THE ETHNO-CULTURAL BELONGINGNESS OF AROMANIANS, VLACHS, CATHOLICS, AND LIPOVANS/OLD BELIEVERS IN ROMANIA AND BULGARIA (1990–2012)

MARIN CONSTANTIN*

ABSTRACT

This study is conceived as a historical and ethnographic contextualization of ethno-linguistic groups in contemporary Southeastern Europe, with a comparative approach of several transborder communities from Romania and Bulgaria (Aromanians, Catholics, Lipovans/Old Believers, and Vlachs), between 1990 and 2012.

I am mainly interested in ***(1)*** presenting the ethno-demographic situation and geographic distribution of ethnic groups in Romania and Bulgaria, ***(2)*** repertorying the cultural traits characteristic for homonymous ethnic groups in the two countries, and ***(3)*** synthesizing the theoretical data of current anthropological literature on the ethno-cultural variability in Southeastern Europe.

In essence, my methodology compares the ethno-demographic evolution in Romania and Bulgaria (192–2011), within the legislative framework of the two countries, to map afterward the distribution of ethnic groups across Romanian and Bulgarian regions. It is on such a ground that the ethnic characters will next be interpreted as either homologous between ethno-linguistic communities bearing identical or similar ethnonyms in both countries, or as interethnic analogies due to migration, coexistence, and acculturation among the same groups, while living in common or neighboring geographical areas.

Keywords: ethnic characters, ethno-linguistic communities, cultural belongingness, Romania, Bulgaria.

---

* "Francisc Rainer" Institute of Anthropology, Romanian Academy, Bucharest; e-mail: *marinconstantinro@yahoo.com*

Acknowledgements: This study is the result of a research project on the *Apartenenţa etno-culturală din Europa Răsăriteană (1990–2012)*/*Ethno-cultural belongingness in Southeastern Europe (1990–2012)*, which, with the generous support of the Romanian Cultural Institute (Bucharest), through a "Lucian Blaga" Fellowship, as well as with the assistance of "Francisc Rainer" Institute of Anthropology (Romanian Academy, Bucharest), I accomplished in Bulgaria in the period of September 19th – December 19th, 2013. My research in Bulgaria took place in the framework of two institutes of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (BAS), namely the Institute of Ethnology with the Museum of Ethnography, and the Institute of Balkan Studies with the Centre of Thracology. My work in Sofia would have not been possible without the friendship and assistance of Professor Dr. Vladimir Penchev, Professor Dr. Alexander Kostov, Dr. Ekaterina Anastassova, Dr. Evgenia Troeva, Dr. Yelis Erolova, Dr. Svetla Lazalarska, Dr. Magdalena Slavkova, Dr. Elena Marušiakova, Dr. Stoyan Antonov, and Dr. Blagovest Njagulov. I would like to express here my gratitude to my Bulgarian colleagues, and I assume the responsibility for the content of my study.

INTRODUCTION: A LEGISLATIVE OUTLINE OF ETHNICITY IN POST–1990 ROMANIA AND BULGARIA

As essentially based on historical and demographic arguments in Southeastern Europe, the *national* representativeness of ethnic majorities is reified within the contemporary constitutional legislation in Romania and in Bulgaria as well. In the Romanian Constitution from 1991, the country is a "unitary national state" (Art. 1), with Romanian as official language (Art. 13) and with "all-level education in Romanian" (Art. 32 [2]); supplementary precisions account for "the right of national minorities to learn their mother tongue, and to be educated in this language" (Art. 32 [3]), as well as for the acceptance of the use of minority languages in the territorial administration with a "national minority significant weight" (Art. 120).

Within the Bulgarian 1991 Constitution, Bulgarian is defined as official language (Art. 3), with the study and use of Bulgarian as compulsory for every Bulgarian citizen, including those of another mother tongue (Art. 36 [1, 2]), with Bulgarian origin to facilitate the acquiring of Bulgarian citizenship (Art. 25 [2]), and with no political parties allowed "on ethnic, racial or religious lines" (Art. 11 [4]).

In both coutries, in relation to the state, religion is recognized as "autonomous" (*Constitution of Romania*, 1991, Art. 29 [5]), and "separate" (*Constitution of Bulgaria*, 1991, Art. 13 [2]), with the Eastern Orthodox Christianity as "the traditional religion" in Bulgaria (Art. 13 [3]). While in the Romanian Constitution, any discrimination is excluded between Romanian citiziens in their "common and indivisible homeland", as they are "equal before the law" irrespective of their "race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex […] or social origin" (Art. 4 [2]; 16 [1]), in the Bulgarian corresponding constitutional text, no "privilege or restriction of rights" are allowed based on the "race, national or social origin, ethnic self-identity, sex, religion […]" of Bulgarian citizens "equal before the law" (Art. 6 [2]).

Aside from the constitutional provisions, there is no other internal legal framework to regulate the relationships between national majorities and minorities in post–1990 Romania and Bulgaria. A "Draft law on the status of national minorities" was promoted by the Democrat Union of Hungarians in Romania in 2005, with several further revisions and recommendations from the Venice Commission for Democracy through Law, it is still in debate within the Romanian Parliament; the draft advances a series of proposals in areas like the definition of ethnic identity in terms of language, culture, and religion, the recognition of national minorities in Romania, the minority inclusion into the Romanian citizenship, the ethno-cultural heritage in Romania, the legal use of minority languages in Romanian administration, the minority cultural autonomy, the anti-discrimination protection, the minority political representation, the contacts

between minorities in Romania and their transborder co-ethnics etc. (Constantin, 2013a)

In the course of their post–1990 integration within the European Union structures, the two Southeast European countries agreed on documents of international legislation concerning the ethno-linguistic minorities in Europe. Romania signed and ratified the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (1995) *as well as* the *European Charter for regional or minority languages* (1995, 2008). As for Bulgaria, its signature and ratification of the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* occurred in 1997 and 1999, respectively.

TOWARDS AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORIZING OF ETHNICITY IN CONTEMPORARY ROMANIA AND BULGARIA

Within the ethno-anthropological research of ethno-linguistic and confessional communities in Romanian and Bulgarian contemporary (post 1990) literature, it is the national and civic metamorphoses of ethnicity, the terminology of ethnic identification, and the transborder variability of ethnic majorities and minorities that emerge as main themes of a comparative relevance. In both countries, for the period under discussion, the disciplinary development of cultural anthropology has generally been contextualized in a still specializing stage as a "long journey to professionalization" in Romania (Geană, 2002) and as a "statu nascendi" in Bulgaria (Eltchinova, 2002) – in terms of either ethnographic environment, interpretive instrumentarium, and institutional framework. In a direct relationship with the ethnographic and historical sources of studying the ethnic groups in Romania and Bulgaria, and basically relying on results of the monographic approach of one or another population in the two countries, anthropological theorizing is here concerned with the conceptual and methodological rationales in the cross-cultural understanding of ethnicity in Southeastern Europe.

According to views of a "larger intellectual family" (of historical, geographical, and sociological paternity) in interwar Romania, *autochthonism* and *tradition* were described to have constantly been "reinforcing each other" – especially within the ideas of "continuity" and "unity" of Romanians; by "bridging *ab originem* beliefs and behaviors with present ones", the Romanian "national-building" ethnology – as a postwar and post-socialist ethnology of the *nation* – would actually operate a "selection" of social facts appearing as "*survivals* of some original models" and expressing "the *authentic* worldview of an autochthonous people" (Mihăilescu, 2007). In Bulgaria, it is the category of *Bulgarianhood* that is currently given a *civic* meaning in defining the Bulgarian nation, as accounting for ethnic Bulgarians as well as for local minorities, after successive periods (since

1878) of Bulgarian primacy as an "unwritten rule in the public sphere" and of *other* ethnicities' cultural seclusion within their private community life; such a change of public (and political) reinterpretation is crucially challenging both the ethno-linguistic majority's traditional centrality, and the minority ethnic groups' marginalization – within the local conceptual *nation* (Izvorska, 2006).

To a significant extent, Mihăilescu's and Izvorska's studies synthesize an enduring debate on the manner of representing the new citizenship structures and relationships in the modern states of Romania and Bulgaria, respectively, with the *national* coexistence of local ethnic majorities and minorities. Apart from the population exchange between Romania and Bulgaria (80 000 Romanians moving to Northern, Dobrudzha, and 60 000 Bulgarians, to Southern, Dobrudzha, with the 1940 Craiova Treaty [Nicoară, 2005 *apud* Chirițoiu; Țugui-Ionescu, 2009]), each state has experienced major changes of own ethno-demographic composition, including (for instance) the emigration of more than 300 000 Germans from Romania between 1977–2011, as well as the exodus of over 300 000 Turks from Bulgaria, in 1989 (Bachvarov, 1997). In both countries, ethno-confessional groups like the Muslim Bulgarians in Rhodopes (Eminov, 2007), and the Hungarian – and Romanian – speaking Catholics in Moldavia (Şerban, 2004; Ciubotaru, 2009) are difficult to frame within standard census categories. Last but not least, the current politics of dual or multiple citizenship/nationality in Southeastern Europe have important implications for the national majorities in the two countries, with the Romanian nationality restored after 1991 for Romanian co-ethnics from Moldova and Ukraine (Iordachi, 2009), and the Bulgarian citizenship granted after 1991 to persons of Bulgarian origin living outside the Republic of Bulgaria (Smilov, Jileva, 2009).

The mainly *civic* (rather than ethno-cultural) description of nationality in Romania and in Bulgaria (see the above-cited constitutional law provisions of the two countries, in 1991) is given further international significance with the two countries' accession to the European Union (2007). Within the *European* citizenship, Romanianness is recognised with Romanian as one of the official languages of the European Union, with the ethnicity, culture, language, and religion as elements of (majority and minority) ethno-cultural identity in Romanian Constitution as well as in the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* in Europe, and with election rights for Romanian citizens in Europe, and for European citizens in Romania (Constantin, 2013a). Likewise, the Bulgarian language and culture are defined as parts of "Balkan and European identity", while the "integration of Bulgarian minorities" – as expectedly benefiting from the European support – is thought to contribute to the "preservation of interior governmental peace" in Bulgaria (Tutunarov-Trajanov, 2011).

As a matter of fact, in both countries, understanding *Romanianness* as well as *Bulgarianhood* as forms of a still developing culturally-rooted citizen counsciousness (instead of accomplished macro-social projects by each of the two

national states) is more and more resonating with the recent viewing of European citizenship as an "active, rather than passive, process", taking also into account that "all citizenship is cultural" (Nic Craith, 2004). An example of a lasting regional interplay of politics and ethnicity is the historical "legacy" of *Balkans* as a "Ottoman", as well as post-Ottoman and socialist world, with "national identities having been defined in opposition to each other", which, in lieu of a "common Balkan identity", are nowadays referred to as "East Central Europe" or "Southeastern Europe" (Todorova, 2004). The alternation of several "ethnic regimes" in Dobrudzha is similarly represented in the local ethnic heterogeneity in 1878, in the Romanian colonization policies during the 20th century, as well as in the governmentally-led valorisation of Dobrudzhan multiethnicity, after 1990 (Chirițiou, Țugui-Ionescu, 2009).

