

Srpske", in December) shows the ridiculousness of the arbitrary methods adopted by the Ban. "The enforcement of the changing of geographical names", — says the article —, "will by no means serve the national ideal; it is not easy to see why it should be necessary to change, again, the names of towns and villages which were changed seventeen years ago, especially those that are not of Hungarian or German origin. There is absolutely no need for such a change, the more so as the Yugoslav books dealing with political, cultural, and literary history, as well as all the encyclopaedias, refer to places in the Voivodina under their old names: moreover, the Hungarians themselves had no objection — in former days — against the use of names of Slav origin."

The Minority Congress held in Geneva in the autumn of last year, also discussed this arbitrary change of geographical names. The Congress passed a resolution, afterwards put before the League of Nations, in which it was declared that "the names of geographical places, districts, regions, and the parts thereof such as mountains, rivers, forests, etc., which a nation has formed according to its national spirit and history, and its social, economic, and cultural development, in correspondence with the rules of its own language, even if those names have been taken from other languages and transformed accordingly, form an inalienable property of the language of that nation. If, therefore, a nation is hindered or not allowed to use the names in speaking, writing, or printing in its own language, it is a sin against the most vital function of its national existence, both for the community and for the individual, namely its mother tongue, which is a sin that must be condemned both from a moral and from a political point of view. In those States, moreover, in which the rights of the minorities, especially in point of language, have been guaranteed by international treaties, such procedure means an open breach of these obligations. The Congress, therefore, resolves to raise a solemn protest against all such attempts and methods."

Furthermore, we would refer to the speech made by Mr. Emil Neugeboren, delegate of the Germans in Rumania, at the Minority Congress in Geneva. In his speech he noted that the Hungarian law referring to the use of geographical names (Act. IV. of 1898.) restricted the compulsory use of official names to official documents, official intercourse, the administ-

ration of public institutions and public works, and school books. *The Hungarian Government, however, has never attempted to prohibit the use of geographical names in the languages of the different nationalities together with the official names, or to print these, in brackets, even in those school books that have been published with the approval of the authorities. Nor is it possible to mention a single instance in which the Hungarian authorities have prevented the nationalities from using their own geographical nomenclature in their papers or in trade relations, or even (in brackets) in the addresses of private letters.* We must also bear in mind that there were no international guarantees in those days for the rights of the minorities such as we have now! We have got them now but apparently only on paper, and with no result, as we can see.

— y —

SERBS NOT ALLOWED TO APPEAR IN HUNGARIAN AMATEUR PERFORMANCES

The Assistant Notary of the village Bajmok (in the Bácska), M. Nešić, reported Dr. Milojevič, the village surgeon, to the authorities for appearing, as a Serb, at various Hungarian amateur dramatic performances and thus, in his opinion, forfeiting his right to hold office. The Attorney General thereupon accused Nešić of libelling against another civil servant, but the Court in Szabadka (Subotica) acquitted him.

— y —

SLOVAK COMPLAINT ABOUT YUGOSLAVIA'S MINORITY POLICY

The "Slovak", the mouthpiece of Hlinka's Automist People's Party, complains in its issue of January 12th that a Serb woman-teacher who cannot speak one word of Slovak has been appointed in the so-called "Slovak Section" of the elementary school at Endevik, a place in the Szerém district. All the petitions of the Slovaks of Endevik for a Slovak teacher, and all their delegations, have been of no avail.

— y —

THEATRE • LITERATURE • ART

BERNARD SHAW*

by

Francis Herczeg

There is a degree of shrewdness of observation, of a propensity to moral indignation and of genius which precludes political caution or acumen. Persons possessing those qualities in such a degree possess one faculty to the exclusion of all others — that of appreciating, appraising and noting what others do.

If the above words of a great French thinker are

* The above article written by the Hungarian author appears on the occasion of the re-playing of Bernard Shaw's "Saint Johanna".

true, we need not rack our brains for the reason why there is such a wide gulf fixed between the cultural aims of mankind and the wretched reality. The reason is that, while culture is the work of geniuses whose intellectual and moral being makes them shrink from political leadership, the fate of the peoples is in the hands of men who carry little ballast beyond their "political caution and acumen". The eternal ideal of these men has always been the diplomatic horse-dealer who is able to cheat all his customers.

