

„We” and „non-WE” – Border post of the „Imagined Mother-Land”: The functional places of memory and instrumentalization of the otherness – Compulsory textbooks (1917–1996) in Modern Bulgarian History

The theoretical framework of this analysis is based on: 1. the concept of the official historical discourse, articulated in the compulsory history textbook, which forms the identity „of its authors and their readers”, persuading them in their continuity and stability in the temporal dimensions of themselves and their world;¹ 2. the notion of the textbook’s role in building the political myth, understood as „widely disseminated narration, with its cortege of images, which endows the group with its cultural homogeneity and moral unity”;² 3. the concept of the transformation of the relation „own – foreign” into the opposition „we-others” during the transition to modernity;³ 4. the notion of the textbook as a „functional place of the memory... places, where a society... gives voluntarily in safe-keeping its remembrance or rediscovers them as a necessary part of its person”.⁴ Therefore the analysis is focused, firstly, on the ways the historical discourse constructs the social community,⁵ postulating its relation with „the surrounding world”, and, secondly, on the images which set up these links and relations. It examines the process of re-writing the history textbook (as a legitimizing resource of the changing political elites during the peri-

¹ Rösen, Jörn, *Studies in metahistory*, Pretoria 1993, p. 5.

² C. O. Charbonell, „Mythes et mythologie politiques. Approche d’une definition et d’une typologie”, In: *Mythes et politique*, sous la direction de C. O. Charbonell et J. Rives, Toulouse 1990, p. 7.

³ Grekova, Maya, „Obshnostta: ochevidnost na podobieto ili problematizatsia na razlichieto”, In: Krasteva, Anna (ed.), *Obshnosti i identichnosti*, Sofia 1998, p. 23–25.

⁴ Nora, Pierre, „Mémoire collective”, In: *La Nouvelle Histoire*, Paris, 1978, p. 401.

⁵ In the methodology of all the authors of textbooks in new Bulgarian history as well as in the philosophic and methodological discussions (most important of them reflected in the journal *Uchilshten pregled* [School review]...) the idea about relation between memory and history is clearly displayed; there is a clear appreciation of the social functions of this relation. The history is charged with the functions of the utilitarian science, orientating the individ/group in the space and in the time, which could acquire the saved memory on the past experience in order to make it relevant to the knowledge of the present moment; this in its own turn will make the future possible. By answering the questions like „Who are we?, Where are we coming from? and Where are we going to?” the History forges the national (self)consciousness of the group and legitimates the group’s self-determination in a given ethnic community, historical tradition and political perspective.

ods 1917–1946; 1946–1955; 1963–1984–1989; 1990–1993–1996)⁶ by scrutinizing the change or non-change in the relation „we – not-we” (and especially in the images of the borders that divide the group „here and now” from „the others”) in order to outline those constant dimensions which formed the memory of „the neighbour” and constructed the perception of the „otherness” as an imperative part of the collective imagination of the Bulgarian nation.

Hence:

A. The discourse analysis of the textbooks in history⁷ and of the implicit educational programs (1917–1945)⁸ points the key concept „of the authors and their readers” on their continuity in the time and space was expressed in the efforts of the Bulgarians to emancipate as separate „national body” in the Balkan cultural political space.⁹ This analysis outlines the types of the historical narra-

⁶ I. e. here we take account of the fact that the inter-war textbook contains in itself the conception of the lineal time and the ideology of the state nationalism; the 1946 textbook reflects the positions of the popular front government; the 1954–1955–1960 textbook supports the imposing of the dictatorship of the proletariat and emancipates the proletariat class; the 1982–1989 textbook legitimates the strategies of the reformats communist elite; the 1990 textbook, 1993 textbook, 1996 textbooks stand behind the strategies of new post-communist elite’s and legitimate their strategies of transition. Cf. *Prenapisvanijata po nova balgarska istoria v ucebnika po istoria*, Sofia, 1995. [The Rewriting of the Modern Bulgarian History in the History Textbooks, Sofia, 1995.].

