

Confronting Legacies of Ethnic-National Discourse in Scholarship and Practice: Traditional Music and Dance in Central Transylvania

ABSTRACT: Ethnic-national discourse in traditional music and dance practice and theory in central Transylvania is pervasive and persistent. Scholarship in the field has been deeply implicated in the elaboration and imposition of national ideologies by cultural elites, but while ethnicity is a naturalized category, the local practice of music and dance in social life need not be primarily so marked. This article examines and critiques the identification of traditional music and dance in this region as Romanian, Hungarian, or Romani as established by twentieth-century scholarship and as institutionalized in practice. A theoretical perspective that moves away from the re-iteration of these categories is suggested, and the possibility of escaping from them in practice is considered.

TRADITIONAL MUSIC AND dance, what I will refer to as a choreomusical idiom, in central Transylvania is among the most thoroughly documented and analyzed in Europe. Generations of work by musical folklorists, ethnochoreologists, ethnomusicologists, revivalists, and enthusiasts built up massive collections archived in Romania and Hungary and these scholars worked tirelessly in the analysis and classification of this material. The weight of this legacy has paradoxically, however, held the investigation of dance and dance-music back from

fully engaging with a contemporary critical perspective. In particular, its study has remained entangled within long-standing ethnic-national discourses and its practice seemingly condemned to endlessly re-inscribe and reinforce these divisive and regressive ideologies. The work of the scholarly community has been deeply implicated, even complicit, in creating this state of affairs, but a tipping point from which it can move forward critically and progressively may have at last been reached.

Critical analysis of nationalisms, particularly as re-emergent in post-socialist Europe, has led some to argue convincingly for the study of “nationalism without nations” and “ethnicity without groups” (Brubaker 1996, 2004). I believe that these formulations offer a possible solution to the problem of how to investigate the contentious claims made for Romanian, Hungarian, and Romani music in Transylvania without further reinforcing and exacerbating these social divisions.¹ As a scholar working from a position outside the immediate environment and its predicaments, I hope to help contribute to clearing a less constrained cultural space in which to conserve, safeguard, and further resuscitate traditions that have been devalued and distorted by a history of ideological abuse.

The seemingly intractable claim of ethnic-national musical discourse on this regional idiom commanded my attention from my introductory fieldwork in the region in 1994. It is a heavy load that burdens music-dance performance and that continues to trouble and mar the experience of its aesthetic and social pleasures. Music and dance have been a terrain on which the history of nation building in central Europe has been played out at least since the later-nineteenth century, becoming focused on particular genres at different times. The patriotic impetus for Béla Bartók’s and Zoltán Kodály’s collection work beginning before the First World War is carefully examined by Judit Frigyesi who also mentions the fascinating exchange concerning Bartók’s “Hungarianess” as a composer with the Romanian musicologist Octavian Beu. Beu argued that his work was in fact more Romanian in character than Hungarian due to the importance of its Romania-sourced folk-music material. She also discusses the contentious debates concerning the relation of (urban) Gypsy music and Hungarian national music at the end of the nineteenth century and on into the twentieth century (1994). During the communist era, state ideologies were systematically imposed on cultural life, and traditional forms of expression in particular were appropriated to

discourses of national identity in Romania. The work of ethnomusicologists and ethnochoreologists was utilized in this reconfiguring of norms and became an important voice of authority comprising music, dance, and custom as representative of ethnic-national identity. Contemporary scholarship has not yet fully recovered from this trauma.

When the ethnicity of a musical tradition is so clearly not substantive—as in central Transylvanian ethnographic zone of the *Mezőség* or *Câmpia Transilvaniei*²—the need for analytic approaches that decouple ethnicity and nationality from their group-ness is particularly apparent. It is precisely because this interethnic repertoire is the most uniform to be found throughout Transylvania (Kelemen 1998, 25–26), that the contingency of its putative ethnicity is so evident while at the same time its inter-ethnicity remains largely un-examined. This is a legacy that has hampered the development of more progressive models for performance as well as theory and practice in scholarship since the abrupt disruption of entrenched state controls following the revolutions of 1989.

Both Romanian and Hungarian folklore researchers as well as revival activists have documented the music of the string bands typical of the region, creating large archival collections and releasing many documentary and commercial recordings. Producers and distributors of these publications are of several types, each with their own mandate, packaging norms, etc. They include commercial world music entertainment productions, special interest “niche” labels, recordings meant to accompany dancing, and government or foundation supported releases with scientific intent. Dance, as well, is well documented in scientific and pedagogical publications and on the internet; it is widely disseminated through the Hungarian dance house movement (Quigley 2014). While my arguments speak to and draw upon both music and dance in the unified sense, my emphasis here is on music, musicians, and musical research. The body of material mentioned above along with my own fieldwork carried out in central Transylvania permits a detailed discussion of the ways in which music-dance is ethnically categorized, how the nation-ness of music emerges, and how its production is institutionalized.

The traditional choreomusical idiom largely shared among the population living in this region consists of cycles of dances and dance suites of changing rhythm and tempo (Lortat-Jacob 1994).³ The dominant musical form is a suite of from two or three to as many as five

or more sections of varied rhythm and tempo that are generally specific to a particular village or a small group of neighboring villages. The standard instrumental ensemble since the late-nineteenth century until quite recently is a string band consisting of a lead violin (*viora* or *hegedűs*), a three-string viola-size *kontra* or *braci*, and a double bass (*bőgő*) usually with three strings (this instrument may sometimes be smaller than the standard size and called *gardona* or *gordon*). Depending upon the size of the occasion and the money available to hire musicians, the violin and kontra/*braci* are frequently played in pairs. Other instruments may be used along with this ensemble, notably accordion or saxophone, but this is less common in the Mezőség/Câmpia than elsewhere in Transylvania. As new genres of popular music (and their dancing) became important at social occasions and new musical technology became available after 1989 this core ensemble underwent an initial expansion and then an economically motivated gradual reduction in size. Guitars and drums were added to accommodate new genres and the violin amplified. Electric keyboard instruments, however, soon made the kontra superfluous and with the incorporation of more sophisticated synthesizers a drummer was no longer needed either. Eventually a single synthesizer may come to play all the parts, including the melodic role of the violin. Most recently the hosts of such social events can be found to incorporate their own mix of music played from laptops, a possibility which can replace the live musicians entirely.

The musical repertoire consists of localized melodies together with others of wide distribution. Some dance types and associated accompaniment are widely identified with one or another ethnic group. Some melodies are specific to certain dances, but many are subject to transposition and adaptation by the musicians to suit various dances. The dance employs a variety of turning couple movements performed in an improvisatory way by individual couples. Slapping motifs performed by the men may stand alone as a separate dance in the sequence or be incorporated into the couple dance segments. Women, for their part, are called upon to perform virtuosic spinning in cooperation with their partners.⁴

Ethnicity in Everyday Music-Dance Practice

In contexts of “everyday” practice the ethnicity of musicians, dancers, and their music-dance need not necessarily be marked as such

nor be particularly significant.⁵ Many string bands in the region are indeed of a single ethnicity, usually Rom, reflecting the family basis of their formation and this recognized professional specialty.⁶ It is not so unusual, however, for ensembles to include Hungarians and/or Romanians as well as Roms. Furthermore any particular ensemble, especially the more professionalized, is quite capable of playing the music preferred by dancers of all ethnicities living in their areas of activity. Those dancing at a particular social event are more likely to be of a single shared ethnicity, depending upon the nature of the social event that occasions the dancing, but mixed ethnicity among dancers is nevertheless quite common as well, depending upon the population mix of a particular village.⁷

In central Transylvania social dance among all three groups shares the same general structure. In social situations of village life that call for music and dance, among which the most common nowadays are weddings, the participants are largely of one ethnicity and there is no need to foreground that identity. It is unmarked and taken-for-granted. It is not the ethnicity of the musicians or dancers that is the most relevant determinant of musical form and style, but rather the specificities of the dancing community. These are more likely to be determined by very local histories, the relative productivity of fields and wealth or poverty of the village, and other features of the immediate performance context.⁸ In a social setting music-dance performance enacts the social relations that animate the occasion. Use of well-known local repertoire facilitates the performance of individuality and personal relationships through improvisation.

