

the precipices." (p. 191), "He was been staying there for the past week." (p. 260), "till than" (p. 265). Besides, page 149 looks highly unconventional as the top half and the bottom half of the page have been reversed. The most serious omission in the book, however, is the absence of any index. The book has an appalling binding, which is extremely unfair on the contributors, who have put together a rather useful essential volume, which is likely to generate considerable interest in the field of contrastive research, involving English and Hungarian. The editor, Éva H. STEPHANIDES managed to achieve remarkable unity of presentation all through. The publisher seems to have taken approximately four years to bring out this book, which is not exactly rushing it into print.

School of Slavonic and East European Studies, London

Béla Hollósy

John Lukacs

Budapest 1900: A Historical Portrait of a City and its Culture

(New York, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988. 255 pages, illustrations)

John Lukacs, who despite his Hungarian background has distinguished himself primarily as a scholar of American history (even if an early work of his did deal with Eastern Europe), has recently come out with a lively and informative book which at last takes account of his Hungarian heritage. As the title indicates, it concerns itself with Budapest at the turn of the century. (Although Lukacs insists on the special significance of 1900, there are in truth so many "watershed" developments that can be dated both before and after this year that it is best regarded as an arbitrary, if all the same useful, organizing center.)

From the almost photographic rendering of the May 1900 funeral of Mihály Munkácsy – the painter of German-Hungarian parentage who briefly basked in the sun of world fame – to the adroit epilogue summarizing the decades which betrayed as well as fulfilled the promise of 1900, Lukacs presents a nuanced and sensitive portrait of this important but generally neglected Central European city. It is a work that complements as well as supplements the now fashionable historical sketches and studies of *fin-de-siècle* Vienna; indeed, in its lyricism and anecdotal quality it is reminiscent of Frederic Morton's books on Vienna (whose *tour de forces* are novel for their copious references to Hungary and Hungarians and the Dual Monarchy's other nationalities). It is in the main an impressive work, combining the studiousness of a historian with the evocative powers of a poet.

But whereas Morton is a biographer-novelist whose renderings of diplomatic and cultural history dispense with the eyesore of statistics, Lukacs mixes his fanciful (and not always telling) tropes with the facts and figures of the conscientious historian. Even so, what Lukacs has produced here is a highly personal work, a memoir in a sense, albeit one that seldom rests – for how could it? – on personal memories. Lukacs was born and reared in Budapest and, as he himself relates, the most impressionable years of his youth coincided with the years of the Second World War. He was among those who witnessed its transformation from a beautiful metropolis – in some ways the most beautiful in the world – to a ravaged, war-torn shell of a city. (As Lukacs notes, Budapest was one of three capital cities to have suffered such wholesale destruction, the others being Berlin and Warsaw.) But he was also old enough to have fixed in his mind the image of a city (much of which has since been reconstructed, some not) inhabited by earlier generations. But such an image will necessarily be patchy and incomplete and, with the passing of time, increasingly fuzzy. One cannot help feeling that Lukacs had long waited for the opportunity to ply his historian's craft towards the ultimately personal, but nonetheless noble goal of replenishing (as well as supplementing) his own memory.

The structure of the book is appealing in its logic and one which, "in accord with my historical philosophy," the author has used before. A detailed description of the physical aspects of turn-of-the-century Budapest – its geographical situation, its division into districts, its public architecture, etc. – is followed by an account of its inhabitants (including a consideration of class and ethnic differences), followed in turn by a look at municipal and – as Budapest cannot be entirely understood in isolation of the country of which it is a part – national politics, the cultural and intellectual life of the city, rounded off by what might be described as a portrait of the *Zeitgeist*, at any rate those aspects of it which seem, in retrospect, to have foretold the doom of that prodigious but innocent age.

In 1900 Budapest was the youngest metropolis in all of Europe and, after Chicago, perhaps in the world. In the last three decades of the nineteenth century it had grown faster than any European city, with the possible exception of Berlin. From 1890 to 1900 its population had increased by more than forty percent and with 733,000 inhabitants it was the sixth largest city of Europe, and the largest one between Vienna and St. Petersburg. In 1720, some three decades after the ouster of the Turks, the combined populations of Buda and Pest amounted to approximately 11,000, and even as late as 1831 the resurgent towns (still not united) boasted of a population of no more than 103,000. So rapid was this growth that Budapest in 1900 was significantly bigger than the other Hungarian cities, dwarfing them in a way unparalleled among European metropolises. It was also essentially the lone oasis of capitalism in a desert of largely feudal or semi-feudal relations which still characterized Hungary as a whole.

