Ágnes Zsolt’s Authorship of her Daughter Éva Heyman’s Holocaust Diary
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This paper, a further elaboration of my earlier work, aims to show that thirteen-year-old Éva Heyman cannot have been the author of the book Éva lányom [My daughter Éva], and the actual author was her mother, Ágnes Zsolt. After its publication in 1947, the diary received little to no scholarly attention, but in 1972, Zsuzsa Scheer wrote an article on the book where she referred to the titular Éva Heyman as the ‘magyar Anna Frank’ [Hungarian Anne Frank]. Éva Heyman was a thirteen-year-old Jewish girl murdered in Auschwitz in 1944, and her diary, allegedly written between February and May 1944, was published by her mother Ágnes Zsolt in the form of a volume titled Éva lányom. Napló [My daughter Éva: Diary]. As a supplement to the diary, Ágnes Zsolt wrote a preface and also attached two private letters, one written by the family’s cook and the other by the governess who raised Ágnes as well as Éva. To this day, the widespread consensus among scholars is that the volume originally published by Ágnes Zsolt contains her daughter’s writing. In contrast, this paper argues that the book was written by the mother in the format and style of a young girl’s diary to explore Éva Heyman’s short life from the child’s perspective and to help Ágnes process her grief over losing her daughter.

In 2010, after seven years of doing comparative analysis of Jewish and Christian adolescent diaries, I wrote a Hungarian-language article where I suggested two possible readings of Éva lányom as either the original writing of Éva Heyman or the work of the mother, Ágnes Zsolt. However, in the next four years, I examined several unpublished diary manuscripts since my doctoral dissertation focused on the comparative analysis of adolescent diaries, and based on my experiences of analyzing these texts, I now firmly believe that judging by its style and format, Éva lányom could not have been written by a young adolescent.

The first section of this paper presents Ágnes Zsolt’s life and career, followed by a section where I discuss the role of Ágnes Zsolt’s guilt and grief over the death of her daughter in writing her memoirs. The
third section focuses on Éva lányom as Ágnes Zsolt’s work and argues that by analyzing certain aspects of the text, we can determine authorship even in the absence of the original manuscript. I also discuss the issue of authenticity as debated by other scholars, then examine articles and reviews from 1947, the year Éva lányom was published. I will then examine the title and structure of the volume as well as the length and style of the diary entries, highlighting certain historical inconsistencies in the text. Finally, I shall analyze the two letters attached to the volume that were allegedly written by the cook and the governess of Ágnes’s family, concluding that the two letters are likely fake and have also been written by the mother.

The tragic life of Ágnes Zsolt, mother of the ‘Hungarian Anne Frank’

In 1912, the year Ágnes was born in the city of Nagyvárad [today’s Oradea in Romania], her father, pharmacist Rezső Rosenberg (who later hungarianized his surname to Rácz) purchased the Hungarian Crown Pharmacy and the family hired an Austrian governess called Juszti, who raised not only Ágnes, but also Éva nineteen years later. Ágnes Rácz completed her studies in Kolozsvár [today’s Cluj-Napoca, Romania] and became a pharmacist, and we may presume that she was meant to inherit the pharmacy her father originally bought to provide for his family. (For a portrait of Ágnes Zsolt see appendix I, [page 153])

In 1931, Ágnes Rácz gave birth to Éva Heyman, her only child from her first marriage to architect Béla Heyman, but their marriage eventually ended in divorce and Ágnes later married leftist writer and journalist Béla Zsolt, changing her name to Ágnes Zsolt and following her husband to Budapest while young Éva stayed behind with her maternal grandparents in Nagyvárad, where she was practically raised by the Austrian governess. By the time Ágnes married Béla Zsolt, he had become a nationally renowned and celebrated writer and journalist, who wrote many extremely successful plays, novels and short stories. However, as a leftist writer, Zsolt also publicly criticized the interwar Hungarian political system, which made him infamous in right-wing circles. In 1942, due to his Jewish origin, Béla Zsolt was conscripted into labour service on the Eastern front, where he developed typhoid fever and was only released in 1944 thanks to his wife’s efforts and support. Following Béla Zsolt’s release from labour service, he and his wife decided to visit Ágnes’s family. On March 16, 1944, the couple arrived in Nagyvárad and was soon trapped there due to the German occupation of Hungary on March 19,
which left Béla Zsolt no choice but to go into hiding due to his reputation as a notorious left-wing journalist. Following the German occupation, many antifascist politicians and prominent Jewish persons were arrested by the German and Hungarian police forces. Nevertheless, the authorities failed to apprehend Zsolt because he left his residence in Budapest and moved in with Ágnes’s family in Nagyvárad.

During Béla Zsolt and his wife’s stay in Nagyvárad, the family had several opportunities to save Éva Heyman from deportation, but Ágnes’s indecision eventually rendered their options impossible. At the beginning of May 1944, the family was forced to move into the Nagyvárad ghetto, where Éva Heyman lived with her grandparents at 20 Szacsvay street while Béla Zsolt was in hiding at the ghetto hospital as a patient, and doctors hid Ágnes Zsolt at the maternity ward to prevent Hungarian and German authorities from finding Béla Zsolt through her, her parents or her daughter. However, due to these arrangements, Ágnes Zsolt could only meet with her parents and child in secret.⁶

