

Ст.н.с. II ст. д-р Еля ЦАНЕВА

(Етнографски институт и музей при БАН, София)

**ОФОРМЯЩИ СЕ БАЛКАНСКИ НАЦИОНАЛНИ СТЕРЕОТИПИ  
ПРЕЗ XIX В. – НЯКОИ ПРИНЦИПИ НА ИЗГРАЖДАНЕ И  
ФУНКЦИОНИРАНЕ**

---

---

**II<sup>nd</sup> Degree Senior Res. Assoc. Elya TSANEVA, PhD**

(Ethnographic Institute and Museum at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences,  
Sofia) **EMERGING BALKAN NATIONAL STEREOTYPES IN XIX C.  
– SOME PRINCIPLES OF CONSTRUCTION AND FUNCTIONING**

В работата се разглеждат условията за формиране на балканските етнически стереотипи, като се обръща особено внимание на психологическите основания за изграждане образа на “другия”, формиран под влияние на ценностите на традиционната култура. Отношенията и лоялностите, създадени и съхранени в традиционните социални организации – семейство и родов колектив, съседска и общоселска общност, професионални сдружения и организации и пр. – се пренасят и пряко въздействат и върху отношението към народите-съседи. Портретът на “другия” е разнопосочен и многопластов, в него има образи с различен оценъчен знак, които се активизират и пренареждат, според нуждите на конкретния исторически момент. В заключение се предлага да се избягва генерализирането върху “правенето” на етническите стереотипи на Балканите, за да не се обезличи тяхната комплексност и вариативност.

*Ключови понятия:* Балкани, етнически/национални стереотипи, традиционна култура

Dispassionate analysis of all aspects of national identity in the Balkans during the XIX c. – time of its creation, is a problem of current interest because of the close similarities with contemporary processes there. Some scholars hold that we are facing today a reemergence of the XIX-century Balkan revival, of which ethnic renaissance is an inseparable part. Unlike that earlier revival, this modern renaissance of ethnic solidarity and sentiment, A. Smith suggests, “has taken its cue from a romantic nationalism, [which] though often aggressive and fanatical, has tried to channel the passions and claims it unleashed into the creation of a new global political order based upon the ‘nation-state’” (Smith 1981:XII). When speaking, writing or thinking of the Balkans, starting from the

period of the Enlightenment, continuing through the whole XIX c. and stepping firmly into the XX c., such characteristics are most frequently in use: “constant turmoil”, “confrontation prevailed”, “balkanisation”, “doomed peninsula”, “political, ethnic and religious intolerance”, “wild backwardness”, “hatred spreaded among the Balkan peoples”.

This way of thinking is of course based on the initial and further developed Balkan stereotypes themselves. Just to remind: an *ethnic stereotype* is a generalized representation of an ethnic group, composed of what are thought to be typical characteristics of its members. As it was correctly said in the introduction of one recent study on the subject: “Confronting and comparing different types of national stereotypes is a way the peninsula can be understood not only in historical but also in psychological perspective” (Stefanov, Robev 2001). The quoted study raises and discusses further interesting and all vivid questions like: “Were Bulgarians really always hating the Greeks, disliking the Turks, fond of the Serbs and mocking the Romanians? Did the Greeks abhor the Turks, demonstrate superiority over the Bulgarians, compromise the Serbs and neglect the Albanians? Were Albanians all the time feuding with the Serbs and admiring the Turks? Did the Romanians always try to lie on the Others? Were the Serbs as wild as they were imagined?” These portraits of the neighbors have always attracted scholarly attention, and gave reason to a huge number of studies on the field of Balkan stereotyping. The literature suggests generally, that the process of Balkan stereotyping is mainly determent by the past and current political situation, and the place and role the neighbors have in it (Banac 1993-1994: 173-182; Cvijic C.1991).

