DOI: 10.11649/sm.3451

Slavia Meridionalis 25, 2025
Article No.: 3451

Citation:
Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2025). Features of propaganda language in the Security Service documents of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria. *Slavia Meridionalis*, *25*, Article 3451. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.3451

Julia Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska
University of Lodz
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5579-3472

Features of Propaganda Language in the Security Service Documents of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria

1. Introduction

This article is part of a research project entitled "The language of Security Service Employees in the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria: An analysis based on archival documents on the surveillance of the intelligentsia". The project aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the language used by the security services[1] in these two former socialist states. Given the impossibility of examining all available documents, the study focuses specifically

[1] Also called special services or the secret police. In Poland, from 1944 to 1956, the name *Urząd Bezpieczeństwa* (the Office of Security) was in use; from 1956 to 1990, it was called *Służba Bezpieczeństwa* (the Security Service).

This work was supported by the Polish Ministry of Education and Science.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2025.

on those related to the surveillance of a single social group. The intelligentsia (or intellectual elite) was chosen due to its significant diversity and the particular attention it received from the security services, which viewed it as especially susceptible to ideological diversion. A Bulgarian agent report from 1954 states: „Имайки ясна представа за ролята на интелигенцията в обществото, комунистическата партия взема всестранни мерки за създаване на нова, безпределно предана и социалистическа интелигенция, както и за превъзпитание и използване на хора от старата буржоазна иинтелиганция". Surveillance of the intelligentsia in so-called "people's democracies" was usually the responsibility of separate departments within the security services. The Bulgarian security services maintained a department called "Intelligentsia and Youth", which provided detailed descriptions of social groups regarded by them as intelligentsia. These included writers, scientists, journalists, artists, musicians, lawyers, engineers, doctors, and teachers. I am convinced that in the context of language analysis (and, to some extent, the mindset of security services), the intelligentsia should be understood as the social groups that the security services themselves classified as such; consequently, these groups were subject to the activities of this department.

Since 2009, the Bulgarian Commission on Disclosure of Documents[2] has been making selected documents from the security service archives available in electronic form. In 2015, a collection of documents from the "Intelligentsia and Youth" department was published, consisting of 144 texts, including reports, summaries, opinions, memos, and informant statements (Комисия за разкриване, 2015). These documents served as the primary research material, supplemented by sources from other collections related to the general structure of the organization and its basic documents (Комисия за разкриване, 2010), the surveillance of musician's circles (Комисия за разкриване, 2016), emigration (Комисия за разкриване, 2014), and so-called *sharp measures* (Комисия за разкриване, 2020). From the last two collections, only documents concerning the intelligentsia were selected. The total volume of the analyzed Bulgarian linguistic material amounts to approximately 2,000 pages.

As Polish research material, the so-called object cases made available by the archives of the Institute of National Remembrance and the personal files

[2] Full name: Committee on Disclosure of Documents and Announcing Affiliation of Bulgarian Citizens to the State Security and the Intelligence Services of the Bulgarian National Army (COMDOS).

from 1945–1989 (which also concern the above-mentioned circles) were used, also totalling approximately 2,000 pages.

The conducted analysis indicates that the language used by the security service officers (SSO) is characterized by a style that can be defined as administrative and bureaucratic, featuring impersonal constructions, standardization, and formulaic expressions typical of the language of state institutions. However, it also exhibits features that diverge from the conventional administrative style, including a high density of epithets, metaphors, and emotionally charged expressions (Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, 2020, 2023). This aligns the language of SSO more closely with the language of propaganda. In simplified terms, the analyzed texts can be described as a hybrid of administrative-bureaucratic language and propaganda discourse, further enriched with a specialized vocabulary unique to the so-called "ministerial language". The objective of this article is to examine one of these characteristics, namely the presence of propaganda language in the analysed documents.

2. Language of propaganda

The language of communist propaganda, frequently termed "newspeak", has been the subject of numerous analyses and scholarly studies. Researchers have highlighted the universal features of propaganda languages, which are distinguished by a distinct structure and a characteristic selection of linguistic devices (cf. Денчева, 2025, p. 173). As Jerzy Bralczyk observes (Bralczyk, 2003, p. 12), a propaganda strategy is based on the deliberate selection of concepts from specific semantic fields and the use of demonstrative metalinguistic behaviours. The objective of this type of language is to impose a simplified vision of reality and to reinforce axiologically explicit divisions. A notable feature of communist propaganda is its employment of oppositional concept pairs, such as *progressive* vs. *reactionary* or *materialist* vs. *idealist*. A key aspect of this strategy is the establishment of a dichotomy between "us" and "them". Such a dichotomy served the purpose of valuation, which in propaganda texts often takes precedence over meaning, ultimately leading to the blurring of distinctions between descriptive, interpretative, and evaluative statements. The premise of propaganda is the existence of a shared value system that connects the sender and the receiver. Unanimity and uniformity are emphasized

through the frequent use of pronouns such as *"everyone"* or *"each"*. The texts often refer to the rhetoric of war, constructing an image of reality that the recipient should desire. Additionally, the opposition between what "should be" and what "is" is neutralized (cf. Bralczyk, 1986, pp. 15–33).

