

# “There Are No Recipes”

## An Anthropological Assessment of Nutrition in Hungarian Ecovillages<sup>1</sup>

---

Judit Farkas

University of Pécs BTK TKI Ethnography – Cultural Anthropology Department

**Abstract:** Nutrition, as a fundamental human need as well as a manifestation of a social and cultural function, has always been the focus of ethnographic and anthropological research. Various concepts – sometimes radically different and at odds with each other – have emerged in modern societies to define food that can be considered safe. These include various nutrition-related movements. Like all social movements, these movements also act as a signaling system: they emerge as a reaction to a societal problem, and the problems they reflect as well as the attempts to formulate solutions also indicate the social dilemmas of the era. Such is the thematization of ecological crisis in recent times.

The ecovillage is a specific type of settlement created in response to an ecological, economic and social crisis. The pursuit of an environmentally friendly way of life and self-sufficiency is also reflected in the food culture of ecovillagers, providing an interpretation of safe food deeply embedded in the ecological discourse. The study presents the considerations that govern the foodways of ecovillagers and how these manifest in practice (from farm to table), analyzing it in a framework of interpretation that places the ecovillages in a broader social context. First, the author briefly presents the ecovillages and the specific community being studied. Next, she sets forth the risk and crisis concept providing the framework of interpretation, and outlines the food movements that respond to it. Finally, she turns to the description and analysis of the specific ethnographic material, the modalities of preparing for an ecological crisis, the relationship and significance of biodiversity and gastrodiversity, and demonstrates the role attributed to the community as an institution in this process.

**Keywords:** nutritional anthropology, food movements, biodiversity, gastrodiversity, ecovillage

---

<sup>1</sup> The author is greatly indebted to all ecovillage dwellers for their kind support of her research, and would like to express her gratitude to Eszter Kisbán and Anikó Bádi for their precious comments on the paper. An earlier version of the material was published in: *Tabula Online* 2015 16(1-2). [http://tabula.neprajz.hu/neprajz.07.16a.php?bm=1&as=418&kr=A\\_10\\_%3D%222015%2016%281-2%29%22](http://tabula.neprajz.hu/neprajz.07.16a.php?bm=1&as=418&kr=A_10_%3D%222015%2016%281-2%29%22)

Nutrition, as a fundamental human need as well as a manifestation of a cultural and social function, has always been the focus of research in cultural anthropology. Essential risks related to food, such as the issue of sufficient quantity and appropriate quality, are just as important in tribal groups as they are in industrial societies. Various concepts – sometimes radically different and at odds with each other – have emerged in modern societies to define food that can be considered safe. Studying these discourses represents a real promised land for contemporary food culture research, indicated by the wealth of scientific literature accumulated on this topic.

A substantial part of the literature consists of studies of various trends and movements associated with nutrition. As all social movements, food movements also operate as a kind of signalling system in society: on one hand, movements emerge basically as a reaction to a societal problem, and the problems they reflect as well as the attempts to formulate solutions also indicate the social dilemmas of the era (see HABERMAS 1981; SZABÓ 1993). On the other hand, however, the dynamics and thematic or methodological innovations of these movements point out the newly emerging problems of the life history of the movement in question. Such factors most recently include the thematization of the ecological crisis and the problematics of local and global approaches.

A special type of settlements, the ecovillage can be seen as a kind of answer to ecological – as well as economic and social – crisis. Ecovillagers, in general, usually want to set up a human habitat that adapts to its natural environment in the most efficient way and with the least harm possible. In order to achieve this, they farm without chemicals, try to use environmentally sound technologies in building, waste management, sewage treatment, and renewable energy resources. The main objectives include earning a living, trading and recreating locally, implementing autonomy and self-sufficiency to the extent possible, and creating a cooperative community based on a close texture of human relations (see BORSOS 2016; GILMAN AND GILMAN 1991). These ambitions, to set up an environmentally friendly life form close to nature, are reflected in their food culture as well, providing a specific interpretation of safe food deeply embedded in the ecological discourse.

I have conducted cultural anthropological research in Hungarian ecovillages for nearly ten years. In the course of my research, I took part in many community and family meals, saw a number of kitchens, larders, pens and vegetable gardens, purchased home-made food and produce, witnessed the bartering and giving away of produce and finished products, and so on.

In this study, I attempt to demonstrate which kinds of ideological considerations govern the eating habits of ecovillagers and how these ideologies manifest in the practices of an actual group of people, from the farm to the table. All this is analyzed in an intellectual context, putting ecovillages into the broader perspective of social sciences. First ecovillages as such are introduced in a nutshell, and then the actual community that is the subject of this study. Subsequently, the risk and crisis concepts that provide the framework of the interpretation are explained, and the food movements that provide the answers to all the questions raised are outlined next. Finally, the actual ethnographic material is described and analyzed, the different modalities of preparing for an ecological crisis, the significance and connection between biodiversity and gastrodiversity, and the role of the community as an institution in this process is demonstrated.

## ECOVILLAGES

The concept of the ecovillage has become widely used by the 1990s, but the first such initiatives emerged in Western Europe and the United States in the 1970s. The international network of ecovillages, Global Ecovillage Network (GEN), was founded in 1994.<sup>2</sup>

The Hungarian ecovillage movement started after the political transition in the early nineties. Hungarian ecovillagers are usually middle class urban intellectuals, motivated not so much by economic reasons but rather by the desire to develop a better life in terms of morals, culture, or ideology. They are characterized by wanderlust, the critique of urban life, and the idea of a kind of counter-world. In terms of their motivations, they are mostly distinguished from the other village-bound migration streams by the wish to create a lifestyle based on ecological commitment different from the mainstream. This approach does not manifest only in their relations with the environment – it penetrates all aspects of individual and community existence. In terms of their objectives, they differ from others who move to villages in the assumption of the role model approach: many want not merely to implement a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable lifestyle, but also to hand down the experiences and know-how thus acquired.<sup>3</sup>

Ecovillages are multi-colored. There are common goals, but the means and degrees of success of implementation are various. It then follows that you cannot generalize them. An outline of the aforementioned efforts was important to pointing out the fundamental common features. However, if you were to get close to the nutritional approach of ecovillages and enter their larder, pantry or kitchen, sit with them at the table, you would never find two households alike (just like in Hungarian society as a whole). This is why I chose a single eco-community; by presenting them, I wanted to illustrate the potential definitions in the food culture of ecovillages.

