

THE IDENTITY OF TÂRGOVIȘTE – AN ACT NEGOTIATED BETWEEN THE LOCAL PEOPLE AND THE FOREIGNERS

Cristina Furtună, Assistant, PhD Student, "Valahia University" of Târgoviște

Abstract: The foreign travelers and the internal documents prove that in Târgoviște the large majority of the population was of Romanian origin. In 1596, Botero mentioned that, out of the 1050 houses existing in town at that time, 1000 were inhabited by Romanians and only 22 by "Catholic Saxons of German and Hungarian origin"¹.

Being a princely residence, at some moments one could talk, exaggerating a little, about a "mixture of nations" (Hungarians, Saxons, Bulgarians from Chiprovtsi, Germans and Poles)², because of the mercenaries from the princely guard; the Greeks signaled by some travelers³ and by the internal documents were, most of them, merchants, attracted here by the profit.

In Târgoviște, the conflict for identity took place between the Greeks and the local people of Târgoviște, or the Turks and the population of Târgoviște, because both of them wanted the supremacy in town.

Keywords: Târgoviște, local people, foreigners, Greeks, Turks, Saxons.

By identity we understand the relation of perfect resemblance between two entities, going up to their complete equivalence. The term also means the property of an object of being the same, while keeping the basic characteristics that define it, giving it an unmistakable singularity. In thinking, it is reflected as the principle of identity, according to which, in the same speech, any expression has just one meaning, any modification leading to the appearance of sophisms. Self identity is a defining dimension of self-consciousness, which appears as the reverse and complementary side of the consciousness of the world, through the influence of the social environment on the individual. Self identity represents the condition of autonomy and self-regulation of the person. It takes shape within the socio-affective relations of the individual with the others. Self identity has a double meaning of "identity for others" (apud Gorgos, C., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychiatry*, 1988); it is the product of the interpenetration of the socio-cultural and individual models with one's personal features. The individual projects himself in the others, incorporating those features in which he finds himself, but does not confound himself with the others, by virtue of some differentiating identifications, by which he delimits his own self identity from the whole environment (collective, group or community)⁴. One may weigh up different national identities, may build alternatives between being Romanian, Hungarian or French, but not between being Romanian or European. The concept of "European" would be positioned on a higher generalization stage than the concept of "Romanian", as the fruit lies on a different generalization stage than the apple⁵.

¹ *Calatori straini* (Foreign Travelers), IV, p. 571.

² *Ibidem*, V, p. 438.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 215.

⁴ Apud *Dictionarul Spiritului Tolerant* (Tolerant Spirit Dictionary), editura Evenimentul, Bucuresti, 1997, 148-148.

⁵ *Idem*, op. cit., p. 148-149.

In order to understand, to appreciate and express a valuable judgment on a cultural period as a whole or only on an aspect and domain of it, it is obligatory that the historical context that delimits it should be considered, along with the mentality of the people of the epoch under analysis, so that the investigator of a past culture and civilization age should aim at becoming, in a way, a contemporary of the people of that time, and his investigation – a restoration act of a “living history”, of a “human history” (M. Block, *History is Science on Human in Time*).⁶

Another defining feature of the Romanian culture is its capacity of keeping a continuous contact with the reality, with the sources of life.

Through its multidimensional moral and spiritual profile, with roots in the public creation, in the Romanian’s philosophy of life, the Romanian culture does not appear as a “picturesque” or “exotic” reality, but as an example of maintaining the balance of the human being in the existence, uniting lucidity with the expectations of integration into the international circuit of values, a circuit that it was to complete and enrich by its specific, by its identity, crystallized, in its turn, through the selective absorption of the universally valid values, of the community brands. By cultivating and promoting its traditions, the Romanian culture proves that it has the vocation of synthesis, of wholeness – which ensures its role and place in universality, in the world circuit of values, to which we contribute unto the maintaining of the ideal of unity in diversity⁷.

