Ethnic indifference – Fredrik Barth's conceptual blind spot

Marek Jakoubek
Charles University, Prague, marek.jakoubek@ff.cuni.cz

Abstract

It has been already pointed out by some of the earlier critics that Fredrik Barth in his seminal "Introduction" to *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (1969) defined ethnicity in an ahistorical way as a universal phenomenon intrinsic not only to some societies or historical periods but to mankind in general. Simultaneously Barth understands ethnic identity as a basic and dominant identity, to which other types of identity are subordinated. In this conceptual frame, ethnically indifferent groups, i.e., the groups in which the us-them dichotomisation does not proceed on the ethnic level, and whose members think and act primarily in non-ethnic terms and their identity repertoire lacks ethnic identification, find themselves in a kind of conceptual blind spot. This article deals with relationships of two ethnically indifferent groups in the territory of Bulgaria in the first half of the twentieth century. This historical case study serves both as a kind of development and criticism of Barth's approach and an elaboration of the concept of ethnic indifference.

KEYWORDS: Ethnicity, Ethnic indifference, Fredrik Barth, Balkans

"Minority Reports" on Fredrik Barth's "Introduction"

Fredrik Barth's "Introduction" to his edited volume *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (1969a) ranks among the best-known texts on ethnicity and is thus one of the indisputable classics in the field. However, the study has suffered the same fate as that of many other classic works – its fame and renown have overshadowed its actual content. Although it is cited, "the citations tend to be mandatory and ritualistic, and rarely engage with its actual contents" (Eriksen-Jakoubek 2019: 2). Typically, Barth's Introduction is referred to as a study representing positions of social constructivism, which may be caused by the fact that Barth himself presented it as such (1994: 12). This general reading of the text has become virtually canonical over the half-century since its original publication. However, "unorthodox" commentaries and interpretations of Barth's study have appeared, challenging – without undermining Barth's achievements and the impact of his Introduction – the "canonised" reading, and pointing to the fact that Barth's contribution contains other than purely constructivist undertones. The present paper follows one of the currents of

ANTHROPOLOGICAL NOTEBOOKS 25 (1): 57–76.
ISSN 1408-032X
© Slovene Anthropological Society 2019

such "minority reports" on Barth's "Introduction".[1]

In his "Introduction" (1969a) Fredrik Barth defines ethnicity as a fundamental mechanism of boundary making. According to Barth, this mechanism is 'held constant and is implicitly assumed to be context-independent' (Eriksen in this volume). The systems of relationships entailed by ethnicity in various contexts 'are implicitly regarded by Barth as comparable' (*ibid.*). Thus according to Barth, ethnicity is a phenomenon 'endemic to humanity and not to any particular kind of society' (ibid.);[2] it is an unconditioned category and (therefore) a universal social phenomenon. Ethnicity in Barth's perspective is *ethnicity* regardless of the historical, cultural, geographical or any other context whatsoever; even regardless the availability of the very notion in the society under examination, regardless of whether the society uses different terms for corresponding mechanisms. In any case, in his Introduction, Barth understands ethnicity as an (*a priori*) *pervasive universal constant*. Here, he even goes 'so far as to attribute to it an existence of its own, separate from any social "content"' (Cohen 1974: xii). According to Abner Cohen, we can thus say that, in the last instance, Barth understands ethnicity 'as an essentially innate predisposition' (Cohen 1974: xii).

Unsurprisingly, Barth's text has provoked criticism for presenting a static notion of ethnicity (Cohen 1974: xv; Eriksen 2010: 63) or being 'tributary to an essentialist and static vision of ethnic identity' (Cojanu 2014: 219). Barth has also been (for the same reasons) labelled primordialist (Banks 1996: 13; Cohen 1974: xii), or naturalist (Eriksen 2016: 110, 114). Moreover, it has been repeatedly pointed out that the way Barth treats his other two key terms, *group* and *boundary* contributes to their reification (Cohen 1978: 386; see also Brubaker 2009: 29).[3]

In accordance with the above-cited stance, Barth regards ethnic identity to be a permanent or total identity, which 'constrains the incumbent in *all* his activities, not only in some defined social situations' (Barth 1969: 17, italics added) and an identity *superior to all other identities* – 'the constraints on a person's behaviour which spring from his ethnic identity … tend to be absolute' (1969a:17). Ethnic identity thus constitutes an imperative status that 'cannot be disregarded and temporarily set aside by other definitions of the situation' (ibid.). In other words, Barth defines ethnic identity 'as a more or less immutable aspect of the social person' (Eriksen 2010: 63). While assuming the universal character of ethnicity, Barth presumes that ethnicity – regardless the context of its "occurrence" – bears the *same meaning* and is attributed the *same value* (in principle the highest, or imperative) worldwide.

[1] In the following, I am using material and argumentation from Jakoubek 2018.

[2] Barth, it must be emphasised, is no exception in this regard. On the contrary – this view is quite common among students of ethnicity (cf. Keyes 1981: 27; Isaacs 1974; Maybury-Lewis 1996: 86; Schwartz 1982: 128-9).

[3] It can be added that while Barth criticises the structural-functional approach (Barth 1981: 4–5), his own terminology and conceptual apparatus ("status", "role", "social system" – and, of course, "group" and "boundary") is stuck in structural functionalism and thus suffers the same weaknesses; the reification of concepts is one among them.

The concept of ethnic indifference – Barth's conceptual blind spot

At the end of the last century, many years since Fredrik Barth's contribution, a new concept emerged within ethnicity studies, which seems to be in a relatively clear tension with Barth's approach to ethnicity, and which can be regarded as a relatively strong (yet implicit) critique of Barth's position – the concept of *ethnic indifference*. The concept assumes that the reading of ethnicity as a universal principle of social organisation is problematic or inappropriate (see Burzová 2014 for the discussion of the topic). There existed (and still exist in many places) many groups in the history of mankind, in which the we-they opposition did not follow ethnic lines; these groups identified and organised themselves based on principles other than the ethnic one. As evident from the above outline, Barth's conceptual apparatus in principle does not (and cannot) take the phenomenon of *ethnic indifference* into account – ethnically indifferent groups find themselves in a kind of conceptual "blind spot" in Barth's explanatory scheme.

This study is devoted to the relationship between two ethnically indifferent groups settled in close proximity to one another in northwest Bulgaria in the first half of the twentieth century. These were Protestants inhabiting the village of Voyvodovo and Catholics inhabiting the village of Bărdarski Geran. The main goal of this text will be an attempt to explain why marriages took place between these two communities – *Protestant* Voyvodovo and *Catholic* Bărdarski Geran – the fundamental principle of which was religious endogamy (maintained against their Bulgarian Orthodox surroundings). I am not interested in a general or theoretical elaboration of the fact *that* the boundaries of social groups are crossed (despite the existence of bans on this happening). I am interested in explaining *why* these boundaries were crossed in one specific example in northwest Bulgaria in the first half of the previous century. In this regard, a model I am attempting to follow is not so much Fredrik Barth's Introduction (that is very theoretical) but rather Gunnar Haaland's case-study (representing a kind of "application" of Barth's theoretical premises). In the following text, I will show that the reason for intermarriage between these communities – despite all the things that set the groups apart, including the strict endogamy of both communities – was their ethnic indifference, a parameter that both communities shared. More specifically speaking, I will attempt to prove that the reason the members of both communities intermarried was – in the negative sense – the fact that these marriages *did not cross the ethnic boundary* (the communities were ethnically indifferent and thus ethnic borders did not divide them). In the positive sense, members of these groups married because of a shared faith (albeit of a differing denomination). The shared attitude towards faith was what was important to them, and this was the reason members of these communities repeatedly intermarried.

