

BOOKS

THE BOOK OF BALLADS

Hungarian folk ballads from Romania

Collected by Zoltán Kallós

Texts, under the care of prof. Attila Szabó T.

Melodies, under the care of János Jagamas

An introduction by prof. Attila Szabó T.

This volume offers —on the one hand to the general public on the other hand to the specialists— a collection, unique in its kind, 259 Hungarian folk ballads from Romania (162 with their melodies) collected from Csángó parts (Moldova, Ghimes), from the Plain of Transylvania and from the Valley of Nadas (Calata). This rich material contains texts and melodies, unpublished till now, selected from Zoltán Kallós's collection, which is the result of a persevering work, of more decades (1942-1970), comprising more than 2000 pieces to date.

An introduction written by prof. Attila Szabó T. helps us to understand the place of this collection among the Hungarian folk publications in our country. The author of the introductory study surveys the history of the Hungarian folklore in Transylvania, with a tradition of more than 125 years. Beginning with Ince Petrás (1842-1843), the first collector of Csángó folk ballads (Moldova), almost unknown in his period, a number of Transylvanian scholars were engaged in collecting folk ballads, especially after the famous edition of the Wild Roses by János Kriza (1863), who gave rise to a current of interest for the folk creations. Kriza's volume was followed by two volumes, published in the Hungarian Folklore Collection (1872-1882), where besides the ballads collection by Kriza, were included those collected by Elek Benedek and Jób Sebesi and later the collections of Oszkár Mailand (1905), and of Zsigmond Szendrey and Zoltán Kodály (1924). At the beginning of our century, famous folklorists and ethnographs like János Jankó and János Seprődi directed their attention to the necessity of studying unseparately, both the text and the melody, in their connection, that means a new step, which would know a strong development with Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály's activity.

Even in 1908 the former published his important collection, from Ciuc country; the latter founding a veritable school, printed, together with Bartók a volume of folk songs from Transylvania, containing also, pieces collected by his collaborators (Béla Vikár, László Lajtha and others, 1921). In that period appeared Pál Péter Domokos's collections (1940-1941), as a result of an unceasing work. He published a great number of classic ballads, underlining the folkloric value of the Csángós in Moldova.

A new period has began, in the folklore-collecting work by joining the generation after 1944, the more so as this generation develops its work in the organized framework of the Institute of Folklore, that has in view a systematic research of all regions of the country. The activity of Hungarian folklorists in Romania finds material and moral support in this institute. As a result of this work, as well as of the individual initiatives, a number of volumes are published, comprising individual or collective collections: József Faragó and János Jagamas (1954), Samu Konsza (1957), István Almási —Ilona Szenik— Ilona

Zsizsmann (1957), Ferenc Kovács (1958), István Almási —Katalin Olosz (1969), as well as the representative edition under the care of József Faragó (Jávorfamuzsika, 1965).

Zoltán Kallós belongs to the latter period, so, his activity of folklorist is characterized, on the one hand, of a participation in the collective research, on the other hand, of his personal work, a result of which is the present volume too. This collection presents some essential aspects quite different as against other volumes printed before it. Kallós brings a contribution in the knowledge of the thesaurus of Hungarian folk ballads in Romania, both with the texts published here, and with their melodies. Exclusively containing unpublished texts, this volume is above, in this respect, to all other editions of Hungarian ballads, including as compared to the classic and modern ballads, known so far variants of a special interest from a scientific point of view. In Kallós's collection there are a considerable number of variants containing 40-80 stanza, collected not only from well-known Csángóes in Moldova, but also from the Valley of Ghimes or the Plain of Transylvania. We have to emphasize that here are presented ballads which are sung even to day.

The variants written in prose, included in the last pages of the volume, are very interesting, also, the combined ones in which the prose and stanza are arranged in a specific manner.

Kallós's collection has a particular value as it comprises new geographical points, extending so the area of circulation of some ballads towards unexplored places or regions. This, besides a great number of ballads collected among Csángóes in Moldova (where he discovered even the trace of some unknown points), he presents a true thesaurus of the Csángóes in Valley of Ghimes, about whom we have had till now only sporadic informations. At the same time he finds a living stratum of Hungarian folk ballads in the Plain of Transylvania and the Valley of Nadas, the regions which were considered already "dead" from a folkloric point of view.

As to the published melodies, a great melodic variety is presented, from a territory identical with that of the texts. The melodic material of this volume numerically surpasses, as a matter of fact, the collections published before. Compared to the 24 melodies published by Sepródi, 57 by Bartók and Kodály, 31 by Domokos and 48 by Faragó and Jagamas, this volume offers not less than 162 unpublished melodies.

The appendixes, especially the explanatory texts and the glossary are destined to make known the world of ballads to the uninformed reader. The scientific apparatus, the indications regarding the data of the collection, as well as the bibliographical references of the variants, offer to the scholars all elements asked for a fundamentally estimation.

Writer Arrested

The Rumanian authorities have arrested Zoltán Kallós, a distinguished Hungarian writer of Transylvania, indicating him on trumped up charges.

Zoltán Kallós is one of several Hungarian writers, who during the past few years have collected the still existing ballads and folk songs of the Hungarian population of Transylvania and Moldavia, now both parts of Rumania. Mr. Kallos' collection was published recently in Budapest (Hungary) by Europa Publishing Co. under the title of "Book of Ballads" and was a major literary event both for its literary value as well as for its beautifully executed craftsmanship in printing.

The deplorable act is explained by the chauvinistic jealousy on the part of the Rumanian authorities, who feel that the works of Mr. Kallós and his colleagues unnecessarily prove to the world the existence and cultural quality of the several millions of Hungarians living now under Rumanian oppression.

*Heckenast—Nováki—Vastagh—Zoltai: A magyarországi vaskohászat
története a korai középkorban*

(A honfoglalástól a XIII. század közepéig)

*(History of Hungarian Metallurgy in the Early Middle Ages. From the Conquest Period
to the mid-13th Century)*

Budapest, 1968. Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 253., 7 t., 230 fig.

This book is the result of a joint enterprise undertaken by a historian, archaeologist and also metallurgists whose complementary studies give a comprehensive survey of the questions related to the early-medieval technique of Hungarian metallurgy and to the social status of those engaged in the production of iron. Books on technological history are not too frequent in Hungarian historiography, and monographs tackling all essential problems of an epoch are particularly scarce. The choice of the subject this volume has been a happy one, as metallurgy provided agriculture and industry with the most important tools, and the armed forces with weapons.

The Introduction by G. Heckenast discusses the developmental phases of metallurgy from novel aspects and defines the technical turning-points determining the trends of progress. In this theoretical explanations the author seeks to find correlations between the turning-points of technology and social development.

Unfortunately, however, a presentation of correlations in questions of principle is missing from the itemized summary of European development. Were it not for this omission, the problematic nature of the first revolution in the technology of metallurgy, believed to have taken place during the period from the mid-12th to the early 16th century, would certainly not have escaped the author's attention. True, the change-over from the shaft furnace to the blast furnace, from the direct to the indirect method, actually took place during this period of some 300 years.

Yet absorption of empirical knowledge, and exceeding it in the institutionalized

system of continually developing scientific attainments, is a precondition of revolutions in general, and an indispensable precondition of technical and technological revolutions in particular. This means that accumulated science is made institutionally available to the generations succeeding one another. In my opinion, a technological revolution consists in the exploration, elucidation and employment of radically new solutions. And this activity tries to find a logical to the practical requirements of production.

In the case of the revolutionary development that lasted from the 40's of the 18th to the 60's of the 19th century, G. Heckenast himself defines the above-outlined system of inventions following from one another institutionally. And we must approve of his arguments.

As concerns this evolution, period covering some 300 years, it seems expedient to renounce the use of such a weighty concept as a revolution. This renouncement involves no loss even if this slow transformation corresponds to the change-over from guild organizations to manufacturing in the textile industry. This, too, was evolution and not a revolution.

