HUNGARIAN STUDIES

1990

HUNGARIAN STUDIES Vol. 6 No. 2 1990

HUNGARIAN STUDIES

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

Hungarian Studies appears twice a year. It publishes original essays–written in English, French or German–dealing with all aspects of the Hungarian past and present. Multidisciplinary in its approach, it is envisaged as an international forum of literary, philological, historical and related studies. Manuscripts will be evaluated by the Board of Editors, and papers vetoed by any of them will not be published. Each issue will contain about 160 pages and will occasionally include illustrations. All manuscripts, books and other publications for review should be sent to the editorial address or to the Chairman of the Board of Editors.

Hungarian Studies is published by

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

H-1117 Budapest, Prielle Kornélia u. 19–35.

Orders may be placed with AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, H-1519 Budapest, P.O. Box 245.

Editorial address

Budapest I., Országház u. 30.
Telephone: 175–9011/327

Budapest H-1250
P.O. Box 34
Hungary

HUNGARIAN STUDIES

VOLUME 6, 1990 CONTENTS NUMBER 2

THE METAPHORICITY OF THE NOVELS BY NÁNDOR GION

FERENC ODORICS

József Attila Tudományegyetem, Szeged, Hungary

1. When can we call a text metaphorical?

1.1.1. If we find "lots of metaphors" in a text, we qualify it metaphorical on the basis of the number of metaphors. In this case we have to do with *local metaphors* which exist independently of one another in the text.

1.1.2. We can also call a text metaphorical if the number of metaphors is not great, but they are associated with one another. In this case we can speak about a "system of metaphors" or a *metaphorical structure.* Obviously, a metaphorical structure does not exclude the existence of many local metaphors in a text; this distinction is relevant, because in the former case we can point out an aggregate characterized by the numerosity of its elements, while in the latter case there is a system, an organic whole.

1.1.3. Finally, we can call a text metaphorical when we understand it metaphorically; e.g. when the reader assumes that the *world of the text/textworld is the metaphor* of his own (or someone else's) world-model. In this case a metaphor is neither a constituent of the world of the text (see 1.1.1.), nor an ordering principle (see 1.1.2.) but it is the entire world of the text itself.

1.2. Whar conditions must be fulfilled so that we can understand the following sentence?

/1/ "In half a year I shall be here again on the Calvary by the Soldier with the Flower."[1]

1.2.1. One primary condition for understanding this sentence is interpreting its metaphorical expression. What is the meaning of "the *S*oldier with the Flower"? When reading the novel we feel that it is something different from "the *s*oldier with the *f*lower". What is that "something different" and what is then "something similar"? However if the token of "something similar" stands here, then why does this token mean "something different"? Why is the token of "something different" not standing here or does "the Soldier with the Flower" mean "something similar" and "something different" at the same time? Are "similar" and "different" identical with each other? If they are identical why do we make a distinction between them? On the other hand if they are not identical, the token of "something similar" cannot stand for both and at most it can refer only to a part of the two meanings. Which is the part that is the same and different at the same time?

1.2.2. Moreover, I suppose that "the Soldier with the Flower" is not only a local metaphor in the novel by Gion Nándor (*He Also Played for Rogues* 1982) but it is a constituent of the metaphorical structure of the novel as well. The reader may observe

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

some connection among the constituents. What is more, he may feel that the connections multiply, and presume that there is a metaphorical structure. What is this structure established on?

Is there "something common" in the meaning of "the Soldier with the Flower" and "Rézi's picture postcard"? How is this common meaning established and what role does the "local" meaning of certain tokens play?

1.2.3. Finally, if we accept the assertion that *He Also Played for Rogues* is a metaphorically interpretable text, then what is the "world of the novel" a metaphor of? What conditions must be met so readers can take it as the metaphor of some world-model?

1.3. The purpose of this paper is to find answer to the following questions.

/1.1.1./ What is a metaphor?
What do we do when we understand a metaphor?

/1.1.2./ What is a metaphorical structure?
What do we do when we understand the metaphorical structure of a novel?

/1.1.3./ What is metaphorical understanding?
What do we do when understand the world of a text metaphorically?

2. The scope of validity of the paper's assertions about the understanding of metaphors

Can we give an explanation for understanding the metaphor/metaphorical structure in general? Can we consider our explanation definitive and irrefutable? Can we make universal assertions about linguistic phenomena? To find possible answer to these questions a brief digression into language theory and the philosophy of science is necessary.

2.1. I accept Wittgenstein's theory of language-games. According to Lars Haikola the principles of language-games are the following:

/i/ The meaning of an expression rests on its use.

/ii/ An expression has meaning only within a given area of usage or language-game.

/iii/ Every language-game has its own criteria of rationality.

/iv/ A language-game as a whole cannot be justified only described.

The /iv/ principle implies that Wittgenstein excludes epistemological considerations from his theory of meaning. However, this would mean that the rules which govern language-games could not be considered; and one could not explain the operation of language-games, either. In this paper I accept the first three principles, but dismiss the fourth, because – making use of the results of speech-act theory – I will put the communicative rules governing the understanding of metaphors into the focus of my considerations. I assume that a linguistic occurrence is part of a language-game and that it is an act as well. Therefore I never consider the Metaphor anything but a linguistic unit (text or part of a text) which operates as a metaphor in a language-game. I will

have a set of assertions which applies only to a text or a language-game (one system of conventions).

I will make statements about a novel (in which we can find metaphors) in Wittgenstein's conventionalist view, and about a type of reader who will consider certaid texts' metaphors. I intend to describe rules which govern the act of understanding certain texts as metaphors.

2.2. My remarks on the theory of science are not independent of Wittgenstein's theory of language-games. We can take a theory *(T)* as a quadruple:

$$T \langle S, A, SC, t \rangle$$

where:

S is a system of sentences,
A is the set of intended applications of *S*,
SC is a scientific community,
t is an interval of time.

That is: "The scientific community *SC* applies the system of sciences *S* to the set of intended applications *A* during an interval of time t." Here *SC* involves the conventions, preferences, attitudes, knowledge etc. which are characteristic of a scientific community.

2.3. Therefore the scope of validity of my assertions about the understanding of metaphors is as follows:

S: The system of rules governing the language-game *N–M*.

A: The language-game, *N–M*, of a novel *N* (Gion Nándor: *He Also Played for Rogues*) and a certain type, *M*, of readers who will understand *N* or a part of *N* as a metaphor.

SC: The scientific community which accepts the conventions, preferences etc. mentioned in 2.1. and 2.2. and probably further ones.

t: The interval during which a representative of *SC* is able to apply *S* to some language-game *N–M*.

3. What do we do when we understand a metaphor?

3.1.1. According to Richards when we *use* a metaphor we have two thoughts at our disposal which are active *together* and whose interaction results in this very metaphor. He speaks action in two senses. Firstly, he describes the action of the persons using the metaphor, "usage", which does not say much about the metaphor itself, as all tokens become signs when used. Secondly, he speaks about the interactivity of two thoughts, but this statement itself seems to be metaphorical; Richards presumedly refers to mental processes or mental activities. So, Richards seems to consider a metaphor definable with respect to *mental activities*.[2]

3.1.2. Similarly, Wheelright speaks about a double *imaginative act* which marks the *metaphorical process* substantially and which he calls semantic motion. He does not speak "metaphorically" as Richards does, but he considers the two modes of metaphor (epiphor, diaphor) to be tools which serve the extension of meaning and the creation of new meanings.[3]

3.1.3. Richards and Wheelright agree in that they both speak about mental activities and only imply language-users; they presume a fixed, and constant interpretive field, and do not account for the variety of the readers' habits.

3.1.4. Although Searle is the apostle of speach-act theory, he does not represent an unambiguous standpoint in the question of metaphors. He finds the essence of a metaphor in the way the sentence *"S is P"* is understood as *"S is R"*. He assumes the extension of meaning from literal to metaphorical and takes the literal meaning for granted; as a result, he believes in the existence of a fixed semantic field (see the problem of "literal" meaning in 3.2.). But when he analyzes metaphorical interpretation he mentions strategies of understanding which the reader possesses already, leaving the reader to decide whether to choose the metaphorical interpretation or not.[4]

3.1.5. At first Wittgenstein, later Hester, gave an unambiguous answer to this problem. Wittgenstein uses the term "aspect blindness", which means that "someone is not able to see something as something else".[5] He explains the understanding of metaphors on the basis of the ability of "seeing as". As a result, metaphors are treated as acts, fixed semantic fields are rejected and the reader's different habits are taken into account.

3.1.6. Before analyzing the process of understanding metaphors I intend to touch briefly on the process of understanding in general. George A. Miller, on the basis of Herbart's theory, classifies the mental processes which relate an experience to familiar conceptual system.[6]

Basically, understanding means that we learn new things by relating them to known ones. Miller assumes that in the process of understanding written texts, "when we finish reading, we have something that we did not have before we had begun".[7]

3.1.7. The process of understanding involves two mental processes: the constructive one and the selective one. The result of the *constructive* process is the memory image which is a single representation of the descriptions in the text, and whose particularities correspond closely to the particularities of the passage at issue. When constructing a memory image, the reader also integrates details into his memory image which were not found in the "original" description but which he "borrowed" from his own memory. As a result of the *selective* process certain *semantic models* are established, i.e. several possible states of affairs which correspond to the written passage only with respect to their common features, but which differ from one another in all other respects.

When beginning to read, the reader's attitude involves the possibility of constructing any kind of state of affairs. However, even when the reading is finished, some indefinite places remain.

An author uses a semantic model to select true descriptive sentences and a reader uses true descriptive sentences to select a model.[8]

Finally, when reading is finished, the reader has a memory image and a model which are synthetized in the course of reading; then he constructs a textual concept.

3.1.8. Consequently, the phenomenon which is to be considered here, is the understanding (apperception) of a text, the result of which is a textual concept.

3.2. Which meaning of the word is the "literal" one?

3.2.1. If we accept Miller's concept of understanding that already known information is linked with the new and the yet unknown, then we have to define "old" and "new" in the understanding of a metaphor. Most authors consider "literal" meaning to be the "old" one. B. Fraser says that a metaphor involves only the nonliteral use of a language,[9] and literal use occurs when the speaker intends to say something by the literal meaning of the sentence. He maintains that literal meaning is the meaning of a "serious" utterance which requires *the existence of a general agreement,* a consensus.

3.2.2. In Wheelright's opinion the beginning of any metaphorical activity is a literal meaning, a *standard* usage. Who uses this meaning and, as regards the so-called general agreement, who agrees?

3.2.3. The American professor Searle mentions four kinds of meaning in his essay on *Metaphor:*

/i/ word meaning or sentence meaning.[10]

/ii/ speaker's meaning or the speaker's utterance meaning.[11]

/iii/ literal meaning.[12]

/iv/ metaphorical meaning.[13]

He interpretes the distinction between *word meaning* and *speaker's meaning* as follows: the former is "what the words, sentences and expressions mean",[14] the latter is "what a speaker means by uttering words".[15] He speaks about *metaphorical meaning* when "a speaker may utter it to mean it in a way which differs from what the word, expression or sentence actually means".[16] "The *literal meaning* of the sentence is the meaning it has independently of any context."[17]

Consequently, word meaning is *what the word means,* speaker's meaning is *what the speaker means,* literal meaning is *what the word means independently of any context,* and finally, metaphorical meaning is *what differs from what the word actually means.* Thus, in Searle's theory of meaning both the word and the speaker can mean something, and there are meanings which are independent of context and which differ from the actual meaning.

I cannot quite make a distinction between what the word means and what the speaker means. I think that meaning is a certain thing the speaker (or the listener) constructs through the word. On the other hand, Searle's system is not clear enough because the basis of his classification is.

3.2.3.1. firstly, by *the agent* (i.e. "word" and the speaker) who constructs the meaning.

3.2.3.2. then *the relationship* between meaning and context (literal meaning),

3.2.3.3. finally, *the meaning* which is, or is not, actual (metaphorical meaning).

3.2.4. We can see that 3.2.3.2. and 3.2.3.3. do not have a common basis, and as a result, Searle's system cannot account for the distinction between literal and metaphorical meaning. If there is meaning independent of context, it cannot be true that the speaker or listener assign the meaning to the word, but it must be contained in the word.[18] But where? According to Searle it is in its semantic content. But where is this semantic content, between the ink and the paper? I am sure that Searle does not think so, but the expression "independent of any context" means that the meaning of a certain word is given in the same way for all users. He probably assumes some kind of a consensus, a general agreement which ensures the constant, fixed meaning of the word. Searle seems to have the lexical meaning in mind. The authors of dictionaries cannot say that this is *the* meaning of the word, either (only, that this is *one* of the meanings of the word). On what basis can Searle take for certain that e.g. the words "freedom", "democracy", "happiness" mean the same to everyone? I cannot imagine any kind of meaning to be independent of context; I think that *any meaning exists only in relation to some context.*

3.2.5. The argument above implies that there is no literal meaning at all. But without literal meaning what can we relate a metaphorical meaning to? Let p stand for "The word x has no literal meaning." and q for "The word x has a metaphorical meaning on the basis of its deviation from its literal meaning."

Then we can conclude that there is no metaphorical meaning. What are we talking about then?

3.2.6. Why is Searle's definition of literal meaning unacceptable? (see 3.2.3.) According to 3.2.5. we can suppose that literal meaning exists, whereas we cannot say the same about metaphorical meaning. Does the literal meaning of an expression mean the same to everybody? To someone who accepts the theses of anarchist philosophy "freedom" means "literally" the following:

/2/ "I do not accept authority, I do whatever I want to." To someone who accepts the theses of historical materialism "freedom" means "literally" that

/3/ "I am free if I recognize necessity."

Can we accept that /2/ and /3/ mean the same? I do not think so. Can we say that anarchist and the marxist use "freedom" „non-literally"? I do not think so. How is it possible that /2/ and /3/ do not have the same meaning despite the fact that both have the literal meaning of "freedom"? We have to conclude that the meaning of a word is given by the word and the user as well. Sentence /2/ contains the literal meaning of "freedom" used by an anarchist (and reflects, of course, the actual literal meaning of the word "freedom"). Sentence /3/ contains the literal meaning of the same word used by a marxist. Thus, I propose the following definition of the literal meaning of a word: ***literal meaning is the meaning a language-user accepts as the literal meaning of a word (a meaning which corresponds both to the word and the reader's wish).***

A language-user always assumes a system of conventions, a language-game. If we qualify the former "lexicalist" conceptions as „contextualist", we can also explain metaphorical expressions on the basis of literal meaning that is meant by the word and the reader as well.

3.3. What can we begin the understanding of a metaphor with?

3.3.1. In this way we can accept Wheelright's view that the outset of any metaphorical activity is a "literal meaning" (meant both by the word and the reader). We do not exactly know what Wheelright means by "outset" (as *Metaphor and Reality* does not deal with this problem) but Searle represents a similar view.

In Searle's opinion the task of the theory of metaphor is to explain how the speaker and the listener are able to get from *"S is P"* (the literal meaning) to *"S is R"* (the metaphorical meaning). Searle distinguishes three sets of constituents in a metaphorical statement. *"S"* is the subject of the statement, *"P"* is the predicate of the statement to which the truth conditions of the literal meaning of *"P"* belong; finally, *"S is h"* is the meaning of the speaker's utterance together with its truth conditions. I do not quite agree with Searle on this question because I think a predicate cannot have truth conditions. Therefore Searle's assertion must be modified: a distinction must be made between the truth conditions of the literal meaning *"S is P"* and the truth conditions of *"S is R"* as a metaphorical meaning. Thus, we can add two meanings to the formula *"S is P"*; moreover, the reader also constructs two meanings in the process of metaphorical understanding. According to Searle, two meanings must be considered in the process of metaphorical understanding. Searle's example is as follows:

/4/ John is a block of ice.

In Searle's opinion, at first the reader understands this sentence as the statement of the identification of John with a block of ice. Later on he will understand this text as the statement: "John is not responsive." Is it certain in every case that at first the reader will understand the sentence /4/ as the identification of John with a block of ice? Can it be possible that at first he will think of John's insensitiveness?

Let's see the following example:

/5/ I love my rose.

Does the reader understand the expression "my rose" as the identification of "a rose" with a "beloved woman"?

3.3.2. I do not think so. Furthermore, I do not think that the identification of *"S" with "P"* is a real statement, but rather a quasi-statement. Moreover, I do not think that the real statement of a metaphorical expression is *"S is R"* either. Instead, in metaphore the real statement of identification does not occur in a straightforward way; that is, we can find only a kind of partial similarity between *"S"* and *"P"*. Consequently, the metaphorical meaning of the expression "John is a block of ice" is not confined to the statement that John is not responsive; it also refers to the fact that in a certain sense

John is similar to a block of ice. The metaphor does not exactly tell the reader what the similarity lies in, because if the reader could express it he would, perhaps, say it literally.

3.4. How can we justify the assumption that the meaning of a metaphor involves the statement of partial similarity between two things?

3.4.1. First we have to decide what constituents operate in the understanding of a metaphor and what we can call them. Most scholars agree that a metaphor has *at least* two constituents. One of them is the "quasi-argument" which is stated to be identical with the second one, the "quasi-predicate". (This view is also held by Hester and Miller.)

3.4.1.1. Wheelright speaks about two constituents, too: one of them is a relatively well-known or concretely known thing whereas the other one is less known.[19] Richards calls the two constituents of a metaphor *tenor* and *vehicle.* The tenor marks the underlying idea or the primary subject, the vehicle marks the borrowed idea or the one the subject resembles.[20] Later on I will use *the term tenor for marking the quasi-argument and the term vehicle for marking the quasi-predicate.*

3.4.2. Marcus B. Hester developed his theory of metaphor on the basis of Wittgenstein's theory of meaning. Hester deviates from the conception of the Viennese nominalist in that he does not exclude the latter's epistemological considerations from his theory, so we are in a position to base our description of the rules which govern the understanding of metaphors on Hester's account.[21]

3.4.2.1. According to Wittgenstein the understanding of an expression is identical with the recognition of the criteria of the expression. Criteria are observable features of an object selected by convention.[22] ("An 'inner' process stands in need of outward criteria."[23]) However, on the basis of C. Wellman's argument[24] Hester thinks that the features of a thing are not necessarily observable (this shows an intention to bring in epistemological considerations). Therefore we can define the criteria of an expression as *those features of a thing which are selected by convention.* According to Hester the conditions of understanding the meaning of a metaphor are the following:

/i/ necessary condition:
the understanding of the criteria involved in the words,

/ii/ sufficient condition:
the perception of relevant senses.

3.4.2.2. What is a relevant sense? It involves those features which are found both in the tenor and the vehicle, that is, "A relevant relation is one in which x is like y in *some* senses but *not in every sense*".[25] Logically we may regard relevant sense as the relation of *partial similarity.* Consequently, the sufficient condition for understanding a metaphoric meaning is the recognition of partial similarity between the things referred to by the tenor and vehicle. This recognition takes place in the act of "seeing as". The act of "seeing as" means to see something as if it were something else. In the case of the sentence "John is a block of ice" to see John as a block of ice is to see John

as if he were a block of ice. In Wittgenstein's opinion "to see as" is to notice an aspect which makes us see something as if it were something else; this supposes some kind of similarity between two things.

3.4.3. At the same time, in the process of understanding the meaning of a metaphor a specific "seeing as", the so-called *metaphorical "seeing as"* operates between elements of an *imaginary*

/i/ the empirical act of the sounding qualities of a metaphor,

/ii/ the act of constructing (quasi-sensory) imagery,

/iii/ the act of selecting relevant aspects from the constructed imagery (the selection of the relevant sense).

This conception is compatible with Miller's conception of understanding: the act of construction is compatible with the constructive mental process and the act of selecting with the selective mental process.

3.5. How can the statement of partial similarity of two things be established?

3.5.1. Miller thinks that the alethic contradiction in the expression *"x is y"* can be eliminated if one accepts the expression *"x is like y"* as true in a world-model. Thus, the convention of similarity operates in the understanding of a metaphor. In Miller's opinion similarity is not part of the textual concept of the meaning, but it is the basis of understanding.

3.5.1.1. Miller explains the understanding of a metaphor on the basis of similarity between tenor and vehicle. This relation is established by the reader who extends certain properties of the vehicle to the tenor. According to Miller's model of understanding (linking the known with the unknown) the way of metaphorical understanding is as follows: the vehicle is the old information, the tenor is the current topic and *the relation of similarity between them is the new information.*

3.5.1.2. He assumes that there are two aspects of understanding a simile:

/i/ the recognition of the occurrence of a simile in the text; there are two conditions for this:

/i–i/ the occurrence of a comparative statement in the text,

/i–ii/ the bases of comparison are not obvious;

/ii/ interpretation: a search for the bases according to which the author presumably compared two things.[27]

3.5.1.3. The relation of similarity between two concept is expressed by the following formula:

$$SIM[F(x), G(y)]$$

SIM: the relation of similarity,

x: tenor,

F: (some) feature(s) of the tenor,

y: vehicle,

G: (some) feature(s) of the vehicle.

To interpret this formula:

/5/ A brain is like a machine.

The missing functions *(F, G)* are understood conceptually.

(JF)(JG){SIM[F(a brain), G(a machine)]} which can be paraphrased as "Some properties of the brain are similar to some properties of a machine".

3.5.1.4. Consequently, the general rule of understanding a simile is as follows:

$$SIM(x, y)\{(JF)(JG) \rightarrow SIM[F(x), G(y)]\}$$

It must be mentioned that this rule is a psychological and not a linguistic one. The reader is not compelled to produce any particular linguistic expression, but only to explore a range of conceptual possibilities.

This rule, which Miller labels reconstructive, serves as a basis for the understanding of metaphors.

3.5.2. Miller states that the understanding of a metaphor has three basic steps:

/i/ recognition,

/ii/ reconstruction,

/iii/ interpretation.

However, even in the simplest cases this process may take place so rapidly that all the steps merge into a single mental act.

Regarding the understanding of metaphors, the problem of fundamental importance seems to center around the relation of partial similarity which forms the basis of metaphor. Miller defines the process of reconstruction as a mental process in the course of which the reader formulates the structure of a concept which expresses similarity, that is, *SIM F (x) · G (y).*

With respect to the understanding of metaphors Miller distinguishes /i/ nominal metaphors, /ii/ predicative metaphors, and /iii/ sentence metaphors.

3.5.2.1. *The understanding of nominal metaphors*

In this case a nominal concept *y* is expressed by a noun phrase and is used metaphorically.

The rule of understanding is as follows:

$$R_1BE(x, y) \rightarrow (JF)(JG)\{SIM[F(x), G(y)]\}$$

Where *"BE"* is some form of the verb "to be". If the reader finds a text which expresses the formula *BE (x, y)* e.g.:

/4/ John is a block of ice,

then he can construct the underlying similarity by *(JF)(JG){SIM[F(John), G(a block of ice]}*

Consequently, we can say that there are common properties which are characteristic of both John and a block of ice.

3.5.2.2. *The understanding of predicative metaphors*

Here a predicative concept G is expressed by a predicative phrase (verbs, verb phrases, or predicative adjectives) which is used metaphorically.

The rule of understanding is as follows:

$$R_2G(x) \rightarrow (JF)(JG)\{SIM[F(x), G(y)]\}$$

If the reader finds a text which expresses the formula $G(x)$ for example:

/6/ I heard the iron cry,

then he can construct the underlying similarity by $CRY(iron) \rightarrow (JF)(JG)SIM[F(iron), CRY(g)]$.

Here the reader must find the thing y which has the property of "crying", that is, the common properties characteristic of both the iron and the thing y.

3.5.2.3. *The understanding of sentence metaphors*

In this case the concept of a sentence $F(x)$ has to be inferred from the text or context.

The rule of understanding is as follows:

$$R_3G(y) \rightarrow (JF)(JG)\{SIM[F(x), G(y)]\}$$

Miller does not say more about sentence metaphors (see the author's conception in 3.6.2.3. and the analysis of R_3 in 3.6.4.).

3.5.2.4. As we can see, rules of reconstruction reflect only the relation of partial similarity but not the content of this relation. The latter is constructed in the course of interpretation by the reader. In the process of reconstruction the reader intends to (re)construct the formula of similarity $SIMF(x) \cdot G(y)$; he established the components, which cannot be found in the text conceptually. The missing components are:

/i/ in nominal metaphors: *G, F, SIM,*

/ii/ in predicative metaphors: *F, y, SIM,*

/iii/ in sentence metaphors: *F, x, SIM.*

(SIM, F) of the five components *(SIM, F, x, G, y)* are always missing.

SIM is missing because it is a typical marker of the simile; if it appears in the text we cannot speak of a metaphor, only of a simile. F (the property of the tenor) is missing because the speaker's aim is to say something new about the tenor and to find something different from the conventional properties when using a metaphor. So as to understand a (metaphorical) expression, two constituents out of x, G, y, always occur in the text.

3.5.3. The process of understanding metaphors is as follows:

/i/ we realize that there is a metaphor in the text,

/ii/ in the processes of reconstruction and interpretation we take the properties of the vehicle into account,

/iii/ in the processes of reconstruction and interpretation we select those properties of the vehicle which can be extended to the tenor as well.

These phases are governed by rules of recognition, by one of the rules reconstruction R_1, R_2, R_3 and by rules of interpretation.

3.6. What rules operate when metaphors are understood?

3.6.1. *The rules of the recognition of metaphors*

On what basis can the reader consider a text metaphorical? What does the text mark?

3.6.1.1. In nominal metaphors the text marks the tenor *x*, the vehicle *y*, and their identity *BE (x, y)*, but does not specify their properties *F, G*. The reader can attribute metaphorical interpretation to an expression if it asserts *the identity of two things*, since two things can never be identical in our world-model. The first rule of the recognition of metaphors is as follows:

F_1 The reader recognizes that an expression can be considered metaphorical if it marks the identity of two things.

3.6.1.2. In predicative metaphors the text marks the tenor *x*, (some) attribute(s) *G* of the vehicle and it connects (some) attribute(s) of the vehicle to the tenor *G (x)*. The reader can interpret an expression metaphorically if the latter assigns properties to a thing which it does *not have conventionally* (the reader does not accept these properties as the criteria of the thing).

F_2 The reader accepts an expression as metaphorical if it attributes some feature to a thing which is not an accepted criteria.

3.6.1.3. The text may involve modal elements which *call* the reader's attention to a metaphorical interpretation *directly*, e.g. "Metaphorically speaking...". Thus we have:

F_3 The reader recognizes that an expression can be regarded as metaphorical if it involves modal elements which directly call for metaphorical interpretation.

These were the cases when semantic anomalies *(F_1, F_2)* or explicit elements *(F_2)* called the reader's attention to metaphorical interpretation. We must also consider cases when contextual elements behave in the same way.

3.6.1.4. In sentence metaphors the text marks only the vehicle *y* and its property *G*. The reader can interpret an expression metaphorically if it makes no sense literally in the actual context, that is, the actual context has no features to help the reader decide if the context satisfies the truth conditions of the expression. Accordingly, the next rule is:

F_4 The reader recognizes that an expression can be regarded as metaphorical if (on the basis of the actual context) he is not able to decide whether the truth conditions of the literal meaning of the expression can be satisfied or not.

3.6.2. *The rules of reconstruction of metaphors*

When on the basis of one of the rules of recognition *(F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4)* the reader decides to interpret the given expression metaphorically, he can start to look for the relation of partial similarity underlying the metaphor.

3.6.2.1. The rule of reconstruction R_1 can follow the rule of recognition F_1.

R_1 If an expression marks the identity of two things then the reader assigns the relation of partial similarity to the expression.

The reader facilitates the destruction of semantic anomalies belonging to the expression by the application of R_1.

3.6.2.2. The rule of reconstruction R_2 can follow the rule of recognition F_2.

R_2 If an expression assigns a property to a thing which the reader does not accept as the criterion of the thing then the reader

/i/ determines the thing as whose criterion he will accept the property G,

/ii/ assigns the relation of partial similarity between x and y to the expression.

The reader facilitates the destruction of semantic anomalies belonging to the expression by the application of R_2, just as in R_1.

3.6.2.3. The rule reconstruction R_3 can follow the rule of recognition F_4.

R_3 If, on the basis of the actual context, the reader cannot decide if the truth conditions of the literal meaning of an expression can be satisfied, then he constructs a relation of partial similarity. One element of this will be the thing y marked in the expression together with its property G and the other one will be the unmarked thing x together with its property F.

Now the reader is able to satisfy the truth conditions of this relation of partial similarity based on actual context.

3.6.2.4. Finally, any rule of reconstruction (R_1, R_2, R_3) can follow the rule of recognition F_3. The difference between the expressions governed by F_1, F_2, F_4 and those governed by F_3 comes from the existence of some modal elements. Namely: some modal elements (e.g.: "Metaphorically speaking..."), plus

/i/ the marker of the nominal metaphor $BE\ (x, y)$ or

/ii/ the marker of the predicative metaphor $G\ (x)$ or

/iii/ the marker of sentence metaphor $G\ (y)$.

All three rules of recognition have a common element in that they facilitate the verification of expressions which are literally false (in the case of R_1 and R_2) or unjustifable (in the case of R_3).

3.6.3. *The rules of interpretation of metaphors*

When rules of interpretation operate the reader assigns appropriate meanings to "empty" terms $(F, G, x, y,)$ established by rules of reconstruction.

3.6.3.1. The rule of interpretation I_1 can follow the rule of reconstruction R_1.

I_1 The reader supplies the terms (F, G) with appropriate meanings, which remained "empty" after the operation of the rule of reconstruction R_1.

3.6.3.2. The rule of interpretation I_2 can follow the rule of reconstruction R_2.

I_2 The reader supplies the terms (F, y) with appropriate meanings, which remained "empty" after the operation of the rule of reconstruction R_2.

3.6.3.3. The rule of interpretation I_3 can follow the rule of reconstruction R_3.

I_3 The reader supplies the terms (F, x) with appropriate meanings, which remained "empty" after the operation of the rule of reconstruction R_3.

The meanings to be assigned to these "empty" terms is determined by their internally coherent configuration and the constituents of the context (the reader's attitude, preferences, knowledge etc.).

3.6.4. As a consequence, our question in 1.2 can be answered. The question is: "What conditions must be satisfied so that we can understand the following sentence?":

/1/ "In a half year I shall be here again on the Calvary by the Soldier with the Flower."

Our main problem was the metaphorical meaning of "the Soldier with the Flower". This is a sentence metaphor not preceded by any modal elements so when it is understood, the rule of recognition F_4, the rule of reconstruction R_3, and the rule of interpretation I_3 operate. In particular:

F_4 The reader recognizes that the expression /1/ can be interpreted metaphorically since he is not able to decide on the basis of the actual context whether the truth conditions of the literal meaning of the expression can be satisfied or not.

The formula of the expression /1/ is as follows:

G (y) : *G* (the Soldier with the Flower).

G is not given in the expression /1/, it can be established on the basis of the text of the novel.

R_3 The reader constructs a relation of partial similarity between the thing *y* marked in the expression /1/ (the Soldier with the Flower) together with its property *G*, and the thing *x* not marked in the expression /1/ together with its property *F*.

G (y) *(F) (G) SIM F (x),* ? (the Soldier with the Flower)

I_3 The reader supplies the terms *(F, x)* with appropriate meanings. *F:* ?

x: ?

G remains empty because /1/ can be interpreted only on the basis of the text of the novel. So we can attribute the following features (relations) to "the Soldier with the Flower":

/i/ he is *hitting the Saviour*[28]
/ii/ he *wants to step out of the pictures*[29]
/iii/ his face is *different* from that of the others[30]
/iv/ he does *not suffer*[31]
/v/ he is *the only happy* man[32]
/vi/ he looks at the people *as if they did not exist*[33]

I select the following relevant properties out of these (on the basis of conventions of my language-game): *happy, outsider, violent.* These properties form *G*. Is there an object in the novel which is similar to "the Soldier with the Flower", or has *G* (or part of *G*)?

This "object" is Gallai István (hence: GI) who has *G* in a certain part of novel. The beginning of this section contains the episode in which GI first succeeds to conjure Bald Fischer (t_1). The end of this section contains the episode in which GI is wounded in the war (t_2). In this section GI has two of the relevant properties of "the Soldier

with the Flower". Consequently, we can say that "the Soldier with the Flower" and GI are partially similar because they have common properties: "happy", "outsider", and they also have different features. For example GI is a human being, whereas "the Soldier with the Flower" is inanimate and violent. One of the empty terms can be interpreted as follows:

x: GI between t_1 and t_2 in the novel.

How can we interpret *F*? *F* naturally involves the properties "happy" and "outsider" and the properties "artist", "meek", etc. The relation of partial similarity underlying the metaphorical understanding of "the Soldier with the Flower" is as follows:

SIM[ARTIST, HAPPY, OUTSIDER, MEEK (István Gallai),

VIOLENT, HAPPY, OUTSIDER, INANIMATE (the Soldier with the Flower)].