Texts serving as propaganda are characterized most prominently by their templating and invariance. Repetitive formulas and phrases assume an almost liturgical form, imparting a ritualistic character to the utterances. The sacralization of language serves a controlling function: any individual employing a different linguistic code is perceived as potentially disloyal. Propaganda readily appeals to authorities – most often party figures – who are presented as infallible, further aligning its language with sacral discourse. The key idioms of the doctrine can be understood only by those who accept its premises, thus reinforcing their ritualistic nature. The ritualization of propaganda language also leads to the construction of solemn, emotionally charged statements. These authors frequently employ epithets, superlatives, grand numerical figures, and stylistic devices such as aggravation and stigmatizing expressions (por. Bralczyk, 1986, pp. 48–50; Ефтимова, 2023, pp. 13–53).

Propaganda language is intended to encourage the actions and attitudes desired by the creator, but rather than using direct imperatives, expressions indicating necessity or demand are used, e.g. "must", "should", or "we demand" (cf. Bralczyk, 1986, p. 23). Propaganda texts also often operate with vagueness. Certain politically taboo subjects are described in vague terms such as 'known events' or 'what happened' (cf. Bednarczuk, 1994, pp. 48–49). Such euphemisms serve to avoid unambiguous wording and facilitate the manipulation of the message.

Bralczyk, in his monograph „O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych" (Bralczyk, 1986, p. 27), distinguishes propaganda texts by the following characteristics:

Importance – the hierarchization of reality through pathos and the use of terms emphasizing uniqueness, e.g., *fundamental*, *exceptional*.

Universality – emphasizing the uniformity and universality of the ideal world through pronouns such as *everyone*, *each*, and numerals like *millions*.

Closeness – a consequence of the division into *we* and *they*, where *they* serves a separating function.

Necessity – depicting the world as the only possible and inevitable one, arising from the logic of progress.

Righteousness – attributing indisputable truth to the presented vision of reality.

Progressiveness – portraying the world as coherent and simplified, devoid of shades of gray.

3. Characteristics of propaganda language in the documents of the Security Office

In the analysed material – despite being official documents related to strictly defined senders and recipients, official seals, case signatures, and all the other attributes of bureaucratic formality – the previously mentioned characteristics of propaganda language are clearly evident (cf. Jastrzębska-Golonka, 2020; Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, 2020, 2022, 2023, 2024; Misiak, 2020). Above all, these documents convey a simplified black-and-white vision of the world that is centred around the opposition derived from an axiological division: the positive, progressive, democratic, one of us, ours vs. the negative, reactionary, regressive, extraneous. As previously mentioned, value judgment is one of the fundamental features of propaganda language. In the language of security office officials, the central evaluative category is the axiological opposition between positive and negative, which is reflected in key phrases fundamental to this technolect, such as "positively/negatively (adversely) disposed toward the current reality/government/party/our values". This is particularly evident in the Polish corpus, cf.:

- *Wymienieni są ludźmi młodymi* ***pozytywnie ustosunkowanymi*** *do naszego aparatu i obecnej rzeczywistości*[3].
- ***Pozytywnie ustosunkowany*** *do naszych wartości ustrojowych.*
- *Twórcy reprezentujący* ***pozytywne kierunki*** *w sztuce.*
- *Były figurant sprawdzenia operacyjnego,* ***negatywnie ustosunkowany*** *do obecnej rzeczywistości.*
- *Wobec naszej służby reprezentuje* ***postawę negatywną****.*
- […] *reprezentuje* ***negatywną*** *postawę polityczną* […] *plastycy o poglądach negatywnych.*

[3] In the examples shown, the original spelling has been retained.

The concept of progress, as one of the main features of the language of propaganda, is reflected in the extension of the basic *positive* vs. *negative* opposition to include precisely the exponent of progress. The result is another *progressive* vs. *reactionary* (*backward*) opposition, whereby the adjective 'progressive' is often accompanied by the adjective 'democratic', and 'reactionary' by 'imperialist'. While the positive vs. negative divide is more prevalent in Polish documents, the *progressive* vs. *reactionary* divide is unmistakably dominant in Bulgarian, cf.:

– *Zaznaczamy że żadnej wrogiej działalności nie wykazywał do Polski Ludowej jak i* ***organizacji postępowych****.*
– *Osobnik o nastawieniu wybitnie* ***reakcyjnym****.*
– *участници с* ***реакционни*** *прояви;*
– ***реакционната*** *интелигенция;*
– *лица с* ***прогресивни*** *разбирания;*
– *произхожда от бедно* ***прогресивно*** *семейство;*
– *оказване помощ на* ***прогресивните*** *и* ***демократични*** *сили;*
– *против* ***империалистическите*** *и* ***реакционни*** *сили.*

