

SCIENCE
IN HUNGARY

LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP

By TIBOR KLANICZAY, Ph.D., D.Sc.
Academician; Research Institute Director

Unlike many other branches of scholarship, the concept of literary scholarship is not quite unequivocal. The reason for this is that with each nation the development springs from the various traditions and particular aspects. In some countries, as in Germany, philology was the basis, in others, for example, England, criticism provided the stimulus, while in Hungary the establishment of a national character was the foundation.

From some brief beginnings in the 18th century, literary scholarship in Hungary developed in the upsurge of the early 19th-century national movements, and it sought first of all to justify the national idea. Its historical character was, therefore, romanticist from the start, and it aimed at underscoring the aspects of a middle-class nationalism rather than presenting the objective development of literature. It could do so the more easily, since from early centuries Hungarian literature had a markedly national character, while in the 19th century it played a principal rôle in the Hungarian people becoming a nation. The last great representative of the traditional view of Hungarian literary history, János HORVÁTH, appropriately stated concerning Hungarian conditions that "the history of literature has been created by literary development as its organ for introspection in an aspiration to consciousness" (*Tanulmányok* [Essays], 23). However, this statement dating from 1922 holds good—contrary to Horváth's opinion—only for the genesis and early periods of Hungarian criticism. The literary scholarship of a nation cannot possibly be restricted solely to the examination of its own literature, nor can the literature of one nation be the exclusive domain of that nation's scientific researchers. It was only the consequence of specific and by no means happy circumstances that the concept of Hungarian literary scholarship, almost up to the middle of our century, meant—if not solely but preponderantly—the history of Hungarian literature.

Today, by Hungarian literary scholarship, we mean not only the history of our own national literature but the totality of researches made in Hungary in the field of literature in any language. It is true that the examination of Hungarian literature continues to be the central theme, but other literatures, comparative problems and researches made in the field of literary theories have now become the integral parts of research. On the other hand, by Hungarian literary historiography we continue to mean efforts made towards disclosing the history of Hungarian literature and analysing its lasting values, with the addition that this cannot be regarded as an exclusively Hungarian task in which only Hungarian scholars can have competence, but the researchers of other countries may also take active part in it. Literary scholarship in Hungary is therefore tantamount to Hungarian contributions to general literature, while Hungarian literary historiography—not unlike the study and analysis of the Russian, German, French and other literatures—should develop—as one of the fields of research of literary science—into the international examination of a national literature. Although in this last field—that of raising the history of Hungarian literature to the level of an international study—we have reached only the initial stage, considerable headway has been made in this direction. Not only in Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia—where a large number of Hungarian minorities live—but also in the Soviet Union, Poland, Italy and the United States, the specialists of Hungarian literature are increasing in number, as are the translations of outstanding products of Hungarian literature. However, in the following *résumé* we shall not deal with the situation of the research on Hungarian literature, but with the problems and results of the most various domains of research work in the science of literature done in Hungary since the liberation. For a clearer picture of this work, let us cast a retrospective glance at the antecedents and conditions with which Hungarian historians of literature had to reckon after the liberation in 1945.

One of the bequests of the past was a most marked isolation between the various individual branches of the science of literature. The field of research regarded as most important and standing at the highest level was the national history of literature, its most prominent figure being János HORVÁTH (1878–1961) who was among us up to recent times. Horváth endeavoured to elaborate the history of Hungarian literature with its autochthonous, internal development, as a means of justifying the great national writers of the 19th century, giving them the stature of ideals and paragons. With his knowl-

edge, his erudition, his mastery of literature, his human greatness, he set an example for generations to come; at the same time his conservative outlook, his lack of understanding for the literature of our century made his activity more and more isolated and solitary.

Criticism of contemporary literature which at its birth in the first part of the 19th century was fully integral with research on national history of literature, took another path soon to break away from it. Critical activity and history of literature were in few countries so sharply separated as in Hungary from 1900 onwards. Besides the strictly professional history of literature which stopped at the second half of the 19th century, a lighter, more sensitive critical essay literature developed—often weaker in scientific foundation but much fresher in its outlook—dealing primarily with the contemporary literature of the 20th century and not restricting its sphere of interest to Hungarian literature alone. The most important representative of this branch, Antal SZERB (1901–1945), undertook to write a critical survey of the history of Hungarian and world literature.

A third separate sector of the researches was—though it touched on the above-mentioned critical branch—the examination of literature from the standpoint of philosophy and aesthetics, covering the greatest writers of world literature and dealing with Hungarian literature only where applicable. Though research work of this character had fine traditions that go back to the middle of the past century, it could not take its due place in Hungarian scientific life before the liberation. This could especially be observed during the period between the two World Wars when the greatest Hungarian theoretician in literary research, György LUKÁCS, was a refugee from his country.