The relevant properties are "happy" and "outsider". Consequently, the expression /1/ carries the following metaphorical meaning: if István Gallai is on the Calvary by the Soldier with the Flower then he has a part of the features of "the Soldier with the Flower", namely, he is happy and stands outside.

3.7. What is the entity we call the understanding of a metaphor though in fact it is not that?

3.7.1. When analyzing Gion's novel the event of Jóska Ubonyi's fighting with Dusan Mandic can be regarded as metaphorical because this event is interpreted as the metaphorical expression of "brutality". But are "this fight" and "brutality" related to each other on the basis of partial similarity? Does Wittgenstein's concept of "seeing as" operate concerning this event when understanding the text? How can the relevant sense, the common properties, be defined?

Common properties can be found, but while all properties of "brutality" (more precisely: brutal events) are valid for "this fight", too, it is not the case that all properties of "this fight" can be regarded as valid for "brutal events". Consequently, the relation between "this fight" and "brutal events" is not that of partial similarity but of entailment.

3.7.2. The event when Gilike is playing with his fingers can also be regarded as metaphorical, because it can be interpreted as "awkwardness". In this case we cannot speak about the occurrence of "seeing as" or partial similarity either because the criteria of one object form a subset of the criteria of the other one. However, the criterion of "awkwardness" is not a necessary property of Gilike's playing with his fingers. Miller calls this type of understanding attribution.

3.7.3. When understanding a novel the following types of understanding must be taken into consideration: attribution (the traditional term is characterization), entailment (the traditional term is generalization) and ironic understanding (analyzed by Searle).[34] These types must be separated from metaphorical understanding.

3.7.4. As a result, the general rule of construction of non-literal understanding can be formulated. The text can involve the elements of understanding in three ways: *BE (x, y)* – nominal case, *G (x)* – predicative case, *G (y)* – sentence case.

As a result,

$$R_G\ BE\ (x, y) \text{ or } G\ (x) \text{ or } G\ (y) \rightarrow (JR),\ (JF)\ (JG)\ \{R\ [F\ (x),\ G\ (y)]\}.$$

Here we meet a new relation *R*. This relation can be specified on the basis of the types of understanding:

/i/ metaphorical understanding
R: partial similarity *(SIM),*
/ii/ generalizing understanding
R: entailment *(ENT),*
/iii/ characterizing understanding
R: attribution *(ATTR),*
/iv/ ironic understanding
R: opposition *(OPP).*

This rule governs the process in the course of which we facilitate the verification of a literally false or unjustifiable expression. The basis for verifying involves the relations *SIM, ENT, ATTR* and *OPP.*

4. What do we do when we understand a metaphorical structure?

4.1. The first condition that must be recognized is that the reader is reading a novel which can be connected with a metaphorical structure. Consequently, the rules of recognition start the understanding of a metaphorical structure. The function of these rules is the construction of an attitude "supposing a metaphorical structure" (A_m). How is this attitude established in Gion's novel?

4.1.1. The reader cannot explain the titles of the novel *(He Also Played for Rogues, The Soldier with the Flower, Rose-honey)* without interpreting them metaphorically. Similarly, he cannot explain certain parts of the text either. For example what is the function of the galloping Serbian riders at Christmas? Why is the description of Gallai's and Ádám Török's "great escape" so detailed? What does Gallai want to do with that rose-honey?

4.1.1. *The rules of the recognition of metaphorical structures*

F_{s1} The reader recognizes that a metaphorical structure can be assigned to a novel if he cannot explain certain parts or the whole of the novel.

This rule involves *the recognition of so-called gaps of interpretation.*

4.1.2. F_{s2} The reader recognizes that a metaphorical structure can be assigned to a novel only if he has recognized some local metaphors in the text.

This rule requires the operation of one of the rules F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, (which give the recognition of local metaphors), but none of the rules of reconstruction or that of interpretation.

The attitude A_m can also be established without the operation of F_{s1} and F_{s2}. For example in the case of readers who assume metaphorical structures occur in most novels. But this attitude A_m can be established also on the basis of the reader's previous literary knowledge e.g. if he knows that metaphorical structure is a standard constituent of Theodor Storm's novels. In the case mentioned above the reader's taste and knowledge play a relevant role in the construction of the attitude A_m. Also, the reader does not always apply both F_{s1} and F_{s2} at the same time; thus it is possible that only one of them forms the attitude A_m. This gives an opportunity to the classification of the reader's habits, too.

4.2. After the reader has recognized that a metaphorical structure can be assigned to a novel, he may start to construct it. What conditions must be satisfied for the reader to do so? The primary condition of a metaphorical structure is that there should be "something common" in the metaphors of the novel. This "something common" is called common designatum by Szegedy-Maszák.[35] On the basis of the theory of metaphor developed in section 2, the designatum of a metaphor is the relevant sense (the common property(s) of the tenor and the vehicle). Therefore I think that *the system of the relevant senses of metaphors forms a metaphorical structure.*

4.2.1. On what basis can we say that "the Soldier with the Flower" and "rose-honey" are associated with each other as metaphors? We have to suppose that they are understood. Consequently, the first rule of construction for understanding a metaphorical structure is as follows:

K_1 The reader understands the local metaphors of the novel, that is, he constructs their relevant senses.

(This rule requires the operation of the rules of reconstruction and interpretation of local metaphors.)

The reader must understand as many local metaphors as are needed to construct a metaphorical structure.

4.2.2. After the operation of the rule K_1 the reader has the following at his disposal (here I analyze the connection of two metaphors only):

/i/ the relevant sense *(C)* of one of the metaphors (m_1): $SIM\ [F\ (x),\ G\ (y)]$

The relevant sense appears to be the result of the interpretation of the relation of partial similarity *(SIM)* which can be defined as the intersection of F and G: $C = F\ G$

/ii/ the relevant sense *(D)* of another metaphor (m_2) : $SIM\ [F'\ (x'),\ G'\ (y')]$

$$D = F'\ G'$$

The relation of the two metaphors is given by the relation of the relevant senses.

$$R\ [C\ (m_1),\ D\ (m_2)]$$

This formula shows the primary condition for connecting two metaphors. Therefore the general rule for connecting two metaphors is as follows:

GG The reader can connect two metaphors of a text if he recognizes a relation *(R)* between their relevant senses.

4.2.3. What relation can be established between "the Soldier with the Flower" and "rose-honey"? In the sequel I will mark the metaphorical expressions to be found in a text as m_1 (one metaphor) and m_2 (another metaphor) independently of their type, and the marking of relevant senses will be e.g. *C* (m_1). In this way the simplified form of the formula K_G is $(m_1, m_2) \rightarrow R\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2)]$

The interpretation of this simplified formula is as follows:

the text of Gion's novel – *R* STANDING OUTSIDE,

HAPPY (the Soldier with the Flower), COMMUNAL, HAPPY (rose-honey).

We see that the two metaphors have both a common element (HAPPY) and different ones, so the relation between the relevant senses is that of partial similarity *(SIM)*. The next rule of the understanding of a metaphorical structure is as follows:

$$K_2\ (m_1, m_2)\ SIM\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2).]$$

4.2.4. The next type of the creation of metaphorical structures is exemplified by the relation between the metaphors "Rézi's picture postcard" and "holiday clothes".

R PROTECTING, IN THE ABSTRACT HUMANE (Rézi's picture postcard), IN THE ABSTRACT HUMANE (holiday clothes)

As *C* contains all the elements of *D* but *D* does not contain all the elements of *C*, *R* is the relation of containing *(CONT)*.

(*D* is a subset of *C*.)

The next rule is:

$$K_3\ (m_1, m_2)\ CONT\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2).]$$

4.2.5. What relation can be established between "the Soldier with the Flower" and "Gilike's playing with his fingers"?

R STANDING OUTSIDE, HAPPY (the Soldier with the Flower), STANDING OUTSIDE, HAPPY (Gildke's playing with his fingers)

The relevant senses of the two metaphors are identical, therefore the relation between them is that of identity *(ID)*:

$$K_4\ (m_1, m_2)\ ID\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2)]$$

4.2.5.1. When understanding a metaphor we cannot accept the relation identity because two things can never be identical with each other, though, when understanding a metaphorical structure it can be accepted, because the sets of features do not mark things but relations. Therefore, they can be identical with each other. The basic difference between the understanding of a metaphor and a metaphorical structure can be defined in the following way:

/i/ when understanding a metaphor we know about a *relation between two things,*

/ii/ when understanding a metaphorical structure we know about *relations* (which are of different types) *between relations* (which are one type–that of similarity).

4.2.6. What relations can be found in this metaphorical structure:

R STANDING OUTSIDE, HAPPY (the Soldier with the Flower),

BEING PARTICIPANT, UNHAPPY (mumbling).

The elements of the relevant senses of metaphors are not only different from each other but they are opposed to each other as well (e.g. HAPPY–UNHAPPY).

This is the relation of opposition *(OPP).*

$$K_5\ (m_1, m_2)\ OPP\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2)]$$

4.2.7. Consider the following example:

R COMMUNAL, HAPPY (rose-honey), BEING PARTICIPANT, UNHAPPY (mumbling)

Some of the elements are opposed to each other, others are identical. ("Communal" and "being participant" can be regarded as identical, because these elements are not explicit in the text but they are constructed by the reader.) The relation between the relevant senses is that of equivalence–opposition *(EO).*

$$K_6\ (m_1, m_2)\ EO\ [C\ (m_1), D\ (m_2)]$$

4.2.8. In Gion's novel these rules of construction seem to be relevant and capable of operation. Of course, theoretically other rules can be conceived of.

The creation of a metaphorical structure assumes that within the whole structure there are *indirect contacts,* that is, any metaphor can be brought into connection with any other metaphor "through" (by means of) the relevant senses.

4.2.9. Finally, we can speak of the understanding of a metaphorical structure only when, by means of this structure the reader explains the text which was inexplicable for him before constructing it. For example on the basis of the metaphorical structure "He also played for rogues", the "galloping of Serbian riders at Christmas" can be explained, because it is this event of the novel that makes Gilike step out of his tales and learn to ride indeed, it makes him stop being an outsider. The expressions "the Soldier with the Flower", "Gilike's playing with his fingers", "the Serbian riders" and "Gilike's riding" play important roles as metaphors, as elements of the metaphorical structure of the novel in the explanation above. Consequently, the general rule of interpretation of a metaphorical structure is as follows:

I_{SG} By means of the metaphorical structure of a novel the reader can explain at least one part of the novel which he could not before the construction ot this metaphorical structure.

The formulation of I_{SG} is necessary because if the reader constructs a "metaphorical structure" on the basis of which he does not understand any of the novel (he does

not fill any interpretative gap) then this structure does not exist as the metaphorical structure of the novel. It cannot be taken into consideration when understanding the novel.

5. What do we do when we understand a textworld metaphorically?

5.1. Ricoeur thinks that the prosess of the understanding of a metaphor is the key to the understanding of larger texts, say, e.g. of literary pieces.[36] Similarly, according to Lodge, a literary text is always metaphorical in the sense that when it is interpreted it is placed into a total metaphor: the text is the vehicle and the world is the tenor.[37] If we accept Lodge's view we face a "big" sentence metaphor in the description of the understanding of a novel. The text marks only the vehicle *y* and its proparty or properties *G* and the reader's task is to construct the tenor *x*, its property or properties *F* and relation *SIM* on the basis of the context. Therefore all the rules which govern the understanding of sentence metaphors operate specifically in the metaphorical understanding of a novel.

5.2. The rules of the metaphorical understanding of a novel

5.2.1. *The rules of recognition*

F_{m1} The reader recognizes that a novel can be interpreted metaphorically if he is not able to decide on the basis of the actual context (his world-model) whether the truth conditions of the textworld (a complex state of affairs) can be satisfied or not.

F_{m2} The reader recognizes that a novel can be interpreted metaphorically if he can state on the basis of the actual context (his world-model) that the textworld is false.

The function of F_{m1} and F_{m2} is to bring about an attitude of "metaphorical interpretation" A_{mi} in the reader. This attitude can also be established without the operation of these rules, e.g. in the case of readers who interpret novels mainly metaphorically. For example Sartre's novel *Les mots* can be regarded as an authentic biography. In this case the reader can satisfy the truth conditions of the textworld on the basis of the actual context (a world-model). But he can also interpret it metaphorically if he *sees* Sartre's life *as someone else's life* (or *as* his own life).

F_{m1} can operate when reading Gion's novel because we can assume readers who are not able to decide whether the first sentence of the novel is true or not: "In the autumn of 1898 Stefan Krebs came from Feketics to Szenttamás..."[38] The reader can raise the questions: "where is Feketics?" or "what is Feketics?"

F_{m2} can operate in that part of the novel in which Gallai tells us that Istenes Ribic Mihály and his wife left their children alone, fastening them to table legs with a string so long they could reach to the middle of the room "where cooked cold grains of corn looked yellow in a hole scooped in the earth".[39] Some of the readers would regard this state of affairs as false because they would think that "such a thing does not exist". (The expression "grains of corn" fulfills an important metaphorical function in the nov-

el.) F_{m1} and Fm_2 can operate together but at same time only one of them can be correlated with the given state of affairs. Here the expression "at the same time" means that what is unverifiable to one reader can be false to another.

5.2.2. *The rule of reconstruction of metaphorical understanding*

R_m The reader constructs a partial similarity one element of which is the textworld as vehicle y and its property or properties G and the other element is a part of his world-model as tenor and its property or properties F.

If F_{m1} and F_{m2} operate before the operation of R_m, the reader is able to satisfy the truth conditions of partial similarity. It has to be noted that if the truth conditions of a textworld can be satisfied, that is, the reader considers the world of novel to be true, we can speak about metaphorical understanding only if the relation of partial similarity between the textworld and a world-model holds as well. If the reader considers the textworld to be true, then the relation of partial similarity ("seeing as") is established between two different parts of a world-model. If the reader does not consider the textworld to be true, then the relation of partial similarity is established between a part of a world-model and a fictive world.

In the latter case a possible explanation for the problem of fictionality of a novel can be given. A fictive world can be considered true if we validate the relation of partial similarity between the former and a world-model. This is possible only if the text is interpretable metaphorically. This possibility can be extended to other types of understanding if we apply the following rule:

$$R_{GV}\, G\,(y) \rightarrow (JR)\,(JF)\,(JG)\,\{R\,[F\,(x),\, G\,(y)]\},$$

where

G (y): the fictive world and its properties,

F (x): a part of a world-model and its properties,

R: the relation between the fictive world and a part of a world-model.

This rule can be called *the general rule of verification.* This relation R can be specified as entailment, attribution, opposition and partial similarity; that is, the values of the general rule of reconstruction governing the non-literal understanding of texts supposedly with other values as well. On the basis of this rule the reader admits a fictive world which is "very similar".

5.2.3. *The rule of interpretation of metaphorical understanding*

I_m The reader assigns appropriate meanings to the terms *(SIM, F, x)* which remained "empty" after the operation of the rule of reconstruction R_m.

This rule establishes only that "part" of the meaning of a novel which is the result of metaphorical understanding. This partial (metaphorical) meaning of the novel can be established on the basis of the relation between the textworld and a part of a world-model. Since the purpose of this paper is not the interpretation of Gion's novel, I say nothing more about this.

Notes

1. Gion 1982, 199. p.
2. Cf. Richards 1936, 93. p.
3. Cf. Wheelright 1962, 72. p.
4. Cf. Searle 1979, 105. p.
5. Wittgenstein 1963, 213. p.
6. Cf. Miller 1979, 202. p.
7. Cf. Miller 1979, 203. p.
8. Cf. Miller 1979, 208–209. pp.
9. Cf. Fraser 1979, 174. p.
10. Searle 1979, 76. p.
11. Searle 1979, 76. and 77. pp.
12. Searle 1979, 78. p.
13. Searle 1979, 77. p.
14. Searle 1979, 77. p.
15. Searle 1979, 77. p.
16. Searle 1979, 77. p.
17. Searle 1979, 119. p.
18. It seems that the word meaning and the literal meaning are more of less same. Then why does Searle make a distinction between them?
19. Cf. Wheelright 1962, 73. p.
20. Cf. Richards 1963, 96–97. pp.
21. Cf. Hester 1967, 17–21. pp.
22. Cf. Hester 1967, 58–59. pp.
23. Wittgenstein 1963, 153. p.
24. Cf. Wellman 1961, 434–446. pp.
25. Hester 1967, 174. p.
26. Hester 1967, 180. p.
27. Cf. Miller 1979, 220. p.
28. Gion 1982, 33. p.
29. Gion 1982, 33. p.
30. Gion 1982, 33. p.
31. Gion 1982, 33. p.
32. Gion 1982, 33. p.
33. Gion 1982, 34. p.
34. Cf. Searle 1979.
35. Szegedy-Maszák 1971, 67. p.
36. Ricoeur 1974, 100. p.
37. Lodge 1977, 109. p.
38. Gion 1982, 7. p.
39. Gion 1982, 57. p.

Bibliography

1979 Fraser, B. The Interpretation of Novel Metaphors In: Metaphor and Thought (ed. A. Ortony) Cambridge pp. 172–185.
1977 Haikola, L. Religion as Language-game (Wallin & Dalholm Boktrickery AB Lund)
1967 Hester, M. B. The meaning of poetic metaphor (Mouton & Co. The Hague, Paris)

1982 Gion, N. Latroknak is játszott (Magvető, Budapest)
1983 Kertész, A. Systems of sentences about signs: an experiment in the theory of science (in print) Debrecen
1977 Lodge, D. The Modes of Modern Writing (E. Arnold, London)
1936 Miller, G. A. Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors In: Metaphor and Thought (ed. A. Ortony) Cambridge pp. 202–250.
Richards, I. A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric (Oxford, University Press)
1974 Ricoeur, P. Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics In: New Literary History Vol. VI. No. 1. pp. 95–110.
1979 Searle, J. R. Expression and Meaning (Cambridge, University Press)
1971 Szegedy-Maszák, M. Metaforikus szerkezet a Kosztolányi és a Krúdy-novellában In: A novellaelemzés új módszerei (Akadémiai, Budapest) pp. 65–72.
1962 Wellman, C. Wittgenstein's Conception of a Criterion In: The Philosophical Review LXXI
Wheelright, Metaphor and Reality (Bloomington, Indiana University Press)
1963 Wittgenstein, L. Philosophical Investigations (Basil Blackwell, Oxford)

ART CONTACTS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND HUNGARY AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

KATALIN KESERÜ

ELTE BTK Művészettörténeti Tanszék, Budapest, Hungary

In the 19th century, the points of orientation for Hungarian artists were the great traditional art centres of the continent. The movement, however, that began to unfold in Great Britain from the middle of the century created a perfectly new situation. The interest in the island kept growing. The Pre-Raphaelites, and later the Arts & Crafts movement, also raised the question of the interrelation of art and society in terms of progress through art. (This also roused the interest of the leaders and intellectuals of a Hungary stricken with social problems.) Eventually art, at least its branches in connection with industrial or economic structures (applied art, architecture), contributed to modern civilization taking root in Hungary.

In this process, British–Hungarian relations reached their summit around the turn of the century. These contacts were such that they exerted and influence not only on style (the union of modernism and national tradition) but also on the theory of art and society.

These contacts came to a head in 1894–1904, as Hungary's prestige rose in Anglo–Hungarian relations. It was followed by the period of strengthening a modern national style, appreciated and backed up by the British art writers, although the country was gradually losing its prestige in England due to the Hungarian political drive at independence. It may be partly attributed to the decline of Great Britain's initiatives that it acknowledged this faraway outpost of its world power. In the two decades at issue Hungarian art was faced with the Pre-Raphaelites, the Arts & Crafts movement and British Art Nouveau. The greatest gain of this influence was that it directed attention to internal resources and traditions from which starting the organic development of modernism seemed possible.

The Great War pitted the two countries against one another, which was reflected in Hungarian art writing as well. However, what actually undermined the British–Hungarian relations was no the war, but the gradual shift of the centre of modernism for architecture and applied art to Germany. The British professional press and the art community also kept track of this reorientation in the mid-teens. Yet Great Britain's modern art left an indelible mark and affected a turnabout in the art of Hungary through its Hungarian followers.

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

Hungarians in Great Britain – Britons in Hungary

One will find the roots of these contacts in the appeal of Great Britain's economy and state administration rather than its art at the time of the reformation/modernization of Hungarian politics and society. Artistic representation of the ideal state that attracted 19th century Hungary to England was born among Hungarian immigrants in England after the fall of the Hungarian war of independence. "The presentation of the Golden Bull", a painting by C. Brocky (Károly Brocky) (c. 1852) who lived in England after 1837 became the symbol of the common ideal of constitutionalism. Hungary's Golden Bull of 1222 is the root of democratic social organization in the same way as the Magna Carta in England. By representing the historical event with the portraits of contemporary Hungarian emigree politicians, the painter underlined the timely significance of the theme.

The first travel accounts that also stimulated architecture and urban planning were written by politicians and leaders in the Hungarian Reform Era (Ferenc Pulszky, István Széchenyi, Bertalan Szemere) who had also toured England and Scotland. Later this liberal circle also drew attention to the aesthetic design of industrial products they had seen in England.

The continuous presence of art parallels Hungarian politicians and intellectual leaders in England. In 1853, Londoners could admire the art collection of the emigrant *Ferenc Pulszky* in the Society of Antiquaries in Pall Mall. In the Royal Institute of British Architects, another emigrant, *Imre Henszlmann,* held a lecture on the theory of Gothic-derived architectonic proportions. Becoming a scholar in England, *G. G. Zerffy* lectured on the history of decorative arts from 1868 to 1892 at the National Art Training School. His moralizing art theory, "A Manual of the Historical Development of Art" (1876) enjoyed wide popularity. A Hungarian designer, *Miklós Szerelmey* invented a stone conserving material called silicat zopissa and some methods of deterring rust and corrosion; using these, the restoration of the Houses of Parliament and St Paul's Cathedral could begin in the fifties. The success of Móricz Fischer's *Herend china factory* at the 1851 world exhibition in London resulted in several orders in the 1850s and '60s by Queen Victoria and several British aristocrats. After the 1873 world exposition in Vienna and the world fair of 1878 in Paris the British Museum and South Kensington Museum enriched their collections with ceramics from the *Zsolnay factory* of Pécs, and Doulton himself bought several pieces. Later the factory delivered lamps upon commission by W. A. Benson. In the '90s Hungarian folk art and homecrafts elicited the enthusiastic appreciation of Alma-Tadema, Kipling, Rossetti, Ruskin, Whistler and Wide, among others, through the collection of Kálmán Rozsnyay, a Hungarian correspondent in London writing under the pen name Carton Sidney. At the same time the *Hungarian Wagon and Machine Factory* delivered a set of 100 cars for the London Underground. Another successful artist in London, *Emil Fuchs,* made the death mask of Queen Victoria and the portrait of the new king, Edward VII for the coronation medal and the new coins. From the outset of our century, Hungarian artists frequently exhibited at the Studio. *Ede Vigand* came to London in 1900; reviews laud-

ed his furniture on display at the Studio in 1901. In the same year *Pál Horti* won a large silver medal for his jewelry and hammered copper pieces. Hungarian typographic art in England (J. Zaensdorf) was continued in the first years of the century by *Elek Falus,* who made book desirders in the 1850s and '60s by Queen Victoria and several British aristocrats. After the 1873 world exposition in Vienna and the world fair of 1878 in Paris the British Museum and South Kensington Museum enriched their collections with ceramics from the *Zsolnay factory* of Pécs, and Doulton himself bought several pieces. Later the factory delivered lamps upon commission by W. A. Benson. In the '90s Hungarian folk art and homecrafts elicited the enthusiaiture. In small-scale sculpture, *Imre Simay*'s "Family Bliss" earned appreciation at the 1908 show of the Hagenbund, while *Árpád Juhász* from Gödöllő won a gold medal at the international exhibition of drawings. However, what made this year memorable was the unique Hungarian exhibition at the Earl's Court.

The first information about the new British art arrived in Hungary 1894–96. The series of essays by Károly Lyka (in the periodical *Athenaeum*) included "The Modern Pre-Raphaelite Art". In Budapest, the first major English exhibition was staged in 1895 in the Art Hall of *W. Crane*'s 500 illustrations and other works. The first innovative exhibition at the Museum of Applied Art was in 1898 under the title "Modern Art" also showing British exhibits in all branches of applied art. The presentation of the National Competition in Budapest in the same year was aimed at the reformation of teaching applied art. The need for a change is clearly illustrated by a single figure: 37,737 people visited the exhibition of the material of 15 crafts and the teachers' judgements in 18 days.

The first direct contacts between E & H are associated with *C. R. Ashbee* and Hungarian Politicians. His considerable Hungarian orders may be attributed to publications on him in Hungary. In 1899 the economist Gyula Mandello asked him to design the interior decoration of his houses in Budapest and Pozsony. These pieces were exhibited at the Eighth exhibition of the Sezession in 1900 (Vienna). Ashbee was introduced by Mandello to Zsombor Szász, a politician of the Independence Party, who in 1900 1900 invited Ashbee to design his house. His article in The Times (1905) mirrors the political influence of his host. Besides the plan of the house and the reconstruction of the interior, a statue of his was exhibited under the title "The genius of modern Hungary". It must have been the artist's private idea about the central figure of the Millenary momument, György Zala's work also reproduced at the Studio. At this time, Ashbee got acquainted with Dezső Malonyay, then working on his book series "The Art of the Hungarian People". Malonyay's house was planned by Béla Lajta, a follower of Ödön Lechner, who also visited R. N. Shaw's architectural office during his London stay in 1898–99. Lajta's change in style toward British architecture, marked by his house for Malonyay, was effected by Ashbee's visit.

W. Crane and his family also paid a visit to Hungary in what proved to be the triumphal march of Pre-Raphaelitism and the Arts & Crafts movement. Crane himself recalled it in his book "An Artist's Reminiscences" (1907), but the Art Journal also carried a report (1901) since it was Crame's largest exhibition so far. A special issue of

the journal "Magyar Iparművészet" (Hungarian Applied Art) (hereafter MI) was published in his honour (July 1901). The title page, designed by Crane himself recalled that of the 1898 Jugend. His article (Some words about Hungarian applied art) emphasizes the role of Hungarian ornamentation in creating a national style. (In his memoirs, however, he notes that folk art will not bloom in an artificial garden.) A separate booklet titled "Walter Crane reading at the Casino of Leopoldstadt (a district of Budapest) on 16 Oct. 1900" was published with his own design for the title page. (His book "Line and Form", a more thorough treatment of the subject, came out in Hungarian translation in 1910.) During his stay he met several artists and representatives of the Hungarian spiritual scene. He designed a book-plate for Elemér Czakó, the librarian of the Museum of Applied Art and later the principal of the Royal School of Applied Art. His colour drawing "The star of Bethlehem" is still in the possession of the Czakó family. When touring Hungary, he also visited the Zsolnay factory of Pécs. His small vase adorned with Greek figures (faience with eosin glaze) and with the inscription "Long Live Applied Art" is preserved at the Museum of Pécs. When he sojourned in Kolozsvár, he was guided by János Kovács, a lecturer of the university who had graduated in England (and written a biography of *John Paget,* the author of the two-volume "Hungary and Transylvania" and a landowner in Transylvania). The exlibris he made for him features Crane paying tribute to Mr. and Mrs Kovács clad in Transylvanian folk costume. His most memorable experience was his visit to Mrs. Zsigmond Gyarmathy in Bánffyhunyad, in the Kalotaszeg region of Transylvania, where a wedding procession was also staged in his honour. He filled a whole sketchbook with figures dressed in folk costumes, some of which appeared in the weekly Új idők (New Times) and later in his book "Ideals in Art" (1909). W. Crane's exhibition in Budapest marks a turning-point in the career of *Mária Undi*, too. A great part of her lifework was created with the aspiration to provide children with an artistic environment. In her autobiography she comments that she got the inspiration from Crane's books. She went to London, at first attracted by the flourishing culture of children's books.

After an average of one British participant for years, the 1901 spring show of the Hungarian Fine Art Society was a milestone. The bulk of the material on display came from 25 Britons including Burne-Jones, Hunt, Millais. This rate remained more or less constant in the forthcoming years, representing the contemporary British art from the academicians to the exponents of Art Nouveau. The third major sensational event was the Exhibition of British Applied Art in 1902. (Also, British collections dominated the exhibition of modern colour engravings in the National Gallery and the book-plate exhibition at the Museum of Applied Art.) Its material was selected by Jenő Radisics at that year's exhibition in Glasgow, and by an experts' panel at the London exhibition of the Studio. Elemér Czakó wrote the catalogue (including biographies and descriptions of works) and Georg Walton designed the cover. Several exhibits found their way to the collection of the Museum, including chairs by Walton and E. A. Taylor, stained glass compositions from Glasgow, bookbindings from the workshops of Cedric Chivers and Alfred de Santy. The expenses were jointly covered by the British and Hungarian ministries. The most prospective asset of the exhibition was the idea of planning

the entire interior as one instead of just a suite of furniture, as well as the harmonious cooperation between designers and artisans' firms. (Whylie and Lockhead of Glasgow fitted up a pavilion of four rooms with complete interiors.) This was the first exhibition to outline the mainstreams of modern applied art in Britain. Himself a designer, *Frigyes Spiegel* differentiated three trends after the Pre-Raphaelites had laid the foundations for artistic handicrafts (structuralism, functionalism, emergence of planar ornamentation): 1. neo-Gothic, rustic furniture design with floral ornaments (Morris, Ashbee, Voysey and B. Scott); 2. the graceful furniture style built on the 18th century traditions and applying various materials in a sophisticated way (Glasgow firms and G. Walton); 3. the style of the Mackintoshes. The main merit of the furniture pieces, he claimed, was being constructed from even surfaces. The exhibition halls were packed full with designers, architects, craftsmen who sketched and studied the displayed objects.

In 1903 a book appeared with the title "Ruskin's Life and Teaching" by his translator into Hungarian, Sarolta Geőcze. In the next year *Aladár Kriesch* wrote a book, his ars poetica as it were, "on Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites" in which he also translated their literary works.

A new revelation was the exhibition of *A. Beardsley*. It was staged at the Museum of Applied Art in 1907, organized by Radisics. Elemér Czakó wrote an analytic essay of the show in MI. In its wake, a whole series of drawings appeared by *Lajos Kozma, Gyula Tichy, Attila Sassy (Aiglon)* (Last dreams – melodies; Tales of an inkpot; Opium dreams). They introduced in Hungary a new genre – the graphic cycle – similar to the song cycles. It is small wonder then that Britons were the majority of the participants of the 1909 international drawing exhibition staged by the Fine Art Society. A total of 425 works (and several more in the mixed categories) represented British drawing from the Pre-Raphaelites to Beardsley and further on, of which a uniquely thorough, insightful and profound analysis was published by *Viktor Olgyai* in the journal Művészet (Art).

The much-awaited introduction of the Hungarians in London – the exhibition at the Earl's Court in 1908 – ended in fiasco for organizational reasons. The architectural setting was designed by József Fischer and Béla Jánszky as well as Bálint and Jámbor. Apart from displays on public education, agriculture and the capital city of Budapest, the products of artisans, the homecrafts, the Zsolnay factory and some works of art were presented. The Studio put the greatest value on handicrafts of traditional inspiration, e.g. on the carpets of the Gödöllő colony and the laces from *Árpád Dékáni*'s Halas workshop. Yet it was the outcome of this exhibition that A. S. Levetus reported from Vienna, concerning the art achievements of Hungary, chiefly of the popular national trend. In 1911 she published a special issue devoted to folk art in Austria and Hungary, for which he selected material from museums and private collections. The accompanying essay "Hungarian Peasant Art" was written by Aladár Kriesch (Körösfői-Kriesch). Contributory factors to the persistent influence of Britain in Hungary were Levetus's richly illustrated article on B. Scott and Ashbee (MI, 1910), her lectures in the Museum of Applied Art (1912), the writing of Zsombor Szász about Ash-

bee and the Guild of Handicraft and the account of *Mihály Bíró,* an assistant of Ashbee, of his experiences in Campden (MI, 1910). In the 1910s the practitioner of a new area debuted in Hungary. 1913 saw the first exhibition of stage design at the Artists' Home in which G. Craig participated. From that time Craig was the paragon and model of the stage designer making architectonic sets for the purpose of creating spaces.