This report argues instead, that before realizing the social stands of the own and neighboring peoples and before reflecting them in ethnic stereotypes, there were certain cultural backgrounds for creating the stereotypes, and also certain similarities in the general cultural patterns in the region, that emerged and evolved both as organised and ordered attempts to cope with the natural environment and to facilitate social interaction with other people. Shaped by the material conditions of life in the Balkans and created upon religious foundations and the medieval cultural legacy, these patterns were rooted in the existential realities of all Balkan peoples’ life in that specific environment. One can suggest a certain List of traditional cultural pre-requisites for national stereotyping in the Balkans in XIX c. which is illustrated further predominantly by Bulgarian empirical data within a frame all valid for the Balkans.

In all Balkan cultures at that time, *family and kin collective* provided every individual with ethnic identity and membership, made him a Bulgarian, a Serb, a Greek, etc. In the family and among relatives this individual learned the language, acquiring through it the specific way of thinking and behaving. With the ritual of Holy christening, he became an Eastern Orthodox Christian, and in the family he accepted the main religious dogmas and norms, the obligations of Christian behaviour and prayer, its notions of good and evil, sin and remission. The ethnic model of life as knowledge about nature and society, morals and ideals, as ideas about social positions, duties and rights and as popular customs and rituals, were all acquired in the family and kin circle, ideally to be again reproduced and repeated in the child’s own prospective family. The Bulgarian family

and kindred network achieved the socialisation of the individual, transmitting through the complicated mechanism of traditions indispensable notions and norms of behavior for the individual and for collective existence. In the immediate family the person took on his first obligatory prescriptions and roles which decided his position both in this smallest social cell and also larger ones. What was once said about the Greeks was also true about the Bulgarians and all Balkan peoples, that “as an individual, he belongs to nothing, is part of nothing and can join no group”. By setting a model of primary, enduring life-long loyalties, the immediate family provided the necessary foundation for the creation and existence of loyalties to all other broader social institutions, beginning with the kin and ending with the state. All these more inclusive loyalties were established upon the same basis of feelings: of love and attachment, subordination and duty, and the submission of personal goals to the demands of group membership.

Other social institutions to which Bulgarians and all Balkan peoples attached mass loyalties in the XIX c. were the *neighbourhood and village communities*. Based initially on territorial and professional grounds, they also often included — because of the traditions of settlement’s organisation at that time and later — close or distant kinsmen. Similar circumstances of material life were not the only unifying reason for membership: elements of common rationalised interest were also presented. Serving as mediators between the official Ottoman administration and the population, these local institutions became schools for adopting and experiencing a collective responsibility and collective defence of mutual interests. They also served an important function regulating relationships among the members; neighbourhood and village communities balanced and adjusted coexistence among people.

*The professional organisations* with their role in public life, in education and culture, with their political activity provide an example of a mature social consciousness and allied behaviour among XIX-century Bulgarians. Through these organisations the craftsman’s group became a social force. In the conditions of late Bulgarian capitalistic development theirs was in fact the most advanced social group of interests (although not unique) that functioned — accordingly to the principles of the *esnaf* — as an autonomously, self governed and self controlled formal institution.

As said, the Bulgarians in the nineteenth century transposed some elements of the loyalties they experienced in these group memberships into their newly developing ethnic images and stereotypes; the process mainly was the same among all the Balkan peoples, of course with the particularities due to their own historical and cultural differences. The continuities between the values sustained in those older institutions and the terms through which the now emerging states were popularly imagined can be seen in four main areas:

First, the structure, role and social function of all the institutions mentioned were *subordinated to the group’s interests*. Within them the population learned to live, think and act in the name of collective ideas and goals, now rationalised and placed above the interests of a single individual. Loyalty to an immediate family and to a family-kin was inherited as an obligation by a child at birth within a certain family group. From birth,

many rituals were performed to transmit symbolically that loyalty to the newborn member; and throughout one's lifetime, at each stage of passage into a higher social level, the relevant rites included also elements that served to remind the person of his obligations and loyalties to a family and a kin. Some elements of these loyalties, undoubtedly *primordial* in their nature, were projected into the notion of Bulgarian ethnicity: the image of *common descent*, the image of *home* as a native place and homeland, the feeling of *togetherness* and *common fate* through the time, while some terms from the kin terminology were consistently used in the Bulgarian ethnic lexicon as denotations for close relationship among the members of the ethnicity. In moral if not in political terms, Bulgarian ethnicity was the Bulgarian family and its obligatory solidarity writ large.