In accordance with the characteristics of propaganda language, the language of Security Office documents also emphasizes that the chosen path of development is the only correct one and the only one leading to progress, cf.:

– *Другояче не може и не трябва да бъде.*

As a result of such a definitive binary division, the next level of opposition becomes the distinction between "ours" and the enemy, which in turn explains the dominant war rhetoric found in the documents (cf. Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, 2024). The war emerging from the analyzed documents is an ideological clash conducted on two levels: global and national. It is a struggle between two worlds with opposing values: capitalist (bourgeois) and socialist (communist). The linguistic analysis clearly indicates that the primary objective of the security office's work thus becomes a fight against the enemy, both external (imperialist, capitalist) and internal, which is prone to ideological subversion. The sense of an ongoing war is reflected in terms borrowed from wartime vocabulary and phraseology, which, in accordance with the principles of propaganda language, is characterized by near-ritual repetition: in Polish sources – *enemy*, *struggle*, *attack*, *centres of subversion*; in Bulgarian sources –

enemy, *hostile underground*, *hostile element*, *opponent*. The documents are filled with formulations such as:

– *Zmasowany i ostry **atak** przeciwników politycznych*;
– *Obecnie organizacja partyjna straciła wiele z **bojowości** i **ofensywności***;
– *Плътен контакт с **противника** за водене по-настъпателна **борба** срещу идеологическите **подривни центрове***;
– *И през изтеклата година **противникът** продължи **подривната си дейност** за разлагане на нашата художествена и научна интелигенция и чрез нея внаясне на обърканост, неверие, нихилистично отношение сред обществеността*.

The war being waged is an ideological clash, hence the frequent occurrence of phrases consisting of a war metaphor and a phrase indicating an ideological/political aspect, cf: *ideological diversion*, *political and ideological warfare*, *acute propaganda-psychological hostile operations*, cf.:

– *Държавните оперни театри в нашата страна са рожба на социалистическото общество и са призвани да обслужват неговите политически и естетически нужди. Те са **боеви пост** на **идеологическия фронт** у нас и цялата им производствено-творческа дейност е част от огромното партийно дело*.
– *Celem prowadzonej sprawy będzie: - ochrona operacyjna środowiska plastycznego przez destrukcyjnymi wpływami i zagrożeniami **działalności dywersyjnej ośrodków propagandy** zagranicznej*.

In every war, there is an assumption that "we" and "the enemy" are present. Besides the aforementioned terms used for contrasting *positive/progressive* with *negative/regressive*, documents tend to emphasise that "ours" are trustworthy ideological individuals, cf.: pl. *osoby zaufane*, bg. *надеждни среди*. Metaphors referring to health often appear, e.g. bg. *израз на нездравите схващания*; *заразяват своето обкръжение*; pl. *ujawnienie zdrowego elementu*.

Most often, however, the authors of the texts employ another characteristic of propaganda language, namely closeness. They use the first-person plural pronoun 'we', thereby emphasizing the *identity/unity* of values between the sender and the receiver, cf.: pl. *element obcy **nam** klasowo*, ***nasz** aparat, **nasza** partia*, ***nasza** rzeczywistość*, bg. ***наши** хора*, ***наши** среди*, ***нашата** партия*, ***нашата** социалистическа култура*, cf.:

– *Произхождат от социално чужди **нам** /реакционни/ семейства*;

– *pozytywnie ustosunkowany do* ***naszych*** *wartości ustrojowych*;
– *Wymienieni są ludźmi młodymi pozytywnie ustosunkowanymi do* ***naszego*** *aparatu i obecnej rzeczywistości*.

On an international level, closeness is expressed through the use of the adjective *fraternal* to personify 'ours', especially in Bulgarian documents, e.g., bg. *братски разведки*, *братски разузнавания*.

The most common descriptions of people who do not share the sender's value system are *enemy*, *opponent*, and phrases with the adjective *hostile*. In Polish material, the collective expression *hostile element (wrogi element)* dominates, while *hostile contingent (вражески контингент)* dominates in Bulgarian. Combinations with a distinctly negative phrase designating the *hostile* in both sets are the primary way of identifying surveilled individuals, cf.: pl. *wrogie środowiska*; bg. *вражески среди*, *вражеска интелигенция*. The most commonly used nouns are pl. *osoba*, *element*, bg. *елемент*, *лице*. cf.:

– *osoby*: *o wrogiej postawie politycznej*, *o postawie negatywnej*, *o postawach rewizjonistycznych*; *elementy*: *antysocjalistyczne*, *rewizjonistyczne*, *karierowiczowskie*, *brakotwórcze*;
– *лица/елементи*: *опозиционни*, *опозиционно проявяващи се*, *вражески*, *вражески настроени*, *реакционно настроени*, *антинародни*.