The Transformation of Hungarian Applied Art and Architecture

The first area to display signs of British influence was applied art, specifically its planning and teaching. As an art historian, *Károly Pulszky* contributed by his official purchases to the establishment of a Hungarian crafts museum patterned after the South Kensington Museum. Though the Hungarian state made some purchases at the London World Fair in 1867, Pulszky's acquisition of 59 items at the 1873 Vienna World Exposition was the core of the first exhibition in 1874 of the Museum of Applied Art (founded in 1873). The guide to the exhibition reveals that Pulszky expected the museum to become a universal demonstrative tool on the English model. However, only decorative arts were taught in the classes of the School of Applied Art founded in 1880. In 1883/84 classes were introduced in goldsmithing and wood and copper engraving. This accounts for Pulszky's insistence on the need for functional, modern applied arts based on design artists' and craftpeople's cooperation, which he expressed in his article "Applied Art and Style" in the journal Művészi Ipar (Artistic Crafts) launched in 1885. He pledged himself to the universal style of applied art. However, the programme-setting article of the journal urged the development of a national current in applied art against imported industrial goods. At that time, however, national character meant the use of folk ornamentation colours and forms. One of the most outstanding folk art collectors organized its production in the manner of homecraft and introduced teaching it at school. This was *Mrs Zsigmond Gyarmathy,* "the Hungarian George Eliot", who wrote several novels and short stories and devoted many articles to the embroidery of the Kalotaszeg region. Her embroideries scored sweeping success at the national fair of 1885, which also promoted the inclusion of folk ornamentation among the subjects taught at the School of Applied Art. For many years afterwards the problem of applied art was on the periphery. The question of modernism was raised again in 1893: Jenő Radisics, the director of the Museum of Applied Art, published his reflexions on the modern home in Művészi Ipar.

In 1894 the minister of commerce launched the publication of the Mintalapok (Pattern Books) with a view to modernizing the mentality of the artisans and the handicrafts. He financed the first exemplary exhibitions as well, trying to set an example for cabinet-makers with Chippendale and Sheraton style furniture pieces. The Park Club was also used as an example by virtue of its practical and harmonious English furniture made of finely finished materials. From that time on the journal Művészi Ipar regularly reviewed the Studio, resulting in the recognition of a novel connection between art and industry of the Arts & Crafts type. In 1895–96 the aim of transforming the

homecrafts into artistic industry was formulated, calling for designs making full use of materials and technologies and suitable for mechanical reproduction. In the millenary exhibition the importance of artistic design was underscored by the participation of the Applied Act Society (1896). The national trend of modern applied art, as the critic József Diener-Dénes conceded, was derived from the union of English forms (especially of furniture) and Hungarian ornamentation.

In 1896 the School of Applied Art, then a part of the Academy of Fine Art, became independent, marking a turn toward a more modern training orientated to functionalism but still preserving the national character. Courses were gradually organized, in 1899 interior decoration, in 1907 homecrafts and carpet weaving, in 1910 textile design and typography. Workshops were established: furniture making in 1905; carpet weaving with the weaving school of Gödöllő in 1907; printing in 1910; ceramics in 1912; the study of nature was also introduced. The minister of public education, Gyula Wlassics, embraced the cause of applied art by including it in an overall programme of popularizing the art: in 1899 he provided the schools with demonstrative pictures of art, initiated a series of lectures for workers at museums and lent financial support to literature on art. The preparations for a comprehensive 3-volume work, "The Book of Applied Art" (1902–12) began around this time (György Ráth).

The journal now called Magyar Iparművészet (Hungarian Applied Art) regularly published information on British exhibitions, art events and education throughout the studied period. Studies were devoted to the history and contemporary currents of British art. Of them, I stress only "The Guild of Handicraft" in 1897, on the Eighth exhibition of the Sezession in 1901, and Aladár Kriesch's series of articles on Ruskin, Morris and the Pre-Raphaelites in 1906. The new periodicals Művészet and Modern Művészet (Art, and Modern Art) also took their share in promoting art. Questions of architecture were also gaining ascendancy around this time.

H. Muthesius's "Das Englische Haus" and a detailed analysis of the English house published in Művészet (1905) were decisive in the process of adopting the attitude of designing a house in its entirety. Its main characteristics (the unity of house, interior and garden, the central role of the ground floor hall, the exterior shaped in harmony with the interior, the use of local materials, compliance with the occupants' individual needs were formulated as normative requirements. This house-centric outlook led *Dezső Malonyay* in arranging the material for his series "The Art of the Hungarian People" (from 1907); the architect *Béla Málnai*'s journal A Ház (The House) was launched under this banner (1908–11). (The competitions for undergraduates of architecture in 1907 highlighted a studio house. The prizes and the designs (Károly Kós, Lajos Kozma) attest that the standard measure was British architecture and, to some extent, folk architecture.) *Ede Vigand* wrote his ideas echoing British principles in an article titled "The House" (1910) and in "The garden and its flowers" (1911). He reiterated the triple unity of interior/house/garden from the aspect of the traditions of the Hungarian flower garden.

As soon as the modern approach to planning houses took root in Hungary, the demand appeared for placing detached houses with gardens in an organized manner both

for the poorer and more affluent strata of society. Both were decisively influenced by B. Howard's book "Garden Cities of Tomorrow" (1902). What underlay the social housing programme initiated by the mayor of Budapest, István Bárczy, was the sudden growth of the population of the capital (from 180 000 in 1850 to 730 000 in 1900). Under an act of 1908, 19 housing estates had been built by 1912, most of them comprising houses with gardens instead of the former multi-storey tenement buildings, in a popular modern style for the rural masses migrating to the capital. They include the housing estate for the *gas factory workers* by Lóránd Almási Balogh, and architecturally the richest residential area, the estate for civil servants in Kispest (1908–14). The so-called *Wekerle estate* with its two churches was designed by Kós, Zrumeczky and others varying 48 different types of houses, some reminiscent of the types in Hampstead Garden. The Hungarian article on Hampstead (MI, 1911) must have accelerated the emergence of the villa district on the Little Svábhegy (district of Budapest), a colony of lawyers and judges with individual demands (Aladár Árkay 1910–13). The idea of the "country of gardens" imported from England in the 19th century Reform Era began to spread at this time, becoming the basis for the ideal of the "Hungary of gardens" which never materialized.

Stylistic connections

The art of the fin de siècle was the richest in painting. Here only the trend in direct or indirect contact with the Pre-Raphaelites will be made touched on. No mention will be of the stylistic links between the artists' colonies of Cornwall and Nagybánya, both fostered by French painting but the former adhering to the naturalism of Bastien-Lapage, and the latter dissolving it in complete plein air. The exhibitions, in France and the French spiritual life simultaneously transmitted the art of the Pre-Raphaelites and Whistler to Hungarian artists in Paris. French criticism pinpointed Whistler's significance in *József Rippl-Rónai*'s pictures (Grandmother, 1892–Whistler: The Artist's Mother). Following his 1888 exhibition in Paris, Whistler's influence can be traced from the first of Rippl-Rónai's longitudinal paintings depicting a standing woman. It is also due to his life-long friendship with the Scottish designer J. P. Knowles that Rippl-Rónai was attracted to l'art pour l'art and Pre-Raphaelite painting (Woman with a Bird Cage–W. H. Dewerell: The Pet). The painting of Burne-Jones, which conquered Paris in the early nineties, led Rippl-Rónai to the "Club of Burne-Jones' Followers" when he visited London in 1893, but it did not affect his art born in the circle of the Nabis and displaying signs of French synthetism and symbolism. Thus his interest in garden scenes (Les Vierges, 1895, published by S. Bing; its counterpart, Les Tombeaux, was drawn by Knowles), his activity in applied art (dining set for Count Tivadar Andrássy, 1897) only indirectly refer to their English sources (the tapestry entitled "Woman in Red Dress" above the fireplace in the dining room reminds one of the corresponding section of Whistler's Peacock Room). "Mme Mazet–Woman in Black Veil" is the only picture whose model was named by Rippl-Rónai, as Gainsborough's "Miss Siddons".

At the outset of his career *Lajos Gulácsy* apparently went to Italy to study the Italian sources of his model, the Pre-Raphaelites. His works executed in Italy from 1903 – the watercolour "Paolo and Francesca", the canvasses "Song of a Rose Tree" and "Ecstasy" mirror the direct influence of Rossetti besides the Botticellis he saw in the Uffizi, but Gulácsy's style is more pictorial, subjective and imbued with fin de siècle decadence. His tales, fabulous short stories and aesthetic thoughts must have been inspired by O. Wilde. His decadent vision of the renaissance, "The Tragedy of Florenze", puts one in mind of Wilde's play of the same title (1910). (In 1905 Gulácsy planned the stage sets for Alma-Tadema's "Invisible Helmsman" at the Thalia Theatre.)

It must have been the Pre-Raphaelites' efforts to resuscitate religious painting and W. H. Hunt's journeys to the Near East that perhaps stimulated *Tivadar Csontváry Kosztka*, the creator of the most singular pictorial lifework at the beginning of our century in Hungary, to head for Jerusalem and Palestine (1904, 1905, 1908). His series of subjective paintings devoid of religiosity and expressing a life philosophy can be conceived as a reinterpretation of Pre-Raphaelite Christianity. His large composition "Mary's Well in Nazareth" (1908) shows the symbol of life, the well, with Pre-Raphaelite reminiscences but in powerful, brightly coloured pictoriality. After his stay in London, Csontváry's monumental landscapes also display signs of the influence of John Martin.

In applied art, the impact of Pre-Raphaelitism was the strongest in artistic tapestry design, which, however, was mediated by French synthetism. More important than this brief union of artists (Pál Horti, Aladár Kriesch, Sándor Nagy) and the crafts was the sudden revival of Hungarian furniture design around 1900: The straight form, grace and subtle mountings of Ede Vigand's furniture pieces suggest that the plank style of Art Nouveau, the trend of democratizing art, had won over our artists. Outstanding among Vigand's "English" interiors is the interior decoration of the exhibition hall for drawing and the reading room at the Museum of Fine Arts (1907). After her trip to England, Mária Undi also became a consistent advocate of the plank style, adopting the practice of designing all in interior's details (children's room 1903, woman's study 1904).

The principle of modernism based on tradition professed by the Arts & Crafts movement also gave rise to the demand for a national variant of the plank style. The designers turned to folk crafts for tradition. The study of folk art began both individually and in an organized manner at the turn of the century. They found the roots of a modern furniture style in the construction of carpentered, peasant furniture, and not only in ornamentation. After this "exploratory movement", the combination of the effects of British and folk art can be demonstrated in the interiors of Vigand, Kriesch, Sándor Nagy and Ödön Moiret. This marks the birth of the popular modern style in Hungarian applied art. The above-mentioned representatives were members of the *Gödöllő artists colony.*

The effect of Pre-Raphaelitism, the Arts & Crafts movement, W. Crane, British Art Nouveau and folk art can all be evidenced in the establishment and organization of this colony of artists. The Pre-Raphaelite idea of art permeating life and work seemed to

them to be reality in peasant art and life. That is also why the Gödöllő artists were not so closely attached to the Pre-Raphaelites in style. The meticulously detailed, true-to-life paintings of Sándor Nagy, Aladár Kriesch's book ornaments mediaeval in tone but composed of folk motifs, and the neo-Gothic ornamental painting and stained windows in churches by both of them attest to this stylistic influence. The way of living and method of work in the artists' colony as well as its training activity remind one of the socialistic community and teaching practice of the Guild of Handicraft, especially after the starting of the weaving workshop. Upon the influence of W. Crane, Aladár Kriesch turned away from an academic pictorial style toward an allegorical-symbolical, sharply contoured style embodying a life philosophy. (The Parable of the Blind, litography 1902; The Good Helmsman, tapestry, 1906; The Source of Art, fresco in the Academy of Music, 1907). The sweeping lines of Crane's Greek figures left their imprint on his illustrations (the poems of Elek Koronghy Lippich (1903), took-plates, his tapestry titled "Cassandra" (1908). In his historical painting identifying moral and aesthetic values (Klára Zách 1911) the figures of Crane's Costumes frieze also exhibited in Budapest come to life. The similarity of their painting techniques is illustrated by the use of tempera on gesso which Kriesch learned in his academic studies. The emergence of a free stylization in Kriesch's carpet designs can perhaps also be traced to Crane's easier, less minutely drawn patterns.

The critics discovered Crane's influence in Kriesch's fellow artist Sándor Nagy's Koronghy illustrations in the Art Nouveau style. The allegorical parable of his painting "The Harvesters" (1903) can also be brought in analogy with Crane's socialistic works. His tapestry "The Pledge" (1906), the epitome of his programme of life and art recalling the bent female figure of Crane's Pandora, is reminiscent of the latter's spiritual atmosphere as well. But Sándor Nagy's stained windows illustrating folk ballads in Marosvásárhely, the book illustrations by him and his wife as well as by Mária Undi, and the wall carperts by Mrs. Sándor Nagy have much more in common with the British Art Nouveau, the style of K. Greenaway and the Mackintoshes.

When the book designer *Elek Falus* returned from England, he continued to cherish the British traditions and set up an artists' colony in Kecskemét starting with carpet weaving. However, his typographic art is more significant. He did the typography and cover designs of books published by the journal "Nyugat" (the West). He was the pioneer of "democratic" paperback books in a popular, decorative style in the line of Morris. The attitude of *Ede Vigand* and young *Károly Kós* to the renewal of typographic art was different. Their books were printed in archaic, mediaeval script or handwritten with a reed pen. Kós attached illustrations to his ballad "Song of King Attila" (1909) in the style of the Mackintoshes.

Our designers were hardly influenced by the Pre-Raphaelites' cult of the Middle Ages. They turned for tradition and national style to peasant art. In architecture, however, the 19th century neo-Gothic trend was an alternative to the national style. A representative example is the Hungarian Parliament (1882–1902). Its designer, *Imre Steindl*, used the neo-Gothic plan of G. G. Scott submitted in 1872 for the competition

to plan the Reichstag in Berlin, but the building also has direct links with the London Parliament on account of the common ideal of constitutionalism.

Ödön Lechner tried to create a national architectural style in quite another way, using ornaments from peasant art. During his trips to Western Europe he studied the national variants of the universal architectural styles to learn the necessary method from them. After his tours of England in 1879 and 1889 he began to apply some elements of British rural castles and cottages (Leovits palace, Szabadka–Subotica, 1893) but eventually he found the clue in British colonial architecture. Adapting to local styles the British created a new style which could serve as an example for a national Hungarian architectural style to be constructed from Hungarian ornamentation then believed to have Sassanian and Persian links and the universal architectonic forms. Together with Zsolnay, Lechner studied Oriental ceramics at the South Kensington Museum. The rich ceramic ornamentation of the Museum of Applied Arts (1891–96) combines brightly coloured, floral ornaments and bizarre "Indian" formal motifs in the parvis of the building's central projection. The large exhibition hall is reminiscent of the "courtyards of Indian mogul palaces". This repertoire of forms and ornaments was further enriched with the roof shapes on the Postal Savings Bank (1899–1901), copied from oriental motifs of "Attila's treasure", the excavated Nagyszentmiklós find. Lechner, who used the historically developed functional types for his ground plans, actually created the national variant of historicism with the use of ostensibly oriental ornamentation (upon Lechner's suggestion, the wall papers of the museum were designed and delivered by W. Crane). When it was opened, Pulszky's purchases of 1895 were put on display, including the printed cloths and velvets, and knotted carpet by Morris & Co. as well as handprinted velvets made in the workshop of T. Wardle in Leek.

Nevertheless, the true source of the stylistic turnabout in Hungarian architecture can be traced to British cottages and the modern English architects who revived the art of cottage architecture. This architectural style appeared in Hungary in the 1850s in the castles and manorial buildings, but around the turn of the century it became the model of middle class housing especially for intellectuals. This change took place parallel with the shift of Anglophilism from the aristocrats to the intellectuals.

A powerful modern trend unfolded in Hungary with the breakthrough of house-centric planning, relying on peasant architecture and folk art with the influence of British modernism. This period from 1905 to World War I can be regarded as the golden age of modernism and nationalism in Hungarian architecture merging of British (modern) and Hungarian (folk) styles. The turning-point is marked by Béla Lajta's villa for Dezső Malonyay: freeing himself from Lechner, Lajta became the chief advocate of British modern functionalism combined with traditionalism in Hungary. He merged the peculiarities of buildings by Webb, N. Shaw, B. Scott, Ashbee and Voysey with peasant architectural traditions. Lajta was the works manager at the construction of a hunting-seat in the Carpathians planned by Scott. That accounts for the asymmetric masses, gables, red brick walls, high hipped roofs, attic windows, tall chimneys, exposed beamed central halls and wooden ceilings (Home of Blind Israelites, his own house).

The architects designated by the generic name "The Young Ones" adjusted better to local folk traditions. In his book "Old Kalotaszeg" *Károly Kós* (1911) described the Transylvanian/Hungarian peasant house's differences from, and similarities to, the English house. The similarities, he claimed, included the central location of the hall, the wooden ceiling, constructivity due to woodwork, and the tall roofs. He recommended that Hungarian traditionalists should use timbered ceilings instead of open ones, stoves instead of fire-places, and lofts instead of attics. As these features were comparatible with the essence of modernism, its tradition-oriented variant was rightly welcomed (MI 1908). In his first representative buildings (Roman Catholic church in Zebegény, Protestant vicarage in Óbuda, 1908–9), however, Kós did not differentiate between the English and the folk traditions. More precisely he used Finnish variations of the British arch-elements such as the open ceiling of Lars Sonck's bank in Helsinki. You can see the similarity of the columns, too. But the whole idea of the church took pattern by the Kalotaszeg churches from the Middle Ages.

When the "Young Ones" appeared with their plans, Ede Vigand also published his series of ideal plans (MI 1907) under the title "My Village". His houses built in Transylvania and Hungary around this time clearly show him as the follower of British modernism (House for his brother in Budapest, 1908; Schmidt house in Marosvásárhely-Tîrgu Mures, etc.). He inventively incorporated his ideal house-type in his public buildings. The plan of the Chamber of Industry and Commerce of Székely Country (1910) orientated in different angles, with its unceiled wooden central room are British peculiarities, but the grouping of the secondary spaces around the centre to eschew the corridor networks of office buildings is unique. Small wonder that A. S. Levetus wrote an article about Vigand in Der Architekt (1911), likening his role in national architecture to that of B. Scott. Indeed, his most important architectural innovation, the open plan in arranging spaces, was similar to Scott's.

Of the "Young Ones" setting out on their careers around this time, the interiors of Dénes Györgyi, the Budapest school of Dezső Zrumeczky, Valér Mende's bank at Gyöngyös, the studio villas and the block of studio flats and casino by the architects Jánszky and Szivessy in Kecskemét are pure examples of British modernism. Of course, the influence of British architecture and interior decoration is also demonstrable, though less markedly, in the work of others over the 1910s, e.g. the blocks of flats by Haász and Málnai, the elegant interior designs of József Vágó and Bálint & Jámbor. Apart from detached houses with gardens, a regrettably small number of urban terrace houses of the British model can be found in Hungary.

Thoughts on art and society

The close interrelation of art and society was the basic idea that inspired Sándor Nagy's book "On the Art of Life" and the philosopher in contact with the Gödöllő artists, Jenő Henrik Schmitt's "Art, ethical life, love" (1911). Both advocated the Pre-Raphaelite ideal of a nobler society created as a result of changes starting from inside

humanity. Both were members of the Social Science Society founded in 1901. At one time the secretary general of the Society was Oszkár Jászi; its members included Gyula Mandello, a Ruskinist. At first the Society discussed every proposal for the betterment of society, e.g. Gyula Mandello's on the transformation of society through the extension of education (University Extension, 1904) and Sándor Nagy's articles on the importance of art education (published in the journal of the Society, Huszadik Század /20th Century/). They also discussed the translation of Morris's book "News from Nowhere", published in their periodical a study on Carpenter by Count Ervin Batthyány, who studied in England and was a friend of Ashbee, etc. The radicalization of this circle fighting for social progress coincided with the rise of the new stylistic and social efforts of our architecture in the wake of the British examples. However, these proposals by art were no longer considered sufficient.

Károly Kós's studies on peasant/modern architecture (1909, 1910) have not lost their validity. The majority of theoretical writings on art also focussed on style. József Diener-Dénes described the process leading to the individualization of art on the example of the history of art in England from a Marxist viewpoint. He envisioned the future of style and art in the committed art of a collective mode of production. Lajos Fülep in his essay "New artistic style" (1908) attributed the 19th century cult of the homogeneous (mediaeval) cultures to individualism. For lack of an extant homogeneous culture, he expected the new style to be developed by individuals reaching out to individuals. Oszkár Jászi, who started his career as a philosopher of history, relinquished the idea of a homogeneous style in his positivistic book "Art and Ethic" (1904). Though on the basis of Spencer's evolutionism and the Marxian historical materialism he accepted the Ruskinian principle of harmony between art and ethic, he defined the essence as the freedom of art, seeing beauty as relative and the moral norms as changing in the process of the democratization of society. Only the Freudian Sándor Varjas anticipated a future style starting out from the art of his age. In his postscript to the drawings of Lajos Kozma, a follower of Beardsley (1908), he saw the decorative-symbolic drawings as the externalization of the inner world and the root of abstraction.

Although the style born of the merging of modernism and folk tradition was not considered by anyone as the true path leading to the future, the fact itself made British readers regard Hungary as the "easternmost country of the West".

References on British–Hungarian art contacts:

British applied art in the collection of the Museum of Applied Art. Catalogue, 1988.

Gál, István: Ruskin a magyar népművészetről (Ruskin on Hungarian folk art). Filológiai Közlöny 1963.

Gál, István: Magyar–angol kapcsolatok az építőművészetben (Hungarian–British relation in architecture). Magyar Építőművészet 1963.

Gál, István: Walter Crane in Hungary. The New Hungarian Quarterly 1965. No. 9.

Gál, István: Walter Crane és a magyar irodalom (Walter Crane and Hungarian Literature). Nagyvilág 1965.
Gál, István: Rosti Magdolna, a Nyugat rejtélyes szakértője (Magdolna Rosti, the enigmatic specialist of Britain for "Nyugat"). Irodalomtörténet 1976.
Gonda, Zsuzsa: C. R. Ashbee és magyar barátai (C. R. Ashbee and his Hungarian friends). Manuscript 1988.
Jeszenszky, Géza: Az elveszett presztízs (The lost prestige). Budapest, 1986.
Koós, Judith: W. Crane and Hungary. Ars Decorativa 1973.
Mikó, Imre: W. Crane Kolozsvárt (W. Crane in Kolozsvár). Utunk 1966. No. III.
Sármány-Parson, Ilona: The Influence of the British Arts and Crafts Movement in Budapest and Vienna. Acta Historiae Artium 1987–88. No. 1–2.

HUNGARIAN ART NOUVEAU AND ITS ENGLISH SOURCES

KATALIN GELLÉR

MTA Művészettörténeti Kutatócsoport, Budapest, Hungary

At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, fine arts in Hungary, as in the Northern and Eastern European countries, could be characterized by a rapid influx of Western European trends and a buoyant artistic life. Naturalism, impressionism, symbolism and art nouveau – all appeared on the scene almost simultaneously and their coexistence might be regarded as one of the principal features of the age. Only a few years passed between the foundation of the *Nagybánya colony* (1896), the association of Hungarian *plein air* painters, and the establishment of the *Gödöllő colony* (after 1902), the most characteristic art nouveau group.[1] As a consequence of their rather belated foundation there is a great interconnection between them. The graphic art of the painters of the Nagybánya colony was influenced by art nouveau, and most of the Gödöllő masters produced plein air paintings.

The acceptance of new ideals and trends in painting was accompanied by a search for a national tradition as a natural counter-reaction, and by the necessity of creating a "Hungarian style", a recurring idea since romanticism, which would strengthen the sense of national identity. One example of this could be István Csók's Tulip box, painted in Paris in 1910 and also Károly Kós, who "smuggled" elements of Hungarian village architecture into Budapest townscape in contrast to the characteristic architectural style of the Monarchy.

Reference to well-known French and English artists was used as a means to legitimize new tendencies. A number of Hungarian artists, mainly those committed to the cause of national independence, were turning towards the examples set by French and English art so as to oppose Austrian and German influence. Instead of going on to study in Vienna or at the German Academies, more and more of them went to Paris for their studies. English aestheticism and the Arts and Crafts movement, at the time having an important impact on the entire art of Western Europe, provided a starting point for the artistic revival of Hungarian artists. Interestingly enough, it was those artists wishing to revive the Hungarian tradition, who, in fact, turned to the example of the latest English architecture and applied arts. English traditionalism was nourished by the awareness of a great empire. Hungary was looking for a way to revive a historic past rich in mythical elements and independence, feasible at least in art, as part of a declining Monarchy. Nevertheless, the commonly held decorative principles of art nouveau made the formation of artictic analogies on the level of style possible. However, the immense effect of English art nouveau was mainly in introducing an anti-his-

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

toricist, anti-imitative style and in stressing the principle of fitness for purpose and the importance of materials in design.

As István Gál said, "Hungarian Anglomania at the turn of the century was in harmony with the Anglo–Hungarian political rapprochement attained partly by the War of Independence and partly by the generation which achieved the 1867 compromise".[2] The statement applies to the fine arts as well; Walter Crane, for example, first became acquainted with Hungarian art in the workshop of W. J. Linton, a supporter of the Kossuth emigration.[3] English philosophy, historiography and economics were well known in Hungary, through the works of Carlyle, Macaulay, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer and John Ruskin. Interest in literature was similarly strong.

Aesthetics of Books

Mihály Babits was the writer who translated the most and who was most familiar with English literature and fine arts.[4] He subscribed to *The Studio* for two years. The Pre-Raphaelites probably influenced his poetry, too. In his autobiographical novel, *Halálfiai* (Destined to Die) he wrote about the Spencer and Wilde cult prevailing among Hungarian university youths. In his novel, the wealthy city-dweller furnishes his study with English furniture. One of the characters in the novel admits the great effect of English literature, philosophy and an aestheticism derived from books. In his reflection on a book published in England he says: "Our present life draws its greatest sensations from books."

English book design had the most direct effect. To mention just a few examples: the first outstanding Hungarian illustrated art nouveau book, Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch's and Sándor Nagy's work, displays inspiration by Walter Crane/shows up mainly Walter Crane's inspiration – even in those Körösfői-Kriesch illustrations which were influenced by ancient Greek vase paintings. Book illustrations by Sándor Nagy and his wife (Laura Kriesch) indicate a close connection with contemporary English and Scottish artists like Jessie M. King and Margaret MacDonald. Aubrey Beardsley also had a great influence after his 1907 Budapest exhibition. This is especially felt in Hungarian graphic art, in the works of Emil Sarkady, Lajos Kozma, Rezsó Mihály, Attila Sassy (Aiglon), Sándor Nagy and Gyula Tálos. With the establishment of the English connection there began a collection of masterpieces of contemporary English art. Thus, for instance, Kálmán Rozsnyay owned a significant English ex libris collection.[5] Andersen's *Fairy Tales* were published in Hungarian with Walter Crane's illustrations and the illustrations to Andrew Lang's "colour fairy tale books" were taken over with illustrations by H. J. Ford, M. M. Williams and Willy Pogány. Books published around 1910 reflect the influence of Lucien Pissarro's Eragny Press and of the Everyman Library Editions. The favourite motif of Lajos Kozma's illustrations, birds arranged in a delicate, decorative arch, is also characteristic of Voysey, like the other artists who were under the influence of Japanese engravings. Álmos Jaschik's book designs recall those of Laurence Housman's in several details.

A great number of Hungarian graphic artists studied in England. Elek Falus was a student of A. A. Turbayne. He designed books for Fischer Unwin and also fabric patterns for Liberty. He designed the cover for an edition of Oscar Wilde's *Fairy Tales.* Willy Pogány also studied in London, where Harrap and Co. published lavishly illustrated *Tale of Lohengrin.* Mihály Bíró, who later excelled in the design of posters, was able to study in Chipping Campden as the winner of one of The Studio's poster competitions. There he worked with C. R. Ashbee's Guild of Handicraft.[6] The figure in his famous poster, the "man with a hammer" appeared as a book illustration, in the English manner, too.

Art and Socialism

The volumes of The Studio were read in Hungary, and there appeared reports on Hungarian art in it as well. Likewise the journal *Magyar Iparművészet* (Hungarian Applied Arts) published articles on English artistic life. In 1898, the Museum of Applied Arts exhibited the prize-winning objects of the English National Competition for Art Schools. In 1895 and 1900, there was a Walter Crane, in 1907 an Aubrey Beardsley exhibition. At the 1901 spring exhibition of the Műcsarnok (Exhibition Hall), the works of Burne-Jones, Holman Hunt and Millais were also displayed. Their influence is visible into the 1910s.

The effect of Ruskin's and Morris' theory, however, came to be known much earlier and more extensively. Ruskin's book, *The Stones of Venice,* was translated by Sarolta Geőcze and published in 1896–98. A few years later Geőcze even wrote an essay under the title *Ruskin's Life and Message.* In 1904 *Unto This Last* was published in Hungarian and *Sesame and Lilies* in 1911. By 1923, his essays, *Lectures on Art,* could be read in Hungarian. Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch's pioneering essay *On Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites* was published in 1905. For Hungarians, William Morris was best known as a Socialist, as the author of *News from Nowhere.* The theory of aesthetic quality remoulding society and having an educational effect was present in the Hungarian socialist movement at the very beginning of the century and it was a keynote, a guiding principle, for Ervin Szabó's *Művelődési Kör* (Cultural Society) founded in 1902. Artists of the Gödöllő group following the Pre-Raphaelite movement also professed socialist ideals and from among then Sándor Nagy kept close connections with Ervin Szabó. On the occasion of Walter Crane's exhibition, Szabó wrote about the elevating effect of beauty on morals and the emotions, and of art as a form of liberalism.[7]

Walter Crane, Ruskin's and Morris' disciple, holds a distinguished position in the development of Anglo–Hungarian relations at the beginning of the century. During his 1900 exhibition he visited Hungary in person (from October 10th to November 5th). Among many other things, he visited Transylvania and the Kalotaszeg region. He made several drawings of Hungarian national costumes. Walter Crane played an important part in strengthening the cult of folklore at the beginning of the century. His excursion was organised by Kálmán Rozsnyay (whose pen-name was Sydney Carton), the Lon-

don correspondent for the Hungarian press, who knew the works of Rossetti, Whistler and Ruskin and was also passionately fond of Hungarian folk art.

As mentioned before, it was through his illustrations that Walter Crane exerted an influence on Hungarian artists. After Crane's visit to Hungary, and under his influence, Károly Kós set up a private home press in his hometown, Sztána. Crane's other works also had an impact. In their conjuring up of the past and compositional solutions, Körösfői-Kriesch's frescoes and some of Sándor Nagy's painted windows are closely related to Walter Crane's works. Crane was also welcomed as an artist representing socialist ideas. Sándor Nagy's drawings made for May Day and his painting Harvesters reflect the influence of Crane's works depicting social issues even though Nagy's work reflects Tolstoyan concepts, too.[8]

The caracteristic accompanying features of the development of the symbolist movement, the various mystical theories, also cropped up partly via English mediation. Annie Besant, editor of *The Theosophist Magazine,* gave a lecture while in Budapest in 1905. Theosophy had an impact on several artists, like Sándor Nagy and Róbert Nádler, who focused on English art in their works.

Mediators of English Aestheticism

While in symbolism the slavish imitation of external reality, the subject matter itself, was pushed into the background, the search for musical and an atmospheric quality as the form of expression moved into the foreground. The choice facing the artists at the turn of the century was whether or not to embrace a more stylized, decorative rendering. On reading the memoirs of Hungarian authors and artists it turns out that they got inspiration and encouragement mainly from French and English artists. In Paris József Rippl-Rónai and Sándor Nagy got acquainted with the works of the Pre-Raphaelites who were popular since 1850. English painters studying in Paris, who generally belonged to the second rank, brought knowledge of the aesthetic style and played an important mediating role.

The writer Zsigmond Justh enthused for The Pre-Raphaelites and Gustave Moreau and his English painter friend, Alastair Cary Elwes whose symbolic paintings still partly appeared in the guise of historicism. József Rippl-Rónai was introduced to the works of the American-born Whistler, who exploited both the English and the French painting traditions, by his Scottish painter friend, James Pitcairn Knowles.[9] Knowles was the son of a rich cloth manufacturer. His wood engravings and book illustrations show strong Japanese influence. József Rippl-Rónai set off on his own course under the influence of Whistler who popularized the Japanese style. His picture painted in 1889, Woman in the White Polka-Dot Dress, with its elongated form and the uniform grey tone can be traced back to the influence of Whistler and Japanese wood engravings. His oil paintings with thick contour lines show the characteristic marks of "cloisonnism", similar to the works of other artists belonging to the Nabis group. His painting, Woman with a Bird Cage (1892) is distinguished by its restrained use of colour,

and its stylized rendering. Concentration on inner-spiritual qualities through the complicated pattern of effects almost inextricably leads back to the English sources of the symbolist movement as well.

