

# Summary

BOGLÁRKA BAKÓ

*À la Gypsy—à la Magyar. Conditions of coexistence reflected in stories of stereotypes within a micro-community*

The study presents apropos of the stories of work-related stereotypes in a mixed-ethnicity Hungarian, Gypsy and Romanian village in South Transylvania the conditions of coexistence of Gypsy and non-Gypsy communities, the differences of their contexts, the “order” and operation of their everyday lives. The key binding force in their communities is work, hence the large numbers of work-related stories. These stories contribute to a curious interpretation of coexistence, revealing the “critical points” of coexistence which enter the realm of stereotypisation. This paper presents the nature of the areas highlighted by stereotypic stories and the “experiencing” of stereotypic acts, the community functioning and individual judgement of the stereotypised areas. The study seeks to establish the line between Gypsy and non-Gypsy everyday lives which are essentially similar, and to identify what makes a way of life determined by village norms typically Gypsy or Hungarian/Romanian. The stories of stereotypes in a village furnish plenty of material for analysis. Knowing them can contribute to our knowledge of “over the border” which is invisible to the outsider but nevertheless determines the communities’ norms of judgement.

SZILVIA BALASSA

*Anti-Semites, Gypsyphobes, xenophobes*

This paper is based on a 2002 TÁRKI survey which was out to investigate attitudes towards Gypsies, Jews, immigrants and foreigners in general, offering an exceptional opportunity to make a comparison of the three prejudices. The three examined systems of prejudice have significant differences in terms of widespreadness, intensity, structure and social determination. While anti-Semitic views and stereotypes are generally not endorsed by the majority of Hungarian society, attitudes to Gypsies and foreigners are on the whole negative. Neither Gypsy phobia, nor xenophobia bounces back off such powerful a cultural taboo that might hinder the endorsement of open prejudiced opinions, which accounts for the fact that the two systems of prejudice are a lot less structured than anti-Semitism. However, like in anti-Semitism, there are signs of an emerging distinction between more pronounced, more discriminating attitudes and sifter, more euphemistic forms of the prejudice. There is a difference between the causal explanatory model of the indi-

vidual types of prejudice. Essentially, there are three “competing” answers. According to one, discrimination is predominantly typical of the lower social classes, rooted in the lack of prospect that comes with lower social status, ignorance due to low levels of education and social isolation, and authoritarian family models. The second explanation puts racial hatred down not to objective, but subjective deprivation (anomy). The third claims racial prejudice comes from a specific political ideology and cannot be satisfactorily explained by socio-economic status or anomy.

GYÖRGY BINDORFFER

*Stereotypisation in inter-ethnic relations*

This paper provides an overall theoretical summary of stereotypisation and stereotypes. Due to the fact that stereotypes, in addition to having social psychological dimensions, comprise a category of cognitive sociology, the author has sought consider both disciplines. As a start, she discusses the cognitive sociological importance of categories, categorisation and its in- and outgroup differences, and goes on to analyse the concept of stereotype and its characteristics. This chapter highlights best the inseparability of the cognitive sociological and the social psychological viewpoint; applied jointly, they mutually reinforce one another. In the subsequent chapter the author presents the sources of stereotypes, their categorisation, characteristics, types and functions. While the previous chapter was concerned with cognitive sociology, social psychology is in focus here. The discussion of stereotypes goes hand in hand with the analysis of prejudices, on account of prejudices frequently having as a basis handed-down stereotypes and the uncontrolled overgeneralisation of observations and the firm and incontestable belief in them. The second part of the study explores, apropos of the example of Schwabian (ethnic German) and Hungarian coexistence, the emergence of group conflicts, their manifestation in inter-ethnic relations, and the controversial relationship between majority and minority. The majority Germans of Dunabogdány, a village in central Hungary, speak of themselves, the minority Hungarians in their village, the majority Hungarians outside the village, and how they see Schwabs of other villages and the Germans of Germany. The paper rounds off with a presentation of the reasons for the emergence of ethnic hierarchy.

