

Catherine Rudin and Ali Eminov

in Ernan Fraenkel & Christina Kramer, eds.  
Language Contact - Language Conflict  
Peter Lang, 1993. (pp 43-71)

## BULGARIAN NATIONALISM AND TURKISH LANGUAGE IN BULGARIA

THIS study discusses the impact of nationalism on language policies and language usage in formerly Marxist-Leninist states in general and in Bulgaria in particular. The first part of the study focuses on attempts by Bulgarian governments since 1878, and especially during the Živkov regime, to achieve cultural homogeneity in the country through assimilation of Turkish and other minorities into mainstream Bulgarian culture. Particular attention is given to the role of nationalist ideology and the place of Bulgarian language instruction in this effort. The second part of the study describes the effects of recent nationality policy on the Turkish language in Bulgaria.<sup>1</sup>

For the purposes of this study we define nationalism as a "theory of political legitimacy which requires that ethnic boundaries should not cut across political ones and, in particular, that ethnic boundaries within a given state should not separate the power-holders from the rest" (Gellner 1983:1); that is, the rulers and the ruled should belong to the same group. Nationalists are people who espouse such an ideology.

We can look at nationalism and nationalists in the abstract and in practice. Nationalists in-the-abstract espouse an ethical "universalistic" spirit. They do not show any biased "favour of any special nationality of their own." Their motto is "let all nations have their own political roots, and let all of them refrain from including non-

nationals under it" (ibid.:1-2). In practice, however, nationalism and nationalists have not been this reasonable and rational. Historically there has been a tendency "to make exceptions on one's own behalf or one's own case"; national sentiment has almost always engendered egoistic nationalism. Nationalism "insists on imposing homogeneity on the populations unfortunate enough to fall under the sway of authorities possessed by the nationalist ideology" (ibid.: 45). It sees cultural diversity as a threat to the integrity of the nation-state.

Nationalism holds that the nation and the state "were destined for each other; that either without the other is incomplete, and constitutes a tragedy" (ibid.:6). Nationalism does not recognize the contingent nature of either. However, a historical analysis of the rise of nations and states reveals that both "are a contingency and not a universal necessity; that before they could become intended for each other, each of them had to emerge, and their emergence was independent and contingent" (ibid.). Therefore, the "[c]oincidence between the nation and the state arises from deliberate political action, but that action may proceed in two directions. The state, defined by its administrative apparatus, may become or drive toward becoming a nation-state by promulgating a single language, a single culture, and a single set of symbols for the people within its borders" or a nation may seek to become a nation state by "agitating for a political apparatus to match its cultural boundaries. In this process, local sentiments and group solidarity are capitalized on and given a political cast" (Woolard 1989:10)

Political action in Bulgaria, especially since the end of World War II, has had the goal of making Bulgaria a nation-state. Bulgarian ideologues have taken "for granted that nation = language = territory = state. . . . Because the territory [was] Bulgarian, the dogma [went], the people who inhabited it [were] Bulgarians. Because they [were] Bulgarians, they [had to] speak the Bulgarian language and should be in a single nation-state" (Lunt 1986:729; original emphases). Language policies in Bulgaria, especially since the late 1950s, have been implemented within this nationalist ideology.

### Turkish-Language Instruction in Bulgaria: Historical Overview

The goals of language policies in formerly Marxist-Leninist states were neither explicitly stated nor consistently applied in a predictable sequence. Nevertheless, careful scholars have been able to discern three stages in the application of language policies in such states. According to Connor (1984), these are pluralism, bilingualism, and monolingualism. During the pluralist stage, national minorities were left to deal with language and educational matters as they saw fit. In some cases the state even encouraged the development of certain minority languages. In any case, little pressure was exerted upon the members of national minorities to learn the state's dominant language. During the bilingualism stage there was a "growing overt pressure to learn the state's dominant language, culminating in making this step mandatory." During the monolingualism stage increasing pressure was applied to make "the dominant language the sole language of instruction and the sole official language" (ibid.: 255). From the time of independence from Ottoman rule in 1878 to 1990, language policies in Bulgaria fit this pattern.

Although Bulgaria gained its independence from Ottoman rule after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, a sizeable Turkish minority remained within the borders of independent Bulgaria. For over a century members of this minority have been able to maintain their linguistic, ethnic, and religious identity, sometimes under very trying circumstances. The Turkish language has played a vital role in this process. As Chaika (1989:297) observes:

When people lose the language of their culture, their family ties as well as religious ties can be weakened, and often their sense of community as well. A shared language strengthens social and familial bonds, just as a shared dialect does. When people lose the language of their traditions, they may also start to dissolve the traditions themselves.

Bulgaria inherited a pluralistic language and educational tradition from the Ottoman Empire. During the Ottoman period each *millet* (ethno-religious community) was given considerable auto-

my to organize its educational institutions as it saw fit. Community control over schools continued to be maintained after Bulgarian independence from Ottoman rule in accordance with provisions of international treaties and bilateral agreements between Bulgaria and Turkey. Later on these guarantees were incorporated into the legal system of Bulgaria. An important study by Negencov and Vanev (НЕГЕНЦОВ И ВАНЕВ) of education in southeastern Bulgaria between 1879 and 1885, prior to the annexation of the area into the Kingdom of Bulgaria, illustrates the ethno-religious organization of schooling in the region (see Table 1). These patterns of education were to persist in Bulgaria until after World War II.

TABLE 1  
Number of Elementary Schools and Students  
in Eastern Rumelia by Nationality, 1880-1883

Nationality	1880-81		1881-82		1882-83	
	Schools	Students	Schools	Students	Schools	Students
Bulgarian	866	49,268	852	53,000	866	51,288
Turkish	771	26,390	770	29,000	763	7,113
Greek	3	925	59	4,088	48	3,471
Jewish	13	818	13	780	14	918
Armenian	4	190	5	233	5	201
Totals:	1,712	80,591	1,699	86,905	1,699	82,991

SOURCE: НЕГЕНЦОВ И ВАНЕВ (1959:128-129)

Between 1878 and 1948 members of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria were educated in private Turkish schools under the control of the Turkish community. Although the 1879 Turnovo Constitution had mandated compulsory study of Bulgarian language in all schools in the country, for a variety of reasons, such as lack of monies and trained teachers, this provision of the Constitution was not implemented in Turkish and other minority schools. Each minority community continued to provide education to its members, structure its own curriculum, publish its own books, newspapers, and journals, and provide appropriate cultural activities for its members. Almost every Turkish village had a primary school (*ilko okul*). Towns with

sizeable Turkish minorities had several such schools. The villagers and townspeople were collectively responsible for the construction and upkeep of schoolhouses and for the recruitment and maintenance of teachers in these schools. Turkish high schools (*ruhiyyes*) were located in towns. In addition, Koranic schools (*medreses*) trained students to minister to the religious needs of Turks and other Muslims in the country (cf. Utküsal 1966:105-121).