At the hospital of the Nagyvárad ghetto, two Jewish doctors, Sándor Bálint and gynecologist Miksa Kupfer, with the help of a gentile pathologist called Konrád Beöthy, attempted to save Jewish patients from deportation by imitating an outbreak of typhoid fever.⁷ The idea was inspired by the fact that it was possible to detect positive signs of typhoid fever in the blood of patients who had already suffered the disease (as did Béla Zsolt in 1943 during labor service).⁸ Kupfer and Bálint took blood samples from patients and then transferred them to Beöthy’s laboratory, where he willingly confirmed the samples for typhoid fever whether the patient in question had the illness or not. The doctors then declared these patients contagious, isolating them in a special epidemic ward established in the air defense basement of the building. At the time of deportation, all non-contagious patients were deported, but thanks to the efforts of the three doctors, some thirty patients residing at the epidemic ward survived because Hungarian and German authorities did not want to risk exposing their personnel to the illness.⁹

Some of the Jewish patients who were saved by the efforts of Bálint, Kupfer and Beöthy at the Nagyvárad ghetto hospital, including Ágnes and Béla Zsolt, eventually managed to escape with forged documents to Budapest, Romania (due to its proximity to Nagyvárad) or to neutral Switzerland. At the end of June 1944, thanks to the Zionist Rescue Committee and journalist, lawyer and Zionist leader Rezső Kasztner, the organizer of the famous Kasztner train, 1,684 Jews managed to escape from Hungary by traveling on board the Kasztner train through Bergen-
Belsen and into Switzerland. Passengers included Kasztner’s relatives and friends, but the majority were prominent Jews (rabbis, writers, artists and Zionists) and their relatives, as well as other persons and a group of orphans. As a fellow journalist, Kasztner was intent on helping Béla Zsolt, and his efforts allowed Béla and Ágnes Zsolt to reach the Swiss border, but Éva Heyman and her grandparents could not accompany them. Since Ágnes’s parents and daughter could not seek refuge in the hospital of the Nagyvárad ghetto, they were all deported and eventually murdered in Auschwitz.

In 1945, Béla Zsolt and his wife returned to Hungary from Switzerland, and once they settled down in Budapest, Béla Zsolt began writing his memoirs while also actively participating in Hungarian politics. Within two years, he became the co-president of the left-wing Hungarian Radical Party, the editor of the party’s journal Haladás [Progress], and in 1947, he also became a member of Parliament. By 1946, Zsolt finished his memoirs titled Kilenc koffer [Nine suitcases], publishing the book in segments in Haladás. In Kilenc koffer, Béla Zsolt commemorated his labor service during World War II, his and his wife’s last visit to Nagyvárad, the German occupation, their stay at the Nagyvárad ghetto and their successful escape to Switzerland, and though he mentioned his stepdaughter Éva Heyman in his memoir, it is interesting to note that he did not mention Éva having ever written a diary. Based on Béla Zsolt’s memoirs, Éva Heyman either did not have a diary, or if she kept one, her stepfather did not consider the diary significant or important enough to mention it in his own memoirs, even though Béla Zsolt did mention some of Éva’s possessions, such as her sports medals or her zoo card.

Although Ágnes Zsolt had originally studied to become a pharmacist, she decided to follow in Béla Zsolt’s footsteps after World War II and became a journalist, publishing articles and reports in the journals Világosság [Light], Világ [World], and Magyar Nemzet [Hungarian nation], and finally publishing her one and only book, Éva lányom.

We may assume that as a starting journalist, Ágnes might have been motivated by her husband’s work and his autobiographical novel Kilenc koffer to write her own book and commemorate the tragedy of her daughter Éva. After 1945, Béla Zsolt once again became a celebrated writer in Hungary, as shown by the fact that he received the Order of Merit of the Hungarian People’s Republic. His prestige definitely played a role in getting his wife’s book published, since Ágnes’s volume was obviously meant to be a tribute to the child as evidenced by the title Éva lányom. The
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The preface also states that Ágnes Zsolt wrote the book at the Szabadsághegy Sanatorium, where she allegedly composed the entire text in eight days. 14

When she received news of Éva Heyman’s early and tragic death, Ágnes Zsolt was overpowered by crippling grief and guilt, but her and her husband’s desperate anger soon turned against their rescuer Miksa Kupfer, and according to my sources, the Zsolts were not the only patients who blamed Kupfer and his associates for not saving everyone at the Nagyvárad ghetto. Reuven Tsur (born Róbert Steiner), who today teaches literature at Tel Aviv University, was also one of the temporary residents of the Nagyvárad ghetto and his memoirs provide us with an additional account of what transpired at the ghetto hospital. Steiner was born in 1932 in Nagyvárad, where he was acquainted with the Zsolt family and Éva Heyman as a child. In 1944, Steiner’s family was forced to move into the ghetto with other Jewish residents, but unlike Éva Heyman and her grandparents, the Steiner family managed to survive by escaping to Romania. Tsur’s memoirs were originally published in Hebrew, but in 2005, a Hungarian translation was published under the title Menekülés a gettóból: egy nagyváradi zsidó család története [Escape from the ghetto: The history of a Jewish family from Nagyvárad]. Tsur mentions the Zsolts in his memoirs and also states that Miksa Kupfer was sued by several patients who were allowed to stay at the hospital as their family members were deported. As Tsur writes, “When the Zsolts returned to Budapest after the war, they decided to persecute Kupfer in any way possible.” 15 By blaming their rescuer, Ágnes and Béla Zsolt tried to alleviate their own guilt and diminish their personal responsibility in the death of Éva Heyman and Ágnes’s parents. Their goal was to sue Kupfer and have him indicted by court, and though their attempts failed, they did manage a small act of revenge by having Béla Zsolt portray Kupfer in an extremely negative light in his book Kilenc koffer, calling him a “demonic ponce of a doctor.” 16 Miksa Kupfer was so deeply offended by Béla Zsolt’s unfair portrayal of him that he almost sued Zsolt for publishing his biased opinion in Haladás, 17 and it is interesting to note that although the full text of Kilenc koffer was meant to be published as a volume in 1947, it only came out in Hungarian in 1980. 18

