

FOOD DEPRIVATION AND SOCIAL STRATIFICATION IN PRE-WAR HUNGARY

MICHAEL SOZAN

The purpose of this paper is to examine patterns of nutrition within a village community in Hungary during the interwar years (1919–1945).^{*} At that time Hungary acquired its present-day borders and came to be ruled by an inflexible government reluctant to carry out badly needed reform. Hungarians experienced a wide range of problems, one of which was rural poverty. One index of poverty is food deprivation which can be assessed from contemporary documents as well as the testimony of those who experienced it. Peasants during these years suffered grave food shortages and became the most discontented segment of society. Had the regime listened to their complaints, the post-World War II communist regime would have had less reason and fewer allies to apply the amount of force it did for the reorganization of rural society.

People who recall pre-World War II Hungary do so with mixed feelings. More so than urbanites, peasants see those times as the “lean years” when the free enterprise system failed to deliver its promises.

The combined effects of World War I, Hungary’s dismemberment, the Great Depression, several years of drought, mounting taxes, an agricultural policy which fostered a distorted pattern of land ownership, and insufficient capital and mechanization retarded the socio-economic progress of the peasant class.¹ Under such conditions the growing rural population, incapable of obtaining urban/industrial employment, was forced to remain in the village.

While Hungary was a food exporting country famous for its urban culinary art,² the food-producing peasant had a diet dissimilar from that of the urbanite.³ Food deprivation was common among all but the wealthiest farmers, urbanized merchants and artisans, and the clergy. The few scientific surveys of the time indicated a strong cause and effect relationship between diet and health.⁴ Hungary led the world in the recurrence of tuberculosis, stomach diseases, tumors, and suicide.⁵ In 1936 Győr County – in which

^{*}The data presented here are the results of twelve months of anthropological fieldwork in Hungary during 1978-9 and in 1981. The purpose of the project was to continue the investigation of Hungarian rural society begun in Austria in 1973. It was financed by the National Academy of Sciences and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Nutritional data from the village of Táp were collected by Eva Sozan whose contributions to the entire research have been substantial. Her material revealed that the food habits in Táp were analogous to those most regions in western Hungary (cf., Edit Fél, *Kocs 1936-ban*) (Kocs in 1936), Budapest, *Magyarságtudományi Intézet*, 1941; Aurél Vajkai, *A Bakony néprajza* (The ethnography of the Bakony). Budapest: Gondolat, 1959.

the village to be examined is located — commissioned a doctor to examine rural school children. His survey indicated that 76 percent of the observed pupils had body temperatures above 98.6 degrees Fahrenheit, 14 percent were undernourished, 12 percent were anemic, 23 percent had swollen glands, 7 percent had heart problems, 12 percent suffered from polio, and 72 percent had dental diseases. Furthermore, 37 percent of the kindergarten children were carriers of tuberculosis — the “Hungarian Disease.”⁶

This examination was not conducted during an epidemic, but in peacetime. In fact, the previous harvest was relatively good and five years had passed since the debilitating drought of 1931. These illnesses indicate that in a relatively prosperous region, such as Győr County, many peasants suffered grave physical deprivations, hunger and a lack of clothing and shelter. Today it is common knowledge that low grade fever, anemia, TB, and chronic infections which the body cannot combat are positively correlated with poor nutrition. More specifically, the inability of the organism to fight fever (caused by infection) is due to low protein intake. As we shall see presently, one of the hallmarks of Hungarian peasant diet during the interwar years was a severe lack of protein.

The village under consideration is Táp, a village in Western Hungary. With an average interwar population of 1,300 Táp was a typical Hungarian village. It is located 27 kms from Hungary's fifth largest city, Győr, which is intersected by the Vienna–Budapest highway. Two-thirds of the population was Protestant and one-third Catholic; there were only two Jewish families. The village had belonged to the wealthy aristocratic Esterházy family for three centuries. After the liberation of the serfs in 1848, the peasants became the owners of the land and cultivated it for their own needs. This ownership, however, was limited to small acreages since the lord retained two-thirds of the township's arable land. As Table 1 indicates, there was a considerable difference in the amount of land which individual peasants owned. This differentiation remained more or less intact until the land reform of 1945.

