

# CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ACCULTURATION PROCESS IN THE LIGHT OF RESEARCH ON MACEDONIAN EMIGRATION TO THE PRINCIPALITY AND KINGDOM OF BULGARIA (A CASE STUDY)

MARIA PANDEVSKA

**ABSTRACT.** Theorists of migration attempt to establish certain basic frameworks for their classification and ranking, and nowadays, they also do so by introducing subcategories. However, the complexities still burden the precise delineation of all nuances of migration processes and their causes. This article, as a case study, is trying to make a small contribution to the vast topic of Balkan migrations. The focus is solely on the migration processes of the Macedonian population towards the territory of Bulgaria (in the 1870s and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) and their aftermath (acculturation). For this occasion, starting from the premise of “all refugees are migrants, but not every migrant is a refugee”, migrations are defined only using the following terms: 1) forced migrations with their product being refugees, and 2) continuous voluntary or so-called “quiet” migration processes. This article analyses an original document produced by a marginalised group in Bulgarian society: “notes” written on the blank spaces of the history. In this case, the viewpoints of these author(s) clash with the mainstream immigration policy of Bulgaria. This document in itself is xenophobic towards all those who do not originate from Bulgaria. However, certain details it provides correspond to the ways in which so-called “quiet” migrations unfold.

**Author:** Maria Pandevska, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Institute of National History, Sv. Kliment Ohridski st., Skopje 1000, North Macedonia, e-mail: mariamanol@hotmail.com

**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4165-9325>

**Keywords:** Ottoman Empire, Ottoman Macedonia, Principality, Kingdom of Bulgaria, migrations, acculturation

Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia, XXX, Poznań 2023, Wydawnictwo Wydziału Historii UAM, pp. 153–170, ISBN 978-83-67284-33-2, ISSN 0239-4278. English text with the summary in English.

<https://doi.org/10.14746/bp.2023.30.10>

## INTRODUCTION

Throughout a very long historical period, the Ottoman Empire was one of the main political factors that shaped the history and culture of Southeast Europe. From the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the Ottoman state was the largest political entity in this region. A large number of different nations and ethnic groups that spoke different languages

and affiliated with different religions were under its domination. It inherited this multicultural kaleidoscope largely from the sizeable, centuries-old Byzantine Empire. It is, therefore, a well-known fact that some of the reasons for the tectonic displacements of the population in this part of Europe was largely due to the permanent decline of both the military and the political power of the Ottoman Empire in 19<sup>th</sup> century and at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The most immediate result of this fact was a reduction of the empire's territory as a whole. On the one hand, every new episode of the Ottoman Empire retreating from its territories on the Balkan Peninsula triggered waves of Muslim populations to migrate towards the central and other parts of the Ottoman Empire which remained under its rule; while, at the same time, wars and uprisings forced the Christian and other populations to abandon their homes located in the areas that were in turmoil. On the other hand, parts of the population found the newly formed Balkan nation-states appealing and started to migrate towards them in search of a better standard of living and better stratification options. All these migrational movements are, by their extent and intensity, very important, complex and multilayered historical occurrences because of the significant impact they had on the later development of not only the Ottoman Empire but also the Balkan peoples/nations and ethnic groups. For this occasion, starting from the premise of "all refugees are migrants, but not every migrant is a refugee", these migrations are defined using only the following terms: 1) forced migrations (resulting from rebellions, uprisings, wars, and changes in political borders) with their product being refugees, and 2) an attempt is made, albeit limited, to identify at least a portion of voluntary or so-called "quiet" migration processes, which in this case does not involve refugees. The migrational movements of both the Muslim population and the Christian and other populations, irrespective of whether they were forced or voluntary, led to quantitative changes in the ratio of many ethnic and confessional groups, and left permanent historical marks on the later ethnic constellations of several Balkan regions and, consequently, on Ottoman Macedonia as well.

## HALF A CENTURY OF MIGRATIONAL OUTFLOW OF MACEDONIANS TOWARDS BULGARIA

### FORCED MIGRATIONS

Regarding forced migrations from Ottoman Macedonia towards the Principality (and later the Kingdom) of Bulgaria, there are numerous sources and historical literature because forced migrations are turbulent. Generally speaking, forced migrational processes are caused by big geopolitical shocks or border shifts as well as by rebellions, uprisings and wars, and are therefore visible and, to a certain degree, measurable. As regards the Macedonian emigrational waves of forced migration towards the Principality of Bulgaria, they began with the very establishment of the Principality

during the Great Eastern Crisis (1875–1885)<sup>1</sup> when a mass of about 2,000,000 heterogeneous (Muslim and Christian) refugees originated in the Balkans. The most important reasons, in this period, that stimulated mass migrational movements directly were rebellions, uprisings and wars.<sup>2</sup> As a result of these events, the Macedonian population (mostly from the areas around the lines of demarcation that would later, with certain changes, become state borders) arrived in Bulgaria as a wave of 30,000 refugees.<sup>3</sup>

Housing all the different refugees and their permanent settlement in the Principality of Bulgaria after the Great Eastern Crisis imposed the need for passing a law on regulating and arranging property and legal affairs. Therefore, one of the first laws passed in the Principality was the “Colonisation of the Empty Lands in Bulgaria Act.” According to this law, the refugees were directed towards and settled in those areas that were abandoned by the fleeing Ottomans, anywhere there were empty houses, available agricultural lands and estates.<sup>4</sup> In this period, most of the Macedonian immigrants belonged to the peasantry. During the first years of settling, the Macedonian refugees faced resistance from the native inhabitants who were reluctant to accept them. And understandably so because the refugees got the more attractive, that is, the abandoned, Muslim houses, mansions and estates which were located in the central, more appealing parts of the settlements. Because of this, the native Bulgarian inhabitants referred to them derisively as the “yabancı”, that is, outsiders. These refugees from Ottoman Macedonia increased the total number of inhabitants in the villages and in some towns within the Principality, and strengthened the Slavic element at the expense of the remaining Muslim population. And in the decades to come, they turned into a motivating factor for drawing in new Macedonian immigrational waves.

<sup>1</sup> M. Pandevska, *The Great Eastern Crisis (1875–1885) as a Balkan Historical Milestone (A Case Study of Article XXIII of the Berlin Treaty)*, “Przegląd Humanistyczny” 2002, vol. 68, no. 4, p. 76–92.

