

need for *partinost'* and revolutionary romanticism in literature, and this makes her meticulously researched work occasionally less convincing. Taking as her point of departure the concept of "Young Hungary"—a term used by Metternich in the 1830s in reference to the rebellious and anti-establishment attitudes of the most progressive segment of the dietal youth—she contends, as Gyula Szekfű and Gyula Farkas did in the interwar period, that the democratic elements of the political program of "Young Hungary" began to take shape when the poet Sándor Petőfi and his circle, the Society of Ten, managed to give new direction to Hungarian literary life. This occurred in the spring of 1846. By the end of the year Petőfi and his plebeian friends found an outlet for their writings in *Életképek*, whose original publisher and editor was closely associated with the leaders of the Hungarian opposition. The appointment of the twenty-two-year-old novelist Mór Jókai, a chief promoter of "Young Hungary" and Petőfi's close friend, as editor of the liberal literary weekly in June 1847 was a further stimulus for the spread of radical ideas on the pages of the journal, which thus became one of the harbingers of Hungary's revolutionary transformation in 1848.

In addition to Petőfi, Jókai, the poets János Arany, Mihály Tompa, and a Pléiade of lesser writers, "Young Hungary" was composed of the most progressive wing of the university youth led by Pál Vasvári. Instead of putting patches on the worn sandal of the fatherland, to use Petőfi's imagery, this truly liberal and daring elite intended to dress it up from top to toe in new clothes. In accordance with this program, the hitherto underprivileged people was expected to take its place in both literature and politics. To show the trend toward democratization, a major portion of the monograph (pp. 36–127) is devoted to a detailed evaluation of the ideologically oriented articles which appeared in *Életképek* from 1846 until the March revolution of 1848. The section dealing with materials published by the journal on philosophical, social, and aesthetic questions gives a valuable insight into domestic literary-cultural debates revealing also the reaction of liberal and progressive Hungarian literati to European intellectual trends. Subsequent analyses of the columns on poetry, fiction, and miscellanea (pp. 157–211) are also informative. The concluding three pages contain a brief sketch of the revolutionary events on *Életképek* (which ceased publication at the end of the year) mirroring, in the opinion of the author, the "whole development" (*italics in original*) of the revolution as suggested by the split between Jókai and Petőfi (who became coeditor in late April) and also within the ranks of "the youths of March," some of whom persisted in their "plebeian-revolutionary consistency," while others took the road of the "renunciation of principles and of liberal opportunism."

GEORGE BARANY  
*University of Denver*

A MAGYAR NÉP SZABADSÁGKÜZDELME 1848–49—BEN. By R. A. Averbuch [*Averbukh*]. Translated from the Russian by József Perényi. Edited by Erzsébet Andics. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970. 190 pp. 32 Ft.

The editor has attempted to condense and arrange the most important elements of Averbukh's numerous monographs on the Hungarian Revolution into a coherent pattern, with only limited success. Chapter 1, for example, is entitled "The Hungarian Revolution and the Vienna Uprising of 1848," yet events in Hungary and developments in Vienna are connected only in a superficial way and are left largely

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-