

# The Concept of the Bulgarian “European Identity” Across the Bulgarian Language and Political Rhetoric in Bulgaria

Ivanka Mavrodieva

University of Sofia “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Sofia, Bulgaria

This paper investigates the extent, to which “European identity” has emerged in Europe before and after the membership of the Republic of Bulgaria the EU (European Union). The results of this interdisciplinary analysis (including CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis), DHA (Discourse-Historical Approach), and rhetorical analysis) of “European identity” presented in the contemporary Bulgarian political rhetoric after 1990 are included in the paper. The corpus includes 50 speeches (excerpts from parliamentary debates, presidential statements, addresses made during the election campaigns, and political reports). The hypothesis is that the language and in particular Bulgarian language helps to articulate European and national identities, but simultaneously the glossary of foreign borrowings is enriched and the vocabulary is intellectualised. The results show that the changes on verbal level are a result of the need to nominate the dynamically political and integration processes and at the same time, these changes can be viewed as functional expression of the civic decision to carry out the synchronization of Bulgarian and European legislation.

*Keywords:* “European identity”, European integration, European membership of Bulgaria, Bulgarian language, Bulgarian political rhetoric

## Introduction

The present paper tries to present linguistic and rhetorical manifestations of the “European identity” in connection with the integration of the Republic of Bulgaria in the EU (European Union). The research comprises the survey of the changes of the Bulgarian language from 1990 to 2013; semantic, lexicographic, and derivational characteristics of the new terms concerning the legislation in connection with the European integration process and with the civic implementation of the Republic of Bulgaria’s policy as a member of the EU.

## Theoretical Frame

“European identity” is a complex idea and it implies on the one hand, that its structural elements shall be deduced from the existing practices, and on the other hand that we are bound to clarify the scope and contents of the notions it includes as well as to investigate their changes and tendencies of functioning. “European identity” is examined on the different levels by representatives of the Bulgarian political elite, state institutions, NGOs (non-governmental organizations), and scientists. Some of them take part in the processes of decision making

concerning our “European identity”. The notion “European identity” is determined by different factors. The term “European identity” is an intricate entity and it is the effect of strategic decisions and tactic solutions; it is a part of long and oversized political project; it is a social construct, etc.. From a geographic point of view, “Europe” is a continent, from a political point of view the EU is an alliance, political association and the integration is an open process. Therefore, the concept “European identity” is a complex construct including social and psychological elements, and it demands the process of building the collective identity and the sense of affiliation of the EU in parallel with the national identity. Simultaneously, the “European identity” insists on a unification, association, and communication around the basic idea, universal values, acceptable causes, and it is reasonable to conclude that the process is uneven in the countries which are members of the EU. At the same time, the concept requires a lot of efforts and activities to involve the people in the process and to build the personal sense of “European identity”.

The theoretical clarification of the concept “European identity” includes great number of attempts and surveys. Simultaneously, “European identity” is intricate and multipolar, it has—as pointed above—geographical, political, and civil manifestations, it includes economic and legal phenomena, cultural and educational appearances.

Prodanov (2005, p. 91) expressed his skeptical position concerning different identities, and the writer considers that the concept “European identity” is undetermined and it is not clearly presented while the particular identities are defined more accurately and are altogether affirmative. Prodanov took a point of view that the EU is legal and economic space and he said that the “European identity” is being constructed, and therefore “Europe” as a mental idea and basic identity will be developed in the future (Prodanov, 2005, pp. 76-79). Prodanov (2005, p. 85) specified that the European citizens are afraid of the future of their national cultures.

The topics “Bulgarian identity”, “Bulgarian national identity”, “European identity”, and “European identity of Bulgaria” provoke the interest of researchers from different fields of knowledge, at the same time, the publications concerned with them are relatively limited and they preset different aspects of this complex subject. Simultaneously, complex research and multy-dimensional survey are not conducted.

Nedelcheva (2007) focused on the basic notions and she tries to throw some light on the meaning and scope of the terms “national identity” and “European identity”.

The subjects of the “European identity” and European integration are discussed in the article written by Vezenkov (2008, pp. 71-75).

Bulgarian language and the “European identity” are investigated by Videnov (2007) and Bojiadjiev (2005). Videnov (2007, pp. 3-8) put the emphasis on the institutionalization and expert approach concerning the cross topical field of the language and the “European identity”. Bojiadjiev (2005, pp. 5-15) studied the Bulgarian language and the influence of other languages on it during the process of globalization; he focused on the linguistic element in the complex construct “European identity”.

The above brief observation shows that the research interests range over a variety of subjects. At present, we can distinguish the attempts to throw light on the meaning and scope of the notions and terms; to establish a theoretical frame for the explanation of the construct “European identity”; and to focus on particular topics: cultural identity, language and identity, European integration, globalization, etc.

Considering the topic of the paper, it is appropriate to present the position expressed by Bruter in his article “Winning Hearts and Minds for Europe: The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity” (2003). He said:

As explained above, one of the main difficulties in comparing individuals’ levels of European identity is that identity and Europe have no common definition across individuals as a political community. In other words, it seems difficult to make sense of differences across levels of European identity without understanding better what people can mean when they explain that they do feel European and without identifying some systematic components of political identities. The measurement model proposed here ties components of political identities to traditional definitions of what makes a nation. (Bruter, 2003, p. 1145)

Bruter drew two components of the “European identity”—civil and cultural, and after the explanation of the results of the comparative analysis, he concluded that civil and cultural identity do not go together (Bruter, 2003, p. 1168).

Christova in her article “The European Identity in the Key Speeches of the European Politicians” (2012) presented the features of the “European identity”: (1) “European identity” is a collective identity; (2) “European identity” is supranational and non-conflict with national identity; (3) “European identity” incorporates civil and cultural components; and (4) “European identity” implies opposition to “European” and “non-European”, the “other” of Europe (USA, Russia, Turkey).

