

**SYMPOSIUM**

## The past of Hungarian anthropology and future objectives

Gyula L. Farkas\*

Department of Anthropology, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

**ABSTRACT** The author lists the goals drawn up by Aurél Török upon establishing Hungarian anthropology. Based on these, he first outlines the history of the establishment of university institutes, collections, scientific associations and periodicals, then lists the places and fields of research of Hungarian anthropology. The author describes the connection of Hungarian anthropology with the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and analyses the present state of the new generation of anthropologists. Based on these points the author formulates objectives for the future. Finally, he gives a chronological list of all Hungarian congresses and conferences related to anthropological research.

**Acta Biol Szeged 44(1-4):61-69 (2000)**

**KEY WORDS**

Hungarian anthropology  
history of science

It is a characteristic feature of both the animate and inanimate world that they had a beginning and they reached the present through a series of events. In this process one can differentiate – with some subjectivity – phases and periods characteristic from a certain point of view. Human beings especially like to connect these periods to certain events, be them historical periods or their own personal lives.

For people birth, biological and social maturation, the end of youth, coming of age, marriage and other significant events of their lives give an opportunity to divide the time between birth and death. These are of varied length and character. They all have special characteristics that none other possesses. But they also have some features in common which connect them and serve as a basis for a trend. In humans such a common feature is perfection followed by decline.

In science one can also separate periods which — like those of human life — have their own special features. At the same time common features that connect these periods can also be observed, such as the perfection of methods, getting closer to the solution of upcoming problems, discovering more and more relations of cause and effect. In the history of science these periods can be connected to events and dates of great importance. Mankind, including Hungarians, and science may look at year 2000 as such a date. It is noteworthy in itself that the older generation of today has lived to see the turn of the millennium.

The millennium is a very important event of our times. It bears special significance for Hungarians since this is the year of our celebration of the 1000<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the country. Hungarian science commemorates the 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the Hungarian

Academy of Sciences in 2000. As to our special field of interest, 2001 is the 120<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of Hungarian anthropology. The Department of Anthropology at the University of Szeged will celebrate its 60<sup>th</sup> birthday that year.

These notable dates are all suitable for taking a look at the past, to ascertain its achievements and experiences, to draw main conclusions and to assign tasks for the next decades and centuries. Lajos Bartucz, who taught anthropology keeping the history of science in mind, emphasised that the history of science calls our attention to two important points:

- on the one hand, we must find out what fields are not worthy of our attention, as they had been thoroughly researched;
- on the other hand, what fields we ought to pay attention to, as they had not been dealt with yet.

Unfortunately, this question is not as simple as that. Problems that had been investigated and supposedly solved, can be approached with methods that have improved in the meantime. So the re-examination of these questions may be considered. A good example of this are those human remains which are often taken under an examination again.

The points mentioned above made two Working Committees of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Szeged — the Anthropological and Archaeological, and also the Dental and Oral Surgical — in collaboration with the Department of Anthropology at the University of Szeged call a meeting on May 25-26, 2000 in order to survey in 17 lectures the achievements of Hungarian Anthropology and formulate future objectives. Each lecturer dealt with their own special field; this volume contains their lectures.

On our part, we tried to draw up the history of Hungarian Anthropology as a whole, and as a part of this, the examination of the Hungarian adult population.

Accepted January 10, 2000

\*Phone: 36(62)544-315, Fax: 36(62)544-314, E-mail: farlgy@bio.u-szeged.hu

## The Conditions of the Establishment of Hungarian Anthropology

When we get to examine the history of Hungarian anthropology, we are in a lucky position. During the 120 years of our science there has been several authors whose work and publications provide an opportunity for a quite easy survey (Bartucz 1957), and others (Eiben 1988; Farkas and Dezső 1994) tried to separate periods as well.

When reviewing the history of anthropology in Hungary, we must accept Aurél Török's concept as a starting point. Although the first plan for introducing anthropology in Hungary was Sámuel Scheiber's original idea, his concept was realised by Aurél Török. This outstanding expert considered the following as the basis for the establishment and development of Hungarian Anthropology:

- to form university department(s) where anthropology can be taught at a high level and which would make it possible to train experts;

- to create a collection in which all the findings can be found and serves as a basis for the anthropological understanding of Hungary's past and present;

- to start a professional association which is suitable for acquainting colleagues (and anyone who is interested) with their latest results;

- last, but not least, to publish a periodical in which they can print their results for the Hungarian and foreign experts.

We can say without exaggeration that in these four points Aurél Török perfectly expressed all those personal and material conditions which are necessary for the creation, functioning and development of a scientific field.

So, when we examine the history of Hungarian anthropology, the best course of action is to take a look at how the above mentioned four points are fulfilled.

