

**SYMBOLIC ARCHITECTURAL CROSS OF SOFIA:  
MASS PERCEPTIONS MANAGEMENT**

**Chavdar Hristov**

**Abstract:** Architecture is one of the oldest propaganda tools that ideologically expresses the human community's attitudes and aspirations. It makes a strategic link among past, present and future, demonstrating permanently the community mission, vision and goals. For centuries it influences mass perceptions depending on the specific architectural configuration, maintaining or changing human collective concepts and beliefs. Information signals emitted are mainly visually recognized, at heuristic level and are manifested as feelings strengthening the dominating ideological stereotypes. The propaganda impact is soft but insistent not requiring any extraordinary concentration and the very persuasive message is conformal.

There are several architectural objects in Sofia center that have not changed their original functions for more than a century. In their interconnectedness they form a symbolic architectural cross, a collective object that reflects the community perceptions for the construction of the restored Bulgarian state and nation as a result of the imposed by the power elite policies.

This kind of a limited architectural complex of buildings, monuments and streets gathers in itself places of memory and "live" periodic commemorations. It affects emotionally thousands of deliberately visiting or daily passing – through people, directing their thoughts and actions in a determined, initially set, perhaps accidentally configured as a cross, direction. This direction expresses the aspiration of the resurgent nation to prosperity, supported by different but interconnected architectural symbolism.

**Key words:** architecture, propaganda, mass perceptions, symbolism, places of memory, cross, Sofia

The article represents an analysis of historical and architectural data of a complex of buildings situated in the center of Sofia and is based on theoretical formulations for mass communication, sociology of architecture, symbolic interactionism and propaganda. Maintained is the hypothesis that the complex represents a symbolic architectural cross, a place of memory, which emotionally influences the mass perceptions of the Bulgarians, supporting mainly their ideological stereotypes associated with the initial construction of the restored Third Bulgarian State and their national self-identification.



The entire architectural complex is limited by “G. S. Rakovski” Boulevard to the west and “V. Levski” Boulevard (“St. Kliment Ohridski” Str.) to the east, by “Oborishte” Street to the north and “Tsar Osvoboditel” Boulevard to the south. (**Fig. 2**). Part of the adjoining streets’ and square’s territory is covered with “yellow bricks” (1907), which appears as one of the popular names of the capital.

### **Study period**

The study period covers the first decades after the restoration of the Bulgarian state (1878) and election of Sofia as its capital (1879). The latter is associated with the intensive construction of institutional and cult buildings, as well as of sculptural monuments located at the studied architectural complex. Most of them are built in the period 1882-1912, i.e. for thirty years [**Kiradjiev, 2001**: 99-265]. It should be noted that during this period Bulgaria rapidly industrializes and financially consolidates. This makes it a dynamically developing European country and its army is the strongest in the Balkans and one of the most efficient ones in Europe. These are all important prerequisites that enable it to perform the Unification (1885) and to declare its independence (1908).

### **Urban, historical and architectural context when choosing the place**

Immediately after the Liberation, in the period 1878-1881 begins the preparation of a master plan of Sofia. It is developed by architect Adolf Kolar (1878), architect Vaclav Roubal (1878-1879) and engineer Licurgo Amadey (1880) under the guidance of the government engineer Nicolay Kopitkin. The first version is approved by Prince Dondukov-Korsakov (1878), and the final (integrated) one – by Prince Alexander I of Battenberg (1881), because of which it is named “Batembergov” plan. [**Jeleva-Martins; Farkov, 2009**: 15-17].

In development of the Sofia master plan from this period the reconstruction models of Paris and Vienna are interpreted as the most vibrant urban phenomena of the XIX century, as well as the influence coming from the United States in the construction of new cities [**Jeleva-Martins, 2006**: 77-79].

Unlike the urban planning where ideas are looked for in Europe and America, in the architecture of the period studied prevails the ideal of national-romanticism [**Jeleva-Martins; Farkov, 2009**: 80]. At the end of the XIX century together with the foreign and Bulgarian architects influenced by the same architectural schools appear various stylistic trends such as Art Nouveau, Jugendstil, Modern, Neoclassicism, Neo-Renaissance, Neo-Baroque, Neo-Byzantine. That is the reason why in some of the analyzed below architectural objects prevails eclecticism combining one or another of these above mentioned styles but dominated by national romanticism.

