

ANTHROPOLOGICAL CHALLENGE – ETHNOGRAPHIC TRADITION. THE QUIET TRANSITION OF THE HUNGARIAN ETHNOGRAPHY IN ROMANIA¹

SZABÓ Á. TÖHÖTÖM

Babeş – Bolyai University,
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Hungarian Ethnography
and Anthropology
400202 Cluj-Napoca, Horea Street 31
Romania

UDC / UDK 39(=511.141):378(498)

Review article
Pregledni znanstveni rad
Accepted: August 12, 2008

In this paper I analyze the situation of Hungarian ethnography in Romania. In the first part of my paper I present the main aspects of ethnography's antecedents mentioning the political and ideological commitment of this discipline and also touching upon its status in minority conditions when ethnography is seen as a way for preserving identity. In the second part I present the current situation of ethnography, which has been professionalized and anthropologized and, as a consequence of this, has been drawn away from the amateur movement. In this paper I also delineate the professional personality of Hungarian ethnographers in Cluj.

Key words: *professional personality, locality, centre and periphery, amateur movement, professionalization, integration and disintegration, minority condition*

¹ In this article I analyze the case of ethnographic teaching at the Faculty of Humanities, Babeş–Bolyai University (BBU) in Cluj-Napoca (in Hungarian: Kolozsvár). Numerous Hungarians live in Romania, especially in Transylvania, and the BBU in Cluj has Hungarian departments or specializations.

INTRODUCTION

It is a well known fact that East-European ethnography has been characterized for about 150 years by political alignment followed by ideological determination. The ethnography of areas in which the Hungarian language is spoken showed these characteristics from the beginning to the second half of the twentieth century, when in comparison to other human sciences and mainly following the effects of anthropology, a slow change started in our discipline. But the political events and the ideologies of the first 150 years are present in the ethnography as an inheritance that has to be discussed. Although the ideological commitment mentioned above could have shown many differences depending on nations, period, institutions, or even individuals, I see some uniformity in research programmes in the questions that ethnographers wanted to answer, and beside these in the way of organizing ethnography. In Tamás Hofer`s words: I saw sameness in professional personality (Hofer 2004:67). The roots of this personality can be discovered in the first main period that coincided with the political programmes of the nation building movements. Whereas László Kósa emphasizes in his work written about Hungarian ethnography`s history, the lack of power assigned to ethnography², none should forget the indirect role of our discipline in these movements³. The forming nations of Eastern-Europe used the folk culture willy-nilly in the 19th century as a basis for their cultural independence: the work of ethnographers constituted the first step towards a political programme aiming to free the nations of this region (Dieckhoff 2002:18-19). The intertwining of ethnography and national culture marked this discipline and led to a special professional personality.

In my paper I would like to find out if the Hungarian ethnography in Cluj has such features that can be used as the basis for drawing a special kind of personality, and if it does, what are these features, and to what extent can they be called anthropological features? In fact, with this question I would

² In Hungarian speaking areas ethnography affected the national culture mainly in an indirect way because its institutional and organizational status did not make it possible to become a national science like history or linguistics (Kósa 2001:111-113).

³ We can see at the same time the role of public opinion and power which reinterpreted the results of ethnography and conferred them a national meaning.

like to get closer to how ethnography looks today, how it is perceived in the scientific world, and what is its public role in a particularly organized minority society. I consider Hungarian ethnography in Cluj as an organic part of the ethnography from Hungary, which at the same time it differs – as a social reality, in questions, and in institutional position – from the Hungarian institutions, and the fact that it is the only independent ethnographic department in Romania makes its situation more special.

THE FRAME

As I mentioned earlier in my paper I shall use the categories of Tamás Hofer, who played an important role in the anthropological turn of Hungarian ethnography. In his paper that first appeared in the late sixties, after a conference organized in the US, he wrote some comments on the relations between European ethnography and American anthropology.⁴ His comments were formulated in a situation where anthropologists attacked the ethnographers very often, saying that the ethnographers are some form of backward, underdeveloped anthropologists, who can not overstep the empiricism of 19th century and can not reach generalization and theorization (Hofer 2004:67). Hofer tried to modulate the simplifying image resulting from these charges, and pointed out the differences between the two specialities originating from their formation and specific questions. To summarize his opinion: he said that anthropology and ethnography – descending from their nature – have different professional personalities.