Gy. Nováki's study is concerned with the archaeological relics of Hungarian metallurgy. A presentation of the results of research done so far speaks of very modest antecedents in this line of science history. Archaeological detection and opening up of metallurgical remains was promoted by the formation of the Commission for Metallurgical History. This activity is mainly connected with the names of Gy. Nováki and G. Vastagh.

The foundries and workshops opened up in North East and West Hungary can be

dated back to the 10th—12th centuries; but no strict chronology can be set up for the time being. A typological arrangement of the material presented also suggest differentiation between the two aforesaid metallurgical regions.

The careful publication of data, presenting the list of sites and the circumstances of exposure render Gy. Nováki's study a useful sourcework for further research.

It is to be regretted that no space has been devoted in this well-proportioned work to a presentation and analysis of the technique applied and the methods observed during the process of exposure. This would have facilitated further research.

Summing up, this study is one of lasting value in Hungarian archaeological and historical literature.

The paper of G. Vastagh is devoted to the technical examination of exposed remains. All his analyses serve the elucidation of the technological details of the direct production of wrought-iron, of the empirical knowledge of early-medieval metalworkers. It is shown conclusively that the pig furnaces of the Imola-type found at Imola village in North Hungary were operating with an open front mouth; melting experiments made with a reproduced Imola-type furnace have confirmed his view. The author is also to be credited for not overburdening the text with technical terms, and for giving explanations to every such term.

This paper, the first in Hungarian technical literature to publish results about analyses of hearth cinder and liquid slag, provides the reader with a series of authentic data on temperature minima and maxima occurring during the operation of pig furnaces. The high silicic acid contents of slag permits the important conclusion that, based on their empirical knowledge, the early-medieval metalworkers were looking for self-fluxible ore of high silicic acid content from which soft iron could be reduced at relatively low temperatures by the contemporary technique, without calcium-containing additives.

The data of the author's careful instrumental analyses are unique contributions

to the Hungarian literature of technical history.

G. Heckenast studies the history of Hungarian iron metallurgy in the 10th—13th centuries. He develops his conclusions with the complex method, making use of archaeological, toponymical, and linguistic data, and also relying on the evidence of deeds and other documents. He delimits three iron-processing regions, viz. those in Western Hungary, Northern Borsod and the Mecsek mountains. Place-names indicating the production of iron and iron implements are given also for other parts of this country. The living conditions of the iron-processing population are treated in a separate analysis. The author proves with convincing data, or renders it probable with impulsive working hypotheses, that the iron-workers of the conquest period carried on their trade under the supervision of ruling princes, and, later on, under royal supervision as the county organization took shape.

This village group-trade began to disintegrate at the end of the 12th century, and was extinct in the 13th. Part of the blacksmiths settled in towns, and this finding is an important contribution to the conclusion that by the 12th or 13th century progress in this country had exceeded the ancient patterns of East-European origin.

Some conclusions of this excellent paper prompt us to polemize. Accepting a view of Nándor Fettich presented in 1933, the author thinks that the metal-working of the Magyars of Levedia (Don region) was influenced by some metal-working method originating in a Central Asian, or, more exactly, in the Minusinsk Culture. He assumes that the Turk tribe-name Tarchan — Tarján in Hungarian — and the blacksmith myth may have been adopted by the Magyars through the medium of this metal-working people of Eastern Turkic origin.

Yet the Magyars got in contact with the western branch of the Turks, and, according to all indications, the dignity of *tarchan* connected with the blacksmith myth prevailed also with the Khazars who spoke Turkic.

The iron and non-ferrous metalwork of the Magyars of the pre-Conquest period was hardly influenced by the less-advanced Central Asian art; rather it was shaped by the more refined Caucasian metal-working of Iranian origin. It was the latter from which the Bulgar-Turks and other Turkic peoples drew inspiration.

As concerns the origin of Hungarian metal-working, it should be kept in mind that the Magyar tribes came to the steppe from the region of the Western Ural where one of the most important centres of the metal and iron culture of entire mankind had developed. The high iron-metallurgical standards of the Finno-Ugrian Ananino culture in the 9th—3rd centuries B. C. are well known among others. It is substantiated by available data that the metal-working of the Finno-Ugrians was under Iranian-North Caucasian influence already in the Ananino age. The metal culture of the Finno-Ugrians, including the forefathers of the Magyars, had developed well before the Ananino age, in the first half of the 2nd millennium B. C. Consequently, it is not only to be assumed — as Heckenast suggests — but may be taken for certain that the iron technique, and the metal culture in general, of the West Uralien and steppe Magyars attained high standards. Thus iron metallurgy can be demonstrated not only from the nomadic Turkic peoples and their agrarian eastern Slavic neighbours. Heckenast is of the opinion that plough was only carried on by the eastern Slavic neighbours of the Magyars. Yet there are data to support the fact that in the southern steppe, where no Slavs were living, in the region between the Volga and the Dnieper, plough was more developed than among the eastern Slavs in the 7th—9th centuries. And this was the region where also the Magyar tribes were living before the Conquest.

Even in the case of this highly circumspect author the absence of more recent data resulted in a number of errors in respect of the antecedents of Hungarian iron-working in the Conquest period. On the other hand, his argumentation for the relative

scantiness of the Finno-Ugrian vocabulary of Hungarian iron-working is convincing and to be appreciated.

The derivation of the place-name Tömörd (Temerd in the 13th century) from the Turkish word "temir" meaning "iron" is authoritative.

On the basis of the comparative data analysed with great care we must accept as a fact that the Hungarian craftsmen were established by princely power on iron metallurgy of Slavic antecedents. The merger of these two types of metallurgies following the same technology—differing from each other in yet unexplained details (e.g. the making of stirrups)—cannot be questioned.

The significance of Vasvár (vas=iron) in County Borsod (North Hungary) is corroborated by five place-names of tribal origin in the surroundings. On the other hand, there are no data to show that it should have borne a function similar to that of Vasvár in County Vas (West Hungary). So it is unnecessary to emphasize its decline into a centre of royal estates.

E. Zoltay reports on his experiments with the Imola-type reconstructed pig furnace. He was the first in Hungary to carry out experiments of direct iron production with ancient methods. His findings are of considerable value.

Yet we see no explanation why his tables published on slag analyses differ in method from those of G. Vastagh. Considering the novel nature of the research results published, the economical presentation of concepts in the chapter by G. Vastagh is more convincing.

The tables published at the end of the volume are helpful for the reader wishing to find his way in the material of the book.

The few objections I have raised, and the criticism I have voiced besides appreciation, are all intended to give expression to my high regard for the authors' laborious and successful work.

By way of conclusion I think it would have been worth-while mentioning that the first expert trials for getting acquainted with the iron-metallurgical technology of the conquering Magyars were carried out by E.

Fuchs and Gy. Nándori upon my initiative.

Akadémiai Kiadó is to be commended for having published this volume. Yet the quality of the illustrations is objectionable;

a few colour tables illustrating the slags found at excavations and the various phases of experimental meltings, might have been of a documentary value.

A. Bartha

Hungarian Author on Metternich

Erzsébet Andics: Metternich und die Frage Ungarns
Budapest, 1973, Akadémia Kiadó

Erzsébet Andics has published a voluminous monograph in German with the title "Metternich und die Frage Ungarns" (Metternich and the Question of Hungary). In addition to the excellent elaboration of the subject, the reader is presented with a supplement of some eighty-two original documents unpublished so far.

The author's sphere of interest covers a wide range of topics (for instance, the period of transition from feudalism to capitalism, the nationality question in Hungary, the history of the workers' movement and of the period of counterrevolution 1919—1945), although in the last two decades she has been concentrating on the regularities of Hungarian bourgeois transformation. Her results won recognition not only in Hungary but also abroad. She published a number of books describing the struggle of Lajos Kossuth against traitors and opportunists and the role of big landowners, in the bourgeois transformation of Hungary. Parallel with these studies the author disclosed extensive European correlations by bringing to light certain Austrian references to the surrender at Világos, further by her profound analysis and documentation of the alliance between the Hapsburgs and the Romanovs. This enterprise of hers, working up the historical preliminaries of the Czarist intervention of 1849 — with the figure of Metternich in the centre as one of the agents that assisted to cement this

alliance — may be regarded as the immediate antecedent of her latest work, the subject of the present review.

