



UNIUNEA EUROPEANĂ



GUVERNUL ROMÂNIEI  
MINISTERUL MUNCII, FAMILIEI,  
PROTECȚIEI SOCIALE  
ȘI PERSOANELOR VÂRSTNICE  
AMPOSDRU



Fondul Social European  
POS DRU  
2007-2013



Instrumente Structurale  
2007-2013



MINISTERUL  
EDUCAȚIEI  
NAȚIONALE

OI POSDRU



ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ



**Marin CONSTANTIN**

# Apartenența etno-culturală din România în contextul globalizării

*Criterii antropologice  
ale etnogenezei și etnomorfozei*



*Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române*



UNIUNEA EUROPEANĂ



GUVERNUL ROMÂNIEI  
MINISTERUL MUNCII, FAMILIEI,  
PROTECȚIEI SOCIALE  
ȘI PERSOANELOR VÂRSTNICE  
AMPOSDRU



Fondul Social European  
POS DRU  
2007-2013



Instrumente Structurale  
2007-2013



MINISTERUL  
EDUCAȚIEI  
NAȚIONALE

O I P O S D R U



ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ

---

Marin CONSTANTIN

**APARTENENȚA ETNO-CULTURALĂ DIN ROMÂNIA**  
**ÎN CONTEXTUL GLOBALIZĂRII**  
*CRITERII ANTROPOLOGICE ALE ETNOGENEZEI*  
*ȘI ETNOMORFOZEI*



---

**APARTENENȚA ETNO-CULTURALĂ DIN ROMÂNIA  
ÎN CONTEXTUL GLOBALIZĂRII  
CRITERII ANTROPOLOGICE ALE ETNOGENEZEI ȘI ETNOMORFOZEI**

Autor: **Marin CONSTANTIN**  
Conducător științific: **Dr. Cristiana GLAVCE**

Lucrare realizată în cadrul proiectului „Valorificarea identităților culturale în procesele globale”, cofinanțat din Fondul Social European prin Programul Operațional Sectorial Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane 2007 – 2013, contractul de finanțare nr. POSDRU/89/1.5/S/59758.

Titlurile și drepturile de proprietate intelectuală și industrială asupra rezultatelor obținute în cadrul stagiului de cercetare postdoctorală aparțin Academiei Române.

*Punctele de vedere exprimate în lucrare aparțin autorului și nu angajează  
Comisia Europeană și Academia Română, beneficiara proiectului.*

---

Exemplar gratuit. Comercializarea în țară și străinătate este interzisă.  
Reproducerea, fie și parțială și pe orice suport, este posibilă numai cu acordul prealabil  
al Academiei Române.

---

ISBN 978-973-167-134-5

Depozit legal: Trim. II 2013

Marin CONSTANTIN

**Apartenența etno-culturală  
din România în contextul  
globalizării**  
*Criterii antropologice  
ale etnogenezei și etnomorfozei*



Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române

---

Colecția AULA MAGNA



UNIUNEA EUROPEANĂ



GUVERNUL ROMÂNIEI  
MINISTERUL MUNCII, FAMILIEI,  
PROTECȚIEI SOCIALE  
ȘI PERSOANELOR VÂRSTNICE  
AMPOSDRU



Fondul Social European  
POS DRU  
2007-2013



Instrumente Structurale  
2007-2013



MINISTERUL  
EDUCAȚIEI  
NAȚIONALE

O I P O S D R U



ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ

### Investește în oameni !

#### FONDUL SOCIAL EUROPEAN

#### Programul Operațional Sectorial pentru Dezvoltarea Resurselor Umane 2007 – 2013

**Axa prioritară 1:** „Educația și formarea profesională în sprijinul creșterii economice și dezvoltării societății bazate pe cunoaștere”

**Domeniul major de intervenție 1.5:** „Programe doctorale și postdoctorale în sprijinul cercetării”

**Titlul proiectului:** „Valorificarea identităților culturale în procesele globale”

**Contract:** POSDRU/89/1.5/S/59758

**Beneficiar:** ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ

**Parteneri în proiect:** (I) UNIVERSITATEA POLITEHNICA București, Facultatea de Mecanică și Mecatronică; (II) UNIVERSITATEA din Craiova



#### Obiectivele proiectului și domeniile de cercetare:

- Obiectivul general:** Model-pilot de școală postdoctorală prin implicarea a 92 de cercetători postdoctoranzi, în scopul dezvoltării carierei în cercetare, al îmbunătățirii programelor de cercetare postdoctorală în domeniul umanităților, al impulsivității și consolidării sectorului de cercetare în științele socioumane din România, pentru sprijinirea economiei românești în dobândirea unor avantaje competitive durabile și micșorarea decalajelor între România și celelalte țări membre ale Uniunii Europene.
- Obiectivele specifice:** Elaborarea și implementarea de noi tehnologii-suport pentru derularea proiectului; formarea și perfecționarea cercetătorilor prin programe postdoctorale
  - Organizarea unor acțiuni de îndrumare a cercetătorilor pe parcursul stagiilor derulate în străinătate
  - Sprijinirea cercetătorilor în participarea la seminarii și conferințe internaționale
  - Organizarea unor sesiuni pentru promovarea egalității de șanse și a dezvoltării durabile
  - Sprijinirea colaborării între universități, institute de cercetare și companii din aria tematică a școlii postdoctorale
  - Dezvoltarea de activități inovatoare în vederea accentuării importanței programelor de cercetare interdisciplinară; crearea de metodologii proprii cu privire la derularea programelor postdoctorale
  - Elaborarea unor ghiduri de bune practici cu privire la schimbul de experiență internațional în aria cercetării în științele socioumane prin programe postdoctorale.
- Domeniile cercetării:** filologie - literatură • științe istorice și arheologie • filosofie, teologie, psihologie, pedagogie • arte, arhitectură și audio-vizual • știința informației • sociologia culturii • antropologie • etnografie și folclor

## CUPRINS

INTRODUCERE.....	9
PARTEA A I-A - STUDIUL BIBLIOGRAFIEI ANTROPOLOGICE A ETNICITĂȚII ÎN ROMÂNIA.....	13
Capitolul 1: AUTO-REFERENȚIALITATE ȘI INTER- REFERENȚIALITATE ÎN EVOLUȚIA ANTROPOLOGIEI CULTURALE ROMÂNEȘTI .....	15
Geneza antropologiei culturale în România, în context est-central european.....	15
Auto-referențialitate în practica antropologiei culturale și sociale românești (1964-1989) .....	19
Menținerea orizontului auto-referențial de cercetare antropologică românească (1990–2012).....	28
Dezvoltarea inter-referențialității antropologice în România (1990 - 2012).....	35
Concluzii: coordonatele evoluției epistemologice a antropologiei culturale românești.....	42
Capitolul 2: ETNOCENTRISM ȘI RELATIVISM CULTURAL ÎN ABORDAREA OMOLOGICĂ ȘI ANALOGICĂ A IDENTITĂȚII ETNO-CULTURALE DIN ROMÂNIA.....	48
Etnocentrismul și relativismul cultural în teoretizarea antropologică .....	48
Comparatismul auto-referențial în antropologia culturală românească.....	52

Comparatismul inter-referențial în antropologia culturală românească .....	56
Omologii și analogii în comparatismul antropologic românesc.....	59
Concluzii: etnocentrism și relativism cultural în antropologia românească a etnicității .....	63
PARTEA A II-A - CONCEPTUALIZARE ȘI COMPARATISM ÎN VARIABILITATEA ETNO-CULTURALĂ ȘI CONFESIONALĂ DIN ROMÂNIA.....	65
Capitolul 3: VOCABULARUL ANTROPOLOGIC AL VARIABILITĂȚII ETNICE DIN ROMÂNIA.....	67
Categorii de analiză ale bibliografiei antropologice românești despre etnicitate .....	68
Etnografia comunităților de căldărari, lipoveni, rudari, sași și secui .....	72
Serialitatea terminologică în etnografia grupurilor etnice minoritare din România.....	73
Repere antropologice în studiul apartenenței etno-culturale din România .....	81
Concluzii.....	87
Capitolul 4: VARIABILE CULTURALE ALE ETNICITĂȚII DIN ROMÂNIA.....	88
Cadre rurale, urbane și regionale ale etnicității din România .....	88
Etnicitatea rurală .....	90

