Ines Crvenkovska - Risteska, (Skopje, Macedonia)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL VIEW UPON THE PROCESS OF CREATION OF MACEDONIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE PERIOD OF REVIVAL

"The feeling of national identity is a powerful tool for determining and location of the individual 'I' in the world, through the prism of collective personality and its culture. In fact this mutual, unique culture enables us to acknowledge 'who we are' in the contemporary world. Rediscovering this culture, 'we discover' ourselves, 'our authentic personal I' (...). This process of self-definition and location is a key to national identity, but also an element that causes most doubts and skepticism"
(Antoni D. Smith 1998:34).

When we talk about the categories of emotionality, i.e. feeling, we speak about extremely complex and multi-layer categories that can not be treated as minimalistic, as a product of the permanent filtration done by the mechanisms of culture, while the feeling, but as well emotionality, are primarily treated in an extremely biologistic way, as a part of the animal, instinctive, that is, human natural predisposition, which results with all emotional realizations being treated as belonging to a category of extreme nature, that through its genetic determination, as quintessential essence, is in fact a confirmation of naturalness sui generis. These categories, established in such a superficial way, treated as pure, that is, purified forms, present another confirmation that man, without any doubt, perceives his environment as extremely black, or extremely white, with no option for elaborative nuances.

Thus, when we speak about the categories of emotionality and feeling we make a distinction between these completely different categories that are opposite to each other, the feeling being located over emotionality as an emotional realization in a form of a culturally shaped antipode. Although etymologically stemming from the same nucleus, these two terms are binary opposite, one is fixed in the category of nature, while the other in the categories that belong to the sphere of culture, since the first one is a biological predisposition that allows information that has been accumulated through an external culturation process, to be transposed in the other, final effect - emotion, formed through the mechanisms of culture. In order to conclude that feeling is formed through cultural mechanisms, one should investigate the relation between emotionality and feeling, that presupposes this process of culturation of the material carried by the individual, that is effectuated into an incorporated feeling that defines/self-defines the individual and his surrounding. This presupposes that the incorporated emotion could be created through the culturation process, but also that it could be modeled according to the needs of the social community.

If we try to deduce the author's stand points to concrete examples from our cultural surrounding, we can conclude that this, so to say, conjugational relation individual : culture is unavoidable. When one takes into account the final objective of this relation, then one surely obtains the current social context with contextual essence, but only as a part of the response to the posed problem, which in this case is related to a certain ethnic, national and even political identification. The other part of the answer could be derived from the research done by ethnologists and anthropologists that deal with traditional cultures and their structural, mythological and religious system with all its elements and features, which would present it as a model for creation of culture

at the level of ethnicity. A conclusion can be drawn that the traditional mythological-religious system has been raised to a level of an 'ideal' model for creation of an ethnic political mythological and religious system, with all its components and features which, according to the semiological concept of Roland Barthes, who treated myth as a semiological system, as a 'carrier of meaning' (Roland Barthes 1971:263, quoted according to Pavlovski Mishel 2004:42), are build as an additional semiological structure upon the ethnic political, mythical story, that has been formed upon an "ethnic-centered ideal, phantasmagoric axis" (Colovic Ivan, 2000, page 16).

This is how one can explain the 'editorial' tendency of the collectivistic ideas through concrete cultural and social realizations (states, uprisings, wars and transitions), as invented 'ideal' expressions related to the management or re-configuration of the continuous survival of identity communities.

The above quoted sequence of the famous anthropologist Antony D. Smith suggests that each individual, by definition, never perceives himself as an isolated entity, but as a part of a certain community, while at the same time establishing and confirming one's own attainment to a certain identity group and most importantly, one's own position in that group. Such a cultural catharsis presupposes an existence of an individual with a developed feeling of identity self-confirmation, that assists the process of psychological relief when it comes to the questions: 'who am *I*?', 'where do *I* belong?'.

According to many authors, a confirmation of the stand-point that the communities and the collective individual *I* have always strived towards defining the sum of elements that belongs to the sphere of *us*, is the establishing of community borders in the sense of B. Anderson's definition, and he is totally right when saying that "communities should differ not according to their falseness/authenticity, but according to the style in which they are imagined" (Anderson Benedict 1998:20). The conclusion of B. Anderson is upgraded with the "desire for separation" (Brumbauer, Ulf 2002:90) and the creation of "symbolic border around one's own community, that feels threatened by the bigger ones" (Brumbauer, Ulf 2002:90), manifested in an organized way, at a number of construction levels.

- From mythology to ethnicity
This research covers a segment of the process of the creation of a Macedonian national identity, in the period before and after the Ilinden uprising of 1903 in Macedonia, as well as the social context of that time. The analysis of the historical events in the social context, aims towards confronting the existing subjective attitudes and abstracting them, and at the second level, but not less importantly, through arrive, through implementation of adequate methodological techniques and tools, to the desired non-biased research solutions, that would be another example of the mosaic of processes of creation of a cultural category of ethnicity, that is nationality in a unit of time, especially since it refers to an example which is extremely complex and still current at the international scene. The anthropologic research of the model of Macedonian national identity done by foreign researchers, have treated it as belonging to the same group with other Balkan national identities. Macedonian authors did not do much research on the problem of the Macedonian national identity, most probably aiming to avoid the danger of falling into the trap of every-day politics, or due to fear of condemnation by the 'national disciplines' that are still dominant in the scientific

sphere in Macedonia. On the other hand, in relation to Macedonian national identity there is still a realistic opportunity that this analysis can be used as a contra-attack by the *others*, that doubt the existence of institutions (the state, the name, the church, the language), which are important for the public manifestation of the Macedonian national identity, thus relativizing the legitimacy of the independent state. This is why such ethnological and anthropological research do not tolerate a daily-politics approach, that would position the research itself on this or the other side, but it treats phenomena as they are presented and not in a biased context.

