

Balázs Borsos

The Regional Structure of Hungarian Folk Culture



WAXMANN



Balázs Borsos

The Regional Structure of Hungarian Folk Culture



Waxmann 2017
Münster • New York

This book was produced under the auspices of the Research Centre for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and with the support of the National Bank of Hungary

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>

Print-ISBN 978-3-8309-3443-1
E-Book-ISBN 978-3-8309-8443-6

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2017

www.waxmann.com
info@waxmann.com

Cover design: Anne Breitenbach, Münster
Map (endpaper): Béla Nagy
Typesetting: Stoddart Satz- und Layoutservice, Münster
Print: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on age-resistant paper,
acid-free as per ISO 9706



Printed in Germany

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

In memoriam László Gábor Breiner (1964–2012)

Contents

1.	Ethnographic Atlases and the Assessment of Regional Cultural Patterns.....	13
1.1	Research on the regional structure of Hungarian folk culture.....	13
1.2	Atlases of ethnography in Europe	22
1.3	Using ethnographic atlases to draw a picture of regional cultural patterns.....	28
1.4	Computer processing and analysis of ethnographic atlases	31
1.5	Territorial units defined using computer software	33
1.5.1	Terminology.....	33
1.5.2	The name of cultural regions	36
1.5.3	Delineation of cultural regions.....	37
2.	Preparations for Computer Processing and Analysing the Data of the Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture.....	39
2.1	The Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture (AHFC).....	39
2.2	The Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture as a database.....	42
2.3	Digitalisation of the Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture data.....	46
2.4	Database in the EM Tool program.....	47
2.5	Cluster analysis.....	48
2.6	Converting the database before analysis	50
3.	Cluster Analysis of the Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture.....	55
3.1	Analysis using the EM Tool program	55
3.2	Clustering all map sheets and settlements (communities)	56
3.3	Filtered clustering.....	64
3.3.1	Filtering out settlements in disperse clusters with numerous zero-value data.....	64
3.3.2	Filtering out the time factor.....	65
3.3.3	Filtering out the language factor	67
3.3.4	Filtering out sheets with too much zero (missing) data (presenting thematic and territorial details).....	68
3.3.4.1	Cluster analysis after filtering out sheets with more than 200 zero-value datapoints	69
3.3.4.2	Cluster analysis after filtering out sheets with more than 50 zero-value datapoints.....	70
3.4	Conclusions.....	72
4.	Computer Processing the Data of European Atlases of Ethnography: the Potential for and Theoretical, Practical Problems Thereof.....	74
4.1	Ethnographic atlases included in the study	74
4.2	The map sheets of the atlases	75

4.3	Problems with the data collection methodology and the determination of collection points.....	78
4.4	The biased nature of ethnographic atlases	81
4.5	Spatial and temporal distribution of data	86
4.6	The problem of linguistic geography and the impact of dialects	89
4.7	Computer processing and analysis of ethnographical atlases	89
4.8	Test analysis of the Atlas of German Folk Culture (ADV) and the conclusions drawn from it	92
4.8.1	Selection of the test area	92
4.8.2	Selection of maps involved in the analysis.....	93
4.8.3	Preparation of the database for analysis.....	93
4.8.4	Analysis of the sample maps of the ADV and evaluation of the results	94
4.9	Expected results of processing each of the atlases of ethnography.....	99
5.	The Regional Division of the Hungarian Language Area Based on Cultural and Other Aspects.....	101
5.1	Supplementary informational maps in the Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture and territorial distribution established on this basis	103
5.1.1	Administrative and political distribution	105
5.1.1.1	Administrative maps.....	105
5.1.1.2	Administrative-political divisions and their correlation to cultural distribution	107
5.1.2	Ethnic conditions	111
5.1.2.1	Ethnic maps	111
5.1.2.2	Ethnic conditions and their correlation to cultural distribution	112
5.1.3	Religious conditions.....	113
5.1.3.1	Maps on religious affiliation	113
5.1.3.2	Religious conditions and their correlation to cultural distribution	114
5.1.4	Settlement demography.....	116
5.1.4.1	Demographic maps for settlements	116
5.1.4.2	Settlement demography and its correlation with cultural distribution	118
5.1.5	Agricultural conditions	119
5.1.5.1	Maps about agricultural statistics.....	119
5.1.5.2	The regional character of agricultural data and its correlation to cultural distribution	120
5.1.5.3	Determination of the regional distribution in agriculture by cluster analysis and correlations with cultural distribution	124
5.2	Regional distribution maps based on cultural and other aspects	126
5.2.1	Geographic distribution	127
5.2.1.1	Geographic distribution maps	127
5.2.1.2	Geographic distribution and its correlation to cultural distribution	130
5.2.2	The pattern of dialects	136
5.2.2.1	Dialect maps	136
5.2.2.2	Dialectic distribution and its correlation to cultural distribution	138

5.2.3	Cultural distribution based on certain cultural aspects	141
5.2.3.1	Settlement and building	142
5.2.3.2	Economy (foraging, hunting, fishing, and gathering, animal husbandry and land cultivation)	150
5.2.3.3	Transport, traffic and trade	155
5.2.3.4	Cottage industry and handicrafts.....	158
5.2.3.5	Everyday life (homes, clothing, and food)	161
5.2.3.6	Society, kinship, and life cycle events	167
5.2.3.7	Customs and beliefs	168
5.2.3.8	Folklore text	170
5.2.3.9	Decorative art.....	172
5.2.3.10	Folk music	173
5.2.3.11	Folk dance	175
5.3	Summary	178
6.	Summary and Conclusions	
	Cultural Regions of the Hungarian People	181
6.1	Methodology.....	183
6.2	Results.....	187
6.3	The cultural regions of the Hungarian people.....	194
	Bibliography.....	211
	Atlases	234
	Appendix	
	Appendix 1	241
	Appendix 2	251
	Appendix 3	366
	Appendix 4	376
	Appendix 5	405

Acknowledgement

This volume is the shortened, revised and reedited (for an international audience) version of the book *A magyar népi kultúra regionális struktúrája*, originally published in 2011. In the preface of that book I expressed my gratitude to everyone who contributed to my work. Here I would like to thank them again, in alphabetical order, and to list the Scholarships and Grants which assisted this work: OTKA F 017986, Humboldt Scholarship, Bolyai János Research Grant, Hungarian Cultural Fund and Book Committee of the HAS:

Bertalan Andrásfalvy, Balázs Balogh, Gábor Barna, Elek Bartha, Anikó Báti, János Bereczky, Péter Berta, H. L. Cox, István Csupor, Mrs. József Borsos PhD, Krisztina Fancsek, László Felföldi, Alexander Fenton, Sándor Frisnyák, Attila Hevesi, Gunther Hirschfelder, Sándor Illyés, Antal Juhász, Dezső Juhász, Róbert Keményfi, Eszter Kisbán, Károly Kocsis, László Kósa, László Lukács, Robert Möller, Károly Zsolt Nagy, István Németh, Attila Paládi-Kovács, Michael Simon, Miklós Szilágyi, Tünde Turai, Fruzsina Sára Vargha, Anildo Vedovatti, László Zentai, Tünde Zentai and István Zöldi.

