



---

On the Bulgarians.

Author(s): John Beddoe

Source: *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 8 (1879), pp. 232-239

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2841034>

Accessed: 23/10/2013 05:15

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The following paper was read :—

*On the BULGARIANS.* By JOHN BEDDOE, M.D., F.R.S.

THE general interest felt just now in the ethnology of the Balkan peninsula must be my apology for a slight and imperfect paper, based partially on observations of my own, but chiefly on the elaborate papers of Kopernicki and Virchow, on the Bulgarian skull-form.

Nowhere in Europe, perhaps, are race-questions of more interest and importance than in Turkey; but notwithstanding much labour bestowed upon the subject, the anthropology of the Balkan peninsula remains to a great extent obscure. National antipathies, religious and linguistic differences, are strongly marked: blending of races by marriage and community of life-interests goes on very slowly, yet nevertheless even the numbers and boundaries of the several existing races are but imperfectly known. Boundaries, indeed, are in many cases quite undefined: thus it is impossible, in the Eastern half of the peninsula, to separate geographically the Bulgarians, Turks, Greeks, and Tartars; and the peculiarly atrocious and destructive character of the present war depends in part upon the dwelling together, in the same or in contiguous villages, of people who are or regard themselves as being of strongly contrasted nationality.

Moreover, our ignorance of the ethnological position of the earliest historical inhabitants is very profound. We may, indeed, pretty safely set down the modern Skipetar, Arnauts, or Albanians, as lineal descendants of the Illyrians and Macedonians. But what sort of people the Thracians were, ethnologically, is quite unknown. We can hardly suppose, however, that even the almost incessant wars and ravages which have torn and desolated the peninsula, but which have spared a remnant of the Macedonians, have been able to extirpate the blood of the Thracians; that the people of Hæmus and Rhodope were utterly destroyed, while those of Pindus were able to preserve their individual nationality. Colonel James Baker mentions a peculiar tribe in Rhodope called the Erghné, supposed to represent the ancient Agrianes, a Thracian tribe; they might well repay investigation, and we might possibly even learn something thereby respecting the old Thracian physical type.

The prevailing race of the northern, north-western, central, and north-eastern parts of the peninsula, passes for Slavonic; and Slavonic it is in the most important point of language, which almost necessarily entails a certain common likeness as to politics and religion. But the Anthropologist desires to

look further, and to know something of the tribal differences of physical and moral character, and of ethnic descent. The true Slavs appear to have spread within the historical period, from a pretty large but still comparatively limited area in Eastern Europe, lying about the Carpathians and the Dnieper, northwards, southwards, eastwards, and westwards; and they retain to a great extent, wherever they have gone, the same physical characteristics. From Procopius's description, their ancestors would appear to have been strong men of good stature and fair complexion, but not so remarkable in these respects as the genuine Gothic race; as compared with whom they were evidently deficient in military qualities. Agricultural and pacific in their habits, as invaders they were remarkable for their ferocity and cruelty. The kind of volatile good humour which is consistent with, and passes suddenly and almost causelessly, into extreme savagery, and which is attributed now-a-days to the Cossacks, appears to have characterised the ancient Slavs; and the tortures and massacres which heralded their permanent settlement south of the Danube, may in part account for the fact that we find their own type predominating there to so great an extent: they generally exterminated or extirpated the prior inhabitants, whereas the Goths or Germans more often established themselves as a ruling caste.

Intellectually, they are capable, but lack steadiness, and perhaps require some admixture of alien blood, as in the case of the Bohemian Czechs, before they can achieve great things. Their cranial development is fine; and this brings me to the subject of their physical character. They are men of good stature, and moderately fair complexions. The Servians and Bosnians are tall, fine, square-built men. So far as I have seen or heard, blue or grey eyes and brown hair predominate over darker hues, and I have seen flaxen hair even among the Bulgarians, who are generally a darker race. It is said that as one proceeds farther south, in Servia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina, darker hues become prevalent, perhaps from the larger proportion of Illyrian or Wallachian blood. The form of the head resembles that of the northern Slavs: it is broad in all its dimensions, and I should call it elliptical, or even oblong, rather than oval—an oblong rounded at the corners. The most common form of face corresponds with that of the skull, and has a tendency to squareness. It is not prognathous, nor are the zygomata broad in relation to the frontal region.