Still, Budapest in 1900 had more than a touch of the provincial about it. No doubt contributing to this atmosphere was that, despite its monstrous growth, Budapest seems, on the evidence of old photographs, to have been relatively uncongested by street crowds. As Lukacs reminds us, photographs from as long ago as the 1880's show that, in cities such as London, New York, Chicago and Paris, outdoor crowds, including traffic jams, were very likely the order of the day. Lukacs, prompted by an observation of Ortega y Gasset, likens Budapest in 1900 to Barcelona or Madrid. He might have added Prague and Vienna, the other great cities of the Habsburg Monarchy. As Vilém Haas wrote in 1912: "Prague seemed to be a dead city. The windows of the old palaces were blind and dark; grass grew on the pavement of the narrow lands ... the porter on his small bench sat and smoked his pipe and breathed the evening breeze. The lanes were empty. The city seemed empty and mute." One reason for the relative absence of street crowds, Lukacs surmises, was that most people spent a good deal of the day indoors. This is not as simple-minded as it sounds. Despite generally dwelling in cramped quarters at home, Budapestians preferred the indoors. Who is to say whether the ubiquitous coffee-house, the gathering place for literally thousands each and every day, was a cause or merely an effect of this phenomenon?

The creation of Budapest took place formally only in 1873, with the unification of Pest, Buda and Ancient Buda. This took place six years after the Compromise of 1867, making Hungary a virtually equal partner of Austria. Of course, much of the groundwork for the unification had already been laid, including the practical steps taken by István Széchenyi (dubbed by his contemporaries "the greatest Magyar" despite speaking German considerably better than Hungarian) through whose good sense and industriousness (not to mention his emulation of English ways) the towns of Buda and Pest had begun to join hands long before becoming a single municipality. By the time of the unification Hungarian was the predominant language of Budapest, and it was continuing to make inroads. But as late as 1851 German-speaking communities had constituted a slight majority in Pest, and an overwhelming majority in Buda, where some five out of six people spoke German as their mother tongue. Buda, which remained predominantly German, had a tradition of being more "conservative, Catholic and loyal to Habsburg rule." Pest, though itself largely Catholic, also harbored a significant Protestant community and a tradition of anti-Habsburg sentiment. Budapest's growth is to some extent the story of Pest's growth. In 1850 the population of Buda (the capital of the Hungarian kingdom from medieval times) was only slightly lower than that of Pest. By 1900 there was only one inhabitant of Buda for every six people living in Pest.

Whereas Buda expanded into the surrounding hills, increasingly the destination of "countryside" excursions of the Pest inhabitants and gradually the home of villas for the old aristocracy and the *nouveau riche*, Pest was transforming itself into the center of finance and commerce. This growth and expansion was not peculiar to Budapest but was part of the economic upswing experienced by most of Central Eu-

rope (including of course Prague and Vienna) during the early 1870's, or *Gründerzeit*, and again in the 1880's and 1890's. Of course, the Hungarian kingdom was much less industrialized than the Cisleithanian half of the Monarchy and what industry there was largely concentrated in Budapest. Moreover, besides a significant building industry, it was in the main built around agriculture, in stark contrast with Bohemia which was rapidly becoming the center of heavy industry for the Monarchy. Grain products (and wheat in particular) from the Great Plains and the Balkans were processed in the great mills of Budapest. Although flour exports declined in the 1880's and 1890's, Budapest remained the largest city of mills in the world until 1900, when it was overtaken by Minneapolis.

Budapest often made an extraordinary impact on its unsuspecting visitors, some of whom Lukacs quotes at length. (It is worth noting that one of the great virtues of the book is its liberal use of contemporary accounts.) De Blowitz, the chief diplomatic correspondent of the London *Times*, extolled the beauty and charm of Budapest, comparing it very favorably to Vienna. "... High up on one of the balconies of the Hôtel Hungarian overlooking the Danube, I experienced one of the most agreeable sensations that I recall." Some decades later, when the cityscape was, if anything, more striking, H. L. Mencken would marvel how unlike Budapest was to the "dingy copy of Vienna" he had expected to see. "This town is really astonishing... It is by far the most beautiful that I have ever seen."

Indeed, by 1900 Budapest had definitely come into its own, boasting of a picturesque look which very few other cities could match. (To add, along with Lukacs, that it was also blighted, here and there, by architectural curiosities and monstrosities is only to state an obvious fact of life about great cities everywhere.) It was (and is) blessed perhaps first and foremost by its physical situation. The Danube, bending just north of the city and continuing south to dissect present-day Hungary practically down the middle, also splits Budapest into two roughly equal halves. This is in marked contrast with Vienna, most of which lies on one side of the great river. This magnificent natural setting, together with the quays and enormous graystone walls, the neo-Gothic Parliament building (a kind of Westminster Abbey which stood complete only in 1902), the luxurious hotels and monumental office buildings on the Pest side, Castle Hill, the Royal Castle (not finished until 1905), and further north the Gothic spires of Coronation Church on the Buda side, certainly contributed to the picturesqueness of Budapest. In addition there were the several bridges that spanned the Danube, including the attractive Elizabeth (still under construction in 1900) and the glorious Chain Bridge (already about a half-century old in 1900), and flanking Buda on the West (but increasingly becoming incorporated into it) a number of towering green hills.