The same feature also characterised neighbourship and village community. Loyalty was owed here, just as it was to one's family and kin: not to an abstract neighbourhood or village area, but to all its specific members. Here the level of members' voluntarism was higher than at the family level though participation was matter of circumstances as well as of choice; hence understanding a group's interests and the rational acceptance of a commitment to them was the principal motivation of the individual action of members. The same awareness of collective interests, responsibilities and joint objectives were the dominant motives for participation in the completely 'chosen' group memberships in the nineteenth century: the professional organisations of craftsmen in the towns, the *esnafi*. The obligations of group membership here were assumed consciously and voluntarily, as the exclusive result of personal understanding and acceptance. Educated to think in broader social categories, the members of the *esnaf* were psychologically and motivationally preadapted for membership and participation in the emerging new social formations based upon rationalised group interests which relied on common characteristics.

Second, *all of the social institutions of traditional culture discussed above were to some degree authoritarian and hierarchical*. There was always a person or group of persons (husband-father, eldest son, eldest people, eldest craftsmen, prominent villagers, priest) chosen because of their qualities (age, experience, honesty, truthfulness, material wealth, professional knowledge) who took decisions and controlled their implementation. Beneath them, ordered according to the same criteria, were all the other members of the group. Membership in these groups entailed acceptance of the hierarchy and of one's status within it. The strong compulsory hierarchy, and obedience to the authority which Bulgarians were taught to respect and follow within the traditional cultural institutions, disciplined their sense of social order. Through the experience of group loyalties in these traditional social organisations, the Bulgarians were prepared to accept collective goals and group considerations on a higher level. They learned what it means to be part of a hierarchy, organised for one's own protection and defence; to be subordinated to an authority; to avoid personal preferences in the interests of the entire group; and make sacrifices in group's interest.

Third (and this is specific to the Bulgarian way of ethnostereotyping), yet contrary to their apparently authoritarian character, all these Bulgarian institutions were also *democratic*, open to influence, and within all of them the individual person was respected.

This at least, was the tendency in the nineteenth century. Even in the most conservative unit, the family, changes occurred towards the democratisation of its ruling organs and in the strategy of its decision-making. Increasingly, the role of the individual was recognised and valued. An important sign of democratisation was the activation of people's participation in local affairs, in the family, and in village, town or professional groups. It was the place where the traditional local Bulgarian democracy resided.

And fourth (also specific to the Bulgarians), each of those social institutions organised the well-known and familiar space for the people; it built a *barrier which outsiders had to cross when joining the group and the members when exiting it*. Characteristic of Bulgarian culture was the conditional character of these barriers. At each level there were numerous possibilities for a 'foreigner' or 'stranger' to penetrate, in most cases regulated by tradition. The perception of the 'foreigner' was milder than in other Balkan Eastern Orthodox cultures. As in all of them, Bulgarian standards of behaviour toward foreigners and the outside world were a function of their membership in their own traditional social organisations: other villages, other kin-groups, other communes, not to speak of people from other religions and ethnicities, were always viewed as differing from one's own, and possessing other characteristics. What differentiated Bulgarians was how these differing features were evaluated: Attitudes toward outsiders, presumed critical in Bulgarian culture, did not always lead to negative conclusions about the subjects of these characteristics. In some situations (especially in cases of a breakdown of a natural process of living and development: in birth rituals and folk medicine), the presence of a stranger was desirable; his role was sanctioned in favour to the group. This was strongly manifested in some specific forms of ritual kin-relations in the nineteenth century when a stranger, coming not from a neighbour village or town but from beyond the ethnic and religious frontiers, was considered suitable for acceptance in the 'own' group. Another manifestation of this cultural pattern of tolerance towards strangers, was the evaluation of their moral and normative systems. Like all people, Bulgarians tended to assume that their values were universally applicable, the only true and right ones. But this view was also open to compromises: for example, in the nineteenth century Bulgarian hospitality was frequently performed to accord with a stranger's rules and traditions, not those of the Bulgarian's own group. Though not numerous, such exceptions show that Bulgarian traditional culture at the time was not xenophobic one, providing some basis for reciprocal elements in national stereotyping as part of national identity.