In 1949, two years after the publication of Éva lányom, Béla Zsolt died of laryngeal cancer 19 and left behind a widow consumed by guilt and loneliness, since Ágnes’ grief over the murder of Éva Heyman did not lessen over the years. In August 1951, Ágnes committed suicide, but my sources disagree on the method she used. According to Tsur, she cut her wrists, while writer and actress Ilona Harmos wrote that Ágnes poisoned
herself.\textsuperscript{20} We only know for certain that her dead body was found in her house, lying next to the picture of her daughter Éva.\textsuperscript{21}

The psychological background of the birth of Éva \textit{lányom}: Trauma, mourning and grief

In November 1947, Zsuzsa Madarassy published a short article about \textit{Éva lányom} in the journal \textit{Politika} [Politics], where she quoted Ágnes Zsolt with regard to her motivation behind writing her book, which was apparently a product of the mother’s guilt over losing her daughter: “This book has made public my private self-accusation of why I stayed alive.”\textsuperscript{22} Ágnes’s words suggest that she blamed herself for surviving when her daughter and parents did not, and Béla Zsolt’s memoirs confirm that his wife was irreversibly traumatized by the fact that she and her husband managed to escape to Switzerland while Éva Heyman and Éva’s parents were deported and murdered in Auschwitz. Since Ágnes lost her entire family in the Holocaust, her mourning and grief work were especially difficult on account of having no relatives who shared her experiences of this tragic period and could have helped her cope with her loss.

According to Béla Zsolt’s memoirs, Ágnes made several unsuccessful suicide attempts in May 1944 after the doctors at the hospital of the Nagyvárad ghetto informed her that her daughter Éva had been deported. After the death of Éva Heyman, the doctors first withheld the news from Ágnes and inspired false hopes of the child’s survival, but after three days, they finally visited her at the epidemic wing to relay the tragic news. In February 1944, Ágnes developed a tumor and had to undergo extensive surgery, which already left her in a delicate condition, but her state of health deteriorated considerably once she became overpowered by crippling guilt and shock. In her grief over losing her daughter, Ágnes turned to self-harm and in her first suicide attempt, she managed to tear open her relatively recent surgical wound. Béla Zsolt was not present during Ágnes’s suicide attempts, but based on the accounts of the doctors, he managed to reconstruct Ágnes’s attempts in \textit{Kilenc koffer}: “On the third day in the cellar, she discovered that she had been misled and her parents and her child had been deported. After a hair-raising nervous attack, followed by a six-hour faint [sic], she was overcome by a speechless, melancholy lethargy and went on hunger strike.”\textsuperscript{23}

To Ágnes Zsolt, the only possible way to cope with the loss of her daughter was to join Éva Heyman in death by taking her own life in any
way possible. According to Béla Zsolt, she nearly succeeded in killing herself at one point:

Then she turned to self-flagellation. For two days she writhed on the bare stone floor of the cellar: her operation wound opened and the doctors had to stitch it up again. It was only with great difficulty that they managed to carry her to one of the empty rooms upstairs. When they left her alone for a few minutes, she tore her artery open at the wrist and in a fit of weeping kept biting her fists till they were bleeding. [...] Eventually she recovered somewhat and frantically demanded to be taken to the gendarmes, put into a wagon and sent after her family. When the doctors tried to calm her down, she started to scream: if they didn’t let her go to the gendarmes, she would reveal the whole deception [sic] and report the doctors and the patients. If her child had been deported [sic], then everybody else should be deported too. In the hospital windows there was no glass, and in the street outside, less than five meters from her room, every word could be heard by the free Aryans [non-Jewish persons – G. K.] of Nagyvárad as they were passing by. The horrified doctors held her down and gave her an injection to make her sleep.24

The tragedy of losing Éva Heyman was exacerbated by the fact that, just like others who mourned the death of their relatives in Auschwitz, Ágnes Zsolt did not know the exact location of her daughter’s body and was denied an important part of processing her trauma, the means of giving Éva a proper burial. Funerals have a special function during mourning since they allow the mourner to conclude their period of shock and say farewell to the deceased through a series of traditional funeral rites in the presence of a supportive community. Ágnes was denied the conclusive farewell of a funeral, and in his 1947 article, Béla Zsolt mentions that the fact that Éva had no designated grave depressed Ágnes, who often visited the cemetery after the war: “As a matter of fact, she often goes to the cemetery to look at the unmarked graves and sometimes manages to delude herself that the child is there somewhere under one of those mounds.”25 Ágnes’s coping strategy served to curb her hopeless and self-destructive grief by finding a place where she could cherish and honor her daughter’s memory ‘in the presence’ of the departed.

Since Ágnes could not process the loss of her daughter by burying Éva’s body, we could argue that her memoirs served not only as a tribute to the child, but also as a means of articulating Ágnes’s most important memories. By writing her book, Ágnes could recreate her daughter to suit her own needs of coping with Éva’s murder and loss, leading her to
construct an idolized image of her child not only in the preface of her book but through the entire volume, where one recurring theme is Éva’s will to live despite her terrible circumstances. In the preface, Ágnes talks of her daughter in the third person, emphasizing Éva’s sensitive nature and will to survive, which the ‘diary’ proceeds to confirm in the form of diary entries written in first person. In my interpretation, writing her book as if it were Éva’s own memoir was part of Ágnes Zsolt’s grief work and gave her a chance to process the trauma of losing Éva Heyman by presenting and preserving an idealized image of Éva as a vigorous, smart, sensitive and open-minded girl with above average intellectual capacities.

