



1991/92

HUNGARIAN
STUDIES

CONTENTS

*Volume 7
Number 1-2*

National Identity and Culture: Hungarians in North America
Conference organized by the Hungarian Chair in the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington (April 1-3, 1990)
Chronicle
Reviews

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 and German — dealing with 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. Each issue contains about 160 pages and will occasionally include illustrations. All manuscripts, books and other publications for review should be sent to the editorial address.

Hungarian Studies is published by

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

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

Orders should be addressed to AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, H-1519 Budapest, P.O. Box 245

Editorial address

H-1014 Budapest, Országház u. 30. Telephone: 175-9011/327

Mailing address: H-1250 Budapest, P.O. Box 34

Editor-in-Chief

Mihály Szegedy-Maszák

Editors

Richard Aczel

Gábor Bezeceky

József Jankovics

Advisory Council

Lóránd Benkő, Eötvös Lóránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest; George Frederick Cushing, University of London; Tibor Klaniczay, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest; László Kósa, Eötvös Lóránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest; Péter Rákos, University of Prague; Denis Sinor, Indiana University, Bloomington; Miklós Szabolcsi, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest; Bo Wickman, University of Uppsala

HUNGARIAN STUDIES

VOLUME 7, 1991/1992

CONTENTS

NUMBER 1-2

<i>László Kósa</i> : Hungarology: Changes and Variations in the Meaning of a Word and Concept	5
<i>George Hoff</i> : The Manfred Weiss – SS Deal of 1944	23
<i>John Lukacs</i> : About the Psychology of the Emigré	35
<i>László Borhi</i> : The United States, Hungary, and the Origins of the Cold War	43
<i>Samuel J. Wilson</i> : Oszkár Jászi and the Hungarian Democratic Emigration	71
<i>Richard Aczel</i> : Central Europe: Oszkár Jászi's American Dream	89
<i>Enikő Molnár-Basa</i> : At Home in the United States: Assimilation without the Betrayal of Roots	99
<i>Thomas Szendrey</i> : Reflections on the Historical Consciousness of Hungarians in North America	105
<i>József Jankovics</i> : The Problem of Identity in Hungarian Poetry Written in North America	113
<i>Nandor F. Dreisziger</i> : Sub-Ethnic Identities: Religion, Class, Ideology, etc. as Centrifugal Forces in Hungarian-Canadian Society	123
<i>László Kovács</i> : Significant Hungarica Collections in American Research Libraries	139
<i>Thomas A. Sebeok</i> : Uralic Studies and English for Hungarians at Indiana University: A Personal View	149
<i>George Bisztray</i> : Heritage Education as a Conceptual Context for Teaching Hungarian ..	153
<i>Steven Béla Várdy</i> : The Verhovay Fraternal Association's Efforts to Perpetuate Hungarian Consciousness among its Native-born Members (1930s-1950s)	161
<i>Károly Nagy</i> : Thirty Years in Voluntary Mission: The Hungarian Alumni Association, "Magyar Öregdiák Szövetség — Bessenyei György Kör" (1960-1990)	171
<i>Paul Bódy</i> : Ethnic Communities and the Retention of Cultural Traditions in the 1990s ...	177
<i>Éva V. Huseby-Darvas</i> : Handmade Hungarianness: The Construction of Ethnic Identity among Elderly Noodlemakers in Michigan	187
<i>Ákos Farkas</i> : A Nuclear Physicist's Foray into the Realm of Fiction: Leo Szilard's <i>The Voice of the Dolphins</i>	197
<i>Marga Kapka</i> : The Story of One Family's Uprooting from Hungary, Narrated through the Persons of Father and American-born Daughter	205

CHRONICLE

The Foundation of the Hungarian Folklore Association in Czechoslovakia (<i>József Liszka</i>)	213
The Foundation of the János Kriza Folklore Association (<i>Ferenc Pozsony</i>)	215

REVIEWS

Ian Thomson, <i>Humanist Pietas: The Panegyric of Ianus Pannonius on Guarinus Veronensis</i> (<i>George F. Cushing</i>)	219
Új Magyar Shakespeare-Tár (<i>Thomas R. Mark</i>)	220
Paul Bódy (ed.), <i>Hungarian Statesmen of Destiny 1860-1960</i> ; Péter Gosztonyi, <i>A kormányzó, Horthy Miklós</i> ; István Bethlen, <i>Bethlen István emlékirata</i> (<i>Nandor F. Dreisziger</i>) ..	223
Joseph Zsuffa, Béla Balázs, <i>The Man and the Artist</i> (<i>Mihály Szegedy-Maszák</i>)	231
Samuel R. Williamson, Jr., <i>Austria-Hungary and the Origins of the First World War</i> (<i>Martyn Rady</i>)	232
Frederick Garber (ed.) <i>Romantic Irony</i> (<i>Eleanor S. Shaffer</i>)	235

**National Identity and Culture: Hungarians
in North America**

**Conference organized by the Hungarian Chair in the
Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies,
Indiana University, Bloomington (April 1–3, 1990)**

HUNGAROLOGY: CHANGES AND VARIATIONS IN THE MEANING OF A WORD AND CONCEPT

LÁSZLÓ KÓSA

Eötvös Loránd University

“The word is not sufficient and yet is still necessary.” Sándor Eckhardt, the director of the Institute of Hungarian Studies at the University of Budapest, wrote these words about the term *Hungarian Studies* (*Magyarságtudomány*) in 1942, which was then indisputably a synonym for *Hungarology* (*Hungarológia*). He had reservations about this term because although the term became generally known in the 20s in Hungary and soon after the other term, *Hungarian Studies*, was used regularly in the literature of science-administration and policy, both terms were also popular in publications, and in fact, the words did not have the same meaning to different researchers. Obviously, the concepts denoted by these words were multiple and complex. This diversity derived from two problems: what should be included in these concepts and what should be their theoretical base?