Voyvodovo: The beginning

Voyvodovo was founded in 1900 by roughly twenty Protestant families from the village of Saint Helena[4] in (today's Romanian part of) Banat. These families left the village for

[4] In Romanian – *Sfânta Elena*; in Czech – *Svatá Helena*.

reasons of religious conflicts and lack of land. The later inhabitants of Saint Helena or their ancestors – so-called tolerance sectarians – were forcibly transmigrated to Banat from Eastern Bohemia (Jakoubek 2010c). This happened after the Patent of Toleration was issued (1781) when they refused to join one of the four "tolerated" confessions of the Patent (i.e., Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Lutheran (Augsburg) and Calvinist (Helvetian)). These were groups that had gathered around folk religious teachers, independent interpreters of the Bible who strictly adhered to their interpretations of Christian teaching. The basis of these groups was the sense of the exclusive salvation that was felt by their members (Nešpor 1999: 129–30). Religion and religious life was 'the primary content of their being; it held a central position in it and was a source of life from which they drew and to which they returned. It affected all elements of their individual and collective lives' (Kutnar 1948: 165). In other words, *religion* was the defining element of these groups.

Voyvodovo and its (not ethnic) endogamy

From the time they entered Bulgarian territory (just as in the previous period), the Voyvodovo community was a significantly closed and self-isolating community characteristic for its high degree of endogamy or endogamy in the position of an ideal (cf. Budilová 2008, 2012, 2017, 2019), i.e., the desire to close itself in from the surrounding population. The rule of endogamy was one of the basic principles for preserving the existence of the Voyvodovo community and one of the primary mechanisms preventing it from assimilating into its surroundings.

Several authors have already mentioned the endogamy of the Voyvodovo community; however, they understood it as *ethnic* endogamy, i.e., as the unwillingness of *Czechs* to marry *Bulgarians* (Večerková 1983; Vaculík 2009; Penčev 2006). Without being familiar with Barth's work, they equally understood ethnicity as a principle of organisation, that is as a principle delimiting individual groups by (ethnic) boundary making. According to these authors, the boundary of the corresponding group was determined by ethnicity – Czechness. This understanding of Voyvodovo endogamy stemmed from the (primordialist) assumption that Voyvodovo Czechs were a part of the Czech nation/ethnic group living beyond its borders – a "Czech compatriot community". It has been pointed out (Jakoubek 2010a, 2018b) that this understanding is erroneous – the ancestors of Voyvodovo's inhabitants left the Czech lands for *religious reasons*. Religion (not ethnic affiliation) was the pivotal organisational principle of their community as the central factor determining their collective identity, while ethnic identity was absent in their identity repertoire. They later left Banat, too, for religious disputes (Jakoubek 2010b: 680), in order 'to have an independent village where no one could interfere in their religious lives' (Karas 1941: 13). Moreover, their desire soon materialised; as a contemporary observer remarked: 'Voyvodovo lived such a rich religious life [which] used to be so powerful that all other phenomena seemed to be secondary and accompanying' (Findeis 1929: 223; cf. also Michalko 1936: 244). Instead of preserving the consciousness of affiliation to the Czech ethnic group, 'what used to be, since time immemorial, the meaning of life for Voyvodovo people … was pure Christianity' (Findeis 1930a: 3), i.e., the striving 'to live a purely religious life' (Findeis 1930b: 2). The goal of Voyvodovans was to create "a king-

dom of God on earth" (*Bozhieto tsarstvo tuk na zemyata*)[5] in Voyvodovo, where people would live "under the flag of faith; under the wings of God" (*Pod zname na vyara, pod krilo na Boga*)[6]. Thus, they built their village not as a community of co-ethnics, but as a *Civitas Dei* (Jakoubek 2010a: 692). As for the self-awareness of the members of this community, it has been argued (Jakoubek 2010b: 688) that its members viewed themselves as (the only true) believers (in opposition to *non-believers*) and as the *sons and daughters of God* (and not members of the Czech ethnic group).

In accordance with the religious definition of the group, the members married only with those of the same religion. They married with co-believers, including other Methodists, Baptists (Kovachitsa, Lom) or Lutherans and Nazarenes (Gorna Mitropolia, Podem, and Brashlyanitsa). Moreover, in fact, the people of Voyvodovo did begin to establish matrimonial ties with members of the local Evangelical congregations in a relatively short period after their arrival in Bulgaria (Budilová 2011: 158–60). In contrast, no cases of wedlock have been recorded between members of the Voyvodovo community and members of the large Czech community in Sofia, the Czech community in near town of Lom, or the Czech work colony near the sugar factory in Gorna Oryahovitsa based on (assumed) shared ethnic affiliation (Budilová 2008; 2010: 184–5).

In addition, the people of Voyvodovo not only attempted through missionary activities to evangelise the surrounding populations but, thanks to these activities, they later took these newly converted brothers and sisters for their spouses (Budilová 2011: 184–5). In other words, these people were accepted as "brothers and sisters" via the act of conversion[7] and – as *believers* – become acceptable as marital partners. Marriages with these people were (from the perspective of their actors) quite clearly *endogamous* marriages, i.e., marriages between group members (i.e., between believers). By the act of conversion, they became a part of one (endogamous) "us-group" along with the people of Voyvodovo. This group enjoyed the feeling of mutual belonging and was determined and defined by a shared *religiosity*. Its boundary was not *ethnic*, but *religious*; it obviously represented an example of an ethnically indifferent group, i.e. a community whose us-them dichotomisation does not take place on an ethnic level.

We, therefore, must correct the findings of authors who in relation to the Voyvodovo community spoke of endogamy, yet understood it as *ethnic endogamy*, i.e., as the unwillingness of *Czechs* to marry *Bulgarians*. As we have just demonstrated, the nature of the endogamy of the Voyvodovo community was primarily religious, and its main directive was not avoiding marriages with Bulgarians; the directive said: marry fellow believers.

Ethnic indifference and the Balkans

The ethnic indifference of Voyvodovo's inhabitants was not uncommon given the time, region, and corresponding geopolitical space. The territory of Bulgaria had long been part of the Ottoman Empire, which only recently had left its dominant position in the area. Ac-

[5] Cit. in Jakoubek 2010a: 688.

[6] Cit. in Jakoubek 2010a: 688.

[7] It should be mentioned that conversion was never carried out with, e.g., one individual, and was typically an affair dealing with at least a whole family.

cording to Muslim religious law, *religion was one of the main criteria for differentiation of the population in the Ottoman Empire*: Muslims had a privileged position; a stronger social ascent could only be achieved by conversion to Islam (Arnakis 1963: 120–2). At the same time, however, followers of other monotheistic religions in the Ottoman Empire received special treatment. The sultan's subjects who fell into this category were split into separate religious-administrative communities, for which the designation *millets* became known. Within the Ottoman legal framework, the terms used had only religious and not national/ethnic connotation (Konortas 2007: 165[8]) and 'the main element of collective identity was religious' (ibid.). So, the millet system followed the line of religion, *because it was the only criterion that the Ottoman government accepted* (Sugar 1996: 5–6). The average citizen of the Balkans '*did not at that time think of himself in ethnic terms*: if asked his identity … he would reply that he was Christian – or Greek or Roman, which meant Orthodox' (Karpat 2002: 441, italics added).