	Etnicitatea urbană.....	96
	Etnicitatea regională.....	99
	Variabile culturale în încadrarea rurală, urbană și regională a etnicității .....	102
	Concluzii.....	118
Capitolul 5:	SINCRONIE ȘI DIACRONIE ÎN VARIABILITATEA ETNICĂ DIN ROMÂNIA .....	120
	Regimuri temporale în istoriografia grupurilor etno-culturale din România .....	120
	Ritmuri etnografice în variabilitatea etno-culturală din România.....	123
	Concluzii.....	136
PARTEA A III-A -	APARTENENȚA ETNO-CULTURALĂ ÎN ROMÂNIA ȘI ÎN UNIUNEA EUROPEANĂ .....	137
Capitolul 6:	TRADIȚIILE ORALE ȘI ARTIZANATUL POPULAR ÎN AUTO-REPREZENTAREA IDENTITĂȚII ETNICE DIN ROMÂNIA.....	139
	Despre etnografia auto-reprezentării etnice din România..	139
	Narativitatea grupurilor etnice.....	144
	Arta populară a grupurilor etnice.....	149
	Variabilitatea narativă și meșteșugărească a grupurilor etnice.....	154
	Concluzii.....	160



Capitolul 7: CRITERII ANTROPOLOGICE ALE ETNOGENEZEI ȘI ETNOMORFOZEI .....	162
Originea și transformarea etnicității în teoretizarea antropologică .....	162
Etnogeneza și etnomorfoza sub-grupurilor de aromâni, germani, maghiari, români, romi căldărari ruși-lipoveni, tătari și turci în România .....	169
Concluzii.....	183
Capitolul 8: DIMENSIUNEA ETNO-CULTURALĂ A CETĂȚENIEI EUROPENE (1992-2012) .....	184
Etnicitatea și cetățenia europeană în legislația Uniunii Europene și în conceptualizarea antropologică .....	184
Aparținerea etno-națională în definirea legislativă românească și în etnografia transfrontalieră .....	193
Concluzii.....	202
BIBLIOGRAFIE .....	204
LISTA INTERLOCUTORILOR.....	223
INDEX TEMATIC .....	225
SINTEZĂ .....	229
ADDENDA	
SYNTHESIS.....	254
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	280

## **ADDENDA**

### **Synthesis**

#### **Ethno-cultural Belongingness in Romania in the Context of Globalization: Anthropological Criteria of Ethnogenesis and Ethnomorphosis**

##### **Introduction**

Relying on the ethnographic information about several ethno-linguistic groups and subgroups in Romania today, my study dwells on the comparative understanding of ethnicity from the perspective of cultural anthropology. The Romanian population (representing the national majority in Romania), and – in alphabetical order – the Aromanian, the German, the Magyar, the Roma, the Russian-speaking Lipovan, the Tatar, and the Turkish communities, are here concerned in their variable ethnographic traits. Except the Aromanians, the other non-Romanian groups belong to the national minorities in Romania.

Choosing such ethno-linguistic „kaleidoscop” has depended on the existence of case studies carried out in an anthropological „key” (mainly based on fieldwork and the theoretical approach of specialized researchers); also implied are field data that I have personally gathered in the ethnography of the German, Magyar, Roma, Russian-Lipovan, Tatar, and Turkish groups in Romania. Following such documentation, I undertake a *study on the intra-ethnicity in Romania*, with ethnography and the anthropological analysis and interpretation engaged in identifying the degree of convergence and / or divergence in the inventory of cultural traits representative for one or another ethnicity. With this aim, my investigation is organized according to the major and apparently irreconcilable

coordinates of *ethnogenesis* (as a given “birth” of ethno-linguistic or religious identity) and *ethnomorphosis* (as “transformation” of ethnicity). By comparison between subgroups of the abovementioned ethnic identities, as well as between ethnic cultures described in the international anthropology, I seek to distinguish a series of conceptual and methodological meanings of *the ethno-cultural belongingness*.

### **Chapter 1: Self-referential and inter-referential perspectives in the evolution of Romanian cultural anthropology**

The bibliographic retrospective of the practice of cultural anthropology in Romania is significant for the actuality of a process of changing and renewing the scientific interest and the inquest “field” of Romanian researchers. More precisely, the self-referential or “intra-cultural” knowledge about Romanian communities or groups of population currently appears to be turned into a inter-referential knowledge, with a cross-cultural content. It is through such theoretical and methodological metamorphosis that the study of minority ethno-linguistic communities in Romania takes part to a contextualized understanding of Romanian cultural identities *in relation* to the groups of Magyars, Germans, Roma, Russian-speaking Lipovans, Turks, Croatians, etc. As a result, my text attempts (first of all) to evaluate the inner dynamics of Romanian cultural anthropology in terms of a critical synthesis of the local specialized literature, in the context of anthropological disciplinary evolution in Central and Southeastern Europe.

Before discussing the epistemological meanings of such scholarly (re)orientation, I outline the continuity of many of the ideas and working procedures that belong (from my viewpoint) to the *self-referential* exercise of Romanian anthropology. To the same extent that the inception (in 1964) of *cultural and socio-demographic anthropology* in Romania stems from ethnography, sociology, and physical anthropology, the *inter-referential* development in the 2000s cultural anthropology is not a total rupture from the *forma mentis* of the *self-referential* anthropological thought, but rather an inheritance (across autonomous research branches, however) of a *culture* –

and - *social structure* way of theoretical categorizing. As if mirroring the constancy of this conceptual framework, the *self-* and *inter-referential* ethnographic data from within the 1964 – 2012 Romanian anthropology has recurrently been focused around the ideas of *village / group / community*, *intra-cultural* and *cross-cultural*, *monographic description* and *comparatism*, *cultural unity / ethno-linguistic variability*, and *geographical distribution*.

Accounting for the self-referential research unit per excellentiam, *Romanian village* has almost exclusively represented the fieldwork “topos” of the native anthropologists in Romania, before 1989 (in villages like Berivoiești in Argeș County, Măgura and Șirnea in Brașov County, Novaci in Vâlcea County, Soveja in Vrancea County, Tilișca in Sibiu County, etc.), and afterwards as well (at Dănești-Maramureș, Cetățele-Maramureș, Crăsani-Ialomița, Drăguș-Brașov, Voinești-Ialomița, Șișești-Maramureș, etc.) Exceptions here were (in 1960-1980s) the region of Bicăz, the “micro-urban” location of the *pilot-station* from Câmpulung-Muscel, and (after 1989) the Bucharest open-air markets. In another case, that of Novaci, the village population was presented *via* the ethnographic dichotomy between the communities of *Pământenii* (autochthonous people) and *Ungureni* (a Romanian, Transylvanian-originated, group); each time, however, the *Romanian* peasants were the sole object of investigation. From the inter-referential angle, the themes and goals of anthropological inquiry have regularly implied the *ethnic group* and / or the *multiethnic community*, in the countryside (Bașpunar in Constanța County, Korond in Harghita County, Oituz and Frumoasa, in Bacău County, Sântana in Arad County, Sfântu-Gheorghe and Slava Rusă, in Tulcea County, Zăbala in Covasna County, etc.), as well as in cities (București, Călărași, Constanța, Medgidia, Roman) and on a regional scale (*Clisura Dunării*, Caraș-Severin County). In most cases, such locations have also included Romanian groups – as described and interpreted not in enclavisation, but in ethno-cultural interaction with the national minorities.