The choice of the studied architectural complex location is largely influenced by the desire of the planners to create a “new central place”, “a super-center” that will concentrate the most important public buildings, squares and monuments not only of utilitarian but also of representative functions (1904) [**Jeleva-Martins, 2006**: 94; 138-140]. The highest elevation of the city landscape

also has an influence. It is the reason the place to be defined as “Acropolis” [Bulev, 2009: 49], where the city forum to be located and is clearly shown in architect Trendafil Trendafilov’s design “Monumental Part of the Capital” (1912) [Jeleva-Martins, 2006: 230].

The design of the studied architectural complex is influenced by the Pan Slavic aspirations of the architects and engineers, who are mainly of Russian and Czech origin and the policy of the mixed-oriented to Russia governments at the beginning of its establishment, known as “pro-Russian” and “anti-Russian” – landmarks that have their reflection in our time, too.

### Construction of the architectural complex (1882-1912)

One of the first buildings constructed (Fig.3)<sup>2</sup> is that of the *National Assembly* (1884). The project is assigned to the Viennese architect Konstantin Jovanovich, who is of Bulgarian origin. Within just a few months the building is erected. It is distinguished by quiet but impressive impact. The style is Neo-Renaissance with frugal plastic decoration and aesthetic sense of harmony and measure. The main entrance is emphasized by the protruding entrance hall above which is the relief image of the state coat of arms with plastic inscription “Unity makes Strength” [Kiradjiev, 2001: 102-103].

Next building (Fig. 4) is that of the *Bulgarian Literary Society* (1892).The project is assigned to the Swiss architect Heinrich Meyer. The originally constructed building is expanded (1928) in the direction of the St. Alexander Nevski Cathedral and acquires its current symmetry. It is characterized by a moderate façade decoration with emblem of the pediment above the main entrance, columns and heavy doors of Slavonski oak. Bulgarian Literary Society is founded



Fig. 3. National Assembly

---

<sup>2</sup> Author of photographs: Antoan Bozhinov.



Fig. 4. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences



Fig. 5. Military Club

in Braila, Romania by Bulgarian intellectuals and revolutionaries in exile and is the oldest institution (1869) in our recent history. It moves to Sofia in 1878 immediately after the Liberation. It is renamed to *Bulgarian Academy of Sciences* in 1911 when by law (1912) it becomes a separate scientific institution. Its main task as a successor remains unchanged – to develop and disseminate science and arts, especially with regard to the Bulgarians and Bulgarian lands, Bulgarian language and Bulgarian literature [Kiradjiev, 2001: 279].

The *Military Club* is built in the period 1895-1907 (Fig. 5). The architectural design is of the Czech Adolf Kolar, who is the first city architect of Sofia. The final completion of the building is in 1907 and is done by architect Nikola La-



**Fig. 6.** St. Alexander Nevski Cathedral

zarov. It is in Neo-Renaissance style. Square towers raised on the both sides of the central part are joined by three balconies one above the other. The façade and rooms decoration is done by the sculptors Andreas Greis and Marin Vasilev [Kiradjiev, 2001: 111-112].

The foundation stone of the *St. Alexander Nevski Cathedral* is laid in 1882 and the construction is finished during the period 1904-1912 (**Fig. 6**). The decision is taken by the First National Assembly (13.04.1879) as a sign of gratitude and tribute to the liberation role of Russia [Azbuchnik kam, 1916:251]. The architectural design is of Prof. Alexander Pomerantsev from the Saint Petersburg Academy (1897). It is a five-nave basilica, designed in Neo-Byzantine style. The place chosen is to the north of the National Assembly and is the highest one in the city center. It is defined as the main bulk dominant in the so called “Acropolis” of Sofia. The Cathedral has impressive dimensions: length 73,5m, width 52,2 m and height without the cross 53 m. It occupies an area of 3170 square meters and can hold 5000 people inside, which defines it for a long time as one of the largest buildings on the Balkans. It has 12 bells cast in Moscow as the largest one weighs over 11 tons. Many Russian and Bulgarian artists work on its decoration [Kiradjiev, 2001: 114-116]. For the Sofia dimensions, not only in the study period, its impact is staggering. The name of the Cathedral is of the canonized Russian Prince Alexander Nevski, who defeated the Western chivalry at the Chudsko Lake (1242). The change of the name in the period 1916-1920 to “St. St. Cyril and Methodius” reflects the sometimes complicated Bulgarian-Russian relations. [Azbuchnik kam, 1916: 252].

