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Abstract

This paper is dedicated to Marc-Antoine Jullien’s bicentennial work, which first appeared as a series of three articles under the main title ‘Éducation comparée’ with a subtitle ‘Esquisse et vues préliminaires d’un ouvrage sur l’éducation comparée’ published in Journal d’éducation from October 1816 to March 1817 and also published as a booklet entitled Esquisse et vues préliminaires d’un ouvrage sur l’éducation comparée in Paris in 1817.

These publications lay the foundations of systematic comparative studies of education which give ground Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris (1775-1848) to be undisputedly regarded as founding “Father of Comparative Education”. Jullien de Paris is recognized as the first to use the term comparative education (Crossley & Watson, 2009), set out a method for comparison (Epstein, 1994) and one of the very earliest exponents of systematic international inquiry in education (Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2014). It was thanks to Jullien that the science of education became comparative (Gautherin, 1993).

In this respect, the aim of this short paper is to explore how Jullien’s work and contribution is presented in Bulgarian comparative education textbooks published between 1969 and 2014. Five systematic Bulgarian comparative education textbooks have been included in the present study and the findings show that Jullien’s work and contribution appear on the pages of all of them, receive respectful attention and prove not to be long forgotten.
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Introduction

At the end of 19th and the beginning of 20th Century different lecture courses on foreign education appeared at Sofia University. The courses on ‘German Education’ and ‘English Education’ which Peter Noykov, the first Bulgarian professor in education, began to deliver during the first two decades of the 20th Century could be given as an example. Although these courses cannot be regarded as comparative education lecture courses, they laid the foundations of the future development of this university discipline in Bulgaria.

In 1925 Christo Negentzov was the first Bulgarian scholar who introduced Comparative Education as a university discipline in Bulgaria with his lecture course on ‘General Theory of School Organization’. In this lecture course he examined and compared the historical development and current state of education systems in about 20 countries. In the 1930s a collection of these lectures was published. However, information on Jullien’s deed was missing there for two reasons: a) this was a course on education systems which did not comprise the history and theory of Comparative Education; b) at that time Bulgarian comparativists were not familiar with Jullien’s work. The Esquisse (1816-1817) remained almost unknown to his contemporaries, but the interest in it arose later due to the fact that in 1885 Franz Kemeny from Hungary, while being a student in Paris, had found one copy of it and later on, in 1935, gave it to the already established International Bureau of Education.
Since 1920-1930s about ten books have been used as comparative education textbooks at Bulgarian universities. Those books can be divided into two types: 

a) textbooks focused on education systems (we can call them comparative education systems textbooks); and

b) textbooks comprising the history, theory, methodology and practice of Comparative Education (we can call them systematic comparative education textbooks).

This paper examines the second type of university textbooks, namely the systematic ones. The main role of all the textbooks has been “to serve students in university Education programs” (Popov, 2013, p. 34).

The following systematic Bulgarian comparative education textbooks, all written in Bulgarian, have been analyzed in order to find how Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work is presented on their pages:

2. Nayden Chakarov & Georgi Bishkov (1986): Comparative Pedagogy;

**Presentation of Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work**

Nayden Chakarov’s Problems of Comparative Pedagogy (1969) is “the first Bulgarian book in the field” where the author “tried to discuss in detail the basic problems of Comparative Pedagogy from a dialectical-materialistic point of view” (Popov, 2013, p. 34). The term which is used at that time is “pedagogy” to denote “education” in line with the Soviet influence.

The analysis of the textbook contents shows that the name and work of Jullien is presented in the chapter “Antecedents of Comparative Pedagogy”, which belongs to Part 1 of the book, entitled “History of Comparative Pedagogy”. Chakarov (1969) specifies two aspects of Jullien’s pioneering deed in Comparative Pedagogy – the use of comparative method in the field and the idea of establishing an international institute. Chakarov claims that in most comparative pedagogy writings Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris is pointed out as the “father” of theoretically grounded comparative pedagogical studies. According to him, Jullien notably stands out above his predecessors Friedrich August Hecht from Germany and César August Basset from France with his theoretical development of making comparisons in the field of pedagogy as well as his bold practical suggestions for organizing this process (p. 48). In this regard, Chakarov mentions that Jullien is also considered to be the “ideological father” of the International Bureau of Education in Geneva.

After informing the reader of Marc-Antoine Jullien’s main life events, leading ideas, prevailing influences and prominent works, Chakarov (1969) refers to his Esquisse (p. 49). He states that Jullien examines the issues of trends, objectives and methods of comparative pedagogical studies in addition to the existing hindrances to perform them. Moreover, what he considers as important, is the necessity of exchange of experience between different countries about novelties in the realm of national education and his idea of establishing an international education committee with the task of developing the comparative method, conducting comparative education studies and publishing the results from them in many different languages.
The second Bulgarian comparative education textbook written by Nayden Chakarov and Georgi Bishkov *Comparative Pedagogy* (1986) is also influenced by the Soviet dependence. In this book the authors choose to present Jullien’s life and work in the range of three pages and a half (pp. 11-14). Initially and very similarly to the previous book, Chakarov and Bishkov (1986) give a brief biographical reference. After that, they continue describing his major work. The authors emphasize on Jullien’s critical attitude towards education at 19th Century French schools. The material about Jullien’s work in this comparative education textbook is presented in a brief and descriptive way without aiming at a more detailed examination or analysis made by the authors.