BALÁZS BOROSS

*Researchers, stereotypes and systems of reference in Moldavian Csángó culture*

This paper explores the attitude categories according to which the researcher, coming from a “different” group, is labelled as—and which historical and experiential factors influence these categories—in a Moldavian village where I spent a month on anthropological fieldwork and which is the frequent target of various ethnographic and linguistic research. The paper presents some of the examples of attitudes and stereotypes with regard to the researcher, their background and connections, and the response phenomena generated in a community by the presence of the researcher. Also, the paper investigates the attitudes and stereotypes of Hungarian intellectuals and of the Hungarian public towards the Csángó as a group, which several studies in the field reflect willy-nilly. In the author’s view this is crucial, on account of the fact that the majority of stereotypic occurrences at Pusztina are the consequence of a to-and-fro interaction: in many instances the attitudinal categories of the Csángó emerge on reflection to, and in the face of, those of the researchers. Examining the different types of stereotypes, he describes and interprets a few concrete cases, major and minor, that have explicitly influenced attitudes to researchers, and presents some aspects of community life (migration, language use, local political relations) which also have an influence on various attitudes. He also explains why the Pusztina categories—activated in the course of interaction between researcher and community—are in many cases situational, combine with one another and can be fundamentally regarded as adaptive answers to the research objectives and methodologies.

GYÖRGY FARKAS

*Theoretical considerations in establishing a definition for ethnogeography. The renewal of ethnic mapping: presenting a GIS database*

The first half of the study presents considerations that arise in establishing a definition and a theory for ethnogeography. In the 1990s, when ethnogeographic research in Hungary was reborn, the generally accepted definition of the discipline had "Soviet roots." Although a few noteworthy contributions have been made towards a new definition, the original one has to be regarded as outdated. The article takes a new stance on the general and specific objectives of ethnogeography and presents a new outlook on the subject of the discipline. Generally speaking, ethnogeography represents ethnic minorities, groups of people in a geographical space. Due to its geographical nature, ethnogeography focuses on the cause-and-effect relationships determining the spreading of an ethnicity, and on describing the character of distribution, leading to a complete description of spatial distribution. Determining the scope of ethnogeography has two main angles. Firstly, the subject of ethnogeography is the breakdown of nationalities/ethnicities in a specific geographical area. Secondly, ethnogeography can focus on any social or geographical location-related problem related to the distribution of nationalities/ethnicities. Ethnogeographic works can, then, be lumped under the heading of a spatially-focused discipline exploring a given ethnicity or several specific ethnicities. The definition of ethnogeography requires establishing the scope of meaning for a number of fundamental terms. The key terms in ethnogeography, a socio-geographical discipline, include space, spatial structure, geographical space and ethnic spatial structure, ethnic blocks and linguistic borders. The second half of the study presents editable ethnic maps created in accordance with the new definition of the discipline, using the geographical information system of the Hungarian Research Database of the Carpathian Basin (compiled, maintained and about to be published by the Research Institute for Ethnic and National Minorities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences).

MARGIT FEISCHMIDT

*Anchored Mythos: Stereotypes engraved in Stone*

The author of this paper explores the localisation acts of identity policies; the manner in which the cultural representations of the nation, its excluded or superseding communities influence the connotative meaning of spaces and locations. She specifically takes a look at the practice of erecting sculptures and its discourses vis-à-vis the memorials put up in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the turn of the century. The author has for long investigated the late 19<sup>th</sup>-century memorials in Hungary's borderland and multiethnic areas. This time she has chosen the so-called Millennial commemorative columns and the statue of liberty erected at Arad [today Oradea, Romania] in memory of the executed generals of the 1848 Hungarian revolution. She looks at the domestic colonisation of the multiethnic borderlands, as well as the collective representations that are generated in connection with the erection (or destruction or protection) of memorials, and how these representations are determined by the fact that they assume a material form and are tied to a specific place. She follows the fate of her chosen memorials throughout the subsequent century and beyond, hoping to contribute to an understanding of the changes (or permanence) of identity policies and representations in multiethnic spaces.