The initial studies in the comparative history of literature can be regarded as a fourth sector, and as early as 1876, these led to the edition of the short-lived *Összehasonlító Irodalomtörténeti Lapok* [Journal of Comparative Literature]. Though Hungarian scholarship took a significant initiative in this field, the definitely nationalistic character of Hungarian science prevented a consistently comparative approach. Nevertheless, during the last half-century this approach had such outstanding representatives as József TURÓCZI-TROSTLER (1888–1962) who attained substantial results in his researches in the European influences on Hungarian literature; and János HANKISS (1873–1959) who, though his scientific activity was not of the highest calibre, was a good organizer and played an important part in the establishment of the International Comparative Literature Association.

There were extensive—though rather mediocre—studies in philology, and these were connected both with national and comparative literary historiographies. This sector of literary scholarship in Hungary—which might be mentioned as the fifth domain—unfortunately had no heritage of classical-philological antecedents as in other countries. In Hungary philology either verged on dilettantism or became bogged down with the assembling of data without holding any views. As a consequence, classical philology proper which developed late could exercise but little influence on the entirety of literary science. Therefore, it is little wonder that the more exacting literary scholars, in fact János Horváth himself who represented the national-historical trend, were averse to philological work. For these reasons of the large number of philologists who lived during the decades preceding the liberation, only the works of Sándor ECKHARDT and József WALDAPEL can be considered of lasting value.

Finally, mention should be made of research into the examination of style and meter. Stylistics being traditionally the weakest branch of the Hungarian science of literature, serious efforts in this field are few. Béla ZOLNAI was the only researcher engaged in stylistic work on a European level. As to metrics the works of János HORVÁTH and László NÉGYESY (1861–1933) are worth mentioning.

Literary science in pre-war Hungary was thus characterized by a great degree of divergency—a circumstance that could not be altered even by the fact that in its development we can find the same successive trends that appeared in other European countries.

Positivism—which asserted itself in the second half of the 19th century—in the beginning encouraged philosophical and aesthetical analyses; it made philology fashionable, but it mainly promoted research in national literary historiography. The positivist school was influential even between the two World Wars, not so much through the scientific works of its representatives as through their key-positions. They occupied the most important professorial chairs at the universities and played a leading role in scientific bodies, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and in the two relevant scientific institutions, the Philological Society of Budapest (founded in 1874) and the Hungarian Society for History of Literature (founded in 1912). The three most important professional publications, the *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* [Review of Literary History] (started in 1890) as well as the *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* [General Philological Journal] (started in 1877) and the *Irodalomtörténet* [History of Literature] (started in 1913)—edited and maintained by the respective societies—were also organs of the positivist trend.

This hegemony of positivism which lasted much too long became one of the main sources of weakness in Hungarian literary scholarship. The slackening of the theoretical and aesthetical interest, and the fact that philological work brought discredit upon itself can chiefly be ascribed to this circumstance. The huge eight-volume positivist synthesis by Jenő PINTÉR (1881–1940) was, by the time of its appearance (1930–1943), the rightful object of derision because of its low level.

The German-inspired *Geistesgeschichte*—which between the two World Wars became the chief rival of the positivist trend—made its first appearance right after the First World War. It meant a new and a fresh outlook, a vision of greater scope on the one hand, and an idealistic speculation to the extreme, a far-flung treatment of facts and data, and constructions based on ingenious ideas on the other. Politically, the trend of our science of literature concerning the *Geistesgeschichte* was strongly divided; one group attempted to justify extreme, nationalistic, counter-revolutionary efforts which outdid even the conservative-nationalistic camp, and the opposite represented a humanistic view and became an active part of the anti-fascist camp of Hungarian intellectual life.

Especially the critics and essayists of the period between the two World Wars belonged to the latter camp; but because of political persecution, the inherent contradictions in the trend and its weak methodology this group could do little more than formulate questions and ideas. The *Geistesgeschichte* thus came to a crisis in the end: one group of followers became bogged down in the reactionary mysticism of the racial theory and swerved from the road of science; the other representatives, though mostly disappointed in it, had no opportunity for a scientific *dénouement*. It is characteristic of the one-sidedness of Hungarian intellectual life that the other modern schools in literary scholarship, for instance Croce's *critica stilistica*, Russian Formalism, and Structuralism, had scarcely any repercussions in literary scholarship in Hungary.

In the first decades of the century, the activity of György LUKÁCS alone showed the possibility of a school of original aesthetics and literary theory. He early went beyond Hegelian idealism, and joining the revolutionary movement of his period, adopted the Marxist view, in fact he became one of the most prominent representatives of the Marxist science of literature and aesthetics not only in Hungary but all over the world. However, the Marxist trend of our science of literature could not yet be actively present in Hungarian scientific life between the two World Wars because its main represent-

atives—not only Lukács, the aesthetician, but even József RÉVAI (1898–1959) who initiated the Marxist analysis of our national history of literature—could display their activity only in emigration.

