The Canadian-American

REVIEW

of Hungarian Studies

From the "Goethe of Széphalom" to the "Hungarian Faust": A Half Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary *DIETER P. LOTZE*

Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers in America, 1849–1852 *BÉLA VASSADY, JR.*

In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909–1944) *MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM*

Vol. VI, No. 1 Spring 1979

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is a semi-annual, interdisciplinary journal devoted to the publication of original articles and critical book reviews relating to Hungary and Hungarians. Since its launching in 1974, the *Review* has been committed to the policy of providing a non-partizan forum for the scholarly discussion and analysis of issues in Hungarian history, politics and cultural affairs.

The *Review* is published by the Hungarian Readers' Service, a non-profit organization incorporated by federal statute in Canada. It is distributed by the University of Toronto Press.

Institutional subscriptions to the *Review* are $12.00 per annum. Individual subscriptions are $12.00 for one year and $20.00 for two years. University students and teachers may obtain personal subscriptions for $8.00 per annum. Subscribers outside of North America please add $2.00 for postage. Please direct inquiries to:
University of Toronto Press
Journals Department
5201 Dufferin Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3H 5T8

Sustaining memberships in the Hungarian Readers' Service Inc. are $100 for organizations and $50 for individuals. Members receive complimentary copies of the *Review*. All donations in support of the HRS are income tax deductible in Canada. Please direct inquiries to:
Hungarian Readers' Service Inc.
P.O. Box 5493, Station F
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2C 3M1

Correspondence regarding the publication of manuscripts, book reviews, etc. should be addressed to the editor:
N. F. Dreisziger
Department of History
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 2W3

Statements or opinions expressed in the *Review* are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the HRS Inc. or the journal's editors.

Articles appearing in the *Review* are abstracted and indexed in HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS and AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE.

ISSN 0317-204X

Typesetting by Brevis Press. Printed at the University of Toronto Press.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1979)

CONTENTS

Articles

From the "Goethe of Széphalom" to the "Hungarian Faust": A Half Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary 3
DIETER P. LOTZE

Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers in America, 1849–1852 21
BÉLA VASSADY, JR.

In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909–1944) 47
MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM

Book Reviews

Béla K. Király and George Barany (eds.) *East Central European Perceptions of Early America* 59
ANNA KATONA

Geir Lundestad, *The American Non-Policy Towards Eastern Europe 1943–1947* 62
STEPHEN D. KERTESZ

Obituary

Ferenc G. Harcsár 1910–1979 64

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

A native of Germany, DIETER P. LOTZE studied English Philology and Comparative Literature at Berlin Free University and at Innsbruck University. His Ph.D. dissertation dealt with Imre Madách and the German world of letters. Dr. Lotze is author of *Wilhelm Busch* (Boston: Twayne, 1979) and of numerous articles in German, Hungarian, Japanese and American journals. Currently he is preparing a book on Imre Madách. He teaches at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

BÉLA VASSADY, JR. teaches history at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania. He received his Ph.D. from Temple University. His general field of interest is trans-Atlantic migrations, and his most recent research centers on Hungarian immigration to America after 1880.

MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM teaches Hungarian language and literature and comparative Ugric folklore at the University of California, Los Angeles. She is the author of a book on Artur Elek and several articles on Hungarian Renaissance poets. Dr. Birnbaum has recently completed a monograph on Janus Pannonius, has edited a volume of Géza Csáth's short stories, and is writing a book on Miklós Radnóti for the Twayne World Authors Series.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1979)

From the "Goethe of Széphalom" to the "Hungarian Faust": A Half Century of Goethe Reception in Hungary

Dieter P. Lotze

The concluding chapter of Steven Scheer's incisive monograph on Kálmán Mikszáth starts with some reflections on what constitutes "world literature":

> No matter how eminent, there is a sense in which a Hungarian writer has no place in world literature. The school of thought that looks upon world literature from the point of view of Goethe tends to include in it the literatures of the major languages of the Western world, or, better, the literatures of the major nations. According to this school of thought almost nothing written outside of Russia, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, England, and the United States has a secure place in world literature. There is, however, another school of thought usually, though not exclusively, advocated by the scholars of those nations that have been omitted by the above. In this sense world literature is, as the name implies, the literature of the world.[1]

The concept of world literature attributed to Goethe in these lines seems unnecessarily restrictive. Goethe's extensive occupation with the literatures of non-Western cultures as well as his interest in the folk poetry of various nations — including Hungary — attest to a far broader view on his part. And while he never systematically defined the meaning of the term "Weltliteratur" which he had coined, numerous statements of his show clearly that he had in mind the active and creative relationship among different national literatures, facilitated, if possible, through personal contacts of their writers.

In 1830, Goethe outlined this idea in his introduction to Carlyle's *Life of Schiller*:

> There has for some time been talk of a Universal World Literature, and indeed not without reason: for all the nations that had been flung together by frightful wars and had then settled down again became aware of having imbibed much that was foreign, and conscious of spiritual needs hitherto unknown. Hence arose a sense of their relationship as neighbours, and, instead of shutting themselves up as

> heretofore, the desire gradually awoke within them to become associated in a more or less free commerce.[2]

As he indicated in another context, he foresaw an "honourable part" for German literature — obviously including his own works — in this "more or less free commerce":

> The nations all look to us, they praise, blame, adopt and reject, imitate and distort, understand or misunderstand us, open or close their hearts towards us: We must accept all this with equanimity because the result is of great value to us.[3]

The reception of Goethe's works in Hungary reveals both the determined orientation toward Western Europe by a linguistically isolated nation and the role her writers had in shaping her culture. Traditionally, Hungarian poets had seen themselves as leaders and guides to their countrymen not only in the realm of literature but also in the political arena. This was especially true for the authors of the nineteenth century. Most of them could not accept the concept of art for art's sake and looked upon writing as a means of educating and refining the community at large. This attitude tied in with an almost unparalleled active involvement in politics. The degree to which foreign literary influences — such as those of Goethe's works — were "adopted" or "rejected" by Magyar writers, then, depended largely on each author's political stance and on the extent to which he considered them beneficial or harmful for the culture of his nation.

A complete history of the Goethe reception in Hungary would have to start at least as early as 1775 when the "*Werther* Fever" had reached the country: the German *Pressburger Zeitung* of Pozsony (Bratislava) published a "Letter to a Lady Friend" that alerted its readers to the moral dangers of Goethe's novel. The year before, there had been a German production of *Clavigo* in the city, and *Stella* followed in 1777. In 1788, the German-speaking inhabitants of Pest had a chance to see *Götz von Berlichingen* on stage. Thus, at least as far as Hungary's ethnic Germans were concerned, Goethe began to have an impact more than two centuries ago.

For the Magyars, the occupation with the works of the German poet started in the late 1780s and early 1790s. József Kármán's epistolary novel *Fanni hagyományai* (Fanny's Legacy) of 1794 shows the influence of *The Sufferings of Young Werther.* When twenty years later József Katona wrote his dramatic masterpiece *Bánk bán,* destined to become a milestone in the history of the Hungarian theater, he referred to Schiller and Shakespeare as his models. Yet it was *Götz von Berlichingen,*

Goethe's *Sturm und Drang* play about a noble-minded knight in turbulent times, which had paved his way.

But rather than attempting to trace the changes in the Hungarian Goethe reception from the beginnings all the way to our time, it may be more profitable to focus on the half century from 1811 to 1860. This period may well have been the most significant phase in the development of a Magyar national literature. It coincided with the age of Romanticism in Hungary which, according to István Sőtér, spans the time from approximately 1817, when Károly Kisfaludy settled in Pest, to the Romantic revival in the works of Mór Jókai, Zsigmond Kemény, and especially Imre Madách in the 1850s and early 1860s.[4]

It seems appropriate to study Hungarian Romanticism in a European context. The very term "romantikus" was a translation of the German "romantisch," first introduced by the eminent literary historian Ferenc Toldy. But the German Romantic movement actually exerted only little influence on the Magyar writers of the nineteenth century. Certainly the political situation contributed to the fact that particularly the generation emerging in the 1830s and 1840s turned to France rather than to Germany for inspiration. It is remarkable, however, that Goethe continued to have an effect on Hungarian literature during this period. A glance at five outstanding representatives of the Hungarian world of letters may serve to illustrate both the changing image of Goethe during the Romantic age and the Goethean concept of "world literature" as an active process. Others could easily have been added to this list, but in Ferenc Kazinczy, József Bajza, József Eötvös, Sándor Petőfi, and Imre Madách, we have the entire spectrum of reactions to Goethe, ranging from uncritical admiration to violent rejection, from imitation to Magyarization.

Ferenc Kazinczy, the "Goethe of Széphalom" to friend and foe alike, was a gifted translator and linguist, not an inspired poet. His 1811 verse collection, *Tövisek és virágok* (Thorns and Flowers), reads like a translated anthology of poems by Schiller and especially by Goethe. It was the latter — along with Klopstock — whom he embraced as his model when his epigrams of 1811, conceived in the rural seclusion of Széphalom, inaugurated his ultimately successful campaign as a one-man *Sprachgesellschaft* to reform the Magyar language and to create an idiom capable of expressing all nuances of thought and emotion. With this undertaking, Kazinczy ushered in the Romantic age in Hungary.

For him, Goethe was the absolute master of style and structure and the conscious reformer of German literature, striving to elevate the level

of the intellectual life of his nation. Kazinczy's Goethe was the ideal poet and teacher. A letter of 1815 exhorts Sándor Bölöni Farkas:

> Above all, I would ask you not to do much reading. Read little, but read good things. . . . Get to know Goethe, and Goethe, and again Goethe. He is my god in everything. And Lessing, Klopstock, Schiller, Herder, and Wieland. All others do not trust completely, but you may have blind trust in Goethe; in him dwells a Greek spirit.[5]

He called *Iphigenie auf Tauris* "divine" and expressed amazement at himself for having ever been able to enjoy other literary works in the past.

In the absence of a Hungarian tradition in literary theory and criticism, Kazinczy relied almost completely on the standards established by the classical writers of Germany. Schiller and Goethe provided the criteria by which he judged any work of literature. In 1807, he wrote to Farkas Cserey, the learned botanist:

> A work is all the more perfect the closer it is to the example of the classical writers; it is all the more intolerable the more it deviates from that example.[6]

It is obvious that, given this attitude, Kazinczy could have only very limited interest in or understanding of German Romanticists. He detested what little he knew about the "mysticism" of Novalis, and in 1809, he referred to Fichte and Schelling in one of his letters:

> I had to confess that, by myself, I see the aestheticians of the new school of thought as "Schönschwätzer," often I do not understand them at all. . . . Lessing, Winckelmann, and Goethe were no "Schönschwätzer," and I understand them.[7]

Kazinczy's repeated linking of Goethe and Lessing is revealing. Imbued with the spirit of European Enlightenment, he approached Goethe from a rationalist's position. It is characteristic of Hungarian Romanticism that it never knew the sharp renunciation of rational thought that was so symptomatic of the Romantic movement in Germany, just as Hungarian Realism was later to grow organically out of this Romanticism and not develop as a countermovement to it.

But Kazinczy's rationalism also prevented him from comprehending Goethe completely. He never understood that the German poet's greatest works had sprung from experiences, not events or reflections. It is no accident that he did not perceive any significant difference between the *Sturm und Drang* writer of Strassburg and Wetzlar and the Goethe who had returned from Italy. Goethe's true genius remained hidden from him who could only appreciate what was serene, clear, humane,

sentimental, melodious, and perfect in form. What was intuitive, irrational, and demonic in Goethe was beyond his reach.[8] To the aging Kazinczy, who had grown from a revolutionary into a conservative, German classicism of the end of the eighteenth century continued to represent the high point in the development of all literature; more recent phenomena in Germany or elsewhere hardly touched him. Yet, despite his limitations, the "Goethe of Széphalom" had opened new avenues of artistic expression for future generations of Magyar writers, and his own unwavering devotion to the poet of Weimar had contributed greatly to this achievement.

In his monograph on József Bajza, József Szücsi [Bajza] refers to the eminent critic, literary theoretician, poet, and translator as perhaps the greatest admirer of Goethe in Hungary, and as the only one to be enthusiastic about Goethe without any reservations.[9] While that may be an overstatement in view of Kazinczy's position and the rather cool attitude which Bajza developed toward Goethe in later years, it accurately describes the young poet who had been introduced to Goethe's writings by Ferenc Kölcsey. On July 9, 1827, Bajza wrote to his friend Ferenc Toldy:

> The first installment of Goethe's works — the new Stuttgart edition — has already come out. My heart is aching because I cannot buy it. . . . I am grateful to Kölcsey for having brought to my attention the poems of this great man. . . . I do not know anything that could give me greater satisfaction than these creations, produced by wondrous hands.[10]

And a few months earlier, he had commented to Toldy about Goethe and his public:

> When I read Goethe and remember how small an audience the works of this poet have attracted in comparison to what they should have, I keep telling myself in order to find assurance: this outstanding Greek master is so close to nature, and today's generation so far from it that — unless they have made a special study of him — they do not know and do not understand what to look for in Goethe.[11]

Certainly Bajza's accomplishments as a literary critic and editor far outweigh his importance as a poet. But he did write some significant political and patriotic poems, he achieved success with his lyrical ballads, and he contributed greatly to the establishment of the song as a poetic genre in Hungarian literature. He considered Goethe the undisputed master of this latter form, and he proudly related in a letter of 1829 how he had converted the poet and historian László Szalay, who had initially detested Goethe's songs, to become one of their ardent admirers.[12] Through his translations in the mid-1830s of some of Goethe's

poems, Bajza sought to acquaint his compatriots with what he saw as the high point in the development of European literature. His 1837 essay "A fordításokról" (On Translations), published in the periodical *Athenaeum,* is largely a Hungarian version of Goethe's discussion of different approaches to translating as presented in the notes to the *West-Eastern Divan.* Bajza added that Hungarians would never equal the Germans in their mastery of the art of translation, but that Goethe's views on the subject had not remained completely unknown in the country because, above all, Kazinczy had served as his spokesman. It is noteworthy, however, that when Bajza selected the models to follow in his own poetic attempts, he chose the German Romanticist Ludwig Tieck along with Goethe. And as Bajza left the enthusiasm of his youth behind, the lyricist Goethe eventually disappeared from his field of vision.

Since Bajza, very much like Kazinczy, admired in Goethe the master of style and form, he emphasized that aspect in his aesthetic and theoretical essays as well. He called the German writer the "founder of the modern novel" but dealt mainly with questions of language and structure when discussing Goethe's prose works without showing much interest in matters other than form. It is only logical, then, that his highest praise was reserved for the poet's accomplishments in a genre in which stylistic precision is essential. In his study of 1828, "Az epigramma theóriája" (The Theory of the Epigram), he lauded Goethe as the most outstanding author of epigrams in modern times:

> None of the writers of his nation has mastered to the same degree as he did the unique form of the epigram and its artful phrasing; only Lessing might be compared with him in this respect.[13]

Characteristically, he considered Kazinczy, Goethe's devoted Hungarian disciple, the greatest master of the genre in Magyar literature:

> We do not know any poet of our times other than Kazinczy who could stand in such beautiful splendor next to the epigrammatist Goethe; only those two are worthy of comparison with the Greeks. As a poet, Goethe is incomparably superior to him; as a master of form, he is his equal; in the genre of the epigram, those two share with Lessing the leading position among modern authors.[14]

The triad Lessing-Goethe-Kazinczy evoked here indicates once more how much young Bajza's image of Goethe paralleled that cultivated by the "Goethe of Széphalom."[15]

The opening of the National Theater in 1837 was a most important event in the cultural history of the country. Bajza had been a consistent champion of a Hungarian national theater, and as the director of the

newly established institution in 1837–38 and 1847–48, he had the opportunity to put some of his theories into practice. This practical experience, on the other hand, enriched his dramaturgical writings which today are valued as the most significant part of his legacy. In the famous controversy with Imre Henszlmann, a literary critic and art historian, he strongly favored French drama over that of Germany because he found in French works a moral purpose and felt that they were not contrary to moral teachings. In his writings of 1833 on the novel, he had expressed his concern over "German sentiment" which he called "the lechery of the soul." He had been worried that "this morbid disease of the soul, German sentimentalism, might be imported too." What he found "harmful to our national character" in the novel, he fought in the theater as well.[16]

Bajza's criticism of Goethe as a dramatist must be seen against this background. It was Bajza, the fighter for Hungarian concerns in the theater and the practitioner of stagecraft, who judged the playwright Goethe. Moreover, Bajza's views seem influenced by Tieck's critical assessment of the poet. On several occasions, Bajza emphasized that Goethe's plays were unfit for the stage. In an obituary article, he took a look at *Faust* in particular.[17] He called the drama a "wonderful depiction of a wonderful myth of the German people" but expressed regret over the fact that the poet had obviously disregarded the limitations of the stage. Numerous scenes in the play are mere tableaux of Faust's psychological condition or extensive reflections on the limits of human knowledge and the insufficiency of reason. Other scenes, although excellent in themselves, are not connected with the whole of the play, while again others, although highly dramatic, are too sketchy. In short, *Faust* represents a collection of rhapsodic fragments, not a tragedy written for the theater. Ten years later, Bajza reiterated his position in an *Athenaeum* article on the Hungarian drama.[18] The principal purpose of a drama is its stage production. If a play fails in this respect, it has not fulfilled its primary function. And in this regard, Goethe — great as he otherwise might have been — was not particularly strong.

When Bajza, together with Toldy and Vörösmarty, began editing the new periodical *Athenaeum* in 1837, his youthful devotion to Goethe had long given way to a more sober attitude, and this new stance seems to be reflected in the number of articles critical of Goethe and his works that appeared in the influential journal under his editorship. Vörösmarty had little interest in the German poet and probably shared Bajza's opinion of him as a playwright. Only Toldy, who had devoted his life to the building of bridges between the cultures of Germany and Hungary,

retained his high regard for Goethe to the end. But Bajza, too, would remember that one of the influences that had shaped him as a writer and critic had emanated from Weimar. As he stressed, Goethe's name represented to him not the life of one individual but an entire era, a phase of development of which he also was a part.[19]

Baron József Eötvös, outstanding statesman and creator of the realistic novel in Hungary, was one of the leading figures of the Reform Period. Both in his literary works and in his political activities, he sought to elevate the cultural level of his nation and to bring about some needed changes in his society. A number of the liberal causes he championed as a politician — such as compulsory education, prison reform, and the emancipation of the Jews — indicate that this Romanticist was an heir to the age of Englightenment, too.

Eötvös was even more familiar with German culture than most of his peers. His mother was German, and young József grew up speaking her language and developing a love for the literature to which she had introduced him. It was his tutor József Pruzsinszky who acquainted him with the Magyar language and who instilled in him the deep feeling of attachment to his native country. When Eötvös entered Pest University at the age of thirteen, he was able to excel in all subjects except Hungarian language and literature. But whatever deficiencies he had in this area soon disappeared, and his literary accomplishments between 1831 and 1835 led to his election to the Academy at the age of twenty-two.

It seems significant that Eötvös's first venture into the realm of literature was with a translation of Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen* which he completed in 1830 but did not publish. Goethe, however, provided more than mere translating exercises to him. In 1839–41, Eötvös completed his popular novel *A karthausi* (The Carthusian). These memoirs of a young French aristocrat who takes the vows as a Carthusian monk soon became the greatest publishing success in Hungary since András Dugonics's *Etelka* more than fifty years earlier.

The prologue to Eötvös's book addresses the reader "who is not left cold by the sufferings of a soul that was created for good and noble things, and who is more interested in the secret history of a heart than in the skillfully woven plots of novels."[20] If this seems like an appeal to the public of Goethe's *The Sufferings of Young Werther,* the novel furnishes additional evidence of the impact of that work. The suicide of young Arthur after he realizes the hopelessness of his love appears inspired by Goethe's tale, and even the structure of *A karthausi* may have been influenced by it.[21] Werther's tragic love story is revealed to us through his letters to his friend Wilhelm, and the book concludes with

the fictitious "editor" relating to the reader the events immediately preceding Werther's death, the suicide itself, and the burial of the unfortunate hero of the story. In the Hungarian novel, Gusztáv, the protagonist, starts as the first-person narrator; later we read only his diary entries; and at the end of the work, Gusztáv's friend Vilmos, to whom he had entrusted his papers, tells of his death. It is hardly by accident that this friend's name is the Hungarian equivalent of that of Werther's intimate.

In his discussion of *A karthausi,* D. Mervin Jones stresses the Wertherian quality of Eötvös's hero:

> The action is continually retarded by long reflective passages; but the introspection is not confined to these — it pervades the whole narrative. Gustave knows no state of mind but crushing grief or blissful happiness, and always faithfully records his emotional reactions to events. Like a true Romantic he is continually asserting the claims of the emotions and sees life from an emotional point of view.[22]

Sőtér is even more specific in suggesting the relationship between the characters of Gusztáv and Werther when he comments on the impact of French literature on the Hungarian novelist:

> We have so far considered the models of the *Carthusian* as romantic, but if either Sainte-Beuve or Sélancour served as examples, they in their turn also go back to Werther, and the figure of Gustavus is chiefly related to him.[23]

If *A karthausi* was indeed partly inspired by *Werther,* Eötvös's novel may be seen as the first mature work for which Goethe's book had provided a creative stimulus — after Kármán's sentimental *Fanni* or Kazinczy's imitative *Bácsmegyeinek gyötrelmei* (The Sufferings of Bácsmegyei), whose very subtitle had indicated that it represented an adaptation of a German original. *A karthausi,* however, was not meant merely to provide sentimental entertainment but contained a political message as well. Eötvös offered to his nation, struggling to develop a suitable political system, a look at the France of Louis-Philippe as a model not to emulate. And just as *Werther* was to be followed by *Wilhelm Meister,* Eötvös's later novels abandon the earlier sentimentality and address in a realistic manner existing social and political problems, as in *A falu jegyzője* (The Village Notary) of 1845, or social inequities of the past, as in *Magyarország 1514-ben* (Hungary in 1514) of 1847–48.

To Eötvös, Goethe offered the highest standard by which to judge literary accomplishments. But he rejected imitation, since Goethe was the product and representative of a different culture — an echo of

Herder's concept of literature. If there were Hungarian novels, dramas, and poems worthy of comparison with Goethe, they would certainly not be similar to the works of the German poet, even though Hungarian criticism had derived its criteria from the analysis of these works. Consequently, he applauded Petőfi's poetry because of its originality.

Eötvös opposed the moralistic condemnation of Goethe as a "man without a heart" which was widespread at the time. He stressed instead that the production of a poet is always more than the poet himself.[24] He had read the authors of "Junges Deutschland" and admired Victor Hugo and French Romanticism, but they had little effect on his high esteem for Goethe. As Pukánszky points out, Eötvös was one of the few in Magyar literature to appreciate Goethe as a complete human being, not just as a master of form — as had Kazinczy — or as an abstract intellectual ideal for which one dutifully voices enthusiasm. He belonged to the small but very important community of Hungarians who were "goethereif," who were ready for Goethe.[25] And Sőtér adds:

> The ideas of Eötvös, even in advanced age, were attached to Goethe, Goethean morality supported him in many hours of trial. In the wake of Goethe did Eötvös proceed from poetry to science, and beyond it to the philosophical content of the sciences.[26]

For Sándor Petőfi, Goethe's image was radically different. When Hungary's most brilliant lyrical poet met his death on the battlefield of Segesvár, he was only twenty-six years old — the same age as the *Sturm und Drang* Goethe when he moved to Weimar. It is not surprising, then, that Petőfi had little use for the serene Olympian. He was neither interested in the formal perfection that Kazinczy and Bajza had admired nor could he grasp the totality of Goethe as Eötvös had done. His concept of Goethe was shaped largely by Börne and other writers of the "Junges Deutschland" movement. It is no coincidence that Petőfi proposed the name "Fiatal Magyarország" ("Young Hungary") for the "Tízek Társasága" ("Society of Ten"), his circle of literary and political friends in Pest.

Kölcsey had complained as early as 1826 that his countrymen were adoring the "pale images" of Schiller at the expense of Goethe's "serenely smiling Graces."[27] In the 1830s and 1840s, in part as the result of the political situation, Hungarian reactions to Goethe were becoming increasingly negative. Imre Vahot, who was to appoint Petőfi assistant editor of his weekly *Pesti Divatlap* in 1844, probably spoke for many when he discussed Goethe and his work in an 1841 *Athenaeum* article entitled "Töredékgondolatok a világköltészetről" ("Fragmentary Thoughts about World Literature").[28] Vahot praised *Götz von Berlichingen* and

especially the first part of *Faust* which had provoked a revolution in the world of ideas. Goethe was a genius who could have led his compatriots in the fight for national unity. But instead, he had become a Philistine, unfaithful to his true vocation and absorbed in the petty concerns of the Weimar court.

Similarly, Petőfi regarded Goethe as the lackey of princes, as a representative of the same detested culture that was manifesting itself politically in the Habsburg domination over his beloved Hungary. The poet, who at the age of twenty had known many of Heine's poems by heart and who had translated Heine as well as Schiller, Claudius, and Matthisson, eventually denied any knowledge of German. On one occasion, he did quote Goethe. When, in a political dispute in 1848, Vörösmarty had accused him of immodesty, Petőfi replied in the *Kossuth Hírlapja*: "Goethe, in his entire long life, only once said something intelligent, and that was when he said: 'Nur die Lumpen sind bescheiden' ('Only rogues are modest')."[29] But it is unlikely that Petőfi was familiar with many of Goethe's works, none of which was among the German books he owned.

One of Petőfi's travel letters of 1847 to Frigyes Kerényi contains his spirited rejection of Goethe as a man and as a writer:

> Goethe's *Faust* was in my pocket. What to do . . . swear or faint? You know, my friend . . . that I do not like Goethe, that I do not care for him, that I detest him, that I find him as nauseating as horseradish prepared with sour cream. The head of this man was a diamond, his heart, however, a flint — ah, not even that! A flint gives off sparks! Goethe's heart was clay, miserable clay, nothing else; moist, pliant clay when he wrote his silly *Werther,* but afterwards dry, hard clay. And I don't have any use for a fellow like that. For me, every man is worth as much as his heart is worth. . . . Goethe is one of the greatest Germans. He is a giant, but a giant statue. The present age crowds around him as if around an idol, but the future will knock him down like all idols. As indifferently as he looked down upon the people from the height of his fame, as indifferently will the people look down on the ruins of his fame after it has turned to dust. He who did not love others will not be loved by others, at most he will be admired. And woe to the great man who can only be admired but not loved. Love is eternal like God; admiration is fleeting like the world.[30]

In the light of Petőfi's political commitment, it is quite consistent that this devastating assessment came after an earlier expression of high praise for Pierre Jean de Béranger, the "greatest apostle of freedom" who was described as the world's most outstanding poet.[31] And it should be kept in mind that many of Petőfi's German contemporaries — and numerous critics in the decades to come — held similar views of Goethe.

But ironically, Goethe had contributed to Petőfi's development as a poet — at least indirectly. As Sőtér states: "From the angle of Hungarian poetry, Goethe was the example of the poet who turned to folk poetry and only in the second place the author of *Faust.*"[32] His successful incorporation of the folksong into literature had a strong impact on Hungarian Romanticism. It stimulated a trend that reached its highest point in some of Petőfi's best works that blend the heritage of folk poetry with the expression of deep personal feeling.

And a poem like Petőfi's "Homér és Oszián" (Homer and Ossian) could not have been written without Goethe's "silly *Werther.*" True, other Magyar authors — such as János Arany — had similarly contrasted the worlds of the Greek poet and the Gaelic bard, and Kölcsey had pointed to Goethe and Schiller as their modern counterparts. But what had perhaps become a commonplace comparison in mid-century Hungary certainly stemmed from Goethe's skillful evocation of the two contrasting moods in his epistolary novel. Throughout the book, Werther's state of mind is indicated by his references to either Homer or Ossian. Homer is the symbol of simplicity and naive enjoyment of nature and life. In his letter of October 12, 1772, Werther tells Wilhelm that Ossian has displaced Homer in his heart, and after that, the Northern atmosphere of gloom and inevitable destruction takes the place of sunny Greece. During their last fateful encounter, Werther reads to Lotte from his translation of Ossian — actually Goethe's own Strassburg rendition of what he had believed to be genuine third-century poetry — and then leaves to take his own life. Thus Petőfi, albeit probably unwittingly and unwillingly, was following in Goethe's footsteps when he wrote in 1847:

> Do you hear Homer?
> In his song there is the vaulted sky,
> The eternal smile of quiet joy,
> Whence the dawn's purple
> And the gold of the midday light
> Flow gently down
> On the honey-colored waters of the sea
> And on the green islands in it
> Where gods are playing
> In happy harmony with the human race
> Your games, oh wonderful love!
>
> And do you see Ossian over there?
> In the country of the eternal fog in the Northern sea,

Above wild rocks his song resounds
As the storm's companion in the shapeless night,
And the moon is rising,
Like a setting sun,
Red as blood,
And sheds a grim light on the vast forests
Where bands of mournful spirits
Of the heroes fallen on the battlefields
Are roaming about.

Petőfi's concluding stanza, urging Homer and Ossian to go on singing and playing the "divine harp," may also serve as a fitting epitaph to Hungary's greatest lyrical poet and Germany's most famous writer:

Years are passing,
By the hundreds and by the thousands; they crush,
Without mercy, everything; but, oh,
You are sacred to them;
They breathe fallow death over everything,
Only the wreaths on your silvery heads remain green.[33]

In case of Imre Madách, Goethe's impact was much more direct. When János Arany, then considered the country's leading literary authority, was asked to read and evaluate the manuscript of *Az ember tragédiája* (The Tragedy of Man), penned in 1859–60 by an unknown aspiring amateur playwright, he put it aside after having perused the first act, convinced that the drama was an inferior imitation of *Faust*. Eventually he was persuaded to read the entire work — influenced, perhaps, by Madách's growing reputation as a gifted orator in the Pest parliamentary assembly. Arany quickly changed his mind about the philosophical poem, declared it a masterpiece, and became its most vocal champion. Almost overnight, Imre Madách came to be one of his nation's most celebrated authors. He was soon afterwards elected to the Kisfaludy Society and to the Academy. His play was widely read and admired, even though its first successful stage production at the National Theater did not take place until 1883, almost twenty years after the poet's death. *The Tragedy of Man* has been translated into more than twenty foreign languages and has been staged abroad repeatedly.

But the label "Hungarian *Faust*" has stuck with the work,[34] and Arany's initial reaction is quite understandable. Like Goethe, Madách used the confrontation scene between the Lord and Satan from the Book of Job as a prologue. A closer reading, however, reveals signifi-

cant differences. In *The Tragedy of Man,* this scene marks Lucifer's rebellion against God. Adam, the first man, is to be his tool in this insurrection. Lucifer, who appears to have been modeled after Goethe's Mephistopheles but is lacking that "devil's" redeeming sense of humor, succeeds in bringing about the Fall of Man. After the first human beings have been expelled from Eden, he shows Adam the future of his race in a series of dream visions designed to lead him into despair and to a renunciation of God. In a very real sense, Adam experiences "what to all mankind is apportioned," as Faust had desired. Accompanied by Lucifer, the "Spirit of Negation," he travels through history, assuming various historical roles and encountering Eve, the embodiment of "Woman Eternal," in her different reincarnations. From the Egypt of the Pharaohs to Fourier's utopian Phalanstery, he witnesses again and again the corruption of all great ideas.