Half a century after Eckhardt's statement there is still no consensus on how to interpret the terms *Hungarology* (*Hungarológia*) and *Hungarian Studies* (*Magyarságtudomány*). They are real concepts and are used in spite of the lack of exact definitions. What is more, although over several decades the use of these terms was not permitted and later it was considered inappropriate to use them in scientific life in Hungary, and it seemed that the concepts themselves became obsolete, suddenly these terms were revived and a series of interpretations emerged.

In this presentation I would like to attempt to give a more precise definition of these concepts. My method will be to follow the development of the various conceptions of *Hungarology* which are closely or loosely related to each other and to follow the changes of its elements and interpretations. I shall analyze them chronologically, summarizing them in eight points.

1. According to our present knowledge, the word *Hungarology* was used by Róbert Gragger (1887–1926), a Hungarian professor at the University of Berlin, as a comprehensive term for the activities of different branches of science. He did not systematize his notions about *Hungarology*, but one can gather what the term meant to him from his significant work accomplished in his short life time. Originally he studied Hungarian–German comparative literary criticism, but his main goal was the introduction of Hungarian culture into Germany. He was appointed to the University of Berlin in 1916. Soon after his appointment he created a Hungarian Department, then in 1917 the Berlin Scientific Institute. He started the *Ungarische Jahrbücher* periodical and the *Un-*

garische Bibliothek book series in 1921, and later established the *Collegium Hungaricum* in Berlin, which served as a model for later educational and research institutes.

These institutes, together with the periodicals and the book series, were forums not only for Hungarian language and literature, but for historiography, art history, folklore and other similar fields as well. Besides papers in literary criticism, Gragger himself published excellent linguistic records, e.g., "The Lament of the Holy Virgin", which was discovered at that time. He also published an anthology of poetry, volumes of folk ballads and folk tales, and wrote articles about the fine arts. Obviously, in the Hungarian Department it was impossible to separate teaching the language from knowing the culture, but with Gragger there is no trace of anything beyond teaching subjects in their own settings, collaterally; he did not strive to show the relationships the subjects had one to another.

2. Gragger's theoretical framework is not known in publication, which is why we do not know whether, through personal communication, his notions about Hungarology met the ideas of Lajos Bartucz (1885–1966), who later became a famous anthropology professor at the University of Budapest. Not only Bartucz but other people as well referred to Gragger as a person who several times presented his point of view orally. In 1930, in one of his articles (*A modern nemzeti tudományról/On National Science*) Bartucz took the following thesis as a starting point: "... the attribute 'national' would go mainly to those sciences which are national in their subject matter and in their goals in addition to the scholar's national character and originality, since his methods and administration of science are based on national language and logic." What follows is much more concrete. "Such sciences are above all Hungarian anthropology, folklore, archeology, linguistics, history, social studies, the investigation of national character, the Hungarian land, culture, nature, and the study of various relationships between them." However, it was clear to him that "the biggest obstacle in clarification was the lack of impartial research and the imperfection of the research methods," which is why he warned against imaginative speculation and subjective opinions.

He strongly advised against the exaggeration of the national character of the sciences because, as he wrote, not every field is suitable for the expression of national character. In other words, he felt that his ideas were not on firm ground, but the encouragement given by the school of *Geistesgeschichte* and the great national tradition alleviated his fears. He felt afraid for national culture, for the disappearance of the Hungarian language, which had been worrying Hungarian intellectuals for more than a hundred years. The sense of danger increased after the Treaty of Trianon, and was accompanied by a concern for the differentiation and specialization of modern scientific life. He referred to the latter when he stated that the small nations had a diminishing chance to produce significant results in any field of science. It is not only an individual, but an absolute loss as well, because the small nations themselves are able to analyze their own culture most successfully. Because of this diversity, it would be necessary to undertake national research in the light of their common goals and to find the relationships among them. Hungarology is defined by Gragger as "an independent science which systematizes the knowledge referring to the nation" and this is in Bar-

tucz's interpretation as well. The enumeration of its content would have allowed the birth of a cultural anthropology if the theory had possessed a modern ethnological background. But this was not the case. Only romantic heritage revived in the *Geistesgeschichte* could be used as a theoretical support. Bartucz was able to find precedents in studies of national character written in the last century. But he did not give a more precise definition of the vague concept of the study of national character and he did not systematize his ideas.

In any event, by the time Bartucz had finished his first Hungarological paper, the Royal Hungarian University Press (Magyar Királyi Egyetemi Nyomda) had advertised its series entitled *Hungarian Encyclopedia (Magyar enciklopédia)* and furthermore the first book in the series *Hungarian History (Magyar Történet)* by Bálint Hóman and Gyula Szekfű had already been published (1925-). The first comprehensive folkloristic study, the four-volume *Folklore of the Hungarian People (A magyarság néprajza)* was published in 1933-37, and the combined geographic-anthropological study, *Hungarian Land-Hungarian Race*, was also published in four volumes (1936-1938). The proposed volumes on art history had not yet been completed. This vast undertaking made the term "Hungarology" widely known to the public, and the fact that the series was called "Hungarological" gives evidence for this fact. It is important to note that the volumes of the series were not consistent in their ideas and themes, that is to say they followed Gragger's pattern, cultivating the different sciences dealing with Hungarian ethnicity and culture as two distinct, but parallel, issues.

3. Meanwhile, the demand for Hungarology outside the field of science appeared with László Németh (1901-1975), a prominent figure in the Hungarian literature and intellectual life of the 20th century. In his periodical *Tanú* (Witness), written by himself, he tried to represent the mind as the receptacle of all the world's knowledge. Németh's concept of Hungarology, or Hungarian Studies as he called it, derived from his thirst for all knowledge.

The concept had emerged even earlier, in the first issue of *Tanú* in 1932. Soon after it was expounded in a shorter article (*A Plan for a Hungarological Association, Response*, 1934) and in a longer article (*The Tasks of Hungarian Studies, Hungarian Studies*, 1935). There is no evidence as to whether the writer knew of the precedents of this field of study. It hardly would be imaginable that he did not, but it is obvious that he saw the tasks of Hungarology in an individual way, differently from the scientists. He contrasted the scientists who, according to him, had lost touch with real life and had become morally empty, with laymen who, because of their integrity, are more devoted to the search for true knowledge. He considered himself to belong to the latter group.