The regional identity and local cultural activities should be multicultural activities, belonging to the minorities, as well; here, there is room for positive discrimination, but we do not have the right to launch any kind of activity or cultural event on the market to maintain and assert an identity when there is a risk of cultural pollution. To maintain and promote the national identity, new objectives are necessary, such as the creation of associations, of partnerships. Cultural institutions such as the libraries may become a real social integration factor. Regarding the identity / diversity relationship, we appreciate that identity - and not diversity - represents a priority⁸.

Recently, the ethnologists declared themselves supporters of the theory that ethnicity is deeply-rooted in the human conscience; it can be, at the same time, a factor of change⁹.

The foreign travelers through our country and the available Romanian documents prove that, in Târgoviște, the great majority of the population had a Romanian origin. In 1596, Botero mentioned that, out of the 1,050 houses existing in town at that time, 1,000 used to be inhabited by Romanians and only 22 by “Catholic Germans living in Wallachia who spoke German and Hungarian”¹⁰.

Being a royal residence, we could speak, at some moments, exaggerating, of a “melting pot” (Hungarians, Germans living in Wallachia, Bulgarians from Chiprovăt,

⁶ Apud Viorica Arghir, *Regiuni, culturi și dezvoltare economică sustenabilă: contribuția etnologiei europene in Diversitate și identitate culturală în Europa (Regions, Cultures and Sustainable Economic Development: European Ethnology Contribution in Diversity and cultural identity in Europe)*, Târgoviște, Editura Bibliotheca, 2004, p. 15.

⁷ Viorica Arghir, op. cit., p. 17.

⁸ Viorica Arghir, op.cit, p. 18.

⁹ Viorica Argir, op. cit, p. 19.

¹⁰ *Calatori straini* (Foreign Travelers in Wallachia), IV, p. 571.

Germans and Polish)¹¹, due to the mercenary soldiers of the royal guard; regarding the Greeks mentioned by some travelers¹² and by the Romanian documents, most of them used to be merchants, attracted by profit.

On January 29, 1608, Cobia Monastery was confirmed as owner of a vineyard in the Hills of Târgoviște, a vineyard that had been the possession of Nica, the tanner¹³. Viforâta Monastery had the privilege of collecting the “wine taxes from Târgoviște Hill among the people of Viforâta”¹⁴. From the diptych of the Catholic monastery, we find out that it owned “... a beautiful large vineyard in Valea Sașilor (The Saxons’ Valley)”, which had, down the hill, “a little house”, and the vineyard was named “the vineyard of the Catholic monks”¹⁵ and lay on a surface of 25 acres, exempted “from land taxes and wine taxes”¹⁶.

Regarding the town itself, some documents mention the presence of the gypsy slaves, as well, who were used by the royal court and great monasteries for different household activities. During that time, their number was relatively high, and they were grouped in Gypsy communities. Documents mention the Gypsy communities of the Metropolitan Church and of Dealu, but there is no mention of their precise location¹⁷.

In Târgoviște, conflicts for identity took place between the Greeks and the inhabitants of Târgoviște, or between the Turks and the inhabitants of Târgoviște, since both wanted to have supremacy over the town.

In September 1813, Ioan Caragea approved Isac Ralet’s request of being given, as a donation, the “place of Târgoviște where there were some falling walls that had once been a royal court”; considering that “they were useless both to the royal court and to the country”, the ruler offered the place with no regret¹⁸.

Giving up the traditional rights which the town of Târgoviște had had, the royal court tried to use them as private properties. With the help of some representatives of the great nobility, in September 1820, the ruler Alexandru Șutu decided to appropriate the town estate of Târgoviște, in order to give it to his daughter Catinca, as a dowery, on her marriage to Manolache Băleanu¹⁹.

At the beginning of October, several officials were sent to Târgoviște, who were in charge with informing the town citizens on the ruler’s documents, with establishing the town estate limits and with entering in its possession. Faced with such an unfair act, the citizens of Târgoviște raised against the ruler’s decision and officials; throughout the town, church bells started chiming the danger rhythm, calling the people to resistance. Outside, in the streets, the town people shouted loudly and started attacking the ruler’s officials who were in town; being taken by surprise, they escaped by running away²⁰. Being aware of the injustice that was

¹¹ Ibidem, V, p. 438.

