Heritagizing the Countryside in Hungary

Melinda HARLOV-CSORTÁN

Junior Research Fellow at the Research Department for Social Integration and Social
Policy of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary
email: Harlov-Csortan.Melinda@tk.mta.hu

Abstract. For long decades in Hungary, not just the inhabitants and their lifestyles but the buildings of the villages were seen as outdated; only small details found their ways as decorative elements of representative architectural styles. A change in the evaluation happened in the second part of 20th century, which led to vivid academic and professional research, extensive popularity and support by the leading socialist power and the public. The paper focuses on the transformation of the built elements from the countryside to the centres, both physically and in their evaluation between World War II and 1989.

Keywords: vernacular architecture, Hungary, socialism, protection and peripheralization

Introduction

Vernacular architecture plays an outstanding role in the Hungarian scholarly and cultural discourse and has a public role and prestige even today. The first UNESCO World Heritage site from Hungary is a village called Hollókő with its built and intangible heritage, which was also the very first internationally acknowledged set of vernacular architectures as well. Similarly, most of the nominated and accepted Hungarian intangible cultural heritage examples are outstanding practices or traditions within its folk culture.

Hungarian vernacular culture is well-documented and researched and widely popular within all social groups (especially in big cities), and its contemporary financial support is ensured and provided by the government. Even though the authentic settlements, the lifestyle, and the social category, which were the sources and elements of vernacular culture, have been transformed in Hungary, their modern interpretations as well as memories have been highly valued.

This multifaceted transformation process, through which vernacular culture almost totally disappeared from Hungary and yet became a subject of research

and positive evaluation, took place between the 1950s and 1980s. That period can be called the golden age of vernacular monument and tradition protection. In my paper, I try to investigate the diverse aspects of this continuum when the classical countryside died and at the same time, through memorization, it became an identity-forming value for the whole society. Even though the process is unquestionably part of a wider-scale historical, ideological, social, and economic history, my intention is to find out the actors, institutions, and intentions that transformed the otherwise degraded location, lifestyle, objects to value, and basis of pride. Due to the limited length of the paper, the following investigation concentrates on the built aspect of the vernacular heritage and its relocation both physically and in the mental map of the society from the periphery to the centre.

Theoretical Background

Semioticians at Tartu School, Juri Lotman and Boris Uspensky, defined culture as the non-hereditary memory of the community, namely a memory that is not contained within the genes but within a symbolic system made out of prescriptions and contradictions, restrictions and conflict. This memory is disputed through social discourse and practices that occur between the institutionalized productions of meaning and the appropriations resulting from the use that the commons make of it (Lotman & Uspensky 1978: 211–232). Memory can be used by politics when a certain section and understanding of the past is aimed intentionally and in a biased way to be selected, stabilized, and ultimately neutralized. The result is a common past that must be preserved and commemorated; a past to be proud of and to be taken to one's heart.[1] Memory is thus a process rather than a result. It is mediated, negotiated, always redefined, interrupted, and resumed. It is also important to note that memories do not belong to a single time. They imply a confrontation sometimes dormant, a tense coexistence of disparate times. Thus, we better think of memory as a palimpsest and a collage, not as a linear narrative (Assmann 2011: 281–324).

Any place in its complex material, symbolic, and narrative aspects contains elements of earlier communities too, such as power relations, value systems, and identities. In this sense, all places carry memories due to their connections to human experiences (Gutiérrez 2011: 19–31). Focusing on these aspects, understanding a place in social studies has been enriched by adding the human perceiver aspect. How people construct and consume locations is the subject of analysis (Lefebvre 1991: 38–43). Place is not a neutral area any more, but it can define actual events taken place there and the possible social activities or use of

---

1   A single cliché-memory is derived from 'common sense' and closed in as much as it represents
      the authorized and canonical version of it.

that spot, too. Heritagization is one of the most common realizations of cautious management, when a memory of the past is identified, selected, and preserved (Bendix 2009: 415–441) in a way that it is kept in the everyday life and to serve the contemporary community. Each place with its built structure has a different predisposition to being transformed. Some can be converted to many new uses, but thorough investigation is necessary in advance. The new usage unites past and present, assuming the respect for environment, historical memory, identity, and local culture as basic parameters in the final outcome of the spatial and architectural resolution (Marconi 1996: 7–32).

This cautious management has its own history which in the researched period went through a transformation. This can be best described as a shift from monumental and tangible perception of cultural heritage towards more anthropological, vernacular, and intangible understanding, towards pluralization of value (Cozzo 2015: 968–973). It may also be understood as a changed emphasis from the conservation of lost cultural traditions towards the protection of living cultures (Vahtikari 2013). Taking into account the link between national, local, and individual memories, identity constructions and a globalized context of heritage making mean both focus on the political exchanges and social use-value circulation of collective memories within the heritage sphere. It is essential to examine the criteria, devices, and values shared, appropriated, or contested by 'cultural actors', according to which a good might or might not enter the 'cultural schemes'. The memory–identity–heritage–territory interplay needs also to be linked to the social diversity of the 'heritage communities', from academic and nation-state institutions to ordinary, non-academic structures taking care of the representations of the past (Hofer 1999: 136).