Now it is remarkable that though the Bulgarians speak a Slavonic tongue, with little or no Turanian element except what may reasonably be supposed, or positively known, to have been introduced by the Osmanli Turks, the description just

given does not generally apply to them. We know that the original Bulgarians, the original bearers of the name, were a tribe from the Volga region, whose name occurs in connection with those of the Huns and the Avars, with whom they seem to have had much in common, and who have always been considered as of Turkish or Finnish, or of mixed Turkish and Finnish blood, like the Hungarians. As the Avars, and subsequently the Magyars, ruled over the Slavs of Hungary, so did the Bulgars dominate the Slavs of the Lower Danube, standing to them apparently in the relation of a ruling caste. Ultimately the two elements, the Bulgar and the Slav, became welded into one, the speech of which was and remained Slavonic, and Slavonic of an older and less developed type than the Servian of to-day. Now it is extremely unlikely that a ruling caste race would have adopted the language of a subject one, unless either: 1st, it was much inferior in numbers; or, 2nd, in civilisation, or unless, 3rd, as Virchow suggests, it received a new religion with the language. The last supposition seems on the whole most probable: for we know that the Bulgarians received Christianity from Servian Apostles.

I have said, on the authority of Kopernicki and Virchow, who base their opinions on eleven skulls collected from various parts of Bulgaria by Kopernicki, and five by Scheiber, that the Bulgarian skull and face differs much from the Slavonic type. What is still more extraordinary is that they resemble neither the ordinary Finnish nor, still more certainly, the ordinary Turkish type. As Kopernicki says, they are neither Finno-Turkish, nor Slavish, but skulls *sui generis* and altogether peculiar. Virchow adds that there are points in which some of these skulls remind one, if of any others, of negro or rather perhaps of Australian skulls; for some of them have a degree of prognathousness unknown in Europe, and a depression at the root of the nose, a subglabellar depression or nasal notch, which we must go to Australia or to Melanesia to find paralleled.

By the kindness of Dr. Barnard Davis, who placed his rich collection at my service, I was able to see and measure a Bulgarian cranium and the cast of another (both originally from Kopernicki's collection); and to compare them with divers Slavish, Rumanian, Turkish, and Esthonian skulls. The cranium is thought by Kopernicki to represent fairly what he calls the type, as distinguished from the mixed type, which by somewhat greater breadth and a shading off of its peculiarities, indicates the admixture of Slavonic blood. The cast seems to have been taken from a skull which was afterwards presented by Kopernicki to Virchow, and became the principal text of the elaborate paper of that illustrious anthropologist.

TABLE of Measurements of Skulls in Dr. Barnard Davis's Collection.

—	Greatest Length.	Greatest Breadth.	Height from ant. edge of Foramen.	Least Frontal Breadth.	Zygomatic Breadth.	Height posterior edge of Foramen.	Index Breadth.	Index Height.	Index height (posterior).	—
Bulgarian male, 28 set., from Rustchuk ..	7.	5.4	5.1	3.75	5.15	5.25	77.	72.8	75.	Phœnozygous
Bulgarian from Bucharest (cast)	7.5	5.9	5.5	4.	5.5	5.9	78.6	73.3	78.6	Phœnoz
Russniak (Galicz) ..	7.	5.8	5.6	4.1	5.	5.65	82.8	80.	80.6	Aphœnoz
Slovak (Neutra) ..	6.9	5.75	5.05	3.8	5.35	5.15	83.3	73.2	74.6	Phœnozygous
Croat ..	7.	6.	5.5	3.8	5.6	5.6	85.7	78.5	80.	Aphœnoz.
Turk (Sulina) ..	7.	5.8	5.4	4.	5.2	5.6	82.8	77.1	80.	Aphœnoz.
Esthonian ..	7.5	5.6	5.4	4.1	5.4	5.7	74.6	72.	76.	Phœnoz ?

Scheiber's Bulgarian skulls: Br. Index, 80.1. Ht. Index, 78.9. Kopernicki, pure, 75.8, 78.1; mixed, 78.7, 77.3

Points most notable are the sloping away above and to some extent laterally of the forehead; the comparative elevation of posterior part of skull, so that the highest part is far abait the sagittal suture, the larger portion of skull behind foramen magnum. The Esthonian has this last point, but not the others, the upper part of the forehead in the Esthonian being well developed.

Virchow's four points from meatus in BD skulls.

Bulgarian 103	106	110	117	Russniak 105	107	105	117	Turk 95	97	102	Czech 100	98	105	130
97	106	112		Slovak 98	98	100	117	Esthonian 98	102	116	Polish Jew 96	103	105	?