There is one additional element that can be added to the axiological opposition in the ongoing ideological war: *peace-seeking* vs. *war-seeking*. We thus have a clash of two worlds: one is *positive – progressive* and *democratic – socialist/people's/communist – ideological – "ours" – peace-seeking*, while the other is *negative – reactionary – capitalist/bourgeois/imperialist – materialistic – enemy – war-seeking*.

A description of the medical community in Sofia illustrates the absoluteness of this axiological opposition, cf.:

– *Лекарите в София* […] *Комунистите са около 120, а като врагове сме отбелязали към 180 души*.

In their reports, officers often emphasise that the positive side always seeks peace, while the negative side acts aggressively, cf. bg. *нашата миролюбива политика*, *миролюбиви външнополитически ходове на СССР*; pl. *agresywna wroga propaganda*, *agresorowie imperialistyczni*; bg. *агресивната същност на империалистическите разузнавания*. The security services, even when they commit unlawful and unethical acts (such as disinformation operations or the liquidation

of dissidents in capitalist countries), are described as waging a struggle for peace. During the planning of disinformation activities in capitalist countries, where false documents are circulated or compromising information is prepared, officers write *Оперативната дезинформация е изключително важна за разузнаването, тъй като тя е средство за активно въздействие на противника* and emphasize that the objective of these actions is to engage in combat with the adversary and to pursue a state of lasting peace. This constitutes a further characteristic of the language of propaganda, the purpose of which is to secure widespread acceptance for the actions it portrays (Bralczyk, 2003, p. 12).

In the documents analysed, all terms describing the opponent are negatively charged. However, this markedness is not constant and undergoes gradation, most often expressed through descriptive phrases bg. *злостен*, *остър*, *отявлен*, *заклет*, *крайно* (*злостни реакционери*, *отявлени врагове на нашата власт*, *остра вражеска дейност*, *крайно реакциолнните сили*, *заклет враг*[4]), pl. *ekstremalny*, *radykalny* / *ekstremiści*, *radykałowie*, *ekstrema*, or superlative forms. Especially in Bulgarian documents, superlative forms are frequently encountered:

– *най-реакционните елементи*, *най-злостните вражески елементи*, *най-върли разпространители на вражески вицове*, *обекти с най-остри прояви*, cf.:
– […] *се е изказал* ***най-ценично*** *и вулгарно по адрес на др. Сталин.*
– *Разпространяват* ***злостна*** *устна пропаганда от* ***най-долни*** *лъжи.*
– *Siedlisko elementów* ***ekstremy****.*

The language of propaganda is full of expression, pathos and emotionally charged phrases, in contrast to the classic normative official language, which is devoid of emotional colouring. This is particularly evident when describing activities considered hostile, when there are numerous epithets, metaphors, phrases of value, cf.:

– *Действуват ръководени от своята* ***кръвна*** *омраза към народната власт.*
– *Разказват* ***гадни*** *политически вицове.*
– *Те започнаха* ***нагла и открита*** *враждебна агитация.*
– *Прословутата* ***лисица-интригант*** *Радой Ралин.*
– ***Коварни*** *вражески замисли.*
– ***Остриет*****о** *на нашето мероприятие.*

[4] The activities of Bulgarian and Soviet services in capitalist countries against Zbigniew Brzezinski had the code name "Заклет враг".

– *Последъци на* ***робската същност*** *на* ***отживилия*** *и* ***умиращ*** *капитализъм.*
– *От колоните на тези вестници се излива* ***кална*** *пропаганда.*
– […] *z uwzględnieniem* ***napastliwych*** *wypowiedzi i zamierzeń w stosunku do poczynań rządu PRL*;
– *Za* ***brudne*** *pieniądze podjęli się* ***nikczemnej*** *roboty przeciwko Polsce.*
– *Wraz z cofającą się armią niemiecką pod uderzeniami zwycięskiej armii* ***wyzwolicielki ludów*** *– Armii Czerwonej uciekały z terenów polskich osoby skompromitowane.*
– ***bagienko*** *„rządowe" londyńskie*
– […] *do związania ich z międzynarodowym* ***śmieciem*** *reakcyjnym* […].

The combination of evaluative and emotionally charged forms with the war narrative leads to the creation of bombastic texts, theoretically unacceptable in the official-administrative style in which state documents should be drafted, cf.:

– *Środowisko andersowskie stanowi po większej części wrogi element, element nie pewny, element który przepełniony jest do obecnej chwili zatrutą propagandą imperialistów anglo-amerykańskich.*
– *Агентурата е основно и решаващо средство на органите на Държавна сигурност в безпощадната им борба с подривната дейност на разузнаванията на капиталистичексите страни, вражеската подмолна дейност и другите антинародни елементи в нашата страна.*
– *От друга страна провежданата политика на студена война от САЩ и страните членки на НАТО и от останалите капиталистически страни и всичките последъци на робската същност на отживялия и умиращ капитализъм, усилват ненавистта към американците, ненавистта към буржоазните правителства проводници на тази политика в отделните капиталистически страни.*

In accordance with the principles of the language of propaganda, in the analysed documents the distinction between descriptive sentences and commentary or value judgements is blurred, cf.: pl. *Pochodzenie społeczne chłopskie* / *bogacz wiejski*, *wyzyskiwacz*/.