His long lifetime and intensive political activities influencing almost the whole of Europe for some five decades qualified the Chancellor as a stubborn defender of feudalism and a determined enemy to bourgeois development. His influence assumed so huge proportions that even the members of the imperial family were dependent on him; furthermore the ambassadors accredited to Vienna tried to win his grace rather than that of their own cabinets. Social conservatism combined with an idea of some Austrian mission: the Hapsburgian empire had, in his opinion, a role to fulfil in view of maintaining the prevailing *status quo*.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that this man took a deep interest, tainted with a feeling of hatred, in Hungarian affairs, national and reform tendencies having been most explicit in Hungary of that time. At this point we have to raise the question if there is a possibility, and if so is it worthwhile, to enrich with further traits the Metternich portrait and to expand the scope of the relating literature that has been increasingly enlarged after the Second World War and that has been paying extremely much attention in the last two decades to the Chancellors political activity. Having read the book

under review, we may frame the answer in the affirmative. And we have more than one reason to do so. First, Metternich-research demanded studies on the Cancellor's activities concerning Hungary as early as 50 years ago; secondly, the author has exposed numerous factual data and revealed such interrelations which have been unknown so far. In addition, the work helps to eliminate a harmful tradition of Hungarian historiography inasmuch as it abandons the narrow Hungarian-centric historical approach — of which not even the Marxist historians have been able to get rid up to now — and considers the events and phenomena of Hungarian national history from a European point of view. It is only after reading Andics's book that we can realize how very necessary it is for analytical study to confront the Hungarian social trends in the preliminary stages of the bourgeois revolution, and the class struggle accompanied by fierce ideological struggles with the Hungarian policy of Metternich and the Austrian ruling circles. By such examination — lending a typical feature to the work — the multi-dimensioned reality of colourful life can be exposed.

From the various documents preserved in the archives of Hungary, Austria and Czechoslovakia the figure of the Chancellor emerges as the highest authority of Hungarian affairs. His writings relating to Hungary show a sharp contrast as against the other writings of his, owing to their concise, clear and concrete style. Notably, Metternich liked to conceal his thoughts and his real objectives in the guise of ambiguous and obscure sentences. This challenged the criticism even of his contemporary followers, historians of later times, however, have been fiercely coping with those puzzles. In contrast, his confidential instructions relating to Hungary, written for the most part by his own hand, are outspoken, self-evident and uncircumstantial.

The Hungarian question significant and complicated as it was from the thirties onwards occupied a central place in the intellectual activity of the Austrian statesman. After the death of emperor Francis, Metter-

nich came in charge of Hungarian affairs, and to control Hungary and Transylvania belonged to the sphere of his highest authority. The statement he made after his fall, to wit that he had had no word in the internal affairs of the empire, is fully contradicted by archival documents. The truth is that the chancellor found time nearly every day to deal with the affairs of Hungary in an operative and detailed manner. One of the author's fundamental conclusions contains the following statement: "For a period of nearly five decades — decisive for the economic and political development of Hungary — Metternich exercised more or less direct control over the fate of the country; traces and consequences of his interference were felt in Hungary over a hundred years, and perhaps they have not vanished to this day." (p. 8.)

In the first five decades of the nineteenth century, i.e. in the period of Prince Metternich's activity, the pace of economic development speeded up, the anti-feudal and anti-absolutistic social forces strengthened, and the national and liberal movements gained impetus in Hungary; consequently, opportunities opened for a relatively quick liquidation of the country's backwardness. Several centuries' delay had to be made good. The Prince played an undisputably great role in the frustration of the progressive endeavours, as well as in the preparation of the failure of the revolution and the defeat of the war of independence. Even though he failed to stop the progress of history, he brought into play many tools to hinder Hungary's advance: "His figure is one of the most fatal in the history of Hungary." (p. 335.)

His first interference with the Hungarian affairs was as typical of his attitude as any of his later manifestations. In point of fact, he waged a fierce attack against the feudal constitution of the estates, since it ensured a certain degree of independence to Hungary, more precisely to the ruling nobility; in any case the country enjoyed a privileged status compared to Cisleithania, and there existed a possibility for these privileges to be filled with bourgeois content. Occupying the top post in the empire, his first step was to come

to agreement with Napoleon, who had won victory not long ago over Austria, and to frame a plan in common for the liquidation of Hungary's independence. Although for certain reasons he was unable to carry out this plan in 1811 and 1812, he never abandoned his conception, according to which the rule of the Hapsburgs must be made absolute and lasting in Hungary.

There survive quite a number of drafts in Metternich's hand, all suggesting the reorganization of the empire into an absolutistic and centralized political administration, with a special view to the incorporation of Hungary. It is in this context that the author examines the nationality policy of Metternich. The Prince had developed a deep despise in respect of peoples and rejected all kinds of national aspirations. At the same time, he saw the irreality of endeavours to frame unity through Germanization. Italian unity was a nightmare for him, Italy having been a mere geographical concept to his mind. He was a desperate enemy to German unity and a relentless suppressor of the Polish wars of independence.

As early as the second half of the twenties of the last century, that is at the time when Hungarian liberal-national endeavours began to take wings, he emphasized the importance of political restrictions and introduced the use of terroristic measures in administration. This is supported, among other things, by the diary of István Széchenyi, who began just in those years the life-long duel with Metternich that lasted for a quarter of a century. Széchenyi cherished no illusions as to the intentions of Metternich: his confidential records contain very accurate descriptions of the Prince's manipulation around Hungarian constitutional life. At the same time, the Chancellor behold Széchenyi's activity from the beginning to the end with the profoundest distrust. Erzsébet Andics presents a highly exciting reading piece when characterizing the antagonistic political and personal relation of the two statesmen. In spite of his sharp criticism, Széchenyi was impressed by the attitudes of the Chancellor as a man of wide European outlook, experience and power. He would have been willing

to use the Chancellor's influence in the interest of his own policy. This is the reason — explains the author — “why Széchenyi, who was sensitive in all other respects, was patient of insults offered to him from the side of the cabinet and the Prince, and this is the reason why he, grinding his teeth for humiliation, suspicion and neglect, was unable to break with the Prince once and for all, although he stood near to it several times”. (p. 52.)

Under the impact of the revolutionary events in the eighteen hundred and thirties Metternich set a target of several decades work before him: in face of the increased menaces of a possible revolutionary development, he planned to revive the Holy Alliance. It is upon his initiatives that the three feudal absolutistic powers, to with Austria, Prussia and Czarist Russia made the Münchengrätz agreement of 1833, by force of which they would react with united might to all revolutionary events. Czar Nicolas I yielded fundamental support to the new Holy Alliance, fulfilling Metternich's anticipations. The convention of Münchengrätz was soon followed by that of Berlin, and both of them were directed, besides the Polish, against the Hungarian national movement.

Terroristic measures of government were increased in number and force after the diet of 1832—1836, this having been a very important station in the reform movements in Hungary. The forcible governmental policy was promulgated by Metternich with the intention of launching a general offensive against the Hungarian reform movement. He had a leading part in the campaigns against Wesselényi and Kossuth, and he personally worked out in details the prosecution and trial of the two great statesmen.

At the same time, the Chancellor sent systematic information to the Czar about “disquieting” developments in Hungary, as shown by the relating portion of his correspondence. He tried to convince the Czar that the reform movement in Hungary was aimed at “the overthrow of all social order” and that it carried menace in the form of impending revolutionary conspiracy against the Russian empire as well.

