

faced much the same challenges. Portions of the Partium and Transylvania received a flow of immigrants—sometimes such as had originally been tempted by an offer from the Banat. At the start the Habsburgs had envisaged a much larger project which treated the whole of Hungary as a kind of *tabula rasa*. O. mentions this so-called *Einrichtungswerk*,² originally drafted in 1689, but neglects its lasting relevance as a larger conjectural context for understanding what took place in the Banat.

A more disquieting absence is that of the native population of the Banat, always a clear majority of its inhabitants. These were mainly the Rascians and Wallachs of O.'s text, where they appear essentially as staffage. He took the decision to describe them using those exonyms, the language of his sources: a creditable expedient up to a point, avoiding the anachronism of attributing to them markers of modern ethnic identity. The Austrian administration often referred to these peoples collectively as *Nationalisten*, again without the later connotations of the word. Yet that sort of usage was, and is, also inescapably patronizing. Their equivalent endonyms were "Serb" and "Romanian" respectively; and an examination of some features of their cohabitation in the eighteenth-century Banat was called for to enhance O.'s portrayal of it.

Above all religion, for both peoples sustained a single rich Orthodox ecclesiastical culture. Whereas O. stresses the official policy of Roman-Catholic hegemony and the establishment of Uniate (Greek-Catholic) churches to extend it, he neglects the differential impact of this on the *Nationalisten*. Serbs, who controlled the Orthodox hierarchy and had settlers' privileges to protect its operation, remained aloof and hostile. Romanians, subordinated and lacking such advantage, could be won over, at least superficially, in large numbers. In both cases, though in separate ways, the experience contributed by the end of the century to calls for national recognition. O. notes this only for the Rascians, ignoring the Wallachs, and he doesn't develop the point. His coverage of the key Serbian political episode, the Sabor convened at Temesvar in 1790, is sketchy; his consistent misspelling of the young and dynamic prelate Stefan Stratimirović who led that assembly as "Startimirović" doesn't inspire confidence.

There is more than one way to write the story of the Banat. For all his scrupulous scholarship and the current resonance of his discussion of an experiment in colonialism, O.'s account belongs in a traditional genre of German settler historiography, with a distinctly national tinge which culminated in the likes of Joseph Kallbrunner and Fritz Valjavec. Another approach has been signaled in the broader multiethnic survey by Irina Marin, which appeared in English in 2013 and is now available in augmented form as *Kleine Geschichte des Banats: Umkämpfte Grenzen im östlichen Europa*.

Oxford

Robert J. W. Evans

-
- 2 Recent tricentennial survey: ANDRÁS OROSS (ed.): *Neuaufbau im Donauraum nach der Türkenzeit: Tagungsband der internationalen Konferenz anlässlich des 300-jährigen Jubiläums des Friedens von Passarowitz*, Wien 2021.

19th-Century Hungarian Political Thought and Culture. Towards Settlement with Austria, 1790–1867. Hrsg. von Ferenc Hörcher und Kálmán Tóth. Bloomsbury Academic. London u. a. 2024. XIII, 245 S. ISBN 978-1-3502-0295-5. (\$ 28,76.)

This collective volume on nineteenth-century Hungarian political thought and culture provides an overview of the major thinkers of this crucial period. It also offers a survey of current Hungarian research on the history of political ideas, represented by the fourteen authors who come from various academic institutes. The essays are also framed as a dialogue between different scholarly generations: one study is by the doyen of the research field, while others were written by young postdoctoral researchers. Unfortunately, however, the book is quite "masculine;" there is not a single female scholar among the contributors.

In general, the book describes a complex period in a comprehensible style and within a moderate length, which should make it accessible to a wider international public. A collective monograph was already published on this topic in 2016, but it adopted a broader Central European framework.¹ While it traces the development of political ideologies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the current volume under review focuses on the most influential Hungarian political thinkers, most of whom were practicing politicians. It examines this era under the triple motto of Enlightenment, nation-building nationalism, and liberalism. This approach is reminiscent of a book series published in Hungarian in the second half of the 1990s, an abridged version of which was also published in English.² Since over a quarter of a century has passed since then, however, the publication of the current volume is nonetheless warranted.

