

## 9. SUMMARY

Антонов, Стоян. *Синхронизации: преходи и трансформации в българското село*.  
Пловдив: Университетско издателство „П. Хилендарски“, 2025.

[Antonov, Stoyan. *Synchronization: Transitions and Transformations in a Bulgarian Village*. Plovdiv: P. Hilendarski University Publishing House, 2025.]

The problem of the *dying* of the Bulgarian village is widely discussed in the Bulgarian media, political and academic discourse. The symptoms are the demographic collapse and the subsequent *depopulation*, which coincide with the historical period of socialism, i.e. with the processes of forced collectivization and urbanization. Against this background, this monograph raises the question of the ways in which villagers individually, on the one hand, and together, as a collective, on the other, maintained their identity, living with their past, woven from contradictions and leading to the heterogenization of the social fabric, but also trying to project their future in attempts of homogenization.

The book describes social phenomena and interpretations of past naming practices and today's activities of rewriting histories and updating traditions. Thus, the village manages to re-create itself to some extent. The re-creation itself is seen as an attempt at synchronization – a fit not only between the individual and the social rhythm, but also between different times. The emphasis is placed not on the general timeline, not on everyday practices, but on exceptions, anomalies and distinctions that signal fluctuations in the rhythm. Both answers (through history and through tradition) to the question of what the village does in order to continue to exist after the socialist period are possible thanks to specific transforming individuals.

The monograph combines the approaches of genealogy, microhistory, ethnography, ethnology and anthropology. The main method is the anthropological one, insofar as it unites ethnography, understood as field research (*up close* and *personal*) and description of the social world, and ethnology – as a comprehension of the collected materials. The anthropological approach is also distinguished by the fact that a *large issue* is posed (regarding the transformations in the Bulgarian villages during the post-socialist period), derived from a *small place* (the community of one specific village – Chereshovo, Slivo Pole municipality).

**Антонов, Стоян. Иновации и трансформации в антропонимията на едно село от края на XIX и началото на XX век. – *Епохи*, 32 (2024), 2, 398 – 412.**

**[Innovations and Transformations in the Anthroponymy of a Village at the End of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Century]**

Through examples extracted from population registers of a village, the paper illustrates some aspects of change in the Bulgarian naming system at the turn of the 20th century. The main results refer to two trends of modernization of anthroponymy: introduction of names belonging to members of the Bulgarian ruling house, and replacement of the original form of the name in the process of *renewal* of subsequent generations. These innovations were reflected in changes of the traditional rhythm of naming, and were most likely provoked by the introduction of population registration and the need for written forms of specific folk names.

**Антонов, Стоян. Кадър Неби, имането и Къдърлез: нюанси на съкровището в татарската култура. – В: *МИФ 10: Съкровището. Научна конференция – Сливен, 2003 г.* София: Издателство на НБУ, 2005, 72 – 83.**

**[Antonov, Stoyan. Qadir Nebi, the Hoard, and Qidirlez: Nuances of the Treasure in Tatar Culture.]**

The text places the issue of the Tatars in Bulgaria at the intersection of history, folklore and ethnology. The relations between the color codes of red, gold, green and white are interpreted in the ideas of the Crimean Tatars of the ancestral homeland, treasure and moral values, as well as in rituals performed on Qidirlez. Through this reading, the symbolic role of the connection with the ancestral homeland as the main marker of the ethnicity of the Crimean Tatars in Bulgaria is emphasized.

**Антонов, Стоян. Татарската общност в България: от културна традиция към културна политика. – В: *Иванова, Р. (съст.). Всекидневната култура на българите и сърбите в постсоциалистическия период. Трета българо-сръбска научна конференция.* София: ЕИМ – БАН, 2005, 285 – 293.**

**[Antonov, Stoyan. The Tatar Community in Bulgaria: From Cultural Tradition to Cultural Policy.]**

The article addresses the problem of studying the Crimean Tatar community in Bulgaria in the context of changes after the collapse of the authoritarian regime and the

revival of small ethnic groups. The text examines the construction and representation of Tatar ethnicity after the fall of the regime. The emphasis is placed on the re-creation of the group through the restoration of traditions, as a result of the activities of new social actors and cultural and political institutions, and implemented in an urban environment. On this basis, those characteristics of the contemporary representation of the Tatar community (the uses of humanities and art; the links to the *diaspora* and to the *minority* status; cultural and educational societies; the *all-Tatar reunion*) are extracted, which speak of replacing traditional models with a cultural policy.