Erzsébet Andics applies a fine analytical method and utilizes a rich documentation in characterizing the so-called neo-conservative trend that followed after the failure of the forcible government policy and that came into existence through the coincidence of the interests of the Hungarian aristocrats and the objectives of Metternich. Anyway, this alliance was welded by the Chancellor. As a consequence, the most flexible aristocratic layess, reacting most sensibly upon the demands of the new era, backed more and more openly the of the influence idea of imperial unity and felt the reinforcement of the absolutistic government necessary.

The chapters dealing with economic questions are particularly interesting. The author sheds light on the Chancellor's ambition to effectuate a set of economic measures in order to prevent the unfolding of an independent bourgeois economy in Hungary. The Chancellor's aim was to maintain Hungary's agrarian function among the dominions of Austria which began to show a relatively vigorous industrial development from the late thirties (with the exception of Galicia). As a special indication to this effect might be mentioned the system of customs union representing the decisive component factor of Metternich's economic policy in the forties.

Never resigning of his plans to suppress, if need be, the Hungarian liberal endeavours by military forces, he wished to win over to his side the Palatine of Hungary.

This course of development led directly to the diet of 1843—1844 which gave further food for the Chancellor's conviction that steps must be taken with a view to building up a more efficient central power in Hungary. The governmental and administrative organs must be headed with reliable men selected from the ranks of the neo-conservative leaders. This is how Metternich incited court policy to introduce the so-called administrative system. The lord lieutenants of the counties appointed by the governments were invested with the power of putting to use all possible means to check the movements of

the reformist opposition, including coercion, bribery and mobilization of forces of arms. Parallel with this, the Prince consolidated the institution of censorship. Strict governmental measures were taken against the various social organizations, especially the Society for promotion the development of Hungarian industry. Neo-conservativist György Apponyi was appointed head of the Chancery at that time and was soon successful in creating a nation-wide political party from the followers of Metternich in Hungary. Beside this possibility of "peaceful development", Metternich did not leave out of consideration the variant of a coup d'état by recourse to force of arms.

Erzsébet Andics gives a thorough analysis of Széchenyi's relation to the new system of administration. By so doing, she enriches the Széchenyi portrait. Although placed at the head of the Communication Commission, partly owing to Metternich himself, he cannot be regarded as a supporter of the conservatives. He maintained his independent views to the end. His aim was to establish a centralist trend that would attract the elements prone to a compromise from both the opposition and the conservative fields.

Metternich's policy evoked increasing resistance on the part of the opposition. They struggled with increasing zeal for national independence and bourgeois development. The opposition reduced to a reasonable level the value of the "reform policy" so ostentatiously proclaimed by the Chancellor and the neo-conservative party. It was made known to public opinion that only the method had changed, but the government policy directed by Metternich remained essentially the same.

Under such circumstances the programme of the group led by Apponyi could not meet with a wider appreciation on the eve of the diet of 1847—1848, which is not to be wondered at since in more than one respect this programme was marked by retrograde ideas far more obsolete and obscure than those of Metternich.

The author is particularly circumspect in describing Metternich's activity on the eve

of the revolution. Earlier, he was inclined to exaggerate the dangers in order to defend his repressive policy; this time however, "he was filled with terror and really shaken, and what is more, he was overcome by a feeling of inertia with which he was not usually possessed". (p. 270.)

Erzsébet Andics examined with special thoroughness the far-reaching political connections of Metternich when he was in exile during 1848—1849. Not even as an exile did he abandon his former policy of suppressing the wars of independence in the various countries. His extensive correspondence contains many references to the Hungarian revolution in the mentioned two years. He regarded the Hungarian war of independence as an unlawful revolt.

The role of the aged ex-chancellor had grown after the defeat of the revolution. He was the central figure of the feudal-absolutistic opposition which held that the Schwarzenberg cabinet that took over power in 1849 was excessively liberal. On returning in 1851, he made his voice heard in questions connected with the "reorganization" of post-revolution Hungary. He maintained close connections with Saint Petersburg and heartily saluted the Bach system in whose preparation he had participated as adviser.

In conclusion, we may state that Erzsébet Andics spanned a full epoch of Hungary's history. She has brought to light an impressive number of novel data concerning the history of those five decades and also gave an analytical appraisal of the archival data. A great credit to her work consists in the polemic nature: throughout the work she refutes the erroneous opinions adopted by bourgeois historiography, and does so by exploiting direct sources with the exact scientific methods of historical materialism.

The false portrait of an idealized figure of Chancellor Metternich drawn by bourgeois historiography — not refraining from declaring him to have been a friend to Hungary — comes to nothing in the light of Erzsébet Andics's synthesis and source-publication.

The publication in a foreign language of a historical work of so general significance can be welcomed with the highest approval. At the same time it would be a great blunder to deprive the Hungarian general public of access to a synthesis so essential for their national history.

E. Arató

Endre Arató: Kelet-Európa története a XIX. század első felében.

(*L'histoire de l'Europe Orientale dans la première moitié du XIX^e siècle*)
Budapest, 1971, Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 597

Une des tâches principales que s'était proposée l'historiographie marxiste hongroise d'après la libération est de dégager le contexte est-européen de l'évolution historique hongroise, de faire la synthèse de l'histoire de la Hongrie et des pays voisins.

L'intérêt scientifique accru pour l'histoire des pays est-européens s'explique non seulement par les éléments communs à l'évolution politique de ces pays mais aussi par les analogies que l'on observe dans l'évolution socio-économique, dans les structures sociales, nées dans cette région, et servant de base à l'évo-

lution politique. C'est après les révolutions anglaise et française, à l'époque de la transformation bourgeoise, que les écarts entre l'évolution à l'Est et à l'Ouest sont devenus manifestes pour les penseurs de l'époque. Au XVIII^e siècle, les souverains essayant d'appliquer les méthodes de « l'absolutisme éclairé », s'engagèrent à favoriser l'industrialisation, l'instruction publique, l'économie plus rationnelle. La révolution française de 1789 et les guerres napoléoniennes ont ouvert des horizons sur toute l'Europe qui, pour bien des personnes, ont mis en relief le retard de

l'Europe orientale. La conjoncture qui accompagna les guerres souligna « l'échec du système économique enfermé dans le lit de Procruste du servage » et signala, comme unique issue, les changements sociaux radicaux, l'évolution bourgeoise.

Dans les recherches relatives aux transformations en Europe orientale, de nouveaux acquis sont dus en Hongrie dernièrement surtout aux travaux d'Emil Niederhauser dans le domaine de l'histoire des idéologies et de la société, de László Katus, d'Iván T. Berend et de György Ránki dans l'histoire économique. Le nouveau livre d'Endre Arató résume l'histoire de la première étape de l'évolution bourgeoise, période allant jusqu'à l'affranchissement des serfs.

Endre Arató, dans son histoire comparative de l'Europe de l'Est, fait la synthèse de l'histoire politique et culturelle des vingt-sept peuples vivant sur le territoire qui s'étend de la Finlande à la Grèce, de l'Elbe à l'Oural, ainsi que des lignes générales du développement économique et social, nécessaires pour comprendre cette histoire.

La « définition de l'Europe orientale » proposée par Endre Arató montre bien des différences d'avec les définitions généralement admises. Se fondant sur le retard socio-économique, sur l'étendue des grands empires multinationaux et sur les analogies dans les mouvements nationaux, l'auteur considère la Finlande et le Caucase comme appartenant à l'Europe orientale. Il est à noter toutefois qu'en ce qui concerne l'appartenance de la grande majorité des régions étudiées, le critère principal en était la ressemblance des structures socio-économiques, tandis que dans le cas de la Finlande et du Caucase l'appartenance politique forcée à la Russie pesait d'un plus grand poids dans ces considérations, ces territoires n'ayant jamais connu le système, fondé sur les grands domaines fonciers, de l'évolution agraire capitaliste, c'est-à-dire l'évolution dite « prussienne », et leur développement n'ayant eu rien de commun avec celui des pays balkaniques.