After the methodological introduction, the work is divided into two main sections. The first four studies familiarize the reader with Hungary's position in the Habsburg Empire, the country's domestic political and social relations, the most important issues of the legislative debates, and the unique constitutional thinking of the Hungarian elites. Of particular value is József Demmel's insights into the thinking and rival nation-building aspirations of the non-Hungarian-speaking peoples living in the country.

The opening study of the second section functions as an excellent introduction for the later, more classical political portraits. Employing a fresh approach, Henrik Hőnich and Ágoston Nagy sketch a horizontal overview of the various trends in Hungarian political thought at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This panorama is followed by contributions that look at nine thinkers (such as Ferenc Kazinczy, József Eötvös, Lajos Kossuth, and Ferenc Deák) in roughly chronological order, all of whom were active in the period between the French Revolution and the Austro-Hungarian Settlement.

In this rather transitional period, these thinkers and politicians fought for the modernization of the country and the development of national culture, as well as to secure state sovereignty and expand individual liberties. Among the different figures, Count István Széchenyi undoubtedly stands out from the rest of this national pantheon. Hungarian historiography typically dates the beginning of the "age of reforms" to when he began to publish his writings and engage in political activities. There is almost no author in the book who does not discuss Széchenyi's influence in some respect. In contrast, however, the volume lacks mention of the conservative thinkers open to moderate reforms who were the debates partners of liberals like Széchenyi; there is no collective portrait of Count József Dessewffy and his sons Aurél and Emil, for example, whom the editors dismiss as having "less impact on political events" (p. xi). Although I disagree with the editors, Iván Zoltán Dénes' book on this topic does fill this lacuna.³ Nonetheless, the list of thinkers included in the collected volume highlights the important role that the nobility—and especially the aristocracy—played in the modernization of the country, particularly since the country's economic underdevelopment meant that the wealthy and educated bourgeoisie was relatively small.

Given the approach chosen by the editors, individuals as well as ideas feature prominently in the individual chapters. The reader can easily understand how political conflicts, the 1848/49 revolution with its struggle for freedom, and the ensuing phase of Habsburg absolutism left painful marks on the private lives of these political thinkers. Most of the politicians discussed in the volume died before the age of 60 or were forced to retire from public life due to serious illness. Nevertheless, their personal sacrifices led to a political turn: The compromise with Austria in 1867 resulted in economic development and politi-

1 BALÁZS TRENCSENYI, MACIEJ JANOWSKI, MÓNKA BAAR, MARIA FALINA MICHAŁ KOPECEK: *A History of Modern Political Thought in East Central Europe*, Oxford 2016.

2 ANDRÁS GERŐ (ed.): *Hungarian Liberals*, Budapest 1999.

3 IVÁN ZOLTÁN DÉNES: *Conservative Ideology in the Making*, Budapest—New York 2009.

cal stability that lasted for five decades. Later figures in Hungarian political thought continued to face some of the same problems, such as ethnic conflicts, but they also had to confront new challenges including a democratic deficit, social tensions, and etatism. I am therefore looking forward to a future volume on the ideological changes and important thinkers of the period between 1867 and 1945.

Budapest

András Cieger

Die Bischöfe der Donaumonarchie 1804 bis 1918. Ein amtsbiographisches Lexikon. Bd. 1: Die röm.-kath. Kirchenprovinzen Gran, Kalocsa, Erlau im Königreich Ungarn. Hrsg. von Rupert Klieber, unter Mitarb. von Péter Tusor. Duncker & Humblot. Berlin 2020. XVIII, 661 S., Ill., Kt. ISBN 978-3-428-55648-9. (€ 99,90.)

