

MARTOR



Title: “The Gaiță Family within and beyond the Ritual”

Author: Otilia Hedeșan

How to cite this article: Hedeșan, Otilia. 1997. "The Gaiță Family within and beyond the Ritual." *Martor* 2: 107-115.

Published by: *Editura MARTOR* (MARTOR Publishing House), *Muzeul Țăranului Român* (The Museum of the Romanian Peasant)

URL: <http://martor.muzeultaranuluiroman.ro/archive/martor-2-1997/>

Martor (The Museum of the Romanian Peasant Anthropology Journal) is a peer-reviewed academic journal established in 1996, with a focus on cultural and visual anthropology, ethnology, museum studies and the dialogue among these disciplines. *Martor Journal* is published by the Museum of the Romanian Peasant. Interdisciplinary and international in scope, it provides a rich content at the highest academic and editorial standards for academic and non-academic readership. Any use aside from these purposes and without mentioning the source of the article(s) is prohibited and will be considered an infringement of copyright.

Martor (Revue d'Anthropologie du Musée du Paysan Roumain) est un journal académique en système *peer-review* fondé en 1996, qui se concentre sur l'anthropologie visuelle et culturelle, l'ethnologie, la muséologie et sur le dialogue entre ces disciplines. La revue *Martor* est publiée par le Musée du Paysan Roumain. Son aspiration est de généraliser l'accès vers un riche contenu au plus haut niveau du point de vue académique et éditorial pour des objectifs scientifiques, éducatifs et informationnels. Toute utilisation au-delà de ces buts et sans mentionner la source des articles est interdite et sera considérée une violation des droits de l'auteur.

Martor is indexed by EBSCO and CEEOL.

The Gaiță Family *within* and *beyond* the Ritual

Otilia Hedeșan

University of Timișoara

In 1967-1973, the Circle of Folklore of the Timișoara University has carried on several ethnological investigations at Mehadica, in the Caraș-Severin department. The systematic interest in the customs of the community was determined by one particular event which took place in the winter of 1967: during the very stay of the researchers in the area, a young man, Iosim Gaiță, aged thirty, died of a violent death. His funeral was organized according to the rites exclusively devoted to those who die young, starting from the symbolic analogy between a man's and a tree's life – the fir, in this case. The whole ceremony was filmed¹ and the film was then shown in many academic circles.

The film made by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, metaphorically entitled „Bradule, brăduțule” (*Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree*), enjoyed a tremendous success. This was due to its strong *ciné-vérité* effect, quite unusual for the ethnographic films at the moment, but also to its coming as a real help for some of the fundamental Romanian studies about funerals². This is why the two film makers have returned to Mehadica to film some of the post-burial ceremonies performed by Iosim Gaiță's family³, but also the main aspects of everyday life and some moments of the popular calendar⁴.

My research was generated by the ethnological investigations I shall describe in what fol-

lows. More general observation about life and communitary ceremonies from Mehadica was not taken into account, and I only focussed on Iosim Gaiță's family. The documents which served me as a starting point were the films: „Bradule, brăduțule” (*Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree*), „Soare, soare...” (*Sun, oh! Sun...*), „Pâinea ceremonială și cultul strămoșilor” (*The Ceremonial Bread and the Worship of the Ancestors*⁵) and showing the rituals performed by Iosim Gaiță's family at his burial and afterward. I took less interest in the ceremonies performed 25 years ago, and instead I wanted to compare those attitudes having a definite communitary motivation with the family's reaction at seeing the film of that passed event.

As Vasile Crețu had already shown in Mehadica his first film *Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree*, I only chosed to show the second one, *Sun, oh! Sun*, a film about the mourning ceremonies (tying the deceased to his house, giving alms of water, of clothes, buying back the deceased, the alms dance).

This film served me a double purpose: it was a stimulant in my discussions with Iosim Gaiță's family and it was also a document about post-burial rituals in Mehadica in the seventies.

Sun, oh! Sun follows *Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree* and shows the most important ceremonial moments of the mourning period. On coming back

from the cemetery, the family offer a commemorative repast and serve several courses made of the flesh of the finest ram in the flock. The next day, a group of old women go to the cemetery to 'tie the deceased to his house'.

