

Roumanie a eu dans la capitale italienne un institut de recherches parmi ceux qui y cultivaient l'archéologie, l'histoire et les beaux-arts. Le prestige acquis alors aux yeux des contemporains a été gardé par les générations qui se sont succédées depuis, même lorsque la conjoncture politique était défavorable à ce souvenir.

L'histoire proposée par les trois auteurs ne se prête pas à une lecture simpliste. La création de Pârvan, grand archéologue vite accueilli par ses pairs de l'étranger, a reçu un siège somptueux, construit aux frais de la Banque Nationale de Bucarest sur un terrain de plus de 4700 m.c., prêté à certaines conditions par la mairie de Rome. Elle était destinée à achever la formation de boursiers qui, envoyés par les quatre universités du royaume de Roumanie, se succédaient pour deux ans. Leur activité comprenait la fréquentation des cours et des conférences à Rome, des recherches dans les archives ou les bibliothèques, ainsi que des excursions qui leur permettaient de connaître de près les monuments de toute époque dont regorge l'Italie et de resserrer les liens d'amitié entre eux. Les travaux que les archéologues, les historiens et les architectes livraient au bout de leur séjour apparaissaient dans deux excellentes revues, *Ephemeris Daco-Romana* et *Diplomatarium Italicum*. En outre, l'*Accademia* entendait exercer son action en participant aux colloques organisés par les autres Ecoles étrangères de Rome et, à son tour, elle était ouverte aux collègues italiens ou à des invités de renom international. La bibliothèque accumulée jusqu'au seuil de la guerre grâce à des échanges ou aux acquisitions, sinon à des donations, allait atteindre une douzaine de milliers de volumes. Pendant le quart de siècle où cette institution roumaine s'est incorporée à la vie savante et artistique de Rome, le protocole diplomatique lui a offert plusieurs visites du roi d'Italie et celle de Mussolini lui-même eut une réception empressée. Cependant, on s'était gardé de manifester une adhésion aux mutations politiques qui se sont précipitées vers la fin des années trente.

En 1940 seulement, un directeur « légionnaire », proche des fascistes, a été imposé par le nouveau gouvernement. Ce qui s'ensuivit – l'intensification de l'idéologie et un budget déficitaire – témoigne de la fermeture graduelle qui devait aboutir à arrêter pratiquement l'existence de l'*Accademia* de 1947 à 1966.

Les anciens membres de l'Ecole se sont dispersés: plusieurs ont refusé de rentrer en Roumanie et ont été valorisés en Occident, d'autres ont subi le filtrage politique et ont même été emprisonnés, tandis que ceux qui se ralliaient publiquement au régime communiste ont été récompensés par des carrières qui répondaient à leur ambition. La plupart sont parvenus à se faire accepter dans la recherche ou dans l'enseignement, ce qui leur a permis de mettre en œuvre ce qu'ils avaient gagné comme expérience à Rome. De cette façon la culture roumaine a bénéficié de cet acquis, quoique semblant parfois oublier ou renier une tradition à laquelle elle devait le meilleur d'elle-même.

Le chapitre le plus intéressant du livre décrit les complicités et les compromis qui ont formé une stratégie de la survivance. A travers les ambiguïtés et les difficultés persistantes, l'institution a repris son existence, formelle d'abord, puis physique. Par là même, son histoire constitue un miroir du devenir de la société roumaine. On peut dire que le désir d'accéder à une authentique vie scientifique n'est pas absent: les auteurs de cette monographie s'orientent d'ailleurs dans cette perspective. Sauf de menues inadvertances (tel article attribué à D.M. Pippidi m'appartient; l'historien Aurel Iordănescu doit être ajouté à la liste des élèves de l'Ecole en 1940–1942), il y a là un travail à louer pour la justesse de ton et la modération de jugement.

Andrei Pippidi

Petar TODOROV, Kancho TODOROV, *Ovcharstvoto v Dobroudja (Sheep breeding in Dobroudja)*, Sofija, Izdatelstvo Faber, 2013, 211 p.