During the last decade of the nineteenth and the first two decades of the twentieth centuries, the educational situation of the Turkish community in Bulgaria improved considerably and the future of Turkish language instruction in the country seemed very bright. The schools which had closed immediately following the Russo-Turkish War were reopened and new schools were built. By the early 1920s the number of Turkish schools of all types had reached 1,712 (Омарчевски 1922:604). Unfortunately, the tolerant attitude of the Bulgarian authorities did not last long. After the assassination of the Agrarian Premier Stamboliski in 1923 the situation of the Turkish minority began to deteriorate. Under a series of anti-Turkish and anti-Muslim regimes, many private Turkish schools, especially in rural areas, were closed so that by 1936 only 545 private Turkish schools remained in Bulgaria. Conditions continued to deteriorate through World War II, reducing private Turkish schools by 75 percent to 367 (Şimşir 1986a:149; MEMMİŞ 1977:126; see Table 2).

TABLE 2  
Turkish Schools in Bulgaria, 1921-1944

School Year	Primary Schools	High Schools	Total
1921-1922	1,673	39	1,712
1928-1929	922	27	949
1936-1937	585	20	603
1937-1938	572	20	592
1938-1939	508	21	529
1939-1940	483	20	503
1940-1941	448	19	467
1941-1942	440	20	460
1942-1943	398	20	418
1943-1944	344	23	367

SOURCE: MEMMİŞ (1977:126)

The closing of many private Turkish schools in rural areas meant that the remaining schools could accommodate less than 40 percent of eligible school-age children (MEMMINEB 1977:170-171). As indicated by the figures in Table 3, over an eight-year period the primary-school student population declined by 36.2 percent while the number of teachers in these schools declined by 43.2 percent. The number of students and teachers in secondary schools showed little change, however, since these schools remained in operation during the period under discussion.

The remaining Turkish schools were still under the control of the Turkish community. Major changes in traditional patterns of education of Turkish speakers were put into effect only after the Communist party consolidated its power in Bulgaria following World War II.

TABLE 3  
*Students and Teachers in Private Turkish Primary and Secondary Schools in Bulgaria, 1936-1944*

School Yr.	Students		Teachers	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
1936-37	51,457	1,878	53,345	1,372
1937-38	49,089	2,130	51,219	1,325
1938-39	44,674	2,298	46,972	1,139
1939-40	41,189	2,264	43,852	1,102
1940-41	39,132	2,115	41,247	1,041
1941-42	39,846	2,128	41,974	1,040
1942-43	9,643	1,888	41,531	909
1943-44	32,808	2,059	34,867	779
				72
				851

SOURCE: MEMMINEB (1977:126)

### Language Policies in Bulgaria, 1946-1960

One of the most far-reaching changes in the education of Turkish speakers occurred in 1946 when all private Turkish schools and school properties were nationalized. As a result, the Turkish community in Bulgaria, for the first time, lost control over its educational institutions. The language of instruction in nationalized schools remained Turkish, but as the curriculum was expanded the study of Bulgarian language became compulsory. The implementation and

strict enforcement of compulsory education for all children necessitated the building and staffing of additional Turkish language schools to accommodate all school-age children. As a result, the number of Turkish schools, students, and teachers increased dramatically in Bulgaria during the early years of the post-war period (see Table 4).

TABLE 4  
*Turkish Schools, Students, and Teachers in Bulgaria, 1943-1944 and 1949-1950*

TYPE OF SCHOOL	1943-44			1949-50		
	Schools	Students	Teachers	Schools	Students	Teachers
Kindergartens	—	—	—	20	755	22
Primary schools	397	35,253	802	1,018	85,917	2,454
Middle schools	27	2,082	69	157	13,692	511
High schools	—	—	—	1	618	21
Teacher train. insts.	—	—	—	1	284	20
Night primary schls	—	—	—	2	110	9
TOTALS:	424	37,335	871	1,199	100,376	3,037

SOURCE: ДИРЕКЦИЯ НА ПЕЧАТА (1951:130)

As Table 4 illustrates, the number of teachers in Turkish-language schools more than tripled while the number of schools and students enrolled in them almost tripled. There was almost a sixfold increase in the number of middle schools. One new high school and a new Turkish language teacher-training institute (*pedagogji*) were established. The foundation of a nationwide system of kindergartens was laid down, including twenty in Turkish areas. The educational needs of older Turkish speakers, who were overwhelmingly illiterate, began to be addressed with the establishment of adult night literacy classes. Over a few short years literacy rates showed a marked improvement. The compulsory study of Bulgarian in Turkish lan-

guage schools led to a significant increase in bilingualism among Turks in the country.

Language policies immediately following World War II can be characterized as encouraging bilingualism among members of the Turkish minority. This period was marked by substantial freedom in educational and cultural matters that lasted until the end of the 1958–1959 school year. Subsequent developments showed that bilingualism was a short-term, practical solution to the educational needs of a largely monolingual Turkish population in the country. Once the Turkish children had learned Bulgarian well enough, they were to be mainstreamed.

#### Language and Nationalism in Bulgaria, 1960–1992

As of 1960, and increasingly after 1970, language policies toward the Turkish minority in Bulgaria were couched in the language of a nationalist ideology. Bulgarian language was to play an important role in the efforts of the Communist party to create a single-nation state in Bulgaria. Although all Turkish private schools in the country had been nationalized in 1948 and a nationwide curriculum had been imposed on them, the language of instruction had remained Turkish. There were Turkish-language primary and secondary schools, Turkish teacher-training institutes, and a department of Turkish philology at the University of Sofia.

