

MIKLÓS, ÁGNES KATA

PROBLEMS OF GENERATION CHANGE IN THE HUNGARIAN
LITERATURE IN ROMANIA IN THE 1970'S

I.

When writing this dissertation, I needed a twofold approach in my research. As I am concerned with the emergence of a literary generation and its opportunities for succeeding, it was necessary for me to structure my paper on two bases: on the one hand, on the basis of literary research and criticism; on the other hand, on that of generation studies. That is the reason why I had to perform two tasks. First of all, I needed a clarification of the generational makeup, as well as of the terminology, of Hungarian literature in Romania, while I also needed to make a brief survey of the research on generation change and to select the points which are relevant for the present thesis.

The primary starting point for the research on the generation change of the 1970's is the literary historical tradition of generation changes in the Hungarian literature in Romania. The separation of generations and assigning given authors to a particular one has always been a central topic in Hungarian literary history in Romania, a problem which was (at least partially) solved by Kántor and Láng (1971)¹. It was this book that introduced the concept "Forrás generation", a cover term for writers whose works were published in the series called *Forrás*, reserved for first-book authors, the first issue of which came out in 1961. When the first issue of Kántor's and Láng's work came out, there were but two "Forrás generations" to be considered, but the concept was later extended to later periods as well. Kántor and Láng drew the boundaries between the several Forrás generations mainly on a chronological basis, regarding the publication of books by authors who represented a new tone in lyric poetry (László Király in the second Forrás generation, Géza Szöcs in the third, András Ferenc Kovács in the fourth) as the relevant date for the emergence of a new generation. Ever since, no one has invented a term more appropriate than "Forrás generation": despite the critical voices during the past decades (which, not quite negligibly, have come from the very people involved), the concept has proved to be indispensable in establishing the generations of Hungarian authors in Romania. The concept appears time and time again in the work of all serious scholars of the period; without aiming at an exhaustive list, let me but mention Zoltán Bertha, Miklós Csapody, Ernő Endrődi Szabó, Lajos Kántor, Gusztáv Láng, Gábor Martos; from among the most recent authors, Imre József Balázs, Péter Demény, Zsolt Láng, Zsuzsa Selyem, as well as Szilárd Demeter and Szabolcs Szonda, who are currently writing their PhD dissertations on this topic.

The categorization by Kántor and Láng, however, created the conceptual framework and the terminology of generation change in literary history exclusively on the basis of *an act of group formation controlled from above*, but it did not give an answer to how *self-forming groups* arose. In order to clarify this problem, it has seemed inevitable to make a survey of how generation change is treated in the sociological literature.

It is hardly surprising that generation change has always been primarily studied from a sociological point of view. The works produced by this research, however, have shown considerable divergence in the authors' opinions on several points. These points include *the period* (including the emergence, the active work and the dissolution of a generation), the

¹ Kántor, Lajos and Gusztáv Láng (1971). *A romániai magyar irodalom története 1945–70*. Bucharest: Kriterion.

given generation's *position* in society, the *role* the generation plays and can play, and several other factors. Further important questions are whether one talks about a scientific, literary, or artistic generation as well as the circumstances of its emergence and what its opportunities were. This list, far from being exhaustive, shows that the definition of a generation is a complex issue, and that a great amount of characteristic features needs to be considered.

Theoretically speaking, Veress (1999)² provides an undoubtedly good overview of these problems. Veress establishes the following categories within the field of generation research: *social generation*, *philosophical generation*, and *cultural generation*. A social generation in his approach is primarily *age dependent*, while a philosophical generation is defined by *existence* and *duration*; finally, a cultural generation is defined by intersubjectivity, common thinking, language use and a generational paradigm.³

A literary generation exists simultaneously as a social, a philosophical and a cultural generation. This dissertation is primarily concerned with the *social* and *cultural* aspects, since the efforts for generation change in the 1970's need to be equally analyzed from both the social and the cultural points of view.

II.

A chief proof of generation change is the appearance of conflicts with previous generations. Each new emerging generation defines itself *against* the previous one; it is these differences which are the main defining features of a generation.

