
Conditions of Minorities

Zoltán Ilyés

**Identity as resource in a small region:
the example of Gyimes****Introduction**

Gyimes got into the focus of Hungarian and Romanian interest after the changes in Romania in 1989. Administratively it belongs to the Counties Harghita (Gyimesfelsőlök – Lunca de Sus, Gyimesközéplek – Lunca de Jos) and Bacău (Ghimes – Făget); it is an ethnographical region of special settlement structure and landscape. The uppermost part of the valley of the River Tatros was historically the part of County Csík, but due to its situation near the border, it was greatly influenced by Moldavian-Romanian culture. It was its historical-cultural characteristics, which ranged it into the small-region of Pogány Alps where, beside the settlements of Gyimes, several villages of the Szépvíz district of County Csík also belong. The settlement area of the Gyimes Csángós is a special chapter of the reception of Transylvania which developed into an 'ethnic landscape' organically connected to Székelyland but in many respect separated from it.

Settlement area, regional identity, administrative arrangements

Balázs Orbán was the first to describe Gyimes and the Gyimes Csángós¹ (earlier József Teleki, László Kövéry and Károly Benkő mentioned them in their writings). He explained how, due to overpopulation in County Csík, poor inhabitants settled down in the cleared woodland and founded settlements in the Transylvanian Alps. There was timbering on a big scale in the Transylvanian Alps in the 19th c. The pastures thus created drew the Csángós there whose livelihood was animal farming. First they rented land, later bought it, building first temporary living quarters, later permanently inhabited settlements. The reason for the 'swarming' of the Csángós in the 20th c. was reinforced by the relative overpopulation, the

¹ Orbán, Balázs: A Székelyföld leírása történelmi, régészeti, természetrajzi s népismei szempontból. II. 1969. pp 77–78. (The description of Székelyland from the point of view of history, archaeology, natural sciences and folklore).

Conditions of Minorities

closing down of the big lumbering factories due to the great depression, the high rent of pastures and meadows.²

A characteristic example how Csángó settlements came about is Háromkút east of the Hagymás Range where the land cleared by the Unio Timbering Company was bought by fourty Csángó families. First they used the area as summer quarters during the time of hay making, later they built houses, stables, barns and settled down permanently; many of them even sold their village houses in Gyimesbükk or Középlök.³ The original patterns of clearance husbandry and typical great-family settlement forms have been preserved in Lesőd near Kászon where the family Fodor are living who moved from Gyimesfelsőlok in 1905.⁴ Similar inland colonisation created Csobányos. Gyürke, Aklos, Csinód, Egerszék, the Csángó settlements of the Úz Valley on the Csíkszentgyörgy and Csíkszentmárton properties as well as Gyertyános in county Háromszék, Brájtes (Barátos) and Terkuca near the border, Farkaspalló along the stream Domuk, Várpaták, Kovács Péter Sövető, Visszafolyó near Gyergyószentmiklós, and Csiba-rét near Csíksomlyó.⁵ The inhabitants of Csobányos, Aklos, Csinód, Egerszék, Úz Valley were employed in saw-mills till the end of the 1940s.

Kostelek, Gyepece, Csügés (Hárompatak), Bükklok, Rakottyás and Lóvész in the Csík-Basin developed out of Romanian shepherd colonies at the end of the 18th and in early 19th c. Through exogamous marriages many inhabitants of Gyimes villages went to live in Kostelek, this influenced the ethno-cultural development of the villages too. Between and 1930 there were 73 exogamous marriages (out of a total of 182) of which in 29 (40%) one of the spouses was from the valley of River Tatros.⁶

² Antal, Imre: Gyimesi króniak. Európa Könyvkiadó – Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1992. pp. 43–49, 86–90. [The Chronicle of Gyimes]

³ Vámszer, Géza: Életforma és anyagi műveltség. I. Kriterion Könyvkiadó, Bukarest, 1977. p. 197. [Way of life and material culture]

⁴ Kós, Károly: Népi építkezés Kászonban. In: Kós, Károly: Erdély népi építésze Kelenföld Kiadó, 1989. pp. 186–227. [Folk architecture of Transylvania]

⁵ Vámszer op.cit. pp. 197–198; Antal, Imre op.cit. pp. 44–46; Tarisznyás, Márton: Gyergyó történeti néprajza. Kriterion Könyvkiadó, Bukarest 1982. pp. 58–59. [Historical folklore of Gyergyó], Pozsony, Ferenc: Gyertyános. Művelődés XL, 1991; Barta, János: úz-völgyi magyarok. Település-néprajzi és népesedéstörténeti tanulmány. Barta Társadalomtudományi BI. Kecskemét, 2004. [Hungarians in the Úz Valley. A study in settlement-folklore and population-history]

⁶ Ilyés, Zoltán: Az exogámia hatása három román eredetű csík-megyei havasi telep anyanyelvi állapotára és etnikus identitására (1841–1930). Demográfia XLI, 1998/2–3: 285–299. [The influence of exogamy on the status of mother tongue and ethnic identity].