After having seen the dismal dusk of humanity in a world where the sun has turned cold, Adam awakens again and is now ready to take his own life. In this way, he can stop the course of history before it has even begun. Thus, his reason for contemplating suicide is very different from that of Goethe's hero at the beginning of the play who is painfully aware of his innate limitations and of his inability ever to find the answers he is seeking. But when Eve tells her husband that she is with child, he realizes that his desperate deed would be meaningless. He bows before the Lord who restores his grace to mankind and assigns to Lucifer the same role that had been outlined for Mephistopheles in Goethe's "Prologue in Heaven." As leaven, he is to keep man from becoming complacent and inactive. He is to serve in the divine order as the force which, in the words of Mephistopheles, "would do ever evil, and does ever good."

The general parallels with *Faust* are obvious, and details in numerous scenes of *The Tragedy of Man* attest to Madách's familiarity with Goethe's dramatic poem.[35] The Hungarian playwright made no attempt, however, to disguise those parallels, as he was aware of having created a work whose structure and intention are quite different from the German tragedy. It is very likely that Goethe himself would have approved of this use of his play. Much of what he wrote to Karl Ludwig von Knebel about Byron's *Manfred* applies directly to Madách and his drama:

> This unusual and gifted poet has absorbed my Faust. . . . He has used every theme in his own fashion, so that none remains as it was; and for this in particular I cannot sufficiently admire his genius. This reconstruction is entirely of a piece; one could give most interesting lectures on its similarity to the original and its departure from it; I do not deny, however, that the dull glow of an unrelieved despair will become

wearisome in the end. Yet one's irritation will always be mingled with admiration and respect.[36]

In his *Tragedy of Man,* Madách discusses philosophical and theological questions in the tradition of the "poème d'humanité" of European Romanticism.[37] He ultimately denounces Hegel's optimistic interpretation of human history as a history of progress. After the events of 1848–49 and the subsequent Bach era, such optimism had become impossible for a Hungarian author. But Madách's play does not end with the "dull glow of an unrelieved despair." The Lord's final admonition to Adam is: "Hark to Me, Man! Strive on, strive on, and trust!"[38] God demands man's faith despite the gloomy visions of history that are in no way invalidated. It is this desperate faith, so often demonstrated by the Magyars over the centuries, that gives Madách's drama a uniquely national quality along with its universal message.

With the conversion and "Magyarization" of Goethe's art and thought in *The Tragedy of Man,* the creative influence of Goethe in Hungary had reached its highest point. What came after the "Hungarian *Faust*" was either epigonic reaction or interpretation. With Imre Madách's dramatic poem, the age of Romanticism in Hungary and in Europe had come to an end.

NOTES

(Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.)

1. Steven C. Scheer, *Kálmán Mikszáth* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1977), p. 147.
2. Quoted in Fritz Strich, *Goethe and World Literature,* tr. C.A.M. Sym (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1949), p. 351.
3. Ibid., p. 349.
4. See István Sőtér, "Hungarian Romanticism," *The Dilemma of Literary Science,* tr. Éva Róna (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973), pp. 212–39.
5. Ferenc Kazinczy, *Összes művei,* Harmadik osztály, Levelezés, ed. János Váczy, 21 vols. (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1890-1911), 13: 241.
6. Ibid., 5: 7.
7. Ibid., 6: 486.
8. For almost identical assessments of Goethe's impact on Kazinczy, see Jakob Bleyer, "Goethe in Ungarn," *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft* 18 (1932): 114–33, and Béla von Pukánszky, "Ungarische Goethegegner und -kritiker. 1830–1849," *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 11 (1931): 353–76. The rather one-sided study by Julius von Farkas, *Die ungarische Romantik* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1931), still offers some valuable information about this phase of German-Hungarian cultural relations.
9. József Szücsi [Bajza], *Bajza József* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1914), p. 71.

10. József Bajza, *Összegyűjtött munkái,* ed. Ferenc Badics, 3d ed., 6 vols. (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1899–1901), 6: 252.
11. Ibid., p. 227.
12. See ibid., p. 292.
13. Ibid., 4: 54.
14. Ibid., p. 58.
15. József Patai, in his article "Bajza és Lessing," *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* 32 (1908): 33–47, 205–23, 354–69, has shown how Lessing's impact was evident throughout Bajza's life.
16. See Sőtér, pp. 217 and 227.
17. "Goethe," *Társalkodó* 1 (1832), Nos. 34 and 35.
18. "Valami a magyar dráma felől," *Athenaeum,* 1842, 2, No. 38.
19. See Bleyer, p. 122.
20. József Eötvös, *Összes munkái,* ed. Géza Voinovich, 20 vols. (Budapest: Révai, 1901–1903), 1: 7.
21. On the influence of *Werther* on Eötvös's technique, see Jenő Koltay-Kastner, *A Karthausi helye a szentimentális regényirodalomban* (Budapest: Németh, 1913).
22. D. Mervin Jones, *Five Hungarian Writers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), p. 169.
23. Sőtér, p. 232.
24. See Eötvös, 19: 119–20.
25. See Pukánszky, p. 376.
26. Sőtér, p. 230.
27. In an article in *Élet és Literatúra* 1 (1826): 210–14.
28. "Töredékgondolatok a világköltészetről," *Athenaeum,* 1848, 1.
29. Sándor Petőfi, *Művei,* ed. József Kiss (Budapest: Szépirodalmi könyvkiadó, 1976), 2: 594. (The quotation is from Goethe's poem "Rechenschaft.")
30. Ibid., pp. 490–91.
31. Ibid., pp. 483–84.
32. "Hungarian Lyric Poetry and the World," *The Dilemma of Literary Science,* p. 243.
33. Petőfi, 1: 740–41. Certainly Petőfi was unaware of Macpherson's forgeries when he wrote this poem.
34. A rather flagrant recent example can be found in J. W. Smeed's book, *Faust in Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), which gives the title of Madách's play in German and quotes exclusively from Ludwig Dóczy's 1891 German translation. Smeed states in his preface: "Quotations are given in the original language except in the cases of A. Tolstoi and Imry [sic] Madách. Here since one of the main points made is the link with Goethe's *Faust,* I have quoted from the German translation rather than in English" (p. v).
35. Vilma Pröhle, in her dissertation *"Az ember tragédiája" és a Faust* (Budapest: József Kertész, 1929), lists 44 literal correspondences. While some of those are rather superficial, any student of Madách and Goethe could add further to that list.
36. Quoted in Strich, p. 256.
37. For detailed discussions of Madách's position in European Romanticism, see the 1972 dissertation by Enikő Molnár Basa, *"The Tragedy of Man* as an Example of the Poème d'Humanité: An Examination of the Poem by Imre Madách with Reference to the Relevant Works of Shelley, Byron, Lamartine and Hugo" (University of North Carolina), and Dieter P. Lotze, "Madách's *Tragedy of Man* and the Tradition of the 'Poème d'Humanité' in European Literature," *Neohelicon* 6 (1978): 235–54.

38. Imre Madách, *The Tragedy of Man*, tr. Charles Henry Meltzer and Paul Vajda, 4th ed. (Budapest: Corvina, 1960), p. 300.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1979)

Kossuth and Újházi on Establishing a Colony of Hungarian 48-ers in America, 1849-1852*

Béla Vassady, Jr.

I

Although much has been written about Lajos Kossuth's motives for going to America in the wake of the unsuccessful Hungarian Revolution of 1848–49, serious scholarly research exploiting sources on both sides of the Atlantic commenced only in the 1940s. Perhaps because it could never be questioned that Kossuth's primary motive for visiting America was to generate aid for Hungary's cause, even this recent scholarship has neglected to assess the degree to which he considered the option of founding a Hungarian colony in America, or to fully assess László Újházi's efforts to bring such a plan to fruition. Thus, for example, Dénes Jánossy's seminal work on the Kossuth emigration and Tivadar Ács's more modest study of Újházi's short-lived colony in Iowa generally ignored the portions of the Kossuth-Újházi correspondence dealing with the colonization scheme and concluded that Kossuth had always opposed the idea.[1] Éva Gál's recent biography of Újházi portrayed this long neglected emigrant more thoroughly, but gave short shrift to Újházi's colonization activities and concurred that Kossuth was against colonization.[2] John H. Komlos' recent study on the Kossuth emigration excelled in its treatment of Kossuth's position on the settlement question before his American journey, but ignored Kossuth's colonization policy after his arrival, presumably on the assumption that thereafter it no longer played a role in his plans.[3] This essay attempts to demonstrate that these assumptions have over-simplified Kossuth's complex, often contradictory, motivations. As the accepted leader of the Revolution and of the subsequent emigration, Kossuth recognized that

*I wish to express my gratitude to Professors S. B. Várdy (Duquesne University), István Deák (Columbia University), and Thomas Spira (University of Prince Edward Island) for their helpful comments in the revision of this study.

an important question to be resolved was how best to regroup the exiles in preparation for resuming the battle for their homeland. Should they be kept in Europe, prepared to invade Hungary whenever political circumstances turned auspicious, or should they be gathered into a closed colony in a country which guaranteed their freedom of action while they established a power base in preparation for a renewed revolution? Kossuth favored the first of these alternatives, but his indecision and vacillation during his first three exile years (1849–52) encouraged one of his followers, László Újházi, to promote the idea of founding a Hungarian colony in the United States. Until early in 1852 Újházi was led to believe that colonization remained a viable option for the Kossuth emigration.

II

The allure of America, with its Utopian image of limitless land in a country of free institutions, did not fail to attract many of the Hungarians exiled from their homeland.[4] Such a man was László Újházi, government commissioner of the fortress of Komárom at the time of its capitulation in September 1849. Újházi was fifty-four years of age at the time of the revolution. Since the early 1830s, he had been an avid participant in that era of reform, spearheaded by liberal aristocrats and lesser nobility, which had prepared Hungary for the achievements of 1848–49. Steadfastly more leftist in his political sentiments than most of his contemporaries, he had been a leader of the erstwhile radical party which had supported total independence from Austria and the establishment of a republican form of government in 1849. With the capitulation of Komárom, however, a passive, even pessimistic state of mind overcame the old ex-revolutionary. His revulsion with the tenacity of absolutism and with what he perceived to be the ephemeral quality of revolutionary ardor among his associates prepared him for the psychological leap necessary to accept the idea of permanent exile.[5] Unlike most of his comrades who continued to indulge in romantic dreams about renewing the revolution, he was determined that the United States, whose democratic and republican institutions he admired, should become the goal of the emigration. In a series of meetings during the negotiated evacuation of Komárom, he persuaded 96 officers of the besieged garrison to form an American emigration society with himself as president. The stated purpose of the association was to emigrate to the American republic, to become free citizens thereof, and there to "form a

united agricultural colony."[6] In October of 1849, Újházi and the fifty-odd officers who had followed him to Hamburg drew up detailed plans for the American emigration. They were assisted by Dr. Károly Kraitsir, a Hungarian-American physician from Boston, who had successfully aided 235 Polish exiles after the abortive Polish Revolution of 1830-31 to acquire free federal land for a Polish colony in the United States.[7] Having solicited President Zachary Taylor's permission to seek asylum in America, Újházi and a small advance party departed with the understanding that they would prepare for the reception of the others, soon to follow.

The Újházi party's warm welcome in New York City on December 16, 1849, was to be surpassed only by Kossuth's reception there two years later. As the first exiles to arrive after the news of Hungary's defeat had become public, they received the full sympathy of a young America which had followed and identified with every event in Hungary's revolutionary struggle throughout 1849.[8] One society magazine reported a veritable "Hungarian fever" in New York City during the next two months.[9] Fund raising dinners, balls, and speeches were the order of the day for weeks, as the Hungarians found themselves lionized wherever they went. Most celebrated were Újházi and Apollonia Jagello, a young Polish woman accompanying the party, who was portrayed by the press as a "Hungarian heroine" of the revolution.[10]

In view of this universal sympathy for the Hungarian cause, not surprisingly Újházi was accepted as Kossuth's surrogate in America. Popular and official opinion considered his widely publicized colonization plans to be that of Kossuth and the rest of the Hungarian exiles. Újházi promoted two goals: the liberation of Kossuth from Turkish captivity and the establishment of a Hungarian colony in the United States. Emphasizing the need to prevent the emigrants from scattering, he advocated a colony to "serve as a haven of refuge to those following us." To provide for their self-sufficiency, he favored an agricultural settlement as the most suitable alternative for Hungarians accustomed to agrarian pursuits. A compact, closed colony would not only preserve their Hungarian identity and culture, he stressed, but would provide a power base from which to prepare for the eventual liberation of their homeland. Since the United States was a free nation with a republican form of government and possessed limitless empty lands available for settlement, such a plan would best serve their purposes. As Hungarian-American citizens living in their own colony, they would learn to practice America's democratic processes in order to better exercise them

upon their return to liberated Hungary. As representatives of their own state in the Union, they would keep alive America's sympathy for Hungary.[11]

Since Újházi had to convince both the American public and his compatriots of the viability of his plans, his emphasis differed, depending on his audience. To the Americans he stressed his compatriots' wish for asylum and self-reliance, and their desire to settle in a land of freedom. To convince the public of their sincerity, the Újházi group immediately filed for American citizenship with much fanfare and publicity.[12] Simultaneously, however, to Kossuth and his companions, Újházi emphasized that only by establishing a compact colony could they expect to receive the necessary financial and military aid from American sympathizers.[13] Not yet having heard from Kossuth, but knowing full well the younger man's revolutionary zeal, Újházi suspected that the settlement plan had to be made palatable to those whose only motivation was the immediate resumption of revolution.

As Újházi incessantly promoted the dual concepts of Kossuth's liberation and emigration to America together with the permanent settlement of the exiles in America, these two ideas became fused in popular and official minds in the United States. To a proud young America conscious of its self-image as the ultimate asylum of freedom and liberty to which all those who suffered from the burdens of European autocracy aspired, the prospect of the heroic Kossuth and his followers finding a new home on its shores was appealing. Újházi capitalized on this appeal, as he pressed the issue in his numerous speeches and his contacts with friends of the Hungarian cause. He persuaded the future Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, of the exiles' desire for a place of asylum where they might find permanent security and peace.[14] In Washington in January 1850, President Taylor, who in his correspondence with Újházi had repeatedly coupled the concept of an American home for the exiles with Kossuth's release, greeted him with the statement: "here... you and they [Kossuth and his companions] will forget much of the hardships and trials you have gone through, in the enjoyment of the liberties and blessings of a new Home."[15] A series of Congressional resolutions conveyed a similar message. Senator Foote's resolution of February 5, 1850, demanded Kossuth's liberation so that he might emigrate to America and requested that the Hungarians be offered land in America.[16] Similarly, Senator Seward's resolution of January 30, 1850, favoring a free grant of land to the Hungarians, corresponded almost simultaneously with Senator Soule's proposal that the United States Government bring Kossuth to America.[17] At the same time, the first

steps were taken toward the liberation of Kossuth from Turkey under American auspices, and Kossuth was queried if he desired a permanent home in America.[18]

The Seward resolution advocating a grant of land to the Hungarians and to other European revolutionary exiles drew spirited debate not only in Congress, but also in the public arena. The press, although generally supporting the proposal, strongly advocated the granting of free lands to all landless citizens of America.[19] In fact, the resolution would have established a precedent whereby immigrants would have received privileges not enjoyed by native born Americans. This impediment proved detrimental to its chances of acceptance in Congress. But it was the sectional dispute over the Clay compromise for Californian statehood in 1850 that finally doomed the Hungarian land grant proposal. Notwithstanding Újházi's steady proddings and the support of numerous friends in Washington, no lands were ever granted to the Hungarians.

But when Újházi returned to New York in January 1850, after the flurry of support he received in Washington, he had reason to be optimistic about an imminent grant of lands to the Hungarians. Much to his chagrin, however, he found that his countrymen, augmented by the arrival of the remaining members of the Komárom American association, did not greet his accomplishment with jubilation. Instead, they had quarreled and split among themselves. The majority voted to replace him with Major Imre Hamvassy, leader of the new arrivals, at the head of the 62 member committee. Grievances against Újházi centered around his soft approach to political action. He was found too humble and inflexible in formulating the Hungarian cause to the American people, too modest in his approach to collecting funds, and too acquiescent to what many of them claimed to be a misrepresentation of Apollonia Jagello as a "Hungarian heroine."[20] As a gesture of their new radical approach, Újházi's opponents issued a formal proclamation declaring the Habsburgs unlawful usurpers of power in Hungary and presented it to members of Congress and foreign embassies in Washington.[21] The committee also declared that Újházi's efforts to acquire land for a colony were unsolicited by the Hungarians. Indeed, unmasking ulterior motives for their actions, some members of the committee even told Congressmen that instead of land the Hungarians wanted money, "because the Hungarians, being true gentlemen, would not labor with their hands."[22] And when they sensed that some of their number were still tempted by Újházi's colonization plan, they further discredited his efforts by proposing an alternative scheme for a Hungarian colony in

Texas, for which they submitted a formal request for free land to Congressional members.[23]

It was Újházi's misfortune to be forced to convince a mixed group of opportunistic and radical elements of the revolution to accept a quiet, sedentary existence in the wilderness. Many of these first arrivals were enterprising men who had risen as a result of the chaos of revolution and, hoping to exploit their newly gained status, perceived Újházi's goals as opposed to their own.[24] There were also radical leftist elements among them, especially the two leaders of the movement: Ágost Wimmer, an ex-Lutheran minister who had served as Kossuth's representative to Prussia, and Colonel János Prágay, the ex-adjutant to General György Klapka at Komárom. Wimmer was reputed to believe that all land must be redistributed and the aristocracy destroyed before a true revolution could occur and, according to Újházi, had spent most of his time blaming Kossuth for the failures of the revolution and emigration; Prágay had fallen under similar influences. In the estimation of the more practical leaders of the emigration, both men were counted among the romantics, Jacobins, and "Red Republicans" of the revolution.[25] Desiring results instead of dreams, these practical leaders perceived the United States as an expedient place to acquire support and repeatedly warned each other to avoid associating with the Jacobin "Reds."[26] Prágay, always the man of action, died in the ill-fated 1851 Cuban Expedition, and Wimmer, finding his influence waning, soon returned to seek more fertile grounds for his activities in Europe. To convince such men to become farmers in the American wilderness was perhaps beyond the realm of the possible.

The committee's gestures to gain attention by issuing radical statements and attacks on Újházi proved counterproductive. American observers deemed its radical political approach as inappropriate as its transparent desire for pocket money. The shabby treatment of Újházi, a man whom New Yorkers had learned to respect and admire, was also deplored. Far from deflecting funds from Újházi's colonial scheme to their own treasury, as the committee had planned, support for the Hungarians ground to an abrupt halt. The committee dissolved, dividing its treasury among its members ($80 per person), who, until then, had received free care from New Yorkers. Now they were forced to scatter, each seeking his livelihood as best as he could.[27]

At a time of greatest need for a Hungarian association of some type to help arriving exiles remain together and provide for their transportation to the planned Hungarian colony, the source of aid dissolved virtually at its inception. Later, after settling in the Iowa wilderness, Újházi la-

mented the absence of a central office in a key city to which the exiles might report as they trickled into the United States. As he told a friend, more harm than good was done to new arrivals by the Hungarians who still lived in New York.[28] This initial schism would plague the Hungarian cause in America for years to come. As additional groups of exiles arrived during the next two years, a few émigrés supported Újházi's plan and even joined him. But others, who found American sympathies cool due to the recent confrontation, or who were simply disgruntled by unemployment or lack of aid, too readily accepted the condemnations of Újházi's detractors; they accused him of pocketing all of the funds and placed the blame for their plight upon his head.[29]

For his part, Újházi withdrew from the controversy and endured the attacks of his companions in silence. He hoped to salvage what he might of the emigrants' reputation by avoiding publicity of their quarrels. As before, his humility did not go unappreciated. During a second Washington trip in an attempt to redress the harm, he was assured by American supporters that his objectives had not been jeopardized. But these events, like those that had driven him from his homeland, were taking their toll on the older man. Notwithstanding his radical reform plans and republican sentiments during the Hungarian Revolution, his personal mannerisms were those of a quiet, humble, non-ostentatious man, whose main goal was to achieve personal integrity for himself and his companions by means of self-sufficient hard labor on free soil. These personality traits proved to be his strongest assets in America, as they impressed sympathizers who identified with the image of self-made men seeking asylum in America. But his plans directly contrasted with the motives of Kossuth and most of his other companions. Despite his intimate association with Kossuth and his many years of observing the younger man's meteoric political career in Hungary, Újházi naively believed that Kossuth would come to share his desire to escape to the peace of a quiet haven in America. Thus he went to the extreme of inviting Kossuth to share with him the simplicity and charm of rustic existence in the American wilderness, away from the corruption of European civilization, which offered only "suffering and servitude for mankind." Notwithstanding his protestations that this did not imply his lack of interest in participating in a renewed battle for Hungary, his sentiments were manifest.[30] Moreover, by his willingness to isolate himself and his companions in the western wilderness of Iowa, away from important contacts and sources of aid, he further demonstrated that for him the colony took precedence over the revolution, the reverse of Kossuth's approach. When he later suggested to Kossuth that Cali-

fornia might be a better alternative to Iowa, if re-locating the Hungarian colony was to be considered, he further demonstrated these personal priorities.[31]

After silently awaiting Congressional action on his request for land during the early months of 1850, Újházi finally sensed the futility of procrastinating any further. Accompanied by a small band of devoted followers, he left New York in April to seek his promised land. Four months of hard travel brought them to Decatur County, Iowa, where they established the settlement they called New Buda. For the next two years Újházi was to remain here collecting exiles around himself. He thereby managed to keep at least part of the emigration together in anticipation of Kossuth's joining them in America.

III

Since only Kossuth's emigration to America and his willingness to support Újházi's settlement scheme could assure its ultimate success, Kossuth's views on this plan deserve analysis. During the first months of his exile in Turkey, he first conceived the idea of establishing a Hungarian military colony as a means of preventing the Hungarians from drifting apart and of maintaining their martial preparedness for Hungary's liberation. In early 1850 land was purchased and outfitted for this purpose in Smyrna, but the Turkish Government rejected the plan.[32] As Austrian pressures continued to diminish his options in Turkey, Kossuth next considered exploiting American sympathies to solicit military and political support.[33] Manifestations of American sympathies were evident in reports about Újházi's successes, as well as in an American offer to Kossuth for a "quiet and tranquil home" in the United States.[34] By February 1850 Kossuth publicly implied that he had adopted Újházi's scheme by urging a large group of Hungarians at Sumla about to embark for America to organize an American settlement association.[35] In their letter of introduction he stated that ". . . the free land of North America is the place where I too wish to be put to rest, if my bones are not allowed to combine with the dust of my homeland."[36]

One month later Kossuth received Újházi's letter summarizing his colonization goals as a means of keeping the emigrants together for renewing the revolution. Újházi also requested Kossuth's strong support in order to legitimize his own status and actions in America. Kossuth's immediate response demonstrated his growing belief in the potential of American aid and his growing pessimism about his continued internment in Turkey. It also reflected much about Kossuth's goals and

philosophy in contrast to Újházi's. His main thrust remained strictly political: his every move was motivated by the desire to resume Hungary's liberation. He provided Újházi with credentials to serve as Hungary's and his own representative in the United States. Since the greatest need was for funds to facilitate agitation and the purchase of arms, he urged Újházi to raise or borrow what he could in America. But he also supported the colonization idea. If and when all hope must be relinquished for Hungary's liberation, he wrote, then an extensive Hungarian colony should be founded in America. With American aid, a new Hungarian state would be added to the Union; he would expatriate thousands of his countrymen for that purpose. But, he added, the United States must do its part. One communications agent should be appointed to stay with Kossuth and another one must be placed in Belgrade to provide financial aid and transportation to potential emigrants. Barring this, he concluded, "there cannot be a new Hungary" in the United States.[37] A few months later, Kossuth explicitly stipulated that substantial financial support must be forthcoming from the United States before he would consider American colonization. Although he perceived no alternative solution for the émigrés than their settlement in America, he wrote to his Paris representative, he would permit this only if twenty thousand pounds sterling were promised for this purpose. This was to be raised by borrowing it against the expected productive value of the Hungarian colony.[38]

Kossuth had in fact proposed that the settlement of the exiles in America be considered a contingency plan, to be acted upon if all other efforts to liberate Hungary failed. In the meantime, however, colonization would remain a live option which would be exploited to elicit American financial and political support. Since with variations this remained Kossuth's policy during the succeeding two years, it did much to encourage Újházi and his American sympathizers to assume that Kossuth would ultimately settle in the United States.

The remaining months of 1850 proved even less promising for Kossuth's release from Turkey. When George P. Marsh, the American Minister to Turkey, officially requested Kossuth's release, the Sublime Porte refused and, bowing to Austrian pressure, removed Kossuth and a contingent of his closest followers even further into isolation to Kutahia, in Asia Minor. With growing despair, Kossuth corresponded with Marsh, often raising the colonization question by requesting information about land grants for the Hungarians and about provisions for passage to the United States.[39] Among official circles in America the conviction grew that Kossuth did, indeed, desire asylum in the United States. And when

John Brown, the Dragoman of the American Legation on home leave in the fall of 1850, told Secretary of State Daniel Webster and other officials in Washington that Kossuth desired nothing more than "a quiet home on the soil of America," he only added more support for this conviction.[40]

By early 1851 the general American assumption about Kossuth's motives was probably best stated by Daniel Webster, when he wrote to Marsh that Kossuth and his companions

> . . . by their desire to remove so far from the scene of their late conflict, declare, that they entertain no hope, or thought, of other similar attempts, and wish only to be permitted to withdraw themselves altogether from all European association, and seek new homes in the vast interior of the United States.[41]

Webster reiterated these assumptions by directing Marsh to request the refugees' release so that they may come "to the uncultivated regions of America, and leave, forever, a continent which to them has become more dreary than the desert."[42] Almost simultaneously, in March 1851, Congress passed a joint resolution empowering the President to dispatch a vessel for the Hungarians on condition that they express desire to settle in the United States.[43] Further corroborating the assumptions about Kossuth's intentions was the announcement by the Sumla group upon its arrival in New York in the fall of 1851 that "our leader Kossuth will, as he said, join us [at New Buda], if he be allowed to come here."[44] Not surprisingly, public appeals were again made to Congress to grant the Hungarians land, because "Kossuth will probably proceed to the colony of New Buda."[45]

In light of the agreeable response of the Porte in February 1851 to renewed American representations for Kossuth's release, in April H. A. Homes, the Second Dragoman of the Legation, requested the Hungarians at Kutahia to sign a statement accepting the Congressional conditions for their emigration to America. With some difficulty Kossuth persuaded his men to comply, but refused to commit himself to emigration on grounds that it would impede his future activities.[46] Apparently, this evasiveness was not reported to Webster. Indeed, by late April, when the Porte offered to liberate all of the Hungarians except Kossuth and a handful of officers (who were to be detained until September) without any stipulation as to where they must emigrate, Homes was hard put to persuade the Hungarians to remain committed to America.[47] In reporting to Webster, Homes explained that the Hungarians had originally agreed to the conditions "when they regarded this course as the means of obtaining their freedom"; since they now re-

ceived it unconditionally, he noted, they seek assurance that "they will come under no obligation to remain any longer in America than they please."[48] In view of these new circumstances, Homes made renewed efforts in June to obtain "a more explicit and fresh answer" as to the Hungarians' "disposition to avail themselves of the offer of the American Government."[49] For the official record Kossuth complied, but privately he informed Homes that he intended only to visit America.[50] Thus, despite Kossuth's forthrightness with Homes, according to official American records he was still expected to arrive as a permanent emigrant in compliance with the Congressional conditions.

With his liberation imminent by mid-1851, Kossuth recognized the danger of having erroneous assumptions circulating about his intentions. In his May 1851 letter to Újházi he used a different tone from that of the previous year. Criticizing Újházi's readiness to find a new home and for having lost hope in Hungary's rebirth, he expressed irritation that this pessimistic approach was "not without influence on weaker individuals." He reiterated his own faith that political changes in European conditions were imminent within the next ten months, three of which he intended to spend in America to gain support. He requested Újházi, as his representative in America, to intensify American sympathies, but for the correct reasons: humanitarian reasons should be deemphasized, and sentiment for defeated Hungary's struggle for independence and democratic principles should be stressed. He expressed disappointment that Webster's directives to Marsh assumed that "I and my companions, having relinquished all efforts for the liberation of our country, desire nothing more than to permanently emigrate to America." Finally, he requested Újházi to communicate with the President and Webster to correct these false views, based upon the suggestions which he [Kossuth] had outlined in his letter.[51]

Despite his changed tactics, Kossuth did not entirely abandon his settlement contingency plan. If all else failed, he wrote to Újházi, a "free Hungary" would be founded in America; but a small settlement must be avoided, as it will be swallowed up by the surrounding masses. Having selected 1852 as the year of liberation, he also implied indirectly that the colonization decision would be reached that year.[52] Shortly thereafter, in a letter to Ferenc Pulszky, his London representative, Kossuth reiterated his willingness to colonize should his new attempt to liberate Hungary fail in 1852, though on this occasion he again suggested that the scheme be utilized as a fund raising device. Tell the American minister in London, he instructed, that "I will either liberate Hungary, or, if I am unable to accomplish this in 1852, then with 2 to 300

thousand Hungarians I will begin a settlement. If I get the opportunity to do so, I would like to increase the United States by a new state." Stressing the need for raising funds to purchase ships and military supplies for the revolution, he further instructed Pulszky to query the minister whether two million dollars might be borrowed from American banks on condition that, "if we liberate Hungary, naturally our country will repay the debt; if we don't succeed, it will become the debt of our new state in the Union."[53]

IV

In 1850 much of the United States comprised empty, unoccupied land. In Iowa alone, where statehood had recently been proclaimed, six million acres stood at the disposal of homesteaders. Congress annually auctioned off parcels of this federal land at $1.25 per acre. Most of these lands, however, found no buyers. The unsold lands could be freely cultivated by squatters with preemptive rights to purchase these lands for $1.25 per acre, should they again come up for auction. In the meantime, the squatter could hold the lands he occupied free of taxes, rental fees, or any other form of encumbrance.

Since in 1850, the new state of Iowa became the focus of settlement interest, Washington officials naturally recommended it for Újházi's planned colony. The Hungarians hoped to acquire the land as a free gift. At the very least, they assumed that since their Iowa lands had only recently been up for auction, they would be left alone to work these lands until they had earned enough to pay for them. Of the 75,000 acres assumed necessary for the extensive colony planned, Újházi staked out twelve sections of land (or 7,680 acres)[54] in Decatur County, located near the Missouri border in southern Iowa. His companions settled on lands adjacent to his. By the spring of 1851, as news of the colony spread, other Hungarians arrived, and as they did, they settled more of the surrounding empty lands, sometimes as much as several hours of travel from each other. They came in groups or as individuals, some seeking Hungarian company in a strange land, others merely looking for a source of livelihood. But nearly all arrived in the hope that this would become the headquarters of the emigration which Kossuth would soon join. Although many departed after a short time, mostly because they could not bear the hard life of the homesteader, sufficient replacements kept arriving for a core colony to prevail, with much planning and hoping for the future.