One of the chief group of questions is what problems are in the centre of emerging conflicts within the given generation change. The most self-evident problem is a comprehensive one: the question of *power*, but it must be borne in mind that the ways this question appears always depend on the given period and the specific situation. Those "preparing for change" may in no way forget about the problem of *age*. A part of the conflicts was modelled along the axis "the young vs. the old", often even in cases when this only served the purpose of concealing the conflicts. Within the problem of *power*, there is another, equally self-evident, source of conflicts: that of *opportunities*. The insufficient amount of opportunities, or a failure to take them, result in problems which range from existential ones to publication opportunities. As we talk about a literary generation, another point to study, within the sphere of power, is *acceptance*, which I discuss primarily as a literary-political question in close connection with the question of opportunities.

Another group of problems I consider important is that of *identity*, which I divide into two separate perspectives: the perspective of *responsibility* (that is, *externally set identity*) and that of *roles* (i.e., *identity originating from inside*). The degree of correlation between definitions originating from above/outside on the one hand, and definitions originating from inside on the other is by far not negligible for definitions of generations. Though a generation defines itself as opposed to another, others will also define the given generation against themselves, which is why a study of the stance of both sides is needed.

An essential basis of my investigation was that whatever was *not* part of contemporary reception was only used to support, but not to elaborate, my statements. As a generation change, or the mere existence of a generation, can be most easily determined in a retrospective way, I believe it is much more essential to seek answers to questions such as what conclusion could be drawn by contemporaries, at which points the question of generation change appeared, and what conclusions can be arrived at from the documents of

² Veress, Károly (1999). *A nemzedékváltás szerepe a kultúrában*. Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár: Pro Philosophia – Polis.

³ Ibid., pp.216-285.

the given period. From these documents, it was debates and inquiries which served as the chief basis for my investigation; specifically, ones which appeared in the given period, i.e., the 1970's. It is not accidental that I consider the role of debates and inquiries essential within contemporary reception, since they present a relatively less face-lifted version of the conflicts of the period. The expression "relatively less" needs special emphasis. For example, the note on the last page of the inquiry entitled *A szóértés előfeltételeiről* (Korunk 1980/1-2.) seems quite unambiguous: "The tape recording was made by Péter-Pál Markos, written down by Zoltán Bretter and József Aradi. Some of the authors made later amendments to their own texts." Even so, debates and inquiries are the most important documents at our disposal, since they represent the most succinct expression of the divergent elements of the world view of different generations as well as how they understood their roles.

The literary and publicational problems of the 1970's appear primarily in the following debates, inquiries and roundtable discussions: *Húsz esztendőm hatalom*. Utunk 1972/12:6-7; *Ankét a nemzedékről*. Korunk 1973/6:835-864; „Az irodalom annál gazdagabb...” Utunk 1976/30:2-3; *Fiatalok irodalma – az irodalom fiatalsága*. Igaz Szó 1977/8; *Újra: költészet és magatartás*. Korunk 1978/7; *Fiatal kritikusok*. Igaz Szó 1978/12:554-564; *Költészet és kommunikáció*. Korunk 1979/9; *A szóértés előfeltételeiről*. Korunk 1980/1-2:41-62; *Echinox-alakzatok*. Korunk 1980/1-2:63-72, 4-6; *Pátoz és paradoxon*. Igaz Szó 1980/6:520-529; *Korszerűség – elkötelezettség*. Igaz Szó 1981/5:437-472; *A 100. Forrás-kötet után*. Utunk 1982/12.

The selection is inevitably arbitrary, much like which of the above inquiries and debates I have chosen for a detailed analysis. I do not give a detailed treatment of debates which are not concerned exclusively with the question of generation change. („Az irodalom annál gazdagabb...” Utunk 1976/30:2-3); neither do I provide a detailed analysis of those inquiries where it was only the starting point that was given, but the comments are not concerned with a common topic (*Húsz esztendőm hatalom*. Utunk 1972/12:6-7; *Újra: költészet és magatartás*. Korunk 1978/7.)⁴. Considering the above criteria, I give a detailed analysis of the inquiries *Ankét a nemzedékről* (Korunk 1973/6:835-864) and *Fiatal kritikusok* (Igaz Szó 1978/12:554-564), in which all participants were asked the same questions, as well as the first part of *Költészet és kommunikáció* (Korunk 1979/9), structured in a similar way.

