THE DE-GERMANIZATION OF THE BUDAPEST STAGE

Alice Freifeld

In 1812 the largest German-speaking theater in the world opened in Pest, a city of only 33,000.[1] The theater contained between 3,000 and 3,600 seats—there is some dispute as to actual number. But even 3,000 is double the capacity of the Vienna Burgtheater today, a thousand more than the Vienna Staatsoper, and only a few hundred less than the New York Metropolitan Opera at Lincoln Center. How could this small city sustain such a large hall, with performances generally four days a week, especially at a time when little traffic could be expected from Buda to cross the pontoon-bridge at night?

At the same time, the various attempts to establish a permanent Hungarian theater in Pest met with repeated humiliating failures. When the German theater vacated its humbler quarters in 1812, an Hungarian ensemble attempted to fill the converted round Turkish fort on the banks of the Danube, but within three years, the Magyar troupe dissolved and its actors scattered among the provincial cities. Within three-quarters of a century, however, the situation was dramatically reversed, with the Hungarian theater flourishing in several locations, while the German theater first retreated to smaller quarters, then found itself abandoned by the German-speaking burghers, and finally it burned down.

The shift from a German to a Hungarian theater culture has been told in different ways: 1) The most familiar is a nationalist version, which embeds the story of the theater in the drama of the liberation of the Hungarian nation and a revival of its culture. The theater offered one of the clearest reflections of this march to progress, from the beginning of the dream of a national theater in the last decade of the 18th century to its realization in 1837. The National Theater became a central venue of Magyar creativity. The development of a repertoire of high drama was

critical in the program for cultural revival. With the appearance of its own playwrights and composers, and the evolution of a rich and complex theater culture, the theater helped transform Hungarian from a "coarse" to an "eloquent" tongue. In this essentially political analysis, the theater was a central venue of patriotic activity.[2] The narrative emphasizes the struggle for dignity, respect, and equality. It is history on an epic or heroic scale: one of maturation, a coming of age.

2) Theater historians offer a variant of the historical narrative. Country after country, they note, made the creation of a national theater the highest priority in northern and eastern Europe from the second half of the 18th century to the beginning of the 20th century. The Hungarian movement is yet another example of this impulse, not unlike the effort by the Finns who challenged the Swedish culture of the dominant Swedish Finns.[3] These national theaters were political institutions, serving both high and low culture. Two processes were going on simultaneously: the public assertion and refinement of the national language, and less publicly, the extension of the cosmopolitanism of the literati to the audience. This involved familiarizing educated Magyar speakers who were not educated in Hungarian with the possibilities of the language, as well as introducing slightly-educated Magyars to higher levels of the spoken language. Popular culture was being satisfied or being created—and drama, opera, light opera, or ballet were all integral to the process. Parallel to this was the growth of a newspaper culture, which made celebrities of actors even among non-theatergoers. The Hungarian theater could stage a Magyar rendition of Shakespeare one night followed by a farce or animal act the next. Pantomimes and tableaux were popular.

3) Linguists interested in bilingualism and language shifts from multi- or bilingual to monolingual societies focus on the linguistic activism involved in the theater project. A linguistic definition of a nationalist is one who believes in linguistic prerequisites to the achievement of a national political regime. The nationalists, in this reading, sought to preserve a threatened language, then officialize a popular language, and finally marginalize what they considered to be alien languages.[4] Thus, language outcomes became tools for national greatness. Nationalists had a linguistic goal, and that goal required a national language regime, which was impossible unless all were competent in and used the one national language exclusively.

During the 19th century in Hungary, the linguistic shift produced a competition between an "advanced" German and an "authentic" Hungarian model, out of which the Hungarian emerged triumphant. This shift to monolingual states also fits into a universal, or at least European, pattern. Apparently, in 1789 only 50 percent of the French spoke French while now all do. The French state has not been so much a means of domination of one class by another as a means of exclusion of weaker languages by a dominant one. The Hungarian playwright, Sándor Kisfaludy, in a 1792 tour of Hungary and Transylvania, found to his horror more Slovak, Romanian, and German speakers than people using the Magyar tongue. The Hungarians were lost, he feared, unless they succeeded in buttressing and expanding the Hungarian language. The early language reformers, such as Kisfaludy and Ferenc Kazinczky, were militant in their vision of Hungarian as the operating language of the region, the language of the school, and turned to the stage as the first proving ground.[5]

The undercurrent in this third perspective is that of paranoia, the specter of language death, of linguistic genocide, a fateful dynamic between two unequal societies. A litany developed around the examples in Hungarian literature: one dates back to the Counter Reformation when the Jesuits are said to have advised Leopold I that it was necessary to render Hungary miserable, then Catholic, then finally German. Later, there was the terrifying aside by Herder wondering whether Hungarian was an obsolescent language destined to disappear. In the revolution of 1848, Hungarians rallied around a lamentation written in 1823 by the romantic poet Ferenc Kölcsey. His *Himnusz* (still the Hungarian national anthem) is a sad, self-pitying poem expressing the fear of national extinction.[6] The "recurring nightmare of *nemzethalál*" (national death) reached poetic height in Mihály Vörösmarty's "Appeal" (1836), which offered up a whole nation swallowed in a gigantic communal grave, while Europe stood by and watched.[7] The pathos of endangerment and the reverberations of political defeat were defining features of Hungarian nationalism. But one inspiration behind all nationalisms is aggrievement. Although Austrians and Germans have belittled Hungarians for this obsession, the Hungarian paranoia was different only in degree from the fear of language death propelling much of the German *Sturm und Drang*. In this case, Germany seemed to be rotting in its provincialism, at least if it did not exert itself vis-à-vis the French. And in a moment of peril (the Napoleonic occupation), the playwright, Heinrich von Kleist, wondered if Germans would still be speaking German in 1910. The German idea of theater as a medium of cultural revival developed out of this pathology or the desire to overcome an oppressive sense of cultural inferiority.

There is an element of irony in the Hungarians adopting the German idea of theater as a powerful tactic in their contest with the Germans. The solidification of a Magyar Budapest stage would mark the de-Germanization of Budapest culture but also an affirmation of the German idea of theater. Language reformers assumed that Hungarian would first have to prove itself as a language of the stage before it could stake the claim to becoming the language of the school, and ultimately, the language of Budapest homes. The history of Budapest theater in the 19th century will be considered in three stages: 1) the nationalist linguistic focus on the making of texts and the theater as a forum for Magyarization; 2) the National Theater in Budapest as an institution—the building itself as an icon of Hungarian political identity; and 3) the role of the crowd in diffusing the significance of the theater, now simply one voice in the multiplicity of the metropolis. With the Magyar linguistic dominance achieved, the didactic importance of the Magyar theater shifted to that of a "civilizing" agent.