This is the general setting. But Lukacs goes considerably further, dissecting the Budapest of 1900 into its ten constituent districts (three in Buda, seven in Pest). He gives a remarkably detailed portrait of each of the major districts, telling us just enough about the others. The Castle District, or the First District, contained both the oldest buildings – old nobilitarian houses of yellow stucco, vintage 1830 and before, much admired by the Frenchman Jérôme Tharaud who otherwise found Budapest too gaudy and mock-monumental – and the oldest inhabitants of Budapest, many of whom still spoke German as their mother tongue. It was also the district of the Royal Castle, the neo-Romanesque Fisherman's Bastion, a number of new government buildings, and the freshly restored Coronation Church. On the southern slopes of Castle Hill was the somewhat unsanitary and boisterous section of the district, since disappeared, known as the Tabán. Straying into this part of town, dotted with taverns, warehouses and gambling dens, more often than not entailed adventure. By 1900 its mixed population of Serbs, Magyars, Greeks and gypsies had, in accordance with the trend at large, become significantly less heterogeneous.

Beyond Castle Hill, and largely to the north of it, was the Second District, the Viziváros or 'the Water Town'. Here could be found the remnant of an old German artisan community. The Third District, or Ancient Buda (Óbuda), was (and is) the site of the ruins of Aquincum, an ancient Roman town. It also contained two of the oldest and most famous mineral baths, the Empire Baths and the St. Luke Baths, housed in yellow-stuccoed late-Empire buildings. Wedged between the Third District (but actually forming a part of it) and the Water District stood Rose Hill (Rózsadomb), named for its aromatic rosebeds planted there some four centuries before by a benevolent Turkish official.

But it was on the other side of the Danube where the dynamism of the sprouting city most manifested itself. The oldest, and at once the smallest, district of Pest was the Inner City, the Fourth District. Here

perhaps more than anywhere else was the good life of the bourgeoisie in evidence. It abounded in shopping streets, clubs, restaurants, and the city's choicest hotels – among them the legendary Bristol – and the Corso “with its row of hotel terraces, coffee-houses and restaurants...”

The general design of Pest, which had been established some thirty years before, much resembled that of other European cities (and, not coincidentally, of Vienna most of all). Two sequences of broad boulevards encircled each other, the larger of them – the Budapest Ring – running all the way from the Margaret bridgehead (marking the extreme northwestern point of the older section of the Leopold District) to a remote point south (which turned out to mark the spot of the bridgehead of a much later-to-be-added commercial bridge). Each part of the Ring was named after a Habsburg: Leopold, Theresa, Elizabeth, Joseph, Francis. Within this semicircle was the much shorter, slightly zigzagging curve of boulevards running from the junction of the Leopold Ring and the Theresa Ring, in the north, to the Franz József Bridge in the south. Cutting a path across these semicircles, in a northeasterly fashion, was Andrásy Avenue, intended as Budapest's answer to Champs-Élysées. Underneath it was an electric subway line, Europe's first, completed in 1896.

The Fifth, the Leopold District, was transversed by the arching sweep of the Leopold Ring. To the south of the divide stood the older section of the district, now the dwelling place of “more- or-less prosperous Hungarian Jews”. It was the site of the massive new Parliament building, alongside of which the new “semipalatial” apartment houses looked strangely deflated. To the north of the Leopold Ring, which in 1900 “was a kind of urban frontier”, stood the vast expanse of “brickyards, empty lots ... and big factory chimneys”. It was largely into this desolate territory that the city would expand. (It is still today one of the least attractive areas of Budapest.)

The Theresa and Elizabeth districts (Districts Six and Seven respectively) were demarcated by Andrásy Avenue. Both districts were heavily populated by Jews, who amounted to about one-third of the total inhabitants. Elizabeth District was the most densely populated district: in 1900 it had 67.6 inhabitants per house as against the city average of 44.2. The Franz and Joseph, or the eighth and ninth, districts were older than the Elizabeth and Theresa districts. It was in the Joseph district that dwelt the largest remnant of Pest's old German artisan class, and, like the neighboring Franz district, it “had a touch of the rural towns of the Hungarian plains, of Danubian and Eastern European cities”. Finally, to the east of these districts “stretched the already vast proletarian sections of Budapest”, including the Tenth District, the Stone Quarry.

Within this vast, and still expanding, metropolis – arguably “the only bourgeois city” then existing in Eastern Europe – the constant whirring of electric trolleys, the rumbling of trains coming in and out of the stations (including the West, which for two years had the distinction of being the largest railroad station in Europe), and the occasional wheezing of a motorcar (still a rare sound in 1900), commingled with the familiar sound of the clomping feet of pedestrians. New communities, some Jewish in origin but increasingly made up of Magyar peasants coming from the provinces (soon to constitute Hungary's first significant proletariat), arose alongside the old. By 1900 there had emerged an immense and complicated hierarchy of class and sub-class differences (Lukacs's analysis is remarkably exhaustive), manifesting itself in everything from choice of food to forms of address, but there were also a few things which tended to cut across class and ethnic differences. Chief among these was language: in 1900 Budapest was predominantly – indeed, it seemed to hold out the promise of becoming exclusively – Magyar-speaking. Unfortunately for the country, Budapest was one thing and Hungary quite another.