Conditions of Minorities

From the 1960s many of the Csángó settlements lost their population. From some villages the inhabitants moved to neighbouring villages (e.g. from Gyertyános to Kurtapatak, Esztelnek), others settled down in towns (e.g. from Aklos to Arad). Úzvölgy, Csobányos depopulated since the closing down the sawmills. In some villages, e.g. in Gyúrke there are no more permanent residents left. On the other hand the population of Egerszék and Csinód (and Lesőd) has been growing since the 1930s, according to the 1992 census there lived 320 people in the two settlements. The number of residents is stable in Háromkút and Csiba-rét; The people from Farkaspalló, Brájtes (Barátos), Terkuca moved back to Gyimes, using the settlements as sommer quarters or they are bought by Romanians from Domuk-Hosszúréz and Tarkő-Barátos (Tarcau-Brates). Among the settlements in Hárompatak Gyepece has suffered considerable population loss.

The administrative location of the settlement area of the Gyimes Csángós was constant till the middle of the 20th c: it belonged to the Szépvíz district with its historically changing dimensions. Between 1950 and 1952 the area of Csík and Kászón – thus Gyimesfelsőlök and Gyimesközéplök – became part of Stalin-territory, which had Brassó as its centre. From 1952 to 1968 Gyergyóbékás, Gyimesbükk, Rakottyás, Magyarcsügés, Gyepece és Kos telek belonged to County Bacau. The other parts of former County Csík was part of the Hungarian Autonomous Province (1952–1960) later Maros-Hungarian Autonomous Province (1960–1968), divided between the regions of Maroshévíz, Gyergyószentmiklós and Csíkszereda.⁷

Since 1968 Gyimesbükk and its area is part of County Bacau, Gyergyóbékás and Háromkút, where Csángós live, belong to County Neamt.⁸ With the ordering of Gyimesbükk and the alpine settlements of Hárompatak to an administrative unit with Bacau as its centre, the Romanian ethno-policy intended to place the village, which forms a contact area between Romanians and Szekelys, under Romanian dominance, however, it has not succeeded because of the Hungarian language of the orthodox (earlier Greek Catholic) congregation and the pastoration in Hungarian language of the Roman Catholic church.⁹

⁷ Volkori, László: Erdély közigazgatási és etnikai földrajza. Balaton Akadémia. Vörösbéreny, 1996. pp. 52, 56. [The administrative and ethnic geography of Transylvania].

⁸ Volkori, László op.cit. pp. 64–65.

⁹ Ilyés, Zoltán: A csík-megyei görög katolikusok identitásváltozásai (1850–1944). Székelyföld, 2001/7: 88- 105 [Changes of identity of the Greek Catholic congregation in County Csík].

Conditions of Minorities

The small region of Pogányhavas was founded – on the pattern of the district of Szépvíz – from Csíksomyló, Csíkpálfalva, Csíkszépvíz in 1999.¹⁰ The new small region association stops the administrative partition of Gyimes on the one hand connecting Gyimesbükkös to its associate villages. On the other hand it ranks the Gyimes-villages, which have a different economy- and mental-history, into a planning and identity-organizing region among the villages County Csík with a greatly different background. The range of the eponymous Pogányhavas – Széphavas is a geographical-hydrographical as well as ethnic limit between the symbolically still divided Csángós of Gyimes and the Székelys of County Csík.