<sup>2</sup> М. Пандевска, *Присилни миграции во Македонија во годините на Големата источна криза (1875–1881)*, Скопје 1993. This book is written on the basis of the available historical sources. For this occasion we will point out to only some of them: *Освобождение Болгарии от турецкого ига. Документы в трех томах*, Москва 1967; С. Никитин, *Болгарский город в 1879 г. по донным русской переписи*, Москва 1966; *Документи за българската история. Документи из турските държавни архиви (1863–1909)*, vol. 3, София 1942; С. Муратовъ, *Документи за дѣйността на Русия по уредбата на гражданското управление въ България отъ 1877–1878 г.*, София 1905; Н. Михов, *Населението на Турция и България предъ XIII и XIX век*, София 1924; Д. Никовъ, *Преселници отъ Македония в Чепинското корито*, “Македонски преглед” 1933, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 37–49. The relevant works of Vasil Kanchov and many other documents, sources and literature from different proveniences. For some of them see also: M. Pandevska, *The refuge waves in Macedonia during the Great Eastern Crisis (1875–1881)* [in:] *Ottoman-Russian War of 1877–78*, Ankara 2007, p. 98–112.

<sup>3</sup> К. Битоски, *Македонија во времето на Големата источна криза (1875–1888)*, Скопје 1982, p. 204–215.

<sup>4</sup> С. Хисарлъшка-Танова, Н.С. Танов, *Изселвания и бежанци од Пиринския край след Кресненско-разлошкото въстание*, “Исторически преглед” 1980, vol. 36, no. 4, p. 73.

Turbulent forced migrations from Ottoman Macedonia towards Bulgaria also took place at the very beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century when the Bulgarian principality was once again hit by waves of forced refugees caused by the suppression of two uprisings: the Ilinden Uprising in Ottoman Macedonia and the Preobrazhenie Uprising in Ottoman Thrace. There was a relatively quick repatriation of the Macedonian refugee wave, but the process of repatriation itself can still never be fully executed in every detail.<sup>5</sup> However, the largest forced migrations that also led to big ethnic changes on the territory of Ottoman Macedonia took place in the third phase of the forced Macedonian emigration towards Bulgaria.<sup>6</sup> This was a conjuncture of complex historical events in quick succession: the Balkan Wars (1912–1913), World War I (1914–1918) and the resulting Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine for so-called “voluntary” population exchange (1923–1928). Besides the mass emigration of the Muslim population, forced Macedonian migrational processes towards Bulgaria appeared again in this period as a consequence of this redrawing of the Balkan borders and, most of all, because of the disintegration of Ottoman Macedonia as an ethnic and geographical entirety.<sup>7</sup> And so, the Bulgarian historiography contains data that the number of the Macedonian population that immigrated to Bulgaria in the period between 1913 and 1928 was 86,582, while in the Macedonian historiography that figure rises to about 120,000 people.<sup>8</sup> Although there is a discrepancy in the said figures, one should still take into consideration the fact that these forced migrational processes that lasted over a decade took place at a time of wars and various losses in the civilian population. In the period of one decade, this type of forced migration was, to a large extent, fluctuating, and followed by movements of refugees within the territory of Bulgaria as well as by processes of repatriation or regrouping. What can be stated is the fact that the Macedonian emigration towards Bulgaria was a human potential that was not to be underestimated as it would later be increased by the natural growth rate that inevitably follows.

### CONTINUOUS VOLUNTARY EMIGRATION

Unlike forced migrations, in order to follow the steady continuous outflow of the population one must use scant and scattered source data that can provide only a general

<sup>5</sup> М. Пандевски, *Илинденските бегалци во Бугарија во 1903–1904 година*, “Разгледни” 1961, vol. 4, no. 3, p. 252–272.

<sup>6</sup> This article shall not analyse the situation of Macedonians from the part that will be conquered and incorporated into the Bulgarian system after the Balkan Wars. The difference between this Macedonian population and the Macedonian refugees in Bulgaria is based on the fact that the former cannot be considered as refugees: they mostly remained in their own hearths and homes in the Pirin area.

<sup>7</sup> М. Pandevska, *The term Macedonian(s) in Ottoman Macedonia: on the map and in the mind*, “Nationalities Papers, The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity” 2012, vol. 40, no. 5, p. 747–766.

<sup>8</sup> Р. Владимир, *Българите въ Македония подъ гръцка властъ*, “Македонски прегледъ” 1941, vol. 4, p. 90. Т. Христов Симовски, *Атлас на населените места во Егејска Македонија*, Скопје 1997, p. viii–xv.

frame concerning the numbers. It is a continuous process that is very difficult to follow historiographically. With voluntary emigration, it is very rare for large groups of population to suddenly move. Quite the opposite, as with this type of migration there is a lasting and constant outflow of smaller groups or individuals which, in the beginning, transpires almost unnoticeably. These outward migrational currents are decades long (which is also the case with Ottoman Macedonia) and can result in permanent changes in the ethnic composition of the population in distinct regions. Voluntary political-economic migration feeds itself (those who had already left draw the next individual who then draws the next, and so on) and, thus, in time increases in accordance with the law of mathematical progression.

The postulates of the “push-pull” theory, which addresses the factors for the emergence of migration movements, also apply to voluntary emigration. Generally speaking, these fall into two groups. The first group comprises factors inciting the movement of population, and the second contains factors for attracting it.<sup>9</sup> The factors for inciting movement include coercion and are related to the country of origin of the migrants, of which the most common are the following: not enough jobs (in the Macedonian case, the most pressing problem was the Christian peasantry not having enough arable land because of the vast Ottoman estates); limited opportunities for upward social stratification (which stemmed from the Ottoman social concept); primitive living conditions; religious restrictions (in spite of all the implemented reforms, the Ottoman Empire continued to rest on the fundamental division of its subjects — Muslim domination over any other religious group); political fear and fear of terror as well as of natural disasters (in the Macedonian case, it was years of drought and difficulties in agricultural management that were not lessened by a reduction in Ottoman taxes). In Ottoman Macedonia, all these factors inciting the movement of population towards Bulgaria were in place at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It was most concisely reviewed by Acad. Manol Pandevski in his analytical article: *The Situation of Macedonia in the Ottoman Empire towards the end of 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Although the article only partly covers the large topic of Macedonian emigration, in its subheadings it still covers, from the aspect of the “push-pull” theory, the factors for inciting the outflow of the Macedonian population: the primitive fiscal and agrarian relations, the empire’s difficult semi-colonial economic state, the devastation of the manufactural and artisanal production, the unsustainability of tax burdens, the corruption of clerks within the Ottoman authorities (particularly at a local level), and banditry.<sup>10</sup>

The factors for attracting migration refer to the conditions of the country to where people are immigrating. Therefore, the factors for attracting migration can be found in: job opportunities, better living conditions, political freedoms, opportunities for all

<sup>9</sup> E.S. Lee, *A Theory of Migration*, “Demography” 1966, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 47–57.