We must not forget that the whole cultural

system of the white races has been produced by the many, — far from royal palaces and houses of parliament, in *scriptoria* and laboratories and studios and garrets, in backwaters far removed from the rushing stream of politics and often in defiance of the political world. The fundamental principles of that culture are in irreconcilable opposition to the barbarian spirit which is the motor force of politics.

At times we cannot escape the impression that the destinies of the nations are being controlled by unscrupulous narrowmindedness, and that the diplomacy of today still adheres to the moral principles developed in the days when Grand Viziers and kaimakams held sway on the shores of the Bosphorus. We may be told that this is an exaggeration; but it is quite evident that, while uttering fulsome protestations of its love of peace, the political world goes on making preparations on a huge scale to bring about fresh bloody catastrophes, — catastrophes the destructive effects of which are just as incalculable and uncontrollable as those of the whirlwind and which in the past, while failing to solve any political problems, merely fresh complications for those which had previously existed.

The real geniuses of mankind have always been bitterly opposed to the whole system of masked barbarism responsible for bringing into being this political spirit — or rather want of spirit. One dons the prophet's mantle — while another maybe puts on cap and bells — to be able to openly tell humanity the awful truth. But Bernard Shaw's withering satire is based upon a magnificent idealism; as Tolstoy's fanaticism is rooted in a fervent love of humanity.

The ideas here propounded seem to be particularly in place just now in connection with the revival — by the Belvárosi Theatre, that refined home of histrionic art of which any great city might well be proud — of Shaw's "Saint Johanna". This wonderful creation, with its bewitching profundity of perspective, its dazzling audacity of dialectic and its enchanting wealth of poetic colour, has been produced by Director Arthur Bárdos in a manner which would surely be a source of infinite pleasure to its world-famed

author himself.

We cannot believe there is any other city in Europe in which Shaw has found so appreciative and so receptive a public as that of Budapest, the very atmosphere of which is in any case saturated with strongly satirical elements. It is true, indeed, that in Hungary so far that public has consisted far more of readers than of theatre-goers; but we are convinced that the complete understanding and the bewildering intensity of the performance of Shaw's masterpiece in the Belvárosi Theatre will result in the enthusiastic reception accorded to "Saint Johanna" in the art centres of Europe which has long been overdue in Budapest too will cast a halo of glory over the head of the dramatist too.

There was a time when we Hungarians could not pronounce the name of the poet now being celebrated here without feelings of bitterness in our hearts; for in a letter addressed to the Czech writer Karel Capek in 1928 which was published in the Prague papers, Shaw unjustly and without reason offended the Hungarian nation. The feelings aroused in us by that letter were not those of anger; but far more a sort of pained disappointment. Misfortune makes peoples doubly sensitive.

Since then Bernard Shaw has made many statements allowing of our concluding that he has revised or maybe only tempered his original attitude, which must have been the consequence of onesided and biased information.

His genius must disarm all petty implacability. But, since we are one of the brilliant paladins of Justice, we cannot help fervently desiring that Bernard Shaw may find ways and means to ascertain the truth in the Danube question by information obtained at first hand. We do not ask him to believe either Karel Capek or us — for both of us are interested parties and may therefore be biased; we ask him to trust solely to his brilliant power of observation and to his keen judgment; and then we know full well which side will secure the sympathy of the man who all his life has been the enemy of every form of oppression and political hypocrisy.

THE 100 YEARS JUBILEE OF THE KISFALUDY SOCIETY

by

Charles Sebestyén

In a splendid monograph, planned with great care and executed with masterly skill, Professor Louis Kéky, Secretary-general of the Kisfaludy Society, has written the history of the Society for the past hundred years. The data in this article have been taken from his book.