Gyimes as a historical region of identity – differences and similarities

The settlers of Gyimes (the area of the so called Hárompatak: Kostelek, Gyepece, Csügé included)¹¹ arrived here from the villages of County Csík¹², from the dioceses¹³, from the alps of Negyedfélmegye¹⁴ and the so-called revindicated alps (territory taken back from Moldavia)¹⁵ since the beginning of the 18th c. They were all poor Székely and Romanian cotters, who paid tax to the landowners of County Csík and did not own any land themselves till the middle of the 19th c. According to the *Erdélyorszá-*

¹⁰ Sarány, István: Pogányhavas kistérségi társulás. Hargita népe. 16. December 1999. In: [The small region association in Pogányhavas]. Koszta Csaba János: Kistérségi szerveződési folyamat Hargita megyében (1998–2002). In Bodó Julianna szerk.: *Székelyföldi mozaik. Térségi szociológiai tanulmányok*, Pro-Print Könyvkiadó, Csíkszereda, 2004. 229–263. p. 237 [Small region self-organization in County Hargita].

¹¹ Ilyés, Zoltán: Hárompatak település- népesség- és akkulturációtörténete. In: Tomisa, Ilona ed.: *Hárompatak Egy ismeretlen néprajzi kisláj Erdély és Moldva határásn*. MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézet. Budapest, 2004. pp. 7–53. [The settlement, population and cultural history of Hárompatak. In: Hárompatak. An unknown small region on the border of Transylvania and Moldavia].

¹² Basically from Csíkszépvíz, Csíkszentmiklós, Csíkkoorzsóva and Csíkszentmihály common lands.

¹³ E.g. Bálványos Alps at Gyimesbükk, which belonged to the St Peter diocese (including Várdotfalva, Csobotfalva, Csomortán, Csíktapolca). Antal, Imre op.cit. p. 61.

¹⁴ U. Kerékgyártó, Adrienne: a csíkiak Negyedfélmegye havasáról. *Néprajzi értesítő* LXXIV. 1992. pp. 5–47. [The people of Csík from the alps of Negyedfélmegye].

¹⁵ Endes, Miklós: Csík-, Gyergyó-, Kászón-székek (Csík megye) földjének és népének története 1918-ig. Budapest 1938, pp. 226–228. [The history of the land and people of the regions Csík, Gyergyó and Kászón of County Csík].

Conditions of Minorities

gi népszámlálás [Transylvanian census] of 1871¹⁶ there were no landowners in the three Gyimes villages, everyone was registered as cotter. The situation was modified somewhat by the law of adjustment in 1871, but even then many of them remained small holders, tenants who worked in the sawmills of the entrepreneurs who amassed huge wooded properties by taking advantage of the law of adjustment keeping the Csángós in proletarian circumstances¹⁷.

In the 18th and 19th cc. the Csángós complained about their exposed state in their letters addressed to the Transylvanian Gubernium and the County administration.¹⁸ Following the law of adjustment many of the Csángós could buy the meadows and pastures previously rented from the Székelys and this enabled them to better themselves materially that was not welcomed by the landowners of County Csík.¹⁹ The letter rented some of their alpine areas to Romanian shepherds coming from Háromszék and Barcaság. In 1883 the Roman Catholic diocese of Csíkszentmihályos rented the Gerendus Alps to a Romanian shepherd who arrived with 1700 sheep to the location. The area was in lease to people of Gyimesbükk who had already built on the land and intended to buy it. They did not let the shepherd to the area. 120 Székely from Szépvíz, Borzsova and Szentmihályos went against them accompanied by 12 gendarms shooting and fighting.²⁰ This is just one example of the century old feud between the Csángós and the Székelys caused by conflicts over ownership.

The rift caused by conflicting economic interests was reinforced by the mixed ethnic background of the Gyimes Csángós, their Romanian style clothing, their dialect, vocabulary, their shepherding way of life. The low urbanisation of the Csángós and the dominantly animal breeding occupation increased the rejection felt by the people of Csík. There was a saying according to which 'beer is not a drink, a girl is not a woman, a Csángó is not a man'. In 1897 the newspaper Csíki Lapok made fun of the thrifty Csángós who went by train to Madéfalva thirty kilometres away but went back on foot. The patronizing attitude was accompanied by authoritative way of speaking often with critical, instructive undertones. At the end of the 19th c. teachers at county-meetings frequently criticized

¹⁶ The Figures of the Transylvanian census of 1871. MS In German. Central Statistical Office.

¹⁷ Antal, Imre op.cit. p. 83

¹⁸ Antal, Imre op.cit. pp. 63–68

¹⁹ cf. Balás, Lajos: *örökös emlékirat*. Hatva, 1935 [Unending Memoirs]

²⁰ Balás, Lajos op.cit.

Conditions of Minorities

the childrearing methods of the Csángó parents and often found the school attendance of the children insufficient.