Lukacs is much more concerned with presenting a balanced picture of Budapest than with developing any theory. This is not to say that Lukacs is not opinionated. His summary dismissal of Mihály Károlyi as head of the doomed radical republican government – granted it is an opinion shared by many of his generation – is as provocative as it is unfair. Similarly, his exalted view of István Tisza strikes me as an attempt to redress the wrongs of a decades-old and virtually systematic villification of the statesman in official and semi-official Hungarian historiography, rather than an attempt to offer a fair and impartial critique. Lukacs's conservatism aside, the picture of Budapest that emerges is by and large unaffected by such biases.

The main ballast to this almost imposing array of facts and figures is the presence of a few well-formulated themes. There is, in fact, one major theme under which all the other themes can be subsumed – namely, the polarization that developed between Budapest and the rest of Hungary, both in real economic and political terms and in the symbolic sense of what each seemed to represent. The gradually better distribution of wealth that characterized the Cisleithanian half of the Empire was less evident in Hungary. The question of language aside, there was perhaps more that separated Budapest from the remote Transylvanian provinces (particularly those heavily populated by Romanians) than what distinguished the more cosmopolitan Vienna from the outlying reaches of Galicia. As already alluded to, Budapest's bourgeois transformation was taking place when the rest of the country remained largely feudal. On the other hand, nowhere was the program of Magyarization happening as well or as efficiently as precisely in Budapest.

But, as Lukacs points out, sometime between 1900 and 1905, when faith in the Magyarization of the other minorities (including the obdurate Romanians) continued unabated, there were some who were beginning to wonder whether the assimilation of Jews, on the surface a *fait accompli*, had actually taken place or, indeed, even could take place. This is the way things were increasingly perceived by Jews and non-Jews alike. Well-situated Hungarian Jews, many of whom had not only adopted the customs and accoutrements of the Magyar gentry, but had converted to Catholicism (or, in the case of a minority, Protestantism), were finally beginning to sense, if perhaps not as intensely, a dislocation similar in kind (but not the same) to that which had been haunting Austrian Jews like Mahler. Non-Jews, meanwhile, influenced by a renaissance of anti-Semitic sentiment (national and racial in character as opposed to religious), seemed to think of the successful Jew as a clever dissimilator who only gave the appearance of acquiescing to Magyar customs, while in reality he was converting everyone around him to manifestly un-Magyar ways.

These un-Magyar ways were perhaps never exactly defined, but they presumably had something to do with business, finance and commerce, which were all largely concentrated in Budapest, and which were in the main the domain of Jews. Hence the city's epithet – Budapest. Of course, as Lukacs points out, the discrediting of capitalism as a Jewish abomination was not peculiar to Hungary. On the contrary, it appeared there somewhat belatedly, much as had the disillusion in liberalism. Although Karl Lueger was not elected mayor of Vienna until 1895, the movement he represented came well before the formation of Hungary's own Catholic People's Party in 1894. Moreover, whereas the center of anti-Semitic sentiment in Austria was Vienna, in Hungary it was in the provinces. (It is worth noting that the German word *Volk* cannot have had entirely the same connotations as the Hungarian *nép*.) Prague, meanwhile, with its ancient Jewish population, saw a rather different development. As the city became indistinguishable from anti-German sentiment. (This is discounting the double jeopardy of Bohemian Jews who, though German in language and culture, were not entirely accepted by the German community either.) Thus we can see that this notion of a dichotomy between Budapest and the country at large, which in one guise or another has been perhaps the dominant idea in Hungarian culture in the twentieth century, is, unlike a great many things so credited, genuinely a Hungarian phenomenon.

Lukacs, however, does not believe that everything should be laid at the doorstep of anti-Semitism. He believes, for example, that an anti-capitalist spirit, as distinct from any anti-Jewish feelings, had long pervaded the aristocracy and the gentry in particular. On this view this is perhaps the main reason why, from being a propertied class, the gentry became a class of bureaucrats and not enterprising businessmen (even when this would have better suited their somewhat extravagant lifestyles.) Also, Lukacs does not exempt Budapest – “this quick, superficial, moneymaking boulevard ‘culture’” – from blame for the rift soon to develop between “the ‘Budapestian’ and the ‘real Magyar’ spirit, which manifested itself, at different times and places, as the rift “between the cosmopolitan and the nationalist, between the urbanist and the populist, between the Jewish and the non-Jewish representatives of the generation of 1900...”

There are many ironies to this situation, which, probably for reasons of space, Lukacs chooses not to go into. For one thing, one should expect to find the most vociferous critics of Budapest in the virtuous countryside. Some, of course, were – at least they were *from* outside Budapest and were representatives in Parliament. But the gentry themselves were increasingly moving to Budapest and, when it did not overly burden their meagre resources – but on occasion even then – even emulated the well-to-do bourgeoisie.