In letters and circulars to his oppressed countrymen in Hungary,

Újházi planned to entice hundreds of families to come to his colony.[55] In veritable real estate prospectuses, he advertised it as an extensive, closed community in which the social and domestic life would remain that of the Magyar landed gentry.[56] He also provided detailed lists of the types of professionals and craftsmen required to complete his colony.[57] Somehow evading Austrian censorship, optimistic descriptions of the colony regularly appeared in the Hungarian press.[58] The symbolic impact of New Buda in Hungary is best illustrated by the abrupt arrest and interrogation of an American citizen in Hungary during 1850, when he expressed sympathy for Újházi's colony.[59]

Újházi's letters to fellow exiles in England and Turkey were no less enticing. The departure of the Sumla group from Turkey in early 1850 with the expressed purpose of joining Újházi was one result. An American Society and a Hungarian Committee were also founded in London to encourage and aid Hungarians about to settle in America. The Hungarians in London were informed that Kossuth was expected to settle in America.[60]

In the United States the colony's existence was a matter of common knowledge. On the road to New Buda in the fall of 1850, Sándor Lukács discovered that everywhere the Hungarians and their settlement were spoken of with respect.[61] In September 1850 New Buda was designated as the site for a post office, with Újházi as its postmaster. This not only facilitated correspondence with the outside world, but provided official recognition of the settlement. The new colony's prominence on the nearly empty map of Iowa was described by Ferenc Varga. The map he used to find the colony in 1851 "pointed out with large letters 'Hungarian Colony — post office New Buda'" (though few people could direct him to its exact location in the wilderness once he reached its vicinity).[62] A steady stream of national sympathy and publicity for the colony continued to keep it before the public eye at least until 1852, when Kossuth made his tour through midwestern United States.

Nor did Újházi slacken in his determination to keep the land grant question and Kossuth's liberation before Washington officials. Upon learning of President Taylor's death, he immediately wrote to Millard Fillmore, his successor, describing New Buda and soliciting his aid. Although Fillmore refused to recognize Újházi's appointment as Hungary's representative, he was warmly encouraging on the land grant issue. Similarly, in response to Újházi's letters, Senators Seward, Cass and Buel expressed confidence that both of his projected goals would soon be satisfied by Congress.[63] Újházi was undoubtedly greatly buoyed by the passage of the March 1851 bill in Congress approving Kossuth's

emigration to America on condition that he settle there. Coupled with this came the favorable news that by the President's orders the lands they occupied in Iowa would be exempted from auction to provide more time for Congress to act on the land grant bill.[64] Those at New Buda had much reason for optimism: they would get their land, and their leader was on his way, too.

Indeed, the expectation that Kossuth was arriving to join them at New Buda, perhaps as their permanent governor, was common among the settlers.[65] Újházi's appointment as Kossuth's representative convinced many that Kossuth shared Újházi's views and plans. With confidence, Újházi told the surveyor dispatched by the Land Office to New Buda in the summer of 1851 that he had letters from Kossuth stating that the latter was "determined on coming to that settlement there to make his permanent home," and that "a large colony of Hungarians would be formed."[66] In his last message to Kossuth in Turkey, at a time when the latter's liberation appeared to be a certainty, Újházi alluded to a time soon when the two of them would "embrace each other as republicans on this free soil," and he rationalized the continued Congressional procrastination on the land grant question by surmising that the Americans were awaiting Kossuth's arrival to surprise him with it. He also implored Kossuth to "chase out" the large number of Hungarians from England and bring them with himself,[67] so as to enable them to remain together cultivating the free soil of democratic America. Finally, he repeated his desire to establish a "compact colony" of Hungarians, and assured Kossuth that if he were to prefer another location for a colony, "we are prepared to follow you."[68]

It is not clear when, if ever, Újházi received Kossuth's 1851 letter in which the latter denounced Újházi's settlement activities. What is clear is that, despite the untimely death of his wife in October 1851 which shook him deeply, Újházi remained convinced that his friend and leader would soon join him in Iowa. This alone drove him on. Anticipating Kossuth's arrival, in November 1851 Újházi sent several letters addressed to him in New York, in which he outlined the methods by which Kossuth should divide the Congressional lands among the Hungarians.[69] He also urged Kossuth to pressure Washington officials to grant the required lands, and asked him to support the Sumla group of emigrants currently awaiting financial aid to defray their transportation expenses from Chicago to New Buda.[70]

V

Almost to the moment of Kossuth's arrival in America, the United States Government remained persuaded that the exiled leader was seeking no other purpose than to accept its offer of asylum. Most revealing in this respect was President Fillmore's happy announcement to Újházi in October 1851 that Kossuth and his men were coming to enjoy life in America, "for the remainder of their lives, and [to] leave their posterity in a land of freedom and equal rights."[71] However, several incidents occurred while Kossuth was in transit to America, such as his attempts to agitate in France and in England, which raised suspicions about his real motives. Kossuth's statement to the American people on the day after his arrival in New York on December 5, 1851, erased all remaining doubts. He openly declared that he had not come to settle in comfort but to continue the battle for Hungary's liberation. Thereupon he embarked upon one of the most brilliant tours of political agitation that America had ever witnessed. Despite the enormous popular acclaim for Kossuth's revolutionary purpose, however, the Whig Government was shaken by Kossuth's policy which it considered

> at variance with the understanding under which the intervention of the United States government was offered for his release . . . It was intended and clearly stated that the intention of the United States government was to offer him an asylum in this country but not to afford him the means of carrying out the objectives of a political mission.[72]

Thus the Government remained cool toward him, and Congress spent several weeks debating whether or not to offer him an official welcome.

The universal acclaim he received as he traveled from New York to Philadelphia deluded Kossuth into assuming that he would encounter similar support in Washington. Not until he met with President Fillmore on December 31 was he shocked to learn that the United States' official policy of strict neutrality in European affairs varied widely from that suggested by popular demonstrations. "From that hour," wrote Fillmore's chronicler, "Kossuth's mission as a propagandist of his wild opinions was a failure. . . ."[73] Chagrined over this turn of affairs, Kossuth remained sulky and broody throughout the rest of his two-week Washington stay, a crucial time, during which he was to decide his future strategy in light of these new circumstances.

Given his temporary mood of pessimism about the possibility of renewing European revolutions or of receiving American aid, Kossuth evidently turned to a serious consideration of the option of pursuing his

settlement contingency plan. In a meeting with the Secretary of Interior during the first week of January, he was quoted as saying that

> the opposition which he met at the hands of Congress and the Executive, convinced him that his mission to this country had completely failed.

He therefore inquired of the Secretary whether land would be provided for a body of Hungarian settlers, "so located that the Hungarians would live together in a separate community." Unfortunately, his conversation with the Secretary was not wholly amicable. An embarrassing misunderstanding occurred over the question as to whether Kossuth would have to pay for the requested land or would receive it as a free gift.[74] A few days later Kossuth also met with the Iowa Congressional delegation concerning the potential for land at New Buda. The senators informed him that at most 160 acres per person could be hoped for.[75] According to one interpretation, "The details pleased him and he decided to ask Congress to approve an act of free land;" but another source has suggested that he was disappointed with the information and may have decided that the potential for the sizable colony he envisioned was not promising.[76] Whatever his response, during the first days of January 1852, Kossuth carefully investigated the potentials for a Hungarian colony in America.

Soon thereafter, however, Kossuth again reversed himself — this time permanently. Kossuth the revolutionary could not become a farmer, nor could he consider terminating his perennial battle with the Habsburgs for long. Recognizing that the recent publication of his statement suggesting his willingness to settle implied a despair on his part which was proving counterproductive to his purpose, he repudiated it, claiming to have been misquoted.[77] Under these circumstances, further efforts on behalf of a Hungarian colony had to be abandoned. Thereafter, Kossuth turned to the alternative tactic of touring the remaining populated regions of the United States, gathering financial support for the revolution which he declared with renewed vigor to be imminent in 1852.

Although this explains Kossuth's decision against forming a large Hungarian colony, it may not fully account for his refusal to support payment of the Sumla group's transportation costs from Chicago to New Buda. Financial aid for this purpose was available from a millionaire on condition that Kossuth approved it. Since Kossuth himself had specifically dispatched the Sumla group to America in order to settle them at New Buda,[78] and since earlier he had accepted the humanitarian argument that those exiles who found themselves destitute owing to lack of language or occupational skills should be settled on farms,[79] his

refusal to approve it appears contradictory. Certainly the Sumla group, consisting mostly of common soldiers, fit the humanitarian argument, and their settlement could have been justified on those grounds alone before the American public. The alternative, already too obvious, was their scattering in destitution throughout the United States. Moreover, if Iowa was not to his liking, Kossuth had a wide choice of other locations for settlement purposes. He had land offers from private sources in New York, Missouri, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas.

There is reason to suspect that the culmination of the so-called Tochman affair, in which Kossuth found himself directly embroiled during his stay in Washington, and which was closely associated in the public mind with the settlement scheme and especially with the Sumla group's plan to reach New Buda, contributed to Kossuth's negative decision, at a time when he was known to have been irritated and despondent.

The Tochman affair had its beginnings in the disturbance occasioned among the Hungarian emigrants over the attentions paid to Apollonia Jagello. Miss Jagello later married Major Gaspar Tochman, a Washington lawyer of Polish descent, and together the couple remained influential supporters of the Hungarian cause in America. Irritated by her continued prominence, a Bavarian officer by the name of De Ahna, who had accompanied the Hungarians to America, published a slanderous tract attacking the Tochmans.[80] In response, the Tochmans brought suit against De Ahna, thereby providing further fuel for the already festering feud among the Hungarians.

Since Tochman had been his most effective agent in Washington, Újházi became one of his strongest advocates. Among other things, Tochman had effectively worked behind the scenes for Kossuth's liberation and had distributed Kossuth's address to the American people; Mrs. Tochman had actively lobbied on behalf of the successful bill to liberate Kossuth; and Tochman had persuaded the President to withdraw the settlers' land from auction.[81] Újházi often expressed his gratitude to the Tochmans, promising that when Kossuth arrived, "he will, in more energetic language, express our thanks, than I am able to do in writing."[82] József Prick and his Sumla group, whose trip to Chicago (with the expectation of continuing to New Buda after Kossuth approved it) had been financed with the Tochmans' help, also strongly favored the Polish couple. In an appeal to the American people signed by 67 members (23 of whom were members of the Komárom garrison whence Apollonia had emigrated), this group defended Apollonia's character as "in all respects above impeachment."[83]

Upon his arrival in Washington, Kossuth, like many of the quarreling Hungarians, attempted to appear neutral, "being anxious to prevent exposure of the private affairs of the exiles, because the trial is likely to give an insight into matters not known to the public."[84] Already disturbed over his political failure, he managed to excuse himself from a court summons in the case and attempted completely to ignore the Tochmans while in the capital. That his public image was not enhanced by this action was illustrated by an editorial accusing him of anti-Slavic racism for having refused publicly to vindicate the Tochmans.[85] Then, in early February, what had now become the Kossuth-Tochman feud broke into the open. In an effort to vindicate themselves, the Tochmans published a series of letters they had exchanged with Kossuth. In introducing the correspondence, the *National Era*'s editor reflected the dismay felt by many Hungarian and Tochman supporters when he conjectured that Kossuth must have acted under great pressures in perpetrating "this unintentional injustice," because

> No two private individuals in this country have labored so earnestly, disinterestedly, and successfully, to promote the welfare of the Hungarian exiles, as Major Tochman and his estimable wife.[86]

The letters revealed that at a Kossuth reception on New Year's Day, Mrs. Tochman had been treated with "coldness and reserve" by the Kossuth party, which was "misconstrued to her injury" by Washington society. Learning that Kossuth believed the charges laid against his wife[87] and finding himself unable to gain access to the Hungarian leader, Tochman attempted to vindicate his wife's reputation by mail. Kossuth responded impersonally through his secretary that Mrs. Tochman "could not of course expect to be received otherwise than with the normal civility one meets thousands of unknown persons," and made no further reference to Tochman's defense of his wife. Thoroughly aroused now, Tochman reminded Kossuth of his friendship with Újházi and listed his many services to the Hungarian cause, including his role in financing the Sumla group, and asked whether Kossuth thought that the 67 Hungarians who had testified to Mrs. Tochman's good character had given false testimony.[88] Kossuth made no further response. By the time this exchange appeared in the newspapers he had left Washington and embarked on his tour. That his feud with the Tochmans did no good for his political cause can be safely assumed. Accepting (or expecting) further help for the Hungarians waiting to be transferred from Chicago to New Buda now was obviously out of the question, and the Sumla group was permitted to scatter.

Meanwhile, for six weeks Újházi's anxious requests for information about Kossuth's plans had been avoided by short, uninformative, almost flippant letters from Kossuth's closest aid, Pulszky, greatly exasperating the old and loyal supporter of the revolutionary leader.[89] Since Újházi expected nothing from what he cynically labeled the "messianic" year of 1852, or from any other year in the near future, he predicted that the Hungarian exiles lingering in Europe would soon tire of waiting for non-existent opportunities to renew the revolution and would join him in America.[90] As Kossuth himself had set 1852 as the year of decision, Újházi had reason to hope that his colonization scheme might yet achieve the support of the émigrés.

Kossuth finally replied in mid-January. He informed Újházi that he still disagreed with the colonization scheme because it was tantamount to an admission of failure and lack of confidence in Hungary's future. Surprisingly, however, even at this late date, he hinted that he would support the creation of a new Hungary in America if liberating the old one proved to be hopeless. But he reiterated that the time for such a decision had not yet arrived.[91] The Sumla group, anxiously awaiting Kossuth's support for its journey to New Buda, received a similar message, but couched in even stronger language.[92] Thus the final opportunity for founding a sizable Hungarian settlement in America was lost forever.

Precisely what transpired between Újházi and Kossuth when the two men finally met in St. Louis during March 1852 remains unrecorded. Presumably, Újházi informed the leader of his decision to settle in a warmer southern climate, but probably repeated his willingness to remain at New Buda or anywhere else upon Kossuth's orders. Convinced that new opportunities for Hungary's liberation were imminent, Kossuth reiterated his opinion that the emigrants would be too isolated in America's wilderness to exploit European opportunities.[93] Yet, in view of Kossuth's consistent espousal of his settlement contingency plan, it is not inconceivable that he again repeated it at this time. Perhaps partly for this reason, when he asked Újházi if he would take possession of a gift of land that had been offered to him (Kossuth) in Texas, the older man jumped at the opportunity.[94] Not only could he seek land for himself in Texas while remaining in Kossuth's service, but there remained the hope that at some later time Kossuth would support a Hungarian colony there. Újházi managed to attract as many as twenty Hungarian exiles to his San Antonio settlement, where he remained for the rest of his days, a broken and frustrated man.

Did Kossuth commit an error by not remaining in America to keep

the émigrés together? There are those who believe he did.[95] However, disregarding the totally impractical plan of exploiting the colony as a base for fomenting revolution, even Újházi's simpler goal of keeping the emigrants together in one colony was probably an impossible task. Certainly, with Kossuth's support a large number of exiles could have been gathered. But even while optimism prevailed about Kossuth's support for a permanent colony, most of the settlers had departed from New Buda soon after their arrival. They were politicians, soldiers, aristocrats, who could not accept the hard labor or isolation required of the pioneer farmer in the wilderness.

Even less likely was the feasibility of maintaining a compact, closed Hungarian community. As Kossuth himself suspected, unless the colony was very large, assimilation was inevitable.[96] There was also the problem of continuous dissension. As Pulszky phrased it, "the Hungarian's nature is such that they can't keep together, but instead quarrel among each other; therefore, there could be no talk about a Hungarian colony."[97] Besides the quarreling in the cities, there is ample evidence to suggest land divisions and speculation at New Buda caused similar disagreements.[98] Finally, continuing Congressional inaction on the land grant question produced insecurity at first, and eventually the realization that free soil would never be forthcoming. By 1852, everywhere they went the disillusioned settlers who left New Buda carried negative news. One emigrant arriving in New Orleans with intentions of settling there was told that the colony was down to nineteen settlers and in the process of dissolution (in fact, there were thirty settlers in March 1852).[99] Another émigré reflected the general consensus in 1852 by comparing New Buda to a "Siberian exile."[100] Although a short time after Újházi's departure a renewed effort to promote the colony met with some success, within a few years the colony disappeared altogether.

After departing from the United States in June 1852, Kossuth relinquished all further hope for American political or financial aid. He spent the remainder of his long life in perpetual efforts to renew the battle for Hungary in Europe. In the process, he often reconsidered the colonization scheme as a means of achieving his ultimate goal. Even before leaving the United States he became involved in an unsuccessful plan to establish a combined Hungarian-American colony in the Dominican Republic to serve as a base for invading Hungary.[101] Rumors of other American locations selected for this purpose continued to circulate. But his most preferred location for colonization had always been, and continued to be, in Turkey, thanks to its proximity to Austria and Hungary, and owing to its natural enmity with the Habsburgs and

Romanovs.[102] On different occasions, Italy and Crete were also considered. However, all of Kossuth's settlement dreams, like his myriad of other plans for liberating his homeland, remained just that — the unfulfilled dreams of one of the most dedicated and persistent nationalist revolutionaries of the nineteenth century.

NOTES

1. Dénes Jánossy, *A Kossuth emigráció Angliában és Amerikában* (Budapest, 1940–48); Tivadar Ács, *New Buda* (Budapest, 1941).
2. Éva Gál, *Újházi László, a szabadságharc utolsó kormánybiztosa* (Budapest, 1971).
3. John H. Komlos, *Kossuth in America, 1851–1852* (New York, 1973).
4. Aladár Urbán, "A Lesson for the Old Continent: The Image of America in the Hungarian Revolution of 1848/49," *The New Hungarian Quarterly* 17 (Autumn 1976): 85–97.
5. Gál, *Újházi*, p. 64; see also Újházi's similar sentiments in Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R section 216, Magyar Országos Levéltár, hereafter cited as O.L.
6. Ladislaus Újházy, *A Brief Explanatory Report, as to the Termination of the Hungarian Struggle . . . and . . . Circumstances of the Hungarian Emigration* (New York, 1850), pp. 16–17. See also Zsigmond Thaly, *The Fortress of Komárom* (London, 1852), pp. 233–234.
7. The 1834 Congressional act granting 36 sections of land to the Poles at the minimum price of $1.25 per acre on condition that they continuously cultivate their lands for ten years became a model for the Hungarians as well. The Polish venture failed, due to misuse of funds collected for that purpose. See Charles Kraitsir, *The Poles in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1837), pp. 193–196. The Polish precedent remained alive in the minds of Americans and was often used to argue for or against the proposed grant to the Hungarians during 1850.
8. Arthur J. May, *Contemporary American Opinion of the Mid-Century Revolutions in Central Europe* (Philadelphia, 1927), pp. 41–50.
9. *The Lorgnette*, Jan. 23, 1850, pp. 50–54.
10. *New York Herald*, Dec. 19, 1849.
11. *New York Tribune*, Dec. 10, 1849, Suppl.; *Ibid.*, Dec. 11, 1849; *Ibid.*, Dec. 17, 1849; *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1849, Suppl.; *Ibid.*, Dec. 24, 1849; *Ibid.*, Jan. 4, 1850; *Ibid.*, Jan. 19, 1850; Újházi, *Explanatory Report*, pp. 16–17. See also Jánossy, *Emigráció*, pp. 192–193.
12. *New York Tribune*, Jan. 4, 1850.
13. Újházi to Kossuth, Washington, Jan. 19, 1850, Kossuth Collection, R. Section 90, Chronological Series I.688, O.L. (in all Kossuth correspondence hereafter cited assume R. Section 90; only series number will be noted).
14. *New York Herald*, Dec. 19, 1849; *The Daily Union* (Washington), Dec. 21, 1849.
15. *New York Herald*, Jan. 18, 1850; for Taylor's previous correspondence with Újházi, see *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1849.
16. *Congressional Globe*, 31st Congress, 1st Session, Feb. 5, 1850, p. 244.
17. *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, 1850, p. 128; *Ibid.*, Jan. 30, 1850, pp. 289–296; *Ibid.*, Feb. 5, 1850, p. 293; *Ibid.*, Appendix, pp. 143–148; *Ibid.*, Miscellaneous, No. 13. See also R.

Section 90, I.698, O.L. It was proposed that these lands be granted, "on condition of their [the Hungarians] permanent settlement . . . , and their eventual naturalization, in conformity with existing laws."

18. Komlos, *Kossuth,* pp. 38–40.
19. *Congressional Globe,* 31st Congress, 1st Session, Jan. 30, 1850, pp. 262–264; *New York Tribune,* Jan. 11, 22, 25, 29, 31, Feb. 1, 2, 1850. As attested by the flow of petitions into succeeding sessions of Congress, support in favor of granting free land to the Hungarians remained spirited throughout 1850–51.
20. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, April 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.; Henri De Ahna, *The Greatest Humbug of the Day* (Washington, Sept. 14, 1851), pp. 2–4.
21. Large posters entitled "In the Name of the Hungarian Nation," dated February 28, 1850, were printed and distributed in four languages. They were signed by Prágay, Wimmer, Hamvassy, Szalay, Fornet, Radnich, and Damburghy. Copies sent to Kossuth can be found in the Hungarian National Archives (I.716, O.L.). Wimmer and the committee kept Kossuth apprised of their activities in an attempt to win the latter's support away from Újházi and other key leaders of the emigration. See Wimmer to Kossuth, New York, Feb. 9, 1850, I.705, O.L.; Wimmer to Kossuth, Washington, March 12, 1850, I.723, O.L.; Wimmer and other committee members to Kossuth, New York, April 16, 1850, I.737, O.L.; Wimmer to Kossuth, Kingston, June 15, 1850, I.794, O.L.
22. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, April 10, 1850, I.736, O.L. "Surely no people will support emigrants who can labor but will not," wrote the U.S. representative in Turkey to Kossuth, in reference to Wimmer's complaints. Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, Aug. 17, 1850, I.878, O.L.
23. *Pesti Napló,* Feb. 15, 1851. Col. János Prágay, ex-adjutant to General György Klapka at Komárom, led this movement for a competing colony. The distribution of the land was planned along military rank lines, as in the case of the earlier proposed colony in Turkey. Prágay requested for each ex-soldier half a section of land; for each officer one section (one section = 320 acres); and for Kossuth six sections, with the guarantee that payment for the land would not have to be made for ten years.
24. *Ibid.*; Újházi to Kossuth, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L. In a similar case, the U.S. representative in Turkey complained in 1851 that many who had exploited the opportunity for a free passage to America were "the dregs of the emigration," and not *bona fide* Hungarians. Homes to Webster, July 5, 1851, Correspondence from Turkey to the Department of State, Book G. No. 3, Record Group 84, National Archives (hereafter cited as N.A.; unless otherwise noted, hereafter assume R.G. 84 in all N.A. citations).
25. Jánossy, *Emigráció,* I: 58–60; Ádám Anderle, "A 48-as magyar emigráció és Narciso López 1851-es kubai expedíciója," *Századok* 107 (1973): 700–701. It should be noted that Újházi himself had counted among the radicals of the revolution. See Gál, *Újházi,* pp. 46–47; Újházi, *Explanatory Report,* pp. 5–6; Thaly, *Komárom,* p. 132. However, Újházi's radicalism focused on republicanism, not socialism. He was also an older, more practical man, whose disappointments may in any case have cooled his radical zeal. His cautious approach apparently brought about his break with his younger, more romantically oriented colleagues.
26. Teleki to Kossuth, Paris, Dec. 27, 1849, in István Hajnal, *A Kossuth emigráció Törökországban* (Budapest, 1927) 1: 598.
27. *Pesti Napló,* Feb. 15, 1851.
28. Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R. section 216, O.L.
29. Csapkay brothers to Pulszky, New York, July 2, 1850, in Acs, *New Buda,*

pp. 106–108. Destitution among the Hungarians remained so acute that by early 1852 Congress was debating how it could save them from starvation. That this destitution played no small part in the exiles' attacks on Újházi and later on Kossuth, when it became apparent that both were collecting for special purposes and would not share the funds with them, can be safely assumed.

30. Újházi to Kossuth, New York, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.
31. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
32. Károly László, *Napló-töredékek az 1848/49-i menekülteket, internáltakat, különösen Kossuthot és környezetét illetőleg, Törökországban és az Egyesült Államokban* (Budapest, 1887), pp. 58–59. The colony was to be under military orders, with all those willing to train for military service drawing sustenance from it. The idea of establishing a Hungarian colony in Turkey was reconsidered in December 1850. See I.971, O.L.
33. Kossuth's representative in Paris, László Teleki, was first to suggest the potentials for exploiting American sympathies for Hungary's cause. See Hajnal, *Törökországban,* pp. 518, 596–98.
34. Komlos, *Kossuth,* p. 40.
35. *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851.
36. Letter of introduction for emigrants about to depart to America, Sumla, Feb. 14, 1850, in Hajnal, *Törökországban,* p. 695. See also I.706, O.L.
37. Kossuth to Újházi, Broussa, March 27, 1850, Manuscripts Division, Magyar Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, hereafter cited as O.Sz.K.
38. Kossuth to Teleki, Kutahia, July 23, 1850, I.844, O.L. Kossuth made it clear that the administration of the colony would be based on the assumption that the Hungarian colonists would eventually return to their homeland.
39. Marsh to Kossuth, Constantinople, June 2, 1850, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the U.S. Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
40. Brown to Webster, Sept. 26, 1850, Miscellaneous Correspondence Received, 1850, N.A.; Brown also wrote to Újházi to persuade him to go to Washington in Kossuth's behalf. See Brown to Újházi, Detroit, Nov. 17, 1850, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
41. Webster to Marsh, Washington, Feb. 28, 1851. Dispatches from the Department of State, Vol. 14, N.A.
42. *Ibid.* These were, of course, very erroneous views of Kossuth's objectives. Újházi, whose personal sentiments were perhaps better reflected by these statements, suspected that Kossuth would be upset by them: "Webster — I believe — could have spoken otherwise . . . he made unnecessary declarations about our future and our convictions," he wrote to Kossuth in 1851. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
43. *Congressional Globe,* 31st Congress, 2nd Session, pp. 710, 778, 816.
44. *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851.
45. *Ibid.,* Oct. 9, 1851.
46. László, *Napló,* pp. 63–64. This exchange of correspondence between Homes and Kossuth is cited in Komlos, *Kossuth,* pp. 44–45.
47. Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, Apr. 29, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
48. Homes to Webster, Constantinople, May 5, 1851, Correspondence from Turkey with the Department of State, Book G, No. 3, N.A.
49. Homes to Morgan, Constantinople, May 15, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.
50. Komlos, *Kossuth,* p. 46. Homes suggested to Kossuth the probability that Austria will insist he emigrate to America as a condition of his release if he does not elect to do so voluntarily. See Homes to Kossuth, Constantinople, June 16, 1851, Miscellaneous Correspondence of the Legation, Vol. J-5, N.A.

51. Kossuth to Újházi, Kutahia, May 21, 1851, I.1222, O.L. This letter is part of a group of letters entitled, "Kossuth's letter book, May 21–June 18, 1851," located in I.1222, O.L. All of the letters appear to be carbon copies, written in Kossuth's hand on very fine paper. Since the letter to Újházi suddenly ends in mid-sentence on the second page, there is some reason to suspect that it may never have been sent.
52. *Ibid.*
53. Kossuth to Pulszky, Kutahia, May 31, 1851, I.1222, O.L. Pulszky, one of the closest confidants of Kossuth and his representative in London, seemed to be under the impression in early 1851 that Kossuth intended to establish a Hungarian colony in America. See Maythényi to his wife, London, Jan. 18, 1851, in Acs, *New Buda,* pp. 154–159.
54. Ferenc Varga, *Varga Ferenc följegyzései* (n.p., n.d.), p. 3, Quart. Hung. 2359, O.Sz.K. For other estimates of the size of Újházi's claim, see *Pesti Napló,* Dec. 14, 1850 and Jan. 7, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda,* pp. 128–135, 143–151, and János Xántus, *Xántus János levelei Éjszakamerikából* (Pest, 1858), p. 45. In the final analysis, only the few acres Újházi worked were effectively occupied. The rest remained part of future dreams never realized.
55. His plans attracted many who said that due to oppression in Hungary they would soon join him in his new colony. See Újházi to Kossuth, New York, Apr. 10, 1850, I.736, O.L.
56. Jenő Pivány, "A New Budai magyar colonia," *Magyar Történelmi Szemle* 3 (1914): 142. Újházi apparently expected to entice landed gentry to join him by promising the life-style they were accustomed to in Hungary. He was criticized for this by some of the exiles. For example, János Fiala reported prevailing negative opinion of Újházi's colony in the spring of 1852: "Újházi assumes a Dionysius role there [at New Buda]. He wants to transplant the Hungarian aristocratic manner of behavior to the West." See Tivadar Ács, *A száműzöttek. Fiala János 1848–49-i honvédalezredes emlékiratai az emigrációból* (n.p., n.d.), p. 214.
57. Rácz Rónay to Feleki, Budapest, Jan. 25, 1923, Charles Feleky Papers, Miscellaneous Mss Collection #63, Library of Congress. Rácz Rónay claimed to have in his possession several copies of what he called Újházy's real estate prospectuses sent to Hungary.
58. *Pesti Napló,* Dec. 14, 1850, and Jan. 17, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda,* pp. 128–135, 147–151; *Pesti Napló,* Feb. 15, 1851; *Magyar Hírlap,* Dec. 22, 1850. All of these consisted of letters from exiles at New Buda.
59. Charles L. Brace, *Hungary in 1851* (New York, 1852), pp. 274–277.
60. Maythényi to his wife, London, Jan. 18, 1851 in Ács, *New Buda,* pp. 154–159.
61. *Pesti Napló,* Jan. 7, 1851 in Ács, *New Buda,* pp. 147–151.
62. Varga, *Följegyzései,* p. 6. Another of the emigrants with Újházi stated that most Americans he met knew of the "Hungarian Colony." *Magyar Hírlap,* Dec. 22, 1850.
63. Most of the originals of this correspondence are found in the Mss. Division, O.Sz.K. Some are reproduced in Lillian M. Wilson, "Some Hungarian Patriots in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* 11 (1913), and in Ács, *New Buda.*
64. Order of General Land Office, Washington, D.C. to Registrar and Receiver, Fairfield, Iowa, April 7, 1851. The *National Era* (Washington), Apr. 24, 1851.
65. Klára Újházi to her family, New Buda, May 22, 1851, Újházi Papers, P section 1539, O.L.
66. *The Boston Daily Advertiser,* Feb. 4, 1852; also excerpts in *Albany Evening Journal,* Feb. 9, 1852.