L'évolution bourgeoise et ses antécédents sont traités par l'auteur en huit chapitres. *L'évolution de l'agriculture est divisée en trois*

groupes. Le premier comprend la Prusse, la Monarchie des Habsbourg, la Russie où, pour l'essentiel, prévalut l'évolution à la prussienne. Le second groupe est formé par les territoires balkaniques où le grand domaine est pratiquement inconnu, et le troisième par les principautés roumaines, la Bosnie-Herzégovine, la Dalmatie, le Monténégro, l'Albanie et la Caucase, dont les spécificités sont nombreuses et les analogies se rapportent plutôt aux territoires balkaniques.

En analysant le système oppressif des empires multinationaux il tient soigneusement compte des nuances. Il démontre que toute nation dominante (sans compter les Turcs), dont même celles qui étaient opprimées (Grecs, Hongrois) cherchaient à assimiler les ethnies différentes d'elles. A ce propos il passe en revue tous les moyens dont se servaient les différents petits peuples pour se défendre. Dans ses investigations, l'auteur applique la méthode de travail de feu Zoltán I. Tóth, chercheur éminent de l'histoire des minorités nationales de Hongrie. Cette méthode part de la théorie dite des *structures sociales incomplètes* pour expliquer les spécificités dans l'évolution des peuples opprimés de l'Europe de l'Est. La majeure partie des minorités nationales en Hongrie, un bon nombre de peuples balkaniques n'avaient pas, au début du XIX^e siècle, leur classe de grands propriétaires fonciers d'origine féodale, et la bourgeoisie urbaine de leur ethnie faisait également défaut en sa majorité. Les porteurs des mouvements nationaux et de l'évolution bourgeoise étaient surtout les membres de l'intelligentsia de l'Eglise ou de l'administration, et à moindre degré les marchands à grande distance déjà engagés dans la voie du capitalisme.

Dans cet inextricable complexe ethnique de l'Europe de l'Est, Endre Arató traite les mouvements des nationalités, qui s'interpénétraient, qui ont des structures sociales différentes et des positions de force inégales dans leurs rapports avec les mouvements d'autres peuples et avec l'évolution des rapports entre les grandes puissances. Dans le contexte du développement économique, du degré de la dépendance nationale, des structures sociales

et de la politique des grands, il passe en revue les mouvements nationaux et culturels de la première moitié du XIX^e siècle, ainsi que les hommes politiques de premier plan. Il analyse le mouvement des défenseurs bulgares de la langue qui luttèrent pour le renforcement de la langue nationale, l'hétairie grecque, l'émigration polonaise qui avait sa voix même dans la grande politique européenne. Il décrit les différentes étapes de l'évolution nationale (de la langue), parallèle au développement de la production marchande. Le lecteur peut faire connaissance des cadres locaux dans lesquels furent lancés les mouvements nationaux: associations pour la défense de la langue nationale, sociétés littéraires, écoles, organisations nationales-religieuses. Pour chaque nationalité, il explore à part les particularités régionales de la lutte menée pour créer la langue littéraire, le rôle des dialecticiens, de la langue ecclésiastique, des influences classiques, la fonction nationale et le contenu bourgeois de la littérature, des arts et de l'historiographie. Les rapports entre la vie culturelle et les mouvements nationaux, les mouvements de libération sont traités séparément, conformément à leur caractère et à leur lieu. Un à un, l'auteur analyse les mouvements nationaux dirigés par la noblesse et contenant des éléments féodaux (par exemple les mouvements hongrois, polonais), les insurrections armées, les sociétés secrètes (surtout en Russie), les tentatives d'union slave. La politique russe aux Balkans occupe une place importante, l'auteur analyse en détail le rôle qu'avaient joué les guerres turques de la Russie dans la prise de conscience des peuples balkaniques. La politique balkanique des autres grandes puissances, de l'Angleterre, de la France, n'est pas non plus négligée. Au tournant des XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles, période par la quelle l'auteur commence ses investigations, seuls les Polonais et les Serbes menèrent une lutte armée d'importance. Au bout de deux générations, en 1848, l'empire des Habsbourgs se trouvait au bord du gouffre du fait de la révolution bourgeoise que firent éclater les peuples habitants l'empire.

C'est précisément la révolution de 1848

qui marque le point suprême des mouvements nationaux traités par Endre Arató. Il est donc juste que cet événement occupe dans le livre une place considérable bien que, avec un sens honorable de mesure, dans l'analyse des luttes des minorités nationales l'auteur ne s'étende pas sur l'exposition des événements connus de l'histoire hongroise. L'ouvrage prend ici le caractère d'une analyse poussée. L'auteur distingue trois périodes principales dans les rapports entre la révolution hongroise et les minorités nationales: mars 1848 où les signes du rapprochement dominèrent encore, la période des luttes armées commençant vers l'été et l'automne, et enfin à partir du printemps 1849 la période des efforts visant la réconciliation.

Dans son analyse de 1848 Endre Arató adopte la position progressiste selon laquelle la tragédie de la révolution hongroise est à chercher dans le fait que l'union contre les Habsbourgs de toutes les tendances politiques, bourgeoises et progressistes, des peuples vivant ensemble, a échoué. Dans cet échec il attribue une grande importance aussi à la politique nationale peu généreuse du gouvernement Kossuth et aussi aux erreurs des minorités nationales, ainsi qu'aux manœuvres de Vienne. Nous pouvons encore y ajouter que même l'intolérance nationale (donc la voie de la «non-réunion des forces») offrait une certaine solution, celle des armes. Lorsque Kossuth, incapable de tomber d'accord avec les Serbes dans la satisfaction de leurs revendications nationales dit à Strati-mirović: «nous allons donc mesurer nos épées» — cette déclaration signifia la reconnaissance, aussi forcée qu'elle fût, de la personnalité nationale des Serbes, de la nation serbe. Par ses préparatifs à la lutte armée, la Croatie à son tour contraignit pas à pas le gouvernement de Pest à reconnaître en fait son indépendance. On peut donc observer en 1848 une certaine tendance qui montre qu'une partie des nationalités astreignit par sa lutte pour l'indépendance le gouvernement hongrois à faire certaines concessions.

La tragédie de 1848—49 consiste donc non seulement dans l'échec de l'union contre

les Habsbourg, mais aussi dans l'impossibilité de suivre même la moins bonne des voies, à savoir la lutte nationale; c'est-à-dire la guerre civile n'a pas pu avoir lieu. Assistée par l'Angleterre, l'intervention armée des Habsbourg et du tzar a été rejetée à titre égal Hongrois, Serbes, Roumains et Croates, dans leurs positions d'avant 1848, donc à une étape précédente de leur évolution nationale. Cela signifia que la solution des conflits nationaux fut remise à une époque ultérieure.

Malgré l'échec des mouvements nationaux de 1848 en Europe orientale, l'évolution des forces productrices était favorable. Comme l'auteur l'indique, l'évolution bourgeoise, engagée par les révolutions, fut achevée d'en haut, par la force du pouvoir, grâce à l'affranchissement des serfs, que l'auteur traite dans le dernier chapitre. Cet événement a écarté les derniers obstacles devant l'évolution capitaliste. Dans les années soixante et soixante-dix, le compromis entre Hongrois et Croates, la naissance de l'indépendance roumaine et bulgare a, provisoirement, clos la première étape de la constitution des cadres

nationaux. Toutefois, un demi-siècle après les guerres napoléoniennes, l'écart entre le développement de l'Europe orientale et occidentale était plus grand que jamais.

A l'intérieur de l'économie européenne s'était instaurée la division de travail fondée sur «l'Occident industriel» et «l'Orient agraire». Afin de lancer sur une grande échelle l'industrialisation, depuis si longtemps revendiquée, l'Europe orientale avait besoin d'importer des capitaux considérables. A la fin du XIX^e siècle l'économie des nouveaux Etats devait résoudre le problème d'utiliser les capitaux importés en tant que force productrice, c'est-à-dire de renforcer le marché intérieur, sinon cette importation des capitaux devait augmenter la dépendance du pays et en fin de compte son état arriéré.