(Of course, the compliment was repaid, with interest.) But otherwise, such criticism as actually emanated from the provinces went largely unheard. In part this was doubtless because, by 1900, the country's newspapers and periodicals were overwhelmingly concentrated in the capital, so that whereas "only one of every twenty Hungarians was an inhabitant of Budapest ... on the average one of every two Magyar language newspapers, literary journals and scholarly or other periodicals was printed there." The criticism, in other words, was coming largely from within. It may not have always issued from native Budapestians, but when it didn't it came generally from those now solidly entrenched in the capital, and who would have been loath to move from there. Maybe Budapest was everything worst about the country, but where else could one find such bountiful amenities of life?

In 1900 all of Hungary was extremely class-conscious, but nowhere as much as in Budapest where laborers, servants, destitutes and twelve grades of civil service only served to enlarge the range of distinctions. Also, in the city there was much more interaction between various ranks and castes and this fact of life necessitated new strategies of social intercourse; and more often than not these strategies (such as forms of address) did not level class distinctions but added to the ways of distinguishing them. But by the same token, there was also much greater social mobility in Budapest than elsewhere. The poorer classes, many of whom had only recently come to the city from the country, were finding it both desirable and possible "to emulate and actually adopt certain urban and bourgeois habits and standards".

Certainly one of the most important factors in this enhanced social mobility was the vastly improved and more widely available schooling in Buda and Pest. This resulted, among other things, in the decline of illiteracy from roughly 33 percent, in 1870, to less than 10 percent in 1900. Another factor was "linguistic homogenization, the rapid Magyarization of the language and commerce of Budapest". To some extent these two things are related, since measurements of literacy were for literacy in Hungarian; therefore if, say, a Slovak learned Hungarian, which increasingly he was doing in school, he was learning also how to read and write.

Whereas the poorer classes were either learning Hungarian as a foreign language (which, if successful, almost always meant effective assimilation) or, if they were already Magyar, were becoming literate in their native tongue, the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie were seeing to it that their children learned at least one foreign language. This was not merely an attempt to be fashionable. It was undertaken to combat the "danger of linguistic isolation", i.e., in appreciation of the fact that Hungarian, a non Indo-European language, was not widely spoken outside Hungary. Thus, besides the regular instruction of Latin, Greek and German in the gymnasiums, children of even middle class homes were increasingly subjected to special language training. Many received a German-speaking governess or a tutor in French (a required subject in most of the convent schools). How effective this training was, however, is a debatable point; no doubt it varied greatly from family to family. I am reminded of Mihály Babits, certainly no slouch at languages, who by his own account resisted the ministrations of his own German governess. His case may or may not have been exceptional.

The enhanced standard of education, and the proliferation not only of elementary schools but of gymnasiums and universities (following almost exclusively Austrian and German models) paved the way for the "cultural explosion" to come. In some ways Lukacs's portrait of the "generation of 1900" is the most problematic aspect of his study. To begin with, the very designation strikes me as somewhat off base. True, it conveniently chimes with the title and the central theme of the book and perhaps this is enough to recommend it. Also, any attempt whatever to categorize, no matter how well considered, will always seem somewhat arbitrary but it may be no less useful for that. In this case, however, it seems to me that Lukacs breaks his own ground rules.

Roughly between 1875 and 1895 – but especially between 1875 and 1885 – a number of writers, artists and intellectuals were born in Hungary who were to come of age some time in the first decade of the twentieth century (or slightly after). Their development into artists and thinkers owed not a little to the general circumstances of the Dual Monarchy – the perpetual parliamentary crises, the gradual decline of liberalism, the discontent of the nationalities – and to the specific circumstances of Hungary. Among the latter were a system of latifundia in sore need of reform, disenfranchisement of the masses, and a scandalous parochialism manifesting itself in culture and politics alike. Although its differences may be more

salient than its similarities, this generation has much in common with that group of Austrians, born between 1870 and 1890 (or between the impressionists and the war-time expressionists), whom Robert Musil identified as his grown generation.

For reasons I have already alluded to Lukacs eschews the more common designation "second reform generation". His own "generation of 1900" reminds me – and maybe Lukacs himself was inspired by it – of H. Stuart Hughes' "generation of 1905". Hughes had in mind such figures as Proust, Péguy, Jung, Thomas Mann, Michels and Hesse; among the Austrians Kraus, Weininger, Broch and Musil – writers who, unlike the avant-garde immediately to follow, still thought of themselves as continuing or developing the work of their predecessors. Be this as it may, Lukacs himself does not make it his business to draw parallels between the cultural renaissance in Hungary and those contemporaneous with it except, on occasion, to minimize the impact of certain cross-cultural currents or the bonding power of a common milieu. This is a point I shall be returning to.