¹² Ibidem, p. 215.

¹³ DIR, B., sec. XVII, vol. I, p. 291-292.

¹⁴ Arh. St. Buc., *Mănăstirea Viforâta* (Viforâta Monastery), L/7.

¹⁵ N. Iorga, *Studii și documente* (Studies and Documents), vol. II, p. 232-233.

¹⁶ Mihai, Oproiu, op. cit, p. 87.

¹⁷ Arh. St. Bucuresti, *Radu-Voda*, XVI/23 și ms. 127, f. 401-401 v.

¹⁸ V. A. Urechia, *Istoria romanilor* (Romanian History), vol. X, p. 114-115.

¹⁹ Ion Ghica, *Scrisori...* (Letters...), Editura pentru Literatura și Arta, Bucuresti, p. 124. Vezi și Radu Gioglovan, *Două procese pentru apararea mosiei orasului Targoviste in secolul al XIX/lea* (Two Trials in Defense of the Estate of Targoviste Town in the 19th Century), S.A.I., II, 1957, p. 461.

²⁰ I. Vaillant, *La Roumanie...*, II, p. 305; G. Bezviconi, *Calatori rusi...* (Russian Travelers), p. 225.

about to take place, the citizens of Târgoviște gathered in a place and elected numerous deputies – about 300 people – who left for Bucharest to protest against the breaking of their old rights of town estate owners²¹. Being informed by means of the horsemen post, the royal court took actions in order to stop the numerous delegacy at the gates of Bucharest City. At the end of the Mogoșoaia Bridge, the citizens of Târgoviște were welcomed by a delegacy made up of great nobles, led by the metropolitan bishop – who were trying to convince them that the royal court would consider their complaint, asking them to go back to Târgoviște, where they were to be informed on the royal decision. But the delegacy did not accept the proposals, asking that a small delegacy go up to the royal palace²². The trip across Mogoșoaia Bridge is interesting; although their number was limited, the citizens of Târgoviște protested with angry shouts, carrying a complaint document lifted up on a shaft and holding wooden mats put on fire. In the complaint document, they showed that they were protesting “according to our custom, when we are in need”²³.

In front of the Council, the delegacy claimed their old rights on the town estate, asking for the delineation of the position of the town’s grazing field, the limits of the town estate and for the right of selling plum brandy and wine, freely, and that of holding fairs. Being persuaded by the nobles to get back home, the deputies empowered Vasile Vătamanul, Tudor Moldoveanu and Nicolae Andronescu to represent them. During the investigation, by exerting pressure on the nobles, the representatives elaborated a report and a document where they contested the rights of the citizens of Târgoviște on the town estate, asking for the punishment of the rebels, as well²⁴. The citizens of Târgoviște found out about the actions of the Council by means of ecclesiarch priest Gheorghe, who had been informed by the Metropolitan Bishop himself. Threatening with dismissals and pushing more pressure, the ruler succeeded in persuading the nobles to sign the report. The representatives of Târgoviște Town are some of them sentenced to prison and others exiled, which actions were meant to intimidate them. To escape from punishment, the representatives were asked to sign the report, as well, thus recognizing the transfer of the town estate to the ruler’s possession. The citizens of Târgoviște were “grieved and disappointed” and came back home “wretched”²⁵. The fight had not ended, since the townsfolk did not give up resisting for good, but they only waited for more favorable circumstances. After the unexpected death of ruler Alexandru Șutu and the revolution of February 1821, the townsfolk sent delegates to Bucharest, asking the former ruler’s widow “to give us the paper signed by us, as we were forced to sign it against our will by our enemies”, as well as two royal documents signed by the rulers Matei Basarab and Constantin Brâncoveanu. Since the settlement of the problem was being slowed down, in the middle of February 1821, the third delegacy of the citizens of Târgoviște, consisting of 400 members – this time armed – was heading for Bucharest, carrying a new complaint letter. Again, requests were formulated regarding the freedom of the village estate, the returning of

²¹ Hurmuzaki, XXI, p. 523.

²² R. Gioglovan, op. cit., 1957, p. 412.