Le livre d'Endre Arató se fait remarquer par une extrême richesse de renseignements et donnés, il fournit un instrument utile aux investigations historiques comparatives, il représente un pas fait en avant dans la voie de l'analyse, sous un angle cohérent, de l'histoire de l'Europe orientale.

Z. Szász

Gyula László: Vértesszőlőstől Pusztaszerig

(From Vértesszőlős to Pusztaszer.)

Budapest 1974, Gondolat Kiadó, 275 pp.

This popular book on the history of the Carpathian Basin from the primitive age to the 10th century is an interesting work of individual tone.

For several years Gyula László has been explaining his view that the great majority of Magyars settled down in the Carpathian Basin about 670, the rest around 894 (204-207). Thus he conceives of the immigration of the Magyars as having taken place in two waves, separated by a long interval of time. As a proof of this hypothesis attention is drawn to records of the appearance of White Ugrians in the Russian Ancient Chronicle. The record is assumed to refer to the 670s and to the arrival of the White Ugrians in the Carpathian Basin. The record in question came into the text of the Russian Ancient Chronicle from the Byzantine chronicle of Georgios Hamartolos. The appearance of the White Ugrians is mentioned in connection with the Byzantine-Persian wars of the 620s. Unfortunately the source is silent on the place where the White Ugrians appeared and their further fate remained obscure. For Hungarian history the name of the people, Ugrian, Onogur, is of basic importance. Their incidence in sources involves ambivalence, because they do not indicate Magyars in every instance. For the people's names Ugrian, Onogur to stand for

Magyars has preconditions which call for elucidation themselves. Since the source in question does not decide whether or not the name White Ugrian implies Magyars, the reader is left in the dark on the problem of ambivalence. The people's name Onogur has another aspect which requires popular explanation. This name evokes confused ideals and ideas. Popularization is not the way to attempt clarification of the meaning of the name Onogur. Therefore criticism of the notions which mask the ambivalence of this name of a people demands a place in popularization, in order to promote perspicacity.

Determination of the ethnic group of the bearers of archeological civilizations raises grave methodological problems of archeology and primitive history. In the knowledge of criteria characteristic of an ancient civilization archeology justifiably supposes that the people of the civilization in question was held together not only by common features of civilization, but presumably also by language and other features. However, there is no proof of a common language, the name of the people's community can not be identified by archeological criteria. Serious, unsolved methodological problems prevent the establishment of a connection between the bearers of archeological civilizations with the remote forefathers of living peoples. At the same time the concept of the ethnocultural unit, the "nameless people" is indispensable in studying the ancient history of a certain geographical region.

When we speak of ancient history or the name of any archeological civilization is preceded by the attribute Magyar, a scientific definition is made which entails responsibility. In this case science undertakes to clear the remote antecedents of our people. To trace the ancient historical antecedents of a people living now is exceedingly problematic, therefore "national" ancient history is the source of all sorts of irrationalisms and new myths. "National" on two counts: ethnic antecedents are searched for in the fading past of ancient history, the opinions formed on the subject are systematized and, nolens volens, they become part of national consciousness. Unintentionally created irrational views are hard to avoid because ancient history breaks boldly into the unknown domains of the origin of peoples and paleoethnography. There are reliable data which inform us that the Magyar people of primitive history differed from the Magyar people of later ages. The fact that the Hungarian people (as well as every other people) is a historical category is waiting for elucidation, not to the expert but to the wider public. Adequate explanation in itself does not ward off the development of erroneous concepts, but it serves as support to those seeking knowledge.

Those who deny that change of certain burial rites and elements of civilization about 670 are unmistakable evidence of change of population in the Carpathian Basin are held by Gyula László to be of the retiring type of scholars, unacquainted with historical reality (194). It must be reckoned with that earlier ethnographic conditions were altered by the effect of some immigrants. This important detail requires intensive investigation, but to assume that the supposed immigrants were identical with the Magyars bearing the name of Onogur is evasion of the open methodological and theoretical problems outlined above. There is a lack of criteria permitting generalization to decide when it is that changes of archeological civilizations are connected with the appearance of new ethnic groups.

The author disapproves of the Hungarian historians who claim that Late Avars were assimilated by the Slavs (215). The fact is that after the campaign of Charlemagne the Avars complained of oppression by the Slavs. From this, of course, it does not follow that the Avars were Slavonized. The historians and linguists who studied the subject have come to various, sometimes hasty, conclusions, but no dogma has been laid down. It deserves cursory mention that Slavonization of the Avars has been weighed not only by Hungarian and by directly interested Slovak historians. The justification of these considerations might nevertheless have been rejected. However, the comments of the American Imre Boba on the Onogurs do not deserve much notice.

The assertion that in the 3rd and 2nd millenium B.C. there was no major demographic activity in the Volga-Chama region inhabited by Finno-Ugrians is highly important. The arguments are obscure from which the author concludes that the Magyar people and language

came into existence approximately about 2000 B.C. upon the final separation of Neolithic civilizations in the Volga-Chama area.

The results of research pursued for several decades have revealed that from the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C. consecutive waves of immigrants from the south reached the Volga-Chama region. In the most out-of-sight corners the 2nd millennium B.C. was not the Neolithic Period, but the Copper-Neolithic, then Copper Age when not only excellent bronze craftsmanship developed, but the first proofs of *iron* production have been discovered in the Volga-Chama region and West Ural area. These are open and problematic questions of the correlations between archeological civilizations and ethnic groups. However, available findings do not provide insight into the essential relations of paleoethnographic processes connected with these questions.

Within certain archeological eras the number of civilizations surpasses the number of those known from sources and that of surviving Finno-Ugrian peoples. Regarding the primitive history of interior regions of the European Continent it is a unique and enviable scientific result that in the loosely limited sense of the term we can speak of *Finno-Ugrian archeological civilization and archeology* from the Neolithic Age. Closer ethnic determinations are available from a period elucidated by written sources (from the turn of the 9th century). At all events, scientifically necessary arbitrary endeavours have to be complied with which strive to connect more circumscribed ethnographic concepts within the Finno-Ugrian ethnic group (Ugrian, Permian, Volga-Finnish) to archeological civilizations which preceded the 9th and 10th centuries. In this case attention is to be drawn to the exceedingly problematic nature of every detail of the experiment, not only in case of popularizing intent, but also in strictly expert work.

In Gyula László's view the Magyar people can not be understood without Eurasia, nor can the latter be understood without the Magyars. The Magyars are not kindred either to this or that people, but are connected with all by the memories of a common Eurasian past, the first chapter of which began in prehistoric times.

In fact, the background of primitive Hungarian history is broad, and to shed light on this background is indeed much more important than localization of the dwelling place of the ancient people from which the Magyars are descended. Moreover, there is slight probability that the Magyar people should have stood in the centre of Eurasian history. No one can deny the manifold mixtures which came about during the ethnogenetic process, but it is contrary to scientific findings made available so far to pursue the "shoreless" experiment trying to present Magyars as the relatives of all Eurasian peoples. Is not this relationship too extensive and is it not risky to trace its origin back to prehistoric man?

Only a few questions have been mentioned. No objection has been raised to any on the plea that it has no place in science or in popularization. It would furthermore certainly be worth-while to study very thoroughly the ethnographic changes connected with the cultural conditions altered about 670 in the Carpathian Basin. Although the notion is improbable, the assumed ethnographic change should also be analyzed to find out whether or not it was connected with the appearance of other than ancient Magyar groups.

In popularizing works ideals have to be cherished and this is impossible without idealization. Emphasis is laid on the theoretical co-ordinates of idealization.

Exception is taken to the methodological and theoretical appraisal of the problems dealt with in the book.