Éva lányom and the question of authenticity in scholarly literature

Éva lányom has traditionally been considered a collection of Éva Heyman’s own diary entries by scholars such as Judah Marton, who wrote the preface to the Hebrew translation of the text published by Yad Vashem in 1964. Marton also wrote the preface to the first English translation of the book in 1974, which was based on the Hebrew version. The first sentence of the preface of the English version reads as follows: “This little volume contains the diary notes of a thirteen-year-old Jewish girl.” Marton supports his statement by referring to conversations he had with unnamed close friends of the Zsolt family, who were living in Israel at the time the Hebrew version was published. Marton also consulted members of the Rácz-Rosenberg family in Israel, mentioning that “they had no reason to question the authenticity of any part of the diary.” However, it is important to emphasize that Marton did not claim that any of the family members had ever seen or read the original manuscript, and he concluded that in the absence of the original, the authenticity of the text could not be proven.

In 1981, Dezső Schön and Mose Heller published an edited volume titled A tegnap városa [The city of yesterday] in memory of the Jewish inhabitants of Nagyvárad, and their work also considered Éva lányom an authentic diary, arguing that the text was ‘honest’ in a way the entries of an adult could never be. At the same time, the editors did assume that the original material was partially edited by Ágnes Zsolt. Mária Ember, author of one of the first historical studies of Hungarian literature on the Holocaust, wrote an article on the book where she accepted it as an authentic diary, and her opinion was also shared by Louise O. Vasvári, who researches the gendered aspects of the Holocaust.

Recent studies of the book Éva lányom published by Ágnes Zsolt
began to emphasize the editing role of the mother over the child’s authorship. For instance, literary historian Sz. Péter Nagy mentions the book in his short monograph on Béla Zsolt: “He married the daughter of a pharmacist in Nagyvárad, who later became a journalist under the name Ágnes Zsolt and also published the potentially fictive diary of her daughter from her first marriage in 1947 under the title Éva lányom.”

Alexandra Zapruder comes to a similar conclusion in her book Salvaged Pages: Young Writers’ Diaries of the Holocaust, which is a compilation of fourteen adolescent diaries, including Heyman’s ‘diary.”

According to Zapruder, it is probable that Éva kept a diary during the war, but for its publication, Ágnes Zsolt edited the original diary considerably by writing supplements and rewriting some of the original manuscript. Zapruder also assumes that it is no coincidence that the original manuscript is still missing and Ágnes may have destroyed it so that her changes could not be traced. However, she concludes that in the absence of the manuscript, its authenticity cannot be determined, an opinion also shared by literary historian György Szőke, who considers Ágnes Zsolt to be the author and attributes the birth of the book to the mother’s feelings of remorse. In his article about Éva lányom, Szőke also notes that “[o]ne more legend debunked: the book we are holding in our hands is not the diary of the Hungarian Anna [sic] Frank.”

Lastly, Reuven Tsur, who knew Éva personally from his childhood years, considers the book as “containing Éva’s diary as well as her mother’s comments.”

Reviews of Éva lányom upon its publication in 1947

In 1947, several reviews were written about Éva lányom to celebrate its publication, and when we examine these reviews, we will find that there was considerable uncertainty at the time regarding the book’s actual authorship. The short articles I examined were published around October and November 1947, one of them written by no other than Béla Zsolt, whose review can be reasonably regarded as the most authentic account of Éva lányom since Béla Zsolt not only knew both Ágnes and Éva intimately as Ágnes’s husband and Éva’s stepfather, but was also likely familiar with the book’s origin. In his review for the journal Haladás, Zsolt introduced the book as follows: “My wife has recently published her book Éva lányom, in which she reconstructed from memory the diary of her thirteen-year-old daughter from her first marriage.” In his review, Béla Zsolt emphasized that the book was not a simple diary due to the fact that the mother not only used her daughter’s diary as the source material, but also
supplemented it: “this thirteen-year-old girl revived in my wife’s book from the fragments of her diary…” As we can see, Béla Zsolt’s review seems to consciously obfuscate the origin of the book by writing that the child is both ‘reconstructed’ and ‘revived’ in the published volume, which suggests that there might have been a diary that inspired the mother to write the book. However, it is important to note that Béla Zsolt never stated that the published volume was identical to the child’s diary and continuously emphasized the mother’s role in creating the volume.

In his 1947 review, writer and journalist Andor Kellér also foregrounded the creative role of Ágnes Zsolt over the authorship of Éva Heyman: “[S]he wrote the diary of her daughter’s last few months from memory in one go, one singular trance. At the time, she snuck a peak inside that private booklet, and the mother’s brain soaked up the voice of that beloved child like a sponge. She then breathed life into her, she who was silenced forever.”

In contrast to Béla Zsolt and Andor Kellér, other reviewers of Éva lányom accepted the book as containing the original diary. According to the 1947 article of writer and poet László Hárs, “Ági Zsolt, who appears on the cover, is not the author but the publisher of the diary of thirteen-year-old Éva who died in that Nazi hell.” Writer and poet Zsuzsa Madarassy shared Hárs’s opinion and wrote, “This is Éva’s diary that her mother sometimes read in secret in Nagyvárad.”

In conclusion, when we examine the reviews and articles published in 1947, the very year of the publication of Éva lányom, we can clearly see that there was general uncertainty regarding the book’s authorship, not in the least due to the fact that Ágnes and Béla Zsolt made no concrete claims in this regard.