⁷ The sole and compulsory textbook was a phenomenon typical for the years 1948–1990 only. Hence, for the rest of the period we analyze all textbooks, which were approved by the educational ministry and competed each other for the choice of the local school councils or teachers as books of public instruction. Our content analysis of the interwar textbooks is focused on Nikola Stanev’s writings for various reasons. He was the author of the first wartime textbook in Bulgarian history (1917), as well as of the history book for the Bulgarian soldiers, published by the Bulgarian history (1917), as well as of the history book for the Bulgarian soldiers, published by the Bulgarian General Staff (1917). Afterwards Stanev wrote several history textbooks as well as a history teacher’s handbook. Personally, he was a teacher of long standing and a principal of a Sofia gymnasium. The effect of his writings is appreciated even nowadays: in various contemporary autobiographical interviews and memoirs the most mentioned textbook author is Nikola Stanev; in this respect, indicative is the fact that in 1989 the Bulgarian Emigration Centre in Toronto chose to publish precisely the Stanev’s history (1943) with the following motto: „The current history has been copied to serve the needs of Bulgarians abroad, without ostentatiously biased changes of a communist character, without comments, remakes and falsifications. Bulgarian exiles.” However, by far the most important argument in his favour was that Stanev’s version dominated the Bulgarian school at that time: all the inter-war textbooks (that were licensed by the Ministry of Education) were shaped in a similar mould (Dimitrova 1998: „The žexternal political other’ and the images of Europe, articulated by the post-1917 obligatory textbooks in Modern Bulgarian History”, paper read at the International Conference: The image of the „Other/The Neighbor” in the School Textbooks of the Balkan Countries, Thessaloniki, 16–18 October 1998.

⁸ Cfs: *Prenapisvanijata po nova balgarska istorija v gimnazialnite ucebnizi* (Rewritings of the modern Bulgarian History in gymnasium textbooks), Sofia, 1995.

⁹ „The free Bulgaria united only a part of the lands inhabited by Bulgarians: hence, from the very beginning it aimed to liberate the lands left under foreign rule and to unite itself with them.” (Pastuhov, Ivan i Tsvetan Stoianov, *Balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1926, p. 252); „Bulgaria had always united in a single whole only the Bulgarian people; the waged wars, in general, aimed at the unification of the people. And now we, the successors of the Bulgarians

tion which formed the base of the educational content and postulated the key connotations that forget the multilayer image of the „other/neighbour”.

1. The story on the national emancipation of the group through its separation and opposition to the others, (firstly, as a Christian-Orthodox community versus the Ottomans, secondly, as Slav-Christians versus the Greeks, thirdly, as a separate ethnic group in the Slave world) defined the nature of the boundaries, which separated it from „the others” on the Balkans.¹⁰ The symbolic of the boundary was determined by the opposition „internalexternal”; it created the foundation norm for the cultural and moral-ethic coherency of the community (religion, language, race, and historical traditions). Moreover, this context used the established value hierarchy of images to rationalize the relations with „the outside”, arranging them according to the degree of „closeness-toleration” and „strangeness-hostility”. Thus the shared images and ideas constituted the unity of the community, they detached it from „the others” on the Balkans with the help of the markers – religion, language, race and historical background. The image of „the cultural difference” was always implied in the figure of „the ethnic other”, because the process of shaping of national consciousness itself (as a process of national emancipation) was a subject of social as well as psychological postulates. Hence, to a certain extent, it resembled the process of differentiation on the individual level: both on the detachment stage by confronting with the environment (i.e., „I am not”) and on re-attachment stage by associating itself with a matching group community on the way to an autonomous self-identity (i.e., „I Am”). In the Balkan case, the two stages (the negative one, designated by „I am not”, and the positive one, designated by „I am”, respectively) were manifested in the detachment from, and opposition to, the ethnically different other.¹¹

of the medieval Bulgaria are still forced to defend our lands, the lands of our grandfathers, from the surrounding peoples”. (Ormandzhiev, Ivan and Mara Velkova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na narodnite progimnazii, odobren za 1937 i 1941 godina*, Sofia 1941, p. 123.