GABRIELA KILIÁNOVÁ

*The border myth: Devín Castle*

Devín [formerly Dévény], steeped in history, reflects in a small way the past two centuries of Central European history. It is an example of a region and cultural environment which, in spite of its

multiethnic and multicultural character, has undergone national movements and many a political and cultural effort to establish national identity. Many ethnicities have lived at Devín, including Hungarians, Slovaks, Austrians and Germans, and people having a Slavic, Czech-Slavic or Czechoslovak. They all insisted the place belonged to them—and more often than not to them alone. Devín is a case in point of the processes of nascent national identity in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and its successor states in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Devín was first a tourist destination for noblemen and townsmen, fans of historical monuments; of students and youths under L'udovít Štúr, and national tradition-loving romantic enthusiasts. Later Devín was a centre for national ceremonies, pilgrimage, and popular gatherings. A number of nationally and politically-inspired events were held there: the “national crucifixion” of Štúr’s adherents, the unveiling of the Hungarian Millennial memorial in 1896, the national pilgrimage in honour of the bishops Cyril and Method between the two World Wars, the German “borderland meeting” in 1939, the get-togethers of Slavic brotherhood organised by the Soviet Union from 1945 onwards, a period of neglect between the Fifties and the Eighties, and its rediscovery after 1989 and 1993.

Its borderland status has for centuries been a leitmotiv in the history of Devín. It was the location and symbol of a variety of states in the region. The frontier changed and re-changed over and over again within a short span of time during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. At the same time Devín became a symbol of disassociation, an imaginary border which, however, separated very real (national, religious, political and social) groups. This segregation was at times tolerant—i.e. the various groups tolerated one another—and at other times ambivalent—i.e. they avoided each other—but more often than not opposition and conflict came to the fore, and the groups persecuted one another, claiming it belonged to them alone.

ZOLTÁN ILYÉS

*Close strangers, distant acquaintances. Stereotypes of the Csángó among Transylvanian Székely Hungarians and the Hungarians of Hungary*

The paper explores stereotypes about the Csángó—an isolated Hungarian ethnic group on the perimeter of the Hungarian language area in Romania—in circulation among their neighbours, the Székely Hungarians, and the Hungarians of Hungary who have long had a great interest in them. The stereotypes about the Csángó of Gyimesamong the Ciuc-county Székely and the Hungarians of Hungary betray a tendency—significant in terms of social history and cultural anthropology—of ethnic categorisation: the Székely’s stereotypes tend to lump them under the same heading as the Romanians, while the Hungarians of Hungary consider them more Hungarian. Of course, the negative and positive stereotypes arose in different receptive environments and socio-historical and social contexts, and reveal different narratives and rites of mental alienation and approaching. The tension that came from the Székely’s rather feudal proprietorship identity and the ambitious, independent mentality of the mountain settlers led to the emergence of a uniquely Transylvanian mountain-region mentality and conflict area, which frequently resulted in verbal and physical atrocities between the Csángó and the Székely. The ethnographical idealism that emerged in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is sustained by self-appointed ethnographic collectors, folk dancers, naive “peasant idealists,” tourists and politicians who are smitten by the bucolic Gyimes scenery, and the folk culture of its inhabitants which is thought to be authentic. The Székely frequently regard this increased interest as a challenge to the Hungarians’ interest in them and refuse to understand the motives behind Hungary’s fascination with Gyimes county and the Csángó. While the hybridity, cultural mixture that exists in Gyimes culture largely goes unnoticed by the ethnographic idealists, and is by no means propagated as a virtue, the Székely and the old administrative élite have included it in the repertoire of Csángó stereotypes. The latter have ethnised and symbolically began to shift

them—a group not entirely belonging to them—in terms of identity towards the Romanians, and have made the eradication of hybridity the condition of entering their group.

RÓBERT KEMÉNYFI

*The “Thousand-Year-Old Borders”*: The means of legitimising ethnic regions in the geography of the first half of the twentieth century

On closer inspection, the relevant critical literature on the so-called “nation-oriented disciplines” of the interim period between the two World Wars, it is relatively easy to discern the individual threads in the fabric of the notion of Hungarian national/state space. This is mostly due to an underlying effort which meant to construct real spaces out of symbolic social phenomena (primarily, out of ethnic and language-related identities). Following the issues of language and culture, and side by side with the establishment of national institutions, a nascent nationalism in the wake of the formation of modern nation-states gradually “discovered” the extent of an “own national space” and the importance of the borders of this said space. Within the actual framework of nationalism per se, the process of mythologising this space ensued. It is only natural that this “process of space formation” introduced its own set of concepts and methods. As regards the land(scape)-theoretical justifiability of the Hungarian political space, contemporary geographers were busy listing a number of geographically based arguments while working on the legitimization of a close connection between politics and land.