Tamás Hofer exemplifies and supports his statement by analyzing the strategies of the two professions from choosing the field to the institutional mobility and the custom of giving titles. On this basis, I would like to emphasize two major statements from his work regarding on the one hand mobility and opportunities for mobility, and on the other hand the relations between data and theories. Accordingly, the anthropological personality is mobile, the ethnographic personality is static. On the level of theories, anthropology is not only inclined to theory making, but the production of the theories is an important requirement, while in the field of ethnography theories fall into the background compared to data (Hofer 2004:71-76).

⁴ The paper was published in Hungarian only in 2004.

Although I know that the statements of the paper written in the late sixties are overwritten in many ways by interdisciplinary approaches, by the easiest penetrability between different disciplines, in this paper I try to analyze some important aspects of the current Hungarian ethnography in Romania connected to the same study. In fact, I examine the transformation of Hungarian ethnography in Romania, the transformation of professional personality, and the anthropological features of this personality. In my examination of this process and personality I make a difference between the science of ethnography (the professional ethnography), and amateur ethnography, which in our minority society is carried out by many people with a lot of affection, but less professional knowledge. This amateur movement is concerned with data collecting and its members are mainly provincial intellectuals (school teachers without professional ethnographic training), who consider this work a kind of national (minority) duty. To give an idea of this difference, I use the contrast of centre and periphery. In this case I do not use this contrast as a geographic or spatial category, but more to define a virtual community. If you like, I use Appadurai's concept of locality (Appadurai 1998:178-179). Consequently, I analyze how the centre works, what are its rules of functioning, what are the characteristics of ethnography's locality in Cluj, what kind of subjects does this centre produce, and I also analyze the influencing factors that formed the present ways of functioning.

The process I analyzed is twofold: I speak on one hand about integration and on the other hand about disintegration. To understand this difference and this twofold process we have to enumerate and summarize some aspects of the inheritance that influenced today's ethnography.

FROM THE BEGINNING TO 1947

The road to the present situation – which can be called favourable – was not always without difficulties, because the institutional education of ethnography was very often the victim of political or ideological wars. Just some examples: a Hungarian scholar, Antal Herrmann started his permanent teaching activity at the Franz Joseph University in 1898, but because of 1st World War and the changing of power in Transylvania he was forced to continue his work at the university that moved to Szeged, Hungary. Ethnographic studies had not been organized at the University of Cluj until the 2nd World

War, when the North of Transylvania once again became a part of Hungary. It was a period when the newly established Hungarian political elite tried to connect Transylvania to the core of the country not just through political means but also culturally, and some institutions were founded to study the Transylvanian question. History, linguistics, sociology, and ethnography had a well shaped aim in this context and the scholars started some research programmes willing to catch up with insufficiency. In this period Béla Gunda was the leader of the ethnographic school, and he succeeded in promoting the activity of a group of scholars. The department of ethnography was closed down again in 1947, but some of the scholars who had studied there continued their activity, although ethnographic studies could not be institutionalized. We will see later, that their activity had no direct effect on teaching, or on implanting new points of view, mainly because this generation that got its training between 1940 and 1947 worked in different institutions (museums, research centres etc.), but not in universities, and when ethnographic studies were reorganized in 1990, they were at a considerably old age, consequently a new generation – trained in the seventies – had the opportunity to form an ethnographic department. Thus we have to understand what happened in these four decades (1947–1990) of ethnography's existence, if it existed at all.

THE DETERMINING FACTORS FROM THE 2ND WORLD WAR TILL 1990

After the consolidation of the new political power in the fifties and sixties the ideologists of the Romanian Communist Party indicated a very severe vocational model for higher education: Romanian universities dominated the course of producing engineers, while the humanities and social sciences like philosophy, sociology, and ethnography were exiled from these institutions. The humanities were tolerated just as part of school teachers' education: the faculties of human sciences prepared school teachers in Romanian, Hungarian, Russian, French, and German languages and literature. In this period sporadic ethnographic knowledge had been passed on as a part of other humanities sciences, such as literature and linguistics, consequently the topics of ethnographic research were tightly closed to these sciences. The curricula of Hungarian literature have always contained a subject matter named folklore (folk tales, folk songs, ballads etc. and their study) because there

are many links between popular and elite culture. Meanwhile the European ethnologies, including German ethnology which played an important role in the evolution of Hungarian ethnography, went through some important changes (Bausinger 1995, Kaschuba 2004:74-77), so in the communist era this was the only way to talk about folk culture in the university.