²³ I. Ghica, op.cit., p. 124-125.

²⁴ Filiala Arh. St. Dambovită, *fond Primaria orasului Targoviste*, dos. 25-1835.

²⁵ Naum Râmnicănu, *Scrisoarea munteanului ca raspuns la scrisoarea moldoveanului* (The Wallachian’s Letter in Answer to the Moldavian’s Letter), in “Bis. Ort. Rom.”, XIII, 1889-1898, p. 275, 276. See as well R. Gioglovan, op. cit., 463-464.

the old documents signed by rulers Matei Basarab and Constantin Brâncoveanu, and the cancellation of the report of September 1820²⁶.

Frightened by the events that had taken place in Oltenia, on February 18, 1821, the Council and the ruler's assistants succeeded in persuading ruler Alexandru Șutu's widow to return the estate to Târgoviște town, and gave a resolution that "from now on the claimers are to live on this estate... freely and undisturbed"²⁷. At the beginning of March 1821, the report of ruler Alexandru Șutu and his document were put on fire in the Council, in the presence of the town representatives²⁸, and on January 18, 1825, the first local ruler reinforced the old documents by a new document²⁹.

During the occupation of the town by Ipsilanti's troops, numerous excesses occurred. The supporters of the Filomousos Eteria movement "at first they robbed all the town houses, then went on robbing the villages around", stealing "all the horses and arms from the local people, then robbed all the vineyards around Târgoviște"³⁰.

As the movement's leader, Alexandru Ipsilanti, was not able to make himself obeyed, many Albanian soldiers "made their shelter in the wineries, where the wine vessels were, and, breaking open the wine cellars, one after another, did nothing but sacrifice oxen and cows and, being drunk, shouted: Long live Elefteria"³¹.

Ipsilanti's authority was disrespected since "the Albanian soldiers would not obey Ipsilanti", going on with the destruction, "damaging all the wine vessels, plum brandy vessels and the other vessels necessary to the vineyard, putting the fences on fire, pulling down fruit trees and damaging many wineries"³². The leading robber was the county administrator himself, Geartoglu, who "was skinning the villagers..., causing an unprecedented waste"³³. Established in Geartoglu's house, where he had his headquarters, Al. Ipsilanti was not able to cope with the facts, being overwhelmed by the actions of the Albanian soldiers, whom he was not able to moderate in their robberies, saying that "they would not obey their leader, either", and the explanation given to those who complained about having been robbed that "the soldiers were young, therefore, they were not accustomed with discipline"³⁴, did not convince anybody.

In order to calm down the population who was dissatisfied with the robbery, on April 19, from Târgoviște, Ipsilanti gave a proclamation to the inhabitants of Wallachia: "Noble Sons of Dacia"; Târgoviște was named the capital town of Dacia, from where Ipsilanti was anxious to move on to his beloved homeland³⁵.

²⁶ V. A. Urechia, op. cit., XII, 484.

²⁷ Muzeul Județean Dambovită (Dambovită County Museum), inv. 105.

²⁸ V. A. Urechia, op. cit., p. 483.

²⁹ Muzeul Județean Dambovită (Dambovită County Museum), inv. 105.

³⁰ C. Aricescu, *Acte justificative la istoria revoluțiunii române de la 1821* (Acts Explaining the Historical Moments of the Romanian Revolution of 1821), p. 141.

³¹ C. Aricescu, op. cit., p. 141.

³² DIR, 1821, V, p. 61-78; C. Aricescu, op. cit., p. 153-154.

³³ DIR, 1821, V, p. 306-307.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 78.

³⁵ Ibidem.

Ipsilanti's situation was problematic; starting to be afraid of being murdered by some undisciplined Albanian soldier, he was living far from the troops, keeping his house windows barred or often sleeping in the vineyards around the town³⁶.

At Târgoviște, Ipsilanti was surrounded by inefficient people; the command of the troops had been entrusted to Caravia, who was not initiated in military problems, and Târgoviște's leader was Geartoglu³⁷.