The title Éva lányom

When The diary of Anne Frank was published in 1947, Anne Frank was designated as the author of the book, whereas the diary of the ‘Hungarian Anne Frank’ published in the same year was listed under Ágnes Zsolt’s name instead of Éva Heyman’s. In both cases, the parents had a choice after the child’s death to decide whose name should be stated on the cover as the author, and from Ágnes Zsolt’s choice, we may conclude that she considered the volume to be her own creation rather than Éva’s. In contrast, Otto Frank published the original diaries of his daughter, which made it self-evident that the diaries should bear the name of the daughter rather than her father’s name.
The original cover of Éva lányom, shown below, promotes Ágnes Zsolt as the author of the book instead of Éva Heyman (this cover is reproduced in appendix II of this article.) Éva’s first name is featured twice on the cover, but her surname is missing in both instances, which implies that she is a character rather than the author of the volume. The cover also features a quote from the preface in capital letters that briefly summarizes the contents of the book: “Thirteen-year-old Éva fought for her life against the killers of the Third Reich, but the German beast defeated Éva.” The inner cover contains the title Éva lányom without the quote, and once again, there is no mention of the book being a diary until the first sentence of the preface. The cover of the book was obviously designed according to Ágnes Zsolt’s specifications and shows how the book is meant to be viewed as her literary work about her daughter. In contrast, The diary of Anne Frank published in the same year clearly states on the cover that the book contains Anne Frank’s diary letters.

In 1964, Éva lányom was translated into Hebrew and published by Yad Vashem, but the translation made considerable alterations, such as changing the title of the book to יומן אוחי [Yomanah shel Eyah Hayman, Diary of Éva Heyman] and replacing Ágnes Zsolt’s name with Éva Heyman’s. In other words, the Hebrew translation gives the illusion of the child’s authorship when the original Hungarian text clearly designated Ágnes Zsolt as the author of the volume. Ten years later in 1974, Éva lányom was also published in English based on the Hebrew version instead of the original Hungarian, which meant that it also adopted the changes of the Hebrew translation. Regarding the quality of the English version, I agree with Tim Cole who notes that “The diary was translated by Moshe Kohn from Hebrew into English (and hence the translation is far from ideal)”.

The preface of Éva lányom written by Ágnes Zsolt had little to say about the diary it was allegedly based on. In fact, Ágnes Zsolt only mentioned the diary twice without any further detail, also failing to clarify how the published diary related to the original manuscript. She noted in the first sentence of the preface that “I found Éva’s diary in Nagyvárad in 1945,” but she did not claim that the published diary was identical to the diary found in Nagyvárad.

The entries of the book

For my analysis, I compared certain diary entries of Éva lányom with two authentic adolescent diaries where the original manuscript proves the
children’s authorship, and then compared these three texts based on the specificities of the diary genre (frequency, personalness, real time narrative and fragmentation), as well as the length of diary entries, style, and recurring themes characteristic of adolescent diaries.

I compared the text attributed to Éva Heyman with the authentic diaries of two thirteen-year-old girls, Anne Frank, and Éva Weinmann, who was born in 1928 in Budapest and kept her diary between October 1944 and January 1945, though the diary was not published until sixty years later. I also compared the Hungarian text of the Heyman ‘diary’ with the original Hungarian manuscript of Éva Weinmann, who started writing her diary at the age of thirteen, while in the case of Anne Frank, I only used those entries of the complete English version that she wrote when she was thirteen years old. My analysis was informed by my experiences with other adolescent diaries in the course of writing my doctoral dissertation on the comparative analysis of fifteen Christian and Jewish adolescent diaries.

When I examined Éva lányom with regard to the specificities of the genre of the diary, I found that unlike adolescent diaries where the randomness and spontaneity of daily entries leads to an overall fragmented text, the entries of Éva lányom are remarkably coherent, which suggests that they were composed in part by an adult. When I compared the diaries of Éva Weinmann and Anne Frank to Éva lányom, the other two diaries showed a number of similarities, the most striking of which was that the two authentic diaries did not contain long entries like Ágnes Zsolt’s volume does. Two to three-page entries are relatively rare in the two adolescent diaries while Zsolt’s text is rife with exceptionally long entries that would have filled multiple sheets of paper in handwritten form. The writing style of these long entries is also more detailed and sophisticated than any entries in Anne Frank’s diary, despite the fact that Anne Frank revised her diary at a later age. Another characteristic of adolescent diaries is that they are often tied to adolescent roleplay where aspiring young people, such as Anne Frank who wanted to become a writer, looked to their diary as their first work of art. According to Ágnes Zsolt, however, Éva Heyman wanted to become a photo reporter, which means she would have had no reason or motivation to write exceptionally long diary entries as a way of testing her abilities. Conversely, there are no short entries in Éva lányom as opposed to Weinmann and Frank’s diaries, which makes her ‘adolescent diary’ sound rather artificial.

Aside from lacking the fragmentation characteristic of authentic adolescent diaries, another aspect that is completely missing from Éva
lányom is the act of constant self-analysis and self-searching, which is especially characteristic of and a traditionally recurring theme in adolescent diaries. In other words, the author of Éva lányom is reporting about her surroundings rather than sharing information about herself, her feelings, desires and plans. Parts that pertain to Éva’s desires or plans are so brief and rare that they do not constitute a recurring theme in the text, which may be explained by the fact that Ágnes Zsolt did not live with Éva and therefore found it difficult to grasp her character. On the other hand, Ágnes was familiar with everyday life in Nagyvárad since she had grown up in the city, making everyday events, places and people easier to write about. Ágnes may have also wanted to cater to readers’ needs by describing and situating places and characters to facilitate navigation in the text.