Lajos Gulácsy and Tivadar Csontváry Kosztka

An authentic Hungarian representative of symbolist painting who evolved from the romantic-historicism of the Pre-Raphaelites was Lajos Gulácsy.[10] One of the main inspirations of his works with their romantic escapism was supplied by Italian painting. He was introduced to works previous to Raphael's time on his trips to Italy in 1902 and 1903. His works, like those of the Pre-Raphaelite painters, were inspired by Dante and Botticelli. His timeless approach to history and aestheticism also make him resemble them. His painting, Supplication, is an interpretation of a Botticelli painting. Most of his paintings were conceived as poetic revivals of earlier paintings and past times. His works are primarily a formulation of the mental-spiritual state of perfection in the form of unattainable longing.

He painted the history of Paolo and Francesca's love, an episode from Dante's *Divina Commedia* so frequently presented in art since romanticism. His water colour is his way of portraying ideal love with its ethereal purity. Gulácsy's oeuvre is separated from the works of the Pre-Raphaelites, with their emphasis on pictoral craftsmanship not only by the years but also by his strongly subjective emotional experience. Sometimes his reliance on emotions leads to graphic stylisation and distortion. In its subject matter and atmosphere, in his works close to the Pre-Raphaelites, such as the Song of the Rose-Tree (1904) and Magic (1906–7) he depicts the ideal relationship between man and woman and beside the spiritual message he suggests an atmosphere of subdued sensuality.

The effect of Oscar Wilde's Salome interpretation, his vision of her as a sinister femme fatale, is reflected in Gulácsy's work depicting Salome. An Oscar Wilde play also provided the source for his painting A Florentine Tragedy (1910). It may have been Wilde's writings again which influenced his short stories, whose plots are on the borderline between fairy tale and realistic narrative, and the strange way the inhabitants of his imaginary town, Naconxipan, are portrayed in them.

Although Tivadar Csontváry's paintings belong chronologically to this period, they are unique in Hungarian artistic progress.[11] The works by him that could be regarded as art nouveau pieces are his weakest. His symbolic painting is a revival of the romantic tradition and the beginnings of surrealism. He combined the compositional method of the painters of panorama-views using a wide angle of incidence with a personal decorative variant of postimpressionism. From the English historical landscape painters Csontváry could have seen pictures by Turner and visionary landscapes by John Martin on his visit to England. But "the biblically inspired Martin, whose works are often based on the poetry of Milton, must have been alien to the Hungarian painter who interpreted the Bible in his own way".[12]

The Gödöllő Workshop

The influence which English art exerted on Hungary manifested itself in applied arts, and acknowledged their theoretical and practical significance. The Gödöllő Workshop was the closest follower of Ruskin's theories and the Arts and Crafts movement in Hungary. Contemporary reviews called them the "Hungarian Pre-Raphaelites", some of the time praising them and the other times reproving them.

The main likeness with the Arts and Crafts movement is their Gesamtkunstwerk ideal and the search for reviving ancient techniques. The workshop was organised around the weaving school as a centre, where various textile methods ranged from classical petit point enbroidery to folk weaving. Natural raw materials and vegetable dyes were used, just as Morris and some contemporary handicraft workshops used them. The leading masters, Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch and Sándor Nagy, tried their hands in several genres simultaneously; they made excellent stained glass windows, designed leather articles, carpets and tapestries and produced ceramic pieces and sculptures as well.

From among the contemporary societies following Ruskin and Morris, their social and cultural endeavours are perhaps most closely related to C. R. Ashbee's Guild of Handicraft. In 1902 Ashbee moved to Chipping Campden and in the same year Körösfői-Kriesch settled in Gödöllő. Ashbee was well known in Hungary. Ervin Battyány, whose book on anarchism was later illustrated by Körösfői-Kriesch and Sándor Nagy, visited Ashbee.[13] The Gödöllő group – as opposed to the British – relied on folk art which was also the inspiration for contemporary Polish, Finnish and Russian craft movements.

Artists of the Gödöllő workshop started developing the new art nouveau form of expression based on collected folk art. Contrary to their predecessors relying on historicism, they used motives of folk art not only as application, but as separate decorative element. It was in 1897 that they first formed an artistic association of Tolstoyan spirit in the town of Diód, in Transylvania. That was where they discovered the richness of the folk art of Kalotaszeg basin, its living handicraft trade. It was a painter friend, Percyval Tudor-Hart, born in Montreal and educated in London and Paris, who drew their attention to the specific opportunities lying in Ruskin's and Morris's ideals. Ever since romanticism, artists have been aware of folk art as the visual repository of the past. From there it was but one step to link folk art to Ruskin's ideal of medieval craftsmanship. This approach was further consolidated by Walter Crane's trip to Kalotaszeg and by the international appreciation of the values of Hungarian folk art. In the theoretical writings of the leading masters of the Gödöllő group Ruskin's medieval ideal town was enriched with the more rustic colours of the Transylvanian village communities.

The Gödöllő artists also reached back to medieval legends, fairy tales, the Bible and Greek mythology for topics. In their ballad interpretation they encountered elements of Christian liturgy and ancient belief, the frequent themes of symbolism and figures

of folk mythology.[14] They also reprocessed some topics from Hungarian romantic historical painting. In formulating a mythological ideal deviating from Viennese art nouveau, it was mainly the Pre-Raphaelites, Puvis de Chavannes and Axeli Gallen-Kallela, who were their models. Thus the Ancient Greek example appeared through English and French and not Austrian mediation.

From the point of view of form, Pre-Raphaelite effect primarily means an allegorical, metaphorical style, an often solemn tone and a decorativeness of graphic character. There are a few works showing direct influence: Körösfői-Kriesch's composition entitled The Ballad of Klára Zách belongs to these. Painted in 1911 in a Botticellian/Craneish(Cranian) idiom, it depicts an episode from Hungarian medieval history. (The story is well known from the ballad of János Arany and from historical paintings.)

The impact the Pre-Raphaelite masters had on their other works of art, primarily on stained glass designs, is also striking. It would be worth comparing their stained glass designs with those of contemporary English glass designers, for instance, Christopher Whall and his School, recently studied by Peter Cormack.[15] Although the stained glass window designs of the Pre-Raphaelites were among Sándor Nagy's and Körösfői-Kriesch's inspirational sources, they naturally developed much farther from them than the English masters, who had strong bonds with this native tradition. The Pre-Raphaelite example, as in the case of the Austrian Kolo Moser, the Polish Józef Mehoffer and Irish Harry Clarke inspired in each case strikingly individual works.

The furniture designs of the Gödöllő artists are strongly under English influence, especially Ede Thoroczkai Wigand's designs, who in the beginning belonged to their circle.[16] In the year 1901, in *The Studio,* the following appeared: "Yet there are in Hungary, as in other parts of continental Europe, some craftsmen whose feeling as to simplicity in design seem to be of true English descent. A good example of this at Budapest is found in the work of Mr. E. Wiegand (sic!), whose Study Hold-All is a piece of furniture which might have been planned by an English designer."[17] Among his works the narrow drawers in the work-desk designed for Sándor Nagy show a Glasgowian influence.

Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch and Sándor Nagy were also theoreticians and expounded their views on art in several articles and books. The way the ethical and the aesthetic spheres were combined can be traced back to the ideologists of Pre-Raphaelite movement in many aspects. "We are all his (Ruskin's) disciples, whether we read a single line by him or not. He is the source of this entire modern artistic movement, of this avalanche that may be growing", Körösfői-Kriesch wrote.[18] Körösfői-Kriesch emphasized two trains of ideas from Ruskin's writings, i.e. his idea of the artist's and his art's moral commitment, and the importance of restoring the universal role of art. Kriesch, like Morris, also defined art as the expression of pleasure experienced while producing the work of art.

Tolstoy was also one of their primary sources. Sándor Nagy and Jenő Henrik Schmitt, a neo-gnostic philosopher, elaborated the ideology of the "revolution starting from the inner self" which is akin to Tolstoy's idea of "inner revolution". In the works

of Sándor Nagy the symbol of the new self-aware human being was nakedness, the portrayal of people in the open air.

The concept of beauty of the Gödöllő masters, built on ethical foundations, seems to be in contrast to the Art for Art's sake concept. The specific decadent trait of aesthetics born at the end of the century, which discovered a secret hidden beauty in sin and professing martyrdom of sin, first worded by Baudelaire in *Fleurs du Mal,* is missing from their theories and from most of their works. The Gödöllő artists are representatives of "white symbolism" as opposed to "black symbolism"; for them mysticism does not mean following a romantic Satanism but the revival of Christian mysticism. From the two path of aestheticism they follow that of the romanticism of John Ruskin, which propagated the social usefulness of art, versus Walter Pater who was closer to the French "l'part pour l'art" and treated art as an abstraction from all that was banal and as essentially an insoluble mystery.

Like the other thinkers and artists of the turn of the century, they interpreted symbolism in their own individual way. As opposed to Babits they represented the Hungarian trend in their own fields, but they shared with Babits a view of symbolism as a movement of the widest scope, involving every significant aspect of life.[19] They both belonged to the same intellectual artistic milieu. For example they almost simultaneously discovered the poetry of Jenő Komjáthy. Babits wrote an essay on Komjáthy whom he regarded as a forerunner of Hungarian symbolism, and Sándor Nagy illustrated his poems.

For Ruskin's "all art is praise" and he presents the "ritual", the rules to be followed as well. The Gödöllő artists also described their artistic goals and aims with the help of biblical similies. Producing a work of art is never itself the goal for them, it is rather an inner instrument for development. The task of art is conveying ideals by portrayal. Creation is "transforming feelings into form", material into spirit and thus crossing into infinity.

The Gödöllő variant of fin-de-siècle philosophies also rests on moral and mystical foundations. Emancipated life and art, indeed the "art of life", is attained in the unity of art and ethical life. Beautification of life and the artistic creation of beauty emerged as a social demand; its utopian goal was the remoulding of humanity and the reform of Society via the individual. Their social idealism was tightly intertwined with aestheticism, their artistic ideals were condensed in the symbol of the triple unity of artist, prophet and teacher.[20]

Identification of Folk Art with Old Art in Architecture

Ödön Lechner was the first among Hungarian architects after the romantic period to place the search for a Hungarian national style at the centre of his work and to design buildings considered modern even when weighed against the standards of contemporary European architecture. (Thus Nikolaus Pevsner regarded him as a prominent art

nouveau artist.) Lechner's idea was that there existed no real Hungarian architectural style and therefore he applied motifs from India and the Far East which he considered related to Hungarian.

From 1907 onwards Thoroczkai Wigand worked in Transylvania, where, starting from the structural elements of medieval castles and the Kalotaszeg enclosed churches, he designed buildings that can be likened to contemporary Finnish architecture and the innovative works of Baillie Scott.[21] Thoroczkai Wigand and the "Youths" Károly Kós, Lajos Kozma, Béla Lajta, Dezső Jánszky, Dezső Zrumeczky, Dénes Györgyi and Valér Mende discovered in folk art a tradition of Hungarian architecture that could be followed not only in its decorative elements but in construction as well.[22] Their ideal was the architecture of the Kalotaszeg basin where peasant architecture and community life could be regarded as a continuation of the 14th and 15th centuries, as archaeological studies of villages proved.[23] Various historical styles, primarily Gothic and Renaissance, exerted a great influence on village art. Thus the pointed steeple and the turret of village churches date to the Gothic style. This tradition effected young artists starting their careers in the 1910s as a reverse process. Károly Kós, who was convinced of the importance of following medieval traditions, wrote in 1909, "The basis of a constructive folk art in Hungary is medieval art, and the basis for national art can only be folk art."

This dual-rooted approach wishing to unite medieval and folk art, became the basis of a new architecture, simple in its structure, which applied the characteristic solutions of Hungarian village architecture to satisfy the requirements of buildings in modern towns.

The theoretical and practical examples of the new Hungarian architectural ideal, which reflect German, Austrian and Finnish influence, also show the significant impact of the reformers of English house building. The English masters, while creating the aesthetics of a new architecture, wished not to break with traditions; W. R. Lethaby, for example, emphasized the value of old constructional principles, adjusting them to new conditions and ideals.[24]

Philip Webb, who realized Morris's ideals in architecture, used local styles in the formation of his "free style", while Thoroczkai Wigand and Károly Kós followed a similar trend. Thus English and Hungarian architecture, though from different roots, both reveal a great deal in common due to their adherence to functionalism and highlighting the building materials used. In the work of Károly Kós, beside the undeniable influence of Philip Webb and Finnish architects, a possibility for comparison arises with Baillie Scott, Ashbee, Lethaby and Edwin Lutyens. In the building designs of Lajos Kozma similar ideas appear to those of Webb, Voysey, George Devey, Lethaby. The example of English garden cities and suburbs was also a great inspiration to architects such as Aladár Árkay. "English cottage-style" buildings were often given Hungarian decorations. Architects trained in varying traditions came to similar, novel solutions. The studio-villa which István Medgyasszay designed for Sándor Nagy in Gödöllő (1904–06), even though enriched by a great number of elements borrowed from

folk art, is reminiscent of C. F. A. Voysey's studio house in Bedford Park in London (1891) with its marked cornices and air of simplicity.

Finally, we may conclude that it was those artists searching for ways of blending the modern with the traditional who were most inspired by contemporary British art. Chief among them was the Gödöllő group, who adhered to the dual principle of having both a national and a European style, and blended the return to classical antiquity and medieval mysticism with Hungarian mythological and historical themes and motifs.

Notes

1. See *Magyar művészet* (Hungarian Art) 1890–1919 (ed. Németh Lajos). Budapest, 1981.
2. István Gál: *Babits szerepe a magyarországi angol műveltségben* (Babits's Role in English-oriented Culture in Hungary). Kolozsvár, 1941. p. 3.
3. István Gál: *Crane Walter kalotaszegi rajzai* (Walter Crane's Drawings of Kalotaszeg). Ethnographia 1967/4, pp. 577–584.
4. Antal Szerb: Az intellektuális költő. *Gondolatok a könyvtárban* (The Intellectual Poet, from the volume Thoughts in the Library). Budapest, 1946, p. 203.
5. Piroska Weiner: Britische Exlibris: *Ars Decorativa* 4. Budapest, 1976, pp. 107–126.
6. Mihály Bíró: *Campdeni levél* (Letter from Campden). Magyar Iparművészet 1910, pp. 67–77.
7. Ervin Szabó: *Walter Crane: Egy szocialista művész* (Walter Crane: A Socialist Artist). Népszava 1900. oct. 20. p. 3.
8. One of the drawings of Walter Crane was published as a "memorial leaf" for May Day in 1903. Nóra Aradi: *Brit hatások a századeleji magyar plakátművészetben* (British Influences on Hungarian Art of Posters at the Turn of the Century). Előadás Edinburghban, 1984, kézirat (Lecture in Edinburgh, 1984, manuscript)
9. See Elek Petrovics: *Rippl-Rónai József.* Budapest é. n. (1942); István Genthon: *Rippl-Rónai.* Budapest, 1958; Mária Bernáth: *Rippl-Rónai.* Budapest, 1976.
10. See Béla Szij: *Gulácsy Lajos.* Budapest, 1979.
11. See Lajos Németh: *Csontváry Kosztka Tivadar.* Budapest, 1970.
12. Júlia Szabó: "Cedrus aeternitatis hieroglyphieum" (Iconology of a Natural Motif). *Acta Historiae Artium* 1981, p. 97.
13. In the Anglo–Hungarian relationship Ashbee has a special significance. He had some Hungarian clients and built a villa for Zsombor Szász in Budapest. Zsombor Szász: C. R. Ashbee és a Guild of Handicraft. *Magyar Iparművészet* 1910, pp. 42–66; Alan Crawford: *C. R. Ashbee.* New Haven and London, 1985, pp. 131–132, 273–274.
14. Katalin Gellér: Hungarian Stained Glass of the Early 20th Century. *The Journal of Stained Glass* Vol. XVIII No. 2. 1986–87, pp. 204–205.
15. Christopher Whall 1849–1924: *Arts and Crafts Stained Glass Worker.* William Morris Gallery, 17th November 1979 – 3rd February 1980 (Preface: Peter D. Cormack); I would like to thank Dr. Peter Cormack here for his help in reading and correcting this manuscript.
16. About the influence of English furniture from the 18th century see Hedvig Szabolcsi: Möbelkunst in Ungarn um die Wende des 18–19 Jahrhunderts. *Ars Hungarica* 1974 (Supplementum)
17. *The Studio* 15th October 1901, Vol. 24, No. 103, p. 209, (206).
18. Aladár Kriesch: *Ruskinról és az angol praerafaelitákról* (On Ruskin and the English Pre-Raphaelites). Budapest, 1905, pp. 8–9.
19. "... l'art pour l'art character does not imply – whether it concerns philosophy or poetry – that it should remain remote from the problems of life, that it ought not touch on burning, topical issues." Mihály Ba-

bits: Bergson: The two Sources of Morality and Religion. (Translated by Ria Julian). In: *Actualité de Babits.* Arion 14, Almanach International de Poésie. Budapest, 1983, p. 48.; see George F. Cushing: Mihály Babits: "All Great Poets are Decadent". *Hungarian Studies* 1986 Vol. 2, No. 1. pp. 47–63.

20. About the aesthetic and symbolism of the Gödöllő masters see Katalin Gellér: A gödöllői műhely esztétikai nézetei (The Aesthetic Views of the Gödöllő Workshop). *Ars Hungarica* 1976/2, pp. 227–241.; Élements symbolistes dans l'oeuvre des artistes de la colonie de Gödöllő. *Acta Historiae Artium* 1981/1–2, pp. 131–174.; Katalin Gellér–Katalin Keserü: *A gödöllői művésztelep* (The Gödöllő Workshop). Budapest, 1987.
21. A. S. Levetus compared Wigand's significance to Baillie Scott's. *Der Architect,* 1911.
22. See János Gerle: Architecture in Hungary at the Turn of the Century and the Research Related to it. In: *Art Nouveau/Jugendstil Architecture in Europe.* German Commission for Unesco, 1988.
23. In her study, Jolán Balogh endeavoured to apply the methods of the history of art for research on folk art. Jolán Balogh: Folk Art and Historical Styles. *Néprajzi Múzeum füzetei* No. 24. Budapest 1967.
24. See Alastair Service: *Edwardian Architecture.* London, 1977.

KRLEŽA AND HUNGARIAN MODERNISM*

MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM
University of California at Los Angeles, USA

In his recent work, *Nomadi Ljepote,* Aleksandar Flaker devotes an entire chapter to Krleza's Hungarian *veduta* as they appear in *Zastave.*[1] He points out that the Hungarian cityscapes appear as fragments shaping the visual conception of the text and express subjective relationships between characters and objects. Indeed, the hero, Kamilo, finds Hungary familiar because it is like Croatia:

> The entire state, with small oak trees and fields on the monotonous route Zagreb–Pest he knew by heart: all the cross-roads and the interseactions, all the plotted parcels and all the stations with their gardens of tulips, pansied pathways covered with white sand, grey-bearded clay dwarfs and shining glass in the rose-beds, with hanging baskets and red geraniums, with lime covered toilets and empty telegraph rooms...[2]

So it is today: the traveler barely notices that after Gyékényes, he has entered Hungary.

There is no need to recapitulate Krleža's biography here; we know that he was at home in Budapest and familiar with the Hungarian countryside, literary life and its protagonists. In his works he depicted a large number of the "moving spirits" of his time, and in *Banket u Blitvi* and *Zastave* they appear in a barely disquised manner.[3]

In *Zastave,* the editor-in-chief of *Flags of the 20th Century,* Ottokár Erdélyi, is modelled on Oszkár Jászi, the editor of Hungary's major sociological journal, *20th Century* (1900+). This publication, with a bourgeois radical profile, had contributors representing the political spectrum from center to left, including Marxists. The journal supported Endre Ady against the conservatives. (Ady, the most important poet of the Hungarian fin-de-siècle, did influence Krleža as we shall see.)

It is in this journal that Krleža's hero's response to an outrageous article on the *Croatian Question* which had appeared in the *Pester Lloyd*[4] is published. Kamilo declares that one cannot talk about parlamentarism in Croatia because the land is occupied by the Hungarians. Only when the counts and the entire feudal system disappear can one discuss a future victory of democracy in Croatia. This part of *Zastave* should be read together with another voluminous work in Hungarian, the autobiography of Anna Lesznai, entitled *Kezdetben volt a kert* (In the Beginning there was the Garden), treating the same period.[5] Lesznai, who in real life was the wife of Oszkár Jászi, appears in *Zastave* as Anna Boronkai. The negative picture drawn of Count A., anglo-

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

phile oligarch and politician, reflects Krleža's views on Count Andrássy who according to local gossip, was the real father of Anna Lesznai.

Kamilo formulates his views about Croatian rights in the Monarchy as follows:

> Today the Croat nation has no influence upon the so-called Hungaro-Croatian legal system... These laws were drawn unilaterally, and published in Hungarian only. No Croat legal experts participated in the project (I: 202).

No matter how "liberal", the Hungarian intellectuals cannot fully share Kamilo's concerns. (The same split is treated earlier in *Banket u Blitvi.*) *Zastave* is full of images familiar to the Hungarian reader. Foremost of them is the literary café, modelled on Paris. The *Stammcafé,* a sadly disappearing concept, gains a central role in all the novels depicting the last decades of the Monarchy. In Budapest, Krleža writes about the Croatian Café (the coffee shop of the Technical University), so nicknamed because the Croatian coat-of-arms decorating the wall above the cash register. This was the home away from home for students of many nationalities, each a Cassandra of the fate of his own country. Real and fictitious characters move about the place (Njegos, Meštrovic, but also Montaigne are discussed, the Illyrian movement is debated). Yet everywhere in the background the alienating, condescending voice of the host country is heard. Against this backdrop Krleža creates a polyphony of ideas which distinguishes his work from his Hungarian contemporaries.

Krleža's elegant irony creates distance and hilarity by presenting some stories without a comment:

After the second bottle of *Veuve Cliquot,* an Austrian officer turns out to be a Russin who proudly claims that his people fill the professional positions at the most prestigious American Universities and in Oxford. The Metropolitan Opera could not exist without Russin singers – all the *Ufa* stars are Russin, including Pola Negri. There are Russin futurists, Faust, Dante and Baudelaire translators (I, 717). Therefore: East and West – these are but the identity problems of small countries versus large countries.

In another chapter of *Zastave,* a typical conversation of young intellectuals is repeated. Names and movements are dropped by the dozen:

Munich Impressionism, Vienna Seccession, French plain air, Szinnyei, their Hungarian follower, Klimt, Klee, and Picasso are discussed. Central Europeans, permanently off-center, prove that they are *with it.*

Another familiar figure emerges in the background, the waiter who turns into a veritable *topos* in fiction about the Monarchy. In his physical description and literary role as mediator between classes and cultures, this waiter is the same in Krleža, Krúdy, Hašek and Musil, and he survives into the fiction of Hrabal, Danilo Kiš and Esterházy. He is the paradigmatic figure of the Monarchy, frequently multi-lingual, servile and aggressive at the same time, a reflection of the shallowness of the social values surrounding him, yet an unfailing conservator of bygone decades.

Much of Hungary is described in Krleža's fiction as landscape seen from a moving vehicle. Flaker points out that Krleža was one of the creators of railroad poetry, and in this context I would like to call attention to one of the earliest poems about travel-

ling by rail, written by Sándor Petőfi in 1848.[6] Here we might be able to establish a line of influence, since Krleža, in his interview with Matvejevič, said that Petőfi was his first and favorite Hungarian poet whose work he began to read at the age of 15.[7] Flaker rightly points out the kinetic character of a Pest daybreak in *Zastave,* as seen from a military transport train:

> Above the yellow-reddish horizon there appear first horizontal spots of yellow, as of light-yellow chalk, bluish lemon-like morning above gas-meters, hydrants and viaducts, over the piles of grey warm rocks, with the lyrical accompaniment of copper gongs (*Finale,* 5, 207).

The contrast between soft and sharp colors, and the geometrical combinations indeed remind us of the work of the constructivists and their preoccupation with the formal organization of planes, and the expression of volume in terms of industrial material and strong color. But a similar description can be found in *Banket u Blitvi,* from the static position of the window of the *Savoy Hotel:*

> The grey morning rain throws vaporous light on viaducts, gasmeters, hydrants and bridges (399).

While Kamilo sees the world in the semiotic signals of modern times, his father's eyes pick out the baroque traits of the same capital: bronze and marble lions, pavillions and turrets. He bears the carefree music of Lehár while Kamilo sees the "grey and misty Pest October dragging itself like a sick cat".

Krleža's young hero views Budapest as a spoiler, the end of simplicity and innocence:

> ...here in the Pannonian mud, a Great City is raising a lot of tumult, a phony Great City, a monumental gala performance in a circus (*Zov* 2, 198).

This picture of the Hungarian capital is perhaps influenced by Ady whom Krleža translated into Croatian and about whom he also wrote an important essay.[8]

Ady too hated the feudal manifestations of Hungary, yet at the same time, he never learned to love Budapest. He saw in it the "wicked city". In his *A Duna vallomásai* (Confessions of the Danube) the river looks contemptuously at the capital on its banks. In another poem "Zúg-zeng a jégcimbalom" (The Ice-Cimbalom Rings and Clangs, 1909), the dirty grey waves of the river are metaphors for the city's ugliness. When Kamilo leaves after his father's death, the train

> ...*turned and got lost* in the night, in the great Hungarian night with terrifying Danubian waters dark as pitch, with a locomotive wailing in the distance... (*Pokoj vječni* 5, 355).

Here I should mention that while Krleža's essay displays thorough knowledge of Ady's work, he merely follows the standard evaluation of Ady's oeuvre, labelling him a modernist most closely influenced by the French symbolists. A more independent critical approach could have provided a different reading, identifying the red thread of late Romanticism of which Krleža himself is not entirely free. He shares, however,

with Ady a "broad" view of the region in which the Danube connects the whole of Central Europe with the Balkans. As opposed to what Flaker claims, Krleža does *not* represent a different ideology. It was Ady who first sent out the message "The Danube and the Olt have one voice".[9] He was the only literary figure of his time entirely free of petty chauvinism. In describing Hungary as a land on which nothing healthy can grow, Krleža also borrowed the Pannonian mud or marcsland concept (a frequent metaphor in his poetry) from Ady.

In *Banket u Blitvi,* which I too believe was meant to be a satire of East European chaos,[10] Blitva and Blatvia allude to marshes (Blato) and so does the name of the village in the *Return of Filip Latinovič* (1932).

The first parts of *Zastave* and *Banket u Blitvi* are played out against the background of the disintegrating Monarchy with its extended fin-de-siècle, which lasted at least to 1914. This is a decadent, suffocating world in which a gigantic bureaucracy is engaged to patch together the ever widening gap between megalomaniac imperial dreams and glum reality. In the war and its aftermath, the Monarchy and with it an entire way of life came to an end. Musil, Ady, Csáth, Kafka, Hašek, and Krleža were prophetic invaders of that middle-class complacency which refused to see the writing on the wall. By destroying the make-believe harmony, their work gives artistic formulation to the real fears and anxieties of the period.

Yet in a number of these works the break with Romanticism remains incomplete – patriotism cannot be given up until the native country achieves independence, and this bars the full development of a Western-type modernism. This is also true for Krleza, especially in *Banket u Blitvi.* Nielsen is only partially a modern hero: his intentions and actions (his world view and behavior) are separated – thus demonstrating a break from the romantic stance. Yet this grand East European satire on the Pannonian marshland is flawed as *satire.* The genre is constantly invaded and subverted because of its national commitment. The same attitude is present in Hungarian literature of the period.

Ervin Sinkó who worked extensively on this period in Hungary and who wrote several penetrating essays on Krleža did not pay enough attention to these reversible similarities.

In *Banket* Nielsen, straight from the front – the time is 1916 – visits a "Hun" poet, Oktavian Desiderius Kronberg. "En famille", as two free men, they talk. But when Nielsen deplores the "Hun campaign against the Blitvian language" – his host becomes nervous, and impatiently moves the conversation away from the subject, and disapproving of his separatist efforts, he considers it high treason to fight against *Aragonia.* With condescending politeness Kronberg refers to the question of independence as mere "formalism" and asks whether the entire problem is really *so* important. The host presents his guest with his recent volume "Hunnic Accords" and dedicates it with the inscription: "Right or wrong, my country." Ten years later Nielsen is in exile but Kronberg appears in the encyclopaedias as someone who has consistently fought for his country's independence.

This conversation really took place. The other protagonist was Dezső Kosztolányi. Krleža also described this meeting in his diaries,[11] yet his entry has not been identified as the source of the episode in Yugoslav works. It is a sad commentary about our ignorance of each other's literature. It is even more sad that Kosztolányi, who excelled also as a translator, never rendered anything by Krleža in Hungarian.

I was planning to write about the Hungarian influences on Krleža's work, but the more I thought about it, the clearer it became that Hungary is simply a background and not an inspiration. Perhaps no two people shared more *subtext* in their culture than the Hungarians and the Croats. While all member-states in the Monarchy used German, Latinity remained pronounced in these two cultures (in Hungary against Austria, in Croatia against Hungary).

One of Krleža's early pieces "Magyar királyi honvéd novella" (1921) could have been written by any good Hungarian realist (the mode of expressionist visions of his *Croatian Rhapsody* are omitted here). The story's captain is a small cog in the Austrian war machine. There is no compassion there for the soldiers either – nothing but a fundamental transformation of society can change the world Krleža depicts. The piece has little to do with modernism.

The *texture* of *Zastave*'s language is also intimately familiar to the Hungarian reader because dialogues render the conversational style of the Croatian and Hungarian lesser Mobility and bourgeoisie in the first decades of the century perfectly. Similarly educated and reading the same German papers (primarily the *Pester Lloyd*), they mix the same foreign phrases and "bon mots" in their speech. They would all prefer to draw a "cordon sanitaire" around Serbia and paste on each toilet a slogan: "Hände waschen vor dem Essen, nach dem Stuhlgang nicht vergessen" (*Zastave,* I, 284).

They love their stable lifestyles and safely prearranged cultural surprises. The prototypical example for this convergence is the marriage connecting the Habdelič and Emericzy families:

> In this marriage two related souls united in the quotes of shared reading material, according to which Dante describes love as the supreme ruler of human fate, and Faust is a grand song reaching the pivotal heights of human intelligence... and so forth. (*Zastave,* I, 251).

The "intimate" knowledge of Goethe accompanies the husband even to the boudoir of his mistress where he muses: "– merkwürdig, dass ihn das Ewig-Weibliche bei seiner eigenen Frau eigentlich nie hinangezogen hat" (*Zastave,* 252). The same characters appear in the novels of Babits and Móricz. Krleža's Italian honeymooners (uttering the clichés about Leonardo, Raffael, and Canova) are exchangeable couples – no reader would notice the difference, if they popped up in contemporary Hungarian fiction.

Just as *parvenu* Hungarians degraded their own literature, the old lady in *Zastave* asks: "Who are this Matoš and that Kranjčevič?... Meinen Sie wirklich das wäre etwas?" (I: 231). As is known Krleža wrote on Kranjčevič's poetry.[12]

I wanted to present excerpts from *The Return of Filip Latinovič* and compare it to Hungarian works.

But there are *too many* similar descriptions of small town Sunday afternoons, and the same is true about the prototypical dinner party in Domačinski's vineyard in *The Edge of Reason* (1938). They all demonstrate the results of their shared history.

In conclusion, Krleža was not influenced by Hungarian literature in any measurable way. All works mentioned above are products of a shared civilization, even if the political objectives were oppositional. It is only sad that Krleža remained untranslated before 1945, and that his name does not appear even once in the most prestigious and modernist journal of Hungary, *Nyugat,* which during its 34 years of existence (1908–41), with the exception of a handful of translations of Jovan Dučić's poems (1932), never published a Southern Slav.

However, when summing up the work of Krleža during, or related to the first part of this century, I would be unwilling to claim him for modernism. In my view he suffered from the same debilitating issues of *national versus modern* as did his Hungarian colleagues. His oeuvre therefore remains bi-directional, often impairing the harmony or the profile of the individual piece.

Banket u Blitvi is perhaps the clearest example of this: naturalism, pathos, 19th century rhetorical devices impede the author's progress. Among his fiction, probably *Edge of Reason* bears most fully the distinctive features of a western-type literary modernism.

Banket u Blitvi appeared late in Hungary because of the rift between Tito and Stalin. Only *Zastave* was translated almost immediately. Still today Krleza's work reaches Hungary primarily through *FORUM,* the Hungarian-language publishers of *Novi Sad.* Let's hope that Central European *postmodernism* will fare better.

