
Spanning the long nineteenth century, Robert Nemes’s remarkable book, *Another Hungary: The Nineteenth-Century Provinces in Eight Lives*, charts the lived experiences and diverse perspectives of eight different people (six men and two women) from the northeastern region of the former Kingdom of Hungary. Having chosen an aristocrat, a merchant, an engineer, a teacher, a journalist, a rabbi, a tobacconist, and a writer as his subjects, Nemes introduces his readers to individuals whose lives intersected in complex and revealing ways with the social, political, economic, cultural, and even environmental history of a peripheral region of Central Europe that has often been dismissed as backward or otherwise unexceptional and unimportant by scholars. Avoiding mere biography, Nemes leads his readers on an edifying journey through this provincial region of nineteenth-century Hungary, one that connects the lives of its towns, villages, and people to broader historical developments not just in Hungary and the Habsburg Empire, but also in Europe and the rest of the world. Focusing as much on the spaces and places of this region as he does on its people, Nemes contends that the villages and towns of the northeast “were not just a dull reflection of the capital city or of western Europe, but [were] interesting and important in their own right.” Significant in economic, cultural, and political terms, their history, he states, “demands our attention” as much as the individual lives of his human subjects (2).

Throughout the book, Nemes makes good on his assertion that a detailed and very close study of the biographies of his eight subjects can breath new life into Hungary’s often-overlooked provinces. Key to each of his chapters, in fact, is a careful and always sensitive presentation of the “mental maps” and “imagined geographies” that emerge from the autobiographical writings and personal reflections of the individuals that Nemes has chosen to study. Woven into the biographies he presents are wonderfully rich and vivid snapshots of the region’s physical and the human geography. The “soggy fields” and “surrounding oak forests” (46) of Žemplén County come to life in Chapter 2, for example, while the “steep” and
“forbidding” mountains of Máramos County, with their “unforgiving and unpredictable climate,” are brought into sharp focus in Chapters 3 and 6. Elsewhere in the book the reader becomes acquainted with the “plunging waterfalls, ruined castles, craggy peaks, and lonesome streams” of the Apuseni mountain range southeast of Oradea (132), as well as with the rich agricultural spaces of Szatmár County with its lowland wheat fields and its “vineyards, pastures, and chestnut forests” that “blanketed the hills” (182). As Nemes clearly illustrates in his opening chapter on “the Aristocrat” Count József Gvadányi, this diverse landscape was also home to a diverse population, and to people whose lives were shaped as much by local geographical realities as they were by broader historical developments. Because he organizes his biographies chronologically, the reader is made aware of the major forces that shaped the region during this period, such as the migratory flows that transformed multiple communities over the course of the nineteenth century, as well as the slow and almost imperceptible material changes that gradually altered the northeastern counties as improved transportation and communication networks began to integrate the Hungarian periphery into expanding national, imperial, and global networks.

Though few of the book’s subjects actually stayed in the northeast for their entire lives, Nemes argues that the towns and villages of the region, no less than the natural landscapes and the people, exerted a distinct pull on the individuals he examines, and even on “the Writer” Margit Kaffka, who was perhaps the most critical and unforgiving of the eight. Despite the relative underdevelopment and isolation of the northeastern counties, each of Nemes’s subjects sees potential in the region, and though the liberal structures and practices of the nineteenth century may not have penetrated the provinces as deeply as they would have liked, there was still hope that the region’s historical diversity would become its future strength, and that a rational plan for resource development would transform this northeastern corner of the Kingdom of Hungary into a valuable and more meaningfully integrated economic hinterland. Though their respective visions and experiences of course varied greatly, the collective lives of these eight men and women suggest that the outlook of the people living outside of Budapest in the nineteenth century was much less provincial, and in some circles perhaps even more cosmopolitan, than we have been led to believe. By listening attentively to the voices of “locals,” Nemes shows quite vividly just
how complex and also dynamic the region was, and by extension how limiting it has been to view the provinces and its people through the one-dimensional and ultimately reductionist lens of “backwardness.”

Of course, being the careful historian he is, Nemes clearly recognizes the pitfalls of a revisionist narrative like his that seeks to challenge and on a nuanced level even significantly rewrite what we know about the history of the Hungarian provinces in the nineteenth century. Though he makes a very convincing case that the history of this region “matters,” and that by investigating it on its own terms a much richer and more dynamic history is revealed, Nemes nevertheless avoids romanticizing the northeast, and in fact does as much to expose the intolerance and retrograde nature of provincial thinking and practices as he does to tease out the progressive and even cosmopolitan characteristics of at least some of its people and urban centers. One of the key achievements of his book, in fact, is the way in which he is able to trace the outlines of a complex and relatively liberal civil society that was “more vibrant and viable than often assumed” (113) while simultaneously reminding us that, despite the legacy of ethnic cooperation in the region and the promises embodied in the emancipation of peasants, Jews, and women in the Habsburg Empire more generally, northeastern Hungary failed in the final analysis to overcome many of the aspects that have rendered it “backwards” in the eyes of so many. Wary of what he calls “the myth of the provinces,” Nemes resists painting an idealized image of the nineteenth century, and reminds his readers that feudal structures and practices persisted into the second half of the nineteenth century (and beyond), and that opportunities for marginalized groups were limited, while ethnic and sectarian divides were often wide and ultimately unbridgeable.