A point of illustration at this stage could be the so-called *államhatár-tartósság térkép* [literally, state border durability/stableness map] created by the representative figures of Hungarian geography. Following in the footsteps of the German political geography springing from the roots identified by Friedrich Ratzel, the domestic practitioners of geography also impose the question of what natural phenomena and landscape components (geo-factors) or landscape character would correspond to the ideal state borderline. One of the obvious responses to the shock brought about by the results of the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1921 was given by Hungarian geographical circles through a notion of the idealistically natural movement of the pre-treaty borderlines around Hungary. Our geography simply considered the previous borderlines idealistic because of the territorial durability and stability of the status of the Hungarian state. And it was exactly through a factor that seems to be the most difficult one to interpret or spatially demonstrate in the discipline of geography; namely through time. In other words, state borders were not interpreted as simple social frames or uniform demarcation lines, unifying legal/taxational territorial units, reflecting the contemporary international power relations/agreements (state-national concept), but rather as systems defined statically and according to the rules of nature by natural determinism, with which the social arrangements were expected to comply (culture-national concept). Moreover, it was taken for granted that, apart from the “visible” configurations of the terrain and of the bodies of water, which was considered then a fundamental fact, the justifiability of a conterminous state space was rooted in the “depth,” i.e. it was actually based on geo-constructional premises. It was within this sphere of thought that Gyula Prinz formulated so succinctly the previously only latent state-geographical interpretation of the fundamentally physico-geographical/geo-constructional Tisia Concept.

MÁRTA KISS

*“In the halls of the Fairy King, the land of legend...” Local identity, self-representation and stereotypes*

This paper is based on fieldwork carried out in a small Székely village in Transylvania, which involved the multi-level examination of identity. The examined community attaches great importance to defining itself vis-à-vis the neighbouring villages. The establishment of their Székely identity is

also an issue. The author observed that they will prefer to refer to themselves as Székely, rather than Hungarian. On closer inspection, the past fifteen years have seen changes in terms of Hungarian identity. Tourism has increased, as a result of which hundreds of visitors come to the village every summer, chiefly from Hungary. The villagers have frequently been involved in situations where they were having to prove their Hungarianness to the Hungarians from Hungary.

The upshot of these researches was that the different levels of identity-content intertwine significantly, and one of the most important elements of the resulting “identity construction” is locality which makes the content elements of identity specific and contributes to their integration.

The village is, naturally, by no means uniform in terms of identity, but can be divided into smaller groups along different lines. One of these is the local identity group consisting of “diligent” men and women (to quote the villagers), but there are others, too. The relationship with new settlers and tourists is also important, given that the greatest change in the life of the village is the rise in their numbers. The visitors’ attitude to the village has led to confrontation of value systems, in the wake of which the value systems of both parties has changed, throwing new opportunities and perspectives into the equation.

The most tightly-knit community of “newcomers” is the Gypsies. There are not very many of them—two or three families only—yet their presence in the village is an important issue. Attitudes to “Gypsies” and “drunkards” are ambivalent: they tend to disown these members of the community public discourse, community protective mechanisms operate differently in everyday-life situations.

ANDRÁS KOVÁCS

*Can prejudice be a prejudice?*

This paper takes a starting point the old observation of prejudice being expressed by means of coded language. The coded expression of prejudice poses a difficult problem to the scholar seeking to measure prejudice. Clearly, the code will only assume the role of a code provided there exists a consensus regarding its interpretation. Possibly, however, a speaker will use expressions expressing prejudice in a coded way, but because the code lacks a consensual interpretation, his or her utterance might ultimately be innocent of prejudicial intention. In spite of this, the parties of the communication might interpret the utterance as being prejudiced. In such a case one might say, the establishment of prejudice was itself a prejudice. The study takes a look at the forms in which ambiguous interpretations, i.e. lacking consensus, occur most frequently, and goes on to demonstrate on two examples taken from empirical researches the kind of tension that can result from the operation of these mechanisms. Jews and non-Jews were asked whether or not they thought certain statements were anti-Semitic. In general, the differences of opinion betrayed latent tension: at least two thirds of the Jews thought five of the seven statements were anti-Semitic, while the absolute majority of the non-Jews considered just one to be anti-Semitic.