Table 1. Economic differentiation in Táp (1935)

	Táp	Nation
Well-to-do peasants (above 17 hectares of land)	2%	2%
Middle peasants (6–17 ha)	19%	12%
Small peasants (3–6 ha)	25%	12%
Poor peasants (0.5–2.5 ha)	32%	35%
Agrarian proletariats (i.e., agricultural workers, day laborers, paupers)	19%	35%
Other (merchants, teachers, priests, etc.)	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Source for national figures: Ferenc Donáth, *Reform and Revolution*. Budapest: Corvina, 1980, p. 40. Figures on Táp from author's survey.

As can be readily discerned from Table 1, more than two-thirds of the population in the village lived on less than six hectares of land. Despite the somewhat better-than-average quality of the Transdanubian soil, this area was not adequate to sustain a peasant family. In addition to the already mentioned European sociopolitical and economic conditions, Hungarian peasants continued to cling to extensive methods of land cultivation with a heavy emphasis on wheat production.⁷ Since the cultivation of wheat required a great deal of land, the goal of the peasant was to acquire more and more of it. Thus, people saved money to quench their thirst for more land and preferred not to become consumers.

Peasants of the lower strata (poor peasants and below in Table 1) had to supplement their farm income by seasonal labor and even some middle peasants sent their children to compete with the agrarian proletariat. The latter's income was merely a fraction of the rich peasant's, but many were able to secure permanent positions as farm hands on the aristocratic estates, or *puszta*k, which saved them from starvation during such disastrous years as 1931.⁸

In reality, the middle and wealthy peasants could have had a richer diet than those below them. They owned more livestock and were able to keep a more close-knit family with a stricter supervision of resources.⁹ Whereas the poor tended to spend their income at once in the spirit of the "culture of poverty" (to use Oscar Lewis' expression), the richer farmer saved, in the spirit of George Foster's "image of limited good."¹⁰ Livestock properties of rich, middle and poor peasants can be broken down into the following categories.¹¹

Table 2. Ownership of livestock (Táp, 1935)

Peasant category	Horses	Cows	Beef cattle	Hogs	Sheep	Poultry
Rich	2-4	3-4	4-6	8	3-4	40-50
Middle	2	1-2	1-3	4-5	1-2	20-30
Poor	0-1	0	0	2-3	0	15-30

Because of vast differences in the manner of husbandry, family size, and individual variation in values, the criteria of wealth go beyond the size of land and animal stock. Thus, there were farm servants who saved hundreds of Pengős (1 Pengő equalled 25¢) and lent money to others, while wealthy or middle peasants slid into poverty.

In spite of the conceptions of Western travellers and Hungarian writers of the first half of the 20th century — a notable exception being the sociologists of the 1930s¹² — the peasantry did not eat well. While more than two-thirds of the nation toiled at producing food, much of which was exported, post-World War I food consumption fell considerably below the level of earlier centuries. Notably, the per capita meat consumption (along with plant protein intake) was less than one-third of calculated meat consumption during the 16th century.¹³ Held cites a figure of 56.1 pounds of meat consumer per capita (including

urban consumers) during the 1940s,¹⁴ while at the same time meat consumption in Germany was 107 pounds per capita, and 141.9 pounds in Denmark. Sugar, dairy, and vegetable consumption statistics were even less favorable for Hungary.

Although the Hungarian class system was rigid and highly differentiated, the menu of the different strata in a single community did not strictly reflect differentiation in wealth. Thus, while there were vast differences in land size and animal stock (especially horses, for which Hungarian peasants spent much of their earnings), housing, sartorial practices, the level of education, and the dietary practices of the social strata exhibited remarkable similarities. Diet was certainly not a measure of differentiation. Yet students of Hungarian peasant culture, particularly ethnographers, have generally associated rural diet with social stratification. For example Balassa and Ortutay have stated: "The greatest differences between peasant strata were reflected by food patterns. Vegetable foods dominated the diet of the poor, while the wealthy consumed greater quantities of fatty meats."¹⁵ The "muckraker" sociologists of the 1930s were especially bent on demonstrating dietary differences between rich and poor. They concentrated on the poorest segment of society, which indeed was losing thousands of calories and badly needed vitamins, but did not investigate the middle and wealthy peasant's diet.¹⁶ These observers embarked on a mission to change social injustices in Hungary but saw only the tip of the iceberg.