¹⁰ Bulgarian school after 1878 transforms this type of emancipation into a key mechanism for defeating various „inferiority complexes” and for emancipation of Bulgarians in the respective time period and within the respective cultural, geographic, and political domain (Popov, Iv. St. i K. Grancharov, *Haii-nova istoriia na tchovetcestvoto*, Sofia 1925, p. 106). Thus, Ivan Kepov and Vana Kepova, authors of a textbook in modern Bulgarian history approved by the Ministry of Education, claim the following in their Teacher’s Guide for teaching history at high school, „There are not a few historic facts and phenomena which may help strengthen our sense of national dignity by bringing to the fore the advantages of our people over other peoples, in the neighbourhood and farther away; amongst all the Slavic people, Bulgarians are the first to create a state to convert to Christianity, to give birth to an abundant and colourful amount of literature, and „they give all the Slavs some books to read” (citation under Father Paissiy of Hilendar, note by the author) (Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Kratko upatvane v obuchenieto po istoriia v progimnaziite*, Plovdiv 1932, p. 6). Nikola Stanev published his 1917 textbook with the following motto on the front cover: „Read and master your nation’s history, honour and cherish your people and your Bulgarian fatherland lest you are derided and disgraced by other nations who know their history and extol their own nation and language”. (Stanev, Nikola (director), *Istoriia na balgarskiia narod s 18 karti i 42 obraza*, Sofia 1917, p. 1.

¹¹ Dimitrova, Snezhana i Naum Kaytchev, „Bulgarian nationalism, articulated by the textbooks in modern Bulgarian history 1878–1996”, In: *Internationale schulbuchforschung*, 1/1998, p. 354.

This type of historical narrative articulated the images of „the cultural distinction”, turning the neighbour with Slavonic/Orthodox identity (respectively Serb, Greek, Romanian) into „the endurable other”, while the neighbour with Muslim religious/Turk-Ottoman linguistic and racial identity was classified as „the eternal foreign”. The narrative also filtered the idea on „the common historical destiny of the Balkan peoples, subdued by the foreign conqueror”: this revealed sympathy towards „neighbour-brother in fate”, articulated in the idea about „the common suffering”. This legitimized „the common rights over the heritage of the Ottoman empire”, hence the Balkan alliance was put in the basket of the positive historical events: „The Balkan union between Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Montenegro, whose task was to drive the Ottoman state out of Europe and Asia, in order to ensure the adopting of the culture according to the pattern of the civilized world... to improve the relations between the separate Balkan states, to stop the age-old envy, united to oppose the common enemy...”¹²

The most essential is that this story did offer no explicit negative appreciation of „the endurable neighbour”; the negation remained in a latent form, concentrated in the strain between the idea on „the different” as something „strange and hostile” (coming from patriarchal time and space) and the idea on the toleration of „the different-other” (imposed with the philosophy of the modern state and its institutions).¹³

Precisely this connotation layer in Stanev’s historical narrative suppressed „the negative image” of „other-neighbour”, generated by the public space of the history and the political publicity. The image of „the enemy-Greek” (as the rule implied in the figure of „Fanariot yoke”), constructed in the political publicity of the revival and installed as a common reference point of the national memory, was only indirectly projected. It resembled the negative: existing, but still undeveloped film. The narrative was free from the „expected hatred” images of „the Serb” (with his privileged identity as Slav) and the „Romanian” (always identified with Christian).¹⁴ The Bulgarian manifestations of charity and compassion were emphasized, especially in the moments of strain relations or war: this was hardly by chance. The entire chapter was entitled as „Charity”;¹⁵ that naming classified the qualities of the Bulgarian in terms of the universal values, joining him to the world nations-symbols.

¹² Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 187.

¹³ The perception about this transition is displayed most frequently in the figure of the breaking off with the blood relation (i.e. with the clan and the family) and is exactly explicated by Ormandzhiev: „the blood is not everything in the society...” (Ormandzhiev, Iv. *Vozpitatelnoto znacenie na rodnata historia* (Educational meaning of the native History), Sofia, 1935.

¹⁴ The „Christian” here was always charged with the positive identity in its being of natural ally against the eternal foreign (the Muslims): for this and Rumanians are those who „sympathized with the struggles led by the Christians in order to be bettered their unbearable situation in Macedonian” (Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 196).

