BOOK REIEWS

KÁROLY KOCSIS

You Say 'Lwów', I Say 'Lemberg'

Péter Bencsik, *Helységnévváltozások Köztes-Európában 1763-1995* [Changes in the Names of Places in In-Between Europe 1763-1995], (Budapest: Teleki László Alapítvány, 1997)

The publication is the index to the map collection assembled by Lajos Pándi with the cooperation of Nándor Bárdi called "*Köztes-Európa 1763-1993*" [In-Between Europe 1763-1993] (Osiris-Századvég, 1995, 798 p.), which was very successful in Hungary. The index presents to the reader the most important historic names, and foremost official name changes, of settlements in the examined area for the given period. The borders of states, political systems, and along with them the names of places and geographical phenomena changed rather regularly in the regions of conflict between the formerly great empires of Europe, mainly Germany and Russia. From the viewpoint of ethnicity and religion, the populations of the settlements in this belt (which was often turned into a mosaic of small nation-states) have remained remarkably pluralistic to this day, despite ethnic-religious cleansing and, for close to four centuries, they have been subject to repression by great powers. As a result, in given territories, e.g., the Polish-Russian, Polish-Ukrainian, Romanian-Russian, and Romanian-Ukrainian zones of conflict or in some of the perimeter regions of the Carpathian Basin, the names of important settlements have changed up to five to eight times since 1763. Among the especially ill-treated cities is Lwów, which until 1772 was Polish, and then passed through Austrian, Polish, Soviet, German, Soviet and Ukrainian changes of authority, – not including the front movements between 1914-1920 which brought with them Austro-German, Russian, Ukrainian and Polish authorities – going through a series

of name-changes: Lwów, Lemberg, Lwów, ¸□□□□, Lemberg, ¸□□‡□, L'vov. We can find similar examples here in the area of the Carpathian basin, as well. For example, the largest city of the currently Serbian Bánság, the capital of the former Torontál county, Nagybecserek, has been, as a result of changes of authority (Austrian, Hungarian, Serbian (Yugoslavian), German, Yugoslavian), presented on various public administration maps with different names: Groß-Betschkerek (until 1867), Nagybecskerek (until 1918), Veliki Bečkerek (until 1935), Petrovgrad (until 1941), Großbetschkerek (until 1944), Zrenjanin (since 1946). The expertly assembled 344-page index presents the most diverse name-change variations and the historic lessons drawn from them. It will serve as a useful aid for Hungarian and foreign historians and geographers in light of the seemingly chaotic nomenclature situation as described above. It is an indisputable fact that the In-Between Europe region, lying between the Laplands of Finland and the Greek Island of Crete, or spreading over the lands between the Elbe, Po, and the Dnieper Rivers, has to this point not been presented in a similarly detailed (it includes Latin, Cyrillic, and Greek names!), well-founded, and broadly-scoped manner. Referring to the outstanding name-place lexicon-dictionaries by Mihály Gyalay (1989) and György Lelkes (1992), and making an effort to create a territorial balance, the author does not describe the Carpathian Basin in more detail than the other territories in the index, which will increase its international utility and prestige. The reader wishing to learn more about the place-name problems of given areas is offered a general description of published general and regional works of a similar nature (pp. 9-12.) and a bibliography reflecting an exceptional knowledge of the literature (pp. 93-99.). More than two-thirds of the publication is composed of the place-name listing which covers 4,000 settlements and approximately 11,000 name variations. This expertly edited (articulation, letter-type, abbreviations, directives, etc.) section will be of use to any reader, regardless of his/her language. The current official names of settlements (or the formerly independent or somehow important quarters thereof) appear in bold print. The listing includes information on the current and past states to which the settlements belonged, the relevant periods of time, and other living and "dead" name variations in the various In-Between European languages. A valuable part of this section is the register, which presents information on place-names in a large variety of Cyrillic – and

Greek – lettered (e.g., Russian, Ukrainian, Serbian, Bulgarian) languages (pp. 306-344.). The historical lessons and connections, which can be traced through the name-changes presented in the listing section, are described by the editor in the chapter called "The History and Linguistic Background of Naming Places." The naming of given settlements (generally like other geographical objects) – at least in the early stages – can be related to nature (e.g., size, form, layout), culture (e.g., persons or ethnic groups) or various events. In describing the practice of naming the author emphasized the practice of so-called official naming. In Hungary, 1898 serves as the date which divides the periods of unsystematic and systematic official naming. In most In-Between European countries systematic, official place-naming dates back only to the inter-war period, given that many countries became independent only then. A particularly interesting section, which is supplemented by illustrative examples, introduces the reasons for name-changes. In the period of unsystematic naming, the disappearance of the motive for the original name, the change of landowners or the modification of man's relationship to the land (expansion, contraction, transformation or switching, etc. of meaning) were the most common reasons for changing names. In the 20th century systematic name-changes usually followed changes in state authority – often related to ethnic structure – while domestic political factors, naming for persons and other indirect reasons were also common. The use of the book and orientation within the exceptionally complicated place-name changes of In-Between Europe are made considerably easier by supplementary chapters: e.g., "The Organization of Terms," "Alphabetical Order," "Name-Change and Pronunciation Rules," "Name-Change Guide," and "Pronunciation Rules According to Alphabetical Order." Appendix 1 offers an overview of maps and text concerning the changing of hands and detachment of lands, which has been one of the most important reasons for settlement name-changes. The informative maps are presented in the style of those of the above-mentioned "*Köztes-Európa 1763-1993*" [In-Between Europe 1763-1993] volume, whose precision, in some cases, could have been increased. Appendices number 2 and 3 ("The Names of In-Between European Countries in the Languages of the Region" and "Dictionary of Terms Found in Geographical Names") make easier the use of the index and are a real treat for those who appreciate foreign languages and geography. While editing the publication the editor had to analyze a

massive place-name database, which resulted in small mistakes in meaning in the descriptive sections and in the listing. The low number of mistakes in no way compromises the utility of the index, which is simply an indispensable handbook for those experts and casual readers interested in territory and in the specific topic.

FRANK T. ZSIGÓ

Acclimatizing Liberalism

János Kis, *Az állam semlegessége* [The Neutrality of the State], (Budapest: Atlantis Kiadó, 1997), 430 p.

In *Az állam semlegessége* [The Neutrality of the State], János Kis presents to the reader a series of essays based primarily on the premise that democratic public life and politics are based not solely on the battle of divergent interests, but also on a series of principles and values. In other words, politics should not be seen solely as a struggle among those competing for power, but as a matter of philosophy. The main argument of his book is that it is the liberal state and political framework which can best ensure and protect democracy, pluralism, and equality. While such premises and arguments are implicit in most normative political theory (certainly of the liberal school), Kis makes them explicit as a response to the widespread view in Hungarian public opinion whereby politics is a dirty game best left to dirty politicians. Thus, the real strength of *The Neutrality of the State* is not found in its contribution to political theory, but in its precise and expert application of liberal theory, within the Hungarian political context, to issues which will be familiar to most followers of Hungarian public life. For this reason, the book will be of interest mostly to Hungarians (or those studying Hungary). However, those studying liberal theory (be they Hungarian or not) will also find this book to be a worthy read.

The book is divided into two main sections. The first is largely theoretical. In it, Kis presents some of the standard questions of contemporary liberal theory. What kind of normative framework is appropriate for democratic life? What is distributive justice? How can a democratic state achieve

the unity and equality of citizens in conditions of deep moral and cultural pluralism? (p. 12.) To approach these questions theoretically, Kis takes up the issues of tolerance, neutrality, and multi-culturalism.

Chapter One begins by introducing the issue of the state recognition of churches. The reader may recall the debate, largely between large historical churches and small, newer ones, over the legality of the latter. Kis uses this debate to introduce and consider the principle of tolerance. For the most part, the chapter reads like a political theory seminar. The author covers some of the historic development of the principle and introduces some of its justifications, drawing from both legal and political theory literature. The chapter becomes more interesting when Kis begins to consider the question of drawing boundaries between what is to be tolerated and what is not. Largely rejecting the Millian version, Kis attempts to transform the harm principle in a context of moral uncertainty and pluralism. He arrives at the conclusion that tolerance in a modern society must consider the ability to manage (and preserve) pluralism, the ability of the individual to make autonomous life choices, and the preservation of a public sphere of debate. It follows that rational criticism becomes the foundation of political community in a society marked by deep pluralism. How does this apply to demarcating the areas of tolerance and intolerance? Kis uses the examples of racism and euthanasia. While public debate has seen racist theories largely defeated, and thus such theories need not be tolerated, euthanasia remains a publicly unresolved issue. Here, the public debate approach offers no solutions. Kis 'resolves' the practical side of the euthanasia issue by calling for religious opponents of the practice to tolerate regulations that would allow for assisted suicide. Why? Because the harm done to the religious opponents in this manner is indirect (the regulation would offend their beliefs, not their persons), while a policy banning assisted suicide directly harms the interests of the suffering patient (assuming the patient has made his/her choice with the full faculty of reason). The interests of the latter simply outweigh those of the former. The religious opponent of euthanasia, then, is paying the price of pluralism, whereby offensive views and regulations must be tolerated. This approach, however, does not resolve the issue in the case of a patient who is clearly suffering and approaching an unavoidable death, but who does not, at the time, posses the ability to make a rational decision concerning the will to live.

While the chapter on tolerance addresses mainly the behavior of individuals, Chapter Two, on neutrality, is addressed to the state. In it, Kis demands the state be neutral on issues of belief, conviction, world-view and lifestyle. In this sense, neutrality is a more demanding principle than tolerance. The tolerant person may express opposition to the convictions of others while living and cooperating with them. The neutral state may not take any such stands. Kis reviews some of the arguments opposed to state neutrality (from within and without the liberal school) before going on to give his important justification for the neutrality principle. State neutrality, according to the author, is the only authority-related position which ensures equal status – as members of the political community – to all subjects of the state. Thus, taking no position on the existence of a deity ensures that neither the faithful nor atheists will be bracketed out of the public sphere. (Recall, this is not a principle demanded of individuals.) While the application of the principle of neutrality seems relatively obvious in the case of theology, it becomes more complex regarding other matters. Is a state which supports 'traditional family values' behaving in a neutral manner? Is a state which does not allow the teaching of creation science in public schools behaving in a neutral manner? Such issues are taken up when the author lays out, in some detail, principles related to the neutrality principle. For example, the neutrality principle demands that the state address its citizens in terms which can be understood by all (p. 116). Kis' framework on neutrality is reminiscent of Rawls' *Political Liberalism*. Both authors call for a neutral state, for the practice of public reason, and for a public sphere which encompasses and addresses all. In Rawls' case the public sphere may be based on a very thin overlapping consensus. In Kis' case it is based simply on membership in the state. Both theories run into similar troubles at the extremes. The political liberalism of Rawls does not adequately address those who are without the overlapping consensus, while Kis' principle of state neutrality does little to address those subjects of the state who exclude themselves from the political community by not practicing tolerance (as demanded in Chapter One).

