

the "Közlöny". The author rightly points out that the government also made matters worse by its deliberate policy of not issuing the paper in the other languages used in Hungary. This was a grave handicap in its attempts to make its policies and aims clear to the other nationalities (pp. 201/202).

It is also of interest that the Austrians continued to be fearful of Kossuth's journalistic abilities and paid him the compliment of producing a forged issue of "Kossuth Hírlapja" in December 1848 which was circulated among the Székely inhabitants of Háromszék district in Transylvania. (p. 245)

The defeat of the revolution inevitably meant that the press suffered during the period of new-absolutism before the Compromise of 1867. But towards the end of that period the press had steadily grown in size and in 1867 the number of papers in circulation had reached the total of 119. After 1867, during the era of the Dual Monarchy, Hungary had a modern press, the foundations of which had been laid during the years of the War of Independence.

This English version of Dr. Kosáry's history is well produced, as is usual with the books published in this series. It has a useful map of Hungary, but, unfortunately, lacks an index. It seems a pity that such a basic aid to the enquiring reader seeking information about a particular topic has not been included in a book which, like its Hungarian original, is bound to remain the standard work on the subject for some time to come. If the book is reprinted, it is to be hoped that this omission can be made good in the next edition.

London

I. W. Roberts

John Lukacs
Budapest 1900 (A Historical Portrait of a City and Its Culture)

(New York: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 255 pp.)

According to John Lukacs's soon to be published book *Budapest 1900*, modernity began in Budapest following the Ausgleich in 1867. A few years later the ten districts of Pest, Buda and Óbuda were united to form the new and official capital of Hungary. In 1892 the Emperor-King Franz Joseph issued an imperial and royal decree that proclaimed Budapest to be equal in rank with Vienna (székesfőváros). By 1900 this city had become, through immigration, assimilation, industrialization and nationalism, a Magyar city in culture and atmosphere. The strong traditional German-Habsburg elements of Buda had been replaced by an element that was nationally Hungarian. But, as Budapest took on the characteristic of modernity the remainder of Hungary still resembled a semi-feudal state of the previous centuries. Budapest led the way in attempting to transform Hungary into a twentieth-century state. Unfortunately, time and the sequence of events that led to the First World War were major road blocks in Hungary's development. While Budapest astounded Western visitors with its beauty and splendor, problems and growing conflicts "...between the urban and the populist, between the commercial and the agrarian, between the cosmopolitan and the nationalist, between the non-Jewish Hungarian and the Jewish-Hungarian culture and civilization of Budapest were already there." Modernity brings destructive forces of change along with all its material, cultural and social advantages. Unfortunately, these problems escaped most of the architects of this modern Budapest.

Lukacs writes that the theme of his book "is not the history of a city but its historical portrait at a certain time, a portrait of its atmosphere, of its peoples, of their achievements and trouble." In this regard he has shown Budapest to be a city reaching its apex as a modern European cultural, political and economic center at the dawn of the twentieth century. It is a city that demands recognition and respect, a city that wants to escape from the shadow of Vienna that had loomed so ominous in the past century. A city that wants to spread its wings and join the European community as one of its own. Lukacs draws the reader's

attention to Budapest's separate identity and its desire for more than a dualist existence with Vienna. By 1900 Budapest could stand on its own and was in some ways superior to Vienna. Budapest had become the showcase for the monarchy and *Magyarodom* to the world.

Lukacs does an admirable job of describing the districts of the city at the turn of the century. The colors, sights, sounds and smells of each distinct section are brought forth through the array of buildings, bridges, coffee houses, landmarks and peoples that span beyond the banks of the Danube. Unmistakably Pest was the center of Magyar culture and language. The traditional German-Habsburg areas of Buda only slowly disappeared in the sea of newly arriving immigrants and under the cloak of nationalism. By 1900 Budapest was a Magyar city. Hungarian had replaced German on street signs, on the streets and in the restaurants and cafes. Gone was the traditional *díszmagyar* dress. It was replaced by the more fashionable dress that one would find in a Western metropolis. In Lukacs's words, "Budapest (had become) the only bourgeois city in Eastern Europe." Its national transformation was nearly complete. The mayor had ceased being German. The only remaining "serious" German newspaper in the city was the *Pester Lloyd*. The Royal Palace was a "representative not of Habsburg baroque but of the then Hungarian nationalist new style, perhaps symptomatic of the nation's place within the Dual Monarchy".

Anyone and everyone came to Budapest if they could. It was the point of departure for the West. It was the West! It offered numerous opportunities for those searching for social mobility, employment, adventure and excitement. It possessed the excitement of no other place within Hungary. By 1900, according to Lukacs, Budapest and Hungarian literature "had become intertwined." It attracted artists, painters, composers, musicians, peasants, Jews, foreign guests, investors and the common proletariat. The gentry, "the truly national and historical class, the flagbearers of Hungarian independence", sought out social mobility, position and respectability in the civil services. Their shortcoming, as Lukacs points out, "...was (their) narrow nationalism... that was as intense as it was shallow". They were part of the class to which Lukacs attributes a "national inclination to political rhetoric", a point that is not clearly explained and is over-emphasized. The gentry attended the universities, frequented the coffee houses, made nationalistic speeches in the parliament while attempting to maintain their position within the state. They were one of the outward symbols, along with the assimilated Jews and the emerging urban proletariat, of modernity in Budapest.