Within the *national* framework of identifying a *citizen* identity of culturally-distinct groups of population, there is – in Romania as well as in Bulgaria – a theoretical interest in defining ethnicity through the dialectical opposition of *majority* and *minority*, and also through deeper distinctions inside such generic categorization. While Romanian subgroups originating in areas like Moldavia and Maramureş live together with Romanians villagers in Western Transylvania, in virtue of a *Romanianness* that "each of these communities have inherited" in accord with the official "cartography of national state", their coexistence also includes a "good minority" of Germans (locally renowned as "hard-working") and a "bad minority" of Gypsies (usually associated with "delinquency") (Chelcea, Lățea, 2000). A similar dichotomy is encountered (on the one hand) between Bulgarians of Orthodox belongingness and Muslim Bulgarians (*Pomaks*) in Western Rhodopes; on the other hand, while the Sunni Turks are seen (for example, in Razgrad area) as "our Turks" and "part of the Bulgarians, as born here", Gypsies "attract the most derogatory evaluations" in terms of a "poor, miserable" and "stealing" ethnicity (Grekova, 1999; Elchinova, 2001). Again, while the "Bulgarians' everyday notion of *minority*" takes the "ethnic groups" *per se* (communities existing since "prior to the establishment of their own nation states"), in contrast to "national minorities" ("groups which used to be within one nation-state but eventually ended up on another [Bulgarian, for instance] national territory") (Grekova, 1999), the historical and ethnographic recognition of ethnicity is not always an argument for a political recognition of a national minority (the case of Aromanians in Romania [Iosif, 2009]).

Accounting for the existence of the "reciprocal minorities" of 8.025 Bulgarians in Romania (2002) and of 10.566 Vlachs, along with 1.088 Romanians, in Bulgaria (2001), are the contemporary renaissance of each group's traditions in own ethnography, folklore, and history, the 1999 establishing of Romanian and Bulgarian colleges in Sofia and in Bucharest, respectively, as well as the founding of associations representative for Bulgarians in Romania (1990, 1992) and of Vlachs (1991), Aromanians (1992), and Romanians (2001) in Bulgaria. However,

the Romanian minority policy is described to be "more advanced" and "more adaptative to international pressure" than the Bulgarian one, especially in the recognition of Bulgarian associations and of the right to education in their own language, as well as in a more active support for Romanian diaspora in the neighboring countries (in comparison with little attention in Bulgarian policy for own diaspora in Banat, Oltenia, and Muntenia, with the Bulgarian distrust to engage in bilateral minority agreements with Romania) (Njagulov, 2006).

Beyond the issues of equating the Romanian and Bulgarian regimes of national majorities and minorities, towards their own co-ethnic trans-Danubian communities (in terms of either folk traditions, civic organizations, or education institutions), the two countries share a broader problematization of *transborder ethnicity*, that is, an ethnicity not entirely circumscribed within one or another state cartography, but dispersed across two or more countries in Southeastern Europe. As scholarly associated with the Gypsy/Roma ethnicity, but Romanian speaking, the Rudars are here an example of ethnic difussion, with regional subgroups in Romania (*Rudars* in Oltenia, *Băieşi* in Banat, *Lingurari* in Moldavia etc. [Kovalcsik, 2007]), in Bulgaria (*Tratzieni* in South Bulgaria, *Monteani* in mountainous regions), *Intreani* in Northern Bulgaria, *Dobrogeni* in Dobrudzha etc. [Erolova, 2013]), as well as in Serbia (*Băniaşi*), Bosnia-Herzegovina (*Karavlasi*) etc. (Slavkova, 2005). Another case of a "pan-Balkan" ethnicity is that of the Muslim Bulgarians (*Pomaks*) that live in the Bulgarian and Greek ranges of Rhodopes Mountains, as well as in Macedonia, Eastern Albania, and Turkey; while they are also called *Slavic Speaking Greeks* in Greece, *Torbeshes* in Macedonia, *Gorans* in Albania, and *Slavicized Turkish Brothers* in Turkey, the Pomaks congregate not into a common "Pomakness", but in their Eastern South Slavic dialect and in their Islamic faith (Georgieva, 1999; Eminov, 2007; Bulut, Ture, 2008). Further cross-border stateless ethnicities (except the *Roma* ethnic heterogeneity) are the *Hutsuli* (in Romanian Maramureş and Bukovina, as well as in the Ukrainian areas of Transcarpathia and Pokuttya) (Bobu-Florescu, 1956), the *Karakachans* from the Bulgarian regions of Pirin, Sliven, Burgas, Dupnica, Montana, as well as from Greece (*Sarakatsani* in Zagori) and from Turkey (Maglish) (Campbell, 1964; Pimpireva, 1999; Kalionski, 2001), and the *Aromanians* in Greece (Pindus), Macedonia (Bitola), Albania (Muzachia), Bulgaria (Rhodopes), and Romania (Constanţa) (Chang, Tourtellotte, 1993; Rakshieva [undated paper]; Iosif, 2009).

It is the very "alternating citinzenship" of such groups (many of which – like the *Hutsuli*, the *Rudari*, and the *Aromanians* are absent from the post–1990 census records in Romania and in Bulgaria) that poses the question of their transborder *civic identity*. Indeed, where there is still no place for "extramural" ethnicities (which are not given official recognition) in the current legislation of national (linguistic or confessional) minorities, they appear in course of representing themselves only within local *politeia* memberships. In two neighboring Danube

areas – Nikopol region in Bulgaria, and Teleorman County in Romania, with Bulgarian and Romanian Orthodox majorities, alongside Roman-Catholic, Protestant smaller groups of Bulgarians and Gypsies – the (still) traditional villagers are characterized in terms of their *communal identity* that basically would "accommodate [rural] cultures with political programs of national construction"; as far as, in both Romanian and Bulgarian contexts, peasants "remain out of the large-scale political participation", their sociality basically consists of an "overlapping of several networks" (traditions, friendships, associations, notabilities...), on which local community development eventually depends (Şerban, 2007). The Moldavian Roman Catholics (many of which being Hungarian-speaking and sometimes locally named as *Csango*) are shown to have made up their "political and *civic identity*" (during one century and half of their history within the Romanian modern state), as a means of adapting themselves to the social, political, and institutional context of Romania; "economic emancipation" (through the access to land ownership), participation in the world wars and military heroes worship – together with the Romanian majority, and also the inter-confessional marriages with Orthodox people – are all elements constitutive for the "political culture" and citizenship recognition of Catholics, even whithin their "acculturation with the majority ethnicity" (Şerban, 2009b).

As a complementary descriptive tool in conceptualizing the transborder condition of ethnicity in Romania and Bulgaria, the notion of *diaspora* has been introduced with respect to ethnic communities that, in the two countries, maintain or revitalize their attachments with origin homelands or peoples. The several thousands of Aromanian families that, following the Romanian state policy, migrated in the 1920s from Balkans to Dobrudzha, are interpreted to have only been a "diaspora" towards co-ethnic Aromanians who remained in Bulgaria, Macedonia, or Greece; while this view is consistent with the post–1990 movement of identiy revival among Aromanians (who, since 1999, are also recognized as an "ethnic minority" by the Council of Europe), it cannot account – at least, in the case of Dobrudzhan Aromanians – for a "principal trait of diasporic behavior", namely the return to some ancestral territory which they would claim as their own (Iosif, 2009). With regard to further distinct ethnicities in Northern and Southern Dobrudhza – the Crimean Tatars, the Roma subgroups of Muslim/Turkish Gypsies, Kalderashi/Kelderari, Rudars/Lingurari, and the Old Believers – their investigation as "diasporas" mainly outline local "reconstruction of ethnicity and identity" and "reaction to modern political and socio-economic realities", with the Tatars reasserting their Crimean belongingness, and with the Old Believers interested in the return to their "Russian roots [in language, literature, and history]"; while the memory of their Indian origin is not preserved among Roma, after living for centuries under Byzantine and Ottoman regimes in Southeastern Europe, the Tatars, the Gypsies, and the Old Believers are all nowadays developing a "strong civil Bulgarian or Romanian identity", perceiving the two countries as

"homelands" for them too, and acknowledging as such their new *European* citizenship (Erolova, 2013).

After 1990, several ethnic groups (especially stateless ones) in Southeastern Europe have been engaging in movements regenerative for their cultural identity, with various forms of public expression and representative institutionalization. Ethno-cultural and civic associations have thus been founded among Bulgarians in Romania (*Bratsvo* Association, 1992), Tatars and Turks in Romania (1990), Vlachs (1991) and Aromanians (1992) in Bulgaria, Karakachans in Bulgaria (1991) etc. Under the limitations of the legal provision stating that "There shall be no political parties on ethnic, racial or religious lines […]" (*Constitution of Bulgaria*, Art. 11 [4]), the Turkish *Movement for Rights and Freedoms* (MRF) and the Gypsy *Euroroma* were involved in the Bulgarian parliamentary election process, with MRF also joining the coalition government in Bulgaria (2001). Whereas the *Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania* (RMDSz) constantly participated in Romanian government between 1996 and 2012, as representing in elections the Hungarian minority in Romania as an organisation (not as a party), each recognized national minority – other than the Hungarian one – in Romania is reserved a seat in the country's Chamber of Deputies (*Constitution of Romania*, Art. 62). National days of ethnic groups are celebrated among Hungarians in Romania (15th March), Aromanians (23rd May) and Roma (8th April) – in Romania and Bulgaria as well, while ethnic festivals or rallies are reported to take place among Karakachans in Sliven (Kalionski, 2001), Tatars in Romania (Erolova, 2013), Turks in Rhodopes (Aleksiev *et al*., 2012) etc.

All the more the revitalizing ethnicity is engaged in political representativeness in post–1990 Southeastern Europe, it is broadly relevant for rethinking contemporary processes of ethnic (re)making as a self- and hetero-identification in Romania and Bulgaria. Within a recent viewing of the *Roma* "identities" in the two countries, a conceptual distinction operates between what the Roma elite argues on a *Roma ethnogenesis* nowadays, and what could actually stand for *ethnicization* in "inventing traditions" for homogenising and unifying the same Gypsy communities, as if a "shared counsciousness" of them better defended general *Romani* interests (Giordano, Boscoboinik, 2003). As such, through "overshadowing" ethnicization and its real backgrounds in the socio-economic marginalization, cultural exclusion, and political manipulation of Gypsies in Europe, claiming ethnogenesis among "Roma" – with a positively connoted model of the people formation in the history of European nations – may only risk "to intensify stereotypes, prejudices, and discrimination" towards this ethnicity within the rest of coexisting society (Boscoboinik, Giordano, 2008).

THE ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHIC EVOLUTION IN ROMANIA AND BULGARIA (1992–2011)

My approach of "visualising" ethnicity in Romania and Bulgaria begins with a demographic framing of it, in accordance with the census information in the two countries, during the last two decades. Thus, the demographic data are structured into two tables indicating the number of ethnic populations, in the years of the three censuses under review (1992, 2002, 2011, in Romania; 1992, 2001, 2011, in Bulgaria). To exemplify, here is the situation of the most numerous three ethno-linguistic groups in each country (the overall list of the ethnic groups in Romania and Bulgaria is provided in the *Annexes no. 1* and *no. 2*).

ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHICS OF ROMANIA (1992–2011)

Ethnic groups	*Population in 1992*	*Population percentage in 1992*	*Population in 2002*	*Population percentage in 2002*	*Population in 2011*	*Population percentage in 2011*
Romanians	20,408.542	89.5%	19,399.597	89.5%	16,792.868	88.9%
Hungarians	1,624.959	7.1%	1,431.807	6.6%	1,227.623	6.5%
Gypsies	401 087	1.8%	535 840	2.5%	621 573	3.3%

ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHICS OF BULGARIA (1992–2011)

Ethnic groups	*Population in 1992*	*Population percentage in 1992*	*Population in 2001*	*Population percentage in 2001*	*Population in 2011*	*Population percentage in 2011*
Bulgarians	7,271.185	85.7%	6,655.210	83.9%	5,664.624	84.8%
Turks	800 052	9.4%	746 664	9.4%	588 318	8.8%
Gypsies	313 396	3.7%	370 908	4.7%	325 343	4,9%

A preliminary comparison can first remark the almost generalized process of demographic decrease in most of the two countries (except the Roma minority), the registering of several small ethnic communities (Albanians, Carashovans, Csangos, Macedonians, Rutenians, and Slovenians, in Romania; the Gagauz group in Bulgaria), the making of a new minority (Chinese) in Romania, as well as the fluctuating recording of Vlach population in Bulgaria (5.159 members in 1992, 10.566 members in 2001, 3.684 members in 2011).

In Romania and in Bulgaria as well, the census data expectedly contributes to the clarifying of ethnic identification through the angles of three categories of demographic indicators, namely the ethnic identity, the maternal language, and religion. Thus, as first concerns the national majorities, the number of 16,792.868 *Romanians* in Romania (as recorded in 2011) may be compared to the number of 17,176.544 respondents whose mother tongue is *Romanian*, and to that of 15,730.426 *Orthodox* Christians. In Bulgaria, according to the evidences of the 2011 census, the 5,664.624 *Bulgarians* is to be associated with the 5,659.024 speakers of *Bulgarian language*, and with the 4,374.135 *Orthodox* people in the same country.

Further statistical concordances (which are culturally relative, but also demographically significant) correlate – in the 2011 Romania – the 1,206.264 *Hungarians*, the 1,259.914 speakers of *Hungarian language*, the 500 444 *Roman-Catholics*, and the 563.611 *Reformats*. Also in Romania, 621.573 *Roma* have as their linguistic correspondent the 244.503 speakers of *Romani language*, while 474.603 Gypsies assert their *Orthodox* confession. 50.920 Ukrainians are mostly (48.910 cases) identified as speaking their *Ukrainian language*, and (39.146 cases) as *Orthodox* believers. Of the rest of Romania's minorities, 23.710 Turks (from a total number of 27.698) are characterized by the usage of the *Turkish language*, while 26.903 Turks are *Muslim*; the 20.282 Tatars are described as *Tatar-language* speakers (17,495) and as *Muslim* (20 060); another numerous group – the Russian-Lipovani (23.487) – include speakers of *Russian language* (18.121) and *Christian Old Believers* (17.267) (for a more comprehensive survey of the relation between the ethnic, linguistic, and confessional identities in 2011 Romania, see the Annex no. 3).

In 2011 Bulgaria, the 585 024 Turks relate to the 564,858 Turkish speakers, and to the 420 816 Sunni Muslims (along with 21 610 Shiite Muslims). The other large minority in Bulgaria – the 320 761 Roma/Gypsies – is identifiable with the 272 710 speakers of Romani language(s); instead, from a confessional viewpoint, the Gypsies are divided between 84,867 Orthodox believers, 42.201 Muslims, and 23.289 Protestant Christians (see the Annex no. 4 for further details about the ethno-linguistic and religious demographic variability in Bulgaria).

In accordance with the above-mentioned census data, the concentration and/or diffusion coordinates of the ethnic groups can be established within the administrative and regional structure of the 42 Romanian counties and the 28 Bulgarian areas.

A first aspect under scrutiny is the synoptic representation of ethnic location and density in Romania and Bulgaria, as regards the local national majorities (Romanian and Bulgarian, respectively) as well as the minorities from Northern and Southern Danube (of a minimum of 1 000 members in their communities). Romania and Bulgaria are both characterized by a variable proportion of their ethno-national majorities across each state's surfaces. For instance, following the evidences of the 2002 census, Romanians in Bucharest and in the surrounding county of Ilfov – in a number of 2,157.359 persons – reprezints 11.1% of the Romanian population as a national whole; on the contrary, the 97 660 Romanians from the counties of Covasna and Harghita make a percent of 0.5% of the rest of their co-nationals in the country.

Likewise, in their 2001 census, Bulgarians in Sofia and in the Sofia Region – 1,377.476 persons – are 17.4% of the total of Bulgarian population, while the 227 541 Bulgarians that are recorded in the regions of Razgrad, Silistra, and Targovishte – represent 2.8% of the national composition of Bulgarian inhabitants.

In their turn, the minority ethnic groups are differentiated at a territorial level according to the compact demographic aggregation of some communities, in

contrast to the isolation or enclavization of others. In both countries, there is a couple of numerous minorities – Hungarians and Gypsies in Romania; Turks and Gypsies in Bulgaria – each of which with their own "scales" of ethno-geographic representativeness. In Romania, the Hungarian "conglomerate" from Harghita (276.038 persons), Covsana (228.575), and Mureş (228.575), plus Satu Mare County (129.158), is reversed by the complete absence of this ethnicity in the counties of Suceava, Botoşani, Iaşi, Vaslui, Ialomița, Călăraşi, Giurgiu, and Teleorman. Gypsies are present to an important extent in counties like Mureş (40.425 persons), Dolj (31.544), and Bihor (30.089), to diminish in the counties of Tulcea (2.272) and Vâlcea (3.955). (Also this time, my reference is the 2002 census in Romania).

In Bulgaria (the 2001 census), the Turkish majority in Kardzhali (101 116 persons), as well as the significant groups of Turks in Shumen (59 551 persons), Burgas (58 636), Plovdiv (53 439), Targovishte (49 495 persons), and Silistra (48 761 persons) – have as their counterparts those regions where the Turks are few: Montana (235 persons), Kjustendil (146), Vidin (139), and Pernik (108). A high number of Gypsies are reported in the Bulgarian districts of Plovdiv (30.196 persons), Stara Zagora (26.804), and Sliven (26.777), unlike the reduced presence of this minority in Kardzhali (1 264 persons) and Smolyan (686 persons).

Two further relevant characteristics of the ethno-demographic mapping in Romania and Bulgaria (in the years of 2001–2002) are the multiethnic influx within some regions and the degree of territorial dissemination among the minority ethnic groups. Indeed, in Northern and Southern Danube as well, there are several areas of multiethnicity with veritable cultural mixtures, such as – in Romania – Bucharest (where Romanians coexist with Gypsies, Hungarians, Turks, Jews, Germans, Chinese, Greeks, and Russians), Timiş (Romanians, Hungarians, Serbs, Slovaks, Bulgarians, Gypsies, Germans, and Ukrainians), Caraş-Severin (Romanians, Hungarians, Serbs, Croats, Czechs, Gypsies, Germans, and Ukrainians), Tulcea (Romanians, Turks, Russians, Gypsies, Ukrainians, Greeks), Suceava (Romanians, Ukrainians, Poles, Russians, Germans, Gypsies), Arad (Romanians, Hungarians, Gypsies, Slovaks, Germans, Ukrainians)(similar situations also appears in the counties of Satu Mare, Maramureş, and Constanța).

In Bulgaria, districts of a similar ethno-cultural variety are Varna (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians, Vlachs), Sofia Region (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians, Greeks), Plovdiv (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians), Blagoevgrad (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Macedonians), Razgrad (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Vlachs), and Veliko Tarnovo (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Vlachs).

Alongside the Hungarian population (whose territorial situation has been previously described), a large geographic distribution in Romania may be noticed for Gypsies (which, except Romanians, are the only ethnic group present in all national counties) and for Germans (who are encountered in 28 counties).

Important topographic occurences are visible also in the cases of Russians (in 13 counties), Ukrainians (in 13 counties), Jews (in 12 counties), Italians (in 11 counties), Greeks (in 10 counties), and Slovaks (in seven counties). Enclavized locations are reported for the groups of Turks (in Constanța, Tulcea, and Bucharest), Serbs (Caraş-Severin, Timiş), Poles (Suceava), Czechs (Caraş-Severin), Croats (Caraş-Severin), Tatars (Constanța), and Bulgarians (Timiş).

In Bulgaria, together with the majority of Bulgarian population, it is the Turks, the Roma, the Russians, the Armenians, the Ukrainians, and the Jews that are spread – in a variable demographic sizing, also including smaller figures for Ukrainians and Jews – across all the national regions. Although much fewer than the Turks and the Roma, and still than the Russians, but in a number similar to Armenians, the Vlach population lives in most of Bulgarian regions (except for Smolyan and Kardzhali), which is also comparable with Romanians (1.088 in number, in 2002, and yet absent only in the districts of Pernik and Montana). As for the ethnic enclaves from Bulgaria, they are identifiable among the Armenians in Varna and Plovdiv, the Vlachs (also including Romanian-speaking Rudars) in Varna, and the Macedonians in Blagoevgrad.

CRITERIA OF ETHNIC COMPARABILITY IN CHARACTERIZING THE CULTURAL CONFIGURATION OF HOMONYMOUS ETHNIC GROUPS IN ROMANIA AND BULGARIA

The demographic and geographic framing of ethnicity in Romania and in Bulgaria opens the perspectives of an anthropological study on the historical and ethnographic evidences of various ethno-linguistic groups in the two countries. Thus my research is not only interested in the numerical inventory of some populaces in their territorial variability, but also (where it is allowed by the ethno-anthropological information) in the repertory of some traits that could contribute to the validation of ethnic sub-group belongingness to one common cultural whole and, as a result, to the interethnic "recognizability" of those populaces. *Comparability* of the charactersitics of such sub-groups becomes then the methodological principle of hereafter developed investigation.

Ethno-demographic realities (in their geographic expression) outline for Romania and Bulgaria several ethnic trait-corresponding or homonymous communities (accounting for either identical, or equivalent ethnonyms in the current ethnographic literature of the same *ethnos*); among such communities are those of Aromanians and Vlachs, Bulgarian Catholics, and Russian Lipovans/Old Believers.

With regard to the contemporary history and ethnography of such groups in Bulgaria, I have investigated a bibliographic corpus on Aromanians and Vlachs (Rakšieva [1997 and undated paper], Grebenarova, 1998, Atanassova, 1999,

Vaseva, 1999b, Gossiaux, 2008), Bulgarian Catholics (Bokova, 1999, Boncheva, 2006), and Old Believers/*Nekrasovtsi* (Anastassova, 1999, Erolova, 2013).

As for those ethnic groups in Romania whose cultural identity is similar to the above-mentioned ones, I have ressorted to specialized references about Aromanians (Bara, 2006, Iosif, 2009, Plecadite, 2010), Bulgarians (Larionescu, 2006; Vaseva, 2012), Hungarian and Romanian Catholics (Şerban, 2004), Russian Lipovans (Bell *et al*., 2004; Capoți *et al*., 2009; Titov, 2009; Erolova, 2013).

The comparative accuracy in assessing the ethnic belongingness in Romania and Bulgaria takes into account several criteria of repertorying the cultural traits, in terms of ***(1)*** analogies between coexisting groups of population, ***(2)*** analogies between remote groups of population, ***(3)*** clusters of homologies between coexisting and remote groups of population, and ***(4)*** isolate characteristics of ethno-linguistic communities and their subgroups. In principle, discussing each criterion will be initially enframed within the above-enounced categories of homonymous or corresponding ethnicity, while constantly considering also the interethnic contextualization of data apparently specific to individualized groups.