The inspiring genius of the Society, which was formed in 1836, was Charles Kisfaludy, whose progressive spirit had sought contacts in form, material, and ideas with the intellectual world of the West, but who, nevertheless, had clung fast to national traditions, and had not scorned to make use of even popular themes. Vörösmarty, Petöfi, and Arany had listened to his teachings, and following in his footsteps, brought Hungarian poetry to its full unfolding. After his death the desire grew and grew to create a society which in his spirit would foster national culture, combine the scattered forces, and organize intellectual work. After many struggles and difficulties, after many obstacles had been overcome, the "Society of Belles-Lettres" which later bore Kisfaludy's name came into being. At the cradle of the new-born stood no lesser men than Vörösmarty, prince of poetry;

Bajza, the first Hungarian critic in a European sense of the word, who later became the director of the National Theatre; and the tranquil Francis Toldy, the "father of the history of literature in Hungary", with his fervent passion for the beautiful. Among the names on the list of its first members we find Gregor Czuczor, the impassioned lyric poet; Andrew Fáy, the novelist, Baron Nicolas Jósika, and Francis Kölcsey, the classical poet, orator, aesthete, and first-rate citizen. The first members of the Society were imbued with two emotions — reverence for Kisfaludy and a hunger for progress.

At the very outset the Society set itself two tasks; the furtherance of Hungarian literature and the establishment of contacts with the world of foreign literature. It was decided to publish a series of foreign works of fiction. Among the first twelve volumes to appear, were works by Bulwer Lytton, Balzac, Dickens, Victor Hugo, Cervantes and Boccaccio translated by eminent authors and so were made available for Hungarian readers. Parallel with this undertaking ran that of the National Library, which contained selected works from the Hungarian literature of the XVIII and

XIX centuries. The Society rendered special service to literature by awarding prizes in competitions intended to spur the younger generation to creative effort. The result of a competition of this kind was the discovery of the till then wholly unknown genius, John Arany. The poet was at that time a petty clerk in the notary's office of his native place, the small town of Szalonta. From there he sent in his satirical epic poem "The lost constitution" to compete for the prize offered by the Kisfaludy Society. His hopes of success were but few, and probably no one could have been more surprised than himself to learn that he had won the prize. His name was so wholly unknown that when the envelope containing it was opened, everybody thought it was a *nom-de-plume*. Application was made to the authorities in Szalonta to inquire whether a man of that name really lived there. In 1847 John Arany won the Kisfaludy Society's prize with his now classical work "Toldi". It was only then that the name of the poet became widely known, and simultaneously achieved fame. When his epic was published Petöfi wrote a poem greeting him cordially. It is interesting to note that Petöfi himself was never member of the Kisfaludy Society, nor did he ever become a member of the Academy of Sciences. This was through no fault of the Society. At the beginning of 1846 he was asked to apply for election, but definitely refused. On the other hand Arany's election could not have been an unmixed joy for himself, for there were many fault-finders, who reproached the Society for admitting men like Arany to membership.

The violent emotions and disastrous events of 1848—1849 had a dire effect on the Society. Even in the first years of the Absolutism it scarcely dared to stir. But its enthusiastic members never lost hope that out of the ruins of the immediate past there would spring a new, budding life which would have its effect on the spirit of the people. But it was not until the year 1860 that a new era dawned for the Society. At that time Baron Eötvös was still Chairman; the Vice-Chairman was Francis Toldy and the manager John Arany. This post enabled the great poet to leave Nagykorös, where he had been teaching in a grammar-school and come to the Capital. Two of the greatest achievements accomplished by the Society during the hundred years of its existence date from this period — viz. the publication of a complete edition of Shakespeare's works in Hungarian and the

translation of all Molière's plays into that language. Our greatest poets took part in the work. Even before the publication of a complete edition of Shakespeare's works was contemplated, Petöfi had translated Coriolanus, and Vörösmarty, King Lear and Julius Caesar. The third prince of poets, Arany, made his contribution to the great collective work with his brilliant translations of Hamlet, King John, and Midsummer Night's Dream.

From the very first the Kisfaludy Society considered that its chief task was to collect and sift Hungarian popular poetry, and present it with the assistance of competent collaborators to the public. A new era of development and inflorescence set in for the Society with the election of the gifted poet and great aesthete, Paul Gyulai as Chairman. In 1908, however, he was obliged to resign for political reasons. Then Zsolt Beöthy was unanimously elected. For twenty-two years that great aesthete and stylist managed the affairs of the Society. In his person he was the embodiment of the ideal which he had always urged upon his own people. Namely, he was both European and Hungarian. His art was a harmonious and organic link between western culture and Hungarian individuality, a tributary to the living stream of world literature; but it was characterized by an unswerving loyalty to the individuality and traditions of the Hungarian world of letters.