After laying down the argument for a state which is neutral in matters of faith and world-view, in the third chapter János Kis argues for a state which is not neutral in matters of ethnicity. The starting point for the argument is the historic convergence of liberalism and nationalism, despite

their seemingly poor fit. The author builds his case for what he terms 'multinationalism' by taking up and refuting nationalism, liberal nationalism, and national neutrality. Nationalism is rejected essentially because of its inability to peacefully accept minorities: nationalism on the part of the majority will be responded to with minority nationalism, leading to conflict. By liberal nationalism, Kis means something akin to civic nationalism, where loyalty to the state, and not to the dominant ethnic group, is the key to membership in the national community. Where public life in the liberal nationalist state is directed in the language of the state, minorities may preserve their language and heritage within the confines of private life. Kis, however, refutes this position by arguing essentially that members of minority groups, whether they choose to assimilate or not, will in some way remain second-class citizens. This would be a direct violation of the liberal principle of civic equality. The author then turns to the case of the state which handles ethnic groups the way it handles religious groups (as argued in Chapter Two): the ethnically neutral state. This position is rejected on the grounds that a state, for practical reasons, cannot be neutral on ethnic matters. For example, administration requires the use of someone's language. Allowing for the use of any language anywhere – which is what the ethnically neutral state would demand – is clearly impossible in practical terms. Further, the ethnically neutral state would provide no grounds at all for identification with the state.

Having refuted the three alternatives, Kis turns to arguing for the multinational state. Such a state is essentially liberal and is composed of two or more ethnic groups. The state, in attempting to provide equality of opportunity, recognizes that the members of minority groups are at a disadvantage when competing for resources (particularly those distributed by the state). Thus, to ensure equality, the state grants members of minorities certain rights, of which some are individual in their nature (e.g., language rights), where others are collective in their nature (e.g., education rights). Kis reconciles individualist-based liberal thought with collective rights by confining collective rights to those groups which are not voluntary in their nature. This is a slippery slope. It would be rather difficult to argue why the collective rights demands of bilingual young adults who cling to minority identity (e.g., bilingual education, whose extra costs are covered by the state) differ from those of young adults of a minority religious persuasion (who

might demand state-funded religious education in public schools). Is the choice to remain in the ethnic minority less voluntary than the choice to continue to adhere to the religion in which one was raised? Are matters of religious conscience voluntary?

In any case, the arguments for the multi-national state will be largely familiar to those who have followed the multi-culturalism debate. (It is unfortunate that the author does not make use of the wide literature concerning nationalism and multi-culturalism in this chapter.) The argument for the multinational state becomes a part of the argument of the book when the issue of the constitution of the political community is addressed. In previous chapters toleration and state neutrality served as the principles allowing for wide inclusiveness of the civic community in matters of faith and world-view. The multinational state is presented as the appropriate liberal approach to ensuring the inclusion of all in the political community in conditions of ethnic pluralism. This is the most convincing part of the multinational argument, but it appears to function best in those states with two large ethnic groups (i.e., in a binational state). Could Kis' multinational framework resolve education and language issues for a larger set of small minorities? How might administrative issues be approached in the liberal framework for a small minority which is geographically scattered?

The second section of the book concerns the application of the theory of tolerance and neutrality to some concrete issues. (Unfortunately, application of the multinational state framework is not attempted.) While discussion of these kinds of issues is common to debates within liberal theory, Kis' valuable contribution is to place the discussion in the Hungarian context. This is a rather significant and instructive exercise. While Kis argues that liberalism in Hungary has roots deeper than one might think (thanks not only to liberal political activity in the first half of the 20th century, but also to the evolution of liberal thought and practice among the democratic opposition and party reformers in the 1970s and 1980s), the examples he puts forth, and the public opinion and official positions concerning these examples, show Hungary's lack of experience in operating within a liberal political framework. If the official positions were liberal in their nature, Kis would have little to write about. In this way, the issues of abortion (Chs. 5-6), euthanasia (Ch. 7), and hate-speech (Chs. 11-12), receive a treatment which should be of interest not only to those interest-

ed in Hungarian politics and liberalism, but also to liberal scholars everywhere – some of whom study politics in environments where liberal/democratic culture and institutions have had time to mature. The context of nascent, post-communist democratic systems and cultures, where the standard liberal position is supported by a very small minority, is unique. Hence, the analysis of issues of general interest to political theorists in this context is also unique.

A rather interesting issue to which Kis devotes two chapters is the association rights of homosexuals (Chs. 9-10). At the center of the analysis is an association called the *Szivárvány Tarsulás* [Rainbow Association], which was established as an interest-protection group for homosexuals. The group was denied official registration by the courts, which demanded that the association set an age limit for membership in order that it may protect minors from the homosexual lifestyle. Kis attacks the positions of the courts from the liberal position. The court position is shown to be not only unconstitutional and in violation of the rights of parents and the members of the association: it is also shown to be discriminative of homosexuals, and thus in violation of not only the principle of toleration, but the state neutrality principle as well. The most interesting part of the discussion is the consistent application of the central thesis of the book, the state neutrality principle, to the *Szivárvány* case. Kis' arguments regarding the case will certainly serve as a solid starting point for debates concerning issues like homosexual adoption rights.