They go round the grave, burn tow and say: 'Here is your home, here is your dinner, this is where you come from, here you will stay'. Six weeks after the burial, alms of the clothes having belonged to the deceased are given to a man in the village. The widow must hold each and every item to the sun and say: 'Sun, oh, sun, please witness these clothes. In this world they will belong to Ion, and in that world to Iosîm'. Then alms of water are given, as it is believed that the deceased should benefit of a water spring in that world. This water spring must be 'released' according to a specific custom („slobozirea apei"); on the river bank they place small ritual breads („colaci"), apples and candles. The widow pours some water from a jug on a towel near the river, and then a ritual bread with a candle and a small board with four burning candles are sent down the river. On that day, the alms of food contain two more special breads: one is sun-shaped and the other is moon-shaped. The widow must light candles for he or she who died – after her husband in this particular case, because this is a means of 'buying back her husband'. A year after the burial, a dance for the alms takes place: three symbolic trees, decorated with ginger bread, are offered to three men – to the leader of the dance, to the one in the middle and to the one who ends the dance.

These rituals are persistent through the ages and their unity may be observed on a larger geographic area, from Caraş-Severin to the Timoc valley⁶. Some aspects of the rituals I have just mentioned were carefully described by Aurel Iana who was interested in the customs near Oraviţa⁷ which were attested afterward by Simeon Florea Marian in his important monography devoted to the Romanians' funerary customs. The most recent description was recorded by Emil Petrovici (1935, p. 58): «On the ninth day, six weeks, half a year and a year following the

burial, they use to give alms of water (...). They also make a big ritual bread (*colac*), a *prescura*, an *arangel*, a *limba* (other types of ritual breads) and three or four more small *colaci*; they take two willow branches, or two nut tree branches; they tie to the branch a bunch of flowers, a candle and a coin; they place this branch on the river bank together with the ritual breads and the lit candles, and they say: 'This be the alms for the deceased (they name him)'. Then they pour water from the jug and say: 'This water be for the deceased (they name him)'. The towel is thrown into the river, and a woman or a boy must catch it three times with a branch. Then they give alms of the towel, the branch and the ritual bread».

Considering the variability inherent to traditional cultural achievements as a matter which does not affect the rites I have studied, I must conclude with Arnold Van Gennep (1996, p. 131) that at first sight it might seem that within the funerary rites the leave-taking gestures are the most important while the threshold and aggregation rites are less developed. Nevertheless, the research demonstrates that the leave-taking rites are not so numerous and are very simple. Among all funerary rites those meant to accomplish the aggregation of the deceased in the realm of the dead are the most complicated and are looked upon as the most important.

The first step of my documentation made me reconstruct a field⁸ where I knew I needed new instruments of investigation, but was also aware that more often than not a researcher might commit errors. I started my research on the 18th-19th of June 1994, I continued it on the 17th of March, and on the 25th-27th of August 1995, then I finally published the result of my investigations. I shall present the most important aspects of my field experiments and some of the problems I was confronted with.

Meeting the subjects

The 18th of June, on a Saturday afternoon, Maria Gaiţă, Iosîm Gaiţă's widow, and their

younger daughter, Ruja Raia, were weeding on a lot near the cemetery. Even if we had come there unannounced, both mother and daughter gladly welcomed us. To them, this meeting meant a sudden revival of their husband's and father's death. The fact I said I was coming from Timișoara, from the University Folklore Archives, immediately established a relation between my present investigations and the tragical event filmed in 1967. From the very beginning the two women asked me to come to the cemetery. This was but a first step in replacing Ioșim Gaiță in the center of the research. The widow and her daughter have told me a lot of things but refused to become themselves the subjects of a separate investigation. They wanted to remain in the shadow of the missing person.

Here is the rendition of the most important part of the discussion we had in the cemetery:

Ruja Raia (the daughter): *I must confess I don't remember very much... As you may already know from the film, I was only a child at the time. I was four years old, I can't remember much of the funeral. What I can remember is from the film (Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree). What can I tell you? When they buried my father, I didn't come up here, mother left us with some neighbours, but I think I had come here earlier with some other children. I remember all the mud and the melt snow and the water in the grave... I don't know very much, except for the things I saw in the film.*

Otilia Hedeșan: When did you first see the film?