Notes

*This paper was presented at the *Eighth International Yugoslav Studies Seminar,* Los Angeles, January 25–28, 1990.

1. Aleksander Flaker, *Nomadi Ljepote; intermedijalne studie* (The Nomads of Beauty; Intermedial Studies), Zagreb, 1988, 326–33.
2. Miroslav Krleza, *Zastave* (Flags). First published in Hungarian, in the translation of Zoltán Csuka. Novi Sad, 1965 (Vols I–II). Later vols appeared in FORUM.
3. *Banket u Blitvi* (A Banquet in Blitva). Translated by János Herceg. Novi Sad, 1960.
4. A German language periodical published in Budapest (1853–1944).
5. *Kezdetben volt a kert* (In the Beginning There was the Garden), Budapest, 1960, 2 vols.
6. "Vasúton" (On the Train). First published in 1848.
7. Predrag Matvejevič, *Stari i' novi razgovori & Krležom* (Old and New Conversations with Krleža), Zagreb, 133.
8. "Madzarski lirik Andrija Ady," ("Hungarian Lyrical Poetry of Endre Ady"), *Eseji* (Essays), Zagreb, 1930, I, 95–119.
9. "Magyar jakobinus dala" ("Song of the Hungarian Jacobin"), first published in 1908.
10. For more on this, see György Spiró, *Miroslav Krleža,* Budapest, 1981, 259 and passim.
11. Quoted by Stanko Lasic, 122 and 127.
12. *Hrvatski revija,* 1931, 3: 137–58.

DIE WIEDERGEFUNDENE HEIDELBERGER BIBLIOTHEK VON GEORG LUKÁCS

JÚLIA BENDL

MTA Filozófiai Intézete, Budapest

Georg Lukács führte ein Leben, besonders bis 1918, in dessen Zentrum die Bücher bzw. die aus den Büchern entstehenden Werke standen. Aus seinen Briefen ist bekannt, daß er auf Reisen überall die Buchhändler besucht hat, um alte Bücher und Raritäten zu kaufen, und auf diese Weise hatte er im Laufe der Jahre eine wertvolle Bibliothek zusammengestellt, von der er schon 1911 schreiben konnte, daß es „eine sehr sorgfältig zusammengestellte Bibliothek von 1500 Bänden" sei. (Lukács' Brief an Irma Seidler am 2. 5. 1911. Lukács Archiv, Budapest) Zwischen 1912 und 1917 lebte Lukács mit kurzen Unterbrechungen in Heidelberg, und es ist unzweifelhaft, daß die wertvollsten und für ihn wichtigsten Bücher während dieser Jahre in seiner Nähe waren. Ende 1917 verließ er Heidelberg, aber eindeutig nicht in der Absicht, dorthin nicht zurückzukehren. Er wollte ja in Heidelberg habilitiert werden, hatte den dazu notwendigen Formalitäten Genüge geleistet, und besuchte im Zusammenhang mit seiner geplanten Habilitation Mitte 1918 mindestens einmal die Stadt. Als die Heidelberger Professoren nach monatelanger Debatte den Vorschlag von Prof. Domaszewski, dem neuen Dekan, akzeptierten und die Entscheidung faßten, Lukács' Gesuch nicht zurückzuweisen, sondern ihn aufzufordern, seinen Habilitationsantrag zurückzuziehen, antwortete Lukács postwendend am 16. 12. 1918 mit den folgenden Worten: „Mein Gesuch zur Habilitierung in Heidelberg ziehe ich ... zurück, da ich mich der ungarischen Regierung zur Verfügung gestellt habe, und in verschiedenen Kommissionen so intensiv beschäftigt bin, daß ich in absehbarer Zeit sowieso unmöglich nach Heidelberg kommen könnte." (Archiv der Universität Heidelberg)

Die schnell aufeinanderfolgenden Ereignisse der ungarischen Revolution und Lukács' Teilnahme an den revolutionären Kommissionen haben ihn tatsächlich daran gehindert, auch nur kurz nach Heidelberg zurückzukehren, so stellte er seine Freunde – wahrscheinlich nach dem Sturz der ungarischen Räterepublik – vor die Aufgabe, seine in Heidelberg gebliebenen Bücher einzupacken und aufzubewahren. Lukács' Vater, keinesfalls einverstanden mit der revolutionären Tätigkeit seines Sohnes, hat am 19. August 1919, um den Zeitpunkt der völligen Niederlage der ungarischen Räterepublik, Lukács' früheren Freund und Patron, Prof. Eberhard Gothein brieflich gebeten, sich um die Sachen seines Sohnes zu kümmern: „Nun weiß ich nicht, ob mein Sohn irgendwie verfügt hat über seine dortige Wohnung, seine Mobilien und seine Bibliothek. Mein Anliegen gienge nun dahin, Sie möchten, sehr geehrter Herr Professor die außerordentliche Liebenswürdigkeit bekunden, sich um diese Angelegenheit zu interessiren und

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

das Ihnen zweckdienlich Erscheinende zur Sicherung und Bergung dieser Werthe verfügen." Josef von Lukács schließt seine „durch Freundes-Hand" gesandten Zeilen mit den Worten: „Ich vermag den Gedanken nicht los werden – wie anders hätte sich wohl sein Schicksal gestaltet, wenn im vorigen Sommer die Docentur hätte jurificiert werden können!" (Handschriftenabteilung der Universität Heidelberg)

Gothein mußte sich aber nicht um die hinterlassenen Sachen von Lukács kümmern. Offenbar hatten die Freunde alles erledigt, und 1930, als Karl Mannheim, der bis dahin in Heidelberg Extraordinarius gewesen war, nach Frankfurt umzog, nahm er höchstwahrscheinlich auch Lukács' Bücher in Kisten gepackt mit. Anfang 1933 mußte Mannheim Frankfurt verlassen und zog nach London, ohne Lukács' Kisten. Ebenfalls Anfang 1933 konnte der in Emigration zu dieser Zeit in Deutschland lebende Lukács nach Frankfurt fahren; er schrieb darüber 1948 Max Horkheimer die folgenden Zeilen: „Als ich 1933 in Frankfurt war, hatte ich vor, die Kisten aufmachen zu lassen und einiges Wichtige für mich mitzunehmen. Damals wußte Leo Löwenthal... noch genau, wo die Kisten zu finden sind, da jedoch, wie Sie sich vielleicht erinnern, gerade in diesen Tagen Hitler zur Macht kam, mußte ich beschleuningt abreisen, so daß dieser Plan nicht verwirklicht werden konnte." (Brief an Max Horkheimer, 28. 4. 1948, Lukács Archiv, Budapest) Im selben Brief erwähnt Lukács auch, daß er seine Bücher seit 15 Jahren als verloren betrachtet.

Zu Lukács' Lebzeiten und auch nach seinem Tode haben einige Forscher versucht, diese Bibliothek aufzufinden, sie haben aber meistens beim Insititut für Sozialforschung nachgefragt, obwohl das Haus und die Sachen des Institutes 1933 vollständig beschlagnahmt bzw. zerstreut worden waren. Da im heutigen Institut – laut der Information der dortigen Bibliothekarin – kein Hinweis auf Lukács' Bücher zu finden ist, sind auch diese Versuche erfolglos geblieben.

Im August 1988 kam Hanno Loewy aus Frankfurt mit der Nachricht nach Budapest, daß er in der Universitätsbibliothek einige Balázs-Bücher mit Widmungen an Lukács gefunden habe, sowie ein Exemplar von Lukács' 1918 erschienenem Buch über Balázs, ebenfalls mit einer Widmung – von Lukács an die erste Frau von Balázs, Edit Hajós. Als ich die Möglichkeit bekam, mit einem Stipendium nach Deutschland zu fahren, habe ich mich entschieden, neben Heidelberg auch in Frankfurt einen Monat zu verbringen, jedoch mit keiner großen Hoffnung, dort noch etwas zu finden. In der UB Frankfurt konnte ich im Katalog die vom Herrn Loewy entdeckten Bücher tatsächlich finden, und so fragte ich bei der Information, was man über die Signatur der betreffenden Bücher (z. B. Aeul 1939/211) wissen kann. So bin ich in der Sammlung Frankfurt gelandet, um etwas über die Geschichte der Rothschildschen Sammlung zu erfahren, da die Signaturen der Balázs-Bücher charakteristische „Rothschildsche Signaturen" sind.

Die Rothschildsche Sammlung bestand seit Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts als eine Sammlung von Antiquitäten und Kunstwerken. 1888 hatte Hannah Louise Rothschild nach englischem Muster eine öffentliche Bibliothek gegründet, als Ergänzung zu den anderen Frankfurter Bibliotheken, vor allem für Kunst- und Musikwissenschaft, neuere Philologie, Volkskunde und vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft. Nach 1927, als die

Bibliothek aus finanziellen Gründen nicht mehr als Stiftung aufrechterhalten werden konnte, wurde sie mit dem neuen Namen „Bibliothek für neuere Sprachen und Musik" als selbständige Einheit der Stadtbibliothek eingegliedert. Nach 1933 hat man in der Rothschildschen Sammlung jene Literatur angehäuft, die „ideologisch abgesondert" werden sollte – also einen bedeutenden Teil der beschlagnahmten Bücher. 1943–44 hatte die damalige Universitätsbibliothek große Verluste erlitten, so wurden gegen Ende des zweiten Weltkrieges die Stadtbibliothek und die ehemalige Rothschildsche Sammlung mit der technischen Bibliothek vereinigt, und so ist die heutige Universitätsbibliothek entstanden. Im Sommer 1945 benutzte man die Sammlung Rothschild als „Collecting point" für Bücher, welche Rosenberg früher für das geplante „Institut zur Erforschung der Judenfrage" beschlagnahmt hatte und welche man nun den früheren Besitzern zurückerstatten wollte. Aus der Geschichte der Sammlung Rothschild ist es eindeuting, daß es zahlreiche Möglichkeiten gegeben hat, in den Besitz von Lukács-Büchern zu kommen – sei es als Geschenk von jemandem, der sich zur Emigration entschlossen hatte, als beschlagnahmtes Gut, oder als Teil einer Sammlung, welche dem früheren Besitzer zurückgegeben werden sollte aber nicht zurückgegeben werden konnte.

Da man in der Sammlung Rothschild die Balázs-Bücher Ende der dreißiger, Anfang der vierziger Jahre katalogisiert hatte, mußte nun die Frage gestellt werden, ob die „Akzessionsjournale" aus dieser Zeit in der Universitätsbibliothek noch vorhanden sind. Zum Glück konnte ich sie mit Hilfe der Bibliothekare bekommen, und ich konnte in diesen Listen zahlreiche Bücher finden, deren Erscheinungsjahr, Thema oder Autor sehr gut in den Interessenkreis des jungen Lukács paßte. Ich habe von diesen Büchern täglich manche bestellt und daneben im Katalog immer wieder solche Autoren und Bücher gesucht, von denen ich als Lukács-Forscherin wissen konnte, daß der junge Lukács mit ihnen etwas zu tun gehabt hat.

Inzwischen habe ich das System der Rothschildschen Katalogisierung kennengelernt. Glücklicherweise sind im Katalog alle Bücher der ehemaligen Rothschildschen Sammlung bis heute erkennbar. Die Signatur beginnt mit Buchstaben, von denen die folgenden für Lukács' Bibliothek wichtig sind:

AeuL – außereuropäische, bzw. nicht indogermanische Literatur
Bio – Biographien
DL – deutsche Literatur
EL – englische Literatur
FL – französische Literatur
GW – gesammelte Werke gemischten Inhalts
IL – italienische Literatur
Lg – Literaturgeschichte verschiedener Völker
MNw – Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften
Mus – Musik und Theater
NL – nordische Literatur
SlL – slawische Literatur
SpL – spanische Literatur

Die Philologie ist unter der Signatur Phll und die Philosophie unter Phs zu finden. Ab Ende der dreißiger Jahre sind auch die Nummern charakteristisch – vorne steht die Jahreszahl der Katalogisierung, danach eine dreistellige Nummer. Diese Methode konnte der Bibliothek ermöglichen, die nicht mehr voraussehbare Menge der Bücher aufzuarbeiten. In den Büchern ist noch eine andere Nummer zu finden, die mit der Nummer im Akzessionsjournal identisch ist. Z. B. im Buch von Georg Brandes über Kierkegaard sind die Nummern NL 1941/234 bzw. 39.1135 zu lesen – in diesem Falle hatte es zwei Jahre gedauert, bis man das Buch in der Bibliothek katalogisierte.

Die Akzessionsjournale führte man sorgfältig; in diesen Listen steht neben Autor und Titel eines jeden Buches im allgemeinen auch das Erscheinungsjahr sowie die Herkunft und der Preis. Die Bibliothek hatte die beschlagnahmten Bücher vom Reichserziehungsministerium bekommen – und zwar kostenlos. In diesen Listen habe ich aus der Zeit um die Wende der dreißiger/vierziger Jahre ziemlich viele Bücher gefunden, welche gut in den Interessenkreis des jungen Lukács passen. Nachdem ich die „verdächtigen" Bücher aus den Akzessionsjournalen notiert hatte, versuchte ich diese im Katalog zu finden – in den meisten Fällen mit Erfolg. Dabei war mir die bis heute erkennbare Signatur der Rothschildschen Sammlung eine große Unterstützung. Langsam mußte ich auch manches lernen: z. B. daß ich die Bücher von ungarischen Autoren sowohl bei dem Familiennamen als auch bei dem Vornamen suchen mußte; die deutschen Bibliothekare konnten anscheinend nicht entscheiden, welcher z. B. bei dem Namen Marcell BENEDEK der Familienname ist, so konnte ich sein Lukács gewidmetes Buch unter seinem Vornamen finden (in der Bibliothek sind auch richtig katalogisierte Bücher von ihm). Die bestellten Bücher habe ich alle sorgfältig durchblättert, in der Hoffnung, etwas zu finden, was mir weiterhelfen kann, was mir bestätigen könnte, daß ich an der richtigen Stelle forsche. Mit meiner Ausdauer konnte ich die Bibliothekare davon überzeugen, daß ich meine Aufgabe ernst nehme, und so hielt der eine Bibliothekar aus der Sammlung Frankfurt im untersten Keller Umschau; es war mir ja noch nicht erlaubt, die Bücher dort anzuschauen, wo sie aufbewahrt werden. Er fand neben den von mir schon bestellten Balázs-Büchern ein Buch, ebenfalls mit einer ungarischen Widmung an Lukács (ich hatte es früher vergebens im Katalog gesucht), sowie ein Buch mit einem Exlibris von „Georg von Lukács".

In manchen von mir bestellten Büchern wurde ich auf ein Zeichen aufmerksam (z. B. L: 327), das keine „offizielle" Eintragung eines Bibliothekars zu sein schien, und die Zuständigen der Universitätsbibliothek konnten mir über diese Zeichen auch keine Auskunft geben. An einem Tag bestellte ich Bücher von Ben Jonson und Samuel Johnson und fand drei aufeinanderfolgende Nummern in diesen Büchern: L: 344, 345 und 346. Am selben Tage stieß ich in der Sammlung für Musik und Theater auf ein Buch von Rudolf Kassner, dessen Inhaltsverzeichnis mit Lukács' Handschrift im Buch zu lesen ist.

Dies waren endgültige Zeichen für mich, auf die richtige Spur gekommen zu sein, und so konnte ich mit der „Katalogisierung" der Lukács-Bibliothek beginnen. Sehr viel hat mir dabei die Tatsache geholfen, daß die Bücher der ehemaligen Sammlung Rothschild – mit Ausnahme der Bücher über Musik und Theater – noch immer als eine Ein-

heit aufbewahrt werden. Um diesen Zeitpunkt habe ich die Erlaubnis erhalten, mit Begleitung im untersten Keller der Universitätsbibliothek Umschau zu halten. In ziemlicher Eile konnte ich den Keller durchsuchen und so habe ich zahlreiche Bücher, nachweisbar aus der Bibliothek des jungen Lukács, gefunden. Bei einigen Büchern beweist ein Exlibris mit Lukács' Namen, daß sie aus seinem Besitz stammen. Das eine Explibris stammt aus den ersten Jahren des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts und nennt Lukács' Namen ungarisch (es ist das Werk von Álmos JASCHIK, Grafiker und nach 1907 Kunstlehrer in Budapest, in den ersten Jahren des Jahrhunderts gehörte er zum weiteren Freundeskreis von Lukács). Das andere dürfte um 1912–14 entstanden sein und nennt den Besitzer „Georg von Lukács". Der Stilrichtung nach kann das frühere dem ungarischen Jugendstil zugeordnet werden, das andere weist keine eindeutigen Merkmale irgendeiner Stilrichtung auf.

Letzten Endes handelt es sich um etwa 100 Bücher, die nachweisbar aus Lukács' Besitz stammen. Als Beweis betrachte ich die mit Bleistift in alphabetischer Reihenfolge geschriebenen Zeichen hinten im Buch, eine Widmung oder ein Exlibris, bzw. solche Eintragungen, die eindeutig als Lukács' Handschrift identifiziert werden können (z. B. im Buch von Georg Brandes über Kierkegaard). In der Bibliothek des jungen Lukács ist Nr. 1 die Gesamtausgabe von Achim von Arnim, und am Ende der Liste stehen Christoph Martin Wielands gesammelte Werke und Young mit seinen „Night-Thoughts". Zwischen diesen Endpunkten entspricht die Numerierung annähernd der alphabetischen Reihenfolge, welche aber mit der „offiziellen", in den Bibliotheken üblichen Reihenfolge nicht immer identisch ist. Leider kann man in mehreren Fällen nur die Spuren ehemaliger Eintragungen sehen, da irgendwer einmal manche Bücher sorgfältig „gesäubert" hat. Die mit Bleistift geschriebenen Eintragungen von Lukács' Hand müssen selbstverständlich noch aufgearbeitet werden, dies konnte ich in der kurzen Zeit meines Frankfurter Aufenthaltes natürlich nicht leisten. Mir hat die Zeit kaum dazu gereicht, einen Großteil des Kellers zu durchsuchen. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, daß man unter den Büchern noch welche aus Lukács' Besitz finden könnte. Ein Teil der Bücher des jungen Lukács (z. B. die Bücher über Philosophie) wird anscheinend in einer anderen Bibliothek in Frankfurt aufbewahrt. Dies könnte eine Erklärung für die merkwürdige Tatsache sein, daß ich kein Buch über Philosophie aus Lukács' Besitz gefunden habe. Aufgrund der gefundenen Bücher (etwa 260 Bände) ist es wahrscheinlich, daß Lukács' Heidelberger Bibliothek im Jahre 1918 aus etwa 2000 Bänden bestand.

Als Kontrolle meiner Arbeit habe ich in den letzten Tagen meines Aufenthaltes in Frankfurt die von mir gefundenen und als Lukács' ehemaligen Besitz identifizierten Bücher aus den Akzessionsjournalen herausgesucht, und es stellte sich heraus, daß insgesamt zwei Bücher nicht vom Reichserziehungsministerium, sondern von einer anderen Frankfurter Bibliothek in die ehemalige Rothschildsche Sammlung gelangt sind. Da aber in diesen Büchern kein einziges Zeichen auf eine frühere Bibliothek hinweist, kann mit Recht angenommen werden, daß entweder die Eintragung in der Liste falsch ist oder daß die Bibliothekare noch vor Inbesitznahme der Bücher bemerkt haben, daß

diese bei ihnen überflüssig sind und sie daher weitergaben. Das war, laut der Auskünfte der heutigen Bibliothekare, damals durchaus üblich.

Neben den eindeutig identifizierbaren Büchern habe ich auch fragwürdige gefunden, z. B. Gundolfs Heft aus 1911 (Hölderlins Archipelagus), auf dessen Titelblatt die Worte „Mit bestem Dank!" zu lesen sind – das Heft wurde aber neu gebunden, so fehlt das letzte Blatt mit dem eventuellen Zeichen von Lukács. Die Bleistiftzeichen im Heft sind zwar verdächtig, aber ich konnte sie nicht als eindeutige Beweise betrachten. Ähnlich ist der Fall von Matthew Arnolds Essays und von Ernst Dowsons Gedichtband. Es gibt auch einige Bücher mit dem Zeichen x:..., von denen z. B. das 1912 veröffentlichte Buch von E. A. Poe (Novellen des Todes) sowie Chambers's Biographical Dictionary sehr gut in die Numerierung der Lukács'schen Bibliothek passen würden. In der Frankfurter Universitätsbibliothek gibt es auch einen Sonderabdruck von Lukács' Die Theorie des Romans, aus dem Jahre 1916. Da man das Heft irgendwann neu gebunden und bis zu den siebziger Jahren frei verliehen hat, sind daraus alle Zeichen, die eine Identifizierung ermöglichen würden, verschwunden. Trotzdem bin ich sicher, daß es einmal das Exemplar von Lukács war.

In der Frankfurter Universitätsbibliothek habe ich zu meiner großen Überraschung auch ein Buch aus dem Besitz von Lukács' Vater gefunden, mit dem Stempel des Besitzers (Ludwig HEVESI, Wiener Totentanz, 1899). Die ausradierten, aber noch erkennbaren Zeichen weisen darauf hin, daß Georg Lukács das Buch gelesen hat, insbesondere die Seiten über Hans Makart. Dieses Buch kommt aber nicht vom Reichserziehungsministerium, sondern stammt als Geschenk aus dem Besitz eines Herrn Wunderlich.

Zu der Ausgangsfrage zurückkehrend, ob die Bücher aus Lukács' Besitz etwas mit dem Institut für Sozialforschung bzw. mit dessen beschlagnahmten Büchern zu tun haben, konnte ich in keinem einzigen Buch, das als Lukács' Besitz identifiziert werden konnte, irgendeinen Hinweis auf das Institut finden. Dies schließt natürlich nicht aus, daß die Bücher von Lukács, eventuell in Kisten gepackt, im Gebäude des Instituts aufbewahrt wurden, als man das Haus mit allen Büchern beschlagnahmte. In einem Buch, Suares' französischem Werk über Dostojewski, habe ich eine Karteikarte gefunden, auf deren Rückseite die Angaben des Buches aus Lukács' Besitz notiert sind. Das auf der Karteikarte stehende Buch ist 1926 erschienen, und der Zettel kann, laut meinen in Frankfurt erhaltenen Informationen, keinesfalls aus dem Institut für Sozialforschung stammen. Woher er stammt, konnte ich nicht ermitteln, jedenfalls höchstwahrscheinlich aus einer „linksgerichteten" Bibliothek.

Die Bedeutung der wiedergefundenen Bücher des jungen Lukács braucht nicht lange erörtert werden. Als gewesene Mitarbeiterin des Budapester Lukács-Archivs und als Forscherin des jungen Lukács kann ich nur behaupten, daß diese Bücher sowohl bei den neueren Ausgaben seiner Werke als auch bei der Erforschung der Entstehungsgeschichte und eventuell auch für die Lukács-Biographie aufschlußreich werden können.

Mein Dank gebührt den hilfreichen Bibliothekaren der Universitätsbibliothek Frankfurt, insbesondere den Mitarbeitern der Sammlung Frankfurt, die meine Arbeit – trotz ihrer anfänglichen Skepsis – mit viel Geduld unterstützt haben.

Zu der Liste der Bücher ist eine kurze Erklärung nötig. Da es sich teilweise um sehr alte Bücher handelt, welche z. T. nur gewaltsam den heutigen Regeln der Katalogisierung angepasst werden können, habe ich die alte Form der Titel, der Namen der Autoren und der Erscheinungsorte beibehalten.

Um die Tatsache anschaulich zu machen, daß die gefundenen Bücher in einer annähernd alphabetischen Reihenfolge als Lukács' Bibliothek numeriert sind, habe ich bei jedem Titel den Namen oder das Wort hervorgehoben, welches bei Lukács' Alphabet maßgebend war.

Zu den Widmungen:

Gyuri – ist die geläufigste ungarische Koseform von György (Georg);

Béla Balázs ist ein Schriftstellername, er hieß ursprünglich Herbert Bauer;

Edit (Edit Hajós) war die erste Frau von Balázs, die auch unabhängig von ihrem Mann mit Lukács gut befreundet war;

Marci ist die Koseform von Marcell.

Liste der Bücher in der Frankfurter Universitätsbibliothek, aus dem Besitz von Georg Lukács

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
DL 1939/225	39.120	Ludwig Achim von ARNIM: Sämtliche Werke. Hrsg. W. Grimm. Berlin 1839–48, Band 1–12, 18–207+3 Bände	L:1[a–l/o–q]
EL 1939/263	38.1938	An eighteenth Century Anthology with an introduction by Alfred AUSTIN. London, o. J.	L:43
EL 1938/291	38.1503	The Lyric Poems of BEAUMONT and Fletcher, ed. by. E. Rhys. London 1897	
FL 1940/258	39.1146	BENEDEK Marcell: Victor Hugo. Budapest 1912 Widmung: Gyurinak, igaz barátsággal Marci. 1912 márc. (Für Gyuri mit aufrichtiger Freundschaft Marci. März 1912)	L:47 (?) (neugebunden)
FL 1939/218	38.1757	Oeuvres de Nicolas BOILEAU, tome 1–3. A la Haye 1722	L:52[a–c]
Lg 1940/209	38.1499	Principes de la littérature par M. l'Abbé BATTEUX, tome 1–6. Paris 1777	L:53[a–e]
Lg 1940/209	38.1499	Suite des principes de littérature...par l'Abbé BATTEUX. Paris 1788	L:55[f]
IL 1939/204	38.1739	Giovanni BOCCACCIO: Il filocopo. Vinegia 1551	L:57
IL 1939/210	38.1740	Due illustri prose di messer Giovanni BOCCACCIO. Firenze 1826	L:52 (8?)
SpL 1938/202	38.1831	Rudolf BEER: Spanische Literatur (Sammlung Göschen). Leipzig 1903, Band 2 (auf Seite 52 und hinten Lukács' Handschrift)	L:72[b]

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
NL 1941/234	39.1135	Georg BRANDES: Sören Kierkegaard. Leipzig 1879 (auf der inneren Seite des Umschlags Lukács' ungarische Anmerkungen)	
EL 1939/234	38.1490	C. F. Tucker BROOK: The Tudor Drama. London–Boston–New York 1912	L:76
AeuL 1939/211	39.1035	BALÁZS Béla: Lélek a háborúban (Seele im Krieg). Gyoma 1916 Widmung: Gyurinak szeretettel Herbert. Budapest 1916 húsvét (Für Gyuri herzlich Herbert. Budapest 1916 Ostern)	L:88
EL 1941/325	38.1936	John BUNYAN: The Pilgrims Progress... (The Temple Classics). London 1899	L:93
AeuL 1941/228	39.1036	BALÁZS Béla: Tristan hajóján (Auf Tristans Schiff). Gyoma 1916 Widmung: Gyurinak Herbert. Budapest 1916 december (Für Gyuri Herbert. Budapest, Dezember 1916)	(neugebunden)
AeuL 1941/225	39.1034	BALÁZS Béla: Misztériumok (Mysterien). Budapest 1912 Widmung: Gyurinak elsősorban első könyvemet, melyet egész súlyának alája merek fektetni. Herbert. Budapest 1912 dec. 1. (Für Gyuri in erster Linie mein erstes Buch, das ich seinem ganzen Gewicht zu unterwerfen wage. Herbert. Budapest, I. Dez. 1912)	L:105
AeuL 1941/202	39.1033	BALÁZS BÉLA: Doktor Szélpál Margit (Fräulein Doktor). Budapest 1909 Widmung: Gyurinak – Herbert és Lukács Györgynek – Balázs Béla, egyformán szeretettel és egy sorszerű összetartozás érzésével. Budapest 1909 jún. 20. (Für Gyuri – Herbert und für Georg Lukács – Béla Balázs, gleichermaßen herzlich und mit dem Gefühl einer schicksalsmäßigen Verbundenheit. Budapest, 20. Juni 1909)	L:111
EL 1939/210	38.1933	The Canterbury Poets, ed. by William Sharp. The Poetical Works of Thomas CHATTERTON. London (um 1909) (gekauft in der Buchhandlung von Zsigmond Deutsch, Budapest...)	L:122
Lg 1939/222	38.1564	COLERIDGE's Essays and Lectures on Shakespeares. (Everyman's Library). London–New York o. J.	L:134
DL 1939/315	38.1576	Thomas CARLYLE: Essays on the Greater German Poets and Writers. London o. J.	L:136
Lg 1941/248	38.1563	Samuel Taylor COLERIDGE: Biographia Literaria London–New York 1908	L:138
Lg 1939/210	38.1537	COLERIDGE's Literary Criticism, with an introduction by J. W. Mackail. London 1908	L:139
FL 1940/265	38.1776	F. Jean CARTHENY: Le voyage du chevalier errant. Anvers 1594. Ex libris Georg von Lukács	L:145

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
Lg 1938/224	38.1509	John W. COUSIN: A Short Biographical Dictionary of English Literature (Everyman's Library). London–New York 1910	L:149
IL 1939/207	38.1738	Il cortegiano del conte Baldessar CASTIGLIONE. Vinetia 1562	L:150
EL 1939/216	38.1770	The Poetical Works of William CONGREVE. London o. J.	L:159
EL 1939/244	38.1507	Essays of John DRYDEN, selected and ed. by W. P. Ker, vol. 1–2. Oxford 1900	L:170[a–b]
FL 1939/208	38.1772	Oeuvres de J. F. DUCIS. Band 2 und 4. Paris 1830	L:176[b, d]
DL 1939/237	38.1572	Paul ERNST: Manfred und Beatrice. Berlin 1913	L:209
EL 1941/348	39.1107	The Temple Dramatists. EDUARD The Third, ed. by G. L. Moore Smith. London 1897	L:211
IL 1938/246	38.1590	Delle Opere dim. Agnolo FIRENZUOLA FIORENTINO, vol. 1–2. Firenze 1723	L:2 ..
GW 1938/211	38.1498	Oeuvres de Monsieur de FONTENELLE, tome 1–11. Paris 1766	L:213[a–k]
SpL 1939/204	38.1767	Les Aventures plaisantes de GUSMAN d'Alfarache, vol. 1–2	L:245[a]
		London 1783 (gekauft bei Berman und Altmann, Wien...)	246[b]
GW 1939/205	38.2020	Correspondance littéraire philosophique et critique par le Baron de GRIMM et par Diderot. Paris 1813 1 partie: tome 1–6, 2 partie: tome 1–5, 3 et 4 partie tome 1–5	L:247[a...]
Lg 1939/202	38.1973	Zeitgenössische Dichter. Übertragen von Stefan GEORGE, Band 1. Berlin 1905	L:261
EL 1941/339	38.1577	GREENE's Selimus, ed. with a preface... by A. B. Grosart (The Temple Dramatists). London 1898	L:269
IL 1938/234	38.1588	Cintio GIRALDI: Ovvero Hecatommithi. Vinegia 1574	L:277
IL 1938/229	38.1463	Carlo GOLDONI: Collezione completa delle commedie, tomo 1–30 (Doppelbände) Prato 1819–1829	L:279[a–p]
IL 1938/230	38.1465	Carlo GOLDONI: Collezione di tutti drame e opere diverse, tomo 1–16. Prato 1823–1827 (Doppelbände)	L:280[a–h]
IL 1938/231	38.1466	Memoire di Carlo GOLDINI, tomo 1–3. Prato 1829–1830	L:280(A)?
DL 1938/690	38.1972	Friedrich HEBBEL: Sämtliche Werke, Tagebücher 1835–1863, Zweite Abteilung, Hrsg. R. M. Werner, Band 1–4. Berlin 1903 (im Band 1, 2 und 3 Ex libris Lukács György)	L:284[aa–dd]
DL 1938/690	38.1972	Friedrich HEBBEL: Sämtliche Werke, Briefe 1829–1862, Dritte Abteilung, Hrsg. R. M. Werner. Berlin 1904–1907	L:284[aaa–hhh]
DL 1941/712	39.1140	Moritz HEIMANN: Joachim von Brandt. Berlin 1908	L:327
EL 1938/301	38.1562	Characters of Shakespeare's Plays by William HAZLITT (Everyman's Library). London 1905	L:331
EL 1939/241	38.1559	The Essay of Samuel JOHNSON (The Scott Library). London o. J.	L:344
EL 1939/204	38.1534	Ben JONSON: Plays and Poems. London–New York 1905	L:345
EL 1941/345	38.1535	Ben JONSON: Timber or Discoveries..., London 1902	L:346