In this way, the hypothesis of any ethno-cultural convergences or divergences has to be verified in the cultural coexistence and neighboring of ethnic groups from within the same regions, as well as in the geographic distance and even in the absence of a direct ethnographic contact between such populations. The particularity of some traits established for the ethnic groups under discussion may reflect (again, hypothetically) the insufficiency of an information postulating some affiliation between them, and also the reality of a certain singular ethnicity within the very generic multiculturalism of Southeastern Europe.

The comparative terminology of my study makes main distinction between *analogies* (as cultural traits shared – through acculturation or cultural exchange – by ethno-linguistic groups of a different origin), and *homologies* (as cultural traits inherited by at least two subgroups of the same ethno-linguistic family). Through their presumptive content, analogies and homologies have a *cross-cultural* applicability (at the level of different ethnicities) and also a *intra-cultural* applicability (as an ethnic, linguistic, or religious compatibility of related groups or subgroups). The methodological caution in identifying some *clusters* of homologies (rather than shared, but also disparate, cultural attributes) is meant to reduce the risk of equating some formal and random similarities between "populaces" whose historical destinies and lifestyles otherwise lack real ethnic afinities.

The interest of such a research consists not only of its possibility to currently *homologate* peoples with more or less known traditions of their own paternities, but equally of its perspectives for outlining some processes of migrations, ethnic unifying, and acculturation – in the conditions of what I have described (from a demographic and geographic viewpoint) as a "multiethnic influx" and "territorial dissemination" of the majority and minority ethnicity from Romania and Bulgaria.

As the mentioned processes portray as many social evolutions (which are memorable in the sequence of a few generations), thus conferring to the ethno-linguistic identity a biographic contour, they may contribute to the (in)validation of comparability in the examination of cultural factology. Depending on the reconstruction of an ethnic *descent* that two or several homonymous subgroups have spent *together*, their becoming would reflect *in time* their *immediate* ethnographic compatibilities. As a result, the ethno-national groups from Northern and Southern Danube are to be also compared with respect to the "ages" of their history – more or less recent or documentary accessible, but theoretically susceptible to reveal important constants or irregularities within a general interpretive approach on the provenances and transformations of contemporary ethnicity.

AROMANIANS AND VLACHS

Aromanians in Bulgaria are situated in Western Rhodopes, in the areas of Blagoevgrad, Pazardzhik, Plovdiv, and Sofia (Anton, Blagoevgrad, Dorkovo, Doupnitsa, Peshtera, Rakitovo, Samokov, Sofia, Stara Planina, and Velingrad). According to recent ethnographies, the Aromanian populace of neighbour country is reported to "cca 2 000–3 000" (Atanassova, 1999), "3 000" (Gossiaux, 2008), and "2 000–3 000" (Raksieva, 1997). Contemporary vernacular narratives of Aromanians in Bulgaria outline the Grammos and Pindus Mountains in Greece – as their common ancestral homeland, with Moschopolis as their capital, and Macedonia and Bulgaria – as their refuge lands (Raksieva [undated paper]).

While due to Romanian state's interwar politics, 6 000 Aromanian families are estimated to have colonized Southern Dobroudzha, after 1925 (Iosif, 2009; Plecadite, 2010), Aromanians are not recognized today as a minority in Romania and subgroups of their ethnicity can mostly be ethnographically assessed in cities like Constanța (Iosif, 2009) and Călăraşi (Plecadite, 2010). An overall (unofficial) number of Aromanians in Romania – that of 25.053 în 2002 (Plecadite, 2010), is clearly contrastive to demographic figures supposedly recorded under "Macedonian" ethnonyme (1.224 in Romanian 2011 Census). Aromanian self-identification in Constanța emphasizes their "diaspora" character (Iosif, 2009), in relation to their historical rootedness in Macedonia (Plecadite, 2010).

In the Bulgarian abovementioned areas, Aromanians coexist with several other ethnic groups – Bulgarians, Turks, Greeks, Roma, and Karakachans – of which it is the Karakachan ethnicity that raises here a particular comparative interest. Indeed, alongside various exonymes in the Rhodopes Mountains and in Dobroudzha, like *Gramusteni*, *Pindeni*, *Farseroți* (Raksieva, 1997; Iosif, 2009; Plecadite, 2010), *Vlachs*, *Kutzo-Vlachs*, *Urouks*, *Arnaouts*, *Tsintars* (Atanassova, 1999), Aromanians are also locally called *Karakachani* (Atanassova, 1999). On the other hand, *Karakachan* is reported as an exonyme among Karakachans, while

their own ethnonyme would be that of *Vlachs* (Pimpireva, 1999; Kalionski, 2001). The kinship pattern in cohabitation of married brothers and their families until the youngest brother's marriage is reported among Karakachans in Zagori, Epirus (Campbell, 1964) and Aromanians in Bulgaria, as well (Gossiaux, 2008).

With the official acknowledgement of the Aromanian *millet* ethno-religious community, within the Ottoman Empire, in 1905, some Karakachans declared themselves *Aromanian* (Kalionski, 2001). Both Aromanian and Karakachan folk accounts evoke these groups' exodus from Janina Pashalik, under Ali-Pasha rule (1.788–1.822) (Kalionski, 2001; Gossiaux, 2008). Aromanian transhumance (Raksieva, 1997; Atanassova, 1999; Gossiaux, 2008) and Karakachan long-distance shepherding (Pimpireva, 1999) or mobile stockbreeding (Kalionski, 2001) are similarly described in terms of summer mountain-and-plain alternation, as a seasonal planning within Orthodox holidays of St. Peter's Day (29 June) and Holy Cross Day (14 September) (Aromanians) and St. George's (6 May) and St. Demetrius' Day (26 October) (Karakachans). Socialist politics in both countries are similar in the postwar forcible cooperativization of Aromanians in Romania (Plecadite, 2010) and in the Bulgarian state decision – in 1954 – to register and settle the nomadic groups (including Karakachans and purportedly Aromanians), with their flocks integrated by force into the cooperative farms (Kalionski, 2001).

Aromanians in Velingrad, Peshtera, and Rakitovo make distinction between "our Vlachs" (as an exonyme of themselves) and "other Vlachs" (from the Danube areas) (Raksieva, 1997 undated paper), whereas Danube Vlachs call Aromanians as *Kutsovlasi* (Gossiaux, 2008), which is a term the Aromanians themselves apply in derision to Karakachans (Kalionski, 2001). Aromanians keep rather distant from identifying themselves with the *Vlach Ligue* in Bulgaria (Vidin, 1993)(Gossiaux, 2008), and disagree with the subordination of their own *Sutsata* association to the Vlach one (Raksieva [undated paper]).

Aromanians in Bulgaria are also reported for their public self-definition as *Romanians* (Atanassova), with a clear distinction between Aromanians and Romanians, however (Raksieva [undated paper]). Among Aromanians, Romanian is seen as "cognate" language, with terms like *stâna*, *koliba, vatra*, *focul viu* of the Aromanian herding vocabulary in Rhodopes (Raksieva, 1997) as identical with the Romanian ones in the Carpathian pastoralism. The seasonal planning of transhumance is another shared trait of Aromanian and Romanian herders (Vuia, 1964), whereas the Aromanian traditional cartage in the Balkans (Atanassova, 1999) is similar to the colportage economy that the Romanian transhumant herders developed in first half of 19th century, between Wallachia and Southern Transylvania (Constantinescu-Mirceşti, 1976). The Aromanian exonymic term for Romanians is alternatelly *Mucan* in Bulgaria (Raksieva [undated paper]) and also in Dobroudzha (Iosif, 2009).

In the Rhodopes and in Dobrudzha as well, the Aromanians are generally conservative with their ancient dialect, which, as "the tongue of grandfathers"

(Raksieva, 1997 [undated paper]), they regard as a basic marker of self-identification and a source of ethnic consciousness (Plecadite, 2010); in both regions, however, Aromanian younger generations actually accept Bulgarian and Romanian language acculturation (Raksieva [undated paper]; Plecadite, 2010). Polyglossia in the command of Bulgarian, Turkish, Greek (Raksieva, 1997b), and Romanian (Plecadite, 2010) is a linguistic proficiency equally reported among Aromanians in Bulgaria and in Romania. Another Aromanian traditional trait – ethnic endogamy – is still reported as *vocea sângelui* (blood voice)(Iosif, 2009) and as their "identity strategy" (Plecadite, 2010), concomitantly with newer exogamic orientation – towards Bulgarians in the Rhodopes (Atanassova, 1999; Gossiaux 2008) and Romanians in Dobrudzha (Plecadite, 2010). On a further referential ground, the Aromanians are recognized for their entrepreneurial esprit in the commerce and industry of Sofia (Gossiaux, 2008) and Constanța (Iosif, 2009).

A series of ethnographic traits are mostly reported for older Aromanian generations, and they are not echoed in current accounts on the language or livelihood of both Vlachs and Romanians, such as – in Romania – the Aromanian kinship structures (*taifa*, *soia*, *fumelia*, and intergenerational godparenthood among Aromanians in Constanța [Iosif, 2009] and in Mihail Kogălniceanu village [Șerban, 2009b]), as well as – in Bulgaria – the Aromanian community organization of *fălcare*, and the traditional leadership of *chelniks* and *kehajas* (Raksieva, 1997; Atanassova, 1999; Gossiaux, 2008). Some details on the Aromanian folk religion (fictive burials of the decesead next to the *stâna* [Raksieva, 1997], the women's Christian tatooing [Atanassova 1999; Gossiaux, 2008]), as well as on their current ethnic revitalization as a minority in this country (Raksieva [undated paper]; Atanassova, 1999; Gossiaux, 2008) – are further distinctive marks of Aromanian in Bulgaria.

Vlachs in Bulgaria are mainly reported today in northeastern areas (Silistra and Dobrich) and mostly the Danubian localities of Kula, Lom-Palanka, Pleven, Rahovo, Ruse, Oryahovo, Svishtov, Vidin (Vaseva, 1999), as well as Vinarovo, Florentin, Leskovec, Selanovci, Gorna Vidin, Sofronievo (Grebenarova, 2006); see Annex no. 9. While in the Bulgarian 1992 census, Vlachs are estimated at a number of 5.199 (Vaseva, 1999), in the 2001 census their number in Varna region is 3.620, while decreasing to 1.066 in Veliko Tarnovo, and to 940 in Razgrad. Historical roots of Vlachs in Bulgaria are traced back to late 18th century and first half of 19th century, with the flight of compact rural groups of rural populations from feudal exploitation in Phanariot Wallachia, and from the Statute Organic conscription in 1830s; in late 19th century, 11.708 of 86.000 Vlachs on record in late 19th Bulgaria were born North Danube (Vaseva, 1999).