The model of Macedonian national identity, especially the process of its creation, could serve as an explicit example of an ethnological and anthropological research related to the problem of ethnicity, as one of the cultural strata in building distinctiveness, based upon the principle of otherness, that derives from the relation between the collective us : others.

The attempt for conducting a research concerning Macedonian national identity in a certain social context and time when the author is doing the research, asks for certain reconstruction of the historical events and the social context in an established historical period, events that proved, through time, important for the process of creation of national identity, and this is the period of 'revival'. This diachronicall analysis is not sufficient for deriving a complete answer to the posed problem. This satisfies only the part that is a result of one of the 'basic categories - dispositions of man and the human nature (...) the need to live in a community' (Risteski Lj., 2005:67). The representatives of the revival speak about this as 'a national unification of Macedonian Slavs, and unification of the interests of all Macedonian people' (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:68).

To finally satisfy the need of an answer, the rest of it should be derived at a level of "disposition of creation of communication systems, based upon the process of symbolical communication (...) where these systems of communication enable(d) cultural values to be transferred, kept, stored and transmitted from one generation to another, from one community to the other etc." (White 1970:11, Casirer 1996:47, quoted according to Risteski Lj., 2005:67). Having in mind that Man is continuously creating symbolical communication systems, it is assumed that the creation of a communication system for identification at the level of ethnicity falls under the same heading. To understand the ethnic-based identity communication system it is necessary to conduct research upon, as Edmund Leach calls it, communication behavior that according to him is a "part of the sign system that 'serves the purpose of transmitting messages', but which is not being based upon mechanical relation between the tools and the goal, but being based upon a culturally defined communication code'. (Leach E., 1971:772). Such communication behavior transmits messages through culturally defined communication systems - codes, that serving the need of symbolical communication appear as generators for (re)activation of the stored culturally defined communication knowledge, accumulated through a certain period of time, also called by different authors collective memory matrix at the level of ethnicity. The (re)activation of the collective matrix, in the given context, and in a given unit of time is objectified through the form of ritual activity, ethnic-political rituals (Dunja Rihtman-Augustin, 2000) and 'festivities' that 'create a whole and give a rhythm of life' (Dunja Rihtman-Augustin, 2000).

If we start from the conclusion that the myth and mythological way of thinking are defining categories upon which the complete system of perception and creation of notions of man and the world is based (Lévi-Strauss 1988:103-236, Lévi-Strauss 1989:202-228, quoted according to Risteski Lj., 2005:67) and the fact that myth should be considered a basic phenomenon of human culture, or more precisely as the only relevant system of religiously and socially prescribed behavior of people in a certain culture' (Risteski Lj., 2005:68), this presupposes that the communication system that serves the purpose of ethnic identification takes its culturally defined communication codes from myth and mythological way of thinking. This means that the ethnic and ethnic-national thoughts and notions are created according to the same processes that creates mythological and religious system, that has been formed as a result of mythical logic, mythical way of thinking and mythical notions. Analogous to the phenomenon of mythical awareness the ethnic-based, that is ethnic-national awareness, was created. From this one can conclude that everything that falls in the sphere of the ethnic is organized according to the analogy to the mythical, and as a result of mythical logic, the structure of the mythical-religious system puts it into a context, as a part of the structure of the ethnic-based, political, mythical and religious system. That is, the cultural level of ethnicity, as a relatively new strata in the cultural communicational symbolic practice, was created according to an analogy to the relatively older strata, the communication symbolic practice, characteristic for the folk culture of Macedonians.

For the needs of this research materials from the period of 'national revival of Macedonia' were used, a period that has been verified by the later official Macedonian historiography as a period of 'revival', and the authors as 'revival authors', and it refers to the period before and after the Ilinden uprising (1903). According to the revival authors, the revival itself is a synonym of what they call 'national separatism' (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:154-216), that is a result of the Macedonian nationalistic movement. Starting from the preposition on the importance of the term revival, being re-born, it correlates with the idea of the creation of the 'essential', established by the historian of religious thought, Mircha Eliade, according to whom "it is a matter of a mythical time, but this is not the 'first', that is, the time that we could call 'cosmogonical' time (Elijade M., 2002:119). This was reflected in the Golden age myth, the structure of the pantheon of the folk heroes (demiurgs), as well as the idea that the 'events that took place in the mythical past deserve to be a subject of knowledge, since learning them man becomes aware of his essential nature - and he wakes up'. (Elijade M., 2002;143). In this context, together with the folk notions of folk culture of Macedonians, where waking up is closely related to the notions of being born, and the 'open eyes are the most important sign of life' (Risteski Lj., 2005:103), the notions of national revival, awakening and future survival of the identity community are embedded, and this is verified by the 'deal' of Macedonian national movement, "autonomy for Macedonia" when the segments of the Golden age myth are being re-opened in the frames of a concrete phenomenon, independent national state.
'(...) "we had the car Alexander the Great". Through these words he remembers the shiny period and the greatness of the Macedonian state. Alexander the Macedonian stands in front the Macedonian as a national pride. This national pride today has, for him, an intellectual importance, concerning the idea of independence. The great Macedonian state, in the face of Alexander, was extremely useful for science (...)" (Makedonija, 1888:13-15, quoted according to Ristovski Blaze, 1966:72).