The mentioned case studies advance their *cross-cultural vision* as concerns various Romanian ethnographic areas (Argeș, Bran, Gorj, Maramureș, Mărginimea Sibiului, Țara Făgărașului), albeit within *the same* linguistic and national culture as the anthropological authorship in discussion. The permanence of such analytical and interpretive standpoint

practically reconfirms the original interdisciplinary “osmosis” between ethnography, sociology, and physical anthropology (all of them preponderantly “self-referential” in Romania), which is also indicative for the theoretical endowment of Romanian cultural anthropology. On the contrary, the research of multiethnicity from areas like Banat, Crișana, Szekeyfold, and Dobrodja reveals its *cross-cultural vision*, which, without ignoring the local presence of Romanians, has been interested in their living together with the different minority groups, as well as in the minorities’ contribution to the making and expressing of indigenous ethnographic cultures. In fact, this perspective belongs to those Romanian anthropologists devoted to the approach of the ethno-confessional and religious otherness of the Magyars, the Roma, the Germans, the Russian-Lipovans, the Turks, the Croatians..., and in exploiting it within their specific theorization or methodological instrumentarium. As a research program, cross-culturalism comes to contribute to the contemporary *specialization* of Romanian cultural anthropology, beyond the initial paternalism in its self-referential interdisciplinary agenda.

As a matter of fact, the Romanian self-referential anthropology cultivates its *monographic* commitment, as originated into the Bucharest interwar Sociological School, and revived thereafter due to the partnership between physical and cultural anthropologists during research campaigns such as in the villages of Bătrâna and Clopotiva (Hunedoara County), and within the “pilot-stations” from Berivoiești and Câmpulung (Argeș County). The same analytical pattern has been reproduced in further situations (Tilișca, Șirnea), while the examination of many local cultural and social aspects also reflects the monographic focus, in the absence of an interregional and even less cross-cultural perspective (for instance, in studying the traditional community economic structures of the *composesorate* and “neighborhoods” in the area of Țara Făgărașului in Brașov and Sibiu counties, the folk philosophy and folk fairs in Vrancea County, the funeral rituals in Argeș and Maramureș counties, etc.) As a consequence, the comparison of “social units” is rarely encountered (Soveja ↔ Tulnici ↔ Negrilești, in Vrancea County; Crășani ↔ Voinești in Dâmbovița County).

The inter-referential approach regularly makes use of *anthropological comparison*, first of all at a village level (normally, a monographic

framework) – with the aim of “particularizing” local ethnographic “topics”: Magyars, Romanians, and Gypsies in Zăbala, Romanians, Germans, and Roma in Sântana, Romanians and Lipovans in Mahmudia village (Tulcea County), Turks and Tatars in Cobadin village (Constanța County), Roma groups of *Spoitors*, *Rudars*, and *Silky Gypsy* in Călărași town, etc. Regional comparisons are similarly engaged between factions of the same ethnic groups: Turks and Tatars in Cobadin and Medgidia town (Constanța County), Magyar-speaking *Roman-Catholics* in Oituz and Frumoasa. Such comparisons may also seek to equate different ethnic groups, in accordance with the given thematic purpose: the “co-belongingness” of the Romanian-speaking *Vlachs* and Serbs in the area of *Clisura Dunării*, the pilmigrage of Romanians in Lăpuș village (in Maramureș County) and the pilmigrage of the “Old-Belief” Lipovans in Slava Rusă, the artisanship industries among Magyars in Korond, Roma Kalderash in Brateiu village (Sibiu County), Turks in Cobadin, Croatians in Carașova village (Caraș-Severin County), etc. In rare cases (the Aromanians in the towns of Constanța and Călărași, Lipovans of Caracaliu village in Tulcea County, and the Turks in Bașpunar village), the anthropological study of ethnicity is conducted within a monograph contour.

The ethnographic locations of self-referential anthropology mostly incorporate the so-called Romanian people’s *unity in diversity*. Evidences for an ancient community organization – *devălmășia* -, often evoked in the Middle-Ages history of Romanian free peasantry, are the peasant *obște* of Bran (Șirnea), the free-peasant traditions of *răzeși* in Vrancea (Negriștești, Tulnici) and of *moșneni* in Argeș (Berivoiești), as well as the *composesorate* from Țara Făgărașului (in Brașov County). Even in post-socialist contexts, the *type of mixed-diffuse household* (in Crășani) and the *type of individual household* (in Voinești) are described as one “historical variation of a common inherited structure”. Lastly, characterizing the villagers from Berivoiești, Drăguș (Brașov County), and Valea Lungă (Dâmbovița County) by means of their *value orientations* is argued to reflect local convergent views with respect to the “positive appreciation of human nature” and “relational collaterality”. In contrast, the inter-referential anthropology is intended to validate the *ethnic, linguistic, and religious variability*. Thus, the social structures of the same village may differ from each other because of

their ethnic composition (Zăbala). The historical narrativity of Romanians, Germans, and Roma in Sântana renders as many ethno-cultural interpretations on the local *villagers'* belongingness. The matrimonial behavior from the villages of the same region is *specific* to each of the local ethno-confessional groups (Oituz and Frumoasa). The crafts of the Kalderash, the Croatians, the Turks, and the Szeklers are “congruent” (from an economic point of view), with distinct “degrees” of expressivity and creativity in their arts and ethnic symbolistics, however. The divergences between the *Popovți* and the *Bespopovți* parishes suspend the Old-Belief Lipovan communion. Also in autonomous community structuring – the Aromanians in Constanța, the Lipovans in Carcaliu village (Tulcea County), the Rudars in Argeș County – the ethnic groups concerned are resembled, or differentiated from, other homonymic groups.

In Romania, the evolution of cultural anthropology from the self-referential viewpointing to the inter-referential one may also be verified in a cartographic representation. Indeed, the Romanian anthropological *intra-cultural* inquiries are centered over communities from ethnographic areas of the national Carpathian chain (Țara Hațegului [Bătrâna și Clopotiva]; Oltenia [Novaci]; Argeș [Berivoiești], Dâmbovița [Voinești], Vrancea [Soveja, Negriște, Tulnici], Mărginimea Sibiului [Tilișca, Turnișor, Cristian], Țara Oltului, Bran [Măgura, Șirnea], Valea Bistriței [Bicaz]), Maramureș [Șișești, Dănăști, Cetățele]). Exceptions from this submontane localization in the research of a free peasantry of *moșnean*, *răzeș*, and *nemeș* traditions are the villages of Crășani and „Romanați” (Olt County) – both of them in association with post-socialist contexts of Romanian peasants’ (under)development. Instead, the topography of Romanian *cross-cultural* anthropology is much more diversified, with the inclusion of villages from the plains (Bratei, Sântana), Danube shoreline (Eșelnița, Plavisebița, Svinița, in Caraș Severin County), alongside rural communities in Dobrodja (Bașpunar, Cobadin, Medgidia, Mahmudia, Jurilovca, Slava Rusă, Carcaliu, Sfântu Gheorghe) and urban (sub)groups (București, Călărași, Constanța, Roman). With respect to the historical areas of one or another ethnicity, sub-Carpathian research sites are also present in such inter-referential bibliography (Carașova, Băbeni, Cislădioara, Oituz, Frumoasa, Korond, Zăbala), with no generalizing interpretation in social and economic terms.