Since the death of Beöthy in 1922 to the present day Albert de Berzeviczy has been the Chairman of the Kisfaludy Society. His versatile and profound erudition, the richness of his professional knowledge in the sphere of Art Philosophy, his unflinching tact, and, last but not least, his energy have for nearly a quarter of a century ensured to the Society a period of tranquil creation, undisturbed development, and fruitful activity. In spite of his advanced years, he still stands erect at its head, with an unflagging zeal and an undiminished capacity for work. And if there have been misunderstandings, jealousies, and, now and then, even bitter strife in the camp of Hungarian literature, the waves of passion have always been stilled by the dignity of his *Quos ego!* In the eyes of public opinion he and the Kisfaludy Society appear as closely connected, it might almost be said, identical terms. Terms of authority and of loyalty to national ideas and to European culture.

FIRST PERFORMANCE IN VIENNA OF EUGENE HUBAY'S "ANNA KARENINA"

On February 9th, M. Eugene Hubay's opera „Anna Karenina" was performed for the first time in the Vienna State Operahouse, which is one of the best in Europe. Its original performance took place in Budapest on November 10th, 1932, and since then it has been produced in Nürnberg, Bochum, Duisburg, etc. The tremendous success of the opera in Budapest was repeated everywhere, indeed the *première* in Nürnberg was a veritable triumph for Hungarian music. Without exception, all the newspapers in South Germany were loud in expressing their delight in Hubay's music. The "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten", for instance, said that "The born musician Hubay has composed a work such as would, were there five more like it, insure German operahouses against a crisis in opera".

Hubay's music on the one hand gives dramatic colour to Tolstoy's moving book of the same name;

but, on the other hand, it soars high above the theme in broadly rolling orchestral effects. Although the plot is rich and multiplex, the composer has not allowed himself to be deflected from the main theme of the drama, the essence of which he has interpreted to the full in terms of music. This opera was composed prior to the War, before Stravinsky's pagan war-cries and Skriabin's fourth harmonies were known, yet, in spite of this, the opera sounds fresh and forcible; for the great inventiveness and wealth of melody which characterize Hubay's compositions are to be found both in the orchestral themes and in the solos.

The music, in keeping with the Russian setting, is partly ethnographic in nature (like Bizet's "Carmen"), partly thoroughly modern opera music in which the use of "Leitmotifs" to indicate the different characters is most effectively employed. All in all it is music that carries us away with it,

It is an infallible sign of a great opera that the *libretto* and the music blend, as they do in Wagner's works. Hubay's opera is a classical instance of the case in point. Everybody is acquainted with Tolstoy's book and its dramatized form, and for that very reason we have an objective standard to judge by. And we see that Hubay's music gives a new force to the well-known contents, indeed it introduces entirely new elements, so that we may safely say that through the music the contents take on an even more profound meaning.

Herr Weingartner conducted with spirit and brought out every minute detail. He also took great care that the whole work should unfold itself in its entirety, and his efforts were so successful that the intense interest of the audience never flagged for an instant.

Mme. Maria Németh was Anna. More than once she was heard to say how happy she had been to accept the rôle. Her performance was proof that she had really entered heart and soul into the character of Anna, and that it was a great experience for her. Her rendering was an event; the dramatic power of her acting and her sublime voice were coupled with the natural freedom of the great artist. With convincing force she portrayed every phase of a passion-racked woman's soul, and the style and *technique* of her singing were perfect and entralling.

As Count Wronsky Herr Kehlenberg's singing and acting were perfection itself. The best singers of the Vienna Operahouse took the minor parts. The staging and the scenery of all the four acts so charmed the audience that Dr. Wallerstein, chief stage-manager, was called before the curtain and warmly applauded. The ballet in the first act was a spectacle worth remembering, while the racing-course scene in the second act was the *non plus ultra* of stage-management. The orchestra and chorus surpassed themselves.

The vast auditorium of the Operahouse was packed with a most brilliant audience. President Miklas and the Austrian Government were there, along with many distinguished figures in Viennese social life. As the opera proceeded the enthusiasm of the audience grew, and after the last chords had died away, a storm of applause broke out which did not cease until M. Hubay repeatedly came out on to the stage, which was covered with masses of laurel wreaths and flowers.