The texts also clearly show a tendency that is characteristic of propaganda texts: the avoidance of direct reference to certain politically taboo subjects (Bednarczuk, 1994, pp. 48–49). Bednarczuk refers to this phenomenon as the indeterminacy of propaganda language. This mainly concerns the strug-

gle against manifestations of opposition to authority, methods of combating the enemy, and the realities before World War II. In the analyzed material, such contexts most often feature euphemisms such as: pl. *te wydarzenia*, *likwidacja*, *neutralizacja*, bg. *бивши хора*, *хора от бивш произход*, *другояче мислещи*, cf.:

– *Някои от тях* ***са с минало, което е известно***.
– […] *се опита да ги подтикне към* ***някоя неразумна постъпка***;
– *Elementy antysocjalistyczne planują w Warszawie uroczystości związane z rocznicą* ***„wydarzeń marcowych“*** […] *Brał aktywny udział w* ***wypadkach marcowych***;
– *uczestniczyła w zajściach w dniu 31.08.82 w Olsztynie*;
– *występowała w charakterze obserwatora* ***„wydarzeń ulicznych”***;
– *w okresie* ***wypadków czechosłowackich***;
– ***przesilenie grudniowe*** […] ***wydarzenia grudniowe***.

Sometimes, in order to circumvent political taboos, officers resort to deliberately inconsistent terminology[5]. In the Polish source material, this is evident, among other things, in the descriptions of the territories lost by Poland after the Second World War. For example, Lviv in 1931 is referred to as part of the USSR, and the USSR's aggression against Poland in 1939 is described as the "liberation" of the territories of western Ukraine and Belarus. This term was borrowed from Soviet texts, where these events were framed as the liberation of western Ukraine and Belarus from Poland. In departmental documents, however, the second part of the term was deliberately nullified. Officers also faced difficulties in describing the territories lost to the USSR, particularly in the context of surveillance of the so-called borderland communities. Circumstances sometimes required them to specify expatriates' places of birth. In such cases, they most often used notation with quotation marks, referring to the "*eastern*" *voivodeships*, cf.:

– *ur. 21.VIII.1931 r. we Lwowie /ZSRR/*
– *W wyniku działań wojennych w 1939 r. i oswobodzeniu terenów zach. Ukrainy i Białorusi przez Armię Radziecką na terenie Z.S.R.R. okazałą się pewna ilość obywateli polskich*.
– […] *„wschodnich” województw.*

[5] This can also be considered a tool for historical manipulation.

An example of a political taboo for Bulgarians was the person of Tsar Simeon, who emigrated after the communists took power in the country. When describing the person of the monarch, officials rarely used a neutral term of the type *former monarch*. In the documents, the main forms aimed to devalue the person of the former ruler and thus legitimise the new power. The most common is the use of "цар" in quotation marks, or the diminutive form of the name Simeon *Симеончо*, cf.:

– […] *ако се наложи контакт със Симеончо и неговите хора* […] *голям привърженик на Симеончо.*
– *бил недоволен от неуважението към «царя».*

At times, negative stigmatisation, linguistic taboos, the use of templates and a tendency to sacralise basic concepts led to a neo-semanticisation (semantic shift). An example of this is the Bulgarian verb *изменя* 'to betray' and its derived noun *изменник* 'traitor', which, in the language of Security Service functionaries, only means *emigration* and *emigrant* (cf. Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, 2022), cf.:

– *Тези елементи възнамеряват да* ***изменят*** *на Родината по нелегален начин.*
– *Най-фрапиращ беше случая с* ***измяната*** *на Родината от двамата оркестранти.*
– *Има* ***изменнически*** *настроения.*
– ***Изменил е*** *в западен Берлин.*

It is not unfamiliar to the employees of the security services and the authors of propaganda texts to emphasize the universality and all-encompassing nature of the phenomena described, as evidenced by the frequent use of large numbers and expressions such as *masses*, *rows*, *immensity*, *total*, *endless*, *boundless*, as well as phrases indicating that the validity of the theses put forward needs no proof, as they are generally known and indisputable, cf.:

– *Dotychczas nie ujawniono żadnych materiałów obciążających ze strony* ***mas pracujących****.*
– *szerzyli wśród* ***masy żołnierskiej*** *nienawiść do ZSRR i sił postępu.*
– ***Огромната*** *помощ на съветската разведка* […] *огромен потенциал.*
– *Противникът в настоящия етап води срещу нас* ***непрекъсната*** *война.*
– *в духа на* ***безкрайна*** *преданост на БКП и народната власт.*
– ***Общоизвестно*** *е* […]
– ***На всички*** *е известно* […]