The studied community does not constitute a stand-alone village community; its members moved into an existing Hungarian village in Transdanubia. The settlement itself is a 400-strong economically deprived dead-end village, where locals and ecovillagers are accompanied by other urban emigrants.<sup>4</sup> Members of the eco-conscious group did not move in all at once; they attracted each other gradually, starting in 2003. Each of the families familiarized themselves with the potentials of the land and the village before moving in, and the loess-based hill range, the surrounding forests, and the water supply in the area seemed to be appropriate for implementing the planned community. Similarly, the affordable and existing unmodernized houses provided a great benefit for them, lending themselves easily to conversion in accordance with the ecological principles. And, in particular, the presence of an emerging community committed to the so-called *permaculture* – to be explained later – was of particular importance.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the history and roots of the ecovillage movement, see BATES 2003; FARKAS 2017. A short summary of ecovillage research is provided by WAGNER 2012.

<sup>3</sup> The Hungarian ecovillage movement is united by the *Hungarian Network of Living Villages* (MÉH), see: [www.elofaluhalozat.hu](http://www.elofaluhalozat.hu).

<sup>4</sup> According to the estimate of the mayor, currently approximately 40% of all incomers are urbanites. More on the village, locals and newcomers, see: FARKAS 2016a.

<sup>5</sup> For the motivation and process of moving to the countryside, see: FARKAS 2016b.

In the main study period (2010–2014), the group consisted of 8 households, with the adults in their thirties and the children ranging from a couple of months to 14 years old.<sup>6</sup> The diets of the households were greatly influenced by the marital status of those living in it, which also caused their diversity: a single young man living under very simple circumstances in a wine-press house lacking all infrastructure, a single mother raising her children alone, families with toddlers, and a childless young couple could all be found among them. Some of the school-aged children attended the local primary school, while secondary school students commuted to a neighboring town. The diets of the families living here were furthermore influenced by the income level and taste of the family members, as well as the strictness of their ideology by which they insisted on the ecological principles and the notion of self-sustenance.

In order to capture this diversity, I attempt to describe their foodways along three core values and principles that have a dominant impact on the life of the community: 1) the concept of crisis, 2) the ecological principle, and 3) the community as a goal.<sup>7</sup>

### CRISIS, RISK, FOOD MOVEMENTS

One of the key motivations of ecovillage organization is the vision that the present processes in the world are unsustainable and self-destructing, and a complex social, economic, moral and spiritual collapse is coming. In their minds, these processes, hand in hand with the global capitalist economic system, will finally cause a collapse by ruining the natural environment, depleting resources, and maintaining unequal distribution and social injustice. The reaction to these uncertainties and sense of danger is a radically new lifestyle experiment, an alternative risk management through the ecovillage concept, its lifestyle components and community approach. I'd like to emphasize that this is only one aspect of the ecovillage idea. The love for and desire to protect nature, living in harmony with nature and being part of a community in the countryside are equally important considerations. Their lifestyle is seen as an experiment of how to be as autonomous as possible, how to gain independence from the economic, infrastructural and social meshwork. Nourishment as a fundamental human need has a key role in this effort; this is the area where self-sufficiency is most intensively implemented and experimented with.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The composition of the community has undergone a lot of changes in the last three years. Several families initially studied moved out, and there are others who moved back. The paper focuses on a stable period of the group, when the life of a closely cooperating and relatively clearly defined set of people could be scrutinized more thoroughly. The reason why they are still considered a community in spite of the continuous changes is that in an attempt to adapt to contemporary social processes, the concept of community in social sciences goes beyond the notion of people living together for a long time and through many generations and makes community a social institution subject to free interpretation (for a Hungarian summary, see TÓTH G. 2002). In fact – at least at this time – they defined themselves as a community. By the way, as mentioned earlier, this was the most stable period of the group, characterized more by newcomers and close cooperation.

<sup>7</sup> Although it would be illuminating to study the food culture of the village as a whole, such an attempt surely exceeded the limits of a single paper. The topic is intended to be developed further at a later stage, focusing on the impact eating habits and related practices in the eco-community (gardening, community events, training courses) have on the village.

<sup>8</sup> They are quite aware of the fact that their current lifestyle cannot be seen as self-sufficient.

Striving for self-sufficiency has several reasons, all closely related to safety and risk: ecovillagers believe that self-produced food makes them independent of industrial agriculture, the food industry and trade, all of which would cause the supply of food to people in case of an eventual collapse impossible. On the other hand, self-produced foods are considered to be healthier, purer and more risk-free.

Concerns related to nourishment have always matched the approach to risk in any society.<sup>9</sup> The emergence of the issue of risk in the literature of nutrition is not new, since an appropriate amount and quality of food is of essential importance in all societies. In their work, Alan Beardsworth and Teresa Keil – having introduced the reader to the historical context of the concerns about food and nourishment – maintain that the two most important sources of harm throughout history was the lack of food (i.e., starvation) and diseased food. According to them, modern societies experience various risk factors related to nourishment just the same. However, while in former times religion, tradition and culture defined unanimously what was safe and what was not, in modern societies people are left to their own devices to make a decision related to their food. The disappearance of traditional forms of risk assessment and management, which offered a uniform pattern to everyone, put a much larger burden of decision-making on the individual and generated anxiety (BEARDSWORTH – KEIL 1997:150–160).

Of course, risks associated with starvation and infected food have not disappeared from modernity and Western countries; on the contrary, they were accompanied by further risk factors and dilemmas. Christian Coff, Michiel Korthals and David Barling refer to new developments in food culture research and associated technologies, which represent a challenge to traditional eating habits (see, for instance, unhealthy conventional diets such as foods causing various diseases). Also, the more recent ethical issues emerging in the course of food production are considered to be an important choice, such as sustainability, the working environment and livelihood of the producers, the use of biotechnology and nanotechnology, animal rights, or research ethics (COFF et al. 2008:9).

Besides striving to remain local, ecovillages are also connected to the change which tries to provide an answer to the problems above in the wider sense. Such a change occurred in the Hungarian context more recently, sprouting confidence-based distribution systems (Community Supported Agriculture groups, vegetable box communities, see: Szatyor, Évkerék Ökotanya, Nyitott Kert), the *local food* or *heritage food* movement, and so on (see also: GRASSEN 2013, 2014; KLEIN et al. 2014; LYSAGHT 2012; SINISCALCHI 2013). In other words, the members of the Hungarian ecovillage movement think it was important enough that some of them join these networks: the vegetable boxes produced by Évkerék Ökotanya contain goat cheese, Racka sheep yoghurt and oven-baked bread made of organic cereals from one of the ecovillages, and the local food items list of a Pécs (Baranya county) group regularly features products from the Gyűrűfű ecovillage nearby (goat cheese, honey, soap). Yet, the members of the community being studied deny entering the organic food market deliberately; for them, self-reliance is the priority. Some projects, gardening courses and seed saver operations relate to the Hungarian food movements to a certain extent, but they do not intentionally take part in the urban and market segment. Nevertheless, they are tied to the discourse of the movements outlined

<sup>9</sup> For cultural determination of risk see BECK 2003; DOUGLAS 1992; DOUGLAS – WILDAVSKY 1982.

above through a number of threads, and they fit in the context of the food movements because of the same problems brought to the forefront and the problem solving attempts which are – albeit different to an extent – fundamentally similar.