"...Macedonians! Think about the world hero, the global glory of Macedonia - the great Alexander the Macedonian; think about the courageous car Samuil, the Macedonian great man, about Krali Marko, the pan-Slavic glory - that they had Macedonian blood in their veins; they bless and take care of our deed from heavens. Let's justify the fact that we are their inheritors; let's keep their honored names and amaze the world with our courage, skill and self-sacrifice..." (Rad makedonskih komiteta, 1902:2, quoted according to Ristovski Blaze, 1966:164).

Starting from the idea on the 'continuity of the transcendence of the axiological values' (Elijade M., 2002:148), to further create national identity segments of mythical reality were activated of which the 'revival authors' thought that they could serve in the creation of Macedonian national identity. Analogue to mythical thinking, that 'is presented as a 'concrete' way of thinking in the essential sense of the world: everything that it embraces experiences a special concretization, merges, and the mythical notion allows the thing that connects it to finally overlap' (Risteski Lj, 2005:70), the national thought was build, which allows the activated axiological values, together with the potentially new cultural values to merge and obtain a new ethnical structural construct. More concretely, there was a process of re-definition of the existing ethnic political myth and defining of a Macedonian ethnic political myth upon which the postulates of the Macedonian political mythological and religious system would be built, in the context of the need of creation and officialization of a Macedonian national identity, confirmed by independent and sovereign state of Macedonia.

The revival texts, as well as the public communication (articles in the printed media, official documents, texts on theatre plays etc.) from this period, contain a continuity of a political mythical story, that did not exist as a separate type of text, but as a 'narrative structure (reservoir of fable), that most often finds its place in certain literature and folklore forms' (Colovic Ivan, 2000:16), which as a 'highly valued form of symbolical communication (...) obtains legitimacy as the 'voice of people' (Colovic Ivan, 2000:16). In the period of revival the texts of the revival authors, but also the official documents, contain a lot of political folklorisms - events and persons from the past, that were used to construct, as Colovic puts it taking the phrase from the structuralists, "an ethnic-centered idea, a phantasmagoric axis" around which the Macedonian ethnic political myth was formed.

"We rose as supporters of freedom. We serve, spilling our blood through Macedonian fields and forests, as the Macedonian army of Alexander the Macedonian did, for freedom, under the motto: 'Freedom or death!" (Macedonian (Kresna) uprising 1878-1879, Makedonium, 2003:13).

"Our dear motherland Macedonia was once one of the most honored countries. Macedonian people, creating the foundations of military skill, through its victorious phalanges and through Aristotle's education, has civilized humanity and Asia. But this once respected motherland of ours today is at the verge of its fall, due to the oblivion of our origin..." (Manifest of the temporary Government 23 March 1881, 2003:16-17).

- Creation of a national identity aiming to define ethnic distinctiveness
Ulf Brunbauer, in his text Dynamics of ethnicity: Identity of the Pomaks, points out the conclusions of the authors that deal with identities at the Balkans. According to

them "the region has not passed through the early phases of the formation of national states" (Brunbauer Ulf 2002:80), that is, that the Balkan national states were formed relatively late, "at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century" (Brunbauer Ulf, 2002:80). The creation of the ideal form of manifestation of unity at the level of ethnicity, defined as a state, according to the revival authors was the only way of creation of Macedonian national identity. Although during this period some conditions were created so that the Macedonian national movement could implement its idea of creation of an independent national state with defined state borders, the plan remained only at the level of an idea, that was implemented later one. But this was not an obstacle concerning the process of creation and officialization of the Macedonian national identity, as if it was imagined by the 'creators'.

The example of the Macedonian national identity is contrary to the idea that in order to build an identity a creation of a national state is a must, and is the only factor that has its own creational politics in the process of the formation of a national identity. On the contrary, the example shows that identity could be created as a result of the need of a reciprocal balance in the power fight of distinctive identities, initiated by the pressure of the big or smaller forces at the Balkans, above all Russia, implemented by the small Balkan states that it formed. This type of pretentious economic, but also cultural influence is what Benedict Anderson calls 'Russification' (B. Anderson, 1998:126). Russia, using the real basis, the Slavic cultural layer, has tried to impose the need of Slavic unity at the Balkans, so that it could participate in the continuous global antagonism towards everything that is non-Slavic. The infiltration of the idea was enabled through the Slavophil Balkan circles, to impose its national interests and impose territorial and economic domination at the Balkans. The idea was also implemented by the Governments of the newly formed Balkan national states that, on the other hand, under the idea of a pan-Yugo-Slavic unity have supported a nationalistic attitude. Both variants of interests were directed towards the Turkish province of Macedonia. The areas of Macedonia where the neighboring official nationalism succeeded to survive were called by the revival authors 'spheres of influence'. The population that was identified with the identity features of the neighboring national identities and official nationalisms, according to the revival authors presented a part of the so called 'propaganda'.

"The Serbian propaganda is spread through whole of Macedonia, except Kostur, Ser, Petric, Drama region, i.e. the extreme South and extreme East. In Kostur the Serbs do not have propaganda, not because they are Serbs from Kostur, but because they are influenced by the Greek propaganda. Serbia is giving the East of Macedonia whole-heartedly to Bulgaria.