Let's see them point by point.

## Founding of university departments

The first department of anthropology in Hungary was founded at Pázmány Péter University in 1881. It was one of the first ones in an international context as well, but its story is not quite smooth. Of Aurél Török's several students only Lajos Bartucz could — with no little sacrifice and effort — carry on his master's work.

In 1881, Aurél Török set out to make his ideas come true with great enthusiasm. His endeavours were facilitated by some previous events. At the Congress of Palaeontology and Anthropology in Budapest in 1876 two of the seven sessions were expressly dealing with anthropological matters. On December 17, 1878, Ferenc Pulszky and Flóris Rómer organised the National Society of Archaeology and Anthropology. In 1880-81, Aurél Török went on a field trip to France and Switzerland at his own expense. In 1881, he published P. Topinard's work "Anthropologie" in Hungarian.

Finally, on September 8, 1881, he was appointed professor and began giving lectures in October. At that time he had but two students.

In 1882 he published a periodical called "Anthropológiai Füzetek" ("Anthropological Letters") at his own expense, which was rather short-lived.

Török took great pains to create an Anthropological Museum, in which he collected 1,500 skulls, several complete skeletons, plaster-casts and brains by 1884.

Nevertheless, his efforts were hindered by the small room secured for the department, and the constant misunderstanding of his concept led to continuous arguments with, and finally total alienation from József Lenhossék, Gyula Sebestyén, László Réthy, Ottó Herman and his student, Károly Pápai.

These incidents undermined his health and on September 2, 1912, met his death at a conference in Geneva.

Among his several plans he created a university department and a collection out of nothing; but his efforts to bring a periodical and a scientific association to life were not successful.

With Török's death the first phase of Hungarian anthropology was over and the long and strenuous days of the department in Budapest began. Between 1912 and 1920 (1921, according to other sources) anthropology was taught by several lecturers but the department had no official head. This is especially distressing, since 1,998 students attended the lectures between 1913 and 1920.

The years between 1920 and 1930 were the second and most critical in the development of Hungarian anthropology. It is related to the work of Lajos Méhely, professor of Zoology. He — whose point of view was exceedingly racist — became the head of the department in 1920. His aims and research were quite one-sided and far from the work that had been carried out at the department previously. This could not be counterbalanced even by the work of Mihály Malán, Károly Ballai, Béla Balogh and Lajos Bartucz, who followed in the footsteps of Török. In 1922, Bartucz established within the framework of the Hungarian Ethnological Society an Anthropological Section, published "Anthropological Letters" again, but these initiatives, though more successful than the previous ones, were not long-lived, either.

In 1931, Bartucz was commissioned to give lectures at the department in Budapest, but practically he had no authority and no possibility to advance the department. This transient state of affairs lasted till 1959, when Bartucz was nominated head of the department at last. This event marks the beginning of a new era in the life of the department, since from this date on it has had anthropologists to lead it. After the death of Bartucz, Ottó Eiben, then Gyula Gyenis filled the position. Improvement was remarkably conspicuous under the leadership of Ottó Eiben, who entirely changed the equipment and research profile of the department, and introduced the

professional training of anthropologists. It also has to be mentioned that some of those who studied anthropology here between 1931 and 1940 became outstanding personalities of their profession (János Nemeskéri, Miklós Fehér, Pál Lipták, Mihály Malán).

In the meantime Malán organised an anthropological laboratory in 1930 at the College of Physical Education (today University of P.E.), which he led until 1942.

Another department of anthropology was formed in Szeged at Horthy Miklós University. This date marks the beginning of the third phase of the history of Hungarian anthropology. Lajos Bartucz became the head of the department, and held his position until 1959. This institute was luckier than the one in Budapest. It always had an anthropologist to supervise it: after Bartucz came Pál Lipták, Gyula Farkas, and now Antónia Marcsik. Its main research profile has been historical anthropology, though since the beginning of the 1960s it has been amplified by the studying of the growth of children, the adult population and the history of science. Today it has a collection of human remains from excavations counting almost 20,000. As for a long time it was Lajos Bartucz who gave the lectures both in Budapest and Szeged, his person secured the department in Szeged a significant factor in Hungarian anthropology. Its leaders and workers have been actively participating in several fields of Hungarian anthropology from the very beginning (Anthropological Section, Anthropological Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences).

During the World War II, in 1940, a very well equipped Department of Anthropology was created at Ferenc József University in Kolozsvár under the supervision of Mihály Malán. It only existed until 1945. During its short existence, however, a significant research programme was carried out there.

After the war, a Department of Anthropology was formed in Debrecen at Kossuth Lajos University. There is no telling as to the exact date (in all probability it was 1947). Its head became Mihály Malán. In 1968 its independence was suspended and it continued working as a part of the Department of Evolutional Zoology and Humanbiology. This department is somewhat different in nature from the previous two.

