

SUMMARY

The present copy of the journal contains the papers read at the scientific session held on the 25th anniversary of the foundation of the Institute of History. In their report *Zsigmond Pál Pach* and *György Ránki* gave a survey of various phases in the development of the Institute of History since its inception twenty-five years ago. In the first phase of its activities the Institute, reorganized and newly founded in 1949, had the primary task to replace the earlier idealistic, conservative-nationalist picture of history by evolving a new perspective which views the world from the angle of the working population and integrates the national past of Hungary into the total picture of European, international development. It was in this period that the peasant revolt of 1514 was interpreted for the first time in a marxist light and numerous studies appeared

on national wars of independence, on the history of 1848—49. Economic history writing also achieved important new results. However, shortcomings have also to be mentioned, arising from the stumbling of newly acquired knowledge and, above all, from the atmosphere of personal cult which led to simplification and schematic treatment of historical processes.

The second phase of the Institute's activities began after the year 1956. This period was actually dominated by individual disclosure of sources and the writing of monographs. An outstanding role was played in this work by the renowned sociologist Erik Molnár who acted as director of the Institute until his death in 1966. It was at this time that a key issue of Hungarian historical development was taken up, notably the reasons why it came to the establishment of a second period of serfdom in Hungary and the other countries of East-Central Europe, while unfolding capitalist tendencies were gathering strength in the West.

The Institute continued to remain a highly appreciated workshop of history of the Middle Ages, but the attention of research fellows was attracted increasingly by modern times. Good results have been obtained by appraising the preliminaries of the Compromise; monographs have dealt with landed property structure of the 19th century, with the history of the peasantry and the agrarian proletariat. The modern age being increasingly favoured by research made it necessary to set up in the Institute a new Department concerned with the study of history after the year 1918. So far the new Department has published monographs on the political history of the period as well as collected documents. Works on economic history have significantly contributed to producing a clear historical picture of the Horthy Era. Universal historical research has brought noteworthy findings by studies on the economic-, ideological-, and diplomatic history of East Central Europe in the first place, furthermore by going into the history of international labour movements. The first comprehensive marxist synthesis of Hungarian history appeared in the mid sixties, with Erik Molnár acting as chief editor. Due to the success of this work and also to the years which have gone by since its publication the demand arose that, with full concentration of its powers, the Institute should tackle a work exceeding all previous undertakings, notably a history of Hungary in ten volumes. Organization was initiated in 1968, and the first volume, the history of the interwar period is to appear in the year 1975.

Parallel with the activities required by the History of Hungary in ten volumes new methods have also been introduced at the Institute, two of which are of particular importance: the use of mathematical methods and the utilization of marxist comparison. Cultural history, the history of social consciousness are becoming ever widening thematic trends pursued at the Institute.

Within the framework of the scientific session *Zsigmond Pál Pach* gave a lecture on "Medieval Trade of the Levante and Hungary", treating old, debated issues of Hungarian literature on history, whether or not the trade route of Levantine merchandise passed through medieval Hungary. The concept that Levantine merchandise did pass through Hungary was put forward in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The assumption rests on a double origin; first, French continental embargo, British maritime blockade turned Levantine trade to the continent, towards Hungary and Austria, which provided an actual parallel. The other source of the thesis derives from an endeavour to produce a historical confirmation of vested Saxon rights in Transylvania asserting that in the 14th and 15th centuries the trade route passed through Transylvania and it was the Saxons alone and almost exclusively who transacted this large-scale commerce. In the eighties of the past century the German medievalist Wilhelm Hayd's work brought a change into the appraisal of Levantine trade. Regardless of Hayd, Hungarian historians came to the conclusion that supplies of Indian products reached Hungary over the Adriatic. Hayd's arguments concerning the 11th—13th centuries were extended to the 14th and 15th centuries, to Transylvania and the Saxons. The study mentions the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 among the late actual-political developments of the first statement of this opinion; in fact, the opening of the Suez Canal buried all earlier views maintaining that newly initiated trade would forward merchandise over continental routes. At the same time the old thesis was retained by Rumanian historiography with the alteration that the middle-men were not the Saxons of Transylvania but the Rumanian Principalities.