¹⁵ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 187.

The patient story and the absence of strain (between the interpreting schemes – of the author, on one hand, and that of the other authorities – Parliament, official discourse, literature..., on the other) could be explained by Stanev's self-assurance in his own value scale, he considered it close to the moral code of the universal human values, manifested by the political propaganda of the League of Nations. In fact this lack of cleavages was based on Stanev's endorsement of the world prestige (in the policy of the League of the Nations) and his identification with the position; identification that gave him the confidence to protect his story even in when it conflicted the official mood on the „the other-neighbour-enemy”. His conviction was lucidly expressed in his methodical book: „The teacher in the classroom differs from the citizen-politician in the club, because he must talk in front of the children as a man of science... without poisonous critics and judgements on the persons or peoples... You are only teacher in the classroom, you bring justice and truth, you express the eternity, your serve the beauty, the nobility and the ideological culture”.¹⁶

Thus this connotation layer marked the identities of „culturally different other”, divided as „the endurable other”/the perennial foreign”; it filled with positive potentials the image of the neighbour; yet these were displayed overtly only at the „points”, when the goal of the Bulgarian historical time was accomplished: „the ethnic union of the Bulgarians”.

2. The story of the political emancipation of the national community („to unite the lands of the dispersed ethnic element into single whole”), was articulated by the pictures of the wars for national liberation. The sole valuable measure (one that exposes respective positive and negative connotations of the two images) was the attitude of the neighbour towards the efforts of the Bulgarians for political emancipation (thought as the sole opportunity for including the Bulgarians in the European political space). It made possible to accomplish smoothly the transformation, firstly, of the image of „the endurable other” into „natural ally” (Serbs, Greeks, Romanians in the Balkan wars 1912–1918), as well as the rapid evolution of the yesterday's „entire stranger” into „the historical enemy” and then into „the necessary ally” (as in the case of the Turks).¹⁷

The supposed strain coming from the dilution of the value hierarchy of the boundaries, (that formed different level of relations with „the other”) was overcome painlessly in two manners. Firstly, through the presenting the political partnership during the wars, when the relations with the „others” were distorted by the figure of „the betrayal, which presumes the „misunderstanding” (Serbs, Greeks and Romanians „stuck the knife into the back of the Bulgarians”) – figure, that practically marginalizes every positive idea about the „neighbour”. Secondly, the concept of „the people as a superior value” facilitated developing of some

¹⁶ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1922 s ilustratsii. Kniga I, ot Osvobozhdenieto do Balkanskata voina*, Sofia 1925, p. 4–5.

¹⁷ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 167.

positive neighbour's features („hospitality”, „natural goodness”, „the kind housekeeper”, „the closeness to the family”...); these that shortened the distance between „we” and „not-we”, the latter becoming to a certain extent „familiar” and „understandable”. Because of this when the terms „Serb”, „Romanian”, „Turk”, „Greek” were presented as „Bulgarian enemies” they were not associated with the image of the respective „people” – adversely, they constructed the idea of „the external political other” (as a subject in the narration on the political influence, the „military propaganda”, „the wars” and „the situation of the minorities”). That story formed one of the most durable images of „the neighbour-external political other”: „extending greedy hands towards the Bulgarian lands and cutting the living flesh from the national body”, or overtly titled as „enemy and opponent”.¹⁸

The image of „the neighbour-political other” is included mostly on implicit and rarely on explicit level at the narration points, when, firstly, the history of the Bulgarian heroism is articulated (exposed in the figure of the „Bulgarian golgota”: „the endured sufferings and torments, once on the battlefield, then when hearing the crying of the unredeemed brothers”) and when, secondly, the story constituting the essence of the Balkan history was evolved: „the emancipation of the Greeks, Serbs and Romanians and Bulgarians in their ethnically just boundaries” (all the interwar textbooks). I.e.: this is the union of „the Greeks with their tribal brothers in Asia Minor coasts and islands”,¹⁹ of the Serbs with „their countrymen in Herzegovina, Bosnia and Southern Hungary”,²⁰ of the Romanians with „their men in Transylvania and Bessarabia”.²¹ Thus Stanev's story created the image of „the nationality principle” (supported by Bulgaria) versus „the geographical symmetry” (advocated by the neighbors); an image legitimizing the value, articulated in the figure: „the just people's ideal” (making only „the United Bulgaria a natural ally of the Christian peoples”²² against „the political checks” („envy and fear” of „the others”, that „the Bulgarians would first accomplish their national unification”).²³ Hence the textbook stories continued to articulate the negative image of „the neighbour-politically other, with stretched hands towards the Bulgarian lands”.