****

Hungary had no theater to speak of before the early 18th century, as the Ottomans made no symbolic display of power before their subject Christian peoples, and the medieval tradition of mystery plays for the commoners survived only in pockets. The Habsburgs filled the vacuum in a minimal way, while magnates cultivated the baroque theater on their estates. Maria Theresa is said to have remarked, "If I want to enjoy a good opera, I go to Eszterhaza," i.e., the Esterházy estate in western Hungary.[8] No expense was spared in the building of this theater, seating 400, complete with box seats that opened into private sitting rooms with couches, mirrors, and clocks.

Esterházy was Haydn's patron for thirty years. The Baroque excelled at musical virtuosity, but it also loved the spoof or comedy. Marionette theater and masked balls were fashionable adult entertainment at the Esterházy estate. Elsewhere, traveling troupes performed for the general public. German-speaking troupes performed farces, pantomimes, and puppet shows along the circuit of Vienna, Bratislava, Pest, and Buda. Occasionally a Hungarian troupe appeared as well, but more as a novelty than as an institution. With the jester more often than not speaking a foreign tongue, he tended to be a traveling salesman of entertainment rather than an indigenous product.[9] The theater tradition of the 19th century, then, would have to be an invented tradition.

A permanent, German-speaking theater called the Rondelle was launched in Pest in 1774. The city paid for the renovation of the round Turkish fort in exchange for a one ducat tax on each ticket sold. Thus from the outset, the city viewed the theater as a source of revenue, and the inclination would be toward popular, profitable entertainment. By 1783 Buda also had a regular theater season, and both theaters caught the attention of Joseph II, for whom the twin cities in the middle of Hungary were a potential emanating point in his new centralizing and Germanizing policies. Joseph II involved himself in moving the German theater of his Hungarian kingdom to Buda, where in 1786 he oversaw the creation of a new theater in the fortress area. The austere facade of the Buda Fortress Theater (1787) reflected his lack of interest in ornamentation and statuary, but the project also reflected his keen awareness of the importance of a German theater in fostering his cultural and administrative goals. Joseph II was planning a much larger theater in Pest, one that could seat 1,200, but his death in 1790 brought this effort to an end. Although historians tend to distinguish Joseph II's administrative centralization efforts from ethnic or linguistic Germanization, the German theaters he built or imagined building were to be vehicles for imparting the imperial culture, with Buda and Pest as German cultural centers. Joseph II's 1784 decision to substitute German for Latin as the administrative and official language aroused furious opposition among Hungarians, who interpreted centralization as Germanization, and consequently viewed the emergence of a German theater in Pest and Buda with a jaundiced eye. In 1779, three years after the Emperor elevated the Burgtheater from "Court Theater" to "National Theater," a German pamphlet appeared in Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava), subtitled "In a speech to the Fatherland," calling for the establishment of a "Hungarian national theater," operating and performing, it was taken for granted, in the German language.[10]

Through his patronage of German culture, Joseph II unintentionally mobilized a Hungarian language revival, and the theater concept began to percolate. Emotional pleas for a Hungarian national theater in Pozsony (the seat of the Hungarian Diet and therefore Hungary's ostensible capital city) were again made at the 1790 Diet, but this time the language of the proposed theater was to be Hungarian. The first patriotic voices in favor of a Magyar theater were not building from an indigenous foundation, critic Pál Gyulai later argued, but rather attempting to transplant something new and foreign. It was a "contrived tool" in the reassertion of the national culture. Theater was but an "abstraction," and as such the stage became Magyar, but the spirit remained foreign. "The weak imitation of German theater could not satisfy the Germanized cultured public," however, and the common people were not attracted. "The actors also did not know what to do. One can not have theater without theater literature."[11]

A Magyar troupe run by László Kelemen sought to establish itself permanently in Buda and Pest in the 1790s. Beginning in an old Carmelite cloister dubbed the Palace Theater, the troupe struggled to draw an audience to the drafty wooden structure, which was dangerous for night performances under candlelight. The Kelemen troupe attempted to perform international plays in Hungarian as an alternative to the German theater. The German theater countered by performing plays with Hungarian themes before they could be translated into Hungarian. One such drama was Simon Peter Weber's "Die hunyadische Familie oder Unschuld schützt nicht immer von Kabale." The first Magyar language opera was also produced in 1793. But there would be nothing again for forty years.[12] The Hungarian Enlightenment could not compete on the stage; the Magyar language needed to be updated first. While the German theater thrived, the struggling Kelemen troupe operated out of a hall in a local hotel and a rental agreement with the German theater to use their stage on the German troupe's off-nights. But the Kelemen troupe self-destructed by 1796. Made up of button-makers with noble titles and others of the lowest, poverty-stricken layer of nobles who lived as commoners, the troupe was sunk by its own internal feuds and sex scandals. Its most talented actor was a wanted criminal.[13]

As city patron, Palatine Joseph was the galvanizing force in the building of a huge new Pest theater, 1806-12. The Pest leading families had been skeptical about the new theater, fearing it might divert funds from education, poor relief, and hospitals, but the Palatine understood the imperial advantage of a Pest German theater that would help draw Hungary into Imperial culture. He and Pest city authorities employed a financial argument for retaining an exclusively German-speaking schedule for the new theater. A Hungarian troupe did inherit the old Rondelle theater when the German actors moved out in 1812, but they failed after only three years. The Hungarian theater had yet to prove its profitability.

The flowering of the German theater between the 1810s and the 1830s coincided with a fleeting German-Hungarian literary movement whose most emblematic figure was the poet Nicholaus von Lenau, but it would not survive the language rivalries of the 1840s. Hungarian German-speakers fell into three camps: (1) along the border between Austria and Hungary, a classic bilingual push and pull of two rivals resulted in language shifts;[14] (2) in Transylvania, the military frontier and southern Hungary, pockets of German-speakers fought a rear-guard action against Magyarization in the defense of the status quo of multi-lingualism;[15] In Pest, Buda, and other German-speaking towns, the Hungarian heartland assumed a more ambiguous stance. German-speaking Pestiek were as eager as their Magyar neighbors to see Budapest become the capital and center of a new autonomous Hungary and were much more willing to accept a subordinate linguistic role in the governance of the country. They had the most to gain from linguistic collaboration and the most to lose from intransigence.