By the generation of 1900 Lukacs means that group of writers, artists and intellectuals "whose formative years occurred in or around 1900". Realizing, however, that he has painted himself in a corner, he adds "It will even include a few people who were born a few years later but who were still formed by the cultural atmosphere of the period, men and women from between 1875 and 1905..." Of course, as we have said, periodization is by its nature fraught with problems. But here Lukacs seems to me to be fudging. The only two figures Lukacs lists among the generation of 1900 whose dates of birth do not fall before 1895 (and most of them come considerably before that) are Attila József, who is mentioned in a footnote, and Arthur Koestler.

Koestler, who as an international celebrity is discussed in the same company as Georg Lukács and Ferenc Molnár, is put into the generation of 1900 because, as the author says, "his childhood and early youth surely belong there". While there is no question that Koestler was born into a milieu that was largely shaped by the preceding generation, and shared in the fruits of a still good education, it seems to me that his life and his work put him in quite a different category. I can only surmise that Lukacs included him in the generation of 1900 quite simply because he wished to have the opportunity to discuss him. Fair enough, and I for one am more than happy to read about him. But Lukacs in fact does not do justice to Koestler and gives a rather misleading impression of him. I think it is wrong to think of Koestler as "greatly influenced by Weimar Germany and certain German thinkers" in the same way that Georg Lukács was. But even if Koestler, who moved to Vienna while still not out of his teens and later was active as a journalist in Berlin, did absorb certain Weimar traits, this cannot account for his *oeuvre*, which as a matter of fact Lukacs does not really discuss. One not familiar with Koestler might imagine, from Lukacs's account of him, that he wrote in German. Which of course he did, but not exclusively, and not at all in the last decades of his life when he wrote in English. Weimar-influenced or not, Koestler was able to express himself, even in German (and even when dealing with the realm of the paranormal) with the kind of clarity for which Lukács is hardly famous.

Turning now to the main argument, Lukacs identifies three distinct strains of this emerging Hungarian modernism. First, there was the "striving to be more urban and cosmopolitan". Second, there was the wish to dig deep into the native culture, to record (and use as raw material) what was left of the forgotten folk culture in the Hungarian countryside. Finally, there was the third alternative which, interested in neither the world beyond Hungary nor the antiquarian world of the *Magyar nép*, sought to "depict the macrocosm of Hungary". He gives as examples of each the names of Ferenc Molnár, Béla Bartók and Gyula Krúdy respectively. This way of distinguishing the different trends within the modernist movement in Hungary is fairly conventional – and, let me add, largely justified. Lukacs has, so far as I know, added his own twist when he speaks of a microcosm – apparently a reference to the Magyar folk culture – as opposed to the macrocosm of the world said to be depicted by Krúdy. Here as elsewhere, Lukacs sacrifices clarity for rhetoric. It seems to me he is using the terms "microcosm" and "macrocosm" in a rather idiosyncratic way. Though the examples he offers are of some help in trying to make sense of this usage, clarification of some kind would be in order. Does "macrocosm" refer to the Hungarian world, in all its complexities (including its multi-ethnic composition), while "microcosm" denotes the realm of the ethnic Magyar? Or do the terms denote a different kind of opposition – the world of the peasants, on

the one hand, and that of the city (where a number of classes commingle) on the other? Or does it mean still something else?

Another matter worth mentioning is the selection of Ferenc Molnár as the first name to come up in connection with cosmopolitanism. Hungarian literary historians are, rightly or wrongly, much more inclined to invoke Babits as that generation's main representative of cosmopolitanism. Of course, cosmopolitanism in Babits's case cannot mean worldly sophistication or great personal knowledge of the world outside Hungary. It can only mean a wide acquaintance and a deep knowledge of foreign literatures – and, though assimilation of them is also important, the inclination and know-how to make conscious use of them. Molnár, whose well-crafted but middle-brow plays are perhaps more urbane than they are cosmopolitan, not only experienced something of the world – the world, it might be said, experienced him. And since Lukacs is quite explicitly addressing the English-speaking reader, it is perhaps only right that he chooses here someone with an international name. (In the interest of fairness I should add that Lukacs does eventually discuss Babits, and largely as a cosmopolitan writer and poet.)

Turning back to the main thread of Lukacs's argument, it might have been wise to indicate how these different paths of modernism, far from running parallel with one another, overlapped and had points of intersection. Ady – to whom Lukacs devotes several pages – is a case in point. While he was not, like Bartók, an explorer of the Hungarian countryside, he was born into such a world and exhibited, till the end of his life, at once sincere affection and utter disdain of the "Magyar fallow". His whole symbology can hardly be understood without reference to the eastern marchland, and beyond, to the historical and mythological East of Magyar origins. On the other hand, he also looked beyond Hungary, and it was in Paris and through his acquaintance with French and Belgian symbolists that Ady turned, from a Biedermeier versifier, into Hungary's first great modern lyric poet.