The author agrees with the opinion proposed in the earlier part of this article, and the position is that the “European identity” does not contradict particular identities: e.g., national, Slavic, and Balkan.

### **Research Design and Methods of Investigation**

The author’s empirical sources for the present study were selected from parliamentary debates, presidential statements, political speeches, and ministers’ speeches on the topics concerning the European integration of Bulgaria, and they represented from three functional spheres: official ministers’ speeches, presidential statements, excerpts from the debates of nine parliaments. All texts of 50 political speeches were taken from the websites of the Bulgarian Presidency and the Council of ministers, the shorthand minutes of debates in meetings of plenary chamber and from the minutes of parliamentary commissions’ meetings. They were collected in a general text corpus and after that they were analyzed in accordance with the author’s research aims.

The topic of the paper is complicated, and it is necessarily to use an interdisciplinary approach. Here, the author will enumerate and present shortly the main methods applied, and will introduce and explain them in order to follow the principle of clarity.

CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) is presented by van Dijk (2001) who said that “Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p. 352). van Dijk (2001) added that:

- Critical research on discourse needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims:
- (1) As is often the case for more marginal research traditions, CDA research has to be “better” than any other research in order to be accepted.
  - (2) It focuses primarily on, social problems and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions.
  - (3) Empirically adequate critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary.

(4) Rather than merely describe discourse structures, it tries to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.

(5) More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society. (p. 353)

From the author’s point of view, the basic notions and the explanation of CDA are relevant to be applied in establishing the model of investigation of the “European identity” in the Bulgarian political rhetoric after 1990. The study is based on some of the most important processes in the contemporary Bulgarian history: the European integration and the implementation of the European legislation after the full membership of Bulgaria being accessed. CDA is a relevant approach to investigate the building of the sense of affiliation to the EU in parallel with our sense of national identity. The focus is on the barriers, prejudices, and cultural differences of other European countries and members in the EU.

The DHA (Discourse-Historical Approach) is suitable for a study of the Bulgarian legislative institution, political environment, and parliamentary circumstances after 1990 as factors determining language and discourse changes. Reisigl and Wodak (2009) accepted that DHA is different of CDA, and they tried to present some of its features: “However, the DHA—like any inter—or multidisciplinary, necessarily sometimes eclectic, enterprise—should avoid the combination of theoretically incompatible scientific (re)sources” (p. 46). They asserted that:

The strengths of the discourse-historical approach include following the interdisciplinary orientation, which allows avoiding disciplinary restrictions; the principle of triangulation, which implies a quasi kaleidoscopic move towards the research object and enables to grasp different facets of the object under investigation; the historical analysis, which allows transcending static spotlights by focusing on the diachronic reconstruction, on processes and developments, and explanation of discursive change; and, practical applications of the results for emancipatory and democratic purposes. (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009, pp. 45-46)

The author will adapt DHA to this study; the main purposes are to present a transformation of a political environment and a diachronical establishment of legislative institution in the Republic of Bulgaria—the National Assembly, the Council of ministries, and the Presidential institution and a creation of institutional parliamentary dialogue, ministers’ meetings and discussions initiated by Bulgarian president. The author will analyze aspects of historical change, political and parliamentary actors, interdiscursive relationships, communication obstacles, and cases of misunderstanding. Particularly, the author will focus on the main events regarding the European integration and in particular the “European identity”.

Linguistic analysis will be used in order to explain the verbal elements and nominative function of the notion “European identity”, the derivation mechanism and lexical features, the process of enlarging the lists of political terminology and extending the vocabulary of Bulgarian politicians, journalists, and citizens.

Rhetorical analysis will be used in order to discover manifestations of the notion “European identity” in different rhetorical genres, the rhetorical figures, arguments, and techniques to present more effectively political positions, ideas, and concepts. The rhetorical analysis includes explanations of the communicative situation, political context, personal features of orators, and effects or errors of their speeches.

### **“European Identity” Across Bulgarian Language**

The concept of “European identity” is presented in the contemporary Bulgarian language through new terms

and words. The terminology is enlarged gradually, the official institutional language is enriched permanently, and the thesaurus is updated immediately after the announcement of each new decision of the EU and as a result of the necessity to inform the civic society about every decision, law, program, project, end policy of the EU. Some of the terms are translated from English and French into Bulgarian, others are fossilized metaphors.

The Bulgarian state institutions introduce the terms and notions. During the first decade after 1990, most new words sounded abstract, for example: *membership in the EU*, *institutions of the EU*, *European Parliament*, *European Commission*, and *European Court*, etc.. In 2007 and 2011, Bulgarian citizens took part in two elections for the representatives in the European Parliament or MEPs (Members of the European Parliament), or EMP (European Members of Parliament). Two Bulgarian women are European commissars—Meglena Kuneva (she was a minister of the European integration from 2002 to 2006) and Kristalina Georgieva. The Bulgarian language includes the terms and notions concerning the new positions: Europe commissar or eurocommissar, and European MP (EMP) or eurodeputy. The terms “eurocrat”, “eurocracy”, and “euro bureaucracy” entered our tongue very fast and they have become part of the modern Bulgarian language. The nominative function of language dominates in the laws and state official documents. Media publications consist of words playing denotative or expressive function. The politicians, journalists, and citizens use the terms “euroskeptics”, “eurooptimists”, etc.. The derivation follows a stable model where the compound words combine as their first element the adjective “European” or the short version “euro” and as their second element a noun.

Another group includes combinations of words naming political processes and traditions and at the same time the positive expression establishes good opportunities to compare Bulgaria with the ether European countries. The words and phrases “old democracies in Europe”, “old European countries”, “European democratic traditions”, and “European parliamentary traditions” display the aim to follow the positive socio-political tendencies in Europe.