In such local settings, relatively free of the constraints that come with a requirement to enact a display-ethnicity, this domain is open to changes in musical culture brought about by the opening of the Romanian media markets to a proliferation of popular music genres from both west and east. New instrumentation, new styles, and new repertoire are adopted with relative ease within these social occasions. As a consequence, the village specific dance repertoire has in many, if not most, places lost its significance—perhaps present at times as part of a more diverse mix of genres, or sometimes completely abandoned. This domain of everyday ethnically unmarked music-making proceeds according to its own dynamic, in principal independent of the highly charged domain of public ethnic display and elite nationalizing discourse. At a mixed wedding, for example, a band will need to

play to the preferences of the various communities represented. But, in this setting, the motivation behind repertoire choice is not related so much to a desire or need for ethnic differentiation or display as it is to the need to engage all present in the social process of music-dance performance.⁹

Within the domain of everyday practice there is of course recognition of ethnicity and distinctions are made among the choreomusical habits and preferences of one group as opposed to another. But such distinctions in musical and choreographic form, structure, and style that are made and used to identify and mark ethnic difference are often only relevant in local contexts. Csilla Kőnczei notes, for example, that regional differences in dance and music style may be interpreted in terms of ethnic national differentiation by their communities of practice. She found that Hungarians from both Kalotaszeg and Mezőség, for example, upon hearing each other's music, described their differences as ethnic rather than regional. That is, each thought the other's music was Romanian (2000)! This example is doubly interesting as it both illustrates the specificity of local stylistic distinctions and a tendency to ethnicize difference.

In the context of village life before the imposition of communist party rule and concomitant implementation of its cultural policies, these patterns of performance in the frame of everyday ethnicity would have been the norm. That is not to say that there was no nationalizing of traditional music-dance before the communist period nor use of traditional idioms in the public sphere for display of national or ethnic identity. The national movement among Romanians in Transylvania in the late-nineteenth century, for example, clearly led to the proliferation and re-invention of *călușerul* men's ceremonial display dancing (Giurchescu 1992; Petac 2014, 183–194). There was also national representation through music-dance in contexts of state sponsored display and tourist presentations, however, such practices are not well documented nor have they been investigated in Romania.¹⁰ There was therefore a legacy from these representational uses that would have lingered in the public mind through the radical disruptions that followed World War II and likely informed musical and choreographic reconfiguration of choreomusical idioms in line with the new ideology. But there was not the systematic and thorough exercise of state influence, even control, in the cultural sphere that reached out and down from the centers of power to the level of village life that characterized

the creation of the Romanian communist state and the promulgation of its nationalist ideology (Giurchescu 1993; Nixon 1998).

Nationality in Politicized Choreomusical Practice

The most obvious ethnic-nationalization of music and dance occurs in the gross appropriation of performances in traditional idioms by political spokespeople into their discourse at public events. Such public presentational performances are frequent in the region and many are institutionalized as recurrent festivals, competitions, village-day celebrations and so on. I have chosen three examples to illustrate this phenomenon that span a range of ideological positioning. In particular we find in these instances a nationalizing Romanian state, a Magyar minority nationalism, and a much less coherent nascent Rom stateless ethnic-transnationalism. The kind of rhetoric used in these frames is often much the same regardless of the political party in question. The complexities of the repertoire, ethnic or otherwise, are simply ignored by such opportunistic politicization. Claims are asserted without much regard for actual practice.

A Romanian example from the 1997 festival Trio Transylvan, held in Gherla, Cluj County, illustrates the power of the “nationalizing state.” The trios competing were of different ethnicities and varied histories, yet all were judged by a jury of Romanian experts, drawn from the ranks of state recognized academic and artistic authorities. A popular television personality and presenter serving as master of ceremonies harangued the audience displaying the real agenda here by simply speaking over the musical performances in progress. In the introduction to one band the local *casa de cultură* (culture house) is praised for its hard work in giving value to “our Romanian cultural diamonds,” and the MC instructs the audience to applaud it. Speaking over the performance of another group, he exclaims at the quality of the music that is “made here—but known all over Romania . . . in Teleorman, Moldova, Banat. . . . Listen to the gentlemen!” he orders, evoking a pan-Romanian-ness explicitly located within its borders and bringing together different regions of the state. A Romanian Magyar minority party example, recorded at the performance of a visiting Hungarian ensemble from Budapest in a Magyar majority village exemplifies the expression of a “homeland nationalism.” An appeal

to the sense of a greater “Hungarian nation” anchored in its own state but reaching beyond its borders is clearly articulated by a local politician, in phrases such as, “Today we are seeing Hungarian dance without borders.” “When we see and hear it together with our language and song,” he continues, we know that, “There live Hungarians!” At a concert of Gypsy music presented by a Romanian-Gypsy friendship association at the Hungarian State Opera House in Cluj, the argument made by a Romani party representative proceeded as follows (closely paraphrased): “See these performances? They tell us that, we have culture! That, our culture has value! Indeed, as much or more value than anybody else’s! And thus, we deserve support for our culture, and, by implication, that my party will fight for it!” This articulates the position of a stateless yet nascent trans-national Romani politics using cultural expression [in this case music] to legitimate a claim on allegiance.¹¹

This level of opportunistic politicized rhetoric, though, has little if any direct impact on the music and dance repertoire referenced. Politicians will take advantage of such public events whenever they can. The opportunities, however, are presented because these events are produced within the web of ethnic-national institutions that pervade public life. Management of the actual choreomusical content in this domain falls within the more specialist domains of the cultural managers, the musical arrangers, the choreographers, and, unfortunately, the scholars who work within these institutional frameworks. It is at this level that power is exerted to transform and shape everyday music-dance into ethnic-national representations.

The Romanian Trio Transylvan festival is organized by the County Center for Conservation and Promotion of Traditional Culture (Centrul Județean pentru Conservarea și Promovarea Culturii Tradiționale Cluj) together with the mayor’s office and municipal culture house (Casa Municipală de Cultură, Gherla) of the town where it is held. This network of state run cultural-management, the former Centru Creații Populare, has changed names several times since 1989 along with the political climate of the time. As an arm of the Ceaușescu regime it was responsible for the now infamous Cântarea României (Song of Romania) festival and competition, the most prominent of many propagandistic cultural projects. It continues its role as the key agency managing the many public events that feature traditional cultural display (see its webpage www.TraditiiClujene.ro for its many activities and an account of the 2014 Trio Transylvan).

The Romanian-Hungarian minority example above, celebrating what the organizers called a “Day of Dance,” took place with the sponsorship of Duna TV, a Hungarian television station aimed explicitly at its external national minorities, thus featuring a lot of programming representing Hungarian life in Transylvania. For it the Válaszút dance ensemble, based in Budapest, visited the small Hungarian majority village of Csávás/Ceaș home to the Szászcsávás Band, well-known in Hungarian Dance House revival circles. This dance ensemble has a long history intertwined with that of the Hungarian Dance House Movement, and its leader, László Diószegi, is an important activist in this context responsible for the field collection, transformation, and dissemination of much dance material employed within the ensemble milieu (“Diószegi László” 2016). If not all present on this occasion were of a single political mind, they were brought together through the actions of Hungarian national minority institutions.