The third textbook, used for the purposes of the present study, is entitled *Comparative Education* (1994) and is written by Georgi Bishkov and Nikolay Popov. “This book is the first one in Bulgaria, which systematically, impartially and without any prejudices examines the historical, methodological and practical aspects of the science” (Popov, 2013, p. 35).

At the very beginning of the book, in Chapter 1 (p. 7), which deals with the periodization of the history of Comparative Education, the authors mention the name of Jullien de Paris in relation to Pedro Rossello’s two studies, published in 1943.

In Chapter 2, which examines the history of Comparative Education worldwide, Bishkov and Popov place a special emphasis on Marc-Antoine Jullien’s significant representation and his *Esquisse* (pp. 14-15). The authors explain that Jullien’s work published as a booklet in 1817 consists of two parts. The first one includes an overview of the comparative method in education, the idea for establishing a comparative education institute and the reasons why it should be established in Switzerland, and definitions of some pedagogical concepts. Bishkov and Popov clarify that in the second part, the research methods are presented. There Jullien mainly uses the inquiry as a research method containing a series of questions aimed at collecting data on education in different countries. Further on, the authors point out that Jullien suggests the collected data to be classified into six series: elementary education, secondary education, higher and scientific education, teacher education, education for women, and legislative aspects of education and its relations with social institutions (p. 15).

Finally, Bishkov and Popov trace back the research and rediscovery of Jullien’s work by P. Rossello, H. Goetz, N. Hans, Fr. Hilker, W. Brickman, G. Bereday, etc. They conclude by saying that in Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work there could be found the first attempts to establish the methodology of comparative education studies.

The second edition of *Comparative Education* (1999) comes five years after the first one. As a whole, the presentation of Jullien’s work remains within the same structure of the textbook. In some places the authors give additional biographical facts about Jullien’s life and reveal his pro-internationalist and convinced pro-European standpoints (p. 28). The reader is also additionally informed on Jullien’s attempt to construct a “science of education” which should establish the laws that govern the observed characteristics of education along the lines of the natural sciences and following their model.

The last Bulgarian comparative education textbook *Comparative Education* (2014) written by Nikolay Popov places the greatest emphasis and presents to the
largest extent Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work and its importance for the development of the field of Comparative Education.

From the very beginning, the Preface directly and firmly reminds the students of the field’s bicentenary and introduces the significance of Jullien’s pioneering role in using the term comparative education to denote the scientific activity of systematic examination of foreign education. Unlike the rest of the Bulgarian comparative education textbooks stated above, which present Jullien’s work in relation to the history of Comparative Education, this publication mainly focuses on the issue of the methodology of Comparative Education and links its beginnings with Jullien’s work. Popov chooses to start Part 2 “Methodology of Comparative Education” with an introduction to this part entitled “Jullien and the Beginning of Comparative Education Methodology” (pp. 105-108). The author presents Jullien’s ambition in relation to his interest in the philosophy of science and the comparative method. Jullien proposed ‘to advance the science of education’ by using the method successfully employed in comparative anatomy to compare schools.

Moreover, Popov shows Jullien’s comparative tool referring to Gautherin (1995): “Like the natural sciences and following their model, the science of education should establish the laws that govern the observed characteristics of education. With the comparative approach, Jullien thought that he had at last found his own method, not deductive principles of reasoning or formal rules but an instrument for the analysis of observed facts and a procedure for investigation; but he still needed a tool to draw up a ‘comparative table of the main educational establishments existing in Europe’, of the organization of education and teaching of the ‘objects embraced by the course of studies as a whole’, and of ‘the methods used to form and instruct young people, the gradual improvements that have been attempted and the degree of success achieved” (Gautherin, 1995, p. 775, cited in Popov, 2014, p. 106).

Finally in this introduction, Popov (p. 107) pays attention to the controversial issue of the exact year when Comparative Education came into existence. According to him, 1816 should be considered as the first year of existence of Comparative Education, because this is the time when the first article of a series appeared and not 1817 as W. W. Brickman (1960, p. 6) inaccurately suggests.

**Conclusion**

It may be concluded that the presentation of Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work in systematic Bulgarian comparative education textbooks is predominantly given in relation to his life and comparative education methodology in a rather descriptive way. Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work is presented more as a part of the history and less as a part of the methodology of Comparative Education. The only exception from that observation makes the last textbook *Comparative Education* (2014) where the presence of Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work serves the author’s purposes of giving thorough explanation of the methodology of the field of Comparative Education.

In the past two decades, in Education programs at Bulgarian universities, textbooks focused on description, analysis and comparison of education systems (called at the beginning of this paper comparative education systems textbooks) have been more often used than textbooks comprising the history, theory, methodology and practice of Comparative Education (called systematic comparative education textbooks and to which the present analysis has been directed). The main
reason for this is the fact that students in various Education programs are more interested in studying education systems than in learning difficult historical, theoretical and methodological problems of the science of Comparative Education. This poses a great challenge to comparativists in Bulgaria: continuously striving to keep systematic lecture courses where Marc-Antoine Jullien’s work could respectfully occupy its eternal place.
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