The Bulgarian politicians use metaphorical language where the common feature is that the image is easily encoded verbally, because the metaphors are fossilized or “dead” and they have lost their figurative meaning. These combinations of words have positive connotation: “European home”, “European family”, “big European family”, “new member of the European family”, “European language family”, “European language portfolio”, “European language frame”, “linguistic diversity in Europe”, or “European linguistic diversity”. The European projects combine some keywords and they aim to establish a solid base of the “European identity” across the involvement of the Bulgarian citizens from different social groups in the actions and events of the projects. Some of the successful initiatives and projects are named: “My home and my European family”, “Paint your European family”. The state institutions and media in Bulgaria create video clips, publish them in the official sites, and broadcast them in the social networks: “Our big European family” from <http://vbox7.com/play:8935ab58> (VBox7 is an analog of YouTube). Another project is named positively “What is European home and how to build it?”. The activities include such as “The European Day of Languages” from <http://edl.ecml.at/Home/Whatisit/tabid/1760/language/en-GB/Default.aspx>. Simultaneously, Bulgarian citizens and journalist present their sceptical opinion and negative evaluation, and they say that Bulgaria is in the European home or house but the place of Bulgaria is in the *basement*, *larder*, *yard*, *lumber room*, and *cupboard*, but not in the normal living space of the flat. The meaning is that Bulgaria does not have equal place in the EU, and its secondary role as a servant is deserved.

The state policy includes new initiatives, and they appreciate the role of the Internet to build the sense of affiliation and to persuade the Bulgarian citizens that “European identity” is not an abstract notion. The state and cultural institutions have started the project “Europeana—virtual home of the cultural heritage of Europe and Bulgaria” from [http://www.emilstoyanovmep.eu/public/files/news/2/document\\_10.doc](http://www.emilstoyanovmep.eu/public/files/news/2/document_10.doc). The equal participation, evaluation, and appreciation of the cultural heritage of Bulgaria is a fact. Other successful initiatives are “European health fund”, “European investment fund”, etc.. The strategic program “Europe 2020”<sup>1</sup> includes some durations, projects, and programs, and some of them are “European platform against poverty and social exclusion”<sup>2</sup>, “Youth in Action program”<sup>3</sup>, “Triangle of knowledge”<sup>4</sup>, “Europe of knowledge”<sup>5</sup>, and “Europe—intelligent, green, common”<sup>6</sup>. The Bulgarians who work, learn, and travel in the European countries use such terms as “European health fund”, “European health card”. Students, teachers, and professors work successfully with other European countries on the programs Socrates, Erasmus, Erasmus—Mundis, Lingua, Komenski, Grundtvig, Minerva, Leonardo da Vinci, etc.. The people from the educational sphere understand the pluses of educational mobility, e-twinning, and the advantage of the “Five freedoms”—free movement of knowledge (the four freedoms include the free movement of people, goods, services, and capital).

Bulgarians express their national identity and simultaneously, they declare their heterogeneous origin: proto-Bulgarians and Slavs; their ethnic diversity: Bulgarians, Turks, Jews, Armenians, Greeks, Gypsies, etc.. Our European identity has been expressed in parallel with our Balkan identity, because Bulgaria is a country of the Balkan Peninsula where Bulgarians, Turks, Greeks, Rumanians, Serbian, and Macedonians live. Bulgarians, Serbian, and Macedonians have Slavic origin. The situation is too complicated, because Bulgarians, Greeks, Rumanians, Serbian, and Macedonians are orthodox Christians but Turks are Muslims. Bulgarian language includes new terms concerning our “European identity” and enrich it, because it is necessary to denote the different identities without their ideological connotation. The building of the “European identity” has connection with the rich cultural heritage of the Republic of Bulgaria and with our contribution to the civilization of Europe.

### **Geopolitical Factors in Bulgaria After 1990: European Integration and “European identity”**

The Bulgarian Parliament has 130 years old history and independent of the form of government, it has always been a unicameral legislature. Chronologically, four constitutions were voted from 1879 to 1991. From 1879 to 1945, Bulgaria was a monarchy but the National Assembly as a legislative power was one of the most significant institutions in Bulgarian political life. From 1945 to 1991 during socialism, the form of state government was a specific kind of republic (the People’s Republic of Bulgaria). After 1991, the National Assembly regained its status in the state system as an authoritative legislative institution. The Constitution<sup>7</sup> from July 1991 stated that Bulgaria is a republic with parliamentary government or parliamentary representative democratic republic. The multi-party system was established after 45 years’ socialist and totalitarian government.

<sup>1</sup> Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=961>.

<sup>3</sup> Retrieved from <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/youth/>.

<sup>4</sup> Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/understanding/what/era\\_in\\_the\\_knowledge\\_triangle\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/understanding/what/era_in_the_knowledge_triangle_en.htm).

<sup>5</sup> Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/research/conferences/2004/univ/pdf/conference\\_proceedings\\_10-09-04\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/conferences/2004/univ/pdf/conference_proceedings_10-09-04_en.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm).

<sup>7</sup> Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/?page=const&lng=en>.

A transition towards a pluralistic, democratic society and market economy is taking place. The Members of Parliament represent not only the voters in their respective groups but also they discuss topics which are socially useful and nationally considerable, e.g., the integration of Bulgaria in the EU. Consequently, more MPs (Members of Parliament) present and defend not only party, personal, and corporative standpoints but also institutional and national policy of different levels of responsibility.

The topic of the integration of Bulgaria in the European Union was seriously discussed in the 37th National Assembly (1995-1997) for the first time. A temporary government served until pre-term parliamentary elections in April, 1997. The 38th National Assembly reinforced the process of integration of the Republic of Bulgaria in the EU.

Diplomatic relations between Bulgaria and the European Community were established during the reign socialism in 1988. The Great National Assembly adopted a Decision on Bulgaria's willingness to become a full member of the European Community in 1990. The 37th National Assembly approved Bulgaria's official application for full membership in 1995 and in the same year, Bulgaria submitted an official requisition for membership in the European Council in Madrid. The Joint Parliamentary Committee Bulgaria—the EU was established in 1995, it functioned successfully to 1999 and nine sessions were held during that period. Simultaneously, Bulgaria-EU Association Committee held a few sessions and took an active part in the integration process.

