

János Orsós

Interpretational instances for critical analysis of the textual corpus of Romology

Translated by Dóra Babilai

In our research we provide interpretational examples for the critical analysis of the textual corpus of Romology, which contributes to the ability to narrate a changing discourse.

Discourses of various studies, such as Romology, are organized by “periodically monopositional power structures, articulable in an easier or more difficult way” (Beck, 2013: 14). When schism in interpretation become recognizable for scientific narration, then philosophical and social studies both become interested in these questions, which sometimes lead to such robust changes that the otherwise merely thematically focused query requires a new perspective, methodology, terminology, etc. Hence, we assume that the discourse within Romology is a valid discourse.

In our research, we attempt to provide an overview of the characteristics and the progression of Romology as a scientific discourse, based on seemingly simple questions, such as what the accepted terminology is; following what categorization the scientific discourse is organized; whether the traditional history of Romology can be assessed, and if so, what is the best way; historically, what themes have been central and permanent and which ones change continuously.

We study to what degree the texts included in the textual corpus of Romology withstand the scientific challenge, what type of meanings they create or stabilize, and how they acquire a given narrative construction. Ferenc Liszt’s book *A cigányokról és a cigányzenéről Magyarországon* [About Gypsies and Gypsy music in Hungary] is also a volume which belongs to the textual corpus of Romology, and thus it became the object of our micro-analysis. During interpretation, the necessity of a critical analysis of the textual corpus of Romology is apparent, as Liszt’s organic theories formed about the Roma are, from many aspects, objectionable. Liszt based his assumptions on non-scientific knowledge, such as the Roma are folk souls. Therefore, his method of cognition lacks those scientific procedures which would allow for more appropriate understanding of the issue, and thus with his stereotyping assumptions he actually represents the “metaphoric,” “literalized” or imagined character of Gypsies, which is merely an abstract and exaggerated reality, without reality behind it. One main purpose of our analysis is to present and unveil the “rhetoric and stylistic existential positions of not knowing, not being aware” (Beck, 2013: 29), so that we may begin “breaking up the closed textual organization” of the textual corpus of Romology, and “mapping and re-writing its ideological fields” (Beck, 2013: 29).

References

- Beck Zoltán (2013): A romológia diskurzusáról. *Romológia* [About the discourse of Romology, Romology], 2013/1. 43-51.
- Lemon Alaine (1996): *Forró Vér és Fekete Gyöngy: a cigány eredetiség paradoxona a szocializmus idején és azután* [Hot Blood and Black Pearl: The paradox of Gypsy authenticity during the era of Socialism and after]. *Replika*, 1996. 23-24.
- Liszt Ferenc (1861, 2004): *A cigányokról és a cigányzenéről Magyarországon* [About Gypsies and Gypsy music in Hungary], Magyar Mecerius Kiadó, Budapest.
- Kovalcsik Katalin, Réger Zita(1995): A tudomány, mint naív művészet. *Kritika* [Science as an Art Naïve, Critics], 1995/2. 31-34.
- Said Edward (2000): *Orientalizmus* [Orientalism]. Osiris Kiadó, Budapest.
- Szuhay Péter (2012): *Sosemlesz Cigányország* [Never-to-be Gypsy Country]. Osiris Kiadó, Budapest.
- Williams Patrick (2005): Cigány házasság. In: Prónai Csaba (ed.): *Cigányok Európában 3.* [Gypsy marriage, in. Gypsies in Europe] Budapest.