Списание "Анамнеза" брой 15, 2012 г.

За да разлиствате страниците, посочете с мишката върху долния десен ъгъл.
Можете или да ги обръщатете веднага, чрез натискане, или да ги разгръщате бавно, като истинска книга, държейки натиснат бутона на мишката.

Приятно четене!

СВАЛИ В PDF

A TRANS-DANUBIAN WALTZ: BULGARIAN MIGRATION ACROSS THE OTTOMAN-RUSSIAN BLACK SEA FRONTIER IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH AND EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURIES

Andrew Robarts

Introduction: The Ottoman-Russian Black Sea Frontier

Studies on the concept of the frontier in history have a long and distinguished genealogy.[1] Therefore, for those wading into this well-trodden terrain there are plenty of excellent works from which to "borrow" terminology and

1 A concise discussion on the "history" of the evolving role of the frontier in historical studies can be found in the introductory chapter to Ottomans, Hungarians, and Habsburgs in Central Europe: The Military Confines in an era of Ottoman Conquest (eds. Geza David and Pal Fodor) (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pages XI-XII. The author of this chapter concludes that "frontiers are now considered to be areas of mediation, linkage, as well as confrontation, where an intensive exchange of cultural, ideological, religious, and commercial goods and men takes place, and which are shifting continuously."

АНАМНЕЗА, Год. VII, 2012, кн. 3-4, ISSN 1312-9295, с. 64-97

frames of reference. In pursuit of the narrow goal of defining what is meant by the term frontier as it applies to the encounter between the Ottoman and Russian Empires in the Black Sea region in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, I have drawn upon the work of the historians Peter Perdue and Thomas Barrett.[2] Although divergent in terms of chronological and geographic scope (the seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Manchu – Russian-Mongolian frontier in Central Asia and the early nineteenth-century north Caucasus frontier zone, respectively), these two scholars offer complementary views on the dynamics and characteristics of frontier regions. Their methods of analysis will be used here to initiate a discussion on the nature of territorial sovereignty in the Black Sea region in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

In zones of "frontier interaction", Perdue writes, "the peoples on either side of an ambiguous border often have more in common with each other than with the heartland of the nations they belong to. Frontier peoples have ambiguous loyalties". In a similar vein, Barrett notes that frontier processes involve "the in-and-out migration of large numbers of people, the settlement and creation of new communities and the abandonment of old ones… on all frontiers, borders were crossed and allegiances

2 Peter Perdue, China Marches East: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2005) and Thomas Barrett, "Lines of Uncertainty: The Frontiers of the North Caucasus" *Slavic Review* (Volume 54, # 3, Autumn 1995), pages 578-601.

shifted."[3] Barrett adds that frontier towns are "a major point of interethnic interaction" and as "hubs of regional commerce" are notable for their "lively, ethnically diverse character."[4] Despite state-driven initiatives to "fix people in place territorially" through the provision of "material and organizational resources: armies, border guards, passports, and visas", Perdue maintains that on the frontier "instability, indefiniteness, and physiographical unboundedness… challenge the unceasing efforts of nation-states to draw lines and settle their peoples in immobile, fixed territorial and psychological sites".[5]

In the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, both the Ottoman and Russian states – in an effort to territorialize, demarcate, and generally stabilize their control over the Black Sea region – expended considerable energy on the management and settlement of migratory populations.[6]

3 Perdue, pages 41-42 and Barrett, page 579. Frontiers and borders often co-exist. According to Peter Sahlins, the term boundary "evokes a precise, linear division within a restrictive, political context" whereas the term "frontier" "connotes more zonal qualities and a broader, social context". As Sahlins asserts the "zonal quality of the frontier persists after the de-limitation of a boundary line." Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), page 4.

4 Barrett, page 597. Both Perdue and Barrett are attuned to the role played by environmental conditions in the formation of frontier zones. For Perdue the "plasticity of the landscape" and the uniformity of east-west climatic zones made it difficult for states to establish fixed and effective borders on the Eurasian steppe. According to Barrett, frontiers are susceptible to "environmental manipulation" (including deforestation) and are typically rife with disease. Perdue, pages 20-23 and Barrett, pages 582-583.

5 Perdue, page 43.

6 In conceptualizing what is meant by the term "state", I have drawn upon Peter Sahlins' straightforward definition of the early modern state as, collectively, ministers and kings in imperial capitals, provincial authorities, local judicial officers, tax collectors, customs guards, and soldiers. In the aggregate, these instruments of state pursue and are defined by "their exclusive jurisdiction over a delimited territory". Sahlins, pages 2 and 22.

Generally referred to by Russian imperial administrators as the "wild field" (*dikoe pole*), the northern Black Sea steppe had long been a haven for outlaws, freebooters, runaway serfs, and religious dissenters.[7] From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the incorporation of these various groups (both nomadic and sedentary) into the empire's administrative and political structure and the settlement of peasant-agriculturalists along the Russian Empire's southern edge formed a core component of the empire's grand strategy.[8]

Linking migration with the spread of epidemic diseases, the Russian state engaged in a comprehensive quarantine and border construction project in the south-western part of the empire in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Despite the establishment of well-marked Russian border posts and the construction of well-defended Russian quarantine lines, in the early part of the nineteenth century Russian state servitors continued to use ill-defined and ambiguous terminology when referring to the Russian

7 More prosaically, the Ottomans referred to the northern Black Sea steppe as the "wide plains between Ochakov and Perekop" (*Özi ve Or sahralar*). See for example, *Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi* (BOA) – Cevdet Hariciye (C. HR.) 16/768 (1760-1761).

8 For an overview of recent developments in the historiography on the Russian Empire's southern borderlands see Gary Hamburg, "Imperial Entanglements: Two New Histories of Russia's Western and Southern Borderlands" *Kritika* (Volume 9, #2, Spring 2008), pages 407-431.

state's territorial position in the south-western part of the empire – betraying the fact that well into the nineteenth century Russian provincial authorities believed that they had not succeeded in fully demarcating and domesticating the "wild field" of the northern Black Sea steppe.[9]

A logical candidate for the construction (both physically and psychologically) of a clearly-defined and geographically-expressed dividing line between an imperial core and a northern frontier periphery, the Danube River gradually hardened (over the course of several centuries) into a fixed border between the Ottoman Empire and the Danubian Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia (*Eflak* and *Boğdan*).[10] As early as the fifteenth century, Ottoman

9 For example, "the limits of Russia" (*predely Rossii*) or "at the limits of the Empire" (*na predelakh Imperii*). *Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii* (GARF), f. 109 ("III Otdelenie Sobstvennoi Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva Kantseliarii, 1828-1837"), op. 4a., d. 7, l. 4 (May 11, 1828), *Derzhavnii Arkhiv Odeskoi Oblasti* (DAOO), f. 6, op. 1, d. 2482, ll. 12-13 (July 6, 1829), and Sobranie Postanovlenii po Chasti Raskola (Saint Petersburg: 1858).