**Антонов, Стоян. Българската хералдика: предразсъдъци и перспективи. – В: Баева И. и П. Митев (съст.). Предизвикателствата на промяната. Национална научна конференция, София 10 – 11 ноември 2004. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2006, 478 – 487.**

**[Antonov, Stoyan. Bulgarian Heraldry: Prejudices and Perspectives.]**

This paper provides a critical overview of the development of heraldry as an auxiliary historical discipline in Bulgaria. The main weaknesses are noted, such as lack of knowledge about heraldic theory, the subjective nature of the studies, erroneous identifications and inaccurate use of heraldic terminology, the dominance of artistic interpretations over academic research, especially in the field of applied heraldry. The next part of the text outlines the prospects. In applied heraldry, they are related to the development of civic heraldry. In academic terms, numerous topics and problems await researchers are outlined. Finally, a model methodology is given that could help in the process of emancipating heraldry from history and including it in the academic exchange with heraldic communities around the world. Specific steps are also given for the implementation of these goals.

**Антонов, Стоян. Гиранте в България (някои размисли). – В: Димов, Т. и Н. Муртаза (съст.). Татарите в България – общество, история и култура. Сборник доклади от кръгла маса, проведена на 29.05.2009 г. в гр. Добрич. Добрич: Наврез, 2009, 91 – 99.**

**[Antonov Stoyan. Girays in Bulgaria (Some Reflections)]**

The text addresses the problem of the Giray Dynasty in the Bulgarian lands and the issues dedicated to the so-called Tatar sultans. Some main problems in the previous studies have been identified, resulting from the impact of ethnocentric readings with the assumption of evaluative characteristics regarding representatives of the Crimean Khanate dynasty and



their attitude towards the local population. Instead of the outlined opposition of *ours* and *other's*, which is evident from these studies, it focuses on the concepts of *aristocracy* and *territorialization*, through which a higher level of understanding of the problem under study may be reached. The prospect of expanding the academic field from history to folklore, ethnology and regional and local studies is shown. Possible sources for expanding the database, which could also lead to new readings, are listed.

**Антонов, Стоян. Символно-реално – дихотомия на нематериалното културно наследство. – В: Кръстанова, К. (съст.). Локалното наследство – ресурс за местно развитие. Пловдив: Университетско издателство „П. Хилендарски“, 2012, 60 – 69.**  
[Antonov, Stoyan. Symbolic-Real – A Dichotomy of Intangible Cultural Heritage.]

The text analyzes excerpts from an interview with a district chief of the Central Balkan National Park using the symbolic-real continuum in order to shed additional light on the way intangible cultural heritage is thought about, recognized and named by an important social actor. The main conclusions from what the interviewee said are related to the understanding of the existence of a process of awareness of heritage, thinking about natural resources and knowledge about them as a resource for local development, the assessment of tensions and conflicts between the regulatory framework and inherited practices, the mechanisms of assigning value to heritage, etc.

**Антонов, Стоян. Руснаците в Пловдив: интеркултурният диалог и градът. – В: Кръстанова, К. (съст.). Разрушаването на порядъка. Научна конференция в памет на проф. Тодор Ив. Живков, Пловдив 2002. Пловдив: Университетско издателство „П. Хилендарски“, 2012, 291 – 304.**

[Antonov, Stoyan. The Russians in Plovdiv: Intercultural Dialog and the City.]

The paper presents the main markers of identity of people who define themselves as Russians in Plovdiv. At the beginning, a definition of the community itself and its group division is made, mainly due to their formation in different historical periods, their attitude to the Soviet heritage and even their gender. Origin, language, music, places and institutions, home arrangements and the calendar holiday system are indicated as markers of identity. An attempt is made to place Russians in the system of intercultural dialog in Plovdiv and the main images that they recreate regarding other local communities, Bulgarian culture and the city as a whole are highlighted.