Throughout *The Neutrality of the State*, János Kis emphasizes his view that the key to the resolution of seemingly unsolvable moral and political tensions is continuous and open political debate. His presentation of the principles of tolerance and neutrality serves to provide an ethical and principled framework for such debate. The discussions of contentious issues relevant to Hungarian public life serve as a deepening of the content and moral seriousness of the debate ensuing within the liberal framework. Thus, where Kis, for example, does not succeed in reconciling the deep differences between the pro-life and pro-choice camps in the Hungarian abortion debate, he does succeed in showing how liberal principles can and should be applied to issues – such as abortion or euthanasia – where reasonable people disagree. While his arguments – which are well thought out and presented logically, thoroughly, and consistently – may leave even the

liberal reader unconvinced at times, Kis has made a valuable contribution to the study and application of liberal theory in Hungary. He has also invited his readers to take part in the political discussion which gives meaning to membership in the political community. Recommended.

FERENC EILER, LÁSZLÓ SZARKA and ÁDÁM SZESZTAY

A Guide to Research on Minorities in South-East Europe in the 20th Century

Gerhard Seewan and Péter Dippold (eds.),
Bibliographisches Handbuch der ethnischen Gruppen Südosteuropas I-II.
(= Südosteuropa – Bibliographie, Ergänzungsband 3.)
(München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997), 1450 p.

A most significant piece of work, from the viewpoint of diverse and intense research on ethnic groups, conflicts, and inter-ethnic relations in East, East-Central, and South-East Europe, was published at the end of 1997. Gerhard Seewann, the director of the Südost-Institut library in München, with the cooperation of Peter Dippold, the director of the László Teleki Foundation's library and documentation service, has assembled a bibliography on work concerning South-East European minority groups in the 20th century. The great mass of data contained in the bibliography on 35 ethnic and religious groups in 20 states took the two editors, with the help of their disciplined colleagues (data collectors, bibliographers, statisticians, cartographers), five years to collect, not including a long period of preparation. The book, which contains 12,030 entries, is the third supplementary volume of the München institute's South-East Europe bibliography series.

"The new South-East Europe bibliography attempts to collect document materials from South-East European states covering all aspects of life, from the natural environments of the countries, to the populations and histories, to economies, science, and cultures." It was with these words that

Fritz Valjavic began the Südost Institute's project's first volume on Slovakia, Romania, and Bulgaria in 1956. The series proved to be successful, and to date seven two-volume publications and three supplementary volumes have been published. Most recently, the series' third supplementary volume, *Bilbiographisches Handbuch der ethnischen Gruppen Südosteuropas*, edited by Gerhard Seewann and Péter Dippold, was published (in 1997) in München.

The supplementary and, in its category, unique publication covers all the ethnic groups which, according to German terminology, live in South-East Europe. The project actually goes beyond this framework, as, in the interest of providing a more comprehensive picture, it covers literature on Italy, Austria, and the Sub-Carpathians (which, after World War Two, 'switched regions') – areas which are traditionally not considered part of the region. This was a justified decision, as the border regions of these areas are home to several ethnic groups whose territories are directly related to the minority settlement regions of unambiguously South-East European countries. Another convincing decision of the editors was to provide separate space for Slovenia, Serbia, Croatia, Voivodina, Kosovo, Bosnia, Montenegro, and Macedonia above and beyond the chapter dealing with literature on the multi-ethnic Yugoslavia.

The editors of the bibliography consider the bulk of 20th century literature to cover the period from 1918 to our days. The two-volume publication contains bibliographic data on 12,030 books and articles. Given our knowledge of high-quality minority journals, it is unfortunate that the pre-1945 material covers mostly monographs, and rarely includes journal articles. However, the justification for this given in the introduction, whereby the editors refer to the large mass of material and the space limitations of the volume, is acceptable.

It is also unfortunate that, despite its original goals, the bibliography has annotated bibliographic data for only a limited span of material (covering a part of Albanian, Kosovar, Greek, and German materials), while for the majority of titles we are provided only with the original and German titles, and standard bibliographic data. According to the table on the distribution of title headings (p. LIV.), the most material in the two volumes is on Czechoslovakian Magyars (697), Romanian Germans (655), and Magyars (617). The relatively small number of headings on Transylvanian

Magyars, for a long time the largest minority in the region, shows that research in both Hungary and Romania (even despite difficulties and contingencies in data collection) has some ways to go.

The largest number of headings covering the data of the 20 analyzed countries and the region refer to Magyar minorities (2006), then Germans (1864) and Jews (1089). Armenians, Bunjevac, Gagauz, non-Macedonian Macedonians, and Poles, Czechs and Ukrainians living outside their respective countries' borders, are covered by less than 50 titles each. Of the titles and bibliographic data referring to the region's Roma populations (altogether 655), 262 are on Hungarian Roma, 45 are on Romanian Roma, 68 are on (Czecho-)Slovakian Roma, while 52 headings refer to scientific research on Roma living in Bulgaria.

In the general theoretical section referring to the region as a whole, the editors split the bibliographic data into three chapters. The first chapter presents data for theoretical basic research, which the reader can review in the following categories: handbooks, bibliographies, terminology, minority research; nation, nation-state, theories on nationalism; national, ethnic, and regional identity; ethnic conflicts; minority rights, conflict resolution; language, and language policy. The second chapter covers those scientific publications dealing with central- and southern-Europe as a whole, and these are grouped according to theme and period. Among these, the most headings refer to minority rights. The chronology shows that publications covering the inter-war and post-1989 periods are quite numerous. The latter show that scientific and political interest in minority issues has significantly grown in the region.