As far as the English version is concerned I want to express my thanks to Balázs Balogh, the director of the Institute of Ethnology, who suggested that my work be published in the framework of the Hungarian National Bank, Hungarian Science Abroad, and to Pál Fodor, the general director of the Research Centre for the Humanities, who accepted this offer. I very deeply thank the Waxmann Verlag for their readiness to publish this complex work, and Ms. Daniela Langer, who helped on behalf of the publisher. The translation was completed by Béla Borsos, the mathematical background of Chapter 2.5 (Cluster analysis) was checked by Solt Kovács, and I want to emphasize my gratitude to Lisa Nóvé, who meticulously corrected the English text and tried to find a coherent and understandable reformulation for specific expressions that may not exist at all in English. The pdf versions of the maps of the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture* Volumes 10 and 11 were created by Judit Komor. But all in all, besides the members of my family, who have always supported me during this work, I am most grateful to my late friend, László Gábor Breiner, who created the digitalizing and analysing softwares and without whom this work could not have been finished.

Budapest, 11 July 2016

Balázs Borsos

1. Ethnographic Atlases and the Assessment of Regional Cultural Patterns

1.1 Research on the regional structure of Hungarian folk culture

When approached from the perspective of systems theory, as a set of interrelated rather than isolated features, folk culture can be seen as a structure comprised of various organisational entities. According to Jenő Barabás, aside from using systems theory to understand the functional, genetic and ethnic structure of folk culture, researchers can also use it to express the spatial pattern of folk culture, which he refers to as the zonal structure.¹ As early as the beginning of the 19th century, forerunners in the international scientific arena, and nearly concurrently in Hungary as well, had recognized the existence and importance of the spatial structure—and thereby accepted that the origin and features of a culture cannot be explored or interpreted without looking at its territorial arrangements.

At the outset and during the evolution of the spatial approach, Hungarian ethnographic research has made ongoing attempts to achieve a twofold task. On the one hand, it has dealt with *the characterisation of the spatial entities that the general public already, commonly perceive to exist*, which can be defined by aspects such as historically developed units, areas limited by geographic properties, entities established as a result of dialect studies or in the course of researching cultural traits. These units, areas and entities were defined using a variety of methods that occasionally overlapped, crossed or supplemented each other. On the other hand, Hungarian ethnographical research is oriented towards *exploring the cultural traits and features which may help to delineate territorial types within Hungarian culture as a whole*. Unfortunately, Hungarian ethnographers often combined these two approaches and focused on cultural features they considered characteristic of a region, but which actually had a limited range of distribution. This altogether hindered them from clarifying the conceptual frameworks of the cartographical method.

The problem with this muddled approach clearly emerged in the second half of the twentieth century when ethnographic researchers put a strong emphasis on theoretical foundations and tried to define the aspects needed to separate territorial entities in Hungarian folk culture. Their efforts, however, failed to result in a single, unified approach. This may be the result of various scientists attempting to formulate generic terms and approaches to fit their own research, which inevitably leads to the emphasis of certain traits and attitudes over others. Furthermore, the sheer number of possible approaches meant that certain viewpoints were confused even amongst the authors calling for an established set of generally accepted, valid and used criteria. As a result, a number of approaches as to how to determine the typical, territorial entities of folk culture remain in usage today, as do a number of names for the formed or established territories.

1 Barabás 1980: 28–29.

The concept that Hungarian folk culture is not a homogenous, monolithic block, but a conglomerate that can be divided into territorial clusters in terms of language and cultural traits emerged in Hungarian scientific writing as early as the beginning of the 19th century. In fact, researchers began to review these clusters using the armoury of ethnography immediately following the epoch of ethnographic institutionalisation in the 1890s as earlier works were mainly descriptive materials focused on the geographic distribution of land and regions. Yet, the first ethnographic studies lending inspiration to the field still reflected this blurred perspective, and subsequently, an ambiguity in territorial classification and the description of denominated entities/units. According to László Kósa, the ‘aspects of area, culture and dialect’ in Fábíán Szeder’s description of the Palóc (1819) were mixed up, while the divisions János Csaplovics made in 1822 (Dunamellék, Tiszamellék, Palóc, Székely) ‘implied cultural history or even political meaning.’² It is also true, however, that the Hungarian language area is still divided into these four, large regions for cultural purposes, though they are often fine-tuned, specifically defined with other names, and include Moldva³.

The regional monographs of the second half of the 19th century—which remain problematic from an ethnographic point of view—continue to influence the most recent research and are sought out for certain data. Perhaps this applies somewhat less to Balázs Orbán’s romantic Székelyföld monograph, which primarily utilizes a historical approach (Orbán 1868–1873), or to *The Austro-Hungarian Empire in Words and Pictures* (Rudolf trónörökös et al 1887–1901), a book that is less ethnographic in nature. Individual volumes within the unfinished series of county monographs edited by Samu Borovszky (Borovszky et al 1896–1911) provide—albeit pending on the competence of the respective authors—professional descriptions of peoples. However, the first scientific studies on some of the territorial units of Hungarian folk culture are represented by the pioneering works of János Jankó in the regions of Kalotaszeg (1892), Torda–Aranyosszék–Torockó (1893), and Balatonmellék (1902). In these works, Jankó incorporated anthropological and ethnological approaches along with their geographic features and dialects, and provided a benchmark used for decades afterwards by those writing regional monographs.⁴

In addition to regional descriptions, the study of distinctive cultural markers was also strengthened at the turn of the 20th century. Besides assessing the specific features of dialects, the study of cultural markers was mainly conducted in fields where territorial variations were apparent, such as in costumes and decorative art (Malonyay 1907–1922), and where the most distinguished researchers had worked (such as Zsigmond Bátty focusing on architecture in 1930, and Béla Bartók researching folk music in 1924).

In the first half of the 20th century, three major researchers—Zsigmond Bátty, István Györffy, and Károly Viski—aimed to create a comprehensive, territorial pattern characterising Hungarian folk culture based on the existing body of ethno-

2 Kósa 1998: 12.

3 For using the term ‘Moldva’ to refer to the region in Romania, see note 4 in Chapter 3.

4 Kósa 1998: 12–13.

graphical information. Yet, only Károly Viski attempted to systematise and conceptualise this subject area.⁵ Bátky reviewed the distributive features of Hungarian folk culture in an early piece of work prepared for a general audience; it appeared in the popular manual, *The Earth and its Peoples*, edited by Aladár György in 1905. Bátky did not clarify the methodological principles used in the article, and his data appeared in strange blocks according to the clusters of a contemporary census (Danube left bank, Danube right bank, Danube-Tisza Interfluve, Tisza right bank, Tisza left bank, Tisza-Maros corner and Transylvania). Due to the manner in which he, without any analysis, tried to fit data of different age, value, origin and quality, contemporary researchers deem this work ‘unacceptable despite its plausibility.’⁶ Bátky did not continue to focus on this issue, despite the ongoing interest in defining cultural regions between the two World Wars. Much like Bátky, Györffy—who remains a significant figure in the history of cultural distribution research due to his regional monographs—also approached the subject with a popularizing tone. His essay on the ethnic and cultural composition of the Hungarian people (Györffy 1925/1942) lacked conceptual definitions, just as Hungarian ethnography at that time lacked appropriate data and elaboration on this topic. Károly Viski dealt with the regional pattern of Hungarian folk culture in several studies. In the introductory section of *The Ethnology of the Hungarians*, he divided the 5 large territorial entities (Transdanubia, The Great Plain, Highlands, Transylvania, and Moldva) into 38 minor parts based on cultural traits which are not exactly defined. Viski stressed that in studying regional groups on the basis of their characteristic cultural traits, you must understand that their boundaries of penetration will not necessarily coincide with the boundaries of the regional groups carrying them as their trait⁷—an important opinion from a theoretical and methodological standpoint. In 1938, he first clearly formulated the main problem of cultural distribution studies in his work entitled *Ethnic Groups and Regions*: cultural distribution studies do not deal solely with the spread of ethnographic traits, they also refer to the study of ‘ethnic groups and geographic-ethnographic regions living in the public mind, in historical or popular tradition, or in other words, presented as reality.’⁸ At the same time he warned: ‘Our groups are thus not the findings of scientific investigation, as no such serious research was made with the intention to define boundaries.’⁹ According to Kósa, Viski’s works (including Viski 1939) placed the issue of territorial differentiation of culture on firm ground within Hungarian ethnographic studies, and it was continued by the works of Gyula Ortutay (1940) and Béla Gunda (1943).¹⁰