In the 1959–1960 school year the government initiated a process of merging Turkish and Bulgarian schools, the end result being the elimination of all Turkish-language instruction in Bulgaria by the early 1970s (Eminov 1983, 1989). It is ironic that precisely when the merger of Turkish and Bulgarian schools was well under way, Todor Živkov sent a congratulatory message to the Turkish-language *Yeni Hayat* on its tenth anniversary in 1964. Part of the message reads:

All possible opportunities have been created for the Turkish population to develop its culture and language freely. . . . The children of the Turkish population must learn their mother tongue and perfect it. To this end, it is necessary that the teaching of the Turkish language be improved in schools. Now and in the future the Turkish population will speak its mother tongue;

*it will develop its progressive traditions in this language; it will write its contemporary literary works [in Turkish]; it will sing its wonderfully beautiful songs [in Turkish]. . . . Many more books will be published in the country in Turkish, including the best works of progressive writers from Turkey. (Yeni Isik 1964:1–2; added emphases)*

But this was not to be. By the late 1960s, perhaps earlier, the Bulgarian leadership had already decided on the complete assimilation of minority populations into mainstream Bulgarian culture. In a secret session in 1969 the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party adopted plans to create a single-nation state by assimilating the country's largest minority groups: Turks, Bulgarian Muslims (Pomaks), and Gypsies. On July 17, 1970, the Council of Ministers published Decree 549 that detailed the forceful steps which might be needed to change the nationality of all Muslims living in Bulgaria. This plan was first put into effect among Bulgarian Muslims (1972–1974), then among Gypsies (1982–1983), and finally among Turks (1984–1985).

Along with the elimination of Turkish-language instruction, publication of works by native Turkish writers came to an end. The final such work by Tašnov appeared in 1969 and soon thereafter the Turkish section of the Narodna Prosveta Publishing House was closed down (cf. Šimšir 1986b, 1986c). The two remaining Turkish-language periodicals—*Yeni Isik* and *Yeni Hayat*—began to appear in bilingual editions. The Turkish portions of these periodicals were gradually reduced so that by early 1985, when they began to appear in Bulgarian only, they had been reduced to less than one-fourth of each issue. Efforts were undertaken to weaken spoken and written Turkish by replacing large numbers of ordinary Turkish words with Bulgarian or Russian equivalents. Native Turkish writers were required to use these Slavic terms for months of the year, continents, countries, seas, oceans, and rivers, and all other geographical names. All Turkish technical terms were to be replaced by Bulgarian or Russian words (see Table 5).

Special style editors were appointed to the editorial offices of the remaining periodicals to ensure that all submissions adhered to the

new requirements. Those native Turkish writers who continued to use the "forbidden" Turkish words were heavily reprimanded or censured. Often, works submitted in the unapproved style, regardless of merit, were denied publication.

TABLE 5  
Partial List of Forbidden Words and Their Bulgarian Equivalents

Turkish	Bulgarian	English translation
mekûre	ИДЕЯ	idea
rapor	ДОКЛАД	report
dönem	ПЕРИОД	era
mağaza	СКЛАД	warehouse
kütüphane	БИБЛИОТЕКА	library
okuma yurdu	ЧИТАЛИЩЕ	communal reading rm.
başkan	ПРЕДСЕДАТЕЛ	president
yenilikci	РАЦИОНАЛИЗАТОР	advocate of change
vedek	РЕЗЕРВ	spare part
emekli	ПЕНСИОНЕР	retired
dümen	КОРМИЛО	steering wheel
mermi	ПАТРОН	bullet
hemşire	СЕСТРА	nurse
ebe	АКУШЕРКА	midwife
albay	ПОЛКОВНИК	captain
burs	СТІПЕНДИЯ	stipend
dernek	КРУГ	association
edebiyat	ЛИТЕРАТУРА	literature
maaş	ЗАПЛАТА	salary
dikeyce	МОЛБА	petition
mukavele	ДОГОВОР	contract
yorum	КОМЕНТАР	commentary
kanun	ЗАКОН	law

SOURCE: Çavuş (1986:67)

After 1970 party ideologues began to declare that Bulgaria was well under way to becoming a unified, single-nation state. The 1971 platform of the Bulgarian Communist Party noted that "the process of development of the socialist nation will expand further" and "citizens of the country of different national origins will come ever closer together" (Работническо Дено 1971). After 1973 the term "unified Bul-

garian nation" began to appear frequently in the official press. An article in Работническо Дено, the party daily, claimed in 1977 that Bulgaria was "almost completely of one ethnic type and [was] moving toward complete national homogeneity." And in 1979 party leader Živkov finally claimed that "the national question has been solved definitively by the population itself. . . . Bulgaria has no internal problems with the nationality question" (Работническо Дено).

Members of the largest minority groups in the country, especially the Turkish minority, were unwilling to change their identities voluntarily in order to comply with ideological requirements. Therefore, in late 1984 the government resorted to brutal force to accomplish its nationalist aims.

The forced-assimilation campaign against Turks and other Muslims had the goal of eliminating most vestiges, with the exception of a few mosques, of the Turkish presence in Bulgaria. It involved, among other things, forcing Turks and other Muslims in the country to replace their Turkish-Muslim names with conventional Bulgarian ones. Even the names of people who had been dead for decades were replaced with Bulgarian names. Passports as well as birth, marriage, divorce, and death certificates with Turkish-Muslim names were confiscated by the authorities and new ones with Bulgarian names issued in their place. Old documents and records were destroyed and new ones created. Tombstones in Muslim cemeteries with Turkish or Arabic writing on them were destroyed. The statues to prominent native Turkish intellectuals and communists were taken down. Turkish and other Muslim women were prohibited from wearing traditional clothes. Speaking Turkish in public and work places became a crime punishable by a fine. Officials were sent to stores, bars, and restaurants to make sure that anyone who spoke Turkish there was not served. The practice of Islam was severely restricted. Muslims could no longer perform traditional funerary rites. Turkish or other Muslim parents who had their young sons circumcised were subject to stiff penalties and possibly prison terms. Health officials were sent to Turkish and Muslim villages periodically to

check that young Muslim boys remained uncircumcised and to report any violations of this ban to the authorities.