One aspect of this history that obviously prevents against an overly optimistic or sentimentalized reassessment of northeastern Hungary in the century leading up to World War I was the expansion and intensification of antisemitism within the region. Reflective of developments elsewhere in the Habsburg Empire and indeed the rest of Europe, antisemitism in the Hungarian provinces was pervasive and often vicious, especially by century’s end. Nemes points to the deportation of 83 Jewish families (approximately 360 people) from Zemplén county in 1807, for example, as evidence that, though it was possible for certain Jews (like “the Merchant” Ráfael Kästenbaum) to prosper, and though certain Jewish communities had otherwise “good”
relationships with county nobility, the existence of Jews was ultimately precarious, and their fortunes “could change overnight” (52). Often regarded as “unwelcome outsiders,” Jews remained vulnerable, and were “easy targets of violence” in the provinces (54). Moreover, despite the liberal reforms and thinking that on some level defined this era in Hungarian history, the nineteenth century ended with what Nemes rightly identifies as an “upsurge of antisemitism and sectarian strife,” and with the growth of nationalist tensions more broadly (153). The complex situation exerted great pressure on Hungarian Jews, and especially on Jewish leaders who found themselves having to navigate an increasingly hostile anti-Jewish public sphere while simultaneously dealing with a new constellation of demands from members of their own communities. As his chapter on “the Rabbi” Ármin Schnitzer clearly illustrates, Jewish attempts to negotiate rising antisemitism at the end of the century were complicated by pronounced social, political, and ideological divisions within the Jewish community itself, divides that were emblematic of fault lines that were emerging and deepening within modern society at large.

The question of modernization, in fact, is a theme that runs through Nemes’s book, and is one that he uses profitably in order to temper idealized notions of the provinces as idyllic if otherwise economically “backward” spaces that, if left untouched, might somehow have served as models of toleration and alternative paths to modernity. In his story of “the Engineer” Pál Vásárhelyi, for example, or in his account of the lives of “the Teacher” Klára Lövei or “the Tobacconist” Vilmos Dároczi, Nemes foregrounds the collective desire of these erstwhile locals to transform the northeast by transcending and even erasing the regressive aspects of the region. Whether it was in respect to the region’s untamed waterways, its unenlightened educational system, or its out-of-date agricultural practices, these would-be reformers embraced the civilizational mission of the Hungarian elite, and viewed the present state of the provinces as something to be overcome. Like Daróczi “the Tobacconist” who characterized the northeast as a region perched on the edge of modernity, all three saw untapped potential in the provinces, and believed that the people there were capable of great things if only proper, state-directed reforms were enacted.

One of the greatest strengths of Nemes’s book, and thus also one of its most important scholarly contributions, is the voice he gives
to each of his eight subjects, individuals who, with the possible exception of Kaffka and perhaps also Vásárhelyi and Gvadányi, are not widely known by students of Hungarian history. Though Nemes’s presence as a historian and as the author of the text is obvious on every page, he nevertheless resists the temptation to editorialize or pass overt judgment on any of the eight personalities, and instead allows them to speak as freely and as openly as possible. The end result of Nemes’s fine touch is a provocative study that is not only rich in broad historical context and meticulously researched biographical detail, but also rooted in the complex worldviews and lived experiences of eight very different people. If there was one possible “weakness” to the book it is that there are not more voices included, and especially more voices of women, and of “non-Hungarians” such as “the Journalist” Iosif Vulcan, a “tireless Romanian nationalist” from Oradea (Nagyvárad/ Grosswardein), or “the Merchant” Ráfáel Kästenbaum, a Jewish immigrant from Galicia who migrated to Hungary in about 1760, and who settled and spent most of his life in Zemplén county. The inclusion of additional voices such as these would no doubt serve to enrich the picture that Nemes has so deftly painted in the book as it is, and would contribute even more evidence to support one of his main points, namely that there is much more to the provinces than many historians have previously assumed, and that it is worth digging around in little-known provincial archives and long-forgotten memoirs in order to uncover and appreciate the complex regional dynamics that “have too often been obscured” (10).

Of course, Nemes recognizes the need for more scholarship in this vein, and is very aware of the limitations of his own study. More can and should be done to breath new life into the existing scholarship on nineteenth-century Hungary, and into regions that have long been underestimated and misunderstood as a result of sometimes crass, one-dimensional historical generalizations. As he suggests at the end of his conclusion, the book is not an ending but rather a beginning, “an invitation to look at other provincial lives, and to look for the unexamined and unexpected in unlikely places” (242). One can only hope that future scholars will take up his invitation, and follow the example that he provides. With Another Hungary, Nemes has set the scholarly bar very high. This book is an impressive achievement, and makes a valuable contribution to Hungarian history and the history of Central and Eastern Europe more generally. Given its impressive scope and novel approach, I have no doubt that Another Hungary will
be required reading in numerous fields for a long time.

Steven Jobbitt
Lakehead University,


By combining critical and detailed literary analysis with twenty-five carefully selected, thematically organized excerpts from primary materials, this concise collection smartly accomplishes a complex feat. The first 100 pages offer ethnicity-by-ethnicity chronological analysis of the emergence of women’s organizing and their literary accomplishments in a time that is now often looked upon nostalgically: the period of the, Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1867-1918). The following 190 pages thematically organizes select texts of literary quality from women writers and female activists on their diverse interpretations of education and career paths, the double standard on sexuality, and especially suffrage — the central international question for the women’s movement at the time. This collection offers the first English-language appearance of some of the original literary texts, showcasing the diverse genres and styles and highlighting their until now forgotten importance.

