It is possible to see the talent of a young anthropologist as much in her or his choice of subject mater as in the success of the first analysis of their data. Csongor Könczei has taken as his subject a topic of great social significance and ethnographic interest, and yet one which has, until now, been almost ignored in the large literature on eastern European societies: the role of Romany musicians in the musical life of the region. These musicians have been not just the bearers but the creators of the musical life of villages and towns for generations and yet no sustained ethnography has been devoted to their study. (Michael Stewart)

ISBN 978-606-8377-12-4

Csongor Könczei • ON THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL NETWORK OF THE GYPSY MUSICIANS OF KALOTASZEG

Csongor Könczei

# ON THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL NETWORK OF THE GYPSY MUSICIANS OF KALOTASZEG

THE ROMANIAN
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH
ON NATIONAL MINORITIES

Csongor Könczei

# ON THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL NETWORK OF THE GYPSY MUSICIANS OF KALOTASZEG

CSONGOR KÖNCZEI

# ON THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL NETWORK OF THE GYPSY MUSICIANS OF KALOTASZEG

THE ROMANIAN
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH
ON NATIONAL MINORITIES

Cluj-Napoca, 2012

Title: On the Social and Cultural Network of the Gypsy Musicians of Kalotaszeg
Author: Csongor Könczei
The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities
Cluj-Napoca
2012

Series editor: István Horváth, Zsuzsa Bokor

Translated from Hungarian:
Könczei Csongor: *A kalotaszegi cigányzenészek társadalmi és kulturális hálózatáról.*
Kriza Könyvek, 36. Kriza János Néprajzi Társaság, Kolozsvár, 2011

**Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României**

**KÖNCZEI, CSONGOR**
**On the social and cultural network of the gypsy muzicians of kalotaszeg** / Könczei Csongor. - Cluj-Napoca : Editura Institutului pentru Studierea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale, 2012
Bibliogr.
ISBN 978-606-8377-12-4

398.8(=214.58)(498 Călata)
784.4(=214.58)(498 Călata)

Peer-review: Michael Stewart
Translated by: Éva Incze
Proofreading: Lóránd Rigán

Cover design: Elemér Könczey
Layout: Ferenc Sütő
Printed by: IDEA Cluj

© Institutul pentru Studierea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale http://ispmn.gov.ro

This publication reflects the views only of the author. The RIRNM and the Romanian Government cannot be held responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

# Contents

# Foreword

It is possible to see the talent of a young anthropologist as much in her or his choice of subject mater as in the success of the first analysis of their data. Csongor Könczei has taken as his subject a topic of great social significance and ethnographic interest, and yet one which has, until now, been almost ignored in the large literature on eastern European societies: the role of Romany musicians in the musical life of the region. These musicians have been not just the bearers but the creators of the musical life of villages and towns for generations and yet no sustained ethnography has been devoted to their study. But the importance of this book also lies in the theoretical issues it raises, which go far beyond the examination of the particular families Könczei writes about. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that, if thought through and integrated by others into academic practice, the approach that this book represents will produce an important shift both in the field of Romany studies and that of regional ethnography and anthropology more generally. But such is the world that we live in that the significance of the phenomenon discussed in these pages, and of Csongor Könczei's contribution to understanding it, will be easily missed.

Könczei examines a history of cultural exchange, borrowing and active transformation of musical culture among a group of musicians in the Transilvanian countryside. Seen, however, at a higher level of abstraction, the cultural process that he describes is an expression of a truly foundational aspect of the lives of all human communities and one that has been puzzlingly ignored by scholarship. For over 100 years, in most social sciences (with the notable exception of linguistics and cognitive science), in the humanities and - most relevant here – within almost all anthropology, the process of transmission of behaviour and practice from one 'group' of persons to another has been largely ignored and treated as unworthy of academic attention. Given the centrality of mimesis, imitation and adaptation to all of social life – how else do children acquire their mother's tongue? – this is an extraordinary gap in the literature. One of the most general reasons for this lies – or so it seems to me - in the deep and paralysing impact of what has recently been named 'methodological nationalism': the uncritical integration into the assumptions of researchers of the perspective of persons who have grown up seeing the social and cultural world in terms of distinct 'nations' and the divisions that are implied by such.

The power of 'methodological nationalism' to mask whole areas of social life from scholars' attention has been greatly intensified by the isomorphism between the cultural model of the nation and that of what we might call 'the modern individual' – that cultural account of 'the self' that has arisen around and since the enlightenment (Handler, Taylor, Gleason). Nations are, in effect, modern individuals writ large. This is to say that the cultural model of the nation is grounded and rooted in the modern conception of the individual. The world of the 'modern individual' is, as Richard Handler, inter alia, has argued, a universe composed of clearly bounded, unique and autonomous entities – individuals who are socially positioned such that they are in full possession of themselves. The world of these self-possessed individuals is, as Charles Taylor has taught us, a self-referential world of authenticity: to realise themselves persons must be true to their own nature (authentic); just as moral action is realised, in a post-Rousseau world, by being in touch with one's own inner feelings, and not found in relation to external sources of authority or judgement. To be owners of ourselves and authors of our own actions we must command our own minds and memories and orient our action in accordance with them. The new individualism is also, according to Taylor, an egalitarian order of dignity: no longer is social standing characterised in relative degrees of honour (which is always conceived of in relation to others in a hierarchical arrangement) but each of us is due the same measure of dignity in a world of equal individuals.

And so it is with nations. The concert of nations is just like a collection of modern individuals composed of clearly bounded, unique and self-determining nations. It is a foundational myth of the modern world order that the nations that populate the international order represent the expression and culmination of the unique geniuses of the peoples who have given birth to them just as a person is imagined to be the realisation of his or her unique character. Each nation is the bearer of a unique culture – or, to put it in the current jargon, carries a distinct heritage – and this heritage or patrimony is the historically formed sediment produced by the development of its unique character. Persons and nations are thus destined – if not thwarted by force majeure – to realise their own unique potential.

As a self-possessed individual writ large, the nation's character can only be given authentic expression when it is free to determine its own fate, and when it finds the sources of its action, its values and the characteristic features of its social life, its institutional arrangements, in its own culture and language. Each nation and culture is, therefore, not only unique but due the same respect (dignity) as every other nation – *so long as it is the author of its own actions*, so long as it finds the source of its behaviour from within itself. Every nation is, thereby, supposed to construct itself in respect of its own traditions and

as a result we find, across many parts of the modern world, always desperate and frequently comic efforts to purify the national culture or the national language of foreign contamination. I write these lines in Budapest in 2012 where radio stations are now forbidden to carry less than 35% of 'national' music in case the Hungarian soul loses its way in foreign tunes.[1] But we are all familiar with the language purifications of the French Academy and the German linguistic authorities- attempting to prevent infiltration of foreign influence, or hybridisation– and with that the contamination of deed and thought supposed to derive from sinister forces encroaching on 'the national patrimony'.

But note, that there is something deeply paradoxical about this obsession with particularity, uniqueness and unrepeatable national genius. As Simon Harrison – one of the very few anthropologists to have made a truly original contribution to the study of the nation state - has shown, all nations demonstrate their supposedly inimitable identities in a remarkably similar fashion. Any self-respecting nation establishes its autonomy with a national sport, a football team, its own flag, an anthem, a memorial to its unknown soldiers and so on and so on. This unacknowledged process of mimicry, in which one nation copies another in substance while differentiating itself in trivial fashion (is it red white and blue or blue red and white; is it a star or the moon?), derives ultimately from the fact that the very idea of a nation state – *the* political form of modernity – is itself *modular*, as both Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson, in their different fashions, demonstrated: that is, the nation state form has been picked up and transported from one place to another, or slavishly copied if you wish to call a spade a spade. In Gellner's hands this mimetic transfer of the model of the nation-state was a function of the industrial division of labour and the cognitive revolution that allows for, nay demands, unconstrained growth. In Anderson's more historically delicate treatment the national idea was handed on like a baton from the Americas (from the Latins on to the founders of the USA in the first instance) to Europe and then, through colonies, to the world beyond. Each time it was adapted and developed but it maintained essentially the same cultural form, with more or less identical institutions (including, on top of those adumbrated above, censuses, clearly defined borders, museums, national newspapers, the novel etc.).

So, let me repeat, there is a fundamental paradox here: a political idea that is predicated on the idea of unique, unrepeatable individual content (national character) rests on an entirely constant formal arrangement of

1 True to form Hungarian DJs have managed to persuade the clearly embattled regulatory authorities that their compilation of music is itself a 'Hungarian creation' so long as the DJ is Hungarian – opening a great breach in the dyke of cultural protectionism.

that content. In this respect, all nations look alike – and look alike too in their denial of ressemblance and their obsessive, frequently aggressive insistence on difference (Harrison 2006). This is, if you will, the psychopathology of modern world politics.

These ideas impact not just on the conception of the political order but also on our understanding of what human communities are and, through that, on the practice of social scientists. The assumptions researchers make about the nature of communities they study and the character of cultural creativity and continuity have been shaped at source by the cultural model of individual/nation. The book you have in your hands, however, tells of people who have not (yet?) been put through the great cultural mill of nation-state formation and crushed into the mechanically regular shape of modern 'citizens'. The musicians of the Kalotaszeg were artists for whom resemblance, mimesis and imitation far from being devalued is understood as central to the process of cultural self-realisation. This is not to say that the Romany musicians whose history and activities Könczei brings to life in this fine study were any more imitative of other people's styles or creations than other artists in other times and places. The truth is rather that the Romany musicians of Kalotaszeg, and beyond, were less troubled by acknowledging the influence of their surroundings and actively celebrating their engagement in forms of creative mimesis than other popular musicians of the modern world tend to be – or, rather, than those who write about them tend to be. They have not been subject to the often aggressive and largely fantastical nationalising efforts of traditional folkloric or other ethnological studies – establishing, by an imaginary process of purification, a codex of 'truly national' i.e. supposedly authentic music, as, for instance, Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály did for the Hungarians.

But the down side of this is that Romany musicianship has been largely ignored in the ethnological and anthropological literature – seen merely as a faint copy of a supposedly 'original source' and therefore, like other forms of mimesis, not worthy of scholarly attention. From the point of view of a global discipline like anthropology the theoretical turn away from the study of creative copying, mimesis and transformative incorporation has meant that both ethnography and a truly anthropological effort to construct theoretically coherent models of cultural transmission have been blighted by unexamined assumptions. They have in effect denied themselves a large part of the data available to their investigations. Notoriously, ethnographers of exotic populations (Roma and Gypsies included but scholars writing of many other populations as well) have in their notes and published accounts stressed the culturally differentiated behaviour and customs of their subjects and have ignored

or downplayed commonalities shared with neighbours or other members of today's global village. Just as in ethnographic films you tend not to be shown the Nike trainers or the coca cola t-shirts worn by 'the last uncontacted peoples in the world', so in the traditional well-crafted ethnographic text you find people who appear to live in another time than our own.

The rot goes deep. Its historical source is surely the foundational rejection of the theory of the theory of 'cultural diffusionism' by Bronislaw Malinowski in his first ethnographic work on the Trobriand Islanders (1922). Malinowski argued that human behaviour as part of a socially or functionally integrated whole could be explained synchronically in terms of the function of this behaviour within the social order. This reasoning – that was partly motivated by the pragmatic consideration that the author was dealing with a society without written records - laid the basis for a prolonged refusal among anthropologists to consider the role of diffusion in human history. Later, new life was given to the refusal to study transmission by copying and imitation by the structuralist/culturalist claim that culture is a kind of system (linguistic, symbolic, religious etc.) in which the significance of any item of behaviour is determined by its role in that system. Behaviour would only be incorporated if it 'made sense' within the logic of the local cultural system and the existence of a behaviour was supposedly explained once its cultural logic – its place in the system - was expounded. This purportedly revolutionary concern with 'totalities' thus led to the perpetuation of the Malinowskian idea that all behaviour in one place and time has to be explicable in terms of its relationship with other synchronous behaviour. The result has been debilitating for the discipline of anthropology in all kinds of ways, but in particular for blinding it to the diverse temporalities of different kinds of social practice and the forces other than 'meaning' that shape human behaviour.

It is perhaps not by chance that Csongor Könczei has been able to avoid some of these traps because he comes from a tradition of ethnology and ethno-musicology that was never taken in by the rhetoric of holism and systems but maintained a fascination with the micro transmission of cultural practices and knowledge. While western anthropologists represented their informants as anonymous representatives of a homogenous culture – the vehicles through which systems of meaning were given expression – ethnology and folklore retained a sense of the importance of place, time and person. This has meant that Könczei has been able to reconstruct, in  fashion that a western anthropologist can only envy, the personal and local trajectories of particular people. Though sometimes struggling with the thinness of the available data, Könczei conveys a fine sense of the personal networks through which cultural appropriation and creative mimesis flourished.

But he also displays a strong connection to modern anthropological concerns. Recent ethnography of the Roma and other Gypsies suggests that ignorance of the Romany musicans' lives has, in fact – at least in certain respects – been an achievement of the Gypsies themselves. I say this because it is ever clearer, as more and more studies are published of Romany adaptations in different parts of Europe, that a strategy of invisibility and disguise has lain at the heart of the historic success of the Romany populations in Europe. As Patrick Williams demonstrated for the French Manouches (1993), it is often through a process of subtraction that the Rom make the world their own: it is through avoidance of some of what 'the others' (the non-Gypsies) do in the world that the Gypsies appropriate the world in their own terms – and the whole point of this is that these acts of appropriation are, therefore, invisible to outsiders who only notice the continuities and not the small but hugely significant alterations introduced by the Roma. A world that ignores them is a world in which they can carve a place for themselves unnoticed.

It is, I think, for this reason that the Romany musicians positively celebrate the continuity of their musical practice with those of their non-Roma neighbours. This has meant that they have traditionally not been seen as worthy of study by musical scholars –most of the published work on 'magyar cigány' music (with the exception of Bálint Sárosi's text) continues the tradition of portraying Roma as mere performers of "other people's" music – but this had the great advantage that a space was left for them to perform their distinctiveness to each other alone – safe in the knowledge that no one was even aware they were doing so.

The field of serious Romany studies (as opposed to the long standing amateur fascination with exotic Roma) is still young in Europe. Anthropologists of an earlier generation, like myself, who focussed on the 'exotic' (traditional, distinctively dressed, self-consciously differentiating) families of Rom inadvertently made the work of the next generation of scholars considerably more difficult. It became not just common but scientifically respectable to talk of the 'Magyar Cigány' or the Baiesi as in some sense 'less Romany' than the 'true Gypsies' or the Rom (thereby incorporating into academic discourse an occasional claim of these Roma). It is one of the great contributions of the younger generation – I think of Cecilia Kovai and Kata Horváth in Hungary, Yasar Abu Ghosh in Czech Republic and László Fosztó and now Csongor Könczei in Romania – to have reinvented the field and demonstrate the vibrant range of ways in which European Romany populations continue to play the great game of human culture – differentiating while imitating and imitating while differentiating.

Michael Stewart

ANDERSON, Benedict
1983 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Verso, London.
1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (revised and enlarged edition). Verso, London.
FOSZTÓ László
2009 *Ritual Revitalisation After Socialism: Community, Personhood, and Conversion Among Roma in a Transylvanian Village.* Lit Verlag, Berlin.
GELLNER, Ernest
1983 *Nations and Nationalism.* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
GHOSH, Yasar Abu
2010 Crediting Recognition: Monetary Transactions of Poor Roma in Tercov. In: STEWART, Michael – RÖVID Márton (eds.): *Multi-Disciplinary Approaches to Romany Studies.* CEU, Budapest
GLEASON, Philip
1984 World War II and the Development of American Studies. *American Quarterly* 36: 343–358.
HANDLER, Richard
1988 *Nationalism and the Politics* of Culture in *Quebec.* Madison. University of Wisconsin Press,Wisconsin.
HARRISON, Simon
2006 *Fracturing Resemblances. Identity and Mimetic Conflict in Melanesia and the West.* Berghahn, Oxford.
HORVÁTH Kata
2012 Silencing and Naming the Difference. In: STEWART, Michael (ed.): *The Gypsy Menace: Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics.* London
KOVAI Cecilia
2012 Hidden potentials in 'Naming the Gypsy': The Transformation of the Gypsy-Hungarian Distinction. In: STEWART, Michael (ed.): *The Gypsy Menace: Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics.* London
TAYLOR, Charles
1992 The Politics of Recognition, In: TAYLOR, Charles: *Multiculturalism and the "The Politics of Recognition"*, with commentary by GUTMAN, Amy – ROCKEFELLER, Steven C. – WALZER, Michael – WOLF, Susan. Princeton University Press, New Jersey
WILLIAMS, Patrick
1993 *Nous, on n'en parle pas: les vivants et les morts chez les Manouches.* Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris

# Foreword to the English edition

I became acquainted with the Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg first as a folk dancer, and later as a folk musician in the dance house of Kolozsvár. The first musician I met was Ferenc "Árus" Berki from Méra, with whom, at the age of six, on April 5th 1981, I could dance with at the first Dance House Meeting in Kolozsvár. Later on, between 1985 and 1990, we often invited Ferenc "Árus" Berki and Sándor "Netti" Fodor (who was already living in Kisbács at that time) to the Folklore Club of the Sámuel Brassai High School in Kolozsvár, led by my mother, the teacher Éva Tolna, and my sister, Csilla Könczei (the club was the predecessor to the Bogáncs Folk Dance Ensemble), to play at our performances. They were sometimes accompanied by young musicians, like Sándor "Netti" Fodor Jr. (Sanyika) and Rudolf Tóni Jr. (Rudika). (Later, from the 1990s onwards, as an ensemble leader or dance house and events organizer I proceeded alike: I invited Ferenc Árus Berki and Sándor Netti Fodor as often as possible to Kolozsvár to play – uncle Feri even kept a "dance rehearsal" for us.) During that period, through uncle Feri Árus, I met his brother, Béla "Árus" Berki and his cousin, Rudi Tóni Sr. In 1988, I started to play instrumental folk music on viola, and following the first chords, my actual "masters" were the aforementioned Rudi Tóni Sr. and János Sztojka. In 1990, the world changed; in different dance houses, dance camps, at festivals and events I could meet Gyula Czilika, then his uncle, Gyulu Boros, and his brother, Béla Czilika, later Viktor Berki and Kálmán Urszuly – to mention just those with whom I could play with. As a student in ethnography, in 1993 and 1994 I collected music from Márton "Csipás" Varga and his band from Bánffyhunyad (in Magyarlóna, at a sheep measuring festivity, and in Magyarvalkó), respectively from József "Toska" Muza from Szászfenes. After the turn of the millennium, younger musicians followed, e.g. Béla "Árus" Berki Jr., István "Kiscsipás" Varga and the youngest Rudika Tóni...