Anzuzeigen ist der erste Band eines ambitioniert konzipierten Grundlagenwerks: Entstehen soll ein biografisches Nachschlagewerk mit den Bischofsviten für alle Diözesen der Donaumonarchie, also Österreich(-Ungarns) zwischen 1804 und 1918. Vorbild ist hier das von Erwin Gatz (1933–2011) hrsg. Werk *Die Bischöfe der deutschsprachigen Länder 1785/1803 bis 1945. Ein biographisches Lexikon*, Berlin 1983; Gatz ist dieser erste Band auch gewidmet. In einer Einführung wird die Entstehungsgeschichte des Werks entfaltet: eine wichtige Grundlage wurde bereits vor einiger Zeit vor allem durch Gatz, Karl Heinz Frankl, Peter Tropper und den Hrsg. Rupert Klieber gelegt, indem sie die Biografien der Zöglinge des 1816 als Kaderschmiede für geistliche Führungskräfte gegründeten Kollegs St. Augustin (Frintaneum) erforschten und sammelten. In der Ausweitung dieses Projekts entstand ein Forschernetzwerk über allen Staaten und Länder der einstigen Monarchie; K. möchte dieses nun für das ambitionierte lexikalische Großprojekt nützen. Im Vergleich zum Gatz'schen Bischofslexikon sollten dabei verstärkt sozial- und kulturwissenschaftliche Aspekte mit berücksichtigt werden. Geplant sind vier Bände (Bd. 2 vor allem zu Italien und Kroatien; Bd. 3 zu den deutschsprachigen und nordslawischen Ländern, Bd. 4 zu den ostkirchlich geprägten Diözesen); diese sind wiederum in Kirchenprovinzen und diese in Diözesen untergliedert.

Ein solches transnationales Unternehmen bringt seine Herausforderungen mit sich. Dies gilt umso mehr, als die kirchengeschichtliche Forschung in den einzelnen Ländern durch sehr unterschiedliche Traditionen geprägt ist; nationale oder auch ultramontan-konservative bzw. kirchlich-apologetische Ausrichtungen waren mitunter noch stark vorherrschend. So ist in der Einführung zu lesen: „Die national wie professionell vielgestaltige Schar von Autorinnen und Autoren ließ Biogramme nach Wien gelangen, die von sehr disparater sprachlicher und fachlicher Qualität waren und nicht selten dem apologetischen Duktus der diözesanen Überlieferung verhaftet blieben. Dies nötigte den Herausgeber dazu, das Vorhaben grundlegend neu zu konzipieren. [...] Auf diesem Wege haben sich die Erstfassungen der Autoren mitunter erheblich verändert; der Herausgeber ist zum generellen Koautor bzw. Generalautor der Endfassungen mutiert, der nicht selten nationale Differenzen auszugleichen hatte“ (S. 2). In der nationalen und kirchlichen Geschichtsschreibung der einzelnen Länder war ja das 19. Jh. lange überaus umstritten, etwa zwischen der Slowakei und Ungarn, was Nachwirkungen bis in die Gegenwart hat (vgl. S. 3).

Ein einführender Beitrag von Gabriel Adriány (1935–2024) und K. entwickelt historisch die strukturellen Eigenheiten der ungarischen Kirche. Als solche können die starke Stellung der königlichen Gewalt in Bezug auf die kirchlichen Institutionen und der mitunter sehr reiche Grundbesitz der Bischofssitze (insbesondere der alten Diözesen) genannt werden. Die Auswahl der Bischöfe, die jeweils einen Sitz im Magnatenhaus bzw. seit 1867 im Oberhaus des Parlaments hatten, erfolgte de facto über die königliche Hofkanzlei in Wien. Die Tradition des Josephinismus wirkte im 19. Jh. noch lange nach; Hofkanzlei und die Statthalterei in Ofen hatten die Zügel in der Hand und sorgten für eine Restituierung von Klöstern, aber auch dafür, dass diese „nützliche“ Aufgaben wie Pfarrseelsorge und Schulunterricht übernahmen. Neben den residierenden Bischöfen gab es sog. „erwählte