These rough lines of the position and development of pre-liberation Hungarian literary scholarship can by themselves give some explanation to the question why after the liberation the Marxist–Leninist view and methods could so quickly become the most important trend of this science which basically defined the development of the last two decades. After the Second World War we have been witnessing all over the world the rise of new schools and currents in literary scholarship. Positivism and the *Geistesgeschichte* have brought discredit upon themselves all over the world, in fact, literary scholarship sought new ways, as can be judged from the group of writers around the periodical *Trivium* in Switzerland and the American *New Criticism*. In Hungary, as we have seen, the situation became ripe for the unfolding of a trend of great vistas. And this, within the socialist transformation of this country after the liberation and as a consequence of the domestic situation of our science and its possibilities, could be none other than of Marxist–Leninist orientation. The Marxist view regards literature as a social phenomenon; it primarily assesses literary works from the point of view whether they present a high-standard, artistic reflection of social reality, while to the history of literature it applies the concept that considers history as war between classes. Since this new method of approach, as a result of Révai's and Lukács's activity, appeared at a very high level in the scientific life of this country, it attracted the majority of the literary historians who had been disappointed in the old methods and sought new ways, and those who were beginners in the profession. In a couple of years, a long series of works by Lukács and Révai demonstrated the superior scientific force of the Marxist approach and method; these works convincingly proved how successfully the Marxist method elucidates questions till then unsolved and lifts our science from a state without vistas, in fact, from its provincialism.

Naturally, the hegemony of Marxism, developing as far back as 1948, did not mean that all literary historians approved or adopted its principles. This refers especially to the outstanding representatives of the older generation, though the most prominent ones among them, such as János HORVÁTH, Sándor ECKHARDT, Béla ZOLNAI, Károly MARÓT, Jenő KOLTAY-KASTNER, Albert GYERGYAI, not only watched with interest and great attention the newly flourishing science of literature but had a share in its work, assisting with their rich experi-

ences the new directions of their 'disciples.' Others again, like József TURÓCZI-TROSTLER, Gyula FÖLDESSY, Aladár KOMLÓS who sympathized with the leftist ideological trends even before, endeavoured to assert Marxist principles in their new works. The 'middle' generation, which began working between the two World Wars, and whose numbers were so tragically decimated by the war and by fascist barbarism, recognized in their overwhelming majority the possibilities afforded by Marxist ideology and method. They formed for nearly a decade the main body of the Marxist science of literature. Its outstanding representatives who could produce the best results were János BARTA, László BÓKA, László KARDOS, Tibor KARDOS, István SÓTÉR, Gábor TOLNAI, Imre TRENCSÉNYI-WALDAPFEL and József WALDAPFEL. To those who then belonged to the younger generation, who started to work in the 1940s or after the liberation (Rabán GERÉZDI, István KIRÁLY, Tibor KLANICZAY, Péter NAGY, Pál PÁNDI, Miklós SZABOLCSI, József SZAUDER) the adoption of the principles of Marxism became a matter of course, since it offered the guide to all their activity.

By the end of the 1940s, the Marxist trend which already had considerable forces when the socialist revolution in this country gained in momentum, was recognized as the responsible patron of the Hungarian science of literature, and its representatives began to build up the new organizational framework and to plan coordinated research. In 1948 the most important University chairs and institutes were reorganized on a Marxist basis. Among them particularly the Budapest University Institute for Literary History became—mainly as a result of József Waldapfel's organizing work—an important centre of radiation of the Marxist science of literature. At the end of the same year the Hungarian Society for the History of Literature was set up, largely owing to the good offices of István Király. The Society—whose president then became György Lukács—encouraged Marxist debates on the essential questions of Hungarian literature and also gave incentive to the most important works to be written on the subject. At the same time *Irodalomtörténet* [History of Literature], the review of the Society, became the leading Marxist periodical of this science.

After the reorganization of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1949, its Committee for the History of Literature was the leading body for scientific planning.

Through the good offices of the Academy the previously discontinued periodicals reappeared one by one, e.g. *The Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* [Review of Literary History] (1953), the *Filológiai*

Közlöny [Philological Journal] (1955), successor to the *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* [General Philological Journal]); and new periodicals were established, such as the *Az Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei* [Bulletins of the Section for Linguistics and Literature of the Academy] (1951), the *Irodalmi Figyelő* [Literary Spectator] (1955) which dealt with the results of the science of literature abroad, as well as the *Acta Litteraria* (1957) published in foreign languages.