67. During his October 1851 visit to London on his way to America, Kossuth did just the opposite by ordering the exiles to remain in Europe in preparation for renewing the revolution. A Kossuth Fund was formed under his encouragement with war-like objectives, distracting moneys and sympathies from the previously successful Hungarian Relief Committee which had financed the emigration of large numbers of Hungarians to America for settlement purposes. The Committee was forced to dissolve, thus terminating its aid to potential settlers at New Buda. See Esterházy to Kossuth, in Jánossy, *Emigráció,* 1: 581–585.
68. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Apr. 29, 1851, I.1200, O.L.
69. Újházi recommended that previous status or rank of individuals be ignored and that instead of attempting to divide the land among them, Kossuth would avoid quarreling if the American method of distributing Congressional lands were followed. Újházi to Kossuth, New Buda, Nov. 22, 1851, in Vasváry Collection, Hungarian-American Foundation, New Brunswick, N.J., and cited in Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 226.
70. *Ibid.*; see also Újházi to Mrs. Tochman, New Buda, Dec. 4, 1851, *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
71. Fillmore to Újházi, Washington, Oct. 10, 1851, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
72. Crampton to Palmerston, Washington, Dec. 15, 1851, Jánossy, *Emigráció* 2, part 1: 204–206.
73. Frank H. Severance, ed., *Millard Fillmore Papers* (Buffalo, 1907), 11: 138, 467–468.
74. *New York Herald,* Jan. 6, 1852; *New York Times,* Jan. 8, 1852.
75. *Washington Union,* Jan. 13, 1852.
76. May, *Mid-Century Revolutions,* p. 72; Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 336–337.
77. *New York Herald,* Jan. 9, 1852, reporting Kossuth's disclaimer of January 7.
78. Brick to the Tochmans, Sept. 16, 1851, in *National Era* (Washington), Sept. 18, 1851. Since no written directive by Kossuth to this effect was produced by the Sumla group to document its claims, it is possible that in its desperate state of destitution the group misrepresented or exaggerated Kossuth's orders. It should also be recalled that in early 1850, when Kossuth sent this group to America, his plans on permanent settlement in America were as yet undecided.
79. Jánossy, *Emigráció* 1: 225–226.
80. De Ahna, *Greatest Humbug.* That the Tochmans enjoyed strong support among top official circles in Washington, from the President down, is attested by the fact that after De Ahna's attacks on the Tochmans, he was fired from his job at the Public Land Office, and the entire Executive Branch of the Government was thereafter directed not to employ him.
81. Újházi to Tochman, New Buda, Jan. 24, 1851, I.1070, O.L.; Tochman to Újházi, Washington, Mar. 24, 1851, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
82. Újházi to Mrs. Tochman, New Buda, Dec. 4, 1851, *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
83. *National Era* (Washington), Oct. 9, 1851. In their appeal, dated September 26, 1851, the Hungarians declared De Ahna a "tool" hired by European despots to foment divisions among the exiles.
84. *New York Herald,* Jan. 14, 1852.
85. *Ibid.*
86. *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
87. Apollonia Jagello was an adventuress whose penchant for publicity had gotten her into trouble. The contemporary press often described her dressed in a military uniform during her first weeks in New York. Sources also agree that the Jagello name, implying noble roots, had been adopted by her. Most debatable remains

the question as to whether she served as a soldier at Komárom. When later forced to defend her reputation, she and her supporters stated that she had never claimed to be any more than a nurse in the Komárom military hospital.

88. Tochman to Kossuth, Washington, Jan. 6, 1852; Nagy to Tochman, Washington, Jan. 11, 1852; Tochman to Kossuth, Jan. 15, 1852. All reproduced in *National Era* (Washington), Feb. 5, 1852.
89. Újházi to Pulszky, New Buda, Jan. 31, 1851, in Ács, *New Buda,* pp. 220–222.
90. Újházi to Vukovics, New Buda, Sept. 12, 1851, Vukovics Papers, R section 216, O.L.
91. Kossuth to Újházi, Harrisburg, Jan. 15, 1852, Mss. Division, O.Sz.K.
92. Rácz Rónay to Feleki, Budapest, Jan. 25, 1923, Charles Feleky Papers, Miscellaneous Mss. Collection #63, Library of Congress. Rácz-Rónay was quoting from fragments of Prick's diary in his possession.
93. Péter Bogáti, "Flamingók New Budán," *Magyar Hírek,* Apr. 14, 1976.
94. Újházi to Kossuth, Austin City, Texas, Apr. 22, 1852, in Jánossy, *Emigráció,* 2, part 2: 797–800.
95. For example, Géza Kende, *Magyarok Amerikában* (Cleveland, 1927), 1: 326.
96. See Kossuth's May 21, 1851 letter to Újházi, I.1222, O.L.
97. Ferenc Pulszky, *Életem és korom* (Budapest, 1884), 2: 97.
98. For example, see Varga, *Följegyzései,* p. 6; and Xántus, *Levelei,* p. 45.
99. Ács, *A száműzöttek,* p. 214; Farkas Újházi to family, New Buda, March 30, 1852, cited in *Magyar Hírek,* Feb. 14, 1976.
100. Kossuth to Asbóth, London, Sept. 9, 1852, *Adalékok a kényuralom ellenes mozgalmak történetéhez. Az Asbóth család irataiból* (Pest, 1871), p. 71.
101. Komlos, *Kossuth,* pp. 123–125.
102. Jánossy, *Emigráció,* 1: 336.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1979)

In Memoriam Miklós Radnóti (1909-1944)

Marianna D. Birnbaum

On June 23, 1946 a mass grave was reopened at Abda, a small village in Western Hungary. The event was by no means unique at this stage of Hungarian history. Hardly a day went by that the authorities of one region or another would not receive word that local people had come upon corpses or hastily covered graves in the fields. According to the findings of the preliminary investigations, approximately six hundred feet away from the Rábca, a small river running through the area, inmates of a forced labor camp had been executed. The ensuing exhumation proved to be a rather difficult job: the corpses were partially decomposed and the coroners had to identify the dead and the time and cause of death on the basis of shreds of clothing and disintegrated scraps of paper. On the corpse which they registered as number 12 the following items were found:

> A visiting card with the name Dr. Miklós Radnóti printed on it. An ID card stating the mother's name as Ilona Gross. Father's name illegible. Born in Budapest, May 5, 1909. Cause of death: shot in the head. In the back pocket of the trousers a small notebook was found soaked in the juices of the body, and blackened by wet earth. This was cleaned and dried in the sun.[1]

On the first page of the notebook there was a short text in Hungarian, Serbian, German, French and English. The latter reads "... contains the poems of the Hungarian poet Miklós Radnóti... to Mr. Gyula Ortutay, Budapest, University lecturer . . . Thank you in anticipation."[2] It is followed by his last poems with a final entry dated October 31, 1944:

> I fell beside him; his body turned over
> already taut as a string about to snap.
> Shot in the back of the neck. That's how you too will end
> I whispered to myself: just lie quietly.
> Patience now flowers into death.

"Der springt noch auf," a voice said above me.
On my ear, blood dried, mixed with filth.[3]
(Trans. by E. George)

The death described was not yet his own, it was the last moment of Miklós Lorsi, a fellow inmate, a formerly celebrated violinist, to which the tragic simile, comparing the dying body to a taut string, alludes.

Radnóti would have been seventy years old this year, but he was shot thirty-five years ago and buried at the mass grave at Abda. In 1959, commemorating his fiftieth birthday, Ortutay said that with his last words — meaning the German quotation — Radnóti acquitted his nation from the opprobium of his murder.[4]

Miklós Radnóti, one of the most oustanding poets of twentieth-century Hungarian literature, lived merely thirty-five years but already his birth was darkened by tragedy. It cost the lives of his mother and twin brother as told in his only longer prose piece, *Gemini*. Grief and guilt feelings over the double tragedy accompanied Radnóti's entire creative life. In a poem written on his twenty-eighth birthday, he searches for his *raison d'être* by returning to the same event:

An ugly, obstinate infant was I,
my tiny, twin-bearing mother, your death!
Whether my brother was stillborn or had
five minutes of life, I do not know,
but there, amidst blood, pain and screams
I was lifted up toward the light, like
a victorious little beast
who has already shown its worth
by leaving two dead bodies behind.
. . . . . .
Little mother — you bleeding sacrifice,
I have reached the age of men.
The burning light is blinding me,
send me a signal with your gentle hand
that you know the truth, that it's all right,
that there is a meaning to my life![5]

His family's early disintegration is the topic of the "Remembering Poem" (1933) in which he recalls the last minutes of his father.

Nothing would be easier than to show in his poetry that all through his life Radnóti was preparing himself for death. It was not the inevitability of passing that had occupied his mind, but the premonition that he would die a young man. This belief was, however, not the decadent pose

of the Symbolist of the fin-de-siècle, or of the post-Impressionists of the twenties, but the objective analysis of historical realities, their signals turning into a poetic scale of his life. Just as Kafka, Musil or Krleža presented us with a "preview" of alienation present in our world today, so did Radnóti progress in his poems on the road which ultimately came to an end at Abda.

Yet he was not a pessimistic poet; perhaps the most moving in his œuvre is the pride and satisfaction with which he had collected and shaped into poems the rare minutes of happiness, those few moments of carefree joy that were granted him during his short life.

Having finished high school, Radnóti followed his guardian's suggestion and spent a year in Liberec, Czechoslovakia, to learn a trade: textile technology. He tried to learn "something useful," but could not go on with it and finally, in 1930, he enrolled at the University of Szeged as a French and Hungarian major. Szeged had a great influence on Radnóti's literary activities. There he met the closest friends of his future years, among them Gyula Ortutay. At the same time his first volume of poetry was published: *Heathen Greeting Songs,* signaling his identification with the revolutionary young. A year later, his second volume, *Song of the New Shepherds,* was confiscated and the poet had to face a court trial, charged with subversion and with having committed blasphemy.

Radnóti's early poetry was rebellious, but not in a clearcut political sense. He was rebelling against the taste of those critics for whom only conventional literature had an appeal. His poetry, abounding in surrealistic images and written in free verse, was meant to break through the barriers of tepid traditions. Young and open to everything new, Radnóti was deeply affected by the famous Exhibition of the Colonial Peoples which he visited during his first trip to Paris in 1931. The artistic achievements of 'primitive' cultures, so often reflected in the work of Picasso and many of his contemporaries, also found their way into Radnóti's poetry after his journey to France. Simultaneously, social themes, the topic of social protest, make their first appearance in his verse. Radnóti's brief involvement with the Populist Left at Szeged gave impetus to these pieces, which after 1945 were often quoted, their political significance disproportionately emphasized, not the least by his surviving friends.

By the end of the twenties and during the first years of the thirties, the young writers had formed a loose but genuine alliance, to which all on the Left, from the bourgeois liberals to the self-avowed communists, belonged, as long as they opposed traditional, 'academic literature.'

Eclectic as the group was, it was personal style and predilection, or often simply a matter of temperament rather than ideological sophistication, that made one or the other choose a certain political position within that broad spectrum. The year 1933, however, ended this relatively tolerant attitude, and the polarization of ideas began to take on a more serious and consequently dangerous shape. Many abandoned the Left as early as 1931–32, feeling that hopes for social change were futile, while after the takeover of Hitler and his party some moved closer and closer to the Right; by the end of the decade they turned into staunch supporters of National Socialism. Radnóti's withdrawal from open political commitment also began in 1933, with the fast spread of Fascist ideology. He did not take sides, but in his poetry the theme of Socialism disappears and is replaced by a search for a universal humanist ideal which permeates his later poetry and was to culminate in the great anti-fascist, pacifist poems of his last years. Engaged humanism was the only way in which the poet who could not fight otherwise undertook to safeguard the cherished human and cultural values which were suddenly endangered by the New Order. He did not participate in the Spanish Civil War but his poems unequivocally reflect his sympathies about the struggle "down South" in which to him right and wrong were clearly distinguishable. In his "First Eclogue" the fate of Garcia Lorca is related, but at the same time the fear of his own future is foretold in the imaginary conversation between the Shepherd and the Poet.

Shepherd:

He . . . Garcia Lorca is dead! that no one has told me.'
News of war travels fast, so fast; and the men who are poets
vanish: like that! Didn't Europe have some memorial observance?

Poet:

No one as much as took note. It's good if the wind pokes the embers,
find some broken lines in the site of the pyre and learns them.
That's how much will be left of the œuvre, for the scholarly future.
(Trans. by E. George)

His deep concerns for the fate of the world notwithstanding, Radnóti was primarily the poet of the individual, and thus his private experience gained equal significance in his poetry. In 1935 he married the only love of his life, Fanni, to whom some of the most beautiful love poems of modern Hungarian literature are addressed. Their texture is interlaced with ingenious metaphors whose most generous source is nature. Nature's images are simultaneously the medium in which Radnóti's social

and moral messages are delivered. Colors, too, have a special role in his poetic world; their function, almost exclusively symbolic, is to separate feelings: the joyous from the sad, and ultimately to identify destruction and death. White and silver are Radnóti's colors for death, standing in significant opposition to gold, which consistently symbolizes life and happiness. Life's blessings are frequently portrayed in a 'golden synecdoche,' reducing them to Fanni's golden curls, or the sun's rays falling on her body. In lines, reminiscent of Mayakovsky's language, he writes:

> . . . the sunshine yells merrily
> down the braids of my lover,
> swaying, my shadow grows to the sky,
> and tonight, for supper, my brazen twenty-two years
> will polish off at least three stars![7]

Consequently, as the years turn darker, silver and white become his predominant colors, forcing gold into the outer fringes of his imagination, to his occasional description of a cherished but unattainable humane future. In addition to the ones he most frequently used, Radnóti assigned symbolic meanings to practically every color of the spectrum. In his recapitulation of the world, nature is broached and its images transferred into various social and ethnic concepts, appearing in metaphorical metonymies such as "the trees rebel crimson flowers,"[8] or "two poppies demonstrate loyally."[9] Emblematic expressions showing the convertability of images and issues are frequent in his political poetry of the early thirties. Similarly, in a synaesthetic perception, people and objects live, suffer, fear and rejoice together. Their differences washed away by intricately interwoven adjectives and predicates, man and things together create a magic world of pananimism in which their convergence alone is sufficient to prove them isomorphs, as in the "Naive Song to the Wife":

> As she enters, the door greets her with a clink
> and the flowerpots break into a pat,
> a sleepy patch wakes in her blonde hair
> like a startled sparrow, chirruping.
>
> The old electric cord utters a scream
> hulking its lazy body toward hers, and
> all is swirling, so fast, I cannot write it down.

She just arrived, absent the entire day,
a tall cornflower in her hand:
with that she'll drive my death away.[10]

For a while, added to marital bliss, professional success brightened his daily existence. Radnóti completed and published his doctoral dissertation in 1934. It was a monograph on Margit Kaffka, an excellent woman poet of the fin-de-siècle. Still, unable to get a teaching position, he was forced to tutoring at the stenography school of his father-in-law, while Fanni added to the common income whatever she earned by giving private lessons. But he began to make a name for himself, and *Nyugat,* the most prestigious literary journal of Hungary, was publishing and reviewing his poems. A year later, Radnóti's next volume, *New Moon,* appeared: poems already written in an atmosphere of foreboding. The quiet, content moments were growing rarer. The earlier carefree idyll became filled with new meaning, and fear was turning prophetic. His collection published in 1936 bore the title *Just Pace Up and Down, You Doomed!,* and while it still contained a few poems of playful charm, the prevailing tone was capsulized in the title poem:

Just pace up and down, you doomed!
Tomcat and wind are hiding in the bush,
the row of dark trees lie tumbled
at your feet — and humping its back
the road turned pale in fear.

Shrink autumn leaf!
Shrink, you horrible world!
Wild geese cast their shadows
on the stiffened, rusty grass . . .[11]

The next one, *Precipitous Road* (1938), was the last volume of poems still compiled by the poet himself. Prior to it, his receiving the Baumgarten Prize, a coveted literary award, and a short trip with Fanni to France marked Radnóti's last peaceful experiences before his final calvary began. But even in the poems written in Paris his legitimate fear of the future overshadowed the happy discoveries made in museums and small French towns they had not visited before. The delightful "Cartes postales," a mini-genre à la Apollinaire which Radnóti had used so successfully, alternate with poems voicing pessimism and deep anxiety. The "Picture Postcards," will sadly return in the fatal "Razglednica"

series of the labor camp. From 1938 on Radnóti's preparation for death intensifies:

> . . . Among my memories I lie prostrated,
> a pupil, maturing speedily for death . . .[12]

He is, however, less afraid of biological death than of having to stop working. The fear that he would not be able to complete his poetic work, that he would die and be judged by a "torso" rather than the full œuvre, caused him the greatest pain. Writing his own 'epitaph,' he anxiously asks ". . . but tell me, will what I've written, survive? . . ."[13] The poems focusing on death become more and more numerous, there are only a few pieces in which neither the word nor its symbolic colors appear. He turns to a new genre, the eclogue (a deliberate misnomer), which achieves its greatest evocative power by the sharp conflict between its form and its content. Radnóti soon abandons the bucolic voice and the traditional dialogue of shepherds: the streaming, pounding message demands a change in structure. His defiant rejection of form and rhyme of the earlier years is now replaced by the lucid language and style of neo-classicism. The rebellion of the Modernists had been directed against an overorganized universe, and in the face of a world gone mad, in Radnóti's poetry purified form, tightly composed lines have become the substitute for lost reason. His hexameters do not reach back to the Latin models. He turns to the Hungarian poets of the 18th and 19th centuries instead, to the verse of Dániel Berzsenyi and János Arany. Choosing them at that new juncture of his life, Radnóti sought out the only cultural community in which he could still feel at home.

Amazingly, some of his last are patriotic poems, although of a special kind. Of these the best example is, " I Cannot Know," in which he, the potential victim, identifies himself with his land, its nature, its history and its present guilt as well.

> I cannot know what these parts could mean to someone else
> to me it's home, this tiny land in the embrace
> of flames, since childhood cradling from far-off, my world.
> It's out of her I grew, as does from a trunk its tender shoot,
> and I hope that one day my body will sink into this soil.
> I am at home. And when a bush kneels, once in a while,
> at my feet, I know its name and can name its blossom; . . .[14]
>
> (Trans. by E. George)

The same sentiment is expressed in his diary,

> . . . my nation does not scream at me from the bookshelf, saying, get out of here; the regions of my land open their treasures for me, the thorns on the bushes do not tear at me more than at others, the tree will not stand on tiptoes so that I cannot reach its fruit. Had I experienced this I would kill myself, because I cannot live any other way than the way I do, nor can I think and believe in any other manner. That's how I feel in 1942, after three months of forced labor camp, and a fortnight spent in the special punitive unit.[15]

His is not a naive patriotism: Radnóti does not close his eyes to reality, and he is filled with revulsion about the world surrounding him:

> I lived on this earth in an age
> when honor was to murder and betray,
> and heroes were the killers and the thieves
> and those who were silent, too lazy to rejoice
> were hated as if they had caught the plague.
>
> I lived on this earth in an age
> when a man who spoke out was forced to hide
> and could only bite his fists in utter shame
> a land got drunk on filth and blood
> and grinned madly at its horrible fate.[16]

And all along he was sharply aware of his own, unavoidable fall:

> Inside myself I live through everything that is still to come.
> I don't look back. I know, not even memory, no
> magic will save me — there's evil in the sky.
> Friend, if you see me, shrug your shoulders and turn away.
> Where the angel with the sword stood before,
> now, maybe no one's there.[17]
>
> (Trans. by S. Polgar, S. Berg and S. J. Marks)

The draft notice came again and in the middle of his *Twelfth Night* translations Radnóti was called to forced labor duty for the third time. He was taken to "Lager Heidenau," to work in the copper mines of nearby Bor, in the German-occupied part of Yugoslavia. By mid-1944, a life spent in human dignity could only appear as an unreachable dream in his poems:

Where are the nights and the taverns, the tables set out under the lindens?
Where, where indeed is the night? that night which shall never return now,
for to whatever is past, death itself lends another perspective.
Here at the table they sit, take shelter in smiles of the women,
and will yet take sips from our glasses, those many unburied
sleeping in forests of foreign, in meadows of faraway places.[18]

(Trans. by E. George)

Longing for his wife, the uncertainty about her fate, caused him additional suffering:

> When might I see you? I hardly know any longer
> you, who were solid, were weighty as the psalter,
> beautiful as shadow and beautiful as light,
> to whom I would find my way whether deafmute or blind;
> now hiding in the landscape from within my eyes . . .

If he had any wish to survive, it was for the sake of his work and for Fanni. The hope of seeing her again lent him courage and strength to go on:

> . . . Despite them I am alive,
> a prisoner: and all I hoped for, I have
> sized up in breadth. I will find my way to you;
> for you I have walked the spirit's full length as it grew,
> and highways of the land. If need be, I will render
> myself, a conjurer, past cardinal embers,
> amid nose-diving flames, but I will come back,
> if I must be, I shall be resilient as the bark
> on trees . . .[19]

(Trans. E. George)

Then came the German retreat, the "Forced March" started, and led him within two months, to the mass grave of Abda.

Radnóti never wrote his "Ars poetica," but it is easy to gather from his poems that his work was his reason for living, ". . . For I am worth no more than the value of the word / in my poem . . . ," he confessed to his wife in the "Hesitant Ode," in which he also wrote:

> . . . And I still can't tell of the full extent
> of what it means to me, while I'm working
> to feel your protective gaze over my hand.[20]

In his persistent concern with every detail of his poems, in his constant striving for the best, the most subtle expression of his true thoughts, Radnóti put his entire intellectual and moral responsibility into every word he left behind.

Even when facing immediate death, the paramount, gnawing question on his mind was not how to save himself but how to assure that his poems in the small notebook would not perish with him.

His poems survived and the following generations have been reading them ever since. They know them by heart, they teach them in the high schools and universities of Hungary. Scholars have been analyzing his verse and rediscovering each piece with each new reading. There is still a hitherto unnoticed fine metaphor, a particularly successful harmony between sound and meaning that may surface with another close reading of the text. Additional ties between his work and that of his contemporaries are discovered by scrutinizing his vocabulary and the micropoetic components of his language. Like all great poets he is as inexhaustible for the interested reader as he is for the scholar. He perished young but he achieved what he had desired most — he has become an inalienable part of Hungarian literature. And as the years pass, he is more and more recognized on a European scale as a significant poetic witness to our time, ranking with the late Paul Celan and with the Polish poet, Zbigniew Herbert.

NOTES

1. Published by A. Kőszegi, *Töredék* (Budapest, 1972), pp. 68–69. Radnóti's final weeks were also investigated by Gábor Tolnai, "A meredek út végső szakasza," *Irodalomtörténet,* (New series) 2: 239–270; 3: 463–497, 763–792; and "Szerbia orman . . . — Radnóti Miklós nyomában," *Kortárs* 16/1 (January 1972): 86–106; 16/2 (February 1972): 254–269; and 16/3 (March 1972): 416–473.
2. M. Radnóti, *Bori notesz,* facsim. ed. (Budapest, 1970), p. 13.
3. "Picture Postcards, 4," from M. Radnóti, *Subway Stops,* ed. and trans. by E. George (Ann Arbor, 1977), p. 90. Henceforth E. George.
4. *Radnóti Miklós, 1909–1944,* ed. D. Baróti, introd. by Gy. Ortutay (Budapest, 1959). Further inquiry into his final days, however, revealed that Radnóti had indeed been killed by Hungarian soldiers, who when unable to find a hospital that would take in the sick inmates in their custody, decided to get rid of their twenty-two prisoners. The men were forced to dig their own graves into which they all were shot — except for the last, who was first ordered to cover the bodies and was then killed with shovels.
5. From "Huszonnyolc év," M. Radnóti, *Összes versei és műfordításai* (Budapest, 1959), pp. 153–154. Henceforth Radnóti. Unless otherwise indicated, all further translations are mine. They will appear in a monograph on Radnóti to be

published in the Twayne World Authors Series. The page numbers refer to the above-quoted original publication.

6. From "First Eclogue," E. George, pp. 47–48.
7. From "1931 április 19," Radnóti, p. 66.
8. From "Tavaszi vers," ibid., p. 42.
9. From "Pontos vers az alkonyatról," ibid., p. 109.
10. From "Együgyű dal a feleségről," ibid., p. 200.
11. From "Járkálj csak, halálraítélt!," ibid., pp. 149–150.
12. From "Ez volna hát. . . ," ibid., p. 155.
13. From "Hajnaltól éjfélig — S majd így tünődöm," ibid., p. 166.
14. From "I Cannot Know . . . ," E. George, p. 74.
15. Quoted from B. Pomogáts, *Radnóti Miklós* (Budapest, 1977), p. 191.
16. From "Töredék," Radnóti, pp. 259–260.
17. From "Not Even Memory, No Magic," M. Radnóti, *Clouded Sky*, tr. by S. Polgár, S. Berg, and S. J. Marks (New York, 1972), p. 83.
18. From "À la recherche . . . ," E. George, pp. 84–85.
19. From "Letter to My Wife," ibid., pp. 81–82.
20. From "Hesitant Ode," ibid., p. 67.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Spring 1979)

BOOK REVIEWS

East Central European Perceptions of Early America. Edited by Béla K. Király and George Barany. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1977. Pp. 144.

Since little scholarly attention has been paid in America so far to the East Central European image of the early United States, volume five of the Brooklyn College series: Studies on Society in Change, is a most welcome enterprise. It consists of six essays: one on Austria, one on Bohemia, two on Hungary and two on Poland, with a preface, an introduction and a concluding article. The present review will concentrate on the two essays dealing with Hungary: Alfred A. Reisch's "Sándor Bölöni Farkas's Reflections on American Political and Social Institutions" and Béla K. Király's "Béla Széchenyi's American Tour."

The first choice, that of Bölöni's *Utazás Észak-Amerikában,* is an obvious one; the Transylvanian wrote the first Hungarian travelogue ever on the United States. What Reisch does not mention is an equally important fact, namely that published in 1834, Bölöni's work preceded by one year Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America.* Even its Hungarian translation by Gábor Fábián came out earlier than the second Hungarian travelogue, Ágoston Haraszthy's in 1844. In consequence, Bölöni's is the only Hungarian account of the young republic unaffected by the Frenchman's perceptive remarks. The second choice, Béla Széchenyi's *Amerikai útam,* 1863, is less obvious. Following Bölöni's and Haraszthy's, three travelogues appeared on the U.S. before 1863, two more with chapters on North America and two others belong to the same period though they were published later; some of these books are outstanding. Evidently, Király was prompted in his choice by the fact that Béla Széchenyi belonged to one of the most distinguished and worthiest aristocratic families in Hungary. His tour in America realized a dream that had been denied by Metternich to his father, István Széchenyi, who had so ardently wished to see "das werdende Land."

The radically different approach and emphasis in the two essays contribute an added interest to the whole volume. Király examines Széchenyi's travelogue in the Hungarian historical context, while Reisch's

standpoint is that of self-critical, post-Vietnam War, post-Watergate America. In his learned presentation, Reisch provides a valuable though incomplete bibliography of his author. He calls him Farkas but the author is better known in Hungary as Bölöni, occasionally Bölöni Farkas. Hungarian names can present almost insolvable problems when it comes to a correct English version. Bölöni Farkas is a kind of multiple surname; Farkas is the real surname and Bölöni merely indicates the place where the family came from. However, similarly to other famous Hungarians, like the poet Csokonai (Mihály Vitéz), he came to be known by that name designating a geographical location. Indeed, in the concluding essay of the volume: "The Appeal and the Echo," George Barany correctly refers to him as Bölöni or Bölöni Farkas.

Reisch describes Bölöni's work as "hardly a balanced evaluation of Jacksonian America." That this "Columbus of Democracy," as a biographer so perceptively pointed to his role in Hungarian history, emphasized the positive sides (liberty, equality, free press, education, progress, free enterprise, etc.) is absolutely true, but he did not ignore the negative qualities (slavery, emergence of a moneyed aristocracy) either. If the positive side comes out stronger, this enthusiasm is not due to "youthful Romanticism," but is a consequence of a historical situation. Bölöni desperately needed to find a model; he accomplished a mission. Travelogues in Hungary of the 1830s and 1840s were a kind of political literature trying to awaken the feudal, backward, apathetic country. Indeed, in the opinion of István Széchényi, the great promoter of progress in Hungary, Bölöni's book had the shattering effect of "thunder and lightning," and in Széchenyi's view no one ever has honored Hungary "with a more useful and more beautiful present." That Bölöni, "like many Americans, . . . believed the U.S. was a pioneer forging a new era for mankind," is a correct assessment. But then most Europeans of the time considered America "the Utopia of the Common Man." As Martin Lipset so accurately stated in his preface to Harriet Martineau's *Society in America,* "the Europeans came to America from societies that retained strong elements of a feudal caste-ridden past." For Hungarians this was even more true. Also, with all their shortcomings, American institutions objectively constituted an attractive alternative to most Europeans. By applying in his essay the point of view of the soul-searching, frustrated, post-Vietnam war, post-Watergate American atmosphere Reisch perfectly matches the spirit of Bölöni's book, which is equally representative of a historical atmosphere.

Király's analysis of Béla Széchenyi's travelogue, on the other hand,

focuses on the relevance of those early travelogues in the old country. As Tocqueville said: "Though I seldom mention France, I do not write a page without thinking of her." Széchenyi too observed everything in America with Hungary in mind. As Király so emphatically points out, the main purpose of his book was "to educate the Hungarians," and thus, to promote progress in all fields of life. In consequence, as Király says, his style had to be "didactic," giving detailed background information before analyzing issues.

When Széchenyi visited, the Civil War was already on. Thus, the slavery issue was much more prominent than in Bölöni's days. Király points out correctly how much Széchenyi blamed the black man's "primitiveness" on the lack of education and how realistic he was in his assessment of the black man's treatment in the North. Nor does Király ignore the fact that Széchenyi showed a great deal of understanding for the Secessionists. Indeed, he was the only Hungarian travelogue-writer to advocate the Southern case out of economic fairness to the white slave-owners. He was trying to strike a just balance. Király is right in claiming that in Széchenyi's view "the South is obliged to proclaim abolition for the sake of mankind." Király also mentions that Széchenyi believed the slave-owners should be compensated. The Hungarian aristocrat certainly tried to weigh carefully the two sides, and Király wants to do justice to this fact. However, occasionally his subtle paraphrase, like, "the emancipation of four million slaves would then ruin the South's six million whites," almost changes Széchenyi's argument. The Hungarian put it in much more aggressive terms: "It is possible to state *à la* Lincoln that there is an end to slavery, but I ask whether anyone has the right to free about four million blacks and ruin by that six million whites?"

Throughout his presentation, Király successfully keeps the emphasis on the Hungary-oriented character of the early travelogues. In consequence, his approach differs radically from Reisch's; indeed, the two essays, following each other in the same volume, successfully complement each other. They demonstrate most vividly how much a writer's emphasis, his priorities influence his presentation of a historical document.