**Chapter 2:**  
**Ethnocentrism and cultural relativism**  
**in the homological and analogical approach of the ethno-cultural**  
**identity in Romania**

In virtue of their very epistemological particularities, the self-referential and the inter-referential “worldviews” of Romanian cultural anthropology can be scrutinized from the angles of ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. Since (under the signature of Romanian anthropologists) one side of the above-cited research is concerned with the Romanian ethnographic cultures, while another one is interested in the minority ethnic cultures of Romania, a theoretical foundation of their authorships is supposedly responsible either for the “intrinsic” understanding of Romanian groups of population, or for the accumulation, verification, and debate over the anthropological knowledge of Romanians *vs.* that of national minorities from the same ethnographic areas. In what follows, I hypothesize the possible correspondence of ethnocentrism and / or cultural relativism with two ways of applying comparison in the Romanian anthropology, in terms of homologies and analogies between subgroups or communities of the same, or a different, ethno-cultural identity.

In order to discern the ethnocentric and / or relativist character of Romanian anthropological comparison, I situate my investigation within *a strictly methodological (and not ethical or ideological) framework* in theorizing ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. My objective is assessing the manner in which comparisons are formulated to establish intraethnic and interethnic corelations, in the national context of Romanian majority and minority ethnic groups, and in variable conditions of inhabitation, migration, enclavisation, cohabitation, and inter-ethnic exchanges.

The comparative argumentation of ethnographic homologies and analogies reveals ethnocentric and / or relativist meanings in the anthropological theory of cultural variability in Romania. In other words, homologation of a cultural trait between subgroups of the same ethnic



community is the result of a comparison centered within *that* ethnicity, while the analogous association of ethnographic characteristics between different ethnic groups is in accord with the cross-cultural relativization of those traits. In Romanian anthropology, there is no absolute relation between self-referentiality and ethnocentrism, on the one hand, and between inter-referentiality and relativism, on the other; while (for instance) the social organization of the Romanians, Magyars, and Gypsies in Zăbala is interpreted in a relativistic sense, the economy of the Romanians from the same village community also requires an ethnocentric analytical support. Again, whereas cultural traits (such as language, exogamy, the exchange of goods, etc.) of Romanian folk fairs in the Carpathians happen to foster the ethnocentric theorization, their “focal” role in the inter-regional trade, and especially their ethnic function - are heuristically exploited from the perspective of cultural relativism.

When comparison is homologous, there occurs the probability of adopting the principle of ethnocentrism – the ethnic groups keep an entire and definitive authorship over their own patterns of culture (such as in the case of Romanian *composesorate* and in that of the Rudar woodcarving), with interethnic analogies not distorting the initial, original, and “unique” imprint of what is made, inherited, preserved, and transmitted by each of these groups. Conversely, an analogous viewpoint of research is in conformity with the principle of cultural relativism – cultural and social facts take place under the regimes of polygenesis and polycentrism, while their evaluation will recognize the interexchange, free convertibility, and equivalence between lifestyles attributes of different ethno-linguistic or confessional groups (for example, goodparenthood among the Romanians and the Muslims in Medgidia town and the protector-saints holy days in the Ortodox church rituals among the *Vlachs* and the Serbs from the region of *Clisura Dunării*).

### **Chapter 3:**

#### **Towards an anthropological vocabulary of ethnic variability in Romania**

The heteromorphic nature of ethnicity (in terms of sociality, economic organization, cultural self-identification, etc.), as well as the current

diversification of Romanian studies and their thematic content related to the minority ethnic groups – equally require a terminological synthesis concerning the description and interpretation of the *ethno-cultural variability* in Romania. It is the ethnographic reality itself of the ethno-cultural groups or minorities of Romania that makes evidence of a remarkable differentiation – at the level of a series of exonyms or denomination categories of the national administration (among which *Magyars, Germans, Roma*, etc.), as well as within the *intra-specific* distinctiveness of several endonyms (Magyar-speaking *Szeklers* and *Roman-Catholic Csangos*; German-speaking *Landlers, Saxons*, and *Swabians*; Romani-speaking *Kalderash, Spoitors, Gypsies*, etc.) On the other hand, in its turn, Romanian anthropological literature is “multi-layered” with its orientation towards subjects such as the ethno-cultural symbolistics, oral tradition, social structuring, multiculturalism, etc., in various ethnographic locations in Dobrodja, Banat, Transylvania, etc.

My assumption is that the scientific vision on social facts or values accounting for ethnicity may converge with the native “arrangement” of them. Without claiming herewith a generalized or invariable congruence between indigenous “ethnic meanings” and their theorization, I attempt to identify the conceptual potential of several categories of analysis in the anthropological study of ethnicity in Romania, in terms of *language, ethno-history, territoriality, sociality, economy, ethos*, and *worldview*.

The narrative identity and the kinship vocabulary are usually defined as theoretical issues. Likewise, the linguistic affiliation and the dialectal differentiation constantly represent themes of ethnographic research. By their content and rhetorical expressivity as well, current verbal evidences prove and reassert the constitutive contribution of native languages, as a primary referential universe of ethno-cultural belongingness in Romania. The official status of Romanian language in the national administration and in the interethnic relationships is in an active coexistence with Rudar vernacular accents (in Băbeni, Vâlcea County) and with dialects like *Kalderash* (Bratei, Sibiu County), Saxon (Michelsberg, Sibiu County), *Szekler* (Korond, Harghita County), Russian-Lipovan (Jurilovca, Tulcea County), etc. Such ethnographic bilingualism practically designates a dialectics of

language distinctiveness at the level of local “knowing each-other” communities.

The analytical constants of retrospective community discourse, with legends about village foundations, as well as the folkloric leitmotifs of the ethnic groups’ origin, autochtony, and sedentation, equally participates to the making of historical traditions of nationalities in their “story-telling”. My field interlocutors (of Kalderash, Lipovan, Rudar, Saxon, and Szekler identity) actually narrate their own ethno-histories within particular “topoi” safeguarded by Church and “plowed up” by inter-generational labor: based on more-or-less veridical reminiscences of their shared experiences in the past, such communities denote essential landmarks of their ancestry. Beyond factology (and its possible stereotypes), the memorial exemplarity of national minorities thus becomes a coordinate of the cultural configuration specific to each of them.

The exploitation of natural resources (in Romanian anthropological bibliography) and the ecology-and-livelihood contextualization of the Rudars and Lipovans – relate to the issues of physical adaptability in local conditions of cultural variability. The ethnic groups’ territorial behavior is relevant for their *anthropization* process, which implies the symbiosis of the abovementioned communities with their environment, as “given”, or appropriated, to / by them. However, such “symbiosis” is not only the function of a sort of organic device in environmental integration, as different social experimentations of a given village hearth (i.e. the sedentation in Rudar Băbeni and the enclavisation in Kalderash Bratei) shape the ethno-cultural pattern of territoriality and, expectedly, the contribution of ethnicity to the “conformation” of *its* ecotypes.

The heuristical importance of sociality for the understanding of the ethnic organization of humankind is confirmed by the special attention that the Romanian researchers of ethnicity pay to the traditional social structures, as well as to the ethnographic reconstitution of the ways in which the customary-juridical institutions work (among the Kalderash and the Saxons). Neither someone’s condition of ethno-linguistic minority, nor his / her cultural cohabitation with people of national majority uniformly shape the institutional “backbone” and “motion” of ethnic groups; from this viewpoint, the differences between the Kalderash and the Rudars (for

example) seem to have originated rather from the internal “arrangement” of such social *ethno-systems*, than necessarily under the effect of acculturation or the administration of modern state. The normative character of ethnic institutionalization may be interpreted as the consuetudinary expression of nationality by the association and solidarity of its members.

Theorizing the economic specialization of urban networks and village groups of different ethnic identity, along with occurrences of contemporary craft knowledge among the Kalderash, the Lipovans, the Rudars, and the Szeklers, simultaneously argue on the compatability of ethnicity with demands of productive activities. Contrarily to the individualistic and somewhat “centrifugal” presuppositions of market orientation, one’s ethno-cultural belongingness thus appears as the social condition basic for his / her daily subsistence, and also for his / her competitiveness and surplus. Economy, then, is able to rediscover an original sense of a micro-community’s “management” and interdependence, as based on technical skills intergenerationally transmitted and accumulated. Beside conferring authenticity to ethnic groups, the labor “vocation” is (at the same time) a resource for their interethnic exchanges.