PROPORTIONS, *measured from Meatus Auditorius, and reduced to Percentages, on Virchow's Plan.*

					To Nasal Notch.	To Spine of Maxilla.	To Alveolar Border.	Chin.
Bulgarian	..	..	..	.. (cast)	100	109	115·5	
Do.	..	..	..	.. (skull)	100	103	107	114·5
Turk	..	..	..	.. "	100	102	107	
Esthonian	..	..	..	.. "	100	104	108	127·5
Polish Jew	..	..	..	.. "	100	107	109	
Czech	..	..	..	.. "	100	98	105	130
Slovak	..	..	..	.. "	100	100	102	119
Russniak	..	..	..	.. "	100	102	100	112

To begin with the cranium—It has the following principal characteristics, all of which are considered by Kopernicki to belong to the type:—cylindrical form, moderate breadth (77), small frontal region sloping away rapidly above and to some extent also laterally, absence of frontal and parietal bosses, large occipital region, comparative elevation of posterior part of skull so that the highest part is far abaft the coronal suture. Observe, not one of these points is Slavonic. The narrowness of the forehead permits the zygomata to be visible when looked at from above, but there is not the same long flat-sided temporal region which is so common in the Irish and other British Celts. The nasal notch is deep, but not very conspicuously so, and the nose may have been well-formed. There is a moderate degree of alveolar prominence: the face is undoubtedly prognathous, but not markedly so; sufficiently so, that is, to distinguish it from a Russniak, Slovak, Czech, or Croat skull, but not to raise the least doubt of its being European.

The cast, however, is much more extraordinary in aspect; it has something of the savage, as Virchow expresses it. It is taken from a large dolichous skull; and exhibits the characteristic points of the other just described, some of them in a more marked degree. The posterior elevation is greater, the prominence of the upper jaw and alveolar border is something extraordinary in a European. The chin is absent from the cast, but is stated by Virchow to be very prominent. But the most remarkable thing is the depth of the nasal notch, and the form of the nasal bones, which start out quite horizontally, and indicate a patulous nose, tilted upwards to an extraordinary degree. This is the special feature that reminds Professor Virchow of Australian or Melanesian forms. Doubtless it is very exceptional even in Bulgaria: still, it would seem to be an

exaggeration only of a feature common there, if not positively typical.

Now what shall we say of Kopernicki's skull type, supposing it to be really the predominant one among the Bulgarians, which, in the defect of evidence to the contrary, we may assume it to be?

The deformity of the nose, which attains such portentous proportions in the cast just now described, does occur in a less degree even among pretty pure Slavs, such as the Poles. We all know the short snub nose of the gallant Pole, Kosciuszko, and I don't think John Sobieski's was much handsomer. Among some Cossack tribes patulous uptilted noses are common; but the term Cossack is scarcely ethnological: some Cossacks are pure Slavs, others are Finnish or Tartar. The Cossacks of the Bulgarian coast, who are descended from non-conformists who fled from Russia to escape religious tyranny, and found an asylum under the Turks, are men of splendid physical development, with rather handsome features.

The skull form, however, must be traced, in the main, either to the pre-Bulgar inhabitants of Mesia and Thrace, or to the true original Bulgars. The former hypothesis is not very probable. It is true that the lowest or aboriginal stratum of a population is now known to be often the most persistent, those subsequently deposited being, to use geological language, more liable to erosion. But the extinction of the Thracian tongue, the fact that the Roumans, Wallachs, or Zinzars, who would be almost equally likely to retain some Thracian blood, exhibit a totally different type, and the general course of the history, so far as we know it, makes it unlikely that the Thracian type survives in force, unless in the recesses of Mount Rhodope.

We fall back, therefore, on the true Bulgars, the Turanian invaders who came from the region of the Volga, and who following or accompanying their Slavonic subjects or allies, occupied lower Mesia and parts of Thrace and Macedonia. If these Bulgars had been a Turkish tribe, we may suppose that they would have had the globular acrocephalic skull-form, with small occipital development, which characterises, I believe, all true Turks. But if they were Finns, or Finns under Turkish leaders, the difficulty would not be so insuperable—though the Finlanders are short-headed, the Esthonians are long-headed, and, for aught I know, the Mordwins, Cheremisses, and other Eastern Ugrians may be the same. The absence of frontal and parietal bosses, and the extreme lowness of the forehead, are not to be found in the Esthonians, so far as I know; but certainly these distinctions do not seem so absolutely to negative a Ugrian hypothesis, as the reasons I have given negative

a Slavic or Turkish one. My conjecture is, then, that this skull type is in the main Ugrian, and that the modern Bulgarians are at least as much Ugrian as anything else.