10 For more on the "gradual delimitation of the Ottoman border along the Danube" in the seventeenth and eighteenth century see Rossitsa Gradeva's, "War and Peace along the Danube: Vidin at the end of the Seventeenth Century" *Oriente Moderno* (Volume 20, #1, 2001), pages 149-175 and "Shipping along the Lower Course of the Danube (end of the 17th century)" in The Kapudan Pasha: His Office and His Domain (ed. Elizabeth Zachariadou) (Rethymnon: Crete University Press, 2002), pages 301-324. It is worth noting here that early nineteenth-century travelers in the Ottoman Empire also recognized the Danube River as a territorial and geo-political dividing line. Referring to the Ottoman Empire, the British Consul in Bucharest, William Wilkinson, wrote in 1806 "the Danube being, in fact, the natural frontier of their present extent of empire… is alone calculated to offer them security." William Wilkinson, An Account of the Principalities with Various Political Observations Relating to them (London: Longman, Hurst, Ress, Orme, and Brown, 1820) re-issued

administrators in the *sancak* of Hezargrad (Razgrad – south of the Danube River in north-eastern Bulgaria) distinguished between towns located "on this side of the Danube" and towns located "on the other side of the Danube".[11] Beginning in the seventeenth century and with increasing frequency in the eighteenth century, Ottoman provincial authorities used ethno-territorial designations to identify peasant-agriculturalists (*reaya*) crossing from the Danubian Principalities into northern Rumelia – *Eflaklu* for migrants from Wallachia and *Boğdanlu* for migrants from Moldavia.[12] A *Hatt-i Şerif* (Sultanic Rescript) issued in 1802 prohibited Ottoman peasants in Rumelia from cultivating lands in the Danubian Principalities and from driving their herds across the Danube River for pasturage.[13] By the

as An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldovia (New York: Arno Press, 1971), page 196. Upon approaching the southern shore of the Danube River during his return from the Balkan front in 1828, a Russian officer wrote, "my heart was filled with joy as I knew that I would soon be returning to my dear Fatherland. Finally, we crossed back over the wide Danube and I looked back one last time on the land of the enemy…", "Tri Miesiatsa za Dunavaem" *Syn Otechetsva* (Volume 1, #5, 1833), page 285. And Felix Fonton (a French officer in the service of the Russian army) proclaimed upon reaching the Danube in May 1830, "I crossed back over the Danube once more… and, praise be to God, I was back on Russian soil". F. P. Fonton, Pokhod Zabalkanskii (Volume 2) (Leipzig: 1862), page 242.

11 Machiel Kiel, "Hrazgrad – Hezargrad – Razgrad: The Vicissitudes of a Turkish Town in Bulgaria" *Turcica* (Volumes 21-23, 1991), pages 495-562.

12 Viorel Panaite, The Ottoman Law of War and Peace (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), pages 410-411.

13 Mikhail Guboğlu, "Dva Ukaza (1801 g.) i 'Sviashchennyi Reskript' (1802 g.) Sviazannye s Turetsko-Russko-Rumynskimi Otnosheniiami", Vostochnye Istochniki po Istorii Narodov Iugo-Vostochnoi i Tsentral'noi Evropy (Volume 2) (ed. A.S.Tvertinova) (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), page 266.

early nineteenth century, dispatches penned by Ottoman provincial and military servitors posted in northern Rumelia – in a clear semantic up-grade over earlier references to the Ottoman Empire's Danubian "frontier" (*serhad*) – increasingly referred to the Ottoman Empire's "border along the Danube" (*Tuna sahilinde hudud*).[14] Yet, despite repeated efforts to impose control over the river-line – which included a concerted joint Ottoman-Russian effort to erect a fortified Danubian quarantine line in the early 1830s – merchants, migrants, and microbes continued to navigate their way across the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier with a minimum of state interference.

The Danubian Principalities as the "Middle Ground" between the Ottoman and Russian Empires

The indeterminate status of the Danubian Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia contributed to the fluidity of the Black Sea frontier between the Ottoman and Russian Empires in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In this period the Danubian Principalities were nominally part of the Ottoman Empire. However, Russian influence in the Danubian Principalities increased considerably in the late 1700s and early 1800s and in 1806-1812 and 1828-1835 the Russian Empire occupied the Danubian Principalities and effectively assumed authority over military and civil

14 BOA – Cevdet Eyalet-i Mümtaze (C. MTZ.) 14/656 (1758), BOA – C. MTZ. 6/277 (1803-1804), BOA – Hatt-ı Hümayun (HAT) 1093/44363-H (October 6, 1811), and BOA – HAT 1042/43136-A (June 30, 1833).

affairs in Wallachia and Moldavia.

Conventionally conceived of as mere pawns in "Great Power" diplomatic and geo-strategic games of chess, the Danubian Principalities – in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries – occupied the all-important "middle ground" between the Ottoman and Russian Empires. In his work on the machinations of powerful Native American confederations and the British and French Empires in the Great Lakes region of North America, Richard White defines the middle ground as a "messy and complicated world" animated by a "hodgepodge of ambitions and aims". On the middle ground "native" elites exploited shifts in imperial fortunes and played one imperial power off against the other. While the British and French Empires fought wars and negotiated for peace, subaltern elites single-mindedly pursued their own interests. In this way, minor actors, native allies, and individual subjects of the middle ground "often guided the course of empires". To minimize risk and maximize gain, imperial powers looked to control territory and trade routes through the agency of native proxies. These tactics elevated certain native elites and undercut others.[15]

Historians of Romania have long debated the

15 Richard White, The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Thomas Barrett uses White's concept of the Middle Ground to explore issues of cultural sharing, accommodation, and intermarriage in the northern Caucasus in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thomas Barrett, "Lines of Uncertainty: The Frontiers of the North Caucasus" *Slavic Review* (Volume 54, # 3, Autumn 1995), pages 578-601.

jurisdictional and political status of the Danubian Principalities in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Terming Moldavia and Wallachia "vassal" states of the Ottoman Empire, Charles King argues that the relationship between the Ottoman Porte and Moldavian elites was "one of suzerainty rather than outright domination".[16] On the ground and beyond legal-historical discussions, the basic point is that both the Ottomans and the Russians had difficulties in dealing with Wallachian and Moldavian elites and establishing political influence on the middle ground between the two empires.