In primitive history marxist historical concepts play a quite peculiar role. Classical marxist explanations of ancient history are respected in bourgeois scientific circles. That is, the appreciation of marxist theory in ancient history does not even imply the acceptance of historical materialism. Regrettably the author has omitted to analyze with adequate depth the results of the theory and their relations to ancient history. So, finally, history was broken up into episodes in his book.

A. Bartha

*Sherman David Spector: Rumania at the Paris Peace Conference.
A Study of the Diplomacy of Ioan I. C. Brătianu*

New York, 1962, Bookman Associates Inc., 368 pp.

Ivo J. Lederer: Yugoslavia at the Paris Peace Conference. A Study in Frontier-making

New Haven and London, 1963, Yale University Press, 351 pp.

Studying problems of identical nature of the same period, these two volumes are results of research and analytical work of high standards, and tokens of international interest, in the history of Central East Europe. Owing to their subject, both are directly correlated with the history of Hungary.

Yet the subtitles of the books under review indicate a certain dissimilarity of treatment or of the manner of presentation. For obvious reasons, Spector places the person of Brătianu in the limelight; presenting the activities of Rumanian diplomacy, the guideline and aspirations of Rumanian policy, through and in connection with Brătianu. Lederer's book is of a different nature because Yugoslav policy, which had been shaped in a uniform pattern by the time of the Peace Conference, had no representative comparable to Brătianu.

Both volumes survey longer periods of time than the one year of the Peace Conference proper. Studying the antecedents, national movements, Lederer goes back to the 19th century; Spector starts his disquisition with the outbreak of the World War. Following as a matter of necessity from the subject, Lederer discusses the events up to Rapallo; also Spector concludes his book with 1920.

Both authors focus their investigations on the problem of how a Yugoslavia and Rumania, which did not yet exist at the outbreak of World War I, emerged as independent states by 1919-1920. Thus the backbone of their treatment is diplomatic activity carried on at official and non-official forums, the skirmishes involved in frontier-making. Lederer presents an immense material, discusses the events in the fullest

details, sometimes from day to day, even hour by hour. Spector does not devote so much attention to details, and this permits a clearer survey of the principal features of a given period.

Spector presents a colourful, many-sided portrait of the Rumanian diplomat, and his role in this highly important period. He emphasizes as the dominant element that Brătianu was a politician of the Byzantine type, endowed with an extraordinary flair for the acrobatics and intrigues of diplomacy, stubborn and unyielding whenever his own ideas, Rumanian interests were involved. This portraiture is not an abstract one: together with and behind Brătianu we can see the factors of Rumanian home politics, the King, the party conflicts, etc.

Spector concludes that, beginning from the outbreak of World War I, the leading political circles of Rumania were united by one great, common aspiration: to unify the Rumanians of East Europe, to accomplish the disintegration of the Monarchy, and to secure in the struggle of the opposing interests a position that would be most advantageous for attaining these objectives. The representative outstanding fighter of these aspirations was the Rumanian Prime Minister, who controlled events when he was no longer head of government. The author is certainly justified in pointing out Brătianu's gifts, his important role, especially as concerns the skilful exploitation of the antagonisms in great power politics and the adaptation of Rumanian interests to these. Although the latter circumstances seem to have deserved more emphasis on the part of the author; for it was exactly these circumstances that brought Brătianu's

abilities into full display; there was agreement of interests, and the Rumanian aspirations were by and large fitting into the anti-Sovietic and East European plans of the Entente, especially of France.

Naturally also Lederer presents those leading diplomats and politicians who represented the Yugoslav interests: Pasič, Trumbić, Vesnić (pp 84—91), and in this connection he succeeds in giving an idea of the conceptions not yet fully co-ordinated of the various Southern Slav nations concerning the features of the state to be formed, and the demands to be raised in respect of the neighbours and the great powers.

A comparative study of the two books, as well as the authors' analyses, present one fact quite clearly: while the Rumanian delegation arrived at the Peace Conference with united demands and an integrated programme, headed by a highly respectable Brătianu who had a firm hold on home politics at the same time, the cardinal difficulty of the Yugoslav delegation was the lack of sufficient agreement, on a uniform programme. The members of the Yugoslav delegation were fighting in Paris not only their rival neighbours or the great powers, but occasionally even opposed one another while their relations with Belgrade were far from being satisfactory.

Both authors start from the premise that it is not the Allies that created the new states on the ruins of the Monarchy: the Peace Conference was only the crowning act of a process which having started within the Monarchy many decades before, and, becoming more and more intensive, had eventually led to secession. They are correct in stressing at the same time that the outcome of the war, the victory of the Allies, had a decisive influence on secession and on laying the foundations for the new states. And we may add here that precisely in this context the Peace Conference played an extremely important role, since it was mainly composed of those powers that had during the war formally pledged their support for the territorial-national claims of the former national minorities of the Monarchy.

The authors illustrate with many interesting data the correlations of occupation and national movements in autumn 1918. Yet speaking of the World War, Spector seems to be overinfluenced by the Entente's declarations, we might as well say propaganda of that time, when stating that the Western Powers had "got involved" in the war, and shifting the responsibility for the war on the Central Powers. Lederer gives a very good and fairly detailed summary of the history of problems between the Great Powers and the Monarchy beginning from 1916.

As mentioned above, the author's attention has been concentrated chiefly on the national problems, on the making of the frontiers and rearranging the territory of the one-time Monarchy according to the national principle. Sources exposed demonstrate novel correlations. The author's comparison and critical remarks made in respect of the various countries are based on these sources, which renders the two volumes very useful. But the same point of approach results in a certain degree of one-sidedness at the same time. Notably not only the national problems called for a solution at the time the Monarchy collapsed but social problems also presented themselves; and how powerfully, it appeared from the revolutions in Hungary, from the events in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia and Rumania, and from the efforts of the bourgeois governments of these countries to relax social tension partly through reforms (e.g. land distribution), but mainly by directing these antagonisms into the channels of nationality problems. If these problems had been treated in closer connection with the diplomatic activities and with the attitudes of the various governments and parties represented in parliaments — discussed elsewhere in both books — then a historically more complete picture would have resulted showing the significance of the diplomatic accomplishments in the national fields from more than one aspect.

Spector emphasizes that within the Rumanian mother state, whose aspiration was

to take possession of further territories, and which was of a rather homogeneous national character, the official conception of a "greater Rumania" was not traversed by any other plan of importance. (He analyses the Transylvanian problem, the events that took place there, the Rumanian—Hungarian—Saxon problem in a very realistic manner.

The Southern Slav question was much more complex, more controversial. Giving portraits of the leading persons as individuals and politicians, and disclosing the events of political history, Lederer gives a well-supported clear presentation of the problems involved by the unification-plan (Serbian leadership, kingdom, association on equal terms, possible Croatian hegemony, etc.). Lederer sees the clash of two major trends here: the struggle of a pan-Serbian or pan-Croatian versus a Yugoslav idea, which was especially acute at the moment of actual union. Lederer's conception, which is apparent throughout his book, culminates in the conviction that the Yugoslavian line was the only up-to-date one and that all the other ideas expressed bygone possibilities of the past, of the 19th century (p. 93). And perhaps the most interesting passages of his book are where his argumentations based on rich material attractively rise to the level of a more general approach to the problem of the entire Danubian basin. Here Lederer points out a highly important fact: the new Southern Slav state, the Kingdom of Serbia—Croatia—Slovenia, obtained recognition by the allies but slowly, reluctantly, while Rumania did never have a problem of his kind.

The policy of the great powers, their relations with Yugoslavia and Rumania, occupies, as a matter of course, much space in these books. Thanks to the rich source material, to the throughgoing research of both authors, we get many a thing that is novel — we may safely say surprising — in this field. Whenever the policy of the great powers and the Peace Conference are discussed, the reading public usually tends to think that the new states enjoyed the unequivocal and exclusive French diplomacy. Spector

shows in an interesting manner that, apart from this principal line, a great number of other factors were seen at work, affecting this support which, in the final issue, was neither unambiguous, nor unswerving. Clemenceau and Pichon, the bourgeois politicians and military leaders, were far from interpreting the support for Rumania in the same way.