The relevance of later works, debates and inquiries can only be formulated conditionally, mainly due to the characteristic features of the processes of remembrance, closely connected to the retrospective conceptualization of generations. The only exception is *A 100. Forrás-kötet után* (Utunk 1982/12), in which the conflicts of the practice of the Forrás volumes were published, hence it contains significant data for my research.

III.

The efforts for generation change in the 1970's need to be analyzed with equal emphasis on aspects of social and cultural generations. As I have mentioned, there emerged a number of questions during the debates and inquiries, which shed light on the reasons for generational conflicts. It goes without saying that such an analysis can only be successful if one chooses the appropriate points of view in one's investigation, and I have structured my dissertation along these lines.

Based on the above said, I have structured my dissertation as follows:

1. INTRODUCTION – POINTS OF VIEW, APPROACHES, PREVIOUS STUDIES
1. 1. 1. CAPTATIO BENEVOLENTIAE

⁴ *Újra: költészet és magatartás* (Korunk 1978/7) is also very important as a work on the topic of poetic cognition, which is why I discuss it in section 3. 2. 1. 4. As opposed to other inquiries, however, I do not aim at contrasting the answers (which would be impossible anyway).

1. 1. 2. POINTS OF VIEW AND APPROACHES – LITERARY HISTORY
1. 2. 1. THE SUBJECT OF INVESTIGATION AND TERMINOLOGY
1. 2. 2. A “REVIEW OF TROOPS”
1. 2. 2. 1. PEOPLE WHO EMERGED DURING THE SECOND GENERATION
1. 2. 2. 2. FORRÁS GENERATION No. “TWO AND A HALF”
1. 2. 2. 3. THE PERIOD OF THE “THIRD GENERATION”
1. 2. 2. 4. THE ESSAYISTS
1. 3. 1. CONTEMPORARY RECEPTION
1. 3. 2. THE LATER DECADES – CHANGES IN THE TRADITION
1. 4. THE CONCEPT “GENERATION” – CHARACTERISTICS
 1. 4. 1. POINTS OF VIEW AND APPROACHES – SOCIOLOGY
 1. 4. 1. 1. RESEARCH ON GENERATION CHANGE
 1. 4. 1. 2. THE CONCEPT OF A “SOCIAL GENERATION”
 1. 4. 1. 3. THE CONCEPT OF A “CULTURAL GENERATION”
1. 5. THE STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION
2. GENERATION CHANGE AND POWER
 2. 1. “ANYWAY, THESE YOUNG PEOPLE” – THE ROLE OF AGE
 2. 1. 1. THE PERIOD OF A GENERATION AND SOME STATISTICS
 2. 1. 2. CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES IN THE USE OF CONCEPTS
 2. 1. 3. CIRCUMSTANCES BEHIND AN INQUIRY ... – KORUNK 1973
 2. 1. 3. 1. THE RELEVANCE OF BELONGING TO A GENERATION
 2. 1. 3. 2. ON THE POSSIBILITIES OF GROUP FORMATION
 2. 1. 4. ...AND ITS RESULTS –ERNŐ GÁLL’S DIARY
 2. 2. PUBLISH, PUBLISH...
 2. 2. 1. THE PUBLICATIONAL PECULIARITIES OF THE FORRÁS VOLUMES
 2. 2. 2. CIRCUMSTANCES BEHIND AN INQUIRY... – UTUNK 1982.
 2. 2. 2. 1. A DEBATE CONCERNING THE DARKÓ VOLUME
 2. 2. 2. 2. THE TASKS OF FORRÁS – “MATURATION”
 2. 2. 2. 3. THE TASKS OF FORRÁS – “TAKING FLIGHT”
 2. 3. OUR STUDENTS’ JOURNAL: ECHINOX
 2. 3. 1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF A UNIVERSITY JOURNAL
 2. 3. 2. ECHINOX – FROM OUTSIDE
 2. 3. 3. ECHINOX – FROM INSIDE (AND LATER). ECHINOX FORMATIONS
 2. 3. 3. 1. THE GENESIS OF A JOURNAL AS IT EXISTS IN MEMORY
 2. 3. 3. 2. “WIRED PUBLICITY” AND THE LIMITS
 2. 4. LET’S GO TO THE “ACROPOLIS”
 2. 4. 1. THE BIRTH OF A SUPPLEMENT AND ITS BRIEF HISTORY – INCLUDING HOW WE REMEMBER IT
 2. 4. 2. A SUPPLEMENT FROM OUTSIDE
3. GENERATION CHANGE AND IDENTITY – THE CONNECTIONS BETWEEN ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND GENERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
 3. 1. “HERE AND NOW”
 3. 1. 1. THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF HUNGARIAN INTELLIGENTSIA IN ROMANIA
 3. 1. 2. THE RELATIONS OF THE “PREPARING-FOR-CHANGE” SECOND GENERATION ELITE
 3. 1. 2. 1. FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD
 3. 1. 2. 2. FATHERS AND SONS
 3. 1. 2. 3. THE DEBATE BETWEEN PALOTÁS AND SZŐCS ... AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