László Makkai read his study on the international repercussions of the anti-Habsburg feudal revolt headed by Bocskai in the early 17th century. Until the Thirty Years' War Western powers refrained from interference in the affairs of the area. However, Bocskai's revolt played an important role in drawing attention to these political movements as potential allies against the Habsburgs. In the introduction the author gave a survey of literature on the foreign policy of the Bocskai revolt, remarking that this aspect had been given scant attention in literature to date. Thus the first steps of the Bocskai revolt in foreign politics have to be put at a much earlier date than assumed hitherto. The author thereafter compared the statement with the "Querelae"

stemming from the same period (end of 1604), a proclamation listing all complaints against the emperor Rudolf who is accused of genocide. The "Querelae" was addressed to the German protestant reigning princes. To begin with it was laid down that they had anyway possessed the right to rise in arms against the emperor for his lawless conduct, but they had refrained from doing so lest the front against the Turks might be weakened. Then the proclamation spoke in general about freedom of worship, applicable to both Roman Catholics and Protestants. As for international relationships, the threat of Habsburg hegemony is rather exaggerated in the "Querelae". Before German princes the accusation of friendly attitude to the Turks had to be repudiated and protests against absolutism had to be couched in careful terms, whereas in the reply to the Polish delegation it seemed more necessary to emphasize neighbourly relations with the Turks and to express strong censure of attempts at absolutism. In conclusion, the author declares that the Bocskai revolt had an effect on the Polish Estates of the Realm so that the paragraphs of the Polish Feudal Confederation of August, 1606, agreed with those of the peace negotiations of Bocskai and the Habsburgs carried on in Vienna.

Ágnes Várkonyi read her study entitled "The Idea of Driving out the Turks in Hungarian Political Thinking in the Mid 17th Century". The two plans devised in the early 1660s for driving out the Turks looked back on Hungarian and European traditions of a century and a half. The multitude of pamphlets and projects dealing with the fight against the Turks in Europe may be traced to two works as regards their notional content. One was the Franciscan Order's memorandum from the early 16th century submitted originally to Pope Leo X, which has appeared several times under the title "Anschlag wider die Türken" and similar other titles. The other was Martin Luther's sermon to the forces in 1542 bearing the title "Eine Heerpredigt wider den Türken".

The plans laid down in the two writings came to nought owing to the Turkish victories, but details of the two pamphlets referring to such issues as general and proportionate sharing in taxation by society, the requirements of army organization, the interests and obligations of the state, the nature of the organization of Turkish power aroused increasing interest. The work of Busbeguius, Emperor Rudolf's diplomat of Flemish extraction, "Exclamatio: sive de re militari contra Turcam instituenda consilium", was also based on the two pamphlets but it had a very different message to convey. Its fundamental idea was that the organization of defence against the Turks by setting up a permanent national army of popular forces was the duty and also in the interest of the state.

This work is known to have influenced Zrinyi when he wrote his "Török áfium ellen való orvosság" (Remedy against the Turkish Evil); however, it is much less widely known that contemporary Hungarian plans also exerted an effect on the work of Busbeguius, and the Hungarian political and ideological antecedents of an international concentration of forces against the Turks go back to the close of the 16th century, the beginning of the Fifteen Years' War. These plans rested on two foundations: 1. Only Hungarian society strengthened by interior order and reforms might count on international aid. 2. The organizer had to be a state power, that is the Principality of Transylvania or the Habsburg state. In one focus of the work of organization endeavouring to create an international alliance stood the Rhein League formed with the support and participation of France after the Peace of Westphalia; the other focus of political organization was the movement of Hungarian high dignitaries, Wesselényi, Nádasdy, and Miklós Zrinyi. Hungarian politicians established direct contact with John Philip, Archbishop of Mainz, chairman of the Rhein League, and with the administration of Louis XIV and organized the East Europe wing of the alliance with Transylvania and the Rumanian Principalities. Lately discovered documents (e. g. several letters of Zrinyi from the years 1663—64) refute the earlier assertions of literature on the subject alleging that instead of an international coalition Zrinyi favoured reliance on purely Hungarian forces.

Owing to the weight of its power and to its geographical situation, the Habsburg state had to be the organizing centre of the war against the Turks, but its interests thrust it into a contradictory position. Interests in the West necessarily called for safety in the East, which implied support of peace with the Turks. On the other hand, it could not be disregarded that open contradiction of European public opinion desirous of driving out the Turks might badly impair the prestige of the dynasty. This explains the peculiar duality noticeable in the 1660s; the failure of the coalition in the years 1663—64 throws a new light on the postponement of full-scale action against the Turks for a quarter of a century. The data quoted by the author and research into the matter is by no means closed.

The paper read at the session by *Gusztáv Heckenast* was entitled "Hungarian Industry in the 18th Century and the Economic Policy of Vienna". In the introduction it is pointed out that few Hungarian historians of the 19th and 20th centuries denied the colonial or semicolonial

dependence of Hungary on Vienna in the 18th century. However, it is equally true that today there is hardly anybody to profess this view. It is emphasized that for various reasons there was wide divergence in 18th century industrial development between the Austrian-Czech provinces on the one hand and Hungary on the other. The question is when this difference became apparent. Earlier historical works put the beginning of the lag of Hungarian industry in the age of Maria Theresa. This statement is partly modified in the part dealing with the subject in volume IV of the History of Hungary in ten volumes. The latter rejects the view of Austrian historians of economy, still claimed to be valid, namely, that industrial development under Charles IV showed regression compared to conditions in the reign of Leopold I, and continuity was unbroken in this respect until the advance of industry in the rule of Maria Theresa. Moreover, it is proved that backwardness of Hungarian industry began much earlier, the lag was evident in 1670 and its roots go back to the centuries of the Middle Ages. The problem has to be examined in its further implications touching to whole of the Empire; first, Hungarian industrial development should be compared not only with Austrian-Czech development; secondly, the question whether or not Austrian customs policy was disadvantageous for Hungary has also to be studied in the context of total-empire-correlations.

Further research should start from the fact that the Austrian-Czech customs union established in the year 1775 excluded two groups of the countries belonging to the empire, notably the countries of the Hungarian crown, and the Tyrol with Vorarlberg. If there was conscious discrimination it affected every undeveloped province of the empire; actually this was conscious economic policy based on the fundamental maxim that existing, flourishing branches should be supported everywhere. It was with regard to such considerations that mining and metallurgy were developed at a quicker rate in Hungary. However, the advancement of these industries was restrained by lack of capital and of skilled labour in the first place. Hence it is not enough to study economic policy, various factors limiting its efficacy and execution have also to be looked into. The court thought in terms of the empire, the imagination of the Peers of the Realm did not stretch beyond the boundaries of their province.

Emil Niederhauser's study deals with the role of literature and science in the national movements of East Europe. The first half of the 19th century witnessed the growth of peoples into nations; it was the period of preparations for bourgeois transformation and of setting up the framework required for the process. Except for the Russians, these peoples were under foreign rule in some form, therefore in the consciousness of contemporaries this age was one of creating national unity and achieving independence, in order to cope, in addition, with such tasks as abolishing serfdom, fighting for and acquiring liberal rights to freedom, in the endeavour of promoting national progress. So the motif of nationhood became predominant in poetry as well as in prose. This feature is characteristic of the first and most important national science, history-writing, which could hardly be separated from fiction at the time.

From the very outset this science was highly exacting in its own way, and if facts and beliefs, realistic views and unreal dreams are presented side by side it was not for lack of talent in historians, but as a result of fundamental conformity with the existing national standard.

Historians strove, in the first place, to show the origin of their nation as the possibly most ancient and glorious; secondly, to justify or prove in some form that the nation has a right to possess the country or area it was holding or was about to occupy. This duty was carried out by the Serbian Rajitz, the Bulgarian Paisky, the Transylvanian Rumanian trio Micu-Klein, Sincai and Major, on a higher plane in the scientific armour of the era by the Czech Palocký, the Slovak Šafarik, the Pole Lelewel. It follows from this role of history as a science that it stood first and foremost among the branches of science concerned with the nation, the parent, as it were, of other national sciences, such as history of literature, and ethnography, appearing within its framework. Only philology, the science of languages, was independent from the beginning with its language reforming activities. Literature and science had the intention to speak to the whole of the nation, although according to contemporary concepts it did not imply the whole ethnic group, only the nobility and bourgeois classes. In this epoch the poet and the historian often played a political role.

In the second part of the study Emil Niederhauser looks into the role of literature and science in the time when bourgeois transformation had been accomplished and the issue of national independence had been solved in some form or had been wiped off the agenda. Literature still had its mission, but not in shaping the destiny of the nation but in treating social problems. The trends of critical realism and naturalism favoured criticism of contemporary conditions. It was in this period that national sciences became independent. Both literature and science found their way to the extensive strata because they are taught at schools, yet neither grew into a direct political power. With the advance of social development the influence of lite-

ature and science decreased; other forces and factors superseded them (political trends, ideas, parties) which may, by the way, be regarded as a touchstone of social maturity.

The socialist labour movement in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy has been studied by *Ferenc Mucsi*. The introduction gives an analysis of certain stages in research concerned with the history of the labour movement. Such work has been carried on at the Institute of Historical Science from its very inception, but notwithstanding significant results, long and meticulous work is still needed to throw light on the origin and stratification of working classes. The history of the foundation of the Hungarian Social Democrat Party and of the activity of its first few years has been written in full detail. Earlier historical literature on the subject blamed the Social Democrat Party for not having headed the movement fighting for national independence. This conception was wrong for two reasons: the Party could have taken up the issue of national self-government only if it proposed to do the same for the national minorities, and such a step was made questionable by the frequently contrary attitudes of involved national minorities. Moreover, this concept a priori presumed the semi-colonial, at all events closely dependent, status of Hungary which has become an antiquated conception by now.

However, the Party itself thought the possible break-up of the Monarchy undesirable; actually it was in favour of maintaining the economic community but for the abolishment of every form of national discrimination. Democratization of the empire was mentioned as an indispensable precondition, the first step towards realization being universal suffrage.

The second part of the study goes into another debated issue, notably the relationship between the Party and the peasantry. In this connection it is pointed out that the agrarian resolution passed by the congress of 1894 was denoted as reformist and sectarian because it started from the premise that the agrarian problem could be solved only in a socialist society. At the time the attitude of the social democrats was in full agreement with the generally accepted concept of the international labour movement which the heads of the Party declined to reject; therefore they refrained from subscribing to the programme of agrarian proletarian movements demanding re-allotment of land. After the turn of the century the Party modified its attitude to the agrarian question, but still failed to recognize the necessity of abolishing the system of big estates. There was, in fact, no "conscious betrayal"; these were objective processes which at the time still led to necessarily separate struggles of the two countries.

Péter Hanák also treats a question of 19th century social history in "achievement of Bourgeois Status and Assimilation". The 19th century was a golden age in the growth of the population of Hungary. According to the national census of 1787, forty per cent of the 8 million inhabitants were Hungarian; in 1910 as many as 10 million, amounting to 80 per cent of the total population, spoke Hungarian as their mother tongue. This shift in the ratio of Hungarians was the result of assimilation which the author distinguished, from political and historical aspects, from the spontaneous processes of medieval ethnogenesis and ethnomutation, practically terminated in the 18th century. The assimilated elements were mostly Germans, Jews, and Slovaks.

The following part of the study contains an analysis of the close correlations to be traced between commodity production and urbanization on the one hand, and gradual Magyarization on the other. With reference to available evidence it is stated that assimilation in that modern age was the direct consequence of the fundamental economic processes of bourgeois civilization, the development of a national, country-wide market, the functioning of a comprehensive commercial, communication-, and credit system, of industrialization and urbanization. It is justified to conceive of en masse assimilation as a process of several generations associated with the development of bourgeois mentality, which may be encouraged, even slightly accelerated by the state and by the leading classes, but is prone to be disturbed by importunate intervention. As seen by the author on the proof of records, it was, indeed, *natural* assimilation which came about in 19th century Hungary, and not any forcible denationalization.

The next chapter is on the social motivation of assimilation. Capitalist economy was only the basis and framework of assimilation which could not have been swift and successful unless it brought with it a social rise. For people with a bourgeois or petty bourgeois mentality magyarization implied gentleness, while the notion "ur" (gentleman) was identical with Hungarian. Hence the second thesis of the study: if assimilation in general went together with the development of bourgeois mentality, in Hungary with the adoption of peculiar Hungarian bourgeois civilization, the fundamental character of Hungarian assimilation may be said to have been determined by the liberal gentry, and not by the weak, predominantly conservative urban (German) bourgeoisie with feudal leanings.

The study then looks into the question where and in what branches these millions of assimilated Hungarians found their livelihood. Available documents permit no more than to indicate the principal trends. From the close correlations with the basic processes of gradually established

bourgeois civilization it logically follows that in the great majority assimilated elements found places in the capitalist sector of economy, in industry, trade, and new branches of communication. It is common knowledge that in the genesis of the Hungarian industrial working classes a significant role was played by workers coming from other countries and from the national minorities. Of the workmen in the capital in 1857 23 per cent, in 1875 25 per cent hailed from abroad, chiefly from Austria and Bohemia. About the time of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (1867) approximately forty per cent of the newborn may have been Hungarian, 1/3 was German, and six-seven per cent was Slovak. Before World War I already 2/3 of the total number of industrial workers in the country were Hungarian; in Budapest 80 per cent. The great majority of Magyarized bourgeois strata found jobs in three fields: in industry, in trade and banking, in intellectual professions. Most of them were of German and Jewish origin. A certain type of the wealthy bourgeoisie bought landed property and often also the rank of nobility; increasing numbers of capitalist tenants may also be ranged into this category. The most characteristic group was, however, that of *businessmen* out for profit who founded, organized and managed commercial firms.

As the third thesis of the study it is stated that it was broadening and accomplished assimilation which accelerated and raised to the East-Central-European standard bourgeois civilization, first of all its economic foundations, secondly — but not incidentally — its cultural achievements.

Assimilation fulfilled its bourgeois — i. e. antifeudal — function imperfectly, although such a spirit should have flown from its very essence. Bourgeois civilization did not become the carrier of bourgeois ethics nor did it undermine the traditional leading Hungarian strata of feudal mentality. To many of the rich bourgeoisie it was the crowning achievement of a successful business career or office of high standing to rise to the rank of a noble and acquire landed estates, that is, to become one of the Hungarian middle-class gentry. A change in this respect came only in the opening years of our century with the emergence of a democratic bourgeois middle-class and intelligentsia.

The fourth thesis may be summed up by the statement that the development of bourgeois mentality in accordance with international standards necessarily required assimilation which in its turn contributed to broadening and accelerating the process. The question whether or not assimilated elements accomplished this function may be answered in the affirmative, but in social and political respects in particular negative features are also implicit. However, judgment is inseparable from a synoptic review of the whole of Hungarian social development. In conclusion it is pointed out that in composition, material and intellectual level and in the true aspect of things the Hungarians underwent more marked changes in the 19th century than in several preceding centuries. What was new in quality came mainly with *altered formation*, the revolution of 1848, and assimilation was only a part of it.

Miklós Lackó's study was submitted under the title "Popular Movement during the Intellectual Crisis of the 1930s." From political-ideological viewpoints the popular movement may be regarded as the most important Hungarian variety of a Third Force; in the 1930s almost every new intellectual-political trend showed a tendency to "middle-of-the-road" policy. As to social basis, adherents came from the intelligentsia disappointed with the counterrevolutionary right and extreme right, and from those, partly of peasant stock, who had abandoned the socialist left wing. Before the movement got under way the intelligentsia had to decide in which stratum or group, standing up for a certain class, they intended to play a leading role. This problem actually did not even arise until the years following the turn of the century, because the nobility-gentry strata assimilated the widening, "alien", non-Hungarian ethnic groups of the modern intelligentsia. As capitalism gained ever more extensive ground, the degenerating gentry of decadent education gradually lost its attraction, while the weak, assimilated bourgeoisie was unable to take over the role of the gentry either socially or as a conscious representative of the classe. The attempt of the socialists at an independent labour movement was also crushed and the nationalist idea elicited increasing response. Hampered but nevertheless advancing social mobility brought to the surface a fairly numerous new intelligentsia, partly of peasant origin, mostly provincials of slender means. The new intelligentsia, which started a public movement, held aloof both from the gentry class and the bourgeois intelligentsia, but also from labour movements. On the other hand, it was ready to represent the peasantry which was not felt to be in conflict with labour, since the father, if not a workman, was a peasant in many instances. These circumstances together led to the social concept of the public movement being permeated by a national-nationalist ideology. From traditional, conservative nationalism it differed mainly by its socialist content, from the extreme right wing by the people-concept being dominated by rational elements. Its critical attitude to culture is shown to have been an important feature of the trend: as a system bent on disrupting communal life, alienating and atomizing people, capitalist society and urbanization were rejected. Also in relation to politics the movement was a

middle-of-the-roader Third Force. It was neither for or against politics, being in the best case a "metapolitical" intellectual trend which endeavoured to stand in politics for the "eternal" spirit isolated from every-day practice; in intellectual life, in culture and literature for propinquity to real life and the people. Among the problems of the movement its literary-artistic aesthetic attitude is denoted as a exceedingly important point, and the connection between the folk trend and contemporary social-intellectual sciences is another essential issue.

In historiography a concept of history was formulated which merged the past social struggles of a people defined predominantly in the ethnic sense with anti-Habsburg wars of independence and the notion of the common destiny of East Europe, — as well as with the still debated idea of "popular nationalism". However, the relationship between the popular movement and sociology is illustrated the most forcibly by social science. The branch cultivated by folk writers the most assiduously was study and sociography of rural life.

The title of *György Ránki's* study is "The Emergence and Development of the Working Class in East Europe until Liberation". In the introduction the concept of the working strata is defined, followed by the statement that they may be regarded by no means as a part of a structure or as a category, but as the expression of a historical condition; as a class they may be studied only under the conditions of production and in the social framework in which that class has been taking shape and has been developing.

In dealing with the origin of the working classes the author explains that their emergence was not exclusively the outcome of the industrial revolution, although it was the latter which created the modern working classes. In West Europe there were considerable strata of hired labour prior to the industrial revolution. Two divergent lines of development are shown in the appearance of the working classes of East Europe. In Russia, in Polish areas and in Hungary an industrial revolution began at the close of the past century which resulted in considerable economic transformation without, however, actually modernizing economic life and society. On the Balkans, on the other hand, industrial revolution failed to materialize even in this form; only initial steps came about in the opening years of the century. In the above-mentioned areas there was considerable increase in the number of workers in the years between 1880 and 1910. Approximately half of them worked in factories and the working classes were far from homogeneous. An urban layer of highly skilled workers developed in which a trade was passed down from generation to generation as a heritage, but, at the same time, the type of workmen who did not break away completely from the village and agriculture continued to exist for quite a long time to come as a result of their rural origin and employment as unskilled labour.

This issue can not be separated from the fact that the revolution of communications preceded the industrial revolution. For the construction of railways and for other communal works labourers were employed who kept up their double status for quite a long time. It was a peculiar feature of agricultural-peasant countries of East Central Europe that to become an industrial worker implied a social and pecuniary set-back for independent tradesmen and members of guilds, etc., while for the agrarian proletariat, for rural have-nots, it brought an advance. Tendencies of development among the working classes were significantly modified in the interwar period. United Poland and Hungary, no longer a multinational state, had to fight structural difficulties; the numerical increase of the working classes was slowed down, whereas on the formerly backward Balkans advance grew dynamic. Simultaneously, in Hungary and Poland there remained a gradually growing, stable working class, the layer of hereditary proletariat continued to increase.

In this period the working classes of the Balkan countries were composed partly of labourers leading a double life, or if they settled down in towns, being workmen of the first generation, they retained many of their peasant customs. The reason why the working classes could nevertheless become the leading political force of society after World War II is explained partly by the Communist Party having multiplied the power of the young working class, partly by the axiom — laid down by Marx — that if an order is to be the par excellence order of liberation, there must be another, reverse order which is obviously bent on reducing the people to slavery.

Ervin Pamlényi read his study on the subject and methods of historiography.

The subject of historiography is still an important, much debated issue of both marxist and bourgeois history-writing. Uncertainty concerning the interpretation of the fundamental concept of historiography is evidenced, among others, by the term historiography itself, the name of the science, being used not unequivocally or consistently. Sometimes it is understood to mean *history-writing*, but in ever widening circles the interpretation has been striking root that historiography means the *history of history-writing*.

In a brief survey an outline is given of the conception of bourgeois history-writing concerning the subject of historiography.

The examination of major syntheses and the views put forward by the conservative British historiographer H. Butterfield led to the conclusion that bourgeois historiography strives to disregard in the definition of the subject the history of the theoretical elements of history-writing, and this endeavour brings about a slow shift in the inner proportions of the subject of historiography from the history of theory to that of practical happenings. This tendency corresponds to the trend of bourgeois history-writing which makes efforts to avoid the sphere of basic problems, preferring extensive elaboration of the area under investigation.

The development of marxist historiography shows a different course: in the past two decades its range of subjects has grown wider, embracing ever more extensive fields. At the outset the history of a certain way of social-political thinking was treated; later it was conceived of as the history of the science of history; there have been attempts to examine every cultural achievement with a historical subject in connection with a certain question.

In the author's view the most logical and clearest definition of the subject of historiography has come from L. V. Tcherepnin in whose opinion the subject of historiography is the process of accumulating knowledge about the science of history; development of the methodology and technique applied in analysing historical sources; changes in problems presented by historical research; finally, the development and change in theories which served as starting-points of inquiry into historical processes.

In connection with this definition it was emphasized that besides purely scientific works, conceptions of history voiced by politicians and publicist outside the circle of scholars are also of eminent importance in the development of history-writing.

Bourgeois history-writing pursues perseverant research to find the light in which the incentives and intrinsic message of a historical work will stand revealed; however, the clue to such an investigation is in the possession of marxist historiography. Moreover, it is not ready-made: it has to be evolved again and again for the solution of every problem.

Péter Hanák's study deals with the antecedents of the Easter article of Deák. The paper — a chapter of a major work analysing the preliminary events which led to the Compromise — starts from the statement that after and owing to serial failure, the semi-constitutional Schmerling régime found itself in a crisis at the end of the year 1864. A sign of this was the autumn session of the Reichstag which in its Address to the Throne, but still more in the debate on the Address, criticized the activities of the government from the benches of the opposition and urged an agreement with the Hungarians. Pest responded cordially to the initiative of the Liberals of Vienna: the "Opinion" worded by József Eötvös expressed readiness to negotiate. It was in this thawing, unbedding atmosphere that Ferenc Deák finished and Published his famous legal historical-political work: *Contributions to Hungarian Constitutional Law* (Beiträge zum ung. Staatsrecht). In the study the creation and message of the work are analysed in full detail; while the Austrian lawyer W. Luskauld's theory of the concrete union of Austria and Hungary is rejected, the interpretation of connection by personal union leaves the door open for negotiations with the possibility of compromise. The *Contributions* broke the deadlock of passive waiting and brought an almost imperceptible moving away from the platform of 1861 with its intransigent persistence in defending the constitution of 1848.

The Pest Liberals' willingness to negotiate coincided with a similar intention from the part of the sovereign. The study gives a detailed account of the conversations of Baron A. Augus with Deák. In the talks from December, 1864, to April, 1865, Deák expounded his confidential opinion on the conditions of a compromise. To begin with, the restoration of the country's territorial and political integrity was declared to be indispensable, and so was the corresponding convocation of the Hungarian Parliament. Deák also insisted on the principle of legal continuity, but was not averse to some modification of the constitution of 1848, inasmuch as he recognized the existence of *common affairs* and acknowledged the necessity of joint management — in agreement with Hungarian constitutional practice. In the course of these conversations he often emphasized that he adhered to the *Pragmatica Sanctio* of the year 1723 and therefore admitted that *safety of the empire's firm existence came first and must not be subordinated to any other consideration*. This concept actually became the political basis of the Compromise.

High significance is attributed in the study to the talks with Augus. These were held not on individual initiative but upon encouragement from the highest places, subsequently with the approval of Francis Joseph. However, the mission of Augus can not be regarded either as an isolated action from the part of the sovereign. Not only Hungary wanted to see the Schmerling administration swept out of office, Austria also wished for a change, the expediency of forced centralism after the German pattern being viewed with distrust. Thus, in February, 1865, a change of government was prepared while secret conversations were held with the selected prime minister designate, Richard Belcredi, Stadholder of Bohemia (Statthalter von Böhmen). Moreover, the Augus mission and the appointment of Belcredi, negotiated simultaneously, were not some sort

of arbitrary "parallel action" either, but fitted closely into the project devised to overcome the by the virtually permanent crisis of the empire.

In this respect an important role was played by foreign politics, by deterioration of the several decades' "dualist" cooperation with Prussia and fear of Bismarck's plans of annexation. Francis Joseph, the "minor German", might have turned against union under Prussian leadership to middle-size German states and the Austrians, he might have appealed to German national feelings. However, from the guardian of the principle of "supranational" dynastic sovereignty, Francis Joseph, every national idea was remote, also exploitation of nationalism for scheming or intrigue. Hence he sought to find the way out of the crisis not by competition with the ideas and weapons of "illegitimate" nationalism, but by restoring the "supranational" balance of the dynastic "patrimony", by combining the "historical dualism" of the Monarchy with a modernized form of autonomy. That is how his choice fell on Deák and Belcredi.

Rassured by encouragement from the highest quarters, Deák took active steps in the spring of 1865 in the interest of a compromise. Mostly by debates with the Centralist press and politicians of Vienna he prepared in a masterful manner the turn of events in Hungary which was to lead to an agreement. The first public sign of this activity was his so-called *easter article* which appeared on April 16, 1865, and laid down the principles, often quoting the very wording, of his talks with Baron Augus on February 25 and April 7. Therefore the easter article was not the initiation, but a statement of the turn of events to the public, proclaiming mutual willingness to come to a compromise and formulating the common basic principles it was to rest on.

In his study *György Spira* deals with the left wing of the Hungarian revolution of 1848.

Of preliminary works which are to form parts of the History of Hungary in ten volumes the Journal contains a paper by *László Benzédi* on the subject of late 17th century plots by Hungarian aristocrats against the Habsburgs.

The report of *Zsuzsa L. Nagy* on her research concerned with the interwar relationship between *Oszkár Jászi*, in exile, and the Hungarian bourgeois radicals has been published in the column *Workshop*.