Regarding to this period I would like to emphasize four important aspects:

1. As I mentioned, in this period ethnographic studies were not institutionalized. Despite this, ethnographic knowledge was present in a teacher's education, but only as part of literature and linguistics. Consequently the first one hundred years of the development of ethnography were influenced by pointing out factors and ways in which it could be influenced. As we all know, Hungarian ethnography, and most of the activity of the nineteenth century folklorists, was determined by literary interest and the literary question, because a significant number of the ethnographers were men of letters, poets or linguists (Kósa 2001). This style of ethnography might have been so powerful after the 2nd World War because on the one hand, those who were educated in ethnography received literary and linguistic training at the same time: in fact, the ethnographic subject matters were hidden in literary and linguistic curricula, thus the two domains could not be separated.⁵ On the other hand we should look at another important aspect: collecting different, but mainly representative folk genres, had its well shaped traditions originating from 19th century. The folklore interpreted this way was the most accessible part of the popular culture, and aside from this it can be represented easily in printed publications.

2. The reformatory questions did not succeed because the renewal of the Hungarian ethnography in Romania did not occur as a direct result of the western science, but through the Hungarian ethnography from Hungary. We have to note that in a totalitarian society those in power or a group of specialists very often restrict the opportunities of renewal, and this happened in Hungary too, where ethnography became a victim of the ideological struggle, and some new goals were assigned to it: ethnographers should have studied the socialist village, the ethnography of cities and the

⁵ Folklore seen as a part of literature and linguistics can be found in schoolbooks as well.

folklore of the proletariat (Kósa 2001:200-211). This ideological turn had been followed by personal quarrels: for example Edit Fél, a Hungarian ethnographer who tried to renew ethnography from the direction of social relations, was marginalized, thus her points of view and the results of her work, done together with Tamás Hofer, had its effect on ethnography much later. Their fieldwork carried out in a Hungarian village was one of the first to apply anthropological results (long fieldwork, holistic view), but the book written as a result of this fieldwork appeared first in English and German, and was published in Hungarian only in 1997 (Fél–Hofer 1997). These results appeared in a Transylvanian ethnographers' work in the eighties.

3. The third point of view that I have to mention is tightly closed to the minority condition and to the task of preserving culture and its accentuated aspects in a minority society. According to some Hungarian ethnographers, whose voices carry weight, the formation and development of ethnography – beside the fact that it had been born in the context of linguistics and literature – was determined by the fact that thousands of amateurs joined a real or imaginary movement with the goals of preserving culture. The scientific and non-scientific attitudes did not separate, and the ethnographic work kept a national political aspect (Niedermüller 1994:91). In our case ethnography studied the minority's own culture, and everybody considered themselves specialists about their own culture, thus they started doing research (mainly data and object collecting) to preserve the values of this culture for the next generations (Hofer 2004:69). At this point, we should see two other aspects of the question: if the rural area is very important in general for the values of national culture, in a minority society where urban life is very often seen as the certain way of assimilation, the village becomes the guarantee of maintaining identity. Second: any intellectual activity, mostly allegoric literature and theatre, of a minority in a totalitarian society can be considered a form of everyday resistance. The ethnographic activity of the professional ethnographers, and the amateurs as well, got this meaning, because it showed the parts of ethnic culture, thus contributing to the maintenance of identity. I think this period was deeply determining for the frames of Hungarian ethnography in Romania, and for fixing the public role of this discipline.

4. Regarding this period we have to mention that until the seventies and eighties the classic paradigm dominated in ethnography. Though some of the scholars mentioned earlier (those who studied ethnography in the

forties) raised new questions and applied new methods⁶, we cannot speak about systematic renewal. A significant part of the dissertations written in this period followed the concept that does not see folk and folklore as an organic part of the same thing, thus these works did not raise questions regarding the ways of life of the people, or their social relations.

After all, in the eighties a process of change started that can be connected mostly to the name of János Péntek, a professor of linguistics. Although his course of ethno-botany was still included in linguistics, it introduced some new aspects that were completed in a course of general ethnology. The new ideas and theories of western literature and linguistics finally had their effect – even if they were delayed. Thus the new points of view which appeared in ethnography were determined by humanities. These new ideas lead to the rethinking of folklore, the different forms of folklore, popular culture, and consequently they broaden the frame of study. The ethnographic studies of this period started to analyze new phenomena, and approached their object from the everyday life instead of the festive point of view. At the same time, Hungarian social sciences in general started a renewal process. As a result of this, social scientists raised questions regarding how rural people lived, how they organized their life, and what kind of aspects characterized the social structure of village communities. These new questions appeared in ethnography too, consequently the ethnographers formulated question like: who are the people who kept traditions alive and whom collected folklore? Nevertheless an important deficiency still remained: excluding the generation that graduated between 1940 and 1947 and worked in institutions, there were no other possibilities to use the ethnographic knowledge within institutional frames. As a consequence of this under the narrow institutional level there was nothing to differentiate between the so called professional ethnography that was carried out by trained teachers and the amateur movement undertaken by intellectuals committed to nation-building and other minority aims.