Shaking the Empire, Shaking Patriarchy: The Growth of a Feminist Consciousness Across the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy significantly enhances the existing scholarship on women’s activism during this period by revealing a significant venue for expressing feminist voices in literature. The two authors are authoritative observers of women’s literary accomplishments during the Monarchy, having collaborated earlier in the volume Gender and Modernity in Central Europe: The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and its Legacy (University of Ottawa Press, 2010). Schwartz’ scholarship includes Shifting Voices: Feminist Thought and Women’s Writing in Fin-de-Siècle Austria and Hungary (McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008). The two authors’ analysis and their edited collection of primary materials deepens previous research on this period conducted by Judit
Acsády, Sibelan Forrester, Judit Szapor, Andrea Pető, and Nora Weber, among others.

Revealing this treasure trove of concrete historical examples of the first wave of women’s activism in the Monarchy carries exceptional political weight and importance both immediately after the 1989 regime change and even now, twenty-five years later. In the early 1990s nascent feminist groups across the post-communist region faced ardent criticism accusing them of being mere lackeys of the neocolonial West. The criticism of being a “foreign import” against contemporary feminist groups and activities has not ceased, but has only become stronger with feminist critics of neoliberalism, such as Kristen Ghodsee and her followers arguing that “cultural feminism” caused immense harm in Central and Eastern Europe. The century-old proposals that the Monarchy-era activists present appear to challenge these charges of being a foreign import, because their language, cultural connections, and claims appear entirely home-grown. For example, a considerable majority of the era’s women writers promote the abolition of the Austrian system of state-regulated prostitution and address the various forms of social and cultural gender inequality. These themes and proposed solutions carry considerable currency today as well.

One of the major accomplishments of the introductory analytical review is that it treats nationalism with much care and astuteness. The authors describe how in each ethnic context the necessity to improve the level of women’s education became increasingly linked with nation-building and thus the image of “mothers of the nation” has emerged as the dominant discourse in arguing for national sovereignty — a rationale whose consequences we are still grappling with. Nationalism became the central political argument against the Monarchy and ethnicity plays an especially powerful role in the self-proclaimed positionality of women writers and activists.

While the first 100 pages follow the ethnicity-based organization, this arrangement is far from doctrinaire. The authors repeatedly point out that many of the writers and activists were not only multilingual (in some occasions, speaking and writing in as many as nine languages), but also multi-ethnic. Embracing such multi-dimensional diversity continues to be lacking in the historiography of the period and today especially as some of the contemporary successor states of the Monarchy imagine and increasingly assert homogeneous ethnicity as a basis of sovereignty. In the welcome complex kaleidoscope of
ethnicities presented in this volume only one national description appears unclear, that is the evolution of calling Ruthenians and Rusyns as Ukrainians (p. 55). Rusyns form a distinct group who did not accept the ethnonym Ukrainian since the beginning of the 20th century.

Less prominently than ethnicity is class distinctions, which also appear as important descriptors of the female writers and activists included in this volume. Although the authors disavow the term “bourgeoisie” as ideological and misleading (p. 21), most of the women writers whose texts appear in this book hail from urban middle class background, with a few exceptions of lower nobility, such as in Poland and in the case of Hungarian Countess Teleki (née Juliska Kölcei Kende), using a pseudonym Szikra (Spark) to publish and present at public venues. The intersection of ethnicity and class is especially apparent in Habsburg-controlled Galicia, where the female Polish lower nobility activists would not cooperate with their mostly middle class Ukrainian counterparts, and neither would reach out to their Jewish compatriots whom they both derided (p. 48).

The authors carefully note that they wanted to, but could not include a segment on Jewish women’s writing and activism in Galicia except when in support of Zionism and traditional gender roles in the family (p. 46). The explanation for this apparent absence may be the preventive self-defense, often observed within oppressed (ethnic, religious, or sexual) minorities whose members often internalize and thus successfully control critiques and outreach. It is the more assimilated Jewish women who appear in this collection as they raise feminist arguments in literary and activist contexts. Especially in larger urban centers, Jewish women could become national and international actors, such as Róza Bédy-Schwimmer, who was elected vice-president in 1916 of the (currently still strong functioning) Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom which has consultative status at the UN Bédy-Schwimmer was appointed as Hungarian ambassador to Switzerland in 1918, and she is credited as one of the early initiators of the International Criminal Court.

Discussing the emergence of what becomes Yugoslavia, the authors skillfully note how yet one more facet of intersectionality, i.e., religious affiliation informs but does not fully define ethnic belonging. Political ideology could have emerged as another important angle of further intersecational analysis. The catapulting ideologies of the time: socialism and communism only make a stunted appearance in this collection as an anti-feminist trend that opposed suffrage (p.16),
although women already worked not only in agriculture, but in many urban services (as maids, for example) and the emerging industries, such as textile factories.