Антонов, Стоян. Преподаването по етнология между теория и практика. – В: Коцева, В. (съст.). *Насоки в академичното изследване и преподаване по етнология и антропология*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2018, 70 – 79.

[Antonov, Stoyan. *Teaching Ethnology between Theory and Practice*]

The paper shares personal research and teaching experience with the aim of provoking a discussion about the teaching of anthropology and ethnology and possibly optimizing the learning process. The main question posed in the article is how a researcher copes with the challenges of teaching theory through practice. The role of the teacher as a representative of the profession and as a mediator between students and the skills and knowledge provided is emphasized. Training is presented as a research field from which lectures can be drawn for the training process. Examples are given of the coordination between educational goals and methods of teaching, learning and students assessment in the main courses of the methodological cycle at the time of writing: Field Research Methods and Theory of Research in the Social Sciences.

Antonov, Stoyan. *The System of Personal Arms of the Bulgarian Royal House (the Saxe-Coburg and Gotha Dynasty)*. In *Genealogica & Heraldica. Origin and Evolution / Origine et évolution / Ursprung und Entwicklung. Proceedings of the XXXII International Congress of Genealogical and Heraldic Sciences, Glasgow, 10 – 13 August 2016*. Edinburgh: The Heraldry Society of Scotland and The Scottish Genealogy Society, 2021, 57 – 74.

The paper presents the model of differentiation of the coats of arms of the members of the Saxe-Coburg-Gotha dynasty, which began during the reign of King Ferdinand and acquired a complete form under his grandson. This system of personal coats of arms is unique for the heraldry of Europe and can be defined as a *Bulgarian type* in the typology proposed in the text. It combines a titular and pedigree principle, the main concepts it reflects are origin, seniority and succession to the throne through the indicators as *title, ancestry, gender* and *primogeniture*. It is clearly recognizable by the fact that the personal coats of arms of the ruler and the heir to the throne are marshalings from the coats of arms of the four ancestors on the paternal and maternal lines, i.e. an armiger's grandfathers and grandmothers.



**Antonov, Stoyan. Social Status and Heraldry: Two Examples from Bulgaria. In: *Actas Congreso Internacional de las Ciencias Genealógica y Heráldica, Madrid 2020, organizado por Confédération Internationale de Généalogie et d'Héraldique, Real Asociación de Hidalgos de España, Instituto Internacional de Genealogía y Heráldica, Madrid, 20 – 23 octubre 2021. Madrid: Ediciones Hidalguía, 2022, 57 – 67.***

The paper presents the two cases of Bulgarian armigers – Raicho Nikolov and Georgi Kyoseivanov. The text comments on the connection between their social status and their arms. The first example is linked to Raicho Nikolov. He was granted a coat of arms in connection with his ennoblement as a reward for his feat during the Crimean War (1853 – 1856). In this way, the boy of modest origin gained access to the upper classes of the Russian Empire. The analysis of his coat of arms leads to the conclusion that his heroic deed is symbolically depicted. In the second case, Kyoseivanov receives a coat of arms in his capacity as a knight of the Order of Dannebrog. He received this distinction at the peak of his career, i.e. the coat of arms was a consequence of his social status. The analysis of the coat of arms shows that the connection of the armiger with the Bulgarian state and the high official rank in it was depicted. It is very likely that Kyoseivanov himself participated in the selection of the charges. Thus, even in Bulgaria, despite the opposing models of social trajectory and granting of a coat of arms in both cases, the direct connection between heraldry and social stratification is outlined.

**Antonov, Stoyan. Crown and Restoration: A Projection of the Past in the Design of the Bulgarian Heraldic Crown. In: Fox, Paul A. (Ed.). *Genealogica & Heraldica XXXV. Reformation, Revolution, Restoration. Proceedings of the 35th International Congress of Genealogical and Heraldic Sciences, Cambridge 15th – 19th August 2022. London: The Heraldry Society, 2023 = The Coat of Arms, Supplementary Volume No. 3, 290 – 304.***