I emphasized the aspects enumerated earlier to make the delay that characterized the ethnography in Transylvania perceptible: while in western states of Europe and Scandinavia ethnography came closer to anthropology

⁶ Olga Nagy started to study the life of women in traditional post-peasant societies and in this context she elaborated the first papers in Transylvania on written folk culture and personality (cf. Nagy 1988).

and other disciplines during these years, in Romania the question remained whether there was any ethnography at all. And: if there was ethnography, it was a form of linguistics or literature with a wide practical side that included the amateurs. Without an institutional background the new generations did not have the opportunity to mark the new ways of ethnography.

ETHNOGRAPHIC EDUCATION – DEPARTMENT OF ETHNOGRAPHY

The possibility of forming a new specialization and marking the borders of a new discipline arose right after the “great transition”: a group of ethnographers with degrees in linguistics and literature started their teaching activity. This happened in the fall of 1990, when ethnographic education was organized (or reorganized) as a specialization at the Department of Hungarian Linguistics and Culture. Because in the previous years nobody (or very few people) had graduated with degrees in ethnography, the newly formed specialization recruited teachers from elementary and secondary schools whose activities had been marked by ethnographic interest (some of them had already published their first books). This group of ethnographers graduated in the eighties and their interest turned to new questions like the genres of folklore, the borders of folklore, semiotics and social structure. It can be considered very significant – because it indicates the strength of the amateur movement and the plasticity of the borders – that before forming this proto-department the professional ethnographers who later became professors at the university had founded an NGO⁷ with amateurs.

Anthropology and the interdisciplinary questions appeared very soon in the educational offer, because the group that started the teaching cultivated a good relationship with the Hungarian ethnographers and with those specialists, who considered themselves anthropologists too.

The department became independent in 2003 under the following name: The Department of Hungarian Ethnography and Anthropology. The Romanian higher educational sector of the nineties had been a changing world: new departments were formed, as universities realized the opportunities of

⁷ Kriza János Ethnographical Society.

the market and the number of students increased constantly. Meanwhile the newly formed specializations institutionalized and started their accreditation. At the beginning ethnography as a specialization could have been chosen as specialization B. As of 1999 it could be chosen as specialization A (there was no big difference between these two options). Both options meant that the students had to choose a language as another specialization, no matter if that language was Romanian, Hungarian, or a foreign language. Most of the students chose Hungarian as a language, so the human and the literary characteristic of ethnography remained. Ethnography did not separate from humanities even when the department become independent in 2003, because the students had to register for another specialization. As of 2006 Ethnography was available as a mono specialization – but the evaluation of this new situation would be premature.

However, we can consider it typical that in Hungarian University circles ethnography is seen as a third Hungarian department besides the Department of Hungarian and General Linguistics and the Department of Hungarian Literature. This can be interpreted as a kind of continuity because we have seen that ethnography was part of literature in the communist era too. I think these factors have a major role in influencing the position of ethnography.

HOW DID ANTHROPOLOGY APPEAR IN THE DEPARTMENT'S NAME?

First, we have to mention that the new name indicated some institutional considerations: the restructuring university needed to modernize, and this process was reflected not only in the offer, but also in the name of the new departments. This process – seen from inside – meant only a surface changing. But there were some real factors determining the new ways not just on the level of names. From a series of factors, I would like to detail just four:

During the nineties a major change took place within the Hungarian ethnography; many Hungarian ethnographers had the opportunity to familiarize themselves with anthropology. This process widened after the political system changed, thus anthropology appeared in higher education. They organized conferences on opportunities and challenges in anthropology, papers were issued on the same theme. Because the ethnographers from Cluj had a good relationship with Hungarian ethnographers, these effects

transformed the scientific life in Cluj, too. The more the ethnographers got acquainted with new theories, the more they withdrew from the former paradigm known as nation building, or to be more precise they named other goals for their work. The new generations that attended ethnographic courses identified themselves with this newly formed ethnography which contained the results and the methods of anthropology.