Public representation of Rom music-dance is a more complicated phenomenon. Generally stigmatized collectively, ethnic identification among Roms themselves is variegated, fragmented, and seemingly entirely situational and thus often subsumed into either the Romanian or Hungarian representational discourse (Timeea 2015). Although most of the musicians at the Trio Transylvan are Rom, this is never mentioned in this context. During the Szászcsávás Day of Dance, the Rom musicians, who might seem to be at the center of the event are, rather, somewhat marginalized and framed by its Magyar signification (Quigley 2004). A key moment in this regard occurred during the singing of the *Székely Hymnus*, a nationalistic poem adopted as the anthem of the region and its people in 2009, in which the Rom musicians do not participate and during which they seem to stand completely apart from the Magyar community. The occasion for a public Rom/Gypsy event cited here was sponsored by an NGO with little or no access to political power or money. Such activities must find support at the margins of the mainstream institutions; in this regard it is worth noting that the event took place at the at-that-time somewhat dilapidated Magyar Opera House rather than the far grander Romanian National Theater. Each of these three examples are characterized by their own particulars but serve to illustrate the complex web of institutions exerting their power in the domain of public traditional music-dance performance.

There is not room here for a full account of the overlapping influences exerted by all the institutions that impinge directly on

choreomusical practice. These would include local “culture houses” at the village (*satul*), local administrative unit (*comună*), and county (*județ*) level, which sponsor a variety of ensemble practice and provide the working environment for a legion of artistic directors, choreographers, arrangers, musicians, and dancers. Cultural institutions outside this government sponsored system could be said to include professional ensembles and the revivalist structures originally emanating from Budapest’s Dance House Movement but later locally institutionalized in Cluj Napoca/Kolosvár (as well as elsewhere in Transylvania). Media of all types exert an important influence on traditional choreomusical practice as well—formerly radio, but now more prominently television, promulgating more than one cultural agenda. Finally, in this less than exhaustive list, are a variety of more scientific institutions. Based in the region’s major city of Cluj Napoca one finds folklore, ethnology, and cultural anthropology units within Babeș-Bolyai University, organized into both Hungarian and Romanian language sections. The Music Academy houses a traditional music program. The Ethnographic Museum offers support for scholars of traditional arts, while the Arhiva de Folclor is the institution dedicated explicitly to collection and scientific research. Non-governmental foundations are also engaged in traditional choreomusical research and promotion. Each institutional framework has its own specific character, but in practice their activities overlap considerably and many of the same individuals can be found working on one project or another within all of them.¹² Thus the work of the more applied organizations is strongly informed by the scientific discourse constructed in the academic-research institutions. I will focus next on this history and current situation. I have written previously on “Nationalism and Scholarship in Transylvanian Ethnochoreology” (Quigley 2008). Here I will reference that discussion while extending it to include ethnomusicological scholarship, thereby looking back to the early-twentieth century, as well as bringing it up to date.

Ethnicity and Nationality in Scholarship

The impact of nationalism on traditional music and dance around the world, in Europe, and in the former Eastern European block in a particular way, is both profound and fraught, having provided much of the underlying impetus to the emergence of folklore as a cultural category, as well as having informed the very beginnings of its study.¹³

Among the most important institutions implicated in constructing music-dance as national and ethnic are those of ethnomusicology and ethnochoreology—largely organized within state systems—and their forebears in folkloristics. This situation is not unique to central Transylvania, nor to Romania or Hungary, but is particularly apparent here because of the competing national scientific projects centered in Budapest and Bucharest, respectively. Since the two were pursued rather independently until very recently their ideological contingency is immediately apparent when brought together.

Of course, ethnomusicology today is no longer asking, as at the beginning of twentieth century, “what is the music of the nation?” Neither is it asking the converse, “what is the ethnicity of a musical tradition?” Rather, a more constructivist perspective dominates today that might phrase the question as, “how is a traditional musical idiom implicated in the making, the marking, and the maintenance of a nation or ethnicity?” And yet, even this formulation easily falls prey to a reification of “nation” or “ethnic group” as a real and enduring collectivity that can be said to “have” its own music (Brubaker 1996; 2004; 2006). The examination of relationships among ethnicity, nationality, and music in this region offers an alternative to the focus on group-ness and its representation that largely continues to dominate scholarship and public culture in this region. Such scholarship can be particularly productive if it focuses not so much on the groups who live there, but rather on the contingent emergence of music’s ethnic nation-ness, its production within the institutions of ethnic nationhood, and its ethnic-national categorization.

The tension between myopic ethnic-nationalist perspectives and more inclusive paradigms continues from the earliest days of research in the region. Bartok’s putative nationalism vs. internationalism has been much discussed, and well summarized by Frigyesi (1994). He is singled out for the broad-mindedness of his later years, while a more national focus continued in the work of his colleagues and many successors, work that remains canonical. Since 1990 however, one can see a gradual and progressive shift away from this intellectual heritage. István Pávai’s 1993 article on interethnic relations in instrumental dance music, despite its admittedly preliminary nature, offers a detailed investigation into an aspect of interethnic folklore relations. He is writing as a Transylvanian Magyar resettled in Hungary, and is a prominent researcher and promoter of Transylvanian music at the Hungarian Heritage House, a post-1989 institution

responsible for promotion of Hungarian traditions in music, dance, and to some extent handcrafts as well.¹⁴ He has continued to develop the arguments begun in that essay and in its most recent iteration he concludes that extensive sharing has rendered the repertoire of instrumental dance music in Transylvania so mixed as to defy easy distinctions or classifications along ethnic lines (2012, 105–108)—a position that runs counter to the strong pressure to construct differences in these terms.

To make his case, Pávai describes the complex patterns of language, religions, and declared ethnicity found among the Roms of Transylvania. This complexity alone makes it difficult to assign particular music to particular ethnic groups. He asserts that similar complexities can be found among the Bulgarian, Greek, Armenian, and Jewish populations of Transylvania present in the distant and more recent past (1993, 2). He notes that groups with more mobility, such as Roms and Jews, generally identify with the more stable ethnicities of Romanian, Hungarian, and, more so in former times, the Saxon, and that this complicates the interethnic musical relationships. But even this observation provides an inadequate account of the complexities of the musical repercussions of the situation. For example, he notes that Saxons coming from different locales settled in various parts of Romania at various historical periods, thus bringing different musical repertoires with them. Their population was in decline for a long time, and since 1989 they have largely emigrated. As a result, melodies and dances most likely introduced by Saxons have now been so assimilated by Romanian and Hungarian communities that they have lost their earlier ethnic association (1993, 120). Tellingly for my argument that an essentialist conception of musical ethnicity distorts an understanding of this idiom, Pávai further reminds us that music fashions spread quite widely throughout Europe without much regard for ethnic national boundaries. As elsewhere, melodies can be found that may be traced through manuscript evidence to much earlier times and more distant sites. Dance tradition as practiced among different ethnicities in central Transylvania is similarly mixed and difficult, if not impossible to disentangle. The idiom here must be viewed as a regional European one, not one of mixed ethnicity.

