STUDII

The Ethno-cultural Belongingness of Kalderash, Rudars, Tatars, and Turks in Romania and Bulgaria (1990-2012)[1]

Marin Constantin*
"Francisc Rainer" Institute of Anthropology, Romanian Academy

Abstract: *From a cross-cultural perspective, my text attempts to establish the degree to which a number of ethno-linguistic and religious groups from Romania and Bulgaria (Kalderashi, Rudars, Tatars, and Turks) could be equated within similar or identical ethnicities from the two countries. In discussing historical and ethnographic evidences relevant for the aforementioned ethnic communities, I consider and investigate (1) their demographic situation and geographic distribution, (2) their cultural trait variability, and (3) the current understanding of ethnicity in the anthropological literature of Southeastern Europe. My approach also takes into account the legislative framework of the ethno-demographic evolution in Romania and Bulgaria (1992-2011). Another objective of my research is to represent the distribution of the Kalderash, Rudar, Tatar, and Turkish groups across Romanian and Bulgarian regions. Based on such contextualization, the ethnic characteristics are interpreted in terms of homologous or analogous relationships among and between Gypsy/Roma, Tatar, and Turkish communities living in Romanian and Bulgarian rural and urban areas. A result of my comparative study is that of viewing the cultural belongingness in the 1990s and 2000s Romania and Bulgaria as an experience of coexistence – beyond the great and continuous ethno-linguistic and confessional diversity and variability in Southeastern Europe.*

Keywords: ethno-linguistic groups; cultural belongingness; Romania; Bulgaria.
Cuvinte-cheie: grupuri etno-lingvistice; apartenenţă etno-culturală; România; Bulgaria.

Introduction: ethnicity according to the law in post-1989 Romania and Bulgaria

In Romania, as well as in Bulgaria, the contemporary constitutional legislation accounts for the *national* representativeness of ethnic majorities. In both countries, the official languages – Romanian and Bulgarian, respectively – are clearly stated as such, with "the right of national minorities [in Romania] to learn their mother tongue, and to be educated in this language", but also with compulsory character of studying and making use of Bulgarian for all the Bulgarian citizens, irrespective if their mother tongue (*Constitution of Romania*, Art. 1; *Constitution of Bulgaria*, Art. 3, 36 [1, 2]). While in Romania, the minority languages are allowed in the territorial administration with a "national

* "Francisc Rainer" Institute of Anthropology, Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania. E-mail: marconstant2015@gmail.com.

minority significant weight" (*Constitution of Romania*, Art. 120), in Bulgaria no political parties are accepted "on ethnic, racial or religious lines" (*Constitution of Bulgaria*, Art.11 [4]).

Romanian and Bulgarian constitutional provisions refer to the "autonomous" and "separate" status of religion within the state (*Constitution of Romania*, 1991, Art. 29 [5]), and "separate" (*Constitution of Bulgaria*, 1991, Art. 13 [2]). Furthermore, the Bulgarian law defines (Art. 13 [3]) the Eastern Orthodox Christianity as the "traditional religion" of the country. "Equality before the law" is guaranteed for the Romanian citizens beyond their "race, nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion, sex […] or social origin" (*Constitution of Romania*, Art. 4 [2]; 16 [1]), whereas in Bulgaria the same civic principle is outside of any "privilege or restriction of rights" that would rely on "race, national or social origin, ethnic self-identity, sex, religion […]" (*Constitution of Bulgaria*, Art. 6 [2]).

The constitutional acts remain the only legal framework that, in post-1989 Romania and Bulgaria, regulates the relationships between national majorities and minorities. Indeed, the Romanian Parliament has not yet adopted the "Draft law on the status of national minorities" that the Democrat Union of Hungarians in Romania first promoted as early as 2005; among the issues that the Draft argues for are the definition of ethnic identity based on language, culture, and religion, the recognition of national minorities in Romania, the acceptance of minorities into the Romanian citizenship, the terms of ethno-cultural heritage in Romania, the legal practice of minority languages in Romanian administration, the granting of minority cultural autonomy, the political representation of minorities, and crossborder contacts between minority groups in Romania and their co-ethnics, etc. (Constantin, 2013a).

With post-1990 accession to the European Union structures, the two countries have similarly agreed to important international legislation relating to the current legal condition of the ethno-linguistic minorities in Europe, namely, the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (as signed and ratified by Romania in 1995, and by Bulgaria in 1997 and 1999). Romania has also adopted the *European Charter for regional or minority languages* (1995, 2008). Within the European citizenship value system, Romanian is recognized to be 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 the Constitution of Romania, as well as in the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (Constantin, 2013a). Similarly, the "Balkan and European identity" are now on argued to both include the Bulgarian language and culture and the local minorities, with their contribution to the safeguarding of "governmental peace" in Bulgaria (Tutunarov-Trajanov, 2011).

Themes of the anthropological literature of ethnicity in the contemporary Romania and Bulgaria

To an important extent, both in Romania and in Bulgaria, the anthropological understanding of ethnicity is dependent on the current phase of disciplinary development in the two countries, with the practice of anthropology as a "long journey to professionalization" in Romania (Geană, 2002), and as a "statu nascendi" in Bulgaria (Elchinova, 2002). After 1990, the development of a research agenda thematically focusing on the anthropological examination of ethno-linguistic variability in the two countries has mainly echoed the local expectancies for a cross-cultural contextualization of Romanian and Bulgarian national majorities *in relation to* communities and subgroups of Hungarians, Turks, Roma/Gypsies, Germans, Russians, etc. (Krasteva, 1999; Constantin, 2014). In these conditions, the study of ethnic diversity in anthropological terms in post-

1989 Romania needs to somewhat transcend a local enduring academic attachments to "autochtonism" and "tradition" (in disciplines like ethnography, sociology, and history), especially favoring the ideas of "continuity" and "unity" of *Romanianness*, which, for a longtime, has legitimized ethnology as a "nation-building" science (Mihăilescu, 2007). A similar "conceptual *nation*" is nowadays reflected into the Bulgarian intellectual category of *Bulgarianhood*, basically dwelling on civic arguments equally relevant for Bulgarians and local minorities, after several periods (after 1878) of an ideological dominance of Bulgarian ethos as an "unwritten rule in the public sphere", entailing a private sphere of cultural coexistence in the case of *other* ethnicities (Izvorska, 2006).

Recent anthropological examination of European citizenship as an "active, rather than passive, process" which emphasizes the cultural dimension of "all citizenship" (Nic Craith, 2004a) allows for further relevance of notions like *Romanianness* and *Bulgarianhood* as concerns the rise of a culturally-rooted citizen consciousness in the two Southeast European countries. In particular, *citizenship* in modern European societies is argued to have "legitimised the majority culture in the name of a non-cultural or civic identity", while *culture* would „have increasingly been associated with minorities or the exotic" (Nic Craith, 2004b). From a historical retrospective, what is nowadays described as "Southeastern Europe" or "East Central Europe" should not distort the "common Balkan identity" of the various national identities that have preserved their "legacy" of *Balkans* as a "Ottoman", as well as post-Ottoman and socialist world (Todorova, 2004).

In fact, the generic *national majority* vs. *ethnic minority* constituencies of an European citizen identity in Romania and Bulgaria ask for deeper ethnographic distinctions that, for instance, explain how, in virtue of a *Romanianness* that, as officially circumscribed within a "cartography of national state", Romanians have "inherited" in their native areas from Moldavia and Maramureş, Romanian different subgroups coexist with stereotypically-defined "hard-working" Germans and "delinquent" Gypsies in Western Transylvania (Chelcea and Lăţea, 2000). Likewise, in Western Rhodopes, the Bulgarians of Orthodox belongingness and the Muslim Bulgarians (*Pomaks*) make a difference between the local Sunni Turks, who are "our Turks and part of Bulgarians", and the "poor" and "stealing" Gypsies (Grekova, 1999; Elchinova, 2001).

Another research theme – that of the "reciprocal minorities" of the 8,025 Bulgarians in Romania (2002) and the 10,566 Vlachs, along with 1,088 Romanians, in Bulgaria (2001) – enlightens important differences between the minority policies of the two countries. Thus, the "advanced" Romanian strategy of recognizing the Bulgarian associations and the right to education in their own language is viewed in contrast to the Bulgarian reticence to engage in bilateral minority agreements with Romania (Njagulov, 2006). On the other hand, a series of "extramural" ethnicities that are outside of the official minority recognition – like (in Romania) the *Hutsuli* and the *Aromanians*, as well as (in both countries) the *Rudars* – come to represent their own cultural characteristics and socio-economic interests within local political structures, such as the municipalities. The ethnography of multiethnic coexistence in both countries has, thus, outlined cases of *communal* or *civic identities* among smaller groups of Bulgarians and Gypsies from the Nikopol District in Bulgaria, and the Teleorman County in Romania, as well as among the Moldavian Roman Catholics (at times, also named as *Csango*) (Şerban, 2007, 2009).