College of Charleston Anna Katona

The American Non-Policy Towards Eastern Europe 1943-1947. By Geir Lundestad. Tromso: Universitetsforlaget, 1978. Pp. 654. Distributed in the United States and Canada by Columbia University Press. $18.00 paper.

This large book was inspired by the author's desire to probe theories on the origin of the cold war in the context of American policy toward Eastern Europe. The structure of the volume is complicated. After an introductory chapter, Part One discusses American universalism toward Eastern Europe. Part Two examines American policy toward Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Finland, and the Baltic States. A chapter compares policies toward the various East European countries. Another examines the peace treaties with the Danubian Axis satellites, and another scrutinizes the American attitude toward plans for federation in Eastern Europe. Part Three raises the question: what could and what did the United States do against Soviet domination in Eastern Europe? Three possible levers are considered — the atomic bomb, the American conventional military strength, and the power of the immense American economy. An appendix summarizes Soviet policy toward Eastern Europe. The notes, about 150 pages of them, show a Sisyphean research in American archives, manuscript collections and libraries. The result is a very useful book for students of East European affairs.

Throughout the narrative Lundestad emphasized that there was no consistent United States policy toward Eastern Europe. But consistency is not always a virtue or even possible in foreign policy. Eastern Europe — a low priority area on the scale of American interests — had to yield to more important interests, as the author explains on several occasions.

In the opinion of this reviewer the main reason for a contradictory and confused American policy toward Eastern Europe was the lack of a high-level policy-making organ in Washington. A first step was made in this direction only in 1944 with establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. But President Roosevelt remained his own secretary of state throughout the war and made the important foreign policy decisions, sometimes even without informing the Department of State, which played a subdued role during his administration. Special emissaries and representatives of wartime agencies appeared in foreign countries and few people knew who was doing what, when, where, how and why in foreign affairs. The tons of planning and briefing papers available now in official publications, archives, and memoirs are to a large extent expressions of individual or group suggestions and opinions

in government agencies, but few of those papers reached the President's desk or were considered by him. The task he assumed was beyond the capability of any man.

There were other factors at work, ensuring confusion. Policy-makers believed, or their attitude created the impression, that the affairs of Eastern Europe would be settled primarily by Britain and the Soviet Union. The Joint Chiefs of Staff ruled, in the autumn of 1943, that the United States should take no responsibilities "in the area of the Balkans, including Austria."

Gradually the Soviet military occupation of Eastern Europe became the decisive factor in policy. This situation would not have changed without use of force, which was never considered by the English-speaking powers. Keeping Soviet influence out of Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Japan remained a more important and more feasible task. In Eastern Europe the armistice agreements and peace treaties simply confirmed the military status quo established at the close of hostilities.

For the East European nations this turn of events brought traumatic experiences. In view of America's tremendous power in the closing stage of the war, the peoples of Eastern Europe believed that their fate would be settled at the peace table according to the Four Freedoms, the Atlantic Charter, and the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe. Alas, these universalist declarations had at best only a tenuous connection with politics, and a foreign tyranny could impose totalitarian systems of government without much ado. The timetable was not the same in each East European country, but eventually the leaders of democratic parties were put in prison, exiled, executed, or otherwise eliminated. Such stark facts, fatal to more than a hundred million people, cannot easily emerge with clarity in a scholarly discussion of the theories of the cold war and the options of American policy.

University of Notre Dame Stephen D. Kertesz

Ferenc G. Harcsár
1910-1979

Founder of the Hungarian Readers' Service and co-founder of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies,* F. G. Harcsár was born in Szatmárnémeti, Hungary (now Satu Mare, Romania). He completed his university education in Budapest. After obtaining a doctorate in chemistry, he embarked on a career in scientific research. The war drove him into exile. Following several years' stay in Venezuela, he immigrated to Canada where he resumed his career as a research scientist. He retired in 1977 as a respected member of Canada's defense research establishment.

F. G. Harcsár was a deeply religious man with an equally strong passion for his Hungarian nation as well as his ancestral Transylvania. Throughout his adult life he had been involved in religious and patriotic organizational efforts. He had been instrumental in the founding and the maintenance of Hungarian Calvinist congregations wherever he stayed for more than a brief period. During the last decade of his life he devoted most of his spare time to the establishment and the directing of the Hungarian Readers' Service, our journal's institutional sponsor. A dedicated and punctual worker, he put in long hours every week, often every day, to attend to the administrative and financial affairs of his organization. Although the apathy and malice he encountered often caused him to despair, he refused to be discouraged and to abandon his plans.

After nearly four years of preparatory work, in 1974 he launched the Readers' Service and published, with the help of N. F. Dreisziger, the first issue of his *Review.* Following his retirement from government service three years later, he devoted even more of his time to the increasing administrative work demanded by the journal. Even during the last months of his life, he expended his rapidly diminishing energy in making arrangements for the periodical's future.

He is survived by his wife, two daughters and two granddaughters. His death is a great loss to his family, his many friends, the Hungarian-Canadian Calvinist community, and to the cause of Hungarian studies in North America and elsewhere.

N.F.D.

The Canadian-American

REVIEW

of Hungarian Studies

László Németh's *Revulsion*: Violence and Freedom
ZSUZSANNA OZSVATH

Literature and Politics in Germany of the 1830s: Karl Beck's Role in the *Junges Deutschland* Movement
AGNES H. VARDY

Vol. VI, No. 2 Fall 1979

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is a semi-annual, interdisciplinary journal devoted to the publication of original articles and critical book reviews relating to Hungary and Hungarians. Since its launching in 1974, the *Review* has been committed to the policy of providing a non-partizan forum for the scholarly discussion and analysis of issues in Hungarian history, politics and cultural affairs.

The *Review* is published by the Hungarian Readers' Service, a non-profit organization incorporated by federal statute in Canada. It is distributed by the University of Toronto Press.

Institutional subscriptions to the *Review* are $12.00 per annum. Individual subscriptions are $12.00 for one year and $20.00 for two years. University students and teachers may obtain personal subscriptions for $8.00 per annum. Subscribers outside of North America please add $2.00 for postage. Please direct inquiries to:

University of Toronto Press
Journals Department
5201 Dufferin Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3H 5T8

Sustaining memberships in the Hungarian Readers' Service Inc. are $100 for organizations and $50 for individuals. Members receive complimentary copies of the *Review*. All donations in support of the HRS are income tax deductible in Canada. Please direct inquiries to:

Hungarian Readers' Service Inc.
P.O. Box 5493, Station F
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2C 3M1

Correspondence regarding the publication of manuscripts, book reviews, etc. should be addressed to the editor:

N. F. Dreisziger
Department of History
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 2W3

Statements or opinions expressed in the *Review* are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the HRS Inc. or the journal's editors.

Articles appearing in the *Review* are abstracted and indexed in HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS and AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE.

ISSN 0317-204X

Typesetting by Brevis Press. Printed at the University of Toronto Press.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Fall 1979)

CONTENTS

Articles

László Németh's *Revulsion*: Violence and Freedom 67
ZSUZSANNA OZSVATH

Literature and Politics in Germany of the 1830s: Karl Beck's Role in the *Junges Deutschland* Movement 79
AGNES H. VARDY

Review Articles

Castle Building and Its Social Significance in Medieval Hungary 91
S. B. VÁRDY

The Hungarian Revolution of 1848 99
LASZLO DEME

Recent Writings on Hungarian Historiography by S. B. Várdy ... 107
THOMAS SZENDREY

Book Reviews

Csaba Varga and András Sajó (eds.) *Modern polgári jogelméleti tanulmányok* (Studies in Modern Bourgeois Legal Theory) .. 115
BARNABAS RACZ

Ferenc Fáy. *Kövület* (Petrification) 118
MAXIM TABORY

44 Hungarian Short Stories 121
PAUL VARNAI

László Sirchich. *A Felvidék az ezeréves magyar államtestben: Magyarok Csehszlovákiában* (Upper Hungary in the Thousand-Year-Old Hungarian Body Politic: Hungarians in Czechoslovakia) 126
EDWARD CHASZAR

Obituary

Veronika Gervers-Molnar 1939–1979 128

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ZSUZSANNA OZSVATH holds a doctorate in German language and literature from the University of Texas at Austin, and currently teaches at Bishop College, Dallas, Texas, and the University of Texas at Dallas. She has previously published in the *German Studies Review* and has delivered papers before the Modern Language Association and the South Central Modern Language Association.

AGNES H. VARDY and her husband S. B. VARDY have both published in our journal on previous occasions.

LASZLO DEME teaches at the University of South Florida in Sarasota.

THOMAS SZENDREY teaches at Gannon College in Erie, Pennsylvania.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Fall 1979)

László Németh's *Revulsion*: Violence and Freedom

Zsuzsanna Ozsvath

The portrait of woman as victim of her own emotional and sexual nature lies within a well-known tradition that permeates Eastern and Western European literature, cutting across the boundaries of religion, ideology, and time. However, the contemporary Hungarian novel *Iszony* (*Revulsion*), written by László Németh between 1942 and 1947, manifests a fundamentally different approach which expands this traditional image.[1] Delineating the heroine with new and startling dimensions, *Revulsion* not only offers an unconventional feminine portrait, but also addresses major social and ethical issues, revealing the necessity of restructuring human relationships in general. It calls attention to the conflicts between individual need and social claim, and establishes parallels between the role of the wife in marriage and the role of the individual in society, suggesting that personal self-determination is the most basic human need and right, and, therefore, the most justified human demand. Indeed, in addition to furnishing an innovative vision of woman, *Revulsion* expounds a radical concept of human freedom.

Conventional in plot and structure, the novel is deceptive in its simplicity. Its form, first person narration, renders Nelli Kárász, her psychological structure and private feelings, central. Different from most young people of the village, she grows up to be a loner, shunning close relationships, avoiding social gatherings, dances, and parties. She has no emotional ties to anyone but her father. Together they share a life of loneliness, hard work, and poverty, a bleak present and a hopeless future.

As soon as she encounters her future husband and adversary, Sanyi Takaró, she fears and abhors him. But her parents disregard her feelings and pressure her beyond endurance: they see in Sanyi someone who will rescue Nelli from poverty, offer her long-absent security, and hence provide her with a good life. At first she defends herself against the pressure, but soon she loses ground; the death of her father, the illness of

her mother, and the encroaching force of Sanyi's pursuit break her will. She surrenders, and they marry: however, Nelli's revulsion to Sanyi prevails. The marriage deteriorates, and bitter hatred dominates her life. She becomes overwhelmed by fury and aggression. Her subsequent animosity grows to such an extent and generates such energy that it culminates in her murdering him.

This work provoked intense controversy among the critics in the Hungary of the late forties. Evaluating the novel from the Marxist point of view, official Hungarian criticism rejected the book because of its focus on the "private, psycho-sexual sphere." As early as 1946, I. Király said: "Németh's heroes are not the victims of objective circumstances, but of their own mistakes; their lot is not typical, but private and individual; they are damned to become lonely and isolated."[2] And György Lukács labeled Németh's individualistic approach not only as "dangerously" pessimistic, but even as "reactionary." As he claimed:

> The radical emphasis on the *inner region* is not coincidental: as a matter of fact, it is a conscious artistic approach as well as a demonstration of the author's moral outlook [italics added]. The type of person *Revulsion* advocates is someone who silently carries out his chores, who bears disappointments even catastrophes without wincing, who perceives self-fulfillment solely in his pedantically-accurate every day work (e.g. the father or the mother-in-law of the heroine). What is then the underlying suggestion of this novel, as László Németh's first significant novel since the liberation of Hungary? A new type of silence. . . . This is, . . . the novel expounds nothing less than a silent objection against the new democracy.[3]

In spite of the dominant critical opinion, a few critics of the time defended *Revulsion* against these attacks on the grounds that the novel *does* manifest social concerns. Contradicting official Hungarian criticism, István Sőtér, for example, said that underneath Németh's representation of psychological problems, themes reflecting class struggle emerge. "Not only does Diane's body break in this novel under the grip of Actaeen," he argued, "but the class of noblemen drowns in the hungry and violent arms of the peasants. And the deepest vibrations of these screams of horror have their roots in prevalent social conflicts; in fact, it would be a mistake not to hear them under the private overtones."[4] Likewise, János Czibor and Imre Sarkadi saw social criticism as an integral part of the novel.[5] In recent years, however, *Revulsion* has become less and less the center of controversial ideological encounters in Hungary; today, it is neither intensely attacked nor intensely defended from the Marxist point of view.[6] Free from doctrinal constraints, the author himself uses personal aesthetic criteria to explain that the work

explores feminine psychological dilemmas and offers a new vision of humanity's sexual and spiritual realm.[7]

Outside of Hungary, critical opinion diverges sharply regarding this novel and Németh's works in general. Whereas Lothar Sträter sees the author not only as a moralist and a social critic of the first rank, but also as an outstanding European novelist, many English and American reviewers consider Németh to be a traditional writer and perceive *Revulsion* as an old-fashioned Hungarian curiosity rather than a book of universal significance.[8] Károly Kerényi, on the other hand, regards Németh's style and characterization, even the gloomy and bleak atmosphere of his novels, as having supreme literary value. "Such novels," he writes in his essay on *Revulsion,* "pessimistic as they are, refute real pessimism through their sublime standards."[9] In fact, Kerényi believes Németh to be one of the greatest writers of European literature. As he says: "His [Németh's] women put him on a par with the creators of Electra, Anna Karenina, and Nora."[10]

Whereas the Marxist outlook clearly fails to elucidate the central issues of *Revulsion,* a psychological interpretation, common in Western criticism, initially suggests itself as a more relevant approach. Indeed, Nelli seems to be motivated solely by a pathologically passionate revulsion to Sanyi. As she says: "Do you know what 'love' is, Aunt Szeréna? It's nothing but the vulgar man's desire to cover his wife with his wetness before he devours her. And that is murderous. It left me without a single healthy thought" (II, 154).

However, in spite of the attention put on her feminine psychological nature, a close reading of the text reveals intricate layers of perspectives with ascending orders of concern: a national focus, a broader and more universal point of view, and finally Németh's own metaphysical perception. Indeed, Nelli only superficially resembles the conventionally drawn, emotionally-torn woman: when seen in a broader context, she illustrates a diversity of social and moral conflicts such as the relation between the individual and society, between isolation and community, between freedom and oppression. By dealing with Nelli's frustrated needs, Németh exposes both the frustration of Hungarian peasants and that of the individual in society; by pointing to her isolation, he discloses the isolation of the Hungarian village and stresses the moral and spiritual superiority of suffering. By insisting on Nelli's right to self-determination, Németh not only affirms the necessity for alternative patterns of life but advocates an extreme vision of human freedom, which justifies even violence, if necessary, for its realization.

In order to explore the underlying themes of the book, we must

examine Nelli and the characters surrounding her on all the levels previously mentioned. First of all, in spite of her authenticity as a particular character, Nelli reflects the expectations, patterns of life, and the socio-economic condition of her milieu as well. Therefore, in order to understand her reactions, we have to start our investigation by projecting her figure against the background of Hungarian village life between the two World Wars. Living in unendurable poverty and every day waging a hopeless struggle for life, the majority of Hungarian peasants hardly had any option to improve their lot.[11] Hence, the fact that Nelli does not attempt to better her life nor even become independent, and that she marries Sanyi and remains married to him against her will, is more significantly tied to the economic conditions of the time and the feudal, oppressive social structure of the country than to her emotional problems or to her feminine passivity. Without marriage, she has no realistic chance for survival. That is to say, rather than being a victim of her sexual determination, Nelli is a victim of the poverty and the slowly changing economic and social processes prevalent in the Hungary of her time. In fact, none of *Revulsion*'s characters seems to be able to rise above the general level of poverty and degradation. None but Sanyi hopes or plans for a better future, nor even tries to mend his life. Each of them accepts the hardship and the hopelessness of his condition. And even Sanyi's optimism is based on nothing but empty hopes: his endeavors are pointless in the long run; he moves in circles and fails in the end on every count. As Nelli describes his frame of mind:

> Instead of working on the farm, he thought of nothing but making deals. Although our cellar was empty, some days his breath smelt of wine. He spent his time with Uncle Kertész and other relatives, explaining the word-economy to them and drinking their wine. (II, 198)

Indeed, lethargy and weariness permeate the atmosphere of the village, restricting ambitions and lowering the expectations of people. Thus, to conceive of Nelli's dependence on men as a manifestation of her emotional instability, or as a traditionally feminine feature present in a male-oriented society, obscures the inherent social criticism of the book and ignores the reality of the conditions.

The characters of *Revulsion* should also be viewed against the background of the Hungarian populist literary tradition.[12] Focusing on the "Hungarian heritage" and the "Hungarian plight," this tradition highlights the isolation and hardship of the oppressed peasantry, and demands social and political reform. Peasants are often represented in the works of the populist writers as lonely and desperate individuals who either resign themselves to their fate or become single-handed rebels,

driven by their destitute circumstances and violent nature to the extreme edges of human tolerance.[13] Sharing the scope and vision of the movement, Németh recreates these characteristics not only in Nelli, but in her father, Sanyi's mother, and Aunt Szeréna, pointing to their common nature as well as to their common background and roots. Each of these four figures is portrayed as a silent and lonely person, suffering under overwhelming physical and existential deprivation. (There is, however, a difference in their reactions to extreme pressures: whereas Aunt Szeréna, Mrs. Takaró, and Mr. Kárász turn their despair inward, dying at the end in sudden heart-attacks, Nelli acts upon her feelings and becomes a murderess.) Németh does not use descriptions nor does he accumulate psychological arguments to explain his characters' most salient features, their need for separation and inner independence. Rather, he lovingly and sympathetically depicts these traits as parts of the figures' immutable essences. Yet, in spite of the similarities between this presentation and those of the populist writers, neither the characters depicted nor the issues raised in *Revulsion* simply follow the orbit of national views and traditions. Quite to the contrary, the traditional perspectives appear in this work in a novel form, imposing a revolutionary ethic of extreme consequences.

Both processes, the reevaluation and reformulation of the traditional populist approach and the development of a new vision, characterize Németh's treatment of the novel's central theme, Nelli's alienation. Reflecting more than a pattern of a literary tradition, more than a representation of an innate mystical quality of the mind, loneliness emerges in *Revulsion* as a necessary condition for man's sensibility, responsibility, strength, inner independence, and love. In spite of the obvious conflicts caused by their alienation, the four silent, lonely, more philosophically-minded characters of the novel demonstrate not only high moral standards, but also the ability to create human relationships of considerable depth. (For example, there is an intense emotional bond between Nelli, her father, Mrs. Takaró, and Aunt Szeréna, between Mrs. Takaró and her sons, between Aunt Szeréna and her relatives.) In contrast, worldliness and sociability appear as negative aspects of human nature, as masks for the emptiness, banality, and moral shallowness of life. Sanyi as well as his friends illustrate these qualities. Slenkai, "his breath smelling of tobacco," Dányi, "brutal, with watery eyes, and red face," the new head notary, "a walking advertisement for drugstores," and the little tax commissioner, "with his violet eyes and long thin face," appear as mediocre figures that demonstrate neither heart nor intellect but grotesquely oversized sexual needs. Likewise, the gre-

garious woman characters of the village are portrayed as chattery, gossipy, oversexed, vulgar, and ignorant. The farmer's wife, the "love-sick dove," as well as Rózsa, the little "red-ball of woman," seem to be interested in nothing but sex; and Marcsa's most important feature is stupidity. "She stares as if compelled to think of something very difficult that she cannot recall" (II, 65). Social gatherings (e.g., the visits of relatives or the company on every third Friday at the Takarós') emerge as useless and senseless occasions, demonstrating people's inability to communicate with each other. Indeed, in Nelli's view, guests just "invade the house with a broad smile and gaiety ready to be released; they eat and drink, fill up your day, and depart with illicit information gained from their spying" (II, 56). This contemptuous view of human nature and behavior, this unsympathetic portrayal of crowds and superficial social contacts in general, questions Nelli's assertion that her need for loneliness created the problem. Although she repeatedly identifies her isolation as the source of her conflicts, the novel reveals this state to be neither negative nor pathological but *essential* to achieving such human qualities as morality and understanding. A contradiction thus emerges between the first person narrator and the inner textual perspective, disclosing two distinctly different levels of perceptions: Nelli's personal account, which concentrates on her sexual revulsion toward Sanyi and an outside objective viewpoint, which focuses on the existential background of her alienation. In fact, societal and moral issues are investigated within the framework of the personal account; and *vice versa,* Nelli's personal feelings are explained and analyzed from the perspective of moral and social concerns. It is the interplay between these two perceptions, Nelli's own point of view and the broader and more general vision, that discloses the complexities of the book.

From Nelli's point of view, sexual revulsion toward Sanyi creates the marital blight; underlying themes, however, point to her spiritual and existential deprivation as the cause of the conflicts. In Nelli's perception the marriage represents sexual defeat and humiliation. As she says: "It is forbidden to squeeze the rolls in the bakery, but I am not protected in the same way. Can you imagine what it's like, Aunt Szeréna, to be at the mercy of ten fleshy fingers that are entitled to lay hold of you wherever they feel like it?" (II, 153). Ill-feelings and rejection overcome her with Sanyi's first visit, as she perceives his push "towards the house across a virgin snowfield" (I, 7). Coming uninvited, demanding time, attention, and space, he overwhelms her at first sight. Hoping to escape him, she flees to the kitchen to prepare a meal, but "by the time I'd finished peeling the first potatoes," she says, "he stuck his brown smile through

the crack of the kitchen door. . . . Obviously he attributed my sudden departure to some sort of virginal alarm that he liked immensely" (I, 23). As the house and field, her pride and joy, became suddenly soiled under his muddy boots, so too the kitchen is soiled by his "brown smile." She notices his "hard stubby fingers," and "those warm, chestnut eyes that looked at you as if trying to remind you of some mischief you had both committed" (I, 8). She is repulsed by his "gypsy" look, by his boisterous behavior, and by the pleasure he obviously takes in her. The development of their future relationship is marked by this first visit. She looks upon him with abhorrence and disgust, and the more they meet, the more intense her revulsion grows. Believing he desires nothing but to "assault and strip the amazon" from her so that "he could clutch the panting chick within," she sees him as dirty and brutal (I, 70). When confronted with the certainty of the marriage, she is overcome by horror. "I had seen animals;" she says, "but even the idea of doing the same with a man was too terrible" (I, 209). Indeed, she detests every minute spent with him. Her thoughts focus unceasingly on his "oily skin," his "sweaty hands," and his "cunning eyes" staring into the night. Obsessed by hatred for his physicality, Nelli extends her aversion later toward their only child. She sees in her "Sanyi's fingers, Sanyi's hair and Sanyi's selfish gaiety" (II, 291). Feeling overcome by this ever increasing revulsion, she kills him. Even after the murder, she remains besieged by repugnance: "My revulsion in bed," she says "the smell of sweat — not even Sanyi's smell but the smell of our whole marriage — were still so much alive in me that there was no room left for guilt" (II, 242). As a matter of fact, at this point, Nelli is free of "ordinary" moral considerations; perceiving the events from her own point of view, she holds the murder to be a direct outcome of her sexual violation, an inevitable rebellion of her misused virginity. "You brought this thing upon yourself," she says, standing by his corpse, "Why did you bring me back from Cenc? I had fled and I even told Aunt Szeréna that if I hadn't done so I would have jabbed a knife into you!" (II, 242).

In the context of the novel as a whole, however, the marriage represents more an arena of struggle between individual need and societal tradition, between personal freedom and external oppression, than an unfortunate conglomeration of contrasting sexual needs. This perspective is created by the appearance of multifarious themes, suggesting other than sexual interpretations of the events. First of all, by pointing to Nelli's romantic feelings toward other men, her portrayal indicates that the aversion toward Sanyi does not stem necessarily from pathological problems, but from the difference between their personalities.

Her interest in both Ernő and Imre allows for the possibility that under other circumstances, and with another man, she could have developed a better relationship. She falls in love with Ernő, and is crushed by their separation; then she feels attracted to Imre, daydreaming about a marriage with him. It is important, however, that both men are different from Sanyi; both are gentle, silent, and withdrawn; neither wants to own her; neither wants to overwhelm her. If she had married either of them, it appears, Nelli could have lived a better life. "Lonely walks with the dogs and silent work alongside another," she says, "this was what I longed for, what would give me happiness" (I, 192). It is thus because Sanyi's character and life style represent the opposite of this ideal, because his forceful and overwhelming personality contrasts with Nelli's basic needs, and because she is forced to marry and accept him, that she feels frustrated in her right to live the life of her choice. Secondly, by investigating the nature of these contrasting needs, the presentation establishes links between power and humiliation, between force and weakness, transforming those connections into implicit moral comment. Indeed, thematic and structural parallels inherent in the novel underline this pattern of Nelli's decreasing and Sanyi's increasing strength. They focus on her plight in the face of merciless circumstances that force her to submit and that lead Sanyi to "victory" at her cost. By periodic references to the past, the reader is constantly reminded that it is Sanyi who pushes himself to Nelli's side when her father dies, takes over the land bit by bit, and makes himself indispensable to her sick and helpless mother. Simultaneously, recurring motifs point to the anguish that befalls Nelli and to the pressure put on her by friends and relatives. Thus, intrinsic in the text is the intention to demonstrate that the marriage is built on an abomination, on the violation of Nelli's free will. As she says, "I was transformed from rebellion to surrender. I was exactly like a horse whipped into submission. Father's death, Mother's helplessness and Sanyi's siege were not arguments capable of rational assessment but forces which had broken me" (I, 191-92). In addition, newly developing situations and events unceasingly demonstrate that the couple's initial pattern of inequality never changes. Analyzing the textual evidence not only elucidates issues more universal in nature than Nelli's personal conflicts, but reveals by implication the metaphysical position of the novel. Since the heroine's sexual dilemma represents more the *consequence* than the *cause* of her lack of autonomy, Nelli's struggle for sexual freedom may be seen as a paradigm of the human struggle for self-determination. "I might have endured it," she says, "if my husband had also been a lonely soul, but Sanyi doesn't even give me

room to breathe" (II, 154). Feeling pursued, invaded, and finally consumed by Sanyi, Nelli has no life of her own. If she is to survive, she must regain her own independence: she must escape her husband. Getting away from him for just a few days, she appears to be liberated: "As if I had emerged at last from a long dark tunnel, as if I were gradually learning — like a patient after an eye operation — what leaves and flowers actually are" (I, 157). Her description of the newly gained sexual independence not only discloses relief from the tension crippling her life, but a metaphysical encounter with freedom as well. "Poetic words," she says, "such as 'freedom' and 'a new life,' jump up and down in my heart and in my mouth" (II, 157). By pointing to the intensity of this experience, Németh emphasizes the essential role of freedom for human life and dignity, and conversely, the grave consequences of its absence. When taken back to Fencs by Sanyi, Nelli feels sentenced to death. "The world," she says, "remains one unbroken dream; like a coffin pushed into the grave, people passively glide toward their fate" (II, 190). This vision of freedom as the ultimate necessity of man's existence suggests additional perspectives from which Nelli's personality, her coldness, emotional detachment, chastity, and her need for isolation have to be understood. Because these characteristics appear as parts of her essence – the novel never examines whether acquired or innate – they are expressions of her freedom of choice. When they are violated, her freedom to choose herself is violated. In this light, Nelli's virginity not only represents a basic choice of her being, a state apart from the "muddy waters of humanity," but also a consequence of her right to "remain enveloped in a layer of cool air." Hence, those who force her to surrender this right obstruct the fulfillment of a higher order. As she says:

> Where virginity defends itself with intense revulsion, there is a higher force that forbids its violation. And if it should be violated, it will revenge itself like an outraged angel, tearing at its bondage and murdering if it must to set itself free (II, 189).

Inherent in this vision is the idea of personal freedom as the supreme metaphysical criterion of human existence. Because it is Nelli's *right* to choose to withdraw from the world and to remain untouched, in Németh's conception, no other consideration may supersede the imperative of this choice.

Using this metaphysical criterion to illuminate practical situations, Németh demonstrates that human relationships built on the obstruction of either partner's freedom bring about destruction for both. Actually, Sanyi is not guilty of anything worse than ignorance and insensitivity, yet his disregard for Nelli's freedom destroys her and brings about his

own death. Although at first he appears to be the "winner," in the end he becomes as much the victim of their relationship as Nelli. Actually, Németh not only criticizes the institution of marriage that tolerates, even fosters, the economic and emotional dependency of woman, but he also points to the disastrous consequences of oppression. It is certainly no coincidence that Nelli gets away with Sanyi's murder. From the metaphysical perspective of the novel not murder but the obstruction of freedom emerges as the worst crime one human being can commit against another; elimination of those who violate this principle thus becomes a necessity for re-establishing justice and order in the world.

Although *Revulsion* deals extensively with the sexual problems of an individual woman, analysis reveals the work to be a criticism of not only Hungarian society and the institution of marriage, but of general societal structures which restrict freedom. By depicting Nelli's isolation as a traditional state of her milieu, Németh points to the tragic conditions prevailing in the Hungary of that time; by depicting isolation as a necessary state for gaining insight and dignity, Németh points to the tragic condition of humanity. The author's insistence on Nelli's right to be different suggests the possibility of a world where men *and* women are equally free, and thus have the inviolable right to self-determination. Indeed, Németh reveals freedom as a metaphysical force that when restricted, will assert itself regardless of the sacrifice required.

NOTES

1. László Németh, *Iszony*, 2nd ed. (1947; reprint ed., Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1975). All further references to this book will be in my own translation and cited in the text with volume and page numbers. The novel has been translated into English [*Revulsion*, trans. Kathleen Szasz (New York: Grove Press Inc., 1965)].
2. Taken from László Vekerdi, *Németh László: alkotásai és vallomásai tükrében*, Arcok és Vallomások (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Zsebkönyvtár, 1970), p. 252, my own translation.
3. Vekerdi, pp. 252-53.
4. Vekerdi, p. 248.
5. Vekerdi, p. 248.
6. Although official Hungarian criticism still blames Németh for his involvement in the "third road" concept, his creative output is not rejected anymore. Cf. Tibor Klaniczay, József Szauder, and Miklós Szabolcsi, *History of Hungarian Literature*, trans. József Hatvany and István Farkas, ed. Miklós Szabolcsi (Budapest: Corvina Press, 1964), pp. 257-61. It is even possible to analyze Németh from the psychological perspective. Cf. László Fülöp, "Lélekrajz és létértelmezés: (Jegyzetek az *Iszonyról*)," *Studia Litteraria* 12 (1974): 97-117.
7. Taken from the jacket of *Iszony* 1975 edition.