Another feature of the language of propaganda that appears in the files of the security services is the frequent reference to party authorities, which is used to emphasise the unquestionable rightness of the actions taken (cf.: Bralczyk, 1986, pp. 48–50; Ефтимова, 2023, pp. 13–53), cf.:

– *Както справедливо отбеляза в едно свое изказване др. В. Гомулка* […]
– *Тук с пълна сила важи лозунг, който издигна БКП на своя XI Конгрес* […]

It is clear from the cited examples that both Polish and Bulgarian functionaries were keen to use features of propaganda language in their reports, denunciations, and memos. However, the Bulgarian documents stand out as being noticeably more saturated with such forms, cf.:

– *Агентурата е основно и решаващо средство на органите на Държавна сигурност в безпощадната им борба с подривната дейност на разузнаванията на капиталистичекситe страни, вражеската подмолна дейност и другите антинародни елементи в нашата страна.*

Diachronic differences can also be observed. Until Stalin's death in 1953, a heavily propagandistic style dominated Polish records. In the following decades, this language gradually lost its intensity, and traces of it were only sporadic by the end of the 1980s. In contrast, Bulgarian documents remained highly saturated with features of propaganda language uninterruptedly until 1989, as illustrated, for example, by a 1987 report:

> *В периода на преустройство и търсене на най-голяма ефективност, обхванал цялостно нашата партия и държава, нашия всестраен обществено-политически, материален и духовен живот, АМ за влияние на ВПР – не могат да останат настрана. Те рябва да бъдат един от челните отряди на този исторически процес, на тази необикновена по своите мащаби, дълбочина и актуалност революция у нас.*

The language of communist propaganda, based on simplification, sacralisation and emotionalisation, acted as a tool of control and persuasion. Using schematic formulas, it constructed a picture of the world in line with the ideology, eliminating alternative perspectives. It acted as a mechanism to legitimise power and strengthen the ideological cohesion of society. The security services, also known as the political police, readily adopted the features of this language and combined them with ossified official-administrative forms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bednarczuk, L. (1993). Pragmatyka i typologia "nowo-mowy". *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego: Prace Językoznawcze*, *17–18*, 47–54.

Bralczyk, J. (1986). *O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych*. Ośrodek Badań Prasoznawczych.

Bralczyk, J. (2003). *O języku polskiej polityki lat osiemdziesiątych i dziewięćdziesiątych*. Trio.

Jastrzębska-Golonka, D. (2020). Język dokumentów resortu bezpieczeństwa w latach 1944–1956. In J. Syrnyk, R. Klementowski, & K. Mikołajczak (Eds.), *Aparat bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie antropologii organizacji i antropologii władzy* (pp. 157–185). Instytut Pamięci Narodowej – Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział we Wrocławiu.

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2020). Język pracowników służb specjalnych w Polskiej Rzeczpospolitej Ludowej i w Bułgarskiej Republice Ludowej (na przykładzie analizy teczek TW "Bolek" i TW "Sabina"). In A. Buras-Marciniak & S. Goźdź-Roszkowski (Eds.), *Języki specjalistyczne w komunikacji interkulturowej* (pp. 119–133). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. https://doi.org/10.18778/8220-071-3.10

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2022). Inteligencja na emigracji jako mniejszość ideologiczna w odbiorze pracowników służb specjalnych Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej i Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii. *Zeszyty Łużyckie*, *58*(2), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.32798/zl.1063

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2023). Expressing veracity reserve in the Secret Service records of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria (on the example of the CHS Bolek and CHS Sabina files). *Slavia Meridionalis*, *23*, Article 3091. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.3091

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2024). Retoryka wojenna i językowy obraz inteligencji jako wroga w teczkach służb bezpieczeństwa Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej i Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, *15*(2), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.10880

Misiak, M. (2020). Język dokumentów Służby Bezpieczeństwa – rekonesans badawczy. In J. Syrnyk, R. Klementowski, & K. Mikołajczak (Eds.), *Aparat bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie antropologii organizacji i antropologii władzy* (pp. 185–203). Instytut Pamięci Narodowej – Комисия Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział we Wrocławiu.

Денчева, Д. (2023). Лексемата *бушон* и нейните фразеологични и метафорични проекции. *Български език, Приложение 72*, 164–181. https://doi.org/10.47810/BL.72.25.PR.12

Ефтимова, А. (2023). *Твърдят запознати*. Университетско издателство "Св. Климент Охридски".

Комисия за разкриване на документите и за обявяване на принадлежност на български граждани към Държавна сигурност и разузнавателните служби на Българската народна армия. (2010). *Държавна сигурност – структура и основни документи: Документален сборник / State security services – structure and basic documents*.