MPs gradually start using relevant terms and notions regarding the European integration: “screening”, “monitoring”, “associated country”, “full membership”, “equal start of negotiations with all applicant countries”, “official accession negotiations”, and “pre-accession period”, abbreviations like “ISPA” and “SAPARD”, “opening” and “closing of the chapters”, etc.

The National Assembly has improved its law-making and decision-making procedures during the negotiations. The 37th National Assembly established new parliamentary committee in 2003, and it was called “European Integration Committee”. This Committee worked successfully from 2003 to 2005 and took part in the decision-making and legislation in connection with the European integration. For the first time, a dialogue on European integration was organized not only in the plenary chamber but also in the special committee where competent MPs took part and prepared a draft of legislative texts regarding the membership of Bulgaria in the EU. The European Affairs Committee has important obligations, as follows: “The European Affairs Committee takes part in the forming and assists the implementation of the Republic of Bulgaria's policy as full Member of the European Union (EU) and the active participation in all aspects of the European integration process” (The European Affairs Committee, 1997-2001).

The 40th National Assembly decided to rename the same committee as “European Affairs” and MPs worked hard and in a business manner from 2005 to 2009, i.e., during their whole mandate.

The 41st National Assembly renamed the committee for the second time: “European Affairs and European Funds Control”. The choice of name is not accidental, because it is the result of rationalization of the necessity for a relevant name in accordance with the new political and parliamentary environment, as well as with the new functions of the committee. On the other hand, it is a demonstration of effective management and a tool for presenting political will and decisiveness to make a change. Thirdly, it is an instrument to build party images of NMSII (National Movement of Simon II), the Triple coalition, and CEDB (Citizens for European development of Bulgaria). As a result, the political language has new manifestations for the period of seven years.

Bulgaria is a member of the EU together with Rumania from January 1st, 2007 after the enlargement of the EU in 2004 (Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia).

Parliamentary debates are an agent in the process of forming of the public opinion in connection with the membership of the Republic of Bulgaria in the EU. The manners and modes of presenting the ideas have changed as a result of the changes in the political programs, political environment, and international relationship. Consequently, the Bulgarian politicians' rhetoric explication of our “European identity” concerning the European integration has diverse manifestation and characteristics.

### **Our “European Identity” Presented by Bulgarian Political Orators**

The “European identity” is presented as a key notion, process, and strategic aim in the political speeches delivered by Bulgarian party leaders and ministers. It is not reasonable to generalize that all of them express integrated and unified portion of the conceptual complexity concerning the EU and the “European identity”.

The first group of political speakers used abstract and ambiguous phrases coming from the communist ideology, and they presented very amorphous ideas. The greater part of the MPs from the BSP (Bulgarian Socialistic Party) had rhetorical experience but their background was from the socialist era, and they could not transform their manner of speaking fast enough. For example, Alexander Lilov from the BSP declared his position as a political slogan: “For Bulgaria—a sovereign and independent state integrated in Europe” (personal communication, November 4, 1991). Jan Videnov from the BSP presented the official political position of the Council of Ministers in the Declaration during the opening meeting of the 37th National Assembly, but it was verbalized in abstract and generalized manner: “Our county should take a well-deserved place on the Balkan crossroad, in the United Europe together with our new partners from West and East and not in the underdeveloped Third world” (personal communication, January 13, 1995).

The second group of Bulgarian political orators used new terms despite that most of these were abstract and foretelling. Petar Stoyanov from the UDF (Union of Democratic Forces) said that Bulgarian citizens and politicians “should support the strategic desire for European integration” (personal communication, January 21, 2002). Ivan Kostov from the UDF appealed and suggested that the full membership in the EU is very important for Bulgaria:

First, Bulgarians want the status of movement in Europe... They want to have confidence as well as citizens of other candidate countries to join the European Union. Second, because three-fifths of the bilateral trade and investment in Bulgaria come from the countries—members of the European Union... And third, the Bulgarians want free visa regime... (personal communication, November 10, 2000)

Some political leaders showed political maturity and they expressed their position definitely: “The United Democratic Forces will continue to fight to take out Bulgaria of the negative list and we will continue to fight for our incorporation in all European structures” (Nadezda Mihaylova, personal communication, July 25, 2000).

Ahmed Dogan, MP from the MRF (Movement for rights and freedom), supported the integration and he used some phrases like: “The inclusion of Bulgaria in the European and world affirmative economic and financial structures” (personal communication, November 4, 1991).

In conclusion, we can say that most political orators in Bulgaria made proposals to accelerate its integration



in the EU, but they used different terms and notions. It was the result of insufficient experience and of the desire to express policy positions from their different rostrum, i.e., personal and party representations dominated in parliamentary dialogue during the first seven years after 1990. On the other hand, the encoding of our “European identity” in verbal expressions is the result of mixed legal notions, formulations, and phrasings with the aid of ideological slogans and appeals.

During the first seven years (1990-1997) after the democratic changes, the Bulgarian politicians repeated words presenting block confrontation (West and East), they used couples of words indicating polarity of meaning (“democracy”—“communism”, “freedom”—“totalitarianism”) and different words in connection with the European integration (“Europe”, “United Europe”, “European Community”, “the European Union”, “EU”, “European structures”). We can say that intertextuality decreased but its manifestations did not disappear.

Independently of their different opinions and proposals, Bulgarian political speeches did not bear the features of responsible statesmen’s addresses. They presented the decision in connection with the integration of our country in the EU as the result from consensus and our country’s membership in the EU as an issue of national significance. They began to think that the request for membership in the EU was reasonable, but it came not as an act of condescension from the EU but as our way to reach the standards of modern civic society.

