

A. Zaprianova, Bl. Niagulov, I. Marcheva

**Historiography between continuity and change A. A Present
History of the Historiography in Bulgaria B. Inquiry “Historians
about the history”**

(Summary)

The article presents a survey of the development of historiography in Bulgaria during the last 15 years. Many already published historiographical reviews as well as authors' investigations have been used as a basis of the research. In addition, the results of the inquiry 'Historians about history' carried out by a team at the Institute of History at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences have also been analyzed. If one assumes that historiographical texts represent an analytical look from the outside, the answers of historians to the inquiry's questions may be considered as a self-reflection of the historians' community. The combination of both approaches allows outlining a correlation between continuity and change which is characteristic of history and historians who experience all contemporary economic, political and social transformations. The development of Bulgarian historiography nowadays is a function of the changes in society and state during the post-socialist transformation to democracy and market economy. At the same time it is influenced by discussions about history and historiography in other countries of Europe, the US, etc., which makes one speak of a crisis in the traditional historical narrative. The preservation of already existing scientific institutions and historians affiliated to them as well as the mainstream orientation of historical investigations in the country explain the domination of tradition over renovation. Survival or adaptation of institutions and historians to the new constellation includes a reform of the existing institutions presumably leading to

their autonomy and an establishment of new private institutions; efforts for assuring some state-independent funding; change of the existing professional paradigms (including the disclaiming of Marxism as a philosophy and methodology, facing history with the social problems and interdisciplinary approach, etc.); formation of new professional adjustments and identities of historians. If the “old” academic and university units could be characterized by tradition and continuity, it is in the new and peripheral for traditional science centers, one may claim, where the alternative ideas have been developed. Defining and defending the networks’ interests of both so called traditionalists and innovators – in spite of the relativity of such a division – lead to the encapsulation of the two groups of scholars.