It is very important to keep in mind that heritage, as many scholars critically investigate (Jokilehto 2008 and Araoz 2011) and institutions deal with (such as UNESCO World Heritage Committee, European Commission via European Heritage label or the national units) today are different from the understanding and management in the research period. Even though numerous aims and practices can be stated in parallel with contemporary heritage notions, it was clearly monument protection under political leadership in those decades. It would lead to false implications if current requirements (such as participatory action and social inclusion) would be tested on the processes and management directions during the given time frame. Accordingly, the following investigation looks at the diverse actors and interpretations that realized the transformation leading to the elimination of classical lifestyle, living conditions, of the agricultural countryside, on the one hand, and to valuing it as an identity-forming aspect, a memory that can be visited and practised in the modern urban settings as well, on the other hand.

Historical, Social, and Cultural Background

World War II brought devastating loss to Hungary in terms of human resources and territories alike. Physical, infrastructural, economic, and 'mental' demolition, including immense territory and human loss, characterized the outcome. According to the propaganda, the Soviets were liberating the country, but they stayed for approximately four decades. Their physical (military) presence and political influence, or rather control, led to the spread of the unchallengeable ideology of the Soviet Union. The researched forty years can be divided into two phases: the first phase was until 1956 – the harshly oppressive one-party system led by Mátyás Rákosi (Bencsik 2010: 215–248). The turning point was the 1956 Revolution. During the cruel punishment of the revolution that took approximately four years, more people were attacked, tortured, and killed than in the actual fights (Granville 1998). From the 1960s, a kind of consolidation of this 'revenge' was realized by the Hungarian political leader, János Kádár, who tried to find a certain balance between the control and requirements of the Soviet Union and the needs of the Hungarian people, mainly to prevent another revolution. This led to a limited but existing freedom of the people. Foreign political changes also made the transformation process of the late 1980s possible, and it also led to the fall of the Soviet Union and to the end of its impact on the country. On 19th August 1989, the borders of the country were reopened to the West, and the first free democratic election took place on 25th March 1990 (Halmy 2014: 129–153).

Due to the communist ideology that preferred the working class and the industrial sector, the country underwent an immense social and economic transformation. As a top-down political-led intervention, de-peasantization (Kovách 2003: 41–67) took place throughout the researched four decades, a process fully accomplished by the 1990s. The process was realized via three major reforms (namely, the redistribution of lands, collective farming, and 'modernization') and constant control (Kovách 2012: 32–33). The expropriation of property was often justified by industrialization-related aims, and it also minimized the independence (both economic and psychological) of the given section of the society. The next phase of de-peasantization was the introduction of collective agriculture that was supposed to increase the living standards of the rural communities, but it was a traumatic change instead (Habuda 1998: 15–32). Simultaneously, the establishment of numerous industrial activities under the name of modernization for social aims took place across the entire country. A chain of mining, energy, and heavy industrial production centres was initiated, which needed substantial human resources and led to social and settlement structural changes (Valuch 1988: 1–30).[2] As a consequence, a huge segment of the rural population migrated to those newly industrialized cities and regions,

---

2   Both are still influencing the current situation of the country (Beluszky & Győri 1999: 1–30).

and a similarly significant segment turned into commuters. Such change led, on the one hand, to a decrease in the number of population in smaller settlements and, on the other hand, to a significant increase in industrial cities (see *Table 1*). However, the emerging housing and traffic necessities were not met in a timely manner. Moreover, there was a great economic crisis in the 1970s that worsened the situation. It blocked major projects as well as ongoing constructions. This led to numerous unprofessional realizations, rendered many architectural projects hazardous – having them demolished later on –, and adverse working conditions froze the documentation of monument buildings (Román 1993: 11–15).

Table 1. *Population decrease of the micro-villages over the decades under review*

Year	Total population of the settlements listed with the given intervals of inhabitant numbers:			Total population of the micro-villages
	Under 100	Between 100 and 199	Between 200 and 499	
1949	27 488	79 714	458 386	565 588
1960	24 501	71 630	428 622	524 753
1970	18 914	58 039	364 210	441 163
1980	12 803	45 920	305 985	364 708
1990	8 803	35 648	254 689	299 140
2001	6 799	31 169	239 934	277 902
The population percentage of 2001 in comparison to the 1949 data	24.5%	39.1%	52.3%	49.1%