Комисия за разкриване на документите и за обявяване на принадлежност на български граждани към Държавна сигурност и разузнавателните служби на Българската народна армия. (2014). *Държавна сигурност и вражеските емигрантски организации (1945–1989): Документален сборник / State security and the hostile emigre organizations (1945–1989): Documentary volume.*

Комисия за разкриване на документите и за обявяване на принадлежност на български граждани към Държавна сигурност и разузнавателните служби на Българската народна армия. (2015). *Държавна сигурност и българската интелигенция: Документален сборник / State Security and the Bulgarian intelligentsia: Documentary volume.*

Комисия за разкриване на документите и за обявяване на принадлежност на български граждани към Държавна сигурност и разузнавателните служби на Българската народна армия. (2016). *Държавна сигурност и българското музикално изкуство (1944–1991): Документален сборник / State Security and the Bulgarian musik arts (1944–1991): Documentary volume.*

Комисия за разкриване на документите и за обявяване на принадлежност на български граждани към Държавна сигурност и разузнавателните служби на Българската народна армия. (2020). *Държавна сигурност: Активни и остри мероприятия (1944–1991): Документален сборник / Bulgarian State Security – active and pointed measures (1944–1991): Documentary volume.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

Bednarczuk, L. (1993). Pragmatyka i typologia "nowo-mowy". *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego: Prace Językoznawcze*, *17–18*, 47–54.

Bralczyk, J. (1986). *O języku polskiej propagandy politycznej lat siedemdziesiątych*. Ośrodek Badań Prasoznawczych.

Bralczyk, J. (2003). *O języku polskiej polityki lat osiemdziesiątych i dziewięćdziesiątych*. Trio.

Dencheva, D. (2025). Leksemata *bushon* i neĭnite frazeologichni i metaforichni proektsii. *Bŭlgarski ezik*, *72*(Suppl.), 164–181. https://doi.org/10.47810/BL.72.25.PR.12

Eftimova, A. (2023). *Tvŭrdiat zapoznati*. Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Okhridski".

Jastrzębska-Golonka, D. (2020). Język dokumentów resortu bezpieczeństwa w latach 1944–1956. In J. Syrnyk, R. Klementowski, & K. Mikołajczak (Eds.), *Aparat bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie antropologii organizacji i antropologii władzy* (pp. 157–185). Instytut Pamięci Narodowej – Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział we Wrocławiu.

Komisiia za razkrivane na dokumentite i za obiaviavane na prinadlezhnost na bŭlgarski grazhdani kŭm Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i razuznavatelnite sluzhbi na Bŭlgarskata narodna armiia. (2010). *Dŭrzhavna sigurnost – struktura i osnovni dokumenti: Dokumentalen sbornik / State security services – structure and basic documents.*

Komisiia za razkrivane na dokumentite i za obiaviavane na prinadlezhnost na bŭlgarski grazhdani kŭm Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i razuznavatelnite sluzhbi na Bŭlgarskata narodna armiia. (2014). *Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i vrazheskite emigrantski organizatsii (1945–1989): Dokumentalen sbornik / State security and the hostile emigre organizations (1945–1989): Documentary volume*.

Komisiia za razkrivane na dokumentite i za obiaviavane na prinadlezhnost na bŭlgarski grazhdani kŭm Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i razuznavatelnite sluzhbi na Bŭlgarskata narodna armiia. (2015). *Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i bŭlgarskata inteligentsiia: Dokumentalen sbornik / State Security and the Bulgarian intelligentsia: Documentary volume*.

Komisiia za razkrivane na dokumentite i za obiaviavane na prinadlezhnost na bŭlgarski grazhdani kŭm Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i razuznavatelnite sluzhbi na Bŭlgarskata narodna armiia. (2016). *Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i bŭlgarskoto muzikalno izkustvo (1944–1991): Dokumentalen sbornik / State Security and the Bulgarian musik arts (1944–1991): Documentary volume*.

Komisiia za razkrivane na dokumentite i za obiaviavane na prinadlezhnost na bŭlgarski grazhdani kŭm Dŭrzhavna sigurnost i razuznavatelnite sluzhbi na Bŭlgarskata narodna armiia. (2020). *Dŭrzhavna sigurnost: Aktivni i ostri meropriiatiia (1944–1991): Dokumentalen sbornik / Bulgarian State Security – active and pointed measures (1944–1991): Documentary volume*.