Being unable to mobilize the troops in the fight against the masses, the Eteria army was not able to stand against the Ottoman attack. Moving through Bucharest, Chehaia Bey went quickly to Târgoviște, which was now the centre of the Eteria movement. Defeating easily the Eteria resistance - organized in the outposts from Nucet and Cornătel villages, the Turkish had a free passage, as Ipsilanti had no intention of organizing the defense, but only tried to save his life, dishonorably running away from the battlefield³⁸.

Once arrived at Târgoviște, although "he had come to chase away the Greek troops", Chehaia Bey had "evil... intentions... concerning this town, as he wanted to destroy it." The arrival of the Turks at Târgoviște happened on May 29, at noon on Sunday; they announced "the guildmasters of the Austrian-protected soldiers ... asking them to gather all their subordinates near the guild headquarters to be safe and sound". Most of the town citizens "were running away... and... frightened...; when the Turkish troops came, they all ran away all over the place: to Viforâta Hermitage, to Gorgota monastery or even "high up the mountain, to the place called Poiana Băjenii"³⁹.

The town is robbed and desolated. Some of the religious monuments are turned into horse stables or, at the best, mosques, as it was the case of the Church of the Holy Emperor Constantine and Empress Helena. On June 31, 1821, impressed by the events, a citizen wrote: "all the churches were damaged in the year of 1821"; here, it is shown how, right after entering the town, the Turks "started to break into the holy Churches". Many books were taken, and few of them could be ransomed. Many inhabitants "died by the sword".

The Ottoman occupation lasted up to the middle of June; "on June 16, the officials took action, as well, on a Thursday morning", making the citizens run away, causing agitation and noise, obliging many inhabitants to make efforts to find their families, as is the case of Nicolae Papazoglu, who "two days later, taking some Turks as a guard,... from Chihaiia Bey – the leader of the Turkish troops – went to "look for his family"⁴⁰.

On January 31, 1822, the citizens of Târgoviște were able to obtain the legal decision of ruler Grigore Ghica, who gave "the local royal churches" the right to gather a local tax for the town and a tax "for the hospital", which tax was to be paid by the merchants coming to town... with goods or food or other products to sell at the Outer Fair (held outside the town)". The hospital was to "receive foreigners, as well"⁴¹.

³⁶ DIR, 1821, II, p. 82-84.

³⁷ C. Aricescu, *Istoria revolutiunii romane de la 1821* (Romanian Revolution History of 1821), Craiova, 1874, p. 260.

³⁸ A. Otetea, op. cit., p. 434-435.

³⁹ R. Gioglovan, M. Oproiu, op. cit., p. 212, 279 and G. Popescu, M.G. Popescu, *Monografia comunei Runcu* (Monograph of Runcu Commune), p. 10.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, p. 279. Vezi și Mircea T. Georgescu, op. cit., p. 87-88.

⁴¹ *Muzeul Județean Dambovita*, inv. 104.

We find out that in the same year, 1822, “the inhabitants of the town outskirts were invited to help, according to their will and heart”, to the restoration, little by little, of all that the Turks had destroyed. Slowly, the people found the necessary time to “have the privilege... to sign” different documents or to read “in detail... getting informed about the translation of the words”. In April 1823, the new churchwarden of the Town’s Church, Ioan Tanasescu, aware of the need to keep the memory of the events, starts the elaboration of the “Town’s Church diptych”⁴². The town life calms down in 1825.

The first local ruler showed that “the Royal Court, convinced of the rights that the citizens of Târgoviște have had from times of yore over this estate, as shown above, approves the report submitted to the ruler”. The local ruler emphasizes that “after the approval, the local people of Târgoviște town came with a complaint letter to my Royal Court”, claiming that “the money spent on the hospital was useless, as both the citizens of the town and the foreigners, not used to having a hospital, lie sick in their beds, at home, considering the hospital as a place where life is shortened”; they were asking for an approval to get “the Road of the Springs remade, to bring water up to the Outer Fair”, which was “of great use to the community”, as the number of people was high and they “missed water and lived far from it”. At the same time, the citizens of the town demanded that “the hospital - which was useless - should be moved near Saint Nicholas Church, “where a school for the poor children’s education was to be built”⁴³. It seems that, being supported by the ruler, the townsfolk overcame relatively soon the hardships.