- 3. 1. 3. INTERPRETATIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY
- 3. 1. 3. 1. CIRCUMSTANCES BEHIND AN INQUIRY... – IGAZ SZÓ 1981.
- 3. 1. 3. 2. RESPONSIBILITY IN THE TRADITION
- 3. 1. 3. 3. RESPONSIBILITY IN A MINORITY
- 3. 1. 3. 4. ... AND THE CONSEQUENCES
- 3. 2. “HERE AND SOMETHING DIFFERENT”
- 3. 2. 1. CONCEPTION OF ROLES IN LYRIC POETRY
- 3. 2. 1. 1. USE OF LANGUAGE AND FORMS –DEZSŐ PALOTÁS AND THE OTHERS
- 3. 2. 1. 2. A SUPPLEMENT – TEXTS ON FORMS OF EXPRESSION – IGAZ SZÓ 1980.
- 3. 2. 1. 3. COGNITION AND PRIVATE MYTHOLOGY –GÉZA SZŐCS AND THE OTHERS
- 3. 2. 1. 4. A SUPPLEMENT – TEXTS ON POETIC COGNITION – KORUNK 1978.
- 3. 2. 2. CONCEPTION OF ROLES IN CRITICISM – THE OTHERS AND FERENC BRÉDA
- 3. 2. 2. 1. AN INQUIRY WITH SEVEN “YOUNG” CRITICS – IGAZ SZÓ 1978.
- 3. 2. 3. CONCEPTION OF ROLES IN LANGUAGE USE
- 3. 2. 3. 1. PRELIMINARIES TO A DEBATE – KORUNK 1980.
- 3. 2. 3. 2. UNDERSTANDING EACH OTHER
- 3. 2. 3. 3. INTERPRETING META-LANGUAGE
- 4. SUMMARY – AGE, POWER, AND IDENTITY
- 4. 1. GENERATION CHANGE AND DISCOURSE REVISITED
- 4. 2. PUBLICATION OPPORTUNITIES AND OBSTACLES REVISITED
- 4. 3. ON OPPORTUNITIES OF A DIALOGUE
- 4. 4. EPILOGUE

IV.

Under no circumstances can generation change be regarded as a process free of problems and conflicts. Ortega y Gasset’s classification of generations is, to my mind, fully appropriate. According to it, generations, from the oldest to the youngest, can be assigned to one of the following categories: “survivors”, “in power”, “in opposition”, and “preparing for change”.⁵ As I drew the lines between the generations who took part in the conflicts most actively on the basis of this theory, I would now like to give a brief overview of Ortega y Gasset’s classification.

On the basis of this classification, the boundaries between generations can mainly be interpreted in terms of the given generations’ *position* in the establishment. The “survivors” are members of that “outdated” generation which no longer takes part in designing and performing the “acts of power”, but possibly supports the ones “in power” in this respect; the ones “in power”, in turn, are the representatives of the current dominating paradigm, who are in a decision-making position; “in opposition” refers to people of the same generation, who, however, do not represent the dominating paradigm and are not in a decision-making position; those who are “preparing for change” are members of a younger generation, who strive to take over the positions of those “in power”. If we concentrate on the statements and behaviour of the representatives of various categories of generations (categories which appear as sources of conflicts), we come across quite interchangeable concepts such as “young”– “preparing for change” or “mature” – “in power”. Nonetheless, the chief criterion that determines which generation a particular author considers himself/herself a representative of is not biological age; instead, it is the degree of his/her *acceptance*, i.e., to what extent the author in question regards himself/herself as a member of the establishment.

⁵

José Ortega y Gasset: *Korunk feladata*, ABC Könyvkiadó Részvénytársaság, Budapest, 1944.

