

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EAST EUROPEAN HISTORICAL STUDIES  
IN HUNGARY PRIOR TO 1945\*

In examining the history of Hungarian historical studies in the course of the past two-three centuries, one is struck by the fact that—notwithstanding Hungary's position in East Central Europe—Hungarian historiography had placed relatively little emphasis on East European historical studies prior to the interwar period<sup>1</sup>. In fact, the study of Oriental languages at Hungarian institutions of higher learning had predated by centuries the introduction of some of the neighboring languages at these same institutions<sup>2</sup>. Moreover,

\* I should like to thank Professors James F. Clarke (University of Pittsburgh), Emil Niederhauser (Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences), Ferenc Somogyi (formerly of the University of Pécs and Western Reserve University), and Agnes Huszar Vardy (Robert Morris College) for their helpful comments in the preparation of this study.

1. No acceptable summary exists on the development of East European studies in Hungary. For some fragmentary information see the following studies: Tibor Baráth, "Kelet-Európa fogalma a modern történetírásban" [The Concept of Eastern Europe in Modern Historiography], in *Emlékkönyv Domanovszky Sándor születése hatvanadik fordulójának ünnepére* [Memorial Album for the Occasion of the Sixtieth Anniversary of Sándor Domanovszky's Birth] (Budapest, 1937), pp. 23-43; Béla Gunda, "Slawische ethnographische Forschungen in Ungarn zwischen 1945-1955" *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 2 (1956) 467-470; Emil Niederhauser, "Geschichtswissenschaftlichen Arbeiten in Ungarn über die Beziehungen zu den Slawischen Völkern" *Studia Slavica* 2 (1956) 437-441; *idem*, "Beiträge zur Bibliographie der Geschichte der slawischen Völker in der ungarischen bürgerlichen Geschichtsschreibung", *Studia Slavica* 6 (1960) 457-473; István Kniezsa, "A magyar szlavisztika problémái és feladatai" [The Problems and Goals of Hungarian Slavistics], *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományok Osztályának Közleményei* [Proceedings of the Section on Language and Literary Sciences of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences] 12 (1958) 69-124; József Perényi, "Hol élünk? Közép- vagy Kelet-Európában?" [Where do we Live? In Central or in Eastern Europe?] *Élet és Tudomány* [Life and Science] 21 (1966): 2092-2096; and Pál Horváth, "A közép- és kelet-európai népek jogfejlődése iránti érdeklődés a magyar burzsoá jogtörténetírásban" [Hungarian Bourgeois Historiography's Interest in the Constitutional Development of Central and East European Peoples], *Jogtudományi Közlöny* [Review of Legal Sciences] 22 (1967) 341-353. The first effort at a brief summary for East European studies in interwar Hungary was made by the present author. See Steven Bela Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (Preliminary Edition, Duquesne University, Pittsburg, Pa., 1974), pp. 184-197. For the permanent edition see Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography* [East European Monographs of the "East European Quarterly"] (New York and Boulder, Colorado, 1976), Ch. XVI.

2. On the history of the instruction of Oriental languages in Hungary see Imre Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar története* [History of the Faculty of Philosophy (of the Uni-

while during the second half of the nineteenth century Hungarian Orientalology had achieved a respectable European reputation (e.g. the works of S. Körösi-Csoma, P. Hunfalvy, A. Reguly, A. Vámbéry, J. Budenz, G. Kuún, I. Goldziher and others)<sup>3</sup>, and before the end of dualism the University of Budapest had four separate chairs in the area, the first chair of East European history was not established until the late 1920's<sup>4</sup>.

One of the reasons for this seemingly strange phenomenon was undoubtedly the eastern origins of the Magyars and their consequent natural desire to learn more about their own past by studying the history and culture of inner Eurasia<sup>5</sup>. Of almost equal importance, however, was the relative social, economic and political retardation of the nations of East Central and Eastern Europe during the modern period, with the result that not until the national revival movements of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries did some of them engage in the serious study of their own respective national histories. Thus, while Hungarian historians had devoted considerable attention to the study of their own origins and history for a number of centuries prior to the rise of the so-called scientific historiography of the nineteenth century, and by the time of the humanist school of the Renaissance period they had produced some respectable works (e.g. those of J. Thuróczy, A. Bonfini, J. Zsám-boki [Sambucus], M. Istvánffy and I. Szamosközy)<sup>6</sup>, the study of the history of their immediate neighbors seemed rather unimportant to them —except

iversity of Budapest]] (Budapest, 1935); Károly Czeglédy, "Oriental Studies", in Tibor Erdely-Grúz and Imre Trencsényi-Waldapfel, eds., *Science in Hungary* (Budapest, 1965), pp. 287-305; and *idem*, "Orientalisztika" [Orientalistics], in *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem története 1945-1970* [The History of the Eötvös Loránd University 1945-1970] (Budapest, 1970), pp. 554-569.

3. In addition to the above studies on these noted Hungarian Orientalists, see also the appropriate volumes of the *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon* [Hungarian Biographical Lexicon], ed. Ágnes Kenyeres, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1967-69).

4. See Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar*, pp. 670-674.

5. The eastern origins of the Magyars was emphasized by all medieval Hungarian chronicles, and the renewed effort by nineteenth-century Hungarian scholars to try to find out more about their origins had much to do with revival of Oriental studies in Hungary and the travels of Hungarian scholars in Asia. On the medieval chronicles see C. A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians. A Critical and Analytical Guide* (Cambridge, 1955). Some of the most noted Hungarian scholars involved in on-the-spot research in Asia in the nineteenth century included Sándor Körösi-Csoma (1784-1842), Arminius Vámbéry (1832-1913) and Sir Aurél Stein (1862-1943). They all published some of their works also in English.

6. On the development of Hungarian humanist historiography see István Sötér, ed.-in-chief, *A magyar irodalom története* [The History of Hungarian Literature], 6 vols. (Budapest, 1964-66), 1:174-178, 247-254, 279-287, 291-294, 332, 335, 369-372, 388-405, 425-437. See also Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. II.

insofar as it related to the history of Hungary and of the provinces under periodic Hungarian control and influence in the Northern Balkans.

Even though East European historical studies did not get official recognition in Hungary in the form of university chairs until the interwar period, the roots of serious research in the area reach back to the third quarter of the nineteenth century. These roots manifested themselves partially in the establishment of the first Hungarian university chair in Slavistics at the University of Budapest in 1849 (to which later similar chairs were added in Roumanian [1862], Croatian [1895] and Ruthenian [1919] languages and literatures)<sup>7</sup>, and partially in the research and publishing activities of the respected statesman-historian Benjamin Kállay (1839-1903) during the last third of the nineteenth century.

The professors who became associated with the above-mentioned chairs of East European languages and literatures naturally produced primarily in their respective fields. A number of them, however, also produced a few studies relevant to Hungarian or East European history. But their overall scholarly achievements were rather modest in the nineteenth century. In fact a number of the early chairholders were primarily language teachers and interpreters of literature, and produced little in the area of literary or linguistic scholarship<sup>8</sup>. Thus, the role of serving as the pioneer of Hungarian East European scholarship fell to the non-university scholar Kállay, who was not even a professional historian in the strict sense of that term.

#### KÁLLAY:

##### THE PIONEER OF EAST EUROPEAN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN HUNGARY

Kállay was primarily a politician and a diplomat who, during the last two decades of his life (1882-1903), served as Austria-Hungary's minister of financial affairs and simultaneously as the governor of occupied Bosnia-Herzegovina<sup>9</sup>. As a protégée of the Dual Monarchy's powerful foreign minister, Count Julius Andrassy the elder (1823-1890), Kállay supported the latter's foreign policy, which—partially at least—aimed to counter-balance Russian

7. Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar*, pp. 422ff, 458ff, 585ff, 618ff, 672-673. See also Béla Nagy, "A szomszéd népek nyelve és irodalma" [The Languages and Literatures of the Neighboring Peoples], in *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem*, pp. 510-517.

8. On the achievements of the linguistic and literary scholars in Hungarian East European studies see below.

9. On Kállay see Lajos Thallóczy, "Kállay Béni emlékezete" [Remembering Benjamin Kállay], *Akadémiai Értésítő* 20 (1909) 307-337; and Thallóczy's preface to Kállay's *A szerb felkelés története 1807-1810* [The History of the Serbian Uprising, 1807-1810], ed. and intr. by Lajos Thallóczy, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1909), 1:1-38.

penetration into the Balkans. Yet, while politically committed to Austria-Hungary's expansive Balkan policy, this conviction did not show up in his scholarship. His enviable linguistic abilities, combined with his known scholarly integrity soon made Kállay a widely respected East Europeanist. Particularly significant were his studies on South Slavic history. Thus, his *The History of the Serbians 1780-1815* (1877), and his posthumously published *The History of the Serbian Uprising 1797-1810* (1909), both of which appeared also in German<sup>10</sup>, are still among the most reliable works on that period of Serbian history, and make him one of the great pioneers of Serbian historical studies.

#### THALLÓCZY: KÁLLAY'S DISCIPLE AND SUCCESSOR

Kállay was among the first Hungarian historians to study South Slavic and Turkish consciously, for the purposes of employing these languages in his historical research. His work was continued by the younger Lajos Thallóczy (1858-1916), who ended up as the civil governor of occupied Serbia during the First World War<sup>11</sup>. Although still rather young, Thallóczy had a significant role already at the Hungarian Historical Congress of 1885, which—in addition to assessing the achievements and shortcomings of Hungarian historiography—also pointed to a number of significant goals that took the Hungarian historical sciences over a half century to achieve<sup>12</sup>. Subsequently he became the director of the Archives of the Austro-Hungarian Ministry of Finances, taught at the Collegium Theresianum, and became one of the two founders of the “Károlyi-Thallóczy Circle” in Vienna during the latter

10. Béni Kállay, *A szerbek története 1780-1815* (Budapest, 1877). Its German version: Benjamin von Kallay, *Geschichte der Serben* (Leipzig, 1878). For Kállay's work on the Serbian uprising see citation above in note 8. Its German version: Benjamin von Kallay, *Die Geschichte des serbischen Aufstandes, 1807-10* (Vienna, 1910).

11. From among the numerous studies written about Thallóczy, see the following: Árpád Károlyi, *Thallóczy Lajos emlékezete* [Remembering L. Thallóczy] (Budapest, 1937); *idem*, *Thallóczy Lajos élete és működése* [The Life and Activities of L. Thallóczy] (Budapest, 1937); Ferenc Eckhart, *Thallóczy Lajos a történetíró* [L. Thallóczy, the Historian] (Budapest, 1938); Károly Németh, *Emlékezések Thallóczy Lajosról* [Reminiscences about L. Thallóczy] (Budapest, 1940); and Mária Tömöry's introductory study to a selection from Thallóczy's diary, “Bosznia-Hercegovina anektálásának történetéből” [From the History of the Annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina], *Századok* [Centuries] 100 (1966) 878-923.

12. See *A Magyar Történelmi Társulat 1885. július 3-6. napján Budapesten tartott Kongresszusának irományai* [The Papers of the Congress of the Hungarian Historical Association held at Budapest on July 3-6, 1885] (Budapest, 1885). For additional comments on the Historical Congress of 1885, see *Századok* 20 (1886) 896-907; and *Századok* 21 (1887) 252-254.

part of the century. This Circle eventually served as the nucleus of the so-called "Viennese School" of Hungarian historiography, that contributed much to the qualitative improvement of Hungarian historical sciences—both during the late dualist, as well as during the interwar period. It was the Károlyi-Thallóczy Circle and the Viennese School that polished many of Hungary's great historians into some of the best trained research scholars in the field. For a while, the Circle also counted among its members the great Czech Balkan specialist of that period Josef Konstantin Jireček (1854-1918)<sup>13</sup>.

While Kállay had limited his scholarly activities largely to the writing of monographs based on unpublished sources, Thallóczy initiated a large-scale source publication activity, particularly for South Slavic history. With the help of a number of other scholars (such as the Czech Jireček and the younger Hungarian scholars A. Hodinka, A. Áldásy, S. Horváth, S. Barabás, J. Gellich, J. Kracsmarik and G. Szekfü) he published about a dozen major volumes on Hungary's relations with such South Slavic lands and provinces as Croatia, Serbia, Ragusa [Dubrovnik], the Banat of Jajcza and several other protectorates or associated states of medieval Hungary. He also dealt with a number of other aspects of Balkan history, both in the form of bulky source collections (many of which appeared in the *Monumenta Hungariae Historica* series, the largest single collection of historical sources for the Hungarian Middle Ages), as well as in the form of monographic studies. Moreover, Thallóczy was among the first Hungarian historians who—along with I. Acsády and K. Tagányi—recognized the significance of the economic forces in history. Thus, he displayed a clearly recognizable economic orientation and interpretation in his summarizing works<sup>14</sup>.