The matters on Dobroudja are even today a battlefield of the national historiographies. The competition is between the authors who are claiming that Dobroudja is a "Romanian" land, and those who state that it is a "Bulgarian" one. Hence, this topic is burdened with nationalistic biases regardless of the nationality of the controversialists. The nationalistic discourse distributes the main roles on this scene, but only seldom the political stakes are recognized. Even when historians make

efforts to join at the round table, again and again the discourse rests captured in the historiography circles (Njagulov 1999). To appropriate Dobroudja's past serves such biases on several points. It is easier thus to write the national history as a linking, a steadily transparent process, while peculiar aspects not fitting with the big picture are left underneath (Iordachi 2002: 168–169). The references to the “oldest dwellers” in the region, either the “*dicieni*” in the case of Romanian historians, or the “*grebentsi*” of the Bulgarian historians, as well as the emphasis on specific facts like the transhumance of the Romanian shepherds from Southern Transylvania or of the Bulgarian ones from Kotel, hide the formidable mixture of populations that came along the times in the province. It is worth noting that the emotional identification of Dobroudja with the Bulgarian national revival goes up till the beginning of 19th century. The land between the Danube and the Black Sea became then both a homestead and an escape corridor for many of the Bulgarians that were seized by the endless Ottoman – Russian wars. The life experiences of the common people were imprinted with traumas like diseases, resettlements, nostalgia for home places (Robarts 2012: 86–94). The authors of the reviewed book emphasize too the close interweaving of the deep social and ethnic changes in Dobroudja with this chain of the Ottoman-Russian wars (pp. 25–35).

The volume by Petar Todorov and Kancho Todorov has at least three main aspects that could interest the researchers¹. Firstly, in the second chapter, the most consistent of the book (pp. 37–150), the authors describe the sheep breeding and the transhumance, a subject of social history, using mainly statistical data. Despite the polemical character of this topic, the use of statistics makes easier to detect and analyse problems like migration, ethnicity, local development of economy and society. Secondly, this statistical frame is used very loosely and it does not prevent the authors to drop in a fallacious argument when they want a trifle too brazenly to decide to whom Dobroudja „does belong”. Thirdly, a comparative perspective, Bulgarian and Romanian, is more fertile in using the statistical sources of the cross-border Bulgarian-Romanian areas, an operation which was quasi-inexistent in the literature of this topic. Therefore, the authors' approach is fully innovative.

The second chapter contains the core of the volume. It starts by presenting the sheepfold/*kashla* in Dobroudja² where the sheep-breeding interweaves with agriculture. According to the authors, there is a difference between a sheepfold with farmstead/*kashla s chiflik* and a Kotel sheepfold/*kotlenska kashla* (pp. 41–48). In both sheepfold types the local notable/*chorbadzhija* was the main owner of the sheep, but in the case of the Kotel sheepfold the other associates could possess together up to a half of the total animals' number (besides sheeps, a sheepfold had also goats, horses and sometimes buffalos). In addition, while in the case of sheepfold with farmstead the head of the domestic unit was the *chorbadzhija* himself, the place of the sheepfold being on his fields near the village, the Kotel sheepfold moved in transhumance to Dobroudja under the supervising of one *kehajja*, whom the *chorbadzhija* has delegated all decision.

In the next chapter are studied the sheepfolds statistics (number of animals, mainly sheep, but not only, owners, areas, taxation) along three periods: before the Crimean war (1856), between this one and the Liberation war (1878), and after 1878 until the Balkan wars (pp. 60–127). The continuation, which is only sketched due to the lack of data, deals with the commerce of sheep breeding products during the same time intervals (pp. 127–141).

For the period before the Crimean war, the authors show how the transhumant routes from southern Transylvania to Dobroudja were interwoven with the commercial exchanges that the Transylvanian towns as Sibiu and Braşov intermediated and introduced in the large networks laying from Central Europe to Ottoman Empire. That explains the relative prosperity of the Dobroudja inhabitants whose sheepfolds had by the end of 16th century around 632,000 animals (p. 67). Bulgarian merchants, who

¹ Kancho Todorov wrote the whole third chapter of the book and a short section in chapter two about the practices of sheep breeding and processing the primary products (pp. 48–59). The Introduction was written by both authors, whereas Petar Todorov's contribution includes chapter one, the rest of the chapter two and the conclusions. Along that time Petar Todorov has published several books and articles about Dobroudja from which he often quotes in this volume.

² The authors refer to the historical region of Dobroudja, that is presently split between Romania, northern part, and Bulgaria, southern one.

lived then in those Transylvanian towns, contributed to this economic growth, enhanced the relations with areas like Sliven and Kotel, and facilitated the transhumant sheep breeding of the Bulgarians.