This story followed its own value scheme (emancipation of the people as emanation of the disappeared good”): while remaining calm, emotionless and free from any pressure it overtly articulated the image of „the neighbour-enemy”. The negative measures of that „image” accelerated the speed of the story,

¹⁸ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 206; Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1937, p. 119–121; Ormandzhiev, Ivan, *Nova i Naiinova istoriia na balgarskii narod*, Sofia 1943, p. 594–601.

¹⁹ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 206.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

reconstructing the history of the Bulgarian minorities; a history, that reveals itself in the pictures of „the violence and cruelty, inflicted upon Bulgarians in the foreign lands” (the paragraph is titled as „Bulgarians under foreign domination”), thus implying „dark associations” with the time of the „Turkish yoke”. This emotionally black-colored background „naturally” suggests the idea of „the cruel neighbor”, exposed in the figure of barbarity: „destruction of everything Bulgarian: schools, libraries, churches; plunder of property, physical destroying of the population...”²⁴

The most essential characteristic of this narration is that: 1. the social community, constructed and emancipated by the sum of textbook stories, was that of „the Bulgarian people”; 2. the people’s genius and its realization were the structural centre of the historical narration (even the possible modernization is presented as a function of the „national spirit”);²⁵ 3. the story was more of a reference legitimizing the unique form of the collective’s existence: i.e. equality nationality (narodnost)=people=state. The realization of this balance defined the group’s relation with „the surrounding world”; the way of this realization that defined the norm which endowed with the positive and the negative identity plots-subjects-objects of the historical action, became a „common place” of the memory.

The new historical versions²⁶ legitimizing in the political publicity the ideal of the state nationalism²⁷ altered the inner normative value scale of the story, imposing as a measure of the progress „the achieved advance and the inner stability” (in the preceding story the progress was always thought in the categories of the people’s happiness, which was imagined as a national unification in its „natural borders”).²⁸ Hence these versions installed the new social commu-

²⁴ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 120–121; Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1937, p. 111–113; Ormandzhiev, Ivan, *Nova i Naiinova istoriia na balgarskija narod*, Sofia 1943, p. 595–595).

²⁵ Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943, p. 522.

²⁶ Ormandzhiev, Ivan, *Nova i Naii-nova istoriia na balgarskii narod*, Sofia 1943; Georgiev, Ivan i Svetoslav Dimitrov, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofia 1937.

²⁷ After the coup-d’etat of 19.05.1934 and the ensued attempts to enforce „a competent cabinet” (that is, a body of administration selected on the basis of professional performance, not belonging to a parliament party), in the textbook readings begins to lurk a certain proclivity searching to legitimize rather the system of government and state institutions than the people as an „invariable value”. This was the reason why several favourable descriptions of Ferdinand and Boris were printed, the two rulers being symbol images of the monarchy. In this sense, the textbook of Ormandzhiev (1943) and the textbook of Georgiev and Dimitrov (1937) grant a privilege to the story relating the astute government of Ferdinand (Georgiev, Ivan i Svetoslav Dimitrov, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofia 1937, p. 108–109), and are considered an attempt to redeem monarchy after the 1918 crisis (the abdication of Ferdinand).