Literary scholarship rejuvenated in Hungary under Marxist philosophy, and, thanks to the society and government of the People's Democracy, developed in very favourable conditions. As a consequence the historical and the aesthetical researches could end their sharp separation witnessed in the past. Révai's revolutionary national concept and Lukács's theory of realism both exerted substantial influence on the new generation of literary historians and critics. This brought about a pronouncedly national literary historiography of theoretical character, though it also asserted certain debatable elements of Lukács's aesthetics. It was reflected at a high level in the works of István Király, Pál Pándi, and of Dezső Tóth and Mihály Czine who came after them.

As a result of the Marxist outlook and of planned scientific work, extensive work went on in disclosing sources and criticizing texts, to correct the omissions of the earlier period. Critical editions of all the great classics of Hungarian literature were started, together with the systematic disclosure of the hitherto unknown remnants and sources of Hungarian literature, but this time the work was not detached from the historical and theoretical-aesthetical researches.

The most important work was the integration of contemporary literary criticism with the history of literature. A Marxist literary science cannot get stuck in the past, in fact it must keep the standpoints of the present in view, even when examining the literature of the past. In the wake of the example set by Révai and Lukács, this unity, even if it could not materialize at once, gradually strengthened. Some of our literary historians (László Bóka, István Király, Péter Nagy, Pál Pándi, István Sötér, Miklós Szabolcsi, Gábor Tolnai and others) regarded it as their task right from the outset to analyse developing Hungarian socialist literature, to help it critically and to take a hand in the edition of literary reviews.

In addition to this, the initial stage of the Marxist literary science was clearly characterized by a consistent endeavour to apply Marxist historicism. This did not indicate a return to the one-sided analysis

of an exclusively historical character but an assertion of a consistently historical approach in all fields, placing equal emphasis on philology, literary theory and criticism. Many circumstances made this trend particularly justified and topical. The earlier bourgeois trends, the methodologic remnants of the conservative and positivist schools were laden with considerable ahistorism, while the *Geistesgeschichte* had turned such historical categories as the aesthetical and ethical into timeless ones. These symptoms often led to serious distortions, and already in the early 1950s they often challenged the rightful criticism of the representatives of the Marxist view of history. However, the assertion of certain ahistoric and normative standpoints inherited from earlier science was characteristic even of the activity of the two great Hungarian pioneers of the Marxist science of literature, József Révai and György Lukács. In the course of extensive and systematic analyses, it could be experienced time and again that Révai's national-historical notions, and Lukács's concepts of aesthetics and literary theory, despite their suggestive power, often conflicted with historical facts and even lawful regularities known from historical researches. Thus, in the more and more frequent controversial issues, it was the consistent historical approach that gave new life, and the dross of *clichés* and norms were discarded as obsolescent, even if inspired by good intentions.

Simultaneously with the unfolding of these sound trends, the organizational basis of literary scholarship in Hungary was now firmly established. Following long preparations, the Institute for Literary History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences started its work in 1956 and—like the other Institutes of the Academy, founded earlier—became the scientific workshop of the main tasks of this branch of science. The Institute for Literary History (director: István Sőtér, deputy director: Tibor Klaniczay) started to realize ambitious scientific plans; it took over from among the journals hitherto published the *Review of Literary History* and the *Spectator of World Literature*, formerly known as *Literary Spectator*. It established a whole series of publications of monographs, treatises, studies, texts, and in a couple of years it became the centre of the new aspirations of the Marxist science of literature. The collective work of the researchers of the Institute, the continual exchange of opinions and the often heated debates led to the crystallization of a new school of literary scholarship in Hungary, characterized by a consistent assertion of Marxist historicism, by the organic unity of theoretical, historical and philological researches, by an international concept rather than the one-sided nationalist point of view, and by the asser-

tion of internationalist and historical aspects in contemporary literature too. For the last ten years, István Sőtér's activity has developed in this direction and has become in this sense an important life-work. And such has been the orientation of the many researchers who took part in the formative work of the Marxist literary science (e.g. Rabán Gerézdi, Tibor Klaniczay, Miklós Szabolcsi, József Szauder, etc.); and here we find also the large camp of the new generation of scholars educated at socialist universities in a Marxist spirit (András DIÓSZEGI, László ILLÉS, Lajos NYÍRŐ, Antal PIRNÁT, Sándor SOMOGYI and many others).