In brief, all along my childhood and adolescence it was natural for me that I knew Gypsy musicians, I knew where they were living, how they were playing, and they also knew me. It didn't occur to me for a long time to write about them, and to reflect upon their lives and musical profession; for me, they were simply musicians from Kalotaszeg, more or less good acquaintances, on the music of whom I could dance, the music of whom I used for teaching dance or to make choreographies, and from whom I learnt to play. And also with whom,

of course, I talked about dance, music, as well as about everyday life; thus, gradually, I got to know their world and their musician society.

It was in 1997 that I wrote about them for the first time with a scientific purpose, on the suggestion of the teachers at the Ethnographic Department in Kolozsvár, Vilmos Keszeg and Ferenc Pozsony. It was a surprise even for myself how many experiences I accumulated, and what a professional success resulted from putting these experiences into words. I won the first prize with my work *Change of generation and style in the Gypsy musician families from Kalotaszeg* at that years Scientific Students' Conference, this being my first publication as well. (I could say that it was the first step in the long research work of more than one decade, concluded by the present volume.) The first study was followed by a second one (*Dancing musicians*), then, on the basis of these first two studies, I completed my postgraduate thesis in 1999. Hence, when I was admitted to the European Ethnology programme led by Attila Paládi-Kovács within the Doctoral School of Ethnography of Eötvös Loránd University from Budapest, I was already decided about the topic of my dissertation.

Thus, this volume is the improved and edited version of my doctoral thesis written between 2003 and 2007, and defended in 2008; its chapters and parts were already published in recent years in different periodicals and volumes. The Hungarian edition was published in 2011 by the János Kriza Ethnographic Society. The present form of my work is also due to many persons close to me.

First of all, I thank my tutor, Mihály Sárkány, for giving me the possibility of continuous consultation, which implied both the guidance of the thesis and his reading of this book. I believe that being the disciple of Mihály Sárkány was decisive to my professional progress.

I would like to thank the Folk Dance Department within the Institute for Musicology from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for their generous help to my research – to László Felföldi, János Fügedi, Zoltán Karácsony and Gyula Pálfy. I thank my friends, Lóránd Boros from Kolozsvár, Adorján Török-Csingó from Gyalu, and Zsolt Varga from Méra, for their help during material collection, and László Lengyel from Türe, for subsequent amendments. I thank my sister, Csilla Könczei for letting me use her collections, and for her help in gathering the photographic material for this manuscript preparation. I thank my opponents, Katalin Kovalcsik and István Pávai, for their constructive critiques. I thank my colleagues at the Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, László Fosztó, Ágnes Gagyi and István Horváth, for their observations concerning methodological and theoretical issues. I thank the colleagues within the János Kriza Ethnographic Society for publishing the volume in Hungarian in 2011. And, finally, I also thank my family for their considerate patience.

The publication in English was assumed by the Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities. I thank Éva Incze for the translation work. I am grateful to the well-known anthropologist Michael Stewart for the reading of the English edition; I feel honored that the first reader of the English version of my book was Michael. Finally, I would also like to thank Ferenc Sütő for the technical editing of the volume.

I owe the protagonists of this book, the Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg, much more than acknowledgements: I am grateful to Ferenc Árus, Sándor Netti, Gyula Czilika, and through them, to all the musicians named in this book, for sharing with me their knowledge, which allowed me to get acquainted with the musical life of Kalotaszeg of the recent past.

Csongor Könczei

# I. The researcher seized by the topic, or methodological syncretism on the limits of interdisciplinarity

> *"Such forms of social existence cannot be apprehended simply from the outside – the investigator must also be able to make a personal reconstruction of the synthesis characterizing them; he most not merely analyze their elements, but apprehend them as a whole in the form of a personal experience – his own."*
>
> (Claude Lévi-Strauss)[1]

The introductory chapter of the present volume is the result of an endeavour to write a study discussing the theoretical and methodological issues of the topic. It is an essay, since the description and interpretation of the topic I addressed and explored, the 20th century social and cultural network of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg, confronted me with issues from the fields of the theory of science, the social sciences and methodology, which proved to be a most complex task to solve.

## 1. The topic

There are several aspects which make me think that the examination of the social and cultural network of the Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg is an interesting and important task. Generally, the activity of professional rural musicians was studied either from a strictly musicological point of view, or in relation with the social and economic connections between a certain rural community and the musician providing music for it. I think, however, that both ethnomusicology and ethnography lack that kind of stance which would ensure a more complex approach to the topic.[2] What I primarily mean

1 Lévi-Strauss: 1963: 373.

2 The Hungarian ethnographic literature published only a few data on the social and cultural conditions of Gypsy musicians playing traditional instrumental folk music, and most of

here is that both the professional activity and the everyday life of rural Gypsy musicians is determined and delimited by a **network**, the description of which would comprise **the totality of the existence** of this community; therefore research itself has to be led by a much more complex point of view.

Two series of hypotheses constitute the guideline for the investigation of the topic; through them I try to outline a definition of the **network** itself.

The first series of hypotheses:

- For Gypsy musicians, the "musician profession" represents a social and cultural entity which can be well delimited, and which functions pretty similarly to a guild.
- This entity has well defined rules, which govern the life of a Gypsy musician from the very beginning. These rules refer to the script of education, or socialization, of the operational network and of the personal career.

---

that are indirect data supplementing the information revealed by that specific collection. Hitherto, Hungarian folk music research treated the Gypsy musician first of all as a professional rural folk musician, or the performer of the urban café music known as "Gypsy music", see for example: Zoltán Kodály: *Hangszeres zene / Instrumental music.* In: Czakó Elemér (ed.): *A magyarság néprajza IV. A magyarság szellemi néprajza / The Ethnography of Hungarians IV. The Spiritual Ethnography of Hungarians.* Budapest, 1937: 61–65; then in an extended version in Kodály's volume entitled *A magyar népzene / Hungarian Folk Music*, published in 1937; László Lajtha: *Gypsy bands and the Hungarian Folk Music.* (presentation in English, presumably in 1962) In: Melinda Berlász (ed.): *Lajtha László összegyűjtött írásai I. / Collected Works of László Lajtha I.* Budapest, 1992: 150–154; Bálint Sárosi: *Cigányzene / Gypsy Music.* Budapest, 1971; or the articles *Gypsy music, instrumental ensemble and instrumental folk music* edited by Bálint Sárosi and published in 1977 and 1979 in the *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon / Encyclopedia of the Hungarian Ethnography*; Lajos Vargyas: *A magyarság népzenéje / The Folk Music of the Hungarians.* Budapest, 1981; Lajos Vargyas (ed.): *Magyar népzene / Hungarian Folk Music.* In: Tekla Dömötör (ed.): *Magyar Néprajz VI. / Hungarian Ethnography VI.* Budapest, 1990: 5–183; István Pávai: *Az erdélyi és a moldvai magyarság népi tánczenéje / The Folk Dance Music of Hungarians from Transylvania and Moldova.* Budapest, 1993; Bálint Sárosi: *A hangszeres magyar népzene / Hungarian Instrumental Folk Music.* Budapest, 1996; Ernő Kállai: *A cigányzenészek helye és szerepe a magyar társadalomban és a magyar kultúrában / The place and role of Gypsy musicians in Hungarian society and culture.* In: Nóra Kovács – László Szarka (ed.): *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből / Space and Field. Studies on Ethnicity and Identity.* Budapest, 2002: 327–345; etc. In recent decades research has been extended to the traditional musical culture of Gypsy communities as well (see for example the works of Károly Bari, Katalin Kovalcsik or Irén Wilkinson Kertész). A significant quantity of data is due to 20th century Hungarian historical, comparative and structuralist folk dance research, and mainly to folk dance music research, the most prominent author being György Martin, see for example: Márta Virágvölgyi – István Pávai (ed.): *A magyar népi tánczene / Hungarian Folk Dance Music.* Budapest, 2000; György Martin: *A dallamok közvetlen forrásai, a zenészek / The Direct Source of Melodies, the Musicians.* In: *Mátyás István "Mundruc". Egy kalotaszegi táncos egyéniségvizsgálata / István "Mundruc" Mátyás. The Personality Study of a Dancer from Kalotaszeg.* Budapest, 2004; etc.

- This "guild-like" social and cultural entity functions as a "network" directed by social, economic and cultural relationships, family relations, friendships, professional reputation, the attractiveness of the village, of the region and of the town (recently of foreign countries as well), but also by constantly changing new fashions.

The second series of hypotheses:

- At present, the traditional "musician's world" is transforming in a way that only the content changes, and its form hardly does – in so far as the denouement of the transformation would not be complete disintegration.[3]
- Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg not only preserved and passed on dance music tradition, but they also formed it through indirect and direct means. Therefore it is likely that the continuous change of this tradition was induced by musicians themselves as well, for they permanently wanted to comply with market demands.
- Since they shaped dance music tradition, they influenced the specific music and dance culture as well.

The precondition to all research is the application of a well-determined and coherent research method. Since publications based on network analysis are lacking within Hungarian ethnomusicology and the ethnographical literature on Gypsy musicians, I had to take an insight first into network analysis itself.

## 2. A short history of network analysis

Originally, network analysis, or the investigation of the systems of social relations, was a research area and method of social psychology, sociology and also of social anthropology. In the last decades, due to different interests and interpretations from the fields of social and even natural sciences, it developed into a very **intricate and independent research method** called **network analysis**. It is intricate because, considering the various criteria of different disciplines, it is hard to view the huge quantity of network analysis literature as the product of a consistent discipline; however, it is an independent field, since its original intricacy conferred upon network analysis a complex and particularly interdisciplinary feature. **István Szent-Iványi** wrote: *"Similarly to other research trends in social sciences, network analysis didn't arise all of a sudden, but it looked for those frameworks which today define it for a really long time. Opinions differ concerning its origins; many precursors contend for the acknowledgement due to the decisive*

3 As today we have to take into account the disappearance of the musician society as a professional layer as well, and not only that of the tradition.

*impulse given to its formation."*[4] Thus, before outlining the method of network analysis and the possibility to apply this method to the topic of the present writing, I find it necessary to offer a very brief account on the history of network-based thinking in social sciences, and of network analysis.[5]

## 2.1 The preliminaries of network analysis in social psychology

Generally, **the researches in sociometry made by Jacob Lévy Moreno** are outlined among the first initiatives in network analysis. **Sociogram** is the mapping of groupings and relatedness of social fields, and its production method is called **sociometry**, *"the basic idea and methodology of which comes from **J. L. Moreno**, an American psychiatrist of Romanian origins. This perspicuous and readily usable method has become widespread. As a set of instruments of social psychology, it is applied in institutions where the displacement, coordination, and organization of groups is needed."*[6]

Sociometry is based on Moreno's findings that spontaneous associations are the latent backgrounds of institutional systems consisting of statuses, respectively, that human connections, irrelevant of their actual realization, are above all driven by feelings and sympathies. The sociogram is the result of a sociometric measurement, which is the outline of the examined social field, the mapping of the relationships constituting that field.

**The group dynamics research done by Kurt Lewin** is also ranked among the social psychology preliminaries of network analysis.[7] Lewis, who is

4 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 2.

5 In his volume entitled *Social Network Analysis, A Handbook* (London, 1994) John Scott writes about the development and basic terms of network research; the book is one of the most important writings on this topic. Almost all of the studies I have read and used refer to it.

6 Mérei: 1998: 6. He treats more in detail the biography of J. L. Moreno (1889-1974) and sociometric measurement in the second chapter of the volume entitled *The sociometry of Moreno – the spontaneous choice out of sympathy* (44-131). In Hungarian social psychology it was perhaps Ferenc Mérei the first to treat the following issues: "In the apparently homogenous social field small units are born; parties, friendly relations, family relatedness, circles of common interests arise. Individuals do not participate in activities all by themselves, but together with their relations." (Op. cit. 5) Mérei applied sociometric measurement in social psychology practice to the phenomena of microsociology, as a method to reveal affections, choices, gatherings, social relations, conflicts within communities of various sizes.

7 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 1 and Iluț: 1997: 115. Kurt Lewin (1890-1947) was born in Germany, but in 1933 he emigrated to the United States; he is considered the founder of modern social psychology. His work, and first of all his social field theory, had a great impact on the development of network theory. (See more in Kurt Lewin: *Field Theory in the Social Sciences*, New York, 1951.)

considered an outstanding author of Gestalt psychology, was also the founder of **field theory**, and claimed that every human group is a system aiming at equilibrium, a purpose for which it applies self-control, and that this network of dependencies is full of tension and determines behaviour.[8]

Stepping further, on the basis of these sociometric and group researches the disciples of Lewin, psychologist **Dorwin Cartwright** and mathematician **Frank Harary** elaborated **graph theory**; namely, they analyzed group behaviour through the graphic representation of complex social systems which are interrelated in multiple and even indirect ways, so that the graph of a certain social structure showed the relations between distinct social groups. Directed and valued graphic representation went beyond the approach focusing on individuals, allowing the analysis of a group's structure.[9] It was also them who *"wrote the history – to which they significantly contributed as well – of how the finding that sociograms can be used to study the structure of social relations led to the rapid development and spread of analysis techniques in sociology and anthropology."*[10]

## 2.2 The preliminaries of network analysis in sociology and social anthropology

Following the aforementioned initiatives in social psychology, Anglo-Saxon social sciences, especially sociology and social anthropology, examined network research issues, integrating the related main methodological principles, and producing the possibility to develop an independent research method, the so-called **network analysis**.[11]

Examining the history of network analysis, **John Scott** outlined the significance of the research done in the 1930-1940s at the Harvard University by psychologists and sociologists, along which they defined the terms of **cliques**, **social circles**, **clusters** or **blocks**, and discussed the internal informal connections of macrosystems and of the cohesion groups within these systems.

8 According to Lewin's field theory, the group is a dynamic unity, in which the change in the condition of a participant causes change in other participants' condition as well. See more in Dr. Lajos Bartha and Lilla Szilágyi (eds.): *Pszichológiai alapfogalmak kis enciklopédiája (Glossary of Basic Terms in Psychology).* Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 1966: 173.

9 Iluț: 1997: 116. In the theory of Cartwright and Harary, complex social structures consist of simple triads built upon each other in a particular manner (triads being sub-groups consisting of three analytic elements, respectively of their relations).

10 Hain: n. d.: 11. The referred volume is: F. Harary, R. Norman and D. Cartwright: *Structural Models: An Introduction to the Theory of Directed Graph*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1965.

11 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 1.

Scott also pointed out the importance of the research done at the Anthropology Department of the University of Manchester by **Max Gluckman**, initiated due to the influence of the **structural functionalism** of the 1930-1950s, which greatly influenced British social anthropology. These latter investigations interpreted social structures through relational networks, distinguishing the form and content of relationships, thus defining **partial** networks (which are focused on the individual, and refer to the particular social actions and to relations of determined content of the "ego"), as well as **complete** networks (which concern the totality of social relations).[12]

According to Szent-Iványi, the earliest preliminaries of network analysis in social anthropology are the researches effectuated in the 1950s. Even though he could not have been familiar with the terminology of connection analysis, **John A. Barnes** studied the small community of a Norwegian island, and his study is considered to be the first attempt to network analysis. During his researches, Barnes *"concluded that relationships within the community can be ranked into three discrete, clearly distinguishable fields, and these fields cover the totality of an individual's system of relations. He distinguished a) workplace relationships, b) spatial relationships, c) relationships based on friendship, family bonds, and neighbourhood."*[13] **Elizabeth Bott** already used the term "social network" in the examination of the social relationships of twenty families from London. *"In her work she tried to determine the nature of different relationship systems, and she wasn't reluctant to drawing far-reaching conclusions belonging to macrosociology. It was her who founded the methodological and terminological basis for comparing different networks [...] According to Bott's generalizing statement, an individual's social network is reliant on the society's nature, on the degree of labour division, and of institutionalization."*[14]

Besides Barnes and Bott, Scott regards the work of **S. F. Nadel** as the precursor of network analysis. Nadel attempted to write a social theory built on network analysis methodology. In his theory, he emphasizes the term of "**social role**", connecting it to the term "network". According to him, roles are determined by interrelated networks of action, therefore social systems are in fact role structures.[15]

12 Iluț: 1997: 116-117. From the working group called by Scott the "Harvard structuralists", Iluț refers to the researches and studies of Elton Mayo, William Lloyd Warner and George Homans.

13 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 2. (The referred article: Barnes, J. A.: *Class and committees in the Norwegian Island Perish.* In: *Human Relations* 1954/7, 39–58.)