<sup>10</sup> М. Пандевски, *Положбата на Македонија во Османлиската империја кон крајот XIX на и почетокот на XX век* [in:] *Македонското ослободително дело во XIX и XX век: пројави, релации, ликови*, vol. 5, Скопје 1986, p. 7–29.

kinds of education, better medical care, life and property security, as well as family ties from previous emigrational processes. It is precisely these factors that are discussed in the Bulgarian brochure *Position of the Native Bulgarians and the Foreigners in Bulgaria* (*Положението на туземците българи и чужденците в България*) published in 1905.<sup>11</sup> For these reasons, this represents one historical source which provides some information regarding the constant, that is, voluntary, Macedonian migration towards the Principality of Bulgaria. The authors of this brochure talk, although in a pejorative manner, about these immigrational waves. And the brochure's subtitle is rather dramatic: *Secret Occupation of the Bulgarian State* (*Тайната окупация на българската държава*). The front page itself bears the call: "Hey Bulgarian! Nefarious deeds imprison you again! Wake up, save yourself, because tomorrow it will already be late!" The brochure ends with disturbing public appeals addressed to the Bulgarian Monarch and all native Bulgarians — industrialists and merchants, craftsmen, pupils and students, as well the "respected Bulgarian women" — who are asked to raise awareness and take actions against this "secret occupation."<sup>12</sup> This brochure of about 60 pages is very interesting and contains plentiful historical material which can be scholarly analysed from a number of aspects.<sup>13</sup> However, one should approach this source document carefully because its text contains strong words that were meant to provoke certain emotions in its readers at the time. What cannot be disregarded are the claims by the author/authors of the text concerning the issue of immigrational processes in the Principality, as well as their intent to spread those positions throughout the Bulgarian public. Therewith, this committee's disagreement with the general (in their opinion, clientelistic) policy led by the Bulgarian state, is obvious. The fact that this issue also existed in the Bulgarian daily and weekly press at the time, can be noticed as well. The target group, that is, who this disturbing text was aimed at, is absolutely clear — it was aimed solely at the Bulgarian native/indigenous inhabitants and the Bulgarian Monarch as the "progenitor of the Bulgarian royal dynasty."<sup>14</sup> All of them together should, in their opinion, stop that "disastrous" immigrant policy, that is, it is they who should "wake up" and realise that a "secret occupation" of their homeland by foreigners (i.e., strangers) was underway.

<sup>11</sup> *Положението на туземците българи и чужденците в България, Тайната окупация на Българската държава*, София 1905.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>13</sup> This brochure does not bear the name of the author/authors. It is anonymous and from its content one can understand that it is due to the fact that it is not in correlation with the official Bulgarian policy. A somewhat more detailed analysis points to authors of certain articles in the Bulgarian magazines/newspapers at the time, i.e. the articles quoted in the brochure taken from "Evening Mail (Вечерна поща)", "Sacred Work (Свято дело)", "People's Rights (Народни права)", "People's Will (Народна воля)" and "Free Word (Свободно слово)". It also points to the followers of the Bulgarian activist Hristo Zahariev (Христо Ст. Захариевъ), the author of *Remnants of the Most Dangerous Parasites in Bulgaria* (*Остатъци от най-опасните паразити на България*) printed in Tatar Pazardzik in 1902.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 56–62.

But who in fact were the “чюзденцитѣ (foreigners)”, those uninvited guests?<sup>15</sup> The answer is precise and is as follows:

Our country is burdened with an entire scum of outsiders: strangers and foreigners, a rabble of the lowest people, thirsty for gold, cunning and sly schemers, and venal dark human figures that consist of: Greeks; Armenians; German, Russian, Polish and Roman Jews; Germans; Czechs; Tsintsars; Bessarabians;<sup>16</sup> Macedonians; Poles; Arnauts, Montenegrins, Croats, Serbs and *tutti quanti vagabondi* (all other sorts of tramps).<sup>17</sup>

However, despite mentioning all of the above peoples and ethnic groups, most of the space in the text is devoted to the Macedonians. It was they who, according to the authors, came to the Bulgarian homeland “in greatest numbers” and “occupy” their jobs in state institutions, and even took up positions in the most profitable crafts.<sup>18</sup> And so the authors conclude that:

for us, native Bulgarians, even though masters of the Bulgarian state, there are only three crafts left to do and have any benefits from. And they are: a) working the sooty land; b) military service; and c) paying the hefty state, municipal and other taxes.<sup>19</sup>

From this aspect, the brochure is also interesting in terms of researching xenophobia which can appear in different historical periods and social orders. In this case, it occurred at the very beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in one marginalised group of Bulgarian citizens. However, these ideas and similar ones will be abused and exploited worldwide during World War II. But in this case, all those issues are not in this article’s area of scholarly interest.

The discontent of this brochure’s authors is directed towards the settling (whether permanent or temporary) of all non-Bulgarians in Bulgaria, and towards the Macedonians in particular as it is they who were perceived as “foreign newcomers” who exploited the state’s wealth and utilised state privileges. However much exaggerated their positions and fears were, this process was, nonetheless, not to be underestimated. Therefore, if one scratches the surface with a little more criticism and then removes the xenophobia from the brochure for a moment, one would find that its words really do speak of a permanent outflow of human potential from Ottoman Macedonia to-

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> Despite the fact that the Bessarabians were part of the Bulgarian diaspora, this Committee still does not recognise them as their own, i.e. native. Namely, it is claimed that when they left Ottoman Bulgaria, they did not have a national awareness at all and therefore are not Bulgarians but are: “Gagauzes from Varnen area more than they are Bulgarians (as is demonstrated by their family names). And again, today’s Gagauzes are Turks by origin who have abandoned their faith but kept their language, and that is why they always speak Turkish at home”; *Положението на туземцитѣ*, p. 9–10.

<sup>17</sup> Ibidem, p. 10–11.

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem, p. 51–52.

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, p. 15.

wards Bulgaria. Thus, the following data that speak of increased opportunities for getting jobs can also be read in the authors' accounts:

In Bulgaria, there are now more than 40–50,000 Macedonians and Bessarabians alone who have taken up all of the above said<sup>20</sup> artisanal jobs, and 3,500–4,000 new moochers come every year, all with speculative goals. 300–360 of them position themselves in the state or municipal services (...).<sup>21</sup>

As regards this situation, it is also said that: “The Macedonians in particular — not only do they constantly exhaust all of our people by drawing more than half of the sum of the state budget as government employees...” but they have also “kidnapped the chance” (...) for 500,000 native inhabitants (...) “to earn for a living (...) after chasing and pushing them away from the various artisanal jobs in a furtive and sneaky manner, and gained more (money) in our liberated homeland than the entire population of today’s Macedonia.”<sup>22</sup> Their conclusion is that Bulgarians: “are to feed not only themselves and not only all of the foreigners that are in our country together with their luxurious and crazy caprices, but their families too who live far away from our homeland.”<sup>23</sup>

The authors of both the brochure and the articles in the newspapers point precisely to the opportunities that Bulgarian society at the time was offering, with an undeniable upward stratification in the secular and in the spiritual authorities as well. A large number of foreigners (of whom most were Macedonians) were, according to the authors, positioned and highly ranked in the state’s army, while: “The Ministry of internal affairs (with the exception of the minister himself) is completely in the foul hands of the foreigners, and Macedono-Tsintsaro-Greeks, Greeks — Levantines, Hungarians and Macedonians are spread all over it.”<sup>24</sup> As far as church activities were concerned, according to them, more than two-thirds of the clerics were Macedonians.<sup>25</sup>

This brochure also gives information about Bulgarian society at the time which, compared to the rest of the Balkan states, was at a higher level of respecting political freedoms and the freedom of expression. Thus, the authors report:

The Macedonians in Macedonia are Turkish citizens (subjects) just as they are here too. But even though they live here in Bulgaria, and as Bulgarian clerks no less, they still pay the Turk (here at the Turkish commissariat) the military tax they owe Turkey with the money they extract from our treasury (...) Those people here in Bulgaria, after taking up various stations, never refer to themselves as Bulgarians and even when you ask one of them: What are you? He replies that he is Macedonian, and

<sup>20</sup> The authors of this brochure meticulously list almost every possible craft and artisanal job that existed at the time in Bulgaria, and at the same time it is claimed that most of them are taken by the “foreigners”; *Положението на туземците*, p. 13–14.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16–17.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11–12.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 28. Perhaps this conclusion drawn by the authors could reveal why their organization was conspirative.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 13.



not Bulgarian; in Greece they are pure Greeks and Greek subjects; in Serbia they are the purest Serbs from old Serbia; in Romania they are pure Romanians, Tsintsars and can pass for Romanians; it is because these people come to Bulgaria just so they can milk it like it is some kind of a cow.<sup>26</sup>

The authors were also deeply insulted by the newcomers' behaviour as, according to them:

(...) because of vanity, delusion of grandeur, stupidity or boorishness, as well as because of disrespect towards us — the foreigners have not made the least bit of effort to learn our language, nor has any one of them seen to acquiring Bulgarian citizenship. And they come here and stay as if on their fathers' chifliks, and in the state institutions you'll hear them speak a Babylonian language which is unknown to our people.<sup>27</sup>

Family ties are one of the more important encouraging factors for immigration, and this brochure's authors also account for this situation in Bulgaria. They write that the Macedonians:

as soon as they arrive at the station in Sofia, they are met by their various agents sent by their secret associations to interview them, find out and write down who desires what kind of craft (...) Any one (of the readers) who is curious will see for himself that this is the case if he goes to the Sofia station just once and stays there a little from 4 to 6 o'clock in the afternoon. And how many more people arrive that are of other nationalities and have the same purpose? (...).<sup>28</sup>

According to them: „The foreigners here establish their own secret associations in line with their origins (in nationality) and help each other.”<sup>29</sup>

By carefully reading the words of this brochure, one can also find out about the opportunities for the Macedonians for accessing higher education:

(...) The Macedonians — those people who up until our liberation didn't know what nationality they were, and called themselves Takavakas; it is because in their speech one often hears the words “taka (like that)” and “vaka (like this/ like that)”, and therefore they took no part in our liberation movement. But then, as they penetrated our free country and were educated and awakened with the help of our scholarships, instead of being grateful, they rose to power in our state authorities through their secret associations and today they govern us!<sup>30</sup>

These claims related to granting Bulgarian state scholarships to Macedonians is also confirmed by current Bulgarian researchers. On the basis of an extensive source documentation that was processed and that pertains to the nostrification of foreign diplomas acquired only in the period of 1878–1912, the historian Ivan Tanchev gives

<sup>26</sup> Ibidem, p. 19–20.

<sup>27</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>28</sup> Ibidem, p. 16–17.

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem, p. 29.

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem, p. 9–10.

a detailed list of almost 500 Macedonians.<sup>31</sup> These foreign diplomas of various educational vocations were acquired at European higher education institutions such as: European universities, academies, conservatories, and regular and specialised schools. These facts are also complemented by the data provided in the survey carried out up to 1918 by the Executive Committee of Macedonian Associations (*Изпълнителния комитет на македонските братства*) where it is stated that:

Macedonia gave Bulgaria 8 ministers, 13 diplomats, more than 54 members of parliament, 11 metropolitans, 12 university professors, 83 educated people (writers and publicists), 32 artists (sculptors, musicians and artists), over 24 senior officials in the educational office, 96 jurists (judges and lawyers), more than 70 senior administrative clerks, 70 doctors, 32 engineers and architects, 679 active and reserve officers, 568 teachers, 96 senior clerics and 1378 other officials (...) and this list is not complete and is subject to further additions.<sup>32</sup>

Therefore, the discontent of the authors of “The Position of the Native Bulgarians and the Foreigners in Bulgaria” and their feeling that the native Bulgarians were somehow deprived of their rights in their own homeland, should not be surprising. For these reasons, they depict the Macedonians only as exploitative people.<sup>33</sup>

The essence of identifying Bulgarians and Macedonians on the basis of their affiliations and the feelings they harboured towards their homelands (the former towards Bulgaria, and the latter towards Ottoman Macedonia) points to one of the fundamental prerogatives necessary for establishing the nationality of a certain ethnic group: the territoriality of a nation.<sup>34</sup> The specificity of the historical process for establishing the Macedonian nation in Ottoman Macedonia can also be analysed on the basis of the postulates of Miroslav Hroch’s theory.<sup>35</sup> A deeper analysis points to the conclusion that the Macedonian ethnos as a whole has gone through stages A and B in its homeland but only through the first element of stage C, that is, only through the mass mobilisation and activities of the MRO which led to the Ilinden Uprising.<sup>36</sup> However, as a result of the failure to establish a separate Macedonian state in that period, and as a con-

<sup>31</sup> И. Танчев, *Македонският компонент при формирането на българска интелигенция и европейско образование (1878–1912)*, “Македонски преглед” 2001, vol. 3, p. 41–62.

<sup>32</sup> Съюз на македонските емигрантски организации в България, *Македонците в културно-политическия живот на България. Анкета на Изпълнителния комитет на македонските братства*, “Балкански Въпроси” 1918, vol. 10, p. 22.

<sup>33</sup> *Положението на туземците*, p. 56.

<sup>34</sup> G.W. White, *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in Southeastern Europe*, New York–Oxford 2000.

<sup>35</sup> M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions of the National Revival in Europe, A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of the Patriotic Group among the Smaller European Nations*, Cambridge–London–New York 1985, p. 194; M. Пандевска, *Транзициите во македонското националноослободително движење (1893–1908): низ теоријата на Мирослав Хрох* [in:] *Транзициите во историјата и културата*, Скопје 2008, p. 171–186.

<sup>36</sup> MRO — Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (SMORO since 1896, IMORO since 1905) was established in 1893 in Thessalonica and it self-dissolved in 1908, also in Thessalonica. Any other later organizations that will contain the same or similar abbreviations in their names are in fact just parts

sequence of the Balkan Wars, Hroch's stage C was forcibly terminated in Ottoman Macedonia. After the Balkan Wars, the territoriality of the homeland of Macedonia was lost in those parts that fell under different state systems. For these reasons it was not possible, under those political and social conditions, for the second element of the third stage, Hroch's stage C — the development of Macedonian “grand processes of transformation in cultural sphere (the rise of a modern literature, political ideologies, the theatre and so on, and also in the social sphere) (the rise of intelligentsia)”<sup>37</sup> — to be fully carried out. The realisation of the slogan “Macedonia to the Macedonians” dissipated under the deluge of military conquests and the Ottoman Empire's retreat from the Balkans.

The Macedonian refugee masses as well as the Macedonians who had already settled in both the forced and the voluntary migrational processes in Bulgaria went through and completed Hroch's stage C within the established institutional culture of the Bulgarian state, and the previously started processes of Macedonian national establishment would, with them, be smothered by the Bulgarian one. I am taking into account here the majority of Macedonian immigrants and not just the individuals — the Macedonian intellectuals or political leaders, many of whom later on continued to create in Bulgaria, their Macedonian activism abundantly documented as well as their tragic destinies as victims of assassinations or marginalised and destitute individuals.<sup>38</sup>

### MACEDONIAN-BULGARIAN RELATIONS THROUGH THE PARADIGM OF ACCULTURATION

In order to be able to understand — from today's (from before the start of the third decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century) aspect — the dispute between the Macedonian and Bulgarian historiography as related to the history of Ottoman Macedonia/the region of Macedonia, one should also make use of the postulates of anthropology. This document from 1905, as an example, speaks openly about the contact of two different ethnic groups on the territory of Bulgaria. The brochure provides us with the information that in 1905 there was awareness (in line with every parameter of Fredrik Barth's theory) of the existence of an ethnic border between Bulgarians and Macedonians.<sup>39</sup> One

---

of its factions (often with contrasted ideologies, agendas and activities) and they operated in completely new social circumstances.

<sup>37</sup> M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions*, p. 28.

<sup>38</sup> For this occasion, (regarding the fact that this issue is not in the focus of this article) only the latest two publications of the Macedonian historiography will be used as an example: *Петар Манџуков (1878–1966): Анархист и критичар на едно време. Публикации и писма*, ed. M. Митрова, Скопје 2019; *Петар Манџуков (1878–1966) и неговиот светоглед, Раскази, публикации и писма*, (ed.) M. Митрова, Скопје 2020.

<sup>39</sup> F. Barth, *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*, Oslo 1969.

group's members were natives in their homeland of Bulgaria and the other one's were "foreigners" — "newcomers" from their homeland of Macedonia. According to the brochure, the former recognised the latter as being "the others" because of the difference in their language as well, to which certain different psychological characteristics were added. The Bulgarian authors of the brochure also point to the difference in how the anti-Ottoman liberation processes unfolded in both groups, and thus point to an already created (in the 20<sup>th</sup> century) different historical experience.

However, a process of acculturation undeniably transpired over time with the Macedonian immigrants. With acculturation, it can often happen that ethnic borders can be overcome as they are not insurmountable obstacles, but rather are fluid, mobile and permeable. Hence, "ethnic borders can uphold, strengthen, fade or disappear over time (...)". Thanks to the amalgamation, the last two changes "can acquire the shape of erosion."<sup>40</sup> Although sometimes the term acculturation is equated with cultural assimilation, that is, with the complete absorption of the dominated culture into the dominant one, modern anthropology insists on a mutuality of the processes in the cultural exchange, that is, they are analysed as one dynamic category that is constantly in a process of internal movement and exchange with others. And so, as a dynamic process, acculturation (over time) implies changes in both groups such as in beliefs, emotions, behaviour, as well as in values, positions, identification models, historical experiences, etc. Old meanings can be ascribed to new elements, and new values can get the initial sense of old cultural forms. This process is two-dimensional in the sense that the ethnic group and its members maintain, although to various degrees, their traditional culture while adapting to the dominant (mainstream) society.<sup>41</sup> But the dominant, or the donating, culture also becomes susceptible to changes under the influence of certain aspects of the newly arrived culture or the acculturated group.<sup>42</sup> Acculturation represents the process in which, due to the contact between two different cultural groups, the culture of one or possibly both of the groups changes by adopting certain elements of the other group's culture, or even adopting it completely (in its entirety).<sup>43</sup>

First, there is the issue of the width of cultural changes analysed in the acculturation: Does the acculturation touch the whole society or just certain groups of the population that are in contact (most often the elite, the educated social layers and those employed in the governing mechanism)? In our observation case, related to the Macedonian immigrants in Bulgaria, it can be concluded that it was not a small

<sup>40</sup> F. Putinja, Z. Stref-Fenar, *Teorije o etnicitetu*, Beograd 1997, p. 174–175.