Bulgaria is not less generous in relation to Serbia when it comes to the Macedonian question: Bulgarians acknowledge the Serbs on the South-East side of Shar mountain, the rest of Macedonia is Bulgarian, according to Bulgaria.

Thus, both propagandas are not questioning only the territory on the South-East of Shara and parts of the sandzak of Ser, that lies close to the Bulgarian border. South-East of Shara there are only Serbs and in the sandzak of Ser only Bulgarians (...) The Bulgarians are even more tolerant: they call the part behind Shara mountain "Old Serbia'.

But besides those two regions, the rest of Macedonia is called Serbian by the Serbs and Bulgarian by the Bulgarians" (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003: 244).

The process of officialization of the Macedonian nationalism started in a parallel way through activities that were generally conducted from outside (outside the territory of Macedonia) and less frequently from inside (at the territory of Macedonia). Its role during that period was to be solidly established among the population at the territory of Macedonia, through the media, science, culture, at the same time imposing the Macedonian question at the international scene. The aim was to discuss and finally solve the issue related to this part of the Balkan region. An example of proclamation of this question is the Manifest of VMRO (United) from 1924, where the goal is defined as follows: "to impose to the European public opinion and to international diplomacy a solution of the Macedonian question" (Manifest of VMRO United, 6th of May 1924, Makedonium, 2003:83).

The emergence of Macedonian national element as an ideological movement

In the first wave of movements for ethnic self-identification representatives of middle and low classes were mobilized, vernacular politicized culture, in the worlds of A. D. Smith, through which they tried to provide separation of the communities and its historical territories from the great empires. Macedonian national movement is in the context of E.D. Smith's statement, that towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century there were a number of national movements at the Middle East. It involved a number of young intellectuals most of which were educated outside Macedonia. The author Blaze Ristovski, in the book *Krste P.Misirkov (1874-1926), Towards the study of the Macedonian national thought development,* wrote that the young intellectuals were under strong influence of "the Russian scientific thought and the Russian public, and major steps were made for affirmation of the Macedonian nationalistic ideas." (Ristovski Blaze, 1966:73-74). This was a result of the interest when "the issue of the Macedonian nationality and Macedonian language became central not only in the relationships between Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece, but also in the Slavonic."(Ristovski Blaze, 1966:73-74) B. Ristovski mentions in the book that in 1886 Ivan Ansanov, prominent leader and inspirer of Slavophil movement "induced the Macedonians to fight for their national emancipation and to raise their language to a level of a literature language" (Ristovski Blaze, 1966:73-74) on allegation that the Macedonian dialect "is richer than the Bulgarian and closer to ours?" (Note. I.C. the Russian) (Ristovski Blaze, 1966:74) and "will bring us closer together and will bond us stronger" (Ristovski Blaze, 1966:74). In the same period, the Bulgarian Petar Draganov "had the possibility to experience the ideals of the Macedonians, (hence) from 1887, he began to publish his extensive memoirs "Ethnographical outline on the Slavic part of Macedonia" in the central-Russian magazine for Slavic issues "Izvestija S.-Peterburgskago Slavjanskago Blagotvoritelnaja Obstestva".(Draganov P., 1887,1888, quotation according Ristovski Blaze, 1966:74). The author Krste P. Misirkov writes about the attitudes of the Russian lecturers at the University of St. Petersburg: "Now there are even scientific representatives as for example Prof. I.A. Boduen-de-Courtene (Polish professor), P. A. Lavrov (Russian Slavist) and V. Yagic (Croatian, professor in Russia), that find that Macedonian dialects are separate representatives of the Slavic language family" (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003). Such a strong influence contributed to the organization of the Macedonian emigration in Bulgaria, at the end of the '80ties of the 19th century, and the Macedonian emigration

in Serbia, in the frames of the so called *Macedonian national scientific-literature associations* (Krste P.Misirkov 2003,108-154) among which there was the Slavic-Macedonian literary association in Sofia, which was organized "with a basic purpose *to revive the folk Macedonian literature*". (Ristovski Blaze, 1966:75).

-Revival national-ideological program:

The interest of the Macedonian revival authors in defining the terms from the area of ethnicity began at the end of XIXth and the beginning of XXth century. The definition of the term "nation" can be found in the book *"Dictionary of three languages"* by Gjorgija Pulevski published in 1875, where it is written: '*people who have the same origin, who speak the same language, who live and associate with each other, and who have the same customs, songs, and festivities; those people are called a nation, and the place where these people live is called the fatherland of that people. Thus, the Macedonians are a nation, and Macedonia is their fatherland* (Georgi Pulevski, 2003: 20). The representatives of the revival have tried to define, through the ethnicity concept of the Macedonian model of national identity, the postulates upon which the ethnicity concept of the national identity of the Macedonians would be based. The representatives of the revival, by mutual acting as representatives of the ideological movement, at the beginning have realized the need of the self-identification process, identification among the intelligentsia, and later on among the Macedonian Slavs, for which a nationalistic - ideological program had been prepared:*"The first task of the Macedonian intelligentsia, then, will be to clear away the mistrust that exists between the intellectuals and the various national and religious groups and to unite the intelligentsia both within Macedonia and abroad, to assess the general interests of the Macedonians by getting down to grass roots, to dispel national and religious hatred, to educate the Macedonian Slavs in the pure Macedonian national spirit, to make determined efforts that the Macedonian language is widely taught and to maintain contact with schools in the towns with a Slav population as well as to teach the language in village schools attended by Slavs. In the Slav villages they should ensure that church services are held in Macedonian".* (Krste P.Misirkov, 2003: 74)