Firstly, because basically it is the only anthropological institute in Hungary in which a scientific school was formed, under the direction of Mihály Malán. There are several anthropologists who learned the tricks of the trade here and became outstanding experts of their field (Andor Thoma, Tibor Rajkai, Ottó Eiben, László Szathmáry, Katalin Szilágyi, Miklós Pap). This tradition is still alive, and a lot of talented young people choose anthropology as their life-long vocation.

Secondly, through Tibor Rajkai, this department established the possibility of teaching Anthropology at Bessenyei György Teachers' College in Nyíregyháza.

Lastly, the systematic study of the growth of children, the characteristics of adult population and population genetics research were begun here.

Nevertheless, it must be noted that the situation at teachers' colleges is not so favourable. True enough that at the colleges in Nyíregyháza and Szombathely teachers with training, interest and research projects in anthropology instruct students, but as for the rest of the colleges (Eger, Pécs, Szeged) this subject is still not an integral part of the training of students majoring in Biology.

Here we do not intend to take a look at on the history of teaching anthropology at universities in detail. That much, however, can be noted that until 1945 it was taught more intensively and in different forms (origin of men, general anthropology, forensic anthropology, social anthropology) At that time not only prospective teachers but students of law and medicine also attended the lectures. After the Second World War the teaching of this subject was restricted to students of Biology and weekly hours were drastically cut. Practically for medical students no anthropology has been taught since, the instruction of forensic medicine for students of medicine and law became the responsibility of medical institutes. Expansion — to a small extent — can be observed only in introducing anthropology for students of Archaeology (in Budapest and Szeged).

In connection with this, after a long delay, instructional materials, lecture notes and a textbook have been written by Lajos Bartucz, Mihály Malán, Pál Lipták, Gyula Farkas, Gyula Gyenis and Éva Bodzsár, which make it easier to teach and study this subject. These must be updated at times.

It is fortunate that the number of students who choose to write their thesis or dissertation on anthropology is not decreasing but proportionately growing with the increase in the number of students.

It is quite apparent from the above that Aurél Török's design for teaching anthropology at Hungarian universities came true, as this subject is taught at three universities. However, it is a task for the future to increase the number and variety of lessons, and to introduce this subject at teachers' colleges. We could modify Aurél Török's original idea for the next millennium as the following: we must make an attempt to introduce anthropology in higher education (not only at universities). The changes that we are witnessing nowadays, leading to the integration of colleges and universities into a large "Universitas," does not make it necessary to modify Aurél Török's concept, only to expand it.

### **Creation of an anthropological collection and museum**

In his 1881 plan, Aurél Török also had the creation of an anthropological collection and museum. As we already mentioned above, these were to a certain extent realised in his time.

If we take a look at the time that has elapsed since then, it turns out that it took the longest to fulfil this goal. Bartucz tried to create a collection as early as 1936 when he was appointed acting director of National Museum of Ethnology. To achieve this, the leaders of the capital issued a decree that all findings must be given notice of. He was helped in carrying out his plans by his friendship with Ferenc Móra, who gave all finds in Southern Hungary to Bartucz. This collection, amounting to about 3,000 finds, was taken to the department of anthropology in Szeged in 1940. The department in Budapest also had a similar collection, which unfortunately ceased to exist.

We must note, however, that obtaining human skeletal remains from excavations and rescue excavations, or establishing such a collection at all was based chiefly on personal connections. It has always been dependent on the connection between anthropologists carrying out the research and archaeologists carrying out the excavation. A proof of this is the above mentioned friendship of Lajos Bartucz and Ferenc Móra, and later János Nemeskéri, Gyula Farkas and several archaeologists.

The collections in Budapest, at the National Museum of Ethnology and at the Department of Anthropology in Szeged were only the first attempts. It was János Nemeskéri who made the formation of a really large collection possible when he established the Anthropological Department of the Hungarian Natural History Museum in 1945. At first this institute collected materials virtually from all over the country. Later Pál Lipták (Department of Anthropology, JATE, Szeged) and Tibor Tóth (Anthropological Department of the Hungarian Natural History Museum) made an agreement that finds from Transdanubia, Northern Hungary and the northern part of the territory between the Danube and the Tisza rivers would go to Budapest, while the ones from Southern Hungary to Szeged. Today there are approximately 20,000 items in the Anthropological Department of the Hungarian Natural History Museum. The institute residing first in Baross Street, after the 1956 revolution in Bajza Street, and finally from 1999 on Ludovika Square, was directly established for collecting finds. For a long time this institution was the centre of Hungarian anthropological research. There was a time when almost all of the most outstanding Hungarian experts were working here (János Nemeskéri, Pál Lipták, Mihály Malán, Tibor Tóth, Andor Thoma and others). János Nemeskéri was followed by Tibor Tóth at the head of the institute, and at present it is directed by Ildikó Pap. Erzsébet Fóthi and Ágnes Kustár are also working at the institute at present.