In 2008 I argued that despite the thorough and pervasive mixing that Pávai identifies, the issue that remains unacknowledged and unexamined by him is the persistence of ethnic constructions of

music-dance here and its use in turn to configure ethnicity (Quigley 2008). In that essay on nationalism in ethnochoreology, I also reviewed some of the contributions to “Transylvania: Music, Ethnicities, Discord,” an issue of *European Meetings in Ethnomusicology* edited by Marin Marian Bălașa (2002), a striking example of the continuing debate over the ethnic and national character of musical tradition in Transylvania. The contributions came from a wide variety of researchers engaged with Transylvanian music that reflect the multiplicity of contending viewpoints that continue to animate discussion of the issue. Some can be seen as presenting positions in the almost inescapably nationalized context of Romanian and Hungarian state-sponsored scholarship (Dejeu 2002; Bălașa 2002). Scholars writing from an intellectual distance, László Kürti and Lynn Hooker, adopt a less essentialist perspective on national identity and see the history of ethnomusicology in the region as a key contributor in the construction of ethnic-national representation in traditional music and dance. They have little to say, however, about the dynamics of ethnicity, nationality, local community, and global networks that shape contemporary traditional music and dance as social practice there (Hooker 2002; Kürti 2002). Hooker has addressed these questions in the context of the Hungarian Dance House Movement dance camps now held in many Transylvanian villages, drawing particular attention to the liminal role of Romani musicians and the tendency to appropriate their music to a discourse of Hungarian cultural identity (2006).

Several major Hungarian researchers (Pávai among them) chose not to contribute to the volume, feeling that continued rehashing of old arguments, which they felt their acknowledgment of ethnic interaction had left behind, was at best a distraction that would perhaps be counter-productive, miring them down in an irresolvable conflict. Bălașa concludes the anthology with a rather harsh characterization of those researchers who did not respond to his call for participation as being fearful of consequences or unwilling to confront old prejudices. He criticizes them for faithful obedience to the state’s politically promoted trends for researching and explaining the facts, as he puts it (2002, 165).

A Romanian counterpart to Pávai—a collector and analyst whose work began under the Ceaușescu regime but actively continued after 1989—is Zamfir Dejeu. In 2011 he published a large collection of musical folklore from Cluj County, which subsumes most of the Central Transylvanian region. As is the case with Pávai, his analyses remain

largely contained within a national perspective. In the Romanian case this is expressed as a strong commitment to or belief in the indigenous presence of Romanians from earliest times, invoked by reference to the Roman conquest of the Dacians, and the stubborn resistance to the Romans and resilience of the Romanian population through many invasions and changes in the patterns of their domination into the present (Dejeu 2011, 5–7). Pávai rejects this kind of ideological historicizing of the Hungarian Transylvanian population, but nevertheless continues to treat them and their traditions separately from that of the Romanians, with whom they live so closely in the Transylvanian Plain, perhaps a more neutral denominator for the Mezőség/Câmpia region.

The newest generation of researchers in ethnochoreology appear to be making more progress than their musicological counterparts. The young Romanian scholar, Silvestru Petac, who completed his dissertation in 2012, has turned away from the structural-contextual approach and regional-dialectical analyses of his predecessors to the project of establishing a more anthropological approach to the subject matter. This approach is well-illustrated in his *Texte și Contexte în Cultura Dansului Tradițional: Călușul din Izvoarele (Olt). Călușerul din Boșorod (Hunedoara)* (2014). Sándor Varga, his Hungarian counterpart, makes a similar move in a recently completed dissertation on the dance life of one particular village in the region, both past and present (2011). These more recently trained scholars are for the first time beginning to collaborate across the ethnic divide, sharing extensive engagement with the discipline outside of Romania and Hungary, a desire to update their research questions and methods, and a growing new interest in one another's work.¹⁵ They are struggling at this moment to correct for the curious blind spots resulting from the split vision they have inherited.

Arguably perhaps the most significant of these lacunae is the glaring absence of the third group that shares this region, the Romani population known as Cigány/Țigan. Marginalized within both perspectives they are paradoxically central to contemporary practice of traditional music and dance (Hooker 2006). Themselves quite diverse they are difficult to pin down, shifting among possible identifications with the dominant groups quite easily. Those who live in majority Romanian villages will speak Romanian and often identify as such; in Hungarian majority villages they may similarly adopt a Hungarian affiliation. Some, but by no means all—and not a majority in the

Mezőség/Câmpia—can speak Romani, which would predominate as the most frequently spoken language only in the few Romani villages. In practice most Roms are multi-lingual and will shift as called for in particular circumstances, sometimes in my experience mixing them quite freely. The range of their musical practice likewise escapes easy categorization and as Speranța Rădulescu and others have demonstrated the Rom-ness (or Gypsy-ness), Romanian-ness, or Hungarian-ness of their repertoire is also situationally constructed, deployed, and inherently unstable (2004; 2003; 2002).¹⁶ The place of Romani music and dance in a re-examination of this paradoxically both well, and yet only partially, known area is if anything more strongly asserted by another outside perspective. The French ethnomusicologists Damien Villela (2012) and Filippo Bonini Baraldi (2013) both center their ethnography on Romani musicians in regions closely neighboring the one focused on here. These musicians, like those in the Mezőség/Câmpia, play music for Romanians, Hungarians, or Roms as called upon, necessitating discussion of such distinctions from the musicians' point of view (Baraldi 2013, 65–74; Villela 2012, 47–49, 69–72). The less nationalized perspectives that inform these newest investigations have yet to make an impact on cultural policy, but are paralleled by developments in some institutional practice. Up until the last decade the findings of musical folklorists and ethnochoreologists were deployed through institutions charged with cultural management in shaping the representation of national and ethnic group identity in public display.

Ethnic-National Representation in Practice and Scholarship

Impinging, at times dramatically, on the domain of everyday life and everyday ethnicity, are official folklorisms promoted through cultural institutions ranging in scale from the community culture house to be found in almost every village or communa, to the centralized national institutions—the Centrul Creației Populare and the nationwide festival scheme *Cântarea României*—for the implementation of state cultural policies that reflected official ideology (Giurchescu 1984; 1987). While the *Cântarea* was immediately abandoned after 1989, the culture house system remained, quite often with the same directors and artistic personnel. The 1990s saw a succession of renamings and reformulation of mission statement in the domain of folk-

cultural policy, which is beyond the scope of this essay to recount. It is significant to note, however, that following Romania's ratification of the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage there has been something of a renaissance of the local culture houses with money spent to refurbish many of them and much more local autonomy than before 1989.

In some instances the state appropriation of traditional idioms effectively drained them of any local meaning, leading to their wholesale rejection. In other situations local practices were actively discouraged. But in many places, as in central Transylvania, the local practice of music and dance was left more or less to the side, neither systematically incorporated into the state ideological apparatus nor actively controlled by local authorities in a sustained manner or on a fully knowledgeable basis. But despite such slippage, state ideology decreed that display of Hungarian minority identity be minimized. When it was unavoidable to acknowledge this minority community, as in those regions where Hungarians constitute a local majority, control was exercised through the culture houses. In public displays Hungarian groups would be subsumed within the largely and overwhelmingly Romanian frame.

The expressly "national" representational Romanian choreomusical repertoire largely comprises the unified-group forms of dance found in Wallachia and Moldova; during the Ceaușescu era particularly drawing from his home region of Oltenia. The Transylvanian repertoire was never a state symbol of choice. When it is included, as performed by stage ensembles, the small string band became a large instrumental ensemble directed by a maestro, incorporating multiple violins, accordions, taragot, cimbalom, and so on.¹⁷ The structure of the dance music and the dancing as well is largely ignored in these settings and elements of the tradition are recombined to suit the staged aesthetic of monumental choreographies. This model persists in the performances of any number of stage ensembles in the region. The Ansamblul Marțișorul is one of the better known in Cluj Napoca and its rendition of the dance suite from Palatca can be viewed on *YouTube*.¹⁸ Just how radically it transforms local practice can be appreciated if compared with any of the many examples of village dancing in situ from Palatca/Palatka accessible online, for example, through the Hungarian Heritage House online *Folkór Adatbázis*.¹⁹ The Transylvanian string band is now primarily ethnicized as Romanian within a regional

frame into which the national is projected, rather than being taken out of Transylvania and used to represent the national whole.

