

FORRÁSOK BUDAPEST MÚLTJABÓL. Edited by *Ágnes Ságvári*. Budapest: Budapest főváros levéltárának kiadványa, 1971. Vol. 1: FORRÁSOK BUDA, PEST ÉS ÓBUDA TÖRTÉNETÉHEZ, 1686–1873. Edited by *Vera Bácskai*. 331 pp. 45 Ft. Vol. 2: FORRÁSOK BUDAPEST TÖRTÉNETÉHEZ, 1873–1919. Edited by *Mária H. Kohut*. 522 pp. 63 Ft.

The occasion is the one-hundredth anniversary, in 1973, of the unification of Buda, Pest, and Óbuda (Old Buda); the purpose is to regale the educated reader with mostly unpublished documents on the history of Hungary's capital. The general editor is a woman, as are the editors of the two individual volumes—a fact which reflects agreeably on the prominent role played by women in contemporary Hungarian historiography. The series is to continue with two further volumes until it embraces the long period between the liberation of the three cities from Ottoman rule, in 1686, and the absorption of numerous suburbs by the eventually gigantic city of Budapest, in 1950. The starting date is as obvious as the future closing date of the series: documents on medieval and Ottoman “Budapest” were almost completely destroyed by the siege of 1686. On the other hand, the first two volumes, containing close to four hundred documents, are the result of a careful selection from extremely rich archival collections. The sources, lightly annotated, are divided into chronological chapters (1686–1847, 1848–49, 1849–73, unification in 1873; and 1873–1914, 1914–18, 1918–19, respectively), with such topical subchapters as city politics, economic developments, social struggle, and cultural life. The emphasis is on economy and society (there exist numerous Hungarian publications on artistic and architectural developments in Budapest) and each chapter and subchapter is preceded by a brief and intelligent introduction. Some slight bias can be detected in the chapters dealing with World War I and the Revolutions of 1918–19, but even the subchapters entitled “Workers’ Movement” refrain from concentrating solely on the class struggle.

The inhabitants of the three cities were never very close to the country people. The eighteenth-century German, Magyar, Greek, or Serbian burghers lived nearly as divorced from the peasants as the uniformly Hungarian-speaking inhabitants of twentieth-century Budapest. There developed a specific “Budapest” mentality—Ágnes Ságvári explains—sophisticated and generally progressive but also ridden by different complexes. Budapest, the “second Vienna” or the “Paris on the shores of the Danube,” always felt itself above rural Hungary but backward compared with the great capitals of Western Europe. It compensated for its complexes with cynicism and a fabulous wit. From time to time, this “alien” city was punished for its sins by the conservative country nobility.

The three cities, or rather the two small free royal cities and the servile town Óbuda, developed only gradually in the eighteenth century. First a commercial center, the three cities became Hungary's second administrative capital, after Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava), around 1800 and welcomed the new national government in 1848. The revolution itself began here, and for a while the inhabitants toyed with the idea of directing the whole revolutionary process from the cafés of Pest. By then the three cities had had some experience with associations of journeymen and with strikes and, more important, with a vigorous cultural, national, and liberal awakening. The era of absolutism after 1849 brought economic expansion, as well as bitter living conditions for the immigrant poor crowded into unsanitary hovels. The unification of 1873 permitted only partial emancipation from governmental tutelage (complete autonomy remained forever

the aim of progressive municipal politicians), but it allowed administrative re-organization, the introduction of first-class municipal services, a building boom, the assimilation of all the non-Magyars, and an amazing industrial development. By the end of the century there were close to a million inhabitants driven ahead by a dynamic bourgeoisie of Magyar noble, German, Slavic, and mainly Jewish origin, but a truly powerful bourgeois political party could never develop. In fact, the liberal bourgeois merely formed a link between the conservative state bureaucracy and the socialist workers. By 1914 Budapest was an economic and cultural giant which dwarfed the countryside in everything but political influence. General living conditions were improving until the First World War put a sudden end to this exhilarating period. The war and the revolutions, although exciting enough, could not mask the decline of Budapest into what it became in 1919: the impoverished, oversized, and strife-ridden capital of an impoverished and small country. The story of the city with the "loveliest geographic location in Europe" is beautifully told through the documents, but why are there no summaries in at least one major language?

ISTVAN DEÁK
Columbia University

HUNGARY IN REVOLUTION, 1918–19: NINE ESSAYS. Edited by *Iván Völgyes*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971. x, 219 pp. \$12.50.

This book will not replace Rudolf Tőkés's *Béla Kun and the Hungarian Soviet Republic* (1967) as the standard work in English on the subject. Fortunately that was not the aim of the editor and contributors. This volume of essays gave nine recognized experts the opportunity to express themselves on certain aspects of the 1918–19 events in Hungary in which they were particularly interested. The result is a welcome contribution to the growing literature on the subject.

The first three essays set the stage for the establishment of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Joseph Held discusses the situation in Hungary before the First World War. The topic is far-reaching and extremely complicated, and not even an expert like Professor Held can cover it satisfactorily in nine pages. István Deák uses more than twice as much space to discuss the problems of Hungary during the years of the First World War. With great skill and literary ability he achieves the task assigned him and finds room for footnotes that contain a very good short bibliography of the subject. The third background essay, dealing with the Károlyi regime, starts somewhat slowly, but by the time Gábor Vermes has finished his chapter, he has given the reader a good short account of an interesting and neglected phase of Hungarian history.

Franck Eckelt covers a great variety of topics dealing with the internal policies of the Kun regime: the theater, schools, literature, health, and many other subjects. Although the information supplied is rich and accurate, the chapter suffers from two shortcomings. The author often forms his opinion on the basis of plans and blueprints that the Kun regime had no time to put into effect, and he fails to cover certain aspects of internal policy, such as security measures. Nevertheless, this chapter can be read with great profit, because it contains much material not easily available in other works.

Éva Balogh's chapter on the nationality problem of the Hungarian Soviet Republic is a first-rate piece of work. It required a great amount of research and at-