In the next chapters, we look at the food culture of an actual community belonging to the Hungarian ecovillage movement.

## DIVERSITY IN THE GARDEN AND IN NOURISHMENT

The response ecovillages provide to the specter of crisis is closely related to ecological principles, the framework of which is specified in this actual community by a specific lifestyle (and the inseparable farming system associated with it): permaculture. The group studied used to be a base for domestic permaculture,<sup>10</sup> distinguished from the other permaculture initiatives by their close community in the same physical habitat. The term ‘permaculture’ is derived from *permanent agriculture*, invented by Bill Mollison in the 1970s (MOLLISON 1978). For lack of space, the ambitions and history of this method cannot be covered here, yet a few elements must be discussed in order to understand the eating habits of the studied group.<sup>11</sup> The main goals include: replicating ecological processes of nature in human habitats and production; dramatic reduction of consumption; energy saving and recycling; creating self-reliant systems (garden, food, energy, community, etc.); covering own needs from own resources to the extent possible; providing multiple functions by one element and securing each function by multiple elements of the system; preferring and reinforcing mutually beneficial and symbiotic relationships; diversity; consideration for the welfare of all living things and the landscape as a whole instead of that of humans only. The principles above – according to the concept – generate practices that serve as preparations for the future through ecological sustainability. These principles dominate their foodways as well. As a young woman put it: permaculture is much more than merely *just picking up food in the garden*. It is a lot more: a lifestyle, a world view, with community as an essential ingredient (K. E. 2009).<sup>12</sup>

As presented above, the households in the community represented a variety of structures. This is true for the forms of livelihood as well. With a view to the ecological principles, group members tried to earn a living without commuting. Success stories included a telecommuting information technology expert, or people employed by the local council. One young woman was the employee of the local government before taking maternity leave, and later the government subsidy she received for the children

<sup>10</sup> See more in FARKAS 2017:80–82. The members of the community which is the subject of this study misinterpret the permaculture concept to some extent. In fact, permaculture is nothing more than a design system aiming at “the set up and maintenance of a consciously designed and agriculturally productive artificial ecosystem with the diversity, stability and resilience (resistance to external impacts) of the natural ecological systems. Man is integrated in it with the landscape, which provides food, energy, shelter and other tangible and intangible assets in a sustainable way” (BORSOS 2018:208). [added by reviewer]

<sup>11</sup> For more on this, see the homepage of the Hungarian Permaculture Association: <http://www.permakultura.hu/index.php> (accessed January 22, 2015). A number of texts in social sciences were also produced on permaculture, see, for instance: VETETO – LOCKER 2008.

<sup>12</sup> Quotes from interviews are identified by the initials of the responders and the year of recording.

represented a part of the family's income. The husband worked in the public works program and raised some income from odd jobs. Formerly their revenues were topped up by selling produce, but later this activity was abandoned. Another man also took odd jobs in the village (from farming to oven-making), and combined with selling self-grown produce (honey, vegetables, fruits), this constituted the income of the family. Another single man obtained some income from odd jobs as well, but he was also active in bartering, working for food, for example. Another family's main source of income was the subsidies received after each child, and in yet another household people mainly lived on formerly accumulated reserves along with maternity allowances. Still others in the community are unable to carve out a livelihood locally and spend part of the week away. Typically, group members sustain themselves on a shoestring budget, and a substantial part of their consumption accounts for home-grown vegetables, fruits and cereals, in some families even milk and eggs (the three families living here for the longest time lead the group in this respect). Cutting back consumption is also an integral part of their livelihood, following the principle of voluntary simplicity: being content with more simple means, they purchase the least things considered unnecessary.

All group members had their own kitchen garden, and most of them had farmland with cereal crops. House gardens were maintained by the residents themselves, but due to the layout of the street, some lots also had garden parcels facing the street, which were sometimes tilled jointly. Farmland was also partly farmed jointly to produce cereals (wheat – *Triticum aestivum*, barley – *Hordeum vulgare*, millet – *Panicum miliaceum*, oat – *Avena sativa*, Triticale – *Triticosecale*). Communal work, however, does not mean communal ownership; land was privately held, and those who agreed to work it jointly, grew wheat, millet, barley, etc., on the land of one, the other, or the third, respectively. Scheduling who worked together with whom in any one year was the outcome of the needs, joint discussions and, certainly, former experiences. There were not too many farm animals: only two families raised chickens, and one family had goats and cattle.

Both their farming and the organization of their everyday life were dominated by the desire to provide each important function by multiple components, and to associate each component with as many functions as possible. The latter is most commonly explained by the example of the chicken (maybe because Mollison himself used the same for explaining multiple benefits): a chicken is kept not only for its meat; other parts, such as feather, manure, eggs are also used, and it may pick up pests in the garden. Additionally, such a chicken not only provides multiple benefits but also lives under proper circumstances, which fits well the principle of strong respect for natural elements.

A component of the crisis vision is that resources providing our basic needs are in dramatically short supply and may vanish altogether. Unless a suitable replacement is found, this may lead to severe problems, such as food and energy crises. Therefore, besides growing their own food, members of the community also produce a lot more varieties of plants compared to the mainstream, trying to capitalize on the many kinds of uses they provide. Furthermore, their nourishment includes raw materials which – although put in the forefront by reform diets and in certain fashionable gastro-styles – are basically unknown in mainstream foodways. These include wild-growing species and plants that are considered weeds in a conventional garden. “This is how we create the resilience of the system; if one of the products fails, the rest would still meet our needs. This way our dependence is reduced and the chance of disasters minimized” (P. K. 2013).

In other words, biodiversity is extended to agricultural diversity, including gardens, orchards and, eventually, the kitchen.