Some aspects of Romanian anthropological literature contribute to the moral portraying of diverse ethnic groups, more exactly to the clarification of their ethical and esthetical orientations (in terms of one’s spiritual-values protection, manner of music interpretation, clothing demeanor, etc.) Similarly, my own ethnographic information regarding the Kalderash traditional costumes, the cult of Saint Michael (among the Saxons in Michelsberg), and the savor of a *kürtös kalacs* cake (among the Szeklers in Korond) – points out as many traits defining the patterns of culture among the minorities under examination. Such approximations of the national ethos are suggestive for the core of ideals and interests that the ethnic groups share, and upon which they found their communion. As a result, ethnicity is also given birth as a value system, with formulae probably unique of conceiving and living one’s beliefs, artifacts, songs, etc.

The Romanian anthropological references about the transborder interethnicity, the economic interdependence in multiethnic context, the interconfessional marital behavior, together with my field documentation

of the cultural coexistence of the Kalderash, the Rudars, or the Saxons with the Romanian majority population - all thematically point to the relation between the ethnic identity and the process of acculturation. Along with local “substantiations” of nationality, the ethno-linguistic groups express their specific worldviews – in fact, indigenous representations of cultural otherness. In the framework of one’s “knowing each other” community, as well as at a regional scale, such osmosis does not lead to the dissolution of ethnicity, but (through various repositionings and reinterpretations of multiculturalism) comes to reify primary data of national (majority or minority) belongingness.

#### **Chapter 4:** **Cultural variables of ethnicity in Romania**

According to the above discussed disciplinary terminology, *language, ethno-history, territoriality, sociality, economy, ethos, and worldview* are theoretically developed as anthropological landmarks of ethno-cultural belongingness. A series of variable traits in the ethnography of Romania may be circumscribed within such equally vernacular-and-scholarly categories, as follows: *language* (mother tongue, territorial ethnonyms, religious ethnonyms, bilingualism and dialectal hybridization, language abandonment, ethno-linguistic revitalization), *ethno-history* (traditions of ethnic and local origins, politic-and-ideological persecution, religious persecution, ethnic extraneity with nomadism, migration, and colonization), *territoriality* (ethno-territorial homogeneity, valuing environment, ethno-residential marginality, territorial-and-confessional dichotomy, and territorial-and-matrimonial interconfessional diversity), *sociality* (traditional-community organization, genealogical structuring, endogamy and exogamy, godparenthood, and social dismemberment), *economy* (traditional livelihoods, ethnic-and-kin based labor organization, autarchy, modern labor, and interethnic exchanges), *ethos* (ethno-confessional attachments, folk religion, traditional clothing, the material culture of ethnicity, ethno-music and choreography, the ethno-traditional revitalization, religious conversion, syncretism, and the ethno-traditional abandonment), and *worldview* (intraethnic and interethnic cultural

otherness, ethno-cultural conservatism, and acculturation). These variables actually reflect the repertoire of ethno-cultural variability of Romania, in accordance with records of anthropological research conducted in rural, urban, and regional analytical scales. Within such classification, ethnic groups appear in relation to the occurrences of their ethnographic positioning, in that their similarities and differences can be synoptically assessed from methodologically juxtaposed perspectives.

Examining Romania's ethnic groups and subgroups is basically relevant for the attempt and presupposition of identifying some "branchements" between certain communities and some discontinuities, between others. At the same time, this is to discuss the methodological premises and variables in the comparative study of ethnicity.

Within my own investigation, choosing one or another „case study” of inter-ethnicity has taken into account the ethnographic *comparability* of them, as seen from the angle of proven convergences between cultural traits in apparent association. Based on this, I have established congruences or disparities between rural, urban, and / or regional references for ethno-linguistic families. A general finding here is that the “nucleus” of given behavior variables may contribute to the mapping of ethno-cultural belongingness across particular environments and analytical contours. Such frameworking in Romania is preponderantly rural, as it includes the Romanians from villages like Frumoasa, Oituz, Sântana, and Zăbala, the Lipovans from Carcaliu and Mahmudia, the Szeklers from Zăbala and Magyar-speaking subgroups from Frumoasa and Oituz, the Turks from Başpunar and Cobadin, and the Tatars from Cobadin. However, this series also eludes strictly countryside localizations of co-ethnics, in favor of (trans)regional contextualizations of their “kindreds”: the Kalderash from Cuza Vodă village and from Dobrodja; the Landlers from Apoldu de Sus (Großpold), Cristian (Großau) și Turnișor (Neppendorf), and the Saxons from Cisnădioara (Michelsberg), in the South-Transylvanian area of Mărginimea Sibiului; Landlers from Sibiu County and Schwaben from Arad County; the Lipovans from Carcaliu and the Lipovans from Mahmudia in Upper Dobrodja; the Szeklers in Zăbala (Covasna County) and the Magyar-speaking Roman-Catholics in Frumoasa and Oituz (Bacău County).

At the same time, the *homologation* of intraethnic compatibilities confirms the significance of the urban referentiality (Saxons in Sighișoara town in association of the Landler villages from Mărginimea Sibiului) or, on the contrary, it shows ethnic disjunctions from the rural world (the Lipovans from Roman town *vs.* the Lipovans from Carcaliu and Mahmudia; the Kalderash from Roman town *vs.* the Kalderash from Wallachia and Dobrodja; the Turks from Medgidia town *vs.* the Turks from Bașpunar and Cobadin; the Tatars from Medgidia *vs.* the Tatars from Cobadin). On the same comparative basis, the Aromanian townsmen from Constanța and Călărași are equated to a common evolution on an ethno-linguistic-and-social ground.

In retrospect, I conclude that it is neither the historical reconstitution, nor the geographic localization, and nor even the combining of such interpretive views, that could always, and only *per se*, argue on the cultural belongingness of ethnic subgroups designated by exonymic categories of the national administration terminology. It is true that the regional contiguity sometimes allows for the conservation and reassertion of ethno-linguistic “rootedness” (the “Germans” in Mărginimea Sibiului, the “Roma”, the “Russian-speaking Lipovans” and the “Aromanians / Macedo-Romanians” in Dobrodja, the “Turks” and “Tatars” in Dobrodja). However, there are situations in which (more or less consistent) connections between some groups come to exceed the universe of a given native or ethnic-compact area, to evolve (in specific conditions of migration and / or multiculturalism) toward a interregional scale (the Kalderash from Wallachia and Dobrodja, the Magyars from Covasna County and from Moldavia, the Romanians from Bacău County and from the Szekler area in Transylvania, the Rudars from Northern Wallachia, and the Dobrojdjan Rudars).

The ethnic communities’ exonymic variability is thus accompanied by a “intraspecific” multiculturalism (per excellentiam, an endonymic one), which requires a new comparative “dioptry”, as adapted not only to the topographic classification of ethnic collectivities, but also to the recognition of their interethnic and cross-cultural mobility. Debates such as on the Aromanian ethnicity, the Magyar origin of the Moldavian subgroups of

Roman-Catholics, as well as the ethno-linguistic belonging of Rudars – are in this way given new horizons of argumentation.

Variables of behavior are able to make it possible to gradually adjust the comparative understanding of ethnographic convergences and divergences. By having made evidence for a common traditional background or, on the contrary, for socio-economic cleavages between ethno-linguistic groups in appearance akin, cultural traits account after all for the self-referential and inter-referential constituents of ethno-cultural belongingness, in its rural, urban, and regional locations.