This could be also seen in the literary opus of the representative of the revival Krste. P. Misirkov and his role in the Macedonian national movement in the period before and after the Ilinden uprising in 1903. He based his research upon the Macedonian national issue, and as a result of his conclusions, he wrote the book *"On Macedonian matters"* where he undoubtedly and in a sublimated way summarizes his program regarding the formation of the Macedonian national identity:

"Through these few words I wanted to explain the content of the proposals directed towards the Macedonian readers of this book, on certain essential issues. As a supporter of the idea for a complete separation of our from the interests of other Balkan nations and for an independent cultural and national development, I wrote them using the central Macedonian dialect, which for me, from now on, will present a literary Macedonian language" (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:18).

The relation Macedonians/others in the book of Krste P. Misirkov "On Macedonian matters"
            -National name:

In his texts Krste P. Misirkov explicitly writes in relation to the national name of the population in Macedonia. He is well aware that the political pressures by the others could strongly influence the defining of identity of the population, but he is also aware that national names were imposed, that they were temporary and that they were changed depending on the success in winning bigger 'spheres of influence' in Macedonia: "If the term 'Serb' would be chased away from Macedonia, there would be only the term 'Bulgarian' referring to Macedonians, this term being a political and ethnographic one since the Turkish rule. This term was not bad from a Turkish point of view, and from the Greek one it was also quite appropriate, since it could be used to express the despise that the Greeks felt towards us. This is why, among other things, we proclaimed ourselves to be Bulgarian, i.e. stubborn people" (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:266). "The Bulgarian name in Macedonia is thus a result of the bad treatment of Macedonian by the Greek clergy. The Greeks have ruined the Ohrid archbishopric due to the mentioning of the adjective "Bulgarian", as a historical reliquium, but they have also used the name Bulgarian to express their despise towards everything Slavic. This is exactly why we call ourselves "Bulgarian" - it is not due to historical traditions" (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:268)" (...) But this change of our name is not a unique case. We were called Serbians by the Serbs" (Krste P. Misirkov 203:252).

Although Misirkov states that *"one nation can be without a national name for many years, if there is no other nation in its vicinity, from which it should be distinguished by a different national name"* (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:115), he is aware of the problem with the Macedonian national name. The examples show that in the relation Macedonians - Greeks, the conformity towards the Slavic community has been imposed as an identification marker in the Greek perception of the Slavs as "Bulgarians", synonym of everything that is Slavic: *"The name Bulgarians among the Slav people was popularized by the Greeks and at first referred only to the Bulgarians- Mongols (..). However, that name in the eyes and in the utterance of the Greeks had another special meaning: hated barbarians, people that were uneducated, rude, resembling the bests. The Greek considered everything that was Slavic as rude and Bulgarian* (Krste P.Misirkov, 2003:252). In the relation between the Macedonian Slavs and, as Misirkov calls them, the Turks, The Macedonians were identified (self-identified) as *"raya"* or *"kauri"*: *"If a Turk had asked us what we were, we would answer that we were "kauri" i.e. non-believers or "raja of the tsar". In other words, we presented ourselves in such way so we would not make the Turkish officer angry. In front of the Turks we were "kauri" and "raja", and we began to call ourselves "kauri" among each other."*(Krste P. Misirkov 2003:260) This means that the national name of the population in Macedonia was formed depending on the side with whom it entered into communication or with whom it had certain relation*:* Macedonians : Bulgarians, Macedonians : Greeks, Macedonians : Turks; and usually the Macedonians have adjusted their self-identification according to the perception of the others, from the view point of *the other* towards the Macedonians, i.e. they proclaimed themselves from the position of the defined social status *by the other*. "Thus, Turks made us a nation that is 'kaurski or 'rajatski', terms that were based upon our humility in relation to the Turks, upon the religious difference between us and them, and upon our social status" (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:262).

This type of self- perception (in respect to the national name), through the perception of *the other*, is typical for a population with non-defined ethnical identity, because

such system of identification on the basis of ethnicity is regarded as a relatively newer cultural communicational system, contrary to the system for social identification where the individuals in the relations have positioned themselves by determination of the social status, which was proven as more relevant for the determined norms in the social living.

-National language

Krste P. Misirkov, in his research, is interested in issues related to the Macedonian national identity and he knows exactly where to search the *idiom* that is specific for certain social group (for the lingual and communicational collective), and which has double symbolic role: as idiom of group cohesion and as idiom for distinction from other groups. In this duality, Skiljan determines the *collective identity designation* of that social group. (Dubravko Skiljan, 1998:240-241). K. P. Misirkov seeks the collective identity designation in the Macedonian language, because, as he says: "*Language is the means by which we are enabled to understand the thoughts, feelings, and desires of others. Language contains individual sounds, signs, or words for all man's thoughts, feelings, and desires. This is why language is the spiritual heritage and treasure of a nation through which all the thoughts, feelings, and desires the people have experienced in the past are unlocked and released through words and sounds to be handed down as something sacred from one generation to another(--)Historical and cultural factors have always been influential in forming a literary language. For this reason we have lately been neglecting to choose the speech of one of our own regions as the general literary language, and instead we have been writing and learning in a foreign, neighboring tongue, chiefly Bulgarian. Now, however, thanks to circumstances, we are taking the dialect of central Macedonia (Veles-Prilep-Bitola-Ohrid) as our general literary language (within his words "the core of the Macedonian language) (--) We have already seen how closely national interests are bound up with language, and language with the character and spirit of the nation* (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:138-139) (..) *Just as in any country there is a center, which is best situated in the middle of the country, so too in the field of language there should be a center".*(Krste P. Misirkov 2003:132). According to Misirkov, "*the creation of a literary language is a spiritual need, for this would put an end to the abuse of our interests by the propagandists and would enable us to form our own literary and academic center so that we would no longer be dependent on Belgrade and Sofia. This, however, is no easy task, and it can only be accomplished if the Macedonian of the north will offer his hand to his brother in the south, and if the Macedonian from the east will do the same to his brother in the west. And their meeting-place will be around Prilep and Bitola.* (Krste P. Misirkov 2003:300)