Following World War II, research on territorial differentiation was set aside for political reasons (as were all issues concerning Hungarian people living outside the borders of the Hungarian state), but it gained momentum again in the second half

5 Kósa 1998: 14.

6 Kósa 1998: 14.

7 Viski no date: 30.

8 Viski 1938: 2.

9 Viski 1938: 2.

10 Kósa 1998: 16. It should be noted that such interest was expressed on behalf of geography as well (for example, Kádár 1941).

of the 1950s when, with the use of international (mostly Central European) models, work on the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture* began (this will be covered in more detail in Chapter 2). Barabás (1963) established the theoretical foundations (and the cartographic method) of the undertaking. He counted the many factors responsible for the development of territorial differentiation, and his list is in many ways still valid today. According to the dominant scientific policy of the time he dealt with the production of material goods and the class nature of folk culture first, getting the mandatory requirement out of the way. Barabás—as can be clearly seen from reading the text as a whole—analysed the factors which really mattered with more serious, international, comparative materials. In line with the territorial-defining outcomes of geography, he highlighted topographical and climatic endowments. For instance, he held that the aggregate properties of soil were only an undirected, derived force of impact on culture. Furthermore, and in consonance with international research, he stressed that the importance of natural factors varies depending on the development level of the society. Out of the main institutions and ideas of society he pointed out the differentiating role of administrative frameworks and religions. He also briefly mentioned the study of small communities and co-living groups of people, but—discussing the culturally specific nature of ethnic character in a lengthy manner—arrived at the conclusion that the character of different communities can only be clarified with very considerate, comparative historical assessments. He attributed a very important role to uneven development in terms of space and time with regard to the territorial differentiation of culture. Highlighting the problematics of the spread of cultural traits (migration of ideas vs. people) Barabás emphasised that you cannot take into account all cultural traits in relation to the nature of the cultural character with the same weight because the spreading dynamics of some special knowledge affecting only a few members of the community may be rapid and does not necessarily require full comprehension and approval of the community as a whole. Finally, while emphasising the necessity of a complex approach to territorial differentiation, he pointed out that factors of differentiation have only two major categories: natural and societal factors.¹¹

The 1950s also brought a rejuvenation of the regional monograph writing tradition started by János Jankó. These books on individual, regional units were eventually compiled into a series but—as a result of their lack of methodological clarity and the outdated structure of their composition—they did little to advance research.¹² A new concept drawn from the university lectures of István Tálasi,¹³ however, was gaining more ground. This concept asserted that ‘research on regional-historical differentiation was nothing but an analytical breakdown of Hungarian folk culture, [and] that the spectrum of the Hungarian peasant culture scattered on

11 Barabás 1963: 63–126.

12 Kósa 1975: 36. Volumes in the series: Bálint 1965, Balogh 1969, Balogh 1973, Bellon 1979, Bíró 1988, Dömötör 1960, Erdész 1974, Katona 1962, Kodolányi 1960, Manga 1979, Novák 1986, Szabó 1982, Tálasi 1977, Timaffy 1980, Vajkai Aurél 1959, Vajkai 1964.

13 Tálasi no date, ‘A university text book known to only a few, but referred to by disciples quite often.’ (Paládi-Kovács 2003/1977: 64).

the prism of such “groups” was the result of [the] development in the past one hundred fifty or two hundred years.¹⁴ In other words, cultural groups treated as a unit cannot be characterised by the presence or absence of individual cultural traits, but rather by the presence of an aggregate or pattern of cultural traits. The crystallisation of these revelations led to the next summarising work, the publication of a separate book of entries by László Kósa and Antal Filep for *The Lexicon of Hungarian Ethnology*. This book, *The Regional-Historical Differentiation of the Hungarian People* has served as a jumping-off point for all differentiation research in Hungary in the past decades.¹⁵

The study of groups of cultural traits or complex cultural aspects of the whole Hungarian language area, which Bátky and Bartók started, continued into the second half of the 20th century. As with their forerunners, researchers focused on the areas of architecture (Barabás and Gilyén 1987), folk music (Vargyas 1988) folk dance (Martin no date, 1980, 1990), and decorative art (Domanovszky 1981). Researchers also investigated, in a somewhat undetailed manner, areas earlier overlooked but that bore distinct, regional features in the public mind, such as: food preparation and consumption (Kisbán 1982), and subfields of individual aspects of culture like hemp processing (Szolnokoy 1972) and human-powered transport (Paládi-Kovács 1973, 1973b).

While ethnographic studies conducted in the second half of the 20th century continued to follow the aforementioned twofold task, an important emphasis on theoretical considerations was added to the research on cultural traits. Along with increasingly thorough descriptions of the regions defined by cultural, geographic, historical or linguistic ‘consensus’ these studies laid the foundation for further work on regional distribution. They applied and completed the work of Barabás within their local sites of investigation in terms of determining which aspects were most necessary in differentiating and naming regional groups of Hungarian folk culture. (Issues of terminology will be discussed in Chapter 1.5.1.) It follows that the ambition to delineate clusters of settlements and communities—which the general public commonly thought of as distinct from their respective neighbours—by cultural traits or by aggregates of their typical features remained alive from the 1950s onward. The ‘pilot area’ of these investigations was mainly Southwest-Hungary, and Baranya County in particular. For example, János Kodolányi (1958) used cultural traits (such as characteristic pieces of costumes) to define the boundaries of Ormánság, widely known before the war as a culturally rich area with a dwindling population as couples had only one child in order to escape poverty. Later, János Zentai (1967, 1972) used the web of relationships established by marriage to define the Ormánság area. Bertalan Andrásfalvy (1972) analysed the cultural distinction between North Mecsek and the rest of Baranya County by considering cultural traits. Eventually, Zentai (1978) studied the entire territory of Baranya County and

14 Kósa 1975: 37.

15 The major deficiency in the volume, a map not endorsed by the authorities at that time (László Kósa, personal communication), was successfully supplemented in *The Lexicon of Hungarian Ethnology* (Kósa 1982: 148–149).

included a number of cultural traits alongside geographic, historical, and linguistic aspects (religion, marriage relations, community identity, customs, etc.), resulting in the definition of 10 geographically distinct entities in Baranya. His work has provided delineation analysis with the most comprehensive set of criteria in the history of territorial-cultural differentiation to date. Edit Kerecsényi (1979) attempted to divide Zala, another South Transdanubian county, on the basis of outstanding cultural traits (costumes, art), but the lack of outstanding traits in certain areas led to gaps or ‘white spots’ in her study. Expanding to the whole country, the focus on cultural traits in ethnographic research led to the identification of the Pota group near the town of Kalocsa (Bárth 1973), as well as a group near the town of Lendva¹⁶ (Szentmihályi 1977b), and Vilmos Diószegi (1968) defined the territory inhabited by people originating from the Palóc group of North Hungary using the spread of the belief in a single supernatural being, the Markoláb. The concept of ‘us’ and ‘them’—self-identity, the emic aspect of demarcation from others—was an important factor in delineation studies like Attila Paládi-Kovács’ work on the Barkó (1968/2003, and 1982/2006), István Sándor on the Matyó group (1976), or Imre Szentmihályi on the people of Hetés (1977, 1977b).