R.R.: *I think it was two years later. I was six or seven. I was talking to my sister and she was telling me she was a schoolgirl in the first form (...). Somebody came and called for the people to the village Cinema, but I still can't remember much. In 1987 Professor Crețu came to Herculan and showed the film there. It was then I may say, when I really saw it. But all these memories are painful... In a way, perhaps we shouldn't have... But I am glad that my father, who was hard-working, simple and honest, had*

such a film made at his burial. For us, who didn't quite understand what happened then to our family, it was a means of reviving the event (...). As far as I am concerned, I think it was well done, it was a means of restoring my father a image. But if I were now involved in such a tragedy, I don't know... perhaps I wouldn't send for anybody to film the burial.

Maria Gaiță: *I remember each and every detail. I was very upset then, my daughters were so young (...) Look, this fir tree over there, I have planted it on that occasion.*

O. H.: Why?

M. G.: *I wanted it here for the girls to see it when they grow up, and stay by its shadow where their father stays (...) In a way, I am glad the film was made, but I am very sorry he died. That's the trouble.*

O. H.: And when you saw the film...

M. G.: *Do you know what I feel? It is as if I saw him then (...) It was well done, and nobody does such things usually, but I don't know how it happened in our case, to have such a film made. When we saw it, we were all very happy, as if we were again at the funerals (...) For the soul of my dead husband, every year I have given alms of colaci (ritual breads) of water, to the river; I have had the bells rung as people use to do here. Only for the last few years we have given up the tradition. Too much time has passed⁹.*

These statements made by Ioșim Gaiță's widow and by his daughter demonstrate their different way of understanding things. For the daughter, the memory consists of the faint image of a grave full of water, overlapping with scenes from the film. For the widow, the burial was apparently a source of sufferings she is reluctant to recall, as it also meant the obligation of performing the rites.

It is nevertheless doubtless that for both mother and daughter the film *Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree* represents a family document – like the photos taken on important events – meant to 'catch' the moment and to support the memory. In this respect, their interpretation confirms the

efficiency of what Jean Rouch calls *anthropologie partagée*. Describing her research in the dogon space, Nadine Wanono (1987, p. 54) recalls the opinion of a woman she had filmed, which astonishingly resembles the one I discussed: 'I asked Ya-temelon (the name given by the dogon family to Nadine Wanono), the woman said, to film me so that people may see me working even after my death; this will last. People will be able to look at me after my death'.

In our case, things are more subtle: for young Ruja Raia, the film is the principal stimulant of her memory. Without it, her father's death and even his image would have remained in the dark. Ruja Raia is a cultivated person – she is a Mathematics graduate of the Timișoara University, and this is why she is proud of the exceptional patrimonial importance of the materials about her family. Her saying that such painful moments should not be filmed is worth remembering and comparing with her mother's opinion. She said having been 'happy' every time she had seen the film, because: 'I feel like I felt when having seen him then'.

If we compare the two attitudes, we must admit they are opposite. For the widow, the film is the last document about her husband, and helps her remember him alive. This is why her appreciation is positive. For the daughter, on the contrary, because the film brings to her the image of a dead man she does not remember alive, it is very frustrating. This is why she doesn't agree with filming such painful events. Her opinion should be carefully considered because it is governed by a paradox: according to her, death should belong to oblivion, but the deceased is worth remembering (Pauline Schmidt-Pantel, 1987, p. 54).

The Interview

On the 18th of June I made a long interview with Maria Gaiță, then aged fifty-five. I shall offer in what follows only her answers concerning the post-burial ceremonies filmed in *Sun*,

oh! Sun..., a film the family hasn't seen yet, and whose interpretations I shall also analyse further.

Maria Gaiță: *The day after we had buried him, a group of women came to my house, and together we went back to the cemetery. We took ritual bread, plum brandy, the incense pots, and got there to circle the place, to burn incense, to put the ritual bread on the grave. Each woman took her ritual bread after having said whose alms it was. After we had finished, we got back home, I warmed the alms meal, the women ate their portions and got back to their work.*

Otilia Hedeşan: When you burn the incense, at the cemetery, you use to pronounce some magic words.