14 Op. cit. 2. (The referred study: Bott, E.: *Family and social network.* London, 1957.)

15 Iluț: 1997: 117–118. (The referred study: Nadel, S. F.: *The Theory of Social Structure.* London, 1957.)

In his historical overview, Szent-Iványi points out that during the 1950s, the father of British structural functionalism (which was at the base of network analysis), A. R. Radcliffe-Brown contributed with his scientific authority *"for the discipline to be born next to other research trends in social anthropology. Radcliffe-Brown stated that »human existence is connected to the complex network of social relationships. Social structure is nothing else but the network of currently valid relationships.« This approach, which became more and more popular, gave a significant stimulus to the research of social networks."*[16]

The theory on complex societies of the well-known American anthropologist **Eric R. Wolf** also influenced the development of network analysis in social anthropology. According to Wolf, *"in complex societies three substantial parallel structures can be observed: kinship, friendship, patron–client relationship; he disputed the view which considers complex society as an orderly anarchy; he argued that all these structures have inherent rules which can be explored."*[17]

## 2.3 Network analysis as an autonomous research method

In the 1970s, the enumerated, predominantly theoretical preliminaries were followed by actual research and methodological studies. In his overview, Scott mentions **J. Clyde Mitchell**,[18] who was interested in the formal features of relationships, among the precursors of network analysis, then presents the activity of **Harrison C. White** and his colleagues, who, influenced by two innovations in mathematics, formulated their findings in two manifesto-like ar-

16 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 2–3. The idea of A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (1881–1955) quoted by Szent-Iványi, according to which social structure is in fact the network of relationships in a certain time, is a frequent statement in the work of the famous English social anthropologist, who was mainly interested in theory and terminological innovation. In his opinion, "the term »social structure« means above all the »continuous network« of social relationships, or »the totality of all social relationships of all individuals in a certain moment«. Thus, he is opposed to the term »social system«, which includes only »the relationships of individuals characterized by a set of similar forms of behaviour«." (See Descola-Lenclud-Severi-Taylor: 1993: 133) Or to quote him: "But **direct observation** does reveal to us that human beings are connected by a complex network of social relations. I use the term »**social structure**« to denote this network of actually existing relations." See A. R. Radcliffe-Brown: 1940: 190.

17 Op. cit. 3. (The referred study: Wolf, Eric R.: *Kinship, friendship and patron-client relations in complex societies.* In: M. Banton (ed.): *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies.* London, 1966.)

18 Hain: n. d.: 9, Iluț: 1997: 117 and Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 3. (The referred study: Mitchell, J. C.: *Social networks in urban situations: Analyses of personal relationships in central African towns.* Manchester, 1969.)

ticles, which described network analysis as a scientific paradigm and as the basic method of social network investigation.[19]

Szent-Iványi lays particular emphasis on the work of the British-Dutch scholar **Jeremy Boissevain**, who "*published his findings along with a theoretical introduction and a methodological guide, almost like a textbook*", on the theoretical interests of **Norman E. Whitten** and **Alin W. Wolfe** in network analysis,[20] and on the bibliography compiled by **Linton C. Freeman**, including almost a thousand articles. *"This bibliography covered all the fields where the method was applied; thus it included references to writings from the fields of political science, sociology, social psychology and economics, as well as studies in social anthropology."*[21]

During this period, social anthropology applied the method of network analysis in an urban environment, with a relatively large specimen; questionnaires and in-depth interviews, used with increasing frequency, pushed into the background common anthropological field research. *"It was **Fischer** and **Jones** who established the theoretical basis and practical application of this new trend, the so-called **assessment method**."*[22] Jeremy Boissevain, *"in one of his comprehensive studies, already draws the conclusion from the application of anthropological network analysis, that the particular significance of this method for anthropologists lies in the fact that it makes possible the examination of developed countries and urban populations."*[23]

In the following decades, network analysis as an autonomous method was applied by many social scientists, thus enriching its theoretical background as well. The literature on the subject mentions, for example, the American sociologist **Mark Granovetter** as a **network theoretician**, who formulated his

19 Iluț: 1997: 118. The first of these two articles described kinship and other types of relationships through algebraic models, attempting to define social role with the method of applied algebra; the second article identified social connections as social distances on a multidimensional scale, thus outlining their place within the social space. (The referred study: White, Harrison C., S. Boorman and R. Breiger: *Social structure from multiple networks*. In: *American Journal of Sociology*. 81. 1976.)

20 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 3. (The referred work: Boissevain, J.: *Friends of friends: networks, manipulators and coalitions*. Oxford, 1974.)

21 Op. cit. 3–4. (The first referred study: Whitten, N. E. – Wolfe, A. W.: *Network analysis*. In: J. J. Honigmann (ed.): *Handbook of social and cultural anthropology*. Chicago: 1973; the second referred writing: Freeman, Linton C.: *A Bibliography of social networks*. Lehigh University, 1975.)

22 Op. cit. 4. (The referred work: Fischer, Claude S. – Jones, L. M.: *Studying egocentric networks by mass survey*. In: *Working paper 284*. University of California, Berkeley, 1978.)

23 Op. cit. 4. (The referred study: Boissevain, J.: *Network analysis: A reappraisal*. In: *Current Anthropology* 20. 1979, 392–394.) Szent-Iványi mentioned that in the 1970s an increasing number of researches were conducted in industrial centres of the most developed countries, instead of the usual research fields of social anthropology.

statements through the investigation of job search.[24] Granovetter noticed the ways how information is gathered and disseminated, distinguished "weak" and "strong" ties in information flow, and studied their durability. He created the model of information flow within social networks, introducing the theory of "**the strength of weak ties**": the so-called "strong ties" established between acquaintances close to each other (e.g. colleagues) presumably carry the same information, while novel and more diversified information can be obtained through occasional, "weak ties", which are more valuable from the point of view of their positioning within the network.[25]

If we take social network analysis as an attempt to give a formal description to social structure, then in its theoretical and methodological development we can track down its effect on the examination of social structure. Both **Barry Wellman** and **Ronald Burt** were prominent theoreticians of network analysis. The former considered the term "structure" as a central category, and used "network" as identification label; the latter viewed structure as a latent construction which can be hardly untied from the network of relationships, transactions, and introduced the term of "structural autonomy".[26]

*"All the fields where the method was applied"* – this allusion of Szent-Iványi refers to the original interdisciplinary feature of network research methods, since from the 1970s a lot of researches using the network analysis method were conducted in many disciplines of social sciences.[27] (The

24 Iluț: 1997: 118–119 and Tardos: 1995: 76. (The referred writing: Granovetter, M. S.: *Getting a Job. Study of Contacts and Careers.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1974.) "The vitality of the paradigm of the network of relationships is also indicated by the strong impact it had on different branches of sociology. The first to be mentioned is the »new sociology of economics«, for which [...] network paradigm was one of the main sources. The birth of the »new sociology of economics« itself is credited to the manifesto-like article of the network theoretician Granovetter (1985), which focused on the social embedment of economy." (Tardos: 1995: 78)

25 Csányi – Szendrői: 2004: 136: "Our human relationships are often established in gatherings, where many people get connected simultaneously: such relationships are those developed at the workplace, in school, or at a sports club. So-called **bridges** may bend between different clumps. In everyday life such a bridge is for example the friendship between two people working at different places. The American sociologist Granovetter noticed the importance of these bridges in information flow, even if bridge-relationships are often much weaker than those existing within a community: an internal gossip spreads rapidly within a community, and becomes tedious, while a news coming from outside might be much more interesting."

26 Tardos: 1995: 76–77.

27 For example Iluț, influenced both by Szent-Iványi and Scott, mentions the elaboration of mathematical models which greatly influenced the methodological development of network analysis. "From the beginning of the '70s, a periodical entitled *Network (An International Journal)* was launched to encourage the debate over mathematical and statistical issues related to network analysis." (Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 4)

present study treats the interdisciplinary feature of network analysis separately, in a different part.)

## 2.4 The institutionalization of social network analysis

The establishment of the **INSNA** (International Network for Social Network Analysis) is considered an important event in the scientific institutionalization of network research.[28] INSNA is *"a non-profit scientific organization founded in 1978 by Barry Wellman in the United States. The organization, gathering scientists engaged in social network analysis, publishes the latest outcomes in its periodical (**Connections**), sponsors the international scientific conference of network research called **Sunbelt**, and issues an electronic newsletter (**Socnet**) for those interested in the field."*[29]

In recent decades, the method of network analysis is taught and applied by many university departments, as well as by research institutes all over the world; a series of specialist volumes, periodicals (besides the aforementioned *Connections*, the other important publication is ***Social Networks***), conferences and symposiums were born, all dealing with the theory of network analysis. The web page of the Social Network Department of the Hungarian Sociological Association, which is the scientific forum of Hungarian network researchers (mainly sociologists, but also economists or even cultural anthropologists) states: *"**Network analysis** is a little bit more than a method, and it is a little bit less than a paradigm. Both its theory and its mathematical-statistical methodology went through a rapid development in the '80 and '90s, they became a scientific fashion. Nowadays, network analysts founded several departments, periodicals and international associations worldwide, their findings are used in many fields of economy and social sciences. Many researchers are engaged in economical and/or social network analysis in Hungary as well."*[30]

## 2.5 Social network analysis: investigation method, paradigm or scientific discipline?

The theoretical background and methodology elaborated in the 1970s, and incorporating a variety of scientific preliminaries, endowed network analysis, already considered to be an autonomous research trend with a particular

28 See more on the INSNA web page: http://www.insna.org.

29 See János Bocz: *SUNBELT XXI – konferenciaismertető (SUNBELT XXI. Presentation of the conference).* In: *Szociológiai Szemle (Sociological Review)* 2001/3: 139–147.

30 See more on the web page of Hungarian network researchers: http://www.socialnetwork.hu.

character, a quite peculiar image. On one hand, this aspect strongly differentiated it from other social research trends and methods; on the other hand, it brought along the possibility of various interpretations in the field of the social sciences.

*"What were the promises, and the theoretical and methodological perspectives that attracted so many social scientists to this trend?"* – asks **Róbert Tardos**. In his view, one of the greatest advantages of network analysis, compared to the traditional "ego-centred, atomic" approach in empiric data collection, is that it opens the way for a multi-levelled analysis. The former *"is blamed with good reason for detaching its subjects from their social environment, and for reducing their determinations to immediate individual attributes."* The application of a network approach, in turn, takes into account the features of the micro-environment and macro-context besides individual attributes, and it *"can assist in the surmounting of the gap which often rigidly separates micro- and macrosociological analysis. Should methods be treated with flexibility, the connections identified on one level can be placed in the relational system of the other level."*[31]

Tardos concludes his study with the following question: *"Can network analysis [...] be considered a coherent theoretic trend [in sociology]?"* He gives the following answer: *"Taking into account the normative demands related to theory construction, for the time being we mostly have initiatives, individual building blocks, and not a unitary construction. We might call it a new paradigm rather as a change in our perspective, than as an elaborate theoretical system. Naturally, the specificity its methodology and technique also distinguishes social network analysis from other approaches in social sciences. However, the critiques pointing to the risk of methodological formalism and self-sufficiency carried by the subtlety of the technical apparatus are not unfounded. A further critical point is that*

31 Tardos: 1995: 74. Tardos emphasizes that this statement "is true even if – as it is in most cases – **snapshots** of networks acquire attributes of a relational network only starting from individual, »ego-centered« data." The study of the sociologist and network analyst Róbert Tardos, besides being a concise overview of the history of network analysis, outlines the theoretical and methodological impacts and perspectives of network analysis pertaining to sociology. He points out that "all this is only a possibility: one could by no means say that the joint enforcement of the micro- and macro-level approach would be characteristic to all network approach." He also states that "the sociological perspectives of the network approach can, in fact, be deduced from the connection of analyses on different levels", and that "related to central issues of sociology, like social structure, stratification and the sociology of mobility, [...] the network approach points at greater social patterns (blocks, structural boundaries, classes) also starting from network data captured on the micro-level." (Op. cit. 1995: 75) Hain writes that "many sociologists consider that the approach itself represents a possibility to surpass the duality often installed between micro- and macro-levels." (Hain: n. d.: 4)

*the fact that the limits of a network can rarely be drawn might become a trap. The flexibility in network analysis may easily turn into blur."*[32]

Although it comes from the field of social anthropology, the conclusion drawn by Szent-Iványi a few years earlier contradicts the quoted view to a certain degree: *"Sceptical or even pessimistic predictions concerning network analysis have not been confirmed; it is certain that this method is in a period of expasion, in a dynamic development. Naturally it would be erroneous to state that network analysis could replace by itself the methods of social science used so far, or that it could offer an explanation to all the questions concerning the operation of society; however, it cannot be doubted that it represents a modern discipline, productive both in terms of its premises and results, within the family of social sciences."*[33]

## 2.6 Social network analysis on the limits of interdisciplinarity

The interdisciplinary character of network analysis is determined as well by its applications in social science research, and not merely by the diversity of its theoretical roots. This applicability is indicated by the extensiveness of the fields of research covered by the method of network analysis. As Tardos points out: *"Without attempting to present in detail the field covered by this research trend, I offer a few examples for the diversity of its applications: internal integration of settlements, neighbourhood and kinships relations, relational networks of different institutions, like the market or public opinion, centre and periphery relationships in world economy, structural positions of the empowered elite, interrelatedness and coalitions of economic and political organizations and parties, or even specific approaches to common topics of sociology, like stratification and mobility."* He also argues that *"the institutionalization of the social network trend does not necessarily mean the formation of a strictly coherent paradigm. Not only the topics, but also the levels of examination are considerably diverse. Besides individuals, groups, organizations, even nations appear as network actors, even if the methodological apparatus ensures a relatively consistent framework for the research."*[34]

32 Tardos: 1995: 79. It is important to note that Tardos treats the social network research trend only within the framework of sociology: "The fact that, when approaching contact fields or structural formations, researchers are interested in network forms and configurations, or that – going beyond the world of networks, and eventually even using network positions as independent variables – they aim at basic issues of sociology, like social stratification, relationships between centre and periphery, social integration or even different vital social problems, marks an important line of demarcation of the trend concerning its content."

33 Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 4.

34 Tardos: 1995: 73.

Tardos treats the diversity of network analysis strictly from the point of view of social sciences, predominantly of sociology.[35] However, in recent years, the natural sciences are taking an increasing interest in the theoretical and methodological outcomes of network analysis, considered hitherto basically a field of sociology and social anthropology. Thus, the increasingly popular network idea infiltrates into different disciplines, as various scientific fields try to answer actual issues. Quoting **Ferenc Hain**: *"The issues cannot be markedly delimited, moreover, the disciplines dealing with them cannot be strictly delimited either. The interdisciplinary feature of the network approach is perhaps also hinted by the fact that [...] there is no issue with a network-related explanation which would not belong to several disciplines. This is due to the fundamental nature of the network approach: because of its methodological predisposition, it does not demand any conceptual or meta-theoretical commitment. In other words, a network researcher explores the connection rules between the constituents of a arbitrarily delimited, and not necessarily closed system, regardless if it is the cell molecules in a metabolism network, prostitutes and their sexual relationship networks, or airports and the flights connecting them. Such exploration lays emphasis on connection itself, on its modality and principles; as such, it is merely a set of orienting guidelines, and it may well offer both a research tool and a common stance for scientists with extremely different attitudes, such as mathematicians, physicists, sociologists and anthropologists."* As a possible starting point for a common stance, he mentions the "common denominator" of Barry Wellman, formulated in five points of "a sociological character":[36]

1. People's behaviour is mostly determined the most by the network of their relationships, and less by their motivations, attitudes or demographic features.
2. Analyses are focused on connections between agents, and not on inherent motivations of the agents.
3. Analysis techniques cannot rely on the traditional view concerning mutual interrelatedness, because that is not a feature, but the very aspect defining a unit or group.
4. A social system is always more than the sum of the relationships constituting it.
5. Generally, groups are not units easy to delimit, but parts of overlapping networks.

35 "The vitality of the relational network paradigm is also shown by the strong impression it had on different branches of sociology." At this point, Tardos mentions the "new sociology of economics", considered one of the main sources of network research. "Beyond the sociology of economics, important impulses came from network, structure and context analysis, towards organizational, political, and even historical sociology." (Op. cit. 79.)

36 Hain: n. d.: 4–5. (The referred work: Wellman, Barry and S. D. Berkowitz (eds.): *Social structures: A network approach*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.)

Besides this common viewpoint, co-authors **Stanley Wasserman** and **Katherine Faust** state that a methodological principle is also indispensable. *"In their view, this specific mathematical orientation (of graph theory, the theory of statistics and probability calculus, algebra) is needed for the treatment of the relational aspect, neglected by the »standard« social science approach. Along the lines of the common viewpoint and methodological orientation, the authors also distinguish metaphorical network thinking from network thinking in its more strict sense."*[37]

Hain's study refers to the book of **Albert-László Barabási** entitled ***Linked***, which brought about a considerable reaction in Hungarian scientific life as well.[38] Barabási aimed at a broad interdisciplinary approach to the "social network" as a research field of sociology. Besides sociology and economy, he gives examples from physics, information science, and cell biology, where, in his view, scientific advancement could be ensured by means of the network analysis; he undertakes to examine the patterns of relational networks, or, as he specifies in the subtitle of this volume, *"how everything is connected to everything else, and what it means for science, business and everyday life."*[39]

Barabási and his research group introduced into network analysis the concept of **scale-free network**. In the mathematical model of Barabási, *"in systems developing uncontrolled, thus naturally, relations are not established accidentally, the newcomers typically connect to previous nodes"*, therefore most of the biological and social networks have a power-law distribution.[40]

37 Op. cit. 5. (The referred work: Wasserman, Stanley and Katherine Faust: *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.)

38 The first edition of the book written by the physicist of Transylvanian origins and living in the United States: Barabási Albert László: *Linked. The New Science of Networks.* Perseus Publishing, Cambridge MA, 2002. The volume is the popular scientific overview of several studies published previously.

39 Letenyei: 2003: 123.

40 Letenyei quotes Barabási in order to define the term "scale-free": "In a random network, the peak of the distribution implies that the vast majority of nodes have the same number of links, and that nodes deviating from the average are extremely rare. Therefore, a random network has a characteristic **scale** in its node connectivity, embodied by the average node and fixed by the peak of the degree distribution. In contrast, the absence of a peak in a power-law degree distribution implies that in a real network there is no such thing as a characteristic node. We see a continuous hierarchy of nodes, spanning from rare hubs to the numerous tiny nodes. The largest hub is closely followed by two or three somewhat smaller hubs, followed by dozens that are even smaller, and so on, eventually arriving at the numerous small nodes.