The issue of Romanian and Bulgarian nationalities in their minority condition accross the Danube opens up a broader problematization of *crossborder ethnicity*, given the dispersal of ethnic groups in two or several countries in Southeastern Europe. Examples like the Romanian-speaking *Rudars* (in Banat, Oltenia, as well as in Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, etc. [Kovalcsik, 2007; Slavkova,

2005; Erolova, 2013]) and the Muslim Bulgarians (*Pomaks*) from Bulgaria, Greece, Macedonia, Eastern Albania, and Turkey (Georgieva, 1999; Eminov, 2007; Bulut Ture, 2008) – are all evocative for the manner in which ethnicity continues to remain "fluid" and permeable throughout and crosswise the national-states political configuration in Southeastern and Central Europe. Accounting for such aspects of transborder permanence or revival in the ethnic attachments with native motherlands and people, the *diaspora* concept has proven its applicability among many linguistic or religious communities from Dobroudja, including the Aromanians (in relation to Aromanians in Bulgaria, Macedonia, or Greece) (Iosif, 2009), the Tatars (vis-à-vis the Crimean Tatars), and the Lipovans/Old Believers (with their "Russian roots [in language, literature, and history])" (Erolova, 2013).

After 1990, as a result of the diaspora consciousness among the multitude of ethnic groups in Southeastern Europe, their identity regenerative movement will take several forms of civic and political associations, like the Turkish *Movement for Rights and Freedoms* (MRF) and the Gypsy *Euroroma* in Bulgaria, and the *Democratic Union of Hungarians* in Romania (RMDSz) – all of which involved in the parliamentary election process from the two countries. Another ground of public expression of the ethno-cultural (self) identification is the celebration of minority national days such as (in Romania) the 15th March (among Hungarians), the 23rd May (among Aromanians), the 8th April (among Gypsies); in Bulgaria, the ethnic festivals among the Karakachans in Sliven (Kalionski, 2001), Tatars in Romania (Erolova, 2013), and Turks in Rhodopes (Aleksiev et al., 2012) similarly express the folk-culture revitalizing of one's belongingness to his/her ethnos. The anthropological reassessment of such contemporary ethnic "awakening" (for example, among the Gypsy/Roma in Bulgaria and Romania) calls attention to the process of *ethnicization* (rather than a real *ethnogenesis*), which, in the quest of developing a "shared consciousness" of one or another ethnic community or metagroup, would (on the one hand) "overshadow" its deeper socio-economic realities, and (on the other hand) could intensify "stereotypes, prejudices, and discrimination" in the national majority's attitudes towards that ethnicity (Giordano and Boscoboinik, 2003; Boscoboinik and Giordano, 2008).

Ethno-demographics of Romania and Bulgaria (1992-2011)

In post-socialist Romania and Bulgaria, an almost generalized process of population decline took place among each country's ethnic communities (except the Roma minority). At the same time, a number of small ethnic groups was recorded during the censuses from 1992, 2002, and 2011, which in Romania includes the Albanians, Carashovans, Csangos, Macedonians, Rutenians, and Slovenians, and in Bulgaria, the Gagauz group. Further demographic phenomena are associated with the new Chinese minority in Romania and with the irregular overall membership of Vlachs in Bulgaria (5,159 in 1992, 10,566 in 2001, 3,684 in 2011). In what follows, two tables are represented with the demographic evolution in both countries, according to the data of the aforementioned census evidences.

Table 1: *The evolution of ethnic population in Romania (1992-2011)*

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%
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%

Source: Romanian National Institute of Statistics (http://www.insse.ro/cms/files/RPL2002INS/index_rpl2002.htm)

Table 2: *The evolution of ethnic population in Bulgaria (1992-2011)*

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%
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%

Sources: The European population committee, *The demographic characteristics of the main ethnic/national minorities in Bulgaria*, The Council of Europe intranet (https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=429995&Site=COE); The National Statistical Institute of Bulgaria, НАСЕЛЕНИЕ КЪМ 01.03.2001 Г. ПО ОБЛАСТИ И ЕТНИЧЕСКА ГРУПА [Inhabitants as at 01.03.2001 by province and ethnic group], 1 March 2001; The National Statistical Institute of Bulgaria, „Население по местоживеене, възраст и етническа група" [Population by place of residence, age and ethnic group], 2011.

In both countries, the ethno-national majorities across each state's administrative and regional structuring (42 Romanian counties and 28 Bulgarian areas) are characterized by their variable percentages, which (for instance) in Bucharest and in the surrounding county of Ilfov in 2002 represented 11.1% (2,157,359 persons) of the Romanian population as a national whole, while in the counties of Covasna and Harghita, Romanians made only 0.5% (97,660 persons) of their national overall number. In the same way, 17.4% (1,377,476 persons) of the total of Bulgarian population lived in 2001 in Sofia and in the Sofia Region, unlike the reduced concentration of Bulgarians in the areas of Razgrad, Silistra, and Targovishte, where their percent was 2.8% (227,541 persons) of the national whole of Bulgarian people.

According to the results of the same 2002 census, a couple of numerous minorities – Hungarians and Gypsies in Romania; Turks and Gypsies in Bulgaria – are similarly differentiated within the two countries' ethno-geographic cartography. Thus a Hungarian "conglomerate" is situated in the counties of Harghita (276,038 persons), Covasna (228,575), and Mureş (228,575), plus Satu Mare (129,158), which is counterbalanced by the absence of Hungarians in Suceava, Botoşani, Iaşi, Vaslui, Ialomiţa, Călăraşi, Giurgiu, and Teleorman. Likewise, the Gypsy ethnic groups – even if they make the only minority present in all national counties – clearly varies from its demographic density in Mureş (40,425 persons), Dolj (31,544), and Bihor (30,089), to a lower presence in Tulcea (2,272) and Vâlcea (3,955). In Bulgaria, while the Turkish population is numerous in the regions of Kardzhali (101,116 persons), Shumen (59,551 persons), Burgas (58,636), Plovdiv (53,439), Targovishte (49,495 persons), and Silistra (48,761 persons), its figures significantly decreases in Montana (235 persons), Kjustendil (146), Vidin (139), and Pernik (108). Again, larger groups of Gypsies are reported in the Bulgarian districts of Plovdiv (30,196 persons), Stara Zagora (26,804), and Sliven (26,777), whereas the same minority diminishes its number in Kardzhali (1,264 persons) and Smolyan (686 persons).

Areas of multiethnicity may be outlined for the two countries, 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), etc. Of the Bulgaria's most ethnically-diversified districts are Varna (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians, Vlachs), Sofia Region (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians, Greeks), Plovdiv (Bulgarians, Turks, Roma, Russians, Armenians), etc.

The census data from above should be regarded in conjunction with two cultural indicators of ethnicity in Romania and Bulgaria, namely the maternal language and religion. That is why, in the following two graphic representations, the ethno-demographic evolution in both countries is shown alongside the information concerning the maternal language speakers and the religion adherents – among local majority as well as minority ethnic groups. This time, the interrelated categories of statistical references – population, language, and religion – are referred to in accordance with the results of the last census results (2011) in the two countries.

Table 3: *The ethnic, linguistic, and religious identity in Romania (2011)*

ETHNIC GROUP	POPULATION	MATERNAL LANGUAGE SPEAKERS	RELIGION ADHERENTS
Romanians	16,792,868	Romanian(16,771,897) Hungarian (14,128) Ukrainian (1,504) German (1,389) 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 (13,667) Evangelical (10,495) Muslim (6,281) Orthodox Serbian (2,591) Lutheran Evangelical (1,970) Augustana Evangelical (1,505) Unitarian (1,044) 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 (7,985) Pentecostal (6,430) Christian Evangelical (1,953) Evangelical (1,492) Augustana Evangelical (778)

Gypsies/Roma	621,573	Romanian (342,674) Romani (244,503) Hungarian (32,777) Turkish (1,127)	Orthodox (474,603) Pentecostal (71,262) Roman Catholic (20,821) Reformat (16,487) Baptist (8,815) Seventh-Day Adventist (6,793) Greek Catholic (6,511) Muslim (3,356) Christian Evangelical (2,973) Jehovah Witness (1,818) Evangelical (871) Unitarian (796)
Ukrainians	50,920	Ukrainian (47,357) Romanian (3,307)	Orthodox (39,146) Pentecostal (6,403) Greek Catholic (1,204) Seventh-Day Adventist (1,295) Jehovah Witness (850) Ancient-Rite Orthodox (651)
Germans	36,042	German (24,549) Romanian (6075) Hungarian (5279)	Roman-Catholic (21,324) Augustana Evangelical (2,893) Evangelical (2,335) Lutheran Evangelical (3,221) Greek Catholic (858)
Turks	27,698	Turkish (23,710) Romanian (3,919)	Muslim (26,903)
Russian-Lipovani	23,487	Russian (18,121) Romanian (5,340)	Ancient-Rite Orthodox (17,267) Orthodox (5,840)
Tatars	20,282	Tatar (17,495) Romanian (2,564)	Muslim (20,060)
Serbians	18,076	Serbian (16,329) Romanian (1,666)	Orthodox Serbian (11,112) Orthodox (6,007)
Slovaks	13,654	Slovak (12,574) Romanian (944)	Roman-Catholic (9,250) Lutheran Evangelical (2,422)
Bulgarians	7,336	Bulgarian (6,335) Romanian (944)	Roman-Catholic (4,840) Orthodox (2,079)
Croats	5,408	Croatian (5,056)	Roman-Catholic (5,283)
Greeks	3,668	Greek (2,460) Romanian (1,172)	Orthodox (3,440)
Jews	3,271	Romanian (2,180) Yiddish (572)	Mosaic (2,371)
Italians	3,203	Italian (2,813) Romanian (346)	Roman-Catholic (2,451)
Czechs	2,477	Czech (2,122) Romanian (299)	Roman-Catholic (2,103)
Poles	2,543	Polish (2,007) Romanian (495)	Roman-Catholic (2,315)
Chinese	2,017	Chinese (2,007)	“Other religion” (1,203)
Csango	1,536	Romanian (709) Hungarian (390)	Roman-Catholic (1,054)

Armenians	1,361	Armenian (705) Romanian (578)	Orthodox (974) Armenian Apostolic (212)
Macedonians	1,264	Romanian (555) Macedonian (697)	Orthodox (1,221)
Others	18,524	Romanian (3,153)	Muslim (6,906) Orthodox (4,669) Roman-Catholic (2,367) "Other religion" (1,845)
Undetermined	1,236,810	Romanian (6,693)	Orthodox (7,359)

Source: Romanian National Institute of Statistics, http://www.recensamantromania.ro/rezultate, 2011.