"Man's most important concern in life is his behavior", wrote Németh. Not only the relation between man and his environment depends on this; but his whole fate as well. As the official science and its "serving priests" expelled the "secular congregation" from its sanctuary (he used this theological metaphor) the latter group is forced to create some sort of new "behavior-and fate-science" for themselves, in order to get the desired knowledge. And this knowledge is more than the totality of the sciences. "It

is necessary to stress their common features, and these features constitute Hungarian Studies." In other words, he did not accept the University Press series as Hungarology, rather he considered them as volumes representing an auxiliary science of Hungarology. He takes exception not only to the fact that the branches of science are separated from one another, but also to the unwillingness to combine them.

In Németh's opinion, Hungarian Studies is comparative studies. It is the province not only of "man" but of "Europeans", and within this, of "Central Europeans", and finally, "the innermost circle is the Hungarians". Around them there is Europe and the belt of ethnic minorities. Within this belt of minority peoples there is also the Hungarian tradition, as well as specifically Hungarian regions. What is the spirit of this geographical and historical area? What is the nature of the people who live here? How did they find their place among the other nations of Europe? What are their distinguishing characteristics? What is the Hungarian "essence", the Hungarian "calling"? And what kind of behavior is required from those who possess this calling? (*Kiadatlan írások / Unpublished Studies*, I. 386.)

The importance of searching for the "essential" and the "characteristic" often appears not only in his studies, but also in others inspired by *Geistesgeschichte*. We can find no concrete answer for the questions raised above. It would be especially difficult to obtain the scientific results expected by Bartucz and Gragger, because László Németh's attitude toward Hungarian Studies is moral rather than scientific. Sometimes it concerns the search for a "calling", while at other times it stresses the importance of the prophetic as the source of actions which transform the future. This, however, illuminates clearly the contradiction in his accusation that official science had lost touch with life, while he himself offers as a substitute a theory very far from practical life. Furthermore, he re-evaluated its concepts in a subjective way, calling them science, although they should belong to some other field, e.g., social policy or social education. Because of his vague theories, his general characterization of Hungarians, and his search for the "characteristic" and the "essential" is often highly subjective. His work over the following eight to ten years produced highly controversial issues which have been debated up to the present time. Bartucz had previously warned against this.

It was the young Ferenc Erdei (1910–1971), a politician and economist, who first initiated this debate with Németh in one issue of *Magyarságtudomány* in an article entitled "Hungarian Economic History". He enumerated his reservations regarding the search for "completeness", and while admitting the mediocrity of science he did not accept Németh's view of an "absolute science" which could replace disciplinary knowledge. Erdei, a rational thinker who tended toward Marxism, was not against the concept of general science, but against the approach of *Geistesgeschichte*. Erdei presented "Hungarian economic science" in a rational framework and gave it a role similar to that given by Németh to Hungarian Studies, although he did not call it "science of fate". He saw the largest problems of Hungarian ethnicity as economic rather than moral issues. He wanted to explore them in a detailed, scientific manner and investigated them systematically, exclusively in the field of political life, in hopes

of finding a way to solve them. This idea is the notion of Hungarian Studies from the perspective of social politics.

The standpoint of István Bibó (1911–1979), a jurist and politician, can be joined with Erdei's ideas. Bibó wrote his article "The Problems of Hungarian Studies" (*A magyarságtudomány problémája*, Budapest, 1948) during the Second World War, but it was published only later. He clearly separated the scientific and social-political issues of Hungarian Studies. Bibó did not doubt the importance of the disciplines of science, but he definitely warned against drawing political conclusions, or, worse yet, making political decisions based on national character as defined by these disciplines of science. He pointed out that it was a dead end to consider the traditional peasant culture as a source of renewal for national culture because it is a terminal culture which is not able to produce anything new. He took into consideration, although it was not true, that in the following decades the peasantry would play an essential part in the life of Hungary, which is why he attached so much importance to the state of the peasantry, but he did not remove it from the structure of national society. In other words, it is not the transformation of the fate of the peasantry which would make a crucial impact on the fate of the nation, but just the reverse, both socially and politically.

After all, Bibó did not deny the relationship between Hungarian Studies based on the research of rural culture and social politics, but he emphasized their possible, but indirect connections. In his concept of Hungarian Studies there is no trace of his being anti-science; he did not want to replace concrete research with a vague notion of "science of fate"; the achievements of the branches of science dealing with the history of civilization and language might be important for regenerating Hungarian culture; general historical research and investigation of society could provide politicians with a lesson worth following; and finally, it is the task of education and social policy to utilize those achievements in practical life.

Between Erdei and Bibó, Hungarology received impetus again from studies of Bartucz, behind which there was a historical scientific background stretching back to Romanticism. There is a possibility that László Németh influenced him, although there is no philological evidence of this. It is true that in his article *On Hungarian National Consciousness* ("A magyar nemzetismeretről", *Ethnographia*, 1936) Bartucz, just like Németh, speaks about the self-image and status-recognition of Hungarians, but by that time those terms had already become widely used. There is still no reference to this fact, but the terms "essence", and later "Hungarian essence recognition", and "Hungarian national consciousness", or so-called Hungarian Studies would suggest Németh's influence in Bartucz's work. Bartucz put a stronger emphasis on the national framework. By "essential" and "characteristic" he understood some kind of special surplus of physical and spiritual characteristics without offering any detailed explanation of his theory. "The body of the nation and national spirit is far more than simply the sum of the physical and spiritual characteristics of the individuals in the society, because the nation is a higher living unit, organized in a very complex way..." Here Bartucz clearly shows that he was a natural scientist. We do not refer here only to the fact that he used outdated theories of social Darwinism, but rather to the exaggerated em-

phasis on the subjects of his profession. The examination of physical appearance (without racist overtones) seems to be more important than the study of state organization (political science), historiography, linguistics, folklore, and the animate and inanimate environments. However, László Németh, who originally was a physician, did not attach much importance to anthropology although he often used physiological metaphors in his works.