Alongside the above-cited exonymes vis-à-vis Aromanians and Karakachans, Vlachs in the past were also designated in terms of *Vuleni* or *Dolentsi* ("lowlanders") in Vidin region, *Kumpeni* or *Polyantsi* ("valley residents") in western villages of the same area, and *Pudoureni* or *Goryani* ("mountain

residents”) next to the Serbian border; further known ethnonyms – standing for the Vlachs’ trans-Danubian origin – were those of *Ungureni* (in Timok: migrants from the Habsburg Banat and from Transylvania), and *Tarani* (in Timok and Vidin: migrants from Wallachia)(Vaseva, 1999). Intraethnic distinctions are made by Vlachs in regard to the “poorer” Romanians, the “diligent” Vlachs from the valley Danube areas, and the “economically backward” Vlachs in mountainous Timok (Vaseva, 1999).

In Bulgarian regions, Vlachs mostly live together with Bulgarians, Turks, and Roma. Ethnographic reports focus on the Vlachs’ complex relationships with the Bulgarian ethnic majority. Within such shared experience of ethnicity, heterogamy is to an important extent instrumental. Intraethnic endogamy with Romanians from beyond Danube is also accounted for (in the Oryahovo villages)(Vaseva, 1999), but it is the Vlachs’ marriages with Bulgarians that bear interethnic significance. Bulgarians are said to appreciate their Vlach in-laws (due to the Vlach women’s housekeeping good reputation) and, in their turn, the Vlachs see mixed marriage with Bulgarians as a status symbol of their family, unlike either marriages with Roma and Turks (Vaseva, 1999).

The Vlachs define their mother tongue as a “cultural value inherited from the ancestors”; they acknowledge similarities and differences from the Romanian language, which among them is a “standard of purity” and known in both spoken and written forms (Vaseva, 1999). However, in context of “lexical heterogeneity”, with the abundant use of Bulgarian, Vlach is mostly spoken by elderly Vlachs only, while middle-aged Vlachs are bilingual, and youth understands and speaks Vlach at home (Vaseva, 1999). The pan-Vlach rite of *pomana de viu*, as performed “both for the living and for the dead” is similarly described as “coming from our forefathers” (Grebenarova, 2006); even though Bulgarian coexisting people disavow the Vlach “wedding-like” *pomeni* for the living, they are also mentioned among Romanians in Oltenia and Banat (Radovanovic, 1930; Zecevic, 1967; Vaseva, 1993 *apud* Grebenarova, 2006) and in Eastern Serbia as well (Zecevic, 1967 *apud* Grebenarova, 2006).

The above-discussed information is rather concludent about the Aromanians and Vlachs ethnographic individualities, than about any common cultural configuration of them. On the one hand, Aromanians are analogous with their coexisting ethnic neigbours in pastoral livelihood and kinship patterns (with Karakachans), and in intermarriage (with Bulgarians)(Orthodoxy is here a common denominator for Aromanians, Karakachans, Bulgarians, Greeks, and Roma). Polyglossia and ethnic exogamy are additional insignias of Aromanian interferences with such other ethnicities in Southeastern Europe. The cluster of pastoral similarities between Aromanians and Romanians is probably originated into the ancient (early Middle Ages) herding specialization of Romanic populace in Southeastern Europe, rather than into late Middle-Ages or modern historical contacts between the two neo-Latin groups (Aromanian rural colonization in

interwar Dobroudzha was a politically-driven fact, with no implications over Romanian pastoralism). Aromanians from Rhodopes and Aromanians from Dobroudzha share main homologies in their dialect, awareness of ethno-regional origins, and entrepreneurship, while maintaining within each of the two areas their particularities in kinship and social organization, economy, folk religion, and ethno-cultural revival.

None of these traits appears to have somewhat interdependently developed between Aromanians and Vlachs (as autonomously transmitted, Orthodoxy and language conservatism are analogies between the two latinophone groups). Instead, the Vlach ancestral consciousness of their transborder origin and rite performance, together with their endogamic orientation – are homologous with the Romanian cultural identity. Processes commonly lived by Vlachs and Romanians in their early modern history arguably indicate the same ethnic development in Southwestern Oltenia, Banat, and Northern Bulgaria (which does not also account for the Romanized subgroups beyond Danube and in Timok).

In retrospect, two intraethnic branchings can be assessed among the Latinophone groups in Romania and in Bulgaria, one of which between the areas of Rhodopi and Dobroudzha, and the other, between Oltenia, Banat, Vidin, Vraca, Pleven...) While these branchings bridge subgroups of Aromanians, on the one hand, and Romanians/Vlachs, on the other, they cannot be referred to *one* contemporary Romanian ethnicity in Southeastern Europe. Classic heritages (Latin language, Orthodoxy) are not in this case accompanied by recent-historical and ethnographic equivalencies.

CATHOLICS

The Catholic ethno-confessional group in Bulgaria is located in Rhodopi and in the Plovdiv area (the villages of General Nikolaevo, Sekirovo and Parchevich, [Boncheva, 2006]), with the Plovdiv-Sofia Exarchate, in Svishtov and in Nikopol Exarchate, in North Central Bulgaria, with a total number of Bulgarian Catholics of 49.740, according to the 1992 census (Bokova, 1999). Transborder communities of Bulgarian Catholics live also in Banat and in Bucharest (Bokova, 1999), with rural subgroups – Cioplea and Popeşti-Leordeni – retrospectively identified in close vicinity of Bucharest, having been founded beginning with late 18th century by Catholics from Nikopol (Vaseva, 2012). The size of Bulgarian Catholic community in Romania can be approximated in accordance with national census data about the Bulgarian minority in Romania (for instance, in 2002: 5.562 in Timiş County, 819 in Arad County, 658 in Dâmbovitsa County, and 370 in Bucharest), which also account for Bulgarian Orthodox subgroups in Dudeşti, Aluniş, Măgurele (near Bucharest), and Băleni (near Târgovişte)(Vaseva, 2012). Further ethnographic research among the descendants of Bulgarian migrants to Bucharest surroundings

associate the Dudeşti people with the villages of Sliven and Karnobat, and the Cioplea ones – with Svishtov (Larionescu, 2006).

In the above-described areas, Catholics coexist with main groups of Turks, Roma, Russians, and Armenians (in Plovdiv), with Turks, Roma, and Vlachs (in Veliko Tarnovo), with Turks and Roma (in Pleven), and with Romanians and Roma (in the Bucharest rural hinterland).

Catholic Bulgarian is the ethnonym and endonym of this population, whose religion and (Bulgarian) ethnicity are described as "main markers of collective identity"; the existence of a *Paulician* dialect in Rhodopi is another argument for the ethno-religious identity of Catholics and their descent from the Vatican-led 16th and 17th centuries conversion of Paulicians in villages around Svishtov and in Plovdiv area, with a *Custodia Bulgaria* and a Archbishopric in Sofia also covering Wallachia, in 1643 (Bokova, 1999). Among contemporary generations in Cioplea and Dudeşti neighborhoods in Bucharest, the usage of Bulgarian dialect is mentioned to have significantly decreased, with local conservation of *coleda*, the Bulgarian traditional texts of Christmas carols (Larionescu, 2006). A "spirit of memorialization" is recognizable in the preservation of Catholics' old prayer books, and also in the transmission of their songs in Banat dialect ("incomprehensible to their performers, but even the youngest know the tunes"), as well as of Latin songs among Catholic settles in Bucharest (Bokova, 1999).

Further distinctive traits of the Bulgarian Catholics are found in their kinship organization. Within subgroup "relative insularity" in Plovdiv, Banat, or Bucharest (Bokova, 1999), Catholics have traditionally maintained their confessional endogamy, with (for instance) no marriages established between Catholic and Orthodox Bulgarian settlers from around Bucharest, due to their different religious affiliation (Vaseva, 2012; Larionescu, 2006); endogamy is also reported to have contributed to the preservation of Bulgarian ethnic identity in Northern Danube, in spite of their citizen recording as "Romanian" in the late 20th century censues (Larionescu, 2006). Catholic both core and extended families emphasized the patrilineal and matrilineal uncle role in taking care of his nephew, and the patrilineal and matrilineal aunt, of her niece – until the mid of the 20th century (Bokova, 1999). Another intergenerational pattern among Bulgarian Catholics is reported within their exogamy (in Plovdiv) with co-ethnic Orthodox people, as a "continuity" between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law (as former Eastern Orthodox Christians) (Boncheva, 2006).

Inter-confessional marriages were engaged (in the interwar period and under socialism) between Bulgarian Catholic and Orthodox believers in Plovdiv area, most widespread of which being those between Catholics and Eastern Orthodox Christians adopting Catholicism, in the dominance of Catholic man – Orthodox woman marriages, of a patrilocal residence and a patrilineal inheritance, and with upbringing of the offspring dependent on the religion of the father (Boncheva, 2006). Catholic-Orthodox intermarriages have similarly been reported (since the

1960s) in Bacău County (Moldavia), with one of the spouses (Hungarian and Romanian) accepting the other one's faith, and with a "numerical equilibrium" of local Catholic and Orthodox marital unions (Şerban, 2004). Local particularities occur in Plovdiv hypergamy for many Orthodox orphan or poor maidens marrying Catholic men (Boncheva, 2006), and in the new baptism for Catholics marrying Orthodoxes (due to the non-recognition by the Orthodox Church of Catholic baptism [Şerban, 2004]).

In Romania, while in 1899 a Catholic priest organized a dairy farm in Cioplea (Bucharest), Church "St. Virgin Mary" is one of the last remains of local Bulgarian Catholics; in the Catholic villages, vegetable growing and gardening will persisted in socialism, and still after 1989, with gardening as the main occupation of Bulgarian settlers (Vaseva, 2012). Gardening among Catholic (and Orthodox) Bulgarians in Wallachia is synchronic with the Bulgarian gardening in Drăguşeni village (Southern Moldavia) with Bulgarians originating in Tarnovo and launching their farming and market development between late 1800s and 1950s (Geacu, Duşan, 2004).

To conclude, a Catholic intra-confessional (and Bulgarian ethnic) continuum may be assesed for Plovdiv, Northern Bulgaria, Bucharest, and Banat subgroups, with homologous characteristics of Catholic historical origins, faith, rite, ethnonym, marriage and kinship patterns. While isolate traits also arise (hypergamy in Plovdiv, gardening specialisation among subgroups in Northern Bulgaria and in Bucharest), they do not dissolve the Bulgarian Catholics' basically ethno-religious identity (which is also confirmed within the Catholic confessional conservatism in cases of exogamy, and within the Catholic – Orthodox hypergamy). Of their ethno-confessional core, the Bulgarian language (except the *Paulician* dialect, however) is apparently the only trait that the Catholic subgroups share with the other coexisting ethnicities in either Bulgaria and Romania. As for the inter-confessional marriage similarities between Bulgarian and Moldavian Catholics, the Bulgarian Catholics are again more conservative when compared to the balance of Catholic-and-Orthodox intermarriages in Moldavia.

LIPOVANS/OLD BELIEVERS (NEKRASOVTSY)

Of the 23 487 Russian-speaking *lipoveni de rit vechi* (the Orthodox Ancient Rite) officially recorded (in 2011) in Romania, the largest group lives in Dobrudzha (16.350 in Tulcea County, and 5.273 in Constanța County), while further important subgroups are also reported for Suceava County (2.543), Iaşi (3.586), Brăila (3.499), and Bucharest (1.141). The current ethnographic distribution of Dobrudzhan Lipovans is associated with the cities of Tulcea, Constanța, and Năvodari, as well as with the villages of Mahmudia, Periprava, Cardon, Mila 23, 2 Mai, Vama Veche, Sarichioi, Enisala, Jurilovca, Ghindăreşti,

Carcaliu, Slava Rusă, Slava Cercheză etc. (Erolova, 2013; Constantin, 2003, 2012a).

As distinguished from the rest of the 9.978 Russians, as recorded during the Bulgarian 2001 census, two only *Nekrasovtsy* villages (also self-defined as *Old Believers*) are identified in Bulgaria, namely Kazashko (in Varna District) and Tataritza (in Silistra District). In these cases, Russian-speaking Old Believers have been estimated at 400 people in Kazashko, and 600 in Tataritsa (Anastassova, 1999), with an overall number of 700–800 people (Erolova, 2013).

In both countries, alongside Romanian and Bulgarian majorities, the Lipovans/Old Believers are part of local ethnic mosaics together with Turks and Roma (in the counties of Constanța and Tulcea; the districts of Silistra and Varna), Tatars (Constanța and Silistra), Ukrainians (Tulcea and Suceava); the Greeks (Tulcea), Poles and Germans (Suceava), Armenians and Vlachs (Varna) are further groups populating the same areas as the Old Believers, and also the Gypsies accompany them in the counties of Iaşi and Brăila. While Lipovans make relatively homogenous communities in Sarichioi village (3.722 Lipovans in comparison with 370 Romanians, in 2002) and Carcaliu (2.780 Lipovans and 326 Romanians [Capoți *et al*., 2009]), their number diminishes in other locations of Lipovan/Nekrasovtsy origins (2.330 Lipovans and 2.837 Romanians in 2002 Jurilovca)(see also Kazashko with Bulgarians as many as 50% of local population [Anastassova, 1999]).

In Dobrudzha, the Ancient-Rite Lipovans most often identify themselves as (*Russian*) *Lipovan* (Jurilovca and Sarichioi villages [Constantin, 2003]); situations of a "hesitant self-definition", however, may occur (for instance *Russian*, *Russian-Lipovani*, *Russian-Staroveri* in Carcaliu village [Capoți *et al*., 2009]). *Staroveri* are also reported as the Lipovans' ethnonym in Roman town (Bacău County, Moldavia)(Flenchea, 2009), while in Mahmudia village (Tulcea County) they divide themselves between *Popovtsi* (priestly faction), *Bespopovtsi* (priestless faction), and still the *Nemolyatsi* (with deeper liturgic apartness)(Titov, 2009). The same intra-confessional schism is reported in Northern Dobrudzha for the *Bespopovtsi* villages of Slava Rusă, Slava Cercheză, and Sarichioi, as well as in Bulgaria, among *Popovtsi* or *Lipovans* in Tataritsa, and *Bespopovtsi* (Nekrasovtsy) in Kazashko (Erolova, 2013; Anastassova, 1999). Language is another self-identifying trait among Old Believers, which (in Jurilovca and Sarichioi) describe it as "our Lipovan speech", "Slavonic", and "Russian" as well; Jurilovca villagers also claim the "300 years archaism" of their language, in comparison with contemporary Russian (Constantin, 2012a). The Lipovans' language conservatism (for instance, in Roman town [Flenchea, 2009]) is also asserted with their ritual use of Ancient Church Slavonic in Dobrudzha [Capoți *et al*. 2009] and in Northeastern Bulgaria as well (Anastassova, 1999). On the other hand, across Lipovan/Nekrasovtsy subgroups, bilinguism is equally reported, with the usage of Bulgarian (Tataritsa and Kazashko) and Romanian (in Jurilovca, Sarichioi etc.),

and still, in multiethnicity context, with the “linguistic interference” between Lipovani, Romanians, and Turks in Mahmudia (Titov, 2009).

Religion is what makes the Lipovans/Old Believers’ core identity in Romania and in Bulgaria as well. In both countries, their community is definitely felt as an *ancient-rite* confession, according to which the arhetype established by God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Apostles is to be reproduced in liturgy (as a piety ideal also related to the Old Believers’ collective eschatology), as it took place before the 17th century reform of Russian Church, with the *Lipovan/Nekrasovtsy* excommunication by the cannonical Orthodoxy, and with their migration to Southeastern Europe (Anastassova, 1999; Erolova, 2013; Constantin, 2013b). With the recognition of Russian Old Orthodox Church by some *Bespopovtsi* from Slava Rusă, Slava Cercheză, Sarichioi, Mahmudia, and Kazashko, they implicitely acknowledge the Russian priests’ authority (Erolova, 2013). In Roman town, whereas the Lipovans generally preserve their ancient church and liturgy, some members of the local community are mentioned with their recent neo-Protestant conversion (Flenchea, 2009).

In remembering their origins, the Old Believers in Kazashko village evoke the River Don Cossacks and the fighting led by *ataman* Ignat Nekrasov with his 5 000 Old Believer rebels, (1660–1737), against Peter the Great (Anastassova, 1999; Erolova, 2013). According to vernacular accounts in Jurilovca, the Lipovan exodus from Russia is dated back to the 17th century, while the Lipovan founding of local village is eponymically associated with *Jurban*, their founding ancestor (Constantin, 2012b, 2013b).

While in Romania, the *Popovtsi* belong to the diocese of the Ancient-Rite Orthodox Church of Belaya Krinitza (Brăila County), and the local *Bezpopovtzi* refuse such affiliation, intra-group marriages are reported (after the 1950s) between *Popovtsi* and *Bezpopovtzi* in Bulgaria (Erolova, 2013). In the context of geographic isolation in Danube Delta, the interwar and still postwar endogamy in the village of Mila 23 village is associated with a higher morbidity of local Lipovan population (Istrate, Bălteanu, 1998). In contrast to the local persistence of ethnic endogamy among Lipovani in Mahmudia (Titov, 2009) and Tataritsa (Anastassova, 1999), but still kept within an Ancient-Rite confessional endogamy, interethnic marriages increasingly occur between Lipovani and Romanians in Jurilovca (as well as in Carcaliu [Capoți *et al.*, 2009]); Old Believers marrying Bulgarians are reported in Kazashko (Erolova, 2013).

Lipovans in Jurilovca and Sarichioi have intergenerationally transmitted their traditional fishing specialization, which they (as well as neighboring Ukrainian fishermen) still exert under contemporary ecology legislation, within the “Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve” as well as in the Black Sea western coast waters (Bell *et al.*, 2004; Constantin, 2012a). As a “main livelihood” resource, fishing is similarly described for the Nekrasovtsy in Tataritsa and Kazashko, in the Bulgarian maritime and river fleet (Anastassovam, 1999).

In the current ethnographic reports, some Lipovan/Old Believers' characteristics are also encountered to show no verifiable equivalency in one or another of the neighboring countries. Thus, the Lipovans' ancestor worship (Archpriest, Avaacum, now sanctified, in Jurilovca, Constantin, 2013b), their folk arts and artifacts (ethnic costumes and cuisine in Jurilovca and in Carcaliu [Capoți *et al*., 2009; Constantin, 2013b], as well as their ethnic costumes and architecture in Mahmudia, Titov, 2009) are not similarly reflected – probably due to the Old Believers' lower demographic presence in Bulgaria – among the *Lipoveni* and *Nekrasovtsy* from Tataritsa and Kazashko. Again, neither the Lipovani's early recognition in Romanian citizenship (1866)(Flenchea, 2009), nor their political representativeness in Romania (Erolova, 2013) – are correspondingly reported for Old Believers in Bulgaria. On the other hand, the resettlement of half of the Old Believer population in Tataritsa and Kazashko to the regions of Kuban, Herson, and Odessa, with the establishment of communist regime in Bulgaria (Erolova, 2013), has no comparable counterpart in any mass migration of Lipovans from Romania to the U.S.S.R.

As the Lipovans/Old Believers/*Nekrasovtsy* are territorialy dispersed from Northern Moldavia to Eastern Bulgaria, their regional subgrouping expectedly argues for further intra-ethnic variation (see the ethnographic particularities of Northern Dobrudzhan Old Believers). However, drawing on the above-discussed historical, linguistic, and ethnographic aspects, the (Russian) Lipovans in Romania appear to share important traits with the Lipovans and *Nekrasovtsy* in Bulgaria – especially in their ethno-confessional ethnonymic and liturgical self-identification, in their ethno-history and ethnic endogamy, and in their livelihood specialisation. When bilingualism and interethnic exogamy are reported, such facts generally account for the Old Believer adaptation to the ethno-cultural polymorphism of Southeastern Europe, rather than for any assimilation within the Romanian or Bulgarian majority populations. (With the Old Believers' Southern Russian dialectal persistence and with their ethno-religious identity preserved in cases of intermarriages, they still promote their group distinctiveness, which is no longer intact with only their – quite irregular, however – religious conversion).

CONCLUSIONS

Accounting for the great ethno-linguistic and confessional diversity and variability in Southeastern Europe, *cultural belongingness* in the 1990s and 2000s Romania and Bulgaria is continously lived as an experience of coexistence. When enclavization occurs, it never and nowhere takes forms of a total isolation and exclusiveness among ethnic groups from the two countries. Again, despite recurrent cases of interethnic or inter-confessional marriages, ethnic identification continues to be relevant within its very multicultural (regional or urban)

contextualization. While autohtony and citizenship are expressed through a national majority terminology, phenomena of transborder ethnicity, diaspora, and ethnic revitalization are reasserting elements of folk culture, intergenerational community networks, and generally a traditionally-rooted sense of ethnicity. On the other hand, the national and civic adaptation of ethnicity takes place as a majority – minority dialectics, within a transnational (European) legislative framework, and – in accordance with the political activism of one or another ethnic group – with ethnicization as an intelectually-sustained development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ALEKSIEV, BOZHIDAR; DOBROVA, DOROTEYA; LOZANOVA, GALINA (2012). Folklore and Traditional Feasts. In: Anthony Georgieff, Bozhidar Aleksiev, Dimana Trankova, Doroteya 2. Dobrova, Galina Lozanova, Ivanka Vlaeva, Orlin Sabev, Radko Popov, Yordanka Bibina eds. (2012): *The Turks of Bulgaria*, Vagabond Media Ltd., p. 89–128.
3. ANASTASSOVA, EKATERINA (1999). Nekrasovtsy Old Believers. In: Anna Krasteva ed. (1999), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, Ravenna, p. 209–219.
4. ATANASSOVA, KATYA (1999). Aromanians. In: Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, Ravenna, p. 125–136.
5. BACHVAROV, MARIN (1997). The current ethnic panorama in Bulgaria, *GeoJournal*, 43 (3), p. 215–224.
6. BARA, MARIA (2006). Relații interetnice dintre creştinii ortodocşi şi musumani în Dobrogea. Studiu de caz: Medgidia şi Cobadin, *Philologica Jassyensia*, An II, Nr. 1, p. 93–104.
7. BELL, SANDRA (project leader); HAMPSHIRE, KATE; PALMER, JOY; OUGHTON, ELIZABETH; RUSSELL, ANDREW plus collaborators from Finland, Greece, Lithuania, and Romania (2004). *Integrated Management of European Wetlands*, Final Report, Department of Anthropology of the University of Durham.
8. BOBU-FLORESCU, FLOREA (1956). Portul popular la huțuli, *Caiete de artă populară: portul popular din Moldova de Nord*, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, Bucureşti, p. 25–28.
9. BOKOVA, IRENA (1999). Catholics. In: Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, Ravenna, p. 137–147.
10. BONCHEVA, TSVETANA (2006). Religion within the context of the marital bans among the Bulgarian Catholics from the region of Plovdiv during the first half of the 20th century, *Ethnologia Bulgarica*, Vol. 3, p. 113–127.
11. BOSCOBOINIK, ANDREA; GIORDANO, CHRISTIAN (2008). Roles, Statuses, Positions Social Categories and Multiples Identities of Roma in Romania. In: Christiano Giordano, Andrea Boscoboinik, Mihai Curelaru, Sorin Gog, Adrian Neculau, Teodor Nițu, François Ruegg, Daniela Tarnovschi, Daniela Zaharia, *Roma's Identites in Southeast Europe: Romania*, EthnoBarometer, Rome, p. 7–23.
12. BULUT TURE, DENIZ (2008). At the Intersection of Borders and Ethnicity: A Case Study Of The Pomaks, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the MPSA Annual National Conference, Palmer House Hotel, Hilton, Chicago, April 3, 2008.
13. CAMPBELL, JAMES K. (1964). *Honour, Family, and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Value in a Greek Mountain Community*, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford.
14. CAPOȚI, ISABELA; CĂTANĂ, ODETA; CULESCU, MIHAI; EVANGHELIE, ROXANA; SĂDEAN, ILEANA (2009). Carcaliu – sat de vacanță. In: Bogdan Iancu (ed.), *Dobrogea. Identități şi crize*, Colecția *Societatea reală* (5), Editura Paideia, Bucureşti, p. 79–93.