At the same time the Transylvanian Magyar minority was using selected traditional forms for self-representation. Following the lead of their Hungarian counterparts, Transylvanian Magyar minority musicians, arrangers, dancers, and choreographers crafted staged displays of the ethnographic regions, each with a distinctive choreo-musical profile. With a national ideology that incorporated more diversity into the greater Hungary that extends beyond its current borders, these forms were never quite as uniform as the Romanian national idiom. Particularly after its spread to Romania, the dance house movement's improvisatory aesthetic began to have a significant impact on staging in Transylvania as well as Hungary (see, for example, the video recording of Csongor Köncei's ensemble Zurbolo.)²⁰ The forms taken by these two opposed agendas for music and dance performance, then, largely followed models emanating from the two national capitals Bucharest and Budapest. The Romanian model emphasized monumental choreographed unison performances of large troupes. The Hungarian model, by the end of the 1980s, was strongly influenced by the Budapest-centered dance-house revival movement that preferred an improvisatory individualized performance aesthetic.

While Hungarians and Romanians struggle to undo certain legacies, Roms find themselves confronting the opportunity and the difficulties of configuring their representations afresh. Denied status as a recognized ethnic group under the Ceaușescu regime, their significant contributions to choreomusical repertoire and style were literally "white-washed" and their undeniable presence and significance to Romanian music and dance was systematically erased. Such performers were almost never allowed on stage. Echoes of this attitude sadly persisted enough for me to encounter racist comments when programming for an international festival in 1998–1999.

Roms in central Transylvania practice a mixture of dance and music at social events, which although not ethnically marked, are ethnically distinct in that they are usually quite segregated. The detached-couple dancing called *cingorița/csingorálás* continues to be distinctively their own, although it has become recently popular in some dance house revival contexts and is known by and sometimes performed (sometimes paradoxically) by the host populations. The contemporary *mahala* dancing is popular, as it is quite generally

throughout Romania, although it is strongly identified as Romani in origin and character (Giurchescu 2011).²¹ Roms also dance the local variants of the regional idiom's men's individual and couple dances, sometimes with distinctive stylistic features.

Romani self-representation generally is in flux and draws upon a variety of potential sources. But Roms are not a unified group nor is there really a Romani music to which they may easily turn that is not contingent on particularities of time and place (Rădulescu 2004). Some presentational performances emphasize a generic oriental character in costume and dance. The use of hip isolations in so-called "Turkish" inspired dancing is not a complete fabrication, having something in common with the genre known as *manea* and more recently *mahala* that is generally considered Romani (Giurchescu 2011).²² Music for this choreomusical genre is amplified and makes full use of electronic resources such as reverb and echo (Stoichiță and La Bretèque 2012) and has been described as a pan-Balkan musical *metissage* (Rădulescu 2000).²³ This music is further explored in the recent publication *Manele in Romania* (Beissinger, Rădulescu, and Giurchescu 2016). Romani social dancing as well as presentational performances in central Transylvania, however, continue to use the string band, although often together with typically expanded modern instrumentation. These presentational performances reference a sense of a modern diasporic Romani identity that is given unity by connecting to a shared historical narrative of eastern origins. The result in central Transylvania has been a kind of overlay of Gypsy stereotypes onto elements selected from the local repertoire: girls with bare midriffs, for example; couple dancing and men's solo dancing shared with Romanians and Hungarians reconfigured as Gypsy; or the distinctive Romani detached couple dancing called *cingorița/csingorálás* re-choreographed according to received notions of ethnic display staging.²⁴ At the same time Roms continue to dance the idiom's shared repertoire of men's solo and couple dances at their own everyday social events.²⁵

The Romafest performance troupe, formed in Târgu Mureș in 1999, is the most internationally successful of the central Transylvanian Romani ensembles. One can follow the more general history of Transylvanian Romani self-representation through the gallery of photos spanning their career accessible at their webpage romafest.com. One may also compare video recordings of performances linked to their Facebook page.²⁶

A recording from the second Romafest Gypsy Dance Festival in 2000, accessed 15 August 2015, for example, shows the vitality that is brought to what might be dismissed as folklorism or invention.²⁷ While this organization has gone on to create one of the most commercially successful of many Romani ensembles to be found nowadays in central Transylvania (as is apparent from their web-site), older recordings capture the then nascent style of Romani self-presentation.²⁸ In the video linked in the endnote, a boy and very young girl dance on an outdoor stage to extremely quick-tempo playing of a common string-band melody. In their as yet non-commercial public performances, as is typical, the young men perform elements of the men's slapping dance form, often one-by-one in front of a chorus line of couples waiting their turn. The women often enter the stage area at first en-masse in costumes suggestive of the east. The performance concludes with a loosely organized group presentation of couple dancing. Not infrequently performances are taken over by enthusiastic participation of the Gypsy audiences. Here one sees an emerging consciousness of an international minority identity being configured in a localized vocabulary.

Presentation of a "Gypsy" identity becomes more significant for Romani musicians as they attempt to move out of Transylvania. The best known and most successful of the Romanian-Romani traditional ensembles that have entered this arena began as relatively purist ethnographic performers. But once they moved outside contexts of national/ethnic representation, in the effort to reach a more commercially lucrative world music market, they were presented primarily as "Gypsy" and sometimes "Roma."²⁹ This transition can be seen in the self-proclaimed "world's greatest Gypsy band" the Taraf de Haiduks, who were formerly the musicians of Clejani in Oltenia, or the Fanfare Ciocărlia, formerly known as the band from Zece-Prajini in Moldova. Thus as they are de-territorialized and disassociated from the locale that underscored the authenticity of their "ethnographic" identity, they and their music are linked instead to a diasporic Romani identity.

Although these two best known and most successful of the Romani traditional ensembles that have entered this arena are not Transylvanian string bands, there are a few examples of such that we can examine. In this endeavor the string bands of central Transylvania have largely fallen into two groups: those with Hungarian affiliation that have found an audience through the internationalization

of Hungarian Dance House Movement while those identifying with the Romanian majority found opportunities as public performers of Romanian heritage repertoire, occasionally using what remains of international folkdance movement and/or ethnic community networks to support their tours. For example, the *Taraful lui Sandorica*, *Soporu de Câmpia* (often so-called in a formal manner when I first met them in 1994), like the *Haiduks* and *Ciocărlia*, began by touring with *Speranța Rădulescu* together with Romanian singer *Soporan Vasile*. After participating in the 1999 Smithsonian Folklife Festival “Gateways to Romania” program, they underwent a strange transformation from Romanian, to Gypsy, to Hungarian by remaining in the United States and finding work as Gypsy musicians first in eastern European ethnic restaurants and later through the Hungarian dance house network.

Outside their immediate social contexts, Romani musicians must negotiate their performance choices and come to terms with the expectations of audiences who have no day-to-day contact with Roms and whose image of “Gypsiness” is romanticized. When no longer set in the frame of a national heritage performance they almost always become “more Gypsy.” For example, the release of *Szászcsávás Band Live in Chicago* (2000) includes recordings of iconically Gypsy mouth music as well as the local *mahala* associated with Roms. It was never accepted as part of the Hungarian tradition by authorities such as *Pávai* and was incorporated into the Romanian popular music genre of *manea*, only to be met by an outraged rejection by the cultural elite (*Giurchescu and Rădulescu 2011; Hooker 2007, 57–58*).