During the period from 1997 to 2007, many Bulgarian party leaders began to use legal terms and notions: They improved their competence regarding the European integration but they continued to show their support emotionally. Some political orators preferred to present their party contribution to the process of integration in the EU but as a whole, they followed the norms of parliamentary behavior and they showed pragmatism and business-like manner of speaking. For example, Nickolay Mladenov from the UDF said:

Bulgaria as a small country does not have any interest to shift responsibilities to the European institutions and to rely upon entirely international institutions where the role of small countries will be reduced. Bulgaria has no interest of accepting Europe in two speeds where one part of the European Union will integrate fast at the expense of other countries. (personal communication, December 1, 2011)

Legislators often use new terms and some of them are “EU”, “European institutions”, “European Parliament”, “European Commission”, “European legislations”, “negotiation process”, and “commissioner”.

Some terms are created as metonymy by journalists or politicians out of the Parliament, probably not in Bulgaria. Most of them are used very often by MPs, and they mix them with other terms and phrases; this is a specific manifestation of intertextuality. For example, “Strasbourg”, “Brussels”, “Schengen”, etc.. Sometimes they have one or two variants: “Schengen” and “Schengen area”. These metonyms do not create communicative barriers but others are understandable only for limited groups of experts and professionals. They are used during the meeting of The European Affairs Committee: “Maastricht Treaty and Maastricht criteria”, “Lisbon strategy”, “Copenhagen criteria”, “Acquis communautaire”, “Roadmaps for Bulgaria and Romania”, “Constitution of the EU”, “Harmonization”, etc.

The third group accelerates the improvement of vocabulary and they stimulate new manifestations of political discourse, because they combine phrases and terms from socialism and post-socialism, e.g.: “Common market”, “European Communities”, “Free trade area”, “enlargement”, “European Commission”, “Eurobarometer”, “Euro sceptic”, “Europe Day 9th May”, etc.. Gradually, Bulgarian politicians, MPs, and statesmen start using terms like Monitoring reports and Regular reports more relevantly in their parliamentary

speeches, and this development of their political vocabulary creates good opportunities for achieving appearance of form and acceleration of intertextuality.

We can summarize that expressive words have been reduced in the last seven years (2007-2013), and most Bulgarian political orators use relevant terms regarding the European integration. However, sometimes the opposition legislators try to show that the government makes mistakes and opposition’s MPs claim that the prime-minister and some ministers did not keep our engagement to EU, for example, in connection with the funds. They prefer to show clear policy position from the parliamentary tribune and to declare personal activity and competence as politicians. For example:

It will be better for the 40th National Assembly if MPs make decisions which will create an opportunity to change the absolutely blocked political model in Bulgaria when we are members of the European Union. It is obvious that the government takes warning by the European reports. (Yane Yanev, personal communication, April 20, 2009)

Consequently, at the linguistic level, the orators mix with and gradually start to distinguish new terms from others derived from the late communist ideology: A typical feature of their public outcome is the gradual inclusion of the metalanguage typical for the European institutions in the speeches of Bulgarian MPs, which has lead to decreasing use of emotional and figurative phrases and increasing use of neutral words and borrowings. As a result, abstract words are replaced by more concrete, pathetic, and appraisal phrases with euphemisms, yet intertextuality has not lost its opportunities for new public outcome.

### **“European Identity” in the Bulgarian Presidential Rhetoric**

Zeliyo Zhelev was the first Bulgarian president who won in free and democratic elections in 1992. Zhelev was the first leader of the UDF, and he strongly supported the country’s integration with the EU. Zhelev’s statements are characterized by optimistic prognoses; he avoids metaphors giving preference to terminology and positive symbolic constructions. He tends to display thematic or chronological consistency and, when making conclusions, he includes new terms in his speeches combining European integration and our integration in NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) giving his preference to terms like “Euro-Atlantic integration”.

Petar Stoyanov (he was one of the leaders of the UDF) won the presidential elections in 1996 and played a crucial role in the complex political situation of 1996-1997. His name was recorded in the most recent political history of Bulgaria as a political leader who participated actively in the political processes so as not to allow the building-up of social pressure. In his statements, he uses imagery and metaphors which are still vivid in the Bulgarian political discourse. Phrases which conceptualize his ideas are: “new social contract between the government and the governed”, “new reformist majority”. His lofty, passionate manner characterized both his campaign and his rhetoric throughout the presidential mandate. His favorite topics are “European integration of Bulgaria”, “European civilization and civilizing”, “the contribution of Bulgaria to the European cultural heritage”, “the old European democracies”, “civil society and European political and democratic traditions”, etc.

Gueorguy Parvanov (the former leader of the BSP) won the presidential election in the fall of 2001. He introduced moderation and diplomacy in the debates on Bulgarian home and foreign policy. His campaign statements were awaited with great anticipation for, as a leader of the BSP, he expressed consistently his serious disagreement regarding Bulgaria’s integration with NATO while he supported the country’s integration in the EU. This was one of the reasons why, while debating with Stoyanov and Beronov during the presidential election

campaign in 2006, he emphatically stated his position in favor of these integration processes. In the context of Bulgaria’s foreign policy, Parvanov presented his position on the country’s relations with Russia: He sought balance between the two great powers of Russia and the USA.

Rossen Plevneliev, the current Bulgarian president after 2012, continues the position of the Bulgarian presidential instruction and the already established tradition. He said that during the next phase of the European integration Bulgaria will be active (Plevneliev, personal communication, May 7, 2012). To the words of the president Rossen Plevneliev, Bulgaria will be one of the EU member states that will show much more solidarity and responsibility in 2012.