Source: Kovács 2004

The named social, economic, and urban transformation in socialist Hungary went along with the popularized idea that villages are rather obstacles of improvement, and their negative representation led to the lack of central support and role in local or regional infrastructure. Even a new type of house was introduced and promoted for people living in the countryside, which was supposed to provide better and modern lifestyle but which had nothing to do with the original and authentic architectures (Prakfalvi 2015: 285–301). The local leaders' main objective was to obtain city status for their settlements despite the actual size, lifestyle, or infrastructural circumstances. Gaining city status became a political question rather than an actual improvement of urbanization processes (Vági 1982). That was visible also as extensive agricultural activities were carried out by the population of these new cities and even at the suburbs of the traditional cities like the capital, Budapest (Konrád Szelényi 1971: 19–35). In the second part

of the researched period, the leadership allowed collective farmers to do extra economic activities for personal purposes, and the social support system was partly modified as well (Kovács 2014: 236–238). Accordingly, the life standards in many rural areas greatly improved, which led to the extensive differentiation among the local communities across the country. Moreover, a large segment of the population, who had already been working in the industrial sector, returned partially (in their free time) to certain agricultural activities for the allowed personal extra income (Enyedi 1984). As a consequence, a unification of lifestyles and life standards and the disappearance of classical rural social community and activities took place undoubtedly in Hungary (Szuhay 1996: 705–723).

Along these lines, in the late 1960s and 1970s, an unprecedented attention was paid to the Hungarian (within and outside the contemporary borders of the country) folk culture mostly among university students. The named young generation studied, researched, practised, and taught each other not just dance steps/moves but songs, traditions, and behaviours as well.[3] Many writers share the idea that this popularity was due to its representation of an indirect testimony against the political system or as a way of escaping from the constant pressure of top-down ideology that overloaded all aspects of life in that period.[4] People who attended these events formulated a community with a strong group identity. The possible existence and the overall success of the dance-house movement can be understood by the above described political easing process of the 1960s and 1970s. Numerous folk bands, dance groups, and dedicated places have been established for the practice of folk music, dance, and traditions. Members of this movement visited the villages and tried to document and learn the exact presentation methods. They thought that the identical characters, group individuality make the folk culture unique, and with thorough documentation and learning it can be saved and transferred to the next generation and to the cities (Perlstein 1982: 48–53). This social movement, especially in the big cities of Hungary, indirectly supported, helped, and motivated the scholarly research of folk culture, but the political control and the strict ideological direction made it impossible to bring about a real change in the methodology and the message of most academic works.

Moreover traditionally (since the 19th century), there are groups of poets, authors, and other literary personalities who have been focusing on the vernacular art for inspiration and as the authentic and original source of any kind of Hungarian culture. They look at the method, style, and forms alike, but these

---

3   The same objective still exists when the educational practice has become an intangible heritage acknowledged by UNESCO. In 1.a. Background and Rationale of the *Nomination Form*, it states: 'conveying norms and patterns of inter-/intra-community communication/behaviour through traditional forms of expression (folk dance, music and poetry) while encouraging creativity', http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00011&Art18=00515, (last accessed on: 5/03/2018).

4   Such views can be read in: Zelnik 2012. See also Vincze 2011.

individuals were also the voices of the silent community, and with their artworks they target all those transformations that may have been difficult to analyse as academic research (Juhász 1986: 103–105). Some actors look for mysticism and archaic language and forms (such as István Sinka) (Pomogáts 1987), while others use more sociological or anthropological approach (such as Sándor Csoóri) and emphasize those questions in their work. Many literary critics believe that by the disappearance of the social unit the so-called 'folk authors' as a category have been eliminated as well. Those authors who chose vernacular life as the subject of their artworks moved together with the community to the cities and found new topics about the same communities and individuals (Radnóti 1993: 107–110). Either way, the vernacular culture and their very human issues have been on the literary agenda and hence are moved from the periphery to the centre of the readers' attention as well.

Academic and Professional Re-evaluation of the Disappearing Villages

The study of folk culture, just as every aspect of life, was influenced by the Soviet ideology – accordingly, politicized messages, Marxist ideologies, and the adoption of the Soviet ethnographic findings were among the required new steps and directions for the Hungarian scholars. It was especially difficult as before World War II nationalistic ideology was expected to be served by the same academic discipline and its representatives. The previous institution system was restructured, and many professionals were sent away to various less influential organizations. Even though the contemporary changes in the society and the intensive transformation of the Hungarian economy from a mainly agricultural character to a more industrial country provided rich opportunities to study, but the scholars of folk culture were allowed to conduct only such research that served the political messages of the leadership.[5] Accordingly, the traumas, the loss of a social group and its culture could not be documented.