13. On the "Károlyi-Thallóczy Circle" and the "Viennese School" of Hungarian historiography, see the works on Thallóczy listed in note 11, and the following works on Károlyi: Gyula Szekfü, "Károlyi Árpád a történetíró" [A. Károlyi, the Historian], in *Emlékkönyv Károlyi Árpád születése nyolcvanadik fordulójának ünnepére* [Memorial Album for the Occasion of the Eightieth Anniversary of A. Károlyi's Birth] (Budapest, 1933), pp. 5-27; Sándor Domanovszky, "Károlyi Árpád, 1853-1940", *Századok* 74 (1940) 357-359; and Dávid Angyal, *Károlyi Árpád emlékezete* [Remembering A. Károlyi] (Budapest, 1943). See also Antal Lábán, *A bécsi Collégium Hungáricum* [The Viennese Collegium Hungaricum] (Budapest, 1928); and G. C. Paikert, "Hungarian Foreign Policy in Intercultural Relations, 1919-1944", *American Slavic and East European Review* 11 (1952) 42-65. Some of Jireček's significant works include: *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Prague, 1876); *Die Heerstrasse von Belgrad nach Konstantinople und die Balkanpässe* (Prague, 1876); *Die Romanen in den Städten Dalmatiens während des Mittelalters* 3 vols. (Prague, 1891-94); and *Geschichte der Serben*, vol. I, to 1371 (Gotha, 1911).

14. Thallóczy's source publications in the *Monumenta Hungariae Historica* (MHH) series include: *Codex diplomaticus de Blagay*, with Samu Barabás (Budapest, 1897); *Codex diplomaticus Comitum de Frangepanibus*, with Samu Barabás, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1910-

POSITIVISM VERSUS THE *GEISTESGESCHICHTE* SCHOOL

The untimely death of L. Thallóczy in 1916 almost coincided with the fall of Austria-Hungary, and thus with the end of a whole epoch in European history. The fall of the Dual Monarchy in 1918 certainly constitutes a major watershed both in Hungarian history, as well as in Hungarian historiography. With the collapse of Austria-Hungary (and therein historic Hungary), the whole dualist social, political and psychological order came to an end. The optimism of the dualist age was displaced by the pessimism of the post-Trianon (1920) period in Hungary; and the monumental, exact and often too factographic historiography of the Positivist School had to retreat in face of the meditative, synthesizing, philosophically-oriented, but also rather subjective *Geistesgeschichte* orientation. Granted that elements of positivism lingered on. But this school, which had dominated much of Hungarian historiography during the period of dualism, could never again emerge into a position of real influence in Hungary<sup>15</sup>.

13); and *Codex diplomaticus partium Regno Hungariae adnexarum*: Vol. I with Antal Hodinka, *A horváth véghelyek oklevéltára, 1490-1527* [Documents on the Croatian Frontier, 1490-1527] (Budapest, 1903); Vol. II with Antal Áldásy, *A Magyarország és Szerbia közti ősszekötetések oklevéltára, 1198-1526* [Documents on the Inter-Relations Between Hungary and Serbia, 1198-1526] (Budapest, 1907); Vol. III with Sándor Horváth, *Alsószlavóniai okmánytár* [Documents on Lower Slavonia] (Budapest, 1912); Vol. IV with Sándor Horváth, *Jajcza (bánság, vár és város) története, 1450-1527* [The History of the Banate, Castle and City of Jajcza, 1450-1527] (Budapest, 1915). Some of the other documentary collections he edited include: *Diplomatarium relationum Republicae Ragusanae cum Regno Hungariae*, with József Gelchich (Budapest, 1887); *Török-Magyar oklevéltár, 1539-1789* [Turkish-Hungarian Archives, 1539-1789], with János Kracsmarik and Gyula Szekfü (Budapest, 1914); and *Illyrisch-Albanische Forschungen*, with Konstantin Jireček, Milan Šufflay and others, 2 vols. (München-Leipzig, 1916). Thallóczy's significant monographic studies on the Balkans and on Hungarian influences in the Balkans include: *Horvát szokásjog* [Croatian Customary Law] (Budapest, 1896); *Tanulmányok a Blagay-család történetéből* (Budapest, 1897) and its German version, *Die Geschichte des Grafen Blagay* (Budapest, 1898); *III. Béla és a magyar birodalom* [Béla III and the Hungarian Empire] (Budapest, 1898; 2nd ed. 1906); *Nagy Lajos és a bulgár bánság* [Louis the Great and the Bulgarian Banate] (Budapest, 1900); *Tanulmányok a bosnyák bánság kezdeteiről* [Studies on the Origins of the Bosnian Banate] (Budapest, 1905); and *Bosnyák és szerb élet- és nemzedékrajzi tanulmányok* (Budapest, 1909), and its German version, *Studien zur Geschichte Bosniens und Serbiens im Mittelalter* (München, 1914). Among Thallóczy's studies with an economic orientation are the following: *I. Apafy Mihály udvara* [The Court of Mihály Apafy I] (Budapest, 1878); *Abauj vármegye közgazdasági viszonya* [The Economic Conditions of Abauj County] (Budapest, 1879); and *A korona haszna (lucrum camerae) története, kapcsolatban a magyar adó- és pénzügy fejlődésével* [The History of Camerial Profit (Lucrum Camerae) in Conjunction with the Development of Hungarian Taxation and Finances] (Budapest, 1879).

15. On the question of the influence of *Geistesgeschichte* orientation in Hungarian historiography see Steven Bela Vardy, *Hungarian Historiography and the "Geistesgeschichte"*

To appreciate fully the significance of the shift from positivism to *Geistesgeschichte* in interwar Hungarian historiography, it is perhaps wise to point out that in its Hungarian context positivism was generally less of a philosophy of history, as conceived by August Comte, and more of an historical methodology, based largely on the critical-philological method of source criticism developed primarily in Germany. Thus, positivist historians in Hungary concentrated largely on producing critically edited source publications and monographs on limited topics, and they were reluctant to engage in synthesizing. But if they did so on rare occasions, the results were usually dry chronological accounts.

The situation was totally different with the newly emerging *Geistesgeschichte* School, based largely on the ideas of Wilhelm Dilthey (1834-1911), and transplanted to Hungary primarily by the great synthesizer Gyula [Julius] Szekfű (1883-1955)<sup>16</sup>. As is well known, *Geistesgeschichte* (Hung. *Szellemtörténet*) believes that human history is essentially the history of the manifestations of the human soul. It rejects the applicability of objective laws to historical evolution, and believes that the governing force of history is human spirituality, manifested in the form of the main "spiritual trends" or "dominant ideas" of a particular age. As opposed to the positivists, *Geistesgeschichte* historians took up the challenge of synthesizing history, and they usually tried to re-create the past through the process of "re-living" (*nacherleben*).

As a result of the triumph of this intellectually captivating, but largely subjective historiographical orientation in interwar Hungary, Hungarian historians soon found themselves split into two major camps: The traditionalists, who were adherents of various degrees of positivism, and the *avant garde*-ists, who opted for the *Geistesgeschichte* orientation. Discounting the adherents of various lesser orientations, and a number of new schools that emerged during the 1930's, this split was evident in the whole historical profession, and it also effected the rising East European studies in interwar Hungary<sup>17</sup>.

*School* [Studies by Members of the Arpad Academy] (Cleveland, 1974), and Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. VI-XI.

16. On Gyula Szekfű, in addition to the above two works by Vardy, see also Gyula Mérei, "Szekfű Gyula történetiszemléletének bírálatához" [On the Critique of Gyula Szekfű's Philosophy of History], *Századok* 94 (1960) 180-256; and József Szigeti, *A magyar szellemi történet bírálatához* [On the Critique of Hungarian "Geistesgeschichte"] (Budapest, 1964).

17. On the *Geistesgeschichte* School in general, see also Wilhelm Dilthey, *Pattern and Meaning of History*, ed. and intr. by H. P. Rickman (London, 1961); and R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (London, 1946).

## THE "TRIANON COMPLEX" IN HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

In addition to the subjectivism represented by the *Geistesgeschichte* philosophy of history, interwar Hungarian historiography also suffered from the emotional "Trianon Complex" and from the resulting irredentism and revisionism that characterized the whole interwar period. This emotionally charged complex was the result of the cataclismic changes that followed World War I and resulted in the territorial dismemberment of historic Hungary.

These changes came so abruptly and so unexpectedly, and their impact upon the "Hungarian mind" reared in the "great power dreams" of the dualist period was so devastating, that the revision of the post-war treaties became the uppermost concern in the minds of most Hungarians. To achieve this end, various other pressing goals were sacrificed or forgotten. These included even the most essential social and economic reforms that—notwithstanding the limited potentials of Trianon Hungary—could have transformed the existing "Neo-Baroque" social and political order into a more progressive society<sup>18</sup>.

One of the direct results of this "Trianon Complex" was the sudden expansion of Hungarian East European studies. This was manifested partially in the rapid expansion of Hungarian scholarship in the area of East European studies, and partially in the establishment of several university chairs and institutes that concentrated on the study of East Central European history and the national minority question. Much of the scholarship of the historians and other social scientists who were connected with these new centers of learning in Hungary were undoubtedly colored by irredentism and revisionism. But while motivated by such political goals, most of them were not willing to compromise their scholarship by purely propagandistic works. Moreover, while authoring studies of peripheral value, they also produced numerous basic, pioneering and lasting works in the previously forgotten or unnoticed field of East European studies<sup>19</sup>.

Although the first chair of East European history and the first "Minority Institute" were not established until 1929 and 1935, respectively, the upsurge of East European studies in Hungary came almost simultaneously with the Treaty of Trianon in 1920. The scholars who became active in the field were either members of the older generation of positivists who were the

18. One of the best and earliest works that reflect this "Trianon Complex" is Gyula Szekfű's *Három nemzedék* [Three Generations] (Budapest, 1920); and its expanded edition, *Három nemzedék és ami utána következik* [Three Generations and What Follows] (Budapest, 1934).

19. See the section on "Klebsberg and Hóman: The New Cultural Policy of Interwar Hungary", in the present study.



products of the positivist historiography of the dualist age, or they were in the ranks of the younger generation who gravitated in the direction of the *Geistesgeschichte* School. Some of the most noteworthy of the older scholars included the historians A. Hodinka, J. Thim and E. Veress who—while producing some significant works during the 1920's and 1930's—did not really feel at home in the intellectual milieu of interwar Hungary. Due to their competence in East European history, however, their active collaboration in initiating interwar Hungarian historical studies on East Central Europe was indispensable.

#### HODINKA: THE "DEAN" OF INTERWAR HUNGARIAN EAST EUROPEANISTS

Perhaps the best known among the older generation of Hungarian East Europeanists was Antal Hodinka (1864-1946), who had already been connected with Thallóczy's source-gathering and source-publishing activities in Vienna during the turn of the century. Among the various young scholars associated with Thallóczy, Hodinka was perhaps the historian who inherited most of the master's interest in Slavic and East European history<sup>20</sup>. And this interest remained with him throughout his life, even though during his career as a professor of history at the University of Pozsony [Bratislava] (1914-1935)—which after 1918 was transferred to Pécs—he had never held a chair of East European history.

As a sometime fellow at Theodor Sickel's Institute for Austrian Historical Research [*Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*] (1889-1891), and as a member of the Károlyi-Thallóczy Circle in Vienna (1892-1906), Hodinka had received a much better methodological training than most members of his generation<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, as an important pioneer of Ruthenian studies in Hungary, he had the advantage of working in an area where he had few competitors even during the interwar period. Thus, even though he was a typ-

20. For Hodinka's brief biography and a list of his publications up to 1940, see Pál Szabó, *A M. Kir. Erzsébet Tudományegyetem és irodalmi munkássága* [The Hung. Roy. Erzsébet University and its Scholarly Activities], pts. 1 and 2 in one volume (Pécs, 1940), 2: 383-387. See also András Babics, "Hodinka Antal", *Jelenkor* [Present] 7 (1964) 1147-1149; József Perényi, "Emlékezés Hodinka Antalról, 1864-1946" [Remembering A. Hodinka, 1864-1946], *Századok* 99 (1965) 1403-1405; and Steven Bela Vardy, "Antal Hodinka", *Hungarian Historical Review* (Buenos Aires) 3 (1972) 266-274.

21. Although all of Hodinka's biographers claim that he had been a member of the *Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, on the basis of his dissertation research ("The Development of National Consciousness in Subcarpathian Rus, 1918-1945", Princeton University, 1972) Paul R. Magocsi of Harvard University doubts this. Magocsi's letter to me, dated June 10, 1972.

ical positivist historian, and as such he preferred source research, source criticism and monographic studies to the synthetic elaborations of the *Geistesgeschichte* School that dominated interwar Hungarian historiography, Hodinka did enjoy a degree of recognition that during the interwar period was generally accorded only to few surviving members of his positivist generation.