M. G.: *Yes, there is always some old woman who burns the incense and addresses the deceased telling him not to come back home, to stay there, and I don't know what more nonsense of theirs. But we laugh at them when we hear them lamenting*

O. H.: What do you use to do six weeks after the burial?

M. G.: *We use to give alms. We go to the cemetery, and when we come back home we give alms of water. We go to the river, and then get back home. About noon, there is a man who goes and calls for as much people as he wants to. All these people are to receive alms of food.*

O. H.: Except for the food, what else do the alms consist of?

M. G.: *Clothes. The man who receives the alms of clothes goes there dressed in his own clothes, takes them off and then puts on those he received. The man must look to the sun and say: 'Sun, oh, sun, please witness these clothes, in this world they be mine, and in that world they be to the deceased' (and he names him). He must say this three times.*

O. H.: Why do you do all these things?

M. G.: *We think it may be of some help to the deceased. I myself I have made alms for my husband: trees adorned with colaci (ritual bread), with painted eggs, with cakes... I belived*

all this was right. Now, many years have passed since my husband died, but still I cannot eat without thinking of him and giving him alms of everything I eat. I got used to it. Once I sit myself down to eat, I say: 'This will be for Iosîm', I mean alms given to his memory. Had he not died so young, things would have been different. Maybe I wouldn't have suffered so much. This is why I belived in this tradition, and I kept giving alms every year, and I have had the bells rung many years. Had I not respected the tradition, I wouldn't have found my peace. I was convinced I could help him by doing so¹⁰.

Before analysing this interview, I should remind the impact that the ritual behaviour from Mehadica has had on the public through the films which were shown. Many Romanian specialists of the time as well as many students, especially those having studied at Timisoara, were ready to admit that all the funerary ceremonies they knew could be recognised in the rituals performed by Maria Gaiță when her husband died, and afterward.

When I had the interview, almost thirty years had passed since Iosîm Gaiță's death. This document reveals the character of Maria Gaiță, a rational and very pragmatic person. To her, all the rites seem to be efficient, if orderly and rapidly performed. And she doesn't think exaggerations are worth be taken into account: 'We laugh at the old women when we hear them lamenting'. Maria Gaiță is rather reticent at those parts of the ceremony having magic connotations. But it is interesting to note that, when she had been personally involved, Maria Gaiță did perform those rites she was actually disapproving. I don't think that her being only 28 years old at her husband's death might admit the supposition she could have accepted somebody else to 'direct' the ceremony for her. I would rather say that this apparent contradiction reveals a personal attitude as regards the tradition. So, if in everyday life, with no ceremonial connotations, the members of a traditional community may have diferent opinions on one or more se-

quences of a ritual, this is not perceived as unusual. When the ritual must be performed as a whole, once accepted by the community, it becomes tyranic, and whoever is confronted to it must obey to all the rules it contains.

If Maria Gaiță is quite reticent concerning the efficiency of the funeral ceremony and of the subsequent socialized customs, in exchange she seems very interested in some everyday quasiritualised practices meant to keep alive her dead husband memory and preserve the peace of his soul. The young widow has courageously assumed her position, and she could do so especially by means of a constant assertion of her mourning. The specialists in funerary ceremonies have noticed that we are confronted with the so called 'bipartition' of death: death from the point of view of the living, and death from the point of view of the dead. 'Mourning represents the point of view of the living – a series of gestures, words and operations meant to recover the loss, to offer social and affective confort. The point of view of the dead is represented by events, beliefs, stories, myths created by the living' (Laurence Kahn, p. 133).

In our case, the situation is deliberately unbalanced. All the post-funeral practices are meant to integrate the *dalbul de pribeag* (the white wonderer) in the realm of the dead and function as many 'thresholds'/stages of the transitory situation of the deceased and of his living widow. Even if the performing of these practices has been carefully watched by the community, in time they are no longer so pregnant. This is why Maria Gaiță doesn't want to put an end to her transitory situation, this is why mourning has become for her a sort of 'screen between herself and death' (Philippe Ariès, 1977, p. 37).