We can see from the text that Misirkov makes a clear distinction between the groups that speaks Macedonian folk tongue, which he uses as a marker for identification on individual level, from the groups that speak foreign, neighboring tongue. This is supported by the definition of the contemporary authors in the area of public communication linguistics, according to whom "every type of identity can best be interpreted as *relational value* that arises from the relation between the bearers of the identity and the others whose identity of same type is different. The identities, on individual and on collective level, *are constructed upon the relation I or we towards others,* and for its defining, both sides in this relation are essential, which means that the identity is not formed solely upon *the self-perception* of its bearers, nor from *the*

perception of the differences regarding others, but also from the perception *by others.*
(Dubravko Skiljan, 1998:235-236)

Krste P. Misirkov realizes the power of language and its actions and he imposes it in his program as one of the basic markers in the ethnicity identification process. Beginning from the stand points of the contemporary researches - anthropologists, who nowadays clearly define the function of the linguistic actions and the way this function shows its distinctive trait towards other living beings (…), leads to a conclusion that human language is specifically marked with the notion that except *sign aspect* (where certain phenomenon of the externally-linguistic macrocosm are marked by linguistic signs) it also has *symbolic aspect* (where the language as a symbol serves for formation of the marked phenomenon) and these two aspects are always mutually connected. Therefore, in the public communication domain there are two areas: *communicational and symbolical area:* the first includes all members of certain linguistic community who can produce and understand message of a certain idiom, as well as all people who find a symbol of their own unity in such idiom. The symbolical area, is important for observation of the relationship between the *language and the identity* where a distinction should be made (even though they are mutually dependent) between *the identity of the language* (as one unit within the multitude of other languages), and the *linguistic identity* of individuals and linguistic communities and communicational collectives. The *linguistic identity* is a dynamical phenomenon, composed of great number of elements, and it is characterized with constant and variable relations between *us and the others*. Krste P. Misirkov is aware of the Macedonian linguistic identity (by which the communicational space of Macedonian language is determined), for the purpose of upgrading the symbolical area (and in such idiom the people to find a symbol of their own unity), strives to define the identity (for which he uses the term "Macedonian people's language") of the Macedonian language (as one unit in the multitude of other languages) and proposes "*we* choose the dialect of central Macedonia as general literary language, i.e. Veles-Prilep-Bitola-Ohrid dialect (within his words "the core of the Macedonian language"), i.e. the central dialect to be standardized, codified, and raised to a level of a national language. Thus, it is emphasized "the human ability, by means of language and speech to construct a world of marked phenomena and simultaneously to include in the symbolism domain a potentially great number of phenomena created by the linguistic activity, that immediately after the establishing of the connection between the communicational and symbolical dimension, at the moment when such relationship is placed in the public communication space, all possible language constructions in the analyzes are reduced in one single type that seemed to us the most relevant for studying the public (Note. I.C. communicational) traffic. According the assumption that, in the human macrocosm, the language itself is manifested as a symbol of individual statuses and roles or as individual and collective entities within the social structure, we can say that in this type of symbolism the language constructs itself as a symbol, but we should emphasize the fact that here we are taking about a type of personification, because in the bases of such processes the speakers of the language can always be recognized, and not the language itself, but also the fact that it is a matter of some type of "circuit" where the language is the means, but also the result of the symbolic construction…" (Dubravko Skiljan, 1998:233). If we consider all of this from a current perspective, it arises as definition that: the nation *produces* (national) language, and the language, with its communicational and symbolical

dimension, provides unity of the nation, and with it the nation is "produced". (Dubravko Skiljan, 1998:244-245)

In order to attract the attention of the population, especially the attention of the educated people, Misirkov, when talking about his book on Macedonian folk tongue, carefully chooses his rhetoric, which is in the spirit of the ethnicity political folklore, and he often calls upon the forefathers, the people's spirit, and everything that according to him is categorized as 'sacred', making personification of the *language and the religion* into one context, with the impressions related to "the soul", as essence for the existence of one nation. This is all for imposing the language and the religion in his program as the two most important markers in the ethnicity identification, but also as symbols of identity unity, as part of the ethnicity symbolical communicational system:*"Preserving one's national language and defending it as something sacred means remaining faithful to the spirit of one's forefathers and respecting all that they have done for posterity. Renouncing one's national language means renouncing one's national spirit (...) Through them we were given our first spiritual nourishment, because they gave meaning to all that we saw with our own eyes. Through the national language we are brought closer to the way of thinking of our fathers and forefathers, and we become their spiritual heirs in the same way as - through our physical strength - we perpetuate them in our body. (...)Religion and language are the soul of a nation (...)*(Krste P. Misirkov 2003:135-136)

We can see from the text that Misirkov assigns double role to language, as part of the essence or the "soul", but also as a synonym of the human "naturality" to judge for himself, on the basis of the acknowledgements about the language that he practices. According to the author, ethnic communication may be established solely through the applied 'spiritual nourishment" - the language of the fathers and mothers, and by preserving and cherishing the language they can be their spiritual heirs. Thus, the people's spirit, through the language as a channel, will be distributed among the people, so they can become spiritual and bodily heirs of their forefathers, and will continue their national parentage.