After the performance Herr Pertner, State Secretary, gave a reception in the Marble Hall of the Operahouse, where M. Hubay was again warmly feted. This *première* in Vienna was a great triumph for Hungarian music, and the Austrian press published long enthusiastic articles in praise of the performance.

— y —

BÉLA BARTÓK ON FERENC LISZT

On February 3rd, Béla Bartók, the world famous Hungarian composer, gave his inaugural address on Ferenc Liszt. He examined the problem from four different points of view and declared that the public was still incapable of a just appreciation of Liszt's most important works. It prefers the less important compositions, such as the Rhapsodies. The reason for this, he said, was that the public could not see the real value of the other works, being mostly influenced by superficial impressions. As for the development of musical style, the work of Liszt is more significant, he said, than that of Wagner. Wagner not only discovered but actually realized and developed all the possibilities of his style himself. Liszt, on the other hand, has many initiating ideas and motives which have not been developed by himself but by his

followers.

Speaking of Liszt's book on "Gipsy Music in Hungary", Bartók finds the explanation of Liszt's statements and mistakes in the conditions of the nineteenth century; the rudimentary principles of musical folklore were not yet sufficiently defined, and there was a general desire for Romantic opulence, bombast, and pathos; moreover, our forefathers, did not think of directing Liszt's attention to the Hungarian village.

What right have we to call Liszt a Hungarian? Liszt himself really said the last word in this matter, when he repeatedly called himself a Hungarian. Surely, the whole world must respect Liszt's will sufficiently to accept it without any contradiction.

— y —

A HUNGARIAN EVENING AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

An excellent Hungarian evening was arranged in the first half of February on the stage of Columbia University, New York. When Professor *John Dyneley-Prince*, head of the Eastern-European Department in the Institute of Arts and Sciences, appeared in the limelight, the hall was filled with crowd of about two thousand people. He introduced the honorary guests of the evening, first of all *Prof. C. A. Manning*, who gave a hearty welcome to all the guests. After him *M. George Ghika* the Hungarian Consul General rose to address the audience and thank the University authorities and Prof. Dyneley-Prince for the arrangement of this evening. Prof. Dyneley-Prince was American Minister in Belgrade when he first came in touch with Hungary; he came to spend a certain length of time with us, he learned our language and became fond of our people; ultimately he came to be the herald of our culture and arts, and the champion of our rights.

The next speaker was *Prof. Herman A. Heydt*; he gave a lecture with the title: „Hungary and Ideals”, founded on profound study and inspired by genuine love. It was perhaps the first time a large American audience listened with great interest to a lecture like this, so full of facts and yet so vivid, on the history and importance of Hungary and her present deplorable condition. The lecturer also informed his listeners of the excellence of our national art and of the high place it fills in the civilization of the world. The amusing anecdotes told here and there in the course of his lecture gave a special charm to his style. Prof. Heydt then informed his audience that on the initiative of Colonel *Boross*, who was also present, there will be a monument erected in Budapest to the memory of General *Bandholz*, as a symbol of American-Hungarian friendship.

After an interval there came a highly interesting programme in which Prof. Heydt's lecture was illust-

rated by the performance of excellent musicians, dancers, and actors. The audience was given a selection of gipsy music and folk songs, and an exhibition of national costumes. The recital of the works of Dohnányi, Bartók, Liszt, and Hubay was received with loud applause. After this followed a talking film of the finest parts and beauties of Hungary. Finally, Dr. Géza Takaró, a Reformed Minister, leader of the

Hungarian class in Columbia University, thanked all those who had helped to arrange the Hungarian evening.

In this connection we are pleased to report that Prof. Herman A. Heydt, of Columbia University, New York, has received from the Regent of Hungary the Commander's Cross of Hungarian Order of Merit.

B O O K S

„Hungary” by C. A. Macartney. With a foreward by H. A. Z. Fisher P. C. D. C. L. London. Ernest Benn Limited 1934.

Mr. C. A. Macartney, the eminent British *savant*, has written a book on Hungary.