On the other hand, as she has already said in the interview, Maria Gaiță strongly believes in the omniscience of the dead and acts accordingly. 'The dead know and can do more than the living' said Edgar Morin¹¹ after having studied an impressive amount of anthropologic material. For Maria Gaiță, things are a bit more complica-

ted: while she believes in her husband's omniscience, she thinks once he has been integrated in the realm of the dead he is no longer able to act. This is why she had to take over a series of practical activities. 'I believed, I strongly believed I could help him in a way.' This explains why for about thirty-four years Maria Gaiță seems to have been living not only for herself but also for her dead husband.

Showing the film

On the same evening, the 18th of June, I showed the film *Sun, oh! Sun...* to Maria Gaiță, to her daughter Ruja Raia, her son-in-law Gheorghe Raia, and her grand-daughter Georgeta. The women wanted to stay together and Gheorghe Raia deliberately remained alone, somewhere behind them. While they were watching the film I filmed their reactions. Here is the rendition of their comments.

1. (Scene in the courtyard. Iosim Gaiță's little girls show up)

Maria Gaiță (to her granddaughter): Can you see your mother, Geta? The one wearing a scarf with flowers.

Geta: That little one!

2. (Witnessing the alms of clothes)

Gheorghe Raia: And here is old uncle Iancu.

3. (Scene with the group of old women lamenting)

Maria Gaiță covers her mouth with her hand.

4. (On the river bank. Getting ready for the alms of water.)

Maria Gaiță: I don't remember having seen so much snow ever since.

Gheorghe Raia: The river was frozen (...) And this is the old bridge.

Maria Gaiță: Geta, look at your mother, she was so young then!

5. (Maria Gaiță goes to the cemetery every day to incense the grave)

Gheorghe Raia: This is the road we went on. What snow!

6. (Buying back the deceased)

Maria Gaiță bursts into tears.

Gheorghe Raia: Who is this man?

Maria Gaiță: He is Nelu Rates' father.

Gheorghe Raia: The postman. Was he old when he died?

Maria Gaiță: Yes, very old.

Gheorghe Raia: Was he seventy?

7. (Iosim Gaiță's daughters go to the cemetery to incense the grave)

Ruja Raia: I remember my sister having pushed me from the back. She was older...

8. (The dance for the alms; the tree is offered to a man in the dance)

Maria Gaiță: This one makes me laugh. Nicolae has never been a good dancer. . .

Gheorghe Raia: And who is this one?

Maria Gaiță: Costa.

Gheorghe Raia: My God! He has grown up so much!¹²

The experiment I made aimed several purposes. First I thought the film *Sun, oh! Sun...* which Iosim Gaiță's family had not seen was a necessary restitution. I also thought that after showing the film to the family I would be able to approach them easier, as I remembered that: 'being close to the people you film means showing them in the field the films they are involved in' (Nadine Wanono, 1987, p. 12 sqq). 'The effective use of portable colour will make possible the immediate restitution of the images and will facilitate a real verbal cooperation between the researchers and their subjects starting from the repeated examination of the images. Thus, the investigation will definitely improve.' – said Jean Rouch (1979, p. 487), one of the best specialists of this problem. Accordingly, showing the film to the protagonists themselves does not represent the end of the research, but it is one of its most important stages.

Let us consider, from this point of view, the reactions of Iosim Gaiță's family. All of them kept silent and watched the film carefully trying not to miss any detail. They did not manifest their pain or astonishment. I should say that all

of them, no matter their age or education – I have already mentioned that Ruja Raia was a mathematics teacher; her husband is one of the best doctors in the area –, tried together to restore Iosim Gaiță's memory. To me it is relevant that none of their attitudes or remarks were determined by Vasile Crețu's text which goes beyond Iosim Gaiță's funerals in order to speak about Romanian funerary ceremonies in general. Instead, the persons I am speaking about were all very interested in the film as a means of looking at their own family life.

And I shall be even more specific: in the discussion I have just rendered, the young couple addressed me twice – Gheorghe Raia identified the road we had been walking on a few hours ago, after our arrival in Mehadica, with the road he saw in the film, then Ruja Raia said something about the way her sister and herself had incensed their father's grave. It is significant that their child's memory refused to retain such a moment. The film *Sun, oh! Sun...*, like *Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree* which Maria Gaiță did see, became thus not only a support for the memory but also its consistent stimulant.