In one of their books, two Hungarian sociologists, the Kapitánys (KAPITÁNY – KAPITÁNY 2007), highlight the reliance on the strength of tradition, the emergency activation of knowledge elements acquired in childhood or otherwise, the experiences handed down by the community but forgotten in the meantime, and the emergence of formerly proven cultural habits and procedures as those related to survival strategies. They include, among others, ingenious food-making practices, the rediscovery of substitutes, the food of the poor, and traditional meals. Since, as mentioned several times, the dominant component of the ecovillage concept is preparation for a crisis situation, the survival strategies the Kapitánys referred to also characterize ecovillages and feature in their foodways. Such practices in the studied group included the mapping of edible fruits and wild plants in the surroundings, the broadening of the knowledge base of edible wild fruits and weeds, and the keeping and consumption of these plants (i.e., *Chenopodiaceae* – *Chenopodium album* and *Chenopodium hybridum*, chickweed – *Stellaria media*, dandelions – *Taraxacum officinale*, purslane – *Portulaca oleracea*, Korean perilla – *Perilla frutescens*, burweed – *Arctium lappa*, etc.). Raw materials and food-making techniques that were less valued in peasant cultures and eventually abandoned were revitalized with the intention of overcoming temporary difficulties (see, among others, BÁTI 2010; GYÖRFFY L. 1978; SZABÓ L. 1991). The same practice was established in ecovillages, but with a different ambition: on the one hand, to be prepared for long-term, distant difficulties which are not yet existing in the present; and on the other, to apply the ecological principle of biodiversity in close connection with the former.

According to Eszter Kisbán, “[taste] includes subjective judgement of the food and at this point tradition and habit may temporarily be a real physiological impediment to the enjoyment of strange tasting, looking, or permanently forbidden, otherwise immaculate food items through the transmission of a system of conditioned reflexes” (KISBÁN 1982:203). A typical example is the consumption of plants known as weeds. This is demonstrated by not only the aversion of mainstream society to such foods, but, according to my own experiences, also by the reaction of interested audiences at the training courses meeting this specific lifestyle and eating habits for the first time, for whom it was a real adventure nibbling a piece of chickweed or some purslane leaves. The analysis of the green salad ingredients collected from the garden was a recurring moment during communal meals. Outsiders frequently looked at those meals as if they were eating the exotic meals of some distant, faraway land.

It is well known that gathering was an important component of vernacular foodways<sup>13</sup> (and, to an extent, in urban eating habits as well, such as the custom of mushroom gathering). Later it was abandoned and it has become a hallmark of poverty: certain kinds are surrounded by social taboos (rubbish-sifting), or associated with poverty (snail gathering, corn and grape grazing, lime blossom gathering). At the same time, some elements of gathering have been revaluated in the contemporary trends of recycling, as in the world of

<sup>13</sup> For the summary of gathering and use of wild plants (forest fruits, berries, leaves, seeds, herbs), see: GUNDA 2001:14–41. Other references: ANDRÁSFALVY 1964; BENCSEK 1983; BÓDI 1983; GAZDA 1970; GUNDA 1948, 1977; JUHÁSZ–MOLNÁR 1971; PÉNTÉK–SZABÓ 1985; SOLYMOS 1984; VIGA 1986, 1993; ZSUPOS 1987.



second-hand shops, recycled art, furniture scavenged off the street and renovated, or the renaissance of wild garlic and elderflower collection. Gathering all these – and a number of other – plants represents a supplementary source of nourishment in ecovillages and has yet another important role: mapping the sites, broadening the knowledge base, getting ready for the crisis. This does not mean that people go out to the fields to consume these plants on a regular basis, but that they gather them occasionally, during excursions, for instance. One day my host wanted to show me something on his corn field and, incidentally, mulberry was ripe on the nearby alley of mulberry trees. We combined business with pleasure and started the day with a fruit breakfast by making a detour to the fruit trees. Another time, collecting tours were organized when the plant or produce in question was ripe, specifically to collect the fruit (cornel, elderberry, horse chestnut, etc.).

Their diet regularly contains raw materials that are also present in reform nutrition, with the difference, however, that – at least in a couple of households – they produce them themselves. Living, fruit bearing specimens of millet, chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*), sesame (*Sesamum indicum*) or grass pea (*Lathyrus sativus*) could be seen in the gardens (triggering awe in visitors who thought them exotic), known to most of us only in the seed form, in bags or pouches from the stores.

Besides revitalizing forgotten produce and foods, a couple of households experimented with growing and consuming new, non-native and less known plant species and varieties as part of diversity enhancement and adaptive gardening.<sup>14</sup> Some of them may be familiar from exotic vegetable shelves of reform shops, such as sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*), artichoke (*Cynara scolymus*), Peruvian groundcherry, goldenberry (*Physalis peruviana* and *Physalis pruinosa*) or yam (*Dioscorea batatas*), and others, presumably, are unknown to most of us, such as skirret (or sugar root, *Sium sisarum*) or yacon (Peruvian ground apple, *Smallanthus sochifolius*). A significant role in this experimenting is played by the fact that some of the dwellers are qualified agricultural engineers, biologists, botanists or horticulturists. Consequently, they know not only the production technology but also the cultural history of these plants by heart, including mineral and vitamin content. The proverbial argument ‘it used to be eaten a long ago’ was supplemented here with scientific information. Two of the gardens and a jointly worked demonstration orchard were operated as a kind of gene bank, and there are households (3) where approximately 400 kinds of plants can be found in the garden. Besides augmenting biodiversity, this versatility allows a very varied nutrition and nourishment as well (gastrodiversity).

The various ways by which products are stored (in larders, pantries, cellars carved out from loess walls)<sup>15</sup> and preserved (home-canning, dehydration, drying) extend this diversity and abundance beyond the vegetation period, from late autumn to early spring. The group is characterized by a kind of provisionment approach, a part of which is seed catching, i.e., sowing and/or storing the seeds collected from their own plants.

“There are no recipes, because we cook what we find in the garden. We start by looking at what we have.” This response was repeated several times during a three-day

<sup>14</sup> Garden experiments using plants adapting to drought and climate change.

<sup>15</sup> They deliberately refrain themselves from freezers – because of the energy wasting operation thereof –, and only half the households have refrigerators. Instead, the storage and preservation methods applied in peasant cultures and – earlier on – in the local food culture are used.

course where attendants wanted to learn the recipes of dishes which they found special.<sup>16</sup> Locals tried to use what they could produce, in the spirit of striving for self-reliance. Although most of the vegetables and fruits eaten came from their own garden, there were some differences depending on life situation and needs: those who did not commute had more time and energy to be spent in the garden; those with more extensive experiences grew food supplies with greater certainty, while the ones who did not want to eat only seasonal food purchased products from the shops, etc. One of the families raised animals (cattle, goats, hens, ducks) so they could meet their needs in terms of milk, cheese, meat or eggs. The others used to buy milk from a local farmer up the street, but when the cow of the family mentioned above started to lactate, they preferred to buy from them. Cooking oil was purchased from an oil press nearby, while honey – after the local beekeeper moved out – was procured from other ecovillages or received as a gift. At one point they tried to grow and process their own cereals, but this attempt failed after a few years: ultimately, there was not enough stamina to perform the hard work (threshing, grinding) of growing and processing grain crops.