One of the very few observers who grasped the harsher realities was the sociologist István Weisz, who stated categorically that "there are only minute differences in the standard of living of the agrarian proletariat and the wealthy peasant. Our prime observation is that the food consumption of our agricultural population is both insufficient and unhealthy. All the experts (physicians) agree that the peasant eats to fight his ever-present hunger and not for the nutritional value of the food."¹⁷

As a rule peasants ate three meals a day: breakfast, lunch, and supper. However, children were often sent to bed without supper, with the cruel order of "get undressed and go to sleep." To make up for such skipped meals, and because they had more free time than adults, many children stole fruits (usually prior to ripening), vegetables and poultry, and foraged as well. Foraging and food collecting — which had so generously provided the peasant with a supplementary diet prior to the breaking up of the common forests and the alienation of waters in the middle of the 19th century — was now restricted. Wild game, fish, mushrooms, roots and berries were the exclusive property of the landlord. Thus, increasingly, the peasant diet began to rely on starches derived from grain cereals. But even in terms of cereals, there was a great competition between people and livestock. The pastures had been broken up for plow land and the stall-fed animals raised for the market were fed grains once consumed exclusively by people. Poultry was kept primarily for eggs, which were the source of quick petty-cash which mothers often saved for their daughter's dowry. Milk and dairy products were produced for the same purpose.

Most families in Táp had no gardens. The entire domestic plot was used for storage, hay and straw stacks, and the poultry. Garden vegetables such as peas, beans, cabbage, and pumpkins were planted in the cornfields.

There were certain norms of eating in Táp, thus enabling one to describe typical meals in Táp during the interwar years. Walking into a peasant house during winter, one would have encountered the following daily menu:

Table 3. A typical daily menu in Táp (1930-40)

Breakfast	caraway soup with flour base and croutons (alternatives: corn meal mush with sour cream and on occasion with fried ham; chicory coffee with bread; milk and bread)
Lunch	potato soup with bread (alternatives: bean-, vegetable-, or pea soup with bread; poppy seed- or cottage cheese noodles)
Supper	lunch leftovers (alternates: "bere": grated potatoes mixed with pieces of bacon, fried in lard)

A typical Sunday menu in Táp (1930-40)

Breakfast	coffee with bread
Lunch	pork soup with cabbage (seldom stew)
Dinner	lunch leftovers

The above abbreviated menus will be now expanded to a week's summer menu of a rich, middle and poor peasant family of Táp. Apart from minor differences, the wealthy family's diet lacked more nutrients (meats, vegetables, vitamins etc.) than that of the middle peasant, and the poor family's diet is only slightly worse than the other two.

Table 4. Rich peasant's weekly menu in Táp (1930-40)

Day	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner
Monday	bread and coffee	potato soup with noddles	leftovers
Tuesday	bread with fried lard pieces ("töpörtyű")	coffee and bread	eggs with bread
Wednesday	bread and coffee	bread and coffee	headcheese and bread
Thursday	bread and coffee	bacon and bread	bread and eggs
Friday	bread and coffee	bread and cottage cheese	walnut noodles
Saturday	bread and coffee	bread and milk	cottage cheese, biscuits
Sunday	bread and milk	meat soup and chicken paprika	leftovers

Let us now summarize these stratified weekly menus. Aside from what they lacked, their common denominator was the following: all emphasized starches (bread and pasta), soups and the repetition of lunches for dinner. In particular, the rich repeated breakfast at least one time during the week. In the repetition of lunch the poor led the way with

Table 5. Middle peasant's weekly menu in Táp (1930-40)

Day	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner
Monday	eggs with bread	bean soup with walnut noodles	leftovers
Tuesday	sour cream with bread	milk with bread	cooked cabbage
Wednesday	sour cream with bread	bacon and bread	bean soup with biscuits
Thursday	break and milk	meat soup with fried potatoes	leftovers
Friday	coffee and bread	eggs with bread	potato soup with cottage cheese noodles
Saturday	bread with cottage cheese	coffee and bread	soup with noodles, cottage cheese noodles
Sunday	eggs and bread	meat soup and pie	leftovers

Table 6. Poor peasant's weekly menu in Táp (1930-40)*

Day	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner
Monday	milk with bread	potato soup, cottage cheese-pie	leftovers
Tuesday	milk with bread	tomato soup and biscuits	leftovers
Wednesday	eggs and bread	bean soup and jam rolls	leftovers
Thursday	walnuts and bread	tomato soup and potato mush	milk with bread
Friday	grapes and bread	potato soup and cottage noodles	leftovers
Saturday	coffee and bread	pork soup and sauerkraut	leftovers
Sunday	milk and bread	noodle soup and pork stew	leftovers

*Roughly analogous to agrarian proletariat's

six, the middle followed with three, and the rich was the last with two. We may also note that three of the lunches of the rich were inferior to those of the poor and that the poor and the middle peasant ate much better breakfasts than the rich.