It is noteworthy, though, that the inquiry *Ankét a nemzedékről* included a question (the fourth one) on the relevance of this classification, and several people, judging from their answers, called the validity of Ortega y Gasset's classification into question. It appears to me that this rejection may originate mainly from the ideologically determined milieu of the 1970's — it is typical of the period, for instance, that the category “in opposition” was both uninterpreted and uninterpretable. Ortega y Gasset based his classification of generations on the given person's position in the establishment rather than on some sort of ideological adherence. If we consider the people “in opposition” to be members of the same generation as those “in power”, but who do not represent the dominating paradigm and are not in a decision-making position, it may appear to us, studying the period from the perspective of researchers working decades later, that there was hardly any chance of giving a definition of what “being in opposition” actually meant in the Romanian (Hungarian) literary-historical system of coordinates in the first half of the seventies. The question is much easier to answer when talking about the second half of the 1970's and especially the 1980's; nevertheless, no real contrast can be detected, even in this later period, that would have been self-evident for the public — except, possibly, in rather extreme situations. The samizdat activity of *Ellenpontok* and the Limes Circle was not made public, and we cannot find overt criticism in the official forums of the period, either.

Since the line between generations can most effectively be drawn according to the particular person's place in the establishment (as discussed above, it is one's acceptance and decision-making position, rather than one's age, that is decisive), the typical situation where conflicts may arise is between those who are “in power” and those who are “preparing for change” in a milieu where the “opposition” generation cannot be defined. My dissertation is an attempt at discovering the reasons for this conflict, based on contemporary documents. It seemed reasonable to conclude that, just as in any other generation-changing situation, the generation of those who were “in power” in the institutional structure of Hungarian literature in Romania in the 1970's was primarily defending its own established position against younger generations and questioned the reasons for the rebellious behaviour and the methods of self-expression of the ones who were “preparing for change”. Nonetheless, the main focus during my investigation was in what ways the system of conflicts resulting from generation change in the examined period *differed* from the problems of generation change *in general*. In other words, what were the problems that were specific to this period and the situation?

A major source of conflicts is the system of institutions, which had been rather restricted at the outset, but it was continuously becoming even more restricted. During the period under scrutiny, i.e., in the second half of the seventies, no institution of literary relevance and public interest was established — including journals, publishing houses, or centres of research. As the only new initiative, one can only mention *Fellegvár*, a Saturday supplement of the daily paper *Igazság* (published in Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár); however, this supplement, which was specifically meant for young people, appeared but 99 times, and, after three years, it ceased to exist in April 1981. The rise in the price of paper in 1974 resulted in a decrease in the size and volume of periodicals (including *Korunk*), which, in turn, meant fewer publication opportunities. It was even problematic for institutions, mainly publishers, to keep their employees, and it certainly did count as a rarity if a new young colleague could be employed on a permanent basis (e.g., Béla Markó with *Igaz Szó*).

The last period when people below 30 were given a relatively significant role in the institutions was 1968 and 1969 — these were the years when editors employed the authors of the second Forrás generation. The 1970's, especially the second half of the decade, no longer offered new opportunities: instead, it was a period which required the use of existing limits. A

major question that arises in this respect is the use of, and the opportunities offered by, youth forums. The talk entitled *Echinox-alakzatok*, concentrating on the opportunities, gifts and acceptance of *Echinox*, was also primarily concerned with “limits” — more precisely, the peripheral existence and limitedness of *Echinox*. The people who participated in the talk took it for granted that the so-called “adult culture”⁶ — an expression used as a working term for that part of Hungarian authors in Romania who were “in power” — regarded *Echinox* as a forum for young people which, being defined by age, was of interest to a narrow circle only; at the same time, these authors considered it self-evident that this narrow circle is to be located on the margin of publication opportunities within Hungarian literature in Romania. *Echinox* was undoubtedly *different* from the Hungarian periodicals in Romania in a quite general sense: concerning the topics it discussed, its manner of speaking, as well as its acceptance, it certainly stood outside of the dominating paradigms of the period. The same goes for the supplement *Fellegvár*, which was considered an “extension” of *Echinox*; it appeared more frequently and reached a wider range of readership, but there is a significant overlap between the persons who published their work in the two forums. This can probably be attributed to the fact that the editor of the supplement, Géza Szöcs, had been the editor of the Hungarian sections of *Echinox* before he decided to become the editor of *Fellegvár*.