8. Lothar Sträter, "László Németh: Lehrer seiner Nation," *Frankfurter Hefte* 27 (1972): 363-70; cf. H. T. Anderson, "Németh, László: *Revulsion*," *Bestseller*, 15 March 1966, pp. 464-65; A. Homer, "László Németh: *Revulsion*," *Books and Bookmen*, December 1965, pp. 43-44; Robert L. Stilwell, "Grounds for Despair," *Saturday Rreview*, 12 March 1966, p. 36. The reason for the lack of enthusiasm among the English-speaking critics probably springs from the shortcomings of the English translation.
9. Károly Kerényi, "On László Németh," *The Hungarian Quarterly* 3, no. 1-2 (1962): 36.
10. Kerényi, p. 38.
11. Various sociological studies written on the life of Hungarian peasants and farm workers between the two world wars point to both the hardship and isolation of these people and to the economic conditions and chronic ailments of Hungarian society. One of the best known of this genre is Gyula Illyés' book *Puszták népe* (1936; reprint ed., Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1972), which offers a realistic picture of the ordeal and frustration of the people in the puszta.
12. Initiated by musicians and writers before the First World War, the populist movement rose to stir interest in folk culture and tradition. Later, historians, sociologists, and economists joined the ranks of the artists to demand social and political reform. Although the members of both groups represent complex and intricate political and aesthetic viewpoints, their interest in peasant themes and problems, their nationalist concept of the "special Hungarian road," their focus on the *corpus hungaricum*, point to a common style, to common concerns, perspectives and goals. It is customary to list Zsigmond Móricz, Dezső Szabó, József Erdélyi, Gyula Illyés, and László Németh among the populists. Cf. "Hungary's Populist Writers," *East Europe* 8, no. 2 (1959): 32-41; Joseph Remenyi, *Hungarian Writers and Literature: Modern Novelists, Critics, and Poets*, ed. J. Molnar (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1964), pp. 33-34; Szabolcsi, pp. 149-266.
13. Both extremes, the stoic peasant figures who resign themselves to melancholy and those who violently rebel against their oppressed position, appear in the works of Móricz as well as in the works of Ferenc Móra, Dezső Szabó, József Erdélyi, Gyula Illyés, and László Németh.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Fall 1979)

Literature and Politics in Germany of the 1830s: Karl Beck's Role in the *Junges Deutschland* Movement

Agnes Huszar Vardy

The purpose of this study is to describe briefly the reception of Karl Beck (1817–1879), a Hungarian-born Jewish-German poet, by the members of the Young Germany movement of the 1830s, and to show that — similarly to most of his fellow Young Germans — Beck's literary fame was largely due to his involvement in that movement.[1] In other words, we contend that it was not Beck's lyrical talent that made him into a notable spokesman of Young Germany. Rather, it was his association with the Young Germans and his ability to express in an unusually daring tone the social, political and artistic needs of his age that lifted him out of obscurity and made him for a while a "celebrated poet" of Germandom.

Junges Deutschland

Contrary to some of its counterparts (e.g., Young Europe, Young Italy, Young Poland), Young Germany or *Junges Deutschland* was not a radical political, but a literary movement.[2] This does not, of course, mean that *Junges Deutschland* lacked political goals; for indeed it did not. But as it never really took the shape of a formal organization, and since its members were all poets, writers and journalists who limited their activities to propaganda in a literary form, *Junges Deutschland* never even came close to resembling the political-conspiratorial make-up of Mazzini's Young Italy.[3] And this holds true even though the majority of the Young Germans concentrated on writing political poetry and other forms of political literature.

Junges Deutschland, therefore, was primarily an informal literary movement, whose members were drawn together by their attachment to liberalism, by their belief in social and political progress, and by their resolve to propagate their convictions through creative works. Thus, instead of establishing conspirational organizations for the purpose of

overthrowing the existing political regimes, they went to war against the literary and artistic ideas of *l'art pour l'art* established by Goethe in Germany. They rejected Goethe's world view, shifting their admiration to Schiller who emerged as the true champion of political and personal freedom. By using literature to expose the social and political needs of their age, the Young Germans became powerful exponents and practitioners of the so-called *Tendenzliteratur*. Thus they proclaimed in *belles-lettres* the need to deal with urgent social, economic, and political problems, as did Victor Hugo and other French Romanticists before them.

In addition to Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Börne — respectively the greatest German lyricist and the greatest political publicist of that period — the key members of *Junges Deutschland* were Ludwig Wienbarg, Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube and Theodore Mundt. But their ranks also included such lesser writers and poets as Gustav Kühne, Georg Herwegh, Ferdinand Freiligrath, Hermann Marggraf, Karl Herlossohn, Ernest Wilkomm, as well as the already-mentioned Karl Beck.

Throughout the existence of this movement in the 1830s and early 1840s, the Young Germans' primary source of inspiration was Paris, or more specifically Heine's and Börne's radical and satirical writings produced in Paris. Heine and Börne were the most politicized German creative writers of that period. Because of their open criticism of Metternich's oppressive political system in Germany, they both ended up as political exiles in Paris. But their absence from Germany did not lessen their influence upon the Young Germans. On the contrary, their exile may even have increased their influence. Certainly their politically-inspired writings, such as Heine's *Französische Zustände* (1832) and Börne's *Briefe aus Paris* (1830–1834), greatly contributed to keeping *Junges Deutschland* in existence under the strictest censorship. By writing about the ideals of liberalism and about French developments after the July Revolution of 1830, and by contrasting the French political and social scene with the situation of Metternich's Germany, Heine and Börne kept the flame of hope alive in the hearts of their fellow poets and countrymen. This was especially true of Börne's *Briefe aus Paris,* which soon became the handbook of contemporary liberalism, not only in Germany and the German-speaking lands, but also in the non-German provinces of the Habsburg Empire.

Most of the Young Germans who remained at home congregated in Leipzig, in that period the center of German intellectual and literary life. Called "little Paris," Leipzig was indeed the meeting place of both aspiring, as well as established poets, writers and journalists. Under the

leadership of Gustav Kühne, the members of Young Germany grouped around the newspaper *Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt.* From an aesthetic point of view, however, few of the Young German writers possessed more than average literary talent. Yet, thanks to the demands of the reform-minded public, and the vigorous publicistic activities of the group, the Young Germans enjoyed considerable influence and prestige. These circumstances momentarily heightened the appreciation of their literary output — an acclaim that later proved to have been largely undeserved. But having turned out to be average poets who achieved recognition primarily because of the timeliness of their topics and their daring expression of the needs of their age, does not necessarily lessen their role in literary history. And because this role, at least collectively, was an influential and admirable one, all of the Young Germans — including Karl Beck — deserve to be remembered by posterity.

Karl Beck

Beck appeared on the German literary scene like a youthful meteor who quickly captivated most of the progressive literati around him. Karl Gutzkow referred to him as the "German Byron"; Friedrich Engels compared him to Schiller.[4] Yet a few years later, virtually everyone forgot about him.

Born in 1817 to a Jewish grain merchant in the southern Hungarian town of Baja, Beck was hardly destined by birth to become a spokesman for German liberalism. The elder Beck ignored the future poet's natural artistic inclination, which showed already at an early age, and strongly discouraged his son's plans for a literary career. But this did not deter young Beck, who continued his interest and won several prizes in literary competitions both at the Baja Elementary School, as well as during his gymnasium studies in Pest.

After completing his secondary education in 1835, Beck enrolled at the School of Medicine in Vienna. He decided to study medicine not because of his fondness for the field, but because medicine was one of the few professions open to Jews. Thus, not surprisingly, during his stay in Vienna he concentrated almost exclusively on his literary interests, in the company of students with similar bent. It was at this time that he established a life-long friendship with the aspiring young poet, Jakob Kaufmann. Their correspondence reveals a great deal about Beck's poetical career.

Within a year of entering medical school young Beck's aversion to the

study of medicine became so intense that he abandoned his studies and returned to Hungary. He left Vienna with a heavy heart, but with an even greater determination to make a name for himself in literature. While serving as an apprentice at a Pest granary, Beck made several unsuccessful attempts to have his poems published. But since he wrote in German, this goal proved to be even more difficult to achieve than he had expected. Influenced by the surging national revival of the 1830s Magyar intellectuals no longer favored poets and writers who failed to use Magyar as their means of literary expression. But because Beck could not, or would not forsake German for Magyar, he had no other option but to try his luck in the German-speaking world. Since he was already acquainted with some of the publications of the Young German writers whose ideas and aspirations greatly appealed to him, he decided to move to Leipzig where he hoped to gain at least some degree of poetical recognition.

Beck among the Young Germans

A virtually unknown foreigner in a strange country, Beck found it difficult to strike roots in Leipzig. It took him a while before he was able to join the ranks of the Young Germans. To make matters worse, he was constantly under surveillance by the local police, who were suspicious of every newcomer. In order to remain in Leipzig, he was forced to enroll in the School of Medicine at the University, even though he had already abandoned his medical studies in Vienna. These initial difficulties drove young Beck into a melancholic state of mind that often haunted him in times of spiritual crises. The bitter tone of his letters to his friend Kaufmann in Vienna attest to this fact. "I am so discouraged that I do not even attempt to justify my silence," he wrote in a letter dated September 9, 1836. "Even now I can bring myself to write only a few lines. But my thoroughly unfavorable and hopeless situation explains everything. . ."[5] Although some of his poems were published in newspapers already during the late summer of 1836, his pessimism lingered. This may explain why he made no attempt to publish his collected poems. He admitted that his individual poems were accepted by the Leipzig newspapers and read with "great enthusiasm."[6] But he found that "the publishers are extremely difficult to deal with and pay very little."[7] And he simply lacked the strength to argue with them.

During his first months in Leipzig, therefore, Beck saw very little chance for poetic recognition. As a result he encouraged his friend Kaufmann, who also planned to move to Leipzig, to have his poems

published in Vienna, before tempting his fate in the midst of the Young Germans. Beck believed that one had to have a volume of poetry published first in order to gain any kind of recognition in Leipzig. As he wrote to Kaufmann: "Germany is not at all like you imagine it to be."[8]

Yet, despite his relatively slow start and initial disappointment, Beck remained in Leipzig. This proved to be a wise decision, for in the course of the following year his fortune changed radically. In 1837 the prestigious *Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt* began to publish his poems, which immediately lent him a certain degree of recognition. His early poems included "Auszug aus Ägypten," "Mondnacht," as well as a group of sonnets entitled "Fannys Tagebuch." He dedicated the latter to Fanny Tarnow, who enjoyed wide renown as a translator of French literary pieces. She was also one of the leading intellectuals in Leipzig literary society and a regular contributor to *Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt.* Contrary to some claims, Beck did not fall in love with the older "lady of the world." But Fanny's superior intellect made a lasting impression on the young and still rather provincial poet. Beck soon became a frequent guest in Fanny's literary salon, where he mingled with a number of noted literary figures, many of whom influenced his personal and poetical development. As a result of these exposures, Beck began to feel more at home in Leipzig society. His lyrical expression also showed a marked improvement. All this resulted in the growing recognition of his talents, and by the middle of 1837 he had won the attention and approval of most of Leipzig's progressive writers and intellectuals. The influential Gustav Kühne became his closest mentor. In one of his letters, Kühne revealed his enthusiasm for the lyrical talent of the young poet by referring to Beck as his "extraordinary intellectual child."[9] He published Beck's poems in his newspaper, adding his own laudatory introductions and enthusiastic comments. Kühne also introduced Beck to all of the leading members of the Leipzig literary societies. Moreover, he arranged meetings between Beck and many of the prominent German writers who visited Leipzig during these years, and who were either members or supporters of the *Junges Deutschland* movement. In this way, Beck established a close relationship with the acknowledged leaders of the movement, which included Gutzkow, Laube, as well as Wienbarg, all of whom were favorably impressed with the young poet.

Beck created a sensation in Leipzig literary circles not only with his poetry, but also with his appearance and personal habits. Described by fellow poet Franz Dingelstedt as "short, young looking, slight of stature with a strikingly handsome face, dominated by eyes of deep blue framed by long lashes,"[10] Beck generally created a favorable impression.

But his appearance was deceiving. His open countenance concealed an introverted personality, which occasionally exhibited eccentric behavior. We know from Kühne's memoires that Beck often felt out of place at social gatherings. He would frequently sit alone in a corner for hours, smoking a cigar. Then he would suddenly stand up, thank his hosts for their kind hospitality, for "allowing him to sit in silence for hours,"[11] and then he would quickly take his leave. Kühne's recollections reveal that Beck was considered an eccentric and his eccentricity also extended to his manner of dress. This was also noted by the contemporary literary historian Rudolf Gottschall, who described the attention Beck aroused with his picturesque Hungarian attire.[12] The braided waistcoat and the spurred boots provided a peculiar sight in Leipzig society and added a touch of the "exotic" to Beck's personality. Beck further enhanced his romantic appeal by hinting that he was a political emigré, who had been driven from his homeland because of his liberal views and his love of freedom. These devices enhanced Beck's popularity, and Kühne and his friends were proud of their "Magyar poet,"[13] whom they treated as if he were "some rare phenomenon from a far-off never-neverland."[14] Gotschall further substantiated Beck's popularity in his memoires when he recalled that "when the topic of conversation turned to Karl Beck, I found everywhere the same enthusiasm. [He] was the pampered darling of the Young German journalists."[15] Thus, despite his initial difficulties, Beck's poetry and his personality combined to earn him widespread recognition. In fact, he soon came to be celebrated as the "great hope" of the *Junges Deutschland* movement.

Beck's Development as a Poet

Young Beck was quickly swept up by the ideas of Young Germany. Its ideologies and objectives were not entirely new to him. He had become acquainted with the movement through reading and through his involvement in the Viennese literary circles. But not until arriving in Leipzig did he make the goals of *Junges Deutschland* his own. He gave expression to their hopes and aspirations in his poetry, but without fully appreciating the significance of the great contemporary and social issues.[16] His lack of full comprehension is best shown by the confused and disorderly fashion he incorporated the dominant ideas of the age into his poetry. But Beck's fellow poets and writers were unaware of this confusion. Like Beck, they too lacked an adequate background for properly understanding the basic social and political issues of their age. This in turn explains their overestimation of Beck's poetical talents, as well as

their reasons for placing so much hope in him as one of the major advocates and defenders of the ideals of the age.

Even the titles of Beck's poems written during this time reveal the extent to which he immersed himself in the ideals of the Young German writers. Titles such as "Der Gefangene," "An Heinrich Heine," "Schillers Haus in Gohlis," and similar headings characterize the content of his poetry. During this time, Börne's influence also began to show in Beck's poetry. He was especially impressed by the older poet's love of freedom, and by his willingness to enlist his poetical talents in the service of progress. Beck was proud to acknowledge Börne as his master. Beck's admiration for Börne is especially evident in a cycle of poems entitled "Neue Bibel," in which he eulogized Börne on the occasion of his death in 1837. In these lyrics Beck portrayed Börne as the unequalled champion of human rights and freedom of expression, a man who even refused to enter heaven without being assured complete personal freedom. Upon reaching the gates of the other world Börne's first question was: "Are we to remain free in your heaven?"[17] There is a great deal of warmth and enthusiasm in these poems, and they are devoid of the customary pathos, excessive description, and forced imagery that dominated much of his previous poetry.

One of the *Junges Deutschland* writers' most important literary and intellectual means of expression was the use of satire, sarcasm, and irony. A mocking derisive tone dominated the lyrics of the age, which was used primarily as a form of attack against the prevailing social, political, and economic system that stood in the way of progress. But satire was also employed as a weapon in battles involving matters of principle and personal disagreements. Besides Heine, one of the lesser poets who used an extraordinarily cynical style was Ludwig Hermann Wolfram, a man of reactionary sympathies, who frequently made Kühne's literary friends the object of his mockery.[18] In his *Dichter Nachtwegen* Wolfram ridiculed the ideals of the *Junges Deutschland* movement, but he was particularly critical of the Leipzig circle. His most cutting remarks, however, were reserved for Karl Beck, whom he portrayed in his long epic poem, *Faust,* as one of the evil spirits. Wolfram thus belittled the Young Germany movement by satirizing the achievements of its members, and by cynically parodying their alleged "rescue" of German literature from total annihilation.

Such incidents disturbed, but could not alter the unfolding of the Leipzig circle. Nor could they hinder Beck's poetical success and popularity. Beck achieved the first climax of his fame in 1838 with the publication of his first volume of poetry entitled *Nächte. Gepanzerte*

Lieder. This collection, and in particular the poem "Die Eisenbahn," composed on the occasion of the opening of the railroad line in Dresden, quickly popularized Beck's name throughout the German-speaking world. The poem is an allegory, a praise of the railroad system which Beck saw as the zenith of technological achievements. He considered the railroad as the embodiment of the new world to come. According to one of his later critics, Hermann Solomon, Beck displayed in this poem "the spirit of a prophet predicting the change that the new invention would initiate not only in the area of trade, but also on the political front."[19] "Die Eisenbahn" appeared in many newspapers in Germany, and "ignited everyone, and made its author an overnight success."[20] Some critics even felt that the publication of Beck's first volume resulted from the success of "Die Eisenbahn," which singled him out of the ranks of the hundreds of anonymous poets.

"Die Eisenbahn" was undoubtedly an oustanding poem with an extraordinary impact upon contemporary readers. Its success has been noted by many critics, including Rudolf Gotschall, who later became one of Beck's closest friends and admirers. But it is doubtful whether this poem was the only reason why Beck's first collected volume was accepted for publication. The German world of the 1830s supported hundreds of poets endowed with modest talent, and most of them were able to secure a publisher sooner or later. In view of his noted poetic endeavors and growing popularity in 1837, it seems rather unlikely that Beck would have been an exception to this rule. It is more likely that "Die Eisenbahn" merely contributed to the success of his first volume and thus enhanced his poetic fame. On the other hand, the popularity of Beck's first volume also prompted the reading public to overestimate his lyrical talents. In the long run, his success may have contributed indirectly to his downfall, because later — when he was unable to satisfy the hopes that were placed in him as a poet — the disappointed critics and public first turned against him, and later forgot about him entirely.

Contemporary Assessment of Beck's Poetry

The appearance of Beck's first volume increased both his reputation and the number of his critics. Studies dealing with his poetry and literary works dedicated to him appeared in great number, all of which served as measures of his success and popularity. Among his admirers was Moritz Carrier, the renowned Berlin aesthetician and literary critic who sent a poem entitled "Freundesgruss an Karl Beck" to the editors of *Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt.*[21] Praising Beck's lyrical talents, Carrier

welcomed the young poet as a worthy heir to the ideals of Ludwig Börne. In his poem he portrayed Beck as the legendary phoenix who appears as the reincarnation of Börne and has the noble calling to continue the older poet's struggle for the freedom of the beloved fatherland.

Julius Seidlitz, another critic, also emerged as a Beck supporter. In one of his works, Seidlitz characterized Beck as a young poet still in the *Sturm und Drang* stage of his development, when "the poet wants to reform, to destroy and to rebuild; within him evolves a dark feeling that he must create. But in the darkness of feeling, destruction appears to him as creation."[22] And Seidlitz appeared to have found the key to Beck's poetry. Like all *Sturm und Drang* literature, it too contained a wealth of ideas, vitality and originality — as well as uncontrolled emotions. *Sturm und Drang* was after all a stage of adolescence more attuned to emotion than to rationality. For this reason, Beck's poems lacked a guiding principle which might have produced positive answers, instead of merely criticizing the existing social system. While pointing to this elemental nature of his poetry, Seidlitz also considered Beck destined for greater things, and predicted that the young poet would score his future success in the realm of epic poetry.

Beck's fellow poets were no less enthusiastic about his first volume than his critics. Ferdinand Freiligrath, another well-known poet of the *Junges Deutschland* movement, for example, called Beck "a great fellow, for whom one must have respect — [his poems have] atmosphere, ideas, style and form, all of these expressed in an extraordinary manner."[23] Georg Herwegh, another poet, believed that Beck's poetry in general contains a great deal of "gold," and he is in possession of the Promethean fire which is indicative of greatness.[24] But as it turned out, in the long run, Beck was unable to fulfill the expectations that contemporary critics and fellow poets placed in him.

Although by the end of the 1830s Karl Beck emerged as one of the popular voices of the Young Germany movement, his fame did not endure long. As mentioned earlier, his success resulted more from his ability to voice the temporary needs of society than from genuine lyrical talent. Thus, when the political climate changed, when it was no longer sufficient to criticize, when one also had to suggest positive programs for the restructuring of society, Beck could no longer fulfill the demands of the age, and his popularity correspondingly waned. He soon disappeared into relative oblivion — as did also the *Junges Deutschland* movement which had served as the pedestal of his temporary triumphs. Beck outlived his sudden popularity by several decades. He continued to write poetry and published several notable collections in the years that fol-

lowed. Yet, he was never again as widely acclaimed and celebrated as he had been during his stay in Leipzig, as a member of the *Junges Deutschland* movement.

NOTES

1. Some of the more important studies on Beck are as follows: Rudolf Gottschall, "Karl Beck," *Unsere Zeit* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 801-823; Robert Gragger, "Beck Károly és a német politikai költészet,"[Karl Beck and German Political Poetry] *Budapesti Szemle* 138 (1909): 268-299, 448-460, 139: 120-133, 277-297; Eduard Fechtner, *Karl Beck. Sein Leben und Dichten* (Wien, 1912); Heinrich Nellen, *Aus Karl Becks dichterischer Frühzeit.* Diss., Münster, 1908; Ernst Thiel, *Karl Becks literarische Entwicklung.* Diss., Breslau, 1938; Antal Mádl, *Politische Dichtung in Österreich 1830-1848* (Budapest, 1969), pp.108-148; Ágnes Mária Várdy, *Karl Beck élete és költői pályája* [Karl Beck's Life and Poetical Career], Diss., Budapest, 1970; Ágnes Huszár Várdy, *Karl Beck* (Budapest, in press).
2. On the *Junges Deutschland* movement in general see: Ludwig Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland und die preussische Zensur* (Hamburg, 1886); Johannes Proells, *Das junge Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1892); Georg Brandes, *Das junge Deutschland* (Berlin, 1904); Desider Bader, *Metternich und das junge Deutschland* (Pécs, 1934); *Literatur des Vormärz,* ed. by Kollektiv für *Literaturgeschichte* (Erfurt, 1958); Julius Marx, *Die österreichische Zensur im Vormärz* (Wien, 1959); Walter Dietze, *Junges Deutschland und deutsche Klassik. Zur Ästhetik und Literaturtheorie des Vormärz,* 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1962); and Helmut Koopman, *Das junge Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1967/1968).
3. Walter Dietze demonstrated that by the mid-1830s a number of like-minded young German poets and writers were in fact in the process of establishing a formal alliance, and the realization of this goal was stopped only by an edict of the German Confederation which banned Heine's writings, along with those of Rudolf Wienbarg, Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube and Theodor Mundt. Since Wienbarg's *Ästhetische Feldzüge* (1834) was dedicated to "Young Germany," this name was given to the above writers and poets and to others who held similar views. See Dietze, *Junges Deutschland,* p. 75.
4. See *Telegraphen für Deutschland,* 1839; Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Über Kunst und Literatur* (Berlin, 1950), p. 446; and Ernst Hanisch, "Der junge Engels und die österreichische Literatur des Vormärz," *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur* 19 (1975): 160-169.
5. As quoted by Nellen, *Aus Karl Becks dichterischer Frühzeit,* p. 53.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Letter quoted by Adolf Kohut, "Ungedrucktes von Karl Beck," *Internazionale Literaturberichte* (1898), p. 375.
9. Edgar Pierson, *Gustav Kühne. Lebensbild und Briefwechsel* (Dresden-Leipzig, 1890), p. 63.
10. See *Der Salon. Wochenschrift für Heimat und Fremde,* no. 12 (1839): 106-107.
11. Gustav Kühne, "Karl Beck," *Westermanns Illustrierte Monatshefte* 46 (1879): 498.
12. Gottschall, "Karl Beck," p. 803.

13. In a letter dated September 9, 1836, Beck wrote the following to his friend Jakob Kaufmann: "Like all writers here, I too have the title of 'doctor,' and they call me the Magyar poet who strikes like thunder with his songs." Kohut, "Ungedrucktes von Karl Beck," p. 375.
14. Gragger, "Beck Károly," 138: 283.
15. Gottschall, "Karl Beck," p. 804.
16. Beck's belief that one of the dominant ideas of the Young German writers was the reevaluation of the role of the poet was expressed, among others, in his poem "Sultan." Here he portrayed the poet as a Turkish sultan, who in spite of all manner of temptation, never loses sight of his noble goal, i.e., to win the battle for the glory of his homeland. In another poem, "Märchen," Beck stated that the poet "may no longer tell stories. . . . This Age of Seriousness will no longer believe them." Yet Beck was never able to state specifically how a poet should become a leader in society. See Karl Beck, *Nächte. Gepanzerte Lieder* (Leipzig, 1838), pp. 7-9, 148.
17. Beck, *Nächte,* p. 169.
18. See F. Marlowe [L. H. Wolfram], *Faust ein dramatisches Gedicht in drei Abschnitten* (Leipzig, 1838), also reprinted in Otto Neurath, *Neudrücke literarhistorischer Seltenheiten* (Berlin, 1906), no. 6.
19. Quoted in Nellen, *Aus Karl Becks dichterischer Frühzeit,* p. 57.
20. Ibid.
21. Gragger, "Beck Károly," 138: 287.
22. Julius Seidlitz, *Die Poesie und die Poeten Österreichs im Jahre 1836,* 2 vols. (Grimma, 1837), 2: 102.
23. Wilhelm Buchner, *Ferdinand Freiligrath. Ein Dichterleben in Briefen,* 2 vols. (Lahr, 1881), 2: 266.
24. Georg Herwegh, *Gedichte und kritische Aufsätze aus den Jahren 1839 und 1840. Herweghs Werke,* 2 vols. (Berlin, 1845), 2: 76.

Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Fall 1979)

REVIEW ARTICLES

Castle Building and Its Social Significance in Medieval Hungary

S. B. Várdy

Vár és társadalom a 13.-14. századi Magyarországon [Castle and Society in 13th and 14th-Century Hungary] (Studies in Historical Sciences, New Series, no. 82). By Erik Fügedi. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977, 219 pp. *Regélő magyar várak* [Fabling Hungarian Castles]. Edited by Amália Bujtás. Budapest: Minerva, 1977. 213 pp.

The history of Hungarian fortification and castle-building has been a subject of Hungarian historiography ever since the 1870s, when Béla Czobor wrote his pioneering study, "Hungary's Medieval Castles."[1] Yet, neither the reasons, nor the social consequences of castle-building has really become a central research topic of Hungarian historians; and — despite the appearance of a number of significant works in the course of the past two decades — this relative lack of attention is still evident today. Most of the recent works — including those by the prolific "dean" of Hungarian fortification historians, László Gerő — deal only with the architectural and artistic significance of Hungarian castles, and pay little attention to their social, economic and political significance.[2] It was this vacuum in Hungarian fortification studies that prompted Erik Fügedi — a product of Elemér Mályusz's famed Ethnohistory School at the University of Budapest — to try to deal with this question anew, and in particular to evaluate the social and economic implications of the great wave of castle building that flared up in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Fügedi undertook this task by collecting a vast amount of data on 330 Hungarian castles built between c. 1222 and 1400, and then organizing much of this data under six separate headings in the appendix of his work.

In discussing the history of fortifications in Hungary — and here, of course, the reference is to "Historic" or Greater Hungary — Fügedi points out that their origins go back to many centuries before the

traditional Magyar conquest in the late ninth century. Some of these were Roman *castri,* while others were Avar or Slavic earthen or wooden fortresses. With the Christianization of Hungary and with the foundation and expansion of the royal counties by King St. Stephen and by his successors, many of these earlier *castri* and fortresses became the "local administrative centers" in this new network of royal administration. But the majority of these fortresses were still made of perishable material (i.e. wood and earth), and remained so right up to the thirteenth century, when a completely different type of fortress began to spread into Hungary. This was the well-known stone castle of Western Europe, that was usually built in inaccessible places, such as protruding hill tops, or within difficult-to-penetrate swamps, and contrary to its predecessors, was built largely for defensive purposes.

Hitherto Hungarian historians have generally presumed that this new castle-building was solely the result of the Mongol devastations of Hungary (1241–1242), which demonstrated that only stone fortifications and masonry structures could withstand such attacks. While this view is still correct to a large degree, Fügedi's research has proved conclusively that this new type of castle was being built in Hungary at least two decades prior to the Mongol conquest. Thus, discounting various royal fortresses that were partially built of stone even earlier (e.g. Pozsony, Moson, Sopron, Abaújvár, Vasvár), some fortified royal cities (e.g. Fehérvár, Esztergom, Veszprém, Győr, Nyitra, Komárom), and a number of fortified monasteries (e.g. Tihany, Pannonhalma, Zalavár), Fügedi found at least ten fortresses of the new type that had been built during the 1220s and 1230s. These include Léka, Németújvár, Borostyánkő, Óvár, Kobald, Fülek, Jolsva, Füzér, Toboly and Vécs. It is reflective of contemporary power relations in East Central Europe that half of these early stone fortresses faced the West, and thus were intended to defend Hungary from her most powerful immediate neighbor, the Holy Roman Empire. While this recognition is significant, it is equally important that three of these castles — Fülek, Kobald and Füzér — were not in royal hands, but were held by members of the increasingly powerful aristocratic families. This phenomenon was rather new in Hungarian history. Up to 1222 only the kings of Hungary had the right to build and to hold fortifications in the country, and not until the second half of the weak and inefficient rule of Andrew II (1205–1235) did they relinquish this monopoly. This was the direct result of the declining royal power in Hungary, which was also manifested by the promulgation of the Golden Bull of 1222, exacted from the weak king by members of the lower nobility. The decline of royal (central) power went

hand-in-hand with the distribution of much of the royal estates to the nobility, which in turn decreased the monarch's power base. It was during this period that some of the most powerful barons gained the right to build stone castles on their own estates. This change of policy soon resulted in the erection of a few private castles, whose numbers increased rapidly after the Mongol devastation. The latter increase was the direct result of Béla IV's new policy, which not only permitted, but demanded that the largest estate owners erect stone fortresses on their property. But contrary to earlier assumptions, Béla IV did not initiate the custom of permitting private lords to build their own castles; he simply speeded up an already existing tradition that had been introduced by his father during the 1220s.

As a result of Béla IV's policy of encouraging castle-building, between 1242 and 1400 at least 320 additional fortresses were constructed in Hungary, nearly seventy-five percent of which were built during the six decades between 1260 and 1330. The main epoch of medieval Hungarian castle-building, therefore, coincided with the critical period that encompassed the late Árpádian and the early Anjou periods in the country's history. This was the period that witnessed the total collapse and then the slow regeneration of royal power, as well as the temporary rise of a number of powerful barons to the position of near-independent provincial lords, who carved virtual mini-kingdoms out of the country's border regions (e.g. M. Csák, A. Aba, H. Kőszegi, B. Kopasz). Hungary's unity was not re-established until the 1320s and 1330s, when the new Anjou dynasty finally managed to cut down these oligarchs and restored the prestige and power of the monarchy.

In light of the above, it is evident that the policy of the Hungarian monarchs in the thirteenth century, which permitted and encouraged castle-building by private lords, had for a period undermined the power of the same monarchs. The laxening of royal control and the distribution of royal estates to the members of the upper nobility also resulted in the termination of the system of "royal counties," and permitted the latter to extend their control also over the lower nobility. Many of these became household vassals (*familiaris*) of the castle-owning barons, and thus came to constitute a dependent noble class. It was to regain their independence and to protect their collective class privileges that they later developed a system of "noble counties," which subsequently became an all-important institution in the defense of Hungarian national rights as well.