Second, there was the Replika-debate which is considered a manifesto for the anthropologization of ethnography; Péter Niedermüller, a Hungarian scholar who got scholarships in German institutions and worked among others in Tübingen, gave rise to a debate in the nineties with a paper which insisted on the theoretic turn of ethnography (Niedermüller 1994). The debate meant not just a first step towards change, but the strengthening of new horizons assumed by the new generations. Whereas the statements of this paper were deeply discussed by ethnographers and other social scientists, they had their effect in Cluj very quickly – although only one scholar joined the debate from Transylvania. The paper appeared in our department's curriculum too (although many of us understood the papers' statements well enough only when we reread it in the fourth-year). I think if this paper showed a conflict between generations, its role in Cluj was indirect, because – as I mentioned – the start of ethnographic teaching also meant a change of generations. Nevertheless we have to see this paper as an important moment for transition, because the anthropologization gained momentum as a result of the debate. On the other hand, as a written and published opinion of a remarkable ethnographer could not be avoided, scholars had to talk about these problems. The anthropological challenge had to be discussed at the level of professors and students as well (many of us imagined ourselves becoming anthropologists).

Third, we have to mention the WAC (Workshop for Anthropology and Communication), a group of Transylvanian Hungarian social scientists – graduating at the same department in Cluj who had the same training in literature and linguistics – and who applied the results of anthropology contributing to the spread of the new discipline's methods and ideas. Their work – though they had not worked at universities until 2002-2003 – had a considerable effect on approaching different scientific questions. According to some Hungarian opinions, anthropology's position in Transylvania during

the early nineties was more favourable than in Hungary, and this can be attributed to WAC, whose activity is irregular from several aspects:

The Hungarian social sciences in Transylvania are very often seen as an enclosed communications system. Foreign results within the sciences can more or less get into this system, but its own results are not communicated abroad, in many cases not even towards Hungary. The WAC was one of the first to create an output of their work, gaining a reputation in Hungary, and the members of the group published their results in English and Romanian.

The group was formed in the early eighties in Miercurea Ciuc (Csíkszereda, a small town in Szeklerland with majority of Hungarian inhabitants) from teachers who graduated in linguistics and literature (so this was not irregular). An older ethnographer who worked at the bureau of the communist party assured the background to their activity. They worked together in the Ethnologic Circle, a formal institution within the County Bureau of the Communist Party. At the end of the eighties they lost the chance for a formal collaboration, thus they continued to work informally publishing books and many papers. After 1990, they founded their present workshop, and despite their considerable results, they hardly succeeded in being an accepted and remained marginalized for years from an institutional aspect.

In a book published in 2002 some scholars summed up the scientific results of the last twelve years in Transylvania. In this book, ethnographers (Keszeg 2002:125-126), sociologists (Roth 2002:353-354) and political scientists (Bakk et alii 2002:406-408) evaluated the work of the WAC⁸, which means the group's results are important for several disciplines.

From their work very briefly: the anthropological turn in Transylvania is often connected to their activity, they introduced the problem of the up and down, they redefined the popular culture. Their work brought some new reflections on the ideologies of the minority society, and contributed to the critique of the political and cultural practice of the Hungarian society in Transylvania.

The fourth aspect is the openness of the group who started teaching at the university in Cluj. This characteristic is reflected in the wide variety of

⁸ The absence of anthropology as an independent discipline denotes the processes of the nineties.

the themes discussed in diploma works. Anybody who looks over the list of dissertations realizes this: the list goes from the “classic” ethnologic domains such as folk customs to historical anthropological themes like witchcraft and to interdisciplinary questions like political rituals or the use of symbols in rituals. This is connected to the fact that the teachers belonged to the new generation of ethnography and they did not graduate in ethnography or ethnology, consequently they had to establish the borders and the rules of the discipline in these years. There were interdisciplinary questions that had to be answered, because they were an important direction of change for the Hungarian ethnography in Transylvania. If we are to mention the disciplines which had a major effect, we cannot forget the role of historical anthropology, history of mentality, and history of society. These disciplines had an effect mainly on the fields that worked with written sources: the relationship between oral and written culture, alphabetization and the use of writing, the structure of popular knowledge. These were questions that meant not just ethnographic, but historical and literary answers. Within this field ethnography most approached historical anthropology and literary anthropology. In my view it is not accidental that at turning points a discipline with literary and linguistic roots gets back to humanities. Beside these, ethnography integrated the questions and the methods of sociology, economic anthropology, and started to study urban culture, different groups, subcultures, and ethnic groups.