Despite the big losses caused by the Ottoman-Russian wars, the sheep breeding economy developed, mainly after 1830. Farmstead sheepfolds that could reach tens of thousands of sheep and thousands of hectares coexisted with the transhumant Kotel sheepfolds and with those of the Transylvanian shepherds (pp. 74–77). To evaluate the number of animals in the Dobroudja sheepfolds around 1850 the authors cite the statistics elaborated by Slava Draganova (1993) and Tudor Mateescu (1986). In the five *kaza*-s of the province there were recorded for taxation around 450,000 animals, most of them in Silistra: 330,000. To this figure must be added around 200,000 sheep and goats owned by the Transylvanian shepherds that avoided taxation crossing in summer in Wallachia and Transylvania (the taxation took place during summer)³.

During the Crimean war the Dobroudja population has dropped once again, making the Ottoman administration to retake the colonization policy after the end of the war. The newcomers who settled were Bulgarians from southwest, but also Crimean Tatars and Circassians. While the Bulgarians have got each a plot of land, being compelled to build by themselves their households, for the Tatar settlers the Ottoman administration planned and built up even a new town, Medjidie⁴. Despite these difficult conditions, in the mid- 1870s the Bulgarians have succeeded to replace the Muslims as sheepfolds' owners, partly due to their skills to organize themselves better in the new frame of the capitalist production (p. 98). On the other hand, yet the polarization of land ownership increased together with the spreading of the credit institutions whose owners were the rich merchants, most of them Greeks, from Burgas and Varna (p. 100ff). The most exposed were the Bulgarian landed people, new settlers, who in crisis situations lost their lands (as in the years 1873–1876). The sheep breeding statistics are scarcer for this period. In Draganova's work can be found only scattered villages in three *kaza*-s of the province which were meaning little more than 10% of the entire population. Other statistics, less reliable however, mention around 1,000,000 sheep and 140,000 goats in the Dobroudja sheepfolds then (p. 96). All these animals were owned by Muslims and Bulgarians, because in 1864 a bilateral agreement between the Habsburg and Ottoman empires forbade the Transylvanian shepherds to cross over the Danube (p. 112)⁵.

In the period after the Liberation, Dobroudja was divided between Romania and Bulgaria. The dogmatic Marxist outlook has aged significantly. For instance, the authors proclaim that the Liberation war "liquidated" the remaining of the "feudal" system in the province, representing a victory of a "democratic bourgeois revolution" (p. 114). However, the collated data are sound and provide a coherent picture. The agriculture was gaining much more room in both parts of the province, but due to the intense migration the sheep breeding does not lose the step. Thus, in the mid-1910s, while in southern Dobroudja there were 1,047,000 sheep, in northern Dobroudja their number was slightly superior: 1,110,000 (p. 124)⁶.

The authors have studied the commerce of sheep breeding products along the same three periods. The results of the two treaties that freed the commerce on the Black Sea (Kuchuk Kainardji, 1774) and in the Wallachian Principalities (Adrianopolis, 1830) bore more fruits after the Crimean war when the sheep breeding economy integrated in larger commercial networks (the resettling of the links between southern Transylvania and Sliven-Kotel regions through commercial firms) and its products became to diversify. The building of the transport infrastructure, roads/*shosi*, and the two railways, Cernavodă – Constanța and Ruse – Varna, however modest, have influenced the commercial exchanges.

³ In Draganova's statistics there are recorded also 400 sheep belonging to Romanians/*vlasii*. It seems only these were the Romanian ethnics who, as shepherds, lived in Dobroudja (all of them in Silistra *kaza*). In fact, all the Dobroudja people lived in a transitory way. In this sense, the authors quote the observation of the Romanian agriculturist Ion Ionescu dela Brad, who travelling through the province at that time has recorded big concentrations of the population in certain areas. The reason was the Ottoman policy to colonize population after the 1829 war, but which still after 20 years had weak results.

⁴ The Sultan Abdul Medjid ordered to build this town having in mind a sort of urban utopia and following western ideas, than the ethnic discrimination (Karpal 1986: 288–292). Finally, only a small part of the town dwellers were Tatars, the rest of the places being got by the other ethnic groups of Dobroudja, including Bulgarians. Furthermore, Medjidie became in the 1870s one of the best fairs for the Kotel shepherds, who sold there the products of their sheep breeding work (Romanski 1918: 219).