4. Meanwhile, the quarterly journal *Magyarságtudomány* was not published after 1937 because of financial difficulties. The editorial board was in agreement with László Németh in their refusal of the dominant trend of cultural policy and the rigid "official" science; however, they could not accept his vague arguments for assuming a point of view outside of the disciplinary sciences, the confrontation of science and dilettantism, and his extreme subjective literary ideas. When in 1942 they started to republish the periodical, it was a forum of the anti-German middle class cautiously supported by the official government. (In 1944, not a single issue was published as a result of the German occupation.) One of its editors, Sándor Eckhardt (1890–1969), who was mentioned at the beginning of the lecture, can be called the pragmatic representative of Hungarology. Eckhardt, a scholar of Hungarian–French comparative studies, a literary critic, and university professor, recognized the reaction and failure that — in the given possible framework of Hungarology, however broad its interest could be — the validity of the universal science might become more narrow. But he considered this negative outcome, a result of the contradiction, as a necessary sacrifice for timely national goals, and as an essential concomitant of keeping the national awareness alert. He did not attempt to establish a theoretical base. He tried to avoid the obscurity in the concepts with his summary statement: "The word is not sufficient and yet is still necessary", on the one hand, and with enumerating tasks and subjects belonging to this group of science on the other hand: "... there is no new science or new method hidden in the word Hungarology; but only a program which contains all the goals of the sciences dealing with the Hungarians — goals that both link and complement each other. Thus, under Hungarian Studies there are all branches of Hungarian historical science: linguistics, literary criticism, history of law, history of music, folklore, anthropology, history of ethnic character, human geography, social history, archeology, and what is more, the science of Hungarian flora and fauna.

All the natural and human endowments which characterize the Hungarians, their past and present surroundings belong to Hungarology. He extends his attention to the neighboring nations as well with which the Hungarians have been living in symbiosis; he includes their history and folklore inasmuch as they are relevant to the Hungarians to some extent. In an ideal interpretation, Hungarian Studies contains the knowledge of Hungarians not only living in Hungary, but in the unity of historical Hungary and in the diaspora overseas." (*Magyarságtudomány*, 1942, 2–3.)

In his detailed program, Eckhardt considered the task of shaping public opinion of the educated extremely important. It was true that shaping public opinion had been one of the goals of the Budapest University Press, but Eckhardt definitely acted against un-

scientific theories, especially against unscientific prehistory and dilettantism. He did not identify himself with Németh's prophetic fate-science.

There was an extensive organizational framework supporting the newly resumed publication of the journal — the Institute of Hungarian Studies (established in 1939) had been operating successfully for years with Sándor Eckhardt as Dean of the University. It coordinated the work of twelve departments and a seminar as a parent institute. Its board of directors consisted of the most distinguished scholars, professors of that time who are highly respected even today. In 1942, a social corporation was additionally organized, which was supported by the intellectual elite.

As they stated that it was not a new science, but rather the cooperation of the work of the old branches, the institute took direction to organize and financially support themes and unclaimed scientific fields. Large and small amounts of money and scholarships were awarded mainly to young researchers or teachers who had just begun their research careers, and for collecting materials. Considering the circumstances that it was war time, they achieved significant results. But it is not easy to judge the individual branches. Folklore and linguistics obtained most significant results. In his criticism, Bibó thought of the predominance of ethnography over the other fields. Historiography achieved a little less, and literary history almost nothing. Together with the periodical, the institute published seven book series and very interesting studies which have been used until the present time. They emphasized the objective introduction of the neighboring nations' cultural and historical connections.

5. The term Hungarology itself reappeared, quite unexpectedly for the outside observer, in Yugoslavia, twenty years later, in the 1960s. Its reappearance, however, was not surprising for those familiar with the circumstances. It occurred as the name of a definite research trend: in Novi Sad (*Újvidék*) in 1969 an Institute of Hungarology was set up in the cultural center of the Hungarians living in Yugoslavia. Its birth was determined by two facts: the intellectual need arising in the Hungarian minority in Yugoslavia for examining the past of its own culture, and the favourable conditions provided by the Yugoslavian policy of nationalities. This time they did not attempt to determine the content of the term "Hungarology", but in their statutory document they specified the four scientific areas the Institute was to take care of: Hungarian language and literature, folklore, and the history of Hungarian civilization. (By the latter term they meant the history of theatre, journalism, publishing, and associations.) In every field they paid particular attention to the study of the cultural and linguistic connections between South-Slavs and Hungarians.

The Novi Sad Institute represented a new version of experiments and attempts in the field of Hungarology. The scale of activities became narrower than in earlier ventures in Hungary, yet, it was the first example of setting up a research institute dealing with the Hungarian minority. Although they struggled with a shortage of specialists, very soon they produced valuable accomplishments. In 1975, in the spirit of the tenth Party Congress, which ordered to achieve the unity of education and scientific research, the Institute merged with the Hungarian Department of the University, under the name of Institute for Hungarian Linguistic, Literary, and Hungarological Studies.

Merging the research institute with the university in this particular case meant the loss of one of the institutions of minority research, but the majority of the research projects begun in the Institute were continued (István Szeli, "On the Institute for Hungarology in Novi Sad" / *Az újvidéki Hungarológiai Intézetéről*, Kortárs, 1978, 3, pp. 437–440).

We can cite examples of both the independent research institutes and those connected with a university department. To the first type belonged the Hungarian Association for Science, Literature, and Art in Czechoslovakia, or Masaryk Academy, as it was also called, which existed in Slovensko between the two world wars and worked rather inefficiently. A better-organized version of this, with higher scientific respectability, was planned to be established by Slovakian Hungarians during "the Prague Spring" in 1968. Since they were not able to proceed, as soon as the changes in Czechoslovakia began in November, 1989, they included it among their requests again.