After the completion of the forced-assimilation campaign against Turks and other Muslims in early 1985, prominent Bulgarian ideologues and intellectuals were recruited to justify this campaign to the outside world. Some argued that assimilation had been entirely voluntary and spontaneous, initiated by Turks and other Muslims themselves after realizing that they had been Bulgarians all along; others argued that assimilation had been an internal and external political necessity. The latter view was articulated in 1989 by Nikolai Todorov, an internationally known Bulgarian historian:

The state has to protect the interests of the nation, and in the Balkans a nation means one particular ethnic group. Keeping the peace in the region means every minority has to be completely assimilated into the majority. It's a pity to say, but it is true. (Kaplan 1990:21)

Most others used the "purity" of the Bulgarian nation as an argument. Then Deputy Prime Minister Todor Božnov, in a speech given in the northern town of Ruse and reported in *ЛЪНАВСКА ПРАВДА* on March 16, 1985, stated:

"Our countrymen who had reconstructed their Bulgarian names are Bulgarians. . . [T]hey are the flesh and blood of the Bulgarian people. Bulgarian blood flows in their veins." (Cited in Best 1985:24)

Anthropologists from the Sofia Institute of Morphology published "findings" purportedly based on anthropological research carried out over the last thirty years in three ethnically mixed districts in Bulgaria, which indicated that

The Bulgarian nation [was] pure and uncontaminated, and [had] remained unchanged since the Middle Ages. According to the anthropologists, the Bulgarian people [had taken] shape in the ninth and tenth centuries as a blending of Slavs, Thracians, and Asiatic tribes. This mixture [had] evolved into a homogeneous entity, the people now called Bulgarians. The foreign invasions of the past 1,000 years [had] left no racial mark, it seems. The implication [was] that the members of the Turkish minority [were] merely Bulgarians who happen[ed] to speak Turkish. (*Newsletter of the FEAG* 1988:16-17)

The forced assimilation policies of the Živkov regime failed and contributed to the downfall of Živkov and his closest allies. In late May and early June 1989, Turks and other Bulgarian Muslims engaged in widespread demonstrations against the government's assimilation policies. In response the government deported prominent native Turkish intellectuals to the West and to Turkey. It also attempted to solve the "Turkish problem" by issuing passports to all Turks who wanted to immigrate to Turkey, triggering a mass exodus from the country. Between early June and August 22, when Turkey closed its border to any more immigrants without proper visas, over 300,000 Turks left for Turkey. This exodus created serious social and economic dislocations in Bulgaria and convinced many in the government to move against Živkov, who was ousted from power on November 10, 1989.

The new president, Mladenov, moved quickly to repudiate the excesses of the Živkov regime. On December 29, 1989, the government announced that henceforth all citizens of Bulgaria were free to choose their names, language, and religion. This decision of the government angered some Bulgarian nationalist groups, which engaged in well-organized demonstrations throughout the country in January, 1990, demanding that the government rescind its decision to restore full democratic rights to the Turks on the grounds that such restoration would jeopardize the national security of Bulgaria. The Mladenov government took a very courageous stand in defense of the civil and human rights of all citizens and managed to pacify public anger against the Turks. In March, 1990, enabling legislation was approved in the Parliament for the restoration of Turkish and Muslim names.

Over eighty parties participated in the free elections held in Bulgaria in June 1990. The Movement for Rights and Freedoms, representing the interests of the Turks and other Muslims in the country, elected 23 deputies to the 400-member Grand National Assembly. Deputies representing the Movement for Rights and Freedoms in the National Assembly have called for, among other things, radio and television broadcasts in Turkish and publication of Turkish

periodicals and books. For the first time since the early 1970s, serious efforts are being made to reintroduce limited Turkish-language instruction in schools with Turkish-speaking students. So far, restrictions on speaking Turkish have been lifted. Muslims have been permitted to publish an occasional bilingual newspaper dealing with religious issues. The first issue of a regular bilingual newspaper appeared on February 12, 1991. Recently, the Minister of Education declared that, as an "experiment," Turkish may be taught in some state schools for three hours a week until September, 1991, but nothing came of this. The Bulgarian Socialist party (excommunists), angered that the Turkish population had not supported its candidate during the elections, did everything in its power to frustrate the efforts of the Movement for Rights and Freedoms to implement the reintroduction of Turkish-language instruction in public schools. On October 1, 1991, just before the National Assembly dissolved itself for the October 13 elections, the Bulgarian Socialist party and its right-wing supporters pushed through a law prohibiting the teaching of minority languages in the country's schools.

Local, regional, and national elections were held on October 13, 1991. The opposition represented by the Union of Democratic Forces scored a narrow victory over the Bulgarian Socialist Party, which, for the first time since World War II, was forced into opposition. The Movement for Rights and Freedoms was instrumental in this victory, increasing its support from 6 to 7.5 percent since the 1990 elections and winning 24 of the 240 seats in the National Assembly. The movement also did very well in regional and local elections in predominantly Turkish areas. Two back-to-back successes established the movement as a third political force in the country, with whose support the Union of Democratic Forces was able to form a minority government. As a result of these political developments the climate for the reintroduction of Turkish-language instruction in public schools improved markedly. Finally, in January 1992, after a twenty-year hiatus, Turkish students once again began to study their mother tongue.

Recent changes in nationality policy have affected the linguistic repertoire of members of ethnic minority groups (the languages they know and use) and have also caused changes in the Turkish language itself as it is used by native Turks in Bulgaria. The following section illustrates some of these effects through an analysis of linguistic data collected from Turkish speakers in east-central Bulgaria.