The Pest German theater succeeded in attracting European attention, with Emperor Franz, Tsar Alexander I, and King Frederick William III attending a gala performance in 1814. But the acoustics in the cavernous hall proved to be so poor that on one occasion a woman is said to have watched a drama from the balcony, only to compliment the actors on their fine pantomime. As a result, theater directors all but abandoned serious drama in favor of opera, ballet, pantomime, and

spectacles of all kind. The large stage was conducive to ballet, and stage set designers had a tremendous backdrop. Similarly, opera presented spectacle and did not require close attention to the dialogue. The Pest German theater offered a broad cosmopolitan program rather than specifically German classical fare. Its repertoire fell more under the influence of Rossini than Schiller. Some more ambitious directors sought with varying success to reserve the smaller, more intimate Buda German theater for serious dramatic works, taking cues from the performances of the Burgtheater in Vienna. The Pest theater, on the other hand, courted Magyar patriotism to fill the hall, performing Theodor Körner's *Zriny* and tableaux on patriotic topics. In 1815 it was able to pack the house with August von Kotzebue's *Béla's Flight*, which enacted a favorite motif: the alienated Hungarian nobleman who saves the king. When Kisfaludy's *The Tatars in Hungary* proved a smash hit in the Hungarian theater in Székesfehérvár, the German theater brought the performance to Pest where it was performed in Hungarian (30 nights in 1818, 19 times in 1819), a sign that Magyar drama had "arrived."[16]

During the "golden age" of the German theater in Pest, the Hungarian theater project retreated into the provinces from 1815 to 1837. One magnanimous magnate, Count George Festetics, gathered the literary lions of the land and feted them with unparalleled largesse twice a year at his agricultural institute, the Georgikon.[17] These Keszthely Helicon holidays began with a theater performance. They ended with Festetics's death after five years, but they had trumped the Rousseauian presumption that theater was culturally corrupting. The Hungarian intelligentsia had become convinced that until it created a theater crowd of its own it would lack any popular base. The first self-proclaimed "national theater" was in Kolozsvár (Klausenburg, Cluj-Napoca), Transylvania. It took to heart Count István Széchenyi's slogan, "in the language lives the nation." In Kolozsvár the attitude toward the national theater movement was different than "out" in the mother country and garnered more patronage from the well-to-do aristocracy. It would be Kölcsey, in an 1827 speech to the Szatmár county assembly in Transylvania, who galvanized the nationwide drive for a national theater. Kölcsey rooted the future security of the national language and culture in the theater. He posited the theater as a safe haven, a "home" for the Magyar language at the end of its long "exile."[18]

Passage of the protection of the national language act by the 1830 Parliament spawned a number of projects. Among these was a commission for the "Protection of the Spread of the Native Tongue," with Gábor Földváry, the sub-prefect of Pest (the top administrator in Pest County), as its most enthusiastic member, and two corporations for the building of a Magyar Playhouse, one led by Földváry and the other by Széchenyi. No longer was the actor a glorified barker, begging for audience and scraping together the fillers for a meager living. Indeed, "actors ... dared to claim themselves 'apostles of the national language.'"[19] Széchenyi, who had founded several key institutions, such as the racetrack, the National Academy, and the casino, pamphleteered for a "Magyar stage," in large part to block the financial interests of the speculators in the Földváry theater-land deal. The call for a Hungarian National Theater became a major political issue, pitting the liberal Pest county authorities against the conservative magnates in the Diet. Széchenyi's patriotism was born out of a profound pessimism about backward Hungary. He recommended a small subdued theater near the Danube and made all the prudent arguments—a

lack of actors, no financial resources—in his call for lowered expectations. Földváry dismissed Széchenyi's recommendations as an overestimation of Hungary's economic and cultural limitations and organized the lesser county nobility around the building of a grander structure. The difference of opinion became quite acrimonious. Széchenyi actually had Pest municipal contributions to the Földváry project sequestered, but through guild donations by Pest burghers, sufficient funds were raised; the county nobility won this battle of wills and built the Pest Magyar Theater just outside the Hatvan gate.[20] Placed on a busy but still dusty thoroughfare leading from the plain to the town of Pest, the theater displayed an ambitious vision of future population growth swelling beyond the inner city, beyond the locus of the river. The opening of the National Theater in Pest in 1837 activated the oppositional cultural politics of the Metternichean period.

The Pest Hungarian theater building itself manifested the difference in the cultural mission of the German and Hungarian theater. Ostentatious elements were absent; seating capacity was modest (200-500 seats). People sat and mingled in a "styleless" audience space, although the boxes were decorated by the subscribers as elaborately or distinctively as they wished. This was less the place to be noticed for one's toilette and more a place to be recognized for one's serious attention to the drama of cultural/linguistic renewal. The theater opened with the prologue of Vörösmarty's *Árpád*. Vörösmarty not only empowered the Hungarian theater with his own plays, but added to its repertoire by translating Shakespeare's *Julius Ceasar* and *King Lear*. Sándor Petőfi translated *Coriolanus*, while János Arany translated *Hamlet*, *Summer Night's Dream [sic]*, and *King John*. In the rush to create a classical theatrical canon, the Hungarian dramatists and actors often sacrificed natural Hungarian intonation, turning out stilted oration and iambic pentameter that tripped over its unnatural Magyar rhythms. Some true gems were produced, but in order to fill an entire season's repertoire, there was recourse to endless repetition and quick, clumsy translations of often weak German works. All too frequently, attending the theater amounted to two hours of boredom in the name of patriotism.

As linguists demanded the return of Hungarian intonation, contemporary French plays were introduced alongside Shakespearean plays or Hungarian dramatic verse. This adopted French realism evolved into a Hungarian theatrical form by Ede Szigligeti (1814-1878) called a *népszinmű*. These tableaux with music were of uneven quality but produced a set of stock caricatures of village life, ranging from the fatuous notary to the peasant bumpkin, which were popular with theatergoers and were able to draw the migrating peasants into the theater as well. In the 1840s, political comedies by József Eötvös, Ignác Nagy, and Imre Vahot became another staple. But the Hungarian theater quickly moved also to compliment its serious repertoire with comedies and even light operettas. Although a dramatic theater was no direct threat to the German Pest theater, the introduction of music was.