That the problem was primarily economic is proved by the recollections of those Csángós who moved from Gyimesfelsőlök to Csinód near the River Úz where they lived on the common property in Csík; they called the representatives of the landowners 'bad men'.²¹ At the same time in the Úz-valley alps, which administratively belongs to Csikszentgyörgy and Csikszentmárton, the inhabitants claimed to be more 'civilized' than those who remained in Gyimes, disregarding the fact that the infrastructure was very backward in the remote alpine settlements: e.g. electricity was installed only by the end of the millennium. The closer contact with the Székelys, the adoption of the patterns of Csík raised an internal mythological frontier emphasizing the differences.

The railway built between Madéfalva and Gyimes in 1897 created hardly any change in occupational mobility or in changing domicile. The reasons lay in the local industry offering work places and the fact that Csík was insufficiently industrialized in general. At the end of the 1920s the great depression reached the area and the sawmills were closed down, the work force was drastically reduced and the people started to leave Gyimes.

In the second half of the 20th c. by the occupational mobility of the Csángós and their taking up domicile in Csík, made it easier for them to meet other people which resulted in more and more 'mixed' marriages. Traditional stereotypes were played down though they are still alive, indicating the awareness of the differences created by the differences in ownership, culture, way of life etc. all through the centuries. Even the members of the younger generation keep referring to the people of Csík as *The Hungarians*; there are conflicts at the work places, and the people of Csík jealously observe the growing interest in Gyimes coming from Hungary.²²

The intellectuals try to reinterpret the old existing division and separation as a Székely-Csángó common history and stress the unity of interests. The idea is exemplified in the new church built in Gyimes-Ükk in 1974–76 where

²¹ Ilyés, Zoltán: Szimbolikus határok és határjelek. A turisták és a helyiek határtermelő és -olvasó aktivitása Gyimesben. In: Biczó, Gábor: [vagabundus] Gulyás Gyula tiszteletére. Kulturális és Vizuális Antropológiai Tanszék, Miskolc (A Kulturális és Vizuális Antropológiai Tanszék könyvei 5). 2004. 189–212. p.193 [Symbolic borders and border markers. Border creating and decoding activities of tourists and locals in Gyimes. In: In honour of Gyula Gulyás].

²² Ilyés Zoltán: Szempontok a gyimesi csángók etnikus identitásának értelmezéséhez. In Keményfi Róbert – Szabó László szerk.: *Varia. Ethnographica et Folcloristica. Ujváry Zoltán 65. születésnapjára*. KLTE Néprajzi Tanszék. Debrecen. 1997. 72–80. p. 75. [Considerations concerning the interpretation of the ethnic identity of the Csángós of Gyimes].

Conditions of Minorities

not only the religious beliefs of the community are represented but its canonised political-national consciousness as well. A new image of the Csángós of Gyimes has been created, who courageously stand their ground in remote places, building a church in spite of prohibitions and obstacles in order to blot out the earlier archetypically negative image the Székelys had of the Csángós. The frescoes in the church try to reflect the identical past, common fate in religion and minority life by depicting figures wearing Csángó and Székely costumes in the scenes of baptism and offering.²³ The church represents a strong identity-marker towards the Romanians of orthodox faith on the one hand but is also the means of demolition of mental division lines between Csángós and Székelys on the other.²⁴

The discovery of traditions and the invention of Gyimes

There was a three act folk play 'The wild flower of Gyimes' published by István Géczy in 1897, that first drew attention to the Csángós of Gyimes. The play became a favourite with amateur drama groups all over the country. The topic became even more popular after the film version of 'The wild flower of Gyimes' was released with popular Hungarian actors in 1938. The film does not even touch the limit of ethnic authenticity; the posters depicted the stereotypical scenery of Székelyland.²⁵ In the second half of the 20th c., thanks to the growing interest and research in folklore Gyimes became the 'folklore museum' of Székelyland.²⁶ Especially through the collecting of songs and dances,²⁷ of myths and archaic prayers²⁸ dedicated the area to a preferred Transylvanian micro-region.²⁹

²³ Székely, László: Csíki áhítal Acsíki székelyek vallási néprajza. Szent István Társulat, Budapest, n.d. pp. 247, 503. [Devotion in Csík. The religious folklore of the Székelys in Csík.]: Váradi, Péter Pál-Lőwey, Lilla: Erdély-Székelyföld. Gyimesek vidéke. PéterPál Kiadó, Veszprém, 2001. p.120 [Transylvania-Székelyland. The Gyimes regions].