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
EL 1938/298	38.1501	The complete works of John KEATS, ed. by H. Buxton Forman, vol. 1–5. Glasgow 1900–1901	L:358[a–e]
DL 1940/229	39.1014	Rudolf KASSNER: Der Tod und die Maske. Gleichnisse. Leipzig 1902	L:364
Mus 1938/357	38.1515	Rudolf KASSNER: Die Moral der Musik. München 1905 (auf der letzten Seite Inhaltsverzeichnis von Lukács' Hand)	L:365 (6?)
EL 1939/264	38.1934	The Two Noble KINSMEN (John Fletcher), ed. C. H. Herford (The Temple Dramatists). London 1909	L:388
DL 1938/686	38.1580	Harry KAHN: Opfer. Novellen. Berlin 1914	L:391
FL 1939/219	38.1766	LE SAGE: Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane, tome 1–4. A Londres 1783	L:400[a–d]
FL 1939/229	38.1737	Le Diable Boiteux par Monsieur LE SAGE, tome 1–3. A Londres 1784 (in allen drei Bänden Ex libris Paul Ernst und Widmung in Band 1: Herrn Dr. v. Lukács zur freundlichen Erinnerung. Weimar 19. Februar. Paul Ernst)	L:401[a–c]
FL 1939/209	38.1762	Nivelle de LA CHAUSSÉE: Oeuvres de Theatre 1–2. Amsterdam 1759	L:402[a–b]
EL 1939/224	38.1650	LYRICS from the Song-Book of the Elisabethan Age, ed. by A. H. Bullen. London 1897	L:426
AeuL 1941/222	39.1037	LUKÁCS György: Balázs Béla és akiknek nem kell (Béla Balázs und die ihn nicht mögen). Gyoma 1918 Widmung: Editnek szeretettel Gyuri, Budapest 1918 V 16 (Für Edit herzlich Gyuri, Budapest 16. Mai 1918)	L:441
FL 1938/343	38.1532	Maurice MAETERLINCK: Théâtre 1–3. Bruxelles–Paris 1901 (im ersten und dritten Band Ex libris Lukács György)	L:444[a–c]
IL 1939/201	38.1647	Opere dell' Pietro METASTASIO, vol. 1–4. Firenze 1814 Opere postume, vol. 5–6. Firenze 1815	L:447[a–f]
FL 1939/207	38.1763	MARGUERITE de Valois, Royne de Navarre: L' Heptameron..., tome 1–2. Paris 1698	L:448[a–b]
EL 1939/262	38.1937	A Seventeenth Century Anthology, with an introduction by Alice MEYNELL. London o. J.	L:465 (?)
Lg 1938/222	38.1569	George MEREDITH: An Essay on Comedy and the uses of the Comic Spirit. London 1905	L:467
Mus 1939/280	38.1506	Du theatre ou nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique, par L. S. MERCIER. Amsterdam 1773	L:469
EL 1939/211	38.1533	The Dramatic Works of Christopher MARLOWE (New Universal Library). London–New York o. J.	L:486
FL 1939/221	38.1765	D'Alexis PIRON: Oeuvres choisies, tome 1–3. A Londres 1782	L:510[a–c] (?)
EL 1939/209	38.1771	Alexander POPE: The Poetical Works, vol. 1–4. Edinbourgh 1773	L:519[a–d]
EL 1939/242	38.1560	Selected Essay of De QUINCEY (The Scott Library). London o. J.	L:521 (?)
FL 1938/351	38.1488	Oeuvres de Madame de RICCOBONI, tome 1–8. Paris 1792	L:526[a–h]
EL 1938/287	38.1487	Samuel RICHARDSON: The History of Sir Charles Grandison, vol. 1–7. London 1781	L:537[a–g]

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
EL 1939/212	38.1570	A. S. RAPPOPORT: The English Drama. London 1906	L:550
AeuL 1941/201	39.1032	RITOÓK Emma: Ellenséges világ (Feindliche Welt). Budapest 1913 Widmung: Lukács Györgynek meleg üdvözlettel Emma (Für Georg Lukács mit warmen Grüßen Emma)	L:557
IL 1939/213	38.1727	Delle Novelle die Franco SACCHETTI Cittadino Fiorentino, Vol. 1–2. Firenze 1724	L:585[a–b]
EL 1938/314	38.1732	Bernard SHAW: The Philander. London 1906.	
EL 1938/316	38.1735	Bernard SHAW: Three Plays for Puritans. London 1906	L:594 (?)
EL 1938/317	38.1734	Bernard SHAW: The Doctor's Dilemma – Getting Married and The Shewing-up of Blanco Posnet. London 1911	L:596
EL 1938/318	38.1736	Bernard SHAW: John Bull's other Island – Major Barbara. London 1907	L:597
EL 1938/315	38.1733	Bernard SHAW: How He Lied to Her Husband – The Admirable Bashville. London 1909	L:598 (?)
EL 1939/233	38.1482	Felix E. SCHELLING: Elisabethan Drama 1558–1642, vol. 1–2. London–Boston–New York 1908	L:602[a–b]
EL 1938/302	38.1500	The Works of Dr. Jonathan SWIFT, vol. 1–14. London 1751	L:605[a···] (?)
EL 1938/294	38.1587	The Works of Laurence STERNE in four volumes. London 1808	L:604[a–d]
NL 1941/237	39.1112	August STRINDBERG: Die Hemsöer. Berlin–Leipzig o. J.	
MNw 1941/202	39.1115	August STRINDBERG: Sylvia Sylvarum. Berlin–Leipzig o. J.	
NL 1941/236	39.1114	August STRINDBERG: Kameraden. Berlin–Leipzig 1906 (Im Buch die Monogramme der Schauspieler der Budapester Thalia-Gruppe, mit Lukács' Handschrift)	
NL 1941/238	39.1113	August STRINDBERG: Nachtigall. Wittenberg–Berlin–Leipzig 1905	
EL 1938/304	38.1554	Algernon Charles SWINBURNE: Bothwell. A tragedy. London 1901 Ex libris Lukács György	L:607
EL 1938/307	38.1551	Algernon Charles SWINBURNE: A Study of Shakespeare. London 1902	L:608 (?)
EL 1938/305	38.1552	Algernon Charles SWINBURNE: Erechteus. A tragedy. London 1894 Ex libris Lukács György	L:612
EL 1938/306	38.1553	Algernon Charles SWINBURNE: Mary Stuart. A tragedy. London 1899 Ex libris Lukács György	L:613 (?)
EL 1938/286	38.1481	The Poems of Algernon Charles SWINBURNE in six volumes. London 1905 (gekauft in der Buchhandlung von Zs. Deutsch, Budapest...)	L:614[a–f]
SIL 1941/241	39.1134	SUARES: Dostoïevski. Cahiers de la Quinzaine, Serie 13, Heft 8. Paris [1912] (Im Buch eine Karteikarte aus einer unbekannten Bibliothek)	L:656
SpL 1939/201	38.1764	La vie et avantures de Lazarille de TORMES. Brusselles 1698	L:714

Signatur	Einlieferungsnummer		Lukács' Nummer
EL 1938/319	38.1649	Selected Poems of Francis THOMPSON. London 1909	L:715 (?)
EL 1941/343	39.1111	Ashley H. THORNDIKE: The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare. Worchester 1901	(neugebunden)
FL 1939/228	38.1773	La Henriade, poëme par VOLTAIRE. Paris 1801 (vom früheren Besitzer, Erwin Rohde signiert)	L:736 (?)
GW 1938/218	38.1976	C. M. WIELANDs sämtliche Werke, Band 1–36. Leipzig 1839–1840 (Doppelbände, Band 19–20 fehlt)	L:757[a-...]
EL 1939/223	38.1769	YOUNG: The complaint, or night-thoughts, vol. 1–2. London 1783	L:759[a-b] (?)

THE POLITICS OF HISTORY: HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTIONS OF 1848/49

MARTHA LAMPLAND

University of California at San Diego, USA

History weighs heavily on the Hungarian nation. For a century poets and intellectuals have pondered the meaning of their past, and fought desperately to assert their varying interpretations of its political message. With time a repertoire was created, a repertoire of events, historical figures and significant images which gave specific form to the debate. Yet the creation of Hungarian historical consciousness was not confined to the fantasies of oracles taking shelter in academies or coffee houses; popular representations and occasions for their production were to be found in communities all across the country. Thus an ideology of the past, which explained a series of disparate events, came to be a formative principle in social action and accordingly, a crucial component of Hungarian national identity. The central event of historical consciousness is the War of Independence waged against the Habsburgs in 1848–1849. Today I wish to illustrate how the representation of history became a crucial political event in Hungarian society by looking at two significant moments in its construction: the funeral of Lajos Kossuth, once governor-president of the provisional revolutionary government in 1848–49, and the beginning day of the Hungarian revolution in 1956.

The War of Independence, ignited by the flash of revolutionary fervor blazing across Europe in the spring of 1848, ended bitterly for the Hungarian nation. Lasting more than a year and half, far looger than any other insurrection at the time, the battle for Hungarian national independence against Habsburg domination was crushed by the combined forces of Habsburg and Czarist armies. Thirteen leading officers of the revolution were executed, along with Count Batthyány, who had been appointed prime minister by Archduke Stephen in the early days of the revolt. Kossuth, who replaced Batthyány as governor-president of the provisional government, fled into exile. For a decade, Hungarians suffered under the vindictive rule of Bach; by the 1860s, however, police measures were relaxed, and once more citizens took to the streets to engage in angry demonstrations commemorating the revolution and agitating for change. By 1867 a reconciliation was sought between the political elites of the two nations, represented in the historic *Ausgleich* or Compromise, elevating Hungary to the status of partner in the governing of the empire.

In the decades following the Compromise, many Hungarians would resign themselves to their continued association with the Habsburg dynasty; Kossuth never did. His staunch voice from the Italian wilderness called unceasingly for Hungarian independence. Forty-five years after the revolution, in 1894, Lajos Kossuth died in exile at

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

the age of ninety-two. His funeral, mounted without the public or financial support of the Hungarian state, was nonetheless one of the most momentous events to occur in Hungary during the latter half of the 19th century. Indeed, Kossuth's funeral may have excelled in majesty and expression of popular sentiment the grand ceremonies celebrating the millennial anniversary of the Hungarians' conquest of the Carpathian Basin held two years later, in 1896. One newspaper columnist even suggested that the second millennium of Hungarian history should be dated from the moment of Kossuth's death. News of his worsening health, and eventually his death, threw the nation into throes of grief. His funeral in Budapest alone was attended by half a million people, while all throughout the country – in every town, village and hamlet – ceremonies were held to commemorate his passing.

After his flight into exile in 1849, Kossuth lived for several years in Turkey, and then set off on journeys to America and England to further the revolutionary cause of Hungary. Atlhough he was never successful in garnering substantial political or financial support for his cause from the great powers of Europe, his fame as an ardent revolutionary spread far and wide. In the 1860s, he appeared, along with Mazzini, Garibaldi and other famous men, in portraits depicting the most illustrious democrats of Europe. Until his death he continued to play a role in domestic politics, even from afar. Parties and newspapers solicited his opinion on various legislation and policies, and he was called upon time and again to resolve internal squabbles in the party most closely associated with his name and heritage, the '48 and Independent Party.

Pictures of Kossuth were first allowed to be printed in Budapest in the year of the Compromise, though the reproduction available portrayed him as he appeared during the revolution, underscoring that Kossuth was merely a figure of the past. By the 1880s, the popularity of Kossuth was visibly on the increase; reading clubs and other peasant societies were frequently named after him. Cheap reproductions of Kossuth as elderly gentleman were peddled with great success at market and village fairs, coming to adorn the humble walls of many a peasant home alongside devotional pictures of saints. Throughout the 1880s Kossuth had been elected to Parliament in absentia from numerous districts across the country, and by 1892 he had been named honorary citizen of 32 Hungarian cities, including Budapest.

News of Kossuth's failing health in mid-March of 1894 paralyzed the nation. Traditional ceremonies usually held on March 15th to commemorate the outbreak of the War of Independence were cancelled in many communities, or transformed into services in Kossuth's name. As his death approached, hourly telegrams were published chronicling the deterioration of his bodily functions, in all the most intimate of details. With final confirmation of his death on the 20th of March, a pall of mourning enveloped the nation. Within days, the Easter eggs and other joyful artifacts of the upcoming holiday were removed from shop windows, to be replaced by somber and ever more elaborate displays commemorating the great hero. The famous Kossuth hat, Kossuth's trademark, came quickly back into fashion, and was even modified for female attire. Tailors advertised short-order and ready-made mourning clothes at competitive prices, while street hawkers pedaled commemorative medals and pins. The leaders of

the pre-eminent gypsy orchestras of Budapest pledged not to play a single note on Easter Sunday until dusk, and requested permission to greet the casket at the train station with strains of the famous song, "Don't cry, don't cry, Lajos Kossuth".

The funeral was held on the 2nd of April. The mass of mourners – aristocrat and peasant, shopkeeper and clerk – blackened the streets of Budapest, drawn together in their grief and sorrow. The steep steps of the National Museum, the site of the funeral, were obliterated with wreaths and flowers. As the coffin was drawn through the streets, mourners were said to turn away, unable to gaze upon it. He was laid to rest in Kerepesi Cemetery, between the mausoleums of his great contemporaries: Batthyány, first head of the 1848 government, later executed, and Deák, 1848 revolutionary and politician responsible for negotiating the Compromise in 1867.

All throughout the three week period leading to the funeral, eulogies and editorials, speeches and songs evoked images of Hungarian pride and national integrity. Kossuth was called Father of the Nation, Father of Freedom, the Greatest Hungarian, the Pride of Hungary. In near blasphemous remarks, Kossuth's coffin was referred to as the ark of the covenant, and five days after his death, both tabloids in Budapest depicted his resurrection, and that of the Hungarian nation, on Easter Sunday. Yet the tranquility of sorrow and the permanence of death were not to be Kossuth's bequest to the Hungarian nation. Major controversies surrounded the funeral, fueling bitter parliamentary fights and provoking riots in the streets. Even before his demise, there was speculation that Kossuth's body would not be returned home, and if it were to be allowed back on Hungarian soil, it was not at all sure whether the state would sponsor his funeral. In deference to Franz Joseph, who considered Kossuth his arch enemy, the leading party managed to steer the debates in Parliament away from state obligations to Kossuth's family and admirers, and engaged rather in grand soliloquies of homage. In the meantime, the prime minister struck a compromise with the city of Budapest by requesting the town council shoulder the obligation and costs. Though cleverly negotiated, the compromise bred anger and dissatisfaction. Government buildings did not fly the black flag of mourning, and performances at the National Theater and the Opera House were not cancelled. On the 22nd of March, within a day of learning of Kossuth's death, university students staged demonstrations at the National Theater and the Opera, respectfully requesting the few patrons in attendance to quit the theater and return home as the nation was in mourning. First at the National Theater, then at the Opera House students scaled the façade to raise a flag of mourning, as thousands gathered to watch. The police attempted to disperse the crowds at both sites with brutal tactics; with swords drawn, they descended upon the crowd on horseback. Fleeing the Opera House, the crowd re-assembled under the bright lights of a neighboring casino, and when the revelers refused to go home, they threw bricks through the windows. In the following days editorials lambasted the police chief's methods, and Kossuth's sons threatened to bury their father in Italy if the violence and demonstrations did not cease. By the Easter weekend, soldiers were parading on city streets with their bayonets prominently displayed to discourage demonstrators, giving the impression that the center of the city was under seige.

Controversy was not limited to student protests. The Roman Catholic Church in Budapest refused to display any mouring paraphernalia for Kossuth. The bishop claimed that since Kossuth had been a Lutheran, he was under no obligation to note his passing. Moreover, to do so would contravene Catholic dogma, although Catholic officials did display flags of mourning in other cities. The memory of lengthy debates on anti-clerical legislation in Parliament, supported by Kossuth and his faction, and the strong relationship between the Church and the Habsburg throne, had undoubtedly influenced the bishop's decision. Eventually, the Catholic hierarchy of Budapest consented to allow the bells of Catholic churches to be rung for the funeral, as no issue of dogma was apparently involved. An Easter procession in Óbuda was disrupted by what the newspapers described as "a tactless and unpatriotic civic orchestra". In the midst of the procession, the band struck up the "Gotterhalte", unofficial anthem of the House of Habsburg, provoking young men to shout them down. When the musicians, reported by the newspapers to be Czech, struck up the anthem a second time, they were set upon, and it took police intervention to stop the fighting.

During the weeks of turmoil and gloom in late March of 1894 the country was far from united. The 1890s were marked by intensified nationalist movements mounted by ethnic minorities, and agrarian socialism had become a significant force in the countryside. Trial hearings had been set for the coming month of May to hear the libel case, known as the Memorandum trial, against Romanian nationalists for publishing their grievances against the government. During March 15th celebrations in the rural community of Hódmezővásárhely, clashes involving agrarian socialists prevented the ceremony from concluding peacefully. Later, on the 20th of April János Szántó Kovács, a prominent leader of the agrarian socialist movement of the Great Plain, was arrested, promting demonstrations and widespread unrest.

The funeral of a popular national hero, the saint of peasant families and resurrected hope of national self-determination, was far from peaceful, rent through by controversies. Conservative factions worked hard to dispel any radical traditions from association with 1848 and attempted to paint the revolution as a preliminary legal step towards the Compromise of 1867, while leftists proclaimed Kossuth's progressive heritage alive in the soul of the nation. Sixty years hence Hungary would be shaken with new controversies, couched once more in the traditions of 1848.

Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the Twentieth Party Congress in February of 1956 precipitated major crises in Eastern Europe. The post-Stalin transition sent a heavy shudder of uncertainty throughout the party and bureaucratic apparatus, staying their hand and emboldening critics. Throughout the summer and into the fall writers, University students, and disgruntled party members raised awkward questions of the regime and asserted their dissenting views in increasingly public ways. In Poland, widespread dissatisfaction culminated in strikes and urban unrest throughout the summer.

Prompted by increasing dissatisfaction and continuing reports of unrest and violence in Poland, Hungarian students compiled a list of demands of the government on October 22nd with hopes that they would be broadcast over the radio. The demands ad-

dressed economic, political and cultural issues, and were modeled explicitly in both form and content on the Twelve-Point Manifesto printed on the first day of revolt in 1848. It was further decided that a silent demonstration would be staged the following day to express solidarity with workers and students still fighting in Poland. The site chosen for the demonstration in Budapest was the statue of the Polish General Bem, who had fought alongside the Hungarians against the Habsburgs and Russians in 1848 and '49.

The next morning the country awoke to radio broadcasts discouraging participation in the students' demonstration in Budapest. The measure backfired, as hundreds took to the streets in anticipation of the day's events. Many gathered in the center of the city at March 15th Square, named for the first day of the 1848 revolt. The Romantic poet Petőfi, who is believed to have incited the citizens of Pest to revolt on March 15th by reciting a poem, is commemorated in stone at the far end of the square. As the crowd mulled around awaiting news of the Bem demonstration a few began to sing patriotic songs, especially the famous Kossuth call to arms in 1848. Suddenly, the actor Sinkovits jumped up onto the Petőfi statue and recited Petőfi's poem, entitled "The National Song".

> Magyars rise! Your country calls you!
> Now or never! Time enthralls you.
> Shall we live as slaves or freemen?
> These the questions. Choose between them!
> By the God of every Magyar
> Do we swear
> Do we swear the tyrant's handcuffs
> Not to beat!

His boldness was greeted with cheers and the singing continued, amidst cries of "Russians go home!"

[10,000 marched; largest demonstration since 1956; calling for democracy and real reforms]

By 3 : 00 o'clok in the afternoon, the students had been granted permission by the party to stage their demonstration. In contrast to the spontaneity on March 15th Square, here organized units with banners and placards were scattered throughout the crowd numbering over tens of thousands. There were groups representing students and professors from the Central University, the Polytechnic, the Agricultural University, the High School of Physical Education, the Petőfi Military Academy (Mikes:75), and the Lenin Institute, the party's training college. Banners proclaimed Polish–Hungarian solidarity, huge posters displayed the white eagle, symbol of the Polish nation, and wreaths and Hungarian and Polish flags bedecked the Bem statue. Virtually everyone in the crowd was wearing the red-white-green cockade reminiscent of 1848. The despised Communist shield depicting a hammer and a sheaf of wheat which had been imposed on the national flag in 1949 was torn from the center, sometimes to be replaced by the Kossuth emblem designed for the 1848 Republic. The Writers' Union

announced their list of demands to the crowd while copies of the students' manifesto were circulated and posted.

Emotions flew high. Demands were shouted, including a call to resist Russification of the army and reinstate the Hungarian tradition of the *Honvéd*, name of the army recruited to fight the Habsburgs in 1848. Soldiers stationed in a barrack adjacent to the square were beckoned to join the crowd. The following account describes what happened:

> The windows opened. There was a moment of terrified silence: then something fell among the crowd. There was a deep, spreading murmur of delight. The soldiers had torn the Soviet star from their caps and started to throw them among the crowd. A veritable rain of Soviet stars followed. The mood of the crowd changed: they laughed and cheered as they trampled the Soviet emblem underfoot.
>
> (Mikes: 78)

The escalation of emotions and actions typified in the above description continued apace through the evening. The colossal statue of Stalin was felled, cut off at the knees by a blow torch. Red stars were torn off buildings, party placards and literature were destroyed, and pictures of the heroes of 1848 and earlier centuries appeared all over town.

The revolution had begun. A confrontation at the Radio Station turned bloody as secret police shot into the crowd. The police and army surrendered arms to the insurgents, and fighting began in earnest. Strikes were declared, and steps taken to establish workers' councils. Peasants left cooperative farms in droves, repudiating the imposition of state control over their production. As the revolution proceeded, references to 1848 diminished, and workers' councils came to dominate the rhetoric and direction of revolutionary action. Learning that Russian troops had crossed the border on the 31st of October, the revolutionary government declared neutrality and withdrew from the Warsaw Pact on the lst of November. On the morning of the 4th Russian troops invaded Budapest to crush the revolution.

Why, in a revolution fought for national independence within the socialist world, were references to 1848 so prevalent? What could be so controversial about burying a defeated enemy? What was meant by invoking and sharing songs, poems, cockades and emblems reminiscent of 1848? The explanation for the emerging form of resistance in 1956 lies in understanding the rise of Hungarian historical consciousness, of which Kossuth's funeral was a significant moment.

Historical consciousness addresses the nature of the past, providing an explanation for the whys of history, the whys of national identity and of politics. In the latter half of the 19th century Hungarian history came to be represented as eternally motivated by the paradoxical complementarity of fate and revolution. The need to revolt was necessarily implicated in the concept of an unalterable fate of subjugation and humiliation. The very permanence of oppression demanded that the Hungarian national spirit realize itself in glorius revolt. In the metaphor of one poet, the thread-bare strand of Hungarian history has been adorned with pearls of revolution. These were familiar

themes throughout Europe during the Romantic period, but their social and political significance did not wane in Hungary, or in Central Europe at large, where problems of politics and identity, of national sovereignty and ethnicity continued well into the twentieth century.

To explain the eternal verities of the Hungarian past, actors, dates, objects were removed from their specific context and reassembled into an elaborate symbolic set. Sixteenth century peasant rebels became the strange bedfellows of eighteenth century princes; anti-Turkish Catholics were equated with anti-Habsburg Protestants. Historical consciousness was thus constructed by decontextualizing events and personages from their own time, from their particular universe of intention and meaning. In fact, a theory about the enduring meaning of history entailed constant controversy and reinterpretation, for although the imperative to define the nation in terms of its past may be dated to the mid-19th century, the concern with historical metaphor in politics and social debate persisted, and became ever more elaborated. Thus, contrary to the explicit message of continuity and a belief in the integrity of original referents, historical consciousness was constantly being refashioned and reformulated.

One particular anecdote from Kossuth's funeral demonstrates the jumbling of referents, the construction of enduring historical identities very clearly. After Kossuth's death, a movement was begun to transport to Budapest clumps of soil from all the sites where the blood of patriots had been shed during the War of Independence, to be mixed with the soil of Kossuth's grave. The original intent seems to have been to commemorate Kossuth's role, and that of his compatriots, in the fight for Hungarian freedom. Soon, however, the category of historical events and actors to be implicated broadened. One editorial expressed surprise that no one had thought to include clods of earth from the site where Kossuth had been hanged in effigy in 1851, and from the building where he had been imprisoned for four years in the early 1840s. The newspaper then listed sites from which boxes of soil had already been sent: from the site of the national assembly in 1532, from the birthplace of the great and beneficent King Mátyás, who ruled in the 15th century, from the site of a famous exchange between King Endre and his younger brother Béla in the 11th century, and from graves from the pre-Christian period of the tribal leader Árpád.

Although Benedict Anderson has focused on the novel and newspaper in his argument about the development of national consciousness, the "imagined community" of the Hungarian nation was to have its historical destiny forged and contested in poetic verse. This ethnographic fact may be attributed to a particular synthesis of historical, political and logical factors. The Romantic legacy of poetry as politics, epitomized in the works of Byron and Wordsworth, struck deep roots in the Hungarian national tradition. Far beyond his practical role as General Bem's adjutant in the 1848 uprising, Petőfi conceived of himself as a pillar of fire in the wasteland leading the nation to the promised land of national sovereignty. His oeuvre was replete with odes to historical figures he deemed to exemplify the Hungarian national spirit, from the pagan hordes invading in the ninth century, to the fifteenth century Hunyadi who vanquished the Turks, to Prince Rákóczi, leader of the eighteenth century war of independence aga-

inst the Habsburgs. Yet Petőfi's contribution to national consciousness transcended the construction of historical equivalence among such diverse figures. His legacy would be the definition of poetry as the preeminent medium for political dissent.

Following Petőfi, succeeding generations of poets donned the mantle of critic for the nationalist cause. Each in their own time and own voice, the greatest of poets eloquently pondered the conundrum of identity and politics. The expectation that poets become the nation's political conscience, and shape the debate over nationality, led to their own apotheosis in the nationalist pantheon, alongside political and military figures. Just as Petőfi enshrined Rákóczi as the embodiment of the Hungarian spirit, so did József Attila write of Petőfi as the nation's hearth fire, and of the great poet Ady as permeating the Hungarian soil, cleaved by every furrow plowed by the nation's rural poor, his revolutionary flesh soon to reap new hope and new life. Bemoaning the absence of a critical political voice in the 1950s, one poet cried plaintively, "How many years has it been, since I've forgotten I was a poet?"

József Attila described poetry as "word-magic acting in the soul of the nation." The magic of poetic form, its stylistic density and hence ambiguity has rendered it particularly suited to serve a tradition of political dissent, resistance and revolution. The poetic panoply of metaphor, obscure reference, and antiquated expression all gird the literary revolutionary with power to incite his fellows and confuse his foes. Finally, a logical correlation adheres between the relationship of form to creativity in poetry and the relationship of fate to revolution. The poet's task is a continual struggle to create a form which overcomes the restrictions of past forms, thereby altering the nature of poetic form itself. Analogously, revolution would cheat fate and so create a new form of Hungarian society.

The developing polemic over national identity and politics in the late 19th and early 20th centuries broadened concern with these issues beyond narrow intellectual circles. The boxes of soil sent to Budapest at the time of Kossuth's funeral epitomize the process of creating national identity and historical consciousness. The makeshift grave of Kossuth shows that the creation of historical consciousness was not solely the work of poets and intellectuals, but also a popular phenomenon. The historical aggrandizement of Kossuth's grave was an event open to anyone wishing to scoop precious gifts of nationhood out of the earth. Kossuth's funeral was far more than the product of a narrow group of intellectuals, much less the exclusive creation of the Entreprise des pompes fünebres hired by the Budapest Town Council to mount the affair. It was truly a ritual of grand proportions, in which prime ministers and peasants, bereaved family and irreverent rabble-rousers all took part.

The debate over a truly Hungarian society as reflected in historical necessity served the purposes of a wide range of political ideologies. Politicians of every stripe sought to make the nationalist cause their own. In 1898, fifty years after the War of Independence, lengthy debates were mounted contesting the true holiday commemorating the revolution. Liberal parties argued relentlessly that it should be March 15th, as 1848 is a radical holiday, symbol of long needed social change. Conservative factions allied

with the monarchy insisted that the official holiday be April 11th, anniversary of the king's recognition of legal reform passed by the Diet.

At the turn of the century the poet Ady decried the reduction by conservative forces of Petőfi to a Romantic fop. In an essay whose very title evokes one of Petőfi's angry poems, Ady writes, "We declare and proclaim that Petőfi does not belong to those who have been living on him since 1849, but he belongs to us, to all those who in Hungary yearn and fight for change, renewal and revolution." By the interwar period, the state actively used schools and other institutions to inculcate the ruling party's vision of 1848, while poets and other dissenting voices continued to contest their claims to such legitimacy. In the famous Petőfi Debate in the 1950s, poets and writers denounced the appropriation of Petőfi by the Communist regime, who lauded his simplistic Romantic rhetoric. Rather than embrace his outmoded poetic style, poets wished to emulate his spirit of critical dissent. As Gömöri notes, after June of '53 Petőfi came to be increasingly a weapon against the regime, a regime which like others before it, had portrayed itself the moral heir of 1848.

Through such debates a whole range of actions, emotions and ideas became embedded in notions of Hungarian destiny and character. A century's sedimentation of act and affect came to be as powerful as explicitly rhetorical or literary forms of historical consciousness. Thus, actions taken in the name of 1848 became inseparable from its complex narrative exegeses, despite the constant imperative to purify and simplify its form and political message. The progressive traditions represented by the March Front and other anti-fascist organizations who staged demonstrations at Petőfi's statue in 1942 find resonance in nationalist consciousness, as do memories of uglier, less democratic actions taken by conservative groups before and during the war. Thus, the emerging form of resistance in 1956, though initiated by student and writers who envisioned a more humane socialist society, could inspire a much broader public, as attested to by the rapid spread of acts of defiance in the city and the heady emotionalism at Bem Square, when 50,000 people burst into tears after singing the national anthem.

This brief story about a funeral and about '56, told by wandering through the maze of Hungarian historical consciousness, has been offered to raise questions about the construction of cultural knowledge and social intention. To comprehend the emerging form of so complex an event as revolution, and so too to comprehend the making of society at its most mundane, requires we investigate how the attribution of meaning and consequence to past actions becomes a formative aspect of the social dynamic called history. In the Hungarian case, a structure of causality called fate is imputed to past events which then acquires significance as these understandings of historical necessity become lived in the present. Interpretations of the past, rendered ever more elaborate through an on-going polemic in poetry and politics, thus come to qualify or give explicit form to history as it is being made. In classic terms, people make their history by living their ideas of the past.

A recent rock opera *Stephen the King* depicts the struggle in 998 between the forces of the good Christian king Stephen and those of Koppány, the leader of the evil and recalcitrant pagans. People were heard later to remark that the very popular rock musical was a sinister revisionist shadow play, pitting the compromising Deák (in the form of Stephen) against the truly Hungarian Kossuth (the pagan), or for a more recent comparison. Kádár, the Russians hand-picked leader in '56 against the doomed Nagy, executed as leader of the revolution. Thus the logic of historical consciousness: the first party secretary of the Hungarian Communist Party has been recast as St. Stephen.

THE INSTITUTIONAL APPLICATION OF FOLKLORE IN HUNGARY

LINDA DÉGH

Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

1.

Power holders (state, clergy, elite interest groups), in their drive for power and dominance, have always used and manipulated folklore (understood here as the unsophisticated and spontaneous art of the rural people, "peasants") to serve, propagate and enforce their diverse purposes. Prior to scholarly interest in folklore, sources document that oppressive institutions were aware of the value of folklore as an ideological weapon and routinely developed methods of application to help further their cause and effectively soften the harshness of their measures and ordinances.

Among the oldest and most successful manipulators was the Christian Church which established its ideology, behavioral pattern, and practice of workship. It created a balanced dichotomy between everyday and holiday, work and celebration, and divided the year according to sacred seasons modeled after the existing system of pre-Christian folk religion. The Church did not destroy earlier beliefs and worship systems, but accommodated them by reinterpretation and reconciliation of the old and the new. Over the centuries the clergy authoritatively maintained equilibrium between traditional and innovative elements, thus creating a homogenized ideological platform for public workship. While the cult of saints at shrines (built on the sites of earlier devotion) and mystery plays were encouraged, the recurrence of their traditional elements was suppressed and condemned as "paganry" in synodal decrees. In its effort to educate and control the masses, members of the clergy acquired a broad knowledge of folklore through active observation and the collection of materials. Tales, anecdotes, legends, magic acts and experience stories were incorporated into sermons with appended moral conclusions and warnings in order to produce ideological homogeneity. While condemning secular songs, dances, music, and mummery in animal masks, Hungarian clerics acknowledged the aesthetic beauty of poetic expression in love-songs, as "pearls in manure". Fighting both the ancient remains of feminine divinity cults and heresy that threatened the hegemony of the Church, scholasts established the concept of witchcraft and devil possession and set the stage for the persecution of witches. Both the famous *Malleus Maleficarum*, guidebook and canon of witch trials, and the illustrative protocols of confessions contain elements of folk belief, the practice of folk magic and medicine, and legend narratives. Following authoritative doctrinal manipulation and alteration, these case reports were returned to the folk masses and are still present, among both the rural and urban populations, as the essential repertoire of supernatural tradition.