Hodinka, therefore, was essentially a source gatherer and source critic, and did not produce synthetic works of major consequence. His greatest efforts were spent in trying to make Ruthenian, Russian and South Slavic sources available for the study of Hungarian history. His best and probably still most consulted work in this area is his bilingual publication, *The Hungarian-Related Sections of the Russian Annals* (1916)<sup>22</sup>. Based on the up to then twenty-three published volumes of the *Complete Collections of Russian Annals* (1841-1911)<sup>23</sup>, this pioneering work contains all of the known chronicles which have relevance to the history of Hungary and the Magyars. Its primary weakness is that it is not sufficiently annotated, and thus it may lead to some misinterpretations on the part of the non-specialist.

Being primarily a collector, analyzer and editor of sources, Hodinka's only significant work of synthetic nature is his *History of the Greek Catholic Bishopric of Munkács* (1909), which is supplemented by a collection of relevant documents, of which, however, only the first volume appeared in print<sup>24</sup>. Hodinka also wrote several other monographs on the Carpatho-Ruthenians, as well as on South Slavic developments<sup>25</sup>. His ultimate goal was to write the

22. Antal Hodinka, *Az orosz évkönyvek magyar vonatkozásai* (Budapest, 1916).

23. Полное собрание русских лѣтописей, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1841-1916).

24. Antal Hodinka, *A munkácsi görög katolikus püspökség története* (Budapest, 1909); and *idem*, *A munkácsi görög szertartású püspökség okmánytára* [The Archives of the Greek liturgical Bishopric of Munkács], vol. I (Ungvár, 1911).

25. Some of Hodinka's other works on the Carpatho-Ruthenians include: *Adalékok az ungvári vár és tartomány és Ungvár város történetéhez* [Contributions to the History of the Castle, City and Province of Ungvár] (Budapest, 1918); *A kárpátaljai ruthének lakóhelyei, gazdaságuk és múltjuk* (Budapest, 1923), which also appeared in the Rusyn dialect, *Uttsiuznyna, gazdustvo y proshlost' iuzhno-karpats'kýkh' rusynuv* (n.p., n.d.), as well as in a brief French version, "L'habitat, l'économie, et le passé du peuple ruthène", *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes* 2 (1924) 244-275; II. *Rákóczi Ferenc és a "gens fidelissima"* [Francis Rákóczi II and the "Gens Fidelissima"] (Budapest, 1937); and his posthumous, "Documenta Koriatoviciana et fundation monasterii Munkácsiensis", *Analecta Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni* (Rome) 7 (1950) 339-359, (1953) 225-551, and 8 (1954) 165, 189. Hodinka's works on the South Slavs include his joint source publication with Thallóczy (note 14), as well as such studies as his *Tanulmányok a bosnyák-diakovári püspökség történetéből* [Studies on the History of the Bishopric of Bosnia-Diakovo] (Budapest, 1898), and *Négy egykorú jelentés az 1704. pécsi rácz dúlásról* [Four Contemporary Reports on the Serbian Sack of Pécs in 1704] (Pécs, 1932).

complete history of the Ruthenians of historic Northeastern Hungary (Carpatho-Ruthenia), but notwithstanding a commission from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences for this work, he was never able to complete his intended *opus magnum*.

THIM AND VERESS:  
THE NON-TEACHING EAST EUROPEANISTS OF THE OLD GENERATION

Although the establishment of the yet-to-be-discussed university chairs and institutes of East European studies resulted in the shift of influence to these institutions, this did not mean that non-teaching research scholars ceased to function. On the contrary, some of the most significant interwar publications in the area came from the pens of such non-teaching scholars of Hodinka's generation as Thim and Veress.

The older of these two scholars was József Thim (1864-1959), who was able to combine the study of medicine with his love of history, and to excel in both of these fields<sup>26</sup>. Having acquired fluency in several South Slavic dialects in the Slavic inhabited section of Southern Hungary, Thim turned his attention very early to the study of Serbian history and culture. After several earlier efforts, in 1892 he published his first major work, *The History of the Serbians from the Most Ancient Times to 1848*, which is still the only major Magyar language synthesis of ancient, medieval and early modern Serbian history<sup>27</sup>.

Between 1921 and 1936 Thim served as the official physician at the newly founded Collegium Hungaricum in Vienna, and during this period he established a close working relationship with the professional historians who were in residence at that institution. Under their influence he began a systematic collection of historical sources relative to the Serbian national renaissance in Southern Hungary (Voivodina). The result of his efforts was his monumental *The History of the Serbian Uprising of 1848-49 in Hungary* (1930-1940), which contains a nearly 500 page synthesis of this question, with an additional 1600 pages of appended documents in several languages<sup>28</sup>. The synthetic part of this work does not display the flare of similar works by the more philosophically oriented *Geistesgeschichte* historians, but it is undoubtedly the

26. On Thim see József Perényi, "Thim József, 1864-1959", *Századok* 94 (1960) 454-455; and *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 2:856.

27. Thim, *A szerbek története a legrégibb kortól 1848-ig*, 3 vols. (Nagybecskerek, 1892).

28. Thim, *A magyarországi 1848-49-iki szerb fölkelés története*, 3 vols. (Budapest, 1930-1940). An earlier work by Thim on this topic is his *Az 1848-49. szerb fölkelés* [The Serbian Uprising of 1848-49] (Nagy-Becskerek, 1894).

most thorough and objective account on this question. The documentary part also stands alone in its thoroughness and completeness, and Thim's work will undoubtedly remain an indispensable publication on this topic for a long time to come. It should also be mentioned that Thim had collected innumerable additional documents on the Serbian question in Hungary, that would have added several other volumes to his work. It is to be lamented that they all remained unpublished due to the outbreak of World War II.

Thim had authored altogether about one hundred different historical studies, most of which deal with aspects of Serbian developments in Southern Hungary prior to 1918. The foundations he had laid in this are so significant that they are altogether indispensable for the study of the Serbian national revival movement and the foundations of the Yugoslav state.

The situation is basically similar with Endre Veress (1868-1953), whose interest centered on Transylvania and the Roumanian question in historic Hungary<sup>29</sup>. Contrary to Thim, Veress was a professional historian, yet his source publications do not always display the quality found in Thim's works. But he was a very prolific scholar, who—in addition to hundreds of articles—authored well over a dozen major monographs and edited over two dozen significant volumes of sources.

The most significant of Veress's source publications (which undoubtedly have more lasting value than his monographs) include a five-volume collection of sources on sixteenth and seventeenth-century Transylvania (*Fontes Rerum Transylvanicarum*, 1911-1921), and an eleven-volume collection on Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia (*Private Documents on the History of Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia*, 1929-1939)<sup>30</sup>. Also significant are his source publications on late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century Transylvanian political figures, including Prince (later King) Stephen Báthori (1533-1586), General George Basta (1544-1607) and the Jesuit diplomat Alfonso Carrillo (1553-1618). All of the latter volumes appeared in the *Monumenta Hungariae Historica* series<sup>31</sup>. Veress's equally important *Roumanian-Hungar-*

29. On Veress see Dániel Csátári, *Veress Endre emlékezete* [Remembering E. Veress] (Gyula, 1960); and *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 2:987-988.

30. *Fontes rerum Transylvanicarum*, ed. Endre Veress, 5 vols. (Budapest, 1911-1921); and *Documente privitoare la istoria Ardealului, Moldavei și Tarii Românești*, ed. Andrei Veress, 11 vols. (Bucharest, 1929-1939).

31. Endre Veress, *Báthory István Király levélváltása az erdélyi kormányval, 1581-1585* [King Stephen Bathory's Correspondence with the Government of Transylvania, 1581-1585] (Budapest, 1948); *idem, Basta György hadvezér levelezése és iratai* [The Correspondence and Papers of General George Basta], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1910-1913); and *Carillo Alfonz jezsuita atya levelezése és iratai, 1591-1618* [The Correspondence and Papers of the Jesuit Father Alfons Carillo, 1591-1618], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1906-1943).

ian *Bibliography, 1473-1838* (1931) appeared with the support of the Roumanian Academy of Sciences, as did his above mentioned eleven-volume source collection on Transylvania, Moldavia and Wallachia<sup>32</sup>.

Veress worked and wrote very rapidly. This haste explains why the critical level of his source publications is generally below the standard of Hungarian source publications of the interwar period. Another explanation may be that having been educated in the 1890's at the University of Kolozsvár (Cluj, Klausenburg), when the methodology of historical research at that Eastern Hungarian university was still on a modest level, he never updated his own method of source criticism in line with the much higher level practiced at the University of Budapest by the turn of the century.

One of the most significant and positive aspects of Veress's publications is that they all tend to reflect his belief in the necessity of coexistence among the peoples of the Danubian Basin. This conviction was reflected in all of Veress's activities, including, his long service as the official Roumanian language interpreter of the Budapest Circuit Court. One can only lament the fact that not many of the historians of East Central Europe (be they Hungarian or of another nationality) displayed an understanding and a toleration found in Veress's published works.

#### KLEBELSBERG AND HÓMAN: THE NEW CULTURAL POLICY OF INTERWAR HUNGARY

As discussed earlier, the sudden Hungarian interest in East European studies in the early 1920's was largely the result of the cataclysmic events of the years 1918-1920, which resulted in huge territorial losses for Hungary, and which also brought about the total reorganization and reorientation of Hungarian historical research. The mastermind behind this reorganization and reorientation was Count Kuno Klebelsberg (1875-1932), and to a lesser degree his successor Bálint Hóman (1885-1951), who jointly served for over two decades as interwar Hungary's minister of culture and education<sup>33</sup>. Of these two ministers, Klebelsberg was one of Hungary's most agile and able

32. Veress, *Bibliografia română-ungară, 1473-1838*, 3 vols. (Bucharest, 1931-1935).

33. On Klebelsberg and on his cultural policy see Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. VII. See also Ferenc Glatz, "Klebelsberg tudománypolitikai programja és a magyar történettudomány" [Klebelsberg's Scientific Program and Hungarian Historical Sciences], *Századok* 103 (1969) 1176-1200; and *idem*, "Historiography, Cultural Policy, and the Organization of Scholarship in Hungary in the 1920's", *Acta Historica* 16 (1970) 273-293. On Hóman see László Tóth, *Hóman Bálint a történetíró* [Bálint Hóman, the Historian] (Pécs, 1939); and Zoltán Szitnyai, "Hóman utolsó útja" [Hóman's Last Sojourn], in his *Szellemi Tájakon* [In Spiritual Lands] (Chicago, 1971), pp. 136-143.

cultural politicians, and Hóman one of the greatest Hungarian medievalists, who ultimately failed as a politician. Klebelsberg was a natural born organizer and leader, while Hóman was a gifted research scholar and professor, who should have never left the field of scholarship for the uncertain field of politics where he soon lost his way. Of these two, it was Klebelsberg who initiated the total reorganization of the Hungarian educational and scientific research system. Klebelsberg also became the prime mover in the effort to broaden the awareness of the Magyars about the history and culture of the surrounding nations, as well as in the goal to extend the knowledge about the nature of Hungarian history and civilization among the nations of Europe. After Klebelsberg's retirement and death, Hóman continued to implement the grand scheme that Klebelsberg had outlined in his works on the ideology of "neo-nationalism", which called for new Hungarian achievements and national regeneration based not on *strength*, but on *intellectual pre-eminence* among the nationalities of the Carpathian and Danubian Basins.

The chief motif behind Klebelsberg's efforts was the widespread belief among Hungarian intellectuals in the 1920's that the Treaty of Trianon and the consequent dismemberment of historic Hungary could have been avoided had the Hungarians been more familiar with the history, culture and thinking of the neighboring nationalities, and had they made a greater effort to make themselves better known to the world in general. In his view these were grave omissions that had to be rectified. He tried to do so by attempting to demonstrate the "proven cultural pre-eminence" and the unique "state-forming capacities" of his nation in the Carpathian Basin. In this way he hoped to advance the cause of the single overriding goal of most Hungarians: The restoration of the political unity of historic Hungary<sup>34</sup>.

In order to inform the world about the past achievements of their nation, Klebelsberg and Hóman ultimately managed to establish over sixty greater or lesser centers of Hungarian learning in numerous European cities. These included three Collegium Hungarici (Berlin, Rome, Vienna), seven Hungarian University Institutes (Ankara, Berlin, Helsinki, Leipzig, Rome, Sofia, Stockholm), four Hungarian Cultural Institutes (Berlin, Milano, Rome,

34. On the nature of Klebelsberg's and Hóman's cultural policy see particularly Klébsberg's *Neonacionalizmus* [Neo-Nationalism] (Budapest, 1928), and Hóman's *Művelődéspolitikai* [Cultural Policy] (Budapest, 1938). See also Sándor Balogh, "Klébelsberg és a magyar neonacionalizmus" [Klébelsberg and Hungarian Neo-Nationalism], *Valóság* [Reality] (Budapest) 2 (1959) 22-30 and Mihály Mák, "A neonacionalizmus terjesztésének főbb módszerei az ellenforradalmi rendszer idején" [The Chief Methods of the Propagation of Neo-Nationalism in the Age of the Counterrevolutionary Regime], *Padagógiai Szemle* [Educational Review] (Budapest) 13 (1963) 441-451.

Stockholm), two unattached Hungarian Institutes (Munich, Paris), two Historical Research Institutes (Rome, Vienna), one Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute (Rome), six university chairs (Berlin, Bologna, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna), two Hungarian Studies Centers (Bologna, Paris), and thirty-four university lectureships. Of the latter, thirteen were attached to Italian universities, five to German universities, three each to French and Dutch universities, two each to Austrian, Swedish and Swiss universities, and one each to the universities of Helsinki, London, Sofia and Columbia in New York<sup>35</sup>.

In addition to establishing these foreign centers of Hungarian learning, all of which have contributed to the improvement of the Hungarian image abroad and to the advancement of Hungarian scholarship, Klebelsberg and Hóman were also responsible—directly or indirectly—for the foundation of four domestic university chairs of East European history (two at Budapest, and one each at Debrecen and Kolozsvár), three Minority Institutes (at Pécs, Budapest and Debrecen), as well as the very significant Teleki Institute at Budapest (with its three member institutes), which was established especially for the study of the historical, ethnic, social, economic, cultural and political developments of East Central and Southeastern Europe and Hungary's position therein. These institutional foundations (even though politically motivated) have increased radically the institutional base of Hungarian scholarship on the area, and have also contributed heavily to the Hungarian scholarly output in East European historical studies in general<sup>36</sup>.

#### LUKINICH AND THE RISE OF A NEW GENERATION

When Hungary's first university chair of East European history was finally established at the University of Budapest in 1929, Hodinka and the other productive members of his generation were all over sixty years old. Moreover, however respected in the field of historical studies, they were still basically products of the Positivist School of Hungarian historiography, and therefore not fully acceptable to the proponents of the new and dominant

35. On Klébsberg's and Hóman's achievements in the establishment of foreign centers of Hungarian research and learning, see Zoltán Magyary, ed., *A magyar tudománypolitika alapvetése* [The Foundations of Hungarian Scientific Policy] (Budapest, 1927), pp. 454-472; "Külföldi magyar intézetek" [Hungarian Institutions Abroad], in *Magyarország tiszti cím- és névtára* [Address and Name Index of Hungary's Public Servants], vol. 48 (Budapest, 1941), pp. 377-378; and Dezső Halácsy, "A külföldi magyar intézetek jelentősége" [The Significance of the Hungarian Institutions Abroad], in his *A világ magyarságáért* [For the Hungarians of the World] (Budapest, 1944), pp. 269-272.

36. On these domestic centers of East European learning, see the section on the minority institutes and the Teleki Institute below.

*Geistesgeschichte* orientation who by the late 1920's and early 1930's have occupied most of the significant positions in Hungarian historical studies. (As an example, Hóman was also one of the self-proclaimed prophets of the *Geistesgeschichte* School, and in his appointments he naturally favored the adherents of that school). Thus, the honor of occupying Hungary's first chair of East European history went to the prolific Imre Lukinich (1880-1950), who represented a kind of ideological and methodological transition between the opposing words of positivist and *Geistesgeschichte* historiography<sup>37</sup>. But beyond his transitional ideological position, Lukinich and the other incumbents of the newly created chairs of East European history, also came to represent official East European historiography in interwar Hungary.

Lukinich, who was educated at the University of Kolozsvár, was neither a philosophically oriented historian, nor a real synthesizer; and as such he was closer to the older generation of positivists. While not one of the real great historians of interwar Hungary, he was a prolific scholar, and he wrote and edited about fifty volumes. While perhaps a fourth of these were memorial albums and other similar collective works that required little critical editing, over thirty of them were either independent monographs or critical source publications with extensive annotation and introductory studies. Several of the latter appeared in the *Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Recentoris* series, that was initiated during the early 1920's by Count Klebelsberg (in his capacity as the President of the Hungarian Historical Association) in order to fill the need for critically edited sources on the more recent period of Hungarian history<sup>38</sup>.

When we examine the topics of the dozens of books authored or edited by Lukinich, we find that he was first of all a specialist of Transylvanian-Hungarian history, and only secondarily an East Europeanist in the conventional sense of that term. In fact, outside of Polish-Hungarian-Transylvanian connections, there was nothing beyond historic Hungary's (and therein Transylvania's) history that caught his attention. In this sense Lukinich was almost a replica of his former professor, Lajos Szádeczky-Kardoss (1859-1935), who held the chair of Hungarian history at the University of Kolozsvár (which after 1918 was transferred to Szeged) for almost four decades (1891-1930)<sup>39</sup>.

37. On Lukinich see Szabó, *A M. Kir. Erzsébet Tudományegyetem*, 2:643-650; and Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar*, p. 674.

38. The two *Fontes* series (*Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Recentoris* and the *Fontes Historiae Hungaricae Aevi Turcici*) were sponsored by the Hungarian Historical Association, and published since 1921. During the interwar period forty-four volumes have appeared in the two series.

39. On Szádeczky-Kardoss (or simply Szádeczky in some of his earlier publications),



While several of Lukinich's twenty-odd monographs contain significant contributions to Hungarian and Transylvanian history—especially those that deal with Transylvania's internal and external developments during the Turkish period—he made his most important contributions to Hungarian historiography in the area of source publications. There he proved to be an excellent positivist master of source criticism. The most important of these source publications include *The Diary of János Ferdinand Auer* (1923) and *The History and Sources of the Peace Treaty of Szatmár* (1925) in the above-mentioned *Fontes* series, *The History and Sources of the High Treason Trial of Francis Rákóczi II* (1935) for the multivolumed *Archivum Rákócziánium*, and the ten-volume *History of the Podmaniczky Family* (1937-1943)<sup>40</sup>. The first three of these publications deal with the late Turkish and immediate post-Turkish era of Hungarian history; while the Podmaniczky family history contains six volumes of sources on the history of the northern highlands of medieval and early modern Hungary.

Next to these source publications and next to some of his monographs on the political, military, social and institutional history of Transylvania, Lukinich's synthesizing attempts are rather pale and unimportant. An example would be his *A History of Hungary in Biographical Sketches* (1930), which appeared in several western languages, and which is a simplicistic account of Hungarian history<sup>41</sup>. His institutional histories and biographical studies are much better, although they too tend to give less than either his topical monographs, or his source publications<sup>42</sup>.

see Imre Lukinich, "Szádeczky-Kardoss Lajos, 1859-1935," *Századok* 70 (1936) 125-126; and G. Bisztray, A.T. Szabó and L. Tamás, eds., *Erdély Magyar Egyeteme* [Transylvania's Hungarian University] (Kolozsvár, 1941), pp. 185, 198.

40. Imre Lukinich, *Auer János Ferdinánd pozsonyi nemes polgárnak hétterronyi fogságban írt naplója, 1664* [The Diary of J. F. Auer, a Noble Citizen of Pozsony, Written during his Captivity in the Seven Towers, 1664] (Budapest, 1923); *idem*, *A szatmári béke története és okirattára* [The History and Sources of the Peace Treaty of Szatmár], (Budapest, 1925); *idem*, *II. Rákóczi Ferenc felségárulási perének története és okirattára* [The History and Sources of the High Treason Trial of Francis Rákóczi II], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1935); and *idem*, *A podmanini és aszódi báró Podmaniczky-család története* [The History of the Baron Podmaniczky Family of Podmanin and Aszód], 10 vols. (Budapest, 1933-1943). In addition to serving as editor-in-chief of the latter work, Lukinich also edited vols. V-IX, which contained the family archives, and wrote vol. X, which is the history of the family.

41. Imre Lukinich, *A History of Hungary in Biographical Sketches* (London, 1937); the original Hungarian version appeared in 1930 in Budapest.

42. Some of Lukinich's significant monographs include: *I. Rákóczi György és lengyel királysága* [George Rákóczi I and his Polish Kingship] (Budapest, 1907); *Az erdélyi hódoltság és végvárai* [The Turkish Rule in Transylvania and their Fortresses] (Budapest, 1912); *Az erdélyi fejedelmi cím kialakulása* [The Development of the Princely Title in Transylvania]

Like most Hungarian historians of the interwar period, Lukinich also wrote under the influence of Trianon, and his Magyar nationalist convictions do tend to get into his works. During that period, however, this was rather common among all historians of the region. In his works on Transylvania, he naturally represented the Hungarian view on the controversial question of the "Daco-Roman origins of the Roumanians". This contention held by Roumanian historians, however, is still not accepted even by Hungarian Marxist historians.

BÍRÓ AND DIVÉKY: EAST EUROPEAN HISTORIOGRAPHY  
AT THE UNIVERSITIES OF DEBRECEN AND KOLOZSVÁR (KLUJ)

Among the three other interwar incumbents of chairs of East European history at Hungarian universities, the Transylvanian Vencel Bíró (1885-1962) was in many ways simply a less-accomplished Lukinich<sup>43</sup>. At the time of his appointment to the new chair of East European and Transylvanian history at the re-established Hungarian University of Kolozsvár in 1940, Bíró was already somewhat advanced in age (55 years old). He was undoubtedly an accomplished historian of the Piarist Order in Transylvania. But his tenure at the university was too short and chaotic to permit him to develop his own "school" of Transylvanian historians. The conditions of war during the early 1940's disrupted his teaching, and the re-Roumanianization of the university after 1945 soon led to his forced retirement in 1948.

Bíró's only synthesizing work is his *History of Transylvania* (1944), which grew out of his university lectures, and which summarizes the traditional Hungarian view of that history, but without much of the Protestant and anti-

(Budapest, 1913); *A Magyar Történelmi Társulat története, 1867-1917* [The History of the Hungarian Historical Association, 1867-1917] (Budapest, 1918); *Erdély területi változásai a török hódoltság korában, 1541-1711* [The Territorial Changes of Transylvania during the Turkish Rule, 1541-1711] (Budapest, 1918); *A bethleni gróf Bethlen-család története* [The History of the Count Bethlen Family of Bethlen] (Budapest, 1927); and *Stefan Bathory* (Cracow, 1934). Lukinich also edited such major collective works as the memorial volumes dedicated to Count Klébelsberg (1925), Mohács (1926), King Matthias Corvinus (1940), as well as a major source collections on the Roumanians, *Documenta historiam Valachorum in Hungaria illustrantia usque ad annum 1400 p. Christum*, with László Gáldi, Antal Fekete-Nagy and László Makkai (Budapest, 1941). Moreover his *Les éditions des sources de l'histoire hongroise, 1854-1930* (Budapest, 1931) contains an annotated list of most of the significant Hungarian source publications published between 1854 and 1930. For a complete list of his numerous publications until 1940, see Szabó, *A M. Kir. Erzsébet Tudományegyetem*, 2:643-650.

43. On Bíró see *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 1:217-218.

Habsburg (*kuruc*) bias that generally characterized Transylvanian-Hungarian historiography<sup>44</sup>. Bíró has also authored a number of good positivistic topical monographs, biographies, as well as histories of religious and educational institutions. All of these, however, are limited to Transylvanian history<sup>45</sup>. His only work that reaches out of the narrow confines of his more immediate homeland is his *The Transylvanian Ambassadors at the Porte* (1921), in which he tries to evaluate the relationship between the Transylvanian and the Ottoman Turkish governments<sup>46</sup>.

The situation was somewhat different with Adorján Divéky (1880-1965), who became the first appointee to the East European chair at the University of Debrecen in 1939, in that he had interests also outside the frontiers of historic Hungary. Prior to his appointment to the University of Debrecen, Divéky had spent some two decades in Poland, both as a lecturer of Hungarian language and Literature, as well as the director of the Hungarian Institute at the University of Warsaw, and during that period he developed a deep interest in Polish-Hungarian historical connections<sup>47</sup>.

Like Lukinich and Bíró, Divéky was basically a positivist historian, but unlike the former two, he did not make any efforts to conform to the requirements of the dominant *Geistesgeschichte* historiography. Nor was he a productive scholar like Lukinich and to a lesser degree Bíró, and he never attempted to produce a larger synthesis in his area of specialization. He wrote only about a half dozen significant studies, virtually all of which dealt with aspects of Polish-Hungarian historical relations, and many of which appeared in both of these languages. Only a minority of Divéky's studies, however, cover relatively longer periods of history. These exceptions include his treatments on sixteenth and seventeenth-century economic, and nineteenth-century political relation between Poland and Hungary<sup>48</sup>.

44. Vencel Bíró, *Erdély története* (Kolozsvár, 1944).

45. Bíró's monographs on Transylvanian history and personalities include: *Az erdélyi fejedelmi hatalom fejlődése, 1542-1690* [The Development of the Princely Power in Transylvania, 1542-1690] (Kolozsvár, 1917); *Altörjai gróf Apor István és kora* [Count I. Apor of Altörja and his Age] (Kolozsvár, 1935); *Székhelyi Mailath G. Károly* [Károly G. Mailath of Székhely] (Kolozsvár, 1940); and *Az erdélyi udvarház gazdasági szerepe a XVII. század második felében* [The Economic Role of the Transylvanian Manor in the Second Half of the 17th Century] (Kolozsvár, 1945). Bíró also edited the work *Az erdélyi katolicizmus múltja és jelene* [The Past and the Present of Transylvanian Catholicism] (Kolozsvár, 1925).

46. Vencel Bíró, *Erdély követei a portán* (Kolozsvár, 1921).

47. On Divéky see Endre Kovács, "Divéky Adorján, 1880-1965", *Századok* 99 (1965) 1390-1391; and Zoltán Varga, *A debreceni tudományegyetem története, 1914-1944* [The History of the University of Debrecen, 1914-1944] (Debrecen, 1967), p. 204.

48. Divéky's most significant works include: *Felsőmagyarország kereskedelmi összeköttetései Lengyelországgal, főleg a XVI-XVII. században* [Upper Hungary's Commercial

Divéky's significance as an East Europeanist lies primarily in having brought the study of Polish-Hungarian relations into the focus of Hungarian historical research—an effort in which he was aided by his contemporary Béla Kossányi (b. 1894), and by the younger and still active Endre Kovács (b. 1911). This effort was all the more significant as Polish-Hungarian relations were among the friendliest and most durable in Hungary's millennial foreign policy<sup>49</sup>.

Being essentially a traditional, conservative historian, Divéky could not even adjust to the requirements of the *Geistesgeschichte* School, let alone to those of post-1945 Marxist historiography. For this reason he ceased to write original studies after 1945, and devoted the remaining two decades of his life to translating Polish memoirs on the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, and to collecting sources on the Hungarian traditions of Cracow during the period of the Renaissance, when the University of Cracow was one of the important centers of learning for young Hungarian scholars.

#### MISKOLCZY AND *GEISTESGESCHICHTE* INFLUENCES IN HUNGARIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY ON EASTERN EUROPE

While Lukinich's and Biró's attention was focused on Transylvania, and Divéky's interest centered largely on Poland and Polish-Hungarian relations, Gyula [Julius] Miskolczy (1892-1962) of the University of Budapest wrote most of his notable works on Hungarian-Croatian and Hungarian-Habsburg connections<sup>50</sup>. His most significant work is undoubtedly the two-volume *The History and Documents of the Croatian Question during the Age of the Feudal State* (1927-1928), which appeared in the *Fontes* series and immediately established Miskolczy as one of the top authorities of the Croatian question<sup>51</sup>. It was largely on the basis of this work that he was named the first incumbent

Relations with Poland, especially in the 16th and 17th Centuries] (Budapest, 1905); *Magyarok és lengyelek a XIX. században* [Hungarians and Poles in the 19th Century] (Budapest, 1919); *A Lengyelországnak elzálogított 16. szepesi város visszacsatolása 1770-ben* [The Re-Annexation in 1770 of the Sixteen Zipser Towns that had been Pawned to Poland] (Budapest, 1929); and *Az aranybulla és a jeruzsálemi királyság alkotmánya* [The (Hungarian) Golden Bull and the Constitution of the Kingdom of Jerusalem] (Budapest, 1932). Most of these works also appeared in Polish.

49. On Béla Kossányi and Endre Kovács, see respectively *Magyarország tiszti cím-és névtára* 48:55, 374 and 597; and *Magyar Irodalmi Lexikon* [Hungarian Literary Lexicon], ed. Marcell Benedek, 3 vols. (Budapest, 1963-1965), 1:685.

50. On Miskolczy see Hans Wagner, "Julius Miskolczy, 1892-1962", *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 15 (1962) 697-700; and *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 2: 221-222.

51. Gyula Miskolczy, *A horvát kérdés története és irományai a rendi állam korában*, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1927-1928).

of the chair of Southeast European history at the University of Budapest in 1935, after Milan Šufflays' inability to occupy that chair.

Šufflay (1879-1931) was a noted Croatian historian who had co-edited with Thallóczy and Jireček the *Acta et Diplomata Albaniae* (1913-1918). He had been named to the newly created chair of Southeast European history already in 1928. But due to political considerations (among them the intense Croat-Serbian controversy and Šufflay's Magyarophilism) the Yugoslav government refused him permission to occupy his chair at Budapest. Subsequently, in 1931, Šufflay was assassinated in Yugoslavia, which "vacated" his chair and obliged the University of Budapest to name his successor<sup>52</sup>.

Šufflay's successor, and in effect the first actual incumbent in the chair of Southeast European history at the University of Budapest was Miskolczy, who had already spent some two decades in Vienna and Rome in various scholarly positions. These included membership in the Hungarian Historical Research Institute in Vienna, directorship of the Hungarian Institute of Rome, professorship both at the University of Rome and the University of Vienna, as well as the directorship of the Collegium Hungaricum of Vienna. Although only a half generation younger than Lukinich, Divéky or Bíró, Miskolczy differed considerably from all of these East Europeanists in that he was a dedicated disciple of *Geistesgeschichte* historiography.

This dedication to *Geistesgeschichte* is most evident in Miskolczy's synthesis of modern Hungarian history since 1526. Entitled *The History of the Hungarian People from the Battle of Mohács to the First World War*<sup>53</sup>, and published in Rome in 1956, this work is in many ways a distilled version of Szekfü's section of the great eight-volume *Magyar History* (1928-1934), that had been authored jointly by Bálint Hóman and Gyula Szekfü, and that is still the unsurpassed master-synthesis of Hungarian historical evolution<sup>54</sup>. There are, however, certain differences between Szekfü's and Miskolczy's interpretations. The most significant of these is Miskolczy's even greater effort

52. On Šufflay, his appointment to the University of Budapest, and his assassination, see Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar*, p. 674; Gyula Szekfü, "Šufflay Milán tragédiája" [M. Šufflay's Tragedy], *Magyar Szemle* [Hungarian Review] 11 (1931) 377-383; József Bajza, "Šufflay Milán, 1879-1931", in his *A horvát kérdés* [The Croatian Question] (Budapest, 1941), pp. 255-261; and J[ózsef] D[érf], "Šufflay Milán, 1879-1931", in Miklós Asztalos, ed., *Jancsó Benedek Emlékkönyv* [Benedek Jancsó Memorial Album] (Budapest, 1931), pp. 410-413.

53. Gyula Miskolczy, *A magyar nép történelme a mohácsi véstől az első világháborúig* [The History of the Hungarian People from the Battle of Mohács to the First World War] (Rome, 1956).

54. Bálint Hóman and Gyula Szekfü, *Magyar történet* [Magyar History], 8 vols. (Budapest, 1928-34), 7th ed., 5 vols. (Budapest, 1941-43).

(than Szekfü's) to liberate himself from the so-called "Hungarocentric" view of history, or as he expressed it, "from the viewpoint of the Hungarian Estates", which, in his view, was basically "representative of provincialism"<sup>55</sup>.

Miskolczy's attempt to free himself from the Hungarocentric view of the history of the Carpathian Basin is evident in most of his major works. This is undoubtedly due to the fact that he had spent a considerable portion of his scholarly life in such European centers of learning as Rome and Vienna, and consequently lost the provincialism of those historians who seldom ventured beyond the frontiers of Hungary. His broad European view of Hungarian history is also evident in his last major work, *Hungary in the Habsburg Monarchy* (1959), in which he tried to examine the role of Habsburg-Hungarian relations from the vantage point of the Habsburg imperial capital, and without the preconceived notion, so popular in traditional Hungarian historiography, that the Habsburgs were there only to oppress<sup>56</sup>.

Miskolczy's general approach to the study of Hungarian history is best expressed in this statement: "Overheated nationalism cannot be a healthy fermenting element of Hungarian history; nor the adoration of the state; only the elevation of the people [*Volk*] to the level of humanitarian morality"<sup>57</sup>.

Like many of the true *Geistesgeschichte* historians of interwar Hungary who followed Szekfü, the main prophet and popularizer of that school, Miskolczy too was a Hungarian patriot, a European cosmopolitan, as well as an intellectual with populist inclinations simultaneously. These Hungarian intellectuals idealized the liberating spirit of the wider European culture and were grateful for its influences upon its Hungarian counterpart. In addition, however, they also idealized the Magyar peasant, and saw Hungary's future largely in the regeneration of Hungarian culture through the "fresh" and "unadulterated" spirit and culture of the rising magyar peasant masses.

#### THE ROLE OF LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY SCHOLARS IN INTERWAR HUNGARIAN EAST EUROPEAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Although—as mentioned in the beginning of this study—East European languages had gained an earlier recognition in Hungarian higher education

55. Miskolczy, *A magyar nép történelme*, p. 299.

56. Julius [Gyula] Miskolczy, *Ungarn in der Habsburger-Monarchie* (Vienna, 1959). Miskolczy's other major works include: *A kamarilla a reformkorszakban* [The "Kitchen Cabinet" in the Reform Period] (Budapest, 1938); and *A modern államszervezés kora* [The Age of the Organization of the Modern (Hungarian) State] (Budapest, 1942), which he wrote originally as an introductory study to the fifth volume of the *Magyar művelődéstörténet* [History of Hungarian Civilization], ed. Sándor Domanovszky, *et.al.*, 5 vols. (Budapest, 1939-42).

57. Miskolczy, *A magyar nép történelme*, p. 298.

than East European history, due to political considerations the study of the history of the region came to be more emphasized in interwar Hungary. Simultaneously, however, the relatively modest achievements of Hungarian East European scholarship in the languages and literatures also improved, largely through the rise of a new generation of linguistic scholars<sup>58</sup>.

In the area of Slavistics, the work of János Melich (1872-1963), who taught at the university of Budapest for three decades (1911-1941), was particularly significant; as was the scholarly activity of his student and successor István Kniezsa (1898-1965), who held the same chair right up to his death in 1965. Melich's pioneering studies on Slavic loan-words in the Magyar language, and his related works on Hungary's ethnic-linguistic composition at the time of the Magyar conquest in the ninth century were rightfully acclaimed for their precision and accuracy<sup>59</sup>. And this also holds true for Kniezsa's major related studies, most of which dealt with the ethnic-linguistic frontiers within medieval Hungary, based on the linguistic analysis of place names<sup>60</sup>. While these studies were undoubtedly motivated at least partially by the post-Trianon revisionist atmosphere in Hungary, Kniezsa's scholarship was always found to be impeccable. This also holds true for his later works on Hungarian orthography and for his own collections of Slavic loan-words in the Magyar language.

Next to Melich's and Kniezsa's scholarly accomplishments, the works coming from the chairs of Ruthenian, Croatian and Roumanian languages

58. On this question of the rise of a new generation of linguistic scholars in the area of Slavistics, see the two works cited in note 7.

59. On Melich see Jolán Berrár, "Johann Melich," *Acta Linguistica* 15 (1965) 135-142. Melich's most significant relevant works include: *Deutsche Ortsnamen und Lehnwörter des ungarischen Sprachschatzes* (Innsbruck, 1900); *Szláv jövevényszavaink* [Our Slavic Loan-Words] (Budapest, 1903); *A magyar szótáriródlom* [Hungarian Dictionary of Literature] (Budapest, 1907); *A honfoglaláskori Magyarország* [Hungary at the Time of the Conquest (by the Magyars)] (Budapest, 1925); and *Magyar Etymologiai Szótár* [Hungarian Etymological Dictionary], with Zoltán Gombóc, parts I-XVI (A-G) (Budapest, 1914-44.)

60. On Kniezsa see the lengthy study by L. Kiss, "Stefan Kniezsa", *Acta Linguistica* 16 (1966) 337-362. Kniezsa's works on place names and ethnic-linguistic frontiers of historic Hungary include: *Pseudo-rumänen in Pannonien in den Nordkarpathen* (Budapest, 1936); *Ungarns Volkerschaften im XI. Jahrhundert* (Budapest, 1938); *Zur Geschichte der ungarisch-slowakischen ethnischen Grenze* (Budapest, 1941), the latter two also appeared in Hungarian; *Erdély víznevei* [The River Names of Transylvania] (Kolozsvár, 1942); *Keletmagyarország helynevei* [The Geographic Names of Eastern Hungary] (Budapest, 1943); *A párhuzamos helynévadás* [Bilingualism in Geographic Names] (Budapest, 1944); *A honfoglalás előtti szlávok nyelve a Dunántúlon* [The Language of the Slavs Prior to the (Magyar) Conquest in Trans-Danubia] (Budapest, 1952); and *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényszavai. Die Slawischen Lehnwörter der ungarischen Sprache*, vol. I, parts 1-2 (Budapest, 1955-56).

and literatures appear somewhat pale. The works of Sándor Bonkáló (1880-1959), who held the chair of Ruthenian (1919-1924) and later Ukrainian (1945-1948) languages, are only modest compendiums on the cultural and literary developments of the Sub-Carpathian Ruthenians<sup>61</sup>. To some degree this also holds true for the works of József Bajza (1885-1938), the incumbent of the chair of Croatian studies during the interwar period (1923-1938)<sup>62</sup>. Although a prolific writer, Bajza was primarily a publicist. Thus, discounting his early literary essays on one of his famous predecessors by the same name, most of his works deal with the question of the Hungaro-Croatian union of some eight centuries, and do so from the vantage point of a liberal Magyar publicist.

From among Bajza's predecessors, only Ede Maraglits (1849-1940), the first incumbent of that chair at the University of Budapest (1895-1915), produced significant scholarly works in the area of Croatian studies. The most valuable of these are his collection of Croatian proverbs, and his index on the sources of Croatian and Serbian history<sup>63</sup>.

Although the first to be established among the chairs of East European languages in Hungary (1862), until the 1930's none of the incumbents of the chair of Roumanian language and literature at Budapest produced worthwhile scholarly works. They were primarily teachers and not scholars. Not

61. On Bonkáló see *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 1:244. His summarizing works on the Ruthenians include: *A magyar rutének* [The Hungarian Ruthenians] (Budapest, 1920); *Az ukrán mozgalom története, 1917-22* [The History of the Ukrainian Movement, 1917-22] (Budapest, 1922); *A kárpátaljai rutén irodalom és művelődés* [The Ruthenian Literature and Culture of Sub-Carpathia] (Budapest, 1935); and *A rutének (ruszinok)* [The Ruthenians] (Budapest, 1940).

62. On Bajza see László Tóth, "Bajza József és a horát-kérdés" [J. Bajza and the Croatian Question], in József Bajza, *A horvát kérdés. Válogatott tanulmányok* [The Croatian Question. Selected Studies], ed. by László Tóth (Budapest, 1941), pp. 5-22; and Ervin Supka, "Bajza József irodalmi munkássága" [The Bibliography of J. Bajza's Works], in *ibid.*, pp. 511-527. In addition to the above posthumous collection of Bajza's historical and publicistic studies on the Croatian question, he has also authored the following larger relevant works: *Horvátország népessége* [The Population of Croatia] (Budapest, 1916), under the pseudonym József Szücs; *A magyar-horvát unió felbomlása* [The Dissolution of the Hungarian-Croatian Union] (Budapest, 1925); *Jugoszlávia* (Budapest, 1929); *La question Montenegro* (Budapest, 1928); and *Podmaniczky-Magyar Benigna a horvát költészetben* [Benigna Podmaniczky-Magyar in Croatian Literature] (Budapest, 1935). The last work is vol. III of the Lukinich-edited multivolumed *History of the Podmaniczky Family* cited in note 29.

63. Ede Margalits, *Florilegium proverbiorum universiae latinitatis* (Budapest, 1895); *Sententiae in classicis latinis*, 3 vols. (Budapest, 1911-13); *Horvát történelmi repertórium* [Index of Croatian Historical Sources], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1900-02); and *Szerb történelmi repertórium* [Index of Serbian Historical Sources] (Budapest, 1918). Margalits had also authored a biography of the great seventeenth-century statesman-poet Zrínyi, *Zrínyi Miklós a költő* [Nicholas Zrínyi, the Poet] (Budapest, 1893).



until the temporary appointment of the Italian scholar Carlo Tagliavini (1928-1935) did Hungarian Roumanian studies emerge from their obscurantism and produce some worthwhile scholarly work, especially in the area of philology. It was on the basis of the foundations laid by Tagliavini that the Hungarian linguist Lajos Tamás (b. 1904) built the chair of Roumanian language and literature into a respectable center of learning.

Except for a few years during the Second World War, when Northern Transylvania had returned to Hungary (1940-1944) and the chair of Roumanian language and literature was headed by Szilárd Siluca (1884-1945), Roumanian linguistic and literary studies at the University of Cluj [Kolozsvár] during the interwar years were in the hands of the Roumanians themselves<sup>64</sup>. Until 1919, however, the Hungarian University of Kolozsvár was one of the two centers of Roumanian studies in Hungary<sup>65</sup>. It may actually have been more significant than the University of Budapest, due largely to the scholarly activities and achievements of Gergely Moldován (1845-1930), who held the chair of Roumanian studies at Kolozsvár for over three decades (1886-1919). Moldován was both an ethnologist, as well as a literary critic, and his collection of Roumanian folk songs, ballads and proverbs are particularly significant<sup>66</sup>. He was also the first among Roumanianists in Hungary to direct the attention of his discipline to the study of the cultural inter-relations between the Hungarians and the Roumanians. He had devoted a number of his studies to this question, and later published many of them in a two-volume work entitled *The Roumanians* (1895-1896)<sup>67</sup>. Moldován also studied the settlement history of sections of Transylvania, and with his pioneering study, *The Roumanian Population of the County of Alsofehér* (1899), he became one of the

64. On Roumanian studies at the University of Budapest see Szentpétery, *A bölcsészettudományi kar*, pp. 458, 459, 586, 587, 672; Tibor Kardos, "Az újlatin népek nyelve és irodalma" [The Languages and Literatures of the New Latin Peoples], in *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem*, pp. 518-525; and Béla Nagy's cited study (note 7) in *ibid.*, pp. 510-517.

65. On Roumanian studies at the University of Kolozsvár (Cluj) see László Gáldi, "Az erdélyi magyar tudományosság és a kolozsvári egyetem hatása a román tudományra" [The Influence of Transylvanian Hungarian Scholarship and of the University of Kolozsvár on Roumanian Scholarship], in *Erdély Magyar Egyeteme*, pp. 285-304. Gáldi also discusses the roles and achievements of Moldován, Siluca and others in Roumanian studies in Hungary.

66. Gergely Moldován's related works include: *Román népdalok és balladák* [Roumanian Folksongs and Ballads] (Kolozsvár, 1872); *Román közmondások* [Roumanian Proverbs] (Kolozsvár, 1882); and *Koszorú a román népköltészet virágaiból* [A Garland from the Flowers of Roumanian Folk Poetry] (Kolozsvár, 1884). Moldován also authored a Roumanian grammar, *Román nyelvtan* (Kolozsvár, 1888).

67. Moldován, *A románság*, 2 vols. (Nagybecskerek, 1895-96).

precursors of the settlement history studies initiated in interwar Hungary by Elemér Mályusz (b. 1898) and his Ethnohistory School<sup>68</sup>.

Interestingly, or perhaps significantly enough, Hungary did not possess a single university chair for the Russian languages and literature until 1945, when the appointment of the cultural historian Zoltán Trócsányi (1886-1971) and numerous Russian guest lecturers had initiated Russian linguistic and literary studies on a mass scale<sup>69</sup>. Whatever occurred in this area prior to 1945, did so primarily at the chair of general Slavistics at the University of Budapest. As an example, Oszkár Asbóth (1852-1920), one of the earlier incumbents of that chair, produced a number of works to aid the study of the Russian language<sup>70</sup>. Moreover, Sándor Bonkáló, the above-mentioned holder of the chair of Ruthenian studies during the early 1920's, also authored a history of Russian literature<sup>71</sup>.

#### NON-PROFESSIONAL SYNTHESIZERS: RÁTZ AND STEIER

Next to these relatively modest achievements by literary and linguistic scholars connected with the University of Budapest, most of the summarizing works on Russian and East Central European history and literature were either translated Western (mostly German) publications, or products of a number of non-professional historians.

An example of the latter is Kálmán Rátz (1888-1951), who authored several syntheses on Russian and Slavic historical questions. These include his *The History of Pan-Slavism* (1941), as well as a *History of Russia* (1943)<sup>72</sup>.

68. Moldován, *Alsófehér megye román népe* (Nagyenyed, 1899). After several shorter studies on this topic, Moldován had also authored a major work on the Hungaro-Roumanians, *A magyarországi románok* [Roumanians in Hungary] (Budapest, 1913). On the Ethnohistory School in interwar Hungary, see Vardy, *Hungarian Historiography and the "Geistesgeschichte" School*, pp. 39-44, 72-75; and *idem*, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. XII.

69. Kálmán Bolla, "Orosz nyelv és irodalom" [Russian Language and Literature], in *Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem*, pp. 499-509.

70. See for example Oszkár Asbóth, *Gyakorlati orosz nyelvtan* (Budapest, 1888), and its German version, *Kurze russische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1889). Some of Asbóth's other works include: *Szlávság a magyar keresztény terminológiában* [Slavisms in Hungarian Christian Terminology] (Budapest, 1884); *A hangsúly a szláv nyelvekben* [Intonation in the Slavic Languages] (Budapest, 1891); and *Szláv jövenényszavaink* [Our Slavic Loan-Words], vol. I (Budapest, 1907).

71. Sándor Bonkáló, *Az orosz irodalom története* [The History of Russian Literature], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1926).

72. On Rátz see *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 2:488-489. The works cited are his *Oroszország története* (Budapest, 1943); and *A pánszlávizmus története* (Budapest, 1941). He also authored a work on the Utopian socialists, *Utópista szocialisták* (Budapest, 1941), and several other works on Asia and Africa.

Although not based on original archival research, both of these works are sizable syntheses, and they rely heavily on Russian and other Slavic monographic publications. In connection with Rátz's writings, however, one must keep in mind that in the course of his checkered career he had been involved in Far Rightist and occasionally Far Leftist politics, and that his political views unavoidably color his views of history.

Another example of such synthesizing publicist-historian was Lajos Steier (1885-1935), who, however, is much more highly regarded than Rátz. Although Steier was also a kind of nationalist historian, he was not an extremist, and his syntheses are generally detached and reliable works of history.

As in the case of some of the other Hungarian specialists of East Central Europe, Steier's place of birth in Northern Hungary (Slovakia) has influenced his interest within the discipline of history<sup>73</sup>. His very first work, *The Slovak Question* (1912), deals with the nationality problems of his more immediate homeland<sup>74</sup>. And even though later he switched his attention to the Revolution of 1848, he produced his most significant works on various aspects of the Slovak problem. These included his great source publication, *The Slovak Nationality Question in 1848-49* (1937), as well as the annotated memoirs of L. Beniczky on the Slovak national movement of 1848, both of which appeared in the *Fontes* series<sup>75</sup>. These significant source publications, with their monograph-size introductory studies, are probably Steier's most significant publications. But his studies on the main personalities on the Revolution of 1848 are also standard works on that topic. These include his *Görgely and Kossuth* (1924) and his *Haynau and Paskievich* (1925)<sup>76</sup>.

During the early 1930's, Steier also authored some revisionist works, but they tell us more about the atmosphere of those years than about Steier as an historian<sup>77</sup>. He also wrote a number of short synthetic summaries on his favorite topic, but his intended *opus magnum*, a thorough history of the Slovak nationality question in Hungary, was never finished. His untimely death prevented him from finishing this major undertaking.

73. On Steier see Pál Török, "Steier Lajos, 1885-1938", *Századok* 72 (1938) 135-136; and *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*, 2:655.

74. Steier, *A tót kérdés* (Liptószentmiklós, 1912).

75. Steier's works in the *Fontes* series include: *A tót nemzetiségi kérdés 1848-49-ben* [The Slovak Nationality Question in 1848-49], 2 vols. (Budapest, 1937); and *Beniczky Lajos bánnyavidéki kormánybiztos és honvédezredes visszaemlékezései és jelentései az 1848-49-iki szabadságharcról és a tót mozgalomról* [The Reminiscences and Reports of Colonel L. Beniczky, State Commissioner of the Mining Region (of Upper Hungary), about the Revolution and about the Slovak Movement of 1848-49] (Budapest, 1924).

76. Steier's cited monographs include: *Görgely és Kossuth* (Budapest, 1924); and *Haynau és Paskievics*, 2 vols. (Budapest, 1925).

77. Steier, *Ungarns Vergewaltigung* (Budapest, ca. 1930).

GÁL: AN ADVOCATE OF EAST CENTRAL EUROPEAN INTERDEPENDENCE  
AND COOPERATION

Although much younger than either Rátz or Steier, and more of a literary scholar than an historian, the pre-1945 activities of István Gál (b. 1912) in the area of East European studies needs to be mentioned<sup>78</sup>. This is so not only because of the innate value of Gál's works, but even more so because of his ardent advocacy of cooperation and mutual understanding among, the peoples of the Danubian Basin.

Gál appeared on the Hungarian literary and historical scene rather young as the founding editor of the journal *Apollo* (1934-1939), a periodical that became the herald of the intellectual and political orientation known as "new humanism"<sup>79</sup>. Convinced that Hungary's only realistic course was to accept her position as one of the small nations of the Danubian Basin, Gál became a vocal spokesman of the necessity of coexistence and collaboration among the nations of East Central Europe. He also realized that this coexistence could come about only through the mutual understanding and respect of each other's national achievements. To advance this goal, Gál wrote extensively on the history of East Central European interaction and interdependence. But what was perhaps even more important, he urged others to do likewise. He hoped to publish his relevant essays and studies in a volume that he provisionally entitled "Eastern Europe and Hungaro-Slavic Relations". While the ravages of the World War never permitted this volume to appear, he did edit a number of relevant works. These include *Hungary and the Balkans* (1942), *Hungarian Balkan Research* (1944), and the even more important *Hungary and Eastern Europe* (1944, 1947), the latter of which appeared both in German and in an expanded Hungarian edition<sup>80</sup>.

Gál was also interested in the cultural interrelations between Hungary and the Anglo-Saxon world, and he made it a point to write about this topic particularly during the war. He even managed to publish a volume of some of his most significant relevant studies (*Hungary, England and America*, 1945), which also contained references to the Slavic and East European region<sup>81</sup>.

78. On Gál see *Magyar Irodalmi Lexikon*, 1:376.

79. On "new humanism" see particularly the essays in *Apollo*, vol. V. (1936).

80. Gál, ed., *Magyarország és a Balkán. A magyar tudomány feladatai Délkelet Európában* [Hungary and the Balkans. The Tasks of Hungarian Scholarship in Southeastern Europe] (Budapest, 1942); *idem*, *Ungarische Balkanforschung. Im Auftrag des ungarischen Balkanausschusses* (Budapest, 1944); *idem*, *Ungarn und die Nachbarvölker* (Budapest, 1944); and its expanded Hungarian version, *Magyarország és Kelet-Európa. A magyarság kapcsolatai a szomszéd népekkel* [Hungary and Eastern Europe. The Relations of the Magyars with their Neighbors] (Budapest, 1947).

81. Gál, *Magyarország, Anglia és Amerika* (Budapest, 1945).

Similarly to Gál, such interdependence and cooperation among the peoples of East Central Europe (or the Danubian Basin) was also espoused by many of the "populist" intellectuals of interwar Hungary. Like their *narodniki* predecessors in late nineteenth-century Russia, these Hungarian populists or "village explorers" also saw the Hungarian peasant masses as the only hope for their nation's future. But in addition to a major social reorganization based on the elevation of the Magyar peasant, they also supported various plans for the federative reorganization of East Central Europe; and did so with the help of some of their Hungarian counterparts in the Succession States, such as the *Sarló* [Siecle] movement in Czechoslovakia, and the *Erdélyi Fialak* [Transylvanian Youth] in Roumania. While none of these populist intellectuals were historians, the movement as a whole did have a noticeable influence on professional historians, including G. Szekfü, the father of the dominant *Geistesgeschichte* School of interwar Hungary<sup>82</sup>.

#### THE ROLE OF THE "MINORITY INSTITUTES" IN HUNGARY

In light of the above developments, one may safely conclude that during the interwar period Magyar awareness about the culture and history of the surrounding nations was rising. Some of this rising awareness was the result of the recognition on the part of some of the Hungarian intellectuals of the need for a cooperation among the peoples of East Central Europe. But as we have seen earlier, the broadening of this awareness of the Magyars, and a similar spread of the knowledge about Hungarian culture and history among the nations of Europe, was the very essence of the cultural and educational policies of Klebelsberg (1922-1931) and Hóman (1932-1938, 1939-1942), the two influential ministers of religion and public education during the interwar period. In addition to the total ideological reorientation of Hungarian education in the direction of traditional nationalism and irredentism, the most significant feature of this cultural policy was the successful establishment of the above-mentioned four chairs of East European history and the sixty-odd European centers of Hungarian learning. But the achievements of this cultural policy also included the foundation of four "minority institutes"

82. For the Hungarian populists and their views see Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. XIV; Charles Gati, *The Populist Current in Hungarian Politics, 1935-1944* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., 1965); and Gyula Borbándi, *Der ungarische Populismus* (München, 1976). For briefer treatment of this same question see Paul Ignotus, *Hungary* (New York-Washington, 1972), pp. 168-173; and Dominic G. Kosáry and Steven Bela Vardy, *History of the Hungarian Nation* (Astor Park, Florida, 1969) pp. 272-278.

for the study of the Hungarian minorities beyond the frontiers of Trianon Hungary, as well as the establishment of the even more significant Teleki Institute that was intended to deal with the whole spectrum of the historical, cultural, social and political developments in East Central Europe.

The foundation of the Hungarian minority institutes at all four universities of interwar Hungary occurred almost simultaneously in the middle of the 1930's. Their birth was a direct, if somewhat delayed result of the drastic territorial changes following World War I. As a result of these changes and of the consequent rise of the national minority question to the forefront of European politics, the 1920's saw the establishment of several minority institutes in a number of European countries. These institutes were intended to study the life, culture, problems and future of the European minorities—with the additional political goal of preserving them for the purposes of revisionism, or as external arms of the mother country.

Although Hungary was the country most adversely affected by the post-war treaties, due to financial and manpower limitations, it was among the last of the revisionist states to establish university institutes for the study of its minorities and Hungarians beyond its new frontiers. It was preceded in this venture by Germany, Austria, Poland and several other countries by as many as ten to fifteen years<sup>83</sup>.

The idea for the establishment of a minority institute in Hungary was first brought to the fore by Professor Ferenc Faluhelyi (1886-1944) of the Institute of International Law of the University of Pécs in 1928. He was seconded among others by the noted Hungarian specialist of the Hungarian diaspora in the Americas, Iván Nagy (b. 1898). Initially Professor Faluhelyi turned for financial support to the Carnegie Endowment. But when his plea proved to be unsuccessful, he switched his attention to the Hungarian Foreign Affairs Association, and through this association to the Hungarian Ministry of Religion and Public Education. His efforts were supported by the Foreign Affairs Association, by the University of Pécs, as well as by a number of other civic and scholarly organizations. Yet, not until the mid-1930's did his efforts meet with success. Urged on by the rapidly changing political developments of the day, in 1935 the Ministry of Religion and Public Education, under the direction of the historian Hóman, decided to support the foundation of minority institutes at all four universities<sup>84</sup>.

83. On the European minority institutes see Iván Nagy, *Az európai kisebbségi intézetek* [The Minority Institutes of Europe] (Pécs-Lugos, 1929). See also the penetrating study of this question by C. A. Macartney, *National States and National Minorities* (Oxford, 1934).

84. On the origins of the Hungarian minority institutes see Dezső Halácsy, "A Pécsi Egyetemi Kisebbségi Intézet rövid története és szervezete" [The Short History and Organi-

The Minority Institute of the University of Pécs came into being already in 1934, but first only as the "Minority Section" of the Institute of International Law. In the course of 1935 and early 1936, however, this Section grew into a full-fledged independent institute under the directorship of Professor Faluhelyi; and by 1944 the number of its professorial, research and adjunct staff rose to sixteen. Thus, the Minority Institute of the University of Pécs was not only the pioneer, but also the largest and most productive of the simultaneously established four sister institutes in Hungary<sup>85</sup>.

The other minority institutes were founded at the universities of Budapest, Debrecen and Szeged. While these institutes at the universities of Szeged and Debrecen were attached to the Faculties (Schools) of Law, the Minority Institute of the University of Budapest was basically independent from all faculties. Yet, through the person of its director, Professor Béla Kené' (1874-1946), the Budapest Institute became associated primarily with the Department of Statistics<sup>86</sup>.

The two sister institutes at the universities of Szeged and Debrecen were also active, but generally less productive. Moreover, the Szeged Institute did not survive beyond 1940. The reason for its demise was connected with the return of the university from Szeged to its original home in Kolozsvár (after Hungary regained Northern Transylvania from Roumania), which was followed by the almost immediate establishment of the much more comprehensive Transylvanian Scientific Institute—to be discussed below<sup>87</sup>.

Basically all of these minority institutes in Hungary had the twofold goal of studying and teaching the legal, political, cultural and economic problems of the Magyar minorities in the Succession States, and after the partial border revisions of 1938-1940, also these same problems of the non-Magyar minori-

zation of the Minority Institute of the University of Pécs], in Halácsy, *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 493-500; and Vardy, "A magyarság összefogásának és tudományos tanulmányozásának kísérletei 1920-tól 1945-ig" [Attempts at the Unification and Scientific Study of the Magyars from 1920 till 1945], in *A XV. Magyar Találkozó Krónikája* [Proceedings of the Fifteenth Hungarian Congress] (Cleveland, 1976), pp. 239-250.

85. In addition to the above studies, see also Szabó, *A M. Kir. Erzsébet Tudományegyetem*, 1:143-146; and Halácsy, *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 261-263.

86. Dezső Halácsy, "A budapesti Pázmány Péter Tudományegyetem Kisebbségjogi Intézetének rövid története és szervezete" [The Short History and Organization of the Minority Institute of the Pázmány Péter University of Budapest], in his *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 487-492; and *idem*, "A Debreceni Kisebbségjogi Intézet rövid története és szervezete" [The Short History and Organization of the Minority Institute of Debrecen], in *ibid.*, pp. 501-507.

87. Lajos Tamás, "Az Erdélyi Tudományos Intézet" [The Transylvanian Scientific Institute], in Bisztray-Szabó-Tamás, *Erdély Magyar Egyeteme*, pp. 409-416.

ties within Hungary. As such, they concentrated basically on the problems of the Carpathian Basin, and more specifically on the question of the historical coexistence of the area's nationalities in the course of the past millenium. In this way, although much of their work was motivated by Hungarian irredentism, these minority institutes advanced considerably the cause of East European studies in Hungary.

Much of the result of the research in the Hungarian minority institutes appeared in a published form, either independently, or in one of their periodical publications. The Minority Institute of the University of Pécs had initiated three separate periodicals, including the *Minority Newsletter* [*Kisebbségi Körlevél*] in 1937, the *Minority Informer* [*Kisebbségi Tudósító*] in 1939, and the *Minority Review* [*Kisebbségi Értesítő*] in 1944. Moreover, in 1936 it also started a monographic series, in which by 1944 twenty volumes have appeared. These monographs concentrated not only on the minorities in the Succession States, but also on the problems of the Hungarian diaspora in the Americas. In fact, the study of this diaspora, particularly by Iván Nagy, became one of the specialities of the Pécs Minority Institute<sup>88</sup>.

The Minority Institute of the University of Budapest was similarly active, although its bimonthly periodical, *Minority Protection* [*Kisebbségvédelem*], appeared only in 1938. But in 1937 it also initiated a monographic series, in which by 1944 six volumes have appeared, several of which were also published in German, English and Italian<sup>89</sup>.

Although the minority institutes at Szeged and Debrecen never started their own serial publications, some of the research in those institutions has also appeared in print. By 1940-1941, however, when the Teleki Institute came into being, much of the research on the problems of the Danubian Basin and on East Central Europe in general began to shift to that institution.

#### THE TELEKI INSTITUTE

While not founded personally by Count Paul Teleki (1879-1941), the Teleki Institute, named after him, was still basically the result of the scholarly and administrative activities of that noted geographer and statesman, whose name is inseparable from the history of interwar Hungary. In a way, however,

88. Most of these twenty volumes dealt either with the minority question in general, or with the problems of the Hungarian minorities in the succession states. For a complete list see one of the latter publications, or Halácsy's study in note 84. Of the two volumes on the Hungarian diaspora, both by Iván Nagy, one dealt with the Hungarians in the United States, and the other with their counterparts in Canada.

89. On the publications of the Budapest Institute see Halácsy, *A világ magyarságáért*, p. 491.



the roots of the Teleki Institute reach back even further: Notably to the first national congress of the Hungarian Historical Association in 1885, when the idea of a domestic Hungarian historical research institute was first put forward<sup>90</sup>. Although in the course of the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century, several such research institutes were founded in a number of European capital cities, the first domestic institute was not established until 1941, when it came into being as the most significant section of the Teleki Institute.

As established on December 10, 1941, the "Count Paul Teleki Scientific Institute" consisted of three member institutes: (1) The Political Science Institute, which originally came into being in 1926 around the university chair of Paul Teleki; (2) the Transylvanian Scientific Institute, which was founded in 1940, in conjunction with the re-establishment of the Hungarian University of Kolozsvár (Cluj); and (3) the Hungarian Historical Sciences Institute, which was the only newly established section of the Teleki Institute<sup>91</sup>.

After its establishment, the Teleki Institute almost immediately became the primary center of scholarly research in Hungary. This came about largely through the conscious policy on the part of the Ministry of Religion and Public Education, which hoped to pull together the fragmented Hungarian scholarship on the history, geography, ethnography and culture of the Danubian area. For this reason, the Teleki Institute was permitted to absorb several of the smaller centers of such research, and was encouraged to establish close contacts and collaboration with a number of other significant centers, including the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Hungarian Historical Association, the Hungarian National Museum, and the Hungarological Institute of the University of Budapest.

From among the three components of the Teleki Institute, the Political Science Institute was the oldest. Its origins go back to the mid-1920's, when Count Paul Teleki established the Hungarian Sociographical Institute (1924) and the Hungarian Political Science Institute (1926), attached respectively to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and to the Hungarian Statistical Association. In 1941 these two institutes were merged, and then also absorbed the National Institute of Regional and Folk Research, founded only a year earlier.

90. On the Hungarian Historical Congress of 1885 see Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, Ch. V; and the proceedings of the congress listed in note 12.

91. On the foundation of the Teleki Institute, see Bálint Hóman's presidential address to the Hungarian Historical Association in the *Századok* 75 (1941) 225-235; Dezső Halácsy, "A Gróf Teleki Pál Tudományos Intézet rövid története és szervezete" [The Short History and Organization of the Count Paul Teleki Scientific Institute], in his *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 479-485; and Béla T. Kardos, "Tudósaink védelmében" [In Defense of Our Scholars], unpublished paper delivered at the plenary session of the American-Hungarian Philosophical and Scientific Society, New Brunswick, New Jersey, September 29, 1973.

Strengthened by these mergers, the new Political Science Institute of the Teleki Institute was assigned the task of studying the settlement patterns and historical geography of the Danubian Basin, and to prepare maps on the region's ever changing ethnic and religious picture. It was also instructed to collect data about the economic, cultural and administrative developments of East Central Europe, as well as about the problems of assimilation, dissimilation and interaction among the nationalities of the area<sup>92</sup>.

The goal of the Transylvanian Scientific Institute, the second component of the Teleki Institute, was somewhat similar, except that it concentrated largely on Transylvania. Originally it was founded as a separate institute when in 1940 the University of Szeged returned to its original home in Kolozsvár, the capital of Transylvania; and in a way it was a successor to the Minority Institute of the University of Szeged. But in 1941 it became part of the Teleki Institute, and it was given the goal to conduct research on the geographical, ethnographical, cultural, archaeological, sociological, linguistic, literary, anthropological, etc. development of that eastern outpost of historic Hungary and on that province's relationship with the surrounding lands and nationalities.

In order to fulfill its mission, the Transylvanian Scientific Institute was immediately divided into eleven sections, each of which was to deal with one aspect of its outlined goals. The eleven sections included those on (1) geography, (2) ethnography, (3) cultural history, (4) archaeology, (5) sociology, (6) linguistics, (7) Hungarian-Roumanian relations, (8) Hungarian-Saxon relations, (9) literature, (10) anthropology, and (11) physiology. The hope of the Institute was to be able to carry out its goals through the study of the various historico-political regions of Transylvania in their entirety. Research toward this goal was immediately undertaken, and even outside researchers were enlisted. Even so, due to the short existence of the Institute (1940-1944), only a fraction of its goals could be completed, and even less could appear in published form<sup>93</sup>.

The third and only newly founded component of the Teleki Institute was the Hungarian Historical Sciences Institute, which proved to be both the most significant, as well as the most durable of the three sister institutes. The official goals of this institute were twofold: (1) To study the historical role of the Magyars in European Civilization, with particular attention to their role in East Central Europe, and (2) to examine the internal development of Hungary, including such formerly neglected areas as the historical devel-

92. Halácsy, *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 481-483.

93. *Ibid.*, pp. 484-485; and Bisztray-Szabó-Tamás, *Erdély Magyar Egyeteme*, pp. 409-416.

opment of the masses—be they Magyar or non-Magyar. In its aim to fulfill these goals, the Historical Institute undertook the collection of a large library and archives, with special attention to the various nationalities of historic Hungary and of the Danubian Basin. Simultaneously, the members of the Institute went to work to elaborate these problems in thoroughly documented monographs, many of which first appeared in the bulky *Yearbooks* of the Historical Institute<sup>94</sup>.

The topical orientation and the quality of the scholarship of the members of the Historical Institute are best reflected in these publications. From them we know that their primary areas of concentration were the nationality question and the historical coexistence of nationalities in East Central Europe, and that the level of their scholarship—particularly in light of the sensitivity of these topics—was unusually high. Thus, the first *Yearbook* for 1942 contained thirteen studies, of which at least ten concentrated largely on aspects of the nationality question in historic Hungary. The remaining three dealt with such other questions as the foundation of the Hungarian state, the peasant question in the late eighteenth century, and Kossuth's economic activities during the 1840's. The Historical Institute's heavy concentration on the nationality question and ethnic settlement patterns became even more evident in the subsequent issues of the *Yearbook* for 1943 and 1944. The two dozen monograph-size studies in these two volumes all dealt with the Roumanian question and with Hungarian-Roumanian historical and cultural inter-relations<sup>95</sup>.

If we examine these and other publications of the three member institutes of the Teleki Institute up to 1945, we generally find that—while some of the works of the members of these institutes were politically motivated—most of their scholarship is meticulous and reliable. Moreover, with the possible exception of the Political Science Institute, they were not willing to publish works with propagandistic motivations. Simultaneously, however, they made greater efforts than their predecessors to publish their findings also in one or another of the Western languages (i.e. German, English, French, Italian).

Because the research of these three member institutes of the Teleki Institute concentrated largely on the Danubian Basin, and because the scholarly quality of their publications was high, the work of the Teleki Institute can generally be regarded as very positive. It drew together and trained numerous gifted young scholars in a number of related fields of humanities and

94. Halácsy, *A világ magyarságáért*, pp. 483-484.

95. *A Magyar Történettudományi Intézet Évkönyve* [Yearbook of the Hungarian Historical Sciences Institute], vols. I-III (Budapest, 1942-1944).

social sciences, and by doing so, it advanced the cause of East European studies in Hungary.

Of the three sister institutes only the Hungarian Historical Sciences Institute survived the Second World War. By 1948, the mutilated Teleki Institute was renamed the East European Scientific Institute; and by 1949, it was transformed into the still functioning Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

#### THE SHORTCOMINGS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF HUNGARIAN EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

In looking at the achievements of Hungarian East European studies as represented by the activities of the great pioneers of the dualist period, by the works of the incumbents of interwar Hungary's four chairs of East European history, by some of the related works of the chairholding linguists and literary scholars, by the non-teaching older scholars and publicists, and especially by the work that was undertaken in the various research institutes during the 1930's and 1940's—particularly the Teleki Institute—, we find that these achievements were increasingly impressive. Yet, it is also evident from the works of most Hungarian East Europeanists, that were less interested in East European studies *per se*, than in Hungary's relations with its immediate neighbors. They were undoubtedly driven by the goal of finding a way to restore the unity of historic Hungary. For this reason most of them worked on the history and culture of the areas which prior to 1918 were part of the Hungarian state, and as such their history was really part of Hungary's millennial historical evolution (e.g. Transylvania, Slovakia, Carpatho-Ruthenia, and to a lesser degree even Croatia).

The situation was basically identical with the literary and linguistic oriented works of the incumbents of the chairs of East European languages and literatures. Next to a few summarizing works and language study aids (like grammar books and readers), most of their scholarly activities centered on Hungaro-Slavic and Hungaro-Roumanian linguistic, literary and cultural relations; and these largely within the borders of historic Hungary. Moreover, until the rise of such scholars as Melich and Kniezsa in Slavistics and Tamás in Roumanian studies, many of these works were of modest scholarly quality.

In addition to its relatively limited geographical interest (discounting Byzantinology, Turkology and various other branches of Oriental studies, all of which occupy a special place in Hungarian historical and linguistic studies)<sup>96</sup>, the second factor that characterized East European studies in Hunga-

96. On the special position of Oriental studies (including Turkology) in Hungary, see

ry was their relative late start. It is indeed strange that it took the Hungarians so long to realize that they should also study the history and culture of their immediate neighbors. This can only be attributed to an overdose of Hungarocentrism in pre-1918 Hungarian scholarship, and perhaps to a simultaneously over-accentuated Western orientation. While the first of these factors made them unaware of the needs and desires of their neighbors, the second obliged them to make the study of Classical and Western Civilizations almost exclusive. Although this phenomenon was not limited to Hungary, it was lamentable. Nor did it disappear completely even from interwar Hungarian historical scholarship. This is evident, among others, from the multivolumed *Geistesgeschichte* synthesis of world history published during the mid-1930's. Although entitled *Universal History* (1935-1936), it is basically a history of Western Civilization. Moreover, in these volumes of 600-700 pages each, the history of Eastern and Southeastern Europe (including the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires) is dismissed in scant thirty to thirty-five pages<sup>97</sup>.

Thus, while the neglect of East European studies was evident throughout the dualist period, and some of this neglect lingered on even during the interwar years, the latter period also saw the rise of a growing awareness of the need to place a new emphasis on this hitherto neglected area. As has been pointed out, this new awareness was the byproduct of the Treaty of Trianon (1920) and of the general belief among the Magyars that this event—which they regarded as a national catastrophe—may have been averted had they been more familiar with the history, culture and thinking of the nationalities most vital to their interests. Moreover, it was also motivated by the desire to probe into the possibility of reconstituting historic Hungary by demonstrating their claim to the alleged cultural and intellectual pre-eminence of the Magyars among the nations of the Carpathian Basin and its immediate vicinity. This goal again required a more thorough study of the civilization of that area.

As we have seen, such broadening of the awareness of the Magyars about the surrounding lands, nations and cultures was the basic motivating force behind interwar Hungary's cultural and educational policy, and the creation

the studies listed in note 2. On Hungarian Byzantinology, which again is connected with the study of Hungarian origins, see Gyula Moravcsik, "Die Problematik der byzantinisch-ungarischen Beziehungen", *Byzantinoslavica* 19 (1958) 206-211; *idem*, "A magyar bizantinológia helyzete és feladatai" [The Condition and Goals of Hungarian Byzantinology], *Antik Tanulmányok* [Antique Studies] 12 (1965): 1-11; and *idem*, "A magyar bizantinológia" [Hungarian Byzantinology], in his *Bevezetés a bizantinológiába* [Introduction to Byzantinology] (Budapest, 1966), pp. 155-164.

97. Bálint Hóman, Gyula Szekfű and Károly Kerényi, eds., *Egyetemes történet* [Universal History], 4 vols. (Budapest, 1935-1936). Although entitled "Universal History", this was basically the history of Western Civilization.

of the above-discussed university chairs and various foreign and domestic centers of Hungarian historical research were some of the most visible manifestations of this policy.

From the vantage point of Hungarian East European studies, the most significant of the above institutional developments was undoubtedly the foundation of the Hungarian Historical Sciences Institute of the Teleki Institute, which even today (as the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences) is the most significant center of historical research in Hungary. In addition to producing a flood of excellent basic studies on East Central Europe, the Historical Institute (and its sister institutes) became the training and research ground of some of the most gifted young scholars in Hungarian historiography. At one or another time their ranks included such already prominent or subsequently noted scholars as K. Benda, J. Berlász, V. Bíró, Cs. Csapodi, J. Deér, L. Elekes, L. Gáldi, M. Gyóni, Gy. Györffy, L. Hadrovics, G.G. Kemény, L. Kniezsa, D. Kosáry, M. Kring, Gy. László, L. Makkai, E. Niederhauser, L. Tamás, Z. I. Tóth and others. With the exception of some of the older ones already mentioned earlier, most of these scholars reached their period of real prominence after 1945. Today these scholars and their students populate most of the related university departments, as well as a number of research institutes of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (including the Institute of History), and make up the core of the best East Europeanists in Hungary<sup>98</sup>. In light of their subsequent achievements, one may even conclude that—notwithstanding the impressive developments of the previous decades—it was at the various sister institutes of the Teleki Institute where modern Hungarian East European studies came of age.

*Duquesne University*

98. For the scholarly achievements of some of the scholars who were associated with one of the three component institutes of the Teleki Institute, and who are now associated with one of the significant centers of historical research and East European studies in Hungary, see *A magyar történettudomány válogatott bibliográfiája 1945-1968* [The Selected Bibliography of Hungarian Historical Sciences 1945-1968], ed. by the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Budapest, 1971).