However, the Institute does not stand alone in the advancement of the new viewpoints and methods of the Marxist literary science because this is a trend that asserts itself in the work of the majority of our literary scholars, young and old. What the Institute with its organizational framework and its concentration of a large number of researchers does is to foster this process and call attention to it. In this context principal roles were played by the analysis of socialist literature and of living literature; attempt to solve questions raised by ideological and literary life; the organization of a section of literary theory that bases its work on historical research; the compilation of a large manual of history of Hungarian literature; and by a new emphasis on research in comparative literature. The latter cannot be regarded as the direct continuation or resumption of the earlier studies in comparative literature but were the organic consequences of a Marxist approach. It became clear again and again that we cannot understand correctly either historical connexions or theoretical problems, or even the most specific national questions without examining the lessons taught by other literatures, comparing them with ours, without analysing literature from its international aspects. To this end, on István Sőtér's initiative, contact was established with the International Comparative Literature Association, and an international conference on comparative literature was held in Budapest in 1962, which was a successful test of our Marxist literary science including the new efforts aiming consistently to assert the principle of historicism, not only in Hungary but also on an international scale.

This rough sketch of the development of our science of literature may give the reader an insight into the circumstances under which the work of the past fifteen years was done. It does give an explanation of the character, quantity, advantages and deficiencies of the scientific results of this rich period. We must continue this survey by going on to the results attained in the individual fields of research.

TEXTOLOGY, STUDY OF SOURCES

A whole series of critical editions were begun as the philological basis for researches in the history of Hungarian literature. These critical editions are completed with an ample amount of philological notes and glossaries, using the latest methods in textology, and under the direction of a committee sponsored by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Critical editions of the complete works of Balassi, Rimay, Batsányi, Fazekas, Vörösmarty, Petőfi, Arany, Mikszáth, Jókai, Ady, Juhász and Attila József have been published or soon will be, and preparations for similar editions of other writers are well under way. *Régi magyar drámai emlékek* [Remnants of Old Hungarian Drama] and *Régi magyar költők tára* [Collection of Early Hungarian Poets] represent another important type of publication in which all the relics of a given literary genre in a given period are collected. During the preparations for these critical editions, an enormous quantity of new source material came to light, much of which has been published either as appendices to the pertinent editions or in special series (*Bibliotheca Hungarica Antiqua*, *Irodalomtörténeti Források* [Sources of Literary History], *Új Magyar Múzeum* [New Hungarian Museum], *Irodalom — Szocializmus* [Literature—Socialism], *Magyar Századok* [Hungarian Centuries]).

HUNGARIAN HISTORY OF LITERATURE

Until the present time there was no representative summary of the history of Hungarian literature. János Horváth alone attempted to write a comprehensive Hungarian literary history at a high level, but he was able to complete only the rough outline and certain parts (the volumes dealing with the Middle Ages, Humanism and the Reformation) of his work, and as a matter of fact, one man could not possibly cope with such a task in a lifetime. From the outset a main task presenting itself to Marxist science was the compiling of a full and comprehensive synthesis of the history of Hungarian literature which is up with the times. This endeavour required that research work should encompass all periods of Hungarian literature, that questions so far neglected be examined and the new Marxist concept of the history of Hungarian literature be elaborated.

József RÉVAI took the first decisive step towards the elaboration of the Marxist concept with his studies on Kölcsey, Ady and Petőfi.

In these studies he contrasted the revolutionary trend of Hungarian literature with János Horváth's national conservative concept. The application of Marxist criteria to the history of Hungarian literature quickly developed, as it was needed in university instruction and demanded by the cultural development of an expanding reading public. The first results—often improvised and hasty, yet forming the basis of further work—were the mimeographed notes made for university students, followed by the *Magyar irodalmi szöveggyűjtemény* [Collection of Hungarian Literary Texts], also prepared for use at the universities and comprising the biggest Hungarian literary anthology published up to this day. The third pioneering enterprise was a series entitled *Magyar Klasszikusok* [Hungarian Classics] which presented to the reader the selected works of the greatest Hungarian writers, each with a detailed introductory study.

• These initial steps were shortly followed by a large number of studies appearing in the various periodicals, then, in 1952, the publication of more important monographs began. Some of these were analytical biographies of great Hungarian authors. These included, in chronological order, the following volumes: *Mikszáth* by István KIRÁLY (1952), *Eötvös* by István SÖTÉR (1953), *Móricz* by Péter NAGY (1953), *Vajda* by Aladás KOMLÓS (1954), *Zrinyi* by Tibor KLANICZAY (1954), *Kölcsey* by József SZAUDER (1955), *Tóth Árpád* by László KARDOS (1955), *Vörösmarty* by Dezső TÓTH (1957), *Apáczai Csere* by Imre BÁN (1958), *Nagy Lajos* by Pál KARDOS (1958), *Bornemisza* by István NEMESKÜRTY (1959), *Kisfaludy Sándor* by István FENYŐ (1961). Even more detailed monographs—planned to extend to many volumes—on the life-work of the greatest writers are in preparation. Of these the following have appeared: the first volumes of extensive monographs on Endre Ady by László BÓKA (1955), Zsigmond Móricz by Mihály CZINE (1960), Petőfi by Pál PÁNDI (1961) and Attila József by Miklós SZABOLCSI (1963).