If Aurél Török could see this collection, in all probability he would be very happy with it. We have a reason to say that it is a high-standard collection, fulfilling the criteria of the next millennium in its location and equipment.

The position of the anthropological collection at the University of Szeged is not at all so satisfactory. Although

here there are about 20,000 items, too, but these are stored at various places (Department of Anthropology, cellars of the University, at a mill in Makó, the former building of the Soviet garrison), and under harsh conditions. The main difficulty arises from the fact that the Department, as an educational institution, does not get enough financial support to take care of and upkeep such a collection. Maintaining this collection practically depends on the co-operation and relationship with the archaeologists. If this collection, which is very important in the study of Hungarian ethnogenesis, cannot be stored under safe circumstances, it may result in the severe damaging of it.

Beside these two large collections, there are several smaller ones in museums (Veszprém, Székesfehérvár, Pécs, Tiszavasvári, Nyíregyháza, Szekszárd etc.) due to the efforts of Alán Kralovánszky, Kinga Vasváry, László Szathmáry and others. There is one problem with anthropological finds stored in museums: these institutions are primarily responsible for storing ethnographical, archaeological and historical artefacts, and have no enough room for anthropological finds, which take up considerably large spaces. It is a very important issue, as finding a place for the great number of well-preserved finds excavated at highway-construction sites and conserving them for future generations is essential. The storage of previously found remains is also important as they have to be re-examined with the improved techniques of today.

No doubt that — primarily due to the traditions of Hungarian anthropological research — there are quite a large number of scientifically evaluated finds. Still, it seems that the amount of material which is waiting to be put under scrutiny is also great.

If we take Aurél Török's concept again as our starting point, we can say that his plans has been realised in many respects. We have collections with a considerable amount of material. But the circumstances of storing this material is not always satisfactory. So our primary objective for the future must be to improve these conditions. It might give us some hope, though, that the Ministry National Cultural Heritage was founded lately, which will probably take part in preserving the relics of the Hungarian soil.

Török's idea, however, has not come true in the respect that the museum of anthropology should collect ethnographical material as well. In our opinion, however, it is not necessary, as there is a special museum for the preservation of such artefacts. So there is no way, hope and need to establish a Hungarian "Musée de l'Homme".

### **Starting a scientific association**

As we have already mentioned, in 1878 the National Archaeological and Anthropological Society was formed. Bartucz in 1922 formed Anthropological Section within the framework of Hungarian Ethnological Society.



These societies and associations were the first attempts. But they did not prove to be long-lived, chiefly because there were few people who dealt with anthropology.

An association which held regular meetings, and made anthropological research known to the public did not exist until 1952, when the Anthropological Section was established within the framework of Hungarian Biological Society. It has been holding its sessions regularly, counting now more than 320. The association has an elected board, with usually the eldest anthropologist heading it, though there may be exceptions. Lectures are held not only by Hungarian experts, but often by foreign lecturers. The existence of this section is justified by its 50 years' history. And also, we must not ignore the fact that there is an opportunity to publish the lectures.

This section fulfils several functions: it procures a chance for announcing latest results, lets young experts to make themselves known, provides a link with foreign professionals, and last but not least, it justifies the existence of Hungarian anthropology.

Besides this, there is also a possibility to give anthropological lectures in the Section of Hungarian Biological Society in Szeged, which has a past and activity similar to the Anthropological Section.

So, we have an association with a long tradition and of high quality. The plan made at the end of the last century has been realised. Our task for the future must be to keep it alive and to keep its high standards.

### **Publishing a periodical**

Among his plans Aurél Török also had the creation of an anthropological periodical. His initiative, the "Antropológiai Közlemények" ("Communications in Anthropology") was very short-lived, later Bartucz's attempt did not prove to be much more successful, either.

After the Second World War, new prospects opened up in this field as well. We used the plural with a reason: as we shall later see, Hungarian anthropology has several periodicals today.

Again, it became possible to publish the results of anthropology in a separate volume entitled "Pars Anthropologica", as a part of "Biológiai Közlemények" ("Communications in Biology") under the care of Hungarian Biological Society in 1954. This then was changed to "Antropológiai Közlemények" ("Communications in Anthropology") in 1956, and from 1957 onward has existed as an independent periodical and has been published regularly, issuing its 39<sup>th</sup> volume in 1998. Its content is mainly made up from the lectures held at the above mentioned Anthropological Section with an abstract in a foreign language.