The paper presents the attitude towards the Bulgarian heraldic crown as a result of the main transitions in the history of modern Bulgaria – the Liberation, the September 9th Coup, democratization after the collapse of the totalitarian regime. Main attention is paid to the debates regarding the crown when adopting the current coat of arms. The crown was present in the iconography of the national symbol during the Bulgarian Revival, including being adopted by the most prominent republican at the time – Vasil Levski. After the restoration of Bulgarian statehood, the main question regarding the heraldic crown was its status – respectively princely or royal. Ultimately, a characteristic design was established, which places the Bulgarian heraldic crown alongside the other regnal crowns of European

monarchies. During the totalitarian regime, the crown was erased from state symbolism, and during the Transition to a democratic society, the question of restoring the Bulgarian coat of arms was also brought to the forefront. This gave rise to heated debates, in which heraldic arguments gave way to political ones. Ultimately, a compromise was reached, in which the supposedly medieval crown and the supposedly Bogomil crosses satisfied the two irreconcilable parts of Bulgarian society.

**Антонов, Стоян. Татароведски изследвания в България през XXI век. – В: Микова, З., Шопова, Б. и Антонов, С. (съст.). *Непознатите 2022. Сборник доклади и статии от научната конференция, проведена на 30 септември и 1 октомври 2022 г. в Пловдив в рамките на четвъртото издание на Културен семинар „Непознатите – Пловдив“*. Пловдив: Академия за музикално, танцово и изобразително изкуство „Проф. Асен Дямаджиев“, 2023, 11 – 27.**

**[Antonov, Stoyan. Tatar Studies in Bulgaria during the 21st Century.]**

The paper deals with the main topics, problems and trends in Crimean Tatar studies in Bulgaria. In the years of the Transition, the interest in Tatar issues has shifted from the fields of history and linguistics to ethnology, folklore, and political science. The studies, along with collecting information according to a neo-positivist model, also include analysis of the construction of the Tatar image and the connections of identity with memory and heritage. Research carried out by representatives of the Tatar community itself entered the scholarly discourse – a consequence not only of striving to solve an academic problem, but also the result of activism.

**Antonov, Stoyan. A Bulgarian Proposal for the Coat of Arms of Dobruja. – In: Atanasiu, Mihai-Bogdan and Tiron, Tudor-Radu (Eds.). *At the Crossroad of Civilizations. Individuals and Families Reflected by Genealogy and Heraldry*. Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre Publishers, 2024, 399 – 407.**

The article presents a proposal for the coats of arms of Dobruja, designed by Haralampi Tachev (1875-1941) and published in a Bulgarian newspaper in 1941. This proposal came about after Bulgaria regained Southern Dobruja in 1940. Before that, the Romanian Consultative Commission on Heraldry had created arms for the provinces, counties and towns, but this heraldic heritage was not retained in Bulgaria. Immediately after the 1940 Treaty, an attempt was made to create a coat of arms of Silistra, but it was not

adopted and was not heraldically correct. The Bulgarian approach neither benefited from what had already been done by Romanian heraldry nor offered a different heraldic solution. In other words, it was both 'non-Romanian' and 'non-heraldic'. In contrast, Tachev's design (*party per fess, 1. Or a bar wavy Azure, 2. Azure two dolphins urinant respectant Or*) was heraldically correct and was based on the existing arms of the province. This project was only a personal initiative of the artist – it was neither a legal attempt to impose the coat of arms nor did it gain any popularity or result in implementing the design. Moreover, this proposal could be used as an example of the relationship between heraldry and cultural context.

**Антонов, Стоян. Хан Татар и Тодорка (един прочит на варианта от Велико Търново). – Български фолклор, 2018, 4, 451 – 474.**

**[Antonov, Stoyan. Khan Tatar and Todorka (A Reading of a Song Variant from Veliko Tarnovo)]**

The text interprets Khan Tatar and Todorka ballad by commenting the historical terms used on one hand, and, on other hand by doing a transformational analysis of the attributes and functions of the mediator in the plot. The situations connected with the Tatars as a historical population are analyzed as potential sources of folk personages and motifs. Resultantly, the folklore situation is seen in the light of a possible reflection of the mythological understandings while at the same time the basic psycho-social functions of the ballad are outlined. Thus the reading combines historical and mythological aspects and compares the particular *Bulgarian* case with the universal models and structures of mind.

Stoyan Antonov