Bulgarian Migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires – An Overview

Large-scale population movements, shifting patterns of agricultural settlement, and the commercial and political activities of migrant diasporas animated and energized the Black Sea world in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[17] A short and by no means exhaustive inventory

16 Charles King, The Moldovans: Romania, Russia, and the Politics of Culture (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 2000), pages 15-16.

17 In time, consistently heavy population movements between the Ottoman and Russian Empires in the Black Sea region formed what Dirk Hoerder calls a "migration system". According to Hoerder, "on the macro-level, migration systems connect two distinct societies, each characterized by a degree of industrialization and urbanization, by political structures and current policies, by specific educational, value, and belief systems, by ethnic composition and demographic factors and by traditions of internal, medium-distance and long-distance migrations. On this level, general push and pull factors and statewide admission regulations are analyzed". See Hoerder,

of the "ethnic" and religious populations on the move in the Black Sea region in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries would include Armenians, Greeks, Wallachians, Moldovans, Gagauz, Gypsies, Cossacks, and Russian Old Believers. In terms of numbers, however, Bulgarians constituted one of if not the largest and most dynamic migrant communities in the Black Sea region in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and it is on this community of trans-imperial movers that this article will focus.

In the general narrative of Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires, two basic points needs to be made. First, the establishment of structural connections – through trade, communication, and return migration – among members of Bulgarian migrant communities in Ottoman Rumelia, the Danubian Principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia), and southern Russia preceded mutual early nineteenth-century Ottoman and Russian border demarcation initiatives. Second, these connections endured despite on-going joint efforts by the Ottoman and Russian states to police their borders and manage (or control) in and out-migration.

In the period from 1806 to the mid-1830s, an estimated 250,000 Bulgarians left Ottoman Rumelia for the Danubian Principalities, Bessarabia, and southern Russia. This figure constitutes roughly 10-15% of the estimated Bulgarian population in the Ottoman Empire in the early nineteenth

Dirk *Cultures in Contact: World Migrations in the Second Millennium* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), p. 16.

century. Research conducted by the Odessan historian A.A. Skalkovskii in the nineteenth century and the more recent work of Bulgarian, Russian, and Ukrainian scholars such as Ivan Grek, Ivan Meshcheriuk, Elena Druzhinina, and Stefan Doinov provide a comprehensive account of Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires throughout the nineteenth century.[18] My goal here is not to critique the work of these historians, whose books and articles I draw upon heavily in my research and writing, but rather to shift the focus of inquiry concerning Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires. I will do so by concentrating on Bulgarian migration in the period prior to the 1840s and highlighting the significant amount of Bulgarian return migration from the Russian Empire to the Ottoman Empire in the early part of the nineteenth century.

The prevailing view on the dynamic of Bulgarian population movements between the Ottoman and Russian Empires in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is that most if not all Bulgarian migrations to the Russian Empire and the Danubian Principalities occurred

18 A.A. Skalkovskii, "Bolgarski Kolonii v Bessarabii i Novorossiskom Krai" *Zhurnal Ministerstva Vnutrennikh Del* (1848, Kn.1), Ivan Grek, "Bŭlgarskite Dobrovoltsi (Volunteri) ot 1828-1829 godina" *Vekove* (1975), Ivan Grek and Nikolai Chervenkov, Bŭlgarite ot Ukraina i Moldova: Minalo i Nastoiashte (Sofia: Izdatelska Kŭshta "Hristo Botev", 1993), Ivan Meshcheriuk, Pereselenie Bolgar v Iuzhnuiu Besarabiiu 1828-1834 gg. (Kishinev: 1965), Elena Druzhinina, Iuzhnaia Ukraina v Period Krizisa Feodalisma: 1825-1860gg (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Nauka, 1981) and Stefan Doinov, Bŭlgarite v Ukraina i Moldova prez Vŭzrazhdaneto 1751-1878 (Sofia: Akademichno Izdatelstvo "Marin Drinov", 2005).

during and immediately after outbreaks of Russo-Ottoman warfare and that Bulgarians primarily engaged in a one-way migration from the Ottoman Empire to the Russian Empire. However, these views on the timing and character of Bulgarian migration to the Russian Empire undersell the complexity of Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires.

While large numbers of Bulgarians did flee the Ottoman Empire during and after Russo-Ottoman wars, an analysis of Russian registration lists of migrants crossing the Danube, Prut, and Dniester Rivers into the Russian Empire provides evidence of considerable Bulgarian in-migration for every year in the period from 1768 to 1834.[19] Historians of Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries tend to overlook the significant Bulgarian displacement which occurred in the first decade of the nineteenth century (a period known in Bulgarian historiography as the *Kŭrdzhalisko Vreme* and in Turkish

19 For a good example of a comprehensive migrant registration compiled by the Russian state see the list requested by the Kishinev Town Duma in 1821. Besides the name, age, and gender of each registered Bulgarian migrant, this registration list notes the year that each migrant family crossed the Danube and settled in the Russian Empire. *Tsentralnyi Gosudarstvennoi Istoricheskii Arkhiv* (TsGIA) – *Moldavskaia Sovetskaia Sotsialisticheskaia Respublika* (MSSR), f. 75, op. 1, d. 130, ll. 22-45. See also TsGIA – MSSR, f. 5, op. 2, d. 439 and f. 5, op. 2, d. 442. It is important to note here that migrants from the Ottoman Empire tended to be identified by Russian authorities as "trans-Danubian settlers". In this frontier environment identity was a fluid concept and most settlers from the Russian Empire would have identified themselves, at this point in time, as a Christian peasant from the Ottoman Empire.

historiography as the period of the *Dağlı Isyanları*) and in the 1820s during the period of the Greek uprising against Ottoman rule.[20] Banditry and political destabilization along the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier peaked in the period from 1800-1808 and the threat of physical violence during this period prompted many Bulgarians to seek security and safety in the Russian Empire.[21] Similarly, as a result of military skirmishes and generalized instability in the Danubian region during the period of the Greek uprising, large numbers of Bulgarians migrated between Ottoman Rumelia, the Danubian Principalities, and southern Russia.[22] For example, in March 1821 Russian border officials posted along the Prut River noted the significant increase of Bulgarians seeking authorization to enter Russian territory in Bessarabia. According to testimonials presented by these asylum-seekers, generalized conflict between Ottoman and Greek forces in and around key Danubian port-towns such as Galatz and Braila had forced many to flee their homes and seek safety in the Russian Empire.[23]

20 For more on this important period in Bulgarian and Ottoman history see Vera Mutafchieva, Kŭrdzhalisko Vreme (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1993).