Vilmos Voigt’s semiotic approach deserves special mention as a method focusing on the spatial character of culture in which priority is given to the theoretical aspects of research. For Voigt, spatiality is ‘used to indicate *two* very distinct and hence, *to be distinguished*, groups of traits. One is a *system of objects*, in other words inherent property of the facts observed, while the other is a *metasystem* only, in other words the notion of analyses.’¹⁷ Therefore, he defines various levels of cultural traits (eight, in fact) used to interpret spatiality ranging from the regional character of the natural environment to the primary (communication) and secondary (symbol systems based on communication) modelling systems. He believes cultural delineation can only be implemented in the latter as a difference between the sets created by the aggregate of certain properties.¹⁸ His idea, however, was not developed upon in later theoretical works.¹⁹

The most complete picture on the research conducted between 1950 and 1980, and the problems inherited in their theoretical and terminological foundations, can be found in the compilation, *Research Methods of Ethnographic Groups* (Paládi-Kovács ed. 1980). This collection of presentations given at a conference organised in Sárospatak, in Northeast Hungary, reflects the participants’ conclusion that due to the many different standpoints and uncertainties in attitudes and approaches it will remain impossible to arrive at a consensus in the future.²⁰ The reason for this, according to Kósa (1998), who authored the last piece of work completed in the 20th century on the issue of the territorial differentiation of culture, is that ‘what is called

16 Today Lendava (Slovenia).

17 Voigt 1984: 76. (Emphasis in the original.)

18 Voigt 1984: 78–83.

19 According to László Kürti’s critique it may also be caused by the fact that Voigt ‘analyses “spatiality of human culture” by unusable, outdated semiotic and communication models.’ (Kürti 2000: 15)

20 Kósa 1998: 29.

by Hungarian ethnography research of ethnic or ethnographic groups, is a mixture of at least four, clearly distinct set of issues.²¹ They are: (1) the investigation of historical-local rural and regional names, including the related regional divisions, (2) the study of groups bearing names similar to the names of people (like Palóc, Pota, Matyó etc.), (3) the ethnographic investigation of geographic regions and zones, and (4) the research of the spatial spread of cultural traits. For Kósa, the latter requires a different methodological approach than the other three, and is also the most important for ethnography as cultural elements rather than geographical aspects are the governing factor. He stresses the importance of cartographic methods when studying the spatial spread of cultural traits, but also points out that relatively few cultural traits were mapped in terms of spatial distribution.²² In his monograph, Kósa lists the factors triggering regional differentiation; he emphasizes the priority of geographic and social factors in line with Barabás, though he places the accents elsewhere—in particular, to transmission agents as a social factor (city dwellers, nobility, free peasantry), and the relationship between landlords and serfs.²³ The golden thread in his work is a historical process: ‘embourgeoisement’ (the modernisation process of the rural population), which caused a strong expression of regional differentiation in the period under his investigation (1880–1920). Thus, he does not start with the investigation of cultural-trait clusters causing regional differentiation, but rather intends to capture the impact of the modernisation of the rural population on folk culture, and the resulting changes as expressed in the regional pattern of folk culture.²⁴ The clusters of cultural phenomena used in his work are those found in the ‘expressive areas’ of folk culture (costumes, decorative art, home-interiors, architecture, food, economy, music, dance, folk poetry, customs and behaviour). In other words, these are not the factors used to denote regional differentiation, but rather the areas of expression of historical development—which is uneven in terms of space. Kósa, in fact, could not rely upon the regional differentiation of these clusters of traits since Hungarian ethnography had only focused on certain aspects (music, dance, architecture) to draw a differentiation pattern applicable to the entire language area. This is why he stipulates that even the large regional divisions (Transdanubia, Great Plain, Highlands, Transylvania, and Moldva)—a distinction assumed to be a commonplace in Hungarian social sciences—would serve only as a framework for description: ‘because their demarcation lacks scientific scrutiny, our definition (of a region) can not be extended to them’.²⁵

In the 1990s and early 2000s, an eight-volume compilation, *Hungarian Ethnography* was published. Aside from the introduction, each volume deals with a certain, larger cultural aspect (economy, handicrafts, lifestyle, folklore, folk music and dance, customs and beliefs, society). These works—reflecting the research of the

21 Kósa 1998: 19.

22 Kósa 1998: 16–29. This last statement certainly appeared before the publication of the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture*, since the first version of his book appeared in 1990.

23 Kósa 1998: 49–59.

24 Kósa 1998: 59.

25 Kósa 1998: 31.

period—lacked detailed descriptions of the regional differentiation of each of the aforementioned aspects with a few exceptions (buildings, music, dance). In the late 1980s until the early 2000s, however, large scale works concerning cultural differentiation and the ethnographic characterisation of the entire Hungarian language area, or a large part of it, were produced (for example: Halász 1988, Balassa 1989, Katona 1990, Vas 1999, and Liszka 2002). The issue was also covered in recapitulative ethnographic works (Kósa and Szemerkenyi 1973, Kósa 1991).²⁶ Studies on territorial differentiation in ethnography had an impact on other branches of science in Hungary (e.g. geography, linguistics) insofar as they took these studies into account when creating their own system of territorial distribution (Hajdú-Moharos and Hevesi 1997/2002), or when analysing the naming of land (Juhász 1988).

The map, 'Ethnographic groups, ethnographic and historical regions of the Hungarians', produced in the edition of Imre Faragó (2004), which highlights only a few territorial units as 'ethnographic groups' selected by an uncertain set of criteria aside from putting the greatest number of historical, geographical and ethnographic place names on a map, clearly reflects both the general public's demand for a picture of the regional structure of Hungarian folk culture and the ever-present lack of clarity in the selection of analytical criteria. It seems to prove László Kürti's (2000) opinion regarding the confusion over the set of criteria in plotting the territorial structure of ethnic groups, the diffuse nature of the boundaries of which he analysed.

Interestingly, several, large compilations were published in 2011: the substantially longer and more detailed Hungarian version of this book (Borsos 2011), and two volumes of the book *Regions of Hungarian Folk Culture*, a work partially developed from the present book aimed at a wider audience (Borsos and Magyar 2011). At the same time, and in conjunction with these papers, the introductory volume of *Hungarian Ethnography* was printed—more than half of which deals with the regional differentiation of folk culture. Despite the fact that the introductory volume was the last in the series to be printed, with its descriptions of geographic units based mainly on the divisions set up by István Tálasi in the 1970s, the series harkens the reader back to the late 1980s when the idea for its publication was launched (Paládi-Kovács and Mohay 2011).