Moreover, the impact of the Ottoman administrative system did not vanish immediately after the fall of the Ottoman Empire; the long ideological influence of this system proved to be long-lasting and deeply 'imbued in the culture and behavior of former Ottoman nationalities' (Karpat 2002: 644; Konortas 2007: 174). Therefore, even after the liberation of Bulgaria in a court in Plovdiv 'when asked if they are Greeks or Bulgarians, the orthodox defendants replied that they were Christians' (Konortas 2007: 175), and in the first decade of the new century in many parts of the region 'many orthodox villagers considered themselves belonging not to a nation but to a religious community' (ibid. 177; cf also Dragostinova 2011: 18–9, 224), finding themselves in the situation of 'national neutrality … contented with the sole religious classification between Christians, Muslims and Jews … indifferent to or ignore the distinction between Greeks, Bulgarians or Russians' (Konortas 2007: 175). So, it was religion – rather than language, culture, race or ethnicity – which very long played a crucial role in the definition of collective identities in the Balkan area (Glenny 1999: 74; cf. also Cowan 2008: 352).

Not only the Ottoman *past* mattered – in the period of the transfer of part of the Saint Helena population to Bulgaria, the country had a valid principle of protection of minorities resulting from the Berlin Treaty (1878), in which, minorities were understood as religious minorities. The first Bulgarian constitution of 1879 followed this line, in which the understanding of minorities as religious minorities was already an exclusive interpretation (Kănev 1998: 68). Furthermore, we should not forget the regional context; the term *Bulgarian*, as in the last centuries, still had a strong religious connotation (Bulgarian = Orthodox), so that conversion to Protestantism entailed that in the eyes of the local population the convert *ceased to be Bulgarian*[9] (Clarke 1971: 304; Nestorova 1987:

[8] Even after 1870 when the Bulgarian exarchate (the Bulgarian millet *(Bulgar milleti)* in Ottoman terms) was created by imperial *ferman*, in Ottoman administrative, a term *Bulgars* (in opposition to *Rums* belonging to Rum millet) 'were not Bulgarians but those who were faithful to the newly established ecclesiastical authority' (Konortas 2007: 168); Bulgars thus were officially a 'not national, but still religious group' (ibid.).

[9] The religious meaning was not the only non-ethnical meaning of the term Bulgarian in the Balkans during the Ottoman period. Another case was a social meaning, when the label Bulgar was used 'to denote peasantry per se" (Roudometof 1998: 13), so that when Bulgars moved into the urban world or became members of the middle class they 'shifted their identity to Greek' (ibid).

115; Stojanov 1964: 57, 60; Shopov 1974: 156–7). In other words, a clearly profiled ethnic awareness of the population was, in the region at that time, presumably, more of an exception than a rule.

Also, in the vicinity of Voyvodovo, there were the villages of Bărdarski Geran and Gostilya, inhabited by a group designated as Banat Bulgarians – Paulicians (the members of this group call themselves *Palkene*) who, in fact, represented a case very similar to Voyvodovo, as their community was also defined by their religiosity, or the (Catholic) confession (Njagulov 1999: 92; Telbizov & Vekova-Telbizova 1936: 3; for more see below).

Bărdarski Geran

As mentioned, Voyvodovo endogamy must be understood on *religious* axes. Just as the community was defined in terms of its religion, the endogamy borders were also religious borders (Budilová 2011: 181–5). Its primary directive was *to marry co-believers*. Most marriages, recorded in the 1898-1950 period, took place among the Voyvodovo Protestants (Methodists). Apart from these endo-local marriages, there were other, exo-local, marital unions with co-believers: five with Baptists from Kovachitsa and 15 with Lutherans from three villages in the Pleven region, Gorna Mitropolya, Podem, and Brashlyanitsa (Budilová 2010: 169). The general acceptability of these marriages for Voyvodovans is obvious from the text above. However, from what has been said so far, the fact that exo-local marriages (i.e., marriages with someone who is not an inhabitant of Voyvodovo) include nine cases of marriages with *Catholics* remains inexplicable.

The Catholics concerned came from the village of Bărdarski Geran[10] inhabited by Catholic Banat Bulgarians – Paulikians.[11] The origin of the group is, within its earlier history, actually double, confluent only after some time. One of these roots is Paulikians. Those first labelled with this term (which is perhaps a reference to Paul of Samosata) were the adherents of a sect with a consistently dualistic teaching, influenced by Manichaeism, whose origin dates back to the end of the 7th century in Armenia, Syria, and Asia Minor. The movement arrived in the Balkan Peninsula in the 8th to 10th centuries, when its followers were settled by Byzantium in present-day Bulgaria (especially in the Plovdiv region), where they were expected to become frontiersmen protecting the empire from invasions from the north. Their learning quickly took root, spread and, in the 10th century, greatly influenced the formation of the Bogomil sect, some of whose members Paulikians themselves became.

The other root explaining the origin of this group is represented by Bulgarian Catholics. The first contacts between Bulgarians and the Catholic Church date back to the second half of the 9th century; in our context, what is essential is the settling of Saxon miners and the establishment of their colonies around Chiprovtsi in the 14th century. Sax-

[10] There were also two marriages between Voyvodovo Protestants and Paulicians from the village of Asenovo in the Pleven region.

[11] In the following recap, we use, without an exception, literature; with regard to the character of the text, we will not refer to each finding separately, but will content ourselves with a lump reference to the works. They are: Njagulov 1999: 14-42; Eldărov 2002: 31-380, Georgiev 2010; Bosilkov-Andreev 1937; Miletich 1903.

ons gradually merged with the surrounding Bulgarian population, but they managed to give them their Catholic faith, so Chiprovtsi and the surrounding villages formed the first homogeneous community of Catholics on the Bulgarian territory, and the region became the centre of Catholicism in the country. Here, later, the Franciscan Missions operating in Bulgaria since the 17th century also found a significant foothold. This, on the one hand, strengthened the faith of existing Catholics; on the other hand, it sought to spread the Catholic faith in the country. One of the objects of their interest was the Paulikians.

The mission celebrated partial successes, partly also due to the significant Paulikian antagonism against both Islam and Orthodoxy. The number of converts, however, was not high. The converts also continued to retain their designation as Paulikians. A significant turnaround occurred, however, in the year 1688, when there was a so-called Chiprovtsi uprising of (mostly) Bulgarian Catholics against the Ottoman domination. After its defeat, part of the Catholic population of the region (including Paulikian converts) left the country and settled in, among others, Wallachia, in the Oltenia region, also called Lesser Wallachia. In 1737, however, the Bulgarian Catholics settled here were involved (on the side of the Habsburg Empire) in war with the Ottomans, but the war would be won by the Ottomans, and the Habsburg monarchy was forced to give up Lesser Wallachia. So, another forced migration occurred, first to Transylvania, then finally (and this time permanently) to Banat, where their centres were (Old) Beshenov[12] and Vinga.

After the defeat of the Chiprovtsi uprising, Paulikians were exposed to significant repression in the territory of Bulgaria. Partly for this reason, and partly because the fugitive rebels found very favourable conditions under Habsburg administration and many of their villages enjoyed considerable privileges, many Paulikians left their village, crossing the Danube and joining the already settled migrants from previous refugee waves from the Bulgarian territory (first in Wallachia, then in Banat). Their population then even outnumbered the former Chiprovtsi population in some municipalities (Vinga), resulting in the fact that the term Paulikian prevails for the identification of the population in Banat. In contrast, as the rest of the Paulikians subsequently adopted Catholicism, the two groups, in principle, merged.

Soon after the liberation of Bulgaria (1878), the Banat Bulgarians sent a delegation investigating the opportunities for a "return" to the country. This opportunity would come shortly in connection with the issuance of the *Law on Populating Uninhabited Land* (*Закон за населяване на ненаселените земи в България*) on 20 May 1880 (according to some authors, this law was directly motivated by the interest of Banat Bulgarians in resettlement). This resulted in several waves of movement of parts of the group to Bulgaria. One of the main regions where the migrants settled is the northwest of the country. A certain part of the population was subsequently made up by Paulikians in several existing communities (e.g., Machmudija (today Radojkovo), Bregare, Dzhurilovo (today Nivjanin), and others). In addition, they were also establishing their new settlements, purely Paulikian ones, such as the communities of Asenovo, Gostilja or the "central" Paulikian village in Bulgaria – Bărdarski Geran. Bărdarski Geran was founded in 1887 by fourteen

[12] In Romanian: *Dudeştii Vechi*.

families resettled from Banat. After them, more and more families came. So, in terms of population and area, the village, soon, hugely increased.