In establishing the institute in Novi Sad, and in choosing its name, they partly made use of the example of the Institute for Albanian Studies, already existing in Pristina, center of the Kosovo Autonomous Area. A number of similar institutions exist internationally. Nearly all significant linguistic-cultural minorities in Western Europe have a similar institution. What is more, from the pre-1918 period in Hungary, the Croatian, Serbian, and Slovak cultural-linguistic associations, the so-called Maticas, can also be considered as belonging here. Their intellectual roots are related to those of the precedents of Hungarology in the last century, inasmuch as they, too, were a product of national romanticism. Their situation changed significantly after 1918, when they became scientific institutions of majority nations and undertook the mission of spreading their culture and language among ethnic Hungarians (Matica Slovenska).

Of the centers of Hungarology collaborating with university departments, mention must be made of centers in Hamburg, Uzhgorod (Ungvár), Groningen (the Netherlands), and the most recently established center of Hungarology in Rome, inaugurated in 1990.

6. The proposition by Lajos Bartucz and László Németh to set up a society of Hungarology was only carried out after several decades in 1977, and then, too, the interpretation was again, in many aspects, different from the earlier attempts. For the first time in the history of Hungarology, the International Association of Hungarian Studies set as its aim the international coordination and construction of a framework for the activities of those studying Hungarian culture as a research subject and those working in Hungarian higher education. This was the first time that the notion of Hungarology, which in the 1920s had a still purely national justification, was acknowledged as having international validity. Accordingly, Miklós Szabolcsi, chairman of the statutory meeting, explained the above goals as follows:

"The first thing we must honestly and openly deal with is that Hungarian literary history, linguistics and ethnography are relatively backward when compared with the research and education of other languages on the international stage... It is a serious handicap, since, as can be proved by several examples from scientific history, scholars and researchers of other nations have substantially contributed to the research of every national language and literature. So far we have had to go without these contributions, largely because of obstacles in the way of information or the total absence of it... This Association makes Hungarology capable

of attaining the form of international organization that characterizes other scientific disciplines..." (*Hungarológiai Értesítő*, 1979, p. 360)

The absence of historiography from among the above sub-disciplines is conspicuous and has served as a basis of rightful criticism. The absence cannot be justified, it can merely be explained by the fact that, prior to the actual establishment of the Association those working on the arrangements of setting it up had already planned to join the *Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes (FILLM)*, which in fact took place in 1979. The member-associations of FILLM deal mainly with literature and linguistics. These facts apart, it is beyond doubt that historical research cannot and should not be left out of the range of activities of the now internationally acknowledged Hungarology. The equivalents in French and English translations of the name of the Association (*études hongroises/Hungarian Studies*) are obviously closer to Hungarian Studies in the broad sense, as well as to the title of the journal of the Association published in Hungary (*Hungarológiai Értesítő/Newsletter in Hungarology*), and comprise significantly broader fields of study than philology. As shown by Robert Gragger's practice and several further examples, teaching Hungarian in higher education to non-native speakers of the language cannot be successful without a profound knowledge of Hungarian culture and history. As is well-known, the case is the same with other languages.

The prestige of the International Association of Hungarian Studies was considerably raised by its two congresses, the first organized in Budapest in 1981 and the second in Vienna in 1986. The number of its members is close to one thousand, with more than half of them living in Hungary. To emphasize its significance in scientific history, it must be stressed that in the field of science this Association was the first to comprise in one organization Hungarians living in Hungary as the majority nation, ethnic Hungarians forming minorities abroad, as well as researchers and scholars of non-Hungarian origin dealing with Hungarian culture and language.

7. In view of the public interest in problems of national minorities, ethnic and religious groups, and the question of nationalities in general, which has significantly intensified in Hungary in the 1980s, the Institute of Hungarian Studies (*Magyarságtudató Intézet*) was established in Budapest, affiliated with the National Széchényi Library, the Hungarian national library. Its significance can only be appreciated if we point out that for over thirty years after World War II the cultural, political, demographic, economic, etc. situation for Hungarians living outside the borders of Hungary was not continually researched. Although in some fields of study (as in literature and ethnography) important publications and books were written, there were years when, because of the alleged danger of internal nationalism or the sensitivity of nations neighbouring Hungary, these questions were regarded as taboo.

Not long after the formation of the Institute in the fall of 1985, Chairman Gyula Juhász, when asked about the responsibilities of the Institute, said:

"...(The tasks include) researching Hungarians beyond Hungary's border and the complex study of their social and cultural conditions, and so as to be able to do so, setting up a data bank based on substantial source material... Furthermore, we are coordinating domestic field research projects, giving assignments for research, supporting the education of new generations of researchers, and facilitating further training. We are determined to study the 20th century history of the Hungarian minority, the changing socio-economic conditions of Hungarians living beyond the border, their culture and the system of their cultural institutions, and the relations of minorities with the mother nation. The most important fields of interest are the problems of the Hungarian language, the conditions of Hungarians living in West European countries and America, trends and currents in their intellectual life, and their relation to today's Hungary." (Interview by György Halász, *Magyar Hírek*, March 28, 1986.)

Today the Institute of Hungarian Studies is the organization which deals, as an institution, with the scientific research into the questions of sporadic Hungarians living in the West. In this field, as well as in other areas, it has to make up for great losses. After such a short period of existence, some results of this activity can already be seen. Among other things, it provides organizational and financial support for research programs promoting education in Hungarology and spreading and teaching the Hungarian language outside Hungary. Last year, the idea of extending the Institute's range of study was raised, which would actually continue the tradition of research institutes of the period during World War II. The idea is for the Institute to include as well researchers and scholars dealing with the relations and historical contacts between East-Central European cultures and Hungarians, and minorities and ethnic groups in Hungary, thus broadening its range of interest and activity to include the whole process of Hungary's cultural adaptation to a European identity.