Whereas most cities like Vienna had only one serious opera company and dramatic theater, Pest now had two. This prompted a most unusual competition between the German and Hungarian theaters between 1837 and 1847. Yet even as this theatrical duel elevated the cultural life of the twin cities, it soon became apparent that it was an unequal contest. After three years in operation, the Hungarian theater received official designation as the National Theater and was subsidized,

while the German was not. The Hungarian theater had a clear focus, developing the clarity and power of a popular idiom. In other countries, "patriotism just raises and ennobles respect for the arts, but here it almost single-handedly bore and nourished it," Gyulai reflected.[21] The German theater had no such national purpose; its primary function was to be a conduit to European theatrical and operatic life. Guest performances became pervasive and featured the Viennese stars prominent in Pest summer theater. This emphasis on imported talent left the Pest German ensemble weak and no match for the Hungarian National Theater. The acoustics of the cavernous German theater had been so problematic from the outset that drama was always eschewed for opera, spectacle, farce, and operetta. Since the German theater had never been experimental or "serious," the Hungarian theater quickly seized the dramatic high road, and then in Ferenc Erkel found a composer, conductor, and manager who quickly established the primacy of the Hungarian opera company as well. Erkel's *Hunyadi László* debuted on 27 January 1844 and was performed regularly from then on. It became the first Hungarian-language box office success.

When the German theater burnt to the ground on 2 February 1847, there were rumors that the management, exhausted and defeated in the theatrical duel, had torched the structure. Clearly, the contest was over. The German theater's future became a source of controversy. Pamphlets appeared on both sides. The two principal arguments in favor of its reconstruction, that the German theater brought "class" to Pest and was a school for Hungarian theater, seemed old-fashioned. The detour through the German language no longer seemed necessary. The Hungarian theater was, in any case, by now less involved in outshining the German theater than in galvanizing the nation behind revolutionary changes. A Pest German theater would linger for another forty-two years, but with its glory years behind it, it would subsist increasingly on the margin, despite sporadic efforts from Vienna to revive it.

****

The theatricality of politics was particularly apparent in the testy atmosphere leading up to the 1848 revolution. Lajos Kossuth's mastery of the new public language established him as the preeminent leader. Unlike many of the magnates of the older generation, such as Széchenyi, who spoke Magyar in a halting way, Kossuth could stir crowds from his soapbox. Kossuth's oratorical talents were informed by theater. During three years in prison, he had honed his highly charged style by memorizing Shakespeare. Since the theater was the center of the cultural revival, it was also the source of material and literary sustenance for young writers. The theater became the center of their lives. Mór Jókai, the most prolific Hungarian writer of the 19th century, married the leading actress of the day, and while Sándor Petőfi proved a terribly awkward actor, the soaring theatricality of his poetry would be the script of the greatest theatrical event of his generation, 15 March 1848.

The demands of that day were proclaimed with a self-conscious theatricality, beginning with Jókai and Petőfi's recitations of the revolutionary demands and the poem, "Hungarians, On Your Feet!"[22] on improvised soap boxes in the morning. Many of the cheering German-speakers could hardly understand the Magyar orations. By noon (just after the violation of press censorship by the distribution of leaflets), a group was dispatched to the National Theater to demand a

performance of József Katona's historical tragedy *Bánk Bán* that evening under lights. By the afternoon, with the great declarations made and freedom of the press ratified, the mass demonstration followed actress Madame Lujza Farkas Szathmary as she self-consciously enacted the role of Marianne and led the crowd across the pontoon bridge to free the imprisoned radical journalist, Mihály Táncsics. The revolutionaries completed their day at the National Theater where the performance was broken off in midstream. The audience preferred to hear and cheer themselves, and the event concluded with a demonstrative rendition of "Hungarians, On Your Feet!" The next day, while Szathmary played the goddess *sancta libertas* in the city hall square, weapons were distributed to the crowd.[23] In the first weeks of the revolution, celebration continued in the theater and the theatrical spread to the streets. Men attached swords to their waists, and red-white-and-green was the fashion rage.

During the Spring of Nations in 1848, spontaneous festivals were celebrated in virtually every town and city in Germany, Hungary, and most of the rest of the Habsburg Monarchy. But the revolutionaries lacked the time necessary to create grand festivals reminiscent of the French Revolution; instead, festivity was drawn inwards into the theater, and in addition, there was no time to write new dramas. During the revolution, articles suggesting theater reform sprang up all over Europe.[24] But despite the aesthetic goals and good intentions, the revolution produced no significant new plays or operas elsewhere in Europe either. Rather, as is symptomatic in revolution, the theater suffered from the discontinuity, the withdrawal of foreign companies, and more importantly, the loss of state funding and box office revenues.[25] With censorship lifted in 1848, numerous banned or discouraged dramas were revived. But the most revolutionary new theater of the Hungarian revolution were tableaux or ballets, such as "The Battle of Fehértemplom" (1848) or "The Fall of the Double-Headed Eagle" (1849).[26]

As the revolution proceeded and the performers and intellectuals left the theater to join or lead the fighting, it would be the poet with a few succinct words standing anywhere who could mobilize and propel the masses into battle.[27] Once the revolution had turned into war, and towns changed hands and changed hands again, a siege mentality descended on the Hungarian towns. The crisis not only crippled the theater, but returning Habsburg authorities often singled out the theater for punishment. For instance, the theater manager of the German theater in Pozsony was executed by Gen. Johann Kempen in January 1849, ostensibly for cursing the members of the royal family and incitement to rebellion.[28] When Pest was on the defensive in March 1849, one burgher commented, "Our theater is empty every evening; restaurants and coffeehouses are unattended; the streets are quiet..."[29] And in May 1849, a canon ball blasted the theater square in Pest.

In victory Gen. Julius Haynau commandeered the Hungarian National Theater for German-language productions, obliging the actors to perform in German the third week of each month.[30] Since there was no real crowd for Haynau or the ruling Habsburg house, the theater became a crucial forum of official demonstration, and the symbolic battleground of the counter-revolution. In honor of Haynau's return after accepting the surrender at Világos, the Hungarian players performed a Verdi opera—the first in a string of command performances and festive theater illuminations that added to the financial strain on the theater. On 28 August 1849, the German

theater used the National Theater building to celebrate the Goethe centenary with *Hermann und Dorothea*. "Here in Pest where Magyar is already preached, where there is no need for a German theater to exist," wrote the *Pester Zeitung*, "German culture has reappeared in the realm of art, on the Magyar stage German is performed."[31] During Haynau's year-and-a-half rule, the Hungarian theater feared that Haynau might go the next step and Germanize the National Theater. But instead, at the end of November 1849, the German theater of Pest, which had burnt down in 1847 and then was bombed out of its temporary quarters in 1849, found a new temporary home, this time in the Redout building.