The Paulikian community of Bărdarski Geran, differed from the ordinary Bulgarian population in many ways; in addition to the Catholic faith and Banat origin, also by a "higher", or "European"/"Western European" culture (Njagulov 1999: 96, 101; Nikolov 1996: 41; Georgiev 2010: 117). This was true for a number of spheres, such as food, household management, organising domestic and municipal areas (order and cleanliness), land management – the use of iron ploughs pulled by horses, breeding geese (and the use of feathers as filling for pillows and duvets), pigs and others (Nikolov 1996: 40–1; Njagulov 1999: 23). The architecture of residential houses was also unique (Bosilkov-Andreev 1937: 8) as well as the equipment of houses (furnaces heated with straw). Therefore, Catholic residents of Bărdarski Geran were, due to the above-mentioned and a number of other (see below) characteristics, a model for the surrounding Bulgarian population in backward regions (Njagulov 1999: 101; Nikolov 1996: 41; Necov 2006: 35).

Voyvodovo and Bărdarski Geran: Culture

However, why did we take this relatively extensive excursus? For a simple but very compelling reason: for the surrounding population, members of the Voyvodovo community significantly merged with the residents of Bărdarski Geran. Voyvodovo was, since its foundation, known as *the Banat village* (*Banatsko selo*) and its inhabitants as *Banat people* (*Banatchani*) (Necov 2006: 34; Stojanov 2005). Although in this case the origin of the term was linked, in the beginning, (apparently) with the fact that Voyvodovo founders came to Bulgaria from Banat, the term "Banat people" was generally used just for the Banat Bulgarians – Paulikians (Njagulov 1999: 99; Telbizov & Vekova-Telbizova 1936: 3). These inhabited several municipalities in the region; their centre was, however, Bărdarski Geran (see above); this was confusing. What was the approach of the surrounding Bulgarian population towards both municipalities and their residents? This is revealed to us by the first (since 1926) Voyvodovo teacher, Findeis, in his essay, based on years of personal experience. The corresponding segment of the text (Findeis 1932) begins with a Bulgarian villager looking for "*baj*[13] Vasil" in Voyvodovo. This baj Vasil is called "Banat man". After a short series of clarifying questions and answers, the Bulgarian continues: 'And in Bardar, [i.e., Bărdarski Geran] there are your people too, right?' After a negative response by the Voyvodovans,

> … the Bulgarian is shaking his head dubiously. Still, he remembers some new people founding a new village on the *Gladno pole*[14] and that they were and are called Banat people. He knows many of them … He recalls that he was in the army with Voyvodovo Banat people and with Banat people of Bardar [i.e. Bărdarski Geran]. He only talked to them in Bulgarian, true, but it never occurred to him to ask them who they actually were; he knew they were not Bulgarians (Findeis 1932: 46).

[13] *Baj* – (from Turkish) a form of addressing an older man, similar to English "uncle".
[14] *Gladno pole* (i.e. Hungry Field) – the territory where Voyvodovo was founded; also: a designation of part of the Voyvodovo area.

The main reason that the two groups, i.e., Voyvodovo Protestants on one side and Catholics from Bărdarski Geran on the other side (or just concerned villages and their residents), blended in the eyes of the inhabitants of the surrounding villages was as simple as valid – the communities *were substantially similar*. This similarity covered a wide range of levels: firstly, the "Banat" origin; secondly, a similar spatial plan of the two communities (both villages consisted basically of a rectangular grid of wide streets, having no parallel in the region of the period[15]), which can be regarded as a kind of external factor. However, mainly, the communities had a number of similarities in areas such as material culture, for instance, a similar disposition of residential buildings, as well as furnishings (to represent the above-mentioned: the furnace or pillows and duvets), farm equipment or machinery (e.g., typical light wagons with an iron axis (Necov 2006: 31; Njagulov 1999: 95; Bosilkov -Andreev 1937: 19); mechanical hoes (Necov 2006: 55; Njagulov 1999: 95); wide rakes for hay-making (Necov 2006: 55; Njagulov 1999: 95) and many others). There were strong similarities with regard to the use of many (especially agricultural) procedures (a typical example is using horses as pulling animals) (Stojanov 2005: 117), and the species of animals raised (horses and, typically, flocks of geese) (Stojanov 2005: 232). Both communities were admired by their neighbours for their personal hygiene and the cleanliness of their homes, yards, municipal public spaces and fields (always clear of weeds), etc. (Penčev 2006: 103; Necov 2006: 53; Stojanov 2005: 234; Nikolov 1996: 41; Bosilkov-Andreev 1937: 8, 22).

In addition to the elements of material culture, both communities were highly similar to each other in the "shared (moral) values" – members of both groups were perceived by their neighbours as extremely hardworking (Necov 2006: 55; Njagulov 1999: 25; Nikolov 1996: 41), enterprising (Njagulov 1999: 25), tidy (Penčev 2006: 103; Necov 2006: 35; Nikolov 1996: 41), disciplined and organised (Njagulov 1999: 102; Stojanov 2005: 234; Gjukov 2006: 89), respectful of other people's property (Njagulov 1999: 25; Necov 2006: 50; Penčev 2006: 98): generally speaking, people with high moral principles and qualities (Njagulov 1999: 102; Findeis 1929: 222; Stojanov 2005: 234). In all these features, these two communities differed largely from the neighbouring villages and residents and resembled each other. Similarly, the culture of both these communities was unanimously regarded as higher than the culture of the common Bulgarian population in the region (by the population themselves) (Stančev 2007: 1; Necov 2006: 35; Njagulov 1999: 101). It is perhaps, therefore, not surprising that the two groups were considered (for the reasons mentioned) and spoken of as models for the neighbourhood (Njagulov 1999: 101; Nikolov 1996: 41; Penčev 2006: 103; Michalko 1936: 54), or a model to follow (Njagulov 1999: 96; Penčev 2006: 102; Findeis 1930b: 2). In both cases, researchers have agreed on the "civilising role" of the two communities in the region (which, it is true, was generally considered rather backward) (Penčev 2006: 102; Niklov 1996: 41; Bosilkov – Andreev 1937: 20, 22).

Now is perhaps the time to come back to our introductory question. It was the following (seemingly difficult to explain) fact: from the total number of exo-local mar-

[15] Naturally, this statement is partly based on the fact that both villages were built on the greenfield site. For more on Voyvodovo and Bărdarski Geran architecture see Kňourek-Budilová 2015.

riages of the members of the Voyvodovo community, whose emblematic element was the *Protestant-oriented religion*, marriages with the also significantly endogamous *Catholics* from Bărdarski Geran amounted to nine cases. For comparison, this constitutes only six cases fewer than marriages between Voyvodovo community members and members of the Pleven Lutheran community. Moreover, if we add two marriages with Paulikians from Asenovo (a village of Banat Bulgarians in the Pleven region), the number of marriages of Voyvodovans with Catholics would be only four cases fewer than their marriages with Lutherans (otherwise most preferable marriage partners of Voyvodovans apart from partners from within their community). As follows from the preceding paragraphs, it seems that we could find the answer or the justification of that disproportionately high number of marriages between Voyvodovo *Protestants* and *Catholics* from Bărdarski Geran in the sphere of culture. It seems that one of the major reasons for the high rate of marriage between these confessionally different groups could be unprecedented *cultural proximity* of the two communities, namely the fact that in a number of key aspects, these communities were significantly similar and close to each other and their members, therefore, "understood" each other very well.