8. The International Center for Hungarology, created by decree in Hungary on July 1, 1989, is a completely new type of institution. Its functions include researching international education in Hungarology; exploring and analyzing the history and organizational structure as well as educational programs and methods of research institutions abroad; developing and maintaining the documentation in Hungarology necessary for work in the Center and for outside information; selecting and publishing textbooks, lecture notes, and other aids and materials to be used in higher education in Hungarology. On the agenda are also the preparation of educational aids, the organizing of post-graduate seminars, educational conferences and meetings, and conducting and organizing tenures for guest professors, and, as a task of exceptional importance, providing educational press publications for institutions abroad. (*Művelődési Közlöny*, 16, 1989, p. 1125.)

The Center operates as an independent budget entity under the authority of the Ministry of Culture. As can be seen, its activities consist mostly of methodological coordination and services. It also continues the work of its predecessor, the Center for Lecturers (Budapest), which helped teachers of Hungarian to visit institutions of higher education abroad, with matters of employment, and other issues. The Center of Hungarology started work with great impetus and under relatively good financial conditions, as borne out by its publications and the First International Conference on Education in Hungarology, organized in Hungary in August, 1989. It was during this conference that the International Association of Educators in Hungarology was established.

Because of its brief existence, there is no point in appraising the achievements of the Center in detail. There is just one more thing that needs mentioning, for the sake of impartiality. It is that the spheres of activity and responsibility of the International Association of Hungarian Studies and those of the International Center of Hungarology are not clearly separated from one another. Consequently, the Center is active in a number of areas which earlier had been the responsibility of the Association (e.g., one of the major themes of the Association's first conference was the teaching of Hungarian outside Hungary; another was compiling a basic library in Hungarology; and another surveying educational institutions of Hungarology). I do not intend to launch a debate here, I should simply like to draw attention to unfortunate overlaps. The significant difference between the legal positions of the two institutions and their respective concepts of Hungarology may, perhaps, serve as a basis to separate tasks and responsibilities. The Center, in spite of its name, is a genuinely national institution, while the Association, though its national commitments are beyond doubt, has in fact a truly international character. The Center sees as its objective the education and popularizing of the Hungarian culture outside Hungary. The Association, however, considers international research into the Hungarian culture to be the subject of Hungarology. The latter thinks of education as part of scientific activity.

I have come to the end of the first part of my lecture. Now, as I promised in the introduction, I want to draw some conclusions. The first will deal primarily with questions of terminology; the second with the ideological content of initiatives and attempts in Hungarology and their spheres of competence and methodology; while the third point is meant to outline one possible task for the Hungarology of the future.

1. As I mentioned in my first quotation, in 1942 *Hungarology* and *Hungarian Studies* were synonymous. Throughout my review, I have tried to use that term which was actually used in discussions at the time. Retrospectively, the dominance of the term *Hungarology* is apparent.

There is more than one reason for this. The word *Hungarology* was born earlier, and, though we have no immediate evidence, the method of word-formation was most probably analogy. I must also mention another form, similar, but much less frequently used, and nearly forgotten today: *Hungaristics*. In his excellent conceptual study, Péter Rákos points out the following possible differences between terms ending in "-istics" (Hung.: -isztika) or "-ology" (Hung.: -ológia): the suffix "-ology", used with the indication of a given research field, emphasizes scientific validity, while "-istics", not questioning the scientific nature, places more emphasis on naming the field of research in question. Other conceptions see "-ology" as a "science of rules", as opposed to "-istics", which is seen as a science having a more descriptive nature, and is often referred to as "the science of events". (*Hungarológia: a dolog és a szó, Hungarológiai Értesítő*, 1986, 1–2, p. 322.) Since the examples mentioned still do not give a sufficient basis for determining differences, Rákos finally speaks merely of tendencies.

In my view, it is more important to state that while Germanistics, Romanistics, Turkology, Scandinavianistics, Slavistics, etc., deal with families or groups of languages, Hungarology, Bohemistics, Polonistics, Russistics, Albanology, etc., refer to a scien-

tific interest in cultures determined by one particular language. As for the above examples (and several others not mentioned here), some other questions might also be asked: Why is there no such general expression for the study of every language? Why didn't every nation create such a term, though they all had the opportunity to do so? Why are the Finns content with Finno-Ugristics, and when then aren't the Hungarians? Why are the Germans content with Germanistics, and what would the Dutch do with Netherlandistics? Further, within Slavistics, why is it exactly the above-mentioned nations that have a separate word for the scientific study of their culture and language, and not the others?

I think there is no unambiguous answer to these questions, since behind each of these designations there is a history of science, sometimes similar, but basically different. Each of them has something to do with the spiritual change that in modern Europe channelled attention away from ancient languages and toward living languages; though, if we only consider the most common cause of interest, notably the process of becoming a modern nation, or attempts at national unity, we come across numerous different varieties. There is a difference between belonging to a family of languages and being an isolated language. The formation of Hungarology is of course included in the latter group. A further distinction can be made that Hungarology, both as a name and as a notion, appeared relatively late, for two reasons: first, in comparison with models of this denomination, which originated mainly in the last century and second, in regard to its own predecessors, which, similarly, go back mostly to the last century (though, from exactly this latter point of view it can in fact be questioned whether or not they are really to be considered predecessors). In other words, what later came to be called Hungarology had been born earlier. Here I have discussed only the historical process and the changes in the concept behind the term from the point of its origin.