Ethnography interpreted in this way was not an amateur movement anymore: institutional conditions were created for this discipline, which led to disengagement from amateur ethnographers because more and more ethnographers graduated and got paid for scientific work. The extensive evolution of the first years when amateurs and professionals founded organizations together turned slowly into an intensive evolution, and the locality of professional ethnography connected itself to the other social sciences and to institutions from Hungary. This process is continuous: the centre moves away from the periphery, the members of the centre (the professional ethnographers) detach themselves from periphery (the amateur movement). The centre integrates the results of anthropology, creates a new locality, in which the use of the newest results of Hungarian and western science is a serious demand. The periphery remains within the paradigm of nation building and culture preserving, it collects data, classic folklore,

does not see the changes in the folklore, writes monographs of villages et cetera. If we see anthropologization as professionalization, then we can say that this process did not happen at the periphery. Meanwhile one of the centre's strongest efforts is to lay down the new rules and new canons of the profession, and to exclude amateur ethnography. The professionalization can be seen as integration and disintegration at the same time: the centre gets closer to anthropology and other sciences, while simultaneously the gap between the centre and periphery becomes wider and wider. This aspect gets critical importance because after the system change the minority society discovers the new ways of culture preserving which in the previous period could have only been reached with strong control of the communist party. Many communities rediscover themselves and their national culture; they try to fix this culture in ceremonies, statues, and books. More and more books published during this period called themselves ethnographic works: these books carry out descriptions of the folk customs, the folklore, and the history of a village. I do not think this can be looked at simply as an answer to the new possibilities, but as an effort of a minority society to compensate the repression of the communist era. The ideas that once could not be published, became public under the new system. Naturally, the demands of the discipline are overshadowed in these works even on the level of the classic ethnography, not to mention the demands of renewed ethnography and anthropology. In spite of everything it is regrettable that ethnography has not marked its new borders and its new role in the public sphere and, parallel with professionalization, has withdrawn to the academic sphere.

On the other hand this sphere assures a relatively good role to the new discipline. Anthropology and ethnography renewed from anthropology has a good position within the Hungarian sciences in Cluj: the other humanities and the social sciences formulate anthropological questions and ethnographers are continuously present in the interdisciplinary scientific life, in different debates and discussions. In this medium, anthropology is considered a new opportunity for finding answers, and a new opportunity for renewing the methodical questions. At the same time, it is often heard that the systematic anthropological study of the Hungarian society in Transylvania is still missing – and ethnographers are conscious of this fact. Regarding the academic sphere and the structure of the university we have to mention another problem: anthropology appeared not just as a charge for ethnographers but

as a possibility to have new specializations in the university's structure. Consequently more departments in more faculties have this specialization and the discipline got into other specialization's curricula: at present anthropology is more or less present at the Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Sociology⁹, and Faculty of European Studies. Another aspect of this is the dismemberment of university's structure that makes dialogue and the cooperation between different academic groups impossible, especially if they see each other as competition for registering students. Thus these groups follow their own way. Among them it is not to be forgotten the professional group organized at the Faculty of European Studies of BBU, whose goal was the institutionalization of anthropology. The members of this group tried to found an independent department for anthropology, but I will not speak about them in greater detail, because in their case the renewal of ethnography is not the main question, rather introducing an entirely new discipline with no tradition in the scientific life. Thus, they do not consider ethnography to be a receptive medium for anthropology. And in a very unfortunate way it seems their trial failed.¹⁰

If we analyze the public role of ethnography and anthropology, we can easily see that in the Hungarian press there are no anthropological questions or questions that could be answered by anthropologists. The Hungarian press in Romania cannot raise questions or problems that would fit the new ideas in ethnography. Because the press has an important role in forming the public opinion this could be a reason why new questions do not reach the public. I consider it very typical that ethnographers are invited to television only on holidays – Christmas, Easter, Valentine's day – , and the editors think an ethnographer might look good in the studio, because he is the right person to talk about the origins of the feasts, the folk customs, the traditions and so on. However, the ethnographer is usually not invited to talk about the past, but rather the present. Inviting ethnographers only during these periods they reproduce the one hundred fifty year old paradigm of festive ethnography. Regarding this view, ethnographers study only the feasts, the customs, and

⁹ Anthropology merged with sociology after the beginning.

¹⁰ The reasons are connected to internal processes of the university which cannot be discussed in this paper.

the old tradition. This might be linked to the re-nationalization (Niedermüller 2002:143-145), an ambiguous process – having its elements in political life and political discourses, but also in certain type of media and on the level of everyday life – that among other means uses the folk customs as basis for the construction of new identities.

Another characteristic of the public role of ethnography is that it has relative notoriety only in the intellectual milieu, in spite of the fact that the amateur movement had, and has, many members. On the level of everyday life, somebody who introduces himself as an ethnographer might get strange reactions. Anthropology might produce stranger reactions. In Hungarian ethnography is translated as *néprajz: nép* (folk), *rajz* (drawing). Almost every ethnographer says that when they told acquaintances what they were studying at the university, those acquaintances exclaimed: *I did not know you were so good at drawing.*

INSTEAD OF CONCLUSIONS: WHAT DOES PROFESSIONAL PERSONALITY CONSIST OF?