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2020). Język pracowników służb specjalnych w Polskiej Rzeczpospolitej Ludowej i w Bułgarskiej Republice Ludowej (na przykładzie analizy teczek TW "Bolek" i TW "Sabina"). In A. Buras-Marciniak & S. Goźdź-Roszkowski (Eds.), *Języki specjalistyczne w komunikacji interkulturowej* (pp. 119–133). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. https://doi.org/10.18778/8220-071-3.10

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2022). Inteligencja na emigracji jako mniejszość ideologiczna w odbiorze pracowników służb specjalnych Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej i Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii. *Zeszyty Łużyckie*, *58*(2), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.32798/zl.1063

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2023). Expressing veracity reserve in the Secret Service records of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria (on the example of the CHS Bolek and CHS Sabina files). *Slavia Meridionalis*, *23*, Article 3091. https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.3091

Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska, J. (2024). Retoryka wojenna i językowy obraz inteligencji jako wroga w teczkach służb bezpieczeństwa Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej i Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, *15*(2), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.10880

Misiak, M. (2020). Język dokumentów Służby Bezpieczeństwa – rekonesans badawczy. In J. Syrnyk, R. Klementowski, & K. Mikołajczak (Eds.), *Aparat bezpieczeństwa w perspektywie antropologii organizacji i antropologii władzy* (pp. 185–203). Instytut Pamięci Narodowej – Komisja Ścigania Zbrodni przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu, Oddział we Wrocławiu.

Cechy języka propagandy w dokumentach służb bezpieczeństwa Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej oraz Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii

W artykule został przeanalizowany język propagandy obecny w dokumentach służb bezpieczeństwa PRL oraz Ludowej Republiki Bułgarii. Badanie opiera się na archiwalnych materiałach z lat 1945–1989, dotyczących inwigilacji środowisk inteligenckich. Język tych tekstów łączy cechy stylu administracyjno-urzędowego z elementami propagandy. Mimo oficjalnego charakteru dokumentów, obfitują one w epitety, metafory wojenne oraz podkreślają konieczność walki z wrogiem politycznym. Analiza ujawnia zarówno liczne podobieństwa między badanymi zbiorami, jak i pewne różnice, szczególnie w zakresie intensywności stosowania środków propagandowych.

Słowa kluczowe: język służb bezpieczeństwa; język propagandy; nowomowa; język polski; język bułgarski

Features of propaganda language in the Security Service documents of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria

This article examines the propaganda language used in documents produced by the security services of the Polish People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Based on archival materials from 1945 to 1989, the study examines the surveillance of intellectual circles. There is an interesting blending of administrative and bureaucratic styles in these texts, as well as elements of propaganda. Although the documents are official in nature, they contain a great deal of epithets and military metaphors, and they stress the necessity of combating political opponents. The analysis reveals numerous similarities between the examined collections as well as certain differences, particularly in the intensity of propagandistic elements.

Keywords: language of secret services; propaganda language; newspeak; Polish language; Bulgarian language

Julia Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska (juliamaz100@yahoo.com) – polska językoznawczyni i slawistka, profesor na Uniwersytecie Łódzkim, pracuje w Katedrze Języków Specjalistycznych oraz Komunikacji Międzykulturowej Uniwersy-

tetu Łódzkiego. Zajmuje się gramatyką porównawczą języków słowiańskich, składnią semantyczną, terminologią techniczną, legilingwistyką, dyskursem protestów, a także polszczyzną Kresów. Autorka książek *Wyrażanie kategorii inchoatywności w językach polskim, bułgarskim i białoruskim* (2008), *Słowiańska terminologia techniczna (na materiale polskim, rosyjskim i bułgarskim)* (2014) i współautorka takich prac jak *Podstawowe struktury zdaniowe współczesnych języków słowiańskich: białoruski, bułgarski i polski* (2010) i *Zintegrowany opis semantyczno-syntaktyczny czasowników bułgarskich, polskich i rosyjskich (verba cogitandi i verba sentiendi)* (2019).

Julia Mazurkiewicz-Sułkowska (juliamaz100@yahoo.com) – Polish linguist and Slavic scholar, Professor of the University of Lodz, an employee of the Department of Specialised Languages and Intercultural Communication, dealing with comparative Slavic linguistics, semantic syntax, technical terminology, legilinguistics, discourse of protests, and Polish language in the Eastern Borderlands. Author of academic books such as *Wyrażanie kategorii inchoatywności w językach polskim, bułgarskim i białoruskim* [On means of expressing inchoativity in Polish, Bulgarian, Belarusian; 2008], *Słowiańska terminologia techniczna (na material polskim, rosyjskim i bułgarskim)* [Slavic technical terminology (on the basis of Polish, Bulgarian and Russian); 2014], and co-author of such works as *Podstawowe struktury zdaniowe współczesnych języków słowiańskich: białoruski, bułgarski i polski* [The basic syntactic structures of Slavonic languages (Belarusian, Bulgarian, Polish); 2010] and *Zintegrowany opis semantyczno-syntaktyczny czasowników bułgarskich, polskich i rosyjskich (verba cogitandi i verba sentiendi)* [Integrated semantic and syntactic description of Bulgarian, Polish and Russian verbs: verba cogitandi and verba sentiendi; 2019].

Publication History: Received: 2024-12-31; Accepted: 2025-02-19; Published: 2025-11-15