⁵ However, the authors do not indicate evidence for this information.

⁶ The growth in the northern part was slower, as its territory was almost double than that of the southern Dobroudja.

Others two chapters of the volume look like as appendix of the first one. They are less likely to hold the attention of most readers. This work written in Bulgarian can not be expected to reveal to its public geographical, biological, historical and demographic information about Dobroudja (pp. 11–35). The historical section tries to be a survey of the anti-Ottoman resistance of Dobroudja long time after the final conquest of Bulgarian lands in 1396. What is said here about the wars fought by Wallachian rulers as Mircea the Elder, Dan II (sic!), Vlad the Impaler, and Ottoman rebels as Mustafa Chelebi, or about the Varna campaign, considered to have attempted the liberation of Dobroudja (pp. 20ff) is superficial and controversial. The population of the province, mainly Bulgarians, the authors argue, did migrate over the Danube to Wallachia. For some figures (like on p. 24) we do not know on what sources they are based. The same may be objected to the authors when they venture to mention that in 1850 the majority of the population in the province was Bulgarian (p. 33)⁷. The pages on folklore and ethnography of sheep breeding unfold on the collective social units: *zadruga*, *chelijad*, *kashta*, *kapchina*, *domochadie*. On this basis, inevitably comprising an account of shepherds' rituals and ballads, among the issues raised at the psychological level are the attitudes toward the family, personal objects, faithful animals (sheep, sheepfold dog), as well as the vision of God.

The volume deserves to be seen in as much as testing the state of the art in Balkan studies. Until this present study, this romantic subject of sheep breeding had not been confronted with the strictness of statistics. This work provides helpful information in a less visited field. On the other hand, there are shortcomings, abrupt distortions, and errors that make the work content uncomfortable for studying. Some exaggerations did not add to the authors' reputation, for instance when they drive to demonstrate the "Bulgarian" character of Dobroudja and even... of Southern Transylvania⁸. High are also the flaws like the coming forth of Marxist formulas: such theoretical premises are incoherent or in the best case elusive. The reader is thus compelled to make a personal effort to interpret him the data, as well as to be cautious on the selected statistics.

Stelu Șerban

References

- Draganova Slavka, 1993, *Kolichestvo analiz na ovtsevudstvoto v bulgarskite zemi pod osmanska vlast ot sredata na XIX v. do Osvobozhdenieto*, Sofija.
- Ionescu de la Brad Ion, 1944 (1850), "Excursion agricole dans la plaine de Dobroudja", in Idem, *Opere*, vol. II, București, pp. 81–121.
- Iordachi Constantin, 2002, "La „Californie des Roumains”. L'integration de la Dobroudja du Nord dans la Roumanie", in *Balkanologie*, 6 (1–2), decembre 2002.
- Karpat Kemal, H. 1986. "The Crimean emigration 1856–1862 and the settlement and urban development in Dobruca", in Ch. Lemerrier-Quellejay, G. Veinstein, S.E. Wimbush, (eds.) *Passé turco-tatar. Présent soviétique/Turco-tatar past. Soviet present*, Paris-Louvain: Editions Peeters, EHESS, pp. 275–306.
- Mateescu Tudor, 1986, *Păstoritul transhumant al românilor pe teritoriul dintre Dunăre și Marea Neagră*, București.

⁷ An article is quoted from the Istanbul newspaper/*Tsarigradski vestnik*, no.9, 11.nov. 1850. Amongst the 15, 121 families in Dobroudja, 3731 were Bulgarians, 3454 Turks, 2980 Wallachians, 2225 Tatars, 1092 Cosacks, 747 Lipovans, 200 Greeks, 212 Gypsies, 145 Arabians, 59 Germans, 126 Armenians, 150 Jews. This record overlaps partially with the census that Ion Ionescu de la Brad has made and published in the same year (Ionescu de la Brad 1944). It is strange that while the figures of the Tatars, Cosacks, Germans, and Armenians are exactly the same, the number of Bulgarians family are more with 1,500 in the newspaper record, whereas the number of Turks and Wallachians are lower. Although the authors praise the works of Ion Ionescu de la Brad, his statistics are not quoted.