Another aspect of adolescent diaries missing from Éva lányom is the focus on the present and on momentary occurrences. For instance, in the entries before the German occupation in March 1944, the author of the ‘diary’ constantly talks of the past rather than the present, which is uncommon for a diary where instances of reminiscing about the past are usually rare and accidental. Finally, another aspect where Éva lányom seems to deviate from authentic adolescent diaries is that the author of the text does not appear as an agent in the narrative. Unlike other adolescent authors, ‘Éva’ does not reflect, evaluate or make sense of the events she’s writing about.

The structure of the ‘diary’

In Éva lányom, the ‘diary’ begins on Éva Heyman’s thirteenth birthday, a date that seems to have been chosen by Ágnes Zsolt to place the text in a tragic framework where the narrative begins with the birthday of the murdered child and lasts until the day of her deportation. It is interesting to note that Éva’s thirteenth birthday fell on a Friday, which lends an ominous atmosphere to the first passage that can be connected to Ágnes’s guilt over having missed her daughter’s final birthday: “I’ve turned thirteen, I was born on Friday the thirteenth. Ági is terribly superstitious, though she’s ashamed to admit it. This is the first time Ági didn’t come for my birthday. […] She didn’t come home for my thirteenth birthday.”

The first entry of the ‘diary’ serves as an introduction and an occasion for Ágnes Zsolt to reminisce about the most memorable experiences of her daughter Éva. Ágnes’s description of the most important events in Éva Heyman’s life begins with the above quoted excerpt and foreshadows the themes and main elements of subsequent entries. In the
introductory entry, the author uses the child’s chain of thought to give short descriptions of Éva’s family members, including the grandparents, the parents, the servants of the family, immediate relatives and Éva’s best friends. These descriptions are then juxtaposed by turning points in the family’s life, such as the divorce of Ágnes from Béla Heyman, the forced leave of the Austrian governess (due to the Hungarian Jewish Laws of the era that forbade German citizens to serve Jews), Béla Zsolt’s conscription into labour service, the expropriation of the pharmacy and the deportation of Éva’s friend Márta Munczer.

In Éva lányom, diary entries from before the period of the German occupation pertain to the early years of Éva Heyman’s life, while subsequent entries describe her ‘present’ life. We may assume that early on, frequent references to the past helped Ágnes Zsolt in constructing the text, since it was easier to simply select a given event from the past at random and include it in the diary than reconstruct the ‘present’ life of the child who lived apart from her mother and stepfather. In this regard, March 19, 1944 was a turning point in the text where the focus finally shifted to the present, a change of temporal perspective that can be explained by the fact that Ágnes Zsolt and her husband arrived in Nagyvárad on Tuesday, March 16, so the mother was by her daughter’s side from that point onward. The German occupation thus became a turning point to Ágnes both in terms of her constructed narrative and in her family’s situation.

One recurring theme in the book is the foreshadowing of Éva Heyman’s tragic fate through a series of linked elements such as her friend Márta Munczer’s red bicycle, which comes to signify the death of Márta and her family by German troops in Kamianets-Podilskyi54 and serves as a basis for Éva’s fear that she would share the fate of her friend due to having matching bicycles. The elements of the symbolic web (bicycle = Márta = Poland = Germans = death) appear multiple times in repetition, and to preserve the connection between them, Ágnes even located Kamianets-Podilskyi in Poland instead of its actual geographical location in the Ukraine.55 If Ágnes had properly located the city in the Ukraine instead of Poland, she would have lost one of the pillars of the complex death symbol, the red bicycle would have also lost its meaning, and the child’s fear of sharing Márta’s fate would have come across as completely irrational. However, through the erroneous location or geographical ‘shifting’ of the first great massacre (Auschwitz = Kamianets-Podilskyi), Éva and Márta’s fates do become the same.56

Ágnes Zsolt’s memoir is structured within a framework where the first diary entry was condensed in order to provide a full overview of the
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child protagonist and her surroundings to the reader, while the last entry serves as the conclusion where Éva Heyman finally parts with her diary: “Now I see that friendly gendarme has let Mariska come in. I can’t write anymore, dear diary, the tears run from my eyes, I’m hurrying over to Mariska…” The character of the friendly gendarme also appears in the memoir of Béla Zsolt and might have been adapted by Ágnes Zsolt, but it is more probable that the identical description stems from their shared experiences.

When was Éva Heyman deported? The final entries of the ‘diary’

Judging from certain contradictions in Éva Heyman’s ‘diary’ and based on accounts of the deportation of Jews from the Nagyvárad ghetto, I concluded that the last two entries in Éva lányom are fictitious. The penultimate entry was allegedly written on May 29, 1944 and informs us about the first deportation from the ghetto, followed by the final entry dated May 30, 1944, in which Éva parts with her diary. Ágnes Zsolt states in her preface that Éva was put into the cattle train on June 3, 1944 and arrived in Auschwitz three days later. However, there are several contradictions in the account, not only within the ‘diary’ and the preface but also compared to the accounts of former residents of the Nagyvárad ghetto.

The Hungarian gendarmes divided the Nagyvárad ghetto into seven deportation districts, and each district was closed before deportation to prevent people from escaping into other districts. Based on these divisions, Éva Heyman and her grandparents residing at 20 Szacsvay street were part of the third district, a fact that Béla Zsolt confirms in Kilenc koffer. The announcements of the Chevra Kadisa published in 1949 list the number of deportation transports per day as well as parts of the ghetto from whence people were taken to the trains and the date of their arrival to Auschwitz. The list places the first deportation on May 25, 1944, when the residents of Rimler Károly street and people forced into the Nagyvárad ghetto from other parts of the country were deported, arriving in Auschwitz on May 29, 1944. The second deportation took place on May 27, when the residents of the odd numbers of Kapucinus street and Szacsvay street were deported and arrived in Auschwitz on May 30, 1944. The even numbers of Szacsvay street, including number 20, were deported on May 28, 1944 and arrived in Auschwitz on May 31, 1944, which means that Éva could not have written her last two entries on May 29 and 30, 1944. The diary of Sándor Leitner, the last president of the Orthodox Jewish
congregation in Nagyvárad more or less confirms these events. According to his diary, the third wave of deportations occurred on May 29.