The power-law distribution thus forces us to abandon the idea of a scale, or a characteristic node. [...] There is no intrinsic scale in these networks. This is the reason for which my research group started to describe networks with power-law degree distribution as **scale-free**." Barabási: op. cit. 70. In mathematics, power function is a continuous function with a single argument, where the base of the power is a variable, and the exponent representing the number of facts is usually a real constant.

The great achievement of Barabási is that, going beyond information sciences, and working together with biologists, physicists and others, he offers an abundance of examples for solving scientific issues can be through scale-free network theory, the examples ranging from the scale-free structure of cells to the issue of the networks of sexual relationships, but also from the world of movies, economy or microelectronics.[41] Besides the discovery of the significance of scale-free networks, Barabási and his team of researchers are also engaged in the description of scale-free networks. Their most important finding refers to the **robustness** of the network, as *"a few busy hubs are able to hold together the system, when most of the system's elements are accidentally destroyed. However, when deliberately attacked, these systems are defenceless: once a few hubs are cancelled, the system may disintegrate. Barabási mentions: »It's good to know this if you're dependent on these networks«; earlier he argued that society and the human body are also scale-free networks."*[42]

Due to the approach of Barabási, who claimed that, *"irrespective of the meaning of connections, everything connects and organizes itself in an identical way within us and around us"*; in fact, *"a large-scale interdisciplinary cooperation becomes possible, where different poles of micro- and macro-level, structural and ego-centred, mathematical and sociological can join together, as different [...] disciplines also do."* Yet, *"besides a few mathematicians or physicists focusing on the organizational algorithms of relations, the statements of Barabási are not supported by anybody. Moreover* – specifies Hain –*, sociologists and anthropologies are interested precisely in the content of relations and their operational possibilities, and in problems related to them."*[43] In his review, **László Letenyei** also expresses a genuine critique, mentioning that Barabási and his research group

41 Letenyei: 2003: 125. Barabási discovered the existence of scale-free networks first through the examination of the World Wide Web, namely of cross-references between web pages (links): "The World Wide Web consists of a few central and many peripheral home pages. This is due to the fact that the Internet itself is a system of uncontrolled growth, where most of the new home pages point to already existing, even widely known, and thus significant home pages." (Op. cit. 125)

42 Op. cit. 126. At this point Letenyei, quotes Barabási again: "Node failures can easily break a network into isolated, noncommunicating fragments. [...] [A] significant fraction of nodes can be randomly removed from any **scale-free network** without its breaking apart. The unsuspected robustness against failures consists in the fact that scale-free networks display a property not shared by random networks. As the Internet, the World Wide Web, the cell, and social networks are known to be scale-free, the results indicate that their well-known resilience to errors is an inherent property of their topology." (Barabási: op. cit. 113.)

43 Hain: n. d.: 5.

refer to only four sociological works in relation to network analysis,[44] and they completely ignore any anthropological aspects, even though, until the turn of the millennium, network analysis was considered the field of sociology and anthropology.[45]

**Gábor Csányi** and **Balázs Szendrői**, who were engaged in issues of sociology and network theory, and debated over the modelling of social network, also emphasize the interdisciplinarity of network analysis.[46] Their study, *"on the borderland between sociology, economics and network science, aims at giving answers through explicit modelling to questions arising in the course of the examination of social relationships, and at exploring the simple, easily describable principles of model networks. A social scientist's most serious objection to such an interdisciplinary research could be that explicit modelling inevitably implies coarse simplification. They can hardly accept the fact that if we model a social system of relationships with points and with a network including the edges linking these points, we do not lose at once the right to formulate statements on real society, namely on people, families, towns. Simplification is not for its own sake, it does not only serve the researcher's comfort, but it carries the possibility of* ***prediction****. If our model is simple enough to preserve its validity in new situations, then we can apply the results of our examinations to other systems which were not studied*

44 One of these (quoted by Barabási as well) is the very expressive sociological and social psychological research, the so-called "small world experiments", conducted by the American sociologist **Stanley Milgram**. Through his experiment, he sought to find out "how thick and unbroken is the network of human relationships, respectively through how many acquaintances might two persons living on two different sides of the world connect to each other" (See Hain: n. d.: 8–9) During Milgram's experiment, "people chosen at random had to send different packages to an unknown addressee through connections. He concluded that the United States with their several hundred thousands of habitants constitute a small world, since packages delivered successfully went through six mediators on average." (Csányi–Szendrői: 2004/7–8: 135) (Today the "six degrees of separation" concept is a widely known, important scientific idea.)

45 Letenyei: 2003: 127–128.

46 Physicist Gábor Csányi and mathematician Balázs Szendrői consider that the beginning of network research is linked to the work of Leonhard Euler (1707–1783), a German mathematician from the 18th century. "It is said that Euler wanted to make a tour of Königsberg, the town where he was living at that time, crossing all its seven bridges exactly once. He translated the problem into an abstract issue so that he represented the regions with points, the bridges linking them with sections, and thus he elaborated the first abstract network in the history of science. Due to this representation, he made sure that the desired path did not exist; in the same time he could determine those types of networks in the case of which this tour was possible (we call these Euler walks). Similar problems, which can be translated simply in network terms, are of great importance even today in various disciplines." (Csányi–Szendrői: 2004/7–8: 134) (It is to be mentioned that the developers of graph theory also relied on Euler's theory.)

*before. What we have here, of course, is a subtle equilibrium: the more simple a model, is the more situations it can be applied to, but the description of the studied system is also the more inaccurate and superficial."* Therefore, *"the significance of the interdisciplinary research work we support lies in the fact that it simplifies the modelling of society more daringly than usual, hoping that this would later lead to useful predictions."*[47]

Thus, according to Csányi and Szendrői, one of the basic aims of "modern network analysis" is to reveal the simple network principles, which are easy to describe, and to classify social networks on the basis of these principles. According to them, the basic research method is the modelling of social network development: *"Using certain simple rules, we generate a model network, and we compare it to the social network we wish to understand. If many of the features of the original and of the model network are the same, one can presume (though it's not a proven fact) that the applied network development rules have a role to play in the development of the examined social network as well."*[48]

The study of Csányi and Szendrői treats **economic** and **commercial networks** separately, as special categories within social networks, *"where the actors can be persons, small communities of persons (villages, settlements), but even large companies or states as well. In the course of history, these networks developed in parallel with other social networks. Their advantage is that they are relatively well documented by letters, contracts and documents, thus their examination is easier."*[49] Finally, as a conclusion, the authors raise again the possibility of prediction, mentioning a few fields where, due to the research of social networks, concrete, precise and useful statements can be formulated. *"Such a field is epidemiology, the science of the spread of infectious diseases, which only recently started to use models explicitly taking into account the network in which*

47 Csányi – Szendrői: 2004/7–8: 133–134.

48 Op. cit. 136.

49 Op. cit. 137. When discussing economic networks, the authors refer to researches conducted by sociologists and anthropologists in the 20th century, and mention as an actual example the product exchange network from the Trobriand Islands described by Malinowski. (It is interesting though that they do not refer to the work of Mark Granovetter, who – as I mentioned before – deduced the birth of the "new sociology of economics" from network research.) They describe the economic relationships within communities on the basis of the economic analysis categories used by Károly Polányi, a historian of economics of Hungarian origins. Such a category is **reciprocity** as a relation type, which means a mutual allotment on the basis of an established system, **redistribution**, when "one of the actors emerges, becomes a hierarchical centre, and the rest of the economic actors exchanges goods through this centre", respectively **market-based trade**, "where independent actors trade in order to obtain benefit". (Op. cit. 138) (See more in Károly Polányi: *Az archaikus társadalom és az archaikus szemlélet / Archaic Society and Archaic Thought.* Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest, 1976.)

*diseases spread. [...] Similar considerations can be applied in the field of marketing, which examines the spread of a product or of a consumer habit. It can be explicitly measured that certain habits are rather influenced by global factors (publicity, media etc.), while others spread through the networks of social acquaintances. Knowing these features, in certain cases one would be able to choose the ideal marketing strategy; respectively one can ascertain the theoretical limits of the speed of the spreading."* However, the authors think that the probably most exciting and (from a practical point of view) most important application trend of network analysis is economics: *"Networks can play an important role in issues of economic theory as well. The central element in today's theoretical paradigm is a homogenous »market«, to which economic actors connect as to an independent entity. In fact (and every economist knows this, of course), the market is not an external entity, but the totality of all the actors, and usually economic actors do not get in contact with the market, but with each other. With adequate data, one can attempt to interpret economic models through the explicit network of actors. In this case, for example, the so-called* ***market efficiency*** *or the lack of it would be deducible from the structure of the network, since an actor can contact only those who are accessible for him in the network."*[50]

Csányi and Szendrői think that network analysis is indispensable for the modelling of the social network as a whole, as well as for a better understanding of society and economy, and they point out that a basic demand for an effective research is interdisciplinarity: *"At present, one of the main obstacles to progress is the lack of data: our investigations use explicit network models, and the accuracy of the models, the checking of the conclusions is possible only in accurately documented networks. Therefore, the most important task is the systematic exploration of various social networks, to which sociologists, epidemiologists, economists, etiologists, media researchers can contribute in their specific fields."*[51]

Summing up the theoretical and methodological potentialities of network analysis, we can say that modern network analysis is characterized by a wide-ranging, increasingly complex interdisciplinarity, absorbing ideas not only from social, but also from natural sciences. Thus, the question is legitimate: can the interdisciplinarity of network analysis extend to ethnographic research, respectively how can ethnographic description use this intricate research method?

50 Op. cit. 138-139.
51 Op. cit. 139.

## 3. Network analysis in ethnographic description

The theoretic diversity of social network analysis and the interdisciplinary feature of its practical application determine the way in which the terms of social network and of the related research method can be described. Different fields within the social sciences (and not only) interpret and use social network analysis according to their specific field.[52] Thus, the question arises: **how can ethnographic collection and description use network analysis, respectively how can network analysis use the method of ethnographic description**? However, before discussing the topic, I deem it necessary to briefly clarify what cultural and social anthropology regards as ethnographic description (mainly according to the structuralist **Claude Lévi-Strauss**), since **ethnographic network analysis** as a method is recently used by anthropology.

According to Lévi-Strauss, ethnography *"corresponds to the first stages in research – observation and description, field work. The typical ethnographical study consists of a monograph dealing with a social group small enough for the author to be able to collect most of his material by personal observation."* He emphasizes that *"ethnography also includes the methods and techniques connected with field work, with the classification, description, and analysis of particular cultural phenomena – whether it be weapons, tools, beliefs, or institutions."* In his view, compared to ethnography, ethnology is the first step towards synthesis, which, *"without excluding direct observation, it leads toward conclusions sufficiently comprehensive to preclude, or almost to preclude, their being based solely on first-hand information"*, while the terms of social or cultural anthropology *"are linked to a second and final stage of the synthesis, based upon ethnographical*

52 In the corresponding introductory chapter of my doctoral thesis, submitted in 2007, I tried to review how different disciplines interpret social network and network analysis method. Thus, I treated in separate paragraphs network analysis in sociology, the basic terms of network analysis, the methodology of sociological network analysis, network analysis in social anthropology, and the modelling, procession and interpretation of social network – see http://doktori.btk.elte.hu/folk/konczei/diss.pdf (in Hungarian). Since I thought (and I still do) that my studies in ethnography and anthropology did not allow me to present in detail the basic principles and methods of sociological and social anthropological network analysis, I did not intend to go into details in my review, my purpose being instead only to outline and compare the sociological and the social anthropological approach to network analysis and its development. But I omit these as well in the present volume, since I did not use these theories and methods in my research, and their presentation is unnecessary from the point of view of the book's topic. Therefore, in the following I content myself with the presentation of the ethnographic approach to social network analysis.

*and ethnological conclusions."* Thus, *"ethnography, ethnology and anthropology are not three separate sciences, or three different conceptions of the same studies. They represent, in fact, three different stages or moments of the same research, and the preference for one concept or the other only expresses the more explicit attention towards one type of studies, which can never exclude the other two."*[53]

**Clifford Geertz** claimed that, *"in anthropology, or at least in social anthropology, what the practitioners are doing is ethnography. And if we understand what ethnography is, or more exactly* ***what doing ethnography is****, then a start can be made towards grasping what anthropological analysis amounts to as a form of knowledge."* He considered that the object of ethnography is "a stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures", and ethnographic description is a "thick description". In his view, *"what the ethnographer is in fact faced with – except when (as, of course, he must do) he is pursuing the routine of data collection – is a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit, and which he must first somehow contrive in order to grasp, and then to render."*[54] (Hereinafter, the present work builds on the quoted views, and treats ethnographic description as the empirical research method, as participant observation and the "thick description" method requiring field work.)

**Robert T. Trotter** discusses two basic approaches to cultural networks in ethnographic network research.[55] One is **the systematic exploration of kin-**

53 Lévi-Strauss: 1963/I: 355-366. In another formulation: "ethnography consists of the observation and analysis of human groups considered as individual entities (the groups are often selected, for theoretical and practical reasons unrelated to the nature of the research involved, from those societies that differ most from our own). Ethnography thus aims at recording as accurately as possible the respective modes of lives of various groups. Ethnology, on the other hand, utilizes for comparative purposes (the nature of which will be explained below) the data provided by the ethnographer. Thus, **ethnography** has the same meaning in all countries, and **ethnology** corresponds approximately to what is known in Anglo-Saxon countries – where the term **ethnology** has become obsolete – as social or cultural anthropology. Social anthropology is devoted especially to the study of institutions considered as systems of representations, while cultural anthropology deals with the study of techniques which implement social life (and sometimes also with to the study of institutions considered as such techniques)." Lévi-Strauss: 1963/I: 2-3.

54 See in detail: Geertz: 1973: 3-32. (The referred study: *Thick Description. Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture*)

55 Trotter: 1999:1-55. In fact, Trotter presents ethnographic network analysis through a case study. By applying the analysis method, he identifies different drug-using networks, and highlights how the different backgrounds and aims of these networks can influence the behaviour of the members. Trotter notes that although the case study belongs to the field of medical anthropology, the analysis method and technique used and presented by him can be applied in any other type of social network analysis.

**ship groups**, while the other is **the ethnographic exploration of social networks**. The results of the former were best summarized by **B. Pasternak**, who, on the basis of genealogical relationships within different cultures, laid down the methods for collecting and comparing data during ethnographic network research. The methodology of ethnographic network exploration was spelled out by the aforementioned Elisabeth Bott, who, on the basis of her research conducted in England, provided an in-depth exploration of the intimate relationships and of the operation of the networks which most people use to support their culture. Bott also outlined a model through which these relationships can be studied across cultures as well.[56]

Trotter points out that the applications of social network analysis to ethnographic description can be various, ranging from purely qualitative descriptions to highly technical and quantitative models derived from graph theory and matrix algebra. These approaches are compatible with each other, and they all offer valuable insights into human cultures. In combination, they provide a powerful explanation for the ways in which humans think, act, and organize their daily lives within their personal cultural context. In Trotter's view, the three primary contemporary approaches to networks are the following:[57]

1. the ethnographic exploration of social networks,
2. the investigation of ego-centred (single-person-focused) networks, and
3. the collection of data on full relational networks, i.e. the description of every relationship between all the members of the network.

---

He lists several examples, such as the implementation of educational innovations, shifts in voting behaviour, or diffusion of health care information in a community, or even the restructuring of bureaucratic institutions. At the same time, Trotter is committed to activist research, which has an effect on the studied social environment, and he considers social network analysis as particularly useful for research programs which aim at intervention in social processes (for example, when the aim is to induce change in a group's behaviour). He regards network analysis methods as efficient tools for intervention, since, if we can get to know and describe a naturally existing network through these methods, then, due to this knowledge, the network becomes controllable. See in detail Trotter: 1999: 43.

56 Op. cit. 3. Trotter regards these two basic and representative works as the starting points in ethnographic network analysis, which allowed anthropologists to develop increasingly finely tuned examinations of both informal and formal human groups and associations. In his view, these works allowed us to expand our knowledge of the dynamics and effects of both kinship and nonkinship networks, in all aspects of human cultures. (The referred studies: Pasternak, B.: *Introduction to kinship and social organization.* Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1976 and Bott, E.: *Family and social network: Roles, norms, and external relationships in ordinary urban families.* Tavistock, London, 1971.)

57 Op. cit. 3-4.

In Trotter's definition, **ethnographic network mapping** uses ethnographic field research methods in order to describe the most common groups found in a culture. Thus, he considers that ethnographic network mapping is a type of network research through which one can describe family, kinship and friendship networks, work groups, voluntary associations, problem-solving groups, or any other types of social groups that are found in different cultures. The applied research method consists in extensive, qualitative interviewing at the community level, combined with observations of people's behaviour. Using ethnographic description, typologies and classifications can be set up, and the extension in time and space of a network (for example over generations) can also be studied.[58]

According to Trotter, ethnographic description of social and cultural networks can be accomplished in almost all areas of life. These investigations include a few important common features, like the following:[59]

1. Defining the boundaries and core participants of the examined social groups;
2. creating network typologies that explain the variation in people's life experiences;
3. studying embedded behaviours in case of specific groups;
4. exploring cross-groups differences in the cultural behaviour of networks.

Trotter compiles the list of steps for an ethnographic network study; these are the following:[60]

- identify the "neighbourhoods" or geographic areas where the research will be conducted;
- familiarize yourself with the local jargon and terminology of groups from local experts;
- identify individuals who are members of the groups;
- during field work, develop a close and trusting relationship with the examined persons;

58 Op. cit. 4-5.

59 Op. cit. 8.

60 Op. cit. 17-18. At the end of his study, Trotter enumerates the advantages of ethnographic network approaches, through which, for example, hidden populations can be identified and assessed, or one can understand social influences on the lives, decisions and behaviours of individuals etc. At the same time, his assessment of these advantages reflects his attitude of an activist, interventionist researcher (for example recruiting, retaining and following up of group members, who would become parts of the intervention, or enhancing the efficacy of behavioural intervention etc.). In my opinion, this sets him against anthropological research carried out from the natives' point of view, in which ethical issues concerning data providers are raised, analyzed and explained. (Op. cit. 42.)