²⁸ Cfs: Snezhana Dimitrova/Naum Kaytchev, „Bulgarian nationalism, articulated by the textbooks in modern Bulgarian history 1878–1996”, In: *Internationale schulbuschforschung*, 1/1998.

nity – the state, the dreamed balance, guaranteeing the group's inner coherence now was different: state=people=nationality. The ways of its accomplishment changed the symbolic content of the borders defying the opposition „we-another”. These stories focused on the „places” where the political pragmatism was displayed: they unloaded the problematic fields of the cultural difference. On one hand, these places forged the negative image of the foreign-political-other (presented in the figure of „the neighbor, realizing his aims at the expense of the other”). On the other hand, they endowed with a negative identity the „Slavonic” (associating it with an anarchy and an estrangement from a social activity („the Slavs didn't love the power and the social interaction”)²⁹ as well as the „Turkish” (whose „laws used to be foreign and adapted for a defense of the winners”).³⁰ This historical discourse emancipated „the state ideal’ from the people’s one. The stories privileged the state genius through the figure of the state skills: „we have our own country”;³¹ thus the new thelos of the history was postulated – the realization of the state ideal. This discourse delineated the new moments of the common memory and constructed the new social space (by promoting new attitude to the laws and by proclaiming care about „the tremendous revival of the whole of the country”).³² Here the discourse’s normative value scale privileged the „social-state relations” instead of the „blood-relation” in order to emancipate and legitimate the citizen model of behavior. (This discourse was included in the number of stories that formed the textbook content, but they coexisted with the versions, articulating the „spirit of the patriarchal time and its values”;³³ this amalgam reflected, to a certain extent, the nature of the Bulgarian interwar modernization... This discourse demonstrated the failure to redesign the „values of the people” as „social” ones, it showed the impossible transformation of the people into a social community, in which the identities are derived from the attitude to the state institutions, (this attitude – instead of the origin and blood – was supposed to generate the social relations and hierarchies). The normative value scale, articulating the inner compositional logic of the narration, although formally dominated by the „state ideal”, continued to embody the ‘people’s idea’ („the imagined national union in fair ethnic boundaries”). In other words, the symbolic content of the borders separating the community from the others was still influenced by the cultural differencers; the major shift being that the new versions focused on the political relations while the religious and race proximity was pushed out and suppressed. This meant that in these versions one could barely discern marks of the modernizing appreciation of a world of radically relativated valued and foreign cultures). At

²⁹ Georgiev, Ivan i Svetoslav Dimitrov, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofia 1937.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid: 121–123.

the same time, however, precisely in these „moments” of the historical narration – elaborating on the realization of the state/social ideal – the transition between the bourgeois and communistic textbook was accomplished painlessly.

3. The communist story: 1945–1948–1954 (rewriting the modern Bulgarian history, articulated in the compulsory textbook) endorsed the working class as the main subject of the world historical process and legitimized the new political elites in the political reality. It constructed the new social community – ‘the Bulgarian society’ (thought as the sum of progressive elements – proletariat and peasants); community, that defined the frame of the inter-social relations and outlined the attitude to the foreign political space. In line with the new normalizing value pattern – the class solidarity (postulating the images that constitute the internal community’s space and the borders with the outside world) – the textbooks forged the picture of the „new foreign political other”: ‘the common enemy – Balkan bourgeoisie’ and „the natural ally – the Balkan proletariat”. This narration privileged the major class as a boundary between „we” and „not-we”, it divided the community to object (the proletariat) and subject (the bourgeoisie) of the political action, it gave a negative identity to the Balkan bourgeoisie by the image of „pillage”, „rapaciousness”, „betrayal”.³⁴

4. The reformat communist discourse (1963–1982–1989) emancipated the national meta-narration as an ideological resource of the new communist elite; it was installed into the textbooks as a parallel line to the historical-materialist narration. In this manner it revived the multilayer image of the neighbor as: the „cultural-different other”; „the eternal enemy or friend”; „the perennial good people”.³⁵ (This image previously was marginalized by the historical narration which attempted to dissolve the national identity into an international one). In this case the most characteristic transformation was, firstly, the accentuated effigy of religious difference, and, secondly, the changed image of Bulgarian bourgeoisie: it was deprived of its negative identity postulated by the 1940s–1950s communist narration unlike the bourgeoisie of the neighbors which remained „rapacious” and „treacherous” („cutting the living flesh from the national body”).