Both the internally democratic and the non-xenophobic character of the discussed institutions were made possible because Bulgarian traditional culture included a strong sense of individual responsibility for behavior; individual optation and qualification for group membership existed at all levels in social scale, except in the ascriptive *primary* groupings based upon real blood ties. This emphasis on individualism and individual dignity and choice did not contradict group loyalties, at least not to the same extent as in Greek society at that time. Many aspects of traditional common law viewed guilt as an individual responsibility, despite the overriding idea that all personal actions were encumbered, (ie., protected and excused), by group membership. Even when errors and

mistakes were not publicly admitted outside the group and a ritual and factual defence was offered by the group of a member accused of wrongdoing, the individual guilt within the group was still proclaimed and punished internally. Blame was not necessarily announced externally in all situations. The idea of the individual responsibility and guilt which a member should feel for misconduct coexisted with a sense of the unimpeachable reputation of the group and its members and of the shame which individual wrongdoing brought to them all. We can make here some serious speculations about the building mechanisms of ethnic stereotypes among the different Balkan peoples, based upon the anthropological characteristics of their culture: mostly “shame-oriented” traditional culture of the Albanians and the Muslim population of the peninsula, the symbiosis between the “guild-“ and “shame-oriented” cultural models that appear in some societies, in Bulgarian and partly in Greek one, etc. – one very promising approach in tracing the differences in image-building: Strong elements of both concepts were clearly present in these two cultures, making impossible any explanation of Bulgarian and Greek psychological features in simple terms of either shame or guilt, as was the case with some Balkan peoples. Because of the presence of a ‘guilt’-impulses in Balkan East-Orthodox traditional cultures, social institutions were not as conservative as in neighboring Muslim societies. Within certain limits the individual had the right to express and defend in traditionally prescribed acceptable limits his own preferences, even to the point of searching for new group identity. The same tendencies were also displayed in the XIX-century Bulgarian and Greek cultural and political organisations — the urban communes, and the church-based educational and cultural organisations. As said, these organisations played a key role in the process of stereotype-building as a creative element of national ideology and helped determine its characteristics.

Before developing a sense of national belonging, the Balkan peoples experienced feelings of attachment and loyalty within their traditional cultures to various institutions. Loyalties to these social institutions of their traditional culture were linked directly, by the line of continuity, to the newer ethnic categories up to the level of the nation and nation-state, where they created their self-image and the concept of their own cultural and psychological features. All Balkan peoples in the XIX c. transposed and projected some elements of the loyalties they experienced in these group memberships into their national stereotypes. Loyalty to a neighbour at home was clearly transposed into the neighbouring people; all the Balkan peoples have developed proverbs as “The neighbour’s dog is not barking at neighbours”, “The neighbour is closer than relative” or “Wedding and burial are not possible without neighbours”. Obviously, the neighbors in these last statements *are not behind the barrier, they do not have to cross it, to become “us”*. (But in another situation there are proverbs as “The neighbour’s hen is bigger than our duck”, “Lock the door for not to make your neighbour thief” or “The bad neighbour is doing harm through seven quarters”, reflecting a somewhat negative view of the Other (Stefanov, Robev 2001).