15. CHANG, CLAUDIA; TOURTELLOTTE, PERRY A. (1993). Ethnoarchaeological Survey of Pastoral Transhumance Sites in the Grevena Region, Greece, *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 20, p. 249–264.
16. CHELCEA, LIVIU; LĂȚEA, PUIU (2000). *România profundă în comunism. Dileme identitare, istorie locală şi economie secundară la Sântana*, Editura Nemira, Bucureşti.
17. CHIRIȚOIU, ANA; ȚUGUI-IONESCU, RĂZVAN (2009). Regimuri etnice din Dobrogea. In: Bogdan Iancu (ed.), *Dobrogea. Identități şi crize*, Colecția *Societatea Reală* (5), Editura Paideia, Bucureşti, p. 41–67.
18. CIUBOTARU, ION H. (2009). Catolicii din Moldova şi universul culturii lor populare, *Revista de Etnografie şi Folclor/Journal of Ethnography and Folklore*, 1–2, p. 135–161.
19. CONSTANTIN, MARIN (2003). The Folk Artisans and Their Work: From Socialism to Market Economy. A Field Research in Five Ethnographic Areas of Romania, *Southeastern Europe/L 'Europe de Sud-Est*, 30/2003, p. 75–107.
20. CONSTANTIN, MARIN (2012a). On the Ethnographic Categorization of Biodiversity in the Danube Delta "Biosphere Reserve", *Eastern European Countryside*, 18, 2012, p. 49–60.
21. CONSTANTIN, MARIN (2012b). Ethno-historical traditions among the minority ethnic groups in the 2000s Romania, *Études Balkaniques*, 1, 2012, p. 26–42.
22. CONSTANTIN, MARIN (2013a). Dimensiunea etno-culturală a cetățeniei în legislația contemporană a Uniunii Europene şi a României (1992–2012), *Sociologie românească*, XI (1), p. 116–132.
23. CONSTANTIN, MARIN (2013b). Ethnogenesis and ethnomorphosis in the ethno-cultural variability of Romania, *Revista de etnografie şi folclor / Journal of Ethnography and Folklore*, 1–2, p. 173–196.
24. CONSTANTINESCU-MIRCEŞTI, C. (1976). *Păstoritul transhumant şi implicațiile lui în Transilvania şi Țara Românească în secolele XVIII–XIX*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti.
25. ELCHINOVA, MAGDALENA (2001). Ethnic discourse and group presentation in modern Bulgarian society, *Development and Society*, 30 (1), p. 51–78.
26. ELCHINOVA, MAGDALENA (2002). In Statu Nascendi: Anthropology in Bulgaria. In: Peter Skalník (ed.), *The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology, 2, Roman Míšek SET OUT, Prague, p. 23–41.
27. EMINOV, ALI (2007). Social Construction of Identities: Pomaks in Bulgaria, *Journal on Ethnopolitics & Minority Issues in Europe*, Vol. 6 Issue 2, Special section, p. 1–25.
28. EROLOVA, YELIS (2013). An ethnological study of the Crimean Tatars, Roma/Gypsies and Old Believers in Northern and Southern Dobrudzha, *Journal of Ethnography and Folklore*, 1–2, "Constantin Brăiloiu" Institute of Ethnography and Folkore, Bucureşti, p. 237–259.
29. FLENCHEA, PETRU (2009). Municipiul Roman: interferențe etnice şi confesionale – ruşii lipoveni şi romii, mentalități în schimbare. In: Adrian Majuru (ed.), *Conferința națională de antropologie urbană*, ediția I, Roman, 23–25 septembrie 2009, Editura Papirus Media, Bucureşti, p. 319–330.
30. GEANĂ, GHEORGHIȚĂ (2002). Anthropology's Long Journey to Professionalization. Some Problems with Cultural Anthropology in Romania. In: Peter Skalník (ed.), *The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology, 2, Roman Míšek SET OUT, Prague, p. 93–113.
31. GEACU, SORIN; STOIAN, DUŞAN (2004). Grădinăritul într-un sat din sudul Moldovei – Drăguşeni (jud. Galați), *Sociologie românească*, II (4), p. 268–277.
32. GEORGIEVA, TSVETANA (1999). Pomaks: Muslim Bulgarians. In: Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, Ravenna, p. 221-238.
33. GIORDANO, CHRISTIAN; BOSCOBOINIK, ANDREA (2003). Introduction. In: Christian Giordano, Andrea Boscoboinik, Dobrinka Kostova, Milena Benovska-Sabkova, Annabel Chanteraud (eds.), *Roma's Identities in Southeast Europe: Bulgaria*, ETHNOBAROMETER, Officinestampa, Rome, p. 15–29.

34. GREBENAROVA, SLAVKA (1998). The 'Other World' for Bulgarians and Vlachs: Illusion, Hope or Goal, *Ethnologia Bulgarica*, Ethnographic Institute and Museum, Bulgarian Academy of Science, Vol. 1 (43), p. 43–52.
35. GREKOVA, MAYA (1999). Everyday notions of *minority*. In: Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, Ravenna, p. 95–110.
36. GOSSIAUX, JEAN-FRANÇOIS (2008). Valaques et/ou Aroumains en Bulgarie: ethnonyme et politique. In: Gilles de Rapper, Pierre Sintès (avec la collaboration de Kira Kaurinkauski), *Nommer et classer dans les Balkans*, Ecole Française d'Athènes, Athènes, p. 63–71.
37. IORDACHI, CONSTANTIN (2009). Politics of citizenship in post-communist Romania: Legal traditions, restitution of nationality and multiple memberships. In: Rainer Bauböck, Bernhard Perching, Wiebke Sievers (eds.), *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*, Extended and updated edition, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, p. 177–209.
38. IOSIF, CORINA (2009). *L'entreprise de la parenté. Réseaux d'échanges entre les Aroumains de Constanța*, Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca.
39. ISTRATE, MARIA; BĂLTEANU, ANA CEZARINA (1998). Evoluția indicelui de endogamie în două comunități din Delta Dunării. Sesiunea științifică a Institutului de Cercetare şi Proiectare Delta Dunării, Tulcea, 12–14 mai 1998.
40. IZVORSKA, ANA (2006). Varying concepts of Bulgarianhood and their reflection on the perceptions of ethnic minorities in Bulgaria. In: Slobodan G. Markovich, Eric Becket Weaver and Vukasin Pavlovic (eds.), *Problems of Identities in the Balkans*, Anglo-Serbian Society, Belgrade and Dosije Press, p. 139–154.
41. KALIONSKI, ALEXEI (2007). How to be Karakachan in Bulgaria? Centre for Advanced Study Sofia Working Paper Series, Sofia Academic Nexus Program, Issue 1, *How to Think about the Balkans: Culture, Region, Identity*, p. 3–23.
42. KOVALCSIK, KATALIN (2007). Gurbane as a representation of traditional identity and culture in an Oltenian Rudar community. In: Biljana Sikimić, Petko Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, Belgrad, p. 109–136.
43. LARIONESCU, SANDA (2006), Cartierul Titan – Balta Albă. In: Sanda Larionescu (ed.), *Relații de vecinătate în localități urbane din sudul țării*, Editura Paideia, Bucureşti, p. 19–88.
44. MIHĂILESCU, VINTILĂ (2007). Autochtonism and National Ethnology in Romania. CAS Working Paper Series, Center for Advanced Study Sofia.
45. NIC CRAITH, MÁIRÉAD (2004). Culture and citizenship in Europe. Questions for anthropologists, *Social Anthropology. Journal of the European Association of Social Anthropologists*, 12 (3), p. 289–300.
46. NJAGULOV, BLAGOVEST (2006). Les minorités « reciproques » en Bulgarie et en Roumanie à l'époque actuelle : similitudes et divergences, *Etudes Balkaniques*, XLIII, 1, p. 3–7.
47. PIMPIREVA, JENIA (1999). *Karakachans in Bulgaria*, Second edition, IMIR, Sofia.
48. PLECADITE, CRISTINA (2010). Repere identitare ale aromânilor din Constanța. In : Stelu Şerban (ed.), *Teme în antropologia socială din Europa de sud-est*, Editura Paideia, Bucureşti, p. 256–282.
49. RAKŠIEVA, SVETLA (1997). The Nomadic Aromunians' Concept of a Territory Under Control, *Ethnologia Balkanica*, Vol. I, p. 196–204.
50. RAKŠIEVA, SVETLA (Undated paper). Roots of Ethnic Identity of Arumanians in Bulgaria, *Proiect Avdhela. Biblioteca Culturii Aromâne*, Editura Predania, Bucureşti (15 pages).
51. SLAVKOVA, MAGDALENA (2005). Rudari u istočnoj Bugarskoj i jevanđeljski pokret (Rudari group in the Eastern Bulgaria and the Evangelical movement). In: Сикимић, Б. (уредн.). Бањаши на Балкану. Идентитет етничке заједнице. Beograd: Српска Академија Наука и Уметности, Балканолошки Институт „САНУ", p. 277–294.
52. SMILOV, DANIEL; JILEVA, ELENA (2009). The politics of Bulgarian citizenship: National identity, democracy and other uses. In: Rainer Bauböck, Bernhard Perching, Wiebke Sievers (eds.), *Citizenship Policies in the New Europe*, Extended and updated edition, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, p. 211–246.