We must also face the fact that these terminological problems should be understood in the context of the romantic and positivistic German scientific life of the 19th century. English and French sciences had a different historical background. Hungarian science largely followed the German model, which in our case is shown by the fact that philology was placed at the center of scientific research. This is what Gragger meant, as well. It should be noted here that creating the term Hungarology, in an area where the German scientific attitude was prevalent, was also intended to support, with its Latin-like sound pattern, international acceptance and validity. However, as stated above, Hungarology, as it developed in Gragger's a work, for the time being remained within national boundaries, contrary to the models it followed, which, at the time, were already internationally cultivated scientific disciplines. It was at this time that a new complicating factor appeared, the term *Hungarian Studies*, which did not help to strengthen the international concept of the field. On the contrary, it seemed to suggest the idea of introversion, though neither Bartucz nor László Németh was in favor of the ethno-centrism implied by the term. We must not forget that Hungarian Studies is the Hungarian equivalent of a word. Despite the fact, however, that the two terms have been regarded by many as synonyms, it is known that the meaning of synonyms is rarely identical. This can be seen in the fact that the term *Hungarian Studies/Ma-*

gyarságtudomány cannot be precisely translated into other languages. Because of the danger of confusion and misunderstanding, there can only be tentative attempts to find a German equivalent. But *Ungarische Philologie* or *Hungarologie* are both lacking some special elements of the Hungarian lexical meaning. Paradoxically, these are the terms related to the Hungarian "history of ideas" (*Geistesgeschichte*) inspired by the Germans, and to the endeavours between the two world wars aimed at the creation of a modern national character. The question is, how much of this meaning is still carried by the term as we use it today?

2. Our historical review did not explain the disappearance of *Hungarologie* after World War II, a fact requiring explanation.

Like every intellectual entity, *Hungarologie* between the two world wars was also bearing the intellectual, ideological, and spiritual impact of its age. We must ultimately consider two facts. One is the above-mentioned "history of ideas", the other was Hungarian national feeling, which was deeply offended by the peace treaty of Trianon, as previously mentioned. This feeling of offense had manifestations on many different levels, ranging from official nationalism to a more realistic appraisal of the political situation. The second factor had two important consequences. Undoubtedly, there was a strengthening of ethnocentrism, which emphasized the protection of particular and specific national characteristics, whether real or presumed, and very often overshadowed social problems. Furthermore, it is also beyond doubt that those active in the fields of science identified more or less honestly with the official policy of culture and science, since the state was the greatest patron of scientific research. It can be understood from this that after the second World War *Hungarologie* and Hungarian Studies, carrying the stigma of the fallen regime, did not appeal to communist policy makers, although the validity of their sub-disciplines was not questioned.

On the other hand, it is also true that they did not even make an attempt to save the lasting achievements and the method itself, choosing to drop the ideology of the previous period. What we have in mind is the fact that, after the Compromise of 1867 between Austria and Hungary, modern scientific life in Hungary was influenced by the diverse ideas of positivism. It followed from the very nature of these ideas, and from practical necessity also, that specialization developed on a large scale. The separation and isolation of some specialized areas was inevitable. László Németh fiercely attacked "academic scientific life", especially its isolation. Some sort of integration, and closer inter-scientific ties, proposed by Gragger, Bartucz, and other scientists and scholars, had become requirements of the general development of science. Later, this came to be known as complex research.

Another important result worth mentioning was that from the 1920s onward, research institutes also appeared in Hungary, and as we have seen, *Hungarologie* had a catalytic role in this process.

Much to the detriment of the development of Hungarian Science, after World War II the implementation of an interdisciplinary program was delayed for fifteen years. (It is a different matter that in practice it often made its way into research work, as central political control was not able to suppress it.) Scientific research institutes were

either dismantled or, removing them from their university context, were placed for the most part under the authority of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, or some other controlling agency. Hungarology and Hungarian Studies were so successfully and lastingly stigmatized with the charges of nationalism between the two world wars, and were consequently so entirely exiled from Hungarian intellectual life, that as late as 1977, after the formation of the International Association of Hungarian Studies, and even at its first congress in 1981, the organizers repeatedly denounced these accusations, though the stigma had by then worn off both from the terms and the concept itself. (Sándor Iván Kovács: *Conversation with Tibor Klaniczay, on the International Association of Hungarian Philology. Kortárs*, 1978, 3, pp. 431–437; *The science of National Memory*, TV talk on Hungarology, *Alföld*, 1982, 5, pp. 51–62.)

It would be a mistake to deny that the question of the nature of national character, or putting it another way, the location and nature of particular traits of a civilization and culture determined by its language, which was first put forth in romanticism, has still not received a complete answer. These are particularities, which, exactly because they are unique and cannot be repeated or reproduced, may be of value to the whole of mankind. "However hard one tries, one just cannot get rid of the notion of a national character or frame of mind," writes Péter Rákos (p. 326).

So it seems that new initiatives in Hungarology are careful enough not to tackle this question, but at the same time do not doubt its validity. There can be no doubt that practice has failed to verify the ideas of the 1930s. A contradiction emerged between theory and practice, inasmuch as the official institutional research in Hungarology did not carry out the ideas and principles they were intended to. This fact provides a possibility for classifying these initiatives. One group would include purely theoretical endeavours illustrated by citations from studies by László Németh, Ferenc Erdei, István Bibó, the other comprises practical work done by people or organizations, beginning with Gragger, to the recently established International Center of Hungarology. The activities of the latter group have gained higher relevance, compared with the theoretical attempts. After World War II, Hungarology quite consistently refuses to refer to any theory as its dominant concept. The sentence I quoted from Sándor Eckhardt about the spoken word being unsuitable, but still necessary, best demonstrates this. Hungarology does not exist as an independent discipline, it is nothing but a collective term for the historical study of a language and culture. This seems to prove, on the other hand, that the kernel of the idea has remained unchanged over decades: it provides more hope for success, if the study of the relationship between Hungarian history, culture, the Hungarian ethnic group and its environment is conducted with the collaboration of several scientific disciplines. Practice requires this question to be answered. As for me, largely accepting the idea of non-discipline, I agree with Péter Rákos, repeatedly quoted in this lecture, who emphasizes the international nature of Hungarology. He writes: "It is not merely a summary of scientific disciplines, but also a specific case of national science" (p. 327).