To sum up, the author would first like to state that both traditions and continuity could be discussed as well as the individual characteristics of each of the three most prominent and successful presidential candidates. Zhelev’s rhetoric is marked by his optimistic manner of speaking and the “European identity” is explained as alternative perspective after socialism. Stoyanov has added the specific use of his elevated tone and positive futuristic visions concerning the concept of “European identity”, and his focus is on the civil and cultural elements in this complicated political and physiological construct. Parvanov’s style is based on moderate tone of statement and balanced use of rhetorical figures and tactics and the “European identity” is presented as a part of a strategic program. Plevneliev follows business-like manner of speaking, but he follows the tradition of the Presidential institution on the topic “European identity”. At the same time, the focus is fixed on new sub-topics: the economy and labor market of the European countries, and the opportunities for the Bulgarian specialists, the employment of young Bulgarians, and a strategic vision for the European development of Bulgaria.

Summarizing all data analyses, the author can say that for the last 23 years, the “European identity” is a main topic of contemporary Bulgarian presidential rhetoric and that all Bulgarian presidents support the membership of the Republic Bulgaria in the EU.

### **“European Identity” in the Bulgarian Parliamentary Rhetoric**

The observations show that the parliamentary debates on the concept of “European identity” have low chances to appear in the public outcome of the Speaker, and some of the reasons are that he or she has informative and regulating functions, quotes articles from laws strictly and avoids using a figurative language. The level of intertextuality is low in the declarations of the National Assembly, because they are rhetorical subgenre which has the purpose to announce and they bear the function of official documents. These declarations are prepared preliminary by a team of experts and they strictly follow the rules. Declarations announce official positions. For example:

We call on the Bulgarian Government to intensify the country’s preparation for the EU membership and to keep the National Assembly informed of the progress made, so as to ensure that the efforts leading to Bulgaria’s successful membership of the Union proceed in a timely and competent manner. (Declaration, 2006)

The speeches in the plenary hall possess the highest level of intertextuality in contrast with the shorter forms “question”, “answer”, “remark”, “interruption”, etc.. The greater part of the MPs cannot define their object and form short questions, and they spend some minutes to articulate relevantly and clearly their question. Intertextuality can be found during the parliamentary control and during the debates regarding of votes of no-confidence. The reasons for such manifestations are different. The existing antagonism of the MPs

stimulates them to express their positions more expressively and emotionally: orators mix terms and figurative language, quotations from laws and from press publications, and party programs and governmental documents. The vote of no-confidence on October 5th, 2002 created conditions and accelerated motivations in the speakers to express their party positions in front of the MPs and the public audience, because the debates were broadcasted by television. The debated topic was the decision of the Bulgarian Parliament contrary to the Constitution, but the reason was that some blocks of Kozlodui Nuclear Power Plant should be closed till the end of 2006. Government MPs defended a position that Bulgaria “will not allow compromises during the negotiations with the European Union”; another member stated that it “is a matter of political decision which can be made only at the end of January after the approval of the energy plan for the New Year” (Shorthand of the Debates in the 39th National Assembly, 2006).

Mincho Christov offered a suggestion to re-negotiate the decision in connection with the shutting down the three and four reactors of Kozlodui Nuclear Power Plant (personal communication, January 12, 2007). Roumen Ovcharov from the BSP used rude language: “Nobody empowered the prime minister to take responsibilities about the closing of the reactors 3 and 4. Bulgaria is obliged to have a clear position about the future of the nuclear energy” (personal interview, January 1, 2008). Minister Meglena Kuneva proposed that “the deadline for stopping the exploitation of the reactors should be between 2006 and 2008” (personal communication, October 29, 2012).

The Bulgarian MPs transfer their experience from parliamentary election campaigns, from tribunes during political events, and conferences and round tables. In the beginning of their parliamentary carrier, they forget very often the rules in the Parliament as a legislative institution, i.e., that their main task is to discuss and vote laws. More MPs follow other ways and they present their ideas directly, but it is an irrelevant approach for efficient debates. Some of them cannot understand that the institutional restrictions are necessity and that does not limit their rights. Most MPs cannot separate parliamentary from political rhetoric. For example, prime-minister Jean Videnov said that “Bulgaria’s foreign policy priorities were its integration into the European economic, political and military organizations and closer relations with the Euro-Atlantic structures”. “Bulgaria’s associate membership of the European Union, effective as of February 1, is an important step to the next objective—full EU membership”, he added (personal communication, February 3, 1995). It is obvious that two integration processes, in the EU and in NATO are viewed as parallel and equally important for Bulgaria. In comparison with the BSP’s official position from 1990 to 2000, this party accepts as a priority our European integration, but avoids expressing its official position in the National Assembly. Actually, the BSP was against our membership in NATO in the stage when the BSP government was in power from 1994 to 1997. This political behavior is reflected in parliamentary speeches and creates opportunities for new manifestations of intertextuality; mixing the terms from metalanguage of two international organizations creates notions as “Euro-Atlantic integration” and “Euro-Atlantic structures” on one hand; on the other hand, it has lead to an amorphous manner of expressing two complicated integration processes in speeches.

The interaction between the MPs is convention-based and rule-regulated. There are strict rules and most of the MPs know very well these rules and their obligations, but sometimes they take part not only in group confrontations but also in personal conflict and fighting speech-situations. Consequently, the parliamentary discourse is transformed from businesslike debates to a pathos-dominated competition.

Some MPs follow their well-known manner of political speaking during the election campaigns and they cannot adapt to other kinds of speaking, because they cannot accept that speaking emotionally as a political orator is different from the parliamentary speaking typical for an MP. Some of them try to make difference and they explain that “association with the European Union is not yet a full membership”, other accept “the EU as a saver”, but third—more competent enumerate some opportunities for Bulgaria: “access to the Western markets, with certain limitations of course”; “access to modern Western technologies”; and “greater confidence in Bulgaria which opens the way to foreign investments”. Parliamentary orators focus on “the role of the EU to accelerate the democratic process in Bulgaria”. It is obvious that businesslike and pathos-dominated manners are mixed. Another reason that simulates the appearance of intertextuality is the constantly repeated MPs’ attempt to present private and party benefit as public benefit. They try to show that their idea or proposal is important from public or national point of view. Every parliamentary orator finds a distinction between two kinds of motives, but he or she shows in front of the audience that they must obey their electorate as their representatives in the highest legislative institution. However, this is a hypocritical manner of participation in parliamentary dialogue.