One of the greatest and most obvious virtues of the bibliography is the balance of titles. By this we foremost mean that the editors have largely succeeded in eliminating (through selection) a large number of short and uninteresting studies and dilettante pieces. Further, it is commendable that the editors attempted to include a wide variety of materials on each of the various countries and ethnic groups.

The chapter on theoretical and basic research in the general section reveals an absolute dominance of literature written in German or by German authors. Further, particularly in the period of 1970-80, there appears to be an abundance of Anglo-American political science, legal, and sociological research recorded in the South-East European bibliography.

This reflects the moderate interest of the region's own researchers in theory and synthesis. Another characteristic also reveals a weakness in the literature: of the nearly 100 headings on Roma in the general section, not one is written by a Hungarian or local Magyar researcher, despite the fact that the two volumes cover a wealth of Hungarian research on Roma. The situation is better regarding literature on minority rights, with a good deal of literature by Hungarian researchers from both the inter-war (Artur Balogh, Zoltán Baranyai, László Búza, István Egyed, Iván Nagy) and contemporary (Antal Ádám, Gáspár Bíró, Géza Herczegh, István Íjgyártó, Erzsébet Sándor Szalayné, Tibor Várady) periods.

In their introduction (which, given the significance of the publication, is too brief), the editors note that in their data collection of minority history in 20th century South-East (i.e., central- and southern) Europe, their main emphasis was put on the years following 1918. However, research on the pre-1918 period, even given space constraints, was given too little attention. This imbalance is as visible in the general section as it is in the sections covering the 20 states, where there are a total of 187 entries dealing with the Habsburg Monarchy (surprisingly with no maps), and covering the Jews of the region.

The decision to collect and categorize ethnic-minority literature dealing with the Jews of the region was undoubtedly a good one: anyone lacking knowledge of the role of Jews in the urban cultures of central and eastern Europe, the controversial relationship with majority ethnic groups arising from cohabitation, and the mass migration, urbanization, and assimilation of the Jewry, will no doubt have imprecise or misleading knowledge of the region's ethnic structural changes. However, for a long time the local literature on South-East European Jews has almost exclusively dealt with questions concerning the Holocaust.

The 'country' chapters begin with mother tongue and ethnic statistics (up to our day), along with a detailed map of the given country and/or maps of the ethnic groups and their settlement regions. It is somewhat unsettling that the introductions are not uniform. The cases of Bulgaria and Romania provide a good example. While we are given only a mother tongue and ethnicity statistical table for Romania, for Bulgaria we are provided with data concerning population growth, religious identity for various periods, and five statistical measures of mother-tongue use. Another table shows the dis-

tribution of ethnic composition and vocations of the active population for 1965, and a further two tables review the distribution and composition of minority schools in 1931. The section of the book on Italy lacks a map and statistical indicators.

Within the chapters on given countries and regions, the listing of literature on 'ethnic groups' precedes the introduction of brief, and thus necessarily sketchy yet important information on examined minority communities. The summaries cover minority settlement areas and historical highlights. An important part of the summaries is that they discuss the current situation of ethnic groups, briefly describing schooling, religious divisions, newspapers, self-government organizations, and political parties.

Regarding publication groupings found in the volume, the most uneven parts of this otherwise outstanding piece of work concern the headings of handbooks. In this aspect, the data collectors and editors were equally challenged, given that from lexicons to various discipline syntheses, from representative glossaries to title indices and bibliographies, this collection had to leave space for many formats. Inclusion of the regular national bibliographies or the official census publications would have broken the well-thought-out balance used by the editors.

However, the collectors and editors did manage to neglect some publications which would have provided great assistance and a sense of orientation to those trying to make their way through bibliographies. For example, one of these missing pieces is the Slovakian historical bibliography series published by Michal Potemra, or his urban and press history bibliography of Kassa. Other missing pieces include: Tibor Mikó's 97-page bibliography (Mikó Tibor, "A nemzetiség kérdés magyar irodalma," in Károly Mártonffy (ed.), *Közigazgatásunk nemzetközi kapcsolatai* (Budapest: 1941) pp. 1011-1108.) and Imre Bédi's continutation of this, the 6,500-entry manuscript bibliography on minorities (Imre Bédi, *A nemzetiségi kérdés magyar irodalma [Die ungarische Literature der Nationalitatenfrage.]*, 1-2. OSZK kezirattári jelzete: Fol. Hung. 33289/1-2.)

The titles on literature concerning Austrian (Burgenland, Stajerland, Carinthia) ethnic groups and minority issues are extremely instructive. First, research in Austria was not subject to the same ideological controls for four decades, and second, it shows parallels with the under-appreciated methods of similar Hungarian research on ethnic groups. It appears impor-

tant that interest in Austrian Croats and Slovenians (and to a much lesser degree Burgenland Magyars) from the 'mother country' is visible when reviewing the titles, which in terms of the measurement of the situation of given minorities meant research competition and mutual professional control.

The (Czecho-)Slovakian chapter is somewhat controversial given the decision of the editors to deal with the Slovak nation as a majority and state-founding group from the time of the establishment of Czechoslovakia (which is a majority view of Slovaks). This in turn means that literature on the Slovak autonomy movement or on the debates and conflicts leading to the break-up of Czechoslovakia does not appear in the volume, despite the fact that these were important and definitive elements of Czechoslovakian ethnic and minority policy.