Beyond Ethnic-National Music-Dance

A useful example through which to examine the potential for change and the inertia of the institutional construction of ethnic-national music-dance in the post-communist period is the music-dance activity of the *Téka Alapítvány*.³⁰ This foundation was established 1993 to serve the Hungarian speakers living in the ethnically mixed region of *Mezőség*. Unlike Hungarian speakers in the Hungarian majority *Székelyföld*, this population in *Mezőség* is rather scattered. Thus they do not rise to local population percentages needed for government support of Hungarian language schooling. It was, and continues to be, largely supported by funding from Hungary.³¹ Its mission, as declared on its website, is to “contribute to the overall process of

rehabilitation and modernization as a civic institution offering cultural and educational activities throughout the region.” The foundation’s main activity is offering school-age programs taught in the Hungarian language. From its inception it has sponsored adult and children’s dance troupes to perform repertoire from the region and in 1997 held its first *Mezőség* dance festival, placing the regional repertoire in a “Hungarian” frame.

Participants were Hungarian village dancers who performed for one another on stage, while representatives of the Hungarian dance research institute took advantage of the occasion to document their performances off stage. The first of these festivals constituted a celebration of the foundation’s regional mandate. Like many other Hungarian NGOs in Transylvania, much of their support comes from Hungary proper. Hungarian state institutions were present in the person of archivists from the folk dance research institute. Many of the best-known music-dance exponents performed, and some lesser-known dance communities were brought for the archive to document. On-stage, the announcer, a young Magyar woman, gave minimal introductions, adding them briefly in Romanian as well, albeit to some laughter at her stumbles. In her commentary one could hear the voice of the Transylvanian Magyar minority. In the following performances one can see (and hear) the dance-musical self-representation of this perspective. The musicians perform as themselves and the music retains its original structural integrity. One might call this heritage dancing. It retains the form and structure of the social dancing in display, but is nevertheless strongly ethnically marked.

An alternate sense of regional consciousness was more apparent when the event had its tenth edition in 2006. The setting for cultural display moved further toward the social in character, from the community hall stage to a new restaurant specializing in large group events, and as a result genuine social dancing broke out during the display with the invited Romanian dancers mixing with the Hungarians. Village groups still presented their dances in front of the others, but there was much less separation of performers and audience in this setting. The audience included members of a visiting folk ensemble from Budapest. Social dancing ensued following the presented program. At the eighteenth edition of the event, October 24–25, 2014, the posters on display confirm that it has now become explicitly bi-national and bi-lingual: renamed the “*Mezőség-Câmpia*” Festival. The

invited villages include Romanian as well as Hungarian majority communities. Younger participants are both rural and urban, some visiting from Hungary, but including many locals as well. Most strikingly, the entire mix of attendees had very little trouble dancing together to music provided by invited bands including those of rural “Hungarian Gypsies,” “Romanian Gypsies,” or dance-house revivalists; indeed they seemed to revel in the experience. Nevertheless, Rom continue to participate only from their paradoxical central yet peripheral position as professional musicians. Overcoming this gulf remains a “bridge too far.”

Conclusions

Central Transylvania and its *Mezőség/Câmpia* region illustrates very well the distortions and discontents resulting from the long history of ethnic-national discourse and practice in music and dance. The interventions of national institutions have had profound effects. Romanians, Hungarians, and Gypsies, however, continue to mingle and interact within the framework of what sociologist Rogers Brubaker has identified as everyday ethnicity (as distinguished from national identity) and to some extent continue to use the traditional idiom within this frame. Over the years since my first fieldwork there in 1994, I have seen an emerging consciousness of the *Mezőség/Câmpia* as a region with its own sense of identity independent of its ethnic divisions and based on common history and challenges shared by all during the processes of transition and transformation. A sense of European regional identification is increasingly enacted, represented, and celebrated through music and dance.

Transylvanian string bands, especially those of the *Mezőség/Câmpia* region, are of mixed ethnicity. Their repertoire is of a shared musical idiom that took shape in a world of ethnically unmarked everyday sociality. Located in a region of nationalized peoples, external national minorities, and marginalized ethnicities, their music making has been inexorably pressed upon by contesting nationalizing state ideologies, homeland nationalisms, and minority politics as played out in cultural life. When ethnicity and nationness emerge as salient points of reference, a procrustean scheme of categorization is imposed upon this historically mixed and largely shared choreomusical idiom, effectively dismembering its organic unity.

It is important to note some threads in recent ethnomusicological research and public music-dance performance in this region that have worked against this grain, such as Bălașa's provocative publication of essays by nationally diverse authors confronting the "ethnomusicological conflict in Transylvania" (2002), Pávai's acknowledgment of inter-ethnicity, Dejeu's observations on borrowings, Kőnczei's observation of situational identifications, and the underdevelopment of a "native" Transylvanian ethnochoreology. My frustration with some aspects of their responses has motivated and informed this paper. Both Pávai and Rădulescu, each in their own way, have sought to undo the blatant distortions resulting from national ideologies that were powerfully institutionalized in both Hungarian and Romanian public discourse including that of ethnomusicology. Both, however, share a valorization of the "genuine" that they strive to disentangle from the ideologically distorted and both have difficulty escaping from the conceptual categories of ethnicity and nation, from the national institutions that support their work, and from the never-quite-forgotten impulse to nationness that is so persistent and pervasive in these societies. From without, one can only admire the efforts being made, appreciate the challenges faced, and hope to contribute by offering a critical view of the processes at work.

What is needed is an approach that problematizes the ongoing (re)production of the practical ethnic and national categories taken for granted in everyday life. Further analysis of how ethnicity "happens" in music and dance in everyday interaction and how the institutions of nationhood that manage music and dance practice produce nationness will offer significant insights into the continuing power of ethnic-national sentiment and its effects on music and dance performance. The history of the Téka foundation Mezőség/Câmpia festival as discussed here is one example. Escape from the constraints of nationalist legacies and programs is possible. There are signs of a regional de-ethnicized post-national identification. One can see instances in which ethnic difference is overcome in the immediacy of a shared experience of music and dance performance and instances in which new cultural institutions are being intentionally constructed outside the existing frameworks. A reworking of music and dance mappings outside the frameworks of national and ethnic consciousness then may have potential as an intervention to undo some of the

damage inflicted on people's cultural life by a long standing and persistent divisive discourse.³²

University of Limerick
Limerick, Ireland

Notes

1. A note on terminology is needed here. In general, I use Romanian, Hungarian, and Rom to reference these identifications. In some instances more precision is called for. Hungarians in Transylvania may be referred to as Transylvanian Magyars when it is significant to distinguish the Transylvanian population from the Hungarians in Hungary. The Romani population is often perceived and presented as a homogeneous whole. In reality Roms constitute diverse groups and make many distinctions among themselves. In central Transylvania most Roms will call themselves *Cigány* or *Țigan* (that is Gypsy). At the same time, Gypsy is used internationally usually in a stereotyping manner. Roma, a term now commonly used in English, has a strong political connotation and is seldom used outside that context. Thus, I understand Rom, Roms, and Romani as more objective terms (for which *Cigány*/*Țigan* is a more native term), Gypsy as an exotic term, and Roma as a politicized term. In relation to their musics, the neutral referent is then music played by Roms. This may include music played that is considered Romani; music that signals Gypsyism; music that is identified with other groups, i.e., Romanian, Hungarian, Jewish, Saxon; and music that mobilizes a "Roma" political collectivity.

2. These are Hungarian and Romanian terms for the ethnographic region that is usually referred to in English as the Transylvanian Plain. It lies to the east of Cluj-Napoca, primarily in the county of Cluj. Maps are easily accessible online, see for example, http://www.unibuc.ro/prof/sandulache_m_i/img/Cp_Transilvaniei.jpg and http://www.pavai.hu/picture.php?picture_id=4715&size=original. One occasionally finds it denoted as the Transylvanian Heath which is not quite an accurate description of the ecology there, or as the Transylvanian Plateau, which refers to a larger geographic area within which it is situated.