At the same time, products bought in stores could also be found in a great portion of the households. This is particularly true for families with children, where chocolate, yoghurt, tropical fruits, or Nutella were common, but there were also families who purchased cheese, other dairy products, flour, pasta, and, of course, salt and sugar in the shops (locally or in the neighboring community).<sup>17</sup> Because of the divergent ways nourishment was organized, it is very difficult to generalize here. However, the governing consideration in their choices was to consume predominantly their own produce or raw materials received from the members of the community, and even beyond this, when it came to shopping, they tried to purchase local and preferably organic products. Over the years, producer-consumer relations with villagers or producers in other communities nearby were developed, based on favorable experiences and a high degree of confidence. This is how they found a proven flour procurement location in the small town nearby, a source of cooking oil in another settlement, a dairy farmer up the street, and so on.

My experiences so far demonstrate that a kind of intermediate adaptation strategy – which does not make life unbearable or too difficult – was chosen instead of rigidly

<sup>16</sup> At one of the lunches, red mountain spinach (*Atriplex hortensis*), chard (*Beta vulgaris* var. *cicla*), a variety of spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*), artichoke (*Cynara scolymus*) and Peruvian yacon (*Smallanthus sochifolius*) were put on the pizza base, on another occasion pan-fried root vegetables (yacon – *Smallanthus sochifolius*, two or three kinds of batatas – *Ipomoea batatas*, purple potatoes – *Solanum tuberosum*, carrots – *Daucus carota* subsp. *sativus*, oxalis tuberose plant (uqa in Quechua) – *Oxalis tuberosa*) and dehydrated tomatoes (*Solanum lycopersicum*) were served as the main course, accompanied by a green salad consisting of four or five types of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*), spinach (*Spinacia oleracea*), Botany bay spinach – *Tetragonia tetragonoides*, Malabar spinach – *basella rubra*), dandelion leaves (*Taraxacum officinale*) and other ‘weeds’, decorated with pot marigold petals (*Calendula officinalis*) and borage petals (*Borago officinalis*). Everything came from the kitchen garden of the host. The quote above also gained a wider interpretation: it was applicable to both the setup of one’s own garden and to the lifestyle experiment as a whole.

<sup>17</sup> Peasants hardly spent any money on food up until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the spirit of self-reliance, if something did not yield enough (because of natural calamities or war), it was not purchased, but simply omitted from the diet (for more on this, see the summary of BÁTI 2010, and an actual example in FÉL – HOFER 1997). Such unilateral stockpiling is not typical for ecovillages.

following the principles.<sup>18</sup> The multi-faceted difficulties and eventual moving out of some of the members was explained in the community by their fanatically frugal lifestyles. No consensus or a common set of rules have been established about the correct dividing line between exaggeration and neglecting the principles, or in other words, the definition of the proper extent of adaptation. There was an intention in the early history of the community to formulate a common set of principles, to define where they want to head, but this was not implemented in the end.

It might have become obvious by now that members of the community eat mainly self-made food, from local or own sources to the extent possible. You might witness the high value placed on self-produced and ‘home-made’ products in mainstream society as well, *local*, *home-made* and *own* being all magical words that attract a specific type of consumers. Such attitudes are associated with a certain amount of nostalgia: yearning for the old, the vernacular, the rural, the natural, interest cast in an idealized rural ‘other’.

Domestic ecovillages organize a three-day-long ecovillage meeting twice a year, once in summer and once in winter, which are also attended by interested parties other than ecovillagers. Meals are eaten communally, including potluck meals for breakfast and dinner, when everybody would bring something to the communal table. Potluck meals serve as a presentation and exhibition of one’s own food products and represent a good occasion for boasting. Everybody tastes and praises the foods, recipes change hands. If the food is made of one’s own raw materials, its value is even higher (that is, bread and cakes made from own grain, honey, fruits, cheese home-made or at least originating from a local farmer or crafter). Put ‘mass products’ bought from shops on the table is uncommon. You would not be scorned for it, but food of this kind will be marginalized, to say the least. Then there are some famous food items, such as the nut bread of one ecovillager, which is always in high demand at the meetings.

In addition to nostalgia, such home-made, local products bear an additional significance in the minds of ecovillagers: they fit the ecological model well. The basic approach of ecological principles is thinking in systems and cycles, considerate and restrained consumption of local resources, and recycling.<sup>19</sup> Home-made bread, cheese, locally produced eggs, meat, marmalade, syrup, brandy, etc., using environmentally friendly methods fit this principle well.

<sup>18</sup> A similar attitude is reported by Philip Vanini and Jonathan Taggart from a research conducted in 11 Canadian ecological communities: while localization and sustainability are important, enjoying the small pleasures of life seems to be equally important in the community studied by them, and instead of following the environmental ideology at any cost, a kind of pragmatic, merry approach was seen – which, however, is still a far cry from mainstream society’s concept of a comfortable, good life (VANINI – TAGGART 2014).

<sup>19</sup> Recycling is an important component of households anyway, including the kitchen: no food is discarded, leftovers are eaten up or used again by giving it a new form as much as possible. Just a few personally observed examples: the rice side dish was left over one day and was revived as rice pudding with fruit on the next; my host baked a walnut stuffed spiral in the oven from the leftover pasta of the ‘Baumkuchen’ baked on the campfire the previous night. Vegetable and fruit remnants (stem, peel, etc.) go to the compost heap, to get into the earth and contribute to producing food next year. Water is also handled with care and returned to the circulation: chemical-free wash-up water is used in the garden. Of course, the recycling potential of leftover food is not reserved for ecovillages, the exception being that the principle of economizing which was believed by our forebears is substantiated here by the ecological ideology.