It is generally accepted, that the image of the Other is usually lacking objectivity, that empirical data is in all cases subjective, and thus the study of the tendencies in the

formation of the national stereotypes has certain conditional character. To illustrate this I have examined the writings of some some selected Bulgarian writers and activists during the time of nation-building in the XIX c. (Aprilov 1968: 122-123; Bosvely 1968: 104-106; Karavelov 1966-1967: V. 5, 210-211; V. 6, 405-408; V. 8, 119-120, 172; Paisii 1972: 42-45; Rakovsky 1980: 46-47; Seliminsky 1979: 303-308; Slaveikov 1968-1971: V. 5, 254-257, 344-346; V.6, 49, 51-52, 340-341; Sofronii 1966: 22), that include subjective stereotyping opinions and views; what any one writer saw in external reality, including the ethnopsychological features of the ethnic groupings he observed, depended to a great extent on his own powers of observation, actual behaviour, education, and goals. Mostly compared to the Bulgarians (and present further) are the stereotyping portraits of the Greeks, Serbs and Turks.

According to the writings studied, the ethnopsychological comparison between Bulgarians, Greeks and Turks was accomplished in different ways. The ethnopsychological portrait of the Turks was quite fragmentary. The authors limited themselves to conclusions about the character of the Turks' actions; their characteristics were described not abstractly but in actions — they “kill unpunished”, “burn books”; Turks took prisoners, tortured and violated Christians, called them “dishonoured” and “untruthful”. Perceptions of Turks were shaped by their role in Bulgarian history. Not all sociocultural characteristics of the Turks featured in the picture Bulgarians formed of them, only those which had special salience in the contemporary historical context. Central here was the historical role of the Turks as destroyers of Bulgarian statehood and conquerors of the Bulgarian people. In opposition to those features, such Bulgarian characteristics as faithfulness to the religion and nationality are mentioned; in this way the notion of a general difference between the conquerors and the suppressed was established in the minds of the latter. The negative attitude of the Bulgarians to the Turks was not directly declared; only a lack of friendly attitude is acknowledged. It is significant that the psychological outlook of the Turks was less attractive to the Bulgarians than that of the Greeks. The position of the Turks as oppressors ethnically and religiously distinct from the Bulgarians left the Bulgarians only one way to define them, as “enemies”. Their portrait was summarised, without any differences in social plan. A direct contrast between both nationalities may be seen in contemporary proverbs such as “the sick Bulgarian is drunk, the drunk Turk is sick”; or the attribution to the Turks of a general quality seen in opposition to those of the Bulgarians, such as “The Turk's friendship is to the knees” - ie., they are not true friends These view correlates directly with the characteristics given to the Turks in the folklore of the other Balkan peoples, as: “Uninvited visitor is worse than Turk”, “ If the wolves are in the forest, the Turks are in the village”, etc. (Karavelov 1861: 10, 141).

The ethnopsychological traits of the Bulgarians and the Greeks were compared at two levels, historical and contemporary. For the most of the Bulgarian writers quoted the present day cultural and political confrontation of the two peoples had historical grounds. To identify them, the authors maintained an elemental-materialistic position, holding that the distinguishing psychological features of the peoples were determined by a con-

crete-historical causality. The Greek character was presented as containing mostly negative features, which were highlighted in contrast to those of the Bulgarians. Usually the characterological opposition was manifested through such mutually exclusive traits as: “simple-educated”, “graceful-cruel”, “fair-unfair”, “pious-sly”, etc. Sometimes the characteristics were given more detailed comments, for example that the Greeks are well educated but unfair and possess a predatory instinct, so that their culture brings more trouble than benefit - Paisii. To denote the Greek character, attributes with a negative nuance were usually involved, or else it was suggested that their positive features found negative expression in life. Such interpretations made possible the creation of false impressions about both one’s own ethnicity and others that could lead to chauvinistic conclusions. But recognition and frequent mentioning in the sources of such Greek achievements as their high culture and contribution in the world civilisation — as well as also their historical role in Bulgarian education and the positive evaluation of their attachment to the *patria* and compatriots - show that these XIX-century Bulgarian authors did not maintain a consistently negative image of the Greeks as an ethnicity and young nation. Such a vision was more clear in the proverbs recorded in this time, where one specific feature was selected from the whole image of the Greeks, and, in accordance to the specifics of the genre, was absolutised and satirised: e.g. “Greek lies more than nine Gypsies”, “Where Greek steps the grass stops growing”, “Greek being a donkey can not be ridden”, “When the Greek lies, he does not believe himself” (Karavelov 1861: 23, 113, etc.).