3. A good synopsis of this structure is to be found in Bernard Lortat-Jacob's *Musique en Fete* (1994), where it is presented without accompanying musicological detail.

4. A more complete description is tangential to the focus of this essay. Interested readers can find numerous representative examples through the World Wide Web. The folklore database of the Hungarian Heritage House is one of the most accessible. See <http://www.folkloredb.hu/>.

5. I take the notion of "everyday" and the term "everyday ethnicity" from Rogers Brubaker (Brubaker et. al. 2006, 167–168). An extended theoretical discussion of this analytical category is beyond the scope of this essay. Particularly relevant to the discussion in this essay are the chapters on "Categories" and "Mixings" (2006, 207–238, 301–315). I use the term here to point to the mundane aspects of ethnicity and nationness as they emerge in everyday "interactional enactment"

and from “institutional arrangements that shape the experience of ethnicity in everyday life” (168).

6. This is most specifically examined in Csongor Kőnczei’s study *On the Social and Cultural Networks of the Gypsy Musicians of Kalotaszeg* (2012, 157–166).

7. The single study of this phenomenon and the relationship of one ethnic repertoire to another in an everyday setting of mixed ethnicity is Gyula Pálffy’s (2010), who concludes that “although there are two ethnically distinguished dance repertoires, both communities know and practice each other’s dances” and moreover that the two dance-cycles, that is the Romanian one and the Hungarian one, follow the same pattern (129). István Pávai (2012, 112–115) illustrates this phenomenon in the music of a dance cycle from Vajdaszentivány in the vicinity of Marosvásárhely/Târgu Mureș.

8. Micro-differences, one might call them, in dance form and dancing style can be accounted for only by very detailed analyses employing exhaustive oral history and the availability of the visual documentation needed for very localized comparison among neighboring villages and of sufficient time depth to capture small changes from one generation to the next. Sandor Varga’s study of dance and dance life in Visa is the only such example; an English summary of the work is available online.

9. Pávai recounts his experience of such a situation during the 1980s in the Mezőség-adjacent Kis-Küküllő mente region (2012, 116).

10. Maurice Mengel’s dissertation, which examines the production of knowledge within the Institut de Etnografie și Folclor in Bucharest, offers some general observations of the pre-communist period (2015).

11. These three events were all video-recorded during 1997, while I was Fulbright Senior Research Fellow at Babeș Bolyai University in Cluj Napoca, Romania.

12. Mengel’s examination of the intellectual history of the Romanian Institut de Etnografie și Folclor provides a broad background within which the changing character of music-dance scholarship in central Transylvania can be placed (2015).

13. Probably the single most relevant account of this is “Chapter 5: In the Belly of the Beast: Music and Nation in Central Europe” (Bohlman 2011, 118–152).

14. View the website of the Hungarian Heritage House at <http://www.hagyomanyokhaza.hu/>

15. A fascinating exception is the effort of Giurchescu and Martin to collaborate in the study of the dance life of a mixed village that was not allowed by their respective Institutes (Giurchescu 2014).

16. Carol Silverman has explored this phenomenon in the domain of Rom [and non-Rom] performance of “gypsy music” in the world music milieu (2012).

17. A later development specific to central Transylvania and Cluj Napoca is the appearance of the Trio Transylvan festival bringing the small ensemble to more public prominence as a specifically Romanian idiom.

18. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2WiOf0jCoc>.

19. One can go to the database URL, <http://folkloredb.hu>, choose the English language option if desired, and follow the on-screen instructions to find dance-video examples by searching for “Palatka” in the place field.

20. See http://zurbolo.ro/orhttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=laVE4rLc_b4.

21. See, for example, this video from the village of Csávás/Ceauș—https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IAtnxIRZqhk&index=2&list=PLUI9c950MX_xZP4DPn-3E0Vz-1AdN6vJF.

22. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c9g_-T8bakQ.

23. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0K9b69LIQcE&list=RDRWlu8LBZsXI&index=5>

24. See, for example, a staged performance by Roms from the village of Csávás/Ceauș https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1udXLShCBo&list=PLUI9c950MX_xZP4DPn-3E0Vz-1AdN6vJF&index=3.

25. See, for example, the DVD accompanying Bonini (2013).

26. See https://www.facebook.com/Romafest-151351374925238/info/?entry_point=page_nav_about_item&tab=page_info

27. See <https://www.facebook.com/video.php?v=828748080518894&set=vb.151351374925238&type=2&theater>.

28. For more videos and information about their current performances, see their Facebook page <https://www.facebook.com/Romafest-151351374925238/>.

29. This phenomenon is extensively examined by Carol Silverman (2012)

30. See <http://www.teka.ro/>.

31. Four of the six sponsor logos displayed on their web page are based in Hungary, for example.

32. I say damage here because of the imposed hyper-ethnic/national reading of performance has penetrated the everyday and devalued its more locally situated meanings and significance.

References Cited

- Bălașa, M. Marian. 2002. "Musics and Musicologies of the 'Hungarian-Romanian Conflict.'" *European Meetings in Ethnomusicology* 9: 4–44.
- Baraldi, Filippo Bonini. 2013. *Tsiganes: musique et empathie*. Paris: Editions de la Maison de sciences de l'homme.
- Beissinger, Margaret, Speranța Rădulescu, and Anca Giurchescu, eds. 2016. *Manele in Romania: Cultural Expression and Social Meaning in Balkan Popular Music*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bohlman, Philip. 2011. *Focus: Music, Nationalism and the Making of the New Europe*, 2nd ed. New York and London: Routledge.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- . 1996. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers, Margit Feischmidt, Jon Fox, and Liana Grancea. 2006. *Nationalist Politics and Everyday Ethnicity in a Transylvanian Town*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Centrul Județean pentru Conservarea și Promovarea Culturii Tradiționale Cluj. 2009. *Tradiții Clujene*. <http://www.traditiiclujene.ro/>
- Dejeu, Zamfir. 2011. *Mongrafia etnologică a județului Cluj III: Zona Câmpia Transilvaniei*. Monografiile Arhivei de Folclor a Academiei Romane 13. Cluj Napoca: Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene.