- use interviewing and participant observation techniques to gather information about them, their group, their activities, and the relationships between group members;
- interview as many members as possible, in order to find out their views on their own group, activities and relationships, and also to find out whether these views are similar to each other. This helps to define inclusion/exclusion rules, the group boundaries, bridges, bonds, group activities, and relationships with other groups.
- continue this work with other named otherwise or identified groups;
- systematically compare and contrast groups using continuous comparison, in order to identify structural characteristics or differences, boundaries, and patterns of behaviour within the group.
- use either qualitative or quantitative (survey) methods to associate network characteristics with other, specific behaviours of group members (e.g. educational achievement, social mobility etc.).

Trotter's study has a separate part for presenting the terminology of ethnographic network research. In ethnographic network approach, **boundaries** constitute the edges of networks. These are defined by entry and exit rules as well as by the cultural patterns of the members of the network, which differentiate one group from the other. **Bounded groups** are networks which have clearly defined membership. **Bridges** are people or organizations that connect different networks. The **openness/closedness of networks** refers to the number of new members recruited during a designated time period. The term **social bond** refers to the relationship between the ego and other members of the network; these bonds may be multiple and weak, or limited and strong. Finally, **social interactions** refer to activities in which network members participate together.[61]

## 4. Overview of the research methods related to the topic

This study aims at finding an adequate, coherent and applicable research method to the description and interpretation of the 20th century social and cultural network of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg. In order to describe such a method, it seems necessary, beyond the theoretical and methodological approaches to network ethnography, to answer a few questions from the field of social sciences which come up in the course of the actual analysis.

61 See in detail op. cit. 8-11.

## 4.1 The applicability of social network analysis in a historical context

What types of network approach and methods can be applied, if the members of the examined social network are deceased, or only some members of it are living? When data collection consists not only of empirical field work, sampling, questionnaire, in-depth interviewing or participant observation, but it includes the exploration of historic documents, the browsing of archives and public records as well? And, above all, when analysis has at its disposal almost exclusively historical sources?

While exploring the present topic, the 20th century social and cultural network of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg playing *traditional* (the emphasis on tradition bears a special importance) instrumental folk music, I was intensely confronted with the historical dimension of both a remote and a recent past. I do not solely refer to the fact that most of the members of the examined community (network) were not alive at the moment when research was initiated, or that they passed away in recent years; it became questionable whether the temporal limitation mentioned by Szent-Iványi[62] can be achieved in the case of a network which, in a way, at the moment of its modelling, exists only in people's remembrance.

To sum up: **is it possible to employ social network analysis in a historical context**? In order to be able to answer the question, the introduction of a social history discipline and of a historical demography method seems necessary.[63]

62 Since the number of possible bonds in a social network cannot be determined or rendered operational for the purpose of research, most accomplished researches apply some sort of limitation. Thus, social anthropology network analysis increasingly adopts the concept of partial network analysis instead of the total networks of social relations. Szent-Iványi mentions that "in a full network analysis, the most frequent method of limitation is to record only those bonds which were established during the research, making sure that every transaction and activated relationship of this period is registered. This limitation method underwent many methodological critiques, since by its use one can only get an authentic image from a restricted period, and it is not possible to clarify the connection between the relationships observed at that very moment and the full relational network of the ego; in other words, usually we find out not much on the particular case, but substantially more on how networks operate." (Szent-Iványi: n. d.: 5)

63 I would like to mention that the historical dimension in the research of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg includes both the historiography of Transylvanian Gypsy musicians, as well as the investigation of the musical history aspects of the musical tradition they performed. The ensuing data and results can be useful and relevant in the description of the given social and cultural network.

Among the social sciences engaged in historical dimensions, it is **historical anthropology** which *"aims at applying interpretations of culture on historical materials. Consequently, it views culture and the forms of cultural manifestations not only as a system of norms, values and actions, but also as the context of social experiences and actions, as the expression of social relations and practices."*[64] Thus, historical anthropology takes into consideration relations between social conditions as well, and therefore, it may "reconstruct" a relational network belonging to the past. **Peter Burke** considers that the method of historical anthropology is **deliberately qualitative**, **concentrates on specific cases**, is of a **microscopic** character, thus **it focuses on small communities**, and it **concentrates on the thick description** elaborated by Geertz, the authors offering *"the interpretation of social interaction in a given society in terms of that society's own norms and categories."*[65] I think that these characteristics of historical anthropology are to be found in the methodology of social network ethnography as well, thus the methodological interconnection ensures an adequate basis for network analysis of historical sources.

Furthermore, in the subsequent identification of the members and relationships of a network from (or supposed to have existed in) the past, the **family reconstitution method** of historical demography seems to be suitable. **Genealogy**, i.e. the exploration of family trees, might lead to considerable results; in fact, the method of family reconstitution, which explores birth registers in a much more complex manner than simply sorting out annual data, is based precisely on genealogy, as in many cases the registers of marriages, baptisms and deaths prove to be the most detailed data sources in the deduction of social relationships.

According to **Rudolf Andorka**, the main point in family reconstitution is that *"data referring to a family is gathered from the register of births, and due to the resulting family history, very specific demographic rates can be calculated."*[66] Therefore, of all historical demographic sources and methods, with the **family reconstitution method** *"one can determine the most accurate rates, and pro-*

64 Sebők: 2000: 8. (On the subject of historical anthropology see Gábor Klaniczay: *A történeti antropológia tárgya, módszerei és első eredményei / The Subject, Methods, and First Results of Historical Anthropology.* In: Hofer Tamás (ed.): *Történeti antropológia / Historical Anthropology.* Budapest, 1984: 23–60.)

65 Burke: 1987: 3.

66 Andorka: 1988: 13. He continues as follows: "Due to its arduous nature, the application of the family reconstitution method on the population of an entire country is impossible. There are two possibilities: 1. a chosen register of births is processed, 2. a pattern of families is chosen from a larger number of registers, and only data referring to these families are gathered to be processed."

*vide the most thorough analysis – notwithstanding that on smaller populations."*[67] Since on the grounds of these accurate rates one can deduce, in some cases, data referring to past networks, these can be regarded as the basic sources of social network analysis as well.

## 4.2 An outlook upon the methodological and theoretical backgrounds of a similar research

All research requires familiarity with the literature on investigations similar to its topic, which can also serve as a basis of comparison. Hitherto, I have found a single writing in Hungarian on the relational networks of Gypsy musicians: the study of **Ágnes Békési**, entitled ***Socialization strategies and relational network of Gypsy musician families in Hungary***.[68]

Békési also uses several social scientific resources when elaborating the methodological and theoretical background of her study, since her *"aim is to find out »how they organize their existence, and how they give sense to the surrounding world«."*[69] She continues: *"This is an anthropologic issue, and in this sense my work belongs to anthropology as well. From the tools of sociology I employed interviewing, the compilation of family monographs (see Péter Somlai: Családmonográfiák / Family monographs. Szociológiai Füzetek 1987), and participant observation,*[70] *but I gave up the attitude of the neutral observant. In addition, I used those family documents, photographs, and publications concerning certain musician dynasties, which were put at my disposal by my interviewees."*[71] Békési

67 Op. cit. 14.

68 Békési: 2002. In her study, Békési examines the socialization strategies and relationships of the *romungro*, that is "Hungarian Gypsy" musician families from Hungary playing traditional café and restaurant Gypsy music.

69 Békési quotes from the introduction of Zonabend, see Descola – Lenclud – Severi – Taylor: 1993: 6.

70 At this point, Békési quotes Earl Babbie: "The participant observer identifies himself as a researcher, enters in the common practice, and does not pretend to be a participant." See Earl Babbie: *A társadalomtudományi kutatás gyakorlata / The Practice of Social Research.* Balassi Kiadó, Budapest, 1995: 309.

71 Békési: 2003: 4. In the same paragraph, Békési describes the methodological complexity of her research in the following way: "above all, I was interested in what happens to those who are compelled to give up the tradition of restaurant music. I could reach them only through personal contact. They surely would not have answered to questionnaires, and they wouldn't have let in interviewers either. I could start my work only using the research methods of ethnology and cultural anthropology, although I am aware that these methods have significant epistemological barriers. My data cannot be confirmed by statistics, and my observations are disputable. However, in my opinion, these methods are suitable for the mapping of those subtle fissures and new trends that I was confronted with. It is their very complex nature which renders them adequate for the exploration of a series of intricate phenomena."

gives an overview of the studies concerning the culture and socialization of Gypsies published in the past few decades; thus, the literature she used includes various works, sociological, demographic and statistical studies, works from linguistics, ethnography and anthropology, as well as autobiographical and documentary literary works, and even newspaper articles about Gypsies. However, her work lacks any explanation, description or definition of the term "relational network", included in the title. (I also have to mention that the study of Békési does not contain any reference to social network analysis, and she presumably did not examine the targeted community as a network.)

However, I also think that the social researcher attitude of Békési is remarkable from the point of view of my topic: *"What would be the guiding principle along which I could interpret the observations I made in the musician community? How can I arrange these into an »unbiased« argument, what are the presumptions I would like to follow, and how would I like to adopt them? After long speculation, I concluded that I am able to interpret my impressions in a single way: if I assume the perspective from which the musician families see the world, including myself, the outsider. Naturally, this identification is always limited, but this was the only possible starting point."*[72]

The thoughts and paragraphs of the quoted study by Ágnes Békési can be found in her volume entitled *Musicians*, which sums up her research on *romungro* Gypsy musicians from Hungary, playing mainly café, that is "Gypsy" music; thus, her quoted study can be regarded as a preparatory study to her book.[73] Though she does not discuss networks in this volume either, she raises several issues – like tradition passed on through generations, family bands and the ensuing socialization, or mobility – which in my view are of general relevance, and therefore come up during the examination of traditional Gypsy musician communities, like the Gypsy musician communities from Kalotaszeg.

## 4.3 Ensuing questions

When writing my PhD thesis, I was looking for a suitable research method through the presentation of the theoretical and methodological approaches of the very complex approach of social network analysis. Then the following questions came up: is it possible to create an adequate and coherent research

72 Op. cit. 4.

73 Békési: 2003. In her book, she attempts to give a brief overview of the Gypsy musician society of Hungary, to present the recent past and the present of Gypsy music and Gypsy musicians. She wrote separate chapters on the traditions of musician generations (touching upon the issues of family bands and bow duels), on education or socialization, on gender roles in Gypsy musician families, and on spatial and workplace mobility.

methodology, that would be applicable to the topic I was to explore, among the various theoretical and methodological approaches in social network analysis? And if it is possible, should that method be built exclusively on the method of ethnographic network analysis, or should we take into account other approaches to network analysis within the social sciences? In fact, to what extent can network analysis be regarded as a unitary method of social science (or natural science?), and to what extent does interdisciplinarity determine an actual case of network analysis? To what degree is the dimension of historicity determinative? At that time, I entrusted the answer to the enumerated questions to the dissertation itself, in the belief that the expounding of the aforementioned two series of suppositions would answer these questions, and it would also provide a definition of the research method I had used.

Now I can see that this was not achieved, or it was achieved partially. The present work does not see the network of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg as an abstract, theoretical model derived from sociology or social anthropology, and therefore it does not carry out a network analysis in the standard sense, i.e. it does not model or make use of their practical methods. In my case, network analysis (or, actually, its ethnographic approach) offers a starting point for a historical and ethnographic ("thick") description. Presumably, it would be considerably difficult to carry out a genuine network analysis, on one hand, because currently the outlined network itself is only a historical, projected network, on the other hand, because that network is much to intricate, thus a uniform analysis method would not be sufficient for its apprehension and interpretation. Therefore, my work cannot be regarded as a "genuine" network analysis, but rather as a network sketch, which serves as the theoretical framework to an empirical research in which the "personal experience" of the researcher prevails.

1. Berczi Eötvös and his band from Nagyalmás (Váralmás). Photo taken in Jegenyefürdő, in around 1892

# II. The "nameless" musicians. Historical overview of the activity of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg during the 20th century

> *"The ability to bestow meanings – to »name« things, acts, and ideas – is a source of power. Control of communication allows the managers of ideology to lay down the categories through which reality is to be perceived. Conversely, this entails the ability to deny the existence of alternative categories, to assign them to the realm of disorder and chaos, to render them socially and symbolically invisible."*
>
> (Eric R. Wolf)[1]

In the assessment of the social and cultural network of Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg, the time and space coordinates of topic definition, the questions (and doubts) came up during data collection, source review and field work, respectively the ensuing methodological particularities confront the researcher with issues pointing far beyond the actual network analysis. The first and fundamental question is already such an issue:

## 1. Who are the Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg?

Before I attempt to sum up and define, on the basis of the available data, who the Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg were in the last century, it is necessary to elucidate two terms included in the subtitle: who is a Gypsy musician, respectively who counts as a local of Kalotaszeg?

### 1.1 The rural Gypsy musician in Hungarian ethnomusicology

This volume does not wish to deal with the origins and history of Gypsies. I assume the researcher attitude of **Michael Stewart** according to which:

1 Wolf: 1997: 388.

"I treat Gypsies neither as harbingers of a new order nor as remnants of an old but as part of the world they live in."[2] However, I find it necessary to give a brief presentation of the knowledge and views about rural Gypsy musicians in Hungarian ethnomusicology, especially since this very point of view within ethnomusicology governs (as we will see) the way in which Gypsy musicians are seen in social sciences in general, and especially in ethnography.[3]

In a general work on Hungarian instrumental folk music, **Bálint Sárosi** states that "*up to the present, our way of thinking about Hungarian instrumental folk music is determined in the main by the views of Bartók and Kodály.*"[4] Indeed, the thoughts of Bartók and Kodály have influenced and directed the ethnomusicology of the last century's instrumental folk music to a great extent. Just to give some examples of such views: "*The origins of all music lay in vocal music, which was the sole expression of the musical feelings of mankind for a long time. Its role is disproportionately larger than that of instrumental music in folk music even today.*"[5] And: "*Naturally, only the music performed on a popular instrument by peasants is of any interest for us.*"[6] The statement of Kodály, which was repeatedly refuted: "*The Hungarian nation does not really prefer instruments. Relatively few people play any instrument: lower classes rather have someone play for them, instead of playing themselves. Therefore, compared to the richness of our vocal folk music, we don't have much instrumental music.*"[7]

Besides pointing out the priority of vocal music, and valuing the "popular", although "rare", instrumental music of rural origins, when **Béla Bartók** and **Zoltán Kodály** became acquainted with the activity of rural Gypsy musicians, they tried to determine the place and role of Gypsy musicians within the

2 Stewart 1988: 9.

3 The Hungarian ethnographic literature publishes few data on the social and cultural life of Gypsy musicians performing traditional instrumental folk music. Moreover, most of this data is indirect, and can be regarded as supplementary information to a specific musical data collection. Thus far, Hungarian ethnomusicology treated Gypsy musicians first of all as professional rural folk musicians, or the performers of the urban café music known as "Gypsy music". During the past few decades, research was extended to the traditional musical culture of Gypsy communities.

4 Sárosi: 1996: 5.

5 Bartók: 1911: 59.

6 Béla Bartók: op. cit. 60. At this point, Bartók states accurately what he means: "Popular instruments are generally those which are made by the peasants themselves in villages, without imitating any artificial, manufactured instrument (e.g. flute, violin), or which are the direct descendants of such instruments made in villages (e.g. the jaw harp, which today is manufactured in factories) – contrary to the accordion, the clarinet, the instruments of the brass band etc." Op. cit. 60.

7 Kodály: 1943: 57.

Hungarian instrumental musical culture, and to elucidate the controversial issue of Gypsy music versus Hungarian music.[8] "*Only later, some two hundred years ago, Gypsies gradually became the experts of popular music. Nowadays, and with only a few exceptions, the musicians of Hungarian villages are Gypsies*" – says Bartók, emphasizing that "*these rural musicians mainly play rustic repertoires in a rustical manner, as opposed to urban Gypsy musicians.*"[9] Kodály also comments on them as being on the margins of rural and urban cultures: "*It is a controversial issue whether the music played by Gypsies counts for folk music. The ethnographic value of the Gypsy musician is precisely what he knows besides the urban songs and dance music. When he plays the songs of the people, he falls within our field of interest. In addition to this, especially in Transylvania, Gypsies play a lot of dance music of so far unknown origins.*[10] *People do dance to this music, but they neither sing, nor play it. Therefore its sole origin is Gypsy music.*"[11]

8 It is important to note that Bartók and Kodály already distinguished so-called instrumental "Gypsy music" from Gypsy folk music: "For there is real Gypsy music too: songs with lyrics in Romani, but only Gypsies who are not musicians, and live in villages, know and sing these; Gypsy musicians never play these in public; what they do play are the compositions of Hungarian composers, and so it is **Hungarian music**." Bartók: 1931: 639. "1) Gypsies are not composers, only performers. 2) The musicians don't play their own folk music, they don't even know it anymore. 3) They chose from the Hungarian popular tradition only the superficial; the real, ancient layer is foreign to them. 4) Most of their repertoire is the creation of entirely or partly dilettante Hungarian composers, who mainly composed dance music without lyrics, and only some popular songs with lyrics." [Written on the blank papers and between the printed texts of an invitation to a concert held on the 10th of May 1964.] Kodály: 1993: 75.

9 Bartók: 1933: 374. In his previous writings, Bartók gives the following formulation of the same issue: "But even the **Gypsy playing style** is not uniform. The simplest rural Gypsy musician plays in a totally different manner than Gypsy musicians of urban bands." Bartók: 1931: 639. "We have data on the musician role of Gypsies only from the 18th century, but the percentage of musicians is fairly low among them; according to statistical data only 6 percent of our Gypsies are musicians, moreover, Gypsy musicians don't have a uniform repertoire or playing style. In remote villages, they play the same repertoire, in the same manner, as the local rural musicians (that is, rustic music). But as we approach cultural centres, the playing style of the Gypsies changes, and in towns the folksy popular songs become dominant in their repertoire, the well-known unrestrained style prevails, which is known as »Gypsy music«." Bartók: 1932: 369.