In 1827, having a quiet time, the townsfolk start to remedy the damage, in November 1827, the building of Viforâta village church, started on May 1 by a group made up of several citizens, is completed⁴⁴.

Even since the 17th century, the documents clearly attested a great number of villages situated around the town. It seems that at the beginning of the 17th century, some of them, due to the economic development and the population growth, were included in the town’s area. This is why we believe that, towards the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century, Târgoviște recorded a real extension, including Sârbi and Călugăreni villages as well, which led to the development of the old area of the town.

Sârbi, a village of colonists, settled near Târgoviște since the 15th century, was part of the town, as one can notice among the town’s administrators the presence of Ivan the Old “from Sârbi”. If the town’s community designated as their representative a person “from Sârbi”, it meant that the inhabitants of this area were considered as inhabitants of the town, on whose estate they had been colonized. At the beginning of the 19th century, the Sârbi Church is mentioned as part of the town⁴⁵. The town estate also included Ulmi village and other important lands southwards.

⁴² R. Gioglovan, M. Oproiu, *op. cit.*, p. 209-215.

⁴³ *Muzeul Judetean Dambovita* (Dambovita County Museum), inv. 105.

⁴⁴ R. Gioglovan, M. Oproiu, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁴⁵ Al. Popescu Runcu, *Catagrafia judetului Dambovita la 1810* (Dambovita County Catagraphy in 1810), p. 10. On the occasion of the archaeological diggings that took place in the area of the Town’s Gates towards Bucharest, T. Musca found out that the fortress ditch had been built over a settlement dating from the 16th century, now part of the town, around Saint Nicholas Simuleasa Church.

Unlike Ulmi, Călugăreni was situated towards east, on the left bank of the Ialomita River, being mentioned until the middle of the 17th century, then it disappears⁴⁶. The explanation consists in the inclusion of this village in the town, the name disappearing and being probably turned into a new toponym which we have not been able to identify. On the Austrian map made in 1791, the presence of the town on the left side of the Ialomita River is still outlined, being termed “Mahala” (Suburb). In 1810, the Russian cartography mentioned the “Suburb over the brook” (“Mahalaua peste gărlă”), which shows that this zone was also included in the town’s area⁴⁷.

The issue of the settlement of a Bulgarian population at Târgoviște has been in the attention of several Slavist historians and researchers. How old the Bulgarian roots are in this area – is a subject of study that, surely, the historical sources have not exhausted.

The Bulgarians’ migration north of the Danube had started since the Middle Ages. Wallachia, preserving a considerable autonomy from the Ottoman Empire, represented the ideal refuge for the inhabitants of the Bulgarian territories, which were systematically plundered and scorched by Turks and turned into Turkish pashalics.

“Between the 15th and the 16th centuries, almost the only solution for the Bulgarians in front of the Ottoman pressure was to runaway to Wallachia”⁴⁸. The process continued, reaching its climax during the Russian-Turkish wars and, particularly, given the wars between 1806 and 1812 and between 1827 and 1829. The runaway of the Bulgarians, like that of the Serbians or of other Balkan populations across the Danube occurred either in groups or individually. Those who travelled in groups tried to adapt to the new conditions, accepting and assimilating a part of the local people’s customs, trying to live in good relations with them. In some cases, they kept their native language, which changed in time, losing a great part of its defining elements.

It is certain that at Târgoviște there were nuclei of Slavic-speaking populations and, gradually, beside them, other refugees – or better said exiles – settled as well, who hoped that the similarities in point of language and ethnic group would diminish the dramatic dimension of their estrangement from home.

“Matei Voievod” District took shape gradually, just as the Bulgarians’ migration took place in waves.