Parliamentary dialogue has specific rhetorical features. The dialogue in the National Assembly is institutionally ritualized public intercourse but the individual manners of speaking of the MPs reflect in the frequent occurrence of intertextuality. Quite often the MPs prefer involving longer explanations on the topics regarding the European integration of Bulgaria in their speeches, because they show that they are prepared very carefully on the subject. They want to express that they defend the rights of their fellow party-members and that they are their reliable MPs. They pretend that the length of their speeches is equal to their significance, but it is a rhetorical tool and a well-known piece of sophism. Another reason is that they cannot organize their speech in advance, and they lose more time to focus on the most important topic and in the middle or in the end of their speech they try to say it. The border between freedom of speech and presentation of unimportant topics from political, legal, and social standpoints is clear but MPs continuously mix these three spheres—private, party-partisan, and institutional. For example: “The European Union should act in support of Bulgaria in its fight against the virus of corruption”, “The majority of Bulgarians still have high hopes for the EU membership and are proud to be EU citizens. It must be our goal to promote this EU optimism into the rest of the union”.

From the beginning of the period of democratic changes, a bipolar model influences parliamentary rhetoric and the majority of MPs prefer to construct their speeches on the antithetic base “We—You”. This model is traditional and useful for presenting the positions of the government and the opposition in the plenary chamber. It establishes good opportunities for the improvement of the antagonistic manner of speaking. For example, some facts presented in the monitoring reports of the European Commission regarding implementations of Bulgaria as a full member in the EU are named by oppositional legislators “blunders”, “failures”, and “collapses”, but by governmental MPs “shortcomings”, “omissions”, and “negligence”.

Intertextuality has interesting manifestation in dialogues during the first session of the 41st National Assembly as a reflection of the statements made in media and press-conferences by the prime-minister Bojko Borissov and the leader of the BSP Sergey Stanishev. CEDB’s orators in the parliament hall repeated key phrases firstly delivered by Borissov: “revisions”, “audits”, “verifications”, and “controls” organized by the new government in accordance with the “Program Declaration for the Priorities for European Development of

Bulgaria”. At the same time, MPs from the BSP define these actions emotionally as a “purge” or “comb-out”, and they claim that the ruling circles from parliamentary rostrum “make a comb-out”. Socialist MPs shift the popular idiom “witch-hunt” in political and parliamentary context and it creates intertextuality, because the governmental decisions and actions (concerning the revisions mentioned above) are named emotionally and figurative language becomes a rhetorical tool to hold up, to ridicule, and to express political satire. But both groups accept Brussels as a metonymy of the authoritative European institutions, and they use it simultaneously as a symbol of the EU and as a clinch that Bulgaria should follow European rules and be equal and responsible European partner.

Some of the new terms used by Bulgarian MPs from the parliamentary rostrum after 2007 are: common responsibility to fight with the weak management and the frauds, sharing and solidarity without actively integrating our political activities into a global approach.

Successful parliamentary debates presuppose knowledge from different spheres: political science, sociology, media, psychology, law, ethics, rhetoric, etc.. MPs need to know the parliamentary procedures, about the political system, the political environment, and the current social and culture activities in the Republic of Bulgaria and in the world, and particularly in the EU. Multidisciplinary knowledge is a fundamental for their efficient performance and functions like execution, implementation, and fulfillment of obligations as a member of the EU. Simultaneously, they need to develop their rhetorical competences interactively.

In conclusion, we can say that emotional words and common terms dominate during the first five years, while the processes of clarification of terminology and precise naming of institutions and activities take place during the second period leading to a frequent use of the new clichés and reduction of expressive phrases.

### **Discussion and Opening New Research Fields**

The two hypotheses proposed in the introduction of this article have been confirmed by the interdisciplinary analysis including CDA, DHA, linguistic, and rhetorical methods. The enlarged Bulgarian language helps to articulate “our European identity” and the results show that the changes on verbal level are the result from the need to name the political and integration processes and the concepts of the Bulgarian and European legislation. The analysis has shown that rhetoric can affect the European identities of Bulgarian citizens—in both their civic and cultural dimensions as well as in following the effort to save our national identity. From rhetorical point of view, the ideological words have been gradually substituted for new terms used by Bulgarian political orators and official state speakers. The new research fields include analyses of the current events, where a significant space is given to the comparison of the concept of “European identity” with the concepts of “national”, “Slavic”, “Balkan”, and “identity”. Second comes the comparison between the sense of their civic affiliation to the EU and their “European identity” of the different generations, as well as of the citizens living in the Republic of Bulgaria and abroad, in particular in the European countries or in the USA, Canada, Australia, etc.

### **Conclusions**

In conclusion, the author can state that our “European identity” is a new topic in the contemporary rhetoric in Bulgaria after the beginning of the democratic changes. Politicians, MPs, Bulgarian presidents, ministers, and EMPs focus on our “European identity” as a main topic in their speeches. Our integration to the EU and membership in the EU accelerate the derivation process, and the contemporary Bulgarian language is enriched

with new terms designating the institutions of the EU as well as its laws, projects, rights, obligations, and its cultural and educational institutions. Most Bulgarian citizens use in their daily conversations a greater number of geographic and political terms, names of European towns and tourist destinations, as well as words concerning documents, standards, norms, and rules in accordance with the European legislation. The concept “European identity” has personal, group and social meanings and it has become clearer after the citizens’ participation and involvement in the projects, activities, and events comprising the topics of the European membership: European funds, European language diversity, European language family, European grants, etc.