Even with reviews and books on the delineation of major (Felföld: Paládi 1994/2003) and minor (Kalotaszeg: Balogh and Fülemlé 2004) regional entities, and additional research made in specific, partial areas of culture (for example, István Pávai completed a sophisticated differentiation of Transylvanian folk music in 2005), and with old aspects given new emphasis (for example, the 'production land' concept based on natural, ethnic and economic factors used by János Bali in 2005²⁷), the available data provided a comprehensive picture of the regional differentiation

26 Beside those mentioned above, shorter essays were also published dealing with 'ethnic' or 'ethnographic' groups, which seem to be reviews according to their titles (Lukács 1989, Katona 1992, and Kodolányi 2000), and as they did not formulate any new perspectives. In one of his most recent publications, Ferenc Pozsony describes the division of Transylvania and provides a review on regional differentiation research (Pozsony 2012–2013).

27 On the concept of the 'production' see also: Bodó 1979, Viga 1984, Illés 2005.

of cultural aspects only to a limited extent. However, the volumes of the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture* published between 1987 and 1992 provided Hungarian ethnography with a set of data which could be used to develop a picture of regional differentiation for several groups of cultural traits. Nevertheless, this was only completed in an area which was already well developed, architecture (Harkai 1995). Even the chief editor, Barabás, avoided using the atlas' data to create a general spatial distribution pattern, but instead tried to create a more accurate representation of the cultural differentiation of small regions by making a denser sample (1989). As a matter of fact, the 634 maps included in the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture* represent a wealth of information which can only be evaluated to a limited extent without technical assistance. The basis for a differentiation study encompassing the entire data set should be a computerised process: the definition of groups (cluster analysis) should be carried out using digitised material. The outcome of such an analysis may inspire new research. As Barabás pointed out: 'it stands beyond doubt that such systems of connections could be revealed by the computerisation of the mapped data on the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture*, which we cannot even think of right now'.²⁸

All in all, it can be said that in Hungarian ethnography research on regional differentiation in folk culture is organised around two sets of scopes of responsibility:

1. Without an exact clarification of the set of delineation criteria, it
 - a) would establish a grouping system covering the complete Hungarian language area, or the Kingdom of Hungary, where historic, geographic and ethnographic aspects are combined to determine the entities and structures which are commonly referred to in public discourse.
 - b) carries out the historical, cultural and ethnographic characterisation of territorial units that have been created by the general public and are commonly referred to in public discourse.

2. Based on a single, typical aspect of folk culture or historical development (e.g. music, dance, architecture, and modernisation of the rural population)
 - a) it establishes a spatial differentiation structure for the entire Hungarian language area (or for Hungary as a historical or post World War I country), and
 - b) based on the aforementioned, and/or other cultural trait(s) considered important, it delineates some minor territorial units.

The purpose of computer-aided processing, namely a cluster analysis of the data of the *Atlas of Hungarian Folk Culture*, is to establish a regional structure for the entire Hungarian language area as listed in point 2.a, based on several cultural traits and aspects demonstrated in the atlas. The objective of this book is to make a comparative investigation of the results of the computer-aided processing with the various

28 Barabás 1992: 627.

approaches of differentiation studies and regional units based on the previous ethnographic research, thus presenting the regional structure of Hungarian folk culture with the broadest possible foundation.

1.2 Atlases of ethnography in Europe

As early as the 19th century it became quite clear in international ethnographic research that the origin and history of cultural phenomena cannot be revealed or interpreted without taking into account the spatial aspects of culture. To this end, it was expedient to develop a cartographic method to easily demonstrate the spatiality of any trait by mapping the available data, be it precipitation or population density. After the theoretical foundations for the spatial approach were laid, ethnocartography was increasingly characterised by systematisation, which led to the creation of atlases of ethnography in the first half of the 20th century.²⁹ Though the concept of ethnographic atlases has undergone a number of changes in the past 100 years, the consideration that exploration of and understanding the culture of a people might be easier when many cultural traits, rather than one or two, are collected and mapped with the same selection criteria remains the basic starting point. The selection criteria represents the respective aspects of culture as completely as possible, and thus the visual representation is made using the same selection principles in order to allow for comparison and matching.

While in the early stages of ethnographic mapping general anthropology and European ethnology were developing in close connection to each other (distinguished users of the method included Arnold van Gennep, Leo Frobenius, and other great figures in anthropology), large scale atlases were only made in European countries due to their substantial infrastructure needs. Wilhelm Pessler of Germany strongly promoted the use of the method in the beginning of the 20th century, yet ethnography only adopted it after World War I to consider the issues arising from the spatial arrangement of traits and phenomena based on mapping large-scale and localised data, instead of merely using maps to illustrate a specific topic. It logically developed that distribution maps should and must be created not on the basis of data obtained from other sources, but by using data specifically collected for the purpose of mapping, and to compile the collection of those maps in an atlas. In Germany and Poland researchers planned to prepare ethnographic atlases in the early 1920s, but the first important work, from an ethnographic perspective, was that of Jaberg and Jud (1928), who created a language atlas for Italy and South Switzerland by processing the data of nearly 1000 research points³⁰ evenly distributed throughout the Ital-

29 Barabás 1963: 20. Barabás critically reviewed the history of ethnographic atlases in Hungarian literature (1955, 1963). More recently, Árpád Papp summarised these atlases on a regional and historical basis as the prequel to ethnocartography in his 2006 PhD thesis. With the existence of these two works, and the fact that my work focuses elsewhere (the international outlook in Chapter 4), in this section I will provide an overview of these atlases based mainly on Barabás' and Papp's research.

30 Árpád Papp claims that only 416 of these were active collection points (Papp 2006: 47).

ian language area—a methodology that could be used to create ethnographic atlases as well.³¹ The first of these atlases³² was prepared by Kazimierz Moszyński and his team in Poland between the two World Wars. Because it was clearly defined thematically and in size (18 trained ethnographers worked on 134 research points, mostly on beliefs), they actually managed to finish the atlas, yet their work did not gain the attention of a wider audience. Far more influential in terms of its impact on European atlases, was the first print wave of the *Atlas der Deutschen Volkskunde* (Atlas of German Ethnography), or *ADV*, which consisted of 120 maps. Published between 1930 and 1935, it contained data collected from partially processed questionnaires containing 243 questions sent to correspondents at 20,000 collection points. Unfortunately, some issues and aspects of processing the atlas did not escape the influence of the National Socialist morale of the time.³³ Despite its deficiencies, the *ADV* proved that ethnographic atlases were justified, and provided atlas makers in a number of nations with a model from which to draw lessons³⁴ (for instance, none of the later atlases, even the Austrian atlas which most closely followed the German method, relied entirely on correspondents).³⁵

The completion of an ethnographic atlas requires a great deal of scientific resources, institutional backing, careful preparation, and last but not least, substantial funding. Thus, it is little wonder that World War II interrupted all work on European atlases except in Sweden and Switzerland, which were only indirectly affected by the war. Nordic researchers focused mainly on data collection: although the plans for the atlas were completed in the thirties, the volume on material culture only appeared in 1957. Interestingly, their findings were not published sheet³⁶ by sheet, but as a book with maps and comments printed and page-set side by side in Swedish, which did not facilitate it gaining recognition among the wider scientific community. The second part of their research, on intangible culture, was published nearly 20 years later in 1976, and was presented with a somewhat more systematic structure. The work on Swiss atlases, however, was conducted without interruption, with the orderliness attributed to the Swiss, and in a timely manner (as if to justi-

31 Barabás 1963: 24–27. In order to avoid an overwhelming quantity of footnotes, I do not separately reference each of the atlases and commentary volumes mentioned hereinafter; they can be found instead in the Bibliography (234–236).