Lederer's picture of Yugoslavia also reveals a number of new features in showing that the position of the Southern Slavs in Paris was much weaker than that of the Czech or of the Polish delegation. Lederer points out that the Yugoslav—French relations involved at the same time the texture of Yugoslav—Rumanian, Yugoslav—Italian, French—Italian, French—American, Yugoslav—American, Italian—American relations burdened with a complexity of antagonisms. The principal difficulty in this respect arose from the Yugoslav—Italian tensions, i.e. clashes of interests, which aggravated the terms of these two countries, affecting also the attitude of their neighbours. This set of problems is discussed in Lederer's book in finely elaborated passages which contain many so far unknown facts and novel conclusions. His relevant statements are significant also in respect of Hungary, because they discuss the London Treaty and its consequences in great detail (the subject is treated with a comparable thoroughness — though from quite a different aspect — only in the *Memoirs of Vittorio Orlando*). Yugoslavia enjoyed partnership neither to the Bucharest nor to the London Treaty, and the *aide mémoire*, on which she could depend, was not a strong enough weapon in the hands of her diplomats.

The interests of Yugoslavia and Italy were seemingly irreconcilable because of Fiume and the seacoast. Lederer cleverly shows that although France was by no means willing to accept a strengthening of the Italian rival she would not take sides with Yugoslavia to such an extent as would have resulted in her overt opposition to Italy.

Novel and highly instructive is the presentation of the Albanian problem in its

leanings on the Yugoslav—Italian relation, because this problem and the ensuing antagonisms presenting themselves already at that time, are usually not given sufficient attention (see e.g. the pertinent paragraphs of the London Treaty, etc.).

Also thought-provoking and interesting is in Lederer's book the disclosure of when and how Yugoslavia tried to seek and find support for her policy. Prior to October 1917, Pasić, the "Great Old Man" of Serbian political life, placed his hopes in Tsarist Russia. Yet after the revolution Yugoslav interests were inevitably drifted to the road of American orientation: President Wilson refused to recognize the secret treaties made during the war, and opposed the Italian claims in the most resolute manner. This not only discloses the particular features of Yugoslav policy — although these were somewhat similar to those of the Cechs — but also presents a sphere of the consequences and effects of the 1917 October Revolution which often escape attention. Lederer emphasizes, however, that despite Wilson's pro-Yugoslav policy the attitude of American politicians towards the controversy about Fiume was not at all uniform. (See e.g. the emergence and acceptance of the "Fiume Free Borough" concept.)

The Italian aspirations which were of so great consequence to the Yugoslav delegation, to Yugoslav plans, the conflict between the Italians and President Wilson, the President's statement that sparked off the crisis (the author is the first to present this statement in detail), the Italian and Yugoslav reaction to the statement, the advantages Yugoslavia drew from the resignation of the Orlando Government, etc., are analyzed with many refined observations. We learn from Lederer's book that under the given power relations Yugoslav interests had to be based by the Yugoslav government on the U.S. as a matter of necessity, but that this basis failed altogether to come up to the expectations attached to it.

Both authors give a greatly detailed, thorough discussion of the problems connected with the frontiers of the two countries.

As concerns the differences dividing Yugoslavia and Rumania, they uniformly conclude that Rumania was able to defend her position much more effectively than the Yugoslav delegation.

In connection with the numerous controversial territorial problems, Lederer makes brief reference to the Yugoslav—Hungarian talks conducted on the Hungarian part by a bourgeois democratic government, and to the fact that the Italians tried to exploit these talks to the disadvantage of Yugoslavia (pp. 177—178). But his only source in this respect is Crespi's book, thus the picture he presents is not a complete one.

Both the subject and problems of either book are closely connected with Hungary's history. The process and the play of forces involved in the disintegration of historical Hungary, the circumstances of the separation of various territories, are illustrated from many aspects and in an objective manner. Very useful and instructive details are presented about the frontier debates affecting Hungary; the revolutions in Hungary, the Hungarian Republic of Councils first of all, are also discussed. True, these problems are treated by Lederer less extensively, since Yugoslavia had no part in the intervention against the Republic of Councils of Hungary. At the same time he draws attention to the circumstance that the leading politicians of Yugoslavia considered the effect of the Republic of Councils to be highly dangerous to the internal affairs of Yugoslavia.

Spector devotes more space to Hungarian-Rumanian relations, to the intervention against the Republic of Councils. He does not call in question the great powers having encouraged Rumania to take part in this intervention (p. 166). (Lederer is more explicit in showing the initiative of the Entente in this question, pp. 234—235.) At the same time Spector, considering the actual situation, emphasizes that the Rumanian government was making very good use for its own interests of the differences between the great powers, their dread of a revolution. He reveals how in July 1919 one wing of

British policy (Balfour and others) came to show much more understanding towards Rumania than before, with the interconnection of Rumanian oil and British interests in the background.

Yet an attitude, usual at that time and recurring ever since, appears also from Spector's conclusions: he brings into connection the policy of Béla Kun, of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the northern campaign, with efforts to preserve territorial integrity; it is this aspect that Spector points out, and he fails to see, or denies, its revolutionary character and aims. This follows only partially from the fact that Spector has evidently not studied the history of the Hungarian Republic of Councils proper, that — owing to the language barrier — he has not studied Hungarian analyses and sources. His remarks in this respect form integral part of the aforementioned nationalistic attitude, and display the influence still exerted by non-Hungarian historical records produced mainly between the two wars. It cannot be denied, of course, that as far as the masses and even the middle strata were concerned, the national factor, too, played a role in the emergence of the Hungarian Republic of Councils, its successful military operations. Yet the entire policy of Béla Kun, of the Revolutionary Governing Council, was determined not by the aspect of territorial integrity, but rather by the idea of a *world revolution*. What they saw in military success was not the triumph of the Hungarian national cause, but a possibility for spreading the revolution, for realizing the world revolution. Instead of referring to well-known and important pertinent facts, let me only recall the debate about the flag to be used in the Red Army. Béla Kun and others rejected the use of the national colours in a most resolute manner, saying that this would be a symbol contrary to the aspirations of the Republic of Councils, and would give food for propaganda campaigns against the Hungarian Republic of Councils in the neighbouring countries.

Both books illustrate in an instructive manner how in autumn 1919, when the great powers considered the settling of European

affairs to be an urgent matter, applied pressure on their allies handling the interests of the latter with less understanding than before in making their political decisions. Yugoslavia had no choice but to accept decisions with which she disagreed; Rumania, on the other hand, was able to profit by the better opportunities open to her, as well as by the circumstance that in certain questions she faced the Peace Conference with accomplished facts (e.g. the occupation of Budapest and of the greater part of Hungary, then the conditions attached to evacuation, the future status of Bessarabia, Bucovina, Dobruja, etc.).

The Paris peace system, the frontiers drawn for Rumania and Yugoslavia, the problems left unsolved or pregnant with further conflicts, are criticized by both authors. On the one hand, they draw attention to the heterogeneity of viewpoints manifest in the making of frontiers; on the other, they emphasize that all this new arrangement failed to create purely national states, and that considerable numbers of populations of different nationalities were annexed to both countries. Spector criticizes Brătianu in this connection, pointing out the mistakes of a policy having its roots in anti-Communism, in the dread of revolution, in chauvinism and intolerance, and emphasizing that territorial claims and the "appetite" were not willing to take into account the difficulties that were bound to emerge in a suddenly increased Rumania. He also disapproved of Brătianu and the Rumanian government for having shown very little understanding towards the national claims of other non-Rumanian peoples (p. 237).

Both volumes rest on a very rich literature and source material comprising not only the American, but also the Rumanian, Yugoslav, even Italian aspects. What is missing from Spector's book is the Rumanian and Hungarian material published since the war; also the use of earlier sources in Hungarian relation is limited and rather accidental.

Zs. L. Nagy