In the future, the examination of local-regional questions will gain in importance. For this reason, the (undoubtedly difficult) inclusion of local history and native awareness, which was previously largely ignored, is one of the great achievements of the volume. The Slovakian titles show that today there is a relatively low number of publications concerning local issues which can serve as the basis for in-depth study or which were thoroughly researched. However, the publications of local Slovakian Magyar history to 1995 (the collection includes communications to this date) show that the minority situation and the assistance of Magyar-led local governments have provided significant support and background for the writing of village-monographs.

The beginning of the chapter on Slovakian Magyars (pp. 263-320.) provides a brief and accurate description of the minority communities. Only the statement which claims "the vast majority of Slovakian Magyars speak a dialect similar to Palóc" (p. 263.) is inaccurate: its lexicon-glossary factual style is, for this reason, rather unfortunate.

Comparing the titles referring to Slovakian Magyars and Romanian Magyars, it is apparent that the number of sources regarding both minorities is rather low: a possible CD-rom version of the bibliography would benefit from such a supplementary collection of data (e.g., including published inter-war League of Nations minority-related propositions available in English and French, parliamentary speeches available in separate publications, minority-policy documents from the party-state era, etc.). The bib-

liographies for local history concerning both minorities, due to inadequate research, could also benefit from expansion. It is surprising that the communist era appears all too little in, for example, the chapter entitled "State Minority Policy", when both the Husak and Ceuasescu regimes both awkwardly publicized and documented their minority policies over long periods of time.

Next to Romania, the largest number of bibliographical titles (2105) refers to Hungary. The low number of handbooks, as in the general section, is apparent. The section entitled "The Minority Question" purposefully covers two widely researched areas: foreign policy and border revisions, and culture and education. Further, the structuring of the material reveals the largest gaps in the literature and research. Both "The Minority Question" section and the parts dealing with specific minorities clearly show how little attention historians have paid to the study of the economic situation of minorities in Hungary.

Both the ratios and sums of the literature on specific minorities (ethnic groups) show that the most widely researched groups are the German and Jewish ethnic groups. There is an attempt made to map out the regions inhabited by almost all the covered minorities – which is stressed for smaller minorities – as well as their settlements and ethnic cultures. It is a fortunate fact that since the 1970s, research on Roma has constituted a significant portion of Hungarian minority studies, and that such research has not been limited to folklore, but has striven to understand Roma social structure and lifestyle as well.

Next to Hungary, the most literature on ethnic groups is collected and ordered concerning the state of Romania. The decision of the authors to take up separately, where possible, the Romanian Germans, Bánát and Satu-Mare Svabians, Bukovinian Germans and Transylvanian Svabs, and further the Romanian Magyars, Seklers and Csango when discussing the German and Magyar minorities, was a good one.

The vast majority of publications deal with Romanian Magyar, German, and Jewish minorities. In these sections, as in the chapter dealing with minority issues, the areas of foreign policy, culture, education, and economy are rather detailed. In the case of German and Magyar minorities, it is noteworthy that a good deal of regional material has been collected over time. While the sections concerning the three minorities mentioned above

orders a serious amount of literature on most every aspect of minority existence; research on the remaining minorities – beyond the fact that the number of publications is very low compared to those on the other groups – leaves much to be desired. This is especially true of the Romanian Roma, which has become the second largest minority group, behind the Magyars. The significance of the issue is poorly reflected in the low number of published studies – possibly because the research is at the initial stages and is of a problematic nature.

The strength of the publications collected on minorities in Italy lies in the pieces on local history and on state minority policy studies. The latter is unsurprising, given that the Italian state did everything in its power to quickly assimilate the 500,000-strong Slovenian minority. The uniform structure of the country chapters is inconsistent in this case, given that the chapter on Italy does not include ethnic or mother-tongue statistical indicators, nor does it include a brief summary of the history and present situation of the Slovenians. (Note: it is unfortunate that the editors' structure could not include South Tyrolia. The northern-Italian region, despite its controversial and conflict-ridden history, has today become a positive model for East-Central and South-East European minority policy. The multi-faceted and wide research literature on South Tyrolia could have been a useful starting point for comparing existing and hoped-for regional minority self-government models.)

The chapter on Bulgaria is longer than most others, and besides providing statistics on mother tongue and ethnicity, it presents tables on minority vocations, and minority and religious schooling. This is true of not only the part preceding the general introduction, but also of the sections concerning the Jewish and Turkish minorities. Of the sections dealing with specific minorities, we must point out the one presenting literature on the 800,000-strong Turkish minority. The 20th century history of this minority is well reflected in the composition of the literature, where the most books and articles deal with the topics of state minority policy, migration, deportation, and expulsion.

The general section of the Macedonia chapter presents unusually little literature to the reader. The "Minority Question" section shows that the topics of national awareness, nationalism, and nation-building are of some concern. It is unfortunate that to date, research on Romanians and

Cserkész has been more widespread than that on the Albanian, Turkish, and Roma populations, which are far more numerous.

The chapter on the Sub-Carpathians is a pioneering work given its bibliographical summary and literature concerning the Magyars of the region – a similar overview of work on this region has not been prepared until now. It presents the tendentious and ideologically burdened, but significant source material, collected from Soviet-Ukrainian literature. (A critical reading of this literature, given the scarcity of other sources, reveals a great deal on the history of the Sub-Carpathians.) A very interesting tendency is visible: in the 1970s linguistics brought a breakthrough in Soviet scientific life, as it was in this time that analyses of Hungarian-Ukrainian (in truth, Hungarian-Ruthenian) mutually operating influences began to appear. The bibliography in this way refers to the post-1945 history of the Sub-Carpathians. The inter-war materials are also interesting, and not just from a Magyar viewpoint. It is unfortunate that books on the Sub-Carpathians have not, to this point, rested on this base of literature.