Although we believe that the just-mentioned "cultural" explanation contains a great deal of truth and, therefore, we consider it to be highly plausible, we do not intend to be satisfied with it. The explanation also has at least one weakness, which is that it ignores or takes no account of a key and for both communities crucial factor – religiosity: no explanation that does not include this element in its framework is adequate and satisfying. The following section will, therefore, attempt to explain this phenomenon: an explanation that not only does not shy away from the religious dimension. Quite the contrary – we will attempt to provide an explanation in which religiosity will constitute the very basis and starting point.

Voyvodovo and Bărdarski Geran: Religiosity

The aforementioned "cultural" comparison of the two communities indicated that the reason for the disproportionately high rates of intermarriage between the two groups could be the cultural similarity that prevailed between the two communities. The explanation ignored religiosity because, in the corresponding sphere between these communities, a consensus was obviously somewhat absent. On the one hand, nothing seems more obvious – one of the groups was Protestant, the other Catholic. On the other hand, however, it must be noted that things appear to be like this primarily due to a biased perspective. In many respects, the two communities are actually significantly similar, even if we focus *mainly* on their religiosity.

We have already discussed the position of religion in the case of the Voyvodovo community in the introductory chapter on Voyvodovo. Now, the Paulikians are going to be discussed. Among the authors dealing with the group, there is a clear consensus that they are a significantly and strongly religious community. Paulikians are considered and considered themselves to be "Christians with firm belief" (Bokova 1998: 268), and it is their faith that is, in the case of their communities, considered to be a constitutive element, meaning the "bolt" holding together the social structure of the respective commu-

nities (Telbizov & Vekova-Telbizova 1936: 3). This fact has an entire range of different manifestations.

A well-known example is the fact that Paulikians, from the beginning, strove to be able to settle on Bulgarian land with their own communities, separated from the rest of the population; in light of this, it is hardly surprising that 'the first and fundamental motive of this effort was the religious' (Njagulov 1999: 92-93). Also, endogamy controlled by religious principles goes hand in hand with this effort to preserve the identity of the community (Elenkov: 31). The heightened religiosity determines the character of the Paulikian communities in other ways; for example, it has a significant influence on the sphere of ceremony, where it caused, inter alia, the elimination of secular folklore (Njagulov 1999: 26) – which is the same conclusion that Penchev made about Voyvodovo (1988: 485).

To sum up, in the case of the Paulikians we are dealing with a society for which the overarching religiosity is the central axis of its existence (Njagulov 1999: 92), where religiosity also dominates the collective identities of its members (Elenkov: 37). We could go on, but it is hardly necessary. It is quite obvious that the Paulikians represent the kind of community whose central organising principle, as well as a central factor in determining the collective identity of its members, is religiosity. It remains only to add – *just like in the case of the Voyvodovo*.

Leaving aside the question of confession, if we assess the *type* of the corresponding groups, or if we look at religiosity with sociological eyes as a structural parameter, then one must conclude that the communities of Voyvodovo Protestants and Bărdarski Geran Catholics are significantly similar – and it is mainly due to the role that (structurally conceived) religiosity plays within them. It seems, therefore, that the greatest mistake of the "cultural" explanation presented above is that it stopped halfway. As we have just shown, it is precisely the consideration of religiosity that shows us the extent to which the given communities are close, or how much they resemble each other as socio-cultural formations.

The presented "upgrade" of the "cultural explanation", which not only takes into account religiosity, but even puts it, in its entirety, in the leading position, shows, like the previous chapter, that the unusually high rate of marriages between the two (confessionally) different groups was the result of the significant structural similarity of the two communities. The communities share not only a number of cultural traits but also an eminently religious worldview in whose centre stood the Bible and God. The final part of this section will be devoted to a discussion of this situation.

The previous text has shown that, in certain respects, it is possible and beneficial to discuss the faith of members of the two communities, so to speak, regardless of their confession. In the previous case, we performed this analytical separation and gave precedence to the structural and cultural dimensions of religiosity over the confessional aspect. Now let us see if it would be possible to take off the confessional gown from the faith of the analysed groups and focus on its aspect that could be called "existential".

Again, in this case, we have better information regarding the Voyvodovo community. The relationship of (the ancestors of) Voyvodovo community to a confession and, in general, to the institutionalised expression of their (otherwise really extreme) faith, was quite free. This aspect of their faith was already evident in Saint Helena (see, e.g.,

Budilová-Jakoubek 2018.); more recently, it significantly arose especially in the context of migration to the Bulgarian territory. Here, the resettlers – members of the Evangelical Reformed Church – found no appropriate institutional framework, so without much ado they became Methodists. The transition from one denomination to another did not constitute a major problem for the people concerned because their needs were, in this respect, relatively modest (though rigorous): "only the basis to be the Word of God. This is what they wanted!" (Míčan 1934:108). What was characteristic of the faith of members of the community was the emphasis (in the wording of their present-day descendants, as well as their former neighbours) on the "true", "genuine" faith – that is, on the aspect of the faith we have called existential – accompanied, of course, by a certain lack of interest in its formal endorsement.

Apart from general theses about the exalted nature of their faith, in the case of Catholics from Bărdarski Geran, we have no such direct evidence. What we have, however, are the testimonies of the Voyvodovans, according to whom the inhabitants of Bărdarski Geran "had the same attitude toward the faith as we did",[16] which allows us to assume that, due to their strong similarity in many other areas, or the structural analogue of both groups, at least a certain degree of consensus prevailed here as well. We can also cite the example of Jurij Bobojchev (*1916), a Paulikian from Bărdarski Geran as one piece of evidence of the validity of the assumption provided. Jurij, after having married the Voyvodovo community member Marie Křivánková (*1922), moved to Voyvodovo. Here, Jurij Bobojchev attended the local Protestant church without a significant discontinuity until his death. He took part in the religious life of the Voyvodovo community, and his religious zeal did not falter by changing confession. He took part in the corresponding events, as former Voyvodovans say, "just like us" (according to others, even "more than our men and women").

Conclusion

We have shown that Protestants from Voyvodovo saw religion as the primary criterion for the selection of a marriage partner. We have seen that they were willing to choose individuals of the same or similar confession, i.e., individuals who belonged to one of the Protestant confessions (Methodists, Darbyists, Baptists, Nazarenes, Lutherans, etc.) located in Bulgaria and the given region at the time. This fact is not surprising if we reiterate that *faith*, not *ethnic affiliation*, had long been the cornerstone of their identity and the organisational basis for their community. This is why Protestants from Voyvodovo were relatively willing to marry Bulgarian Methodists or Baptists but never married Czech Catholics living, for instance, in the nearby town of Lom, in Sofia or Gorna Oryahovitsa, and other locations throughout Bulgaria. A shared Protestant confession and the similar concept of faith to them represented a guarantee of shared values; what we today call "ethnicity" in no way played a fundamental role, no less a decisive one. The relationship between faith and confession, however, was more complex in this context. For the inhabitants of Voyvodovo, faith was important primarily as an internally experienced

[16] P. K. Velké Přílepy, 4. 4. 2018.

(and shared in the community) individual relationship with God (see Budilová-Jakoubek 2018). If this condition was fulfilled, the issue of a specific confession was more or less secondary (they changed their confessional affiliation twice in Saint Helena in Banat and once more after moving to Bulgaria).