Hungarian Studies 6/2 (1990)
Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

During the feudal period in Hungary, secular powers also depended on the ideological control of common people by the dominant church on the basis of the *cuius regio eius religio principle.* But in more practical matters, such as the recruitment of soldiers for the army or when competing political factions wished to attract mass support for their claims to power, folklore manipulation was employed (Pesovár–Dobos, 525–26). From the time the regular Hungarian army was established in 1715, attractive young officers appeared at fairs, *kermis*es, and other popular gatherings in their showy military attire to promote the heroic image of the soldier. They invited young men for drinks in the pub and challenged them to join in dance competitions. Musicians struck up an enticing old tune and the unsuspecting recruits, intoxicated and enraptured by the fiery rhythms and the virtuoso dance, were easily lured into wearing the shako and saber which symbolized accepting the military life.

My study of historic and soldiers' songs resulted in the identification of two distinct categories expressing contradictory sentiments (Dégh–Katona–Péter, 1952). One consisted of lamentations about the suffering of unwilling, homesick recruits who were in the barracks, far away from home, mother, and sweetheart, in fear of death on the battlefield. The other expressed the pride and joy of being a soldier, serving to the last and dying happily for king and fatherland. In these latter songs the soldier's virtue is true manliness: idol of women; protector of the weak, carefree carouser, virtuoso dancer, master of weaponry and irreconcilable fiend of the enemy.

My sources revealed the origin of this second category of folksongs and the situations in which they were implemented for ideological reinforcement by military authorities. Army officers ordered the singing of these songs, particularly when marching, to lift the spirits of the enlistees. Athough these songs followed traditional formulas and made to fit popular tunes, slight changes brought them up-to-date by substituting the names of the ruler, war hero, enemy, time and location of the battle. During the last 250 years of Hungarian history, identical songs consistently have been varied and manipulated by the government to fit the current military operation.[1] Communal singing by command was complemented by widely publicized printed song books up to World War II and even later during recruitment for the new People's Army.

It is well known that the most popular folk melodies often served as empty vehicles for political messages propagated by aspiring interest groups. One classic example is the Kossuth-song (Dégh, 1952; Ortutay, 1952; Katona, 1980), often referred to as the Hungarian Marseillaise; the most popular version was sung in the fall of 1848 in connection with Kossuth's recruitment tour and was distributed soon afterwards in print. Its origin is obscure. Some trace it to an eighteenth century semi-folk recruitment song, others to a nonpolitical love song. Nevertheless, the 600 variants of folk and nonfolk inspiration were liberally disseminated and adjusted to address crucial issues during the War of Independence for the purpose of changing political interests. As pioneering Hungarian folklore scholar Lajos Kálmány observed in the 1880s, "The historian must consider our soldier and patriotic songs to acquaint himself with the folk evaluation of a given epoch." The folk, indeed, can become a dependable sounding-board of contemporary political issues.

The Kossuth-song became the symbol of struggle for national independence after the defeat and continued as a symbol during the years of Austria's bureaucratic suppression. Even the singing of the song was considered an act of subversion. To avoid being accused of conspiracy, only the tune was hummed and neutral or nonsensical words were substituted in the text, such as:

> The big calendar of Gyula Müller
> Edited by István Friebajsz
> Typography by Gustav Emich
> in eighteen-fifty-four.

The Kossuth-song was among the most popular melodies utilized by canvassers in the political struggles. They used it at parliamentary elections with the application of strophies, praising a political party and its nominee while denigrating the opponent. The attractiveness of the tune helped popularize candidates and rapidly folklorized the stanzas created by hired governmental or opposition party propagandists (Dégh, 1952; Katona, 1980).

2.

When folklore was discovered as the naive art of the "ignorant" folk, collection began and assimilation of materials gave rise to folkloristics as a distinct scholarly field. In fact, from the outset the discipline tried to emphasize its importance to the general public by rejecting the idea that collecting, classifying, and analyzing materials is conducted for its own sake – for mere description and interpretation. As is well known, the discipline of folklore emerged as a by-product of political aspirations in Europe, particularly in small ethnic minority groups within large and powerful empires (Dundes, 1985). Distinctive indigenous schools developed on the basis of given socioeconomic conditions and reached the highest level of scholarly sophistication, while also remaining strictly nationalistically oriented. That is to say, folkloristics in essence retained its nationalist–populist–public service motivation.

Hungarian national independence and the liberation of the serfs were major factors in shaping the discipline and its peculiar mission for the national cause. (Ortutay, 1939; Horváth, Fenyő, 1976) Between 1762 and the 1850s leading members of the progressive elite appealed to "fellow patriots" to collect folklore and to retrieve and preserve relics of original national traditions lost over the centuries but which were still discernible among the folk. During this period patriotic sentiments were expressed to this effect. One author declared that "The first national culture evolved from the songs of the folk under the most difficult conditions" and that "these are the first flowers of early national life worthy of appreciation." Another asserted that "It is within the public interest to gather these songs" which are "treasures of national value". The same author added "there were poets in the past and there are still some who make folksongs which filter down to the folk..." And finally, Fenyő summarized, "Songs are sung by

the common folk, or people in low ranks, to rejoice at social gatherings or pastimes". (Fenyő, 126–271)

The patriots (educators, clergymen, public servants, authors and scholars) responded enthusiastically to the call and turned their concern with the folk and their poetry into a cultural movement in the service of national unity: the creation of a unified national literature on the basis of folklore. Thus literary populism[2] in Hungary meant active inclusion in literary works of themes, stylistic expression, aesthetic norms and ideology of the lower classes. The extremely flamboyant political utilization of folklore was expressed by the revolutionary poet Sándor Petőfi, whose poetic application of folklore to sacrificial death on the battlefield became the ultimate expression of national heroism. He wrote the following in a letter to poet János Arany on February 4, 1847:

> No matter what, folk poetry is the real poetry. Let us make it dominant. If the folk will rule in poetry, it will also come close to rule in politics. This is the task of the century, to fight for which is the desire of all noble souls who have seen the martyred millions while a few thousands idled and enjoyed life.

No wonder the conscious political utilization of folklore by nineteenth century populists, who were the most respected, and worshipped, poets and statesmen of the most glorious epoch of Hungarian history, is often mentioned by contemporary state ideologists. It is they who made the effort to legitimize their cultural policy and further the evolvement of a unified socialist art. (Révai, 1948)

3.

The classic epoch of interest in folklore already possessed the attributes that became increasingly characteristic in later epochs – stabilization of ideas in the development of the discipline of folklore and exploitation by the arts, literature, and public education. As in the beginning, these remain inseparably intertwined and interdependent. Although the nature and intensity of the relationship varies according to needs and governmental ideologies, none can be understood without the other. If, as Dundes suggested, a national inferiority complex triggered scholarly study and "fakelore" (manipulation of folklore) (Dundes, 1984) from the outset and led to the establishment of a distinctive national identity, then it can be illustrated in Hungarian history. The changing tendencies in these processes can be divided according to the following historic periods: the millennial celebration; the interwar period of rising consciousness; and the rapid beginning with the 1949 turning point in Marxist–Leninist cultural politicalization and indoctrination.

Folklore theory, research methods and orientation during the period from the 1880s onward developed to service national causes and made its impact on the presentation and manipulation of materials; thus, it also shaped public appreciation of folklore. In the beginning, Hungarian folklorists' primary duty was to compile and publish a body

of materials "before it is too late and will be devoured by civilization''. In the spirit of the Grimmian principle, they selectively chose representative pieces which were aesthetically pleasing and edited the texts to restore the original perfection of an anonymous folk and eliminated the awkwardness of individual informants. The texts thus presented were not only useful for artistic delight, but also adequate for comparative diffusional text analysis – the first scientific approach to folklore. When interest changed and ethnographic accuracy became a *sine qua non* in research, complementary information to illuminate the text became more important. Community studies focused on the life of folklore genres in villages with regard to individual artists and the creative process. Yet, the focus remained on archaic peasant life, folklore items and their survival in modern post-peasant times. Holistic descriptions, observations, and scrupulous recordings of all the events were required. Public service (presentation of aesthetically pleasing pieces for artistic use and consumption as a goal) kept Hungarian folklorists eclectic. They differentiated between original, pure peasant folklore and folklore corrupted and contaminated by folk-alien, rootless urban elements, destructive of tradition.

Folklorists' attitude toward folklore – both discipline and subject – characteristically differs from the attitude representative of other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Folklorists are natively (or by choice) involved with and committed to their subjects; they join in a give- and -take relationship perpetuating the flow of folkloric interchange. Thus folklorists increasingly broaden their commitment "to the benefit of the folk'' while feeling that urbanization, step-by-step, drives nations to cosmopolitanism. If not always directly or consciously, folklorists make their materials accessible to professional mediators in various fields. For example, during the last century a large number of folktales, compiled, edited and annotated by expert folklorists for children, resulted in authoritative implementation and redistribution of tradition. This kind of utilitarian dissemination of archaic folklore materials by folklorists, however, was complemented in even more pervasive fields: by professional mediators such as artists, writers, politicians, educators, social workers, museologists, commercial agents, cultural program coordinators and center directors. Folklore's attractiveness as a recreational and nostalgic form of mass entertainment makes it flexible and adaptable to the general public. Organized groups of lay people or professionals can occasionally engage in dancing, singing, and playing folk games as a form of diversion. The academic, applied and recreational mass-use and manipulation of folklore (taken from print, oral, written or electronic media sources), insures the feedback of folklore to the folk for screening, regeneration and perpetuation. This circulation between scholars, appliers, laypeople, creators, peddlers and consumers, elite and the folk, is continuous and interdependent. Thus "pure", "original", "genuine" folklore and "fakelore" (Dorson, 1969) – the phenomenon defined in processual, functional terms as "folklorism" by Hungarian scholars (Verebélyi, 1981) – cannot be isolated and separated from each other. They are interdependent, natural companions in perpetual flux and need to be observed together as a folklore process, an entity in itself.

4.

By the turn of the century literary populism, aimed at the nationalization of oral prose and verse forms, was complemented by a new interest in folk arts and crafts. Architects, interior designers, sculptors, painters and industrial artists borrowed styles and decorative elements from peasant households. The educated urban and provincial middle class introduced peasant or peasant-inspired textiles, furniture, and pottery into their fashionable homes and displayed their patriotic commitment by wearing folk-style national costumes made by fashion designers. A new architectural style, rich in peasant decoration, was evident on important public buildings in Budapest and other urban cities (Kresz, 1952). By the time the Millennium of the Hungarian nation was celebrated in 1896, artistic populism was complete. This period became a landmark permeated with a feeling of national rejuvenation: a new beginning for a second millennium. As a focus of attraction, professional ethnographers erected an ethnographic village in the large Municipal Park of Budapest consisting of twenty-four fully furnished peasant houses representing the country's most colorful artistic material products. Nevertheless, the real attraction was the choreographed performance of village dancers and the spectacular costume parade of peasants. The display attracted the young Bartók and Kodály and persuaded them to visit villages in order to put together a basic resource of archaic peasant melodies for a new national music to be created by professional composers. Deeply committed to the tradition of 1848, the young Bartók composed his Kossuth Symphony. At the first performance he appeared on stage in self-styled national costume. Disappointed by the way Brahms and Liszt applied pseudo-folk music created by the Hungarian provincial elite, Bartók offered his services both as scholar and composer to "the good of the Hungarian nation". As critic A. Kern noted in 1910, Bartók and Kodály "were convinced that the roots of Hungarian music are in the very deep, hidden, unadulterated singing and music-making of the folk... The one with turanian power and passion. Once, hundreds of years ago, this must have been the tone of all our music." (Bartók Breviarium). The principle to exclude the new style and adapt archaic music which was discernible from the contemporaneous peasant repertoire made the Bartók–Kodály novement appealing to the young urban elite who, from the early 1930s, carried the torch of populism in Hungary (Dégh, 1987).

The folk movement resurged periodically between the two wars in relation to important political issues and conflicts created by social inequity, peasant poverty, territorial loss, urbanization and industrialization.

In addition to the musical revolution of Bartók and Kodály and their disciples, one of the most notable attempts to propagate the peasant folk was the creation of the Pearl Bouquet. This annually staged, government-supported show of organized song and dance ensembles introduced urban audiences to customs from more than 100 villages. Local grade school teachers were organizers and coaches and also participants in the performance of the partly-existing, partly-reconstructed dances and songs of their villages. The cheering audience was instrumental in supporting and propagating the revival and reassertion of the old customs of performing villagers, and of folklore in ge-

neral. Marxist culture politicians of the 1950s harshly criticized the Pearl Bouquet as "lacking in principles, exploitive, and serving the interests of the bourgeoisie". (Kresz, 1952) Lately, however, there were more positive and appreciative opinions of the pioneering role of the enterprise (Andrásfalvy, 1978).

While the Pearl Bouquet and the folksong movement of Bartók and Kodály succeeded in introducing peasant art as a superior manifestation of Hungarian folklore and the folk as carriers of significant features of national character, writers and scholars, driven by social conscience, visited villages and gave accounts of peasant misery in shocking colors. The contradiction between the public worship of folk art and the abuse of the folk was depicted in scholarly and journalistic sociographies, ethnographies, novels, and poetry, often by new authors of peasant extraction. The populists, in opposition to the government, formed their political faction often challenging the system and facing prosecution. They saw their mission as propagating the rejuvenation of the nation by returning to its true value; folk tradition as the basis for a unified educational system.

In his pamphlet, *Folk Tradition and National Education* (1939) István Györffy, founder of the Hungarian ethnography chair at the University of Budapest projected his educational policy in which ethnographic research plays a major role. Concerned with the Nazi menace in the year of Austria's annexation to Germany, he sent his proposal to the Ministry of Education. The introduction reads:

> **"World history events in recent times warn us to increase our national forces and unity ... the ultimate and greatest resource of Hungarian society is the Hungarian folk ... spiritual unity must now be expressed by the intelligentsia ... Unity can be achieved by making folk tradition the basis of national education ... (86–87) the nation does not live only in its language but also in its folk traditions. (57)**

Györffy's legacy was picked up by the arbitrators of national culture (cultural politicians, folklorists, sociologists, artists and writers), who were building a new concept of public education after cleaning up the rubble of war (Ortutay, 1962).

5.

When the Ninth Division of the Red Army invaded Budapest and destroyed the occupying forces of the Third Reich (which was making its last stand in the Buda Castle), it "liberated" Hungary – the last unwilling ally of Nazi Germany. The populace, emerging from bomb shelters, encountered a new world growing out of the total destruction. Heaps of bodies, both soldiers and civilians, lined the streets and thoroughfares amidst the rubble of what was the capital city. The traffic of vehicles plowing through the remains of humans and buildings was vigorously controlled at crossings by female soldiers and the pulsating polyphonic singing of marching soldiers filled the air. Signs of life and a promise of a new start appeared in bright red: flags, five-pointed stars, symbols and hastily put-up posters appeared on damaged buildings, conceal-

ing bullet holes. Members of the newly formed civilian militia sported red armbands on their shabby winter coats. Slogans were inscribed on the red decorations surrounded by victory signs declaring the defeat of the enemy: "Hail to the Heroes, The Glorious Soviet Army and its Great Leader, Comrade Stalin", "Death and Eternal Damnation to the Enemy of the People, the Fascist Villains", "Proletarians of the World Unite, Down with Capitalism", etc. At the center, flanked by banners and framed with gold laurel leaves, stood the portraits of Stalin and Mátyás Rákosi; Rákosi, the exiled Commissary of the 1919 Hungarian-Soviet Republic, returned to become the General Secretary of the new Communist Party. There were also pictures of other exiled Moscovite politicians who came with Rákosi to help lay down the foundations of the new Marxist government and the leadership of the Party.

For Hungarians, this was their first encounter with the joyous future-oriented, optimistic but uncompromisingly combative and purposeful communist demeanor, which was expressed in terms of celebratory public display of heroic images, signs, symbols, and slogans as a complex hierarchy of meanings (Armstrong, 1952, 327–46). At the time, Hungarians could not yet read the message of the spectacle and its details. However, the first celebration of May Day soon set the pattern of ritualized patriotic festivities. Floats and pageants signified actual political statements. The happily cheering marchers carried banners and portraits of champions of the Party. From the platform the leaders waved to the crowd, which then dispersed for picnicking and playing celebration of the worldwide unity of the working class (Voigt, 1981, 38–40).

Ritualizing the form and standardizing the contents of additional patriotic festivities continued:

> March 15 (1948/49 War of Independence)
> April 4 (The Liberation of 1945);
> August 20 (originally honoring Saint Stephen, Hungary's first king, first converted into the Feast of the New Bread and later to the Day of the Constitution);
> November 7 (The Great October Revolution).

The program of these festivals followed similar guidelines and became important vehicles of indoctrination by annual repetition. Simultaneously essential bureaucratic changes were carried out: nationalization of private business, mines, factories, banks and estates; dividing large estates for redistribution among landless agricultural workers; and the assumption of government dominance over competing political parties. By 1949 the Communist Party rose to power. This year was the turning point when the cultural revolution was declared. It meant the beginning of indoctrination of the masses into a new symbol system and a new etiquette of behavior. Through the indicated public forms, mass indoctrination began on all levels. No political system before demanded the total involvement of the citizenry in daily politics and concerted reaction to events on the basis of an established ideology such as the Marxist–Leninist doctrine.

Historical materialism, the scientific basis of the new system was dispensed through formal education, whereas private life (work, recreation) had to be profoundly politicized. Slogans multiplied and became usable formulas, sayings, and proverbial phra-

ses, when applied to important issues: "Yours is the factory, you build it yourself", "Learn better to be worth more – Produce more to live better". These examples illustrate the relationship between folk sayings and actual issues.

> "In the midst of our work and (class) struggle, we have to take note of sayings which originate in factories, cooperative farms, construction sites, machine stations, among members of the army, and young writers... "in the epoch of the building of socialism the ability of the folk to create sayings is improving. Several of the combative slogans of the Hungarian Worker's Party and M. Rákosi became known as proverbs among the entire folk (Békés, 1952).

This does not come as a surprise:

> Like Lenin and Stalin, their best Hungarian disciple, Comrade Rákosi also uses proverbs as effective weapons ... this method of application of folk sayings embodies a lesson and a priceless example for writers and folk educators.
>
> (Ibid.)

These excerpts suggest that the spectacular and appealing means which bear the semblance of folklore, or are authentic folklore, serve well in mass education, helping transform people's moral values, world view, social and working relationships. The aim of education was the creation of a new "socialist man" – the "communalist man" – a kind of superman devoted to and capable of creating a new egalitarian socialist state.

Socialist transformation in Hungary followed the Soviet model as exemplified by the subsequent periods of the Soviet Epoch from 1917. Concurrent with the restructuring of the economy, industrialization and farm mechanization, was the campaign of ideological enlightenment. War was declared on internal and external foes: revolutionary vigilance was encouraged to fight against the remains of the bourgeoisie (the class-enemy) and the infiltration of hostile ideologies from capitalist–imperialist environments. Under the leadership of the working people (alliance of workers and peasants), and endowed with the most advanced theory, the building of socialism was to begin.

According to Marxist doctrine:

> The basis of society is its economic structure: the summary of production relationships in the given period of social progress. The economic base ultimately is determined by the development of forces of production. The superstructure mirroring the base is the sum total of corresponding political, legal, artistic, religious, ethical and philosophical views and their pertaining institutions and organizations; the most powerful among them being the state. In this relationship economic basis is primary and decisive, while the superstructure also pays an active role in the life of society. It reacts to the basis, siding or blocking progress. The superstructure of socialist society has particular significance because it plays a major role in the building of the economic base of socialism already in its transitory period.
>
> (Új Magyar Lexikon 1,57).

Furthermore:

> Social consciousness of individuals is basically determined by their class-adherence, life conditions, activities, and goals. It is however, not attached to given social existence. Previous forms of consciousness may be carried over and aid, retard or block the progress of social existence.
>
> (Ibid. 317).

Guided by these principles, the formation of the superstructure as well as class struggle becomes a matter of paramount importance. Therefore, special attention is paid to the ideological domain: the social sciences and humanities as vehicles of ideological messages. The Soviet example was instructive in showing how struggle for ideological purity has been a Leitmotif in the subsequent phases of history (Tokariev, 1951), helping strengthen the accomplishments of the October Revolution, building the union of working people, defeating fascism in the Great Patriotic War. The Communist Party initiated ideological purification, criticizing deviation from true Marxism and socialist patriotism and attraction to bourgeois ideas. These ideas represent pessimism, decadence, belittling of the leadership of the working people, misinterpretation of national heroes, and falsification of history.

During the Stalin era (from 1946), particularly during the sharpening of the class struggle, cultural politician A. A. Zhdanov launched his attack on cultural life (Oinas, 1973, 53–54). He introduced public criticism of deviant scholars and artists, ending in self-criticism and repentance for making mistakes. The Party, and Stalin himself, acted as absolute authority in setting artistic and scientific trends. Stalin's *Marxism and Linguistics,* for example, attacks N. J. Marr's theory that language has class-character and belongs to the superstructure. Stalin's statement that "language is a vehicle of communication" had to be evaluated by all scholarly fields of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in order to propose ways of applying his ideas to respective fields of knowledge (Marr-vita, 1950). No wonder that under this patronage system, submission and humility were the expected attitudes of scholars.

In 1949 Rákosi declared that Hungarians were behind in the political clarification of culture: "It is time we create a new and clear situation through honest and sincere criticism and self-criticism." (Rákosi, 1945. 368) In his programmatic address in 1949, the President of the Hungarian Ethnographic Society echoed Rákosi's suggestion:

> It is true that the development of Hungarian ethnography was uneven. We tried to internalize Marxist–Leninist ideology but experienced intermittent relapses and grave errors... We must face our mistakes openly, with unyielding self-criticism.

More importantly, inspired by Stalin's definition of culture of the socialist era as being national in form and socialist in content, the president elucidated the tasks awaiting the folklore scholar:

> Collection and analysis of present day folklore will decisively realize the traditionality and the generative nature of culture. This is how the discipline will fulfill its mission and furnish ideological guidance and practically applicable materials, in terms of the dialectical relationship of tradition and progress and the political conception of the worker–peasant alliance...

Furthermore:

> **The discipline of folklore has to supply properly interpreted materials for the diverse sectors of Hungarian mass movements, so that the features of our national character should permeate the new socialist content of culture (Ortutay, 1949, 20–21).**

Thus, the atmosphere was prepared to launch a new style utilitarian exploitation of folklore. It was assumed that at this early stage of forming the foundation of socialism, and that the economic transformation was so overwhelming it would precipitate immediate new folklore as part of the superstructure, expressing the feeling of gratitude and loyalty of the people.

Ideologists, concerned with the evolution of socialist culture free of class-conflicts and biases, reached back to the legacy of pioneer nationalists. Identification with the heroic past was often ascertained by politicians. "We are the lawful heirs and direct successors of all that was viable and future oriented in our millennial history", said Rákosi, and his words alerted folklorists to distinguish between progressive (useful) and retrograde (harmful) traditions. And he continued. "The future of the Hungarian people is bright. It is our historic mission to pursue the aims of the heroes of 1848, Kossuth, Petőfi, and Táncsics" (1945). Rákosi also explicitly suggested cultivation of the heroic tradition: "Now that we regained national independence, it is time more than ever to reach back to Hunyadi, Rákóczi, Kossuth, and Petőfi's stimulating traditions." Party ideologist Révai (1948) makes direct reference to legitimization: "A hundred years ago national independence and liberation of the folk were united and made a program for the century. Now, for the first time, working masses became leaders of social and national causes as they acquired political leadership of the country."

Once the link to past heroism and patriotism was found, it became the task of folklorists to collect new material from the folk and keep it alive among them. Folklore, defined as "a specific form of social consciousness which mirrors reality in artistic images" puts the folklorist to task. According to Istvánovics (1962), collectivity is an essential feature of folklore and mirrors concepts common to all working people as they develop in history with the growing awareness of class struggle. In socialist society collectivity means the ethical and political unity of the folk. The evident task is to do fieldwork in cities and villages, agricultural and industrial workplaces, and gather the body of evolving new folklore. Folklorists and creators of new folklore must work hand-in-hand to act as agitators for the realization of socialism (Sokolov, 141).

The establishment of the Ministry of Folk Education in 1950 marked the beginning of organized, public indoctrination of the masses through folklore and its derivatives. The cultural revolution took steps to fill a new need – "folksong, play, and art became an everyday diversion for the working people in the city and country and an inexhaustible resource for literature and arts..." (Ethn. 1952. 1–8). Through the Folk Art Institute (1951) and the Folk-and-Home Industry, Inc., the folk arts (a selected body of progressive folk traditions which mirror the reality of the folk) became the cooperative product of the folklorist, the folk, and the art expert. This relationship has al-

tered over a period of more than three decades. Trends in folklore, folklorization, and defolklorization that were developed further through agencies and individuals were serving purposes that were more practical and commercial than ideological. However, the network of folk-based professional and lay art was kept under ideological control.

In the beginning Stalinist models were followed. The Folk Art Institute was "to support and propagate the forms of folk art and to make it useful to the cultural revolution" (Kresz, 1952).

In an atmosphere of keen political vigilance, the life of common people was permeated by ideological enlightenment. Newspaper-reading circles were formed in the workplaces, to assure that people kept abreast of daily events and properly evaluated them. Ideological seminars offered instruction in Marxism and ad hoc meetings or rallies were called to respond to relevant international political issues. Consciousness raising in the interest of increased productivity, the promotion of actual programs, collectivization, the anti-clerical movement, selling government Peace Bonds, were also communicated through artistic means (books, movie and theater productions). If novels and dramas could depict the everyday life of workers in the vanguard, why would it not be possible to show how traditional folklore is modified and how new folklore, rooted in the new economic base, is created?

Soviet folklorists had already compiled a large body of materials created during the Soviet period. Eyewitnesses reminisced about their experiences during the October Revolution, the Great Patriotic War, and their encounters with war heroes and founding fathers. New epic poetry sung the praises of Lenin and Stalin, both of whom also appeared as folktale heroes. Lyric songs commented on the bravery of soldiers in the Red Army, the industry of kolkhoz peasants, miners, and factory workers – the Heroes of Socialist Labor.

In their new endeavor, Hungarian folklorists followed the ideas of Maxim Gorky expressed at the first All-Union Congress of Soviet Workers in 1934. These attested to the superiority of oral literature which can be attributed to the fact that it was created by the working people and reflected their life and work experiences. Therefore, oral literature must be collected and taught as the basis of the history of all literature and as an inalienable part of the contemporary literary movement. "Folklore is just as much a part of contemporary social life as artistic written literature." (J. Sokolov, 1941, 26.) According to Gorky, folklore "yields a great deal of material both... to poets and prose writers..." (1937, 450). The Writer's Congress was also attended by collective farmers and workers who produced "new collective farm songs" and asked for the "creative guidance" of the folklorists. Sokolov stressed the "necessity of active intervention in the process of folklore", because "the actual tasks of the contemporary workers' and collective farmers' folklore are exactly the same as the actual tasks of proletarian literature" (27). No wonder traditional folk narrators and artists were coached by folklorists not only on how to improve the style and the traditional themes, but received instruction in ideologial enlightenment and were empowered to create stories inspired by current events.

When the Hungarian Folk Art Institute began sponsoring folklore fieldworkers, guidelines were set to shape the viable and most conveniently applicable "progressive traditions". Folklorists were expected to function as propagandists in assisting the improvement of existing forms of expression. For example, folkdance specialists carefully recorded customs, dances, and play-party games from older villagers and reworked them for stage presentation for a broader national audience. Thus, with the help of local educators, the foundation for the future folkdance ensemble movement was established. At that time collaborative work at state farms and village communes was a new experience in labor relations; it did not work well. In order to help consciousness-raising, cultural propagandists resorted to the use of folklore. For example, fieldworkers were asked to adjust the May-pole tradition to the new need. An attempt was made to persuade members of agricultural brigades to erect the May-tree in front of the highest producing worker's house instead of the house of their sweethearts, as was customary. In another case, inspired by the application of the traditional Russian chastushka to topical ideological themes of the Soviet epoch, Hungarian urban and rural workers' song groups (including office workers, intellectuals, students, and professors), were asked to create their own stanzas criticizing corruption and praising virtue within their own circles.

Folklore, particularly dancing, singing, and music making, soon became a general recreational activity. Specialists made their village collections accessible to the masses and thus non-peasant groups, coached by artists and folklorists, appeared in programs of festive events. As the ensemble-movement spread, groups competed with each other locally, regionally and nationally. Distinction was blurred between villagers who manipulated a selected set of their own tradition and those who lacked such tradition and synthesized several forms. The goal was to create a national folk-based style as suggested by Bartók and Kodály. In the dance field, several artists (M. Rábai, I. Molnár, E. Muharay among them) rose to fame by similar efforts that culminated in the establishment of professional state folkdance ensembles with selected artists from the ranks of talented amateur performers.

The Folk Art Institute and experts of the Folk and Handicraft Association had a somewhat different policy of organizing and retraining market-oriented traditional craftspeople. Potters, carvers, and other producers of practical objects were urged to return to traditional forms as well as adapt new symbols; village women formed their own cooperatives to weave and embroider their regional patterns on non-traditional objects for new decorative uses. Through the special stores of the Folk and Home Industry Association the popularization of art pieces was successful. Cultural centers, party and government offices, restaurants, hotels and private homes were soon filled with folk art objects. Urban and rural consumers picked colorful ashtrays, pitchers, wall plates, coverlets or pillows for their homes, without regard or awareness of regional styles. Tourist souvenir hunters, delighted by low princes, did not care for ethnographic information. The goal to make decorative folk art an "integral part of the cultural mass movement" (Kresz, 6), was achieved through the total blend (or confusion) of regional and ethnic styles. While household utensils lost their traditional value for the

peasant household, they became decorative elements and symbols of a new populism in urban homes.

Ethnographia, the journal of the Hungarian Ethnographic Society, reported an exhibition of folk artists in honor of Mátyás Rákosi's 60th birthday on May 9, 1952. The article stated that the nation owed tribute to the celebrant because under his wise guidance culture became more national in form and increasingly more socialistic in content. The evolvement of a new Hungarian folk art is also attributed to him, particularly the enormous boom in decorative folk art. (*Ethno.* 1952, 1) The exhibit included gifts made by folk artists from each village in the country. The traditional objects (textiles, pottery, carvings, beadwork, painting, sculpture, honeycake) contained inscriptions (slogans, initials, dates), symbols (flags and red stars, the new coat of arms of the People's Democracy of Hungary, etc.) to document a new period of cultural revolution.

The anonymous author of the article concludes with:

> This exhibit has a significant artistic and scientific meaning. It was the first mass-based representation of our new folk art. As such, it is the faithful mirror of the artistic taste of the whole country. Despite unevenness, it is the indisputable proof of the fact that the new Hungarian folk decoration found the way to continue living amidst the folk democracy.
>
> (Ibid, 8.)

6.

Following Stalin's death, the XX. Congress of the Soviet Communist Party condemned the personality cult characteristic of his dominance and a thawing process began. A new, less rigid cultural policy was evolving in the Communist Bloc. In Hungary relaxation of the stiff dogmatism made it possible to launch an attack against the remains of the Stalinist system and create a new form of "folk democracy".

The institutional direction of the folklore movement was broadened under the firm leadership of the Folk Art Institute. This was done on the basis of decentralization and the establishment of partnerships with regional and local agencies. The number of specialists in related fields of folk culture greatly increased as academic, as well as secondary training, was made available. New careers emerged in the domain of folk education through the foundation of museums, culture clubs, folk art centers, and libraries.