#### **The Linguistic Effects of Recent Nationality Policy**

The village with which we are most familiar is Polianovo (Полианово), near the city of Aitos (Айтос), in the Burgas (Бургас) region of east-central Bulgaria. This village is inhabited almost entirely by Turks, the majority of whom migrated there from the village of Avramovo (Аврамово) in the eastern Rhodope Mountains at the time of collectivization some thirty years ago. Polianovo is an overwhelmingly Turkish environment and Turkish is by far the majority language. Nevertheless, Bulgarian influence is present in the village. In addition to the few Bulgarians who actually live in the village, native Bulgarian kindergarten teachers come in daily to supervise the young children and during the summer young people from the nearby Pioneer work camp come to drink and socialize at the village bar and general store in the evenings. In addition, many adult male residents of the village have jobs outside, which bring them into daily contact with Bulgarians, and almost everyone goes to the nearby towns and cities occasionally. The cities of Karnobat, Aitos, and Burgas are easily reached by train, bus, or car from the village—easily enough that people go to the city for an afternoon of shopping or a movie. Furthermore, a number of villagers have relatives living in Aitos who visit them frequently. Every household has a television set which young people and children spend many hours watching. Most significantly, all school-age children attend schools where instruction is entirely in Bulgarian. Students are required to speak Bulgarian with one another while in school. As a result, nearly all Turkish residents of Polianovo are bilingual to some degree.

We define a bilingual as "a person who is able to produce grammatical sentences in more than one language" (Lehiste 1988:1). This definition is broad enough to include a range of persons, from those who are effectively monolingual but can produce a limited number of grammatical sentences in a second language to those who show equal facility in more than one language and who can switch with ease between them. It is also understood that not all bilinguals produce equally grammatical sentences. Most bilinguals frequently deviate from the norms of either language; that is, either language may interfere with the production of grammatical sentences in the other at a number of levels—phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and lexis. Moreover, bilinguals differ in the degree of interference at a given level.

Our data indicate that changes in the educational policy and the extent of contact with Bulgarian over the past half-century have resulted in quite different linguistic repertoires for Turks of different ages and genders. Older women are effectively monolingual in Turkish, although even they exhibit some lexical influence from Bulgarian, as we shall see.<sup>2</sup> Most men born before about 1935, who completed their education before Bulgarian language study became compulsory in the 1950s, speak Bulgarian very badly. Middle-aged people, those born between approximately 1935 and the late 1940s, are usually quite fluent in Bulgarian, but at a clearly non-native level, and make many grammatical errors. This is the group that had Bulgarian as a required subject in school but did not learn it in early childhood. Women of this middle-aged group are generally somewhat less fluent than their male contemporaries, partly because very few girls went beyond primary school in the past and partly because most women work on collective farms near their villages where they have less contact with Bulgarians than do the men.

The younger generation, those born after about 1950, is fully fluent in Bulgarian. Many speak it essentially natively and some are actually more comfortable in Bulgarian than Turkish. In this age group the sex difference evident in older and middle-aged speakers disappears. Even though girls still tend to leave school early, mem-

bers of this group learned the language young and have had continuous opportunity to use it, unlike the preceding generation. The youngest children do not know Bulgarian, but as soon as they enter kindergarten they quickly acquire it. Even in heavily Turkish settings like Polianovo the kindergarten teachers are Bulgarian and they require the children to speak Bulgarian even among themselves.

In addition to differences in which languages are used, the residents of Polianovo differ in the extent and types of influence of the two languages on one another. Many, particularly older and middle-aged people, exhibit Turkish interference in their Bulgarian. Some degree of Bulgarian interference is also evident in the Turkish of nearly all speakers, most dramatically in that of the young. To illustrate, we turn to some examples—all spontaneously produced sentences taken from informal conversations and letters and typical of normal speech within the ethnic Turkish community.

Example 1, containing both feminine and masculine adjectives modifying a neuter noun, was written by a man born in 1944, a fluent but clearly non-native speaker of Bulgarian.

1. *МИНАЛОТО ЛЕТО И ТОЗИ ЛЕТО РАБОТИМ КРАСТАВИЛИ.*  
"Last summer and this summer we work (growing) cucumbers."

The stereotypical view of Bulgarian spoken by Turks among Bulgarians is that they can never get their gender agreement right. In fact, this type of error is very frequent in older and middle-aged speakers, probably reflecting the lack of grammatical gender in Turkish. Such errors are, however, seldom if ever found in the speech of younger Turks.

Examples 2 and 3 are further examples of grammatical errors in the Bulgarian of middle-aged speakers: an impersonal construction mistakenly treated as personal, and an incorrect definite article.

2. *АЗ ПЪК НАМАХ В КЪЩИ.*  
"But I wasn't at home." (instead of *мене ме намаше*, literally "there wasn't me")
3. *И ТИЕ КРАТКИТЕ РЕЧОВЕ ТЕ ПИША ОТ АЙГОС.*  
"And these the short lines I write to you from Aitos"

While such examples could be multiplied ad infinitum, the point should be clear: middle-aged Turks make typical second-language-learner errors whereas younger Turks in general do not.

One way that Turkish influence affects even young speakers is the use of the Turkish pattern of reduplication with *m* to mean "and so on" in both Turkish and Bulgarian. Several illustrations are given in Example 4. This type of reduplication is also used by some Bulgarians, but is considered a Turkism.<sup>3</sup>

- 4a. *Korekoma gittim pantlı mantlı aldım.*  
"I went to Korecom (and) got some pants and stuff."

- 4b. *СВЕТНО МСВЕТНО herpsi oluyor.*  
"Colored and everything, it makes all kinds (of pictures)."

- 4c. *ЮФКА МОФКА ВАРИШ НАЙНАПРЕД В ТЕНДЖЕРЕТО . . . .*  
"First you boil the noodles and stuff in the pot . . . ."

It is not surprising, certainly, that the native Turkish of these speakers influences their non-native Bulgarian. More interesting is the degree to which Bulgarian influence is evident in the Turkish not only of younger, bilingual speakers but to a certain extent also of older people and even monolinguals. All of the Polianovo Turks use Bulgarian loan words frequently. Many of these are lexical borrowings of the most expected sort; that is, words for culture-linked items or concepts which have been taken over from the surrounding Bulgarian society such as terminology of government, education, jobs, and technology acquired in post-Ottoman times. These are words which even monolingual speakers use. They have entered the everyday vocabulary of the Turkish community and are used like ordinary Turkish words, with appropriate grammatical endings and normal Turkish syntax. Some illustrations in context are given in example 5 and a few more words of this type are shown in example 6.

- 5a. *Испитлерими başarıyla kazandırmı dediler.*  
"They wished me success in passing my exams."

- 5b. *О ТКАЗСДЕ ПЛАВЕН АГРОНОМ Олду.*  
"He became a chief agronomist in the collective farm."

- 5c. *Бу БУТЛИККАУ аЛ ХИЛИЦИКЕ КОУ.*  
"Take this bottle (and) put it in the refrigerator."

- 5d. *Benim elynda spiracka hiç tutmuyor.*  
"My hand brake doesn't hold at all."

6.	МАГАЗИНЕРКА	"storekeeper"	ТЕПРАЛКА	"notebook"
	ДРУТАРКА	"teacher"	ХИМИКАЛКА	"[ballpoint] pen"
	РАДИОСТАНЦИЯ	"radio station"	ЛЕНТА	"tape, lane"
	ДЕВЕТИ СЕПТЕМВРИ	"September 9"	МВР	"[internal] police"
	ПЪРВИ МАЙ	"May 1"	ДЕТСКА ГРАДИНА	"kindergarten"
	ЛЯПО МРАЗ	"Santa Claus"	ЧАСТНО	"privately owned"
	ГЛЮБА	"fine"	ОТПУСК	"vacation"

Somewhat less expectedly, many Bulgarian words which have nothing to do with modern technology or Bulgarian society when a perfectly good Turkish equivalent exists. These include ordinary nouns, adjectives, and adverbs, as shown in example 7:

- 7a. *Babamın BRATOVÜÇÜMÜN güveysi.*  
"He is my father's cousin's son-in-law."

- 7b. *БРАТ daha burda ya.*  
"(Your) brother is still here."

- 7c. *Babam bir ДИВАЛКА vurmuş.*  
"My father has killed a wild duck."

- 7d. *Baya МОДЕРНО bir şey o.*  
"It's quite a modern thing."

- 7e. *Arabada bir ШУМ çıktı.*  
"A noise started up in the car."

- 7f. *ВИНАЛИ аша güliyor ZALDI.*  
"He's always putting down the west."

Interestingly, they also include conjunctions and other minor categories. In fact, one of the most frequent Bulgarian words in our Turkish data is *оbаcе*, "however."

- 8a. *Resim var ДАК sesi yok.*  
"There's a picture, but there isn't any sound."

- 8b. *Recep ОБАCЕ beygirleri hiç düşünmemiş.*  
"Rejep however didn't think about the horses at all."

- c. Bana bakma çe evde yok.  
"Don't look at me because he's not at home."
- d. Benim maslıkayı dake oturmussun içmeye.  
"You've even sat down to drink my maslık."
- e. Çok adanrı aramaya gelmiş.  
"It seems she came to look for the man."

There are even a few candidates for possible transference of bound grammatical morphemes from Bulgarian into Turkish. The -*ç*o diminutive suffix has become quite common alongside the native Turkish *ik/çik*, and some young people seem to use the feminine -*ka* suffix fairly productively in Turkish too.

- a. Adem<sup>ç</sup>o nasıldır?  
"How is little Adem?"
- b. Şarkıyı söyleyen Apri ağabeyin baldızkası.  
"The one singing the song is your brother Apri's sister-in-law."

One particularly interesting pattern of Bulgarian loan-word usage is the construction exemplified in example 10, in which Bulgarian verbs are combined with a form of *çatmak*, ("to do") with appropriate person/number/tense features. The Bulgarian verb is nearly always a third-person, singular, present-tense form. Unlike nouns and other parts of speech, Bulgarian verbs never seem to be used as a simple stem with Turkish suffixes attached.

- 0a. Ben çyle öveşava yaptım.  
"I promised (to do) that."
- 0b. Akşam sabah hızla yapacak.  
"She will travel evening and morning."
- 0c. Ben uçuplava yapıyorum.  
"I am using (it)."
- 0d. Nerede otklonlava yarıtk?  
"Where did we turn off?"
- 0e. Onu çerxavyalı yapcaz, onun yerine seni alcaz.  
"We will transfer him, we'll take you in his place."

- 10f. Ama osvobozhlava yapmıyorlar daha.  
"But they aren't liberating any more."

The above patterns of fitting a Bulgarian lexical item into a basically Turkish sentence contrast with actual code switching—changing languages in the middle of a sentence—which is comparatively rare in our data. One illustration is shown in example 11, where the first clause is Turkish (with a Bulgarian lexical item incorporated) and the second clause is Bulgarian.

11. Sende voenna knizka vatni imalı pravdo za upravlenie na kola.  
"If you have a military id., you are allowed to drive a car."

In some cases, particularly among the very young, Turkish vocabulary actually seems to be disappearing and is being replaced with Bulgarian words. Our sixteen year-old nephew does not know the Turkish names for the months and days of the week. His thirty-six year-old parents normally use the Bulgarian forms, but if asked they can sometimes (not always) come up with the Turkish word as well (*Eylül* for Септември [September], *Perşembe* for четвъртък [Thursday]). Teenagers as well as middle-aged people consistently use the Bulgarian names for most countries, continents, and other geographical features: Унгария for Hungary rather than *Macaristan*, to give just one example. Combined with the overwhelming use of Bulgarian rather than Turkish technological and social terminology, of the sort discussed in examples 5 and 6, this lack of knowledge of Turkish vocabulary can lead to significant difficulty in communicating with Turks from Turkey, especially since young people are sometimes unaware of which words are Turkish and which are not.

For the most part, however, speakers are aware of the differences between the two languages; in fact, code switching is sometimes used for rhetorical effect. This is particularly prevalent in songs, as illustrated in example 12. The first sentence shows two lines differing in a single word; the second is a popular song about the army, whose chorus consists of one line in Turkish and a nearly identical one in Bulgarian.

- 12a. Geldi zor zaman  
Дойде zor zaman

"Hard times have come.  
Hard times have come."

- 12b. Yakti bütin gençleri \*  
Язиде боскуките муладелин

"It burned up all the youth  
It ate up all the youth."

Even in everyday speech, language switching is sometimes used consciously for comic effect. Example 13 was said by Eminov's sister to her husband, who had just finished helping her chop cabbage for a *bidie*, and both laughed.