Table 4: *The ethnic, linguistic, and religious identity in Bulgaria (2011)*

ETHNIC GROUP	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)	

Source: The National Statistical Institute of Bulgaria, *2011 Population Census – Main Results* (http://www.nsi.bg/census2011/PDOCS2/Census2011final_en.pdf)

In terms of national majorities, the 16,792,868 *Romanians* in Romania may broadly be associated with the number of 17,176,544 *Romanian-language speakers*, and with the 15,730,426 *Orthodox* Christians. Similarly, in Bulgaria the 5,664,624 *Bulgarians* are compared to the 5,659,024 speakers of *Bulgarian language*, and to the 4,374,135 *Orthodox* believers.

As concerns the larger minorities in Romania, the 1,206,264 *Hungarians* are numerically next to the 1,259,914 speakers of *Hungarian language*, the 500,444 *Roman-Catholics*, and the 563,611 *Reformats*, while the 621,573 *Roma*/*Gypsies* appear to be related to the 244,503 speakers of *Romani language*, and to the 474,603 *Gypsies* who assert their *Orthodox* confession. Among the Bulgaria's minority ethnic groups, the 585,024 *Turks* overlap with the 564,858 *Turkish* speakers, and with the 420,816 *Sunni Muslims* (along with 21,610 *Shiite Muslims*). Instead, also in Bulgaria, whereas the 320,761 *Roma*/*Gypsies* probably include the 272,710 speakers of *Romani* language(s), their religious affiliation is divided between the 84,867 *Orthodox* believers, the 42,201 *Muslims*, and the 23,289 *Protestant Christians*.

Hypothesizing ethnic comparability among the homonymous groups of Kalderashi/Rudars, Tatars, and Turks in Romania and Bulgaria

In presenting my research data, I am interested in identifying those historical and ethnographic traits that could contribute to the cross-cultural recognition of one or another ethnic group, in other terms: in the *comparability* of such communities and their subgroups in Romania and Bulgaria. Indeed, as will be seen below, since they bear identical or equivalent ethnonyms in the field and in the anthropological literature, the Roma/Gypsy subgroups of Kalderash/Kelderari/Căldărari, and Rudars, and the Muslim minorities of Tatars and Turks bear identical or equivalent ethnonyms in the field and in the anthropological literature, they can be broadly characterized as homonymous ethno-linguistic groups between the two countries. Such nominal correspondences across the Romanian and Bulgarian border open up the possibility of advancing to the study and understanding of a supposedly common or shared origin, tradition, and contemporary lifestyle – in a word, *belongingness* – among the ethnicities such as above.

In order to ground my own ethnographic information concerning several regional subgroups of the aforementioned ethnic communities (which I have collected in Romania), I resort to a series of Bulgarian bibliographic references, especially including Tomova (1995, 1999), Marušiakova and Popov (1998, 2013), Slavkova (2005), Nunev (2010), Zdravkov (2010) (in the case of Kalderash and Rudars), Antonov and Miglev (1999) and Erolova (2010a, 2013) (as regards the Tatars), Bachvarov (1997), Denova (undated paper), Erolova (2013), Eminov (2007), Georgieva (1999), Karamihova (2007), Popov (2007), Rudin and Eminov (1990), Sabev (2012), Trankova (2012), Troeva (2013), Vlaeva (2012), and Zhelyazkova (1999) (about the Turks). All this Bulgarian databasis is compared to case studies in Romania, as conducted among Kalderash by authors like Hasdeu (2004), Flenchea (2009), Erolova (2010b, 2013), and Paşca (1999), among Rudars by Tesar (2006), Dorondel (2007), Kovalcsik (2007), and Erolova (2010b, 2013), among Tatars by Bara (2006), Radu and Ciotaru (2008), and among Turks (Bara, 2006, Radu and Ciotaru, 2008 and Chiriţoiu et al., 2009).

In the work of discussing the historical and ethnographic data about the Kalderashi/Kelderari/Căldărari, Rudars, Tatars, and Turks in Romania and Bulgaria, I methodologically distinguish between (1) analogies between coexisting ethnic groups, (2) analogies between remote ethnicities, (3) clusters of homologies between coexisting and remote ethnic communities, and (4) isolate traits of ethno-linguistic metagroups groups and their subgroups. In practice, each such criterion will primarily be referred to the above-enounced forms of

homonymous ethnicity, to be next considered within a further interethnic contextualization of aspects apparently characterizing individualized groups.

Within the conceptual content of my comparative approach, I speak of *analogies* when dealing with those cultural traits that, through acculturation or cultural exchange, are shared by ethno-linguistic and religious groups of a different origin. Instead, when the cultural traits are proven as inherited by at least two subgroups of the same ethno-linguistic community, I call them *homologies*. Such terminological distinction is particularly useful in potentially allowing for either *cross-cultural*, or *intra-cultural* categorization of what – as a result of inquiry – would reveal the occurrence of different ethnicities, or, conversely, the ethnic, linguistic, or religious relatedness of homonymous groups or subgroups. In order to circumvent the purely formal or random similitudes between groups of population with no clear evidences of a joint community becoming, I am mostly interested in the incidence of *clusters* of homologies (in lieu of characteristics of a possibly shared, but also uprooted way of life).

I admit that the more-or-less perceptible affinities or, on the contrary, incongruities in the ethno-cultural identification of the Kalderashi, Rudars, Tatars, and Turks basically need to account for the coexistence and territorial proximity of them. However, my cross-cultural investigation has to also verify the manner in which the geographic isolation, remoteness, and the absence of a direct ethnographic contact between the homonymous ethnicities – are still relevant in the effort of establishing of, or denying to, their hypothetical belongingness to a larger ethno-linguistic and religious group.

Beyond the issue of microregional or transregional *homologation* between groups of people whose traditions – across the Romanian – Bulgarian borderline – may coincide or vary, in terms of their contemporary traits, my work will also seek to outline possibly interdependent processes of ethnic enclavization, development, (re)unification, and revitalization, in contrast with facts of migration, acculturation, hybridization, and multiculturalism. As a matter of fact, identifying the "ages" of a shared ethnic past would, theoretically, provide the mapping of current ethnographic trait configuration with the historical reconstruction of what two or several homonymous groups could have lived and experienced together, as part of their interwoven cultural transmission.

Roma/Gypsy (Kalderashi/ Kelderari/Căldărari and Rudar subgroups)

In Romania, as well as in Bulgaria, Roma/ Gypsy ethnicities range as the secondly best-represented (in either demographic or geographical distribution) national minority groups. Indeed, while in the Romanian 2011 census, the 621,573 Gypsies make 3.3 % of the country overall population, 325,343 Roma live in Bulgaria (according to the 2011 census), which equate with 4.9% of the total number of inhabitants in the Southern Danube country. Moreover, the Gypsies are the only minority present in all Romanian counties, with largest subgroups in Mureş (40,425 people), Dolj (31,544), and Bihor (30,089), and with smallest ones in Tulcea (2,272) and Vâlcea (3,955) (in accordance with the 2002 census). Likewise, except for Sofia city and Sofia province, Roma groups are recorded all across the rest of Bulgarian regions, with major figures in Plovdiv (30,196), Stara Zagora (26,804), and Sliven (26,777), in comparison with of a minimum of 1,264 people in Kardzhali and 686 in Smolyan.

Among Roma/Gypsy groups, it is the *Kalderashi*/*Kelderari*/*Kaldarari* and *Rudar* ones that, in terms of their transborder location and dispersion, are particularly relevant for a comparative examination. Even though the populace size for both Kelderari and Rudar is still open to research (as these groups are not named as such, but as "Roma" only, in contemporary census categorizing), several ethnographic reports provide information on the current cartography of the both groups' in

Romania and Bulgaria. While Dobrudzha is mostly inhabited by Romanian and Bulgarian majorities, together with minority groups of Turks, Tatars, Russians, Greeks, and Ukrainians, it is also a main area of Kelderari (amidst other Roma), grouping in the localities of Constanţa, Tulcea, Năvodari, Palazu Mare, Murfatlar, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Ovidiu, Valu lui Traian, and Cuza Vodă (in Romania), as well as in Silistra, Babuk, Kalipetrovo, and Karapelit, Donchevo, and Shabla (in Bulgaria) (Erolova, 2010b, 2013). Further subgroups of *Kaldarari* (as well as other Roma subgroups) have been reported for in Muntenia, as regards "Căleni" (a fictive village name, where the *Kaldarari* live alongside Romanians [Hasdeu, 2004]), and Săruleşti (Paşca, 1999), for Roman town in Moldavia (with *Kaldarari's* coabitation with Romanians and Russian-Lipovans [Flenchea, 2009]), and for Bratei village in Sibiu County (within a regional Romanian, Hungarian, and German multiethnicity [Constantin, 2013b]).