Of the many questions that arise in course of interpreting the phenomenon, this paper discusses just one: how to interpret, as empirical scholars, opinions and statements when no consensus exists as to their prejudicial nature? Can our theoretical knowledge contribute to a better understanding of individual cases? Is prejudice theory not culture-dependent?

Answers to the question be explored in connection with three types of statement. Firstly, there are statements which have to be regarded as prejudiced on the basis of any definition of prejudice—however, even so many consider these not to be prejudiced, arguing that everyone shares them and everyone cannot be prejudiced. Secondly, there are statements which are generally speaking prejudiced, but can, in certain contexts, be non-prejudiced. Finally, there are statements which the group they are referring to consider to be prejudiced, but others not. In summary, it can be said that empirical research as revealed that there are many statements and opinions which—complying with the criteria of prejudice—are beyond question prejudiced, but are in certain cases employed

as a constituent of socio-cultural knowledge/awareness and therefore they do not qualify as being prejudiced in the eyes of their users. This affords the scholar two important conclusions. One is that, in the research of prejudice, one must tread very carefully in the area normative-theoretical definitions advocated by prejudice theories. There are cases whose examination requires not only the application of the criteria suggested by theory for revealing the extent of prejudice, but also the attitude to the cognitions, stereotypes and opinions of the group they are referring to, and of the group using them in connection with the former group. The other conclusion is that this context of prejudice opens much opportunity for coded prejudicial talk, for expressing prejudice euphemistically. The research of prejudice must take these into consideration.

ANTAL ÖRKÉNY—MÁRIA SZÉKELYI

*Summary overview of a research project. Magyar Agora 2005. A deliberative poll on minority Gypsies in Hungary*

People are willing to discuss “awkward” topics with others, and even change their previous opinion if they have recourse to information and consider opposing views, pro and contra arguments.

That might be the brief summary of the first Hungarian deliberative poll, Magyar Agora 2005, and its main event, an open discussion (16–18 September 2006) on a particularly complex and sensitive issue, one that has much underlying dramatic tension: the coexistence of the Gypsy and non-Gypsy, the conflicts of coexistence and possible alternatives for lessening these conflicts.

In the summer of 2005 a thousand people were asked what they thought the difficulties of minority Gypsy and majority non-Gypsy coexistence were, and what might be done to reduce the conflicts. Two hundred and fifty of them were subsequently invited to the open discussion in September. In sixteen groups and in three plenary sessions the participants discussed problems such as poverty, discrimination, segregation and integration. The views of the participants were asked again, after the discussion weekend.

Like in other countries, the deliberative poll led to a change of opinion in the Magyar Agora, too.

One of the most important outcome was the participants knew a lot more about the Gypsy than before. They had learnt exactly how many Gypsy lived in Hungary, the extent of poverty; on the whole the level of knowledge about the Gypsy increased from an average 28 to 42 per cent—that is, rather significantly.

The discussion weekend affected the area of discrimination most strikingly: rejection of Gypsy discrimination had become much more powerful. For example, in earlier interviews, a quarter of the respondents had agreed it was right for the police to treat Gypsies “differently”; only 9 per cent said the same after the discussion—that is, 91 per cent of the participants had come to reject police discrimination. Views changed with regard to discrimination in employment, too: the number of respondents who disapproved of any form of workplace discrimination against Gypsy increased; more importantly, however, there was a significant rise (22 to 33 per cent) in the number of people who are dissatisfied with the maximum penalty imposable on employers, and would significantly increase the penalty rates.

The research data and the recordings of the discussion weekend are subject to further analysis.