The rest of the discussion, of no consequence for our purpose, consists of several reactions to some particular images. Maria Gaiță and her son-in-law seemed to be interested in the people who had come to the commemorative meals, or in what the weather had been like. Maybe it is worth noticing that Maria Gaiță comments upon the images she sees, while her son-in-law asks questions. Maria Gaiță, the only one who had actually been involved in the ceremonies we filmed, tries to go beyond the

film. To her, it was a document which had only managed to preserve the last act of a whole series of events, more complex and more dramatic. She does not say a word about the film, but in the end she laughs at the man who was offered the tree be-

cause he was not a good dancer. Gheorghe Raia's reactions are also very interesting in order to better understand the importance of seeing the film 'in family'. His questions about the identity and the age of some people he saw in the film may be explained by the fact he had come in the village a long time after the tragic event. To him, the film is a

means of discovering a world he didn't know before, a part of the past of the family to whom he now belongs. On the other hand, his remarks may as well have another motivation. Presuming the film would revive painful memories to his wife and to his mother-in-law, he deliberately sat himself in a place from where he could watch their reactions in order to be able to distract them from the dramatic moments. Taking the risk to disturb them, he believed in the therapeutic effect of his intervention. The particular moment when Maria Gaiță bursts into tears is by far the most important for our demonstration. It coincided with the image showing the group of women lamenting in the cemetery. Watching this scene, Maria Gaiță covers her mouth with her hand (photo 1); then, watch-

ing the scene where she identifies herself as a young widow giving the alms of food, she begins to cry (photo 2). Her reaction might be explained by the fact that she was more impressed by the perspective of her loneliness than by the image of



Figure 1



Figure 2

the dramatic moments she had got through. At the same time, the coincidence between the lamenting scene in the film and the moment Maria Gaiță bursts into tears recalls a famous interpretation of tears as a compulsory reaction to dramatic situations: 'There is not only the cry in itself, but a whole series of oral expressions of one's feelings, which are not only physiological or psychological phenomena but social phenomena which are by no means spontaneous, but obey to social rules' (M. Mauss, 1969, p. 81).

Looking at those images, Maria Gaiță proved her extraordinary capacity of going beyond the appearance of things in order to understand

their essence.

The researches carried on at Mehadica, interested in the reactions of the members of one particular family to a certain ritual (to the moment they were involved in the ritual and afterwards), offered the opportunity of analyzing the way memory, especially the affective memory, functions within traditional cultures. We tried to bring forth convincing arguments for the importance and efficiency of the ethnologic films and for the debates they may engender within a community.

(Translated by Marina Văzaca)

Notes:

1. Cf. „Bradule, brăduțele“ (*Fir Tree, Little Fir Tree*), a film by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, Mehadica, 1968, 11 minutes, black-and-white, mgt. sound, French and Italian commentary, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 3. The film shows the burial of Iosim Gaiță, aged thirty, at Mehadica. On the day of the burial, an adorned fir tree is placed next to the house of the deceased. In the courtyard there is a group of *zoritoare* who *strigă zorile* (women who are lamenting at dawn). The most important part of the film shows: the funeral cortège going to the cemetery led by the man who carries the fir tree; next come the *zoritoare* who sing the *Cîntecul mare de petrecut* (Great Farewell Song), the flag-bearers, the priest, the coffin, the family and villagers. When the grave has been covered and the fir tree has been set up, the family give alms of *colaci* (ritual bread) wrapped in woven towels, candles and money.

2. It is only the next year that were published: Mihai Pop, 1968, „Mitul mării treceri“, în *Folclor literar*, II, Timișoara, pp. 79-91; Nicolae Bot, 1968, „Buhașul – obicei și cîntec ceremonial de înmormîntare din Ținutul Năsăudului“, în *Folclor literar*, II, Timișoara, pp. 193-221; Vasile Crețu, 1968, „Mitul marelui drum în cîntecele ceremoniale de petrecut din Banat“, în *Folclor literar*, II, pp. 269-277.