At the same time, products made of one's own source materials by hand are assigned a certain spiritual quality as well. A young woman, when relating how quickly she sold out of her products on the local market (marmalade, vegetable creams), put it this way: "We have a spiritual relationship with the product, and this is perceived by people, this is the reason why they buy it" (B. R. 2010). In other words, metaphysical and spiritual contents are also present in thinking about food. Kandel and Peltó include the so-called *organic-motive*, preferring organic and natural food as opposed to any kind of synthetic products. With respect to our topic here, the *mystic motive* seems just as important, that is, the symbolic attributes of food which determine its choice. For instance, raw food is thought to have a stronger life energy, or the importance of yin and yang balance in macrobiotic diets (KANDEL – PELTO 1980:335). A closely related observation is that symbolism has a specifically great significance in healthy nutrition movements: they maintain that modern food is over-processed, contaminated and lacking essential nutrients, while healthy food bears the signs of naturalness, and is tied to tradition and folk wisdom. The latter are 'clean and natural' foods, representing a balance against the stressful, destructive, unhealthy modern lifestyle.<sup>20</sup> Healthy food movements create and formulate the connection between the cultural and the natural in the language of symbolism and along the aforementioned approaches (KANDEL – PELTO 1980:335). Ecovillage narratives frequently refer to the opposition pairs of vegetables and fruits picked freshly from your garden versus those purchased from the department store. Healthy food is in its natural state. In this respect, the main hazards are not represented by biological risk factors such as viruses, bacteria or fungi, but rather pesticides, additives, preservatives and other chemicals and 'non-natural' starting materials (GMO). In the words of Deborah Lupton – and with reference to the artificial man created by Frankenstein – *frankenfoods* (LUPTON 1998:92). Clean/unclean issues are formulated in this context as sprayed/non-sprayed and natural/unnatural counterparts. Visitors coming for a training course or just to see the place are exhilarated by the exciting new freedom of just picking a piece of fruit or vegetable from the plant and – following the example of their hosts – eating it without washing. The raw food item consumed directly from the garden thus loses its former unclean (sprayed, dirty, unwashed, not prepared) property and becomes connected to nature (the earth, the plants) without any mediator – a key idea in ecovillages. Similarly, guests see it as crossing a boundary and a new type of freedom when they taste plants they considered earlier as weeds and not food.<sup>21</sup>

## EATING AND COMMUNITY

Sustainable nourishment for ecovillages is closely associated with their relationship to the land, hands-on experiences, the transfer of traditional knowledge and techniques into practice, and community as such. All this is based on mutuality and cooperation

<sup>20</sup> Clean is meant by the authors as culturally construed cleanliness, and the concept is used in this paper in the same meaning. For more on this, see DOUGLAS 1966.

<sup>21</sup> Alice Bombrin, studying the nourishment of ecovillages, also found this was important: "Eating the fruits directly from the plant is another way to break down mediations and to create a most direct horizontal way to relate through the consumption of food" (BOMBRIN 2015a:472).

(see BROMBIN 2015a, 2015b).<sup>22</sup> Besides common efforts to produce food, meals bear a specific significance. Communal meals are practiced not only at the ecovillage meetings but are also an important part of the everyday life of the studied community. When the group was most active, members regularly ate dinner together, rotating hosts, and a number of local traditions grew out of this. Such dinners were also ‘potluck parties’, and in addition to food, everyone also brought glasses, plates, utensils, which were then taken back home to be washed, sparing the host both the preparations and the cleaning up. Throughout the years it was observed that these communal meals played the role of a sensitive indicator as to the state of the community: harmony and tensions, respectively, were clearly indicated by the joining, re-joining, or dropping off of members, and by the occurrence/omission of those meals.

An additional community institution related to food – also organized in other Hungarian ecovillages – is the concept of *komatál*, i.e., the community assistance of a new mother in confinement and her family.<sup>23</sup> After a while, new mothers were helped out not only by the members of the closer community subject to this study, but also by other newcomers from the broader community. Members of the group shared the work and discussed who, when, and what kind of warm food should supply. (Or even who would undertake the job of washing or taking care of the older children, etc.) This commitment was voluntary, and even the elderly participated, who no longer needed any *komatál* but might be rewarded in some other way.

In fact, great significance is attributed not merely to communal eating but also the process by which raw materials are grown and make their way into kitchens and onto plates. Community existence and all kinds of common activities, such as joint production and processing, are all interpreted as a method of preparing for the crisis outlined above. As mentioned, attempts were made at communal grain production, including further workflows (harvesting, threshing) done collectively. Marmalade was prepared collectively, tomatoes canned, etc. Since ecological principles require that machinery be phased out (see FARKAS 2015), the importance of human labor increased and led to the need for communal work (either because the given work cannot be accomplished alone, or because work is more fun when done together). Similarly, barter and swapping are seen as tightening human relations. The subject of the exchange may be produce (vegetables, fruits, eggs, milk as raw materials, marmalade, syrup, honey, etc., as processed food), tools or labor. Or even an exchange of courtesies, as seen in the case of the ‘*komatál*’. Their combination is also common: one of the families needed a lot of labor for their big garden, a single man had no income, so the former provided food and accommodation to the latter in exchange for his workforce for years. There is no traditionally developed set of rules for such services and counter services in this new, intentional community.<sup>24</sup> In

<sup>22</sup> The importance of community is emphasized in the definition of permaculture found on the home page of the Hungarian *Permaculture Association*. Permaculture is “a natural lifestyle protecting nature; *Living human communities*; A global solution to the environmental problems” (emphasis added). BAJI, no date. <http://www.permakultura.hu/index.php> (accessed January 21, 2015.)

<sup>23</sup> ‘*Komatál*’ or godmother’s pot: a standard custom in peasant culture when female relatives and friends bring food to the new mother in confinement and her family, as long as she is not able to supply herself and her family. For ethnographic references, see: KISBÁN 1997:557; KNÉZY 1975; SCHWALM 1989.

<sup>24</sup> Ecovillages are so-called *intentional* communities, i.e., they were created by the conscious efforts of larger and/or smaller groups.

an exciting period of community development, there were many discussions about how to determine the units of measurement in the barter or exchange process, such as, how many zucchinis are worth one kilogram of home-made muesli.

## CONCLUSION

It is well known from the anthropological literature on nutrition that food plays an important role in drawing boundaries and enabling communication across borders, whether they are boundaries between social groups or human and non-human (natural, supernatural) entities. It is also well known that food, as a symbol, provides information about world view and lifestyle as a whole (see APPADURAI 1981; BOMBRIN 2015a, 2015b; DOUGLAS 1966; GOODY 1982; LÉVY-STRAUSS 1966). This also means that how and from what sources food is prepared indicates relationship to the environment, pointing out and at the same time influencing how the natural and social environment is perceived and understood.

It is not too surprising, therefore, that the sensitivity characteristic of ecovillagers in their thinking and relations with nature is also manifested in their nourishment, from farm to table. 'Clean food' raises the notion of pure nature, aiming at the attainment of a clean nature, a natural and just life.

Hopefully this study helps the reader understand that food and meals are indeed able to reflect the world view of their makers, as a medium of the principles which they try to follow. At the same time, the given conditions and current situation of the families require some flexibility in handling the principles and the various methods of adaptation. The dialogues, judgement, thinking about boundaries and norms are just as interesting as the actual study of nourishment. Taken together, a world view focusing on a sustainable future and the practices of nourishment deeply embed the ecovillages and each of the ecovillagers in the discourses on the actual criticism of globalization.