²⁴ Ilyés, Zoltán op.cit. p.204.

²⁵ <http://www.ernstgaleria.hu/plak/122.html>

²⁶ Kósa, László: A gyimesi csángók hagyományos élete. In: Kallós, Zoltán-Martin, György: Tegnap a Gyimesben jártam... Európa Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1989. p. 15 [The traditional life of the Csángós of Gyimes. In: Yesterday I was in Gyimes].

²⁷ Kallós – Martin op.cit.

²⁸ Salamon, Anikó: Gyimesi csángó mondák, ráolvasások, imák. Helikon Kiadó, Budapest 1987 [Tales, charms, prayers of the Csángós of Gyimes].

²⁹ Cf. Karátson, Gábor: és az elmaradtLeonardói fordulat. Utószó Lao-Céhez. In: Lao-ce: Tao te King. Cseréplávi n.p. 1999. p.vii. [Huang Kung-Wang and the turn of Leonardo which never happened. Epilogue to the translation of Huang Kung-Wang by Karátson, Gábor].

Conditions of Minorities

The cultural features, ethnic and micro-regional characteristics – which earlier were meant to be the manifestation of distance and backwardness vehemently criticized by the elite of Csík – represent the models of 'real Hungarian' tradition for the ethnographers from Hungary. The TV channel Duna went so far as to changing the order of the stations at the feast of Csík-somlyó to be able to focus on the group of Gyimes pilgrims wearing their costumes. Thus the age old symbolic and sacred ordering of space was sacrificed for the sake of 'authenticity'. Because of the great masses arriving to the feast the traditional choreography had already changed by necessity since 1990.³⁰ In this context the Csángós of Gyimes, who stand out by their attire which is more in Romanian than Székely style, are held to be an ethnic group with its adherence to its culture, clothing and being Hungarian more exclusive and archaic than the Székelys.³¹

It is not surprising that Gyimes recently became a touristical target among the destinations in Transylvania; it became an almost compulsory stop in the journeys across Transylvania organized by travel agencies or planned individually. The house of pilgrims and school named after St. Elizabeth of the Árpáds in Gyimesfelsőlök, the skanzen in Gyimesbükk, the churches of the main valley are the most important attraction as well as the ancient 'thousand year old frontier'. The nearby opened Agrotouristic Hotel offers Csángó banquets. The buildings of the hotel cannot be called authentic compared to the traditional Gyimes architecture – which by now has completely disappeared – but being built of natural materials and of modest size they fit into their surroundings. The tourists are offered dishes of the local cuisine, they can familiarize with the costumes, music and dances. The ancient frontier is the backdrop. The landlord, a descendant of an old Gyimes landowner family tells the story of the community and his own minority experiences, this way the tourists from Hungary can feel the atmosphere of the borderland and learn about the challenges of survival. A similar tourist project has been planned in Gyimesközéplök where the old houses collected in Gyimes and Csík are going to be reconstructed with care of the old architectural details but supplemented with modern comfort to offer appropriate accommodation.

³⁰ Cf. Mohay, Tamás: Térszerveződés a csík-somlyói pünkösdi búcsún. Néprajzi értesítő LXXVIII. 1996: 29–58. [Space-order at the feast of Csík-somlyó].

³¹ On the esthetics of regions cf. Maase, Kaspar: Eine Republik von Provinzlern? Ästhetisierte Region und nationale Identifikation im vereinigten Deutschland [Kulturation 1/2003] In: www.kulturation.de

Conditions of Minorities

The dance camps in Gyimesközéplek that were organized from the beginning of the 1990s till 2004 became one of the most important place of heritage-management and tradition-creation drawing vast numbers of tourists every summer.³² Its forerunner was the quiz and folklore festival entitled 'At the spring of River Tatros' organised in the Ceausescu era what wanted to commemorate the Gyimes peasant rising in 1934 and the brotherhood of Hungarian and Romanian peasants.³³ The internationalistic ideology faded away but the festival itself has survived the change of regime.

The invention of tradition of the Gyimes folklore, the landscape and the 'thousand year old frontier' its touristic canonisation and marketing has been going on since the beginning of the 1990s; it managed to free itself from the restrictions of the ethnocentric Romanian nation-state but sometimes is loaded with forms of the Hungarian minority's hegemonous consciousness of the area, interpretation of the past and invention of tradition.