South of the National Assembly (**Fig. 7**), facing its main entrance is the *Tsar Osvoboditel (Liberator) Monument*<sup>3</sup> (1903). The original idea is from 1898 and is of

---

<sup>3</sup> Tsar Liberator, nickname of the Russian emperor Alexander II that he removed serfdom in Russia (1861), but in Bulgaria is uniquely associated with Russian-Turkish (1877-1878), liberating for Bulgaria, War.

the eponymous committee composed of Bulgarian combatants and volunteers, and financed by the National Assembly. The project is won by the Florentine sculptor Arnaldo Zocchi. The height of the pyramidal monument is 12 m, and only the bronze statue of the Emperor Alexander II on horseback is 4,5 m. The Emperor holds in his hand the manifesto announcing the Russian-Turkish liberation war. Below it is the goddess of victory with a shield and sword, leading the Russian troops. The pyramid is surrounded by famous Russian generals, soldiers and volunteers running forward after the Samara Flag. On the back are shown Bulgarians meeting the liberation troops. The figure of the emperor is calm and the soldiers and the people form a dynamic group. There are three bas-reliefs on the pedestal, depicting the signing of the San Stefano peace treaty, battle of Stara Zagora and portraits of prominent builders of modern Bulgaria. Frontally there is an inscription “Царю Освободителю признательна България /To the Tsar Liberator from grateful Bulgaria” [Kiradjiev, 2001: 121-123].



**Fig. 7.** Tsar Osvoboditel (Liberator) Monument

Adjacent to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (**Fig. 8**), facing Saint Sofia Church and St. Alexander Nevski Cathedral is the *Synodal Chamber* (1906-1908). It is built on the place of an old Turkish barrack by architect Petko Momchilov in cooperation with architect Yordan Milanov. The style is Neo-



**Fig. 8.** The Synodal Chamber



Fig. 9. National Academy of Arts “Nicolay Pavlovich”



Fig. 10. Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”

Byzantine influenced by the Medieval Bulgarian architecture. The upper decorative frieze is with arcades lined with majolica (glazed ceramics), that give specific splendor and color. Tympanic above the entrance is a mosaic depicting bishops, who have contributed to the independence of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. In the tradition of the church donors they hold in their hands a model of a church. The entrance has the form of a three arch portico outside the building volume. The cladding is designed by architect Hristo Tanev and the interior frescoes and stained glass are the work of famous Bulgarian artists [Kiradjiev, 2001: 118-119].

In the east, after the National Assembly, is (Fig. 9) the building of the *National Academy of Arts “Nicolay Pavlovich”* (1907). It is designed by the Russian architect Alexander Smirnov. In its architectural style eclectically co-exist Byz-

antine, Arab and Medieval Bulgarian influences [Kiradjiev, 2001: 110; 269]. Its alumni are a plethora of Bulgarian artists, who left their traces not only in Bulgarian but also in European art.

In the same way is constructed the building (Fig. 10) of the *Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"* (1906-1934). The initiative is of the two brothers Evlogi Georgiev and Hristo Georgiev, who in 1896 donated a place and significant for that time amount of money for the construction of a High school/University. The architectural design is won by the French architect. Henri Breason but for various reasons the project is not implemented. It is redesigned by architect Yordan Milanov, where the predominant Neo-Renaissance style of Breason is eclectically combined with Baroque. The entrance hall with the stairs and the auditorium are solemnly effecting, surrounded by magnificent stained glass of Bulgarian first teachers and kings. The main entrance is of impressive size. The bronze statues of the two donor brothers made by sculptor Kiril Shivarov are placed on both sides of the entrance (1934) [Kiradjiev, 2001: 130-131; 265-268].