After the dramatic years of the late 1950s, a kind of qualitative boom could be detected in many areas of the researched discipline. Institution-wise, the Ethnography Institute was established in 1967, among others, while one of the most outstanding collection works, the editing of an encyclopaedia started in 1969. Folk culture research was combined with urban historical studies, which provided a new location (the city) for investigations besides villages and agricultural fields (Létay 1996: 315–324). Besides these drastic and positive changes, the political and the strict ideological control still existed and made it impossible to reach a real change in the methodology and the message of most academic works.

---

5   An example for the ideologically influenced research: Kardos 1954.

Exceptions can only be found in the case of smaller projects that focused on smaller communities or settlements and involved a group of researchers and local sources (such as museums, archives). In these cases, new directions and methods as well as more complex investigations could be realized. Later on, Western examples and new notions could reach the Hungarian scholarly world as well, and the folklorist movement of the 1970s had a belated impact on the Hungarian research methodologies and directions as well (Paládi-Kovács 1990).

Despite this high level of variety of origins, intentions, and results, one scholarly aspect was realized which fruitfully influenced the future of the research. It was the notion of chronology and the acknowledged change through time in this field as well. Accordingly, not just the old, or even ancient, products, songs were evaluated but the current state of folk culture came to be researched and analysed as well. Similarly, due to the increasing variety of research, the amount of collected data and documented materials were extremely high despite the risk, difficulties, and often changing status of the researched territories and communities (Barabás 1971: 331–344). At a time when the existence of a nation is questioned, comparative studies are requested that lead to the greater knowledge of the surrounding countries as well as of the minorities within the society. That happened in Hungary as well when the various minorities were researched to reveal the uniqueness of the Hungarian folk culture that incorporated those findings.

Monument protection started at the end of the 19th century in Hungary, while the acknowledgement of protecting vernacular architecture was expressed in law as early as 1949. During the first period, control over scholarly and professional work, especially field research, was also a very strong one, which meant limited possibilities and rights as well. It was always due to thorough and highly politicized decision-making that research could be conducted. From the idea at the local level through numerous requests for approval on several stages to the final authorization by the relevant central office of the Party, the route was clearly propagandistic and political (Foote, Tóth, Árvay 2001: 138–163). Legal protection and guidelines had been established and ensured by the 1960s, which made it possible not only to protect the given architecture, its immediate surrounding but also to recognize the relevance of the group of buildings or of the whole settlement structures that individually might not be as valuable but their coexistence represents value (Barcza 1978: 35–43). Especially this type of protection made it possible to save street views and even whole settlements of vernacular architectures. Due to housing shortages, valuable buildings were modified with cheap materials, quick fixes, and unprofessional techniques or were overused and demolished (Román 1972: 315–329).

The nation-wide institutional system of monument protection was established and operated successfully in the Socialist time (Tilinger 1978: 19–26). Unlike in other neighbouring countries, in Hungary, monument protection was the task of

the Ministry of Construction – hence professionals could assist the projects from realizing the need for the accomplishment of the building process. However, renovations or protection projects were accepted many times not due to professional and scholarly decisions but based on political factors such as the propaganda potentials of the given task. Accordingly, the envisaged complexity of the research and documentation often could not be realized (Kecskés 1979: 69–70). Moreover, many participants evaluated (in retrospective interviews) the institutional system to be highly bureaucratic, hence slow and inefficient (Tompai 1978: 29–34). Monument protection in general and especially in the cases of vernacular heritage examples was an interdisciplinary and cooperative task. Every assignment required the teamwork of ethnographers, art historians, architects, archaeologists, and others to understand, document, preserve, and protect the given example.

During the second part of the socialist past, numerous instances of international cooperation and events took place both within the Comecon countries and with the West. For instance, vernacular architecture protection and the establishment of unified tools and methods within the Eastern Bloc were initiated by Czechoslovakia in the 1970s. The fourth meeting took place in Budapest and Szombathely in 1977 (Román 1971: 275–301). The third general assembly of ICOMOS, the professional supporting committee of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, was organized in Budapest in 1972, and it was an outstanding success with approximately 400 participants. Over ten excursions and a similar amount of receptions and other cultural programmes were organized for the guests with which not just the image of Hungary was supposed to be formulated (after the 1956 revolution and the international reactions to it) but also an appraisal of the 'Socialist society and the accomplished works within that system' (Román 1971: 301).

Ferenc Mendele (1934–1994) was an Ybl-Award-winning architect, conservationist, and the former director of the National Inspectorate of Historic Monuments. He believed and adopted the ideology that every contemporary function that is necessary in a settlement has to be present within the monument buildings. Along these lines, extra elements that were added later to a monument have not been counted as mistakes or as negative impact on authenticity. For example, a Hopper window was added to the roof of a house that originally served as the post office in a village. Later, this building became a post museum and hostel, and to fulfil these functions the Hopper window seemed plausible. Part of the justification for the newly added element was that it had an authentic look from the outside as a garret window made of tin (Mendele 1969: 201–211). Such tendencies became generally adopted across the centralized nation-wide monument protection institution system as a typical realization of top-down socialist control.