The periodical of the Anthropological Department of the Hungarian Natural History Museum bore several different names: "Crania Hungarica," "Anthropologia Hungarica,"

"Anthropologia Hungarica Studia Historico-Anthropologica." Unfortunately, this periodical, which published the results of historical anthropology in foreign languages, ceased to exist after its 20<sup>th</sup> volume.

The "Humanbiologia Budapestiensis" is published by the Department of Anthropology at Eötvös Lóránd University, and has existed as a periodical since 1974. It also has supplements at times.

Besides these regularly published periodicals, anthropological studies also appear in the publications of museums and in "Acta Biologica Szegediensis", published by the University of Szeged. Hungarian anthropology has several periodicals today. So the original aim of creating a forum for regular publication has been realised.

Most certainly, besides those possibilities mentioned above, Hungarian anthropologists have other occasions to publish their results in foreign periodicals, monographs and collections. Our future task is primarily to maintain these possibilities and, most importantly, to adapt to modern ways of publication.

### **Research institutes**

In addition to the aforementioned three university departments, other institutes also carry out anthropological research, and certain fields of anthropology are also taught within the framework of education.

Among these the first to be mentioned is the Institute of Hunankinesiology and Sports Medicine, University of Physical Education in Budapest (János Mészáros, János Mohácsi), and the Biomechanical Laboratory of the University of Physical Education (Anikó Barabás and Anna Farkas), where primarily growth and physique studies are carried out in relation to sport.

Similar research is performed at the Central School of Sports in Budapest (Iván Szmodis, Tamás Szabó, Júlia Pápai).

At the Department of Pathophysiology, Bárczi Gusztáv Training College Teachers' of Handicapped in Budapest, studies concerning the growth and physique of retarded children are conducted (József Buday).

At the Department of Biology, Bessenyei György Teachers' College in Nyíregyháza, they carry out growth studies, and also deal with the somatic development in children with Down syndrome. These projects were begun by Tibor Rajkai, and kept on by Károly Nyilas and Teréz Szabó. Anthropology is also taught here to students.

At the Berzsenyi Dániel Teachers' College in Szombathely, a trained anthropologist Gábor Tóth ensures the introduction of students to anthropology.

At the Institute of Experts in Forensic Medicine in Budapest, Éva Susa investigates the questions of forensic anthropology and identification.

At the Paediatric Clinic of Semmelweis Medical School

in Budapest, Rózsa Ágfalvy and Sarolta Darvai do the medical, demographic, and human ecological investigations of pregnant women and infants, respectively on a national representative sample (2%).

At the Vascular Surgery Clinic of Semmelweis Medical School in Budapest the early-deceased Imre Lengyel carried out palaeoserological research.

At the Institute for Producing Human Vaccine in Budapest a nation-wide study of ABO blood-types and seroanthropological investigation of the people of Ivád and Bodrogköz were carried out (Richárd Backhausz, János Nemeskéri and Hubert Walter).

The head of the Department of Forensic Medicine, Medical School in Pécs, László Harsányi with János Nemeskéri and the demographer György Acsádi worked out a method for the determination of the age of death in skeletons, now widely used.

At the Paediatric Clinic of this University Ilona Dóber investigates the growth, development and obesity of children.

At the Department of Forensic Medicine at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Szeged (previously Szent-Györgyi Albert Medical University) Ferenc Kósa and Gyula I. Fazekas worked out a method for the determination of the age of death from bones of foetuses. In addition to this, they do investigations on human polymorphism.

Dentists joined anthropological research a long time ago. Some of them (Dénes Schranz, Pál Bruszt, György Huszár, Károly Tóth, János Tari, Géza Prágai) studied a great number of finds from excavations. Today this is continued by Gábor S. Kocsis, who works at the Clinic of Dentistry and Oral Surgery, Faculty of Medicine of the University of Szeged (previously Szent-Györgyi Albert Medical University).

At the Department of Forensic Medicine of the Medical School in Debrecen, Sándor Ökrös did dermatoglyphic studies. At the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the same University, Antal Borsos and Judit Csoknyai do repeated serial investigations on the maturation of girls. At the Institute of Public Hygiene growth studies have been carried out since 1931 (by Ede Neuber, Erzsébet Szöllősi, Márta Jókai).

Human populations' genetic polymorphism and gene frequency was studied by Tamás Tauszik, at the National Institute of Haematology and Blood Transfusion in Budapest.

Balázs Bugyi, as a factory radiologist, did constitutional investigations from morphological, histological and palaeopathological point of view on living and fossil samples.

At the Research Institute of Demography, Central Statistical Office in Budapest, Kálmán Joubert does human ecological and biodemographic research on newborns and conscripts. This direction was set out by János Nemeskéri.