### **The symbolic architectural cross of Sofia as place of memory**

The buildings forming the symbolic architectural cross of Sofia reasonably could be defined as "places of memory". They combine both one tangible physical reality that fits in the space, time, language and tradition of the Bulgarians and one symbolic reality, loaded with history. Common to all of them is the laying of the foundations of the state system and nation, which turned them to a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of Bulgaria [Nora, 2005: 19-20].

Each one of them has physical, symbolic and functional significance, which are in close co-existence [Nora, 2004: 59], related with no less force to the entire architectural complex. It is this interweaving of meanings that creates a certain difficulty, each one of them to be considered separately and not together as the symbolism prevails over the utilitarianism.

Their physical significance to a great extent overlaps their architectural appearance, which combines Eastern Orthodox tradition and Western European Neoclassicism clearly expressed by the architectural schools of the designers. On the one hand the buildings are impressive as area and volume not only for their time and give the impression of a real, strong and functioning state system, and on the other – the crossroad location of the country between East and West Europe. Two trends that constantly accompany our new and latest history.

In each one of the buildings are situated governmental/state or religious institutions, whose place and functions have not changed over a century. They serve the needs of the army, science, religion, parliamentary management, fine arts and university education, religious and secular commemorations. Each one of the institutions is associated with important decisions and events that represent an integral part of our national history and are diligently studied in the textbooks. This in turn loads them with historicism, which makes an unbreakable bond with the collective memory.

Spaces around them, namely squares in front of the Cathedral and the National Assembly, as well as the streets limiting the architectural complex, are intensively used in the past and nowadays for military parades and mani-

festations, canonical and solemn processions to celebrate important religious or historical dates and events, for commemorations to those, who died for the freedom and independence of Bulgaria. Also for meetings and demonstrations related to the democratic changes in the recent past, students' or in general civil protests nowadays. This regular or spontaneously organized human activity concentrated in a limited by its parameters architectural space maintains the historical memory alive.

The components listed create a certain symbolic aura as the memory is associated with the studied areas of the architectural cross of Sofia expressing the national development, define the belonging of the Bulgarians and supports their self-identification. Collective memory is associated, although not fully realized, with the historical past but also with the living present, outlining in aggregate the community mission and vision.

### **The symbolic architectural cross of Sofia as communication–propaganda tool**

The buildings of the studied architectural complex as independent architectural sites are mediators that carry messages from their creators and those, who assigned their construction to a wide range of people. Messages represent a predominant combination of practical functionality with architectural aesthetics that combines them into a coherent whole. Their information signals are mainly tactile, mostly visual but of propaganda character as they are an essential element of the national idea [Thesse, 2011]. Thus they function not only individually as a “monumental hypermedia, translating complex suggestions of universal character” [Diamandieva, 2014: 299] but also with their interdependence, outlining one symbolic architectural cross. With decades of unchanged existence they become a form of memory and knowledge storage through images, i.e. mass influence information canal [Diamandieva, 2014: 305]. The impact they have is mainly emotional, peripheral, manifested in specific feelings, passes to heuristic level, supports or changes acknowledged for its significance common ideological stereotypes associated with our national history.

Monumental art is that art which makes the meaningful and figurative connection among art of painting, sculpture, decoration and architecture – elements that are seen in the studied architectural complex. Thus it achieves strong cumulative effect of influence and therefore is one of the oldest and most used propaganda tools. Primarily it is associated with the propaganda communication strategy – demonstration of the community power [Hristov, 2014: 186]. The process of formation of new states in Europe marks periods of particular activity in the XIX and XX centuries and Bulgaria is of no exception. It uses consecutively corporate strategies to unify its separate, fragmented for some historic reason territories into a whole one on the basis of nationalism. This strategic approach results in the formation of a cohesive national community that has the aspiration to prove not only to itself but also to the others around it its group identity and power [Hristov, 2014: 109-139]. The monumental architecture appears precisely as such propaganda tool. The symbolic architectural cross of Sofia built in the first decades after the Liberation demonstrates strong state man-

agement on the basis of nationalism. With this strategic focus, disregarding the particular embedded symbolism and the time difference, it could be compared with the project “Skopje – 2014”.<sup>4</sup> The latter relies on places of memory through eclectically connected architectural designs and sculptures, which are intended to format the perceptions of the future generations towards self-identification with the evolving Macedonian nation.