From this perspective, Voyvodovo Protestants should evaluate all other Christian faiths in their surroundings (i.e., Protestants, Catholics, Orthodox) in the same way.[17] However, Voyvodovans saw their Orthodox surroundings as *non*-believers. This was not for reasons of their differing confession, but for their insufficient interest in faith and the absence of an effort to establish an individual relationship with God. It was thus tepidity of faith (or – in the eyes of the Voyvodovans – the absence of it) on the part of their Orthodox surroundings that stood (among the Voyvodovans) in the background of the given endogamous border, not affiliation to a different Christian confession, a differing language or "ethnic origin". Although they regarded the Orthodox Christians as non-believers for their lack of interest in faith, they viewed Catholics from Bărdarski Geran in a wholly different manner. With them, they encountered a similarly deep, devout faith and an emphasis on a good, morally correct life. Although this was a group that was in many perspectives different to the Voyvodovans, they were brought together by their concept of faith, a factor that was decisive in this context. It was for this reason that Bărdarski Geran Catholics became the marriage partners of the Voyvodovo Protestants.

Now we have arrived at the conclusion of our hypothesis regarding the disproportionately high number of marriages between Protestants of Voyvodovo and Bărdarski Geran Catholics. In the first round of our response to the question, namely of what stood behind the surprising number of marriages mentioned between members of the two communities, we proposed the strong *cultural similarity* between the two groups as one of the possible main reasons. Subsequently, we showed that part (quite a central part) of the cultural similarity is, despite the difference in the overt expression of professed faiths, also *religiosity*, in principle occupying an identical role in both groups and shaping both communities into structurally considerably identical forms. Finally, we showed that religiosity/faith is the same characteristic feature for both groups, not only in the cultural sphere but also in the existential sphere. In both cases, a clear contradiction on the confessional level was overcome by looking to a more significant conformity in other areas and thus, this contradiction was considered secondary. We cannot ignore that in this section of our study, we have come full circle: at the beginning it was a certain aspect of religiosity, i.e., denominational affiliation, which made, to some extent, the number of marriages between Voyvodovo Protestants and Catholics from Bărdarski Geran a mystery; at the end, it was *another aspect of religiosity*, the "sincerity", "genuineness" of faith, which presented this "mystery" in a new light, in which this practice seems quite understandable and acceptable. In other words, if it initially seemed that the biggest obstacle to intermarrying between the two communities stood on the religious level, later it turned out that it was *the* religious sphere that provided probably the strongest reasons for this practice.

[17] There were no Muslims located in the region (after the foundation of an independent Bulgarian state in 1878, they were either ejected or left for the Ottoman Empire on their own accord).

The phenomenon of ethnic indifference is two-sided. On the one hand, ethnically indifferent groups represent those in which the we-they opposition does not follow ethnic lines, while on the other, these groups identify and organise themselves on the basis of principles other than the ethnic one. In the case of the inhabitants of Voyvodovo and Bărdarski Geran, this principle was religion. In both communities, religiosity was a dominating organisational principle as a central factor of the constitution of identity. So, in the case of these communities, both criteria – the "negative" as well as "positive" – are met. These criteria or parameters are at the same time a response to the question placed in the introduction of this text, i.e., why members of both communities intermarried. My answer, then, is: on the one hand, they shared a faith (albeit not a denomination), on the other they were *not* divided by a differing ethnic identity/loyalty and were not crossing an ethnic boundary by marrying. The "genuineness" of faith, in this case, managed to overcome even the boundaries between Protestant and Catholic denominations. Not *ethnic* but *confessional* boundaries were what was at stake in this case, what divided the given groups, and, naturally, what was crossed. Therefore, the case was not that *Czechs* were marrying (Banat) *Bulgarians* – *believers* were marrying *believers*.

This conclusion does not constitute only an "empirical" finding. It is an illustration of an application of the ethnic indifference concept (theory). The concept is the antithesis to Barth's influential notion of ethnicity. Barth defines ethnic categories mainly formally as empty "organisational vessels" (Barth 1969: 13), which are, as such, constant, fixed, and universal (Cohen 1974: xii; Eriksen 2010: 63). Barth understands ethnicity as an *analytically* defined domain; he does not pose the question of whether ethnicity is recognised as a separate domain by investigated societies. The existence of ethnicity in the *emic* perspective of actors thus seems quite irrelevant for Barth. Thus, Barth's framework is unable to, or cannot comprehend ethnic indifference. However, it should be pointed out that Barth's approach is not *a priori* wrong; it is only inappropriate to the analysis of certain phenomena and processes. This study indicates that Barth's concept of ethnicity is not universally valid, on the contrary, it is a partial and particular concept, and in certain cases, we must complement it or even substitute it with other approaches. However, perhaps we can even say that neither Barth's nor any other concept of *ethnicity* would help us in understanding the particularity of the two communities because their notion of identity is, in fact, the antithesis to *ethnic* identity as such.

In their discussion of the "ethnicity paradigm" established in Western scholarship, Linnekin and Poyer (1990: 4) claim that 'ethnicity is … perceived to be grounded in differences of descent and origin' (cf. also Astuti 1995: 464). This holds true since the first conceptualisations of ethnicity by Max Weber (1978: 389), through many others (Brass 1980: 3; Francis 1976: 6, 39; Eller 1997: 2; Horowitz 1985: 57; Isaacs 1974: 29–30; Keyes 1981: 5; Schermerhorn 1970: 12; Schermerhorn 1974: 1; Shibutani – Kwan 1967: 40–41; Stone and Piya 2007: 1475; Todorova 1993: 135; Van den Berghe 1981: 24 *at passim)*[18]*,* to Thomas Eriksen (2013: 294) or Andreas Wimmer (Wimmer 2013: 7) – in

[18] It could be added that (a belief in) common origin was also a part of a definition of belonging to ethnos according to proponents of Soviet "ethnos theory" (cf. Bromley 1978: 18).

all the theories, the key element of the definition of ethnicity is (a belief in or a myth of a common) origin.[19] *Inter alia* for this reason, Linnekin and Poyer (ibid.: 2) also point to the fact that conceptualisation of ethnicity is akin to the conceptualisation of kinship (see cf. Eriksen 2001: 44; Hechter 1986: 19; Horowitz 1985: 57; Keyes 1981: 6; Smith 1981: 66; Van den Berghe 1981: ch. 2 *passim*). Thus, at the very core of the "ethnicity paradigm" Linnekin and Poyer find a key proposition that 'people are as they are because they were born to be so' (ibid. 4; cf. also Astuti 1995: 464). This finding also confirms a more general conclusion made earlier by De Vos and Romanucci-Ross that 'ethnic identity is in essence *a past-oriented form of identity*' (1982: 363; italics added).

In this perspective, as mentioned above, a collective identity of the Voyvodovo community is an antithesis of all identities stemming based on "ethnicity paradigm". A constitutive element of the identity of members of Voyvodovo community was faith. In their view, in contrast to what a person is born to, he or she *becomes* a believer. Unlike the identity acquired by one's origin, for Voyvodovans faith is an (existential) performance ('You've got to want it ... you have to accept it in your heart'[20]). Faith is not inborn, inherited, faith is *gained*.

Moreover, (gained) faith – as well as an identity based on it – was, for the Voyvodovo community, more important than any origin. In general terms, for the Voyvodovo community, what you become (through an act and continual performance of belief) was more important than what you are born. Therefore, in its nature, the religious identity of Voyvodovans was *post-natal* (i.e., origin-free) and *performative*. In the typological frame posed by Linnekin and Poyer (1990: 8), Voyvodovo identity represents a Lamarckian type (the opposite to the Mendelian model, in which an identity is determined by descent) whose premise is that 'people are not simply born into social groups but may – in fact, must – become members through their actions' (*ibid*. 8). Contrary to past-oriented, birth-ascribed ethnic identity, based on one's origin, in the case of Voyvodovans one's identity was life-achieved and depended on one's will and practice; i.e., Voyvodovans were as they were not because they were born to be so, but because they (postnatally) *became so*. To sum up, to understand the distinctiveness of this (ethnically indifferent) group and its identity, we need a concept other than ethnicity.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported by the European Regional Development Fund-Project "Creativity and Adaptability as Conditions of the Success of Europe in an Interrelated World" (No. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000734).