The counter-revolutionary 1850s had an ambiguous relation to the theater. While punishment was swift, the system of Interior Minister Alexander Bach invested in pomp and spectacle. First Haynau's departures and arrivals in Pest were turned into formal spectacles, then the Bach Hussars displayed themselves as they wished to be seen at the theater. At a time when all public assemblies were banned or carefully monitored, the theater remained a volatile and potentially subversive arena. But precisely for that reason, several hundred *Gutgesinnt* ("the well-intentioned") had a special feel in a packed theater. The theater could then be a forum for the display of loyalty and a source of counter-revolutionary solidarity. By military order, on holidays of the imperial house, theater performances were to open with the imperial hymn. Being fashionably late became ever more fashionable, but occasionally such edicts backfired and the finality of revolutionary defeat was once again tested in the theater gallery. On the Emperor's birthday in 1850, screeching, whistling, and banging in the balcony brought the orchestra to a halt three times during the singing of the imperial hymn. The special police arrested 17people, beating 14 of them with 30 blows apiece, and injuring 3 seriously. The balcony of the Pest Hungarian theater was closed down for weeks causing a substantial loss in box office receipts. On this same day there was a demonstration at the summer theater in Buda, when patriotic phrases in the play were met with stormy applause. When an audience hysterically cheered a bit player because he was dressed in a Hussar uniform, for the next decade Mecklenburg uniforms were substituted for Hungarian ones. There were also reports from the provinces of audiences cheering Kossuth on Franz Joseph's birthday in 1850.[32]

Thanks to the largesse of the centralized administration under Bach, the German theaters in Pest, Buda, and the provinces gained a moment of respite. Bach was convinced that the German theater was important as a social institution. An amateur actor himself and a friend of poet Nikolaus Lenau, he was attuned to the power of the word. German theater had a heightened political importance simply because the Hungarians placed such an emphasis on their theater. Support for the German theater was an indirect means of curtailing the scope of the Hungarian theater, especially in towns with only one theater building. Bach officials, therefore, took a proprietary interest in the theaters of their jurisdictions. The German-speaking bureaucrats who came in to govern the land in 1849 became heavily involved in overseeing the day-to-day operations of the provincial theaters.

The case of Košice (Kassa, Kaschau) is particularly illustrative of the theatrical conflicts that bedeviled provincial towns with two competing theater companies, a Hungarian and a

German, vying for the control of one theater.[33] Since Kaschau originated as a "German colony," officials made it a matter of pride that the town not lose its German theater, while the Hungarians never forgot that the nucleus for the first ensemble of the Hungarian National Theater had been recruited from the local Kassa troupe. The Slovak peasantry in the hinterlands was not yet a party to the competition, and neither the German nor the Hungarian population, about equally divided, was actually sufficient to sustain a year-long theater schedule. The town of 17,000 had a sizable number only interested in the Hungarian theater, while the theater-going German public, made up mainly of officials, the military, and German commercial families, was so small a public that there was a limit to repeat performances, making new productions particularly costly and exhausting for the actors. The Kaschau bureaucrats were painfully aware that the German theater directors hardly lasted a season. As a result, city authorities were increasingly reluctant to extend generous leases and/or free heating to German theater directors. The Bach theaterocrats found themselves in a rearguard battle on behalf of the German theater, concerning themselves inordinately with their revenues and their prospects. Ticket prices remained the same for many years despite significant inflation and the increase in wages of actors; one official conceded that to price tickets in correct relation to cost they would have to be doubled, but this he quickly added would be to throw the baby out with the bath water, for it would reduce attendance. He was unwilling to support even a moderate increase in ticket prices.[34]

Clearly the most important function of the German theater company was keeping the Hungarian company at bay. Officials became alarmed when a shrewd Hungarian theater director in the neighboring town of Eperies sought a six-week engagement in the middle of the lucrative winter season in return for splitting the profits with the German theater director of Košice; such a marginalization of the German theater would be a most distressing precedent.[35] As one official wrote:

> I must emphasize that the Hungarian theater has long waited to establish itself in the winter here; if the German performances ended in the winter or if in the summer a competent German company can not be put together for next winter season then the Hungarian side will see it as a perfect opportunity to get a concession which cannot be denied them on legal grounds. This would create an unfortunate precedent which would encourage the Hungarian theater to eliminate the German theater altogether [thereby], a terrain would be lost which had been won through sacrifice, toil and money.[36]

If the German theater went under, there would be no legal way of barring the lease for the Hungarian theater. After all, it would be "disadvantageous if the Hungarian public saw that one preferred to see the theater empty than to allow them any pleasure."[37]

Despite official encouragement in this age of fussy censorship, German theater in Pest and Buda never found its footing. In 1851 the Pest German theater was moved to another interim wooden structure, but it turned out to be uncomfortably drafty. Public interest in the German theater had declined, and financial difficulties proved unavoidable. The Pest German theater became ever weaker and increasingly reliant on foreign guest performers.[38] The audience came to see the latest Viennese curiosities, but no longer patronized serious drama. The *Pester Zeitung*

commented in 1851 that the loges were empty for *Othello,* but filled when a midget performed.[39] Consequently theater directors passed through a revolving door of short tenures, bankruptcies, and interim closures.