While the wave of castle-building in the thirteenth century helped to elevate the wealthy barons to a position of unusual power and influence

within Hungary, this same process also served as a bulwark to the development of lasting autonomous provinces in the country. Unlike in such Western countries as France or Spain, in Hungary the provincial barons (oligarchs) "emerged victoriously only from the struggle of every feudal lord against every other feudal lord" (p. 67). This was so because neither the powerful provincial lords, nor those who struggled against them were able to think in any other way, except in terms of "large estates," each of which was centered on a particular castle. Each castle and each estate constituted a separate entity, and thus the "province" of even the most powerful of these barons was nothing more than simply a chain of estates, with no signs of real centralization. They were linked together only by the force that the baron represented. This recognition on the part of Fügedi is very significant, and it applies equally to all of the great Hungarian feudal lords of that chaotic period, including Matthew Csák, the greatest of them all, who at one time may have held as many as fifty castles.

Following their rise to the Hungarian throne, the Anjous gradually broke the power of all of these feudal lords and re-established centralization in the country. Moreover, having learned from the experiences of the immediate past, they very seldom permitted a lord to hold more than a single castle. There were, of course, a few exceptions, such as the Újlaki, the Lackfi, the Wolfart, the Drágfi, the Szecskői-Herceg and the Jolsvai families, who held between two to four castles each. But even in these instances, the castles held by a single family were at a great distance from one another, which prevented the likelihood of the emergence of new "provinces" to rival the centralized powers of the monarchs.

The Anjous were also responsible for the development of the offices of the *castellanus* (commander) and *vice-castellanus* (deputy commander) for their castles. The holders of these offices had military, economic, administrative, as well as judicial functions. Later the office of the castellan was often merged with the office of the *ispán* or *comes,* who was the chief administrative officer of the new "noble county." Moreover, in a number of instances, these offices became hereditary in a specific local family.

To prevent the decline of their recently strengthened monarchical powers, the Anjous also made certain that the majority of the most important castles would revert to and remain in royal hands. This policy soon bore fruit. Whereas in 1300 less than one-fifth of the Hungarian castles were held by the monarchs, at the time of King Louis's death in 1382, over half of all castles were royal fortresses.

The Hungarian castles built or rebuilt during the Anjou period were far ahead of those of the late Árpád period also in the area of architectural technology. Thus, in addition to being built only from stone (some late Árpádian castles still had some perishable materials), the Anjou castles also became more complex structurally. In addition to the *donjon,* generally called the "old tower," now a second tower — usually a gate tower — was also added. In a number of instances we also encounter a "palace" that served as the quarters of the lord and of his family, as well as a chapel or a church. Thus, fourteenth-century Hungarian castles had developed into multifunctional fortresses, even though the use of gunpowder and explosive weapons — that would require additional structural developments — had not as yet come into general use in Hungary. But by that time the castle ceased to be simply a defensive fortress as it used to be during the first century and a half of its existence. It also became the center of the baronial estate, and of the baron's feudal administrative and jurisdictional powers over the peasants who were moving in the direction of becoming bonded serfs.

Fügedi's introductory essay is a very useful summary of the social, economic and political impact of castle-building in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Hungary. Yet, at least of equal importance is his lengthy appendix that contains the relevant data of the 330 castles he was able to locate. Here Fügedi was searching for answers to the following six basic questions with respect to each of the castles: 1. Who built it? 2. When was it built? 3. What was its strategic importance? 4. Who and during which time period were its commanders in the fourteenth century? 5. What was its history like during the same period? 6. What are its architectural data? In light of the scarcity of sources, naturally it was impossible for the author to answer all of these questions for all of the castles. But even with the unavoidable omissions, Fügedi's work is still a treasurehouse of information on medieval Hungarian social and fortification history. The usefulness of his data is further increased by the two appended maps that pinpoint the location of the castles built before 1270 and 1300 respectively. His bibliography is also useful. But one would wish that the book also contain a name and subject index. The lack of such an index makes its use more difficult; and this, in my view, ought to be corrected in a future edition. This is all the more desirable if — as rumored — Fügedi's work will also appear in Western languages.

Erik Fügedi, who has published a number of significant works since 1939,[3] has again done a great service to Hungarian historical scholarship. His research on medieval Hungarian fortifications has filled a considerable void. We hope that he will continue his research, and

eventually will also produce a similar study on the development of Hungarian fortifications during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. With such a sequence to his present work, he would contribute much to our understanding of Hungarian social history of that period.

As opposed to Fügedi's monograph, the multi-authored *Fabling Hungarian Castles* is not, nor does it purport to be a scholarly work. Rather, it is a popular compendium of twenty-seven individual essays, one of which introduces the work, while the other twenty-six deal with the history and architecture of as many Hungarian castles. The introductory essay by László Gerő, the "dean" of Hungarian fortification scholars, is an excellent summary that discusses the history of Hungarian castle-building and fortification technology right up to the end of the sixteenth century, and does so with ample number of illustrations for the general reader to follow the technical aspects of these developments. Gerő, however, could not as yet incorporate into his study some of Fügedi's conclusions, and consequently he still regards the Mongol conquest as the starting point for the new type of stone fortresses in Hungary.

While Gerő's introductory study goes only up to the end of the sixteenth century, the essays on the individual castles carry their history right up to the present. But in addition to narrating the history of each of the castles, the authors also make an effort to reconstruct the castles as they were during the heyday of their history; and do so with the use of floor plans, sketches, as well as photographs.

Although many of the twenty-six castles discussed belong or at one time were among the largest and most important fortifications in Hungary (e.g. Buda, Diósgyőr, Eger, Esztergom, Győr, Gyula, Kőszeg, Sárospatak, Siklós, Szeged, Székesfehérvár, Szigetvár, Vác, Várpalota, Veszprém), this does not apply to all of them (e.g. Csesznek, Egervár [Zala county], Hollókő, Kisnána, Nagyvázsony, Sárvár, Sümeg, Szerencs, Szigliget, Tata, Visegrád). Moreover, numerous others of equal or almost equal importance were left out simply because they are not located within present-day Hungary (i.e. those in Czechoslovakia [Slovakia], Roumania [Transylvania], Austria [Burgenland], Yugoslavia [mostly Croatia-Slavonia], and the Soviet Union [Carpatho-Ruthenia]). Although indefensible from a historical point of view, the editor and the authors justified their selection on the basis of the purposes of the book, which was intended to serve as a guide to those castles that are readily accessible to their readers.

As each of the essays was originally written to be broadcast on radio, the authors used easy-flowing styles, and they also sprinkled their

essays with quotations both from contemporary sources, as well as from later poetical works. This makes for easy and enjoyable reading. Moreover, because the authors are all recognized authorities in their fields, the book can be useful reading even to historians. This also holds true for the bibliography, which lists some of the better and more accessible works both on fortification research in general, as well as on each of the castles discussed.

The *Fabling Hungarian Castles* is a beautifully printed and amply illustrated work, but like Fügedi's volume, it too lacks an index. In this case, however, this omission has less significance.

NOTES

1. Czobor Béla, "Magyarország középkori várai," *Századok* 11(1877): 602–641, which also appeared as a separate publication in 1878. See also Csaba Csorba, "A magyarországi várkutatás története," *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia II. Osztályának Közleményei* 23 (1974): 296–310.
2. See for example: László Gerő, *Magyarországi várépítészet* (Budapest, 1955); idem, *Magyar várak* (Budapest, 1968); *Várépítészetünk*, ed. László Gerő (Budapest, 1975); and László Gerő, *Történelmi városmagok* (Budapest, 1978).
3. Erik Fügedi's main works include: *Nyitra megye betelepülése* (Budapest, 1939); *A 15. századi magyar arisztokrácia mobilitása* (Budapest, 1970); *Uram, királyom . . . A XV. századi Magyarország hatalmasai* (Budapest, 1974); and the work under review.

The Hungarian Revolution of 1848

Laszlo Deme

The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849. By Istvan Deak. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. xxi, 415 pp.

The 1848 revolution is the central event in modern Hungarian history. More has been written about the various aspects of the revolutionary years than about any other period in the long history of the Magyars. For a short while Hungary was in the mainstream of European developments and her struggle for freedom and independence from Austria was met by an enthusiastic response among contemporary progressives abroad and liberal Western historians ever since. In the Hungarian collective consciousness the revolution and the War of Independence became sacred. The leaders, above all Lajos Kossuth, are considered national heroes, and will be probably forever in the spiritual Pantheon of the Magyars.

The exalted place of 1848 in Hungarian history appears justified because through the liberation of the serfs the immense majority gained significant new freedoms, and because the national cause inspired truly extraordinary human effort and sacrifice. But the generally positive attitude of most historians has tended to justify rather than explain and critically analyze the events which took place in Hungary during the revolution. Mihály Horváth, Hungary's outstanding nineteenth-century historian, began this trend and through his monumental works a romantic-heroic view of 1848–49 was firmly established. After 1945, Marxist historians in Hungary gave greater emphasis to economic factors, the conditions of the peasantry were more thoroughly examined, and the radical left was given more attention. Thus, the traditional picture became somewhat more complex. But recent Hungarian historians also tend to emphasize primarily the positive aspects of 1848, as did their pre-

1945 predecessors. Mistakes in the treatment of the non-Magyar nationalities are now frankly admitted, but other political errors or blunders of the Hungarian leadership are usually underplayed and passed over in a few sentences. In short, the treatment of the revolution in many ways remained essentially romantic down to our own times. In essence, this view changed relatively little in a century.

There are certain obvious advantages to treating a great romantic revolution in a romantic fashion. But for our own age other modes of explanation appear to be more meaningful. Istvan Deak brings a new and different approach to the study of 1848. In his new book, *The Lawful Revolution, Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians, 1848–1849,* he consistently applies the critical-analytical method to the Magyars and their adversaries and to different political groups among the Hungarian revolutionaries. The result is not a romantic but a realistic and critical account interpreting political developments and the actions of participants objectively and with sophistication.

The author characterizes his work as "a political history with brief excursions into social and institutional history" (p. xviii). His book is a combination of a detailed biography of Kossuth during the most important two years of his life and a systematic scholarly account of the Hungarian revolution. Such an approach gives primacy to the human element in the historical process. Consequently, Deak's book is interesting and exciting and will certainly hold the reader's attention.

In the introductory chapter, Deak presents the Vormärz in Hungary and acquaints us with the political institutions, parliamentary politics, and most important political figures of the Reform Period. We also follow Kossuth's career from the modest position of a country lawyer in northern Hungary to that of a nationally known leader of the liberal opposition and Pest county's representative at the 1847–48 session of the Diet. Kossuth's leadership role in the Diet in March and April is well documented and the new constitutional setup created by the April Laws is thoroughly described. The historic significance of the reform in the spring is considered to be that "it guaranteed the economic and political survival of the landowning class; it opened the way to spectacular economic and cultural development; and it provided the Magyar nation with an eternal romantic legacy" (p. 106).

The months between April and August 1848 are regarded as a period "between legality and rebellion." The author deals with the negative reaction of the non-Magyar nationalities of Hungary to the April Laws and shows the beginning of the civil war. Deak correctly points out that the Court and the Austrian Cabinet cooperated with the Hungarian

Government in the spring and early summer and sees weakness, desire to gain time before a counter-offensive, and sincere good intention as the combined motivation for this cooperation. The coming of the conflict between Austria and Hungary is also explained on the basis of a combination of factors, but Deak believes that the primary cause was the April Constitution itself: "Two foreign services, two armies, and two fiscal administrations were simply too much for a European great power" (p. 133).

The mistakes of the Hungarian side are clearly pointed out, for instance, Hungary's refusal to shoulder one-fourth of the Imperial State debt is regarded as "politically and morally indefensible" (p. 134). But it is also stated that in June 1848 not the Hungarians but the Croats acted revolutionary when the Zagreb Assembly declared readiness to secede from Hungary and join Austria. The situation is presented though, not primarily in terms of right or wrong, but as it truly was, confusion. The confusion was caused by conflicting loyalties, contradictory orders, and a complete lack of clear lines of authority. Above all, it was due to the fact that to obey the Austrian Emperor in Hungary was treason and directly contrary to orders issued in the name of the King of Hungary. Both Majesties being the same person, Ferdinand, the situation indeed left the loyal subject with the idea that no matter what one did, one was bound to violate His Majesty's laws "by the very act of obeying them" (p. 141).

After surveying the work of the First Representative Assembly during the summer, Professor Deak correctly regards the "month of defiance," September, a turning point and notes that after Jelačić's attack, Hungary was a constitutional monarchy in name only. In reality it had become a parliamentary dictatorship. To the author, the responsibility for the conflict seems to be a divided one. He considers the Austrian accusation about a planned invasion of Croatia by the Hungarians nonsense, but also points out that the Hungarians had forced the Court into excessive concessions in March, and they should have been more accommodating on such matters of common concern as military and financial affairs. Contrary to most Hungarian historians, Deak does not consider the appointment, at the end of September, of Count Ferenc Lamberg as royal commissioner and commander-in-chief of all armed forces in Hungary a counter-revolutionary act. Lamberg's appointment is seen in the interest of peace and autonomy of Hungary, and it is considered to be the last effort to save the Monarchy in its old decentralized form.

After "September Days," the author describes the opposing armies

and, using the latest research available, gives a detailed and thorough account of the military potential of both sides. Apart from regiments, armaments and equipment, we learn such rather astonishing facts that the officer corps of the Hungarian revolutionary army had a larger proportion of nobles than the Imperial side, which prompts Professor Deak to say that "it is an apt commentary on the 'gentlemanly' character of the Hungarian revolution that its army was less open to talent than the Habsburg army" (p. 197).

The fall offensive of Prince Windisch-Graetz against Hungary, the evacuation of Budapest, and the Hungarian parliament's move to Debrecen are well outlined. Although the months of "near-disaster" and those of the "recovery and ecstasy" are described in terms of Kossuth's dictatorship, in examining the events of the winter and the spring Deak presents the vast panorama of the war and often diverts attention from Kossuth. He explains political and military motives of various army leaders, different political groups, and early attempts to arrive at some accommodation with the Austrians. The main course of the victorious spring offensive is clearly presented. Following traditional interpretation, Deak considers it to be the worst military mistake of the Hungarians that, instead of pursuing the retreating Austrian army to the frontier or beyond, they turned to the siege and capture of the castle hill at Buda. He believes, however, that the fate of the Hungarians had been sealed already by the defeat of the Vienna October revolution, and after that they fought "only a costly delaying action" (p. 184).

The author's contention that Austria would not have needed Russian help to defeat the Magyars seems justified from a military point of view. He argues that the new Austrian commander Haynau rejuvenated the Austrian army. He fought a dozen important engagements against the Magyars and did not lose any of them. Thus, ultimately "it was the Austrians, and not the Russians, who put an end to the Hungarian War of Independence" (p. 302). The Russian army in Hungary is presented as "a witless but benevolent giant" which "inflicted only limited harm on its opponents and in turn suffered little harm from the Hungarians" (p. 305).

Although the facts as presented above are undoubtedly correct, it appears to this writer that a large invading foreign army cannot be regarded as benevolent under any circumstances, and that the harmful effect of the Russian intervention is generally underestimated. It certainly is true that the Austrians fought the major battles. But Professor Deak himself teaches us the importance of the fact that the peasant masses did not answer Kossuth's appeals against the Russians in June

because submission to the enemy seemed to offer more protection than armed resistance (p. 293). He also properly calls attention to the fact that by early August there no longer was a Hungarian national will to go on fighting (pp. 318–320). It does not seem very likely that without the Russian intervention the Hungarian national will to continue with the war would have disappeared so rapidly. After all, the Hungarian forces numbered about 170,000 against an Austrian army of ca. 175,000, and the Magyars had certainly proved a few weeks earlier that the Austrians were by no means invincible. The sudden loss of confidence and a change in the national psyche seems very much connected with the appearance of the "Russian colossus," an army of 200,000 backed by the vast resources of the enormous Russian Empire. The Russian forces may not have inflicted much actual damage on the Hungarians, but their presence must have been the deciding psychological factor for unconditional surrender.

After describing the capitulation of the Hungarians, Professor Deak surveys Austrian retribution and briefly outlines Kossuth's career in exile in the epilogue. There is no separate chapter at the end of the study for the author's conclusions. But since description and analysis are combined throughout the entire work, the reader is certainly not left in the dark about the author's views on the major issues and the most important participants.

Among the *dramatis personae* in Deak's book there are no complete villains or faultless heroes, and he avoids seeing things in black and white. It is noted even about Metternich that in the spring of 1848 there was no fundamental difference between Kossuth's and Metternich's socio-economic programs for Hungary (p. 105). Contrary to most Hungarian historians, Palatine Archduke Stephen is regarded not as a traitor to Hungary or to anyone else, but is simply presented as an "embattled leader trying to mediate between two hostile camps" (p. 92). Similarly, Deak stresses the conservative features of the Windisch-Graetz regime set up after the occupation of Budapest, but also describes its essential moderation and respect for the territorial integrity of Hungary.

In terms of personalities the period before 1848 is symbolized by the rivalry between István Széchenyi and Kossuth and the history of the War of Independence by the competition between General Arthur Görgey and Kossuth. Although Széchenyi is dealt with rather briefly, the author regards him as Kossuth's "much greater contemporary" (p. 62). On the other hand, while Görgey is considered to be modern Hungary's greatest military genius, of the two Kossuth was undoubtedly the greater

figure, according to Deak (p. 183). Görgey's military talent and leadership qualities are clearly recognized, and he, too, is considered to be a Magyar patriot. Unlike Kossuth, however, Görgey fought for the more limited aims of securing the April Laws and maintaining a dignified place for Hungary within the Habsburg Monarchy. The author's sympathies are obviously with Görgey when on January 1 Kossuth ordered him to fight a decisive battle near Budapest, but "without endangering the safety of the army." Deak goes on to point out, however, that after the victorious spring offensive, Görgey's behavior became incomprehensible. He, who had always seemed to hope for some kind of reconciliation with the ruling house, now openly denounced the "perfidious dynasty" and talked about the "funeral ceremony of the House of Austria." One is indeed inclined to agree with Deak's evaluation, giving Görgey credit for his military talent, but considering him a confused amateur in the art of politics. Kossuth's final charge of treason against Görgey and his attempt to place the blame on the General for the defeat Deak sees as a calculated move "to find a scapegoat to provide the nation with the traitor its broken pride so badly needed" (p. 322). The available evidence supports this opinion.

The most interesting and challenging aspect of *The Lawful Revolution* is the presentation and assessment of Kossuth's role. The author is more critical of Kossuth than most other Hungarian historians have been. The tone is set in the introduction. The author states that the principal actor of the drama of 1848 was Kossuth, and refers to his organizational abilities and towering personality. But he adds:

> In him, Hungarians recognize their spokesman and their hero, but also the symbol of much that they see as calamitous in the national character: pomposity, excessive pride, a penchant for theatrical gestures, naivite, and easy enthusiasm. (p. xiv)

Indeed, *The Lawful Revolution* provides ample evidence for both the positive and negative features attributed to Kossuth. A systematic presentation of the March Days shows Kossuth's immense parliamentary victories and his success and great popularity even in Vienna. Later, we see him time and time again as an extraordinarily successful orator able to influence deputies in the parliament and induce masses of peasants to take up arms for the defense of the country. Similarly, Deak shows and demonstrates Kossuth's assiduity in crisis situations. He points out, for instance, that between September 1 and 15 Kossuth made sixteen parliamentary speeches, drafted at least thirteen decrees and five other lengthy communications, and wrote several newspaper articles. But in other contexts Deak rejects Kossuth's boast that had he wanted to he

could have put an end to the Habsburg role in Vienna on March 15. Similarly, Deak does not quite believe Kossuth's claim that he would rather have been "a dog than a minister or prime minister" (p. 205). He makes repeated references to Kossuth's lack of physical courage and considers him "energetic but somewhat weak and irresolute" (p. 225). He even calls attention to Kossuth's opportunism and to the fact that he often declined to shoulder responsibility for his decisions (p. 254).

Thus, admiration for Kossuth's great accomplishments is mixed with some criticism. Should the book be translated into Hungarian, no doubt it would create quite a stir among Budapest intellectuals. It is based on a very thorough mastery of both primary and secondary sources and on substantial archival research. Its greatest value is in the brilliantly incisive application of the critical-analytical method. Deak also has obvious literary ability, and tells an interesting story vividly and elegantly. His *Lawful Revolution* will remain the best single-volume study on the Hungarians in 1848 for a long time to come.

Recent Writings on Hungarian Historiography by S. B. Várdy

Thomas Szendrey

Hungarian Historiography and the Geistesgeschichte School — A magyar történettudomány és a szellemtörténeti iskola. Cleveland: An Árpád Academy Publication, 1974. 96 pp.

Modern Hungarian Historiography. Boulder, Colorado: East European Quarterly (distributed by Columbia University Press), 1976. 333 pp.

A concern with the history of historical scholarship, or the self-examination of the development of a profession, is invariably undertaken as a constantly practiced sideline by some historians, but only a very few write historiographical accounts and even fewer concern themselves with the methodological, ideological, and philosophical dimensions of historical scholarship.

Hungarian historiography has been hardly written about since the professionalization of scholarship in this discipline has been institutionalized, in the modern sense, during approximately the past two centuries. This is not meant to state that there was no history written earlier; there quite obviously was, as even the cursory but compact introductory chapters of Várdy's book, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, describe. There was, however, no institutionally based historical profession, until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries generally, and the mid-nineteenth century in Hungary. Indeed, the organization of the Hungarian Historical Society dates back to 1867, although support for the historical profession was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences through a commission for the study of the past in 1854.[1]

The history of the development of historical studies in Hungary has not been extensively written about and the books under review comprise one of the best major efforts yet undertaken to provide an account of this development. There are a few other books and studies in Hungarian and German which deal with some aspects of the subject, but no other

sound and scholarly comprehensive accounts.[2] There is the book written by Alexander Flegler,[3] a friend of the nineteenth century Hungarian historian László Szalay, a few sketchy studies in periodicals and general books dealing with historiographical developments[4] and a doctoral dissertation by this reviewer,[5] which, however, deals more with ideological and methodological concerns and is not strictly a historiographical study. Hence, the publication of these two books fulfills one of the long neglected needs of Hungarian historiography and one can only hope that Várdy as well as others will continue to broaden and especially deepen our understanding of the development of Hungarian historiography, important not only for the understanding of a historiographical heritage hitherto mostly neglected, but also because an understand ing of this particular branch of scholarly activity opens up new vistas in the study of Hungarian intellectual, cultural, and literary life as well. Furthermore, these studies can also contribute to an enhanced comparative understanding of the development of European historiography.[6]

The brief dual language book, *Hungarian Historiography and the Geistesgeschichte School — A magyar történettudomány és a szellemtörténeti iskola*[7] anticipates, in somewhat abbreviated form, the ideas and conclusions presented in the other, lengthier and more substantial, treatment of the same and other topics. Hence, those who wish to read a briefer treatment of some of the major trends in twentieth century Hungarian historiography, especially those who read Hungarian only, will be well served by this briefer version. However, the specialist, and those interested in following the argument more closely and obtaining a more comprehensive account, must definitely read the longer version presented in the other book.[8] Since the argument and basic philosophical orientation in the two books under consideration is sufficiently identical, the substantive discussion in this review will generally be based on the lengthier version.

A few observations concerning the basic thesis of both books should be briefly stated before considering the structure, orientation, and content of these works. It is Várdy's thesis that the widely held belief that the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation was the only viable one in interwar Hungarian historiography should be modified. In his words: "This study deals basically with the nature of inter-war Hungarian historiography. Its basic thesis is that — contrary to the generally accepted belief by inter-war and more recent historians — the so-called *Geistesgeschichte* (Szellemtörténet) School, while undoubtedly the most important one, was not the only worthwhile orientation or school in the historiography

of inter-war Hungary."[9] While accepting this judgment in its essentials and also understanding the fact that there were numerous other historical schools operative in Hungarian historical scholarship in interwar Hungary, there is another sense in which the idealistic philosophical foundation characteristic of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation was shared, in some way — often misunderstood, invariably misinterpreted, and insufficiently appreciated — by the numerous strata comprising Hungarian historians and the educated reading public. Virtually all of the other orientations discussed in these books had in common, if nothing else, an anti-materialist conception of history; thus, an insignificant number of Marxists notwithstanding, a dominance of some form of philosophical idealism, of an essentially eclectic character and irrespective of how well understood or how greatly misunderstood, characterized interwar Hungarian intellectual and cultural life generally. It should be added that there was no official imposition of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation; indeed Várdy's discussion of the numerous schools of thought only underscores this often neglected and misunderstood characteristic of interwar Hungary. Thus, Várdy is quite correct when he states that there were numerous other historical schools influencing Hungarian historical scholarship, but I believe that he neglects to emphasize adequately that the philosophical influences which gave birth to the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation in Hungarian historical scholarship were more pervasive than his argument would indicate.

In order to fully appreciate the pervasiveness of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation in Hungarian thought, including naturally historical thought in the first half of our century, it is necessary to conceive of this orientation as a multi-faceted, complex, essentially idealistic (in both the epistemological sense and the sense that ideas were to be considered as the motive force of history and historical change), and an obviously anti-materialistic conception of history. Even those who polemicized with Szekfű and some of the other major figures in the formulation and propagation of the Hungarian *Geistesgeschichte* orientation, with very few exceptions, stayed within the confines of an essentially idealistic frame of reference.[10] An anti-materialist philosophy of history was undoubtedly dominant, but it existed not as a monolithic and superimposed ideology, but as a widely held and accepted pattern of thought and sentiment in many diverse forms and manifestations. Although other, mostly non-idealistic patterns of thought (Marxist, positivist, existentialist, etc.) also exercised a limited impact in Hungarian intellectual circles, these were by no means widespread. In sum, it can be

argued that many of the opponents of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation were opposed only to certain manifestations of it and not to the dominant idealistic orientation of interwar Hungarian intellectual life.

Thus, there are at least two other observations which must be made about the philosophical dimension of Várdy's account of Hungarian historical scholarship. Despite the excellent organization of the work, a feature much praised by some of the reviewers,[11] and the relative completeness of his account of Hungarian historiography — based furthermore upon solid and painstaking research to which all future scholars will be indebted for quite some time — the discussion of the principles and development of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation in historical thought is quite sketchy, especially when the determination of the character of this school of thought is related to the major theme. This brevity of philosophical discussion characterizes not only his account of the origin of this school in mostly, but by no means exclusively, German philosophic thought concerning the nature of historical knowledge and the methodological concerns of the human sciences more generally; the discussion of the Hungarian philosophers and thinkers instrumental in preparing the mental climate for this orientation, which was to influence so fundamentally Hungarian historiography, is also quite brief and limited to more or less a listing of some of the pertinent individuals and some of their works. His numerous and informative, quite often perceptive and trenchant, comments about historians and their works, so valuable a feature of much of the book, are not to be found to the same extent when he is discussing philosophers and their writings.

Second, another feature of his works which this reviewer wishes to cast a critical glance at, is the characterization of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation and the philosophy of Dilthey and other thinkers of that orientation as irrational.[12] Indeed, this is the major criticism I wish to make of the otherwise commendable and very useful two books.

Other than the fact that the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation should more properly be termed as anti-positivist, anti-materialist, and generally as post-rationalistic in the sense of being opposed to the Enlightenment conception of rationalism, Várdy's discussion of this orientation obviously suffers from his characterization of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation as irrational, augmented furthermore by at least one attempt to link idealism and irrationalism.[13] In all likelihood, this characterization of this orientation as irrational may have its origin in a similar judgment concerning the *Geistesgeschichte* school as irrational by György Lukács, the eminent Hungarian Marxist philosopher, whose ideas con-

cerning this orientation have a wide circulation in philosophical circles, so wide that sometimes this judgment is accepted without specific reference to the source in the writings of Lukács.[14] It is for these reasons that subsequent work in the field of Hungarian historiography and Hungarian intellectual history generally, will have to come to terms with the philosophical dimension and certain related issues, specifically the epistemological problem of historical knowledge and the numerous significant concerns centering on the meaning of the human experience (the speculative philosophy of history), in order to obtain an understanding not only of the development of the tradition of Hungarian historiography, but also the motivations which shaped it and the ideas which inspired it. However, the discussion of these issues was not the theme the author of these books chose to develop, hence he cannot be faulted for not doing so. Nonetheless, these observations are intended to broaden those vistas which Várdy's books have opened for the reader concerned with these subjects.

It is an often stated truism that reviewers sometimes review the books they have not yet written and this reviewer's case is no exception to that generalization. However, an attempt to explain the philosophical and methodological aspects and concerns of Hungarian historical scholarship in its intellectual and cultural setting could not be undertaken until this extremely well structured and organized, pertinently and exhaustively documented, and pioneering work had been completed.

Turning attention to the structure and content of the book, it should be stated again that one of the major accomplishments of Várdy was to have provided an organizational schema, in itself an act of historical synthesis, to make the discussion of a myriad of orientations and individuals, comprehensible and structured. There can be little doubt that after a careful reading of these books one will have a good working knowledge of the Hungarian tradition of historical scholarship, augmented by an even more comprehensive understanding of two individuals whom Várdy has chosen, most properly one might add, to emphasize, namely Gyula Szekfű, whom he considers as the dominant influence in the development of the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation, and Elemér Mályusz, the developer of the ethnohistory school and an outstanding historian of social and institutional structures. His account of Szekfű is based upon a very comprehensive collection of works by and about him, whereas the account of the career and works of Mályusz, is based also upon numerous personal interviews and an extensive correspondence. Várdy's numerous and extended opportunities to work in

Hungarian libraries, archives, and institutes, coupled with personal contact with a number of Hungarian historians, further enhances the source value of some parts of his book.[15]

Generally, most Hungarian historians and their works are at least mentioned, although one would have hoped for a slightly less diffused discussion of the other major figures; quite often one must turn to the index to find numerous scattered comments about individuals such as Bálint Hóman, Péter Váczy, Sándor Domanovszky, as well as numerous others. Although most themes and concerns of Hungarian historical scholarship are covered, some even in separate chapters — specifically East European studies, world history, legal and constitutional history, auxiliary and allied sciences — there are other fields, such as the philosophy of history and church history, both Catholic and Protestant, which at least in the judgment of this reviewer, could have been discussed in a less diffused manner in the first instance and more completely in the second instance.

These critical comments and observations notwithstanding, Várdy's contribution to our understanding of the Hungarian historiographical tradition should prove to be fundamental and no one who proposes to work in this field can afford to neglect his efforts. This well researched and detailed account of the history of Hungarian historical scholarship in the twentieth century (prefaced by a few brief background chapters concerning earlier developments) serves as a very useful introduction and guide to the labyrinth of Hungarian historiography. It is undoubtedly a work of fundamental importance.