“It has been noticed that the inhabitants of Târgoviște town and of Băleni Sârbi, Dâmbovită County, as well as those from Brebeni Sârbi and Coteana, Olt County, speak the northern-western type of Bulgarian language, the Beala Slatina-Pleven sub-type, derived from the main Bulgarian mass a few hundred years ago. The oldest certification of a massive group of southern-Slavs in these localities is at Târgoviște (in 1810; the previous evidence regarding the settlement of some solitary Bulgarians of those who had been refugees before 1739 not included here). As it is supposed that in all the above-mentioned four points the refugees

⁴⁶ DIR, sec. XVII, vol. II, p. 85-86, 296. The archaeological diggings carried out between 1962 and 1965 produced, at the foot of the Dealu Monastery Hill, a little church that dated back from the 16th century.

⁴⁷ Ac. RSR, Hărți (Maps), DXXVII / 6.

⁴⁸ Steliana Grasu., *Bulgarii de la Târgoviște (The Bulgarians from Târgoviște)*, București: Ed. Ararat, 2000, p. 20.

came at the same time, their settlement is related to the wave that had come prior to their first mention (1793-1806)⁴⁹.

In 1851, a number of 57 or 60 Bulgarian families (the data come from different sources) left Băleni locality and settled in Târgoviște⁵⁰.

Even if they are called Serbs, the Bulgarians from Târgoviște can be identified as such by their Bulgarian traditional clothes (similar to those of Bulgaria and Greek Macedonia), by their Bulgarian language (“*Beala Slatina Pleven*” sub-type, orally transmitted) or by specific customs.

From the very beginning of their colonization, at first at Băleni, then at Târgoviște, they have cohabited with the Romanian population of the area, having multiple connections and assuming the same destiny in the historical evolution of the unique social collectivity⁵¹.

References:

- Aricescu, C, *Istoria revolutiunii romane de la 1821* (History of the Romanian Revolution of 1821), Craiova, 1874
- Arghir, Viorica *Regiuni, culturi și dezvoltare economică sustenabilă: contribuția etnologiei europene în Diversitate și identitate culturală în Europa* (“Regions, Cultures and Sustainable Economic Development: the Contribution of the European Ethnology” in Diversity and Cultural Identity in Europe), Târgoviște, Editura Bibliotheca, 2004
- Grasu, Steliana *Bulgarii de la Târgoviște* (The Bulgarians from Târgoviște), București: Ed. Ararat, 2000
- Oproiu, Mihai, Pârvan, Dobrin, *Târgoviște*, vol. II, 1821-1918, Târgoviște, 2001.
- Oproiu, Mihai, *Targoviste. Vol. I-1600-1848*, Targoviste, Editura Bibliotheca, 1999.
- Popescu Runcu, Al. *Catagrafia judetului Dambovita la 1810* (Catagraphy of Dambovita County in 1810)
- Romano, Louis, *Așezări de bulgari și alți sud-dunăreni în Țara Românească* (Settlements of Bulgarians and Other South-Danube People in Wallachia), București, 1984.
- Tufeanu, Maria, *Interferențe lingvistice în comunitățile de bulgari din Muntenia. Cartierul “Matei Voievod” din Târgoviște* în Diversitate și identitate culturală în Europa (*Linguistic Interferences in the Bulgarian Communities in Muntenia. “Matei Voievod” District in Târgoviște* in Diversity and Cultural Identity in Europe), vol. III, Târgoviște, Editura Bibliotheca, 2006
- Dictionarul Spiritului Tolerant* (Tolerant Spirit Dictionary), Editura Evenimentul, Bucuresti, 1997

⁴⁹ Louis ,Romano, *Așezări de bulgari și alți sud-dunăreni în Țara Românească* (*Settlements of Bulgarians and Other South-Danube Inhabitants in Wallachia*), București, 1984.

⁵⁰Maria Tufeanu., *Interferențe lingvistice în comunitățile de bulgari din Muntenia. Cartierul “Matei Voievod” din Târgoviște* în Diversitate și identitate culturală în Europa (*Linguistic Interferences in the Bulgarian Communities of Muntenia. “Matei Voievod” District of Târgoviște* in Diversity and Cultural Identity in Europa), vol. III, Târgoviște, Editura Bibliotheca, 2006,p. 164.

⁵¹Maria Tufeanu., op. cit, p. 165.