[19] Though Linnekin and Poyer quote Barth as a prototypical case (Linnekin & Poyer 1990: 2), his position is not so simple and he may even be regarded as an exception – although he does mention origin when defining ethnic identity (Barth 1969: 13), it is indicated as one of the "presumptive" options; he is thus much more cautious to equate (the myth of) origin and ethnicity than the majority of other authors.

[20] B. Č. (born in 1921), Mikulov 2.5.2014.

References

Arnakis, George, G. 1963. The Role of Religion in the Development of Balkan Nationalism. In: Charles Jelavich & Barbara Jelavich (eds.), *The Balkans in Transition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 115–44.

Astuti, Rita. 1995. The Vezo are not a kind of people. Identity, difference and 'ethnicity' among a fishing people of western Madagascar. *American Ethnologist* 22(3): 464–82.

Banks, Marcus. 1996. *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions.* London: Routledge.

Barth, Fredrik. 1969. Introduction. In: Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Differences.* Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 9–38.

Bokova, Irena. 1998. Katolici. In A. Krăsteva (ed.), *Obschtnosti i identichnost v Bălgarija.* Sofia: Petekteon, pp. 260–71.

Bosilkov, Evgenii & Dano Andreev. 1937. *Kratka istorija na s. Bărdarski geran 1887-1937*, Bjala Slatina.

Brass, Paul, R. 1980. Ethnic Groups and Nationalities. In: Peter F. Sugar (ed.), *Ethnic Diversity and Conflict in Eastern Europe.* Santa Barbara: Clio Press, pp. 1–68.

Bromley, Yulian V. 1978. On the typology of ethnic communities. In: Regina E. Holloman & Serghei A. Arutiunov (eds.), *Perspectives on Ethnicity.* The Hague: Mouton.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2009. Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism. *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 21–42.

Budilová, Lenka. 2008. Některé aspekty příbuzenství a sňatkových vzorců u 'vojvodovských Čechů'. *Český lid* 95(2): 127–142.

Budilová, Lenka J. 2011: *Dědická praxe, sňatkové strategie a pojmenovávání u bulharských Čechů v letech 1900-1950*. Brno: CDK.

Budilová, Lenka. 2010. *Vojvodovo, česká vesnice v Bulharsku: příbuzenství, manželství a dům*. Disertační práce na katedře antropologických a historických věd FF ZČU v Plzni (unpubl.).

Budilová, Lenka, J. 2012. 'Ať se neztratí jméno': Jména a pojmenovávání u bulharských Čechů. *Český lid.* 99(4): 407–25.

Budilová, Lenka, J. 2017. Patriarchát na Balkáně – Dominantní ideologie nebo škála možností? (Na příkladu Vojvodova, obce Čechů a Slováků v Bulharsku). S*ociológia* 49(4): 405–26.

Budilová, Lenka J. and Marek Jakoubek. 2018. *Bulgarian Protestants and the Czech Village of Bulgarian Voyvodovo.* Sofia: New Bulgarian University.

Budilová, Lenka J. 2019. Endogamy between ethnicity and religion. Marriage and boundary construction in Voyvodovo (Bulgaria), 1900-1950. *History of the Family.* DOI: 10.1080/1081602X.2019.1641132

Burzová, Petra. 2014. *Okouzleni pohledem na dav. Principy uzavření a meze postsocialistické slovenské identifikace.* Prague: SLON.

Clarke, Franklin, J. 1971. *Bible Societies, American Missionaries and the National Revival of Bulgaria.* New York: Arno Press & The New York Times.

Cohen, Abner. 1974. Introduction: The Lesson of Ethnicity. In: Abner Cohen (ed.), *Urban Ethnicity.* London: Tavistock, pp. ix-xxiv.

Cohen, Ronald. 1978. Ethnicity: Problem and focus in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7: 379–403.

Cojanu, Daniel. 2014. Ethnicity as Social Fact and Symbolic Construction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 149: 217–21.

Cowan, Jane K. 2008. Fixing National Subjects in the 1920s Southern Balkans: Also an International Practice. *American Ethnologists* 35(2): 338–56.

De Vos, George and Lola Romanucci-Ross. 1975/1982. Ethnicity: Vessel of meaning and emblem of contrast. In: George De Vos & Lola Romanucci-Ross (eds.), *Ethnic identity: cultural continuities and change.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 363–90.

Dragostinova, Theodora. 2011. *Between two motherlands. Nationality and emigration among Greeks of Bulgaria, 1900 – 1949*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Eldărov, Svetlozar. 2002. *Katolicite v Bălgarija 1878-1989.* Sofia. Mezhdunaroden centăr po problemite na malcinstvata i kulturnite vzaimodejsvija.

Elenkov, Ivan. Katolicheska cărkva v Bălgarija i obshtnostnite identichnosti na prinadlezhashtite kăm neja verni prez XIX u părvata polovina na XX vek. http://www.ilit.bas.bg/bi/include.php?file=elenkov#_ftnref134. Accessed on 25 January 2019.

