

Kellermann (Marburg) and *L'évolution de la structure sociale des milieux ruraux en Hongrie* by János Rechnitzer (Pécs).

Despite this fact, we need not complain about the Hungarian participation. The first chapter of the book is on folklorism, and the first two articles are written by Hungarians: Zádor Tordai in his article: *Les métamorphoses du folklore: quelques repères, pour une compréhension*—shows philosophical and theoretical perspectives and Vilmos Voigt in his paper (*L'élaboration des symboles ethniques dans le folklore*) examines the origins and the main types of ethnic symbols. Their statements have a kind of summarizing character, since folklore and folklorism and research into such questions have a hundred years' tradition in Hungarian culture. We can consider it a great advantage that the interested reader can get acquainted from the book with various schools of folklorism and ethnic identity research in Hungary by their scholarly writings and not only from "ethnographical" and "folkloristical" leaflets made for French tourists.

Otherwise it is quite remarkable how often and correctly the specialists at the C.N.R.S. and first of all one of the main organizers of the Conference, Claude Karnoouh, refer to Hungarian research. Hence this edition carries on paradigmatic articles, where the carefully selected "ethnic" subject is always described in contrast to other cultures. Thus the non-Hungarian papers are instructive for Hungarian studies in this respect as well.

It would be necessary to organize more international conferences and encourage further publications on this level. Until that time this Proceedings are an indispensable source of important data and conclusions for European ethnology and research on South-East European peasant cultures. Since all the articles are quite rich in references, while containing comparative remarks as well, one has to go through them several times, if one wants to understand something of traditional South European peasant cultures in the last two centuries. Another special merit of these articles is that they cover the subject matter up to the present.

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem,
Budapest

Kincső Verebélyi

Az 1941. évi népszámlálás 3/a anyanyelv, nemzetiség, nyelvismeret

Budapest, Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Könyvtár és Dokumentációs Szolgálat — Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1983, pp. 141.

One of the most important census in Hungarian ethnic history was completed in 1941. The present publication (sub-volume 3/a *Mother tongue, ethnicity, languages*) is in fact the eighth volume in a series, which was started in 1975. Hitherto general data, demography, professions, habitat and a history of the census were published in several volumes. Volume 3, to which the present text is an annex, deals with demography and profession in general, i.e. in the whole of then Hungary. The present volume begins with a short and practical introduction. Then retrospective and general statistical data follow from 1910 on. The major material is grouped according to counties (*megye*), subdivided into communities (*község*) in alphabetical order. The data is exact and even include 1-1 persons. An indispensable source book, with thousands of important, surprising or even fantastic pieces of data. E.g. in 1941 the following were registered in Hungary according to mother tongue:

8 655 798 Hungarians	475 491 Germans
75 877 Slovaks	14 142 Rumanians
4 816 "Vends and Slovenians"	18 640 Gypsies
27 983 Others	5 442 Serbs
	37 885 Croatians

(Germans and Gypsies numbered less than is generally acknowledged). According to census data, 9,587 more persons also spoke Gypsy, as a secondary language. It is interesting to note that in Hungary in 1941 no

less than 51,735 persons spoke English, but only 490 of them had it as their mother tongue. (Among the rest one might also include the Hungarian-American immigrants, who came back to Hungary later.) At the same time 2,664 persons spoke Russian as their mother tongue, and 12,324 more as a secondary language. Since the census here do not specify Ruthenians, the question as to who were the fifteen-thousand Russians in 1941 Hungary remains unanswered. Four-fifths of them were men. In Budapest there lived 13 speakers of Albanian, 121 speakers of Arabic, 84 of Danish, 45 of Esthonian, 99 of Finnish, 298 of Flemish and 1,159 of Netherlandish (= Dutch), 37 of Japanese, 33 of Chinese, 35 of Latvian, 34 of Malay, 69 of Armenian, 33 of Persian, 204 of Portuguese, 1,296 of Spanish, 242 of Swedish, 626 Turkish, etc. Because in 1941 the (by now) outer districts of Budapest were independent communities, the same data is available about them too. Thus we read that in Csepel 14 people spoke Dutch and 27 spoke Turkish. Because the data is also specified to sex, further striking features are easy to find.

In general the book (and the whole series) is one of the most reliable and important source works in modern Hungary.

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem,
Budapest

Vilmos Voigt

Nagy Károly

Magyar szigetvilágban ma és holnap

New York, Püski, 1984, 159 pp.

Károly Nagy, a professor of psychology and sociology at Middlesex County College, is known as a spokesman of Hungarian national self-awareness in the Western hemisphere. In 1956 he left his native country for political reasons, but he started to make a *rapprochement* with the Hungarian state much earlier than most members of his generation.

This book is a collection of essays, talks and interviews written with the explicit purpose of making Hungarians aware of their common heritage, irrespective of the different political and social circumstances under which they happen to live. For their author the revival of one's national traditions figure as a human duty rather than merely a virtue. Such an attitude may suggest a view of culture which some would regard as conservative at the end of the 20th century, but it can nonetheless do a great service to a community which is kept together by a language, while its members are scattered in the most remote parts of the world.

Károly Nagy's basic hypothesis is that since World War II politicians have largely overstated the cultural differences between Hungarians living abroad and those living in their own country. This may be so, despite the fact that occasionally Nagy seems to be prone to the temptation of excessive optimism. Speaking of 16 million Hungarians, he tends to consider language as the basis of national identity. Far from questioning the relevance of a mother tongue, I would prefer an analysis of national identity less restricted to linguistic factors. The history of Hungary, a small country often menaced and sometimes even occupied by the great powers, is beset with peculiar difficulties, and because of the great influence changing historical conditions have exerted upon the fate of the country, terms like Hungarian self-image, identity, or even nationalism may admit of different interpretations. All theoreticians of that identity select those facts which accord best with their own idea of Hungarian characteristics, and in this the present author is no exception. The idea underlying his view of Hungarian self-assessment is that national culture largely depends upon the unwritten legacy of the peasantry. Such a conception of "organic culture," inherited from the Romantics and represented by the Populist writers, musicians, visual artists, and social anthropologists of the 1930's has made a tremendous impact on the Hungarian self-image, but sometimes its advocates have failed to do