⁸ For instance, the authors claim that the Transylvanian Szeklers are proto-Bulgarians! Apparently because of this origin they practiced transhumance to Dobroudja and kept close relations with the Bulgarian merchants/*Shkei* in Southern Transylvania (pp. 76–77).

- Njagulov Blagovest, 1999, "Dobrudžanskata problematika (1878–1940 g.) v nai-novata rumŭnska istoriografija", in *Dobrudža*, vols. 14–16, pp. 255–277.
- Robarts Andrew, 2012, "A Trans-danubian Waltz: Bulgarian migration across the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries", in *Anamneza*, vol. VII, no. 3–4, pp. 64–97.
- Romanski Stojan, 1918, "Narodnosten karakter", in Petar Petăr (sust.), *Nauchna ekspeditsija v Dobrudža, 1917 g. Statii ot sbornik "Dobrudža". Geografija, istorija, etnografija, stopansko i durzhavno-politichesko zanchenie*, Izdanie na Saiuza na bulgarskite ucheni, pisатели i hudozhnitsi, Sofija, 1918, pp. 206–230.

Sashka BIZERANOVA, *Mezhdū zhivota i smarta. Pogrebalni i pomenalni obichai pri balgari i vlasi vav Vidinsko* (Between life and death. Funerals customs amongst the Bulgarians and Wallachians from Vidin), Vratsa, Aleksprint, 2013, 544 p.

The volume is the result of the doctoral dissertation Sashka Bizeranova successfully defended in 2012. The author currently works as curator at the Regional Museum in Vidin. She is a Vidin native being born in a village located on the Danube bank, 25 km far from Vidin town. At first glance these circumstances suggest expectations for a conformist work. The use in south eastern European countries is that local intellectuals as teachers or cultural bureaucrats write works on local history which intend to satisfy the national canon. Bizeranova's book challenges this idea.

In this respect, several points should be emphasized. First, the topic, although apparently popular and well known, is framed in a comparative and intercultural context. From 1992 to 2011, Bizeranova did ethnographic field trips in 55 villages from the Vidin area, where the population is Bulgarian and Romanian speaking (the author calls them *vlasi* and *vlashkigovoreni*/speakers of Wallachian, terms she sees as overlapping). Secondly, she has tried in the end to extend the researched area in Romania, mainly in Dolj county, in settlements with Bulgarian speaking people, but not exclusively, as well as in Serbia, in Negotin and Zajechar, areas where islands of Romanian speaking population live⁹. Third, the author extensively uses the archives data, mainly those preserved at the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore in Sofia (pp. 24–26). She compared such information with her field findings and also with the appropriate chapters of the topic's literature. Forth, the vast bibliography is joining foreign books and papers to the Bulgarian works, without neglecting the works in Romanian. It is gratifying to see the author's efforts to learn Romanian, as it is seen from the quotations in the text.

The seven chapters are linked each other, the volume structure is balanced and the main argument easy to delineate. When dealing with the frames of the funeral rituals, they are historical and demographic, but the cultural patterns on which these rituals are lying are also thrown into proper relief. For instance, the author studied these patterns in forms of everyday life, as curses/*kletvi*, and dreams, while in the next chapter the concepts and representations of soul/*dusha* (Bg.)/*sufletu* (Rom.) and Other World/*onija svijat* (Bg.) are described according to the Bulgarians and Wallachians from Vidin. Bizeranova describes with a full amount of details the funeral rituals in three sequels: in the household of the dead person, on the road to the church and cemetery, including the burying rituals, and what happens after the burial. In the last chapter the author records the changes that the funeral customs have got after 1945.

The first chapter (pp. 34–76) deals with the history of the region from the Roman period onward until the Ottoman conquering of the region in 1396, Vidin being the last Bulgarian land that resisted. Bizeranova, purposely or not, does not melt the historical facts with statistics, mainly that of population and ethnic groups. She states that the Vidin population was Bulgarian, but acknowledges that as late as the 18th century there is not sound evidence for population and ethnicity (p. 43). Only at the beginning of the 19th century, there are accurate statistical data. Until then, the region was

⁹ In Vidin Bizeranova has interviewed 83 Bulgarians and 58 Romanian speakers. In Romania she met 14 informants, few of them Bulgarian speakers, while in Serbia all the eight informants were Romanian speakers (pp. 460–465).