5. Although the post-communist textbooks stressed their modernizing pathos, they continued to articulated the ethnocentric historical discourses with all accompanying effigies of the „other/neighbor”.³⁶ Here the progress is linked to

³⁴ Bozhikov, Bozhidar i Aleksandar Burmov, i Petar Kurekchiev, *Balgarska istoria za 7 klas na gimnaziite*, Sofia 1946; Burmov, Aleksandar i Dimitar Kosev, i Hristo Hristov, *Istoria na Balgariia. Uchebnik za 9 klas na obshtoobrazovatelnite uchilishta*, Sofia 1955.

³⁵ Dimitrov, Ilcho i Mito Isusov, i Iordan Shopov, *Istoria na Balgariia za 10 klas na ESPU*, Sofia 1982/1984/1989.

³⁶ Bakalov, Georgi i Petar Angelov, Tsvetana Georgieva, Dimitar Tsanev, Bobi Bobev, Stoiicho Grancharov, *Istoriia na Balgariia za gimnazialnata stepen na obshtoobrazovatelnite uchilishta*, Sofia 1993; Delev, Petar i Petar Angelov, Georgi Bakalov, Tzvetana Georgieva, Plamen Mitev, Staiko Trifonov, Iskra Baeva, Boika Vasileva, Evgenija Kalinova-Jaidzieva, *Istoriija na Balgaria za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta*, Sofia 1996; Guzelev, Vassil i Konstantin Kossev i Milcho Lalkov i

teh attempt to unload the image of the „cultural-different other” from the negative value connotation grade (by introducing the History of social and everyday life). However, this attempt ultimately failed due to the preservation on both explicit and implicit level (mostly in the War History chapters) of the image of the „neighbor – foreign political other” („stretching greedy hands to the Bulgarian lands and cutting the living flesh from the national body!”).

B. Conclusion: The image of the „other/neighbour” in its multilayer dimension preserved its basic characteristics in all re-writings of the modern Bulgarian history textbooks due to the emancipating and legitimating function of the historical discourses which did not permit creation of the separate measure of the „other”. The idea about the „different” as ther „unintelligible foreign and hostile” (typical for the patriarchal time and space) was transformed into the textbook through the opposition „we-another”; it obtained the concrete dimensions of the conscious religious, language, racial and political otherness. These images draw the border of the „we” and „not-we” and became border posts of the „Imagined Mother-Land”, guaranteeing the unity of the group; this imagination was the main communication tool that predetermined either acceptance or exclusion of the „individual-group” from the values dominating the society of the time; these textbook stories offered a memory which legitimated the existence of the ethnocentric national state; this historical narration became as the mirror of the pride and the pain, as the mirror in the tale about Snowwhite, which has to reflect our infallibility in the surrounding world.

Bibliography:

Bakalov, Georgi i Petar Angelov, Tsvetana Georgieva, Dimitar Tsanev, Bobi Bobev, Stoiicho Grancharov, *Istoriia na Balgariia za gimnazialnata stepen na obshtoobrazovatelните uchilishta*, Sofia 1993.

Bozhikov, Bozhidar i Aleksandar Burmov, i Petar Kurkchiev, *Balgarska istoria za 7 klas na gimnaziite*, Sofia 1946.

Burmov, Aleksandar i Dimitar Kosev, i Hristo Hristov, *Istoria na Balgariia. Uchebnik za 9 klas na obshtoobrazovatelните uchilishta*, Sofia 1955.

Guzelev, Vassil i Konstantin Kossev i Milcho Lalkov i Lubomir Ognjanov i Marija Radeva, *Istorija na Balgarija za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta*, Sofia 1996.

Delev, Petar i Petar Angelov, Georgi Bakalov, Tsvetana Georgieva, Plamen Mitev, Staiko Trifonov, Iskra Baeva, Boika Vasileva, Evgenija Kalinova-Jaidzieva,

Lubomir Ognjanov i Marija Radeva, *Istorija na Balgarija za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta*, Sofia 1996; Fol, Alexander i Jordan Andreev, Vera Mutafchieva, Rajna Gavrilova, Ivan Ilchev, *Istorija na Balgaria za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta*, Sofia 1996.