32 Some of the editors of the atlases of ethnography have provided an English title (for example, the Finnish, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and Swedish), but some have not (such as the Austrian, German, Slovakian, and Swiss). Furthermore, those translated to English do not follow a general rule (Romanian Ethnographic Atlas; Atlas of Swedish Folk Culture; the two volumes of the Finnish atlas have two different titles: Atlas of Finnish *Folk* Culture 1. Material Culture; Atlas of Finnish *Ethnic* Culture 2. Folklore). Taking this into account, I equally use the expressions ‘atlas of ethnography’, ‘atlas of...folk culture’, ‘ethnographic atlas’ etc. regarding the atlas involved, and never as a real title.

33 This is clearly seen from the papers of the co-chief editor, Heinz Röhr, discussing the issues of “Volkstum” (national character) with regard to the *ADV* (Röhr 1938, 1939). For a complete review of the political problems of the pre-war questionnaires and maps of the *ADV* see Gansohr-Meinel 1993.

34 Barabás 1955: 414–418.

35 Wolfram 1968: 93.

36 Atlas maps may be printed on individual sheets of paper which are not always bound together. Hence, one sheet is often synonymous with one map.

fy their characterisation in collection note No. 5 of the *ADV* focusing on national character). As the lessons learned from the German atlas advocated against further use of the correspondence method,³⁷ the Swiss utilized a mere 11 scientists to carry out collection work at nearly 400 research points on 150 topics between 1937 and 1942. The maps were continuously published between 1950 and 1983.³⁸ The exemplary role of the Swiss atlas is reinforced by the fact that supplementary commentary volumes explaining the data were prepared in addition to the maps. Furthermore, the work successfully continued following the untimely death of the main organiser, Richard Weiss, in a mountaineering accident in 1962.³⁹ Barabás understandably declared his high esteem for the atlas saying, ‘this is the very first complete atlas which appeared with an appropriate introduction and explanatory section, where the original objectives set was consistently adhered to throughout the entire work from the beginning to the end.’⁴⁰ The difficulties encountered completing such a thorough and in all aspects mature atlas are clearly reflected by the fact that no atlas with a similar number of maps and encompassing as many cultural aspects with complete, explanatory comments has since been completed.

In the second half of the 1950s, work on European atlases gained new momentum and moved beyond the completion of individual national atlases to the wider aim of creating a European atlas of ethnography based on uniform editorial principles. Beside convergent tendencies, however, these atlases also reflected divergent trends. In France, one of cartography’s ancient homelands, instead of purely ethnographic atlases, regional language atlases taking note of ethnographic materials were put in the forefront. Spain followed suit.⁴¹ In the member republics of the Soviet Union (and in the Czech area of Czechoslovakia), the objective was to compile ‘historical-ethnographic’ atlases. These researchers strived to record diachronous rather than synchronous data, and hence, tried to capture the dynamics of a changing culture instead of a snapshot representing the contemporary state of affairs or a certain time-window of regional differentiation in folk culture. Consequently, their materials were not derived from wide-ranging ethnographic fieldwork, but rather from museums and archives, with the exception of data collection in regions that were not represented by older materials.⁴² All of this inevitably entailed the dominance (in fact, the exclusivity) of material culture, as evidenced by the contents of the published Baltic and Russian atlases. The large amount of archival material, and the failure to associate dates or periods with the data, make the Finnish atlas of ethnography a transient type; the dynamics of change in folk culture can mainly be interpreted from its data. In terms of formatting, the first volume of the Finnish atlas

37 Weiss 1950: 18–19.

38 The index was only published in 1995.

39 Geiger, who was much older, passed away in 1952. http://www.unigeschichte.unibas.ch/cms/upload/FaecherUndFakultaeten/Downloads/Burckhardt-Seebass_Volkskunde.pdf (pages 8, 11, last accessed 12 March 2016)

40 Barabás 1963: 37.

41 On French ethnocartography see the related articles by Schippers et al 1982–83. The French and Spanish ethnolinguistic works are listed and analysed by Papp 2006: 64–67, 68–69.

42 Barabás 1955: 417; Barabás 1956b: 361–362; Barabás 1963: 38.

follows its Swedish counterpart in that the— unfortunately, not very detailed—comments were placed alongside maps, but contrary to the monolingual Swedish atlas, the text was translated to German as well. The second volume of the Finnish atlas on non-material culture (wherein comments were printed before the maps) was also published in German.

As seen retrospectively from the 21st century, the compilation of ‘real’ ethnographic atlases⁴³ utilizing a synchronous methodology explicitly for the purpose of creating a collection of national or country maps using a large infrastructure remained a primarily Central European approach and project. The atlas encompassing Dutch and Belgian Flemish territories—as it dealt exclusively with beliefs—remained biased; the Czech atlas, though called ethnographic, contains exclusively historical particulars; while the Yugoslavian and Greek initiatives were abandoned after the publication of only a few maps. Researchers from Norway, Denmark, Bulgaria, Albania, Portugal, Ireland and other countries may have appeared at international atlas conferences, yet the various initiatives they reported on did not develop beyond the planning phase.

Ethnographic studies in Poland and Germany experienced a surge of activity and implementation in the 1950s that was not unlike that of the pre-war period. German researchers were faced with processing a huge amount of previously collected data that had already been partially published, while Polish researchers needed to start collecting afresh. On the one hand, Moszyński’s material was biased, and on the other, Poland was “pushed to the West” by the peace treaty that had ended World War II. The new Polish atlas did not take into account the folk culture phenomena in the Polish language area, but rather in the political territory of modern-day Poland. Therefore, a problem arose caused by the cultural mapping of areas which belonged to Germany before the war: Germans who had lived there were deported and new settlers came mostly from Eastern Poland, which had since been occupied by the Soviet Union.⁴⁴ In the new venture, a total of 900 maps were proposed to embrace nearly all aspects of folk culture. With the exception of 17 trial sheets from 1958, only 355 sheets were actually printed between 1964 and 1981. The first commentary volume of the Polish atlas appeared in 1993, when the scientific audience was informed that an additional 270 sheets were ready to print and that the data for the last 275 maps had also been compiled.⁴⁵ However, the maps were not published due to financial reasons, and the concept changed: commentary volumes were published in the 1990s, and these included previously unpub-

43 According to Ingrid Kretschmer, an editor of the Austrian atlas of ethnography who summarised the conclusions from the German, Austrian and Swiss atlases, ‘real’ atlases are only those which contain data associated with retrievable collection points, representing a single period, in which uniform collection methods were used (Kretschmer 1965: 12).

44 Zender 1959: 106.

45 Bohdanowicz 1993: 33. Even previously unpublished sheets were used, however, roughly 80 such sheets are used by Bohdanowicz to characterise typical, traditional forms of wedding ceremonies (Bohdanowicz 1988/1991: 57–58). See also Gajek-Kłodnicki 1976–77.

lished maps.⁴⁶ The new sequel to the German atlas included 80 pages accompanied by commentary volumes to enhance the function of the atlas. However, as the new volumes only contain folkloristic materials, the biased approach remains unchanged. And, as the original responses from correspondents in the 1930s were also processed in the sequel, the maps cover territories which have since been attached to Poland and the Soviet Union, and in the case of certain data, to parts of Central Europe inhabited by German minorities.