Even though there existed some plans to renew and “rejuvenate” the existing institutions, they were not fully carried out. As testified by Ernő Gáll’s diary,⁷ the intention to “rejuvenate” *Korunk* was only realized as a desire for graphic renewal in the end.

Another major source of conflicts is the desire for “totality” on the part of the minority culture. Literary historians structure their periodizations, and establish generations, according to who were the most influential authors rather than who were the most typical ones; this is also characteristic of the classification by Kántor and Láng. The elite-centred approach of Hungarian literary historians in Romania is not only explicable with the literary-historical tradition; instead, the chief reason for it is to be sought in the peculiar ideological background of the Hungarian intelligentsia in Romania. It was established by József D. Lőrincz that the confusion of the concepts “elite” and “intelligentsia” resulted in a concept of intelligentsia which leaves out of consideration the “proletarians” of culture, that is, the wide masses working for the party and the administration; moreover, it even fails to consider the ideological background of “original” thoughts. This is why the emphasis is regularly laid on the “top” elite. All this led to a conviction that important events could only be influenced by “first-rate”, “original”, and “creative” individuals.⁸ Whenever questions of generation change were discussed during the 1970’s, those who were asked or took part in the debate were almost automatically selected from the representatives of the elite, and the performance of the elite was also required from generation changers. Naturally, what counted as the “performance of the elite” was the reproduction of the accomplishment of “old masters” or of the ones “in power”; that is why people “preparing for change” were expected to produce a “new Tamási” or a “new Sütő”.

There is a third source of conflicts, which is closely connected to the previous one and can be derived from the persistence of “popular ideology”. Due to the peculiar position of Hungarian intelligentsia in Romania, public life and speech were always in close correlation with literature. I needed the general observations of political scientists, historians and sociologists concerned with various aspects of this topic in order to come to a specific

⁶ The expression originates from Géza Szöcs (*Echinox-alakzatok*. *Korunk* 1980/1-2:66).

⁷ Gáll, Ernő (2003) *Napló I. 1977-1990*, Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár: Polis. 10-25.

⁸ D. Lőrincz, József (2004). *Az erdélyi magyar értelmiség – hivatás és pragmatizmus*. In: *Az átmenet közéleti értékei a mindennapi életben*. Múltunk Könyvek. Miercurea-Ciuc/Csíkzszereda: Pro-Print. 32-66.

conclusion as to how the people “in power” and those “preparing for change” differed in their conception of roles. This is because the primary determining factor in the generation change problems of the seventies was the difference between conceptions of roles; specifically, the aspect which was treated as a question of responsibility. There were three unquestionable (and unquestioned) basic concepts behind “popular ideology”: *community*, *tradition*, and the idea of *serving the people*. The interpretation of *community* simultaneously included the concept of the Hungarian minority (together with any subgroup, such as a village community), a group which bears and maintains the values that serve survival. Being the most important value and the bearer of values at the same time, the community defined in this way was the guarantee for an unchanged and unassimilated national existence; it was the medium through which the *tradition*, i.e., culture understood to be permanent, could be preserved. (The emphasis on ethnographical research and the frequency of field studies is partly due to this fact, i.e., a systematic effort to maintain the tradition came into existence.) The preservation of cultural values was made possible by the idea of *serving the people*, starting out from the assumption that an activity is only valuable if its functions and goals can, in some sense, be connected to the community and its values.

The combination of the three basic concepts within the idea of *serving the people* also determined the expectations of the representatives of popular ideology regarding the intelligentsia and its tasks. A significant part of generation change problems in the 1970's is derivable from what *responsibilities* the representatives of Hungarian literature in Romania had to take, and what *roles* they had to perform. It is not an accident that I have used the expression “had to”: the tasks they undertook, and which were to be undertaken, were not considered optional — instead, they formed an integral part of the duties of all intellectuals. What makes the problem special is that the idea of serving the people came to be understood as a bearer of values primarily within the elite part of the intelligentsia, in a rather paradoxical way. The intelligentsia provided itself with an illusion of equality by constantly emphasizing that it was interested in the community's problems and was a loyal member of it while it *required no privileges*; at the same time, the question of the idea of *serving the people* was always approached from the elite's point of view.