21 V.P. Grachev, "Kŭm Vŭprosa za Preselvaneto na Bŭlgari v Rusiia v Nachaloto na XIX v., 1800-1806 g." Bŭlgarskoto Vŭzrazhdane i Rusiia (Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1981), pages 266-267.

22 BOA – Hatt-ı Hümayun (HAT) 872/38770 and BOA – Cevdet Haricye (C.HR.) 27/1337. Additionally, 4,000 Bulgarian volunteers from Bessarabia participated in the Greek uprising against Ottoman rule. Grek and Chervenkov, page 127.

23 "Ispravliaiushtii Dolzhnost Namestnika Bessarabskoi Oblasti I.I. Inzov Stats-Sekretariu I.A. Kapodistrii" (March 10, 1821) Vneshniaia politika Rossii XIX i nachala XX veka: Dokumenty Rossiiskogo Ministerstva Inostrannykh Del (VPR), Series #2, Volume 4(12),

In the first decades of the nineteenth century, a significant number of Bulgarian settlers in Bessarabia and southern Russia opted to return to the Ottoman Empire. Many of these return migrations occurred after only a short stay in the Russian Empire. For example, in 1811 a large group of Bulgarian peasants from the village of Cherna in Dobruja migrated to Bessarabia, stayed for a year, and then returned to their home village.[24] In the early 1830s, a repetition of the Russian state's failure to provide for and protect Bulgarian migrants in Bessarabia sparked another wave of Bulgarian return migration to the Ottoman Empire. For example, of a group of 9,000 Bulgarians who settled in Bessarabia after the conclusion of the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-1829, 4,100 returned almost immediately.[25] In 1831, roughly 5,000 Bulgarians who had migrated to the Russian Empire in 1829 returned to the Ottoman Empire. It is estimated that in the period from 1833-1834, 20,000 Bulgarians engaged in return migrations from Bessarabia to the Ottoman Empire.[26] Reports filed by Ottoman provincial governors in Rumelia attest to the generalized nature of Bulgarian return migration to the Ottoman Empire in the early 1830s. The destination points identified in these reports for Bulgarian returnees included: Dobrujan and Black Sea coastal towns such as Ahyolu, Mesembria (Nesebur), Babadağ, and Hacıoğlu Pazarcık (Dobrich); Danubian

(Moscow: 1980), pages 39-40.

24 Stilian Chilingirov, Dobrŭdzha i Nasheto Vŭzrazhdane (Sofia: Dŭrzhavna Pechatnitsa, 1917), page 187.

25 Iov Titorov, Bŭlgarite v Bessarabia (Sofia: 1903), page 24.

26 Meshcheriuk, pages 196-197.

fortress-towns such as Silistre; Samakocuk (Demirköy), Karnobat (Karinabad), and Yambol (Yanbolu) in eastern Rumelia; and several villages along the northern shores of the Sea of Marmara.[27]

Bulgarians migrating back across the Danube River from southern Russia to Ottoman Rumelia did not always return to their original village or town. Finding good agricultural conditions and generally positive economic opportunities, many Bulgarians on their way back to eastern Rumelia from Bessarabia and southern Russia stopped and settled permanently in Dobruja. For example, the population of the village of Kasapköy (located on the main road between Köstence and Babadağ) nearly quadrupled in the early 1830s due to the arrival of Bulgarian return migrants from the Russian Empire. The Dobrujan village of Kamana was founded in 1831 by Bulgarian return migrants from Bessarabia.[28]

Bulgarian Migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires – Push and Pull Factors

One of the main tools employed by migration specialists and demographers to understand the motivations for migrant behavior is an analysis of so-called migrant "push" and "pull" factors. During the period in question there were a myriad of reasons why Bulgarians migrated between

27 BOA – HAT 747/35272, BOA – HAT 776/36417, BOA – HAT 778/36443-A, BOA – HAT 1038/43008, BOA – HAT 1038/43008-A, BOA – HAT 1039/43027, and BOA – HAT 1042/43136.

28 Chilingirov, pages 180 and 202.

the Ottoman and Russian Empires. The main reasons are described below:

Reasons for Leaving the Ottoman Empire (Push Factors):

1) Political instability, bandit activity, and frequent outbreaks of epidemic disease resulted in the regular displacement of Bulgarian peasant populations in the Ottoman Empire. During these distressed periods, Ottoman state servitors in Rumelia struggled to provide adequate food, water, and housing to displaced populations. As a result, many Bulgarian peasants boarded ships or set out over land for Moldavia, Wallachia, Bessarabia, and southern Russia.[29]
2) During periods of Russo-Ottoman warfare many Bulgarian peasants volunteered for service in the Russian army. Upon the cessation of fighting, some of these volunteers, fearing retribution from Ottoman authorities, joined Russian soldiers in their return march to the Russian Empire.[30] For example, after the conclusion of the 1806-1812 war, a group of 2,000 Bulgarian volunteers opted for re-settlement in Bessarabia.[31]

Reasons for Leaving the Ottoman Empire (Pull Factors):

1) In an effort to gain the allegiance and support of the

29 BOA – Cevdet Askeriye (C.AS.) 20/894, BOA – Cevdet Dahiliye (C.DH) 113/5636, BOA – HAT 1007/42257 and Grachev, page 269-270.

30 *Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheski Arkhiv* (RGIA), f. 379, op.1, d. 987, l. 1a. (October 4, 1829).

31 Elena Bachinska, "Bŭlgarskite Volontiri v Dunavskata Kazashka Voiska (1828-1869)" Bŭlgarskite v Severnoto Prichernomorie (Volume 4) (Veliko Turnovo: Izdatelska Kŭshta Asta, 1994), page 182.

Bulgarian populace during periods of Ottoman-Russian warfare, Russian army officers distributed proclamations in occupied Ottoman territory promising material assistance, rights, and privileges to any Bulgarians wishing to migrate to the Russian Empire.[32] Many Bulgarian peasants in Ottoman Rumelia responded to these incentives and migrated to the Russian Empire with expectations for improved economic, political, and social conditions.