In general the poorer the peasant, the more soup was consumed. Of the twenty-one weekly meals, the rich ate soup four times, the middle peasant nine times, the poor thirteen times. The advantages of soup over, let us say bread and milk (which the rich relished for lunch), were: a) the use of animal fat hortening, b) one could have several

servings of it, c) it contained a variety of items, such as noodles, vegetables, potatoes, and sometimes meat.

The distribution of pasta and bread in these meals is also noteworthy. Somewhat contrary to the expectations, the rich peasant consumed them at every meal, the middle only sixteen times, and the poor eighteen times a week.

The rich ate eggs and dairy products on four occasions only; the middle peasants eight times; and the poor five times. Here, the middle peasant fared decidedly better than the other two. The richer peasant, who had better means of transportation and thus freer access to the railroad station in the next village (Tápszentmiklós), was able to haul his milk and eggs to the market in Győr, thereby depriving his family.

Most meat was consumed by the rich (who killed pigs several times a year, or several pigs during winter). The typical rich family ate meaty meals four times a week as did the middle peasant but three of these meals were in the form of soup. The poor had only two meaty meals; one of which was soup, another a stew.

The diet of the rich was somewhat better than that of the middle and the poor peasant, but it was almost identical in nutrients to that of the middle peasant. The advantage of the two upper strata over the poor was in the variety of foods and in the practice of not skipping meals. However, these advantages were reduced considerably by the fact that their children were restricted from foraging and were severely punished when caught stealing. For this reason, they tended to suffer from vitamin deficiency even more than the poor children. Rich and middle peasants kept a close eye on the pantry and taught their children self-denial, saying "we don't want to raise gluttons."

The most notable feature of the middle peasant's diet was the smart utilization of eggs and dairy products and the greater variety and preparation of noodles. This dubious "variety" in food preparation allowed the middle peasant to conclude that the diet of the rich was worse than his. Indeed, in many cases it was, and this was reflected in the normative system of Táp. Middle and poor peasants disliked eating at the home of the rich and many middle peasant women made a point of "outcooking" their rich sisters.

The chief feature of the poor peasant diet was the skipping and repetition of meals. They used more starches and less meat than the middle and rich peasants. The poor restricted their meat-eating to the winter months when hogs were slaughtered. The poor also ate less bacon and smoked meat (perhaps an advantage) but ate more potatoes and fruits. They consumed few dairy products and, as a result, their health suffered.

Even worse off were those poor peasants of "dwarf" holdings, the paupers and the dispossessed whose diet brought them close to starvation. One of them reminisced in the following way: "We were always hungry, even after a meal. The only thing in our mind all day was how to get food. We stole from everyone, the neighbor as well as the lord. We hated school because it kept us from getting food in some way."¹⁸

Since there are no exact measurements available of the food consumed by the villagers, it is impossible to ascertain whether the rich, middle, or poor peasant consumed the most. For this reason, we cannot calculate daily calorie intake. We know from medical surveys that 7,000 calories were needed by an adult male during harvest. But it is unlikely that any of the peasants consumed 5,000 calories. The ironic aspect of peasant diet — already

mentioned above — was that it was best during the winter months when they exerted the least amount of energy and became increasingly worse as the agricultural season advanced.

The monotony of the protein items is reflected by the exclusive use of pork and chicken. It is safe to assume that the optimal annual per capita meat consumption did not exceed 30 pounds — considerably under the national average of 56 pounds.

The ultimate result of this diet was chronic undernourishment for the rural population.

As for the nutritional value of the rural diet, the menu of the villager consisted of approximately a dozen foodstuffs, most of which were carbohydrates. Most carbohydrates consumed in Hungary were derivatives of wheat, although in some regions of Western Hungary, rye was mixed in bread flour. But by milling the grain the peel is removed, which deprives the consumer of important Vitamin B. Since it was the cheapest food source, all peasants consumed it in almost equal amounts and forms of preparation. There were, however, some differences. The middle and upper strata used more shortening in pastas and this gave them a slight edge over the poor.

Peasants consumed very few vitamins. This was a curious shortcoming since western Hungarian gardeners excelled in the production of fruits and vegetables. There were, for example, several thousand families of Hungarian origins who contributed to urban markets. But these were the exceptions. Peasants placed a higher value on grain rather than fruit and vegetable production, which they held in abeyance. And whatever vegetables they used, they cooked them thoroughly thereby destroying their vitamin content. Vitamin C deficiencies were observed by doctors in the vast majority of the rural population.¹⁹ Green, leafy vegetables (such as spinach and sorrel), carrots, cantaloupes and squash seldom appeared on the table.