As a result of the academic and monument protection objectives and results, the national ethnographic museology was established and a network of institutions was formed that incorporated collections at regional and local museums, smaller-

sized museums dedicated solely to folk culture. A unique system of complex protection was formed in situ, which incorporated a single house or a group of original, authentic houses with their equipment in numerous settlements (Gráfik 1997: 19–45). These buildings called 'tájházak' in Hungarian, or Regional Houses in English, serve as showcases, where not just the history and the character of the local folk culture can be exhibited but educational and entertainment programmes can be organized as well. Accordingly, these were intended as archives, museums, and social places as well but are not moved to the centre but stayed in the countryside, on the periphery. Only in the early 2000s did these initiatives join a nation-wide network, and as a system it is now proposed as a future nominee for the UNESCO World Heritage list. After regional examples (such as in Zalaegerszeg), a nation-wide open-air museum, which has collected, preserved, researched, and promoted Hungarian folk culture in Szentendre, was established near to the capital during the researched period in the 1960s. Accordingly, examples of vernacular architecture became subjects of cultural representations across the country both in major cities and small settlements.

Political Support for the Heritagization Process

There have been numerous obstacles in protecting heritage in the socialist period of Hungary. Due to the political circumstances and directives of the period, the state first had to buy up the buildings in order to be able to protect them, for instance, by listing them as monuments. In the latter case, the regulations cut down the quantitative requirements in order to categorize more and more vernacular heritage examples as state-protected architectures (Tóth 1999: 153–174). Another supporting methodology was to provide extensive financial support and instructions for the owners. The support varied from an annual maintenance fee to a one-time reconstruction cost, which was a significantly higher amount (Barcza 1977: 25–35). The protected monument buildings went through a functional transformation due to the 'socialist monument policy' that was prevalent at the time (Merényi 1972: 11). It was envisioned that the conserved monuments would become a venue for cultural educational tasks of socialism. Recognized values, such as community, hard work, and simplicity, could be studied on the spot, at the objects of the vernacular heritage. The natural surroundings were protected also in order to save the traditional agricultural methods, if they were still in use. Moreover, vernacular culture was adapted to numerous political aims such as in the rhetoric fight against the class enemy, the so-called *kulak*s (Csurgó 2007: 90–103).

The original and preserved houses were transformed into museums, motels, artist residencies, and weekend houses. Hence, the main target groups who were attracted to use these transformed buildings were the tourists, pioneer

groups, and artists. So, the public from the centres were encouraged to visit these cultural and recreational spots in the peripheries. Another feature of the socialist ideology can be identified in the Hungarian vernacular heritage management of the time, and it was the overemphasis of social belonging in contrast to the ethnic or national one. In this way, Serbian architectural heritage in Szentendre, the Palócz heritage of Hollókő, and the German vernacular heritage of Fertőtáj (the region of Neusiedlersee) were the very first nationally protected vernacular heritage examples in Hungary (Fejérdy 1988: 12–14).

Vernacular heritage was popularized in the media as well but from another perspective. Television shows, radio programmes, and print media examples were created to change the general perception of the past from seeing old buildings and practices as useless and shameful to their positive evaluations and protection (mainly due to the country's economic situation and incapability to continuously establish new buildings and cities). For instance, the *Folklore of the Hungarians* was published by the main scholarly publishing house that ensured the increased status of the research subject as well. Not just among the academic circles but within the wider audience too folk culture became tempting and popular (Balassa & Ortutay 1980: 662–664). One of the most successful initiatives started in 1977 titled *Regions, Ages, and Museums*. This was a network organization on the one hand that united important cultural sites all over the country, advertised them with series of publications, but, on the other hand, it was a national competition as well by which the public was urged to explore local heritage all over the country.[6] There were televised talent shows as well for popularizing various segments of folk culture. In these programmes, viewers were informed about the given region and the represented heritage as well. An example for this aim was the participation of the female choir from Hollókő at this competition, whose ultimate success played a role in the heritage protectionists' aim to make it the first UNESCO World Heritage site of Hungary (Mezősiné Kozák 2001: 121). The National Monument and Museum Month in 1977 was another project that drew attention, among others, to the vernacular heritage with the support of politics (Román 1987: 453). These few examples represent well the success of the political and propagandistic support that turned vernacular culture into a valuable asset in Hungary during the socialist period.