During the latest 23 years, many terms from the past Communist ideology have been gradually substituted with new terms used by Bulgarian politicians, statesmen, and MPs after 1990 and by MEPs after 2007. The modern Bulgarian political rhetoric is an active agent in the process of forming the positions of the Bulgarian citizens regarding our “European identity” and, through political decision-making, the processes and procedures of adopting and voting laws. The topic “our European identity” has been displayed on some different levels and one of them is that of rhetoric. The rhetorical level consists of several sub-levels: different subgenres, rhetorical figures and techniques, and pathos-oriented speaking and its replacement by goal-oriented discussion strategies.

In conclusion, we can say that our “European identity” has been displayed more clearly and tolerantly, and this is a result of the rationalization and realization of the social, political, and communication roles of the Bulgarian politicians and statesmen.

### References

- Avramov, J., Ivanova, V., Prodanov, V., & Todorov, A. (2009). *The Bulgarian parliament and transition*. Sofia: Ciela.
- Bojiadjiev, T. (2005). National language in terms of foreign influence and globalization. *Bulgarian Language*, LII, 5-15.
- Bruter, M. (2003). Winning hearts and minds for Europe: The impact of news and symbols on civic and cultural European identity. *Comparative political studies*, 36(10), 1148-1179.
- Checkel, J. T., & Katzenstein, P. J. (2009). The politicization of European identities: European identity. In J. T. Checkel, & P. J. Katzenstein (Eds.), *European identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christov, M. (2007, January 12). Speech. *The 40th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Christova, P. (2012, September). The European identity in the key speeches of the European politicians. Retrieved from <http://rhetoric.bg/>
- Daynov, E. (2000). *The political debate and the transition in Bulgaria*. Sofia: PH Science and Art.
- Declaration. (2005, July 14). Declaration about the priorities of 40th National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria. Retrieved from <http://parliament.bg/bg/declaration/ID/5191>
- Declaration. (2006, September 27). Declaration of the 40th National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria on the full membership of the Republic of Bulgaria in the European Union. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/declaration/ID/5199>
- Declaration. (2007, January 1). Declaration of the 39th National Assembly expressing the support for Bulgaria’s accession to the EU. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/news/ID/370>
- Dogan, A. (1991, November 4). Speech. *The 36th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Jordanova, R. (Ed.). (2008). *Chrestomathy on parliamentary rhetoric (2008)*. Varna: VFU PH.
- Jordanova, R. (Ed.). (2010). *Chrestomathy on parliamentary rhetoric (2010)*. Varna: VFU PH.
- Kostov, I. (2000, November 10). Speech. *The 38th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Krasteva, A., & Stoitzova, T. (2008). *The first year European Bulgaria: Elections and images*. Sofia: New Bulgarian University PH.
- Kuneva, M. (2012, October 29). Who, how, and why closed four blocks of NPP “Kozlodui”. Retrieved from <http://meglenakuneva.bg/>
- Lilov, I. (1991, November 4). Speech. *The 36th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Mavrodieva, I. (1995). Argumentum ad hominem in the parliamentary debates (1990-1991). *Sociolinguistics and communication*, IV, 116-118.

- Mavrodieva, I. (2004). *The integration of Bulgaria in the European Union and NATO: Rhetorical aspects*. Sofia: Sofia University PH.
- Mavrodieva, I. (2012). *Political rhetoric in Bulgaria: From street meetings to the social networks (1990-2012)*. Sofia: Paradigms PH.
- Mihaylova, N. (2000, July 25). Speech. *The 38th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Mladenov, N. (2011, December 1). Speech in Brussel. Retrieved from <http://novinite.bg/articles/1916/Mladenov-Balgariya-ne-iska-Evropa-na-dve-skorosti>
- National Assembly. (2006, November 28). *Shorthand of the debates in the 39th National Assembly*. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/bg/plenaryst/ns/1/ID/2046>
- Nedelcheva, T. (2007). National and European identity. In M. Mizov (Ed.), *Dialogue and tolerance*. Sofia: Faber PH.
- Pirgova, M. (2002). *Bulgarian parliamentarism in conditions of global transition*. Sofia: Paradigma PH.
- Plevneliev, R., & Popova, M. (2012, May 7). *Press Conference of the Bulgarian President and Vice-President*. Retrieved from <http://www.president.bg/cat49/223/Izviavlenie-na-Prezidenta-i-Viceprezidenta-po-povod-100-dni-ot-vstapvaneto-v-dlajnost.html>
- Prodanov, V. (2005). Contradictions in the European identities. *Ethnic diversity and United Europe* (pp. 76-91). Sofia: Centre for Historical and Political Studies, Foundation “Cohesive Society”, Foundation “Jean Jaures”.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodan, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA* (2nd revised ed., pp. 87-121). London: Sage.
- Rusinova-Hristova, A. (2003). *Political speaking: Psychological mechanismus*. Sofia: InterPress PH.
- Stoyanov, P. (2002, January 21). Presidential speech. Retrieved from <http://www.vesti.bg/novini/zakliuchitelnoto-obryshlenie-kym-naciiata-na-petyr-stoianov-kato-prezident-pylen-tekst-358880>
- The European Affairs Committee. (1997-2001). *The National Assembly Archive*. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/en/archive/2/3/171/info>;  
[http://www.parliament.bg/pub/cW/20120222100250Doklad\\_06\\_12\\_2011.pdf](http://www.parliament.bg/pub/cW/20120222100250Doklad_06_12_2011.pdf)
- The Seven Grand National Assembly. (1991, July). *Constituion of the Republic of Bulgaria*. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.bg/en/const/>
- van Dijk, T. (2001). Critical discourse analyse 1998. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vezenkov, A. (2008). European integration and the question of the European identity. *Christianity and Culture*, 5, 71-75.
- Videnov, J. (1995, January 13). Speech. *The 37th National Assembly*, Sofia.
- Videnov, M. (2007). The European Union and the challenges in front of Bulgarian linguists. *Bulgarian Language and literature*, 1, 3-8.
- Yanev, Y. (2009, April 20). Speech. *The 40th National Assembly*, Sofia.