I have said that light colours of hair occur among them. But darker tints prevail; and my very small experience agrees with the extensive observation of Kopernicki, that the light hair is found in individuals of tall stature and more Slavonic aspect.

The *physique* of the Bulgarians is a difficult and obscure subject: their *morale* presents its own difficulties.

They differ from the Serbs in some points favourably; in more, perhaps, unfavourably; and though some of the worst faults are doubtless what naturally arise in a race which for hundreds of years has been subjected to another, they cannot all have originated in that way.

The heroic type, which appears among the Serbs, whether they be Mussulman, Rayah, or free Christian, and culminates in the splendid barbarians of the Montenegro, is absent here. The ballads and popular songs of a people may generally be taken in evidence to the ideal, and therefore in some degree to the character of that people. The Robin Hood of England, the Cuchullin or Diarmid of Ireland, the Cid Rodrigo of Spain, the Reduan of the Moors, the Antar of the Arabs, the Czar Lazarus of Servia, have all more or less of chivalry in their composition, and are not mere embodiments of force, like Marco the Bulgarian hero, who is represented as a ferocious brute, a murderer of women, and a traitor. Their religion, too, rises little above fetishism, and has little connection with morality. Manliness, generosity, truthfulness and respect for women, are scarcely to be expected of such a people. But industry is there, and ambition, industry and acquisitiveness to a degree not found among the Serbs; and the desire of knowledge is there, and the capacity to learn; and but for the forcible interference of Russia, and the vast amount of moral and physical evil brought about thereby, they might gradually, under an improving Government, have developed into better things than we can now expect to see in our own days.

#### DISCUSSION.

Dr. SEBASTIAN EVANS called attention to the fact that few nations had suffered more severely from the attacks of their neighbours than the Bulgarians. Basil II, Emperor of Constantinople, at the beginning of the eleventh century, had not only earned the title of Bulgaroktonos by his slaughter of an immense number of the male population, but had planted settlements of other races in their midst, whilst the incursions of other peoples from the North had

no doubt tended to infuse a further admixture of foreign blood. This circumstance would account for the occurrence of almost any type of skull among the Bulgarians, and materially increase the difficulty of determining the normal type.

Dr. BEDDOE, referring to the remarks of Dr. Sebastian Evans, said he did not think even the massacres of that most Christian Emperor, Basil, the Bulgarian slayer, could have materially altered or confused the physical type of the Bulgarians; the original stock would soon reassert itself. Though he had himself seen only one skull and one cast, that single skull was considered by Kopernichi to represent fairly the type of the eleven he had collected from different districts in Bulgaria, and Scheiber's five were said to be on the whole very similar. The custom in the Levant of keeping the head covered was adverse to craniological observations on the living, and he should not have supposed the Bulgarians he saw there to be so dolichocephalic as measurement showed them to be. In answer to Mr. Lewis, he had described the prevailing Slavonic form of head in the paper; it was usually rather short and broad, and elliptic or oblong rather than ovate. It was well figured in Fitzinger's excellent monograph on Avar skulls. The Slavs, where least mixed in blood, were a rather fair race, with hair varying from flaxen to deep brown; and he had seen some tall fair-haired Bulgars whom he could not have distinguished from Serbs. Prof. Virchow was now expecting a number of Bulgarian skulls, the material being only too plentiful just at present, and probably he would soon throw further light on the subject.

---

The following paper was also read.

ETHNOLOGICAL HINTS *afforded by the STIMULANTS in use among SAVAGES and among the ANCIENTS.* By A. W. BUCKLAND.

LAST year I had the honour of laying before the British Association and this Society my views with regard to the origin and development of agriculture, and that inquiry led me naturally to the consideration of those stimulants and fermented beverages in use in very ancient times, and still made and consumed by tribes in a very low stage of civilisation; for if we glance round upon races uninfluenced by European civilisation, we shall find that all, with the exception perhaps of two or three of the very lowest in the scale of humanity, have found means of manufacturing some sort of stimulating drink, or have discovered among the herbs or trees of their native land some leaf or root or fruit possessing stimulating and invigorating properties, capable of sustaining their strength, and increasing their courage in time of need. The doctors of civilised Europe have been indebted to rude aborigines for many valuable medicinal