Other monographs or volumes of studies aiming to present the individual periods, trends and genres comprise the history of almost our entire literature, thus contributing to a large extent to the preparation of a comprehensive synthesis. The works that can be mentioned in this context are the following: *Árpádkori latin nyelvű irodalmunk stílusproblémái* [Problems of Style in the Latin-Language Literature of the Árpadian Age] by János HORVÁTH, Jr. (1954); *A magyar világi líra kezdetei* [The Beginnings of Hungarian Secular Lyrics] by Rabán GERÉZDI (1962); *A magyarországi humanizmus kora* [The Period of Humanism in Hungary] by Tibor KARDOS (1955); *A reformáció jegyében* [In the Period of the Reformation] by János

HORVÁTH, Sr. (1956); *Die Ideologie der Siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren* by Antal PIRNÁT (1961); *Reneszánsz és barokk* [The Renaissance and the Baroque] by Tibor KLANICZAY (1961); *A magyar irodalom a felvilágosodás korában* [Hungarian Literature in the Age of Enlightenment] by József WALDAPFEL (1954); *A romantika útján* [On the Road to Romanticism] by József SZAUDER (1961); *A magyar regény kezdetei* [The Beginnings of the Hungarian Novel] by Antal WEBER (1959); *Romantika és realizmus* [Romanticism and Realism] by István SÖTÉR (1956); *Nemzet és haladás. Az 1850-es évek irodalma* [Nation and Progress. The Literature of the 1850s] by István SÖTÉR (1963); *A magyar költészet Petőfitől Adyig* [Hungarian Poetry from Petőfi to Ady] by Aladár KOMLÓS (1959).

This list, of course, suggests only the dimensions of this work and gives only an indication of the pivotal questions in research. In many cases studies appearing in journals and periodicals came forth with very substantial results: a multilateral elaboration of questions on the Renaissance and humanism; the elucidation of the importance of the Baroque in the development of Hungarian literature; a new concept of the interrelations between enlightenment, Classicism and Romanticism; a virtual renaissance of the Petőfi researches; valuable new researches on the 1850s, one of the most complicated phases of our literature; and the many-sided examination of the last third of the 19th century, a period almost quite neglected before.

However, research into 20th-century literature gave the most conspicuous results, though so far no comprehensive synthetic monographs have been produced on this period. But then in this field Marxist research had little to start on because pre-liberation historical science left out the literature of our century almost entirely from its orbit of interest. A completely new team of researchers had to be educated before the life-work of the many great writers of this period nearest to us could be made accessible to scientific examination. Purposeful educational and organizational work, and especially the establishment of the 20th-Century Section of the Institute for Literary History (headed by Miklós Szabolcsi) have created the necessary conditions for this, so that, in addition to the above-mentioned monographs on Ady, Móricz and Attila József, a rich series of short life-sketches, treatises and studies on the significant writers of this period are at our disposal. Among the pioneering initiatives of the Institute for Literary History, there is a new work under way: the systematic and scientific study of Hungary's socialist literature that has already a 50-year-old past. The first important results of

this work appeared in 1962 in a volume entitled *Tanulmányok a magyar szocialista irodalom történetéből* [Studies on the History of Hungarian Socialist Literature].

*

The above brief account shows that the most necessary preparations for writing a new synthesis of Hungarian literary history have been made. First a popular version came out, at least two volumes of it: *A magyar irodalom története 1849-ig* [The History of Hungarian Literature up to 1849] (1957) edited by László Bóka and Pál Pándi, and *A magyar irodalom története 1849-től 1905-ig* [The History of Hungarian Literature between 1849 and 1905] (1963) edited by István Király, Pál Pándi and István Sötér. The one-volume *Kis magyar irodalomtörténet* [History of Hungarian Literature] by Tibor Klaniczay, József Szauder and Miklós Szabolcsi, which appeared in 1961 and was translated into several foreign languages, shows the full, though rough outlines of a ripening synthesis. It is the first attempt at systematizing along broad lines the development of 20th-century literature. After these extensive preliminaries began the writing of a six-volume manual in the Institute for Literary History. We think we may safely say that this synthesis, scheduled to appear on the 20th anniversary of the liberation, will be the worthy closing down of one of the richest periods of researches in Hungarian literary history and the starting-point of further works.