As neo-absolutism was routinized, the celebration of the Emperor's birthday and his visitations became ritualized. The Hungarian National Theater's gala performances generally played to a packed house. For the Emperor's birthday in August 1851, the German Buda theater was full, and everyone rose from their seats when the actors displayed a picture of the Emperor; Generals Appel and Geringer led the singing of the imperial hymn.[40] During the royal tours of 1852 and 1857, Franz Joseph visited most of the provincial theaters in Hungary; any self-respecting town now had to boast the most resplendent theater it could afford. Franz Joseph's receptions during his 1852 royal tour were poorly attended, but at the National Theater he did receive an enthusiastic reception from the Hungarian elite. It was the first time Franz Joseph entered "national ground" where Hungarian—not German—was the language of the hour. When he appeared, accompanied by Archdukes Albrecht, Ernst, and Wilhelm, in a Hungarian Hussar uniform as a concession to Hungarian feeling, the audience burst into an extended ovation that lasted several minutes. When the curtain was raised, the entire theatrical company sang the imperial hymn.[41] Nothing so illustrated the decline of the Pest German theater than its inability to perform for Franz Joseph during his 1857 tour due to its temporary financial insolvency.[42]

Although the Hungarian theater had established its ascendancy over the German stage in Pest, in 1857 Gyulai asked, "Why is the young generation of actors less optimistic about the future...?"[43] Despite a few, stellar, new talents, there was a consensus, he claimed, that theater was on the decline. He readily admitted that the number of fine actors in the ensemble had increased and that much more could be expected—not just a few well-done scenes, but entire performances of quality acting. Yet, he complained, actors used to be driven by their mission, while under neo-absolutism no new leaven was being added to the mix. In short the actors lacked the vision that came from political commitment.[44] "Now there is much behind us; exhaustion and disappointment weighs on us."[45] Actors were forswearing their role as political missionaries and martyrs for wealth and international fame made imaginable by the breakthroughs in travel and communication. Gyulai's lament that Hungarian actors were more cynical, self-absorbed, egoistic, and materialistic signaled the revival of the political theater:

> Once the Hungarian scholar, writer or artist starts falling into the sick desire to have been born in a country where one could have been famous in half the world, one does not sacrifice oneself to the common suffering, which substitutes for everything else here; if in the desire for wealth or pride one forgets, that one must live for the homeland: there will be tragic consequences and our literature will lose its center of gravity. Thank God, we are not anywhere near this point."[46]

The censor's heavy hand had promoted the frivolous tendencies of the German theater. The Bach system sought to depoliticize all theater, to trivialize much of it.[47] "The audience acts quite peculiarly," wrote a reviewer of one operetta on the Hungarian stage. "They laugh a lot at the first

act, even more at the second, and even more at the third, and then they leave the theater shrugging their shoulders that there wasn't much to that piece." "In today's sad world" such a comedy is about as funny as things can get, concluded the reviewer.[48] While the 1840s had fostered a politicized high-culture, mid-cult theater flourished all over Europe in the 1850s. By contrast the martyrology of the Hungarian stage became ever more compelling. The more neo-absolutism became routinized, the more impoverished and banned Hungarian playwrights were elevated to the status of martyrs. The funerals of legendary actors and playwrights became the focus of an outpouring of collective emotion. The first of these nationalist demonstrations was for a relatively minor writer, János Garay, who had gone mad after losing his job in the counter-revolution. The fate of the writer resonated in the oppressed atmosphere of neo-absolutism.[49] Charity theater performances were held in Debrecen, Györ, Nagybánya, and elsewhere to finance a stately monument in Pest's new cemetery.[50] He is remembered today only for his stock character, János Háry, subsequently immortalized by the Zoltán Kodály opera of the same name. The 1855 funeral of Vörösmarty became the first great unofficial crowd event in Pest since revolutionary defeat. The death of a great matinee idol three years later was the occasion of another great demonstration, when 15,000 to 20,000 people marched in the funeral procession for Marton Lendvay. Lendvay had delivered the first lines on the National Theater stage in 1837, when he recited the prologue of Vörösmarty's *Árpád*. He had also fought in the revolution. His funeral and a hurriedly-erected statue a few months later in the square before the National Theater signaled the return of the political theater and theatrical politics.[51] The Lendvay statue became an embarrassment in only a few years, an all but anonymous figure in bronze. That it was built in 1858 for an already fading star reflects the nostalgia and mythology surrounding the founding era of the Hungarian theater.[52]

At the end of the 1850s, it had become possible to erect statues to Hungarians, provided they were a minor playwright or an actor. These funerals and statue raisings reflected the intense feeling the public had for the National Theater, seeing it as the place where national expression was still braved during a time of oppression. No wonder, then, when the German-speaking world was immortalizing Schiller, the Hungarians hurriedly kept pace by celebrating their theatrical herald in the Kazinczky centennial of 1859. The Austrian press mocked Hungarian pretensions, but the three-month Kazinczky subscription campaign became the springboard for the political breakthrough. The Pest German theater celebrated Schiller on one evening. Although the Kazinczky celebration in the Pest Hungarian theater was also a one-day affair, the theater event was embraced and duplicated in one regional theater after another. The Kazinczky festival convulsed Hungarian political and cultural life from mid-October until the end of the year, testing the very limits of the Bach cultural policy.

By the time of the Kazinczky festival, the roof was already falling in on efforts to sustain the German theater. When the war in Italy began in the spring, the Ministry of the Interior announced that it was reducing theater subsidies, a position reaffirmed after Bach's fall in the summer. In Košice local officials dipped into a secret police fund to keep the German theater afloat.[53] In 1860 as the Bach system began to unravel, all over the country authorities struggled to keep control of song. Song galvanized everyone; strangers on the street began singing, joining

in with one another, until passers-by were linked, almost as if in a crowd. New songs were springing up constantly. In the German theater of Timişoara (Temesvár), the audience sang Hungarian songs between acts.[54] Traveling actors and a gypsy band arrived in Szeged one Sunday in June.[55] They marched from the theater to the front of the city hall to music and waving flags. In a few minutes, more than 1,000 people gathered. As the crowd grew, the emboldened actors led the crowd through the main streets of the city singing the *Himnusz* and refrains of the Rákóczi, Klapka, and Kossuth marches. The denouement of provincial German theaters followed quickly.