3. The film „Soare, soare...“ (*Sun, oh! Sun...*) by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, Mehadica 1968-1969, 24 minutes, black-and-white, mgt. sound, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 6 was made starting from these considerations. Cf. *supra*. The second film is „Pâinea ceremonială și cultul strămoșilor“ (*The Ceremonial Bread and the Worship of the Ancestors*) by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, Mehadica 1971, 7 minutes, black-and-white, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 18. The two filmmakers have continued the work they had begun in 1968-1969, after Iosim Gaiță's death. On the Good Thursday, the woman prepares the alms of *colaci* (ritual bread). She leaves for the cemetery before daybreak carrying a bag full of *colaci* and candles; in her hand she holds incense and branches of a nut tree (the branches have not been put down on the ground since they have been broken). The woman offers the alms of *colaci* over the grave.

4. Cf. „Un străvechi sat românesc“ (*An Old Romanian Village*), a film by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, Mehadica, 1971, 15 minutes, black-and-white and colour, soundless, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 19; „Manifestări ludice cu substrat simbolic“ (*Some Game Manifestations with Symbolic Connotations*) by Vasile Crețu and Sandu Dragoș, Mehadica, 1973, 14 minutes,

black- and-white, mgt. sound, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 28.

5. Cf supra 1, 3.

6. Cf Otilia Hedeșan, „Cultul strămoșilor la Bucova” (*The Worship of the Ancestors at Bucova*), VHS, 1 hour 55 minutes, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 67 and „Slobozirea apei la Bucova” (*Giving Alms of Water at Bucova*), VHS, 3 minutes, in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no.68.

7. Aurel Iana, „Înmormîntarea la români, credințe și datini din părțile Oraviței”, în *Familia*, XXV, Oradea Mare, 1889, apud S. Fl. Marian, 1995, pp. 311-315.

8. Mondher Kilani (1994, p. 46) says that the field where the anthropologist works is asemiotic construction.

9. „Soare, soare... și lecturile sale” (*Sun, oh! Sun... and its interpretations*), in the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 77.

10. Ibidem.

11. Edgar Morin (1976, p. 167) also says the dead know the future, and necromancers must sleep on the graves and use exhumed skulls in order to discover the secrets and know their power. Rain, fertility, good luck at war or at hunt may depend on the humour of the dead.

12. „Soare, soare... și lecturile sale”, the *Folklore Archives of the Timișoara University*, no. 77.

Bibliographic References

ARIÈS Philippe, 1977, *L'Homme devant la mort* (first volume). *La mort ensauvagée* (second volume), Paris, Seuil.

GENNEP Arnold Van, 1996, *Riturile de trecere*, trad. de Lucia Berdan și Nora Vasilescu, studiu introductiv de Nicolae Constantinescu, postfață de Lucia Berdan, Iași, Polirom.

KAHN Laurence, 1990, „La mort a visage de femme”, *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, under the direction of G. Gnoli and J.P. Vernant, Paris, Cambridge University Press – Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

KILANI Mondher, 1994, „Du terrain au texte. Sur l'écriture de l'anthropologie”, in *Communication*, 58.

MARIAN S. Fl., 1995, *Înmormîntarea la români, Studiu etnografic*, ediție critică de Teofil Teaha, Ioan Șerb, Ioan Ilișiu, text stabilit de Teofil Teaha, București, Ed. „Grai și suflet – Cultura Națională”.

MAUSS Marcel, 1969, „L'expression obligatoire des sentiments”, in *Essais de sociologie*, Paris, Minuit.

MORIN Edgar, 1976, *L'Homme et la mort*, Paris, Seuil.

PETROVICI Emil, 1935, „Folklor din Valea Almăjului”, in *Anuarul Arhivei de Folklor*.

ROUCH J., C de FRANCE, 1979, „La caméra, outil nouveau de recherche ethnographique”, in *L'anthropologie en France. Situation actuelle et avenir*, Paris, Édition du C. N. R. S.

SCHMIDT-PANTEL Pauline, 1990, „Évergétisme et mémoire du mort” in *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, under the direction of G. Gnoli and J.P. Vernant, Paris, Cambridge University Press – Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

WANONO Nadine, 1987, *Ciné-rituel des femmes dogon*, Paris.