

*Tolerance and Movements of Religious Dissent in Eastern Europe.* Edited by Béla K. Király. Series: East European Monographs, Number 13. Copyright by *East European Quarterly*, Boulder, Colorado. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975. Pp. xii + 227.

The book under review contains thirteen separate essays by twelve contributors on a topic that has not really been treated by American East European scholarship: religious tolerance and dissent in East Central Europe.

Not counting the introductory essay by H. J. Hillerbrand, which has been prepared specifically for this volume and contains general reflections on the topic of the book, the twelve remaining essays have all been prepared as lectures for several independent symposia between the years 1971 and 1975. These essays are organized around three themes: 1.) religious intolerance, 2.) religious dissent within the Jewry, and 3.) religious tolerance in East Central Europe.

Of these three themes, the second is perhaps the most self-contained, in that the two essays that deal with it both concentrate on a rather limited aspect of East Central European history: an inner controversy within the Jewish community of the area. The "hostile phase" of the controversy between the Hasidim and the Mitnaggedim is treated by M. Wilensky, and the "phase of dialogue and reconciliation" by N. Lamm.

The other two themes are treated in five essays each. Of the five essays on intolerance, three deal with this question primarily from the vantage point of Czech history (the essays by F. G. Heyman, P. Brock and M. S. Fousek), and one each within the context of Austrian (R. A. Kann) and Hungarian history (B. K. Király).

This system of apportionment also holds true for the theme of religious tolerance, where three of the essays deal with the tolerant nature of "Pax Ottomanica" (E. K. Shaw, S. J. Shaw, and S. Fischer-Galati), and only one each with the Polish (A. G. Duker) and Hungarian (B. K. Király) aspects of this question. (It should perhaps be noted here that S. J. Shaw's contribution is closer to a brief commentary on the Ottoman *millet* than to an independent essay on par with the other contributions.)

Of these thirteen contributions by twelve authorities, the two that deal with Hungarian developments were both written by the editor of the volume, Professor B. K. Király of Brooklyn College. Although it would be desirable, lack of space does not permit us to do more than to give a brief summary of their content and of the author's conclusions.

The first of these essays, entitled "Protestantism in Hungary between

the Revolution and the *Ausgleich*," (pp. 65-85) centers largely on the so-called "Protestant Patent of 1859," and on the Hungarian reaction to the same. This short-lived Patent was basically an attempt on the part of the Austrian authorities of the period of post-revolutionary absolutism (1849-1860) to limit the traditional Protestant autonomy in Hungary. Although based partially on Josephinism, the motivation behind it was largely political. So was the Hungarian reaction to it. Irrespective of their denomination, all Hungarians regarded this Patent as simply another attempt at curtailing Hungarian political and individual liberties, and they reacted to it accordingly.

Given the almost simultaneous defeat in Italy, Vienna could hardly do anything, but to retreat. And thus this Patent, which was repealed after only eight and a half months, hardly did more than to aggravate the already tense Austro-Hungarian relations. On the other hand, by shaking up the Viennese leadership, it may have contributed to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867.

Professor Király's second contribution, "The Sublime Porte, Vienna, Transylvania and the Dissemination of Protestant Reformation in Royal Hungary" (pp. 199-221), is basically a brief analytical history of the rise of Hungarian Protestantism in the sixteenth century. It covers this development right up to the Law of 1608, which granted religious freedom to the Protestants, and an almost equal treatment with the Catholics.

Following the lead of some of Hungary's great Reformation historians, Professor Király perceives this Protestant victory to have been the result of a number of interdependent factors. He sees the most significant of these as (1) the Ottoman conquest of Central Hungary, (2) the impact of the nearly independent and mostly Protestant Transylvania upon Royal Hungary, and (3) the consolidation of the gentry's dominance, or in other terms, the nobility's successful defense of their "constitutional liberties" against Habsburg centralism.

Professor Király concludes his essay with the statement that "the direct and indirect consequences of Protestantism in Hungary were progressive for intellectual life, education, culture and constitutional liberty, and were retrogressive in the social sphere." (p. 209). While much of this statement would be acceptable to most historians, I personally would qualify the last part of his conclusions. It is true that the gentry's dominance—in addition to securing all of the above liberties—also led to such reactionary social developments as the enserfment of the peasant masses. But this "second serfdom" was more the result of the general social and economic tendencies throughout East Central

and Eastern Europe of that period, than the result of any specific developments in Hungary. For this very reason it was not limited to areas under Protestant influence. In fact, the only areas of East Central Europe that were free from "second serfdom" were those under Ottoman control. And this was so precisely because of the tolerant and egalitarian nature of the Ottoman system during the height of its power; a fact that has also been pointed out by Professors E. K. Shaw, J. S. Shaw, and S. Fischer-Galati in their respective contributions to this volume.

The book ends with a useful list of the biographies of ten of the twelve contributors. (For some reason, the biographies of M. S. Fousek and E. K. Shaw were not included.) But it lacks a name and subject index, which would have enhanced its usefulness considerably.

All in all, this work under the editorship of Professor Király is a good start in the right direction, and the author-editor should be complimented both for his own contributions, as well as for his efforts in putting this pioneering volume into the hands of American scholars.

Duquesne University

S. B. Vardy

*A magyar irodalom fogadtatása a viktoriánus Angliában, 1830–1914* [The Reception of Hungarian Literature in Victorian England, 1830–1914]. By Lóránt Czigány. Translated from the English by Bálint Rozsnyai. *Irodalomtörténeti Füzetek* 89 [Literary History Booklet No. 89]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976. Pp. 287.

Literature is a form of art which is bound more to the original language than any other art forms (painting, sculpture, music, etc.). It is of course possible to translate literary works, but the translated versions always lose something of the original flavor. This is all the more so, when the literature in question is the product, and therefore a reflection of a small self-contained world. Such is usually the case with literatures of small nations which use minor languages. Having been enclosed into their small world, and having been constantly subjected to the pressures and dominance of larger nations, they are usually less able to look upon problems from a universal perspective. For this reason, their literature is also more self-contained, has less universal application, and consequently—notwithstanding their innate merits—cannot be fully appreciated by the outside world.

To this must be added the problems connected with translation.