Macartney is quite right in establishing the fact that *Hungary's position in the centre of Europe is that of a keystone*, the consequence being that, while that country is of vital importance to its surroundings, Europe generally cannot be indifferent to the fate of a country situated in its very heart. Macartney is quite right also when he establishes the fact that for a thousand years the political frontiers of the Hungarian State almost exactly coincided with the natural boundaries of the Middle Danube Valley. It is this valley that was split into five parts by Trianon, the result being that the Hungary of today is merely a limbless trunk in the centre of the valley of the Danube. Now, pre-War Hungary was not only a historical unit, but also an economic and geographical unit of unequalled perfection. Mountain districts and plains were superbly inter-complementary, the hilly regions supplying with raw materials the lowlands engaged in industrial production, and the plains providing the food required by the mountainous districts. The dismemberment of the country has proved injurious to all classes of the population alike. And Macartney is only voicing a truth when he shows that the present-day map of the Middle Danube Valley is — both geographically and economically — a monstrosity.

One of the explanation given by the writer for this treatment of Hungary is that the statesmen of the Allied Powers were both plaintiffs and judges. They listened only to the arguments of their friends and allies and were not concerned to bring into being a just peace, but merely to strengthen their friends.

So far Mr. Macartney is entirely right. But he is not unprejudiced when he goes on to say that the aristocratic régime in Hungary before 1918 gave the nationalities the chance to clothe their own cause in the guise of liberty, democracy and enlightenment. According to the author it did much harm to Hungary that after the Bolshevism a régime was restored which made little or no allowances for the spirit of the times. To this Mr. Macartney attributes the fact that much bitterness was felt towards Hungary, as a result of which the nationality principle was applied only where it was detrimental to Hungary; where it would have been to her advantage, other principles, of strategy, communication, security, etc. were applied, and of those, such as were unfavourable for Hungary. To Mr. Macartney's opinion as outlined above we must reply that it may have been that the pre-war Hungarian régime was to a certain extent anti-démocratic, but if

this was true, it was the spirit of the age, and the régime was as anti-démocratic towards all classes of Hungarians as towards the nationalities. It is, however, an entirely erroneous statement to say that the system in force in Hungary previous to the war was so anti-démocratic that it was well-calculated (even without the misrepresentations of the Czech, Serb, and Rumanian departments) to stir up the nationalities. And it is a greater mistake still to make it appear as though the national régime which was restored after the collapse of Bolshevism was so much at variance with the spirit of the post-war days that the victors were justified in punishing so sorely a country entirely innocent of any responsibility for the war. The fact that on re-gaining the upper hand the national régime, for a time, replied to the Bolshevist terror with a counter-terror, was so natural a reaction to the Bolshevist atrocities that it must be regarded as something so human as to be inevitable.

In the historical part of his work Mr. Macartney gives a faithful picture of the Hungarian Constitution and the evolution of Hungarian political life. He says that the Hungarian Constitution, like the British, is not a codified Constitution, but one drawn from life, and that the Hungarians jealously preserve their ancient Constitution, mould and modify it, but never take away from it.

In the territory now forming their home the Hungarians (Magyars) on their entry did not find any consolidated State; merely a country thinly populated by Slavs, Avars and Bulgarians. The latter they absorbed. The Slavs whom the Magyars found there were the ancestors of the Slovaks living today in the Highlands. The Rumanians claim that when the Romans withdrew their legions from Dacia, there was left behind in Transylvania a certain latinised rustic population which was the source of the Rumanian people of today. This is denied by the Hungarians, who show scientifically that it was only from the twelfth century that the Rumanians began to filter into Transylvania.

In this connection we cannot help remarking — as against what Macartney has to say — that the question as to whether the Rumanians of Transylvania are autochthonous or not is no longer a moot point. It was solved long ago — negatively — by science. In Roman days there was not the slightest trace of Rumanians (Wallachs) in Transylvania. And even if during their stay in that province the Roman legionaries did actually intermarry with the Dacians, the result being the coming into being of latinised Dacian families, in no case did the Rumanians derive from the Romans (nor indeed did they even indirectly, by the intermingling of races acquire any Roman blood), seeing that the Wallachs (Rumanians) did not begin to filter into Transylvania until about the twelfth century, some eight hundred years after the departure