I tried to point out that the transition was less revolutionary than quiet and that the ethnographers did not turn away entirely from classic ethnographic tradition. In this concluding part of my paper I try to summarize some reasons and aspects in order to delineate the professional personality of this school.

The change of generations and the openness of the new generation: anthropology did not mean crisis in ethnography in Cluj, because the scholars who set up the new specialization belonged to the new generation. The teachers who started their activity in the nineties were relatively young (not older than thirty five, only one of them was forty five), and came from the generation that graduated in the eighties, when an inside renewal went on in ethnography. They tried to answer the new questions of ethnography, they used the notion of folklore in a new way, they overstep the static and homogenous folk view and studied new genres and new fields. Beside these the Hungarian ethnography of Cluj identified with this group has always been open, and has integrated the new themes and questions easily.

Keeping the results of ethnography: today's ethnography – though renewed from anthropology – kept the results and methods of ethnography.

These results are a living tradition in Cluj, and they intertwine with the results of anthropology. Anthropology formed the methods and the ways of approaching. For example, when ethnographers elaborate texts, it is a demand to demonstrate that they know the works of ethnography and anthropology as well. Beside this, it is a constant demand to elaborate the text concerning all the data with a philologist's punctuality, with footnotes and huge lists of references.

Between ethnography and anthropology: we can see the effects of anthropology, but the mobility, the ways of text elaborating, title giving, the fieldwork are typically ethnographic. If we analyze the career of the professors who have been there from the beginning, we can see that after graduating from the university they worked as elementary or secondary school teachers, and after that (with the new system) they got into the university. These careers in the light of social and political system can be considered as lives spent in one institution. According to Hofer, this is a characteristic of the European ethnography (Hofer 2004:73). In addition there are some more characteristics: ethnographers become engrossed in one field, the research lasts for years, even for a lifetime, but without long lasting fieldwork, the textual approach is dominating. These characteristics are valid more or less to the ethnography of Cluj too. Regarding the points of view mentioned in my paper's introductory part – mobility and the relation with the theories – we can see that the patterns of classic ethnography are predominate in the mobility of this school, whilst the patterns of anthropology can be found at the level of theories. This is an important characteristic of the Cluj School of Ethnography's locality: the subjects produced here follow these patterns. One may say that ethnography integrated the anthropological tradition, but it is not open to its concept of personality. Another characteristic of this personality is its close position to literature and linguistics: these two disciplines have marked not just the academic role of ethnography but the ethnographic approach and practice. Although this effect was stronger before system change it lasts until today.

Regarding all of these, if we want to analyze the public role of ethnography/anthropology we should underline that all these rules enumerated earlier are valid only for the centre. Because of this, the newly interpreted ethnography draws away not only from its own medium (the

amateur movement), but from the public sphere, where the ideas seem to be jammed at an older, anachronistic, and sometimes wrongly interpreted version of ethnography.

REFERENCES

- APPADURAI, Arjun. 1998. *Modernity at large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis – London: University of Minnesota Press.
- BAKK, Miklós, Barna BODÓ, Zoltán KÁNTOR, D. József LŐRINCZ, Levente SALAT, Alpár Zoltán SZÁSZ. 2002. Az erdélyi magyar politikatudomány a második évezred utolsó évtizedében. In: *Tizenkét év. Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi magyar tudományos kutatások 1990–2001 közötti eredményeiről* (ed. Vilmos Tánczos & Gyöngyvér Tökés). Cluj-Napoca: Scientia Kiadó. 397-469.
- BAUSINGER, Hermann. 1995. *Népi kultúra a technika korszakában*. [Volkskultur in der technischen Welt]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- DIECKHOFF, Alain. 2002. Egy megrögzöttség túlhaladása – a kulturális és politikai nemzet fogalmainak újraértelmezése. *Regio* 4. 7–23.
- FÉL, Edit – HOFER, Tamás. 1997. *Arányok és mértékek a paraszti gazdálkodásban*. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.
- HOFER, Tamás. 2004. Amerikai antropológusok és hazai néprajzkutatók közép-európai falukban: összehasonlító jegyzetek két tudományág szakmai személyiségéről. In: *Fehéren, feketén. Varsánytól Rititiig. Tanulmányok Sárkány Mihály tiszteletére* (ed. Balázs Borsos, Zsuzsa Szarvas, Gábor Vargyas). Budapest: L'Harmattan. 65-79.
- KASCHUBA, Wolfgang. 2004. *Bevezetés az európai etnológiába*. [Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie] Debrecen: Csokonai Kiadó.
- KESZEG, Vilmos. 2002. A romániai magyar néprajzi kutatás egy évtizede. 1990–2001. In: *Tizenkét év. Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi magyar tudományos kutatások 1990–2001 közötti eredményeiről* (ed. Tánczos Vilmos & Tökés Gyöngyvér). Cluj-Napoca: Scientia Kiadó. 119-171.