2) The previous settlement of Bulgarians in the Russian Empire and the Danubian Principalities promoted further out-migration from the Ottoman Empire. In the 1820s and 1830s, many Bulgarian migrants from the Ottoman Empire settled in long-established Bulgarian communities in Wallachia. Previous settlers in these communities provided food, housing and employment to new arrivals. For example, the village of Alexandrii in Wallachia was established during the war of 1806-1812 by Bulgarian migrants from Sviştov (a port-town on the right bank of the Danube River). In the 1830s, Alexandrii proved to be an attractive settlement destination for Bulgarian migrants moving north across the Danube River.[33]

Reasons for Returning to the Ottoman Empire (Push Factors):

1) Fear of enserfment by Russian and Moldavian land owners

32 Ufuk Gülsoy, 1828-1829 Osmanlı-Rus Savaşı'nda Rumeli'den Rusya'ya Göçürülen Reaya (Istanbul: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1993), page 27 and BOA – HAT 42606-B (May 31, 1828).

33 *Bŭlgarski Istoricheski Arkhiv* (BIA), Fond 14 – Grigor Nachovich.

constituted the main reason for Bulgarian return migration from Bessarabia in the period 1812-1819.[34] Similarly, in Wallachia in the 1820s and 1830s, disputes between Bulgarian settlers and Wallachian land-owners prompted many Bulgarian migrants to return to Ottoman Rumelia. In the 1830s, petitions to the Russian Governor-General in the Danubian Principalities, Pavel Kiselev, were filled with allegations by Bulgarian settlers of ill-treatment by Wallachian land-owners. In these petitions, Bulgarian migrants often argued that their current situation in Wallachia was no better than, and in many cases worse than, what they had left behind in the Ottoman Empire. For many Bulgarian migrants, expectations of a better life in Wallachia were not fulfilled and for this reason many decided to return to Ottoman Rumelia.[35]

2) Bulgarian migrants to southern Bessarabia faced difficulties in adapting to the land and climate of the Bucak steppe and many died of malnourishment during the winter months. This acclimation process proved especially difficult for migrants from southern Rumelia and Thrace.[36]

34 K.P. Kryzhanovskaia and E.M. Ruseev, "K Voprosu o Deiatel'nosti Dekabrista A.P. Iushnevskogo po Ustroistvu Zadunavskikh Pereselentsev v Bessarabii" Moldavskii Filial AN SSSR, Institut Istorii, Iazyka i Literatury, Uchenye Zapiski (Volume VI) (Kishinev: 1957), pages 106-107 and Meshcheriuk, page 135.

35 "Narezhdane na Izpŭlnitelniia Divan na Vlashko da se Provede Sledstvie po Povod Zhalbata na Nekoltsina Bŭlgari ot Selata Zhilaba i Kŭtsel pri Bukuresht, che Bili Ograbeni ot Vlashki Chinovnitsi" (October, 2, 1830) Bŭlgarite v Rumŭnia, XVII-XX v.: Dokumenti i Materiali, pages 36-37.

36 Titorov, page 28.

3) Rapid and large-scale in-migration to southern Bessarabia during and immediately after the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-1829 placed considerable stress on the region's natural resources. Dwindling water supplies and a lack of arable land resulted in significant crop failures in the period 1831-1834 – prompting many Bulgarian agriculturalists to return to the Ottoman Empire.[37]
4) Particularly deadly outbreaks of plague and cholera struck southern Russia and Bessarabia in the early 1830s.[38] Thousands of recently-arrived Bulgarian migrants succumbed to disease during this period. In Bolgrad (the largest Bulgarian settlement in Bessarabia) a large graveyard was devoted solely to those who died of plague.[39] The lethalness of the migrant experience in Bessarabia and southern Russia compelled many Bulgarians to return to the Ottoman Empire.
5) Many Bulgarians who had fled to Bessarabia during the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-1829 believed that their stay in Russia would be temporary. They expected that the terms of the treaty concluding the war would result in the liberation of Bulgarian lands from Ottoman rule and that they would return to their homeland following the conclusion of the war. Therefore, many Bulgarian migrants in southern Russia did not make significant efforts to settle in Russia permanently and did not invest energy, money, and time in farming land. When the expected Bulgarian liberation did not occur these Bulgarian

37 Grek, pages 8-9 and Meshcheriuk, page 185.
38 Grek and Chervenkov, page 46.
39 Titorov, page 28.

migrants were left in a psychological "no man's land". Many went bankrupt.[40] Poor economic circumstances in Bessarabia and southern Russia prompted large numbers of Bulgarians to return to the Ottoman Empire.
6) Many Bulgarian migrants in Bessarabia feared that they would be forcibly enlisted into the Russian army. These fears kept many Bulgarians from settling permanently in the Russian Empire and, together with encroaching enserfment, promoted the return migration of many Bulgarian settlers to the Ottoman Empire.[41]
7) The imposition of onerous *corvée* duties compelled many Bulgarian migrants in the Danubian Principalities to return to the Ottoman Empire. Among the workers at a newly established lazaret on the land of a Wallachian Boyar in Dudesht (outside of Bucharest), recently-settled Bulgarian migrants were responsible for transporting the sick, digging graves, and burying the dead.[42]
8) Administrative confusion hampered the provision of resettlement services to Bulgarian arrivals in southern

40 Meshcheriuk, pages 180-181.
41 "Raport Inspektora Dubossarskogo Sukhoputnogo Karantina N. Karpova Khersonskomy Voennomy Gubernatory E.I. Diuku-de-Rishel'e ob Otkaze Zadunaiskikh Pereselentsev ot Poseleniia v Novorossii" (June 27, 1811), Ustroistvo Zadunaiskikh Pereselentsev v Bessarabii i Deiatel'nost A.P. Iushnevskogo: Sbornik Dokumentov (Kishinev: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo Moldavii, 1957), pages 8-11.
42 "Molba na Bŭlgarite ot Selo Dudesht do Pŭlnomoshtnia Namestnik i Predsedatel na Divanite na Moldova i Vlashko Graf Palen da Budat Osvobodeni ot Tegobite na kŭm Karantinnata Bolnitsa" (February 28, 1829). Written in Russian and signed by Getsu Ivanov, Ivan Veliki, Ivan Kerchu, Iordan Tŭnas, Kresti Ivanov, and Khrestu Ganchu. Bŭlgarite v Rumŭnia, XVII-XX v.: Dokumenti i Materiali, pages 20-21.