Finally, calcium, which is contained in dairy products and fish, iron (found in liver) and other important nutrients were also lacking, thereby contributing to poor dental health and bone diseases.

All in all, the peasant diet of the interwar years can be characterized more by what it lacked than by what it contained. It caused the agricultural sector innumerable problems. Among these were high infant mortality, low productivity, high recurrence of diseases, and low life expectancy — all of which contributed to a general feeling of discontent among the rural population. By the time conditions began to improve (1940s), World War II enveloped Hungary and, not long after it, socialism put an end to traditional peasant life.

Conclusions and Implications

Because of exogenous and endogenous forces, the peasant diet in Hungary during the interwar years eroded in both quality and quantity. In spite of sustained and, in some respects, improved agricultural production, food deprivation became the hallmark of the Hungarian rural life style for the first time in centuries. An intrinsic peasant belief was

that self-sustenance and mobility were intimately linked to belt tightening. Instead of placing food on the table, peasants converted it to cash to pay for taxes, animal stock and more land. All social strata were equally affected by these norms. Therefore culinary values and habits permeated the entire village to a remarkable degree. We saw that the rich peasant practiced a higher degree of self-denial and self-exploitation than the poor. Diet was not a means by which prestige could be measured.

Peasant diet depended heavily on carbohydrates, which came primarily from milled wheat, seldom from rye and corn. Meals lacked protein, vitamins and minerals. Variety was expressed in the minor rather than major ingredients and in the manner of food preparation. From the perspective of food preparation, Hungarian peasant culinary practices proved unhealthy, primarily because of the repeated use of pork lard as shortening,²⁰ overcooked vegetables, and smoked meat. Although the exact number of individual meals is not known, the meagerness of portions and the frequency of meal-skipping is beyond dispute. While Hungarian peasants were not starving in the strict sense of the term, hunger was an integral part of daily life. Instead of generating pleasure, food dampened hunger. They ate in a quiet, sullen atmosphere, and the well known proverb was: "Hungarians don't talk while eating." Wedding feasts and two or three annual festivities ("búcsú", or church-day, Christmas and Easter) were the only times of lavish food consumption.

Food deprivation was responsible for an alarmingly low energy output, poor health, high infant mortality rate (in 1930 two hundred out of 1,000 children died before the age of one), and low life expectancy (40 years in 1930). Medical reports testify to the high recurrence of anemia, malnutrition, infectious diseases, and dental problems. One third of the school children carried tuberculosis.²¹

Although medical services improved during the interwar years, rural health conditions did not substantially change until after the great social transformation of the 1960s. By the 1970s peasant life under the system of collectivized agriculture created unheard of levels of food production and traditional peasant life itself disappeared from Hungary.

Notes

1. Consult Péter Hanák, (ed.), *Magyarország története, 1890–1918*, (The History of Hungary, 1890–1918). (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1978), Chapter IV; György Ránki, (ed.), *Magyarország története, 1918–1919, 1919–1945*, (The History of Hungary, 1918–1919, 1919–1945), (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976), Chapters V, VIII; Joseph Held, (ed.), *The Modernization of Agriculture: Rural Transformation in Hungary, 1848–1975*. (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1980), Part V; Mihály Kerek, *A magyar földkérdés története*, (The History of the Hungarian Land Problem). (Budapest: MEFHOSZ, 1939); Péter Gunst, *A mezőgazdasági termelés története Magyarországon, 1920–1938*, (The History of Agricultural Production in Hungary, 1920–1938), (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970); *Mezőgazdaságunk fejlődése a két világháború között* (The Development of our Agriculture between the Two World Wars): *Valóság* (1970) 4:78–91; Ferenc Erdei, *A magyar paraszttársadalom*, (The Hungarian Peasant Society), (Budapest: Franklin, no date).
2. Not only the urban but the rural culinary habits were held in high esteem. The general consensus

both inside and outside of Hungary was that peasant cooking was lavish and was practiced as embroidery, woodcarving or folkpoetry. The most respected ethnographer of the interwar years, Zsigmond Bátky, for example, concluded that "our culinary art has elevated our folk cuisine above those of our neighbors, to international renown". (Elemér Czákó ed., *A magyarság néprajza*, (The Ethnography of Hungary), Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, no date, Vol. I, p. 38.) Because of this generally shared misconception, children were often sent to the rural areas for summer vacation. Many returned to school in worse physical condition than in the beginning of the summer.