The bibliography attempts to provide an overview of the economic and political aspects of the minority question. This is quite appropriate, given that the problems of ethnicity are multi-faceted. At the same time, one should not forget that in socialist times taboo topics could be discussed only in frameworks which might escape the attention of today's researchers. For example, in the Sub-Carpathians one could make mention of the few studies which appeared in the second half of the 1960s in Hungarian literature journals (e.g., *Tiszatáj*), in which information on the region's Magyars was presented foremost in the guise of workers' movement articles.

As rather little could be known about the development of the Sub-Carpathians thanks to the Soviet information block, the brief summary and description of the Magyars of the region is useful. Notably, despite the fact that the introduction is brief, there is mention made of the Magyar Jewry, and the concept of dual identity is introduced. However, the introductory sentence of the passage, which attempts to describe the Sub-Carpathian Magyars linguistically, is inaccurate: it claims (exclusively) that the Magyar spoken there is essentially standard Hungarian, but is full of imported Russian and Ukrainian words. In order to avoid misunderstanding, it

should have been added that this is not the result of an organic development, but is instead a product of neologism.

The use of the official term *Transkarpatenukraine* instead of the terms used in historical German and English language literature (Subkarpathien, Subcarpathian) is justified from two vantage points: attention must be paid to political sensitivities, and efforts need to be made to directly use the official term. From a Ukrainian and Russian viewpoint the term makes sense, as does the Polish term TransCarpathian Rus (which is more organic than the previous term, and does not refer to present-day Ukraine), but the use of the term *Transkarpaten* is as foreign to German geography as it is to Hungarian geography. True, this terminology is not used consistently. The term Sub-Carpathia, taken from the Hungarian titles, is translated into the bracketed German as Carpath-Ukraine, which is rather distant from the traditional and Hungarian terms, but is still not the same as the Moscow-centric or Kjiv-centric term of *Trans-Carpathia*.

The brief passage describing the Sub-Carpathian Germans is rather superficial (although it is a bit longer than the listing of the nine bibliographical references). It takes sides on debated issues such as the German founding of Beregszász, although it makes no mention of the inner ethnographic divisions of the Sub-Carpathian Germans. (The Svabs of the plains and the Cipszers also contributed to the development of the region's cultural pluralism, given that despite their common language, they represent diverse mentalities and cultures. Certain mountainside cities, like Rahon, are unique due to the existence of the one-time "Zipserei" alongside two or three other languages.)

The titles concerning the Jews of the Sub-Carpathians should have included the memoirs of those who were deported but survived the Holocaust. For the sake of clarity, the mention of Jewish dual-identity should have been made not only in the section on Magyars, but in the Jewish and German sections as well.

The existence of Roma, Slovaks, and Romanians in the Sub-Carpathians is evidenced in this bibliography only through statistical tables. It is possible, though not probable, that there is no literature on these groups. Neglecting the Ruthenian issue is, however, a serious error. The scientific bibliography, which for the most part attempts to be politically neutral, takes a stand at this point in the debate between Ukrainian nation-

alists and the leaders of the Ruthenian ethnicity concerning whether the Ruthenians of Sub-Carpathia should be considered a minority, or whether they are part of the Ukrainian majority. The view of the editors was likely that the Ruthenians are to be viewed as part of the Ukrainian nation. The trouble with this opinion is that it is not shared by a significant number of Ruthenians. In this way, by neglecting Ruthenians, the volume essentially sides with Ukrainian nationalists. In this sense though, there is not a total lack of literature, given that some studies on this topic are listed in the general section (notably the works of Paul Robert Magocsi). There are researchers of the Ruthenian issue who emigrated to other countries in the Carpathian basin, and whose help could have been enlisted in constructing the bibliography (or in writing a short description of the Sub-Carpathian Ruthenians). The Ruthenian ethnic movement has issued several publications recently, which could have usefully been brought to the attention of the readers of the bibliography.

The attempt to establish the neutrality of the bibliography was correct in not taking a stand in the debates of the former Yugoslav republics. There are thus chapters on both Yugoslavia and on the separate successor states. Even the two formerly autonomous regions of Kosovo and Voivodina have their own separate chapters. Unfortunately, this division does not succeed in precisely separating various regions, provinces, and countries, as is the case with the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, where various minority groups are discussed based on the borders of the states established after the break-up of the empire. In the case of the south-Slav states, there is a little confusion concerning what should be sought under Yugoslavia, and what should be sought under the titles of the various republics. The editors tried to use a system whereby issues going beyond given republics are discussed on a federal level, while domestic issues are discussed on the level of the republic. This can, however, lead to misunderstandings, given that in some instances federal-level decisions had local effects within given republics. It may have been more useful to treat the issues of various "ethnic groups" until 1991 under the auspices of "the former Yugoslavia."

The inconsistent withdrawal of geographical terms in this way leads to distortions. For example, in the chapter on Croatia, under the heading of state minority policy, only literature on the World War II crimes of Croatia is listed. This leaves the impression that Croatia's past is identical with that

of the wartime Ustasha regime, which is a stark contrast to the usual political neutrality of the bibliography. It should also be noted that the listed literature is captivatingly expansive, and might go a long way in ensuring that the now vogue topic of Yugoslavia be approached more factually and professionally. Some of the annotations provided are very useful, in that they draw the reader's attention to the potential propaganda nature or one-sidedness of given entries. This is particularly the case concerning literature related to the Serbian-Albanian conflict.