Russia and Bessarabia. Additionally, many local and civil authorities in Bessarabia and southern Russia viewed the arrival of Bulgarian migrants as an unwelcome burden. These officials advocated for reduced numbers of settlers and, occasionally, the outright deportation of Bulgarian migrants. The inability and, at times, unwillingness of Russian state officials to provide for new arrivals prompted many Bulgarian migrants to return to the Ottoman Empire.[43]

9) Overcrowding and squalid conditions at Russian border quarantine stations promoted the immediate return of large numbers of Bulgarian migrants to the Danubian Principalities and Ottoman Rumelia.[44]

10) Bulgarian migrants in the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia faced difficulties in adapting to their new cultural and linguistic environment. According to petitions appealing for the right to leave Wallachia and return to Ottoman Rumelia, many Bulgarian settlers indicated that they felt like strangers in Wallachia.[45] For these Bulgarian migrants, the Ottoman Empire was home and the familiarity of life there drew many back to Ottoman Rumelia.[46]

Reasons for Returning to the Ottoman Empire (Pull Factors):

1) Like all migrants, many Bulgarians felt the natural desire to return to their homeland and be reunited with their

43 Meshcheriuk, page 110.

44 Ibid., pages 116-117.

45 Veselin Traikov, "Bŭlgarskata Emigratsia vŭv Vlashko sled Rusko-Tŭrskata Voina ot 1828-1829" Odrinskiat Mir ot 1829 g. i Balkanskite Narodi (Sofia: 1981), page 161.

46 Meshcheriuk, page 187.

kinsmen. An example of this sentiment can be found in a petition written by a group of Bulgarian refugees from Yambol in August 1831. This group had left the Ottoman Empire following the retreat of the Russian Army in 1830 and had split up in three different directions. One part of the group had left for Bessarabia, another part had gone to Braila, and one part had gone elsewhere in Wallachia. In a petition to the Wallachian government they requested that they be returned to the Ottoman Empire collectively so that they could be re-united in their home town.[47]

2) Many Bulgarian migrants from Ottoman Rumelia fled in a hurry – leaving behind their possessions, property, and farm-land. Often, these vacated lands were occupied by fellow villagers or recent migrants from the Russian Empire (generally Crimean and Nogay Tatars). In order to reclaim their goods and resolve property disputes, many Bulgarian migrants returned to the Ottoman Empire on both a temporary and permanent basis.[48]

3) After the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-1829, in a period of rising Bulgarian nationalism, many Bulgarians responded to appeals by exiled revolutionary leaders operating among Bulgarian migrant communities to return to their homeland and fight for Bulgarian national liberation.[49]

47 "Molba na Bŭlgari-Preselnitsi ot Iambolsko do Goliamata Vornichiia na Vŭtreshnite Raboti na Vlakhiia da Im se Razreshi Zavŭrshtane v Rodinata" Bŭlgarite v Rumŭnia, XVII-XX v.: Dokumenti i Materiali, page 42.

48 BOA – HAT 1016/42515, Grek, pages 8-9 and Meshcheriuk, page 183.

49 Grek, page 9 and Meshcheriuk, page 184.

4) Ottoman decrees providing for guarantees of amnesty for any Bulgarians who had joined the Russian cause in 1828-1829 and promises of assistance in re-settling in the Ottoman Empire promoted considerable Bulgarian return migration to Ottoman Rumelia in the 1830s. In support of these decrees, Ottoman agents operating among Bulgarian migrant communities (mostly in the Danubian Principalities and Bessarabia) informed Bulgarian migrants of the guarantees and promises issued by the Ottoman government and generally propagandized in favor of Bulgarian return migration.[50]
5) Bulgarian migrants in the Russian Empire often engaged in long pilgrimages through Ottoman territory to important religious sites on the Khalkidiki Peninsula (in the northern Aegean). For example, in the period from 1816-1821, an estimated 1,400 Bulgarian pilgrims travelled from Russia to the Zograf Monastery on Mt. Athos in Khalkidiki. Many of these Bulgarian pilgrims opted to remain in the Ottoman Empire rather than undertake the arduous journey back to the Russian Empire.[51]

Bulgarian Migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires – The Human Dimension

Historians tend to analyze migrant populations in units of hundreds, thousands, and tens of thousands. The adoption of this macro-level perspective is often

50 Traikov, pages 160-161.
51 Grek and Chervenkov, page 111.

unavoidable as historians lack the conventional tools (such as real-time surveys and personal interviews) used by scholars of contemporary migrations to track individual migrations. Memoirs and travel accounts penned by migrants and refugees are rare for the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Therefore, in order to engage the topic of early-nineteenth century Bulgarian migration between the Ottoman and Russian Empires at the human or individual level, the historian must draw upon unconventional archival and secondary sources and employ a little historical imagination.[52]

Bulgarian migration from Plovdiv

In the 1860s, the Bulgarian educator Konstantin Moravenov conducted a survey of the Christian population in his native city of Plovdiv (Filibe).[53] Through his research (which yielded a mix of census and biographical information), Moravenov was able to reconstruct generational histories of Bulgarian families in Plovdiv stretching as far back as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An analysis of the data contained in Moravenov's genealogical record of the Bulgarian population of Plovdiv leads to the conclusion

52 In so doing, I endeavor to connect "macroscopic" (political and diplomatic history) with "molecular" (ethnographic) history. This approach to history-writing is discussed in Peter Sahlins, Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), page xv.
53 "Unikalen Vŭzrozhdenski Rŭkopis: Konstantin D. Moravenov. Pametnik za Plovdivskoto Khristiiansko Naselenie v Grada i za Obshtite Zavedeniia po Proiznosno Predanie, Podaren na Bŭlgarskoto Chitalishte v Tsarigrad – do 1869" *Izvestia na Narodnata Biblioteka Kiril i Metodii* (Volume XIV, 1976), pages 511-631.

that displacement, death from disease, and migration to the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia was a fact of life for a significant part of the Bulgarian population in Ottoman Rumelia in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Of the roughly 400 Christian households surveyed by Moravenov 90 experienced the loss of at least one family member through permanent out-migration or death due to plague or cholera over the course of the one-hundred year period from 1750-1850.

Moravenov often used general terms such as "Russia" or "Wallachia" to identify the destination points for migrants from Plovdiv. For example, the eldest son of Ivan Kostadinov left for Wallachia in the early part of the nineteenth century and never returned and Todoraki Diulgeroğlu left Plovdiv and passed away in either Wallachia or Russia. Occasionally, migrant destination points in the Danubian Principalities and the Russian Empire are specifically identified by Moravenov. Bucharest, Braila, and Odessa drew significant numbers of Bulgarian migrants from Plovdiv. For example: the brother of Dimitar Stroevets left for Bucharest in the late eighteenth century; the two sons of Dimitri Abadzhi (Mikhail and Kostadin) emigrated to Bucharest in this same period; the only son of Ivan Zarbuzan emigrated to and died in Bucharest; Sotir Gerdzhikoğlu squandered his wages on drink, sold his possessions, and left Plovdiv for Braila; Stoian Toshkovich moved with his family from Plovdiv to Odessa; the great-grandfather of Christo Koiumdzhioğlu was one of the first Bulgarian merchants to set up shop in Odessa; Stancho Mutev emigrated to and died in Odessa; and several

members of the Mandoğlu family emigrated to Odessa and sent remittances to support their family back in Plovdiv. There is also the example of the family (two parents and two sons) of Kostaki Papasaula which moved from Plovdiv to the Black Sea town of Constanţa (Köstence) in northern Dobruja. The reasons for this move are not entirely clear but it is implied that because the parents were of a mixed Bulgarian-Turkish marriage the family was unable to remain in Plovdiv. Kostaki, identified as a Bulgarian, had married a young widow from an Anatolian (Turkish) family.