FOREFATHERS →lang. as a channel →authors-repr. of the revival →lang. as a channel →contemporary 'pure' Macedonians
(bearers of nation's soul and religion)   (heirs)
                (heirs)

-Religion
Besides the issue of the language, to which Misirkov gives great importance in his work, the issue of religion is presented as infallible segment in the construction of his program for formation of the national identity, and he pays great attention to the *religious propaganda,* which according to the author, is closely related to the national propaganda, that have made a huge influence upon the ethnic self-determination and determination among individuals: "*Unfortunately the Orthodox religion - the oldest, the most widespread, the basic faith of all the nationalities of Macedonia - has completely lost sight of its main aim, which is to encourage brotherhood amongst the different nationalities (..) Instead of pursuing these noble aims the Orthodox religion has simply spread discord and envy. (..). The Orthodox faith in Macedonia has now become so compromised that one can no longer speak of a true Orthodox church, for there are now three churches, and they are not Orthodox but Greek, Bulgarian and*

Serbian. (..)If the propounds of religious propaganda try to disrupt the unity of the Macedonian people and the intelligentsia they will come to see that this is impossible and that the only choice left to them is to form One Holy Apostolic Church in Macedonia, i.e. to form an Archbishopric in Ohrid which would be the "Archbishopric of all Macedonia".(Krste P.Misirkov 2003:62,64)

According to Misirkov, orthodox Christianity is the 'basic' religion of Macedonians. In this way he defines all other religions existing at the territory of Macedonia as potentially marginal concerning the process of building the national identity.

Having in mind the tendency of ethnic determination, as a concrete ethnical and national definition of the population by *the others*, the idea was to inspire a process of nationalization of the older layer of cultural, social and religious auto-identification/identification. In this way he only orthodox institution, 'the Orthodox church', as a result of the nationalized religious propaganda, was separated into institutions with a national character, that continued to exist as carriers of nationalistic ideas: "One can not talk about one and only Orthodox church, there are 3 churches, not Orthodox but a Greek, Bulgarian and Serbian one" (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:62). This style can be found in the frames of the Orthodox community, where the ethnic background of an individual was defined according to his belonging to a certain nationalized religious community: Greeks - "Patrijarhists", Bulgarians - "Egzarhists", Serbs - "Patrijarshists". The ones that did not belong to Orthodox Christianity, the Muslims, according to religious the religious affiliation of the ethnic Turks ('Osmanlii') that settled in Macedonia were qualified as 'Turks', i.e. the ones that became Turks - "poturcheni".

Continuously supporting the idea that Orthodoxy should be treated as basic religion in the creation of national identity, Misirkov sees the solution of the religious issue in Macedonia in the re-institutionalizing of autonomous Ohrid Archbishopric: "If religious propagandas try to disrupt the unification of Macedonian intellectuals and Macedonian people, the only solution is to create a unique church, i.e. to establish the Ohrid Archbishopric as an Archbishopric of the whole of Macedonia (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:64). This institution would undertake the activities of the religious institutions with a different national auspice which will lead to creation of an institution that will affect the 'national spirit' of the Slav population through the mechanisms of 'people's enlightening':*"This view upon history of Macedonia, it seems to me, not only shows that we, Macedonians, have our own history and that we are a nation, connected through our faith with other neighboring nation, but at the same time independent and autonomous, as for example the Archbishopric in Ohrid, with its efforts for national enlightenment. (..)At the same time this historical view shows that, almost in all times, the strong influence of the national spirit on cultural-historical bases can be seen , whose result is formation of strong Macedonian state of tsar Samuil and rich folk literature"*.(Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:280)

Conclusion

The model of Macedonian national identity, especially the process of its creation, could serve as an explicit example of an ethnological and anthropological research related to the problem of ethnicity, as one of the cultural strata in building

distinctiveness, based upon the principle of otherness, that derives from the relation between the collective us : others.

The attempt for conducting a research concerning Macedonian national identity in a certain social context and time when the author is doing the research, asks for certain reconstruction of the historical events and the social context in an established historical period, events that proved, through time, important for the process of creation of national identity, and this is the period of 'revival'. This diachronicall analysis is not sufficient for deriving a complete answer to the posed problem. This satisfies only the part that is a result of one of the 'basic categories - dispositions of man and the human nature (...) the need to live in a community' (Risteski Lj., 2005:67). The representatives of the revival speak about this as 'a national unification of Macedonian Slavs, and unification of the interests of all Macedonian people' (Krste P. Misirkov, 2003:68).

To finally satisfy the need of an answer, the rest of it should be derived at a level of "disposition of creation of communication systems, based upon the process of symbolical communication (...) where these systems of communication enable(d) cultural values to be transferred, kept, stored and transmitted from one generation to another, from one community to the other etc." (White 1970:11, Casirer 1996:47, quoted according to Risteski Lj., 2005:67). Having in mind that Man is continuously creating symbolical communication systems, it is assumed that the creation of a communication system for identification at the level of ethnicity falls under the same heading. To understand the ethnic-based identity communication system it is necessary to conduct research upon, as Edmund Leach calls it, communication behavior that according to him is a "part of the sign system that 'serves the purpose of transmitting messages', but which is not being based upon mechanical relation between the tools and the goal, but being based upon a culturally defined communication code'. (Leach E., 1971:772). Such communication behavior transmits messages through culturally defined communication systems - codes, that serving the need of symbolical communication appear as generators for (re)activation of the stored culturally defined communication knowledge, accumulated through a certain period of time, also called by different authors collective memory matrix at the level of ethnicity. The (re)activation of the collective matrix, in the given context, and in a given unit of time is objectified through the form of ritual activity, ethnic-political rituals (Dunja Rihtman-Augustin, 2000) and 'festivities' that 'create a whole and give a rhythm of life' (Dunja Rihtman-Augustin, 2000).

If we start from the conclusion that the myth and mythological way of thinking are defining categories upon which the complete system of perception and creation of notions of man and the world is based (Lévi-Strauss 1988:103-236, Lévi-Strauss 1989:202-228, quoted according to Risteski Lj., 2005:67) and the fact that myth should be considered a basic phenomenon of human culture, or more precisely as the only relevant system of religiously and socially prescribed behavior of people in a certain culture' (Risteski Lj., 2005:68), this presupposes that the communication system that serves the purpose of ethnic identification takes its culturally defined communication codes from myth and mythological way of thinking. This means that the ethnic and ethnic-national thoughts and notions are created according to the same processes that creates mythological and religious system, that has been formed as a result of mythical logic, mythical way of thinking and mythical notions. Analogous to

the phenomenon of mythical awareness the ethnic-based, that is ethnic-national awareness was created. From this one can conclude that everything that falls in the sphere of the ethnic is organized according to the analogy to the mythical, and as a result of mythical logic, the structure of the mythical-religious system puts it into a context, as a part of the structure of the ethnic-based, political, mythical and religious system. That is, the cultural level of ethnicity, as a relatively new strata in the cultural communicational symbolic practice, was created according to an analogy to the relatively older strata, the communication symbolic practice, characteristic for the folk culture of Macedonians.

The interest of the Macedonian revival authors in defining the terms from the area of ethnicity began at the end of XIXth and the beginning of XXth century. The definition of the term "nation" can be found in the book *"Dictionary of three languages"* by Gjorgija Pulevski published in 1875: '*people who have the same origin, who speak the same language, who live and associate with each other, and who have the same customs, songs, and festivities; those people are called a nation, and the place where these people live is called the fatherland of that people. Thus, the Macedonians are a nation, and Macedonia is their fatherland* (Georgi Pulevski, 2003: 20). The representatives of the revival have tried to define, through the ethnicity concept of the Macedonian model of national identity, the postulates upon which the ethnicity concept of the national identity of the Macedonians would be based. The representatives of the revival, by mutual acting as representatives of the ideological movement, at the beginning have realized the need of the self-identification process, identification among the intelligentsia, and later on among the Macedonian Slavs, for which a nationalistic - ideological program had been prepared:

This could be also seen in the literary opus of the representative of the revival Krste. P. Misirkov and his role in the Macedonian national movement in the period before and after the Ilinden uprising in 1903. He based his research upon the Macedonian national issue, and as a result of his conclusions, he wrote the book *"On Macedonian matters"* where he undoubtedly and in a sublimated way summarizes his program regarding the formation of the Macedonian national identity.

References:

1. Risteski S. Ljupco, *Kategoriite prostor i vreme vo narodnata kultura na Makedoncite*, Matica, Skopje 2005.
1. Antoni D. Smith, *Nacionalni identitet*, Biblioteka XX vek, 99, Beograd 1998.
2. Čolovič Ivan, *Politika simbola*, Biblioteka XX vek, 110, Beograd 2000.
3. Krste P. Misirkov, *Za makedonckite raboti,* fototipno izdanie po povod 100-godisninata od izleguvanjeto na knigata, MANU, Skopje 2003
4. Benedikt Anderson, *Zamisleni zaednici:, razmisluvanja za potekloto i sirenjeto na nacionalizmot*, revidirano izdanie, Kultura, Skopje 1998.
5. Brunbauer Ulf, *Dinamika na etnicnosta: Identitetot na Pomacite*, EtnoAntropoZum, Spisanie na Zavodot za Etnologija, br.2, Skopje, 2002.
6. Bla`e Ristovski, *Krste P. Misirkov (1874-1926),* Prilog kon proucuvanjeto na razvitokot na makedonskata nacionalna misla, Kultura-Skopje 1966.
7. Dubravko Skiljan, *Javni jezik: Pristup lingvistici javne komunikacije*, Biblioteka XX vek, 102, Beograd 1998.
8. Makedonium, Antologija na makedonskata politicka misla, Skopje, 2003.
9. Leach E, *Kultura i komunikacija*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd 1971.
10. Elijade Mirca, *Aspekti na mitot, Kultura, Skopje,*2001.
11. Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, *Ulice moga grada,* Antropolgija domačeg terena, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd 2000.
12. Dirkem Emil, *Pravila sociološke metode,* Savremena škola, Beograd 1963.
13. Pavlovski Misel, *Teatarot i mitot* (mitopoetskite elementi vo sovremenata makedonska dramatika), Knigoizdatelstvo MI-AN, Skopje 2004.