## REFERENCES CITED

ANDRÁSFALVY, Bertalan

- 1964 *A Duna menti gyümölcsöskertek. Adatok a magyarországi déli Duna-szakasz népi gyümölcs kultúrájának ismeretéhez*. MTA Dunántúli Tudományos Intézete Értekezések. [Orchards along the Danube. Contribution to the Knowledge of Vernacular Fruit Culture of the Southern Hungarian Danube Section. HAS Scientific Institute in Transdanubia] Pécs.

APPADURAI, Arjun

- 1981 Gastro-Politics in Hindu South Asia. *American Ethnologist* 8(3):494–511.

BATES, Albert

- 2003 Ecovillage Roots (and Branches). *Communities Magazine* 117. <http://gen.ecovillage.org/iservices/publications/articles/CM117RootsandBranches.pdf> (accessed March 20, 2013.)

- BÁTI, Anikó  
 2010 Táp-érték [Nutritional Value]. In BALI, János – BÁTI, Anikó – KISS, Réka (eds) *Inde Aurum – Inde Vinum – Inde Salutem: Paládi-Kovács Attila 70. születésnapjára*. 458–474. Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézet – ELTE BTK Tárnyi Néprajzi Tanszék.
- BEARDSWORTH, Alan – KEIL, Teresa  
 1997 *Sociology on the Menu. An Imitation to the Study of Food and Society*. London: Routledge.
- BECK, Ulrich  
 1992 *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
- BENCSIK, János  
 1983 A gyűjtögető gazdálkodás emlékei. [Memories of Gathering Economies] In DANKÓ, Imre (ed) *Békés város néprajza*. 277–292. Békés.
- BORSOS, Béla  
 2016 *Az új Gyűrűfű. Az ökofalu koncepciója és helye a fenntartható település- és vidékfejlesztésben* [The New Gyűrűfű. The Concept and Place of Ecovillages in Sustainable Settlement and Rural Development]. Budapest: L’Harmattan.  
 2018 *Fertile Ground*. Budapest: Typotext.
- BÓDI, Erzsébet  
 1983 A gyűjtögető gazdálkodás emlékei Szirénfalván. 1. Gombászás; 2. Vadgyümölcsök és termékek felhasználása; 3. Virágok, levelek, szárak, ágak és gyökerek gyűjtése [Memories of Gathering Economies in Szirénfalva. 1. Mushroom Gathering; 2. Use of Wild Fruits and Produce; 3. Collecting Flowers, Leaves, Stems, Twigs and Roots]. *Múzeumi Kurír* 41:63–66; 42:95–101; 43:66–72.
- BROMBIN, Alice  
 2015a *Faces of Sustainability in Italian Ecovillages: Food as ‘Contact Zone’*. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 39:468–477.  
 2015b “Luxurious Simplicity”. Self-sufficient Food Production in Italian Ecovillages. In SLOAN, Philip – LEGRAND, Willy – HINDLEY, Clare (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Sustainable Food and Gastronomy*, 3–20. London New York: Routledge.
- BRUCKMEIER, Karl  
 2015 “Eating the Planet” – Seeking a Philosophy of Food in the Anthropocene. *Socio.hu. The Social Meaning of Food*. Special issue in English 3:5–21.
- BRUNORI, Gianluca  
 2007 *Local Food and Alternative Food Networks: A Communication Perspective*. *Anthropology of Food*, [Online], S2, March 2007, <https://aof.revues.org/430#text> (accessed June 29, 2017.)
- COFF, Christian – KORTHALS, Michiel – BARLING, David  
 2008 *Ethical Traceability and Informed Food Choice*. In COFF, Christian – KORTHALS, Michiel – BARLING, David – NIELSEN, Thorkild (eds) *Ethical Traceability and Communicating Food*, 1–23. Dordrecht: Springer.
- COUNIHAN, Carole – SINISCALCHI, Valeria (eds)  
 2014 *Food Activism: Agency, Democracy and Economy*. London: Bloomsbury.

- CUCCO, Ivan – FONTE, Maria  
 2015 Local Food and Civic Food Networks as a Real Utopias Project. *Socio.hu. The Social Meaning of Food*. Special issue in English 3:22–36.
- DOUGLAS, Mary  
 1966 *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Allen & Unwin.  
 1992 *Risk and Blame. Essays in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge.
- DOUGLAS, Mary – WILDAVSKY, Aaron  
 1982 *Risk and Culture. An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- FARKAS, Judit  
 2015 ‘We Should Give It Some Time.’ Case Study on the Time Horizon of an Ecological Lifestyle-Community. *Acta Univ. Sapientiae Social Analysis* 5(1):43–62. <http://www.acta.sapientia.ro/acta-social/CS-1/social51-04.pdf>  
 2016a „Mindenki, aki idejön, meg akarja változtatni a falut.” Migráció, közösség és vidékfejlesztés egy tolnai faluban [“All who Come Here Want to Change the Village.” Migration, Community and Rural Development in a Tolna Village]. *Erdélyi Társadalom*, XIV(1):113–132.  
 2016b “Where Is the Large Garden that Awaits Me?” Critique Through Spatial Practice in a Hungarian Ecological Community. *Socio.hu. Space and Society – Special Issue in English* 2016(4):116–134. <http://www.socio.hu/uploads/files/2016en/farkas.pdf>  
 2017 ‘Very Little Heroes’: History and Roots of the Ecovillage Movement. *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica* 62(1):69–87.
- FÉL, Edit – HOFER, Tamás  
 1997 *Arányok és mértékek a paraszti gazdálkodásban* [Proportions and Scales in Peasant Economy]. Budapest: Balassi Kiadó.
- GAZDA, Klára  
 1970 Adatok a sepsiszentkirályi gyűjtögető gazdálkodáshoz [Contributions to the Gathering Economy at Sepsiszentkirály]. *Aluta* I. 421–428.
- GOODY, Jack  
 1982 *Cooking, Cuisine and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GRASSEN, Cristina  
 2013 *Beyond Alternative Food Networks: Italy’s Solidarity Purchase Groups*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.  
 2014 Seeds of Trust. Italy’s Gruppi di Acquisto Solidale (Solidarity Purchase Groups). *Journal of Political Ecology* 21:178–192. [http://jpe.library.arizona.edu/volume\\_21/Grasseni.pdf](http://jpe.library.arizona.edu/volume_21/Grasseni.pdf) (accessed June 29 2017.)
- GUNDA, Béla  
 1948 *A magyar gyűjtögető és zsákmányoló gazdálkodás kutatása* [Studying Hungarian Gathering and Hunting Economies]. Budapest: Néptudományi Intézet.  
 1977 Gathering of Wild Plants among the Hungarian People. *Acta Ethnographica* XXVI:1–24.