<sup>41</sup> K. Liebkind, *Acculturation* [in:] *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*, eds. Rupert Brown, Samuel L. Gaertner, London 2003, p. 394–396.

<sup>42</sup> J.E. Trimble, Trimble E. Joseph, *Introduction: Social change and Acculturation* [in:] *Acculturation, Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied research*, eds. Kevin M. Chun et al., Washington 2003, p. 7.

<sup>43</sup> I. Spasic, *Akulturacija* [in:] *Sociološki rečnik*, eds. Aljoša Mimica, Marija Bogdanović, Beograd 2007, p. 7–8.

number of the Macedonian immigrants who were provided with conditions for a rapid upwards stratification; some of them towards the elite of Bulgarian society (towards those social layers that are politically engaged public figures — policymakers), while the basic needs for a decent existence were provided for the majority of Macedonian immigrants. However, in this case there are groups that belong to different social layers of the part of the native Bulgarian population that felt threatened in their own homeland by precisely those opportunities given to the “newcomers”. Later research points to the fact that in spite of this (marginalised) resistance within Bulgarian society in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this tendency to favour immigrational processes continued.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, the answer to the above question would be: the dominant Bulgarian culture becomes susceptible to changes under the influence of the Macedonian acculturated group.

Second, also important in acculturation, is the issue related to the circumstances under which the contact occurs: Is it desired or imposed, planned or spontaneous, tolerated or resisted? When the contact is desired, it causes a gradual adjustment within a mainly peaceful exchange. In the case of Macedonian immigrants in Bulgaria from voluntary migration, this contact is desired. But the brochure as a source material on these migrations, on the other hand, speaks of a discontent (maybe marginalised) that existed in some parts of Bulgarian society with respect to these immigrational processes. The claim that there was a “secret occupation” of their homeland underway cannot be underestimated as far as the contact between these two ethnic groups was concerned. Therefore, regarding the circumstances under which this contact occurred, it can be concluded that it was contradictory: it was desirable for the members of one group and imposed for some of the others. And as regards the turbulent migrational processes that occurred as a product of wars, the very use of the term “forced” migrations make it clear that it was a process imposed on both ethnic groups.

Third, the characteristics of those cultures that come into contact are also important in acculturation: What is the difference in demographics, political significance and economic development, and what is the initial degree of cultural similarity? In this case, it is an undeniable fact that in the Balkans, the Macedonian and Bulgarian peoples are the closest as far as the language and ethnic distinctions are concerned. But with respect to political significance and economic development, in 1905 the Bulgarian nation already had a rich history and tradition which began even before 1876. In acculturation, loaning mostly occurs in the direction from the more powerful cultures towards the less powerful ones, from the more prestigious towards the less prestigious, and from the more complex towards the less complex ones. In our case, it means that the smothering will be executed by the more powerful state-established Bulgarian culture onto the Macedonian immigrants. However, the interaction between these two groups here is also not to be underestimated. Thus, under the influ-

---

<sup>44</sup> И. Танчев, *Македонският компонент при формирането*, p. 42.

ence of Bulgaria's state interests for territorial enlargement towards the "warm seas", the Macedonian acculturated group gained in importance in the comprehensive process of development of the Bulgarian state. This direct joining would put the Bulgarian state in a situation where it had to enter into alliances three times with those states that could offer it and approve that territorial enlargement.

FACING TODAY'S DILEMMAS:  
ENTANGLED, SHARED OR ANAMORPHOUS HISTORY?

When historical sources talk about turbulent forced and continuing voluntary Macedonian migrational processes in the direction from Ottoman Macedonia to Bulgaria, it becomes clear that the Macedonian populational waves (over a period of several decades) have been, as human potential, incorporated into the Bulgarian national corpus. But under the influence of the Macedonian acculturated group, changes occurred in the dominant Bulgarian culture as well. In the course of this prolonged contact, the native Bulgarian historical experiences and processes were equated with the Macedonian historical experiences and processes. Despite the existence of an abundantly documented Bulgarian history (for the Middle Ages, for the struggle to liberate from the Ottoman domination, as well as a rich state history), a direct linking (much like the arithmetic operation of adding) of all that Bulgarian history to the history of the region Macedonia happened over time.

In Macedonian-Bulgarian relations, the problem in treating these topics appears abruptly after World War II and the establishment of the first Macedonian national state within the Yugoslav Federation on the territory conquered by the Serbs during the Balkan Wars. The Macedonians in the Kingdom of SHS/Yugoslavia were marginalised, politically deprived of their rights, and subjected to terror as well as to colonisation and assimilation processes, and branded with the term Southern Serbians. However, during and following World War II, when historical conditions allowed it, they employed their entire human potential in the establishment of Macedonian institutional culture, starting with the codification of the Macedonian national language all the way through to the establishment of various Macedonian national institutions (educational, cultural, state, and so forth). Under these newly created historical circumstances, the Macedonian nation (within the Yugoslav Federation as its equal federal member) completed the last necessary precondition from Hroch's third stage in the establishment of smaller European nations — the development of an autochthonous high culture.<sup>45</sup>

Hence, historically completely spontaneously, the feeling of difference between the natives and the "чюзденцитѣ" (foreigners) was reactivated in the Bulgarian

---

<sup>45</sup> M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions*, p. 22–30.

state. Therefore, one of the reasons for nonacceptance of the historical reality as well as for the animosity of the acculturated group towards establishing (on the historical scene) Macedonian statehood over a part of the region of Macedonia is due to the fact that this process reminds them that they are not quite native.<sup>46</sup> The persistence in insisting that the Macedonian nation is just a “communist creation” is derived from these complicated and complex historical relations. This is why the following question should be posed: Are not their family histories also connected to the struggle for liberating the Macedonian nation from Ottoman dominance (regardless of the fact that — over several generations of acculturation — they developed, and rightly so, a Bulgarian national awareness)? One should not view this problem only through the prism of the Macedonians who had gone through all of the stages of development of a nation in the Republic of North Macedonia (RNM). The problem should also be viewed through the prism of those who have the national awareness of Bulgarians but who originate from Ottoman Macedonia. And as long as they accept the analogousness of their self-perception as nationally aware Bulgarians with Macedonian origins, the problem does not exist. The problem appears when they try to explain these complex processes only through the prism of some kind of “artificial establishment” or, in more extreme cases, through denying the existence of Macedonians and a distinct Macedonian nation, and when these positions become the basis of the contacts between two sovereign states.