Rudars are similarly identified in Northern Dobrudzhan settings (Cuza Vodă, Mircea Vodă, Satu Nou, Valea Teilor, Nalbant, Ceamurlia de Jos, Ciucurova, Beidaud, Rahmanu, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Niculiţel, and Hamcearca) (Erolova, 2013). Rudar village subgroups have also been spoken about as concerns the villages of "Dragomireşti" (a fictive name for a Rudar community in Argeş County [Dorondel, 2007]) and Băbeni (Vâlcea County [Constantin, 2013b]). Regional distinction is made between *Rudars* (in the areas of Oltenia and Muntenia), *Băieşi* (Banat and Transylvania), and *Băniaşi* (Banat) (Kovalcsik, 2007). In all these regions, Rudars live amongst Romanians and (other) Gypsies, as well as together with important groups of Hungarians, Germans, Serbians, Croats, Bulgarians, Ukrainians, and Csechs (in Banat). Further Rudar communities in Southeastern Europe are recorded for as *Băieşi* (Croatia), *Băniaşi* (Serbia), *Karavlasi* (Bosnia-Herzegovina), *Lingurari* (Moldavia, Bukovina, and Moldova), etc. (Slavkova, 2005; Marushiakova and Popov, 2013).

As for Bulgaria, Rudars are described to form a "metagroup community" (as originated into their "great migration" after the Roma juridical liberation in Wallachia and Moldavia, at the half of 19th century), with several subgroups living in urban and rural locations of North-Central Bulgaria (Lom, Veliko Tarnovo, Lovech, Plovdiv), in North-East Bulgaria (Razgrad, Varna, Burgas), and also in South-East Bulgaria (Haskovo, Yambol). Among Rudar subgroups, it is the *Lingurari* that are mentioned to inhabit Northern Bulgaria (Pleven, Kojnare, Razgrad, Shumen), Central-East Bulgaria (Stara Zagora, Burgas), Western Bulgaria (Prvomajsk), and Central Bulgaria (Yagoda village) (Slavkova, 2005). Rudars in Bulgaria are also defined, according to their regional grouping, as *Tratzieni* (South Bulgaria, Thrace), *Monteani* (mountain regions), *Intreani* (around Yantra river, Northern Bulgaria), and *Dobrogeni* (Dobrudzha) (Erolova, 2013). Within the high ethno-cultural heterogeneity of these regions, leaving aside further Roma subgroups, Rudars coexist with Turks, Tatars, Russians, Greeks, and Ukrainians (in Dobroudzha), with Turks, Armenians, and Russians (North-Central Bulgaria), with Turks, Armenians, and Russians (Central-East Bulgaria), and with Turks (South-East Bulgaria).

Kelderari are shown to distinguish themselves in "subgroup" and "kin" communities of *Pletoshi* (*Kalaydzii*) and *Chori* (*Grebenari*, *Pieptenari*) in Northern Dobrudzha, as well as in *Militari*, *Tasmanari* and *Zhaplesh*, in Southern Dobrudzha (Erolova, 2013). Intermarriages (which could also be seen as intra-ethnic Gypsy matrimonial choices) are inferred to have united many other subgroups – *Grastari* (or *Zlatari*, *Srbski Cigani*), *Niculešti*, *Dudulani*, *Tasmanari*, *Žapleš*, *Lajneš*, *Njamcurja* (or *Avstrijski*, *Nemski*, *Ungarski Cigani*, *Ungarski Kalajdži* – under a common ethnonym of *Kaldaraši* or *Kardaraši*, after their migration from Romania and Yougoslavia, to Bulgaria, and after *Kelderari* "really existed as Gypsy nomad group" during the nineteenth century (Marushiakova and Popov, 2013). In Romania, *Kaldarari* make a urban subgroup separately from those of *Zlatars* and *Muzikantsi*,

in Roman town (Flenchea, 2009), while in "Căleni" village they condescendingly regard other Roma like the *Djambashi*, *Vatrashi*, and *Rudari* (Hasdeu 2004); in Bratei village, *Căldărar* is, at the same time, an ethnonym, a technonym ("cauldron makers"), and a family name for the local *Kelderari* (Constantin, 2011).

In Bulgaria, *Kaldaraši*/*Kardaraši* are reported to speak a "Vlax II dialect of Romani" (Marushiakova and Popov, 2013). *Kaldarari* in Bratei village argue on language differences between their own so-called "Kade" speech, and further Gypsy groups in Southern Transylvania, such as *Gabors* whose dialect would be the "Kide" one (Constantin, 2011). The *Kelderar*-Romanian bilingualism is generalized within Gypsy subgroups in Romania, while one-tenth of the *Kardarashi* are estimated for Bulgarian language command among contemporary Roma in Bulgaria (Tomova, 1995).

All the above-mentioned Rudar subgroups are described as speakers of Romanian language (Slavkova, 2005; Kovalcsik, 2007; Marushiakova and Popov, 2013; Erolova, 2013, etc.), which they also invoke in support for the claim of their "Romanian" (even "Dacian") origin and identity, while categorically denying to any Roma belongingness. In Băbeni village, as similarly relying on their only usage of Romanian language, Rudars insist not to be confused with other Roma groups, including the *Ursara* (Constantin, 2013b) – with which, however, they are associated in Bulgaria. In characterizing their vernacular, Rudars point to their utterance of a palatalized *sh* in place of *ch* of the literary language (Kovalcsik, 2007). Variation in Rudar self-identification is also observed (in Bulgaria), with Rudars as "Romanian-speaking Bulgarians", "Vlasi", "Romanian-speaking Gypsies", etc. (Slavkova, 2005).

Traditional traits of *Kelderar* sociality are regularly pointed out, including (among Dobrudzhan subgroups) endogamy (Tomova, 1995; Marushiakova and Popov, 2013; Erolova, 2013) and cross-cousin marriage (Tomova, 1999; Zdravkov, 2010), as well as customary courts of *Meshere* or *Žudikate* (in Bulgaria (Tomova, 1995; Nunev, 2010; Erolova, 2013) and *Kris* in Southern Transylvania (Constantin, 2013b) and in Wallachia (Hasdeu, 2004). *Kaldarar* chieftainship is associated with the authority of *Bulibasha* in Romania, in the village of Săruleşti (Paşca, 1999); in Bratei village, while *Bulibasha* is currently less effective in his headship prerogatives, he is ethno-historically evoked to have coordinated the local *Kaldarari*'s return from their transborder deportation, during World War II (Constantin, 2012b). Also in Bratei village, *Kaldarari* keep coppersmith's techniques and styles within the remembering of their ancestral (patrilineal) descent (Constantin, 2011).

Rudar genealogical subgroups (*spiţe de neam*), as probably linked to some known ancestor, are reported in Bulgaria, among *Koliostaciovi*, *Vanghileţi*, *Paruşevţi*, *Ţoneşti*, *Koikeşti* etc. (Slavkova, 2005). Within the framework of their broader ethnic endogamy in Oltenia (Kovalcsik, 2007), the Rudars in Băbeni village argue on their intergenerational heritage in woodcarving, while rarely-occurring intermarriage with Romanians is claimed not to guarantee inter-ethnic transmission of craft (Constantin, 2013). Endogamy among Rudars is similarly sighted in Bulgaria, in the case of *Ursara* subgroup, except for a relative frequency of marriage with *Lingurari* community (Marushiakova and Popov, 1998; Erolova, 2013).

Among both *Kelderar* and Rudar groups, artisanship appears to be a technical resource of ethnic representativeness, particularly with the "professionyms" whose predominantly Turkish and Romanian origin generally reflects historical (Middle-Age) socio-economic condition of Gypsy in the Ottoman Empire, Wallachia, and Moldavia, and which are interpreted as exonyms serving to the internal differentiation of Gypsy groups, rather than to their identification in contact with non-Roma people (Marushiakova and Popov, 2013). Thus, *Kalderashi*/*Kelderari*/*Kaldarari* in Romania and in Bulgaria are associated with tinsmithing

and with the coppersmiths' trade of making cauldrons (from the Romanian word *căldare*), which, while actually characterizing "only few of their subgroups", has been prefered – and appropriated – by further Gypsy groups too, in lieu of older (non-Roma) appelations like *Čergari*, *Katunari*, *Grebenari*, *Zavrakči*, and *Valajaši* in Bulgaria, and *Laješi*, *Kortorari*, or *Pletoši* in Romania (Marushiakova and Popov, 2013).

Beside their regional ethnonyms, the Rudars in Romania also identify themselves based on their woodcarving terminology, such as *Rotari* and *Corzeni* (as closest to one another, with their crafts)*, Băltăreţi* in Oltenia, *Albieri* (including *Nemţoi*/*Unguroi* ['German' and 'Hungarian' Rudars from Banat]) in Muntenia (Kovalcsik, 2007). In Bulgaria, within the larger Rudar group, two main subgroups are recurrently outlined – the *Lingurari* (spoon makers) and the *Ursari* (bear trainers, for example in the regions of Ruse and Razgrad) –, as closely related with each other within mixed marriages (Marushiakova and Popov, 1998); *Kopanari* in Dobrudzha and Veliko Tarnovo are another Rudar subgroup, with a craft specialization in the making of wooden utensils and instruments (Erolova, 2013; Dorondel, 2007).