On St. Stephen's Day, 20 August 1865, at the first Pest music festival, Franz Liszt showcased his *St. Elizabeth* oratorio.[56] Although it was never a great crowd pleaser, the piece took on a special significance because it became so identified with the reigning Empress Elizabeth. This was a triumphal moment for Liszt, whose childhood debut had been in the old, cavernous, Pest German theater. His endorsement of the Hungarians, despite his own imperfect Hungarian, represented a bridge from the Germanic through the Catholic and Austrian to Hungarian. Liszt bolstered Hungarian liberal confidence that they could make Pest a worthy partner in a dual monarchy. Indeed, with the founding of the Musical Academy in the 1870s, Liszt would draw Pest into the European musical circuit.[57]

The Hungarian National Theater, however, continued to measure itself against the Burgtheater. Placards and program notes would boast that a performer, set design, or fashion was as good as, or "from the Burgtheater." By contrast the Burgtheater remained oblivious to Hungarian drama, performing only two Hungarian plays in the period of the *Ausgleich*, one by Jókai in 1885 and the other by Ferenc Molnár in 1912.[58] Meanwhile in the south, the national theater idea was spreading. In Zagreb a Croat national theater soon followed on the heels of the closing of the German theater. A Serbian theater opened in Novi Sad in 1861, and the Serbian National Theater opened in 1868 in Belgrade. A Slovene national theater reopened in Ljubljana in 1882.[59] In the hinterlands, competing traveling troupes had kept alive a multilingual theatrical life. For instance on 18 May 1862 in Vrsac (Verseg, Werschetz), in the mixed Vojvodina, a Serbian troupe played *The Dream of Kraljevič Marko* by Sterija Popović (a well known dramatist from Vojvodina) in the Hotel Klinger, while a German troupe performed *A German Warrior* in the city park, which was followed by a Hungarian troupe performing Heinrich Ludwig Edmond Dorn's *Rozsa Sándor*, a depiction of the Hungarian highwayman with song and dance.[60] As regional theaters blossomed in former grain silos and other large structures, or in quickly erected buildings, non-Hungarians began to view the Hungarian national theater much as Hungarian theatrical nationalism had once viewed the Burgtheater, a model to emulate and displace.

****

The Buda city authorities ended their contract with the German theater in Buda in 1870, and the Várszinház became a Hungarian theater. The sword of Damocles now hung over the German theater in Pest. In April 1880, Pest ordered the closing of the theater rather than allow a Viennese bank to finance a renewal of the lease, a decision ratified by the Budapest city council by one vote amidst a fire storm of controversy. The *Pesti Napló* spoke of "traitors" who supported

the German theater, while the German-language newspapers denounced the sacrifice of "liberalism" in the name of "patriotism."[61] Budapest in 1880 was still 33 percent German, some 120,000 people in all, among them a sizable number of recent immigrants from Austria.[62] In numerical terms, the number of Germans in Hungary had actually increased. In 1840 there were a little less than 1.25 million, forty years later there were a little under two million.[63] Bitterness grew among the German-speaking middle class, which felt threatened by "national terrorism."[64] Prominent liberal Forty-Eighters, like Dániel Irányi,[65] called for the Hungarian nationalists to retreat, insisting that their actions were illegal. In any case, the idea that the Germans could absorb the Hungarians, least of all through the theater, seemed ridiculous.

Despite a ban on any further performances, the German theater opened once more amidst rumors of demonstrations. Because of the fear of violence, there were few women in the audience. But those students who did demonstrate were quickly removed, and when the curtain was raised the actors were greeted with fifteen minutes of applause before the playing of Franz von Suppé's operetta, *Donna Juanita*. The city authorities had chosen not to prevent the performance physically, instead they fined the theater director. In any case, the theater had run out of money and could not have afforded any further defiant performances.

What had been a local cause célèbre had by now become an international incident. The pressure came less from Vienna than Berlin. One German business canceled a contract with a Hungarian insurance company; a Berlin newspaper called for a boycott; and the Berlin-based *Schulverein* rallied the liberal academic elite behind a "threatened German culture." Disgusted that "our chauvinists have excited Austrian and German chauvinists," Jókai attacked the ban. He added that German theater was stagnating in Hungary's provinces and would have been ruined in the capital in any case without any bureaucratic harassment.[66] Kálmán Tisza finally reversed his endorsement of the ban when the Hungarian ambassador in Berlin arrived to warn of damage to German-Hungarian relations. The German theater was granted its concession, prompting a band of some 30-40 protestors to smash the windows of Jokai's house and the *Pester Lloyd*, yelling "We don't need a German newspaper." But when someone yelled, "Let's burn down the theater!" the others shouted him down, saying "We are not petroleurs [arsonists]!"[67]

In the ensuing year-and-a-half, the passionate support of the *Schulverein* for the resistance of the Transylvanian Saxons to Magyarization compromised the assimilation-minded, largely bilingual, Budapest German-speaking community. A further upsurge of anti-German sentiment placed this German-speaking community in crisis. It was especially disturbing to the German-speaking Jews faced with the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany, pogroms in Russia, and the unfolding blood ritual trial of Tiszaeszlar at home. On 30 April 1882, the German-speaking community came out onto the streets in a mass demonstration to protest the anti-Hungarian propaganda of the *Schulverein*. Calvin Square was filled with protesters who then marched to the city park to hear speakers declare that their demonstration of loyalty had no parallel in history. They described themselves as the mass of German-Hungarians who had previously shied away from all patriotic demonstrations, but who now felt compelled to declare themselves publicly as free Hungarians.[68] The cause of the German theater was marginalized. In any case, in an age of

rapid railroad travel, the wealthy had fairly easy access to German theater in Vienna, while the taste for spectacle and popular fare was being filled by holiday events performed in the open, such as on the evening of St. Stephen's Day 1882, when 60,000 spectators gathered at the pond in the City Park for an electrical light extravaganza.

In 1887 the critic Adolf Silberstein (aka Ötvös), a prominent voice of the Budapest bilingual community, reviewed the Hungarian National Theater jubilee for the *Pester Lloyd*. "Fifty years ago Pest and Buda were so-to-speak foreign colonies...Pest was a suburb of Vienna. The German muse dominated, she had her palaces, her repertoire, her public, her artists." Hungarian theater existed "only as a dream."[69] Silberstein's article was in tune with the monumentalizing Hungarian rhetoric of the time, and it was remarkable for its disinterest in the presence of the German theater. Silberstein viewed the jubilee as a "political-patriotic celebration," rather than a literary-cultural one, since in his view Hungarian theater was also in decline as a consequence of its lost political role.[70] Instead of the theater as a catalyst of the political, the talent of the theater had been sucked into the political; parliamentarianism had drawn the talent to itself.[71]

The end of the German theater came on 20 December 1889 when a fire demolished the theater building. The police blamed a foyer heater on the first floor, but there were rumors that it had been set by a Hungarian chauvinist infuriated by an upcoming annual Christmas guest appearance of the Burgtheater star, Adolf Sonnenthal. Sonnenthal had just exchanged his Hungarian citizenship for Austrian citizenship, and anonymous letters had warned that his guest performance would be disrupted. The manager had been sufficiently concerned to promise Sonnenthal police protection. In any event, so ended the German theater in Pest.[72] A furiously impotent rage festered in the shadows. Pan-Germans vacillated between the desire to smash Austria-Hungary and the desire to reassert Austrian control of Danubia. A pamphlet of 1895, *Greater Germany and Mitteleuropa in the Year 1950*, projected one state including all Germans and millions of Germanized Slovaks, Slovenes, and Hungarians.[73]

****

The theater began to fade in importance in the 1880s. With Hungarian politics institutionalized, politics developed its own theater—a parliament, and its own actors—party politicians. Journalists had replaced actors as the principal purveyors of Magyar political culture and linguistic identity. But most importantly, mass politics had moved the political stage from the theater to the streets: where once the public found its Magyar voice in demonstrations against the German theater, marching workers now took to the streets in disciplined May Day Parades. The state responded with ever greater extravaganzas such as the Millennium Exhibition of 1896.