### **Chapter 5:** **Synchrony and diachrony in the ethnic variability of Romania**

Across the ethnographic areas of Romania, the immediate circulation of social phenomena, institutions, and techniques between contemporary ethno-linguistic groups, as well as the historical continuity of social facts within ancestral and genealogical “chains” of ethnicity – are equally heuristical for the chronological interpretive potential of anthropology. In vernacular accounts, as well as in the national bibliography references, inscribing the bearers of one or another ethnic cultures either into the same temporality, or in the intergenerational sequentiality, supposedly points to important variables in their (inter)ethnic identification or representativeness. As a matter of fact, defining a synchronic or a diachronic character of the information about the ethnic belongingness and distinctiveness is a way of establishing the relation between the traditional social facts and those aspects of sociality – institutions, techniques, worldviews, etc. – that originate in exogenous influences.

In their rural, urban, and regional contextualizations, the ethnographic descriptions and the case studies on ethnicity in Romania contain meaningful details regarding the *situation in time* of diverse national groups or minorities, which, on the one hand, provide general information about the historical “age” or “development” of them, while conferring, on the other hand, certain constants and / or irregularities to their collective evolution. The historiographic representation of ethno-



cultural groups in rural, urban, and regional milieus practically enlightens distinct *temporal regimes*, according to specific ethnographic thematizations. In this way, communities are studied either at the level of their everyday life (as part of a very recent past and of immediate actuality), or in a chronological expanding of a multi-centennial duration.

Within my approach, the above-described cultural variables are discussed in ethnographic and bibliographic concern with *synchronic* and *diachronic* characteristics of ethno-national groups and identities in Romania. When, for instance, some ethnic communities appear to be more “conservative” than others that are in course of “modernization”, their *rhythmicities* expectedly stem from, and also generate, cultural particularities of social organization and interaction. As a result, the understanding of the relation between *tradition* and *cultural metamorphosis*, between *duration* and *ethnographic present*, and between *permanence* and *everyday life*... - is estimated (within my field information and in relation to the Romanian anthropological literature) in accordance with the synchronic or diachronic distribution of cultural traits reported for subgroups of Aromanians, Germans, Lipovans, Kalderash Roma, Magyars, Romanians, Rudars, Tatars, and Turks.

The interpretation based on circumstantial “dating” or simply historical contextualization of ethnicity points out the existence of a number of *diachronic cultural nuclei* (the Aromanians in Constanța and in Călărași; the German-speaking Landlers in Großpold, Großau, and Neppendorf, the Saxons in Sighișoara, and the Schwaben in Sântana; the Russian-speaking Lipovans in Carcaliu, Jurilovca, Mahmudia, and Sarichioi; the Romanians in Frumoasa, Oituz, and in Zăbala; the Magyars in Frumoasa, Oituz, and in Zăbala). A *synchronic cultural nucleus* is documented for the Kalderash from Cuza Vodă and Constanța. Establishing such “contemporaneities” is followed by identifying situations of cultural-and-historical discontinuity of some ethnic subgroups in relation to the rest of their ethnonymic ensemble (the Kalderash in Roman town *vs.* the Kalderash in Wallachia and in Dobrodja; the Saxons in Mărginimea Sibiului *vs.* the Schwaben in Sântana; the Lipovans in Roman town *vs.* the Lipovans in Dobrodja; the Szeklers in Harghita *vs.* the Magyar-speaking Roman-Catholics in Moldavia). In the case of the Muslim Turkish and Tatar groups

in Dobrodja, the existence of a synchronic linguistic and religious background is not invariably echoed into a historical convergence in the evolution of these ethnographic cultures.

Categorizing ethnographic traits in Romania into either “genealogies” or “generations” of populations is not to recognize absolute properties of “historicity” or “ahistoricity”, nor to hierarchize ethnicity according to the “cultural memory” of communities concerned. Each subgroup or ethno-linguistic larger family actually “becomes” and “coexists” to the same extent – with mention that, in particular conditions, their becoming and coexistence are “rhythmed” either in autonomous and distinct manner, or in interdependence and confluence. In time, cultural variability reveals (among others) a repertory of such “rhythmicities” and their “frequencies” between ethnic groups homonymic but not entirely homogenous.

#### **Chapter 6:** **Oral traditions and folk artisanship** **in the self-representation of ethnic identity in Romania**

In the ethnographic description, the oral traditions and the folk artifacts generally stand for types of *uttering* and, respectively, *making* of ethnic identity. The hypothesis according to which one’s vernacular evocations would participate to restoring his / her *specific* community origins (of legendary or historical character) is thus accompanied by the presupposition that the same informant’s artifacts would mirror specific cycles of events responsible for the cultural developments and trajectories of his / her ethnic group, once its founding – be it mythical or historical – would have taken place. The narrativity and material culture are expectedly interdependent, in equally historical and ethnographic contextualizations, as legends and life stories are learned and transmitted by word of mouth and by the ethno-folkloric recognition of the past craftsmen’s contribution. The ethno-national belongingness in Romania has, therefore, to be validated in coherence of the local *expressivity* and *substantiation* of ethnicity, in the framework of several linguistic minorities

referred to here (Kalderash, Lipovan, Rudar, Saxon, Szekler, Tatar, and Turkish), then in their cross-cultural referentiality.

In the Romanian anthropological literature, the ethnic minority groups' cultural distinctiveness is often depicted by means of their particularities in folklore (oral histories, eponymy, toponymy, music and dance, etc.) and in the material ethnography as well (traditional livelihoods, forms of habitats, clothing, etc.) The vernacular and craft traditions are especially attributed a *representational* function in the ways in which the various ethnic communities narrate and portray themselves. Within my own research, the actuality of such process of cultural self-definition is evaluated through several ethnographic references on the Kalderash in Bratei (Sibiu County), the Lipovans in Jurilovca and Sarichioi (Tulcea County), the Rudars in Băbeni (Vâlcea County), the Saxons in Cîsnădie [Heltau] and Cîsnădioara [Michelsberg] (Sibiu County), the Szeklers in Korond (Harghita County), the Tatars in Cobadin and Independența (Constanța County), and the Turks in Bașpunar and Cobadin (Constanța County).

As such, ethnicity in Romania is understood as a variable interrelationship of narrativity and folk arts, with three interpretive directions concerning the theorization of one's cultural belongingness. Identifiable cases of *intraethnicity* are reported for the Lipovans in Jurilovca and Sarichioi (both in terms of correspondence between oral traditions and artisanship, and of local distinctness in narrative and craft performances), the Saxons in Heltau and Michelsberg (in narrativity and craftsmanship as well), the Tatars in Cobadin and Independența (narrativity), and the Turks in Bașpunar and Cobadin (narrativity and craftsmanship).

Some *interethnic* "compatibilities" or "congruences" are also mapped in regional and transregional frameworks. While the neighboring communities of the Kalderash, the Saxons, and the Szeklers, with concordances in their vernacular traditions and artisanship, may be represented within a "Southeastern Transylvanian ethnographic area", a similar situation is encountered in Dobrodja, among the Tatars and the Turks (as concerns their shared religiosity). As to the transregional inter-ethnicity, it is discerned within the similitudes in narrativity and artisanship between the Kalderash and the Rudars.

## Chapter 7: Anthropological criteria of ethnogenesis and ethnomorphosis

In the study of ethnicity, the *founding* and the *becoming* of ethno-linguistic groups are recurrent (and hence continuously reconsidered) themes of anthropological literature. The ethnographic recognition of various peoples representing national majorities and minorities as well – does imply validation of their *constitutive* antecedents. In either terms of a mythological tradition or a historical reconstruction, the beginnings and modifications to, or admixtures of, ethno-nationality reflect the ever-changing relationship between autochtony and foreignness; in which ways is such relationship formulated in the methodological, analytical, and conceptual framework of cultural anthropology?

In the international anthropological literature, ethnogenetic evolutions are associated with the perpetual dialectics of ethnic origins and transformations revealing as many particular worldviews of an equally intraethnic and cross-cultural character. Inaugural *ethnogenesis* may evoke the “gestation” of a people as well as its revivalism. However, under the influence of its own analytical polisemantism, ethnogenesis is currently adjusted, verified, and reinterpreted by means of two further concepts, namely *ethnomorphosis* and *phylogenesis*. As a matter of fact, the making of ethnicity is rather a process that, in virtue of continuous ethnographic changes among communities of various cultural identities, radically differs from the circumstantial prominence of a given ethnogenesis having occurred “once upon a time”. Ethnogenesis as *acculturation* is responsible for such transformative meaning. From another point of view, ethnogenesis through cultural diffusion is contrasted to phylogenesis and its association between cultural variation and biological patterns.

To the extent to which the identification and juxtaposition of cultural traits can contribute to the characterization of national belongingness among the ethnic groups in Romania, the ethno-linguistic variability allows for a comparative investigation of the processes of ethnogenesis and ethnomorphosis. Intracultural evolutions among the Aromanians, the Germans, the Magyars, the Romanians, the Roma, the Russian-Lipovans, the Tatars, and the Turks are thus synthesized according

to historical and ethnographic similarities between their own subgroups (the Aromanian *Cipans*, *Cutsovlachs*, *Farsherots*, *Gramostens* in Constanța, and *Gramostens* in Călărași; the German-speaking *Landlers* in Großpold, Großau, and Neppendorf, *Saxons* in Sighișoara, and *Schwaben* in Sântana; the Magyar-speaking *Szeklers* in Zăbala and *Csangos* in Frumoasa and Oituz; the Romanians in Frumoasa, Oituz, and Roman; the Tatars in Cobadin and Medgidia; the Turks in Bașpunar, Cobadin, and Medgidia).

In the abovementioned cases, the *linguistic identity* is conservative (as it is the Aromanian dialect in the continuity of homonymic subgroups of *Gramostens*); it is also adaptive in technical domains (the terminology of Lipovan fishing and the lexicon of the Turkish artisanship) and in sociality (the Landler and Saxon institutional vocabulary, and the Romanian and Magyar bilingualism); otherwise, the native languages are simply differential (the Kalderash *Kade* dialect *vs.* the *Kide* dialect of other Roma groups; the Tatar *Kirim Tili* dialect *vs.* the further Tatar dialects *Nogai Tili* and *Yaliboyi Tili*).

The *ethno-historicity* first comprises evocations of one's remote past (the historical tradition of the Saxon Middle-Ages colonization, the mythology of the Szekler early Middle-Ages migration, the narrativity of the Lipovan late Middle-Ages religious persecution); accounts of recent collective experiences are also active (the memory of the political persecution of the Germans and the Kalderash in World War II circumstances).

The *ethno-cultural territoriality* initially results from state colonizing politics (as regards the German-speaking Saxons, Landlers, and Schwaben, from Central Europe to Transylvania, under the Middle-Age regimes of Kingdom of Hungary and Habsburg Empire, respectively, as well as the Aromanians from Balkans to Dobrodja, under the Romanian interwar regime). In other situations, demographic movements take place during Middle Ages, under pressure of various fiscal policies and also as a requirement of pastoral economy (the Szekler and the the Romanian trans-Carpathian migration); in contemporary times, ethnic exodus occurs as a political reaction (the Saxon, Schwaben, and Landler migration from Transylvania and Banat to Germany). The ethno-territorial homogeneity is

a conservative trait of inhabitation among the national minority groups of the Kalderash, the Tatars, and the Turks.

The *sociality* in the organizational patterns of ethno-linguistic communities is similarly conservative (the Aromanian endogamy, the Saxon and Landler traditional social institutionalization) and adaptive (exogamy among the Aromanians, the Magyars, and the Romanians).

The *economic dimension of ethnicity* continues to be associated with traditional livelihoods (the Kalderash coppersmithing, the Turkish iron smithing and leather processing), in concomitance with the trading adaptation of artisanship (the Szekler pottery, the Kalderash coppersmithing), and with the agrotourism development (among the Saxons and the Szeklers).

The *ethos* of national belongingness first of all defines religious attachments of the ethnic groups and their subgroups (the Orthodox Christianity among Aromanians, Kalderash, and Romanians; the Old-Belief Orthodox Christianity of Lipovans; the Roman-Catholic and Protestant Christianity among Magyars and Schwaben; the Protestant Christianity among Saxons and Landlers; the Islamism among Tatars and Turks; the folk religion among Kalderash). The ethno-confessional identity is sometimes reinforced by religious ethnonyms (the Magyar *Roman-Catholics*, the Romanian *Orthodoxes*, the Tatar and Turkish *Mahomedans*). Further traits of ethnic culture and civilization are architecture (among Kalderash, Lipovans, and Turks), traditional clothing (among Kalderash, Lipovans, Tatar, and Turks), music and choreography (among Magyars, Romanians, and Lipovans), and cuisine (among Saxons, Lipovans, and Turks).

On the whole of the above-described ethnic variability, the *worldview* reproduces the perspective of *cross-cultural* coexistence (Aromanians with Romanians; Germans with Romanians and with Roma; Magyars with Romanians and Roma; Romanians with all the other groups; Tatars with Romanians, Aromanians, Turks, and Roma; Turks with Romanians, Tatars, Aromanians, and Roma). The *multiconfessional* cohabitation is encountered among the Protestant Landlers and Saxons and the Roman-Catholic Schwaben living together with Orthodox Romanians and Roma, the Roman-Catholic and Protestant Magyars with the Orthodox Romanians

and Roma, the Old-Belief Orthodox Lipovans with the Orthodox Romanians and Roma, the Islamic Turks and Tatars with the Orthodox Romanians, Aromanians, and Roma. The ethnic hybridization and syncretism are favored by the Orthodox Romanians' marriages with the Roman-Catholic Magyars, as well as by the exogamy between Lipovans and Romanians.

In this way, the conservative or traditional character of some cultural traits has been highlighted with respect to historical dialects and traditions, ethno-territorial homogeneity, endogamy and customary social organization, ancestral crafts, and millennial religious devotion. Several particularities of "adaptive" ethnicity have equally been summarized in terms of bilingualism, migration and colonization, exogamy, folk-arts trade and agrotourism, religious reform, and syncretism.

From such perspectives, the validation of *intra-ethnicity* (as a repertory of cultural characteristics shared by at least two homonymical subgroups) outlines two complementary methodological ways at the level of the abovementioned ethnic groups' *ethnographic contemporaneity* and *historical sequentiality*. Indeed, cultural equivalencies may occur within a "long duration" of history (the Aromanian dialect, the Tatar dialects, the Magyar Roman-Catholicism, the Romanian Ortodoxy, the Turkish Islamism, and the Tatar Islamism), while concordances of material culture may seem "ahistorical" (the Kalderash artisanship and folk clothing). Convergent evolutions are evident among the Lipovan subgroups (from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries) as well as among the Aromanian, German-speaking, Magyar-speaking, and Romanian ones (in Romania's interwar and postwar periods). Religious persecution, migration from Russia, and the Old-Belief Orthodoxy are simultaneously lived by the Lipovans in Carcaliu, Mahmudia, and Roman. Likewise, the Aromanians in Constanța and in Călărași are synchronized with their post-1925 colonization and exogamy from the second half of the twentieth century onwards. The deportation to Russia (after 1945) and the emigration to Germany (in the 1980-2000s) are ethnic experiences identically shared by the South-Transylvanian and Banat-located Germans. The Magyar exogamy in Frumoasa, Oituz, and Zăbala, as well as the Romanian exogamy (in the same localities) are reported for the interval of 1947 – 1996.

The Crimean origination of Tatars from Cobadin and Medgidia is dated back to the half of the nineteenth century, while the territorial homogeneization of these subgroups (as well as that of the Turks from Başpunar and Cobadin) belongs to a history they spent together in the framework of the modern Romanian state, during one century and half.

As a result, *ethnogenesis* is accounted for conservative cultural traits of a “paternity” recognizable within their very intergenerational succession, as the evolution of a given ethnic group (and its component subgroups). *Ethnomorphosis*, instead, based on ethnic circulation, foreign ethnographic influences, and cultural hybridization, is rather associated with adaptive ethnographic traits of a cross-cultural condition belonging to the same community (also including its subgroups). The interdependence of such traits does definitely not entail any uniformization in the making and transformation of ethnicity; indeed, the Aromanians, the Germans, the Magyars, the Romanians, the Roma, the Russian-Lipovans, the Tatars, and the Turks represent as many “processes” and “syntheses” of their own history or cultural patterns. However, the documented expression of the relationships between ethnogenesis and ethnomorphosis may contribute – through the intraethnic comparison – to the clarification of ethno-linguistic origination and interculturality as variable criteria of cultural belongingness.

## **Chapter 8:**

### **The ethno-cultural dimension of European citizenship (1992-2012)**

An implication of Romania’s accession to the European Union (2007) is the reappraisal of the traditional cultural heritage both in the case of Romanian majority and in that of the national minorities. The cultural identify of ethno-linguistic communities is currently related to the statute of *European Union citizenship*, as established by the article 8 of the Maastricht Treaty of European Union (1992). In such socio-economic and legislative framework, the anthropological theorizing of ethnicity and “cosmopolitanism”, alongside that of the “human rights” and the “national minorities”, actually approximates the *ethno-cultural dimension of the*



*European and national citizenship*, in the historical continuity and development of the European national states, as well as within their institutional structuring, once they have adhered to a *European* community. The three main conceptual constants of *ethnicity / nationalism, citizenship*, and *cosmopolitanism* are empirically and theoretically interwoven, which does not restrain their ethnographic, macro-social, and philosophical substance.

Both among the Romanian majority and the national minorities in Romania, *Europeanism* can be interpreted from the perspective of law documents according to which, once they have been adopted for the country's citizen ensemble, the ethno-cultural rights, freedoms, and duties wholly become *values of a patrimony shared with the citizens of European Union*. Indeed, the *Constitution of Romania* (1991, last amendment in 2003) and the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* (a draft law in Romanian parliamentary debate since 2005) stipulate the legal assignment of ethno-nationality not only within the citizen framework of Romanian state, but also within the horizon of international relationships (first of all, the European ones). Romanian (including national minorities) citizens' right to elect and be elected in European Parliament, together with the European Union citizens' right to elect and be elected in the authorities of Romanian public administration – together enlarge the sphere of the national civic body's public expression and political representation, along with the similarly democratic exercise from the part of citizens (of diverse ethnic identity) from other European countries. Likewise, in the *Statute of National Minorities*, the engagement expected from the part of Romanian state to support the contacts of its minority nationals with their co-ethnics from other states and the transborder cooperation in areas of the same spoken language – implicitly recognize the variable distribution of ethnicity throughout the European state territoriality. Lastly, with the exigency (jn 2005) of the European Comission for Democracy through Law that the terms of the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* should be in accordance with the provisions of the *European Convention of Human Rights* (1950, last amendment in 2010) and of the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (1995) – the *ethno-national* legislation is accurately shaped "in letter and spirit" of international law.

To the same extent, the traditions and politics of transborder ethnicity anticipate (and coexist with) contemporary law theorizing of the rights, freedoms, and obligations associated with the identity, belongingness, and character of ethnicity in Romania and in Europe. *Romanianness* is thus significant not only as a system of national-state values, in the *ethnic-majority* expression of them, but also as an ethos shared within micro-community and regional frameworks beyond the national state borderline, this time in a *minority* worldview. Moreover, with their citizenship, Romanians allow for the participation of ethnic minorities to their own *national* structure of government, just as, in their turn, they are recognized and integrated within a *European* elective body. From this point of view, the amendments of the European Commission for Democracy through Law to the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* are illustrative for the critical thinking exercise of complementing local understandings of ethnicity with its civic and transnational or “cosmopolitan” correspondence.

The equivalence and communication between the terminology of European and national legislation (with its specialized juridical principles) endorse in this way the *European* conceptualization of national citizenship, and, at the same time, the *national* intelligibility of European citizenship. To exemplify, the *official language* of Romanian state is also one of the official languages of European Union, the same as the recognition by the *Constitution of Romania* of the minorities’ right to use their *maternal languages* in justice. The *ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious identity* compose the “configuration” of ethno-nationality in the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, in the *Constitution of Romania*, and in the draft *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* as well. In conclusion, the membership within a recognized minority in Romania is basic for benefiting of the same elective rights as any other national citizen, within national as well as European election campaigns.

Despite the existence of such “common values of European peoples”, the legislative “harmonization” over the cultural content of *citizenship* in Europe and in the national law framework does not also authenticate a theoretical agreement on the representations and “givens” of ethnicity within the native ethnographic cultures. When the *Framework Convention for*

*the Protection of National Minorities* specifies the prevalence of the “national law”, the “international [legal] standards”, and the “requirements of public order” over “traditional practices”, one’s *ethnic identity* (together with all its characteristics) is obviously adjusted, particularly as regards the possibilities – constitutionally state-guarenteed – of “protecting and preserving the national cultural heritage”. Similarly, the expectations of the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* in “safeguarding traditional relationships as based during history in those country areas where they are reported to traditionally occur” cannot coincide with the reticence of the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* in defining the “areas traditionally inhabited”.

Again, the European Comission for Democracy through Law consents (by its 2005 Opinion on the draft law of the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania*) that it is “only cultural institutions” that, “in cooperation with the public authorities”, “can implement the policy of promotion and preservation of the historical and present culture of national minorities”, and that „the exercise of rights in community with others, including rights for persons belonging to national minorities, is often an emanation of the freedom of association”. On the other hand, the terminology of the *Statute of National Minorities in Romania* also utilizes, along with the phrase “national minority”, that of “national community”. However, the *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities* (within its *Explanatory Report*) excludes “the recognition of collective rights” from the constitutive principles of the “protection of national minorities and of the rights and freedoms of persons belonging such minorities”.

## Table of contents

INTRODUCTION .....	9
Chapter 1: SELF-REFERENTIAL AND INTER-REFERENTIAL PERSPECTIVES IN THE EVOLUTION OF ROMANIAN CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY .....	13
Chapter 2: ETHNOCENTRISM AND CULTURAL RELATIVISM IN THE HOMOLOGICAL AND ANALOGICAL APPROACH OF THE ETHNO-CULTURAL IDENTITY IN ROMANIA.....	48
Chapter 3: TOWARDS AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL VOCABULARY OF ETHNIC VARIABILITY IN ROMANIA .....	67
Chapter 4: CULTURAL VARIABLES OF ETNICITY IN ROMANIA.....	88
Chapter 5: SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY IN THE ETHNIC VARIABILITY OF ROMANIA.....	120
Chapter 6: ORAL TRADITIONS AND FOLK ARTISANSHIP IN THE SELF-REPRESENTATION OF ETHNIC IDENTITY IN ROMANIA.....	139
Chapter 7: ANTHROPOLOGICAL CRITERIA OF ETHNOGENESIS AND ETHNOMORPHOSIS.....	162
Chapter 8: THE ETHNO-CULTURAL DIMENSION OF EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP (1992-2012) .....	184
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	204



Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române

CNCS PN - II - ACRED - ED - 2012 – 0374

Coperta colecției: *AULA MAGNA*

Machetare, tehnoredactare și prezentare grafică:

Luminița LOGIN, Nicolae LOGIN

Logistică editorială și diseminare:

Ovidiu SÎRBU, Radu AMAN

---

Traducerea sumarului și sintezei, corectură și bun de tipar  
asigurate de autor

---

ISBN 978-973-167-134-5

Apărut trim. II 2013