Along with woodcarving, Rudars living in many countries of Southeastern Europe share the ritual of *gurbane*, which mainly entails (on St. George Day) the animal sacrifice (usually of a lamb), within a folk ceremonial invested with therapeutic valences, while developing next into a community feast. Local performances of *gurbane* are reported for Rudars in Oltenia (Kovalcsik, 2007), Kozak (Silistra [Slavkova, 2005]), Balchik (Dobrich [Erolova, 2010b]), Grebenac (among the *Bayash* subgroup in Voijvodina, Serbia [Sikimič, 2007]), etc. On various holidays, the g*urbane/kurban* also takes place among Dobrudzhan *Kelderari,* on Saint John the Baptist's Day (Erolova, 2010b), while, as a pan-Balkan blood sacrifice, it is also held by Bulgarians (in areas like Pernik, Vidin, Plovdiv, Haskovo, etc., on St. Elijah's Day, on Saint Nicolas of Summertime Day, on Ascension Day, etc.) (Hristov, 2007; Popov, 2007), by Turkish Gypsies (in Haskovo) and Muslim Bulgarians, within the Transfiguration feast (in Central Rhodopes) (Karamihova, 2007), and generally by Turkish and Muslim population in Bulgaria (after the fasting month of Ramadan, for instance in the districts of Targovishte, Razgrad, Ruse, as well as in Western Rhodopes, etc. [Zhelyazkova, 1999]). Muslim, as well as Orthodox Christian, variants of *kurban* have furtherly been described for Albania (Shpati region, after Ramadan, as well as on Assumption Day, etc. [Dalipaj 2007]) and in Macedonia (Radovish region, on St. George Day, on St. Constantine and Helen Day, on St. Elijah's Day, etc. [Bocev, 2007]).

Contemporary Rudar Neo-protestant conversion is reported among subgroups in Romania (in Oltenia region [Kovalcsik, 2007)], as well as Bulgaria (*Ursari* and *Lingurari* in Burgas district [Slavkova, 2005]).

While both *Kelderari* and *Rudari*, along many other Gypsy subgroups, are generically integrated within the 'inter-group ethnic formation' of a "*Roma* ethnic identity" – despite the wide variety of exonyms that have been applied on them in Central and Southeastern Europe (Marushiakova and Popov, 2013), *Kelderar* and *Rudar* ethnicities in Romania and in Bulgaria appear, however, to clearly display a broad array of own traits that express the ethno-cultural distinctiveness of each of them, rather than their common historical rootedness or ethnographic interdependence. Except for Dobroudzha, *Kelderari* and *Rudari* do not show further context of intra-ethnic coexistence, nor they coincide in their ethnonymic self-definition, dialects, preferential intermarriage, craft specialisation, and ceremonial behavior. When compared to such differential factology of isolate characteristics, analogies occurring in both groups' processes of migration and dispersal in Central and Southeastern Europe, endogamous traditions, and tehnonymic bases of inter-ethnic recognition – could hardly support *Kelderari*'s and *Rudari*'s belongingness to the same contemporary or recent historical ethnos.

Tatars

Census estimations of Tatars in Bulgaria indicate the demographic decline of this minority (due to their negative natural growth, migration, and Turkish assimilation) from 4,151 people (in 1992), to 1,893 (in 2002), which matches current ethnographic (unofficial) data of a number variation of Tatar population between 2,000 and 3,000 people (Erolova, 2013). Main geographic areas where Bulgarian Tatars live are Ruse (Ruse city, Golyamo Vranovo, Slivopole, Trastenic, Semerdjievo, Gurtchinovo, Vetovo), Silistra (Silistra city, Belogradetz, Cherkovna, Onogur, Lyuben, Prof. Ishirkovo, Severnyak, Sredishte, Davidovo), Dobrich (Dobrich city, Capitan Dimitrovo, Ograjden, Baltchik, Lomnitza, Sredna Smolnitsa, Samuilovo, Kupinovo, Svetlik, Spasovo, Lyulyakovo, Momtchil, Kavarna, Batovo, Liakovo, Topola, Yovkovo, Sokolovo, Bobovetz), Varna (Varna city, Provadia), Shumen (Shumen city, Tsarev Brod, Makak, Belogradetz, Zlatna), Razgrad (Razgrad city, Mortavonovo, Strahilitsa, Ionkovo, Varbak, Brestovene, Savar); two further small subgroups live in the regions of Veliko Tarnovo (Vardim) and Pleven (Debovo) (Antonov and Miglev, 1999; Erolova, 2013).

While in the Romanian census evidences, the Tatar community is significantly larger (with 20,282 people, in 2011) than in Northeastern Bulgaria, it similarly faces a lessening process (in comparison with 24,596 people in 1992, and with 23,935, in 2002). Again, ethnographic "off-the-record" evaluation of Northern-Dobrudzha Tatars is cited as about "30-40 thousand people" (Erolova, 2013). Constanţa County is reported as the region of Tatar focal grouping in Romania, with representative locations in Constanţa, Medgidia, Babadag, Năvodari, Murfatlar, Mangalia, Eforie, Tulcea and the villages of Valu lui Traian, Ovidiu, Valea Dacilor, Agigea, Castelu, Valea Seacă, Poarta Albă, Negru Vodă, Pelinu, Nisipari, Cobadin, Independenţa, Lumina, Techirghiol, Mihail Kogălniceanu (Erolova, 2013; Bara, 2006; Radu and Ciotaru, 2008; Constantin, 2011).

In Dobroudzha and also in Northeastern Bulgaria, the Tatars live in multiethnic contexts, which, alongside Romanian and Bulgarian majorities, also include (more or less compact) groups of Turks, Roma, Aromanians, Russians, and Armenians. Of these groups, it is the Turkish one with which the Tatars are often merged within the common (Sunni) *Muslim* theonym, and locally identified as such by other ethnicities (for example, Romanians [Bara, 2006; Chiriţoiu et al., 2009]). In part, Tatars themselves in both countries agree with such designation, which, while also accounting for some Turkicisation process, is based on shared Islamic identity, desire to make a larger minority community, and intermarriages (Erolova, 2010a, 2013).

Otherwise, Tatars overtly assert their distinct ethnic descent as when evoking (in Medgidia town) epic *gesta* of Genghis-Khan (Bara, 2006), and (among *Sora Tattari* subgroup in Bulgaria) the epic hero Chora Batyr (Antonov and Miglev, 1999). Also in both countries, physical anthropological traits are recognized – among coexisting foreign groups and in literature – to unmistakably portrait Tatars in terms of "wide zygomatic bones", "large mandible width", and "dark brown hair prevalence" (Radu and Ciotaru, 2008), "large heads, slit and dark eyes", "prominent, Mongoloid, cheekbones", "broad, flat face" (Antonov and Miglev, 1999), as well as "Mongoloid eyes, a broad face and pronounced cheekbones" (Erolova, 2013). Tatars' (patrilineal) descent and physiognomy are theoretically relevant for their traditional endogamy as described (for instance, for Medgidia Tatar subgroup) to have long been maintained to prevent "family dividing" (Antonov and Miglev, 1999), and as still reported (in Cobadin village) among the local Tatar's reticence towards mixed marriages that cannot last because of interethnic divergences in the religious initiation of newborn (Bara, 2006). The acceptance of ethnic exogamy between Tatars and Turks (in postwar Bulgaria, as well as in Constanţa County [Bara, 2006]) is followed by the inheritance of both ethnicities, with the difference that Turkish daughters-in-

law are more readily allowed by Tatar families than Tatar daughters-in-law by Turkish families; marriage with Bulgarians is also reported among Tatars in Bulgaria (Antonov and Miglev, 1999).

Crimean Tatar is the ethno-historical ethnonym relating to the Tatars' origins in Crimea, before their massive migration to Dobrudzha – *Little Tatarstan* – in circumstances of the Russian annexation of the Tatar Khanat (1783) and the Crimean war in 1853-1856 (Antonov and Miglev, 1999; Erolova, 2010a, 2013). In Bulgaria, further subgroup variation in Tatar self-naming refers to *Nogay, Tat, Kazan, Kipchak, Laz, Kazakh*, with "racial-type" (*Nogay*) and dialect (*Tat*) local distinctiveness (Antonov and Miglev, 1999). Dialectal differentiation is also made among Tatars in Northern Dobrudzha, between *Kirim tili, Noghai tili,* and *Yaliboyi tili* subgroups (Bara, 2006). Although currently most spoken by elderly people only, Tatar language is still seen as "the main marker of *Tatarlik*, Tatar ethnicity", as a *Kipchak* language from the Western Turkic language (Antonov and Miglev, 1999). It also matters as a criterion for the "ethnic authenticity", to the extent to which "failure to speak the [Tatar] language is considered as loss of ethnicity" (Erolova, 2013; Antonov and Miglev, 1999); in Constanţa County, the Tatars insist to reinsert the study of their language in schools of Romania (Bara, 2006). At the same time, the Tatar trilingualism in both countries is reported for Tatars able to speak, along with their own dialects, also Turkish, Romanian, and Bulgarian languages (Antonov and Miglev, 1999; Erolova, 2013).

In both countries nowadays, the Tatar ethnicity is similarly enacted through several forms of community attachments and values, including Southern-and-Northern Dobrudzhan Tatars' visits or touring excursions to Crimea (Bara, 2006; Erolova, 2010a), the Tatar national flag as displayed within mosques in Vetovo and Eforie (Erolova, 2010a), traditional artifacts of Tatar rites of passage in Cobadin village (Constanţa County [Constantin, 2011]) and folk ensembles in Dobrich (Antonov and Miglev, 1999), the Tatar cuisine in Constanţa County (for example, *Shuberek* pastry in Independenţa community), and also in Southern Dobroudzha (*Tatar burek* pastry [Erolova, 2013]), the Tatar butchery tradition in Constanţa County and in Northeastern Bulgaria (Antonov and Miglev, 1999), etc. Another comparable trait is the inter-ethnic perceptive divergence from between Tatars and Turks, as it occurs in Northern Dobrudzha (Chiriţoiu et al., 2009) as well as in Southern Dobrudzha (Antonov and Miglev, 1999).