At the National Institute of Geology in Budapest, Miklós Kretzoi dealt with the question of human evolution, which is continued by László Kordos.

At Katona József Museum in Kecskemét, Gyula Henkey studied the anthropological characteristics and taxonomic distribution of the adult population.

Ferenc Szalai carries out the palaeopathological investigation of human remains from excavations at Janus Pannoniensis Museum in Pécs.

At the Institute of Archaeology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, István Kiszely studied human fossils from excavations and, most importantly, wrote several popularizing books. His historical anthropological work is carried on by Balázs Mende here.

The material in István Király Museum in Székesfehérvár was studied by a team (János Nemeskéri Kinga Éry, Antónia Marcsik, Ferenc Szalai, Gábor Kocsis).

At the National Museum of Hungary (Budapest) Zsuzsa K. Zoffmann did the examination of fossils from prehistoric times.

As it becomes clear from the previous list, scientists in institutes not definitely of anthropological nature also deal with anthropological research, either because it is related to their field of study, or out of pure interest. These examinations are usually connected to applied anthropology.

## Fields of research

Hungarian anthropologists have been studying human remains from excavations from the very beginning. These were put under scrutiny from the point of view of the distribution of races, but in the past few decades the emphasis shifted towards the examination of palaeopathologic anomalies, palaeostomatological and non-metric variations. This field of research — called “historical anthropology” in Hungary — is closely linked with the study of Hungarian ethnogenesis.

Another important field of study is the examination of the characteristics of the present-day population.

This aims partly at adults (ethnic anthropology), and partly — especially in the last 50 years — at the somatic development of children. In this last case physique-studies and the application of their results (sport anthropology) have come into the limelight in the past few decades. The examination of retarded children (especially ones with Down syndrome), conscripts and newborns is also connected to children.

Dermatoglyphic studies are very popular both among adults and children.

Physiological studies are partly related to finds (palaeoserology, osteochemistry), partly the serological attributes of the living population (population genetics).

The identification of historical figures (Ferenc Rákóczi II, King Béla IV, Martinovics and his companions, members of the government in 1956, Petőfi, the so-called “royal graves” in Székesfehérvár) has been dealt with since the beginning of the century. These are related to forensic medical examinations, during which several anthropological

methods are made use of.

Other occasional studies: history of science, applied anthropology (ergonomics), anthropological methodology, the examination of isolates.

Although mathematical methods in anthropological research have been used since the '30s (biometry), these have played even a greater part since the widespread use of computers in the evaluation of data (measuring biological distance).

### **The representation of Hungarian anthropology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences**

The development and organisation of science have surpassed Aurél Török's ideas. The Hungarian Academy of Sciences aggregates the different fields of science into subdivisions, which practically reflect the classification of science. So was the Section of Biological Sciences formed, within which each special field has its own committee.

The Anthropological Thematic Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was formed in 1958; its head became the zoologist István Boros. The reason why a zoologist was appointed for this position was partly the critical state of Hungarian anthropology after World War II, and partly the conflict among anthropologists of the times.

From 1970 onward the association has been functioning under the name of "Anthropological Committee" up to this very day. Heads: János Nemeskéri (1970-1980), Gyula Farkas (1980-1985), Ottó Eiben (1985-1999), Gyula Gyenis (1999-).

The composition of the Committee reflects the all-time professional power-relations, the opinion of the Section of Biological Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the major directions of research, the determinative role of the head and the development of science. Its main function is the theoretical guidance of this field of science and establishing a standpoint in political and ethical questions.

The position and significance of a science in the national scientific public life is greatly determined by who from its experts are admitted into the Academy. Hungarian anthropology is in a rather disadvantageous position in this respect. Aurél Török was the only one who, in 1892, became the corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, though both Lajos Bartucz and János Nemeskéri would have deserved the same.

### **Scientific recognition**

Another indicator of professional standard is how many scientists get doctor's degrees, become professors or honorary doctors. Quite a number of experts has got doctor's degrees. Béla Balogh, Miklós Fehér became honorary doctors, János Nemeskéri an honorary professor, Lajos Bartucz, Ottó Eiben, Gyula Farkas, Gyula Gyenis, Imre Lengyel, Pál

Lipták, Mihály Malán professors. In addition to the aforementioned names, some scientists who strictly speaking do not work in the field of anthropology (László Harsányi, Miklós Kretzoi, János Mészáros, János Mohácsi and Endre Riegler) were appointed professors.