Results and Conclusions

One example for ensuring the continuous existence of vernacular heritage (when its social group was disappearing) was realized by transforming the function of

---

6   For the history of the movement that became an institute, see: http://www.tkme.hu/tortenetunk/ (last accessed on: 5/03/2018).

the protected vernacular buildings and transmitting them to the geographical and mental centre of the society. Besides the destroyed settlements after World War II, the ideological and political oppression that characterized all aspects of life was the major problem. All these circumstances were even more threatening for vernacular heritage elements as not just the related economic and social segments (hence the owners and users) fainted away but also the technical, material, and structural deterioration was faster-paced regarding this type of tangible heritage (Szász & Szigetvári 1976). All in all, the future of vernacular tangible heritage seemed to be a dark and short one. On the other hand, rural images came to be seen worth protecting by the political regime; hence they were intensively popularized among the general public through media and public events. The clichés about the life style of the rural society, such as being healthy and strong or hard-working, are characteristics that also suited well contemporary political propaganda. That is the reason why with certain and definite limitations it was possible to academically and professionally protect the disappearing rural social unit and its lifestyle. Accordingly, in the context of dealing with the Soviet period, it is important how the issue of vernacular culture is articulated and presented to the community by the various actors (Forest & Johnson 2011: 269–288). In the researched time frame, vernacular heritage and its management, for instance, by monument protectionists served ideological aims as well besides the cultural, architectural, and public policy issues that all played a role in the success story (Barcza 1977). As Lowenthal describes, our contemporary time is justified by the past and by recognizing vanished or oppressed values. He sees the past as being integral both to individual and communal representations of identity and their connotations of providing human existence with meaning, purpose, and value (Lowenthal 1985). The reminiscences and events of the past are raw materials which are commodified for contemporary consumption (Ashworth 1991). That is why in the researched period the disappearing social unit and lifestyle through their representative built relics could be reactivated at new locations to serve new purposes. Reactions to political and social changes were difficult in the case of these examples as the 'traditional' glorification of the past could not be done due to the (at least) questionable evaluation of the actors and events (e.g. the same leadership supported and eliminated the researched tangible elements). Accordingly, it is very important how the issue of such reminiscences of the past is articulated and presented to the community via the various actors, management instruments, or interpretation narratives. The article looked at this reinterpretation process that took place while physically and mentally transmitting vernacular architecture from the periphery to the centres. The process was realized by numerous actors and several factors and could result in the reevaluation and survival of vernacular culture, while the rural areas went through a dramatic change and the earlier agricultural population has disappeared.

References

ARAOZ, Gustavo F. 2011. Preserving Heritage Places under a New Paradigm. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1(1): 55–60.

ASHWORTH, Gregory John. 1991. *Heritage Planning: The Management of Urban Change.* Groeningen: Coopers.

ASSMANN, Aleida. 2011. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

BALASSA, Iván–ORTUTAY, Gyula. 1980. *Magyar Néprajz.* Békéscsaba: Dürer Nyomda, 2nd edition.

BARABÁS, Jenő. 1971. Tér és idő a néprajzi kutatásban. *Népi Kultúra – Népi Társadalom* V–VI: 331–344.

BARCZA, Géza. 1978. A területi védelemre vonatkozó műemlékvédelem és egyéb jogszabályok. [Monument Protection regarding Territorial Management and Other Legal Regulations]. In: Barcza, Géza (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelőség. 35–43.
 1977. Műemlékeink hatósági felügyelete [Institutional Protection of Our Monuments]. In: Barcza, Géza (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelőség. 25–35.

BELUSZKY, Pál–GYŐRI, Róbert. 1999. A magyarországi városhálózat és az EU-csatlakozás. [The Hungarian Urban Network and the EU Accession]. *Tér és Társadalom* 12(1–2): 1–30.

BENCSIK, Péter. 2010. A Rákosi-rendszer állama 1949–1956 [The State of the Rákosi System 1949–1956]. In: Szabó, Pál Csaba (ed.), *A magyar állam története 1711–2006* [History of the Hungarian State 1711–2016]. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium. 215–248.

BENDIX, Regina. 2009. Heritage between Economy and Politics. An Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology. In: Smith, Laurajane–Akagawa, Natsuko (eds), *Intangible Cultural Heritage.* London: Routledge Publication. 415–441.

COZZO, Carmelo. 2015. Construction History and Preservation. The Recovery Manual as Operational Instruments for Intervention on the Built Heritage. *Tempo, Materia, Architettura* 1(1): 968–973.

CSURGÓ, Bernadett. 2007. Vidékképek a politikában a parlamenti beszédek tükrében [Rural Images in Politics through Parliamentary Speeches]. In: Boda, Zsolt–Kovách, Imre–Szoboszlai György (eds), Fiatal kutatók elitekről, kampányokról, vidékimázsokról. Mikroelemzések politikai jelenségekről [Young Researchers about Elites, Campaigns, and Rural Images. Microanalysis

of Political Phenomena]. Budapest: MTA Politikai Tudományok Intézete. 90–103.

ENYEDI, György. 1984. Az urbanizációs ciklus és a magyar településhálózat átalakulása [The Urbanization Cycle and the Transformation of the Hungarian Urban Network]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

FEJÉRDY, Tamás. 1988. A nemzetiségi kultúrák építészetének védelme Magyarországon [Protecting the Architecture of Minority Cultures in Hungary]. In: Román, András (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelősség. 12–14.