Isolate traits in the current ethnography of Dobrudzhan Tatars are (in Bulgaria) the ethno-historical memory of Chaka – a "Tatar Bulgarian Tsar" –, along with the Tatar professional traditions in mailing and guidance, horse-breeding, cartage, candle-making, furriery, coffee-making, *boza* production, and barbering (Antonov and Miglev, 1999), as well as the Tatar Islamic-and-ethnic holidays of *Tepresh* (for instance, in Vetovo), namely all-group folk meetings (Erolova, 2013). In Romania, *Tatar Qures* (Tatar wrestling [Erolova, 2013]) are reported to take place in Medgidia.

Turks

According to the 2011 census evidences in Bulgaria, the Turkish ethnic group – 588 318 people – is the most numerous minority, with a percent of 8.8% out of national population (7,364,570). While the overall number of Turks has constantly decreased (in comparison with 800, 052 in 1992, and with 746, 664 in 2001), they practically inhabit (to various degrees) most of Bulgaria's regions, ranging (in 2001) from the district majority of 86,527 persons in Kardzhali, and also from demographically significant districts of Razgrad (57,261), Shumen (50,878 persons), Burgas (49,354), Silistra (40,272), and Plovdiv (40,255), to the weakest Turkish presence, in the districts of Pernik (231 persons), Montana (171), Kjustendil (105), and Vidin (85). The Turks are mainly concentrated in Northern Bulgaria (in coexistence with the Bulgarian majority and with groups of Roma, Vlachs,

Armenians, Tatars, and Russians), in Southern Bulgaria (along with Bulgarians and Roma), and in Eastern Rhodopes (in Plovdiv region, together with Bulgarians, Roma, Armenians, and Russians); 63.7% of Turkish population in 2011 is reported to live in the districts of Kardzhali, Razgrad, Targovishte, Shumen, Silistra, Dobrich, Ruse and Burgas. Also in 2011 census, Muslims in Bulgaria are as many as 577,139 persons (10.0%), of which 546,004 persons identify themselves with *Sunni* Muslims and 27,407 persons with *Shia* Muslims. As regards the correlation between ethnicity and religion, 444,434 Muslims (of which 420,816 *Sunni* and 21,610 *Shia*) are recorded as belonging to the Turkish ethnic group. The Turkish demography in Bulgaria is recognized to have noticeably altered after the repeated exodus of Turks to Turkey in 1951 (155,000, in the context of the Bulgarian colectivization campaign), and in 1989 (over 300,000, with the changing-name campaign against Turks in 1980s Bulgaria) (Rudin and Eminov, 1990; Bachvarov, 1997; Zhelyazkova, 1999).

While the Turkish ethnicity in Bulgaria follows (asymmetrically) the Islamic confessional division between *Sunni* and *Shia* believers, another intra-ethnic distinction is made with the *Alevi/Aliani/Kuzzelbashi* community, as developed under *Shia* influence, in the districts of Razgrad, Bourgas, and Haskovo (Georgieva, 1999). Ethnicity and religion are complementary, and yet not entirely overlapping with each other, especially among Turks and *Pomaks* (Bulgarian-speaking *Sunni*), as well as among Turkish, Tatar, and Gypsy Muslims (Zhelyazkova, 1999; Sabev, 2012). The Bulgarian 2001 census indicates a number of 131 531 ethnic Bulgarians having self-declared Muslims (*Mjuslumani*), with scholarly evaluations of Pomaks in Bulgaria ranging between 80,000 and 269,000 (Eminov, 2007); out of a total population of 500,000 Pomaks (also living in Macedonia, Albania, Greece, and Turkey), Bulgarian Pomaks (in Central Balkans and in East-Central Rhodopes) are roughly estimated at 200,000 (Georgieva, 1999). As for the Roma Muslims (with main geographical locations in Northern, Southern, and Eastern Bulgaria), official figures mention as many as 104,944 Sunni Gypsies and 18,393 Shia Gypsies (out of 313,396 recorded Roma in 1992 Bulgaria) (Erolova, 2012); a recent estimate of Muslim Turkish Roma in Southern Dobroudzha (Silistra and Dobrich districts) is that of 30-35,000 people, with the further subdivision of a small Muslim Tatar Roma community in Balchik (Erolova, 2013).

In Romania, the Turkish minority distribution primarily includes (in 2011) Dobroudzha (20,826 people in Constanţa County and 3,331 people in Tulcea County), within a multiethnic province where, alongside Romanians, also live Tatars, Russians, Gypsies, Greeks, and Ukrainians; a smaller group of 2,315 Turks coexist in Bucharest with Romanians, Gypsies, Hungarians, Jews, Germans, Chinese, Greeks, and Russians. 2001 was the year of Turks' highest demographic representativeness (32,098 persons) in contemporary Romania, between two lower populace levels in 1992 (29,832) and in 2011 (27,698). The only ethno-confessional differentiation between Turks and Tatars in Romania occurs within their common Muslim (*Sunni*) religion (Bara 2006; Chiriţoiu et al., 2009), while the Turkish Gypsies are reported (as about 15-20,000) in Medgidia and Mangalia (Erolova, 2013), and, still, in Călăraşi town (Tesar, 2006).

In Bulgaria, the Turkish language is described to differ from the Istanbul/Anatolyan "national" dialect in Turkey (Zhelyazkova, 1999), with phenomena like the erosion of Turkish vocabulary and loss of Turkish literacy – in context of social advantages felt in speaking majority language – even in Turkish significant environments, like Burgas (Polyanovo village) (Rudin and Eminov, 1990). The compulsory name-changing campaign in the 1980s Bulgaria is remembered with its profound religious implications over the Turkish population traditionally believing that, on Judegment Day, they will be summoned by their original Turkic names (Zhelyazkova, 1999; Sabev, 2012). Vernacular accounts among

Bulgarian Muslims (*Pomaks*) point sometimes (for instance, in Yakoruda town) to their "lost" Turkish language, before their association with Bulgarian ethnicity (Georgieva, 1999; Eminov, 2007). At the same time, the Turkish language is reported as acculturative towards co-religious Tatar and Gypsy groups (Erolova, 2012, 2013), as well as in the Turkish preeminence over Tatar in the Romanian education system and within the Muslim theological high school in Medgidia (Bara, 2006).

Among Turkish minority in Bulgaria, there is a largely-documented tradition of Koranic study and caligraphy (for instance, in Shumen) and also Ottoman writing schools (in Samokov, Vidin, Kjustendil…) (Trankova, 2012). In Dobroudzha (under Ottoman administration until 1878), a Koranic school and Muslim seminar existed in Babadag from 1484 to 1901, when it was moved to Medgidia (Bara, 2006). The architecture of mosques (in Razgrad, Targovishte, Shumen…) reflects (alongside its religious functions) the historical continuance of Turkish ethnicity in Northeastern Bulgaria (Trankova, 2012) and in Northern Dobroudzha as well, with monuments like Babadag Mosque (Kiel, 1978), Medgidia Djamia and Cobadin Mosque (Bara, 2006), Başpunar mosque (Radu and Ciotaru, 2008), etc. In both countries, ancient tombal remains (*türbe*) become local landmarks of ethno-cultural memory – such as Sari Saltîk in Babadag (accounting for early – the 14th century Turkish Islamization in Balkans [Kiel, 1978]), as well as Muslim tombs in Teketo (Haskovo) and in Nova Zagora, which, among *Alevi*, are today places of pilgrimage (Trankova, 2012).

Ethnic endogamy is mentioned among Turkish people (in Başpunar village [Radu and Ciotaru, 2008]), as well as among Turkish Gypsies in Southern Dobrudzha (Erolova, 2012), while Muslim intra-confessional endogamy (but ethnic exogamy) may also take place, such as between Turks and Tatars (in Cobadin village [Bara, 2006]), Turks and Turkish Gypsies (in Northeastern Bulgaria [Erolova, 2012]). Intermarriages between Turkish and Tatar Roma (in Northern and Southern Dobrudzha, as well) actually entail a process of assimilation by Turkish Gypsies, with the membership in the Turkish Roma group as only recognized for people born within the Turkish ethnic community (Erolova, 2013). Interethnic marriages also occur, as (for instance) when engaged between Turkish men and Muslim Bulgarian women in Gotse Delchev area (Rhodopes) (Troeva, 2013), as well as between Turks and Armenians in Plovdiv city (Denova, undated paper). Name-changing campaign in the 1980s Bulgaria is described to have provoked withdrawal within Turkish nuclear or extended family (as a place of restoring traditions, customs, family legends and stories, language and folklore) (Zhelyazkova, 1999).