In comparisons with the Turks, the Greeks were differentiated into distinct sub-groups. From the whole Greek community, those directly connected with their own spiritual and social oppression, the Greek-Phanariots, were detached. Some authors - V. Aprilov, P. Slavejkov, thought about this as temporary, something that would disappear with time. Also underlined was the lack of Bulgarian hatred for ‘others’ (ethnically foreign peoples), and their wish to develop mutual contacts of “historical and religious closeness”. The absence of explicit ethnic prejudices in Bulgarian minds was reinforced by the lack of absolutisation of their own positive characteristics. They viewed themselves as possessing many positive features, but at the same time, it was also said, some did not love their homeland and their people, were limited in their social activity, and their social sense was underdeveloped. Bulgarians were susceptible to thinking of themselves in negative terms. From earlier periods the Bulgarians had a consciousness of their cultural supremacy, and of themselves and their land as endowed with unique qualities; but this view was far from the Greeks’ assumption that their land was the center of the universe and they themselves were of a very special people. When revealing the Bulgarian ethnopsychological self-portrait the most observers strived for objectivity. It was in any case obvious, that the evaluation of the own Bulgarian characteristic features, made by some prominent activists among them at that time, crossed each other with their idea what should those features be in the ideal case.

It is difficult to generalise that the stereotypical image of the Other was one and the same for the whole society, for every single social stratum in it. Although the image



was from the period of the Enlightenment, formed mainly by the national intelligentsia and propaganda, it was never united and one-sided, moreover, it changed and differed through periods. The literature on stereotyping, however, shows that attitudes to outgroups are highly complex and differentiated. It has been suggested that the Balkan stereotyping can be viewed as “a strategy of successive approximations towards valuable generalizations in an environment of restricted information” ( ). It seems also true, that the process of image-building there could be viewed as a particular form of adaptive strategy for surviving and further developing, which is successful because it has its roots in the values of traditional cultures. Studying the stereotypes, the ethnologists should aim at finding appropriate methods of analysis which will take into account the Balkan complexities and specifics, and not simplify them for the sake of model building, which in fact kept me from major generalizations.

## LITERATURE

- Aprilov, 1968:** Априлов, В. Съчинения. Ред. П. Тотев. С., Български писател, 1968.
- Banac, 1993–1994:** Banac, I. Misreading the Balkans. – Foreign policy, 1993–1994, № 93.
- Bosvely, 1968:** Бозвели, Н. Съчинения. Ред. Ст. Таринска. С., Български писател, 1968.
- Cvijic, 1991:** Cvijic, C. Remaking the Balkans. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1991.
- Karavelov, 1966–1967:** Каравелов, Л. Съчинения. Т. 5–8. Ред. Цв. Унджиева. Български писател, 1966–1967.
- Karavelov, 1861:** Каравелов, Л. Памятники народного быта болгар. М., 1861.
- Paisii, 1972:** Паисий Хилендарски. Славянобългарска история. Ред. П. Динев. С., Български писател, 1972.
- Rakovsky, 1980:** Раковски, Г. С. Автобиографични трудове. Съст. В. Трайков. С., Изд-во на Отечествения фронт, 1980.
- Seliminsky, 1979:** Селимински, И. Избрани съчинения. Ред. М. Бъчваров. С., Наука и изкуство, 1979.
- Slaveikov, 1968–1971:** Славейков, П. Р. Избрани съчинения в 10 тома. Ред. Ст. Михайлова, Д. Леков. Т. 5–7. Публицистика. С., Български писател, 1968–1971.
- Smith, 1981.** The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Sofronii, 1966:** Софроний Врачански. Съчинения. С., Български писател, 1966.
- Stefanov, Robev, 2001:** Stefanov, Sv., N. Robev. The Doomed Peninsula: Confronting National Stereotypes in the Balkans from the Enlightenment until the World War II. – Nordic Notes. Vol. 5, 2001.