Lukacs, much as Mario Fenyo did in his recent study of the *Nyugat*, emphasizes the important role played by the coffeehouse in the quickening of cultural life in turn-of-the-century Budapest. There were some six hundred of them in 1900, and they were practically all things to all people (excluding, of course, the poorer classes). Lavishly furnished and decorated, they were the place for relaxation, meals, chitchat and even business transactions. They were also frequented by journalists, artists, writers and intellectuals, who either huddled together at a table for conversation or spread themselves out, with all the necessary accoutrements probably obtained there at the coffeehouse, to do their work. Among the more famous coffeehouses of the period were the Café New York, the Bristol, the Japan, the Hall of Arts, the Opera, the Dreschler and the Abbazia. Although most of these attracted a certain clientele – e.g., the Bristol was the unofficial editorial office of the *Nyugat*, the Japan the meeting place of architects, sculptors and painters – perhaps the most notable thing about them was their heterogeneous quality. Each coffeehouse had its own distinct atmosphere, but few habitués of the cafés did not vary their routine and people of different disciplines and walks of life had ample opportunity to interact. This was a haven to the cultural scene which cannot be measured.

While Lukacs acknowledges that the institution of the coffeehouse was a Central European phenomenon and not peculiar to Budapest, he nevertheless confers upon Budapest the distinction of having an older – indeed, considerably older – coffeehouse culture than Vienna. Although I am not familiar with his source, Béla Bevilacqua-Borsody, I must confess to being somewhat sceptical. For one thing, he seems to rest a great deal of his argument on the presumption that the "Turkish habit of coffee drinking" was adopted by Hungarians as early as the middle to middle-late sixteenth century. But most contemporary sources indicate that Hungarians, rather disgusted by the smell and taste of the black syrupy concoction, largely resisted the custom. Besides, even if the beverage was being drunk in Hungary somewhat earlier than in Vienna, this is no reason to suppose the rapid growth of a coffeehouse culture. In any event, the coffeehouse of Central Europe at the turn of the century was, in its architecture, décor, and largely its customs, clearly a Viennese invention, and this is as true of the coffeehouses of Prague and Cracow as of those of Budapest.

Lukacs devotes about half as much space to the Hungarian painters (much less to the other artists) as he does to the writers. These are just proportions. He discusses, among others, Tivadar Csontváry, József Rippl-Rónai, Béla Iványi-Gründwald, Lajos Gulácsy and Simon Hollósy, most of whom came "from fa-

milieus of the older, cultured Magyar gentry of the provinces". He points out the irony inherent in the fact that, just as Budapest was becoming the cultural magnet of Hungary, these painters were going to the countryside for their inspiration. The *plein-air* explosion had hit Hungary belatedly and artists were making up for lost time. Schools sprang up in Nagybánya, Szolnok and Gödöllő, in 1895, 1899 and 1911, respectively. Nevertheless, it was to Budapest, where museums, art dealers and galleries were on the increase, that artists had to go to establish their reputations. In the field of music – to which Lukacs devotes less space than he might – the same fact of life applied. Kodály and Bartók may have been happier tramping about in far-away villages, but their own music, however much it may have owed to the newly discovered melodies of the *Volk*, could only get an audience – a sophisticated and cultivated audience at any rate – in Budapest.

Although Lukacs does not entirely ignore the wider European milieu in which the Hungarian cultural efflorescence took shape, by and large he downplays its significance. Already in the introduction Lukacs, aiming to delineate Hungarian and Austrian trends in the arts, states: "The new Hungarian painters Ferenczy, Hollósy, Rippl-Rónai and Csontváry had learned nothing from Klimt, Schiele and Kokoschka; the writers Krúdy, Kosztolányi, Ady, and Babits were very different from Musil, Trakl, Hoffmannsthal. Bartók and Kodály had little in common with Schönberg and Webern..." All this may seem to be a matter of common sense but, with all due respect to Lukacs, I find it a not entirely fair generalization. It is, indeed, hazardous to posit many direct connections between Hungarian artists and writers and their Austrian counterparts. Nevertheless, one can make out a few, such as the influence of Mach on Babits and – though it may only reveal an affinity and not an influence as such – the striking similarities between Klimt and Gulácsy (the latter is acknowledged by Lukacs). Moreover, if one turns one's attention to the graphic art of such figures as Sándor Nagy, Lajos Kozma, Béla Révész and Gyula Tichy, it is almost impossible not to detect the influence of Klimt.

But the question of direct influences aside, there is the sheer fact of the greater European milieu of which both Hungary and Austria formed a part. In a word, Hungarians and Austrians shared many of the same sources of inspiration. Symbolism, which Lukacs almost entirely ignores, produced a distinctly Central European variant. Though I would be the first to caution against overemphasizing their similarities, a largely common milieu nevertheless put its stamp on the works of Musil, Kafka, Ady, Csontváry, Gulácsy, Klimt, Kokoschka and Mahler. In music, Richard Strauss's influence of Bartók is greater and more lasting than Lukacs suggests. Bartók, moreover, was receptive to other currents; it should not be forgotten that his music-collecting forays into Magyar (and other) villages were probably inspired by the Russian nationalists who had already begun to incorporate non-Western folk elements. He was also influenced by Debussy, and through Debussy can be linked with Schönberg, who, much like Bartók, experimented with tonal-modal strategies until taking the deep plunge into dodecaphonic music.