NOTES

1. Concerning the establishment of the Hungarian Historical Society see Imre Lukinich, *A Magyar Történelmi Társulat története, 1867–1917* (Budapest: Magyar Történelmi Társulat, 1918), esp. pp. 15–24.
2. Most of these other studies and books are cited by Várdy in his very extensive bibliographies, see *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, pp. 289–297, especially the works of Hóman, Léderer, and Lékai.
3. Alexander Flegler, *A magyar történetírás története* (Budapest: Franklin, 1877). The book was originally published in German.
4. The sections, in most instances only a few pages, dealing with Hungarian historiography in these major accounts of historiography are very sketchy and inevitably misleading. Hopefully, publications, such as Várdy's books, will provide the information which will make subsequent general accounts of historiography more accurate and complete when dealing with Hungary. Among those major accounts which have generally insufficient and very incomplete

information about Hungarian historiographical developments include, but are by no means limited, to the following: Harry Elmer Barnes, *History of Historical Writing,* 2nd. rev. ed. (New York: Dover Publications, 1962); Eduard Fueter, *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1925); George P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1959); and James Thompson, *A History of Historical Writing,* 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1942).

5. Thomas Szendrey, *The Ideological and Methodological Foundations of Hungarian Historiography, 1750–1970* (Ph.D. diss., Jamaica, N.Y.: St. John's University, 1972).
6. Other books which have contributed to an enhanced understanding of European historiography by presenting a national historiographical tradition include Georg G. Iggers, *The German Conception of History, The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (Middletown, Conn., Wesleyan University Press, 1968); Konstantin F. Shteppa, *Russian Historians and the Soviet State* (New Brunsick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1962); and Bert James Loewenberg, *American History in American Thought* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972).
7. The discussion of this book is based upon the English version.
8. *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (Boulder, Colo.: East European Quarterly, 1976).
9. *Hungarian Historiography and the Geistesgeschichte School,* p. 59.
10. *Modern Hungarian Historiography,* p. 247, chap. 12, fn. 3, citing a letter from Mályusz to Várdy, March 30, 1975. Mályusz writes: "I did not turn against *Geistesgeschichte,* only against Szekfű's and Hóman's interpretation and use of the same — being as they were guided by ulterior motives, the desire for success [and] in search of cheap glories." Furthermore, this reviewer recalls a conversation with Mályusz, held at the Várdy residence during their IREX tenure in Budapest in May 1970, during which Mályusz stated that his historical orientation had indeed been idealistic in nature.
11. Most of the reviews I have seen have mentioned the excellent organization of *Modern Hungarian Historiography,* including the reviews published in Hungary, especially one by Emil Niederhauser in *Századok* 111 (1977): 826–827.
12. The term irrational is used any number of times and was objected to by other reviewers, specifically Lee Congdon in his brief review published in *History — Review of New Books,* January 1977, p. 77.
13. This is most evident in a discussion of the activities of Sándor Domanovszky, where he writes as follows: "In other words, while trying to dethrone or at least lessen the influence of the *Geistesgeschichte* School, Domanovszky himself attacked the philosophical foundations of the positivist system he represented. Thus, *while generally opposing idealism and irrationalism,* (emphasis added) at this time Domanovszky appeared to speak up for an *idealist and irrational* (emphasis added) interpretation of history, placing himself dangerously close to the position of the *Geistesgeschichte* historians." *Modern Hungarian Historiography,* p. 169.
14. With the exception of one book by György Lukács, *Magyar irodalom — magyar kultúra* (Budapest, 1970), listed in the bibliography, there are no other references to the works of Lukács, even though he dealt extensively with the

philosophy of Dilthey and related subjects in his book, *Az ész trónfosztása* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965) and numerous other books and essays. Furthermore, a selection from the works of Dilthey was published in Hungarian; Wilhelm Dilthey, *A történelmi világ felépítése a szellemtudományokban* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1974).

15. See the preface to *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, pp. xiii–ix.

BOOK REVIEWS

Modern polgári jogelméleti tanulmányok [Studies in Modern Bourgeois Legal Theory]. Edited by Csaba Varga and András Sajó. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977. 145 pp.

This small volume, published under the auspices of the Institute of State and Legal Sciences [Állam és Jogtudományi Intézet], is a series of translations of studies in twentieth-century legal theory. All of the writers are celebrated representatives of non-socialist legal scholarship: Hans Kelsen, Rudolf Stammler, Bódog Somló, Eugen Ehrlich, Jerome Frank, Axel Hagerstrom, A. Vilhelm Lundstedt and Gustav Radbruch. Outstanding as these legal theoreticians are, the inclusion of their contributions was not intended to provide a complete sample of twentieth-century legal theories, but the editors claim that they do represent the most important trends in "contemporary bourgeois scholarship."

The volume opens with Hans Kelsen, the most distinguished positivist of the twentieth century. The section from Kelsen's *The Law as a Specific Legal Technique* (1941), includes the seminal theses of his theory, analyzing the law as a particular societal technique. Law is viewed as an enforced order based on the application of sanctions. The evolution of the legal technique is a history of the differentiation of the system of sanctions; a higher system of law is based on centralization as against the decentralized nature of primitive law. The presented material includes the core of Kelsen's pure theory of law. He argues that no theory of justice can form part of a pure theory of law. Ideals of justice must be a matter of political science, while the pure theory of law must be uncontaminated by politics, ethics, sociology and history. Its task is knowledge of all that is essential to law, it is a quest for pure knowledge. Kelsen does not extend a theory of law to what the law *ought* to be; that is the task of political science, or of ethics, or of religion.

From the neo-Kantian school, Rudolf Stammler's legal philosophy is presented. The selections are based on his *Theorie der Rechtswissenschaft* (1911) and focus on the form and substance of the legal thought, the concept and meaning of law and the distinctions between written and effective law.

The Hungarian Bódog Somló represents the analytical legal positivism (*Juristische Grundlehre,* 1917). He was among the first continental jurists who studied John Austin thoroughly, but reduced Austin's six necessary notions to four: right, duty, sovereignty and state. All these are logically presupposed by the idea of legal order. In the translated parts Somló deals with the meanings of the concept of law, the law-making power, the multiple meaning of the word "law" and the consequences of its different interpretations.

The exponent of the modern sociological school is Eugen Ehrlich's *Grundlegung der Sociologie des Rechts* (1913). His main thesis is that the crucial aspect of the legal development lies not in legislation, nor in juristic science, nor in judicial decision, but in society itself. The "living law" that actually lives in society is in permanent evolution, always outpacing the rigid and immobile state law.

From the perspective of Marxism-Leninism, probably the most disagreeable scholar in the collection is the American Jerome Frank who probes into the fundamental myth of law (*Law and the Modern Mind,* 1930). In tracing the historical roots of this problem, he explores the causes: desire for stability in the society contradicts the relative nature of law and of the legal cases. Frank analyses the law from the psychoanalytical point of view: he likens the desire for (legal) certainty to the infant's craving for infallible authority (father complex).

The volume continues with two outstanding exponents of the Scandinavian realists: Axel Hagerstrom (*On Fundamental Problems of Law,* 1930) and A. Vilhelm Lundstedt (*Legal Thinking Revisited,* 1956). Scandinavian realism is essentially a philosophical critique of the metaphysical foundations of law. Hagerstrom totally rejects the natural law philosophy and any absolute ideas of justice. Lundstedt analyses the contemporary legal sciences as well as outlines his concept of the "constructive legal science." For him, law is nothing but the very life of mankind in organized groups and the conditions which make possible "peaceful coexistence" of masses of individuals and social groups; law is determined by "social welfare." This formulation does not differ greatly from the objectives of legal order as outlined by Soviet jurists.

The last piece in the collection is by Gustav Radbruch, a distinguished exponent of relativist legal philosophy. In his *Gesetliches Unrecht und Übergesetzliche Recht* (1946), he analyzes the questions of "lawful illegality" and "lawless law." Based on the bitter experiences of national socialist jurisprudence, Radbruch suggests that where the violation of justice reaches an intolerable degree ("lawless law"), the law has no claim to obedience.

This reviewer concurs with the editors' statement that there are no discernible ideological reasons for the selection of the translated pieces. Nevertheless there is some cohesion between the chosen themes of the respective jurists: they all address themselves to fundamental questions of legal theory, i.e., the nature and origin of law, the sociological, psychological and philosophical foundations of legal institutions, as well as some important controversial issues of contemporary legal thought. Careful effort was made in selecting from each writer the vital substance of their respective theories.

While most major modern trends are represented by a renowned scholar, some other schools of thought have been altogether omitted. The new legal idealism, François Geny and the German 'Interessenjurisprudenze," the neo-scholastic doctrine, modern Catholic legal philosophy, the questions of legal theory and international society are cases in point. Furthermore, in some instances the question arises why some jurists were included while others were not. The reader has a feeling of uncertainty and discomfort, because of the lack of explanation by the editors as to the rationale of their judgment regarding their choices; if this would have been done adequately, the scholarly value of the volume could have been so much greater.

Although the publishers apparently expect that the volume will contribute to the Marxist evaluation of these "bourgeois" scholars, the real value of the publication is that it makes these works — hitherto unavailable to readers without proficiency in foreign languages — accessible to the Hungarian students of legal theory. It is, however, questionable whether the publication of this somewhat haphazard selection of legal theories will meaningfully contribute to knowledge in the larger sense. If this is all that the readers can know, the material will be out of focus; yet it may provide a limited, but valuable insight into non-socialist theory.

The publisher of the volume is a strictly party-controlled institution representing the official Marxist-Leninist scholarship. Therefore, it is not meaningless that the work appeared in print without an ideological critique; it is one more expression of the generally more tolerant academic atmosphere in Hungary.

Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti Barnabas Racz

Kövület. By Ferenc Fáy. Toronto: Vörösváry Publishing Co., 1977. 131 pp. $10.00.

"You went off to bring back from the blossoms of the Black Rose the dew, which sustains others forever, and in which you too may beautify yourself." With these words Ferenc Fáy launches the Prince on his journey in his most recent book, Petrification. Will the Prince succeed in his quest? "The Treasure? – Your Treasure? — You are too late." The poet does not blame somebody else for what he considers his own failure: "It is your own fault if you live like a prisoner in a cage of petrified faces. And you don't see beyond the hedge of your fingers, where people live." Although he is stuck fast in "the petrified, cruel picture frame," those who until recently had been unsympathetic, now gather round him "that they may see in the transparent firmament of your face, the disintegration of their own faces." The words of the poet had petrified. Hence the unusual title, Petrification. Is his voice indeed frozen into stone? Will his lines of rare beauty and uncommon depth remain sealed in the slowly yellowing pages of his books, because future generations are not interested in reading them? Many of his readers firmly believe that his words will continue to be read. The torments of exile, centuries from now might be a thing of the past, but that pain will always be understood, because it is eternally human. Although most of his poems are permeated with sorrow and loneliness, he is not forsaken. Many of his fellow immigrants share his suffering, and like him, for years have been going through the pangs of hell, and there is no Beatrice for them to bring blessing and relief. They can never forget their birthplace, friends, family and the culture which even in unfavorable times still keeps thriving in the fertile soil of the home country. In Fáy's village, Pécel, the well-to-do villagers, his beloved parents, the respected Uncle Batár, and others as well, who were so full of vitality in his other books, here appear as mere shadows: "Their faces like larva, muddy remembrance." Here his village does not emerge in its pristine beauty. He himself has "to dig the street out of the dust." And the poet-child of yore is "a skeleton, a boy dressed in a blue sailor's suit." As he tries to resurrect his dead, he keeps seeing their decayed bodies, and only the shadows of their spirits are sensed by the reader. Still, how mighty are those shadows. In the "Miraculous Fishing" his net shows wear and tear and "from his crushed fingers drips the wounded sky's blood." ". . . Dying student heroes of Corvin Street, workers' mangled bodies from the Csepel plants, them I see," says Fáy, "when I cast my net to fish out the young heroes of October from the currents of deep waters." "And

now," continues Fáy, "at night, when the cemeteries take a seat at your bedside, and the dead of the past question you, can you answer them, or have you already been assimilated, and just stand there without understanding them? . . ."[1]

The poet seems to be gradually losing his formerly firm contact with God, who used to be his refuge and a source of strength. The Almighty, not Fáy, started the process of separation. The poet sighs in desperation: "How desolate is the land without you." Nevertheless, he tries to contact Him. In "Rövidzárlat" (Shortcircuit) he dials in vain, for the Lord is constantly on another line. It seems to him, in his bitterness, that the longhaired, marijuana smoking members of fanatical religious sects have appropriated God for themselves: "While they disgrace Him in the churches and in public, the Lord in seeking their favor," says Fáy, "takes drugs and plays the guitar."[2]

Is there a way out of this "world without a doorhandle or key?" Although the poet "is nowhere" and "is nobody" and cannot reach the Lord who seems to be dwelling in the immeasurable distance, still, perhaps he is also "so near to us, that his breathing can almost be heard."[3] Indeed, such nearness seems to have been necessary for writing the most gripping work in the volume: the "Keresztút" (The Way to the Cross). The writing of this poem was not the result of a sudden inspiration, but rather a slow ripening process. The third, fifth and final parts of this work were published several years ago in one of his former volumes of poetry, and only now we see it completed. In the introduction to this poem Fáy writes: "In the 'Keresztút' I endeavor to tell about that God who is in every wound of my life." This is a most unusual allusion to the stigmata. In this writer's opinion Fáy sometimes uses too much figurative speech, but here it does seem excessive. Nature not merely takes part in the events, but fuses with the tragedy. Like Frigyes Karinthy in one of his stories about Christ, Fáy also sees the masses lining the Way to the Cross as a gigantic, bloodthirsty Monster, in whose shapeless form thousands of individuals unite to demand the release of Barabbas.

Perhaps the Messiah is never seen to be more human in suffering than when "his swollen blue tongue, like a piece of rag hung out from his mouth," and when "he lay down as tired men lie in the dust everywhere in the twilight of all times." Thus we are in him, and the Savior is in us. We see his painful progress. He falters under the weight of the cross, while the Hill of Golgotha towers high above the soldiers, priests, wailing women, the mocking, rowdy crowd and the Via Dolorosa. The Hill, in its inevitability, is the Destiny and Fulfillment. Fáy sees in it Pécel's Road to the Cross too. No doubt, there are many thousands of

poor villages like Pécel, scattered from Kamchatka to the Tierra del Fuego, but Fáy is Hungarian and therefore he immortalizes the Hungarian village on the eve of the Second World War.

Could an immigrant ever feel at home in a foreign country? Lajos Kutasi answered this question when he wrote, "The first time a man finds a favorite place in the world outside his homeland, to which he can return without losing his way, where the buildings and the faces of the people somehow are familiar, without being closely acquainted with them, in that place he won't feel himself a stranger any more."[4] Although such a well-liked and familiar place never can make one forget the country of his birth, still it may serve as *terra firma* in which to sink his roots. Is it possible for a writer, who is the living conscience of his people, to accept another country as his second home? Can he pursue a "two-hearted" existence? Tamás Kabdebó, a librarian and writer in England, proves in his own life and works that this is possible. Tibor Flórián after thirty years of wanderings finally found his place. He writes: ". . . For a long time I wandered in desperation, until I found a place in New England with an atmosphere akin to Transylvania. There, in a forest in Connecticut the trees of Transylvania were whispering in the wind. The hills and lakes reminded me strongly of the country of my youth. Thus I sank my roots into the New England soil, but remained Hungarian and European."[5] If the poet, or any immigrant for that matter, refuses the friendship of his new country and its people, how will he ever be able to open the barred window of his life and to step out — to quote Fáy — "Into reality which can be opened only from the inside." He writes in the poem, "Egy hazaindulónak" (To One Who is Returning Home): "Here every branch mocks me . . . ," but elsewhere he describes the beauties of the Canadian countryside and warmly and exquisitely sketches the seasons in the Canadian forests.

In this writer's opinion Fáy's further progress will largely depend on whether he succeeds — if he is willing to try — in finding his emotional balance between his motherland and Canada. Those who think that such a change so late in life is not possible, should consider Tibor Flórián, the thoroughly Hungarian writer who after thirty years found his second home, which he does not think of any more as a foreign land. Fáy says in "Sütkérezés" (Sunbathing): "And you are listening to the walnut-brown silence breaking open its green outer shell and how it falls and rolls among the chairs in the dust. And there is nobody for whom I can crack it open." In this, to a great extent, he is mistaken, for there are thousands of fellow immigrants who eagerly wait for his cracking the walnut-brown silence and will be happy to feast on what he offers for the

sustenance of their spirits. There is a future for Fáy's poetry. The promise of this can be seen in his "Mese a tavaszról" (A Tale About the Spring), whose optimistic mood surprises the reader who has become accustomed to his beautiful, but self-tormenting poems. The sarcastic and self-critical "Halotti maszk" (Deathmask) foreshadows works of a new thematic and stylistic approach. Most of his poems in the volume have a uniformly high quality but the "Keresztút" rises above them all. In it the poet seems to have successfully met the challenge presented by the theme.

László Buday, who so ably illustrated *Kövület,* writes in Krónika: "A deep-seated sorrow chokes us. . . . In vain we search for words to express it. How comforting it is to see those words coming from Fáy through the beautiful epoch of the Keresztút. Your past is revived, and now you can progress and continue to believe in the wonders of Fáy's poetry."[6]

Perhaps here we find the key to the continuing existence of Hungarians scattered in the world — a Future growing out of the sterile soil of the Past.

Maxim Tabory

NOTES

1. Ferenc Fáy's words, quoted from a taped discussion with the author in 1978.
2. Ibid.
3. The quotation is from a poem by this reviewer.
4. *Szabadság* [Liberty] (Cleveland) 88, no. 40 (October 6, 1978): 12.
5. *Krónika* [Chronicle] (Toronto) 5, no. 3 (March 1979): 8.
6. Ibid., 4, no. 1 (January 1978): 13.

44 Hungarian Short Stories. Budapest: Corvina, 1979. 733 pp.

This volume has been published in the series of translations of representative works, European Series, sponsored by UNESCO.

The *44 Hungarian Short Stories,* the most ambitious of its kind ever to appear in the English language, follows in the footsteps of the earlier *22 Hungarian Short Stories,* published jointly by Corvina and Oxford University Press, back in 1967.

It is quite understandable in one sense that the editors deemed it necessary to double the selection of the earlier collection. In its excellence the short story in Hungary is only second in poetry. Although

essentially the product of the last decades of the nineteenth century, the variety of themes and techniques demonstrated in nearly a hundred years is indeed impressive. Moreover, the question of the choice of a country's authors represented in an anthology is a difficult and a sensitive one. Few if any editors have ever managed to please everyone. This is not the place to discuss the mechanism of a selection, and, in any event, the reviewer has it easy for his is the last word. Besides, "de gustibus non est disputandum." What ought to be attempted here is then assessment rather than overt criticism in the light of the manifold problems confronting the production of such an anthology.

Initially, an argument may put put forth that quantity may overwhelm quality. Few readers if any will have the patience to read all the selections. Yet, it may be claimed that this is surely not compulsory. The abundance of material might make one lose the way, the perspective, and consequently trap one in an avalanche of theme, character, and imagination.

Secondly, a more important argument for a clarification of the aim of such an anthology might be sought. It would be easy to argue for a more modest collection of stories were Hungary not a *terra incognita* for the majority of the prospective readers. What might the average reader expect to find in a collection of stories from a country with traditions vastly different from his own? Will he more likely search information about life and society or appreciate artistic execution, the writer's competence in telling a story? Will he expect to identify or will he be more adventurous in seeking the exotic? C. P. Snow, the eminent English writer, states in the Preface that "the anthology will teach us something, and something very important, about a remarkable country, and a remarkable literature." The stories, comments Snow further, "spread over a whole range of history and social change, and they represent a good deal of the Hungarian experience. The best of them represent, as one would expect, much more than that, since good art, though it is embedded in its own time and place, speaks to us in a common human voice."

In comparing the earlier twenty-two stories to the present forty-four, one thing immediately stands out: eleven selections are common to both volumes. Since most publications, particularly those of marginal interest to the large public, soon go out of print, the present collection provides a service by making these stories once again available. Yet, one suspects that the choice may have been made on the basis of material already conveniently translated. This new volume, on the other hand, provided an excellent opportunity to publish material as yet unavailable to the English-speaking public.

Nonetheless, let us take a close look at the volume on its own merits. Of the republished stories three are truly first-class, an opinion borne out by the critical comments in each volume. *Omelette a Woburn* (1935) by Dezső Kosztolányi, is about a student travelling from Paris to Budapest. Getting off in Zurich, he walks into a chic restaurant with only a few francs in his pocket. He worries all through his sumptuous meal whether he will have enough money to pay in the end. This is a well-written, uncomplicated story about hidden social tensions. In *The Birthday of Emil Dukich* (1958), a story by Ferenc Karinthy, an elderly professor's young assistant gets drunk, makes a pass at the professor's two daughters, and, finally, his wife. Failing with all three of them, his luck turns and the janitor's wife falls his way. The slightly malicious, witty story about sophisticated Budapest society that the author knows all too well, has a very mid-European flavour to it. The third selection is by Tibor Déry, one of Hungary's major prose writers. Déry is among the few who managed to achieve some reputation in the West. His story, *Ambition and Hilarity* (1946), is about innocent war orphans who murder thoughtlessly for sweets. Another choice from Déry might have been his famous story, *Love,* which is about the imprisonment and release of an innocently convicted political prisoner in the fifties. Definitely more compelling than Boris Palotai's *Promise Darling* (1972), dealing with the same theme.

The re-publication of the other stories raises some questions. Andor Endre Gelléri, a victim of the Holocaust, was one of the most gifted prewar writers of the short story. His writing dealt mainly with the poor, people on the fringes — those with shattered hopes, hoping against hope. Gelléri's *House on an Empty Lot* (1931-1934) is an important and moving story about homelessness. Since this writer is known for his "fairy realism," a fusion of dream and reality, perhaps it may have been wise to choose a more uplifting story which better represents this strong element in his work. Magda Szabó has long been a bestseller, with publications in many languages. Szabó's preoccupation with epic themes is indicative of her strength in the novel and drama, and hence, such themes are too constrained within the boundaries of a short story such as *At Cockrow* (1967), presented here. It is a pity that she is not represented in this volume by *The Guest,* a story with less evidence of epic dimensions about the hazards of an emigré's visit home. *Fear* (1948) is hardly one of the best stories by the excellent writer, Endre Illés, and could have been omitted easily. The same can be said of stories by two classic authors, Gyula Krúdy and Dezső Szomory, *The Last Cigar and the Grey Arab* (1928) and *The Divine Garden* (1909), respectively. These stories as well as the world they reveal appear marginal.

Géza Csáth and Károly Pap represent special cases. Hitherto not widely known, their importance seems to increase with time. A psychiatrist and a music critic of note, Csáth, in his writing, was interested in pathology, particularly in extreme situations. Recent years have witnessed a revival of interest in this pioneering and experimental writer both in Hungary and abroad. The theme of *Music Makers* (1913), the destruction of high hopes in a backward society is typical for East-Central Europe. While an excellent story, *Music Makers* is among Csáth's more traditional works. It is rather his more modern, analytical stories, such as *Matricide* that give Csáth an international status. Károly Pap occupied a unique position in Hungarian literature: he incorporated such themes as the world of the Old Testament and Jewish legends. One of the stories dealing with such themes, it might be argued, might have been more typical and might have added more variety than *Organ* (1927), included here.

Anthologies are not perfect. The editors of the *44 Hungarian Short Stories* were ambitious in attempting to cover all aspects of a country's social and political history. The effort seems to have been not to exclude any author of literary eminence. Yet, too often the selection process yielded to other criteria than literary ones. To paraphrase C. P. Snow, whose comment is that some of the stories "leave out too little," the editors should have extended this thought to leave out more authors. The overall effect is that along with the numerous marvellous and adequate stories there are clearly weak ones, and a certain repetition of theme and approaches is clearly evident.

In Sándor Hunyadi's *Adventure in Uniform* (1930) the protagonist wears a private's uniform in order to get a date with a pretty housemaid. When he sheds his uniform which hides a gentleman, the girl regretfully but proudly leaves him. In *Ignác Vonó* (1963) by Endre Fejes, an ex-soldier marries a middle-class woman and pretends to be an aristocrat. In *Anna Szegi's Kiss* (1939) Pál Szabó employs again the familiar theme of class-distinction. This story ends tragically: both hero and heroine drown themselves because they are not allowed to marry.

Hungarian literature abounds in tales of poverty. This is most evident in stories about peasant life. *Brutes* (1932) by Zsigmond Móricz, Hungary's outstanding writer of prose, has been regarded as a masterpiece ever since it was written. The story relates how two shepherds brutally murder a third and his son and how their crime is uncovered; a shocking tale of backwardness and brutality, told in a terse, dramatic manner. *Brutes* may lose some of its effectiveness when removed from its native context. The unfortunate but inevitable loss is in the flavour of folk

speech. Contemporary English doesn't appear to have the means to convey this important element in the peasant stories. The most gifted chronicler of peasant life since Móricz is Ferenc Sánta. In his stories the tragedy of poverty is always redeemed with an element of the idyll; there is "a ray of sunshine in the realm of darkness." The story *Nazis* (1960), while an important period-piece, does not quite do justice to Sánta's special, huge talent.

To conclude a random sample of stories that raise doubts: György Moldova is perhaps Hungary's most popular and outspoken writer. The story printed here about socceer teams, *Legend of an Outside Right* (1962), is disappointingly long and tedious. The international success of the plays *Catsplay* and *Tot Family* made István Örkény the best-known Hungarian writer abroad ever since Ferenc Molnár. In his native Hungary Örkény's grotesque "one-minute stories" are often ranked above his plays. When well-chosen, their effect will be inescapable even in translation. When no sufficient discrimination is exercised in the selection, however, the English-speaking reader might find them overtly cynical and alien to his sense of humour.

C. P. Snow mentions in the Preface that some of the stories are too long and leisurely by English standards. While this is unfortunately true, length seems less of a factor in a truly good story. The mother in *Smouldering Crisis* (1909), gentle psychological story by Margit Kaffka, had lost both her husband and lover and now lives in withdrawal, only for her son. Her seeming resignation hides a latent anxiety, a mysterious force that inspires the unrequited passion of the narrator, her son's young friend.

One of the collection's best pieces, *The Student and the Woman* (1959) by László Kamondy, also relates an infatuation of a young student for a beautiful mature married woman. While rowing people around on Lake Balaton, the student becomes fascinated with a woman sunbathing on the shore. She tries to fight him off, alternately amused and angered. He is only asking for a kiss; at the end he is given more than he is asking for. Written with a disarming simplicity, the story is on the top of Snow's list. The seldom outstanding István Csurka nevertheless can be counted upon to turn out genuine stories. He is particularly adept at portraying the outclass — people on the fringes. *Kerbside* (1975) is about two elderly streetsweepers. One of them, the woman, is trying to persuade the other, an alcoholic man, that they could make a go of it together.

Among the many somber stories, humour, fun, is a rare guest. With its wry, bizarre humour, Gábor Goda's *Peaceful Sunday* (1960) is such an

exception. The story takes a satiric view of careerism under socialism. The protagonist has two ambitions in life: to be promoted and to get married. He is concerned that promotion should take precedence over marriage as the girl in question is the manager's daughter and "under socialism things like this are tricky." The story takes a tragic turn: discussing his promotion with his boss while swimming long distance in Lake Balaton, the hero suffers heart failure and drowns.

In conclusion it might be said that from a strictly literary point of view a few of the stories are no better than mediocre without a real story base. Several others repeat problems stated in other stories, while the other half are distinguished works. From another point of view, the anthology provides a useful service as a source of information, as an encyclopedia of Hungarian life. When considering the amount of work and care that went into its production and the consistently high quality of its translation, the *44 Hungarian Short Stories* is a worthy addition to the little that had been available in the field. This reviewer cannot help feeling though that more discrimination and a slightly less conservative approach might have produced a smaller but a higher quality volume.

Carleton University Paul Varnai

A Felvidék az ezeréves magyar államtestben: Magyarok Csehszlovákiában [Upper Hungary in the Thousand-Year-Old Hungarian Body Politic: Hungarians in Czechoslovakia]. By László Sirchich. Cleveland, Ohio, 1979. Published by and available from the author: 2092 West 95th Street, Cleveland, OH 44102. 48 pp. $3.50, paper.

This booklet unites three valuable short studies. The first of these highlights little-known episodes of Hungarian resistance in 1919 to the annexation of Upper Hungary by Czechoslovakia. The episodes include the protest of the citizens of Pozsony/Pressburg (later Bratislava), and their petition for a plebiscite; the defense and eventual counteroffensive by Hungarian military units against the Czechoslovak Legion; and the June, 1920 declaration of Hungarian deputies in the Prague Parliament, branding the annexation of Hungarian-inhabited territories a violation of the principle of self-determination. A brief survey of subsequent efforts to ease the burdens and solve the problems of the Hungarian minority completes the study, bringing it up to the unrealized hopes of the Prague Spring in 1968.

The second study, entitled "From Belvedere to Kassa," traces developments in Slovak-Hungarian relations from the fall of 1938 (Vienna Award) to the reestablishment of pre-war borders in 1945, and the proclamation of the "Košický Program," resulting in punitive measures for Hungarians. The latter — together with other nationalities — were considered to be second-class citizens subject to deportation and expulsion.

The third study deals with the cultural life of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia since 1945, and it is based extensively on Hungarian-language publications in Slovakia, reflecting a mixture of hope and despair by those who live "under the double yoke" of foreign and communist rule.

Although somewhat polemical in nature, the studies attain credibility by the simple fact that the author himself was a participant in the interwar politics of Czechoslovakia, and he is able to draw on personal experiences and observations, as well as original written sources. Currently president of the National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia (and organization founded in Hungary by the expellees, and now functioning in North America), Mr. Sirchich is considered to be one of the best informed persons concerning the situation of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania Edward Chaszar

Veronika Gervers-Molnar
1939—1979

In July 1979 the world of learning lost a young, yet already distinguished scholar when Veronika Gervers-Molnar died after a brief illness.

Vera Molnár, as she was known to many Hungarian specialists, was born and educated in Hungary. In 1966 she married Dr. Michael Gervers, currently of the University of Toronto. Soon thereafter she immigrated to Canada, and joined the Royal Ontario Museum's Textile Department. She continued to work there until her untimely death. During the past few years, she also held a teaching appointment in the University of Toronto's Department of Fine Arts.

Highlights of her career as a student and curator of ancient textiles included the developing of one of the world's most comprehensive collections of early Christian and Moslem fabrics at the Royal Ontario Museum, and the publication of a large volume of essays, *Studies in Textile History* (Toronto, 1977).

In the realm of scholarly publishing, she gained acclaim for two monographic studies: *A középkori Magyarország rotundái* [The Round Churches of Mediaeval Hungary] (Budapest, 1972), and *The Hungarian Szűr: An Archaic Mantle of Eurasian Origin* (Toronto, 1973), as well as for numerous articles in North American and European journals.

Veronica Gervers-Molnar had twice published in our *Review* (Fall, 1975 and Spring, 1977), and since 1975, has been one of our corresponding editors. With her departure we have lost not only a scholar of wide experience and knowledge, but a friend who has been a source of inspiration and encouragement to us.

N.F.D.