The ethno-cultural interplay between Turks and other Muslim subgroups and ethnicities in both Romania and Bulgaria takes various forms of expressions, such as in the folk music among Turks, Pomaks, Bulgarians, and Gypsies (in Lukavit area [R. Kazarova *apud* Vlaeva, 2012), in folk dance among Turks and Pomaks in Rhodopes (Vlaeva, 2012), as well as in the common Islamic and Christian inheritance of the *kurban/gurban* sacrifice ceremony (among Turks in Bulgaria [Zhelyazkova, 1999] and in Northern Dobrudzha [Bara, 2006]; among Muslim and Christian Bulgarians in Rhodopes [Troeva, undated paper]; among Turks and Armenians in Plovdiv city [Denova, undated paper]; among Turkish Gypsies in Haskovo and Muslim Bulgarians in Central Rhodopes [Karamihova, 2007]; among Bulgarians in Central, West, and Northwestern Bulgaria [Popov, 2007], etc.) In North Dobrudzan village of Cobadin, Muslim (Turkish and Tatar) women use to dye red eggs on Easter, while, in their turn, Aromanian women cook the (Turkish-originated) sweet pastry of *baclava*, on the feast of Bayram (Bara, 2006); similar ritual exchanges – red-dyed eggs for sacrificial meat – are reported (also during Easter and Kurban Bayram) in the Ottoman past of Turkish-Bulgarian relationships in Bulgaria (Sabev, 2012), while (in Rhodopes), with Bulgarian ex-Muslims still performing kurban

even after their Christian conversion, coloring red eggs for Easter is locally considered a "loss of Muslim identity" (Troeva, 2013).

Several traits in the ethnography of Turkish ethnicity, or Muslim groups in Romania and in Bulgaria are given little or no transborder relevance, and, in any case, they are open for further comparative scrutiny. To some extent, Turkish artisanship in Northern Dobrudzha (iron smithing, weaving, woodcarving, and leather processing in the villages of Başpunar and Cobadin [Constantin, 2011]) may be paralleled in the traditional folk weaving of Turks from Kardzhali (Aleksiev et al., 2012), as well as the circumcision is generally characteristic to Turks in Bulgaria (Zhelyazkova, 1999) and also to Turkish Gypsies in Călăraşi town (Tesar, 2006). Instead, anthropometric evidences of Turkish ethnicity (for instance, in terms of cephalo-facial measurements), which are available for Northern Dobrudzha (Radu and Ciotaru, 2008), expect for future analysis in relation to physical description of Turkish groups in Bulgaria. On the other hand, aspects like the ethno-folkloric panorama of Turkish rites of passage in Bulgaria (as exemplified with the weddings among Turks in Nikopol [Vlaeva, 2012] and with the Muslim funerals in Borino village, in Rhodopes [Aleksiev et al., 2012]), as well as the ethno-historical accounts among the Turks subgroups on their Turkic origin (in the areas of Deliorman and Gerlovo [Zhelyazkova, 1999]) – would require supplementary ethnographic information among Dobrudzhan Turks, in order to establish deeper relatedness (if effective) between the Turkish communities that live today in the two countries.

Conclusions

To an important extent, further discussion would infer elements of autonomous intra-ethnicity among *Kelderari* and *Rudari*, in Romania, and in Bulgaria as well. Romanian language is, thus, a common background for most of *Kelderari* and *Rudari* subgroups technonyms, as it is also for *Rudari*'s self-referential identification, which (as already demonstrated in existing literature) is indeed relevant for the recent historical trajectory of each of them. Coppersmith's trade and woodcarving sustain conjectures of homologous branches of artisanship among *Kelderari* and *Rudari* in both countries, respectively. At least provisionally, kinship (especially the ethnic endogamy) is another source for establishing equivalencies between Gypsy communities that, in Romania as well as in Bulgaria, relate themselves under similar ethnonyms of *Kelderari* and *Rudari* (with their sub-categories). Bilingualism and Orthodoxy generally reflect *Kelderari*'s and *Rudari*'s multicultural coexistence within the ethno-confessional heterogeneity of Southeastern Europe. At the same time, local aspects of the *gurban* sacrifice (such as the calendar, the ceremonial ascriptions, and the folk faiths), and also current inclination to religious conversion, supposedly provide further argumentation for Rudar (rather than *Kelderar*) subgroups' relatedness – on condition of acknowledging the broad interethnic circulation of *gurban/kurban* ritual complex in Balkan, Danubian, and Carpathian areas.

The acknowledgement of a *Crimean Tatar* consistent intra-ethnicity in both Southeastern Romania and Northeastern Bulgaria basically relies on the Tatar nucleus of homologies in own ethno-historical traditions and modern-historical processes, ethnonymic self-representation, endogamy, language conservatism, national ethos, and folk culture. (The physical traits of Tatars contribute to such ethno-characterization, not as arguments *per se*, but in connection with the rest of cultural attributes). When aspects of cultural change or effects of multiethnic coexistence are also reported, they are equivalent (rather than simply analogous) in Tatars' trilingualism towards Turks, Romanians, and Bulgarians, in the Tatar exogamic orientation towards Turks, and in their religious congregation with Turks. As regards the *Nogay, Tat, Kazan, Kipchak, Laz,* and *Kazakh* ethnonymic mixture in Bulgaria, the *Kirim, Noghai,* and *Yaliboyi* dialectal peculiarities in Romania, and theTatar

ethnographic particularities in both countries, they are not reflected into deeper sub-group variability within what makes, after all, a shared ethnicity (of a transborder minority status), the *Tatarlik*.

Discussing the ethnographic bases of (di) similarity between the Turkish minority groups in Romania and in Bulgaria is to acknowledge first their *Muslim* ethno-confessional larger identification, and, within it, the greater majority of *Sunni* Turks in relation to further Muslim subgroups of *Shia* (also including *Alevi/Aliani/ Kuzzelbashi* communities), Pomaks, and Turkish Gypsies. From the Muslim subgroups, it is only the Turkish Gypsies that, due to some homologies in their ethno-confessional attachments, dialect, and marital orientation, appear to represent the same ethnicity in Northern and Southern Dobrudzha. The *Sunni* Turks from Bulgaria and from Dobrudzha are analogous (at least until further assessment) in their theological traditions of literacy and architecture, intra-confessional endogamy, and folk arts, many of which stemming from a common historical or intergenerational development in Southeastern Europe (sometimes rooted into the pre-Ottoman times). As a matter of fact, intermarriages and the multiple cultural exchanges between Turks and other ethnic groups, as well as several isolate traits of Turkish confessional or regional subgroups – presumptively account for the Turks' irregular positioning (as a Sunni majority and as a Shia minority; as ethnicity, but together with Tatars, Pomaks, and Roma…) within the *Muslim archipelago* of Dobrudzha and the Balkans.

Note

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 not have 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.

References

Aleksiev, B., Dobrova, D. and Lozanova, G. (2012) Folklore and Traditional Feasts, in A. Georgieff, B. Aleksiev, D. Trankova, D. Dobrova, G. Lozanova, I. Vlaeva, O. Sabev, R. Popov and Y. Bibina (eds.), *The Turks of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Vagabond Media Ltd., 89-128.

Antonov, S. and Miglev, I. (1999) Tatars, in A. Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 275-286.

Bachvarov, M. (1997) The current ethnic panorama in Bulgaria. *GeoJournal*, 43, 3, 215-224.

Bara, M. (2006) Relaţii interetnice dintre creştinii ortodocşi şi musulmani în Dobrogea. Studiu de caz: Medgidia şi Cobadin. *Philologica Jassyensia*, II, 1, 93-104.

Bocev, V. (2007) Kurban among the Macedonians, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 269-277.

Boscoboinik, A. and Giordano, Chr. (2008) Roles, Statuses, Positions, Social Categories and Multiples Identities of Roma in Romania, in Chr. Giordano, A. Boscoboinik, M. Curelaru, S. Gog, A. Neculau, T. Nițu, F. Ruegg, D. Tarnovschi and D. Zaharia, *Roma's Identites in Southeast Europe: Romania*, Rome: EthnoBarometer, 7-23.

Bulut Ture, D. (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.

Chelcea, L. and Lăţea, P. (2000) *România profundă în comunism. Dileme identitare, istorie locală şi economie secundară la Sântana*. Bucureşti: Nemira.

Chiriţoiu, A., Nicolăescu, M., Novac, S. and Popa, M. (2009) Etnicitate şi turism cultural în satul Başpunar, in B. Iancu (ed.), *Dobrogea. Identităţi şi crize*, *Colecţia Societatea Reală* (5), Bucureşti: Paideea, 94-125.

Constantin, M. (2011) Artisanship and Ethnicity in the 2000s Romania. *Canadian – American Slavic Studies*, 45, 1-35.

Constantin, M. (2012b) Ethno-historical traditions among the minority ethnic groups in the 2000s Romania. *Études Balkaniques*, 1, 26-42.

Constantin, M. (2013a) Dimensiunea etno-culturală a cetăţeniei în legislaţia contemporană a Uniunii Europene şi a României (1992-2012). *Sociologie Românească*, XI, 1, 116-132.

Constantin, M. (2013b) Ethnogenesis and ethnomorphosis in the ethno-cultural variability of Romania. *Revista de Etnografie şi Folclor/Journal of Ethnography and Folklore*, 1-2, 173-196.

Constantin, M. (2014) Auto-referenţialitate şi inter-referenţialitate în antropologia culturală românească (1964-2012). *Revista Română de Sociologie,* Serie nouă, XXV, 3-4, 105-138.

Dalipaj, G. (2007) Kurban and its celebration in the Shpati Region in the first half of the 20th century. A case study of local social structure and identities, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 181-196.

Denova, S. (Undated paper) *Turkish-Armenian Intermarriages in Bulgaria*. Sofia: Institute of Folklore, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1-8.

Dorondel, Şt. (2007) Ethnicity, state and access to natural resources in the southeastern Europe. The Rudari case, in S. Şerban (ed.), *Transborder identities. The Romanian-speaking population in Bulgaria*, Bucureşti: Paideea, 215-239.