While we can safely describe the female writers’ and activists’ approach as feminism, this political stance/ideology remains an undefined concept in support of women’s education and participation in social and political life. Given the considerable variety of feminist orientations that the women writers and activists of the Monarchy promoted, it would have been inviting to include a discussion on what conservative and radical feminist views were at the time when the term feminism had not yet appeared. Change has become a defining element of this region: not only states such as the Monarchy disappeared, but old states re-emerged such as Poland and Hungary, and new states appeared such as Slovenia and Slovakia to disappear yet again in the form of federations. Similar changes affect feminism and woman activists/authors. For example, previously radical female activists in support of women’s advancement, such as Elena Pop Hossu-Longin in Romanian-majority Transylvania (p. 63) and Isidora Sekulić in Vojvodina, the highest ethnically complex region of the Monarchy (p.73), later criticized others who wished to carry the torch further toward suffrage and political representation, and thus they have become seemingly more conservative when their ethnic communities reached the stage of national statehood.

The second most notable achievement of this volume is that it includes an impressive variety of responses of women writers and activists to the many challenges of the era. However, the timing and themes of women’s activism overlap but also considerably differ in territories that later become Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and parts of Italy, Poland, Romania, and Ukraine. For a comparativist, it is inviting to speculate whether and if so, how the 1867 Ausgleich/Compromise-led division of Cisleithania (the areas administered from Vienna) and Transleithenia (the territories under the Hungarian crown) continue to matter.

It is puzzling why some parts of the Monarchy developed women’s literary contributions and activism much later (such as Croatia) than others. The selection of agenda items is also intriguing: Why did some ethnicities focus on some parts of the agenda of the emerging international women’s movement that others tended to avoid? The main foci of activism seem to reappear in the Monarchy
and internationally with some predictable patterns and regularity. Without fail, the first wave of women’s activism tended to focus on charity, often according to religious affiliations. The second and still relevant theme is women’s access to all branches and levels of education and professions. This second theme of activism strongly relied on often foreign-educated women’s literary involvement as a form of convincing others of the worthiness of education. Rejecting the age-old prejudice that women cannot produce intellectual work, women’s education led to demands of suffrage—but not even leading female activists agreed in this aspect during the time of the Monarchy. With a ban on women’s political organizations in Cisleithenia, women had to use the available institutional frameworks, such as charity outreach, education, and professional groups and creatively expand them to gain the support for women’s vote among political decision-makers. The analysis and collection of primary materials in this book offers a timely reminder of the centenary of the suffragist movement and the first, if short-lived attempt for women to gain the vote in 1918 in the successor states of the Monarchy.

The collection, *Shaking the Empire, Shaking Patriarchy* offers a highly illustrative view of the past whose message is highly applicable to the present. It offers a much needed view of an overlooked but central and constitutive feature of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy — a compelling, lucid, and timely analysis of women’s literary, social, and political contributions that combines deft insights with fascinating literary contributions and ethnographic details. It is a highly recommended reading for all interested in the history and the literary accomplishments of the various women’s movements internationally and specially following the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy’s complex binds in ethnic, religious, political, and gender affiliations.

Katalin Fábián,
Lafayette College


Steven Renner’s *Broken Wings, The Hungarian Air Force, 1918-45* makes a significant contribution to the history of modern Hungary and
to Great War and World War II aviation history. Renner engages in broad discussion of the administrative, technological and military history of the Hungarian Air Force, but goes far beyond the limitations usually found in studies of armed services and was careful to demonstrate links between air power development, international relations and Hungarian foreign policy. From the theoretical point of view, the book uses Hungarian civil and military aviation and its role in forming Hungarian patriotism and nationalism, to explain Hungary’s complex and calamitous history in the period, and as such stands in sharp contrast to works which attempt to view military history outside the purview of political concepts. Renner achieved a genuine equality between the military and nonmilitary dimensions of Hungarian history in the period, and was more attentive to the political ramifications of military policy (and vice versa) than most other authors.

The work is meticulously researched, drawing mostly from Hungarian military and state archives, as well as on English and Hungarian language secondary sources, making some of the latter available to English language readers for the first time. Engaging many relevant sources (not least from the papers of Horthy’s office, which have been overlooked even by the most recent Horthy biography) in a strong narrative Renner brought his vast experience, professional expertise and historical knowledge to bear in balanced judgments. The author took issue with standard Cold War clichés, which did nothing but blame the tragedy of Hungary in World War II on Horthy and its regime. While evidently sympathetic towards the Regent, especially because of his quick realisation of the military significance of air power, the argument carefully places itself above judging the political and military performance of interwar and World War II Hungary, and instead strictly concentrates on empirical analysis.

Renner places a great deal of emphasis on the domestic and international factors that brought about changes in Hungarian aviation theory, tactics and technology. It deals also with politics within the Hungarian military elite, and civil-military dynamics. Through this lens the author explains the factors that led to the Hungarian General Staff sliding increasingly towards a full-fledged German alliance from the mid-1930s. This tendency, as the author demonstrates, became responsible for the gradual adaptation to German air-combat tactics and technology in the Hungarian Air Force, and eventually led to the
service becoming the auxiliary force of the Luftwaffe by the end of the war.

The central thesis of the book is that small states with weak military, regardless of their Air Force’s honor and gallantry were at the mercy of great power politics and military developments on the world stage. While the Hungarian Air Force had some influence on determining the theory and tactics of air power in its own military doctrine, the application of these were difficult in practice. Whether it was unwanted military camaraderie with Austria in the Great War, the financial and military control of the League of Nations in the interwar period, or the political, economic and military domination of Nazi Germany, the Hungarian Air Force was unable to assert itself fully as an independent power that could serve the Hungarian nation’s interests.