FOREIGN LITERATURES

With reference to research in foreign literatures, we cannot speak of such all-encompassing work as that performed in the examination of the national literature. In this small country it is difficult to train a research team of specialists in the individual literatures of the foreign countries. In fact, in the case of most literatures we have much fewer experts than required, or none. And, except for the *Világirodalmi antológia* [Anthology of World Literature]—a seven-volume trail-blazing work which serves as a university text—we can mention only individual initiatives rather than comprehensive projects over the past 15 years.

Nevertheless, these individual efforts cannot be underestimated because they meet both scientific and broad educational demands.

Under the impact of the large-scale cultural development following the liberation, there was a general demand to read the classics of world literature in new translations as well as to gain access to valuable foreign works as yet inaccessible to the Hungarian reader. This flood of translations gave work to the researchers in the individual foreign literatures because our publishers, very rightly, had introductory studies written to the new editions of foreign classics. And though these introductions or afterwords have an informative character, yet as they apply Marxist criticism to the various authors, often for the very first time, they represent a genuine scientific contribution. The interest taken in universal literature gave rise to the demand for brief popular summaries on the foreign literatures by Hungarian writers. Brief, concise histories have so far appeared of the history of Chinese literature by Pál MIKLÓS and Ferenc TŐKEI (1960), the history of Polish literature by Endre KOVÁCS (1960), the history of Rumanian literature by Endre PÁLFFY (1961), the history of Yugoslav literature by Zoltán CSUKA (1963), the history of French literature by László DOBOSSY (1964), the history of Czech literature by Rezső SZALATNAI (1964), and the history of ancient Greek literature by Róbert FALUS (1954). László SZIKLAY compiled a larger, more scholarly work on the history of Slovak literature, which appeared in 1962.

Research on Russian and Soviet literature developed slowly because, in consequence of the earlier counter-revolutionary period, there were few experts. However, during the last fifteen years, a competent research team was trained in this field, the members of which show considerable promise, though they have not yet written independent major works.

With reference to German literature pertinent studies of note are those by József TURÓCZI-TROSTLER on Goethe, Heine and Lenau, and György Mihály VAJDA's papers on Lessing and Schiller. In connection with French literature mention should be made of János GYÖRY's and Ottó SÜPEK's investigations of the Middle Ages, and Albert GYERGYAI's essays on 18th- and 19th-century French writers. Contributions to the history of English literature include Tibor LUTTER's book on Milton and Miklós SZENCZI's examination of the English Renaissance drama. On Italian literature—which is comparatively best represented in this connection—fruitful work has been done by Tibor KARDOS, Jenő KOLTAY-KASTNER and József SZAUDÉR who studied nearly all periods of Italian literature. Gábor TOLNAI's pioneering essays on García Lorca concern Spanish literature; Géza KÉPES's researches deal with Finnish literature. Finally, mention

should be made—as outstanding works of an international calibre—of Károly MARÓT's and Imre TRENCSENYI-WALDAPFEL's contributions on Greek and Latin literature; Lajos LIGETI's research on the Mongolian epic and Gyula GERMANUS's studies on Arab literature.

METRICS, STYLISTICS

These represent the least cultivated domain of research in literary scholarship in Hungary, and it was in this field that after the liberation the least efforts were made. Exception can be made in relation to Hungarian metrics which—because of the dominance of poetry in Hungarian literature—could not possibly be neglected. János Horváth's metrical researches, though of a conservative spirit, produced many new results. These appeared in three special works between 1948 and 1955; but studies by Bence Szabolcsi, Lajos Vargyas, Géza Képes, and László Gáldi also yield important findings. Gáldi deals with the questions of metrics primarily not from a Hungarian standpoint but from universal, theoretical and comparative considerations, extending his attention to the metrics used by the various peoples. A thorough organization of research on literary stylistics is a pressing necessity in the next few years. Some preparation has been started in this direction, including work on the vocabularies of individual authors (the Petőfi, Gyula Juhász and Attila József dictionaries) which is well under way.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Although in the post-war transition period, due mainly to the growing number of national tasks, comparative research was temporarily relegated to the background, yet substantial results were achieved in this area. A significant undertaking was a rough synthesis entitled *A Duna-táj nyelvi alkata. A Duna-táj irodalmi fejlődése* [The Vernacular of the Danube Region. The Literary Development of the Danube Region] (1947) by László Gáldi. In this entirely original work he presented the common traits of development of the literatures in the Danubian Basin. The studies by József Turóczi-Trostler on the European reception of Petőfi and Hungarian folk-poetry can be regarded as the crown of a scholarly life-work. The bold hypotheses

of László HADROVICS on the connections between the Hungarian and South-Slav tales of chivalry, and Endre ANGYAL's work entitled *Die Slawische Barockwelt* (1961)—which filled a gap in international Baroque research—had noteworthy European repercussions. Comparative studies developed especially in the fields where they were badly needed for a more thorough study of the history of Hungarian literature, and where previous bourgeois research had neglected them. In particular the question of connections with the neighbouring literatures and with Russian literature attracted increased interest, and many such studies have appeared in periodicals. The most outstanding achievement in this field is the three-volume compendium of studies on the history of Hungarian-Russian literary connections (1961), and this will be followed by other works on other literatures.