Moravenov's survey also provides some evidence of return migration from the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia to Ottoman Rumelia. For example: a member of the Greek household of Andrea Georgiadi Seleniklii left for Wallachia in the early 1820s and returned to Plovdiv in 1828; Sotiraki Kaftandzhi obtained Russian subjecthood while in the Russian Empire and returned to Plovdiv; and a family (unnamed) returned from Wallachia to Plovdiv in the 1830s and purchased a new home from an Armenian resident in Plovdiv.

In addition to the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia, popular destinations for Bulgarian migrants during this period included Syria (Damascus and Aleppo), Istanbul, Izmir, and various (unidentified) Anatolian towns. Further afield, one migrant from Plovdiv (Atanas Sakhatchi) found himself in Khorasan in Persia and a surprising number of Bulgarian migrants from Plovdiv made their way to India (Hindistan).[54] Apparently there was enough trade

54 Calcutta is the only specific Indian city cited in Moravenov's

between south Asia and Ottoman Rumelia in the early to mid-nineteenth century to support a Bulgarian-Ottoman merchant community on the Indian subcontinent.

Plague and cholera epidemics posed a constant threat to the population of Plovdiv in the early part of the nineteenth century. Mavrodi Dimitraki died (unmarried) of cholera in Plovdiv in the 1830s and all of the members of the large Merdzhanova family save one (Lambra) perished during a series of plague epidemics in Plovdiv in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Plague and cholera epidemics in the early 1800s were so devastating that they remained in the collective conscious of the population of Plovdiv well into the late nineteenth century. These searing events included the so-called "Plague of 1815" and "The First Cholera Epidemic of 1831". By the mid-1800s, a graveyard existed in Plovdiv (at the base of Cambaz Tepe) dedicated solely to the victims of early nineteenth-century plague epidemics.

The experiences of the four children of Moko Boiadzhi encapsulate the overall trauma and loss from plague and migration that was typical of life in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Ottoman Rumelia. One daughter, Sultanitsa, married a prosperous Bulgarian merchant who grew rich engaging in trade with India. The second daughter, Zoitsa, married a man by the name of Stavri. Zoitsa and Stavri had two children – a daughter who died of the plague and a son who emigrated to Bolgrad (in Bessarabia). The third daughter, Elena, had a daughter who

account.

died of the plague. The only son, Konstandinaki, migrated to Bucharest, became a merchant and moved to Braşov in Transylvania.[55]

Bulgarian Migration into Bessarabia

From the 1770s onwards, the Chancellery of the Novorossiya Gubernate and (after 1812) the Bessarabian Oblast requested, received, and maintained fairly comprehensive lists of Bulgarian migrants entering the Russian Empire. These lists were generated by quarantine officials at border crossing points and by civilian authorities and police units in Bessarabian towns. In general, these lists contained basic demographic information on migrant families entering the Russian Empire including the name of the head of household, the number of adults in the household, the number of children in the household, and the total number of individuals in the migrant household. More sophisticated versions of the lists contained information on the age of the migrants (usually that of the head of household but sometimes of all household members), the stated occupation of the head of household (usually either "agriculturalist" or "merchant"), the home village

55 Additionally, there is the story of the family of the Bulgarian merchant Kalipov who lived and worked in Plovdiv in the last part of the eighteenth century. All of his sons save one died in their youth from plague. The surviving son, Dimitrii, left Plovdiv in the 1770s to become a merchant in Wallachia or Bessarabia. He ultimately died of plague in Bucharest in either 1826 or 1828. There are also the similar fates of the families of Stavria Langera and Iakobaki Argirchenin. Ancestors of these two families fled Plovdiv during the *Kŭrdzhalisko Vreme* in search of temporary safety in Wallachia. Both families opted to settle permanently in Bucharest.

of migrant families, and the intended settlement site of specific migrant groups.[56]

In July 1830, the commander of the Satunov quarantine (one of the busiest of the nine Russian border quarantine posts along the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier in the early 1830s) forwarded a list to Kishinev (the Bessarabian capital) with information on "Bulgarian families crossing the border through the Satunov quarantine".[57] Included in this particular group of 33 Bulgarian households (totaling 146 individuals) were: Yura Dimova (age 86), her son Stanko (age 60), Stanko's wife (age 38), their daughter Sofia (age 14) and their three sons Nikolai (7), Yano (5), and Yuri (1); Todor Nikolaev (70), his wife (60), their sons Petro (25) and Zheko (18), and their daughters Stana (14) and Stoyana (10); Petro Vasiliev (60), his wife Mira (45), their sons Zheko (20), Yura (18), Stoyan (8), and Rado (3), and their daughters Stoyana (16), Stana (14), and Nedelia (12); and the widower Stoyana (50) who crossed into Russia with her four sons Marincho (25), Koncho (20), Stanko (19), Bolko (2) and her two daughters Karina (6) and Sultana (3). The occasionally wide discrepancy in the age of an adult female migrant and child migrants listed as her "sons" or "daughters" leads to speculation that these "sons" and "daughters" were in fact either the children of her real sons and daughters who had died en-route to the

56 Of the estimated 32,000 Bulgarians who crossed into Bessarabia in 1830, roughly two-thirds classified themselves as peasants. 1,600 declared "merchant" as their occupation. TsGIA – MSSR, f. 2, op. 1, d. 1501, ll. 2-3.

57 TsGIA – MSSR, f. 2, op. 1, d. 1467, ll. 29-32.

Russian Empire or orphaned child migrants who attached themselves to intact family units during migration.