On this not altogether upbeat note I will bring to a close this perhaps long-winded critique. I realize I have been somewhat harsher than I set out to be. On the other hand, my criticisms have been almost exclusively criticisms of errant details, and when not this they have been shifts of focus or emphasis. I have neglected almost entirely the issues raised in connection with the political life of Budapest, which is treated in what may well be the best chapter of the book. Overall, given the enormity of the task which Lukacs assigned himself, *Budapest 1900* is a very remarkable achievement.

Greg Nehler

Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

HUNGARIAN STUDIES
**a Journal of the International Association
of Hungarian Studies**
(Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság)

Editor-in-Chief
Mihály Szegedy-Maszák

Volume 6
Numbers 1, 2



AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST
1990

CONTENTS

<i>Angyalosi Gergely</i> : Les deux visages de la liberté (Kassák et Lukács)	17
<i>Bendl, Júlia</i> : Die wiedergefundene Heidelberger Bibliothek von Georg Lukács	173
<i>Birnbaum, Marianna D.</i> : Krleža and Hungarian Modernism	167
<i>Cornelius, Deborah S.</i> : The Recreation of the Nation – Origins of the Hungarian Populist Movement	29
<i>Deák, Ernő</i> : Zur Sozialgeschichte des Kleinadels in der Wart	3
<i>Dégh, Linda</i> : The Institutional Application of Folklore in Hungary	195
<i>Gellér, Katalin</i> : Hungarian Art Nouveau and its English Sources	155
<i>Kadas, Carolyn</i> : The Hungarian Enterprise: Issues of Size and Ownership	65
<i>Keserü, Katalin</i> : Art Contacts between Great Britain and Hungary at the Turn of the Century	141
<i>Lappland, Martha</i> : The Politics of History: Historical Consciousness and the Hungarian Revolutions of 1848/49	185
<i>Ludanyi, Andrew</i> : Hungarian Lobbying Efforts for the Human Rights of Minorities in Rumania	77
<i>Odorics, Ferenc</i> : The Metaphoricity of the Novels by Nándor Gion	117
<i>Rakosi, Carl</i> : A Self-Portrait	41
<i>Szegedy-Maszák, Mihály</i> : Márai's Novel of the Hungarian Bourgeoisie	91

REVIEWS

<i>Epstein, Irene R.</i> : Gyula Szekfű: A Study in the Political Basis of Hungarian Historiography (Wilson, Samuel W.)	106
<i>Fenyő, Mario D.</i> : Literature and Political Change: Budapest 1908–1918 (Nehler, Greg)	101
<i>Hoensch, Jörg K.</i> : A History of Modern Hungary: 1867–1986 (Sakmyster, Thomas) ...	99
<i>Lukács, John</i> : Budapest 1900 (Nehler, Greg)	220
<i>Marcus, Judith</i> : Georg Lukács and Thomas Mann (Bendl, Júlia)	108
<i>Nemes Nagy, Ágnes</i> : Szőke bikkfák (Báthori, Csaba)	113
<i>Ordass, Lajos</i> : Önéletrajzi írások (Kósa, László)	112
<i>Porter, Roy–Teich, Mikulas</i> (eds): Romanticism in National Context (Nemoianu, Virgil)	97
<i>Sauvageot, Aurélien</i> : Souvenirs de ma vie hongroise (Szávai, János)	110
<i>Stephanides, Éva</i> (ed.): Contrasting English with Hungarian (Hollósy, Béla)	217

PRINTED IN HUNGARY

Akadémiai Kiadó és Nyomda Vállalat, Budapest

CONTRIBUTORS

- Júlia BENDL MTA Filozófiai Intézete,
Budapest, Hungary
- Marianna D. BIRNBAUM University of California at Los Angeles, USA
- Linda DÉGH Indiana University
Bloomington, USA
- Katalin GELLÉR MTA Művészettörténeti Kutatócsoport
Budapest, Hungary
- Béla HOLLÓSY University of London
School of Slavonic and
East European Studies, London
- Katalin KESERŐ ELTE BTK Művészettörténeti Tanszék
Budapest, Hungary
- Martha LAMPLAND University of California at San Diego
USA
- Greg NEHLER Indiana University
Bloomington, USA
- Ferenc ODORICS József Attila Tudományegyetem
Szeged, Hungary

270 ✓

From the Contents of Forthcoming Issues

George Biztray: Heritage Education as a Conceptual Context for Teaching Hungarian

Enikő Molnár-Basa: At Home in the United States: Assimilation without Betrayal of Roots

Mihály Hoppál: Ethnosemiotic Research