Ágnes Zsolt claims in the preface of Éva lányom that her daughter was deported on June 3, 1944 and arrived in Auschwitz on June 6, 1944, but several facts contradict her statement. The preface hints at the fact that in the last three days before the deportation (June 1 to 3), Éva could not have written anything if she had previously given her diary to the cook on May 30 for safekeeping. However, if we accept the mother’s preface as factual, then her daughter could not have lived at 20 Szacsvay street based on other available sources and somehow had to either avoid or miss her deportation. However, this does not seem to be a viable alternative according to other related sources, including Béla Zsolt’s memoir, which states that Éva was deported from Szacsvay street in district three. According to Béla Zsolt, Ágnes Zsolt’s efforts to transfer her daughter into another district failed, and every available information supports the idea that Éva and her grandparents were deported either on May 28 or May 29 from district three.

The child Ágnes had (not) left

As I have previously mentioned, Ágnes Zsolt and her husband managed to find refuge inside the ghetto hospital at Nagyvárad before deportation began at the ghetto. Béla Zsolt was admitted to the hospital as a patient and Ágnes was hiding in the maternity ward under an alias, which meant that she could only meet her daughter and parents rarely and in secret. However, we only know of their location from Béla Zsolt’s memoirs since Ágnes Zsolt’s book does not mention that she was hiding there while the child was left with her grandparents. Instead, the text of the ‘diary’ constantly stresses the opposite, that Ágnes did not abandon her child and they were preparing for the deportation together. For instance, the entry on May 14 reads as follows: “Grandpa is in charge of the pharmacy, and now he put Ági on the list of workers so that she would be able to visit Uncle Béla every day.”

It is clear from the entry that Béla Zsolt was no longer staying with the family at 20 Szacsvay street, a fact that is confirmed by other accounts, but these same accounts also confirm that Ágnes Zsolt was not a visitor or hospital staff but a patient at the hospital. One of these accounts is the memoir of Reuven Tsur I have mentioned before, who was acquainted with the family and his mother was an old friend of Ágnes Zsolt. In his memoirs, Tsur mentions a conversation between his mother and Ágnes at the ghetto hospital, which likely took place in May or June.
1944, and the fact that the conversation took place at the hospital proves that Ágnes Zsolt was not with her daughter and parents at 20 Szacsvay street. According to Tsur’s memoirs,

My mother asked her old friend where Éva was. Ági replied that she was with her grandparents. “She had always been with them. We thought it would be best if she stayed with them.” To which my mother said, “At times like these, a child’s place is by their parents’ side. Ági, I’m afraid your maternal instincts have failed you this time.”

By careful shifting of certain facts regarding her stay at the Nagyvárad ghetto, Ágnes Zsolt managed to create a narrative that may not have reflected reality but helped alleviate Ágnes’s remorse as a mother over abandoning her daughter Éva. To maintain the illusion of staying by her daughter’s side, Ágnes and even Béla Zsolt appeared in the ‘child’s’ final entry, where Éva allegedly witnessed a conversation between her mother and stepfather. Their implied presence served to ease Ágnes’s guilty conscience by indicating that her daughter stayed with her mother until the end and the whole family was preparing for the deportation together. There are also other details that suggest to the reader that Ágnes remained with her daughter and parents, such as parts of the text where the ‘child’ writes about her conversations with her mother or Béla Zsolt, or describes their everyday activities. From the mother’s perspective, these entries served two important purposes: in the self-constructed past of the diary, her daughter knew her mother wanted to save her, which alleviated Ágnes’ guilt, and such passages were also an indication to the reader that the child was included in her parents’ escape plan: “Ági and Uncle Béla are whispering something to each other about our staying here in some kind of typhoid hospital, because they plan to say that Uncle Béla has typhoid fever.”

Ágnes Zsolt deliberately left out the details of her own escape to Switzerland from the preface of Éva lányom because her narrative attempted to convince the reader that Éva Heyman and her mother were preparing for their deportation together. In the preface, Ágnes Zsolt only mentioned very briefly and vaguely that she managed to escape to Switzerland while her only child died in Auschwitz. However, this means that it remains unclear to the readers how Ágnes actually managed to escape when according to the final entries of the diary, she was still by her daughter’s side at 20 Szacsvay street. The preface raises questions that Ágnes Zsolt’s book does not want to answer, probably because she knew
that the answers were all in her husband’s memoir *Kilenc koffer*. While the abandonment of the child filled Ágnes with so much grief and guilt that she could not bear to write about it, Béla Zsolt gave a detailed account in his own memoirs of how they failed to rescue Éva. In his book, Béla Zsolt not only pushed responsibility onto his wife and her family, who did not recognize the severity of the child’s situation like he did, but also blamed the doctors who failed in their attempts to transfer the child into another deportation district.

**The letters and self-accusations of a negligent parent**

When Ágnes Zsolt published her book in 1947, she attached two letters that were often completely ignored by scholars. Both letters were written after the war in 1945 and addressed to Ágnes, one by the Christian cook of the Rácz family, Mariska Szabó, and the other by Juszti, the Austrian governess who had raised not only Ágnes but also her daughter Éva. Both letters were replies to Ágnes Zsolt’s letters, which suggests that her first letters were written to inform them of Éva’s death at age thirteen. In light of my discussion of the text as the mother’s work rather than her daughter’s writing, one may ask why Ágnes Zsolt considered it important to publish these letters along with what she claimed was the child’s diary.