The Rákóczi castle near the border is about to develop into a Hungarian place of pilgrimage, raising national sentiments, mobilizing historical knowledge and awakening the consciousness of communal fate in the visitors.³⁴ The locals do not offer more food for thought, they do not care to reveal deeper, ambiguous, enigmatic layers. Thus the ancient border has become an understandable item of folklore-tourism. The visitors on their turn also shape the image of the locals about themselves and through the stereotypes unwittingly decide what should be included into the stock of heritage. what is interesting for strangers.

This way the visitors are not induced to try to understand.³⁵ If we accept Gábor Biczó's definition of the 'deep tourist' cited from Simmel and József Böröcz, according to which the tourist is prompted to understand and

³² Invention of tradition is a legitimate theory in European ethnology and historiography. cf. Briesen, Detlef – Gans, Rüdiger: Regionale Identifikation als 'Invention of Tradition'. Wer hat und warum wurde eigentlich im 19. Jahrhundert das Siegerland erfunden. *Berichte zur deutschen Landeskunde* 1992. 66: 61–73

³³ Atal, Imre op.cit. p. 128.

³⁴ Ilyés, Zoltán: A gyimesi 'ezeréves' határ olvasatai. In: Feischmidt Margit ed. Erdély (de)konstrukciók. Néprajzi Múzeum – PTE Kommunikáció- és Médiatudományi Tanszék, Budapest–Pécs, 2005. pp.35–49 [Reading the 'thousand' year border. In: Transylvania (de)constructions].

³⁵ On the ethnicity of regions cf. Kenényfi, Róbert: Az etnikai táj kultúrnemzeti mítosza. *Regio* 2002:93–108. [The national-cultural myth of the ethnic landscape].

Conditions of Minorities

make himself understood, abolish distance and strangeness,³⁶ the average tourist visiting Gyimes falls rather short of these requirements.

The present attitude toward Gyimes neglects the multicultural nature of the region, the covert as well as overt manifestations of Romanian influence, the ethnic and religious rivalries, the Gyimes people's grievances they suffered for their Greek Catholic faith and the deeply seated and ever repeated patterns of the controversies between the Székelys and the Csángós.³⁷

Summary

The visitor to Gyimes finds a special area dominated by the local religious and secular intelligentsia. It is defined by attempts at monopolizing the memories. In turn all these are taken over by the tourist narratives, into publications about the region, and appears in scholarly publications as well. The reception of the frontier and heritage is selective and arbitrary: apart from the local intelligentsia it is formed by travel agencies, guides and Transylvania-fans. The picture depicts the Csángós of Gyimes as a group of cultural relics standing sentry on the borders. This image overlooks the multi-ethnic character of the region and stresses Hungarian identity, requires steadfastness where it is not necessary and thus cannot ever be completely fulfilled.

In everyday life there is no isolating cultural-ethnic dividing line between Székelys/Csángós and Romanians but a wide zone of interference.³⁸ The border in this interpretation is a sensitive membrane, an intermediate zone letting through common memories and feelings of identity.³⁹ In this zone of the Csángós of Gyimes there is a sensitivity for double identity, compatibility with both cultures that the local and national elite have tried to homogenize and simplify.⁴⁰

³⁶ Biczó, Gábor. A határ metafora mint a turizmus antropológiai vizsgálatának paradigmikus példája: Gyimes esete. In: Fejős, Zoltán–Szijártó Zsolt eds: *Helye(in)k, tárgya(in)k, Képe(in)k. A turizmus társadalomtudományi magyarázata*. Néprajzi Múzeum, Budapest 2003. 40–50. p.42. [The metaphore of the border as the example of anthropological analysis of tourism.]

³⁷ Ilyés, Zoltán op.cit. pp 72–81.

³⁸ Ilyés, Zoltán: *Nyelvhatár/kontaktzóna értelmezés a Székelyföld keleti peremvidékén*. In: Kozam, István–Papp, Richárd eds.: *ikai kölcsönhatások és konfliktusok a Kárpát-medencében*. Gondolat-MTA Etnikai-nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intéze, Budapest 2003. pp.77–88. [The interpretation of language border/contact zone in the eastern borderland of Székelyland].

³⁹ Frida, Balázs: *A másik felé. SA közeledés és az különbözős szimbolikus stratégiái a gyimesi interetnikus zónában*. In: Kozma–Papp op.cit. p28.

⁴⁰ Ilyés, Zoltán op.cit. p. 83.



**Minority
Culture**