The Austrian ethnographic atlas followed the German correspondence method in compiling questionnaires, but the Austrians published commentary volumes from the beginning. The Austrian atlas, however, derives from its German model as it contains a number of illustrative, auxiliary sheets and photographic tables. Among the atlases finished in the second half of the 20th century, the Slovak atlas provides the most complete picture of a folk culture. Prepared and published ahead of the Slovak independence efforts of 1990, the atlas claims eligibility for the entire Slovak political territory and includes materials on areas inhabited by Hungarians. It presents a variety of cultural aspects and explains the material with a number of illustrations, but the comments printed beside the maps lack detail and are not translated.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the Slovak atlas is exemplary in the sense that it processes its own material: the regional differentiation of cultural aspects are presented at the end of thematic blocks, outlining the cultural regions of Slovakia as a whole at the end of the volume.

Ethnographers interested in atlas work also set out to prepare a European atlas of ethnography using uniform editorial principles. The idea was originally raised by Sigurd Erixon before the war, but the organisational committee (SIA) was only established in 1953.⁴⁸ Following the 1958 planning meeting in Linz (Bratanić and Burgstaller 1959) the organizers met in their official capacities⁴⁹ every two years in the 1960s and 1970s (Zagreb in 1966, Bonn in 1968, Helsinki in 1970, Stockholm in 1972, Budapest-Visegrád in 1974, St. Pölten in 1976, Eniskillen/Northern Ireland in 1978). Though the participants all gave accounts of the current state of their respective national atlases, the main aim was to develop a uniform questionnaire and set of criteria necessary for the ethnographic mapping of Europe and the adjacent territories. In spite of the preparatory work which launched a number of activities, and the interest other disciplines and areas outside of Europe⁵⁰ showed in the project, the creation of the European atlas was a failure. The driving forces behind the atlas lost interest or died, and the next generation of ethnographers put their research

46 <http://weinoe.us.edu.pl/content/instytut-etnologii-i-antropologii-kulturowej/polski-atlas-etnograficzny> (last accessed 7 April 2014). The site is no longer in operation.

47 The key and the text explanations were published in a separate, fairly simply-designed volume in German (Kovačevićova 1991).

48 Erixon 1955, ill. Bratanić 1965: 243–244.

49 Initially, the organiser was officially the organising committee of the atlas of ethnography of Europe and the adjacent countries. This name was changed in 1990 to the International Ethnographic Working Group.

50 See for example, Bratanić 1979, Kretschmer 1967, 1975.

focus elsewhere.⁵¹ Only one map, depicting the dates of an annual lighting of a fire in a field, was prepared for the Ethnological Atlas of Europe (Zender 1980), and it relied heavily on the databases of previous national atlases. The institution of ethnocartographic conferences almost dissolved following the 1978 meeting; the next conference was organised 12(!) years later in 1990 at Stará Lesná (Felsőerdőfalva), Slovakia. While attendees faced the failure of the ethnological atlas of Europe, work on other ethnographic atlases (Czech, Hungarian, and the freshly finished Slovak atlas) gave some impetus to the idea of continuing in some capacity. Cartographers of ethnography continued their activities under a new name with new priorities: the processing of certain topics with a focus on the use of cartographic methods.⁵² The 1990s brought the last of the ethnocartographic conferences (Bad Honnef, Germany in 1993, and Třešť, Czech Republic in 1996). The eleventh conference, held in Cieszyn/Teschin (Poland) in 1998, was followed two years later by a 12th meeting, in Komarno/Komárom, Slovakia, at which the 'last Mohicans' (H. L. Cox and Alexander Fenton) resigned as leaders of the working group. Official activities were never revived, as indicated by the failure of the last meeting in Szeged, Hungary in 2009.⁵³ Facing the failure, researchers interested in the spatial distribution of folk culture formed the working group, Space-lore and Place-lore within the SIEF, but regard the International Ethnocartography Working Group as their forerunner.⁵⁴

In spite of a loosened web of international connections, work on national ethnographic atlases did not cease. In 2000, Volume 3 of the Czech atlas, which contains historical data, and a German language edition of the folklore volume of the Finnish atlas were published. The publication of a five-volume Romanian ethnographic atlas began in 2003. It should also be mentioned that the ethnographical atlas of the Hungarians in Voivodina, a regional rather than national atlas, was published in 2002 in an entirely digital, not hard copy, format following the changing times.⁵⁵

51 The failure of the European Atlas of Ethnography was analysed at length by Rooijackers and Meurkens (2000, in particular 79ff) in connection with the novel, *Het Bureau (The Office)*, written by a prominent member of the European atlas committee, J. J. Voskuil. He suspects a conflict between generations to lie behind the problems, but his views are not commonly shared (see Cox 1988).

52 Fenton 2000/2001: 225.

53 Beside the co-chairs, Thomas Schippers and Gábor Barna, only one researcher actively involved in ethnocartography was present: the author. On the outcomes of earlier conferences see: Bericht 1977, 1978, Beschlüsse 1972, Bratanic and Burgstaller 1959, Cox 1993/94, Feltenberg 1970, 1972, Fenton 1981, Kisbán 1978, Liszka 2000–2001, and Vařeka et al 1997.

54 <http://www.siefhome.org/wg/iea/> (last accessed 12 March 2016)

55 According to the enthusiastic review by Vilmos Voigt, 'this is the first Hungarian ethnographic work made with really modern technology. Everybody will mimic, follow and intend to surpass – unless [he/she] wants to get stuck in some kind of ancient tradition forever.' (Voigt 2002: 210)

1.3 Using ethnographic atlases to draw a picture of regional cultural patterns

According to Alexander Fenton, ‘with the careful selection of the features to be plotted, and attention to the chronological compatibility of the evidence from published or questionnaire sources, a sound basis should be provided for relating the theme and its various features to geographical space, and new patterns and relationships should become evident. In this it should fulfil the basic function of an ethnological atlas.’⁵⁶ The use of maps in ethnographic atlases, in other words, the horizontal distribution of various cultural traits within a territory occupied by a nation or ethnic group for the purposes of defining cultural regions and cultural boundaries, is a very palpable idea that appeared quite early on in ethnocartography.⁵⁷ Applicable and relevant analyses were published early in the processing phase of some national ethnographic atlases, even before the actual maps were published. In 1947, for example, Richard Weiss, an editor of the ethnographic atlas of Switzerland, noted, based on his experience of processing the collected data, that the so-called Brünig–Napf–Reuss-line constituted a cultural boundary between East and West Switzerland (Weiss 1947)—a claim which was later substantiated by analysing and overlapping 18 ethnographic maps (Weiss 1952).⁵⁸ In the first volume of the Swedish ethnographic atlas (1957), Sigurd Erixon made attempt to draw the outlines of cultural meso-regions using historical data and information about the traditional material culture.⁵⁹

Such analyses saw its heyday in the 1970s. Knut Kolsrud of Norway, based on the work of Erixon, stated that when analysing the problematic of cultural areas and their boundaries, which can be defined with the help of ethnographic atlases and maps, a cultural area ‘has a stable distribution of institutionalized forms which are assumed to stand in connexion to one another’⁶⁰ and that ‘the criterion for a boundary is therefore stability over a shorter or longer period.’⁶¹ However, he did not consider all cultural components to be of equal value in terms of defining cultural areas: ‘for example the elements which function together with natural resources such as

56 Fenton 1976: 12.

57 Kolsrud also evaluated their general conditions and correlations, and summarised his conclusions in 15 points which will later be quoted (Kolsrud 1973: 29–30).