In practice the architectural cross of Sofia appears to be a form of the mass communication that is closely linked to the ideology of nationalism. It is here, where its commitment to propaganda as a social technology for mass influence is revealed. The occurred over the time functional changes in it, from utilitarian to predominantly symbolic and ideological, push towards a particular type of consensus related to the national identification. The persuasive messages are of conformal type and with soft insistence, not requiring deep concentration, direct the mass audience to the desired ideological commitment [Vilkovskii, 2010: 52-54].

### **Symbolic architectural cross of Sofia as a mass perceptions management tool – theoretical formulation.**

The architectural cross of Sofia to a great extent appears to be a bearer of the public mythology in the collective consciousness, causing images in which the new is permeated by the old and at the same time directed to the future. It could be assumed that it represents an aesthetic idealization of the aspirations of our society for a relatively long period of time from the Liberation till today. Its purpose is to change the mass man by managing their behavior, reminding him retrospectively for the state and power, giving them knowledge of the past and present and of the road passed by the nation [Vilkovskii, 2010: 29-39].

Each one of its constituent architectural components enters into symbolic interaction expressing generalizations relatively equally understandable to the most participants in the communication process. The emitted by it information signals constantly remind of themselves. They have strong emotional impact and cause unidirectional associations. They maintain a certain outlook on life, certain ideology and beliefs; influence the thoughts and actions and the human behavior. And as an architectural complex it reflects common for the society ideas and assumes the quality of their collective model. The impact on the mass perceptions is prolonged and covers a huge amount of different people [Vilkovskii, 2010: 126-135]. Thus, the relationship between the state and the nation is realized and strengthened, indicated is the path to which they are committed to and to they must adhere to.

### **The symbolism of the architectural cross of Sofia**

There is no evidence unambiguously showing that the symbolic architectural cross of Sofia is designed purposely. The configuration has occurred largely arbitrarily but under the influence of the architectural requirements to

---

<sup>4</sup> Project “Skopje – 2014”<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J6eHb7qqBLQ>.

the planning and construction of a metropolitan “super-center” that composes important for the country’s government buildings – a peculiar “forum” on the city “Acropolis”. Here it could be assumed that possibly a definite impact has caused the subconscious “cross thinking” of the combative generation in post-liberation Bulgaria dominated by the opposition of the cross against the crescent as a symbol of the national liberation struggles. And also that Bulgaria is one of the oldest Christian countries (891) in Europe, a fact, which has given a serious imprint on the thinking and behavior of the Bulgarians though less visible in cultural aspect.

The symbolic archetypal significance of the cross is noble and full of suffering but also a promise of resurrection [Ronnberg, edit., 2010:744]. In this aspect it fully complies with the sufferings of the Bulgarian people during the five centuries of Ottoman rule and its endeavors to get rid of the oppressive yoke. Liberation turns to a fact the resurrection of the Bulgarian state and nation.

The vertical beam location from west to east symbolizes revitalization, a new beginning and building of a new world (sunrise) [Ronnberg, edit., 2010: 90] but also the archetypal vision for the hero, who has defeated the night (sunset) and has obtained new knowledge for himself [Ronnberg, edit., 2010: 96]. In this context is the knowledge that he can be free and can build his future independently. Such an interpretation to a large extent is confirmed by the arrangement of the architectural buildings.

At the vertical beam base is the Military Club, which symbolizes in architectural aspect the military power on the one hand and on the other – its purpose to defend the hardly acquired freedom and independence of Bulgaria. In fact, history, not only in the studied period, illustrates a series of military victories that are an example of heroism and self-renunciation that turn Bulgarian army into a victorious mythical hero.

The other buildings, namely the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the Patriarchy at first look are in conflict not only architecturally but also in functionally-philosophical aspect. One uses scientific methods and symbolizes the intellectual potential of the nation aimed at creative action and the other – the canonical faith and symbolizes the Orthodox affiliation of the Bulgarian people. The intellect and the spirituality are two important distinguishing characteristics of the human nature and in this aspect the symbolic importance of the studied objects is not in contradiction but in unity, supporting the reviving Bulgarian nation.