DÓRA PÁLOS

*“Let’s grow up.” The self-stereotypisation processes of a Boyash community*

My area of research is a small Zala county village which I shall call Zalaszát, to protect my friends and informants. I had first visited the village many years ago during a research project I was working on, and had become friends with the local Gypsies. Since I came to know them, a bunch of questions arose which had since become significant, revolving around what I might sum as

“community identity”. While a community identity will never be homogenous, many distinctive patterns are discernible in the identity of the different generations (young, middle-aged, old) and in their “strategies of getting by.” In this paper I speak of self-stereotypes, a term I consider appropriate in that it expresses the fact that the Gypsies’ ideas about themselves cannot be separated from the stereotypes formed by others.

The description of the use of language and of the local characteristics of the source of prestige give some idea of the fact that in the life of an individual there exist two types of expectation system vis-à-vis two “worlds,” i.e. the “inside” Boyash world, and the “outside,” non-Gypsy, world.

As regards the changes of values in the course of the lives of the middle generation and their parents’ generation, it can be generally said that the primariness of the “Gypsy laws” has disappeared, and today’s youth regard as an alternative the values of majority society.

The most important question raised in the paper is, what happens when, alongside the discriminatory attitude of majority society towards the Gypsy, certain Gypsy individuals and groups stand of the border of the Gypsy –non-Gypsy in the sense that as a result of their inner motivations, they seek to please both sides? “Where do I belong?” and “Who am I to compare myself to?” are questions that rarely go without inner conflict or identity crises.

The most striking reactions to such situations is the tendency of the various forms of self-definition that prevents local Gypsy from referring to themselves as “Gypsy.” They have many alternatives, all of which serve to isolate a (small) local group from the rest of the Gypsy, a heterogeneous group showered with negative stereotypes.

Another Gypsy group, the so-called “Knife-grinders,” assume an important role in establishing the identity of the Zalaszát community. An important dividing line has emerged within the Gypsy as an ethnic category: the good and the bad Gypsy.

This paper explores this marginalised area of the community and thematises the responses given to it, contributing psychological comments to the anthropological “statements.”

PAPP RICHÁRD

*“Real Jews“ and “good Balkans folk.” Self stereotypes and mentality categories in the life of two minority cultures*

The examples in this study have been taken from the world of religious Jews and the Voivodina minority Hungarians. Specifically, the paper focuses on the mentality categories of these communities which establish their self-images and the stereotypes related to “the others.” Mentality categories are such hidden inner categories of a community, by which the insults, conflicts, prejudices and positive self-reflexions arising from minority existence gain expression.

Accordingly, the study reveals what it means to be a “real Jew” or “Yiddishkeit” in the researched Jewish community, and what it means to be „good Balkans folks, real Voivodina Hungarians“ as reflected in the image of old South Hungarian Magyar communities.

The described case studies reveal the many issues raised by the anthropological “facts” which help to understand the diverse connotations of mentality—a cultural characteristic—which is highly debatable as an “objective/hypothetical” concept. These diverse meanings lead to the many minority self-stereotypes, as well as majority stereotypes and viewpoints. These viewpoints conceal identity traits which betray unity and diversity vis-à-vis the surrounding cultures and the universal communities whose unique, regional, autonomous minority members they are. In addition to mentality categories, the paper reveals their world of ritual and religious system, too. The minority strategies underlying the mentality categories are reinforced by them, and acquire sacred-cognitive boost. These minority strategies create an opportunity for cultural self-defence as regards both majorities, by means of striking a balance between keeping distance and striving for cultural

adaptation in the course of coexistence. Accordingly, they draw on universal, common national and religious content in the same way as on the consensually valuable cultural features of the majority culture they are living with. The balance of the two value systems determines the mentality categories of the researched mentalities categories. The relevant community control becomes a measure of individual behaviour. The “real Jew” and “good Balkans folk” in the examined communities is a person who identifies with the standards of this system, organises his or her personal life strategies and patterns of behaviour within his or her respective community in accordance with these standards. The experiencing of everyday life in one’s own culture, the strategies applied in interethnic relations—i.e. phenomena influenced by the mentality categories—and, through their interpretation, the common value and norm system and cultural practices of minority cultures can be analysed in a way that brings us closer to individual worlds, personal fates and world views. This approach can perhaps contribute to a better understanding of the reality content of minority cultures.