Istorija na Balgaria za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta, Sofia 1996.

Dimitrov, Ilcho i Mito Isusov, i Iordan Shopov, *Istoria na Balgariia za 10 klas na ESPU*, Sofia 1982/1984/1989.

Dimitrova, Snezhana i Naum Kaytchev, „Bulgarian nationalism, articulated by the textbooks in modern Bulgarian history 1878–1996”, In: *Internationale schulbuchforschung*, 1/1998.

Fol, Alexander i Jordan Andreev, Vera Mutafchieva, Rajna Gavrilova, Ivan Ilchev, *Istorija na Balgaria za 11 klass, odobreno ot ministerstvoto na narodnata prosveta*, Sofia 1996.

Georgiev, Ivan i Svetoslav Dimitrov, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofii 1937.

Grekova, Maya, „Obshnostta: ochevidnost na podobieto ili problematizatsia na razlichieto”, In: Krasteva, Anna (ed.), *Obshnosti i identichnosti*, Sofia 1998.

Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Kratko upatvane v obuchenieto po istoriia v progimnaziite*, Plovdiv 1932.

Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1937.

Kepov, Ivan i Vana Kepova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1940.

„Mythes et mythologie politiques. Approche d’une définition et d’une typologie”, In: *Mythes et politique*, sous la direction de C. O. Charbonell et J. Rives, Toulouse, 1990.

Nora, Pierre, „Mémoire collective”, In: *La Nouvelle Histoire*, Paris, 1978.

Ormandziev, Iv., *Vozpitatelnoto znacenie na rodnata historia*, Soifia 1943.

Ormandzhiev, Ivan and Mara Velkova, *Obshta i balgarska istoriia za III klas na narodnite progimnazii, odobren za 1937 i 1941 godina*, Sofia 1941.

Pastuhov, Ivan i Tsvetan Stoianov, *Balgarska istoriia, uchebnik za III klas na progimnaziite*, Sofia 1926.

Pastuhov, Ivan i Tsvetan Stoianov, *Haii-nova istoriia, uchebnik za srednite uchilishta spored programata ot 1925 godina*, Sofia 1928.

Pastuhov, Ivan i Tsvetan Stoianov, *Istoriia na balgarskiia narod, uchebnik za VIII klas spored programata ot 1925 godina s 18 mnogotsvetni karti*, Sofia 1929.

Popov, Iv. St. i K. Grancharov, *Haii-nova istoriia na tchovetcestvoto*, Sofia 1925.

Popov, Iv. St. i K. Grancharov, *Istoriia za II klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofia 1939.

Prenapisvanijata po nova balgarska istoria v ucebnika po istoria, Sofia, 1995. (The Rewriting of the Modern Bulgarian History in the History Textbooks), Sofia, 1995.

Rüsen, Jörn, *Studies in metahistory*, Pretoria 1993.

Stanev, Nikola (director), *Istoriia na balgarskiia narod s 18 karti i 42 obraza*, Sofia 1917.

Stanev, Nikola i Tsvetan Stoianov, *Istoriia za III klas na narodnite progimnazii*, Sofia 1922.

Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1922 s ilustratsii. Kniga I, ot Osvobozhdenieto do Balkanskata voina*, Sofia 1925.

Stanev, Nikola, *Haii-nova istoriia na Balgaria 1878–1941*, Sofia 1943.

The image of the Other. Analysis of the high-school textbooks in History from the Balkan countries, Sofia 1998.

Резиме

Снежана Димитрова

„Ми” и „не-Ми” – Међаши „замишљене домовине”... Уџбеници (1917-1996) у модерној бугарској историографији

Слика „другог” је у свим верзијама модерних бугарских уџбеника задржала своје основне карактеристике захваљујући легитимизирајућој функцији историјског дискурса који није дозволио друкчије мерење „другог”. Идеја о „друкчијем” као „страном и непријатељском” трансформисана је у уџбенике преко опозиције „ми – други”. Те слике одредиле су границе између „нас” и „не-нас” и постале су имагинарна места „имагинарне мајке земље”