58 Weiss’s results, which hold that the boundaries of religious and other cultural traits are more important than linguistic borders (see Weiss 1951), were later questioned. However, this does not diminish the validity of using ethnographic maps to this end, it merely calls attention to the importance of the selection principle of the groups of phenomena used. Burckhardt-Seebass and others noted that Weiss, giving priority to national unity over all else during World War II and the Cold War maybe, unconsciously, overstressed phenomena which crosses language borders. It might happen that the so-called ‘Röstigraben’, which expresses fundamental cultural differences by the spread of a food item (a fried, grated, potato pancake), was more important than the line he drew 100 km to the east, because the former happens to coincide with the French–German language border (Burckhardt-Seebass 1993, in particular 15, and 18–20).

59 Barabás 1980: 30.

60 Kolsrud 1973: 9.

61 Kolsrud 1973: 8.

raw materials, the bases of production, and other topographical conditions are important.⁶² In this respect, he followed the cultural core theory of Julian Steward.⁶³ As a result, Kolsrud outlined the existence of two types of areas: the element and the system area. The element area is characterized by ‘internal likeness and external difference’ that ‘can concern any element at all, i.e. the smallest unit under analysis. In the system area, on the other hand, ‘elements are found in a combination not existing outside the boundaries of that area.’⁶⁴ Ilmar Talve (1973/74) defined Finnish folk culture patterns with the help of a number of distribution maps—without the use of the Finnish atlas of ethnography which had not been published at the time. He found that cultural boundaries exist where the dispersion range boundaries of a number of important phenomena representing various aspects of folk culture coincide.⁶⁵ His findings remain acceptable, but his argument is somewhat weakened by the fact that he mainly gave significance to ‘old traits’ and disregarded data that did not fit his pattern.⁶⁶ Regardless, his comparison of the cultural boundaries in Finland (two major east-west, with three additional units in each), outlined with linguistic, physical-geographic, political and religious boundaries, makes him worth following. Talve’s fellow countryman, Lauri Honko, expressed his doubts in the wake of Barth (who held that the traditional boundaries of cultural traits cannot also be interpreted as ethnically significant boundaries⁶⁷), that any conglomerate of certain cultural traits could ever represent an ethnic group in itself. Honko’s conclusions were inspired by the maps of Talve where we see that ‘the boundary lines of many elements of tradition wind about rather capriciously’. As a result, Honko stated that it would be better to ‘speak of zone-like cultural boundaries’.⁶⁸ Józef Gajek (1976) seemingly reinforced Honko’s doubts in his analysis of the maps of the Polish atlas of ethnography, during which he established a total of 11 territorial units on the basis of the spread of certain clusters of phenomena (i.e. the distribution pattern of a total of 6 cultural zones or belts), that do not constitute an interpretable territorial structure as they overlap and cross each other. The reason for this is that the clusters of traits characterising the zones penetrate from various directions to various directions, while the zones themselves are not territorial units defined by the clusters of cultural traits. (Therefore the structure of the zones reflecting the spread of different clusters of traits was simpler in Finland, a country more geographically closed and culturally alike.) Gajek tried to resolve this problem two years earlier (Gajek 1974) by making distinctions between zones containing clusters of cultural traits that originated from other ethnic groups and spread by migration and diffu-

62 Kolsrud 1973: 9.

63 Steward 1955: 37.

64 Kolsrud 1973: 10.

65 Talve 1973/74: 56.

66 Paládi-Kovács 1980: 69.

67 Barth 1969: 38.

68 Honko 1973: 33. Referring to Honko, Tamás Hofer (1980: 121) cautiously warns against ethnography as a science trying to determine ethnographic groups on the basis of the spread of cultural elements. For me, however, Honko and Barth’s criticism only substantiates the zonal nature of ethnographic boundaries, which was accepted by ethnography as a solid fact at the time (Kolsrud 1973: 26).

sion, and the so-called historical-ethnographic regions that are characterised by specific cultural traits and which are separated from each other—according to him—by their distinct group identities. Lacking a computerised processing procedure, Gajek still failed to compare the zones he defined on the basis of substantial data sets with other zones or ethnographic regions at the time. The dichotomy of zones drawn up according to alien cultural impact and historical-ethnographic regions determined according to ancient Polish settlement areas provided the basis for Bohdanowicz's analysis (1987). However, while Gajek worked mainly from the first 350 maps of the Polish atlas of ethnography dealing with material culture, Bohdanowicz managed to also evaluate unpublished maps dealing with intangible culture and arrived at the conclusion that historical provinces differ from a cultural perspective as well.⁶⁹ Two Irish scientists argued in favour of the need for an Irish ethnological atlas in order to explain the cultural distribution pattern of their country in greater detail.⁷⁰ While such an atlas has yet to come to fruition, they have outlined the possibility of it in a joint article (mostly based on their former map making experiences⁷¹). A cultural differentiation study was prepared on the basis of the data from Rhine country in the German atlas of ethnography (Borsos 2001, 2005, see Chapter 4.8). Since the German atlas contains data from language areas, it was used by scientists from neighbouring countries to compare linguistic and cultural boundaries.⁷² Micro-analysis was carried out in Hungary based on the Szolnok County atlas of ethnography (for example, Gulyás and Szabó 1998, Örsi 1998, 1999).⁷³

The most complete analysis of an atlas in terms of territorial distribution was carried out by the authors of the Slovak ethnographic atlas. Based on data taken from the atlas, the last map of each thematic block was a map of cultural distribution, a great part of which was prepared using the conventional method of overlapping relevant atlas pages.⁷⁴ An additional 10 summary maps were added to the last part of the atlas to outline the territorial distribution of folk culture in Slovakia.⁷⁵ Thereafter this work could be referred to, for instance, when cultural and linguistic

69 Bohdanowicz 1987: 191.

70 Gailey and O'Danachair 1976: 30.

71 Gailey 1964, O'Danachair 1957, 1965.

72 For example, Vařeka 1993/94: 50, or Kłodnicki 1984, Staszczak 1973. Though fewer cultural differentiation studies were made on the basis of the *ADV* (spread regions were researched), German scientists interested in ethnocartography tried to exploit this wealth of material (see for example, Grober-Glück 1959, 1962, 1977, 1989–90, Zender 1965, Wiegelmann 1984, Cox 1984, 1989–90, 1991, 1999, Simon 2003, 2005).

73 The usefulness of ethnographic atlases is indicated by the rich comparative materials they offer in certain areas. In a long study carried out as part of his academic doctoral thesis, László Lukács compares the date when Christmas trees were introduced, and the data he used came from various Central European atlases of ethnography (Lukács 2006).

74 These included: III/15. (animal husbandry), IV/40. (crafts), VII/39–41. (food), VIII/34–35. (costumes), IX/48–51. (buildings), X/28. (society), XI/44–47. (family), XII/30–33. (life cycle), XIII/30–33. (calendar customs).

75 XX/1–10.