SORIN MITU

*The Transylvanian Romanians’ stereotypes of the Hungarians in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century*

In spite of the immense body of literature discussing (or, at least, referring to) Romanian-Hungarian relations, Romanian historians have taken little interest in the mental representations that emerged in the course of coexistence. The author of this paper has therefore set out to explore in greater depth the image of Hungarians in Romanian culture. This study interprets the image of the Hungarians as reflected by the texts of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Romanian authors—historians, writers, politicians, publicists—and the arguments they cite. The conclusion is that while at the beginning of this period the image roughly coincides with contemporary Hungarian self-representation, in the second half of the period, that is after the 1848 revolution, nationalist-Romantic ideology became predominant. Sorin Mitu devotes special attention to the writings of Ion Papiu Ilarian who created a history of Transylvanian Romanians which is best characterised by an endless confrontation with the Hungarians. The events of 1848 were momentous in that in its wake emerged the image of the life-and-death struggle of the two nations.

SÁBA TESFAY

*“We are the hatted Gábor Gypsies who don’t drink...” The cognitive norms regulating the interior and exterior relations of the Gábor Gypsies*

This study is based on a comprehensive one-year research project conducted among the Gábor Gypsies in and around Targu-Mures, focusing on cultural representation. Although there are a number of Gábor Gypsy groups in other Transylvanian and old Hungarian towns, the paper discusses the stereotypes determining the interior and exterior relations of a Mures-county community.

The identity structure and self-definition of this community draws a distinct line between them and the other groups living in the area. The exterior and cognitive trans-generational elements of this boundary, however, can change in space and time, without ever allowing the community to forget where they belong.

While the community lives in accordance with the rules of endogamy, its economic welfare hinges on its exterior relations, a fact which drives the members of the community to seek out and consciously exploit these sources. Their primary source of income is trade and tinwork, performed not inside the Gábor environment. Additionally, because the community are chiefly Adventists, the practice of their religion serves to reinforce external ties.

Their economic ties, frequent visits to the Adventist prayer house, the relationships with their neighbours, their daily contact with non-Gypsies and other Gypsy groups fosters an awareness of the otherness of their own community, and at the same time helps to establish standardised

conditions based on daily regularity and practices. They define themselves in terms of these relationships, and form impressions of other groups by means of these channels.

The paper seeks to present their conditions and the stereotypes they have come to form about other groups under conditions, not neglecting the stereotypes the community has formed about itself either—those equally having an effect on the stereotypes about others, as does the information gained in the course of everyday interaction.

ÁGNES TÓTH—JÁNOS VÉKÁS

*Family and identity. The role of mixed marriages in the reproduction of Hungarian national/ethnic minorities*

This paper focuses on families at least one of whose members claimed, in response to at least one of the four questions relating to national/ethnic identity in the 2001 census, to belong to one of the thirteen minorities in Hungary listed in the Minorities Act.

The study set out to answer the question whether in mixed marriages there were any traces of efforts of conscious assimilation, and the disproportionality of a mixed marriage revealed which hidden national/ethnic dimensions of social structure.

The following conclusions were drawn:

1. The national average of mixed marriages, was higher in every ethnic minority—except the Gypsies—than among minority Hungarians in Romania, Slovakia and Serbia.

2. This high proportion can be put down firstly to spatial distribution, secondly to age breakdown, and the proportion of the sexes. These conditions have roughly the effect in every community, and only secondary to this is the anomaly induced by social norm.

3. Mixed marriages with one non-Roma member are predominant, but not exclusive. Members of the various ethnic minorities will marry among each other, and the proportion of such marriages is significantly higher than the proportion of the given minority in relation to majority population would warrant.

4. Intergenerational assimilation is significant among homogenous minority couples, too, but the former reveals a slighter extent of dissimilation, too.

5. Although the proportion of homogenous minority couples is related to the proportions of that minority in the village/town they are living in, a significant proportion of such couples were born outside the given village/town. This would indicate that the greater proportion of minority in the village/town is a factor that contributes to identity—which indirectly relates back to the number of mixed marriages.

6. In communities where the proportion of individuals born abroad is high, these individuals will remain significantly dissimilate in homogenous minority marriages, too.