What could be the aim of this "non-disciplinary" science apart from the fact that its subject of study is the nation itself? Péter Rákos does not undertake to answer this

question. My own interpretation has a double nature. On one hand, Hungarology examines the history of the Hungarian ethnic group, with a definitely comparative type of approach. It deals with the behaviour, the way of thinking, and the attitudes that manifest themselves in culture. It examines what this culture has accepted, what it has rejected, and in what ways it has formulated its own identity, which at the same time is similar and dissimilar to other nations of Europe. It can well be established that the subject of Hungarology has been formed historically and has been continuously changing. It is not merely historiographic research, but a summary of historical sciences (literary history, history of art, ethnography, history of the language, etc.). This concept of Hungarology, however, does not include a knowledge of economics, demography, present-day society, statistical data, geography, material culture, present-day Hungary, or a knowledge of the anthropological characteristics of Hungarians. All of the above aspects should be included in the other model of the aforementioned "national science". Between these two models, I can see relevant differences, even a contradiction. The first model is suitable to include all those speaking Hungarian, all the potential carriers of Hungarian culture, including, of course, national minorities, sporadic Hungarians, and emigrants, but for the same reason it cannot undertake to present economics, statistics, natural conditions, etc., which are determined by the actual type of state. The second model, however, if only for technical reasons, cannot go beyond the borders of today's Hungary. If it employed a historical perspective for its research within the presently given state frontiers, it would certainly lead to the falsification of history. Behind the contradiction there is the difference between "nation as culture" and "nation as state", and the characteristically peculiar, though not unique, situation of the Hungarian ethnic group in Europe.

Considering the given possibilities, I believe there is only one scientific complex, notable historical anthropology, that holds out a promise of significant achievements. It has been shaped over the past decade, combining historiography, traditional ethnography, and cultural anthropology. Amalgamating the methods and the factual knowledge of all three areas not only promises a scientific system on a higher level, but also carries the hope of solving the contradictions between the two concepts of nation.

3. I think it is quite clear that I attach a great deal of importance to the subject of my lecture. This is only natural. Still, I must ask the question, because the logic of my lecture requires it: What is the point of dealing with Hungarology, and why is it useful today? The question calls for a specific answer since it is beyond dispute that the creator of every language and culture is obliged to research what has been created. It is a task belonging to mankind. The question I am more specifically raising here is that of timeliness.

In press statements and interviews preceding and following the establishment of the International Association of Hungarian Studies it was often said and written that the event was a result of increased interest in Hungarian culture. This argument was used as a tactical weapon by those who, establishing the Association, broke with the earlier policy of state-controlled isolation. To me it seems, however, that, as regards contemporary official scientific and cultural policy, the above statement was meant to hold

another meaning as well: that of self-justification. The Association demonstrated to the world that it had not been without reason that it invested energy and money in popularizing and researching Hungarian culture and language on an international level. There was interest, and the venture was a success. There was also the suggestion that the international attention and interest may have increased as a result of the Hungarian government's policy of openness which was really laudable considering the position of Hungary's allies. International attention thus could be presented as a special phenomenon, singularly deserved by Hungarians.

Both of the above approaches were false. In the second half of the 20th century cultural, economic, and social rapprochement was increasingly apparent all over the world, and, thanks to the broadening of mass communication, every nation and language could take its share of the benefits, except for those, of course, which were, in some way or other, impeded from doing so. The responsibility rests with the Hungarian cultural administration for neglecting cultural diplomacy throughout the third quarter of our century. It had restricted interest from whichever direction it arrived. This was the case whenever interest in Hungarian culture was shown abroad, when Hungarians showed interest in other languages and cultures, or when the proposal referred to popularizing non-Hungarian cultures in Hungary. Handling international cultural relations as a party/state monopoly, they were careful enough to keep ideas they regarded as detrimental at a distance, and paid special attention to discouraging private initiative.

Through the establishment of a unified market within the European Community, the process of European integration is soon bound to reach a historically decisive state. Every country of the continent, including those in the Eastern half, has realized how vital it is for their future how and to what extent they become part of this integration. The most important area of the planned unification is, of course, the economy, which will surely have an impact on culture. There is a lot of talk these days of a common European consciousness which is still to be created. On the other hand, giving up national cultures seems to be out of the question. They are emphasized as elements of a precious heritage, something to be preserved. One needn't be a prophet, however, to see that, based on the rules of psychology, in the near future we shall face, as a reaction against integration, a revival of regional and national cultures throughout Europe. The reaction to this eventual integration is bound to bring a tremendous amount of tension and problems to be solved, both in general, and for each of its participants. This also applies to Hungarians, even if some kind of participation in this integration proves possible on their part. Let me just call your attention to one grave difficulty, which cannot really be understood outside of Europe, or even in the Western part of it. In the countries belonging to the USSR's sphere of influence, national feeling takes forms quite different from those in Western Europe. Because of the different historical paths they have taken, the attempts at independence and autarchy, some welling up of hatred and nationalism might be expected. Hungarians know this particularly well.

The different co-existing approaches to Hungarology might play an important part in integrating Hungarian culture into European culture. There is obviously going to be

a growing impetus to increase interest in Hungarian language and culture outside the country. Hungarology can be instrumental in demonstrating the Hungarians' share in the common European culture, and in calling attention to their enriching contributions. Analysis of national characteristics is an essential ingredient of the much sought-after European consciousness. I am not only thinking of the things discussed above. All significant initiatives in the realm of Hungarology include the objective study of the cultural, historical, and political relations between Hungarians and their neighbors. For Hungarians it might be a program of primary importance to at last take advantage of the heretofore rarely celebrated fact that Hungarian culture exists not within one, but in several neighboring countries. This program could emphasize linguistic and cultural regions instead of a framework of nations and states as determining factors, much in the spirit of European integration. This presupposes, of course, a change in attitude within the Hungarian ethnic group itself, and requires from it a realistic approach to the values of its national culture, historical events, and the political-geographic situation. In the shaping and consolidation of this approach, Hungarology might assume great responsibility.

I must admit that in this lecture I have used the conditional form, because my historical experience does not let me express wishes and proposals either in the affirmative or in the imperative. I have only mentioned just a small portion of the tasks and opportunities in order to draw your attention to them. It is not for this lecture to survey them in detail or to make a blueprint for carrying them out.