The division of themes is often inconsistent. The Yugoslav school reforms of the 1950s and 1960s are often listed in both the educational and bilingualism subjects. (This is not to mention the fact that school policy could basically be put under the title "State Minority Policy", given that the lack of community self-government meant that this was the main area for the execution of political ideas concerning ethnic minorities.) The Yugoslav constitutional reforms (1963, 1974, 1991) are found at times under the state minority policy title, and at other times under the minority rights heading. It is interesting that the relative political weight of minority communities largely explains the fact that there are some ethnic groups, like Magyars, Germans, and Italians, who are present at all levels, while there are others (e.g., Bulgarians) who are presented only under the chapters of certain republics.

The short introductory passage on Yugoslavian Magyars (pp. 926-28) accurately emphasizes the two-faced nature of Tito's minority policy. It is worth noting that which strongly characterized socialist Yugoslavia: its very successful political image at the time. This made it possible for Tito's minority policy to serve as a model for the minorities in the socialist block and for public opinion in Hungary, despite its two-faced nature. This was one of the most important areas in which Yugoslavia succeeded in developing its positive image, even though the reality behind the image was rather unclear.

Of the Yugoslav successor states, Magyar settlement names were omitted only in the case of Slovenia. In other former republics there is mention of names used in Magyar, and Slovenian Italian names are marked. The omission of Magyar names was not likely the result of some conscious policy, but instead fell out of focus due to the multi-faceted nature of the project. For Yugoslavia, as for Hungary, there are remarkably short and superfi-

cial introductions of that part of the given country's majority ethnic group which lives as a minority elsewhere. This despite the fact that in both cases this is (or was) a prominent problem in public opinion and, in certain times, in foreign policy as well. Literature published in the mother country is naturally found in the sections on the minority ethnic group, but it is still difficult to understand why there is a need for separate yet incomplete topic sections.

The bibliography provides an expansive list of literature on Greece compared to the fact that public opinion knows little of minority issues in that country. However, there are not even brief descriptions of the given minorities. The book only presents statistics at the beginning of the Greek chapter, and offers no explanation of them. This is clearly due to the fact that the literature is difficult to obtain, or is perhaps superficial. This, however, does not mean that Greek or Greek minority issues (be they concerning Macedonians, Turks, or Albanians) are not serious concerns in the politics of our day.

The excellent bibliographical work is supplemented in the appendix by László Sebők's expansive, three-language Central- and South-East European minority map. With the help of the EuroGraph geographical information system, the map is based on official census data from 1951-1992. Taking into account community boundaries, it presents in a most clear way the region's ethnic space-structure at the end of the 20th century.

Taken as a whole, the potential reader or researcher (potential because, at least in most of the countries covered by the volume, the book costs about the amount of one month's pay) using the bibliography has access to a truly informative guide. The two-volume bibliography provides a means of becoming oriented in the theoretical literature, and allows for the greater realization of comparative approaches which are so important to minority studies. The databases of the CD-rom version, which is under construction, will hopefully be maintained and kept fresh, which would allow for research to keep pace with a quickly-changing world. Reviewing the outstanding book, the data-collection and research for which was completed in 1995, the reader is left with a numbing feeling: in the last two and a half years another volume's worth of research results has been produced on the examined region's ethnic and minority groups. Accessing and making use

of this new material is again left to us. The reviewers, to show their deep respect for the data-collectors and editors of the bibliography, have attempted to offer their critiques and comments in order that the computerized version may benefit. Thanks to the work of editors Gerhard Seewann and Peter Dippold, the minority researchers of the region now have access to a indispensable resource, whose utility cannot be described in a short review. Its utility will instead be felt in the everyday process of research.

REGIO
A review of studies on minorities, politics and society
Volume11, 2000, No. 2

ANTHONY D. SMITH
Nationalism and the Historians

The Millenium and Social History
The Conversation of Éva Kovács and Attila Melegh
with Social Historian Gyula Benda

HUNGARY AND THE HISTORY OF HUNGARIANS IN THE HISTORY WRITING OF CENTRAL EUROPE

GERHARD BAUMGARTNER
Distant Relatives - On the Austrian Point of View on Hungarian History

JÓZSEF KOBÁLY
Hungarians and Hungary in Ukrainian History Writing (1989-1999)

CONSTANTIN IORDACHI and MARIUS TURDA
Political Reconciliation versus Historical Discourse:
the Perception of Hungary in the Romanian History Writing
between 1989 and 1999

ÁGNES ÓZER
Change in the Approach of Serbian History Writing and the Perception of Hungarians at the End of the 20th Century

DÉNES SOKCSEVITS
The History of Hungary in the Croatian History Writing, 1989-1999

LÁSZLÓ GÖNCZ
How do Slovenian Historians See Hungarians and their History in the Last Decade of the 20th Century?

OLGA HAVANOVA - ALEKSZEJ MILLER
The Study of Hungarian History in Russia between 1989 and 1999

GERHARD SEEWANN
1989 and Other Ceasuras in German History Writing Concerning Hungary

REVIEWS

The Search for the Frameworks of Interpretation (Nándor Bárdi)
Hungarian History Writers on Tour from the Balkans (Mihály Dobrovits)
Politicized Hungarian History Writing from the Balkans (Tamás Kende)