Based on the abovesaid, it seems easier to understand why the accusation that the ones “preparing for change” were “elitists” is quite controversial. This accusation was formulated chiefly in connection with the family background of the people “preparing for change”; specifically, this was the first period in the history of Hungarian literature in Romania after the second World War when a significant part of the people “preparing for change” came from a second-generation intellectual elite. Exaggerating somewhat, one can say that the uniqueness of the situation is due the fact that the ones “in power” experienced personally what it meant to be “on the other side” during this decade, and that inheriting positions was also possible in a socialist society.

Generally speaking, the situation of a second-generation intellectual can be said to be more advantageous than that of a first-generation one. One reason for this is that the previous generation had already built up a system of relationships; another reason is the more favourable infrastructural environment (as mentioned, for instance, in the debate entitled *A szóértés előfeltételeiről*, referring to one's “own library and record player”); finally, the early influence which facilitates one's progress at school. The situation of second-generation intellectuals becomes more complicated when the first generation in the family is not merely a member of the intelligentsia, but a member of the cultural elite. An intellectual who strives to become a member of the cultural elite meets a greater amount of suspicion if one of his/her parents is already part of that elite; indeed, it is the inherited system of relationships which arouses suspicion in those who had been forced to build up their own system of relationships by themselves.

Precisely because these conditions were given to a great part of generation changers in the 1970's, the suspicion aroused in the people "in power" was proportionally stronger. It is mentioned in several inquiries and debates that the people "preparing for change" are too esoteric, and that they are unable or unwilling to reach down to the wide masses. (The most noteworthy example is *A szóértés előfeltételeiről*, especially the comments by Edgár Balogh and Sándor Tóth.) It was exactly in the name of popular ideology that the "survivors" and the ones "in power" condemned the fact that young representatives of the intellectual elite were mostly descendants of older representatives of the cultural elite. In certain cases, therefore, it was precisely the authors of the second-generation elite, born into a privileged situation, whose position was most difficult. The conflict between "fathers and sons", often in a literal sense, as well as the evaluation of second-generation intellectuals relative to the previous generation, further complicated the problems of the conception of roles.

The situation of those who were "preparing for change" in the seventies was not only complicated by generation change problems generated from above and from outside. First of all, it must be pointed out that the generation in question lacked a group-forming act, a manifesto which could have emphasized that people of the same generation did belong together, or common action. This is the reason why the generation-changers of the 1970's are still known as the "third Forrás generation", a term applied to them by others rather than themselves. This categorization and classification was mainly called into question by those who were involved in the first place. Even members of the second Forrás generation considered the classification by Kántor and Láng arbitrary, a feeling that appears even more emphatically with members of the third generation. The chief reason for this was that most of the thirty-two authors who published their works in the Forrás series during the third-generation period (1976-1983) were not connected to each other; what they had in common was the mere fact that they published their volumes in the same series and during the same period. Those, however, who can be assigned to the same group (not merely because they started their literary career together) had several opportunities to build up relationships; such opportunities were provided, just to mention a few, by Gábor Gaál's Circle, the *Echinox* editorial team, the "Cselényi house" (the home of László and Béla Cselényi in Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár), and, later on, *Fellegvár*, the Saturday youth supplement of the Cluj-Napoca/Kolozsvár daily paper *Igazság*. The essayists, whose volumes were published in the Forrás series during the period of the third Forrás generation, undoubtedly represent a significant group as far as efforts for generation change are concerned. They, however, can only be partially regarded as members of the third Forrás generation for purposes of literary-historical classification. Their separate status, which is derivable from the special theoretical genre they represented, is still less significant than the fact that they had the same medium for publication, inspiring milieu, environment and sphere of interests as the lyricists. The very authors assigned to the category "third Forrás generation" have used the term with reservations; yet, we have no more appropriate definition.

The period, nearly a decade, which I have examined did not lead to the integration of the generation "preparing for change" in the 1970's either institutionally or as far as systems of values are concerned. It is partly due to this fact that a surprising number of the members of this generation were forced to emigrate or keep silent by the 1980's. Since a literature that is produced in a given milieu and is understood and needed by a particular audience can only be partially appreciated elsewhere, the majority of those who settled down in Hungary (or in some other country), with a small number of exceptions, did not go on publishing new works; they re-published their earlier works at best.

