srehnevski, Konstantin Dimitrov Petkovic left for Prague, where he met Šafarik and Hanka and under their influence carried out the first Bulgarian translation of *Court Libuše's Judgment*, the main poem in the *Zelená Hora* Manuscript. With regard to both Petkovic and Todor Ikonov and Konstantin Pavlov, greater attention could be paid to their Prague period and to the impact of this factor on their future activity. It seems to me especially necessary to note the fact that it was Todor Ikonov who translated (more precisely, Bulgarianised) the Czech national anthem and taught it to his students — and this is a question whose importance stems from the main thematic emphasis of the habilitation work. Moreover, this fact has been noted by the author in a footnote to her article (the “Above-border members of the IRO — chance or precedent?”), but it could also be pointed out in her habilitation work. In this respect, the pages dedicated to Ivan Shopov, which the author presents also in view of his attitude towards the Czech education system, are highlighted. In fact, all this part of the work, entitled the *Czech movement under neo-absolutism. The appearance of the first Bulgarians in Prague* focused primarily on the contacts of Šafarik and Hanka with Bulgarians in Prague and on problems that represent the main thematic circle of research interests of T. Gotovska-Henze — both of her articles and her monograph of the *Cyrillic code*. In this sense, she builds on a material she has studied for years and which she knows very

well. The presentation is meaningful and correctly analysed, but at certain times it gives the impression of insufficient systematisation and purposefulness in view of the topic.

This applies to a certain extent to the part entitled *First Inclusion of Czech Workers in the Bulgarian Educational National Movement*, in which, however, the focus is shifted to the Czech presence in the Bulgarian educational system. Surprisingly, the story begins with Sava Dobroplodni, who is led by the ambition to get acquainted with the educational system of the Habsburg Empire and to transfer his experience to the Bulgarian school in Shumen. The expectations of the problematic emphasis stated in the title are justified by the moment when the attention was focused on Joseph Meissner (written by author Meissner) and his participation in both the modernisation of the schooling process in the Shumen school and sending a group of young people to study in Czech schools. The following exposition is dedicated to the remarkable activity of one of them — Vasil D. Stoyanov, an active mediator between the Czech and Bulgarian scientific and literary circles and a contributor to a number of Prague periodicals. The author pays due attention to the Bulgarian association in Prague “Travana” („Побратим“), the founder of which is Vasil D. Stoyanov. This moment is particularly important in view of the thematic claim of the monograph, as the aim of the association was to attract Czech teachers to go to Bulgaria in order to contribute to the development of the Bulgarian educational system. The situation in Plovdiv and Stara Zagora as main educational centers is outlined, in which towns contacts with representatives of the Czech education system took place in the 1860s and 1870s. This part presents the mediation role of some notable Bulgarians, such as Hristo G. Danov and Marin Drinov, in carrying out a mutual educational exchange. In particular, the analysis of the activity of Hr. G. Danov and his “project for comprehensive educational modernisation of the Bulgarian nation according to a European model” (p. 521).

The main part of the habilitational work, examined so far in this review and synthesised in the conclusion (p. 523-526), has the ultimate chronological boundary of the Liberation and, together with the attached excerpt of P.J. Šafarik’s speech at the Slavic Congress in Prague in 1848, constitutes an organic whole. However, there is another, much shorter, chapter (p. 529-440), which “jumps” several extremely important decades — from the Liberation to the First World War, when the participation of Czech teachers in the Bulgarian educational system was most productive. The inclusion of this aspect of the Czech-Bulgarian relations would also make a smoother transition to the last chapter of the habilitation work, as the Slavic Society established

in Bulgaria not only attracts Czech intellectual circles, but in the person of Stefan Bobchev shows an active attitude towards Russian and Czech Slavophilia. In fact, in this final part of the habilitation work of T. Gotovska-Henze, the Young-Czech *and the informal diplomatic mission of Vladimir Sis during the First World War*, the political position of Karel Kramář and St. Bobchev's reaction to his death sentence (which was revoked) is presented, but in a text suggesting that the focus should be Vladimír Sís. By this, I do not diminish the scientific value of this text, but rather draw attention to structural imbalances. The justification for the inclusion of this text I see above all in the probably deliberately unspecified chronological framework of the topic of habilitation work, which would require a diachronous follow-up of Czech-Bulgarian relations in the field of both education **and** politics. However, there are two asymmetrical parts in which these two problem circles are distinguished: the first chapter deals with Czech-Bulgarian relations in the field of education until the Liberation, and the second — one aspect of the area of political interrelations related to the position of Vladimir Sís in the process of constitution of the First Republic.

As mentioned above, T. Gotovska-Henze participated in the competition not only with her habilitation work but also with publications of scientific articles and studios attached to the documentation. In them, the focus is again mainly on Czech-Bulgarian relations, manifested in different historical periods: e.g. the Bulgarian-Czech educational transfer during the Revival, the long-standing stay of Shafarik in Novi Sad and the emergence of his interest in the history and culture of the southern Slavs, including the Bulgarians, the Prague period of Marin Drinov and his beneficial role in his formation as a scientist, the empathy of Czech settlers such as Jiří Prošek and Antonin Pelts to the National Liberation Movement, the Balkan War of 1912 and its Czech resonance. The intermediary role of Russian Slavistics in the construction and development of these relationships is represented primarily by the personality of Osip Bodyanski, but also by I. Sreznevsky, P. Preiss and V. Grigorovich. Special attention deserves the extensive study of T. Gotovska Henze, comparing the processes of modernisation of the education of the peoples under the Habsburg monarchy and the Ottoman Empire. In some cases, the research interest is entirely devoted to important moments in Czech history: e.g. on the issue of the constitution of state borders with the collapse of Austria-Hungary, the position of Vladimir Sís “as an unofficial diplomat of future Czechoslovakia”, the resonance of the political situation at the Fourth Congress of the Union of Czechoslovak Writers in 1967, the confirmed and

unconfirmed facts of Prague events in November 1989. The attached publications convincingly outline the scientific profile of Assoc. Gotovska-Henze and are an important argument for my final evaluative position.

As a member of the scientific jury, I give my positive vote for the nomination of Assoc. Prof. DSc Teodorichka Ilieva Gotovska-Henze and I propose to the scientific jury to award her the academic position “professor” in the professional field 2.2. History and archaeology in scientific specialty "New and newest general history; History of the Slavic peoples, 19th to 20th centuries.