Elchinova, M. (2001) Ethnic discourse and group presentation in modern Bulgarian society. *Development and Society*, 30, 1, 51-78.

Elchinova, M. (2002) In Statu Nascendi: Anthropology in Bulgaria, in P. Skalník (ed.), The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe, Prague: Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology, 2, Roman Míšek SET OUT, 23-41.

Eminov, A. (2007) Social Construction of Identities: Pomaks in Bulgaria. *Journal on Ethnopolitics & Minority Issues in Europe*, 6, 2, Special section, 1-25.

Erolova, Y. (2010a) The Crimea and/or Turkey in the self-identification of Crimean Tatars from Dobrudzha, in M. Karamishova (ed.), *Readings in the History and Culture of the Balkans*, Sofia: Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Studies with Ethnographic Museum and Institute for Balkan Studies with Center for Thracology, Paradigma, 213-229.

Erolova, Y. (2010b) Cultura materială şi identitatea ţiganilor din Dobrogea, in S. Şerban (ed.), *Teme în antropologia socială din Europa de sud-est*, Bucureşti: Paideea, 333-358.

Erolova, Y. (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, 237-259.

Flenchea, P. (2009) Municipiul Roman: interferenţe etnice şi confesionale – ruşii lipoveni şi romii, mentalităţi în schimbare, in A. Majuru (ed.), *Conferinţa naţională de antropologie urbană*, ediţia I, Roman, 23-25 septembrie 2009, Bucureşti: Papirus Media, 319-330.

Geană, Gh. (2002) Anthropology's Long Journey to Professionalization. Some Problems with Cultural Anthropology in Romania, in P. Skalník (ed.), *The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, Prague: Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology, 2, Roman Míšek SET OUT, Prague, 93-113.

Georgieva, T. (1999) Pomaks: Muslim Bulgarians, in A. Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 221-238.

Giordano, Chr. and Boscoboinik, A. (2003) Introduction, in Chr. Giordano, A. Boscoboinik, D. Kostova, M. Benovska-Sabkova and A. Chanteraud (eds.), *Roma's Identities in Southeast Europe: Bulgaria*, Rome: ETHNOBAROMETER, Officinestampa, 15-29.

Grekova, M. (1999) Everyday notions of *minority*, in Anna Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 95-110.

Hasdeu, I. (2004) *Kaj Marfa*. Comerţul cu aluminiu şi degradarea condiţiei femeii la romii căldărari, in L. Chelcea and O. Mateescu (eds.), *Economia informală în România: pieţe, practici sociale şi transformări*

ale statului după 1989. Colecţia de antropologie (4), Bucureşti: Paideea, 289-314.

Hristov, P. (2007) Tsvetana Manova: The new "old" kurban. A case study, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 209-230.

Iosif, C. (2009) *L'entreprise de la parenté. Réseaux d'échanges entre les Aroumains de Constanţa*. Cluj-Napoca: Fundaţiei pentru Studii Europene.

Izvorska, A. (2006) Varying concepts of Bulgarianhood and their reflection on the perceptions of ethnic minorities in Bulgaria, in S. G. Markovich, E. Becket Weaver and V. Pavlovic (eds.), *Problems of Identities in the Balkans*, Belgrade: Anglo-Serbian Society, Belgrade and Dosije Press, 139-154.

Kalionski, A. (2007) How to be Karakachan in Bulgaria? Centre for Advanced Study Sofia Working Paper Series, Sofia Academic Nexus Program, 1, *How to Think about the Balkans: Culture, Region, Identity*, 3-23.

Karamihova, M. (2007) Kurban sacrificial offering for good health at a "strange" place, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 231-244.

Kiel, M. (1978) The Türbe of Sarı Saltık in Babadag – Rumanian Dobrudja – some remarks on its historical importance and present condition, in *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi* VI, Istanbul: 205-225.

Kovalcsik, K. (2007) Gurbane as a representation of traditional identity and culture in an Oltenian Rudar community, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 109-136.

Krasteva, A. (ed.) (1999) *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*. Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna.

Marušiakova, E. and Popov, V. (1998) Bear trainers in Bulgaria (tradition and contemporary situation). *Ethnologia Bulgarica. Yearbook of Bulgarian Ethnology and Folklore*, The Ethnographic Institute with Museum, Bulgarian Academy of Science, I, 106-116.

Marušiakova, E. and Popov, V. (2013) "Gypsy" groups in Eastern Europe: Ethnonyms vs. professionyms. *Romani Studies* 5, 23, 1, 61-82.

Mihăilescu, V. (2007) Autochtonism and National Ethnology in Romania. *CAS Workinng Paper Series*, Sofia: Center for Advanced Study Sofia.

Nic Craith, M. (2004a) Culture and citizenship in Europe. Questions for anthropologists. *Social Anthropology. Journal of the European Association of Social Anthropologists*, 12, 3, 289-300.

Nic Craith, M. (2004b) Anthropology and citizenship. A rejoinder. *Social Anthropology*, 13, 2, 211-213.

Njagulov, B. (2006) Les minorités «reciproques» en Bulgarie et en Roumanie à l'époque actuelle: similitudes et divergences. *Etudes Balkaniques*, XLIII, 1, 3-7.

Nunev, Y. (2010) The "informal leader" phenomenon among traditional sedentary Roma communities in Bulgaria, in M. Karamishova (ed.), *Readings in the History and Culture of the Balkans*, Sofia: Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Studies with Ethnographic Museum and Institute for Balkan Studies with Center for Thracology, Paradigma, 245-259.

Paşca, R. (1999) Specificité du terrain tsigane. Notes d'enquêtes auprès des Chaudronniers de Săruleşti. *Annuaire de la Société d'Anthropologie Culturelle de Roumanie*, 90-100.

Popov, R. (2007) Kurban sacrificial offerings on the feastdays of the summertime saints in the calendar tradition of the Bulgarians, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.), *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 259-268.

Radu, E. and Ciotaru, L. O. (2008) Anthropology of the Turkish and Tatar population in South Dobrudzha. *Proceedings of Romanian Academy*, B, 3, 247-267.

Rudin, C. and Eminov, A. (1990) Bulgarian Turkish: The Linguistic Effects of Recent Nationality Policy. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 32, 1-2, 149-162.

Sabev, O. (2012) Who are the Turks of Bulgaria, in A. Georgieff, B. Aleksiev, D. Trankova, D. Dobrova, G. Lozanova, I. Vlaeva, O. Sabev, R. Popov and Y. Bibina (eds.), *The Turks of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Vagabond Media Ltd., 13-34.

Slavkova, M. (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", 277-294.

Sikimič B. (2007) *Gurban* in the village of Grebenac: between participants'memory and researchers' construction, in B. Sikimić and P. Hristov (eds.) *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrad: Serbian

Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Balkan Studies, 153-180.

Şerban, S. (2007) Local Politics and Multiculturalism in Southeastern Europe. *Revue des Études Sud-est Européennes*, XLV, 1-4, 393-406.

Şerban, S. (2009) Catolicii din Moldova. Identitate civică şi istorie orală. *Sfera Politicii. Revistă de Ştiinţe Politice,* Fundaţia Societatea Civică (ed.), XVII, 138, 52-58.

Tesar, C. (2006) Non-locuri şi imagini ale comunităţii «re-create». Romii din Călăraşi, in S. Larionescu (ed.), *Relaţii de vecinătate în localităţi urbane din sudul ţării*, Bucureşti: Paideea, 181-203.

Todorova, M. (2004) Introduction: Learning Memory, Remembering Identity, in M. Todorova (ed.), *Balkan Identities. Nation and Memory*, London: Hurst & Company, 1-24.

Tomova, I. (1995) *The Gypsies in the Transition Period*. Sofia: International Center for Minority Studies and Intercultural Relations.

Tomova, I. (1999) Roma, in A. Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 255-274.

Trankova, D. (2012) Architecture, Arts, Literature, in A. Georgieff, B. Aleksiev, D. Trankova, D. Dobrova, G. Lozanova, I. Vlaeva, O. Sabev, R. Popov and Y. Bibina (eds.), *The Turks of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Vagabond Media Ltd., 71-86.

Troeva, E. (2013) Rhodopes: Perceptions about Boundaries, in Dr. Radojičić and S. Radović (eds.), *Cultural Permeations: Anthropological Perspectives*, Belgrade: Institute of Ethnography SASA, Collection of Papers, 28, 77-87.

Tutunarov-Trajanov, H. (2011) Cultural diversity and identities in process of European integration, in S. Denchev, B. Rama, D. Ivanov, M. Mizov and G. Nazarska (eds.), *Ethnic and Religious Tolerance. Civil Society in South East Europe*, Sofia: Publishing House За буквите – О писменехъ, 266-274.

Vlaeva, I. (2012) Music and Dance, in A. Georgieff, B. Aleksiev, D. Trankova, D. Dobrova, G. Lozanova, I. Vlaeva, O. Sabev, R. Popov and Y. Bibina (eds.) *The Turks of Bulgaria*, Sofia: Vagabond Media Ltd., 129-136.

Zdravkov, Z. (2010) Kinship structures among the Gypsies, in M. Karamishova (ed.), *Readings in the History and Culture of the Balkans*. Sofia: Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Studies with Ethnographic Museum and Institute for Balkan Studies with Center for Thracology, Paradigma, 231-243.

Zhelyazkova, A. (1999) Turks, in A. Krasteva (ed.), *Communities and Identities in Bulgaria*, Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 288-306.