3. An average Hungarian restaurant during this period served the following main courses: Kettle goulash ("bográcsosgulyás"), veal pörkölt ("borjú pörkölt"), fish soup ("halászlé"), pork flekken ("sertésflekken"), braised beef or pork ("marha-" or "sertésrostélyos"), assorted meat platter à la Transylvania ("erdélyi fatányéros"), braised pork à la Brassó ("brassói aprópecsenye"), hot liver pudding ("májashurka"), stuffed cabbage ("töltött káposzta"), chicken paprika ("paprikás-csirke"), smoked pig's knuckle ("füstöltcsülök"). Of these typical Hungarian dishes – eaten anywhere in the world – only the last two were seen during the interwar years on the peasant's table. For extensive survey depicting the utter monotony of South-West Hungarian cuisine, see László Kardos *Az Őrség népi táplálkozása* (The Folk Diet of the Őrség). (Államtudományi Intézet, Budapest, 1943).
- For an overview of Hungarian peasant cooking, see Judit Morvay, *Népi táplálkozás* (Folk Cooking), (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum-Néprajzi Múzeum. Ethnológiai Adattár, VI, 1962). The best historical treatment of Hungarian high class cooking with some references to peasant diet is that of George Lang, *The Cuisine of Hungary*. (New York: Bonanza Books, 1971).
4. For a highly revealing scientific appraisal of the effects of poverty upon peasant health, see Andor Németh, *A naposabb oldalon* (On the Sunnier Side of the Street) (Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda, 1937).
5. See *Magyarország népesedése a két világháború között* (The Demography of Hungary between the Two World Wars). (Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, 1965).
6. Németh, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
7. See Gunst, *op. cit.*
8. See Gyula Illyés, *Puszták népe* (The People of the Pusztas). (Budapest: Nyugat, no date); Held, *op. cit.*, pp. 255–92.
9. For a comparison of middle peasant life-styles, see Edit Fél and Tamás Hofer, *Proper Peasants*. (Chicago: Aldine, 1969).
10. Oscar Lewis, *The Culture of Poverty*, Scientific American, (1966) 215, 19–25. George M. Foster, Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good. *American Anthropologist*, (1965–67), pp. 293–315.
11. The categories are based on the testimony of villagers.
12. Among the best known were: József Darvas, *Egy magyar parasztcsalád története* (The History of a Hungarian Peasant Family). (Budapest: Athenaeum, no date); Imre Kovács, *A néma forradalom* (Silent Revolution). (Budapest: Cserépfalvi, no date); Géza Féja, *Viharsarok* (Stormy Corner). (Budapest: Magvető, 1957).
13. During the 16th century an artillery man received 1 pound of meat, 2 pounds of bread, and a quart of wine daily. These were most likely also consumed by a well-to-do peasant (cf., Ferenc Maksay, *Parasztság és majorgazdálkodás a XVI. századi Magyarországon* (The Peasantry and the Management of Large Estates in Hungary during the 16th century). (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1958), p. 104; Péter Hanák, *Hogyan éltek elődeink?* (How did our Ancestors Live?). (Budapest: Gondolat, 1980); pp. 67–8; Béla Radvánszky, *Magyar családélet és háztartás a XVI. és XVII. században* (The Hungarian Family and Household during the 16th and 17th Centuries). (Budapest, 1897).
14. Held, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
15. Iván Balassa and Gyula Ortutay, *Magyar néprajz* (Hungarian Ethnography). (Budapest: Corvina,

1979), p. 263. The picture of the stratified peasant diet elsewhere has been seriously challenged by anthropologists with thorough field experience. See Michael Freedman, *Report on Some Aspects of Food, Health and Society in Indonesia*. (World Health Organization, MH/AS/219.55, 1955); See Schoenfield, *Development and the Problems of Village Nutrition*. (Croom Helm London, 1979).

16. See, for example Féja, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

17. István Weisz, *A magyar falu* (The Hungarian Village). (Budapest: Magyar Szemle, 1931), pp. 68–9.

18. Quoted from an elderly informant during anthropological fieldwork in 1979.

19. See Németh, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–20, 154.

20. The use of sunflower and pumpkin seed oil all but disappeared between the two wars. The last wooden oil press made in the 18th century was taken to the Xantus János Museum Győr, in 1962.

21. Németh, *op. cit.*, p. 20.