The question of comparative literature has become one of the central problems of literary scholarship in Hungary only in the past few years. Although the new research programme in comparative literature has been in progress for only a brief period, it has not only produced an adequate organizational framework (Academy committee, institute groups) and given considerable encouragement to international relations, but has also yielded heartening scientific results. Studies by László Illés, László Kardos, Tibor Klaniczay, Béla Köpeczi, Lajos Nyíró, István Sötér, Miklós Szabolcsi, György Mihály Vajda and others have brought new initiatives especially to the following fields: the Marxist analysis of the theory and method of comparative studies, the criticism of the earlier Hungarian comparative researches, the laws governing the development of the East-European literatures and the international problems of socialist literatures. A fine proof of the popularity and the dimensions of the rapidly developing Marxist research in comparative literature is the fact that at the conference held in Budapest in 1962 thirty-eight Hungarian researchers reported to the international audience on their comparative work.

The newest results of comparative literature in Hungary are represented by two collections: *Littérature comparée en Europe orientale* (1963) contains — in French, German or Russian—the lectures delivered at the Budapest conference; *Littérature hongroise —littérature européenne*—published in French only—was compiled by Hungarian literary historians for the 1964 congress of the International Comparative Literature Association and includes their recent studies.

LITERARY THEORY

In addition to the Hungarian editions of collected articles and statements by Marx and Engels on literature and art (1946), and Lenin's writings of a literary character (1949), primarily some works by György LUKÁCS—written and published abroad earlier but published in Hungarian only after the liberation—have proved helpful in laying the foundations of Marxist literary theory and aesthetics. His books appeared in quick succession and dealt with the most various subjects: *Balzac, Stendhal, Zola* (1945); *Nagy orosz realisták* [Great Russian Masters of Realism] (1946); *Goethe és kora* [Goethe and His Age] (1946); *Az újabb német irodalom rövid története* [A Brief History of the New German Literature] (1946); *A történelmi regény* [The Historical Novel] (1947); *Thomas Mann* (1948); *Nagy orosz realisták — szocialista realizmus* [Great Russian Realists—Socialist Realism] (1952); *Adalékok az esztétika történetéhez* [Contributions to the History of Aesthetics] (1953).

These works have greatly enriched the Hungarian science of literature by bringing the Marxist theoretical-aesthetical approach into focus and by opening up vistas of world literature. At the same time, some features of Lukács's concepts—such as his 'realistic-antirealistic' view which presents the best of bourgeois realism as an ideal—had, through its exaggerated and one-sided influence, negative consequences from the point of view of both the science of literature and developing Hungarian socialist literature.

The encouraging unity deriving from researches in literary theory, literary history and aesthetics began to crumble as a result of the ahistoric elements in Lukács's literary theory and aesthetics which frequently challenged historical facts—a circumstance which made it a pressing necessity that the problems of literary theory be approached differently.

After several sporadic efforts organized work on literary theory was started in the Institute for Literary History and after 1961, in the special Section for Literary Theory set up within the Institute that year.

This section, headed by Lajos Nyíró, successfully started to apply the latest results of Marxist literary science, to criticize the present bourgeois conceptions of literary theory as well as to examine the questions of the theoretical problems of socialist realism and the modern trends.

LIVING LITERATURE AND CRITIQUE

Critical activity analysing contemporary literature had substantial Marxist traditions even before the liberation; critique was the organic part of Révai's and Lukács's activity, and many others besides them helped lay the foundations of Marxist literary critique in domestic reviews and in socialist periodicals published abroad in Hungarian. The new feature after the liberation was that scholars playing an important role in the science of literature and in literary history took up in large numbers the critical analysis of living literature; in fact, the outstanding critics of the last fifteen years came from their ranks. The critical activity of literary historians lays, at the same time, the basis for the study of the post-liberation period of literary history. Several authors, like Pál PÁNDI, Péter NAGY, Miklós SZABOLCSI and Dezső TÓTH, devote entire volumes to the questions of contemporary literature. At the same time, in the Institute for Literary History, literary scholars began to elaborate monographs on certain genres of the post-liberation literature, which are destined to pave the way to a synthesis of the questions of contemporary Hungarian literature.

The critical analysis of living literature and theoretical literary research are greatly fostered by the review *Kritika*, launched in 1963 as the new periodical of the Institute for Literary History. This monthly, edited by András Diószegi, has become the main forum of the new trends and endeavours of Hungarian literary scholarship.