Lukacs pays particular attention to the commercial advancement of the Jews in the city. He cites their assimilation to the Magyar culture and the effects of nationalism upon liberalism as being of primary concern for their future. First, liberalism was regarded "as the remnant proposal of an antiquated system", second, the Magyarization of the Jews - and of the Germans of Buda - produced the desired result of this policy upon a minority. Nationalism brought the dawn of a new, more deadly evil for the Jews of Hungary. As Lukacs points out, the Hungarian handling of the Jewish question and anti-semitism was far more judicious than in any other European state. Lukacs does a good job in covering this topic in detail.

Under the heading of the literary achievements of this period Lukacs is highly subjective. For example, one of the many artists to come to Budapest during this period was *Gyula Krúdy*. Of Krúdy Lukacs writes the following: "...the greatest writer of Magyar prose in the twentieth century, perhaps the greatest prose writer in all Hungarian literature, and surely one of the greatest writers of Europe - even though he is seldom translated and remains largely unknown outside Hungary." In actuality, Krúdy should be known beyond the borders of Hungary, but Lukacs has gone overboard in his adulation. In describing Budapest, Lukacs uses eight lengthy quotes by Krúdy. However, this has a negative effect. These quotes are quite effective in giving the reader a feel for Budapest in 1900. They ignite an interest in the reader to discover the works of Krúdy, but they take away from Lukacs's description of the city. Does Lukacs's book add anything in its description of Budapest that Krúdy has not already described? Also, should *Ady*, whom *Oszkár Jászi* called the soul of reform and *Georg Lukács* the soul of revolution, be given a greater role in this study than Krúdy? Granted (John) Lukacs gives Ady serious consideration. He writes, "he (Ady) was that very Magyar type of great poet who is, by nature, a great pessimistic visionary". But Krúdy has achieved immortality in (John) Lukacs's description. Ady, who had a greater impact on the "Generation" than Krúdy, is just another writer.

Another criticism of this work is its organization. For instance, it is not until page 67 that the thesis of this work surfaces. The beginning of chapter 3, "The People", belongs more to the introduction than as a separate chapter. Sections on the historical evolution of Hungary and the city that are listed in the latter chapters should also be in the introduction. Also, the effects of urbanization and industrialization on the city needs to be given more attention; more statistical data and analysis are needed on this topic. Is there a link between Budapest's industrialization and the rise of nationalism? The problems of urbanization in its nascent structure had to have many negative effects on Budapest in 1900. Also, the importance of the nationality issue on Budapest was largely ignored. It seems that the more nationalistic Budapest became had to be related in some manner with the rise of nationalism amongst the minorities. As Budapest's importance grew, along with its population, would it not attract the national minorities in a "magnetization" as much as the neighboring states beyond the Hungarian borders? Lukacs puts greater emphasis on the minorities attraction to the neighboring states, whose people spoke their languages, than to their attraction to Budapest. However, Lukacs states that Budapest was attracting everyone to its borders. It was not until later on that the minorities looked beyond the borders of Hungary for national justice. In 1900 the roads for all the peoples of Hungary went through Budapest. The increase of minority membership in parliament in 1906 bears this out.

In conclusion, this book does go under the surface and exposes the emergence of a city that was to have played a major role in twentieth century Europe. But, there is a lack of consistency that should have been tightened and clarified through proper editing. It is an interesting portrait of a city approaching one of the most trying times in its history. Budapest in 1900 is an exciting place to be. The color, splendor and appeal of this city was evident to all who ventured to its borders. Lukacs gives us a glimpse of a Budapest that experienced noticeable changes with each day. Unfortunately, many of these changes were as destructive as some were constructive.

Sam Wilson

Indiana University,
Bloomington

La Romania nella diplomazia Vaticana. 1939-1944.

By Ion Dimitriu-Snagov

(Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana. 1987. Pp. 170. Lire 16,500)

Among the Greek-Orthodox states of southeastern Europe Romania's relations to the Vatican during World War II are especially interesting, since the Romanian government made special efforts to cultivate these relations in order to make a favorable impression not merely on the Holy See but, through it, on the neutral world and, at least indirectly, on some of the Western Allies. The principal factor in these relations was Monsignor Andrea Cassulo, the papal nuncio in Bucharest, whose integrity, diplomacy, and humanity led to certain favorable results, including the alleviation of the fortunes of persecuted Romanian Jews, especially after 1942, when the great general fortunes of the war had turned against Romania's principal ally and protector, Germany. Most of the evidence of these developments are contained in the Vatican's publication of documents relating to World War II. This thin volume by Dimitriu-Snagov adds little to what is already contained in the documentary volumes. His commentary, too, is vitiated by a nationalist account of those years, to the extent that it bears many of the marks of special pleading. That the diplomacy of the regime of Marshal Ion Antonescu was more flexible and more circumspect than it had seemed at the time of the war is well-known of historians of the period. Yet its record is compromised by a very arbitrary selection of documents and by an extremely nationalist and often erroneous interpretation of events the tendency of which hardly differs from that of the pamphleteering histories produced under the aegis of the present (1983) Communist dictatorship in Bucharest.

John Lukacs

Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia