

unexplained. The author asserts that "after September 13, 1848, the Imperial government purposely incited the Viennese people to rebellion in order to create a pretext for liquidating the Revolution" (p. 19). Even authors sympathetic to the Revolution consider this charge farfetched. The reader is told that "on October 6, 1848, . . . the Viennese people and the Imperial grenadiers began to fraternize everywhere" (pp. 18 and 45). There is no basis for such a sweeping claim.

Chapter 2 and most of chapter 3, dealing with the Revolution itself, explore many intricate and interesting details, but these are known to Hungarian readers. The conclusion of chapter 3, concerned with Russia's intervention, might have been an important contribution, but even preintervention tsarist diplomatic maneuvers elicit only cursory comments. Andics's own superb monograph (*Das Bündnis Habsburg-Romanov*, Budapest, 1963) is far superior. Errors abound. Austria provisioned Russia's army, but did not finance the Russian campaign in Hungary; and the first Russians entered Hungary on May 13 under General Paniutin and on May 14 under General Sass, not on May 27 as the author claims (p. 104).

Chapter 4 is probably the most interesting part of the book, centering on opposition to intervention among certain segments of Russian society, domestic and exile, and on desertions from Russia's armed forces. Unfortunately there is insufficient evidence to indicate that these incidents were more than minor annoyances. The final chapter, an orthodox Marxist appraisal of the extant literature on the Revolution, serves in lieu of a formal bibliography.

In sum, the narrative is either too general or too specific, certain important issues are omitted, there are several inaccuracies and misleading generalizations, and references to non-Marxist sources are rare. Most chapters are valuable not so much for what they reveal as for what they conceal. These deficiencies should encourage exploration of Soviet archives for further information.

It seems that nonscholarly considerations played a part in this publication. The editor suggests that the Revolution is not only an interesting and timely historical topic but a live political issue as well; hence the interest of Soviet historiographers in the Magyar nation's struggle for freedom is important, for it must lead to a closer mutual understanding between the two peoples (p. 13). This aim might be better served if Averbukh's works on Hungary were to appear translated into Magyar from the original, unabridged versions.

THOMAS SPIRA

University of Prince Edward Island

ADY ENDRE. 2 vols. By *István Király*. Budapest: Magvető Kiadó, 1970. Vol. 1: 779 pp. Vol. 2: 788 pp. 79 Ft.

Ady criticism in the half-century since the poet's death falls into three categories: (1) the biographical and critical works of personal friends and acquaintances (Révész, Schöpflin, Bölöni, Hatvany, and others) who had a literary bent and a socialist outlook; they were successful in confirming Ady's pre-eminence as Hungary's foremost poet since Petőfi; (2) charges by the Academy that Ady had abandoned Hungarian traditions in imitation of foreign models, and a defense by some of his survivors and a new left-wing generation, including the proletarian poet Attila József, who saw the attack as part of an attempt to blunt Ady's stimulus to Hungarian political and social reform; and (3) Marxist interpretations, chiefly by György Lukács and József Révai. In the United States, Ady criticism and com-

mentary have been limited, although criticism exists on the considerable work done by Ady's English translators. This narrow outlook should come to an end with the rise of a new generation of interested scholars confident of their critical abilities. Much of the present negativism about Ady-in-English is proliferated by a passing generation. Though Great Britain has produced outstanding scholars in the field of Hungarian political history, it has done less well in the literary field.

Király's book is the latest and certainly most thorough contribution so far to the Marxist interpretation of Ady. It is the author's stated objective to examine the poet's ideas from 1905 to 1919 using Lukács and Révai as guides. To achieve such an objective is not unlike attempting a synthesis of Freud and Marx, Catholicism and communism, the existent and nonexistent God. It is, however, to the author's credit that he appears to have chosen two guides as a way of circumspectly paying lip service to one of the reigning spirits of Hungary prior to 1956 (and also one of the tormentors of Lukács).

In the 1,567 pages of his two-volume work Király cites his two Marxist sources some two dozen times each, and frequently only in a fleeting manner. However, in acknowledgments (buried on p. 719 of vol. 1) Király says, "I must give special attention to the name of György Lukács, who assisted in the birth of this book not only with his writings but also . . . by way of private conversations he helped in the clarification of certain problems." Lukács's contributions may well be greater than would be indicated by a casual inspection of the "name index."

Révai's major contribution to the book seems to be the "discovery" that Ady was not fully enamored of capitalist institutions, although he belonged to a group of writers called the "Westerners." However, I have not succeeded in finding a reference to Révai's most telling evaluation—namely, that along with Bartók, József, and Derkovits, Ady reflects "a decadent desperation and alienation from the people because of an isolation from the revolutionary movement of his time" (1952). This does not beat about the bush too much in its admission that Ady fails to fit the Communist mold, but Király does not seem interested in letting his readers in on this (according to the jacket, teachers and students form the main audience target).

Once past the Pelion and Ossa of the guides' ideas, the reader may well find much to gain from Király's work. This is especially true of the analyses of individual poems. Much is still to be done on Ady in this respect, and Király's contributions are most welcome. An outstanding piece of commentary, for example, is the one on "A pócsi Mária" ("Mary of Pócs") (pp. 330–34, vol. 2). One of the least known of Ady's great poems, it deals with the subject of faith. The poet is Calvinist, the characters Rumanian peasants, the theme Catholic, the critic Marxist—and poem and commentary fit together like joints and marrow! "Séta a bölcsőhelyem körül" ("A Walk Around My Birthplace") (pp. 517–29, vol. 2) is another striking example of Király's ability to shed new light on Ady's individual poems. Commentary on "A Rothschildék palotája" ("The Palace of the Rothschilds") is in the Marxist mold.

Given Király's significant positive achievement under what must have been trying working conditions, it is almost unfair to fault him for failing to accomplish what no one else has succeeded in doing—namely, invest Ady with an international significance. The poet emerges from under Király's pen as a singer and thinker of a purely Hungarian tragedy, and his world perspective derives only from what current relevance he may have to the Marxist movement. There is not even a

pretense at investing the poet with wider importance. The biographical materials take Ady from alienation to Hungarian consciousness via various stations including anticapitalism and socialism.

It is almost impossible to expect more from Hungarian critics at the present. The reviewer wonders, however, whether it is not time, in the West at least, to investigate Ady's total human course. If the index to Reményi's history of modern Hungarian literature (1964) is an indication of what Western scholarship has achieved in this field, we are in a strangely bad fix. Basic materials on Ady are available and accessible to an extent unparalleled in the case of many major East European writers. If these materials are not used to their full potential, Marxist interpretation will leave us in the dust.

ANTON N. NYERGES
Richmond, Kentucky

TRANSYLVANIA IN THE HISTORY OF ROMANIA: AN HISTORICAL OUTLINE. By *Constantin C. Giurescu*. Consultant editor for the English edition: *Gheorghe Ionel*. London: Garnstone Press, [1969]. 138 pp. \$4.50.

This work represents the effort of one of Rumania's leading historians to summarize the characteristic features of the province of Transylvania. And Professor Giurescu does survey that area's history, culture, topography, and ethnic mixture rather well. The student familiar with Rumanian history will discover nothing new here, although the book does constitute a handy compendium. Furthermore, as might be expected in so difficult a task, this outline lacks focus and structure. All too often the author becomes overly concerned with minutiae which—though interesting—seem out of place in an introductory volume. Also, into the detailed lists of villages, the number of sheep to be found in seventeenth-century Wallachia, and a rather unsophisticated use of statistics, Giurescu has chosen to weave the traditional Rumanian brief for possession of Transylvania. Naturally this entails emphasizing points like the "Romanization" of Dacia, the population's continuity with present-day Rumanians, and those "organic" links with the Principalities indicating a development distinct from Hungary proper. Though understandable, this presentation is somewhat tendentious, especially since the readers of a book of this kind will most likely be unacquainted with the polemical heritage in which the author writes.

Perhaps to ask anyone to write an outline and in doing so to rise above the impressionistic is to demand the impossible. Despite these criticisms then, Giurescu has brought together a great deal of useful information about Transylvania. Unfortunately the English publisher has done little to make the book intelligible to the general reader. The excellent documentation of the original Rumanian edition has been omitted almost entirely; there is no guide to Rumanian spelling or pronunciation; the only map is confusing and inadequate (though the Rumanian edition had a satisfactory map of Roman Dacia); and references to an item like the Transylvanian School are never explained so that the nonspecialist might comprehend the points being made. The net result is a book uninformative for the scholar's purposes and in some respects unintelligible to those who buy outlines.

WILLIAM O. OLDSON
Florida State University