For a book that carries the timeframe 1918-45 in its title one expects an argument designed to primarily focus on World War II, to which the preceding period serves only as a background. Renner does not follow this deceiving tendency often found in recent works. Instead, he handled the task of sketching the history of the Hungarian Air Force in widely divergent eras and governments with considerable balance and deftness, regardless of the Great War era, the 1918-19 revolutions, the interwar period and World War II requiring very different research questions and approaches.

Arguably, the most valuable part of the book is Chapter 2: *Upheaval, 1918-19*. Offering a crisp, analytical narrative Renner contributes significantly to the historiography of Austro-Hungarian military cooperation (and Hungarian tendencies to organize independent military services – including air force), and to the military history of the Great War. This section, which accurately demonstrates Hungarian glorification of its newly founded air force as a source of national grandeur stands in contrast to later periods, when for example from 1919 the service was truncated, and existed in a precarious limbo between prohibition and clandestine innovation and expansion.

Moreover, the argument complements our understanding of interwar Hungarian revisionism, which scholars so far have approached from the perspective of Hungarian efforts to overturn the territorial mutilations of Trianon, and the minority complaint Hungary filed internationally against the successor states of the Habsburg Monarchy. Renner adds army development, military innovation and aviation to this concept, and explains that Hungary aimed for regional
rearmament equality just as much as for territorial adjustments.

Despite the excellence of Renner’s book, some of the secondary literature it uses about international relations, and Hungary’s relationship with great powers and countries in the region, are dated. Also, while Renner arguably aimed to de-focus from World War II, the fighting on Hungarian soil between 1944 and 1945 unduly received limited attention. Also, the reader occasionally feels an unjustified inward-looking Hungarian perspective. While military relationship with Germany has been discussed extensively, German official or personal testimonies about the mentality and performance of the Hungarian Air Force (especially in chapters about the wars) would have provided a broader context. Despite these minor constraints, Renner produced a very noteworthy history of the Hungarian Air Force and has advanced the field of modern Hungarian history and aviation.

András Becker,
Indiana University


John Sarkett’s passion for Hungarian literature — and his particular passion for Csongor és Tünde, Mihály Vörösmarty’s 1830 opus — led him to search assiduously for a translation that he could present to Anglophone readers. His persistence enabled him to locate the late Peter Zollman’s translation, secure the reprint rights, and shepherd it into a new, bilingual edition.

The Merlin International Theatre in Budapest had commissioned Zollman to translate a performing version for a production run during Hungary’s millecentennial year of 1996. It is this text which has been reprinted.

Csongor and Tünde is termed both a fairytale drama and a dramatic poem — and there’s the rub: the two designations allow radically different treatments of the text. The text of a poem is generally treated as integral and inviolable. By contrast, a play script is considered the starting point for a given production, subject to cuts, rearrangements, and sometimes even additions or alterations by someone other than the author. This tradition is ancient: consider the
divergences in Shakespeare’s theatrical texts between the various quarto and folio editions. The complete, composite text of Hamlet, requiring about four and a half hours in performance, almost never makes it to the stage intact.

The present translation, having been commissioned for a specific stage production, adheres to the latter treatment, as Peter Zollman’s introduction makes clear: approximately one third of the original’s lines have been cut. Although he does not mention it, one character, Dimitri the Serb (Rác) shopkeeper, disappears entirely along with the scene in which he appears, and the scenes of Act III are reordered (and one of them is also cut in toto).

Cuts, of course, affect how the work is perceived, in keeping with a given director’s vision. The effect of cuts is particularly noticeable in Csongor and Tünde because Vörösmarty uses two main verse forms in specific ways. Trochaic tetrameter, often rhyming, springs from Hungarian folk narrative and is used for much of the fairytale narrative as well as the comic (often slapstick) scenes, such as those involving the imps (ördögfiak). It forms the bulk of the text. Vörösmarty employs blank verse to present more abstract, philosophical thoughts and to express his own characteristic Romantic pessimism. (Shakespeare’s Midsummer Night’s Dream and Schikaneder’s Magic Flute are often cited among the influences on Csongor and Tünde. While they inspire much of the content in tetrameter, it may be another Shakespeare play, The Tempest, that — among other forebears, to be sure — lies behind the darker concerns and visions of the passages in blank verse.)

Passages in blank verse represent a small fraction of the overall text, but their impact is outsized. In Act II, our questing hero, Csongor, encounters a Merchant, a Prince and a Scholar, each offering his own vision of purpose and endeavor, and each in turn inviting Csongor to join him and abandon his own quest. These figures return in Act V, each utterly disillusioned with the fruits of his endeavors — thereby validating Csongor’s quest for Tünde’s love as the only truly worthwhile pursuit amid the grim pointlessness of existence. The 379 lines of these two sets of encounters have been truncated to 233: a 39% loss that significantly changes the balance of the work. To oversimplify, it has the effect of emphasizing Schikaneder over Shakespeare, or perhaps the Midsummer mechanicals over Prospero. Although many more lines were cut from the passages in tetrameter, the proportion of lost lines is less, and the impact of those cuts is
mostly to speed the play along.

There is one other passage in blank verse: Night’s great soliloquy. It is no accident that Zollman’s eloquent translation of this soliloquy was chosen to represent the play in Ádám Makkai’s monumental anthology of Hungarian verse, *In Quest of the Miracle Stag, Vol. 1*. It is also no accident that the Merlin production left this soliloquy intact.

Peter Zollman’s translation superbly renders the original’s trochaic tetrameter and iambic pentameter in English and deftly handles the occasional song-like interludes in other meters. It also conveys variations in tone effectively. Zollman makes the play accessible to Anglophone readers (or audiences), beginning with his decision to keep the Hungarian names only of Csongor, Tünde, and her servant Ilma, while finding witty monikers for the other characters. Take the witch: her name in Hungarian, Mirígy, sounds menacing but not entirely serious, but it doesn’t play well in English. Zollman’s solution is the delightful Suckbane: a veritably Shakespearean name for a comic witch.

Of course, no translation is perfect, and there are a few places where this reviewer itched to go to work with an editor’s blue pencil (something he also does when rereading his own translations). Such instances do not detract significantly from the overall pleasure. One recurring lapse, however, requires attention. Consider the following line and a half from the original: “Bocsássatok, / Vagy hernyóvá változtatlak”. Zollman renders it as “You set me free, / or I turn you into maggots.” In Hungarian, the two verbs, one expressing a demand and the other a threat, are both in the present tense, though the threat is understood to follow the demand’s possible lack of fulfillment. English idiom, however, places the second verb in the future: “Do this or I will do that to you.” Each of the eighteen times a similar construction arises in the text, the unidiomatic English jolts the reader right out of the fairytale. The solution is simple enough: in the example cited, “You set me free, / or I’ll turn you into maggots.”

Set against this one recurring defect are a myriad of happy inspirations; indeed, in places, Zollman’s English more than matches wits with Vörösmarty’s original. In the very first scene, Mirigy/Suckbane tries to cover for having inadvertently let slip an indiscretion: “Vén ajak, tudod csevegni / Jobb’ szeret mint enni-inni.” Zollman renders it, brilliantly, as: “Aged lips prefer to chatter, / chewing is a harder matter.” Where Vörösmarty had to content himself
with an uncharacteristically feeble rhyme, Zollman manages an amusing, strong, polysyllabic rhyme without the slightest strain. Part of the joy of reading his translation is the discovery of such nuggets throughout the text.

John Sarkett deserves gratitude for making this translation widely available again. And if we regret that the truncated text serves Vörösmarty’s play better than it does his dramatic poem, we may yet hope that other translators will take up the challenge of a complete translation. They will have their work cut out to match, let alone surpass, the quality of Zollman’s text.

Peter V. Czipott,
independent scholar, San Diego, CA


Those Hungarians who believe that their ancestors have lived in the Carpathian Basin since time immemorial have a saying: We didn’t come here from anywhere, we have always been here. There have been several highly-qualified students of the Hungarian past who, while they lived, belonged to this school of historiography — but there are very few now. There are more such people outside of Hungary but many of them are what might be called independent scholars: they have no university affiliation. In the author of this book we have a new member of this school and he is a bona fide Hungarian academic: Faragó teaches at Budapest’s premier university Eötvös Loránd, also known by the acronym ELTE.

In his preface to the book, Faragó cites the opinion of “serious researchers” who claim that “the people who have been living in the heart of Europe for longer than any others are those that speak the Hungarian language.” He goes on to say that in Hungary’s schools it is taught that Hungarians are late-comers, intruders, in this part of Europe and yet it turns out now that they are a “handful, demographically constantly diminishing people who have lived here continuously for millennia.” Those who have lived here according to the school-texts, the Celts, Romans, Huns, Avars, Magyars, were elites that ruled over the Hungarians, one group replacing the next. It was
not the Carpathian region’s peasant population that kept changing according to Faragó, but their “military masters.” Why there is no record of this process he asks? Because the deeds of tillers of the soil were not newsworthy — only the conquests of military elites were noted by ancient reporters and medieval chroniclers. (pp. 12-13, 305)

Hungarian then is an ancient language and it has many unique features. One of these, according to Faragó, is the way it produces place names. Hungarian place names are different in their formation from the place names of neighbouring peoples. The book at hand is an extensive study of geographical names in the Carpathian Basin and in adjacent areas and it argues that most such names, even those that at first sight seem to be non-Hungarian, can be traced back to Hungarian roots. The evolution of place names is not only a reflection on Hungarian history, according to Faragó, it is also the story of the geographic constriction or diminution of the Hungarian nation: over the millennia Hungarians so-to-speak vacated large areas of Central Europe. They disappeared, went extinct, or became assimilated by neighbouring peoples — and their ancient lands are now populated by speakers of other tongues. Faragó identifies the regions outside the Carpathian Basin where he found evidence of Hungarian place-names and where, according to him Hungarian speakers lived, sometimes in isolated settlements, up to early or even in mid-medieval times. He lists these: the basin of the Danube and Morava rivers, the Graz Basin, the Zagreb Basin, the territory between the Drava and Sava Rivers, Moldova, and the southern slopes of the Transylvanian Alps. (p. 300)

The best-known of such ancient Hungarian geographical names is of course Bécs, the Hungarian name for Vienna.

On the question when the Hungarian language appeared in the Carpathian Basin students of Hungarian history are divided into two sharply delineated schools of thought. The overwhelming majority of them argue that there were no Hungarian-speaking peoples there prior to the arrival of Prince Arpád and his nomadic warriors at the end of the 9th century. In the other school belong Faragó and his predecessors: a long list of scholars who thought otherwise and whose writings go back a century-and-a-half. The first of these we should mention was László Réthy (1851-1914), who was a staff member of Hungary’s National Museum, and who suggested that the Hungarian language, in fact the Finno-Ugric languages had evolved in the Middle Danube Basin of Central Europe. Réthy’s theory was adopted and elaborated on by Ármin Vámbéry (1831-1914), a member of the Hungarian
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Academy of Sciences (MTA), who suggested that the Hungarian language emerged from its Ugric core and Turkic loan-words and developed in the Carpathian homeland — and that Prince Árpád’s warriors were Turkic-speakers. Balázs Orbán (1830-1890), a prolific writer, ethnographer and member of the MTA who argued that the Székelys of Transylvania in that land had pre-dated the age of the Árpád dynasty. Then there was archaeologist Géza Nagy (1855-1915), another staff member of the National Museum, who contended that Hungarian-speakers began to settle in their present homeland in Avar times. Similar conclusions were arrived at by historian Gyula Pauler (1841-1903), the CEO of Hungary’s National Archives. Writing in the 20th century, there was Gyula László (1910-96, a faculty member at ELTE) who, at the end of his life, argued that the ancestors of Hungarians arrived in their present homeland in late Avar times and that Prince Árpád’s people were predominantly Turkic-speaking.

Another, a younger ELTE scholar and administrator who expressed similar views was Pál Engel (1938-2001). Using evidence derived from physical anthropology still another ELTE professor, Pál Lipták (1814-2000) came to believe that the Hungarians’ ancestors arrived in several waves or phases, starting possibly as early as the 5th century and ending in the 9th; and that Árpád’s people were predominantly Turkic.

Writing mainly in the 21st century, Gábor Vékony (1944-2004, another ELTE faculty member) declared that Hungarians probably arrived in their present homeland in Avar times — but possibly as early as the 5th century — and that Prince Árpád’s people might have been mainly Bashkirs. A few years later appeared a book by the veteran linguist-historian Péter Király (1917-2015) of the College of Nyíregyháza, in which he placed the arrival of the first Hungarians in Central Europe to the last decade of the 6th century. Still more recently a history of medieval Székelyland was published by an institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in which the two main authors, Elek Benkő (a historian) and Erzsébet Fóthi (a paleo-anthropologist), contend that in Avar and possibly already in Roman times the Hungarian-speaking Székelys lived in western Transdanubia including the Danube-Morava Basin. But the theory Faragó’s ideas resemble most closely, had been advanced by someone who lived two generations earlier: Lajos Kiss of Marjalak (1887-1972). He, through his study of geographical place names in the Middle Danube Basin, also came to the conclusion that Hungarians had
lived in the Carpathian region since time immemorial, and their language survived repeated conquests by other peoples, mostly nomadic warrior tribes including the Huns, Vandals, Ostrogoths, Gepids, Longobards, Avars and Prince Árpád’s Magyars.

In today’s Hungary, Lajos Kiss of Marjalak is a forgotten scholar. We wonder if Imre Faragó will also be one — and his book *Ber Bere Berény* will be consigned to oblivion by a nation that finds it difficult to live with the idea that its ancestors might have been tillers of the soil (and hunters and fishers) rather than marauding warriors who put the fear into the hearts of other Europeans.

Nándor Dreisziger
Kingston, Ontario


This book is an embracing study of contemporary Transylvania. It consists of five lengthy sections and of twenty-three chapters which are written by eminent scholars of this region. Numerous salient topics are explored: Transylvanian historical patterns, its minority group problems, and its social, cultural, and legal activities. The major themes that emerge from this fine study concern tensions among the ethnic and religious groups in Transylvania and conflict between Hungary and Romania to exercise control of this region. Tersely stated, contemporary Transylvania is suffering from irredentism — a pertinent historical feature of many lands in Eastern Europe.

In the first section there is a stimulating chapter about the region’s history written by Géza Jeszenszky. He maintains that after the Battle of Mohács in 1526, Transylvania became part of Hungary. Jeszenszky’s chapter also contains accounts about how Hungarians, Germans and other groups which had lived in Transylvania throughout the centuries had acquired collective rights. He explains that after the Great War, this region, with its many ethno-religious groups, was integrated into Romania, thus bringing about significant tensions between Hungary and Romania. Jeszenszky’s chapter also outlines how the Romanians governed this region after World War I and how it was controlled by communist leaders from the end of World War II until their overthrow in 1989.
Also in the first section András Bereznay discusses the evolution of Transylvanian demography. He describes how cultural zones developed in this region, and he explains how and why conflicts had ensued among Romanians, Hungarians, and Germans in Transylvania. Other essays in this lengthy section concentrate on urban spaces, on monuments, and on cemeteries.

Significant minority groups are examined in the book’s second section. Attila Gidó explores the world of Jews in Transylvania. He has a persuasive account regarding the devastating effects of the Holocaust, correctly claiming that only a few Transylvanian Jews who survived this experience did return to their former homes. He also discusses Romanian rule over the few Jews left in Transylvania during the communist era, arguing that they often suffered from anti-Semitic policies. Gidó claims that the Romanian Jewish Federation during the past fifteen years has tried to reduce anti-Semitic activities in Transylvania, but has met with limited success. He also reveals that Jewish assimilation in this region, for the most part, did not materialize.

The book’s second section also has an essay by János Nagy dealing with Transylvania’s Saxons; he emphasizes that many Saxons were well educated and became farmers. Nagy points out that many Transylvanian Saxons in the wake of World War II lost their property rights but that some were spared by Romania’s communist regime. In another chapter Mártá Jôzsa writes about the Roma in Transylvania. She shows that this group has suffered from discrimination and prejudice. Since the fall of the communist government in 1989, the Roma have been denied their political rights and have not been permitted to engage in commercial activities. Likewise, discrimination and prejudice are prevalent in the lives of the Csángô in Transylvania. As Andrew Ludanyi shows, this group consists of Catholics who during the communist era were denied their commercial and political rights. In the last chapter in this section about minorities Csaba Zoltani explains that Armenians in Transylvania contributed to agriculture and did much to foster cultural activities in the region’s towns and villages.

The book’s third section treats developments regarding state and church relations. László Bura examines matters regarding the Catholic Church in Transylvania since 1944. He maintains that communists leaders after World War II were anti-Catholic and shows that they took over church properties and exerted control over monastic orders. The Communists also nationalized Catholic high schools and colleges. In 1949 the government terminated relations
with the Vatican, thus exacerbating the status of Catholics in Transylvania. The author asserts that conferences between Romanian authorities and church leaders did little to ameliorate the church’s status in the region. However, after the Communists lost power in 1989, the National Salvation Front surfaced in Transylvania; it declared religious freedom and reinstituted the Catholic Church’s organizational structure. Furthermore, new lyceums and schools were established to teach Catholic theology. As a result of a new Romanian educational law, Catholic leaders attempted to improve Transylvanian parochial schools, thus further enhancing religious education.

Vilmos Kolumbán treats matters regarding the Transylvanian Hungarian Reformed Church after 1945. He shows that this church promoted missionary work and Scripture studies. The Communist regime in 1948 enacted a law limiting the religious and educational activities of the Reformed Church. Following the fall of the communist government in 1989, this church was granted certain rights especially in the realm of schooling of future religious leaders. Similar patterns characterized the Transylvanian Unitarian Church and the Romanian Greek Catholic Church. A stimulating chapter shows that under Romanian rule, the Unitarian Church experienced a curbing of its religious activities and was compelled to cede to the communist government many of its properties. Under communism, church leaders experienced repression. After 1989 Unitarians were entrusted with their rights, and its leaders, in various ways, acted to advance their religion. Likewise, Zsuzsa Hadházy lucidly explains that from the end of World War II until 1989, Romanian Greek Catholics were denied their rights. However, with the demise of the communist regime at the end of 1989, they were able to secure many of their religious liberties.

The book’s fourth section is quite interesting and pertains to culture as a means of survival in Transylvania. János Pértek shows that Hungarians, Germans, and other nationalities were permitted to exercise their language rights in the 1990s. In 2011 the Romanians enacted an educational law to allow minority rights in Transylvania. The essay of Kinga Magdolna Mandel concerning the Hungarian-language education in Romania is quite revealing. Mandel contends that legislation has been passed to resolve the salient and contentious problem of the use of the Hungarian language in education. On the other hand Attila Ambrus describes how minority leaders in the Romanian press are unfairly depicted. The author concludes this essay
by maintaining that inflammatory (anti-Roma, anti-Semitic and anti-
minority) language in Romania’s mainstream press have not been
reduced and have led to the heightening of minority group tensions in
Transylvania and in the rest of Romania.

The book’s last section is devoted to a discussion of legal
issues. Csaba Zoltani’s essay about private and communal property
lucidly shows that after World War I, Romania acquired control of
Transylvania and that this development was responsible for the
confiscation of Hungarian properties. Detailed and incisive, this essay
reveals how Romania during the 1920s seized Catholic, Reformed, and
Unitarian church lands. Zoltani also outlines the discriminatory tactics,
especially against the Hungarians, of the regime of Nicolae Ceauşescu.
Since the first decade of this century, minority groups, especially in
Cluj, have not been granted their property rights. Zoltani concludes his
perceptive essay by claiming that the Romanian government, in which
corruption is pervasive, has produced excessive social and economic
tensions in contemporary Transylvania.

The book’s last essay is Tihamér Czika’s study about the
struggle of Hungarians for autonomy in Transylvania. Czika explains
that political and cultural autonomy had been extended to Hungarians
to some extent after the end of the communist era. The author
maintains that leaders of the Democratic Alliance of Hungarians in
Romania (DAHR) opposed the 1991 Romanian constitution, which
provided for a unitary state. Through the European Council’s General
Assembly, DAHR leaders tried but failed to achieve full autonomy. As
Czika shows, Hungarian and other ethnic groups between 2004 and
2011 were consequently unable to achieve full autonomy. As a result
contemporary Transylvania continues to suffer from political and
ethnic tensions.

This book is a valuable study; it fills a void, for it consists of
lucidly written chapters in English about pertinent groups and institu-
tions in Transylvania. This well organized study also confirms the
arguments regarding discrimination, tensions, and persecution in this
East European entity. This book, which might have included a glos-
Sary, is well documented and contains a substantial bibliography at the
end of each essay. Graduate students and East European scholars will
find this volume to be informative.

R. William Weisberger
Butler County Community College, Pennsylvania