The three buildings represent a symbolic support (military power, scientific intellect and Christian spirituality), directed to the National Assembly, which is the center of the cross. It, in turn, symbolizes the sovereignty of people, legislation, and state system. It is through making of laws that it outlines the vision for the nation’s development to its prosperity.

The vision for the national development represented in the vertical beam of the symbolic architectural cross of Sofia is inextricably linked to art and education. The buildings of the National Academy of Arts and Sofia University, separately and in interaction, symbolize the aspirations of the nation to the exquisite, beautiful, aesthetic and universal, covering various branches of science and education. The functional purpose of the two institutions is to educate each new generation, including it in the common efforts to build the national prosperity.

Thus the vertical beam of the cross contains the symbolism of the mission and vision of the reviving Bulgarian state and nation, expressed in the one-way symbolic interaction of the military power, scientific intellect, and Christian spirituality, sovereignty of the people, art and education.

The horizontal beam, connected to the center of the cross, has a symbolic commitment to the mission and vision of the restored Bulgarian state and the developing nation but from a different propaganda angle. The north side of the St. Alexander Nevski Cathedral symbolizes Orthodoxy as a dominant religious doctrine. After the Great Schism (1054) Christianity is divided into two hostile clans (Orthodox and Catholics), which zealously claim to be the sole carriers of the “pure faith” and accusing each other of heresy. And the name of the canonized Great Russian Prince Alexander Nevski is associated not so much with his vassal relations with the Golden Horde but with the defense of the Orthodoxy against Catholicism by his victories over the Sweden and Teutonic crusaders. North side further symbolizes Russia and its claims of “Third Rome” [**Uspenskii, 1994**: 60-75] and Pan-Slav leadership [**Danilevskii, 1991**].

From the south facing the main entrance of the National Assembly is the Tsar Osvoboditel (Liberator) monument, whose direct symbolic meaning is of the bearer of the freedom of the Bulgarian people – from the manifesto declaring war on Turkey (1878) at the hands of Alexander II till signing of the preliminary San Stefano peace treaty (1879) unifying Bulgaria in its ethnic borders. It is an undisputed symbol of the realized Bulgarian aspirations for brotherly support in the national liberation struggles after the failure of the April Uprising, expressed very emotionally by the Patriarch of the Bulgarian literature Ivan Vazov in his poem “Russia” (1876).

The horizontal beam in turn contains the symbolism of the Russian Orthodox and crucial military support in gaining the freedom of Bulgaria, of its role in the restoration of the Bulgarian state and nation but also its dominance binding both countries in a long perspective. In this aspect both architectural sites are located opposite the two entrances (main and working) of the National Assembly, symbolizing the bidirectional Russian support, namely Orthodox and military power. Thus the mission and vision for the development of the restored Bulgarian state and nation originally is linked to the Russian influence, which has an actual role in modern times, too.

### **Summary**

The symbolic architectural cross of Sofia is a micro-culture manifestation of the community beliefs and aspirations during the first decades after the Liberation, which have not lost their meaning nowadays, too. As a fixed architectural configuration in the “super-center”, in the “Acropolis” of the capital its role of a mass communicator remains unchanged. It has relatively one-way propaganda impact on the perceptions of many people passing through it. The impact is not only directly noticeable, visual but also redistributed by the electronic media in a variety of occasions associated with our history or contemporary events and occasions. Thus it expands its limited by time and territory scope of impact, constantly recalling about itself as a place, concentrating historical memory and creating a new one, too.

The information signals emitted by it are mainly of propaganda character associated with the state system, authority and national self-identification. The symbolic interaction among the separate architectural elements outlines the mission and vision of the Third Bulgarian State, its aspiration for science and Christian spirituality, sovereignty of people, art and education. The more noticeable and visible accent is connected with the beginning of the mission, with the national liberation struggles and the role of Russia in them. In this aspect are the names of the streets and boulevards that limit the architectural complex. They are associated with memorial for the new Bulgarian history names—with the founder of the organized Bulgarian national liberation struggles (Georgi Stoykov Rakovski), the place where the decision for the April Uprising is made (Oborishte), with the ideologist and organizer of the Bulgarian national revolution (Vasil Levski), with the liberation role of Russia (Tsar Osvoboditel/Liberator).