But history and historical processes are never black and white. Accordingly, the path towards Macedonian-Bulgarian interactions should start with the separation of these problems: because as we in RNM should not deny them their family history (oftentimes revolutionary, mythologising the birthland, or sometimes “Lost in Translation” as regards the forefathers’ affiliation to a certain political option or action) and their Macedonian origins, all the while respecting their Bulgarian national awareness, so they should not deny us the fact that, due to historical circumstances, this part of the Macedonian ethnos has completed Hroch’s third stage in a distinct manner. Only on the basis of these postulates could it be distinguished what is entangled, what is shared or mutual, and what is the anamorphous history of these two closest Balkan nations. Hence, the pictorial form of anamorphosis is in fact a contorted/distorted projection that requires the viewer to use a special device or assume a specific position or angle in order to be able to reconstruct the image. There are two types of anamorphous works in painting: those that require a change in perspective and those that require specific mirrors to catch the true image painted on the canvas. For instance, *Leonardo’s Eye* by Leonardo Da Vinci is the earliest example of an anamorphic perception while Hans Holbein’s *The Ambassadors*, which is exhibited in the National Gallery in London, is perhaps the most famous work of anamorphosis where a distorted shape is positioned diagonally at the bottom of the painting. When this distorted shape is seen from a specific angle, it transforms into the real image. In

---

<sup>46</sup> F. Putinja, Z. Stref-Fenar, *Teorije o etnicitetu*, p. 182.

short, anamorphosis is a deformed image that appears in its true shape only after it is viewed in an unconventional manner or through a special mirror, often in the shape of a cylinder. And this is precisely why I believe that the sincere and politically unburdened historical science is the only tool (the mirror) or approach (such as the unconventionality in observing) for viewing the vast canvas of what represents the processes for establishing the Balkan nations, each with its own specifics, distinct trajectories, sometimes having a point of connection or entanglement, and sometimes distant parallel processes.

The bridges that should be the basis of this bringing closer have so far, unfortunately, been the obstacles over which that bringing closer tripped. In order to overcome these differences easier, we should all agree with the German historian Holm Sundhaussen. He wrote:

If one would start to write the history of the Balkans from the perspective of the history of relocations/migrations, one would get a much more realistic and closer depiction of the reality than that provided to us by the twisted and extremely constructed national history.<sup>47</sup>

Accordingly, as regards Macedonian-Bulgarian relations, the disputes that encumber the present could be overcome by researching the migrational processes between the regions of Bulgaria and Macedonia. That way, all of us here in the Balkans will quite simply discern that in the past, under certain historical conditions, we have shared mutual as well as created our own historical processes.

## REFERENCES

- Barry W. John, Sam David, *Acculturation and Adaptation* [in:] *Handbook of cross-culture philology, Social behavior and applications*, eds. John W. Barry et al., vol. 3, Boston 1997, p. 291–327.
- Barth Fredrik, *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*, Oslo 1969.
- Bitoski Krste, *Makedoniya vo vremeto na Golemata istočka kriza (1875–1888)*, Skopje 1982 [Битоски Крсте, *Македонија во времето на Големата источна криза (1875–1888)*, Скопје 1982].
- Corbet John, *Ernest George Ravenstein: The Laws of Migration, 1885*, “CSILSS Classics” 2003, p. 1–4.
- Dokumenti za bălgarskata istoriya. Dokumenti za turskite dărzavni arhivi (1863–1909), vol. 3, Sofiija [Документи за българската история. Документи из турските държавни архиви (1863–1909), София 1942].
- Everett S. Lee, *A Theory of Migration*, “Demography” 1966, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 47–57.
- Hanioglu M. Sukru, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, Princeton 2008.
- Hrisarlaška-Tanova Spasina, Tanov Stoyan, *Izelvaniya i bežanci od Pirinskiya kraj Krespensko-razloškoto v’stanie, “Istoričeski pregled”* 1980, vol. 36, no. 4, p.70–83 [Хисарлъшка-Танова Спасина, Танов Стоян, *Изелвания и бежанци од Пиринския край след Кресненско-разлошкото въстание, “Исторически преглед”* 1980].
- Hroch Miroslav, *Social Preconditions of the National Revival in Europe, A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of the Patriotic Group among the Smaller European Nations*, New York 1985.

<sup>47</sup> Х. Зундхаусен, *Историја Србије од 19 до 21 века*, Београд 2008, p. 54.