FOOTE, Kenneth–TÓTH, Attila–D. ÁRVAY, Anett. 2001. Emlékezés, nemzeti identitás, politikai emlékművek rombolása [Remembering, National Identity, Destruction of Political Monuments]. *Studia Historiae Literarum et Artium* 3: 138–163.

FOREST, Benjamin–JOHNSON, Juliet. 2011. Monumental Politics: Regime Type and Public Memory in Post-Communist States. *Post-Soviet Affairs* 27(3): 269–288.

GRÁFIK, Imre. 1997. A néprajzi múzeum magyarországi gyűjteményeinek kezdetei. *Néprajzi Értesítő* LXXIX: 19–45.

GRANVILLE, Johanna. 1998. *In the Line of Fire: The Soviet Crackdown on Hungary 1956–1958*. Pittsburgh, PA: Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh.

GUTIÉRREZ, E. Martínez. 2011. Memories without a Place. *International Social Science Journal* 62(203–204): 19–31.

HABUDA, Miklós et al. (eds). 1998. *A Magyar Dolgozók Pártja határozatai 1948–1956.* [Resolutions and Documents of the Hungarian Workers' Party 1948–1956]. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó.

HALMY, Keve Kund. 2014. Diktatúrából demokráciába: szocialista evolúció Magyarországon 1988–1990 között [From Dictatorship to Democracy: Socialist Evolution in Hungary between 1988 and 1990]. In: M. Kiss, Sándor (ed.), *Rendszerváltás 1989* [System Change 1989]. Lakitelek: Antológia Kiadó. 129–153.

HOFER, Tamás. 1999. A nemzettudat változó jelképei [The Changing Symbols of National Consciousness]. In: Pataki, Ferenc–Ritóók, Zsigmond (eds), *Magyarságkép történeti változásai* [Historical Transformations of the Hungarian Self-Image], 133–143.

JOKILEHTO, Jukka. 2008. What Is OUV? Defining the Outstanding Universal Value of Cultural World Heritage Properties. *Monuments and Sites* 16. Paris: ICOMOS.

JUHÁSZ, Pál. 1986. Korrajz vagy ítélet? Esszé Zsille Zoltán: Egy önhit életrajza (1956–1980) című művéről. *Szivárvány* 6(18): 103–105.

KARDOS, László. 1954. A magyar falu szocialista fejlődésének néprajzi kérdései [Ethnographical Questions of the Socialist Development of the Hungarian Village]. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Társadalmi-Történeti Tudományok Osztályának Közleményei* 5: 409–442.

KECSKÉS, Péter. 1979. A népi műemléki kutatás és felmérés [The Research and Documentation of Vernacular Monuments]. In: Barcza, Géza (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelőség. 69–70.

KONRÁD, György–SZELÉNYI, Iván. 1971. A késleltetett városfejlődés társadalmi konfliktusai [Social Conflicts of Delayed Urbanization]. *Valóság* 14(12): 19–35.

KOVÁCH, Imre. 2012. A vidék az ezredfordulón [Countryside at the Turn of Millennium]. Budapest: MTA TASZI, Argumentum Kiadó.
2003. A magyar társadalom „paraszttalanítása" – európai összehasonlításban [De-peasantization of the Hungarian Society – in a European Comparison]. *Századvég* 2(28): 41–67.

KOVÁCS, József Ö. 2014. The Forced Collectivization of Agriculture in Hungary 1948–-1961. In: Iordachi, Constantin–Bauerkamper, Arnd (eds), *The Collectivization of Agriculture in Communist Eastern Europe. Comparison and Entanglements*. Budapest: CEU Press. 211–247.

KOVÁCS, Tamás. 2004. Aprófalvainkról – illúziók nélkül [About Our Micro-villages – Without Illusions]. *Területi Statisztika* 7, 44(2): 125–137.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. 1991 [1974]. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LÉTAY, Miklós. 1996. A Nagy-Budapesti Néprajzi Munkaközösség története [History of the Greater Budapest Ethnographic Working Group]. *Tanulmányok Budapest múltjából*. 35: 315–324.

LOTMAN, Juri–USPENSKY, Boris. 1978. On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture. *New Literary History* 9(2): 211–232.

LOWENTHAL, David. 1985. *The Past Is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MARCONI, Paolo. 1996. The Way It Was or the Sudden Passion for Regional Restoration and the Italian Architecture. *Richerche di storia dell'arte* 60: 7–32.

MENDELE, Ferenc. 1969. Hollókő műemléki jelentőségű területének védelme [Monument Protection of the Valuable Area of Hollókő]. *Műemlékvédelem* 13(4): 201–211.