- KÓSA, László. 2001. *A magyar néprajz tudománytörténete*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- NAGY, Olga. 1988. *Asszonyok könyve. Népi elbeszélések*. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó.
- NIEDERMÜLLER, Péter. 1994. Paradigmák és esélyek avagy a kulturális antropológia lehetőségei Kelet-Európában. *Replika*, vol. 13-14:89-129.
- NIEDERMÜLLER, Péter. 2002. Elavuló fogalmak. *Regio* 4:138–47.
- ROTH, Endre. 2002. Magyar szociológiai kutatások Erdélyben 1990–2001. In: *Tizenkét év. Összefoglaló tanulmányok az erdélyi magyar tudományos kutatások 1990–2001 közötti eredményeiről* (ed. Tánzos Vilmos & Tőkés Gyöngyvér). Cluj-Napoca: Scientia Kiadó. 341-369.

ANTROPOLOŠKI IZAZOVI – ETNOGRAFSKA TRADICIJA.
MIRNA TRANZICIJA MAĐARSKE ETNOGRAFIJE U RUMUNJSKOJ
Sažetak

U ovom članku analiziram trenutni položaj i antropologizaciju mađarske etnografije u Rumunjskoj. Jedna od namjera članka jest prikazati vezu između etnografije i njezina naslijeđa te ukazati na rezultate tog naslijeđa. U tu ću svrhu prikazati glavne značajke povijesti etnografije, upozoravajući pritom na politička i ideološka opredjeljenja discipline, te se dotaknuti njezina statusa u manjinskim kulturama gdje se etnografija promatra kao način očuvanja identiteta. Etnografije istočnoeuropskih naroda imale su važnu ulogu u procesu stvaranja nacija i taj aspekt – koji postaje još naglašeniji u manjinskim kulturama – bio je glavna značajka i mađarske etnografije. U vezi s time je i nepostojanje institucijske potpore odredilo snagu amaterskog pokreta među članovima mađarske manjine u Rumunjskoj. Druga namjera ovog članka jest predstaviti stanje današnje etnografije koja je profesionalizirana i antropologizirana i koja se time udaljila od amaterskog pokreta. Kako bih podrobnije objasnila taj proces, kratko ću govoriti o etnografskom obrazovanju tijekom Drugoga svjetskog rata i razdoblja komunizma. Osim analiziranja

posljedica kratkog postojanja etnografskog odsjeka u razdoblju između 1940. i 1947. godine, kada je jedna generacija diplomirala etnografiju, pokušat će analizirati i situaciju u razdoblju komunizma kada se etnografsko znanje prenosilo kao dio studija literature i lingvistike. Tu posebno naglašavam stvaranje nove generacije u 1980-ima kada su nove ideje sa Sveučilišta u Cluju utjecale na znanstveni život ovog područja. Po mojem mišljenju, prijanje etnografije uz humanističke znanosti imalo je odlučujuću ulogu za mađarsku etnografiju u Rumunjskoj: generacija nastavnika koji su počeli predavati odmah nakon revolucije 1990-ih, diplomirali su na istome odsjeku za literaturu i lingvistiku u Cluju na kojem su slušali neke teme iz etnografije, a širi im je interes za etnografiju bio svojevrsan hobi. U sklopu toga analiziram i procese koji su se dogodili tijekom 1990-ih i tijekom kojih je etnografija prerasla iz B predmeta u nezavisan odsjek. Također promatram razliku između profesionalnih sklonosti mađarskih etnografa u Cluju u odnosu na obnavljajuću ulogu antropologije. Tvrdim da u nekim slučajevima etnografi zadržavaju staru tradiciju etnografije, a u drugima primjenjuju rezultate antropologije: obrasci mobilnosti, na primjer, tipično su etnografski, ali teorije dolaze iz antropologije. Naposljetku, u odnosu na sve navedeno, zaključujem da etnografi nemaju moć utjecati na javno mišljenje, mediji doživljavaju etnografiju na klasičan način pa je stoga ovaj antropološki obrat važan samo za akademsku zajednicu.

Ključne riječi: profesionalna osobnost, lokalno, centar i periferija, amaterski pokret, profesionalizacija, integracija i dezintegracija, manjinske kulture