If we consider the book to be Ágnes Zsolt’s work, then it is of course possible that the letters attached to the diary were also written by her. Viewed in this light, the first letter allegedly written by the cook would thus serve to further reinforce the authenticity of the child’s diary. Similarly, writing the letter on behalf of Juszti gave Ágnes an opportunity to openly articulate her self-accusation through the character of the governess, pointing out where she made wrong decisions as a parent that she would later regret.

In my opinion, the primary function of the cook’s letter was to prove the existence of Éva Heyman’s diary to the reader since the letter does not pertain to the book in any other way. Similarly, the purpose of the final sentences of the last entry is to establish a connection between the ‘diary’ and the attached letter, in which the family’s cook informs Ágnes Zsolt about the diary in her possession: “Madame knows that on the last day, when I got inside the Ghetto, Évike gave me her diary.”

In her letter to the Austrian governess, Ágnes Zsolt must have written of her immense guilt over surviving while Éva was murdered in Auschwitz, which firsts elicits the governess’s sympathy in her reply to Ágnes, but Juszti then goes on to accuse Ágnes of neglecting Éva well
before the time of their transportation to the ghetto in a straightforward and harsh criticism of the mother:

If there is one thing for which I must blame you, it isn’t for having stayed alive while the girl is dead, for the very opposite could have happened too, but for having lulled yourself with excuses that looked real — things I have already referred to — and for not having fought to have Éva with you, even in more modest circumstances. You, who fought so hard for your man when everybody said it was hopeless; you, who in the end succeeded in rescuing him from that horror in which you found yourselves in Várad; and in the end you, who understand people so well, for you have an instinct about this sort of thing, you, my Ágika, in this matter you failed!  

If we read Ágnes Zsolt’s published volume as the mother’s memoirs, then certain recurring themes in Éva lányom, such as Ágnes’s divorce from Béla Heyman, can be traced back to the image of the negligent mother projected by the governess’ letter to Ágnes Zsolt. Ágnes likely realized in retrospect that not only was her divorce a difficult period for Éva, but that her relation with Éva was also different from more conventional mother and daughter relationships, as evidenced by her calling herself Ági throughout the book rather than ‘mother’ to illuminate their peculiar relationship. Therefore, in an attempt to view herself from the child’s point of view, Ágnes wrote about the negative impact of the divorce and often described herself in the book as someone who was unsuitable for the maternal role, with several episodes included to reinforce her incompetence while there are hardly any instances that counterbalance it. The reason behind such passages would be Ágnes’s self-accusations fueled by her reflection on her daughter’s life and realizing she did not do her best as a mother to give Éva a short but happy life until the day of her deportation.

To counterbalance somewhat the negative image Ágnes projected of herself as Éva’s mother and to compensate for her neglect of her daughter, Ágnes Zsolt made a point to mention her desires that pertained to the postwar reunion of mother and child. While divorce as a recurring theme could be attributed to the author’s guilt, her guilt would then be alleviated by repeatedly projecting a happy future in Pest. At the same time, by constructing the text in this particular way, Ágnes Zsolt also attempted to validate herself by claiming that she only left her child due to forced circumstances and trusted her to the care of her grandparents in Nagyvárad. There are several episodes in the book that contrast the child’s
negative present with a happy future in which the ‘family’ is together again:

…I go to them, and when there won’t be any more Jewish Laws for journalists. I’ll live with Uncle Béla in Budapest. That is why Ági says that my staying with grandpa and grandma is only a transition [sic] period, and that my true, final home will be with them in Pest, as I’ve already written in you, dear diary. 68

Conclusion

In this paper, I focused on the book Éva Lányom published in 1947 in Budapest by journalist Ágnes Zsolt, and offered an alternative interpretation of the volume that has traditionally been presumed by scholars to contain the diary entries of Ágnes’s daughter Éva Heyman, murdered in 1944 in Auschwitz at the age of thirteen. Due to Ágnes Zsolt’s circumstances and her difficulties in coping with the murder of her child, this paper posits a possible alternative according to which the book was written by Ágnes Zsolt as a tribute to her daughter. The memoir of Ágnes Zsolt’s husband Béla Zsolt suggests that his wife was irreversibly traumatized by the fact that her connections helped her and her husband escape to Switzerland during the deportation of Hungarian Jews while Ágnes’s daughter and parents died in Auschwitz. Therefore I deemed the book to have been the work of the mother, whose grief and remorse over losing her daughter Éva compelled her to write her memoirs in the form of a child’s diary. In my interpretation, the book was conceived from the mother’s inexpressible grief, and as such not only commemorates the child but also served as an attempt to articulate Ágnes’s most important memories. Ágnes Zsolt’s mourning period was especially difficult due to losing her closest relatives who shared her experiences and could have reminisced with her about her daughter and the Holocaust. In the absence of her family, Ágnes’s grief over the murder of Éva Heyman did not lessen over the years, nor did she ever forgive herself for managing to survive, leading to her suicide in August 1951 at the age of thirty-nine.

I argued for Ágnes Zsolt’s authorship by presenting evidence from authentic accounts of the Nagyvárad ghetto and examining the text with regard to the specificities of the genre of the diary, and based on my research, I concluded that Éva lányom is not Éva’s diary, but Ágnes Zsolt’s book written in the style of an adolescent diary. If Éva did write a diary during World War II, her manuscript was likely negligible and only
served as an inspiration for the mother to write her own book, just like the letters of the cook and the governess.
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