10 The allusion of Kodály, calling attention to Gypsy musicians from Transylvania, did produce an effect. In the 1940s, it served as a basis for the field research of Pál Járdányi conducted in Kide, and that of László Lajtha, carried out in Szék, Szépkenyerűszentmárton and Kőrispatak.

11 Kodály: 1943: 57. The following concise note expresses clearly the view of Kodály on the playing style of Gypsies: "One couldn't think of a greater difference between two nations than the difference between Hungarians and Gypsies. Language, character, racial aptitudes. Yet, Gypsies could serve Hungarian music to a certain extent." Kodály: 1993: 217.

In other words, both Bartók and Kodály considered that only those Gypsy musicians are valuable and authentic providers of information for ethnographical studies, who perform in villages, and who follow and preserve exclusively the vernacular tradition in their style and repertoire.[12] In the view of their generation of researchers, instrumental music and the musician profession linked to it did not belong to the vernacular tradition.[13] Sárosi summarizes the scientific doubts of the generation of Bartók and Kodály in the following manner: "*How could this music be the authentic representative of popular tradition, considering that, due to their social position, occupation and lifestyle, its professional performers themselves surpass more or less their environment? They don't play music as a spontaneous manifestation or as a traditional custom compulsory for all, but for remuneration. If they have the possibility, they provide their services for several people and different social layers. They are keen to adapt to external fashions.*"[14] Sárosi too mentions that "*it was János Seprődi (1874–1923), the immediate predecessor thrust unfairly into the background among the great pioneers of modern Hungarian ethnomusicology, who regarded instrumental dance music played by professional musicians as an organic part of the vernacular musical tradition, and who collected and studied it accordingly.*"[15] However, the methodical and systematic collection of the repertoire played by professional rural musicians can be linked to **László Lajtha**. He not only collected music, but also provided

12 It is thought-provoking that researchers who studied folk music thoroughly in its spatial and historical aspects, and thus could be thoroughly familiar with its complexity, tried to deal with the issue of Gypsy musicians in terms of such simple (rural and urban) units of culture.

13 "It is a separate matter whether the musicians could make their living from these fees. It seems that in somewhat primitive conditions they never could. In 1912, I was a witness myself when a well-off Szekler farmer hired the Gypsy, the only musician in Kászonfeltíz, a village of ten thousand inhabitants, for the wedding of his son. That sole violinist had to play twenty-four hours in return of food and drink, scarves, and five forints. Of course, he couldn't live on that. Basically, he was a blacksmith, he was called off from the anvil then too. Such modesty – of both sides – might be surprising, for people commonly imagine that even the smallest village has a Gypsy band of several musicians. We have to acknowledge that even in the 1880s, in many wealthy weddings, people were content with bagpipes (Garamvölgy, Félegyháza). In those times, Gypsy musicians were settled rather in the vicinity of towns and country towns. It was due to the increasingly extravagant mentality of simple people that they arrived to small villages, where they had never been before. With the spreading of the Gypsy population, the musical diversity of people also became increasingly limited." Kodály: 1943: 58.

14 Sárosi: 1996: 5.

15 Op. cit. 5.

a theoretical expression for his important observations:[16] "*Folk music, real folk music transmitted from generation to generation is the music consumed by the folk themselves. Thus, it is them, namely the folk, who preserve tradition, and who perform this preserved music. This kind of music cannot be separated from the folk's life, customs, beliefs, poetry, and it is only an important part of the greater whole called ethnology; the research of this music is called ethnomusicology. In addition to this stage we can find folk music which is not performed by the folk, but by professionals. In this case, the role of the folk is not that of the primary, instinctual performers. They do take part in playing music, whether this is connected to folk customs, to dance, or is an accompaniment to singing, whether it is linked to ancient beliefs or more modern entertainment; but they hand over the most important role, that of performing, to professionals. Their controlling role might be essential, but in many cases this role becomes insignificant. Often, the professional preserves tradition better – as they play it – than the social class called the folk, who are only listeners or participants.*"[17] Lajtha was perhaps the first to point out that "*Gypsies represent only a part of this popular professionalism. [...] Formerly not all Gypsies of Hungary were violinists. Fortresses and towns hired them as trumpeters as well. Neither were they the only violinists, as we know that Jewish violinists came to Hungary from Galicia, and up to the end of the 19th century there existed Jewish bands with the same composition as that of Gypsy bands. In some smaller villages there isn't any Gypsy band, but a Hungarian band. These Hungarian bands play the same, in the same style as Gypsy bands.*"[18]

16 Contrary to the statement of Sárosi, according to which Lajtha "did not undertake the analysis of his notes on instrumental music and to elucidate the matters of principle of instrumental folk music." Op. cit. 6.

17 Lajtha: 1962: 150. In his opinion, "it is still not clarified when, how long ago, or in what primitive societies professionalism started to grow within folk music. Moreover, the issue itself was raised only recently. [...] In many cases the term professionalism must be extended to the singing and music playing of priests, sorcerers, shamans, healers of primitive social classes, as the community does not participate in these either. We can see now that the essence of the problem must be located at the point when a community mandates a certain type of music to people destined to perform it, namely to professionals." Op. cit. 151.

18 Op. cit. 151. Lajtha too stresses that research has to distinguish urban and rural Gypsy musicians, since "one cannot say that Gypsy bands are all the same. Their repertoire and playing style is very different. Let me remind you that the Gypsy performer's repertoire and playing style depend on the taste of the social class he plays for. Gypsies playing in town restaurants, who in most cases can read music, differ quite much from small rural bands – the latter can't even read music, and used to play in remote villages for peasants who not so long ago couldn't even really read or write. Therefore, today's urban Gypsy bands must be distinguished from rural ones." Op. cit. 151.

The work of Bálint Sárosi builds upon and outgrows precisely this tradition within ethnomusicology. He realized that, "*due to the development of research on instrumental folk music, it has become more and more necessary to determine in detail the social position and role of the musicians. Through the closer examination of the role of the musicians, some features of the music they play became clearer, thus we can find better answers to strictly musical issues. In many places – in Hungary in particular – the conviction took root that the product of the professional musician has an inferior value in folk music, therefore it deserves less attention from the researcher.*"[19] Due to this reduced attention, musical criteria almost exclusively prevail in the chapters dealing with instrumental music within general works of the past decades, and scientists were primarily interested in "folk" instruments and music played with such instruments, hardly examining the personality of the performers.[20]

Nevertheless, "*what do we know about the history of rural Gypsy musicians, and their settling down in villages?"* The question is raised by Sárosi, who also answers it: "*Historically, we know relatively little, incomparably less than we know about Gypsy musicians playing for aristocrats.*"[21] Since, while we have a considerable amount of documents on the activity of the latter, research could rely only on very sparse data until the folk music collection conducted in the 20$^{th}$ century. In order to quote Sárosi again: "*Concerning Gypsy musicians, we know that their infiltration into Hungarian folk music is the result of a long historical process lasting until the present. Their style, their repertoire – similarly to that of Gypsy musicians working in other countries – gained its present features by adapting to local tradition and to local needs. They came from the south-east and, according to historical documents, in the 16$^{th}$ and 17$^{th}$ centuries, very few of them settled in Hungary. Even during the 17$^{th}$ and 18$^{th}$ centuries, we have information on their limited presence in the entourage of important aristocrats. In the larger part of the Hungarian language area, their importance in the musical life of peasantry began to grow mainly in the second part of the 19$^{th}$ century.*"[22] According to the sparse data available, this spread of influence presumably started in fairs and inns, and only later Gypsy musicians started to play at different celebrations and dance events. "*Thus, after a while, in some places where they were more*

19 Sárosi: 1980: 75.

20 See Lajos Vargyas: *A magyarság népzenéje (The Folk Music of Hungarians).* Budapest, 1981; and *Magyar népzene (Hungarian Folk Music).* In: Tekla Dömötör (ed.): *Magyar Néprajz VI. (Hungarian Ethnography VI)* Budapest, 1990: 5–183; or the work of Katalin Paksa, in: *Magyar népzenetörténet (The History of Hungarian Folk Music).* Budapest, 1999.

21 Sárosi: 1971: 185.

22 Sárosi: 1980: 75–76.

*often requested, those who were engaged exclusively in music may have settled down, and gradually they became the true experts, preservers and developers of the musical tradition."*[23] (It is important to note that Gypsy musicians playing for aristocrats, and later in an urban and middleclass environment, cannot be neatly separated, either in the past, or in the present, from Gypsy musicians serving rural traditions. "*There are many transitions, connections, interactions between them. They have the same roots."*[24])

Who are the rural Gypsy musicians then? Today's Hungarian ethnomusicology tries to define them as professional rural musicians, considering ethnic features to be secondary.[25] According to Sárosi, for today, the assimilation of Gypsy musicians "*is accomplished to such an extent that musicians of Hungarian villages are considered Hungarian folk musicians with good reason. The designation »Gypsy musician« implies a professional differentiation rather than designating the ethnic origins of the musicians."*[26] Therefore, "*when talking about the performers of instrumental Hungarian folk music, we can distinguish Gypsy musicians and rural musicians in general. The denomination »Gypsy musician« refers also to the fact that they are professionals; while the expression »rural musician« means – with a very few exceptions – semi-professional or amateur."*[27] The identification of the professional rural musician as "Gypsy musician" is tied up with the issue of the social segregation of Gypsies, since, "*until our present century, professional entertainment – including professional entertainment music – was an occupation unworthy of a decent person, despised all across Europe, and especially in our coun-*

23 Sárosi: 1971: 187.
24 Op. cit. 187.
25 This is perhaps also due to the fact that, irrelevant of the ethnicity of rural Gypsy musicians playing traditional dance music, "it is out of the question that this music would be of Gypsy origins. This is folk music too, it's just that people do not sing, but dance to it." Op. cit. 183.
26 Sárosi: 1980: 76.
27 Op. cit. 75. In the "instrumental folk music" article of *the Hungarian Ethnographic Encyclopaedia*, Sárosi writes: "One can clearly distinguish two great layers in Hungarian instrumental folk music, at least in its state in the present century. One is performed by amateur or, at best, semi-professional peasants, the other mainly by semi-professional or professional Gypsy musicians. [...] Today, the active guardians and performers of the instrumental tradition are, generally speaking, the Gypsy musicians. Within the framework of tradition, they represent, as opposed to the superannuated rural instrumental music, the »modern« instrumental folk music generally accepted as high-class. [...] Thus, the music of rural Gypsy musicians is part of the Hungarian folk music tradition. Usually, the string bands, founded in a large number from the turn of the century onwards, consider Gypsy bands as models to be followed." See *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon II. / Encyclopaedia of Hungarian Ethnography* (Ed. by Ortutay Gyula) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1979: 460–461. Hereinafter referred to as: MNL II.

*try. Partly, this is the reason why professionally performing instrumental folk music became the occupation of Gypsy musicians; as a consequence, they became the main inheritors and disseminators of the former vivid Hungarian instrumental tradition as well."*[28] Nevertheless, scholarly literature gradually drops the indication of ethnicity, including the very accurate definition of the professional rural musician status supplied by **István Pávai**, which I accept as well: "*The expert performers of folk dance music, the professional rural folk musicians have a distinct place on the social scale of a village. Every instrumentalist who is regularly hired by a rural community in return of a fee, even if this is not the musician's sole income, can be regarded a professional folk musician."*[29]

However, in my opinion, the issue is much more complex. My own research and field experience indicate that besides professionalism, ethnic differentiation did and does have a role to play in the assessment of rural Gypsy musicians.

## 1.2 Who counts as a local of Kalotaszeg?

*"In Hungarian ethnography and in the history of Hungarian national culture, the toponym Kalotaszeg has become a concept. It is one of the most famous areas of Hungarian vernacular culture, with a complex and richly nuanced culture, in which each field, from music to dance, from embroidery to traditional costume, furniture painting and woodcarving, represents the highest embodiment of Central-European vernacular culture."*[30] These remarks by **Ágnes Fülemile** offer an explanation of the richness and diversity of the ethnographic literature on Kalotaszeg:[31] perhaps there cannot be found any other region within the Hungarian language area with an equally huge number of data sources

28 MNL II.: 461. As to the activity of the professional rural musicians, "the Hungarian rural society reacts in the same manner as it is familiar from the history of European music or the practice of people outside Europe: it does not accept as members of the community people playing entertainment music professionally, although they are often needed. [...] Professional musicians have to adapt to the public to such an extent – submitting themselves even to the caprices of nightclubs – which could not be expected from other members of the society, considered as equals." Sárosi: 1980: 78.

29 Pávai: 1993a: 173.

30 Fülemile: 1996: 65.

31 The volume entitled *The Bibliography of Kalotaszeg* (*Kalotaszeg bibliográfiája*), published in 2001 by the Kriza János Ethnographical Society from Kolozsvár, edited by Judit Ercsei, undertook to assemble these bibliographical data; the volume contains 1230 titles. Naturally, this bibliography does not include the publications related to Kalotaszeg issued since then; furthermore, it was Kálmán Sebestyén who revealed the insufficiencies of the bibliography in his writing *Ami Kalotaszeg bibliográfiájából kimaradt* (*What was omitted from the bibliography of Kalotaszeg*) (In: *Kalotaszeg.* XIII. évf. 3. sz., Bánffyhunyad, 2002: 3–4).

available to scientific research. One of the characteristics of this huge literature is that, based on different social science perspectives and methods (and, of course, influenced by different epochs and historical situations), there is a continuous attempt to describe the regional, historical and cultural landmarks of Kalotaszeg, and thus, to grasp the nature of "being from Kalotaszeg", to define the "Kalotaszeg identity".[32] Therefore, the fundamental ethnographic question pertains to the borders of the region Kalotaszeg, or, in other words, which villages belong to Kalotaszeg, and who counts as a local of Kalotaszeg?

Historian **Éva Balázs** writes that, historically, "*the toponym Kalotaszeg is derived from the river Kalota; from the beginning of the 13th century, the name Szil is connected to the Kalatha clan. The Szil-Kalota clan was a landowner in the two valleys of the Almás river in Doboka county, but their lands also extended to this region, to the south.*"[33] As the name of a region, it relates in fact to a river, as well as to a medieval church and a secular administrative unit: "*under the rule of the bishop of Nagyvárad, the area along the Almás river, the region of Bánffyhunyad"* was administrated as *"the archdeaconry of Kalota"*; and *"the register of the papal tithe of 1332–1337 specifies the following settlements within the archdeaconry of Kalota: Hunad (Hunyad), Almas (Almás), Farnos (Farnas), Zentelke, Senkral (Szentkirály), Buken (Bökény), Valkó, Monostor (Gyerőmonostor), Dereete (Derite).*"[34] During the Middle Ages, the greatest part of Kalotaszeg was

32 To quote László Kürti: "It seems that since its discovery, the diminution and extension of the Kalotaszeg region has become a process in itself within Hungarian ethnography." Kürti: 2000: 34. According to Balázs Balogh and Ágnes Fülemile, "the unavoidable problem of studies on Kalotaszeg remains the delimitation of the region. [...] Since systematic research was started, from the study of János Jankó written in the 1890s and up to the present, both professional and the public opinion follows with an increasing interest in case of every newly published study the criteria that would guide the author, and the villages they would rank as belonging to Kalotaszeg. Naturally, the selection of the locations of data collection reflects the different features of the related disciplines and research conceptions: different viewpoints would guide a linguist than an ethnographer, a folk dance or a farming researcher. The acceptance of the traditional division of Kalotaszeg (**Felszeg**, **Alszeg**, **Nádasmente**, and sometimes, linked to these, the **Kapus-vidék**, **Átmeneti-vidék**) also raises the doubts of the scholars. The frequent mentioning of the **border regions** without an explanation causes further uncertainty." Balogh – Fülemile: 2004: 11.

33 Balázs: 1939: 26.

34 Op. cit. 18–19. Éva Balázs enumerates the written sources of secular administration, which also emphasize the separateness of the region, mentioning that several settlements of the region in question used to belong to the former Bihar county: "Its ecclesiastical administrative autonomy is confirmed by its secular autonomy. In 1238, the advowee of Almás-monostor was László comes. He expelled the Benedictines from here, and substituted them first with Premonstratensians, and then with his own chaplains. The lawsuit deriving from this was referred to the pope. Already in 1249 – we know nothing about what happened in the time period between –, Chief

"*a complex of lands belonging to the demesne of Sebesvár. The villeins living there fulfil their services towards the castle, which at first was a royal castle under the supervision of the voivode of Transylvania, and later, in 1435, became the property of the Bánffy family from Losoncz.*"[35]

The first document which includes the name of the region is a document from 1443, in which "*Kalota, Szt. Király, Mogyorókerék and the neighbouring, meanwhile vanished village of Himtelke are specified as belonging »in comitatu Kalathazeg«. [...] In 1468 and 1475, this name is repeated in the documents (»in perinentiis Kalathazeg«), and by the 16th century, it is so much narrowed that only Sebesvár itself is considered: »alio nomine Kalathazeg« or Kalotaszeg.*"[36] Yet, in the 16th century the name of Kalotaszeg referring to this region appears in documents written in Hungarian too. The *Transylvanian Hungarian Lexicological Encyclopaedia* includes Hungarian written documents from the 16th to the 19th centuries with five meanings of the word "*kalotaszegi*", which is a derivative of "Kalotaszeg", meaning "from Kalotaszeg":[37] (1) being located in Kalotaszeg, (2)

---

Justice Pál receives as a donation not only Füld and Bikal, but Almás as well, for he had eradicated the ruffians after the entering of the Tartars. At that time, these three settlements, and in 1356 also Bedecs, belonged to Bihar county. Thus, at that time, Bihar county extended deeply into the territory of the later Kolozs county, comprising the neighbourhood of Almás, near the Sebesvár estate. If it isn't referred to as *Bihar*, then this distinct area has a different name. Thus, in 1359, *comitatus Hunyad* is mentioned, where the royal delegates came to inquire about the lawsuit between the reeve of Sebesvár and a villein of Bikal." Op. cit. 19–20.

35 Op. cit. 24. Éva Balázs explains the connections between the management of the latifundium and the settlement of Romanian inhabitants too: "The management of the latifundium is always purposeful. Just as in the area along the Kapus river the Transylvanian bishop, and east to the Szamos river the Zsuki family did, the lords of many settlements brought in Romanians in order to increase their incomes, and the same happened in Kalotaszeg. The families bearing the names Valkói and Farnasi, who were landowners on the territory independent from the castle, shared, in 1449, the Nyirszeg property. Nyirszeg, »intra metas possessionis Walko de novo locata«, was a new establishment within the confines of the entirely Hungarian village. However, in lack of surplus inhabitants, in Nyirszeg, which was also called Nagybérc, Romanians live as new settlers: »Nicolaus Kenezius, Johannes Kerezy, Daan and Stephanus de Inchel«. (Incsel was a Romanian village.) The owners agree that, since »adhuc solummodo quattuor iobagiones essent locati«, they wouldn't be content with four villein families, and they would continue the process of settling. – It is rare that the origin of a village is preserved in a similarly accurate formulation. However, one can safely presume that the rest of the Romanian villages originating from the 15th century were established in similar conditions." Op. cit. 24–25.

36 Op. cit. 20.

37 *Erdélyi magyar szótörténeti tár VI.*, Akadémiai Kiadó 1993: 58. The article offers examples of the enumerated five meanings from historic documents. As these were written in late Old Hungarian or Middle Hungarian, their translation appeared to me to be idle. (The translator)

cultivated (plant) in Kalotaszeg, (3) produced or manufactured in Kalotaszeg, (4) living in Kalotaszeg, and (5) as a surname or attribute referring to domicile or origin.

According to Éva Balázs, the data of local history and the history of language indicate that "*the territory in question was Kalotaszeg in the geographical sense, and not in an ethnographic meaning.*[38] *The ethnographers' Kalotaszeg lies not only in the valley of the Körös and Kalota streams, but also along the Nádas stream up to Kolozsvár.*"[39] Thus, we are back again to the same fundamental question: how far does the "ethnographic" Kalotaszeg extend?

Since the limits of the present study do not allow a detailed presentation of the research on the Kalotaszeg region and identity,[40] I briefly present the most important definitions of Kalotaszeg as a region within Hungarian ethnography, which were published and/or referred to with several occasions. In 1892, in the first comprehensive monograph on Kalotaszeg, **János Jankó** wrote that Kalotaszeg, "*as a geographic term, is easy to determine, as it is nothing else but the valley of the rivers Kalota and Körös; thus, it would entail neither the valley of the Nádas or that of the Almás or their headwaters. In turn, drawing the ethnographic boundaries of Kalotaszeg is much more difficult, and I may at-*

38 László Kósa discusses the mingling of four, clearly distinguishable issues within the research of ethnographic or ethnic groups in Hungarian ethnography. Thus, he distinguishes the research of historical and vernacular region and country names and the territorial division connected to them, from the groups named similarly as the ethnicities, from geographical regions and areas, respectively the spatial extension of cultural phenomena. Concerning the research of historical and vernacular region and country names, as well as the territorial division connected to them, he writes: "It is characteristic for every population how they transform, along their history, the natural environment; the occupation of this environment through naming is part of this process. Geography also creates names for regions, but most of these reflect the specific scientific results and aims of these studies. Therefore, one has to distinguish the official geographic names from historical and vernacular toponyms, the greatest part of which did not originate from written culture, and was carried on for a long period of time by the spoken language and by oral tradition." Kósa: 1998:20. Thus, one cannot define Kalotaszeg exclusively as a geographical toponym; it is much more likely that it is also rather a historical and vernacular designation.

39 Balázs: 1939: 25. According to Éva Balázs, "perhaps a migration, which would be hard to demonstrate, had a role to play in the fact that ethnographic phenomena have been preserved precisely at the Nádas stream, along which lie Türe, Mákó and Daróc, which received the people from Kalota. We have to find an explanation to this ethnographic unity also because the history of Kalotaszeg detaches itself from the history of the archdeaconry of Kolozs." Op. cit. 25–26.

40 The detailed synthesis and analysis of the issue was undertaken by László Kürti in his study entitled *Kalotaszeg – határ, régió, fogalom* (*Kalotaszeg – borderline, region, term*). Kürti: 2000: 9–53.

*tempt to do it only based on presumptions. By reason of the results summed up in this book, it is certain that even today the geographic Kalotaszeg is the kernel of the ethnographic Kalotaszeg, which comprises also the valley of the Nádas until Kolozsvár, the Almási valley until Nagy-Almás; and, indisputably, the 34 villages I have researched belong all to Kalotaszeg, but I don't know yet which are the eastern boundaries, and I can only presume that the Hungarian-speaking isle around Kolozsvár, which is surrounded from all directions by Romanians and Saxons, and which is tied to the Hungarian inhabitants of Torda, respectively of the Szilágyság region by thin threads or lines marked by small villages, is ethnographically entirely uniform even in its encircled condition."*[41] In 1932, **Károly Kós** writes something similar: "*Originally, Kalotaszeg means the small, triangular piece of land lying below the Vlegyásza Mountain, which is surrounded by the waters of Körös and Kalota, merging near Bánffyhunyad. In a broader meaning – and this is how we and the people of Kalotaszeg too mean it –, Kalotaszeg is the territory within Kolozs county which lies between the railway line connecting Kolozsvár and Nagyvárad, respectively the main road, and along the two sides of this road, from Kolozsvár to Csucsa, and which is enclosed by the northern foot of the Gyalui Mountains on the south, and by the eastern foot of the Vlegyásza Mountain and Meszes Mountain on the west. To this uniform, quite closed territory extending in an east-west direction, a few villages are joined on the south, forming a thin tongue of land, along the road between Gyalu and Jára, up to Alsó-Jára, which, from an*

41 Jankó: 1892b/1993: 1–2. The description of János Jankó concerning Kalotaszeg as a region was a reference for a long time in Hungarian ethnography. Some researchers accepted it without reserve, for example Dezső Malonyay, who, in 1907, enumerates the 34 villages named by Jankó as a definition of Kalotaszeg (see Dezső Malonyay: *A magyar nép művészete I. A kalotaszegi magyar nép művészete. / Hungarian Folk Art I. The Hungarian Folk Art of Kalotaszeg.* Budapest, 1907). There were researchers who used it as a starting point, and then broadened it according to distinct criteria, as for example the art historian Lajos Kelemen, who, in 1944, ranked as belonging to Kalotaszeg the settlements along the road between Gyalu and Jára, from Magyarlóna to Magyarléta, Györgyfalva and Ajtony, which lie to southeast from Kolozsvár, and even included Szamosfalva, Szentmiklós and Dezmér, which are east from Kolozsvár (see Lajos Kelemen: *Kalotaszeg történelmi és műemlékei / The historical monuments of Kalotaszeg.* Kolozsvári Szemle, 1944: 97–112). Yet, as if he had forecasted subsequent definitions, Jankó was aware that the Kalotaszeg region he described might be enlarged through further research: "Now let me introduce you in the programme of future research. I know that Kalotaszeg lies between the Hungarian-speaking areas of Torda and Szilágyság, and I can see that in both directions series of Hungarian villages lie across the sea of Romanian settlements from the Kalotaszeg region I had examined, which thus ensure connection between the Hungarian isles. [...] The primary question is whether these villages belong to Kalotaszeg or not, or perhaps they partly belong to Kalotaszeg, partly to the Hungarian areas of Torda, respectively Szilágy. If I would start from Kalotaszeg in my investigation, I would solve the question shortly." Jankó: 1892a: 25.

*ethnographical point of view, have to be counted as belonging to Kalotaszeg as well."*[42] Similarly, according to the linguist **Attila Szabó T.**, "*historically, the actual name of Kalotaszeg indicated only the small part between the waters of the Kalota and Körös, the territory between the banks of these two rivers, and the outer spurs of the Gyalui Mountains. Thus, today we consider that the Hungarian, or mixed, Hungarian and Romanian villages of the neighbouring areas belong to Kalotaszeg as well. Yet, previous researchers had already enlarged the boundaries of the actual Kalotaszeg, partly due to the roughly uniform ethnographic feature of Hungarian villages neighbouring this area, as well as, more strictly, due to the unity of the vernacular language of the neighbouring territories and the aforementioned territory."*[43] In fact, **László Kósa** sums up precisely these statements in an article about Kalotaszeg written in the 1970s: "*Kalotaszeg is a historical and ethnographic region in Transylvania, to the west of Kolozsvár. It is enclosed on the south by the northern range of the Gyalui Mountains, and on the west by the eastern ranges of the Vlegyásza and Meszes mountains. Today, forty reformed villages (only Jegenye and Bács are catholic settlements), inhabited partly or entirely by Hungarians, and lying along the road between Gyalu and Jára, belong to Kalotaszeg, together with a few villages with a similar vernacular culture. Its fair centre is Bánffyhunyad, and its famous villages are: Magyarvista, Méra, Gyerővásárhely, Körösfő, Magyargyerőmonostor, Magyarvalkó, Kalotaszentkirály*

42 Kós: 1932: 9. Kós appointed the administrative and geographical boundaries of Kalotaszeg, and he also wrote about the ethnic and religious composition of the region's population: "If we consider administration, the greater part of Kalotaszeg belongs to the Bánffyhunyad, Gyalu and Nádasmente district of Kolozs county, its small northern part to the Hidalmás district, and its two villages lying to the south (Tordaszentlászló and Magyarléta) lie within Tordaaranyos county. Its shape is that of a narrow wedge, the tip of it being Kolozsvár. From here to the west it is some 55 kilometres long, and it is the largest near Bánffyhunyad, where it is 20 kilometres wide. The Hungarian inhabitants of this territory, belonging to the same race, partly live in entirely Hungarian, partly in mixed villages, with the exception of a few completely Romanian villages. [...] Most of the Hungarians living in Bács, Szászfenes and Magyarfenes, situated near Kolozsvár, and thus, on the eastern side of Kalotaszeg, are of Roman Catholic religion. The Hungarian inhabitants of Szentlászló, from the same region, are partly of Catholic, partly of Reformed faith. The rest of the Hungarian communities are Reformed, with the exception of the entirely Catholic Jegenye, situated in the middle of the territory." Op. cit. 9–10.

43 Attila Szabó T.: 1942: XI–XII. Attila Szabó T. specifies toponyms as well, in order to draw the presumed boundaries of Kalotaszeg: "Thus, we include here several villages along the Kapus, Nádas and Almás streams. Therefore, the last village on the western part of Kalotaszeg is Bánffyhunyad, respectively Magyarókereke, and, on the east, Kisbács (at this point, Kalotaszeg is adjacent to Kolozsvár!); on the south, the borderlines are marked by Magyarvalkó, Magyargyerőmonostor, respectively Magyarkapus and Magyarkiskapus; on the north, Bábony, Váralmás and Középlak constitute the borders of Kalotaszeg."

*etc. Kalotaszeg can be divided into three, distinct areas: Felszeg, lying below the mountains, Alszeg, which is situated along the Almás stream, and the area near Kolozsvár, along the Nádas stream."*[44] So, the triple division of Kalotaszeg – Felszeg, Alszeg and Nádasmente – was enforced by Károly Kós, and subsequent scholarly literature accepted it with various further specifications.[45] The first to regard the area along the Kapus stream as a distinct sub-region of Kalotaszeg was Attila Szabó T. He even criticized the previous descriptions of Kalotaszeg in this matter: "*Without entering into a somewhat meticulous criticism concerning the geographical delimitation of Kalotaszeg, I mention that none of the definitions mentions the area along the Kapus river, though the few villages situated here (Gyerővásárhely, Magyarkiskapus, Magyarkapus) belong to the region as well."*[46] Hungarian ethnochoreology, which applies structuralist and comparative methods, follows this division into four sub-regions. I would quote, for example, the concise definition of **György Martin** (that I accept as well), which is accurate also from the point of view of ethnochoreology: "*The Hungarians of Kalotaszeg living in the western part of the former Kolozs county, in the cca. fifty villages lying in the valleys of the Sebes-Körös, Kalota, Almás, Nádas and Kapus streams, created special values in their dance too. The smaller regions of Kalotaszeg – Felszeg, Alszeg, Nádasmente [the territory along the Nádas stream], and the valley of Kapus – are interlinked by common features of dance, and they differ from the dance culture of surrounding areas."*[47]

However, besides the historical, geographical and linguistic, or even administrative, ethnic and religious criteria, which are the ethnographic data and arguments on the basis of which Kalotaszeg can be described as an autonomous cultural entity? The foreword to a volume about the traditional Hungarian costumes of Kalotaszeg states that the authors use "*the term **Kalotaszeg** as a succinct term for designating an area with specific folk art, folk-poetry and dialect, without the pretence of geographic or ethnographic exclusivity, since one cannot delimit the territory of Kalotaszeg or the area of our data collection with a ruler."*[48] This

44 Kósa – Filep: 1975: 123. / MNL II.: 1979: 737.

45 For example: "From the point of view of ethnography, Kalotaszeg can be divided into three parts. One area is **Felszeg**: the triangle formed by the Sebes-Körös and Kalota streams, its centre being Bánffyhunyad. The second part is **Alszeg**, situated to the north of the Körös stream, and gradually inclining along the valley of the Almás stream towards the Szilágyság region; finally, **Nádasmente** is situated from here to the east, until Kolozsvár, in the valley of the Nádas stream. Since Nádasmente comprises the villages lying in the parallel valley of the Kapus stream, in 1892, János Jankó called this third sub-region of Kalotaszeg a **transit area of Kolozsvár**." Faragó – Nagy – Vámszer: 1977: 6–7.

46 Attila Szabó T.: 1942: 4.

47 Martin: 1990: 432. / 2004: 59.

48 Faragó – Nagy – Vámszer: 1977: 6.

quote also emphasizes the fact that, within ethnographic scholarly literature, the description of Kalotaszeg as a region depends mainly on the aim and objects of a certain research, respectively on the stance of the researcher, and reflects less the regional identity of the examined area's inhabitants.[49] Thus, for example, the authors of a recently published volume, when facing the theoretical problems related to the methods for the delimitation of the Kalotaszeg ethnographic area, restricted the borderlines of the region on the basis of marital relations:[50] "*Kalotaszeg is primarily a network of human relationships, changing in time and space, which above all means the relational and cultural system of peasant inhabitants belonging to the Reformed religion, and of Hungarian ethnicity. This system of relations did not include the non-peasant social layers and the non-Reformed denominational groups of the region. On the basis of these two exclusion factors, the area did not include the villages of nobles, nor the social layers of craftsmen and merchants who adopted a bourgeois way of life at quite an early time (including the local Jews of Jewish religion), the Catholic Hungarians, the Catholic Saxons, the Orthodox or Greek Catholic Romanian peasants, and the Gypsies, whether nomads or settled, most of whom were engaged in crafts and music.*"[51] At the same time, sensing the considerable restrictedness of this definition from a cultural and social point of view, the authors outline a broader network of relations as well: "*When we examine the region's entire social structure as a network of relations revealing the totality of communication between individuals, we can define the region in a different manner, contrary to the previous, restrictive interpretation, as a*

49 Often the views transmitted by scientific research become embedded in public opinion in the course of time. A telling example for this is that even today, due to the "Grande Dame" of Kalotaszeg, Etelka Gyarmathy Hory, one frequently reads and hears that Kalotaszeg extends up to where the *muszuj* (a special female apron) is worn. According to László Kürti, "emphasizing the regional characteristics is possible only if researchers first determine how they select the special features. It remains doubtful, however, whether the ethnographic and customs related data ensure the specific features of the region as such, or, on the contrary, certain customs and ethnographic data receive a regional qualification through the delimitation of the territory." Kürti: 2000: 37.

50 It is not a purpose of the present study to give a detailed, theoretical overview of the research on vernacular culture regions. In this matter, I consider to be a reference work of László Kürti's volume, published in 1998, on scientific history and terminology.

51 Balogh – Fülemile: 2004: 18. The reasons given for the quoted statement: "If we want to delimit Kalotaszeg according to **relationships by affinity**, we can proceed quite simply and reasonably as follows. The network of marriage circles enclosed the regional structure on a social, denominational and, accordingly, on an ethnic basis, indicating those groups which shaped the circles of genetic reproduction by common consent, and which formed within the group a distinct cultural focus, forms of recurring practice, and clearly visible external features, the familiarity with and practicing of which created a sense of community for those living in that group." Op. cit. 17–18.

***scene of interactions**. If, besides the »festive« side of life, we also take into account **»daily« human contacts** – like economic relations (trade relations, fair, travel trade, local stores, inn, carriage, craftsmen, paid work, journey-work, lease work, servant work, aid in support of a neighbour, patron-client relations, hiring of a shepherd, of musicians etc.), and also participation in education, managing legal or administrative matters, or doing army service –, then a much greater circle of human relations can be drawn, which would go beyond the social, denominational and ethnic boundaries. **Within such a broader interpretation, interethnic relations form an integral part of the regional structure**."*[52]

But is it possible to slice up and to separate so simply the research of a certain population? According to László Kósa, a region is a territorial unit, "*distinguished for a longer period of time by constant cultural, social, economic and ecological features, and thus detached from its environment."* As such, it is thought to be an intricate phenomenon composed of several factors, which "*cannot be characterized genuinely by a single factor. By a single factor we mean not only a single element, but even a larger group of phenomena is understood, which, irrelevant of its comprehensiveness, belongs to only one of the enumerated four main components.*[53] *Thus, the territorial unit called »region« cannot be characterized satisfactorily, for example, exclusively by cultural or ecological components, although this is what the scholarly literature frequently does."*[54] At the same time, the region's definition given by Kósa "*includes the time factor, which is related to space at all times*", as one of the main factors of the relativity of the definition of a region. I

52 Op. cit. 18. Altough Balázs Balogh and Ágnes Fülemile discuss different relational networks ("After all, both the first approach: the tracing of the family relationship networks, and the second method: the complex spatial network of extended economic, social and ethnic contacts of everyday life, may offer a relevant solution in the delimitation of a regional structure." Op. cit. 23–24.), they ignore the theory of Eric R. Wolf on complex societies, which had such a seminal impact on network research in social anthropology, and according to which "three fundamental, parallel structures can be noticed in complex societies: relatives, friendship, and patron-client relation." (See Szent-Iványi: 3.)

53 See note 38.

54 Kósa: 1998: 30. Kósa mentions that, "theoretically, the four elements have an equal importance, although research demonstrates that, from time to time, there might be a shift in their relationship, because, due to the uneven character of research, sources and data are available in different proportions." He also stresses the fact that, "since in the history of Hungarian ethnography the differences in regional features were expressed first of all in culture", it is important "to always present the determining and influential role of the other three components, if possible." In the following, he emphasises that "the relationship of the components tolerates as many shifts as do not yet disrupt the characteristic unity of the region. For the components of the regional unit can be the constituents of other spatial structures separately, but the specific structure called region is created by their unrepeatable meeting in conjunction." Kósa: 1998: 30.

consider this to be a very important statement, since, according to Kósa, the meeting of the components constituting a region "*is the result of a historical process, but the tendency creating it did not cease with the birth of the »region«. The components building up the structures continue to change, and the region is identical with itself as long as the equilibrium of these components ensuring the region's specificity is preserved to a certain degree.*"[55] As the territory of a region can be evaluated only within a certain time dimension, the question arises: if the toponym Kalotaszeg was known prior to the Reformation, why are the inhabitants of Kalotaszeg "mainly of Reformed religion", and why are people of Roman Catholic religion not considered as being from Kalotaszeg?[56] Or, if we take into account only the last century, where do the many Neo-Protestant communities living in the region belong? Furthermore, if we study the folk music, dance music and dance culture developed during the centuries, then the lads' dance of Jegenye would not be from Kalotaszeg, because it is "Catholic", just like the "tune of dawn" of Szucság, for noblemen were singing it, moreover, the *învârtita* from Papfalva neither, since this Renaissance dance type is known only by local Romanians. In any case, **Balázs Balogh** and **Ágnes Fülemile** admit that "*we don't discuss now the similarities of cultural features or stylistic issues, because it was not our intention to use a definition of ethnographic region based on traditional culture.*"[57] Yet, is it possible to study human relationships or identity without cultural features? **Mihály Sárkány** contends that "*the intermingling of cultural and social phenomena manifests itself in reality at all times*", and then, discussing the connections between culture and society, he explains that "*if we take as a starting point the fact that culture and society are in a dialectical relationship of content and form, we can presume that along any kind of social division a cultural pattern is taking shape as well.*"[58] In another study dealing with identity, he mentions that

55 Kósa: 1998: 31.

56 In 1892, János Jankó wrote: "At the same time, these researches convinced me that the ethnography of the Catholic Jegenye is nearly identical with that of the Reformed villages of Kalotaszeg, and differences can only be detected in customs related to religion." Jankó: 1892a: 4.

57 Op. cit. 23.

58 Sárkány: 2000a: 91. According to him, "one can presume that at the origin of any kind of cultural fracture there are social groups and formations which detach from each other. It would be erroneous, though, to conceive of these as being of the same order of magnitude. For it is characteristic of all sorts of social groups to express their difference from others. Thus, beyond the fact that some group types are able to carry on even the whole of a culture, some group types of a lower organizational level also endeavour to express some sort of cultural difference as the evidence of their distinctiveness; and often, this does not happen spontaneously, but deliberately. However, of course, this is not an inherent feature of culture. If you like, culture develops in a more objective manner. Obviously, objectivity is relative. On one hand culture, changes in relation to the society carrying it, on the other hand, it changes according to its own inherent principles of motion. Therefore, social

"*the image people have of themselves is inseparable from the image their own society forms about humanity, about the structure of the world, as well as about its own structural principles; thus, it is a cultural phenomenon.*"[59] If identity is inherently a cultural phenomenon, then, when examining a multiethnic and culturally diverse area, the research of interethnic relations is unavoidable from the outset, and it is not part of a "broader interpretation". This is very much so the case, in spite of the statement that interethnic relations "are an organic part of the region's structure", and "*it is worth mentioning that Hungarian ethnography still needs to research the mixed, Hungarian, Romanian and Gypsy Kalotaszeg. [...] Only very few studies have hitherto focused on interethnic coexistence.*"[60]

But is there a Romanian[61] or Gypsy[62] Kalotaszeg? The answer is: yes and no, as this is a matter of point of view. It might exist, if we take the local Romanian or Gypsy community manifestations as cultural entities specifically linked to

boundaries and cultural boundaries do not necessarily coincide in their dimensions. It may occur that the phenomena which are expressions of important cultural differences from the point of view of a certain social group, are negligible trifles when considered from the side of the cultural system they belong to." Sárkány: 2000a: 91–92.

59 Sárkány: 2000b: 108.

60 Kürti: 2000: 29. On the same issue, see Balogh – Fülemile: 2004: 11: "Meanwhile, the coexistence of Romanian and Gypsy communities with the Hungarians is a scarcely raised and unanswered issue in the elucidation of the term »Kalotaszeg«."

61 It is important to note at this point that in Romanian ethnographic research the *Zona Călata* ("the region of Kalota") or *Zona Huedin* ("the region of Hunyad") is a less known and studied ethnographic area. Due to specific historical and ethnographic criteria in Romanian research, its territory differs from Hungarian descriptions, namely, it is not identical (or it is merely partly identical) with Kalotaszeg. As László Kürti puts it: "for Romanian ethnography, the toponyms ***Călata***, ***Depresiunea Călățele*** (Kalotaszeg basin) or the ***Huedin*** region (quite often mentioned as ***Depresiunea Huedinului*** – Hunyadi basin) is not so well known as it is for Hungarian researchers, respectively, the entire region is overshadowed by the Tara Moților region and its **moți** inhabitants [this region being in the proximity of Kalotaszeg]. Most of Romanian scholarly works included the smaller regions, thus parts of Kalotaszeg too, into the region of the **Apuseni Mountains**." Op. cit. 30–31. (For example, the Romanian-Hungarian, bilingual volume on folk music, published in 1978 by the Folklore Institute and the Music Academy of Cluj, follows the same scientific paradigm, according to which the title already designates the region in Romanian – *Huedin környéki népzene*, i.e. folk music from the region of Huedin. Not only the title reflects the aggressive Romanization of the communist regime: the way in which the Hungarian introductory study, edited by Ilona Szenik, deals with "the neighbourhood of Hunyad", instead of Kalotaszeg, is also somewhat repugnant.)

62 Hitherto, the research of the Gypsy communities of Kalotaszeg – in spite of the promising beginnings related to the work of Antal Herrmann and the Wlislocki couple – was limited to a few short studies or collection of data. The present study will discuss in the following sections this lack of sources separately.

this region. But it could not exist in so far as the complex society examination developed by Wolf, as well as my own field experiences show that the Romanian and Gypsy communities living there do not really know or refer to this region as Kalotaszeg.[63]

As we enquire about the self-knowledge of the local communities, the question inevitably arises: why and to what extent do the local Hungarian communities consider themselves as locals of Kalotaszeg? Or, in other words, "*how does the regional division of vernacular culture reflect the regional identity of rural communities, where do these mental boundaries lie, what factors signal them, and where do these boundaries blur?" "Hitherto, the research of the regional division of vernacular culture reflects a notion of culture which conceives of it as the totality of circumscribable and measurable products, and examines rather its objectified parts.*[64] *In turn, my analysis views culture in its permanent change and*

63 According to László Kürti, there is no Romanian Kalotaszeg, for the very reason that, "obviously, the Romanian term *Călățele* [...] has been imported from Hungarian into Romanian language." Thus, "it is rather a guess than a proven fact that the Hungarian Kalotaszeg exists as the aforementioned Călățele or Huedin region, simply because it is a typically Hungarian region, and Romanian ethnography cannot, or will not, accept its significance (which is of crucial importance in Hungarian ethnography)." Op. cit. 32.

64 I refer, for example, to the general work of Kósa and Filep: 1975: 37: "The study of groups formed regionally and historically is nothing else but the analytical decomposition of Hungarian vernacular culture." In fact, Kürti formulates precisely the critique of this view: "The classification of regions developed by Kósa and Filep ignores similar local features, and also the fact that smaller inner regions, though apparently prove the theory of **territoriality**, call in question the entire Kalotaszeg theory. It also ignores that the »**original**« triple division aims at hegemony and generalization, through which local specificities and differences get lost and become meaningless." Kürti: 2000: 36. (I mention that later Kósa, as a self-critique of the research of the regional division of vernacular culture, stated that "I can see now that what I aimed at was to define a »quasi-term« developed by a heterogeneous tradition of science history, and never elucidated in a satisfactory manner. That is why my categories are not based on the same classification criteria, but they reflect instead the unsuccessful effort to include distinct issues in a uniform framework. I realized by now that what was called for decades the research of ethnographic or ethnic groups within Hungarian ethnography, mingles at least four, clearly distinguishable issues." Kósa: 1998. 19. Moreover, after he discusses the four distinguished components, he draws the conclusion that "Hungarian ethnography caused itself a great difficulty by introducing the term ethnographic or ethnic group. Both the unelucidated status of the term, as well as its heterogeneity, which, in turn, comprises separable scientific tasks, suggest the conclusion that there is no need for the term of ethnographic group." Kósa: 1998: 28. ) Perhaps Balázs Balogh and Ágnes Fülemile tries to get round this very notion of culture in the following explanation: "The definition of the ethnographic area has to include elements of consciousness." However, they consider that "the method that can be applied in a consistent manner" consists not in the analysis of the local culture, but

*progress, or, as* ***Fredrik Barth*** *put it: »We now realize that global empirical variation in culture is continuous, and it does not partition neatly into separable, integrated wholes. In any population we may choose to observe, we will also find that it is in flux, it is contradictory and incoherent, and it is differentially distributed according to variously positioned persons. These features arise from the very way in which culture is reproduced: although we learn it largely from others as a basis for interpretation and action in the world, it accumulates in each of us as a result of our own experience. This is certainly true of our sense of identity: albeit we do not invent it ourselves, we can only develop it by acting in the world and interacting with others."*[65]

I think it's likely that every researcher of Kalotaszeg faced or is facing the issue of what regional identity the region's inhabitants have. Of course, it remains unknown how this influenced the result of any particular research, for only an insignificant part of the large quantity of the scholarly literature on the region deals with the issue of identity.[66] True enough that in the case of Kalotaszeg, a "fashionable" region with an intricate symbolical content, the impact and dissemination of identity features created by science (which are often stereotyped, and refer primarily to folk art) is a more palpable phenomenon than the analysis elaborated on the basis of the regional identity of the specific communities, in spite of the fact that observations concerning regional identity seem to gain importance in the research literature published in recent years.[67] The volume of Balázs Balogh and Ágnes Fülemile, published in

also "in the research of regional districts organized through a network of relations by affinity, which form a sense of community with each other, and which have proper self-knowledge. [...] The **micro-regions seen as »collectivities«** do not necessarily differ regarding cultural features. The emphasis is not on culture, but on the ability of self-support, of reproduction. To put it more simply, a regional unit can be considered an ethnographic group as long as it has the need and possibility to sustain a traditional marriage circle. We could see in many cases that when a marriage circle starts to disintegrate, group identity and group culture disintegrates too." Balogh – Fülemile: 2004: 24–25. However, would it not be possible to think of the reproduction processes, and of marriage circles, of customs linked to these as the circumscribable and measurable products of a certain culture? Is it not the historical situation established by a certain cultural and social medium which determines the need for preserving tradition? Isn't disintegration, as the change of identity and culture, a natural process?

65 Könczei: 2002: 7–8. For the quotation from Barth, see: Barth: 14.

66 Furthermore, these few works deal with the ethnic aspect of identity.

67 For example, László Kürti refers to regional identity when he observes that "the **Kalotaszeg identity** of the inhabitants of the villages around Bánffyhunyad is much stronger than that of locals of more remote villages", respectively that "almost everybody in Zsobok suggested me that I'm really in Kalotaszeg only by them." Kürti: 2000: 35.

2004, certainly represents a leap forward in the study of regional identity; the book treats the layers of the Kalotaszeg identity in detail, in a separate chapter, "*with reference to local self-consciousness and view of the region.*"[68] In this volume, the authors distinguish "***three layers of the Kalotaszeg-consciousness*** *(as regional consciousness), on the basis of the inhabitants' identity, self-placement and their image of others*", i.e. the old and new layers of the Kalotaszeg identity, respectively the recent members of this identity.[69]

In my opinion, the frequent use of the term "transitional" region or territory in the definitions of Kalotaszeg can be also explained by the lack of regional identity research,[70] since "*the questioning of the term »transitional area« is also grounded by the fact that in vernacular regional identity there are no »transitions«, since every rural community feels that their culture is their own, and they belong somewhere. Taking this into account, I don't think that the use of the term* ***transitional area*** *would be appropriate, for, in my opinion, there is no region of that kind in vernacular culture.*"[71] Or, in order to quote László Kürti: "*Thus, the question remains the same: to what extent do we have to close or delimit a territory, what are the criteria on the basis of which this can be decided, for, as a matter of fact, every territory is transitional, depending on the criteria by which the surrounding territories are delimited. We might simply argue that the entire region of Kalotaszeg is a »transition« between Szilágyság and Mezőség.*"[72]

68 Balogh – Fülemile: 2004: 86–95.

69 According to the authors, "the **Old Kalotaszeg** consciousness is assumed by those living in the western part of the region, in Felszeg and Alszeg (with Gyerővásárhely, and excepting Középlak), which, as we have seen, all the documents mention as Kalotaszeg since the 17th century. We consider as being from the **New** K**alotaszeg** the inhabitants of the Hungarian, Reformed villages situated east from the Körös and Szamos rivers, on the territory extending to Kolozsvár, with Kiskapus, Nagykapus, Magyarlóna, and the area along the Nádas stream (excepting Gyalu, Szászfenes, Egeres, Jegenye, Szucság and Kisbács). Furthermore, we define as the **Recent Kalotaszeg** Kajántó, which lies north of Kolozsvár, in the valley leading to the Borsa, and the three villages in the valley south-west of Kolozsvár, in the Fenes valley, extending until the Jára stream, namely Magyarfenes, Tordaszentlászló, Magyarléta." The most important criteria of their analysis were "the oldness, cohesion, structure of the identity of the people living there." Op. cit. 87. In my opinion, as I already mentioned, it is impossible to study identity without cultural features, therefore I treat the Balogh–Fülemile classification with a certain reservation. However, I would stress its importance, since the study of the regional division of vernacular culture cannot ignore the regional identity of those living there.

70 Könczei: 2002: 9: "I consider that so far the scholarly literature tried to apply the term »transitional area« to those territories and community cultures which seemed to be exceptions, i.e. hard to be classified for researches applying analytical, historical and comparative methods."

71 Op. cit. 10–11.

72 Kürti: 2000. 39.

Now, to sum up: to where does Kalotaszeg extend, which villages belong to Kalotaszeg, and who counts as a local of Kalotaszeg? If we approach the issue from the perspective of the present Hungarian ethnography, we have to accept László Kürti's following view: "*even today, Hungarian ethnographers have different opinions concerning the criteria which would be appropriate when delimiting Kalotaszeg. When doing so, either they accepted the already existing boundaries, or they added to or subtracted from these boundaries on the basis of their own research. Through the discovered features they either re-enforced theories on existing boundaries, or disproved them, if the author deemed it proper.*"[73] In turn, if we approach the issue in terms of regional identity, it becomes very simple: a person is a local of Kalotaszeg if he or she considers himself or herself, and his or her own smaller or larger cultural and social medium as such.[74]

## 1.3 The definition of the topic

I come to address the chapter's initial question once again: who are the rural Gypsy musicians from Kalotaszeg in fact? If I am to give a "scientifically" adequate answer, I choose from the enumerated ethnographic views the definition of István Pávai concerning professional rural musicians, and the

73 Op. cit. 40. At the same time, Kürti criticizes the way of thinking in which "the territories and the boundaries delimiting them are attributed a special symbolic power, and classified according to a hierarchy, while others are blurred and debased. Thus, some territories and boundaries gain a special significance – as the people living there would be valued according to that special definition –, which separates these territories from mediocrity, and raises them to mythical heights." Op. cit. 40. At this point, Kürti mentions the "dance set from Kalotaszeg" observed in the dance houses, which ignores the fact that, "in Kalotaszeg too, there are centres and smaller regions, even communities [or persons – I would add], which do not have such a globally developed, stereotyped dance and musical culture, but a different set of sounds and movements are their specificity." Op. cit. 41. Furthermore, he keenly criticises the almost exclusively ethnographic approach to Kalotaszeg, considering ethnicity: "Is it a rule that a territory like Kalotaszeg can only appear within scientific research as a Hungarian region? Where are the Romanians, the Saxons, or the Gypsies, of whom the ethnographic descriptions of the last century are silent?" On the other hand, he also criticizes the tendency to achieve homogeneity and functionality within scientific research: "While the Kalotaszeg area is mythicized as a remote ethnographic culture, the actual territory is very close to the central problem of Hungarian ethnography: to an endeavour to achieve homogeneity and functionality, which cannot and will not solve certain delicate issues." Op. cit. 41.

74 In fact, the last sentence of Kürti's study raises a similar, simplified question: "Did Hungarian ethnography get to the point to raise and answer the question, where the boundaries lie in our field of research, in our scientific theories, and in artistic terms, and where can the boundaries be found on the semantical and mental map of those living in these regions?" Op. cit. 41.