13. Senin şimdi başka işin HAMA.  
"Now there isn't any more work for you."

We turn now to a brief discussion of the written language. Although fluency in spoken Turkish is essentially universal in Poljanovo, and among Bulgarian Turks in general, literacy in Turkish is far from universal. As we have already mentioned, Turkish language instruction in the schools was eliminated by 1970, so those who began school afterwards were taught to read and write only in Bulgarian. Turkish-language publications became unavailable at the same time. Many Turks who are now over twenty-five can write in both Bulgarian and Turkish, although those between the ages of twenty-five and thirty years who began their schooling during the years when Turkish instruction was being phased out have minimal reading and writing skills in Turkish. For most of those under twenty-five, literacy is exclusively in Bulgarian. Thus our sixteen-year-old nephew, who has recently immigrated to the United States, writes to and receives letters from his friends in Poljanovo in Bulgarian, although they would normally speak to one another in Turkish. This is true despite the fact that they know the Roman alphabet (having studied French in school, and now English) and regardless of their anti-Bulgarian feelings resulting from the recent wave of official repression of the Turkish minority.

A few of the Poljanovo children *have* learned to write Turkish recently, probably as a direct result of the anti-Turkish policies of the 1980s. When Turkish language became an overt political issue, some

parents were motivated to teach their children to read and write at home. One of our nieces, who was about eleven at the time, wrote the message in example 14 in a postcard in 1986:

14. Yaz mevsiminda bir hatra. (correct: Yaz mevsiminden bir hatra)  
"A souvenir of the summer."

The few errors are not surprising considering that she was just learning to write Turkish at the time. Even adults who write both languages often make errors as a result of interference from Cyrillic. Example 15 lists a few representative illustrations from letters written by people between twenty and forty-years old. Especially typical are the spelling *dc* instead of Turkish *c*, presumably as a calque on Cyrillic *дх*, and confusion of *d* and *g*, or *v* and *y* because of the shape of the corresponding Cyrillic letter. Confusion of *c* and *s*, *p* and *r*, and so on is also common for the same reason.

15. Güldcan (Gülcan) gerhal (derhal)  
dederleyle (dereceyle) bykagarla (bukadarla)  
gakika (dakika)

A different approach to Turkish literacy is exemplified by example 16, the text of a card written to us in 1987 by another young niece. With the exception of the first line, which is a Bulgarian greeting formula, the message is in Turkish, but transliterated into Cyrillic letters.

16. 1987 ГОДИНА ДА ВЕ ЧЕСТИВА.  
СЕЛЯМ СЯЗЛЕПЕ. ЙЕНИ ЙЫЛЪНЪЗ КУТЛУ ОЛСУН АБЕЙИМ ВЕ ИЕНТЕДЖИМ.  
ТЪОНДЕРЕН СЕЛЪИМЕ. ХОШЧАКАЛЪН.  
Happy New Year 1987.  
Greetings to you. May your new year be happy, uncle and auntie.  
Sent by Selime. Goodbye.

The efforts at teaching the children to write Turkish seem to have been short-lived, though; these same nieces have since reverted to writing to us in Bulgarian.

## CONCLUSIONS

Over the past half century, the general trend has been toward greater facility in Bulgarian by an ever greater proportion of the ethnic Turkish population. Nonetheless, even though most residents of Polianovo (and most Turks elsewhere in the country) speak Bulgarian quite comfortably, Turkish is still the primary language and is used almost exclusively at home. Many Turks, especially young ones, switch between the two languages many times each day, speaking Bulgarian in many public situations. Bulgarian is increasingly the only written language. In addition, Bulgarian loan words pervade the spoken language, particularly of the young, and some minor grammatical effects of bilingualism are beginning to be evident in the Turkish spoken in Polianovo and elsewhere.

As little as six or seven years ago it appeared as though the increasing use of Bulgarian, erosion of Turkish vocabulary, loss of Turkish literacy, and social advantages of speaking the majority language and being able to "pass" as Bulgarian would lead inexorably to accelerated changes in the Turkish spoken in Bulgaria—perhaps even to significant numbers of Turks abandoning their ancestral language altogether within the next generation or two. The recent nationality policy zigzags have probably made this less likely.

The extreme anti-Turkish policies of 1984–1990 had the unintended effect of strengthening Turkish ethnic identity. Speaking and writing Turkish became a political act of defiance. However, the liberalizing trend since the ouster of Todor Živkov in 1989, if it continues, may lead to the revival of native-language or bilingual-education programs, access to Turkish periodicals, books, and radio and television broadcasts, as well as to opportunities for travel to visit relatives in Turkey. Such measures, if and when implemented, may slow—although probably not halt—the trend toward increased Bulgarian influence and reduced Turkish fluency.

Nationalism and language and cultural policies designed to create a nation-state with a single language and a homogeneous culture in Bulgaria have failed. Attempts at forced assimilation of the Turkish

minority into mainstream Bulgarian culture, instead of dissolving linguistic, ethnic, and religious bonds, have strengthened them. The opening up of the political process to many competing interest groups, including Turks, since the fall of the Živkov régime in 1989 and the commitment of the new regime to democracy and civic freedoms, should make a return to the authoritarian policies of the past difficult if not impossible.

Several characteristics of the Turkish community in Bulgaria also favor retention of the native language for the foreseeable future. The size of the Turkish ethnic community in the country is one such factor. Approximately one million of the roughly nine million people in Bulgaria are ethnic Turks and native speakers of Turkish.<sup>4</sup> Linguists have noted that "[t]he larger the community of speakers of a given [minority] language, the longer the language is likely to be retained" (Chaika 1989:312). Second, most Turks in Bulgaria live in ethnically homogeneous communities and neighborhoods. In such environments their most intensive contacts are with other Turks. Turkish is used as the primary medium of communication and major social activities are carried out in that language. Chaika points out that a minority language is most likely to survive "where people are somewhat isolated physically or psychologically from the mainstream" (ibid.:313). In addition to the physical separation noted above, the trauma of the recent forced-assimilation policy has increased the psychological distance between Turks and Bulgarians. To a greater degree than in the past, Turks try to restrict their contacts with Bulgarian to official encounters and the workplace. The pattern of endogamous marriages, despite government discouragement, remains strong. The religion of Islam supports the uniqueness and separateness of Turks from their Christian neighbors. Finally, despite the recent liberalizing trend in the country, ethnic conflict is likely to remain an important aspect of life in Bulgaria. Ever since Živkov's ouster, Bulgarian nationalists have tried to use the minority question, especially the restoration of the rights of the Turkish and other Muslim minorities, for their own political ends.