To establish a scientific standard, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences introduced the titles of candidate's degree and doctor of sciences. These can be earned by defending one's dissertation in front of a qualifying committee, or can be bestowed on the basis of previous outstanding work. Among the proportionately few anthropologists several experts have qualified for these degrees. Lajos Bartucz (as a recognition of his previous work), Ottó Eiben, Gyula Farkas, Imre Lengyel, Pál Lipták and Tibor Tóth became doctors of science this way. To these belong László Kordos and Miklós Kretzoi, who did not exclusively deal with anthropology. Thirty one persons qualified for candidate's degrees on the basis of their work.

Pál Lipták was given the title of "professor emeritus" by the management of József Attila University in Szeged.

One of the manifestations of the appreciation towards foreign experts in Hungary is the Lajos Bartucz Commemorative Medal of the József Attila University. This has been awarded to Hubert Walter (Bremen), Michael Finnegan (Knoxwill) and Olivier Dutoir (Marseilles).

Charles Susanne (Brussels) became an honorary doctor of JATE. A similar title was conferred on James M. Tanner (London) by ELTE. Professor Derek F. Rogers (Newcastle) became an honorary member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Professor Marcel Hebbinck (Brussels) and Professor William D. Ross were conferred honorary degrees on by the University of Physical Education, Budapest.

### **The new generation**

The staff of the departments of anthropology is usually limited. This goes for both the Hungarian and foreign institutes. As a result of this, the training of a new generation of experts is not without difficulties. The employment of young scientists is only possible through the retirement or death of an old one. And even then, it may be problematic. As the number of staff at university departments is limited by the number of students and lessons, it is impossible to create new positions. Economic and financial regulations have meant an additional difficulty. During the last decades in Hungary, primarily the development of molecular biology was emphasised, now ecology has come to the front. Within this context, anthropology cannot make much progress. The introduction of new fields of research (palaeoserology, anthropogenetics, etc) is rendered practically impossible by the lack of suitable equipment as a result of insufficient funding.

Nowadays this problem can be increasingly felt. During the past ten years a new prospect opened up for young experts

to study in foreign institutes within the framework of various programmes (Tempus, Erasmus, Socrates). In addition, the introduction of post-graduate education and several scholarships ensures for the young generation the learning of the tricks of the trade. But after getting a PhD, or finishing a scholarship, it is quite hopeless for them to get a job. It is particularly complicated, as this kind of training takes several years, and the candidates who are admitted to the programme might not be suitable either professionally or in their personal qualities. Unfortunately, this only turns out after several years. In this case one can start again from scratch, provided the person in question is not filling a position, as finding a substitute can also be problematic.

### Organisation of congresses

The activity of the experts of a certain field is shown by their presence, lectures and posters at conferences and congresses held from time to time.

Hungarian anthropologists have been engaged in this only for the past few decades. For some 10-15 years after the Second World War it was quite problematic to participate in congresses abroad. Here we will not mention lectures held abroad, but only list Hungarian programmes.

Although the birth of Hungarian anthropology is connected to the Congress of Palaeontology and Anthropology in 1876, it took almost eight decades to organise a new congress.

First Anthropological Symposium. Budapest. October 8 - 10, 1959.

Advances in the Biology of Human Populations. Evolutionary Trends in Fossil and Recent Hominids. The Ninth Congress of the Hungarian Biological Society was sponsored by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Demographic Research Institute of the Central Statistical Office. Budapest. May 6 - 8, 1970.

The Sex and Age Determination of Skeletonfinds. International Palaeodemographical and Palaeoanthropological Course. Organized by the Biological Section of Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Budapest-Debrecen. September 2 - 7, 1974.

Growth and Development, Physique. First International Symposium of Human Biology. Balatonfüred. September 27 - October 1, 1976.

International Palaeodemographical Colloquium. Sáropatak. August 22 - 26, 1978.

Functional Biotypology. Second International Symposium of Human Biology. Visegrád. September 10 - 14, 1979.

Variations in Human Growth and Physique. Third International Symposium of Human Biology. Bozsok. May 26 - 30, 1981.

International Centennial Anthropological Congress. Budapest. June 2 - 4, 1981.

There was a centennial congress in connection with the

100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of the department in Budapest, a memorial session celebrating the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Lajos Bartucz's birth on April 1, 1985.

Growth Standards. Fourth International Symposium of Human Biology. Pécs. June 23 - 26, 1986.

European Populations in Past, Present and Future. Sixth Congress of the European Anthropological Association. Budapest. September, 1988.

Third Symposium on Upper Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic Populations of Europe and the Mediterranean Basin. Budapest. September 3 - 7, 1990.

International Scientific Session of the Foundation of the Department of Anthropology, József Attila University Szeged. October 1 - 3, 1990.

Fifth International Symposium of Human Biology. Keszthely. June 3 - 6, 1991.

Auxology '94. Children and Youth at the End of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Seventh International Congress of Auxology. Szombathely. June 26 - 30, 1994.