In this new era ideological clarification concerning archaic and emergent new folklore, that is, problems about the responsibility of the artists, writers, folklorists, and questions on more efficient methods of application became the ongoing subjects of intellectual exchange, debate, and controversy. Discussion often occurred at the closing sessions of artistic performances, indicating keen interest in refinement and a firm commitment to public service. "... these deliberations evidently help not only the preservation of folklore values in the most appropriate manner but also do everything to serve the interest of socialist society and public education." (V. Voigt, 1978, 1). More im-

portantly, crucial issues were often discussed in public forums, revealing the deep involvement of society. *Élet és Irodalom*, the central weekly literary magazine, published the debate over the "cultural democracy's uses and abuses of archaic and new style folksongs, old style pop songs and new beat music. Triggered by national folksong competition broadcasts via radio and television folklorists, ethnomusicologists, public sector specialists, writers, composers, and sociologists expressed their opinions, which amounted to a deep re-thinking of the "folk art renaissance" of 70s and early 80s. From February through May, 1981, 15 authors expresed their feelings. The concluding remarks of I. Vitányi, Director of the Folk Art Institute, presented an idea of the official position on the state of the arts. Vitányi's sociohistorical periodization of the folklore movement as related to social progress is worthy of attention:

> This is the fourth [folk art] renaissance in the twentieth century history of our culture. (The first: the early years of the 1900s with Bartók and Kodály in the lead...; the second in the 1930s, a prelude to the democratic folk revolution; the third, during the years after the Liberation; and the fourth, now.) This listing in itself indicates that in a broader sense, we are talking about reaching back to half of the country's population were peasants and not only the existence and future of the peasant class was unsettled, but also its culture. Since then, we have become an industrial–agricultural country, but we still bear the negative impression of the peasant past in production constraints and discrimination effecting the life of the rural population. To eradicate disadvantages is a key problem to our social progress and public education. We have to find the way to organically accommodate our traditions into our public education so that they can express and prepare the way for cultural progress of the segments of the population who were left out from the autonomous institutional current of culture. (*Élet és Irodalom*, May 9, 1981, 4.)

Concern for the formation of a culture that is national in form and socialist in content continues. The folk element is still regarded as the unique expression of collective cultural identity. The goal is to unite all layers of society by sharing that common folklore (peasant) heritage, thus creating the communal socialist orientation of culture. Nevertheless, over the years the main concern with channeling and directing the folklore movement became more profuse and ramified because of the more liberal treatment of scholars, artists, and audiences. More room was given to individual and local initiative, innovation, experiments, and formation of trends and schools. There is a growing awareness of the interdependence of scholars and artists in shaping the future of folklore. Yet the platform of the previous era and the institutional control of folk arts remains the same, aiming at the same goal.

There is an important factor which characterizes the movement. The basic ideologization was carried out during the Rákosi Era, but in the memory of the older generations there were bourgeois survivals (even after 40 years) which were overshadowed by new experiences. On the other hand, today's younger generations (producers and consumers of folklore) brought up in the spirit of Marxism–Leninism, have little, if any, awareness of internal class-conflict. The rural and urban – peasant, worker, intellectual – were acculturated by an integrated educational system. Their interest in folklore, particularly as a form of recreational activity (either as a performer, or as a memb-

er of the audience) is the same. Vitányi's essay in *Népszabadság,* the central daily of the Hungarian Worker's Party (January 7, 1979), explains the meaning of the emerging socialist art in clear terms:

> Socialist art stands for national art but without limitations of the bourgeois concept of nation... This new culture involves the entire people and is truly collective. People turn to it not only because of its national qualities but rather because of its nature which is present in both the artistic content and the structure of public education... This new collective art, of course, can exist only in a communal society – i.e., in the socialist and especially in the communist societies – which brings the collective idea to full realization. On the other hand, the development of collective art is not only the outcome of a communal society, but the essential condition for the evolvement of a communist society.

Folklore, as well as its artistic applications, became a part of general education both formally in schools and informally through regular media programs. Academic folklorists appear on prime time radio programs lecturing (Jávor–Küllős–Tátrai, 1978). Village artists perform ballads, funeral laments, magic healing ceremonies, play instrumental music or demonstrate procedures, of making art objects. TV quizzes test participants' knowledge of folklore as a discipline – its classic genres and noted performers. On the other hand, academic folklorists safeguard the application of folklore both in the works of professional and amateur ensembles and festivals; they serve as jurors in competitions and supervise commercially produced folk-art objects. Folklorists are also consultants for movies and theater plays in which folklore or ethnographic elements are used. This kind of part-time sector work, so to speak, legitimizes the manipulation of folklore by culture-club directors and festival and lay folk-ensemble organizers who are also trained in folklore.

While speaking about village ensemble work and folk manipulation of its own tradition, B. Andrásfalvy relates it to the pioneer work of E. Muharay in the 1950s. The ensembles presented spectacular celebratory events of local folklife (weddings, carnivals, seasonal rituals, and spinning-bee entertainments), garnished with dance, music and a variety of prose folklore. This tradition has been maintained and further developed by local community leaders. In tradition-bearing villages the *Pávakör* (Peacock Circle) functions as the recreational workshop for the elaborate traditional customs which the villagers enjoy. If successful, villagers present their play in regional communities and meet in competitions. The best win prizes, distinctions and invitations to perform at vacation places, retirement homes, and youth camps. Village groups who attain status develop a whole variety show program and are then bussed from place to place to perform.

Another recreational village activity is conducted by the women's embroidery and handicraft workshops. After working for hours under the guidance of a teacher, individuals enjoy personal creativity for its own sake and use the products to decorate their own homes. (Andrásfalvy, 1978, 25–27)

Over the past 15 years Hungarian folk ensembles have not only met with each other in competition; but also competed internationally with the aid of the Folk Art Institute, collaborating with other culture–political agencies, to create the Folklore Festival of the People of the Danube Valley. The reformers were mostly from socialist bloc countries. The program for the VII event in 1981 contained the statement of the late György Martin: "...this is the only festival in Hungary in which we are able to introduce the authentic forms of folklore. All other festivals are the competitions of choreographers and folkdance ensembles..."

The festivals, the gatherings of performing groups, became the scene of artistic and scientific discussions. While folklorists and art experts supervised the work of the ensembles and participated in the judgment of competing groups, they also met in sessions to discuss the question of authenticity, the folklore value of the programs, the theoretical significance of the movement known as *folklorismus* and its impact on evolving new folklore, and the future of the discipline. With the publication of these discussions and exchanges of experiences by international folklore scholars, Hungarian folklorists attained international visibility and recognition. Although the phenomenon had been the point of interest since the early 60s, particularly in Germany and West Europe (Moser, 1962), Hungarian participation broadened the scope of study. In a way, the Hungarian type of folkdance and song movement entered the stream of the international folklore movement, which erupted largely as a humanistic response to the pressures of the alienating industrial society's affluence and technological efficiency. The festival and its revivals, in their spectacular public forms, express the identity claims of a young generation while appealing to to preindustrial harmony, the good life, and the desire to foster genuine artistry as opposed to mass homogenization. Vitányi, in his essay, explicitly dissociated Hungarian folklorism from its Western forms:

> Nowadays more than ever, the folk art movement becomes a worldwide phenomenon, not a reactionary nostalgia (as in Western countries). For the developing countries, folklore is the only cultural tradition to preserve and develop as their own national culture... It is a historic question whether this demand leads them towards bourgeois or socialist culture. The unique Hungarian situation originates from having common characteristics with both the rich and the developing countries. We can still adapt from a burgeoning folk tradition. Folk art has always played an integral part in the development of professional Hungarian art. But we also have a universal art to help establish a new collective art based on folklore... This is the Hungarian model of folklorism..."

Hungarian folklorists, accepting the international consensus in defining folklorism (Voigt, 1978, 1979, 1980), pointed out distinctive features of orientation towards the arts and political purposes:

> Folklorism in a narrower sense, is primarily an aesthetic communicative process which, contrary to folklorization, departs from folklore toward non-folklore. In a broader sense... it is the communicative process, or the end-product of total or partial implantation of traditional peasant culture into an alien movement. Empowered by new social, political and aesthetic content, it gains new significance by assisting cultural leveling of social classes, calling attention to social, ideological and even political issues in this homogenizing process. (Fejős, 1981)

In addition, Niedermüller (1981, 66) states, "One of the most important tasks of Hungarian folklorism research, both for scientific and ethical principles, is the description of sociocritical tendencies in order to help political decision-making. This is to say, folklorism research has to join other social sciences committed to terminate discord in our social life."

Without going into details about the impact of academic and doctrinal principles (translated into practice by local folk culture agents) on folklore and the folk, the results seem to be confusing. Guests of the VII Danube Valley Festival were invited to observed a staged wedding ceremony *in situ* on the premises of Decs, a "tradition-preserving" village in the Sárköz ethnic region. Everything seemed authentic except that the couple were not to be married and that Christmas animal mummers from the neighboring Bucovina Székelys were brought in as clowns for the post-wedding entertainment. Where are the village folk going? Will making villagers aware of the value of their archaic traditions help them continue preservation and creativity along traditional guidelines? Or will peasant youths, after leaving the village and joining the working class, return to the cultivation of archaic folklore as is fashionable nowadays among young urbanites? Will they continue to reconstruct their own heritage or adapt and create a new expressive form from the displaced rudiments accessible to them?

Cultural politician J. Báthory (1981, 88) has pointed out that in the field of folk arts there are two contingents producing real value: marginal peasant communities which still preserve authentic folklore and the young folk of the city. In fact, in recent years the urban youth movement has experienced a new boom. As pointed out elsewhere (Dégh, 1987), the folklorism of young urban intellectuals, in the Bartókian sense, was influential in making archaic peasant art the basic source for the renewal of folk and lay arts, as well as the creation of a new professional art. At this time, the youth movement for a "new collective art" seems to be the product of inspired artists who, with the support and stewardship of the Folk Art Institute, catered to a genuine need for artistic expression.

Two distinctive forms have been developed to give an institutional frame for this need. Both are described and documented by illustrations in the book, *Nomadic Generation* (1981). One form is the *Táncház* (dance house), a kind of dance club except for its claim to be a recreational dancing occasion with strong educational, moral, behavioral consciousness-raising overtones. The name is adapted from the dance hall set up for traditional occasions in Szék (one of the best researched Hungarian villages in Transylvania). Originating in Budapest, the dance-house movement spread to cities all over the country where cultural centers provided the place for the entertainment. Membership consists of folkdance and music-loving young people, ranging in age from 14–30 (mostly students, intellectuals, and about 25% factory workers) all wanting to have a good time. (Sági, 1979, 43) The leaders, however, are professional choreographers and musicians trained in the folkstyle regional dance dialects and musical instruments. In addition to obtaining dance instruction, attendants also enjoy the performances of invited artists and lectures given by writers, scholars, and artists.

The youth movement, also sponsored by the Folk Art Institute, activates interest in objective art. The goal is to preserve "authentic folk art" which, with the passing of the generation of genuine folk artists, will vanish if it is not preserved and continued by young artists. To promote this cause, workshops, courses, seminars, camps, visits to museums and studios of peasant ("naive") artists are organized. The instruction covers pottery carving, architecture, textiles, embroidery, and other crafts. Studios, dormitories, and exhibition halls were built to promote amateur arts and crafts, as well as to discover new naive and sophisticated artists with roots in peasant art (Sági, 1981, 44–45).

The promoters of the young artists' movement are critical of the tourist market flooded with clichéd, mass-produced souvenirs for the china cabinet (Nomadic Generation, 81 and 89). Nevertheless, the Hungarian government, through its tourist agency IBUSZ, fully promotes the Hungarian image of the 1930s – the drinking, goulash-eating, carousing, csárdás-dancing, puszta-dwelling, Gypsy violin-addicted Magyar (Greverus, 1977).

The tourist industry in Hungary is booming and scores of gift shops sell the cliché products of the Folk and Handicraft Corporation, homogenizing the aesthetics of the new consumers who are decorating their dwellings nostalgically and museumizing them. Tourism as a commercial enterprise is a form of folklorism the world over; in equal measure the East and the West market symbols of national character and folk identity (Bausinger, 1971, 172–9). Hungary offers its visitors an ever-increasing number of shows, guided tours and pageants, misinforming them about the goals and achievements of its cultural policy. Gulyás-parties, pigslaughterings, candlelit carriage rides to the Puszta with arranged kidnaping attempts by bandits *(betyárok)* on horseback, gypsy band concerts, folkdance programs in hotel halls, all demonstrate little of modern Hungary.

Interior tourism, on the other hand, developed by local travel agencies under the advisory assistance of the Folk Art Institute, seems to place more emphasis on educational tendencies than on commercial gain. Vacationers are urged to visit many points of interest, explore attractive places in the country, and learn abour natural, historical and cultural monuments. Outdoor museums, and so-called protected villages are specific sources of folkloristic enculturation from which urban visitors can get the taste of seemingly routine folklife. Dressed in local costume, the visitor attempts spinning and weaving, horseback riding, and cooking palacsinta; he or she can purchase local folk art objects and picture postcards, all for relatively modest fee.

The most spectacular tourist-oriented event is the reconstruction of the traditional county fairs. The foreign visitor receives a printed calendar of "folklore events" which is available to the natives through newspapers or radio announcements. The schedule lists all folklore programs, festivals, and local, amateur and professional ensemble performances across the country.

These fairs are mainly folk art fairs and take place from spring to fall, held in connection with patron saints' days. Regional potters, cloth-dyers, basket weavers, carvers and other craftspeople, as well as salespersons from textile cooperatives, bring their

goods – most of which is usually available anywhere the year round in the stores of the Folk and Handicraft Cooperative. The fairs are indeed persuasive vehicles of taste integration.

7.

Finally, I will return to my initial premise that power holders have always used folklore as an effective persuasive tool to achieve their goals. This seems evident and only proves that folklore is an ever-present basic expression in all cultures. Its attractive forms and styles lend themselves to become a means of communicating messages of current significance. In fact, this flexibility and applicability keeps folklore alive. The quality of folklore is well known to manipulators of the masses and it is for this reason leaders develop strategies of application. In Communist Central and East Europe, folk educators were trained in the native folklore in order to help governmental goals. Through a network of educational agencies, a systematic indoctrination is conducted using folklore in order to change the worldview. Those who have folklore will give it to those who do not, thus everybody will come to a consensus by sharing this folklore.

Every entrepreneur who wants to popularize his merchandise – be it toothpaste or politics – must convince the public that his product is worthy, has a good reputation. The strongest evidence is when the product can already exhibit success and popularity before the time of its advertisement. Hence commercial advertisements and political statements anticipate popularity and insist that the customers buy that particular product ("More and more people eat Tombstone Pizza!"), or that the folk, *en masse* choose to listen to this particular politician. In other words, the folk *will not* buy this merchandise, *will not* follow this politician, it *is* already doing it.

In deciding whether a movie is good and worth seeing, the prospective viewer is influenced not so much by the critics as by friends and neighbours. The opinion of people of the same mind is more influential than authority and circulates through the same conduits as folklore. From this point there is only a small step to reach a conclusion that folklore, by definition, is the most authentic conveyor of public opinion. Once a segment of the society formulates an opinion, it is controlled through folklore. By way of folkloristic persuasion, this will help convince the rest of the population about the validity of that opinion. Therefore, to manipulate folklore effectively, public opinion's enhancement of folklore's prestige is the primary task. The second task, and the most essential, is its interpretation and suitable correction.

Thus, folklore (or what seems to be folklore) is the most influential tool of persuasion.

(1984)

Bibliography

Bertalan Andrásfalvy, Hagyományőrző együttesek közösségteremtő szerepéről. *Folklór, Társadalom, Művészet* 2–3, 1978, 22–27.

Robert Plant Armstrong, What's Red, White and Blue and Syndetic? *Journal of American Folklore* 95 (1982), 327–46.

István Békés, *Ökölbe szorított szó. A magyar nép válogatott közmondásai és szólásai.* Budapest: Művelt nép, 1962.

János Báthory, Városi népművészek. *Nomadic Generation.* Budapest: Népművelési Intézet, 1981, 88–91.

Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskunde.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971, 159–79.

Linda Dégh, *A szabadságharc népköltészete.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1952.

Linda Dégh, *Uses of Folklore as Expression of Identity by Hungarians in the Old and New Country.* Journal of Folklore Research 21 (1984), 187–200.

L. Dégh, K. Katona, L. Péter, *Történeti Énekek és Katonadalok.* Budapest: Közoktatási Kiadóvállalat, 1952.

L. Dégh, K. Katona, *Bartók and Folklore,* in Gy. Ránki (ed.) *Bartók and Kodály Revisited.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987, 107–22.

János Demény, *Bartók Béla (levelek, fényképek, kéziratok, kották).* Budapest: Magyar Művészeti Tanács, 1943.

Bartók-Breviárium (ed. J. Újfalussy). Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1968.

Richard M. Dorson, "Fakelore." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65 (1969), 56–64.

Alan Dundes, *"Nationalistic Inferiority Complexes and the Fabrication of Fakelore: A Reconsideration of Ossian, the Kinder- und Hausmärchen, the Kalevala and Paul Bunyan."* Journal of Folklore Research 22 (1985), 5–18.

Zoltán Fejős, "A kultúraőrzés és folklorizmus." *Folklór, Társadalom, Művészet* 9 (1981), 13–26.

István Fenyő, *Az irodalom respublikájáért.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.

M. Gorky, *On Literature: Articles and Speeches,* 1928–1936. 3rd ed., Moscow, 1937.

Ina-Maria Greveras and M. Beutel, *Ungarische Notizen.* Frankfurt a. M., Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie, 1977.

István Györffy, *Néphagyomány és nemzeti művelődés.* Budapest, 1939.

János Horváth, *A magyar irodalmi népiesség Faluditól Petőfiig.* Budapest, 1927.

Márton Istvánovits, "A szovjet folklorisztika elmélete." *MTA Osztályközleményei* I. Osztály, 18: 1–4 (1962), 291–309.

K. Jávor, I. Küllős, Zs. Tátrai, *Kis magyar néprajz a rádióban.* Budapest: Minerva, 1978.

Lajos Kálmány, *Szeged népe.* I–II. Arad, 1881–82. III. Szeged, 1891.

Imre Katona, "Kossuth-nóta" *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon* III. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 284–85.

Imre Katona, *"Kortesdal". ibid,* 279–80.

Mária Kresz, "Népi díszítőművészetünk fejlődésének útjai". *Ethnographia* 63 (1952), 10–37.

Hans Moser, "Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit". *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 58 (1962), 274.

Péter Niedermüller, "Folklorizmus és társadalomkritika". *Folklór, Társadalom, Művészet* 9 (1981), 61–68.

Nomadic generation. Youth and Folk Art in Hungary 1970–1980. T. Bodor ed., Budapest: Népművelési Intézet, 191.

Gyula Ortutay, "A magyar népköltési gyűjtések története". *Ethnographia* 59(1939), 227–37.

Gyula Ortutay, "A magyar néprajztudomány elvi kérdései". *Ethnographia* 42 (1949), 1–23.

Gyula Ortutay, "Kossuth Lajos a magyar nép hagyományában". *Ethnographia* 63 (1952), 263–307.

Gyula Ortutay, "The Science of Folklore in Hungary Between the two Wars and During the Period Subsequent to the Liberation". *Acta Ethnographica* 4 (1955), 5–89.

Gyula Ortutay, "The Role of Rural Schooling in Hungarian Peasant Culture". (1962) *Hungarian Folklore. Essays.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972.

Felix J. Oinas, "Folklore and Politics in the Soviet Union." *Slavic Review* 32 nr, 1, 1973, 45–50.

Ernő Pesovár and Ilona Dobos, "Verbuválás." *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon* 5. 1982, 525–26.

József Révai, *Marxizmus, népiesség, magyarság.* Budapest: Kossuth, 1948.

Mátyás Rákosi, *Építjük a nép országát.* 1945. *Rákosi Mátyás Elvtárs születésnapja: az új magyar népi díszítőművészet fejlődésének hatalmas forrása. Ethnographia* 63 (1952), 1–9.

J. M. Sokolov, *Russian Folklore.* Hatboro Penn. Folklore Associates (1941) 1966.

Mária Sági, "A táncház." *Folklór, Társadalom, Művészet* 4–5 (1978), 53–65.

Mária Sági, "New Folklore Movements in Hungary." *Folklorismus Bulletin* 1 (1979), 41–45.

A szovjet nyelvtudomány kérdései: Marr-vita. Budapest, 1958.

István Tálasi, "Györffy István emlékének (1884–1939)." *Ethnographia* 1956, 152.

Sz. A. Tokarjev, "A forradalom előtti orosz és a szovjet néprajz fejlődésének fő szakaszai." *Ethnographia 62 (1951), 257–76.*

Vilmos Voigt, Introduction to "Folklorism once and now". Kecskemét 1978. *Folklore, Társadalom, Művészet* 2–3 (1978), 1.

Vilmos Voigt, "Folklore and Folklorism Today." *Folklorismus Bulletin* 21–29.

Vilmos Voigt, "Folklore, Folklorism, Symbol, Symbolism." Budapest, 1980. *Proceedings of the Folklore Department.* Mimeographed papers and project. No. 21.

Vilmos Voigt, "A Semiotic Investigation of the Ist of May Celebrations in Budapest During the 1970s: A Brief Report." *International Folklore Review* I (1981), 38–40.

Iván Vitányi, "A félreértett demokrácia". *Élet és Irodalom* May 9, 1981.

Contrasting English with Hungarian

Stephanides, Éva H. (ed.)

Studies in Modern Philology 2
(Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1986. pp. 292.)

In his *Introduction. A general Linguist's Views on Contrastive Linguistics,* Ferenc KIEFER assesses the role of contrastive linguistics as a branch of applied linguistics not independent of linguistic theory. It is through heavy reliance on up-to-date linguistic theory as well as acute awareness of pedagogical considerations that contrastive linguistics can achieve its primary goal of shedding light on linguistic complexities of many kinds (phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, etc.) in the contrastive analysis and go way beyond simplistic comparisons of haphazardly structured data drawn from the languages concerned. Contrastive analysis can but benefit from what typological investigations, the theory of language acquisition in general and the theory of foreign language learning in particular can offer by way of relevant information. If contrastive linguists take advantage of a complex approach of this kind, they will not only be able to draw significant structural conclusions but make revealing predictions of potential errors in the learner's usage as well.

The volume under review contains five papers written in English, each of which addresses a distinct area of English–Hungarian contrastive grammatical analysis. A Contrastive Analysis of English Passive Structures and their Hungarian Equivalents by Ágnes F. KEPECS (with 41 references) sets out to "find an adequate subdivision of English passive clauses by arranging them along a passive-active scale and thus providing a suitable framework for their opposition with the corresponding Hungarian structures". (p. 80) As all the data derive from written English texts (novels, plays, essays by both British and American authors as well as academic and legal texts), it is somewhat confusing to be told that "A one-way contrastive analysis is presented, with English as the target language and Hungarian as the base language". (p. 24) After a concise survey of definitions of the Passive Voice in the literature, the study focuses on the various passive clause types in English (altogether nine). This is followed by an analysis of the means of expression of passive meaning in Hungarian, coupled with a summary of the "grammatical, syntactical and lexical structures and forms that are employed in the Hungarian equivalents of the English passive". (p. 49) Since this section precedes the contrastive analysis proper of the English passive subgroups and their Hungarian equivalents, this way of presenting the material seems tantamount to begging the question.This is all the more infelicitous that "The Hungarian counterparts do not form a single unified structure, but rather an aggregation of various structures loosely integrated formally or semantically". (p. 80) Thus, one finds the Hungarian equivalents listed before they are discovered in the analysis. Fortunately, however, this is entirely a question of presentation and does not detract from the merit of a thorough and informative study, which succeeds in pinpointing, in a reliable framework, most of the troublesome cases Hungarian learners of English face when they try to cope with the various passive clauses in English. Some minor quibbles: 1. subsection 1.1.2. ought to have been corroborated by a couple of references (p. 25), 2. it is not clear what "unanimous" has to do with this sentence: "... it is not always unanimous when it is a real passive construction and when a statal-equative clause..." (p. 25.), 3. the transformational generative view of the Passive is too sketchy (p. 27), 4. as this volume is likely to arouse the interest of scholars who speak Hungarian as a foreign language and, most hopefully, that of learners of Hungarian as well, a few examples illustrating subsection 2.1. (that on Hungarian devices) would have been most welcome., 5. Table 3. (p. 48) is misleading in giving *ember* (man) as a type of general subject. It should read *az ember* (lit. the man) 'one', 'you'. 6. the formulation "It (the focus) precedes the verb or the pre-

dicate..." (p. 49) is too vague as the position of focus in Hungarian is right in front of the verb or predicate (unless it is the verb or predicate that is in focus position).

A Hungarian Look at the Meaning of the English Perfect by Nándor PAPP (containing 37 references) spotlights a category of the English verb which has been the bane of many a foreign learner's life and which continues to intrigue linguists and teachers of English the world over. The data analysed are finite verb forms from British English sources, excluding, rightly, the treatment of passive forms as well as that of the perfect infinitives preceded by auxiliaries. The problems under investigation are put into sharp focus by a list of errors typically made in the use of perfect forms by Hungarian learners of English. The errors point both to the underuse and to the overuse of the perfect. A distinction is drawn between objective time and its "psychological and linguistic interpretation" in language. (p. 92) In defining his conceptual rools, PAPP draws on W. Bull's axioms concerning time and events, including his differentiation between the primary axis of orientation (signalled by the Simple Present) and the secondary axis of orientation (marked by the Simple Past). Kiefer's dichotomy between external and internal time specification and Reichenbach's trichotomy of Speech Time, Reference Time and Event Time. These concepts are then used in the analysis of the perfect forms (restricted to the Present Perfect and the Past Perfect) in relation to the other past and non-past tense forms in English. It is claimed that the Present Perfect is a "period verb-form", is "temporally indefinite", represents an "indirect approach" to the event described, expresses "current relevance" by implying a subsequent state in the present. The importance of semantic classes of verbs, such as "telic" and "atelic" verbs (those implying a goal and those without a goal respectively) in decoding the meaning of perfect forms is emphasized. Internal time specification and the category of 'aspect' (expressed by the correlation between continuous and non-continuous forms) is also touched upon. Section 3. is devoted to time specification in Hungarian, while section 4. presents the projection of the English verbal forms on their Hungarian counterparts. PAPP's treatment of his topic is complex, informative and well-presented. It is an important study from the theoretical and the practical point of view alike. In addition to the targeted audience, learners of Hungarian will also find numero us insights in it. Nevertheless, there are a number of theoretical points made which can be challenged. 1. It is stated that perfect forms are sometimes called tenses, sometimes they are associated with the category of aspect. (p. 88) This is correct but the treatment of the Perfect as a category in its own right is also worth noting (M. Joos and G. Bauer among others). 2. There are inconsistencies in the use of the terms "past" and "present". "Past means any time point or span earlier than now, and which does not include now." (p. 100). Both the Simple Present and the Present Perfect "are present in that they both contact the moment of speaking, they both refer to present facts. They occur in present time contexts." (p. 104) "The Present Perfect is not opposed to the Past in terms of time; both refer to the time before the moment of speaking." (p. 111) "Though both the Present Perfect and the Past refer to past time, there is difference in the way they do so." This controversy can easily be resolved by using the term "past" only to refer to time intervals to the left of the "extended present" indicated by adverbials of varying length, such as 'today', 'this week', etc. and to correspond to the Hungarian term "múlt", while its interpretation as time intervals to the left of the moment of speaking (the "point present"), to render the Hungarian term "elmúlt" should be scrapped. The latter use should be termed "anterior". Now, all past events are also anterior to the moment of speaking but not all events anterior to the moment of speaking are past – some are present. Thus, the Present Perfect will express, as its name suggests too, events that are anterior to the present moment of speaking but are not past. In this way, the contradiction of calling one of the present tense forms in English 'past' can be eliminated. 3. To describe the Simple Present as a "temporally definite" form is hardly tenable. 'The sun rises in the east' may involve spatial definiteness but scarcely temporal definiteness. 4. Tense and Aspect of Present–Day American English Kenkyusha, Tokyo. 1963 was written by OTA, Akiro. In the Bibliography we find it listed under Akira, O.

A Contrastive Study of English 'SOME' and 'ANY' and their Hungarian Equivalents by Éva H. STEPHANIDES (with 20 references) sets out to describe the role of these two "grammatical devices" in various contexts and grammatical functions, paramount being, of course, that of indefiniteness (p. 151). The corpus used comprises plays, short stories, novels as well as economic and legal texts written in English and translated into Hungarian. Following a detailed critical survey of the literature, the theoretical points

are summarized in a table (p. 167). Prior to the contrastive analysis undertaken, the most frequently used Hungarian counterparts are examined and tabulated for easy reference. Some of the main problems tackled include the role of pure, implied and incomplete negation associated with any; some and any as quantifiers, the different handling of countability in the two languages, some in its particularizing function, any in its distributive and generic meaning, some with cardinal numbers. All the predictions of language use, with particular attention to difficulties likely to arise, are made possible as a result of the analysis and are integrated into the main line of thought. Both learners of English and those of Hungarian will find this paper most useful, as it is rich in descriptive detail, painstaking comparisons and revealing comments. Nevertheless, I find myself at odds with some of the points made. 1. I take leave to doubt that some as used in (8) Some telegrams you have to deliver, ... some telegrams you can't phone ... is synonymous with a few, is untressed and expresses "unspecified quantity". (p. 153) Clearly, certain would have been a much more adequate alternative. 2. Néhány új bútort, the suggested Hungarian equivalent of some new furniture (p. 180) appears to me to be semantically ill-formed. Néhány új bútordarabot would have been more appropriate. 3. I suggest that 'Angol könyv van a polcon?' is a better equivalent of 'Are there any English books on the shelf?' than 'Van néhány angol könyv a polcon?' (p. 186) 4. I think *néhány* tends to be at greater ease with a *few* than with *some* as a rule. Although the latter can be used in a sense typical of the former, more often than not, especially in subject position, it is closer in meaning to *sok*. Also, the construction *van, aki* could have been included in the list of Hungarian equivalents (as in 'Some like it hot.' = 'Van, aki forrón szereti.')

László VARGA's paper entitled A Contrastive Analysis of Some Types of Negative Sentence in Hungarian and English (supplied with 18 references) concerns itself with a small but well-defined range of Hungarian sentences involving negation and consisting of a verb and one single argument and their English counterparts. VARGA approaches the problem in a strictly controlled and consistent way, relying on word order and intonation as well as functional sentence perspective, with its categories of topic, comment and focus, which are much more relevant to the description of Hungarian than those of subject and predicate. The author defines his topic in the context of research into the field of functional sentence perspective, ranging from Brassai to É. Kiss. There are five types of Hungarian sentences analysed, excluding those with indefinite arguments. Part of a more detailed study of Hungarian and English negation, this paper is exceptional in the volume in using Hungarian as the source language and English as the target language. The analysis is meticulous, lucid, exhaustive and accurate.

In his paper on Reported Statements in English and Hungarian (containing 22 references), Tamás VÁRADI chooses the original method of positing a scale of remoteness from the original utterance in dealing with the various ways of reporting statements in English and Hungarian. (pp. 238–9) Some simplified traditional views on indirect speech are criticised and a new definition is proposed: "Indirect speech is any form of discourse reporting some previous linguistic communication that meets the following conditions: (a) referential identity is preserved between direct and indirect speech forms; (b) any additional information introduced by the reporter cannot be taken as attributed to the quotee; (c) the indirect speech form can at least ambiguously be interpreted as referring to prior linguistic communication; (d) on the basis of information about the reported and the reporting situations the utterance-meaning of the direct speech form can be unambiguously identified." (p. 246) All the important deictic factors involved in shaping indirect speech form and content are thoroughly scrutinized (personal pronouns, demonstratives, the definite article, place adverbs, time expressions, certain types of adjectives and tenses). The contrastive examination shows that "the Hungarian and the English tense system differ in that they use different time signalling systems". (p. 278) VÁRADI's paper is highly original, very informative and sheds light on many a vexing problem connected with reported speech. The usefulness of the paper is further enhanced by error predictions as well as tabular arrangement of the most essential points. Two minor critical comments: the formulation 'két napon belül/múlva' on p. 266 is confusing, and the reference to Lotz 1976 is missing from the Bibliography (p. 269).

There are a few misprints which mar the appearance of the volume, e.g. "... might help to HLE's to recognize ..." (p. 56), "... and had to carried out ..." (p. 62), "... the meaning of these forms have still not been satisfactorily defined." (p. 88), "A state either exist or does not." (p. 149), "... the top of any

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 recetly 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 compliments 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 tonque. 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, whorehouses 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 Jósef Bridge in the south. Cutting a path across these semicircles, in a northeasterly fashion, was Andrássy Avenue, intended as Budapest's answer to Champs-Elysées. 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" aparment 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 Andrássy 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 accomplis,* 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 accountrements of the Magyar gentry, but had converted to Catholicism (or, in the case of a minority, Protestantism), were finally begining 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 renascence 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 antrenched 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 renascence 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 milieau. 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 milieau 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 cosmospolitan". 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 worldy 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 coffehouses 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 meating 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 leaven 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-

milies 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 trapsing 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 sophistacted and cultivated audience at any rate – in Budapest.

Although Lukacs does not entirely ignore the wider European milieau 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, Hoffmansthal. 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 milieau 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

REVIEWS

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 KESERÜ	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

HU ISSN 0236—6568

From the Contents of Forthcoming Issues

George Bisztray: 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