Eller, David J. 1997. Ethnicity, Culture, and "The Past". *Michigan Quarterly Review* 36(4): 1–25.
Eriksen, Thomas H. 2001. *Tyranny of the moment.* London: Pluto Press.
Eriksen, Thomas H. 2010. *Ethnicity and Nationalism. Anthropological Perspectives*; New York: Pluto Press.
Eriksen, Thomas H. 2019. The Epistemological Status of the Concept of Ethnicity. Anthropological Notebooks 25(1):27-36.
Eriksen, Thomas H. 2013. Ethnicity: From Boundaries to Frontiers. In: James G. Carrier & Deborah B. Gewertz (eds.), *The Handbook of Sociocultural Anthropology*. Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 280–98.
Eriksen, Thomas Hylland & Marek Jakoubek. 2019. Introduction. In: Thomas Hylland Eriksen, and Marek Jakoubek (eds.), *Ethnic groups and boundaries today. A legacy of fifty years*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–19.
Findeis, Jan. 1929. Vojvodovo. *Jubilejní ročenka československé kolonie v Bulharsku 1868 – 1928*. Sofie: ČS dům T.G. M., pp. 220–5.
Findeis, Jan. 1930a. Vojvodovo. Část první, *Věstník Komenský* 5(1):1–3.
Findeis, Jan. 1930b. Vojvodovo. Část druhá, *Věstník Komenský.* 5(2):1–3.
Findeis, Jan 1932. Jak vojvodovské děti hájily své češství. In: *Pro naše a pro nás.* Praha: Školský odbor při ČÚZ, pp. 46–7.
Francis, Emerich K. 1976. *Interethnic Relations: An Essay in Sociological Theory*. New York: Elsevier.
Georiev, Ljubomir. 2010. *Bălgarite katolici v Transilvanija i Banat.* Sofia: Nacionalna biblioteka "Sv. i sv. Kiril i Metodij".
Gjukov, Anton. 2006. *Po petite na Kleo (Mojata malka deliormanska Evropa).* Stara Zagora.
Glenny, Misha. 1999. *The Balkans: Nationalism, War, and the Great Powers. 1804–1999.* New York: Penguin.
Haaland, Gunnar. 1969. Economic Determinants in Ethnic Processes. In: Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*, Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 58–73.
Hechter, Michael. 1986. Theories of Ethnic Relations. In: John F. Stack, Jr. (ed.), *The Primordial Challenge: Ethnicity in the Contemporary World*. New York, N.Y.: Greenwood Press, pp. 13–25.
Horowitz, Donald L. 1985. *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Isaacs, Harold R. 1974. Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe. *Ethnicity* 1(1): 15–41.
Jakoubek, Marek. 2010a. Vojvodovští Češi očima svých sousedů. *Český lid* 97(3): 281-299.
Jakoubek, Marek 2010b. From believers to compatriots. The case of Vojvodovo – 'Czech' village in Bulgaria. *Nations and Nationalism* 16(4): 675–95.
Jakoubek, Marek. 2010c. Sesek – zapomenutá česká obec v Bulharsku, *Český lid* 97(2): 35-50.
Jakoubek, Marek. 2011a. *Vojvodovo: kus česko-bulharské historie. Tentokrát převážně očima jeho obyvatel.* Brno: CDK.
Jakoubek, Marek. 2018a. Zur ethnischen Indifferenz in Nordwestbulgarien in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts oder Die Abhandlung darüber, warum die Protestanten von Vojvodovo in einer unerwarteten Zahl die Katholiken aus Bărdarski Geran heirateten. *Zeitschrift Für Balkanologie* 54(1): 7–29.
Jakoubek, Marek. 2018b. On the Process of National Indifferentiation. The case of Bulgarian 'Czechs'. *Nations and Nationalism* 24(2): 369-389.
Kănev, Krasimir. 1998. Zakonodatelstvo i politika kam etnicheskite i religioznite malcinstva v Balgarija. In: A. Krasteva (ed.), *Obshtnosti i identichnosti v Balgarija*. Sofia: Petekston, pp. 67–117.
Karas, František. 1941. *Mezi svými v malebném Bulharsku*. Praha: Spolek Komenský.
Karpat, Kemal H. 2002. *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History.* Leiden: Brill.
Keyes, Charles F. 1981. The Dialectics of Ethnic Change. In: Charles F. Keyes (ed.), *Ethnic Change.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 4–30.
Kňourek, Bořivoj & Lenka J. Budilová. 2015. *Dům ve Vojvodovu. Stavebně-historický vývoj, kulturní a sociální rozměr*, Brno: Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury (CDK).
Linnekin, Jocelyn & Lin Poyer. 1990. Introduction. In: Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer (eds.), *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, pp. 1–16.
Maybury-Lewis, David. 1996. Living Ethnicity: the Need for a New Paradigm. In: Lourdes Arizpe (ed.), *The cultural dimensions of global change: An anthropological approach.* Paris: UNESCO, pp. 77–88.
Míčan, Vladimír. 1934: *Nevratem v nový svět*. Brno: Knižnice Biblické jednoty.
Michalko, Ján. 1936. *Naši v Bulharsku*. Myjava: Knihtlačiareň Daniela Panického.
Miletich, Ljubomir. 1903. Nashite pavlikjani. *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina* (SBNU) XIX.

Necov, Neco Petkov 2006. Dějiny Vojvodova. In: Marek Jakoubek, Zdeněk R. Nešpor & Tomáš Hirt (eds.), *Neco Petkov Necov: Dějiny Vojvodova, vesnice Čechů a Slováků v Bulharsku.* Plzeň: Studijní a vědecká knihovna, pp. 27–89.

Nestorova, Tatyana. 1987. *American Missionaries among the Bulgarians (1858–1912).* New York: Columbia University Press.

Nikolov, Bogdan. 1994. *Ot Iskăr do Ogosta.* Sofia: Alisa.

Njagulov, Blagovest. 1999. *Banatskite bălgari*, Sofia: Paradigma.

Penchev, Vladimir 1988. Njakoi problemi na adaptacijata na cheshkite zaselnici v Severozapadna Balgarija. In: *Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres po balgaristika, SV. 15*, Sofia: BAN. pp. 480–92.

Penčev, Vladimir. 2006. Tempus edax rerum aneb O minulosti a současnosti vojvodovských Čechů. In: Marek Jakoubek, Zdeněk R. Nešpor and Tomáš Hirt (eds.), *Neco Petkov Necov: Dějiny Vojvodova, vesnice Čechů a Slováků v Bulharsku.* Plzeň: Studijní a vědecká knihovna, pp. 90–105.

Roudometof, Victor. 1998. From Rum Millet to Greek Nation. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 16: 11–48.

Schermerhorn, Richard, A. 1974. Ethnicity in the Perspective of the Sociology of Knowledge. *Ethnicity* 1–14.

Schwartz, Theodore. 1982. Cultural totemism: ethnic identity primitive and modern. In: George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross (eds.), *Ethnic identity: cultural continuities and change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 106–31

Shibutani, Tamotsu & Kian M. Kwan. 1967. Ethnic Stratification. A Comparative Approach. New York: Macmillan.

Smith, Anthony, D. 1981. *The Ethnic Revival in the Modern World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stojanov, Ljubomir, K. 2005. *Kovachica – Nasha zemja pod slănceto. (Skazanie za Davidovija rod ot selo „Kovachica").* Sofia: Avantgard.

Stojanov, Manjo. 1964. Nachalo na protestantskata propaganda v Bălgaria. *Izvestia na Instituta za Istoria* (14–15): 45–67. Sofia.

Stone, John and Bhumika Piya. 2007. Ethnic groups. In: *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, London: Blackwell, pp. 1457–9.

Sugar, Peter F. 1996. *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule 1354-1804*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Shopov, Petăr. 1974. Propagandnata i prosvetna deinost na amerikanskite bibleiski obshtestva v bălgarskite zemi pres XIX. vek. *Izvestia na Instituta za Istoria* 23: 149–84.

Stančev, Toško Metodiev. 2012: Krátký životopis. In: Marek Jakoubek (ed.), *Vojvodovo: historie, obyvatelstvo, migrace*, Brno: CDK, pp. 39–40.

Telbizov, Karol & Marija Vekova-Telbizova. 1936. Tradicionen bit i kultura na banatskute bălgari. *SBNU* 51, Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.

Todorova, Maria. 1992. Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Communist Legacy in Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies* 7(1): 135–54.

Večerková, Eva. 1983. Svatební obřad bulharských Čechů a jeho proměny v jihomoravském pohraničí. *Časopis moravského muzea v Brně* 68: 251–64.

Vaculík, Jaroslav. 2009. *Češi v cizině 1850-1938.* Brno: MU.

Van den Berghe, Pierre. 1981. *The Ethnic Phenomenon.* New York: Elsevier.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic Boundary Making.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Povzetek

Nekateri zgodnejši kritiki so že opozorili, da je Fredrik Barth v svojem "Uvodu" v Etnične skupine in meje (1969) opredelilk etničnost na ahistorični način kot univerzalni pojav, ki ni lasten le nekaterim družbam ali zgodovinskim obdobjem, temveč celotnemu človeštvu. Ob tem Barth razume etnično identiteto kot osnovno in prevladujočo identiteto, ki so ji podrejene druge vrste identitet. V tem konceptualnem okviru so se etnično indiferentne skupine, tj. skupine, pri katerih se dihotomizacija mi-oni ne nadaljuje na etnični ravni in katerih pripadniki mislijo in delujejo predvsem v neetničnem smislu, njihovemu identitetnemu repertoarju pa manjka etnične identifikacije, znajdejo v nekakšni idejni slepi točki. Ta članek obravnava odnose dveh etnično indiferentnih skupin na ozemlju Bolgarije v prvi polovici dvajsetega stoletja. Zgodovinska študija primera služi kot nekakšen razvoj in kritika Barthovega pristopa ter opredelitev koncepta etnične indeferentnosti.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: etničnost, etnična indeferentnost, Fredrik Barth, Balkan

CORRESPONDENCE: MAREK JAKOUBEK, Charles University, Department of Ethnology, nám. Jana Palacha 2, Prague 1, 116 38, Czech Republic. E-mail: marek.jakoubek@ff.cuni.cz.