- 2001 A vadnövények gyűjtése [Gathering Wild Plants]. In PALÁDI-KOVÁCS, Attila (ed. in chief) *Magyar Néprajz II. Gazdálkodás*. 11–40. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- GYÖRFFY, Lajos  
 1978 A „rettenetes esztendő”, az 1863. évi „nagyínség” emlékezete [The ‘Terrible Year’, Memories of the ‘Great Famine’ of 1863]. *Szolnok Megyei Múzeumi Évkönyv*. 91–103.
- HABERMAS, Jürgen  
 1981 New Social Movements. *Telos* 49:33–37.
- JUHÁSZ, Antal – MOLNÁR, Imre  
 1971 Gyűjtögetés, víziélet. [Gathering, Aquatic Life]. In JUHÁSZ, Antal (ed) *Tápé története és néprajza*. 257–269. Tápé.
- KAPITÁNY, Ágnes – KAPITÁNY, Gábor  
 2007 *Túlélési stratégiák. Társadalmi adaptációs módok* [Survival Strategies. Social Adaptation Methods]. Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó.
- KISBÁN, Eszter  
 1982 Táplálkozás [Food Culture]. In ORTUTAY, Gyula (ed) *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon* 5., 202–204. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.  
 1997 Táplálkozáskultúra (Food Culture). In PALÁDI-KOVÁCS, Attila (ed. in chief) *Magyar Néprajz IV. Életmód*. 417–583. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KLEIN, Jakob A. – JUNG, Yuson – CALDWELL, Melissa L.  
 2014 Introduction: Ethical Eating and (Post)socialist Alternatives. In KLEIN, Jakob A. – JUNG, Yuson – CALDWELL, Melissa L. (eds) *Ethical Eating in the Postsocialist and Socialist World*, 1–21. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.
- KNÉZY, Judit  
 1975 A táplálkozás szokásai és rendszere Gige, Csököly, Rinyakovácsi és Kisbajom belső-somogyi községekben [Eating Habits and Systems in Gige, Csököly, Rinyakovácsi and Kisbajom in the Inner Somogy]. *Somogyi Múzeumok Közleményei* 2:103–118.
- LÉVY-STRAUSS, Claude  
 1966 The Culinary Triangle. *Partisan Review* 33:586–595.
- LYSAGHT, Patricia (ed)  
 2012 *Time for Food. Everyday Food and Changing Meal Habits in a Global Perspective*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- LUPTON, Deborah  
 1998 *Food, the Body and the Self*. London: Sage Publications.
- MOLLISON, Bill – HOLMGREN, David  
 1978 *Permaculture One: A Perennial Agriculture for Human Settlements*. New York: Transworld Publishers.
- PÉNTEK, János – SZABÓ, Attila  
 1985 *Ember és növényvilág. Kalotaszeg növényzete és népi növényismerete* [Man and the World of Plants. Vegetation and Folk Plant Knowledge in Kalotaszeg]. Bukarest.

SCHWALM, Edit

1989 A palócok táplálkozása ünnepeken és hétköznapiokon [Holiday and Everyday Eating Habits of the Palóc]. In BAKÓ, Ferenc (ed) *Palócok. III.* 379–495. Eger.

SINISCALCHI, Valeria

2013 Environment, Regulation and the Moral Economy of Food in the Slow Food Movement. *Journal of Political Ecology* 20:295–305.

SOLYMOS, Ede

1984 A természeti környezet elemi kihasználásának emlékei [Memories of Elemental Exploitation of the Natural Environment]. In BÁRTH, János (ed) *Kecel története és néprajza.* 509–519. Kecel.

SZABÓ, Lajos

1991 Aszály a Nagykunságban a XVIII. század végén [Draught in Nagykunság at the End of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century]. *Zounek* 6:99–112.

SZABÓ, Máté

1993 *Alternatív mozgalmak Magyarországon* [Alternative Social Movements in Hungary]. Budapest: Gondolat.

TÓTH G., Péter

2002 A „közösség”. Egy fogalom megalkotása, kiteljesedése, széthullása és felszámolása [‘Community’. Creation, Enlargement, Fall and Disintegration of a Concept]. In PÓCS, Éva (ed) *Közösség és identitás.* Studia Ethnologica Hungarica III., 9–31. Budapest–Pécs: L’Harmattan.

VETETO, James R. – LOCKYER, Joshua

2008 Environmental Anthropology Engaging Permaculture: Moving Theory and Practice Toward Sustainability. *Culture & Agriculture* 30(1–2):47–58.

VIGA, Gyula

1986 *Tevékenységi formák és a javak cseréje a Bükk-vidék népi kultúrájában* [Forms of Activity and Swapping Goods in the Vernacular Culture of the Bükk Country]. Borsodi kismonográfiák 23. Miskolc.

1993 A tárkányi Tisza-kertek. Az ártéri gyümölcsösök hasznosításának formáihoz [The Tisza Gardens of Tárkány. Contribution to the Forms of Utilisation of Floodplain Orchards] *Ethnographia* CIV:425–434.

WAGNER, Felix

2012 Ecovillage Research Review. In MARCUS, Andreas – WAGNER, Felix (eds) *Realizing Utopia: Ecovillage Endeavors and Academic Approaches*, RCC Perspectives 8:135–48. <http://www.environmentandsociety.org/perspectives/2012/8/article/ecovillage-research-review> (accessed June 29, 2017.)

ZSUPOS, Zoltán

1987b Dél-Gömör gyűjtögető gazdálkodása [Gathering Economies in Southern Gömör]. *Gömör néprajza* X. Debrecen.

Online sources:

<http://www.elofaluhalozat.hu/> (accessed 29 June, 2017.)

<http://evkerek.blogspot.hu/p/kerdesek-es-valaszok.html> (accessed 29 June, 2017.)

[www.gen.ecovillage.org](http://www.gen.ecovillage.org) (accessed 29 June, 2017.)

<http://www.permakultura.hu/index.php> (accessed 29 June, 2017.)

---

**Judit Farkas**, Ph.D., is assistant professor in the Department of Ethnography and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Pécs. She graduated from the University of Pécs with a degree in cultural anthropology in 1999, ethnography in 2001, and Hungarian language in 2002, and a Ph.D. in 2006. Since 2003 she has been teaching at the Department of Ethnography and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Pécs.

Her narrower area of expertise is the study of religious, social and ecological movements, and she spent the most time researching Hungarian Krishna devotees and domestic eco-villages: she continues to research the history, socio-cultural background, organizational ideologies, social structure and way of life of these communities.

---