Teaching on Human Biology. Szeged. June 24 - 25, 1994.

Natural Endowments and Possibilities in Human Growth. Sixth International Symposium of Human Biology. Veszprém. June 10 - 13, 1997.

After all we can say that since 1959, several international or national congresses have ensured the strengthening of bonds between Hungarian and foreign anthropologists.

### Conclusions

On the previous pages we tried to survey the past development and present state of Hungarian anthropology. Summing up, we can say that even if our circumstances are not the most favourable, but for teaching and research we possess:

- institutes of higher education;
- competent experts;
- a scientific public life which gives opportunity for discussion and lectures;
- periodicals;
- collections for research;
- an academic committee to guide this field of science.

The achievements of Hungarian anthropology and especially the research that had been carried out for the last 50, years has won the praise of foreign experts, too.

If we would like to draft the tasks for the next few decades, they would be the following:

In education:

- we must ensure that the already independently existing departments of anthropology at universities survive;
- considering circumstances, we must prevent cutting down on the weekly lessons of this subject;
- more special courses should be offered, even within the framework of general courses, so that anthropology can be introduced comprehensively;



- we must make an effort to integrate anthropology into the schedule of teachers' colleges, and of the teacher training faculties at the newly formed "Universitases";

- the already existing educational materials (lecture notes, textbook) must be updated from time to time so that they can be used at all universities, but not excluding the predominance of the profile of each department;

In research:

- departments and research centres must retain their own traditional projects and begin new ones;

- research projects must be co-ordinated, and can be divided among several research centres, or can be extended all over the country, providing an opportunity for cooperation;

- modern methods must be made use of;

- interdisciplinary research should be favoured in the future;

- we must take every chance to protect and store under satisfactory conditions our ever-growing collections;

- we must provide an opportunity for Hungarian experts to meet and exchange ideas, and to make foreign experts acquainted with their results by organising conferences, congresses and scientific sessions, like in previous decades.

In staff:

- taking into consideration that the staff of this field of science is getting rather old, we must find the possibilities for young ones to become experts, like PhD courses, professional training of anthropologists, Hungarian and foreign scholarships, the creation of new positions in the framework of research projects, etc.

In scientific public life:

- we must go on with and keep the meetings regular of the Anthropological Section;

- with all our might we must try to publish continuously the periodicals exclusively dealing with anthropology (*Communications in Anthropology*, *Humanbiologia Budapestiensis*); we must make use of the opportunities to publish (year-books of universities and museums); we must make an attempt to publish *Crania Hungarica* again.

The Anthropological Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences must guide Hungarian anthropology more firmly and resolutely by setting a course for favoured research programmes, by co-ordinating the work of institutes, by defining the goals and conditions of education, by taking a clear standpoint in ethical and political questions, by establishing closer relationships with experts working on related fields, by continuing to popularise anthropology.

If we take a critical look at the 120 years of Hungarian anthropology, we can say without any bias that in general, but especially in the past 50 years, it produced results that we do not have to be ashamed of, either in front of Hungarian or foreign experts. Our tasks for the next decades, however, are numerous and demanding. Nevertheless, to make this all

come true will mainly be the duty of the young generation of today. Let's just hope that in 50 years' time in a similar appraisal they will have lived up to the expectations and have enriched Hungarian anthropology with great results. Let them learn from the mistakes of the past, let them seize new opportunities, let them be the enthusiastic researchers and teachers of Hungarians. But let them not forget that academic excellency does not only mean expertise but also moral correctness. This latter issue we did not discuss when surveying the history of anthropology in Hungary, although unfortunately there is a lot to consider in this field as well. In the name of the older generation, I wish the young ones devotion, stamina and lots of luck to realise these tasks in this spirit.

## References

- Allodiatoris I (1958) *A Kárpát-medence antropológiai bibliográfiája* (Bibliographie der Anthropologie des Karpatenbeckens). Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp.183.
- Bartucz L(1938): *A magyar ember. A magyarság antropológiája.* (The Hungarian Man. Anthropology of Hungarians). Egyetemi Nyomda Budapest, pp. 509.
- Eiben O (1988): *History of human biology in Hungary.* Internat Assoc Human Biologists, Occasional Papers, 2(4), pp.73.
- Farkas LGy, Dezső Gy (1994) *A magyar antropológia története a kezdettől napjainkig* (History of Hungarian Anthropology from the beginning up to the present). JATEPress, Szeged, pp. 123.

Further publications on the history and research of Hungarian Anthropology can be found in *Anthropológiai Közlemények* (Communications in Anthropology) vol. (1965) 9, (1966) 10, (1968) 12, (1969) 13, (1972) 16, (1973) 17, (1967) 20, (1978) 22, (1981) 25, (1983) 27, (1987/88) 31.