The mass perceptions management is realized through unobtrusive, soft, aesthetic, mostly visual impact of the architectural objects of the architectural complex studied, which are loaded with historical memory. Their symbolic interrelation and interaction highlight the hard way of the nation to freedom, independence and prosperity from the unification to knowledge that makes the power<sup>5</sup>.

## REFERENCES

- Azbuchnik kam stenografskite dnevnitsi na Narodnoto sabranie v Tsarstvo Bulgaria i na oblastnoto sabranie v bivshata Iztochna Rumelia ot Osvobojdenieto do 18 avgust 1916.** 1916. [Азбучник към стенографските дневници на Народното събрание в Царство България и на областното събрание в бившата Източна Румелия от Освобождението до 18 август 1916]. София: Държавна печатница [Dazjavna pechatnitsa] <http://lib.sudigital.org/record/18820?ln=bg>.
- Bulev, Todor.** 2009. Градът и изкуствата [Gradat i izkustvata]. София: Булхарт [Bulhart].
- Danilevskii, N.** 1991. Русия и Европа [Russia i Evropa]. Москва: „Книга“. [Kniga]
- Diamandieva, Maria.** 2014. Архитектурата като комуникация [Arhitekturata kao komunikatsia]. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“ [Sv. “KlimentOhridski”].
- Hristov, Chavdar.** 2014. Войната на идеите. [Voinata na ideite]. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“ [Sv. “Kliment Ohridski”].
- Jeleva-Martins, Dobrina.** 2006. Биография на София. Историческу студиу. [Biografia na Sofia. Istoricheski studii] София: „Пространство-форма“ [Prostranstvo-forma].
- Jeleva-Martins, Dobrina, Ulii Farkov.** 2009. История на българското градоустройство XIX-XX век. Първа част. Диахронни анализи на устройството на големите български градове. [Istoria na balgarskoto gradoustroistvo XIX-XX vek. Parva chast. Diahronni analizi na ustroistvoto na golemite balgarski gradove] София: Изд. „Валентин Траянов“ [ValentinTraianov].

---

<sup>5</sup> “Knowledge is Strength” – slogan of the Sofia University “St. KlimentOhridski”.

- Kiradjiev, Svetlin. 2001.** София, каквато е била 1878-1943. [Sofia kakvato e bila 1878-1943] София: Свят [Sviat].
- Nora, Pierre. 2004.** Места на памет, от републиката до нацията. Том 1 [Mesta na pamet ot republikata do natsiata. Tom 1] София: Дом на науките за човека и обществото [Dom za naukite i obshtestvoto].
- Nora, Pierre. 2005.** Места на памет, от архива до емблемата. Том 2 [Mesta na pamet ot arhiva do emblemata. Tom 2] София: Дом на науките за човека и обществото [Dom za naukite i obshtestvoto].
- Thiesse, Anne-Marie. 2011.** Създаването на националните идентичности. Европа XVIII–XIX век. [Sazdavaneto na natsionalnite identichnosti. Evropa XVIII–XIX vek] София: Кралица Маб [Kralitsa Mab].
- Uspenskii, B. A. 1994.** Избранные труды, том 1. Семиотика истории. Семиотика культуры. [Izbranie trudi, tom 1. Semiotika istorii. Semiotika kulturi] Москва: Издательство „Гнозис“ [Gnozis].
- Vilkovskii, Mihail. 2010.** Социология Архитектуры [Sotsiologia arhitekturi]. Москва: Фонд „Руский авангард“ [Ruskii avangard].
- Ronnberg, Ami, edit. 2010.** The Book of Symbols Reflections of archetypal images. Koln: Taschen GmbH.

Correspondence address

**Chavdar Hristov**, Assoc. Prof., PhD  
 Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”  
 Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication,  
 Department “Communication and Audiovisual Production”  
 49, Moskovska Str.  
 1000 Sofia, Bulgaria  
 Tel.: (+359) 888 519 876  
 E-mail: ch\_h@abv.bg