53. ŞERBAN, STELU (2004). Catolici şi ortodocşi în Moldova: aspecte ideologice şi sociale în sate mixte confesional, *Sociologie românească*, II (1), p. 117–140.
54. ŞERBAN, STELU (2007). Local Politics and Multiculturalism in Southeastern Europe, *Revue des Études Sud-est Européennes*, XLV, 1–4, 2007, p. 393–406.
55. ŞERBAN, STELU (2009a). Local Institutions and Multicultural Identities. Aromanians in Mihail Kogălniceanu Commune, Constanţa, *Martor. The Museum of Romanian Peasant Anthropology Museum*, Vol. 24: Patrimony and Local Identity, p. 49–62.
56. ŞERBAN, STELU (2009b). Catolicii din Moldova. Identitate civică şi istorie orală, *Sfera politicii. Revistă de ştiinţe politice*, Fundaţia Societatea Civică (ed.), XVII, 138, p. 52–58.
57. TITOV, IULIANA (2009). Rolul comunicării în relaţia populaţie majoritară – populaţie minoritară. Studiu de caz: relaţia dintre români şi ruşii lipoveni din Mahmudia. In: Adrian Majuru (ed.), *Conferinţa naţională de antropologie urbană*, ediţia I, Roman, 23–25 septembrie 2009, Editura Papirus Media, Bucureşti, p. 306–318.
58. TODOROVA, MARIA (2004). Introduction: Learning Memory, Remembering Identity. In: Maria Todorova (ed.), *Balkan Identities. Nation and Memory*, Hurst & Company, London, p. 1–24.
59. VASEVA, VALENTINA (1999). Vlachs. In: Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Longo Editore Ravenna, 1999, Ravenna, p. 315–329.
60. TUTUNAROV-TRAJANOV, HRISTO (2011). Cultural diversity and identities in process of European integration. In: Stoyan Denchev, Bashkim Rama, Dimitar Ivanov, Maxim Mizov, Georgeta Nazarska (eds.), *Ethnic and Religious Tolerance. Civil Society in South East Europe*, Publishing House За буквите – О писменехъ, Sofia, p. 266–274.
61. VUIA, ROMULUS (1964). *Tipuri de păstorit la români*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti.

Annex no. 1

THE ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHIC EVOLUTION OF ROMANIA (1992–2011)[1]

Ethnic groups	*Population in 1992*	*Population percent in 1992*	*Population in 2002*	*Population percent in 2002*	*Population in 2011*	*Population percent in 2011*
Romanians	20,408.542	89,5%	19,399.597	89,5%	16,792.868	88,9%
Hungarians	1,624.959	7,1%	1,431.807	6,6%	1,227.623	6,5%
Gypsies / Roma	401.087	1,8%	535.840	2,5%	621.573	3,3%
Ukrainians	65.472	0,3%	61.098	0,3%	50.920	0,3%
Germans	119.462	0,5%	59.764	0,3%	36.042	0,2%
Turks	29.832	0,1%	32.098	0,2%	27.698	0,1%
Russian / Lipovani	38.606	0,2%	35.791	0,2%	23.487	0,1%
Tatars	24.596	0,1%	23.935	0,1%	20.282	0,1%
Serbs	24.408	0,1%	22.561	0,1%	18.076	0,1%
Slovaks	19.594	0,1%	17.226	0,1%	13.654	0,1%
Bulgarians	9.851	0,1%	8.025	0,0%	7.336	0,0%
Croats	4.085	0,0 %	6.807	0,0 %	5.408	0,0 %

[1] Source: Romanian National Institute of Statistics.

Greeks	3.940	0,0 %	6.472	0,0 %	3.668	0,0 %
Italians			3.288	0,0%	3.203	0,0%
Jews	8.955	0,0 %	5.785	0,0 %	3.271	0,0 %
Czechs	5.797	0,0 %	3.941	0,0 %	2.477	0,0 %
Poles	4.232	0,0%	3.559	0,0%	2.543	0,0%
Chinese			2.243	0,0%	2.017	0,0%
Armenians	1.957	0,0%	1.780	0,0%	1.361	0,0%
Csango			1.266	0,0%	1.536	0,0%
Macedonians			695	0,0%	1.264	0,0%
Albanians			477	0,0%		
Rutenians			257	0,0%		
Carashovans			206	0,0 %		
Slovenians			202	0,0%		
Other	8.984	0,0%	13.653	0,0%	18.524	0,10%
Undeclared	766	0,0%	1.941	0,0%		
Unidentified					1,236.810	6,1%
TOTAL	22,810.035	100%	2,276.138	100%	20,121.641	100%

Annex no. 2

THE ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHIC EVOLUTION OF BULGARIA (1992–2011)[2]

Ethnic groups	*Population in 1992*	*Population percent in 1992*	*Population in 2001*	*Population percent in 2001*	*Population in 2011*	*Population percent in 2011*
Bulgarians	7,271.185	85,7%	6,655.210	83,9%	5,664.624	84,8%
Turks	800.052	9,4%	746.664	9,4%	588.318	8,8%
Gypsies / Roma	313.396	3,7%	370.908	4,7%	325.343	4,9%
Russians	17.139	0,2%	15.595	0,2%	9.978	0,1%
Armenians	13.677	0,2%	10.832	0,1%	6.552	0,1%
Vlachs	5.159	0,1%	10.566	0,1%	3.684	0,1%
Karakachans	5.144	0,1%	4.107	0,1%	2.556	0,0%
Ukrainians	1.864	0,0%	2.489	0,0%	1.789	0,0%
Macedonians	10.803	0,1%	5.071	0,1%	1.654	0,0%
Greeks	4.930	0,1%	3.408	0,0%	1.379	0,0%
Jews	3.461	0,0%	1.363	0,0%	1.162	0,0%

[2] Source: 6.1 European population committee (The demographic characteristics of the main ethnic/national minorities in Bulgaria) “Council of Europe”;

НАСЕЛЕНИЕ КЪМ 01.03.2001 Г. ПО ОБЛАСТИ И ЕТНИЧЕСКА ГРУПА (Inhabitants as at 01.03.2001 by province and ethnic group). National Statistical Institute of Bulgaria. 1 March 2001;

“Население по местоживеене, възраст и етническа група (Population by place of residence, age and ethnic group)”. NSI. 2011.

Romanians	2.491	0,0%	1.088	0,0%	891	0,0%
Tatars	4.515	0,1%	1.803	0,0%		
Gagauz	1.478	0,0%	540	0,0%		
Other	23.542	0,3%	12.342	0,2%	19.659	0,3%
Undeclared	8.481	0,1%	86.915	1,1%	736.981	10%
TOTAL	8,487.317	100%	7,932.984	100%	7,364.570	100%

Annex no. 3

THE ETHNIC, LINGUISTIC, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN ROMANIA (2011)

E T H N I C G R O U P	POPULATION	MATERNAL LANGUAGE SPEAKERS	RELIGION ADHERENTS
Romanians	16,792.868	Romanian (16,771.897) Hungarian (14,128) Ukrainian (1504) German (1389) Romani (897)	Orthodox (15,730.426) Roman-Catholic (297,246) Pentecostal (276,678) Greek Catholic (124,563) Baptist (90,412) Seventh-Day Adventist (64,473) Jehovah Witness (35,477) Christian Evangelical (36,805) Reformat (19,802) Ancient-Rite Orthodox (13667) Evangelical (10,495) Muslim (6281) Orthodox Serbian (2591) Lutheran Evangelical (1970) Augustana Evangelical (1505) Unitarian (1044) Mosaic (931)
Hungarians	1,227.623	Hungarian (1,206.264) Romanian (20,706)	Reformat (563,611) Roman-Catholic (500,444) Unitarian (55,794) Orthodox (26,009) Greek Catholic (16,144) Lutheran Evangelical (12,431) Baptist (12,408) Jehovah Witness (11,322) Seventh-Day Adventist (7985) Penthecostal (6430) Christian Evangelical (1953) Evangelical (1492) Augustana Evangelical (778)

Gypsies / Roma	621,573	Romanian (342,674) Romani (244,503) Hungarian (32,777) Turkish (1127)	Orthodox (474,603) Pentecostal (71,262) Roman Catholic (20,821) Reformat (16,487) Baptist (8815) Seventh-Day Adventist (6793) Greek Catholic (6511) Muslim (3356) Christian Evangelical (2973) Jehovah Witness (1818) Evangelical (871) Unitarian (796)
Ukrainians	50,920	Ukrainian (47,357) Romanian (3307)	Orthodox (39,146) Pentecostal (6403) Greek Catholic (1204) Seventh-Day Adventist (1295) Jehovah Witness (850) Ancient-Rite Orthodox (651)
Germans	36,042	German (24,549) Romanian (6075) Hungarian (5279)	Roman-Catholic (21,324) Augustana Evangelical (2893) Evangelical (2335) Lutheran Evangelical (3221) Greek Catholic (858)
Turks	27,698	Turkish (23,710) Romanian (3919)	Muslim (26,903)
Russian-Lipovani	23,487	Russian (18,121) Romanian (5340)	Ancient-Rite Orthodox (17,267) Orthodox (5840)
Tatars	20,282	Tatar (17,495) Romanian (2564)	Muslim (20,060)
Serbians	18,076	Serbian (16,329) Romanian (1666)	Orthodox Serbian (11,112) Orthodox (6007)
Slovaks	13,654	Slovak (12,574) Romanian (944)	Roman-Catholic (9250) Lutheran Evangelical (2422)
Bulgarians	7 336	Bulgarian (6335) Romanian (944)	Roman-Catholic (4840) Orthodox (2079)
Croats	5 408	Croatian (5056)	Roman-Catholic (5283)
Greeks	3 668	Greek (2460) Romanian (1172)	Orthodox (3440)
Jews	3 271	Romanian (2180) Yiddish (572)	Mosaic (2371)
Italians	3 203	Italian (2813) Romanian (346)	Roman-Catholic (2451)
Czechs	2 477	Czech (2122) Romanian (299)	Roman-Catholic (2103)
Poles	2 543	Polish (2007) Romanian (495)	Roman-Catholic (2315)
Chinese	2 017	Chinese (2007)	“Other religion” (1203)
Csango	1 536	Romanian (709) Hungarian (390)	Roman-Catholic (1054)

Armenians	1 361	Armenian (705) Romanian (578)	Orthodox (974) Armenian Apostolic (212)
Macedonians	1 264	Romanian (555) Macedonian (697)	Orthodox (1221)
Others	18,524	Romanian (3153)	Muslim (6906) Orthodox (4669) Roman-Catolic (2367) “Other religion” (1845)
Undetermined	1,236.810	Romanian (6693)	Orthodox (7359)

Annex no. 4

THE ETHNIC, LINGUISTIC, AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN BULGARIA (2011)

E T H N I C G R O U P	POPULATION	MATERNAL MAIN LANGUAGE SPEAKERS	RELIGION ADHERENTS
Bulgarians	5,604.300	Bulgarian (5,571.049) Turkish (15.959) Romani (7.528) Other language (7.511)	Orthodox (4,240.422) Muslim (67.350) Roman Catholic (43.985) Protestant Christian (36.613)
Turks	585.024	Turkish (564.858) Bulgarian (18.975) Romani (549)	Sunni Muslim (420.816) Shiite Muslim (21.610)
Gypsies / Roma	320.761	Romani (272.710) Bulgarian (24.033) Turkish (21.440) Other language (1.905)	Orthodox (84.867) Muslim (42.201) Protestant Christian (23.289)
Russians	9.868	Russian (9.556)	
Armenians	6 360	Armenian (5.235)	
Vlachs	3 598	Romanian (1.964) Vlach (1.462)	
Karakachans	2.511	Greek (1.479)	
Ukrainians	1.763	Ukrainians (1.279)	
Macedonians	1.609	Macedonian (1.163)	
Greeks	1.356	Greek (1.237)	
Jews	1.130	Bulgarian (897)	
Romanians	866	Romanian (822)	
Others	19.260	Bulgarian (7.390)	
Undetermined	53.107	Bulgarian (6.976)	