Local and town officials in the Novorossiya Gubernate and Bessarabian Oblast also submitted registration lists to provincial-level authorities with the names of newly arrived Bulgarian migrants. Seven registration lists under the title of "correspondence to the Governor-General of Novorossiya from town police on the in-migration of Bulgarian subjects to Russia" were produced in the spring and summer of 1830.[58] One list compiled in April 1830 contained information about 295 Bulgarian migrant families "from various places in Rumelia wishing to settle in Bessarabia." The 295 listed family units totaled 1644 individuals (317 male adults, 309 female adults, 547 male children, and 471 female children). This particular group of Bulgarian migrants consisted of some large extended family units including those of Stoyan Petko (16 family members including three male adults, three female adults, five male children, and five female children), Momcho Pisar (14 family members including one male adult, one female adult, six male children, and six female children), and Panaiot Pancho (17 family members including four male adults, four female adults, five male children, and four female children).

Most of the Bulgarian migrants registered on these lists arrived from Black Sea coastal towns (such as Balçık, Mangalia, and Ahyolu) or from eastern and central Rumelian towns (such as Aytos, Edirne, Islimiye, and Yanbolu). One interesting feature of this particular batch of migrant

58 TsGIA – MSSR, f. 2, op. 1, d. 1326, ll. 112-220.

registration lists is the notation, next to the name of each individual migrant, of an assigned *bilet* number. As discussed above, *bilets* were a form of migrant travel documentation. The placement of a *bilet* number next to a migrant's basic demographic information leads to the conclusion that by the early 1830s *bilets* were utilized by Russian officials as the primary form of migrant identification in the Russian Empire.

Bulgarian migrants were tracked not only at their point of entry and in their initial settlements, but also through the recording of changes in the composition of migrant communities. A good example of this on-going statistical management of Bulgarian migrant communities in Bessarabia can be found in a document entitled "List of residents of the colony of Tashbunar who have died of fever and are afflicted with disease". This list contained the names and ages of 48 Bulgarian migrants (grouped by family unit) who had died or who were suffering from disease in Tashbunar in the summer of 1829. Those named included Dimo Nikolaev (45), his wife Yana (30), their sons Nikolai (12) and Stoiko (6), and Yana's sister (21); and Nikolai Penov (age 60), his wife Stoyana (age 50), their four sons Stoyan (28), Stepan (15), Petro (13), Todor (7), and their daughter Rada (11).[59]

Conclusion – Communication and Structural Connections among Bulgarian Migrant Communities in the Black Sea Region

Trade, return migration, and intra-communal communication forged strong and enduring structural connections among Bulgarian migrant communities in the Black Sea region in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These connections endured despite on-going efforts by the Ottoman and Russian states – through the construction of quarantine lines and the imposition of comprehensive migration management regimes – to establish territorial sovereignty along the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier.[60]

Members of Bulgarian migrant communities in the Black Sea region communicated with their kinsmen about the pros and cons of settlement conditions in the Russian Empire, the Danubian Principalities, and Ottoman Rumelia.[61] Information obtained in this manner often convinced Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire to take their chances and seek material improvement through migration to the Danubian Principalities and southern Russia.[62] Conversely, word of favorable economic and resettlement conditions in

59 *Derzhavnii Arkhiv Odeskoi Oblasti* (DAOO), f. 6, op. 1, d. 2482, l. 4.

60 According to James Scott, in implementing migration management regimes, states often "confront patterns of settlement… and a natural environment that have evolved largely independent of state plans." James Scott, Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), page 183.

61 BOA – HAT 1047/43226.

62 "Molba na 49 Bŭlgarski Semeistva ot Selo Sloboziia do General Kiselov za Osvobozhdane ot Danutsi kato Postradali ot Voinata" (January 9, 1832) Bŭlgarite v Rumŭnia, XVII-XX v.: Dokumenti i Materiali, pages 43-44.

Ottoman Rumelia in the period after the Russo-Ottoman War of 1828-1829, stimulated considerable Bulgarian return migration to the Ottoman Empire.[63]

Despite the best efforts of Russian state servitors and border guards, Bulgarians on the move in the early 1830s were aware of, and sought out, the easiest points of entry into the Danubian Principalities. For example, in the fall of 1830 Russian officials in Wallachia received reports on a significant drop in Bulgarian migrant arrivals at the Kalaraşi quarantine and a significant increase in migrant arrivals at the Braila and Pioa Pietri quarantines.[64] The result of a shorter quarantine period and less stringent documentation requirements in Braila and Pioa Pietri as compared to those in force in Kalaraşi, this shift in the Bulgarian migratory pattern – as a counter to recently-enacted Russian border security measures – typifies the fluidity of the Ottoman-Russian Black Sea frontier in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

ТРАНСДУНАВСКИЯТ ВАЛС: БЪЛГАРСКАТА МИГРАЦИЯ ПРЕЗ ОСМАНО–РУСКАТА ЧЕРНОМОРСКА ГРАНИЦА В КРАЯ НА XVIII И НАЧАЛОТО НА XIX ВЕК

Андрю Робартс

63 Titorov, page 28.

64 "Doklad na Logofeta Sht. Vlŭdesku do Izpŭlnitelniia Divan vŭv Vrŭska s Preminavaneto i Nastaniavaneto na Bŭlgarski Bezhantsi" (May 23, 1830) Bŭlgarite v Rumŭnia, XVII-XX v.: Dokumenti i Materiali (compiled and edited by Maxim Mladenov, Nikolai Zhechev, and Blagovest Niagulov) (Sofia: Akademichno Izdatelstvo "Marin Drinov", 1994), pages 27-28.

АНАМНЕЗА, Год. VII, 2012, кн. 3-4, ISSN 1312-9295, с. 64-97

Статията анализира миграцията на българите между Руската и Османската империи в контекста на отношението държава-общество в Османска Румелия от периода преди Танзимата. Тя се основава на проучвания в архивите на България, Турция, Русия и Украйна. Приемайки Черноморския регион като основна аналитична единица, текстът аргументира, че установяването на структурни връзки – чрез търговията, комуникациите и обратната миграция – между членовете на преселническите български общности в Османска Румелия, Дунавските княжества (Влахия и Молдова) и Южна Русия, предшества съвместните руско-османски инициативи по демаркация на границата в ранния XIX век. По-нататък е обоснована трайността на тези структурни връзки, въпреки усилията на Руската и Османската държави да охраняват своите граници и да направляват или контролират миграцията в двете посоки. Опирайки се на изследването на случая с миграцията на българите между двете империи и на подробен анализ на движенията на население на индивидуално и семейно равнище, тук е потърсен баланс на преобладаващата гледна точка за динамиката на българските преселения между Османската и Руската империи в края на XIX – началото на XX век. Това е направено чрез данните за значителна ежегодна вътрешна миграция в периода мужду 1768 и 1834 г. и откроването на немалкия брой български заселници в Бесарабия и Южна Русия, които избират да се завърнат в Османската империя след кратък престой в Руската империя.