MERÉNYI, Tibor. 1972. Százéves a magyar műemlékvédelem [The Hungarian Monument Protection Is Hundred Years Old]. In: Barcza, Géza (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelőség. 5–16.

MEZŐSINÉ KOZÁK, Éva. 2001. Hollókő. In: Balázs, Péter et alia (eds), *Száz magyar falu könyvesháza* [Bookstore of Hundred Hungarian Villages]. Budapest: Grafika-Typopress Nyomda.

PALÁDI-KOVÁCS, Attila. 1990. *Néprajzi kutatás Magyarországon az 1970–1980-as években. Felmérések, dokumentumok, vélemények* [Ethnographic Research in Hungary during the 1970s and 1980s. Research, Documents, and Opinions]. Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatócsoport.

PERLSTEIN, Klára. 1982. A népi hangszeres együttesek képzésének néhány tapasztalata. *Zene, tánc*. 48–53.

POMOGÁTS, Béla. 1987. *Költészet és népiesség*. Békéscsaba: Új Auróra Kiadó.

PRAKFALVI, Ervin. 2015. Háztűznéző. Epizódok a házhomlokzat díszítés XX. századi történetéből, különös tekintettel az úgynevezett kockaházakra [Checking-Out. Episodes of the Façade Decoration History of the 20th Century, with Special Focus on the So-Called Cubic Houses]. *Műemlékvédelem* 5: 285–301.

RADNÓTI, Sándor. 1993. Van-e ma népi író? In: *Múltunk jövője: szabadelvűek a népi kultúráról*. Budapest: T-Twins Kiadó.

ROMÁN, András. 1993. Műemlékvédelem és településfejlesztés [Monument Protection and Settlement Development]. In: Román, András (ed.), *17. Országos Műemléki Konferencia* [17th National Monument Protection Conference]. Budapest: Országos Műemlékvédelmi Hivatal, 11–15.

1987. Kastélysors 1945–1987 [Faith of Noble Villas between 1945 and 1987]. *Magyar Építőipar* 9–10: 453.

1972. A műemlék-lakóházak problémái [The Problems of Monument-Apartments]. In: Dercsényi, Dezső et alia. *Magyar Műemlékvédelem 1969–1970* [Hungarian Monument Protection 1969–1970]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 315–329.

1971. Peculiar Characteristics of Rural Monuments. *Acta Technica* 1–4: 275–301.

SZÁSZ, János–SZIGETVÁRI, János. 1976. Népi építészetünk nyomában [In Pursuit of Our Vernacular Architecture]. Budapest: Műszaki Kiadó.

SZUHAY, Péter. 1996. Az életmód változása a magyarországi falvakban [Changes in the Way of Life in Hungarian Villages]. In: Orosz, István–Für, Lajos–Romány, Pál (eds), Magyarország agrártörténete [The Agricultural History of Hungary]. Budapest: Mezőgazda Kiadó. 705–723.

TILINGER, István. 1978. A magyar műemlékvédelem jellegzetességei [Characteristics of Hungarian Monument Protection]. In: Barcza, Géza (ed.), Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelőség. 19–26.

TOMPAI, Géza. 1978. Területrendezés és fejlesztés és annak műemléki vonatkozásai [Area Management Development and Their Consequences on Monuments]. In Barcza, Géza (ed.), *Az Egri Nyári Egyetem előadásai* [Presentations at the Eger Summer School]. Eger: Heves Megyei Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat és Országos Műemlékvédelmi Felügyelősség. 29–34.

TÓTH, Zoltán. 1999. A vidék épített környezeti fejlődése. A kistelepülésektől a vidéki urbánus központig [Transformation of the Rural Built Environment. From Small Settlements to Urban-Like Centres in the Countryside]. In: Csontos, János–Lukovich, Tamás (eds), *Urbanisztika 2000* [Urbanism 2000]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 153–174.

VÁGI, Gábor. 1982. *Versengés a fejlesztési forrásokért* [*Competition for Development Funds*]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

VAHTIKARI, Tanja. 2013. *World Heritage Cities between Permanence and Change. International Construction of 'Outstanding Universal Value' and Local Perceptions at Old Rauma from the 1970s to the 2000s*. Tampere: University of Tampere.

VALUCH, Tamás. 1988. A hagyományos világ alkonya [The Dusk of the Traditional World]. Budapest: Országos Közművelődési Központ.

VINCZE, Barbara. 2011. A táncoló ellenállás világgá megy [The Dancing Resistance Goes Abroad]. *Origo* 8, December. http://www.origo.hu/kultura/20111207-a-magyar-tanchaz-az-unescoelismeres-utan.html (last accessed on: 05/03/2018).

ZELNIK, József. 2012. Nomád nemzedék negyven év után [Nomad Generation Forty Years Later]. *Ökotáj* 43. http://www.okotaj.hu/szamok/43/ot43-02.htm (last accessed on: 5/03/2018).