Continued discrimination against Turks, the persistence of economic and political inequities between the ethnic Bulgarian and ethnic Turkish populations, and unique cultural and religious traditions will motivate Turks to assert themselves. In the future as in the past, the manifestation of Turkish identity in Bulgaria will revolve around the activation of linguistic, ethnic, and religious support systems to maintain Turkish identity and integrity. Maintenance of Turkish language will be an important aspect of this process. Turks will continue to use Turkish as the primary medium of communication among themselves, even though the interference of Bulgarian in the local variety of Turkish will very likely continue to grow.

## NOTES

1. Parts of this study were presented at the 7th Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore held in Toronto, Canada, May 17-19, 1990 (Eminov and Rudin) and the 22nd Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, held in Washington, D.C., October 18-21, 1990 (Eminov). The linguistic examples used in this study were collected in the village of Poljanovo and the town of Aitos during the summers of 1982, 1984, and 1990. Additional data were derived from letters written by Turkish-speaking relatives to the authors and from taped conversations with Turkish speakers. A slightly different version of this paper entitled "Bulgarian Turkish: The Linguistic Effects of Recent Nationality Policy," will appear in *Anthropological Linguistics*.

2. While there are a number of studies on the influence of Turkish on Bulgarian, as far as we are aware, little or nothing has been done on the influence of Bulgarian on Turkish. For a good summary of the influence of Turkish on Bulgarian see Grannes (1989).

3. See Grannes (1978).

4. Statistics on national origin and native language of the population of Bulgaria have not been provided by the Bulgarian government since the 1965 census. Reliable estimates of ethnic Turks in Bulgaria put the number between 1 and 1.5 million. The number of Turkish speakers is higher because the majority of Muslim Gypsies speak Turkish in addition to Romany and Bulgarian.

## REFERENCES

- Baest, Torsten F.  
1985 "Bulgaria's War at Home: The People's Republic and its Turkish Minority." *Across Frontiers* (Winter):18-26.
- Çavuş, Mehmet  
1988 20. *Yüzyıl Bulgaristan Türk Şiiri*. Istanbul:Tekin Yayinevi.
- Chaika, Elaine  
1989 *Language: The Social Mirror*. New York: Newbury House.
- Connor, Walker  
1984 *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.
- Дирекция на Печарта  
1951 Туретское Мешничество в Народной Республике Болгарий (The Turkish Minority in the People's Republic of Bulgaria) София: Издателство Георги Димитров.
- East European Anthropology Group  
1988 "Racism in Bulgaria." *Newsletter of the East European Anthropology Group* 7 (1-2):16-17.
- Eminov, Ali  
1983 "Education of Turkish speakers in Bulgaria." *Ethnic Groups: An International Periodical of Ethnic Studies* 5 (3):129-149.
- 1989a "The Elimination of Turkish Language Instruction in Bulgaria." In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth European Studies Conference 1989*, ed. Karl Odwarka, 91-98. Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa.
- 1989b "There are no Turks in Bulgaria: Rewriting History by Administrative Fiat." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 4 (2):203-222.
- Gelner, Ernest  
1983 *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Grannes, Alf  
1973 "Le redoublement a m-initial en Bulgare." *Linguistique Balkanique* 21 (2):37-50.
- 1989 "Turkish Influence on Bulgarian." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 4 (2):223-239.
- Kaplan, Robert D.  
1990 "Europe's Third World: Poverty and Ethnic Strife in Southeastern Europe Will Give the Russians a Headache for Years to Come." *The Atlantic* (July):16-22.
- Lehiste, Ilse  
1988 *Lectures on Language Contact*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lunt, Horace G.  
1986 "On Macedonian Nationality." *Slavic Review* 95 (4):729-730.
- Мемишев, Хюссейн (Memişev, Hussein)  
1977 Участието на Българските Турци във Борбата против Капитализма и Фашизма 1914-1944 (The Participation of Turks of Bulgaria in the Struggle against Capitalism and Fascism, 1914-1944). София: Партизанар.
- Нерепов, К., и И. Ванев  
1959 Образованието във Източна Румелия, 1879-1885 (Education in Eastern Rumelia, 1879-1885). София: Българска Академия на Науките.
- Омарчевски, Стоян  
1922 Отчет за Дейността на Министерството от 20 Май 1920 год. до 1 Юли 1922 (Report on the Activities of the Ministry of Education from May 20, 1920, to July 1, 1922). София: Държавен Вестник.
- Работническо Дело  
Daily newspaper of the former Bulgarian Communist party.

- Rudin, Catherine, and Ali Eminov  
1990 "Bulgarian Turkish: The Linguistic Effects of Recent Nationality Policy." Paper presented at the 7th Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics and Folklore, University of Toronto, Canada, May 14-17.
- Şimşir, Bilal  
1986a. *Bulgartistan Türkleri, 1878-1985* (The Turks of Bulgaria, 1878-1985). Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi.
- 1986b *Turkish Minority Education and Literature in Bulgaria*. Ankara: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press.
- 1986c *Turkish Minority Press in Bulgaria: Its History and Tragedy, 1865-1985*. Ankara: Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press.
- Ташинов, Мухаррем (Ташинюв, Мухаррем)  
1969 *Çarıkli Filozof* (Peasant Philosopher). София: Народна Просвета.
- Ülküsal, Müstecib  
1966. *Dobruca ve Türkler* (Dobruzdza and the Turks). Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- Woolard, Kathryn A.  
1989 *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Yeni İşik  
1964 "The Turkish Population of Bulgaria is Proud to Live in a Socialist Society: Comrade T. Zhivkov's congratulatory message to the editors of Yeni Hayat." March 5, pp. 1-2.