- Jordanowski Nikola, *Some Considerations about the 19th-century National Revival in Macedonia* [in:] *Miejsce Macedonii na Balkanach, Historia — Polityka — Kultura — Nauka*, ed. I. Stawowy-Kawka, Krakow 2005, p. 199–208.
- Lange-Akhund Nadine, *The Macedonian Question, 1893–1908, from Western Sources*, New York 1998.
- Liebkind Karmela, *Acculturation* [in:] *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*, eds. Rupert Brown, Samuel L. Gaertner, London 2003, p. 386–406.
- Marinov Tchavdar, *“We, the Macedonians”: The Paths of Macedonian Supra-nationalism, 1878–1912* [in:] *“We, the People”: Politics of National Peculiarity in Southeastern Europe*, ed. Diana Mishkova, Budapest 2009, p. 107–139.
- Mihov Nikola, *Naselenieto na Turciya i Bǎlgariya pred’ XIII i XIX vek*, Sofiyya 1924 [Михов Никола, *Населението на Турция и България предъ XIII и XIX век*, София 1924].
- Muratov Sergej, *Dokumenti za d’nostata na Rusit’ po uredbama na graždanskoto upravlenie v B’garii ot 1877–1878*, Sofiyya 1905 [Muratovъ Сергей, *Документи за дѣйността на Руситъ по уредбата на гражданското управление въ България отъ 1877–1878 г.*, София 1905].
- Nikitin Sergej, *Bolgarskij gorod v 1879 g. po donnym russkoi perepisi*, Moskva 1966 [Никитин Сергей, *Болгарский город в 1879 г. по данным русской переписи*, Москва 1966].
- Nikov D., *Preselnici ot’ Makedoniya v Ćepinskoto korito*, “Makedonski pregled” 1933, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 37–49 [Никовъ Д., *Преселници отъ Македония в Чепинското корито*, “Македонски преглед” 1933].
- Pandevska Marija, *Periodizaciya velikogo vostoĉnogo krizisa (1875–1881)* [in:] *Balkanot i Rusiia: Opštoto i specifiĉnoto vo istoriskiot i kulturniot razvitok*, Skorje 2010, p. 23–34. Пандевска Марија, *Периодизација великого восточногo кризиса (1875–1881)* [in:] *Балканот и Русија: Општото и специфичното во историскиот и културниот развојок*, Скопје 2010].
- Pandevska Marija, *Prisilni migracii vo Makedonija vo godinite na Golemata istoĉna kriza (1875–1881)*, Skorje 1993 [Пандевска Марија, *Присилни миграции во Македонија во годините на Големата источна криза (1875–1881)*, Скопје 1993].
- Pandevska Maria, *The Great Eastern Crisis (1875–1885) as a Balkan Historical Milestone (A Case Study of Article XXIII of the Berlin Treaty)*, “Przegład Humanistyczny” 2002, vol. 68, no. 4, p. 76–92.
- Pandevska Maria, *The refuge waves in Macedonia during the Great Eastern Crisis (1875–1881)* [in:] *Ottoman-Russian War of 1877–78*, Ankara 2007, p. 98–112.
- Pandevska Maria, *The term Macedonian(s) in Ottoman and Macedonia: on the map and in the mind*, “Nationalities Papers, The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity” 2012, vol. 40, no. 5, p. 747–766.
- Pandevska Marija, *Tranziciite vo makedonskoto nacionalnoosloboditelno dviženje (1893–1908): niz teorijata na Miroslav Hroh* [in:] *Tranziciite vo istorijata i kulturata*, Skorje 2008, p. 171–186 [Пандевска Марија, *Транзициите во македонското националноослободително движење (1893–1908): низ теоријата на Мирослав Хрох* [in:] *Транзициите во историјата и културата*, Скопје 2008].
- Pandevski Manol, *Iindenskite begalci vo Bugarija vo 1903–1904 godina*, “Razgledi” 1961, vol. 4, no. 3, p. 252–272 [Пандевски Манол, *Илинденските бегалци во Бугарија во 1903–1904 година*, “Разгледи” 1961].
- Pandevski Manol, *Položbata na Makedonija vo Osmanliskata imperija kon krajot XIX na i početokot na XX vek* [in:] *Makedonskoto osloboditelno delo vo XIX i XX vek: projavi, relacii, likovi*, vol. 5, Skorje 1986, p. 7–29 [Пандевски Манол, *Положбата на Македонија во Османлиската империја кон крајот XIX на и почетокот на XX век* [in:] *Македонското ослободително дело во XIX и XX век: пројави, релации, ликови*, т. 5, Скопје 1986].
- Petar Mandzukov (1878–1966): *Anarhist i kritičar na edno sovremie*. Publikacii i pisma, ed. Makedonka Mitrova, Skorje 2019 [Петар Маџуков (1878–1966): *Анархист и критичар на едно совремие*. Публикации и писма, ed. Македонка Митрова, Скопје 2019].
- Petar Mandzukov (1878–1966) i negoviot svetogled. Raskazi, publikacii i pisma, ed. Makedonka Mitrova, Skorje 2020 [Петар Маџуков (1878–1966) и неговиот светоглед. Раскази, публикации и писма, ed. Македонка Митрова, Скопје 2020].

- Položenieto na tuzemците българи i чюзденците в Българи, Tajnata okupacija na Българската држава, Sofiya 1905 [*Положението на тuzемците българи и чюзденците в Българи, Тайната okупация на Българската држава*, София 1905].
- Popek Krzysztof, *The Bulgarian Migrations and the End of Ottoman Rule in Bulgaria (1878–1900)*, “Historijski zbornik” 2018, vol. 71, no. 1, p. 45–59.
- Putinja Filip, Stref-Fenar Zoslin, *Teorije o etnicitetu*, Beograd 1997.
- Ravenstein E. George, *The Laws of Migration*, “Journal of the Statistical Society of London” 1885, vol. 48, no. 2, p.167–235.
- Rumenov Vladimir, Българите в Makedonija подă грăcka vlastă, “Makedonski pregled” 1941, vol. 4, p. 56–93 [Руменов Владимир, *Българите в Makedonija подă грăcka vlastă*, “Makedonski pregledъ” 1941].
- Săyuz na makedonskite emigrantski organizacii v Bălagariya, Makedonskite v kulturno-političeskiya život na Bălagariya. Anketa na Izpălnitelniya komitet na makedonskite bratstva, “Balkanski Văprosi” 1918, vol. 10 [Съюз на мakedонските emигрантски организации в България, *Makedonците в културно-политическия живот на България. Anketa на Изпълнителния комитет на мakedонските братства*, “Balkanski Văprosi” 1918].
- Simovski Hristo Todor, Atlas na naselenite mesta vo Egejska Makedonija, Skorje 1997 [Симовски Христов Тодор, *Atlas на населените места во Egejska Makedonija*, Скопје 1997].
- Spasic Ivana, *Akulturacija* [in:] *Sociološki rečnik*, eds. Aljoša Mimica, Marija Bogdanovič, Beograd 2007, p. 7–8.
- Tadmor T. Carmit, Tetlock E. Philip, *Biculturalism: A Model of the Effects of Second-Culture Exposure on Acculturation and Integrative Complexity*, “Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology” 2006, vol. 37, no. 2, p.173–190.
- Tančev Ivan, Makedonskiyat komponent pri formiraneeto na bălgarska inteligenciya i evropejsko obrazovanie (1878–1912), “Makedonski pregled” 2001, vol. 3, p. 41–62 [Танчев Иван, *Makedonskiyat komponent pri formiraneeto na bălgarska inteligenciya i evropejsko obrazovanie (1878–1912)*, “Makedonski pregled” 2001].
- Teske H.C. Raymond, Jr., Nelson H. Bardin, *Acculturation and Assimilation: A Clarification*, “American Ethnologist” 1974, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 351–367.
- Trimble E. Joseph, *Introduction: Social change and Acculturation* [in:] *Acculturation, Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied research*, eds. Kevin M. Chun et al., Washington 2003, p. 5–10.
- White W. George, *Nationalism and Territory: Constructing Group Identity in Southeastern Europe*, New York–Oxford 2000.
- Zahariev’ Hristo, Ostat ā ci otā naj-opasnite prozniti na Bălagariya, 1902 [Захариев’ Христо, *Ostatъци otъ naj-opasните паразити на България*, 1902].
- Zundhauzen Holm, Istorija Srbije od 19 do 21 veka, Beograd 2008 [Зундхаусен Холм, *Istorija Srbije od 19 do 21 veka*, Beograd 2008].