- . 2002. "Cultural Connections within Traditional Music and Dance in Transylvania." *European Meetings in Ethnomusicology* 9: 114–148.
- "Diószegi László." 2016. *Táncélet*. <http://tancelet.hu/tancosok-koreografusok/155-dioszegi-laszlo>.
- Folkór Adatbázis*. 2010. <http://folkloredb.hu/fdb/index.php>.
- Frigyesi, Judit. 1994. "Béla Bartók and the Concept of Nation and 'Volk' in Modern Hungary." *The Musical Quarterly* 78 (2): 255–287.
- Giurchescu, Anca. 1984. "Romanian Folklore and State 'Cultural Management.'" *Folklore and the State in Eastern Europe*. Bellagio, Italy: Conference Proceedings.
- . 1987. "The National Festival 'Song to Romania': Manipulation of Symbols in the Political Discourse." In *Symbols and Power: The Esthetics of Political Legitimation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*, edited by Claes Arvidsson and Lars Erik Blomquist, 163–171. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wikksell International. Nordic Committee for Soviet and East European Studies.
- . 1992. "A Comparative Analysis between the Căluș of the Danube plain and Călușer of Transylvania (Romania)." *Studia musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 34 (1–2): 31–44.
- . 1993. "Folklore in the Service of the State Ideology, Romania: A Case Study." *Symposium on the Balkans: Folklore and National Symbols*. Institute for European Studies, Cornell University, 1993.
- . 1998. "Gypsy Dance Style as a Marker of Ethnic Identity." In *Dance, Style, Youth, Identities*, edited by Theresa Buckland and Georgiana Gore, 80–87. Straznice, Czech Republic: Institute for Folk Culture; International Council for Traditional Music.
- . 2014. "Metszéspontok és összefonódások: Emlékeim Martin Gyögyről." In *Az erdélyi magyar táncművészet és tánctudomány az ezredfordulón II*, edited by Csongor Könczei, 11–26. Kolozsvár/Cluj Napoca: Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet and Kriterion.
- Giurchescu, Anca, and S. Bloland. 1995. *Romanian Traditional Dance: A Contextual and Structural Approach*. Mill Valley, CA: Wild Flower Press.
- Giurchescu, Anca, and Speranța Rădulescu. 2011. "Music, Dance and Behaviour in a New Form of Expressive Culture: The Romanian *Manea*." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 43: 1–36.
- Hooker, Lynn. 2006. "Controlling the Liminal Power of Performance: Hungarian Scholars and Romani Musicians in the Hungarian Folk Revival." *Twentieth-Century Music* 3 (1): 51–72.
- . 2002. "Transylvania and the Politics of Musical Imagination." *European Meetings in Ethnomusicology* 9: 45–76.
- Könczei, Csilla. 2004. "A halva született harmadik ikertestvér. Nyilvános beszéd a nemlétező romániai magyar táncutatról a hatvanas-nyolcvanas években." *Adatbank*. <http://konczei.adatbank.transindex.ro/belso.php?k=34&p=3129>. Accessed 20 June 2016.
- . 2000. "A hagyományos zene reprezentációi a kommunista és posztkommunista Romániában" *Adatbank*. <http://konczei.adatbank.transindex.ro/belso.php?k=34&p=3119>. Accessed 15 August 2015.
- Könczei, Csongor, ed. 2014. *Az erdélyi magyar táncművészet és tánctudomány az ezredfordulón II*. Cluj Napoca: Editura Institutului pentru Studiarea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale, Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet.

- . 2012. *On the Social and Cultural Network of the Gypsy Musicians of Kalotaszeg*. Cluj-Napoca: The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities.
- , ed. 2010. *Az erdélyi magyar táncművészet és táncstudomány az ezredfordulón*. Kolozsvár/Cluj Napoca: Editura Institutului pentru Studierea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale [Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet] and Kriterion.
- Lortat-Jacob, Bernard. 1994. "Tsiganes et fêtes rurales de Roumanie." In *Musique en Fête*, 97–127. Nanterre: Societe d'ethnologie.
- Mengel, Maurice. 2015. "The Archeology of an Archive: Uses of Knowledge at the *Institut Etnologie și Folclor* in Bucharest." PhD diss. Universität zu Köln.
- Nixon, P. 1998. *Sociality-Music-Dance*. Vol. 34. Skrifter fran Institutionen for Musikvetenskap. Goteborg, Sweden: Goteborgs Universitet.
- Pálffy, Gyula. 2010. "Egy vegyes lakosságú falu—Gerendkersztúr—tancai." In *Az erdélyi magyar táncművészet és táncstudomány az ezredfordulón*, edited by Csongor Könczei, 93–97. Kolozsvár/Cluj Napoca: Nemzeti Kisebbségkutató Intézet and Kriterion. (English abstract p. 129)
- Pávai, István. 1993. "Interetnikus Kapcsolatok as Erdélyi Népi Tánczenében" [Interethnic Relations in the Folk Dance Music of Transylvania]. *Néprajzi látóhatár* 4: 1–20.
- . 2012. "Interetnikus vonatkozások." In *Az Erdélyi Magyar népi tánczene*, 99–120. Kolozsvár (Cluj Napoca): Kriza János Néprajzi Társaság.
- . 2016. *Pávai István*. Accessed on July 22. <http://www.pavai.hu/>.
- Petac, Silvestru Dorel. 2014. *Texte și contexte în cultura dansului tradițional: Călușul din Izvoarele (Olt), Căluserul din Boșorod (Hunedoara)*. Bucharest: Editura Etnologică.
- . 2012. "Contexte ale dansului tradițional Românesc: Problematică și metodologie, studii de caz." PhD diss. Academia de Muzică Gheorghe Dima, Facultatea de Interpretare Muzicală, Departamentul de canto și artele spectacolului muzical. Rezumatul tezei de doctorat. <http://www.amgd.ro/upload/files/2.%20PETAC%20SILVESTRU,%20REZUMATUL%20TEZEI%20DOCTORALE-ROMANA.pdf>.
- Quigley, Colin. 2008. "Nationalism and Scholarship in Transylvanian Ethnochoreology." In *Balkan Dance: Essays on Characteristics, Performance and Teaching*, edited by Anthony Shay, 116–129. Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland and Company.
- . 2004 "Szászcsávás: Village, Nation and World Wide Webs." In *Performing Identities: Renegotiating Socio-Cultural Identities in the Post-Socialist Eastern Europe*, edited by Enikő Magyar Vincze and Petruța Mîndruț, 235–241. Cluj Napoca: Editura Fundației pentru Studii Europene (EFES).
- Rădulescu, Speranța. 2004. *Taifasuri despre Muzica Țiganeasca. Chats about Gypsy Music*. Bucharest: Paideia.
- , producer. 2003. *Gypsy Music from Transylvania* Ethnophonie CD #006 and *Romanian and Hungarian Music from Central Transylvania* Ethnophonie CD#007. Bucharest.
- , producer. 2002. *Romanian and Hungarian Music from Central Transylvania*. Ethnophonie CD#005. Bucharest.
- Romafest. 2016. <http://www.romafest.com/>
- Sandulache, Marius Iulian. 2016. "Homepage." University of Bucharest. Accessed July 22. http://www.unibuc.ro/prof/sandulache_m_i/

- Silverman, Carol. 2012. *Romani Routes: Cultural Politics and Balkan Music in Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stoichiță Victor A. and Estelle Amy de La Bretèque. 2012. "Musics of the New Times: Romanian Manele and Armenian Rabiz as Icons of Post-Communist Changes." In *The Balkans and the Caucasus. Parallel Processes on the Opposite Sides of the Black Sea*, ed. Ivan Biliarsky and Cristea Ovidiu, 321–335. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00690160/document>. Accessed June 19, 2016.
- Téka Alapítvány. 2016. <http://www.teka.ro/>.
- Timea, Elena Marin. 2010. "'We Are Gypsies, Not Roma!': Ethnic Identity Constructions and Ethnic Stereotypes—an Example from a Gypsy Community in Central Romania." *Studii de Atelier. Cercetarea Minorităților Naționale din România/Working Papers in Romanian Minority Studies/Műhelytanulmányok A Romániai Kisebbségekről* Nr. 36. Cluj-Napoca: Institutul pentru Studiarea Problemelor Minorităților Naționale. <http://www.ispmn.gov.ro/node/we-are-gypsies-not-roma-ethnic-identity-constructions-and-ethnic-stereotypes—an-example-from-a-gypsy-community-in-central-romania>. Accessed November 2, 2015.
- Varga, Sándor. 2011. "Transformations in the Traditional Dance Culture of a 20th Century Village in the Mezőség Region." PhD diss., Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. PhD Program of European Ethnology. (English summary available) <http://doktori.btk.elte.hu/hist/vargasandor/thesis.pdf>
- Villela, Damien. 2012. *Musique traditionnelle de Transylvanie et affirmations culturelles*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

COLIN QUIGLEY is Senior Lecturer at University of Limerick and Emeritus Professor, University of California Los Angeles. He was Curator for the 1999 Smithsonian Folklife Festival Romania Program. He has published in journals such as *Ethnomusicology* and the *Yearbook for Traditional Music* and has contributed the Music, Dance, and Custom in Romania collection to the Indiana University EVIA Digital Arts Project. (colinhquigley@ul.ie)