The very success of Magyarization in Budapest also demonstrated that language shifts did not necessarily result in fundamental cultural transformations. Romantic nationalism in the theater had made a cult of the folk, folklore, and popular culture precisely when Magyar folk culture was mutating into a national commercial product, and Budapest was creating an

alternative urbanity that had ceased to be explicitly identified with either Magyar folk traditions or German culture.

It would be wrong to deduce from the de-Germanization of the Budapest stage a de-Germanization of Budapest cultural life. In a certain sense, the opposite happened. As the theater retreated from the center of the political stage, it ceased to be a rhetorical platform of political nationalism and became one of the "classical" institutions of liberal nationalism, rendered respectable but dull. The onset of modernism with its internationalist agenda created an intensified appetite for non-Hungarian works. Modernism would arrive in a fundamentally German guise, with the shining lights of Hungarian modernism, e.g., György Lukács and Ervin Szabó sporting Nietzschean mustaches. As the German theater had introduced the Rossini cult to Pest, with its departure Budapest fell under the virulent musical control of a Magyar Wagnerian. Indeed, one might well ask whether Hungarian culture was even more under German influence than in the half century following the demise of the Pest German theater in 1889.

NOTES

[1] Wolfgang Binal, *Deutschsprachiges Theater in Budapest von den Anfängen bis zum Brand des Theaters in der Wollgasse (1889)* (Vienna: Hermann Böhlaus, 1972) is an invaluable source on the German theater.

[2] See Edith Császár Mályusz, *The Theater and National Awakening* (Atlanta: Hungarian Cultural Foundation, 1980).

[3] See Heinz Kindermann, *Realismus*, vol. 7 of *Theatergeschichte Europas* (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1965), 404-11; Laurence Senelick, ed., *National Theatre in Northern and Eastern Europe, 1746-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[4] See, among others, Nessa Wolfson and Joan Manes, eds. *Language of Inequality* (Berlin: Mouton, 1985); Brian Weinstein, ed., *Language Policy and Political Development* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1990); J. A. Laponce, *Languages and their Territories* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

[5] Friedrich Gottas, "Die Deutschen in den Ländern der Ungarischen Krone (1790-1867)," in *Land an der Donau*, ed. Günter Schödl (Berlin: Siedler, 1995), in the series, Hartmut Boockman et. al., eds, *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas*, 220-21.

[6] Kölcsey's *Himnusz* was set to music in 1844 by Ferenc Erkel. The national militia battled to its somber message in 1848, and it has been the national anthem despite the changes in regimes.

[7] Lóránt Czigány, *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Present* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1984), 128.

[8] Karl Geiringer, *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1968), 63. See also Géza Staud, *Adelstheater in Ungarn (18. und 19. Jahrhundert)* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademïe der Wissenschaften, 1977).

[9] Pál Gyulai, "Nemzeti szinház és drámai irodalmun" [The National Theater and our drama literature], *Budapesti Szemle* 1, no. 1 (1857), 124.

[10] The author was Frentzel, a military officer; see Lajos Laurisin, *A magyar királyi operaház* [The Magyar Royal Opera House] (Budapest, 1941), 18.

[11] Gyulai, 124.

[12] Laurisin, 17-18.

[13] For a discussion of 18th-century antecedents to Kelemen, see Binal, 38, 48, 53, 64, and Mályusz, 113-71. Other traveling troupes contemporary to the Kelemen performed in Kolozsvár, Miskolc, Kassa, Debrecin, Nagyvárad, Szeged, Pest, Székesfehérvár, Pozsony, e.g. in all of upper Hungary and parts of the Alföld.

[14] Susan Gal, *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria* (New York: Academic Press, 1978).

[15] Gottas, 219-290; Béla Bellér, "Das ungarnländische Deutschtum im Reformzeitalter, während der bürgerlichen Revolution und Absolutismus," *300 Jahre Zusammenleben - Aus der Geschichte der Ungarndeutschen. 300 éves együttétés- A magyarországi németek történetéből*, ed. Wendelin Hambuch (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1988), vol. 1, 53-61.

[16] Binal, 94-5, 98, 101, 110-11, 129.

[17]. Karl von Klempa, *Die kulturpolitischen Bestrebungen des Grafen Georg Festetics* (Győr, 1939).

[18]. Gyulai, 120.

[19]. Gyulai, 120.

[20]. Laurisin, 19; Mályusz, 282.

[21]. Gyulai, 127.

[22]. "Talpra Magyar."

[23]. Jankotvckh v. Adlerstein, *Chronologisches Tagebuch der magyarischen Revolution,* vol. 1 (Vienna: Sollinger, 1851), 243.

[24]. Wilhelm Widmann, *Theater und Revolution. Ihre gegenseitigen Beziehungen und Wirkungen im achtzehnten, neunzehnten u. zwanzigsten Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Oesterheld, 1920), 107-10.

[25]. Widmann, 59-124.

[26]. Kindermann, 409.

[27]. See Frederick Brown, *Theater and Revolution: The Culture of the French Stage* (New York: Viking Press, 1980).

[28]. Josef Karl Mayr, ed., *Das Tagebuch des Polizeiministers Kempen von 1848 bis 1859* (Vienna-Leipzig: Österreichischer Bundesverlag für Unterricht, Wissenschaft und Kunst, 1931) [January 1849], 126.

[29]. "A pesti magyar ember" [The Magyar man of Pest], *Közlöny,* 14 March 1849.

[30]. Tivadar Rédey, *A Nemzeti Színház Története* [History of the National Theater] (Budapest, 1937), 241.

[31]. 11 August 1849; cf. Binal, 216.

[32]. Lajos Lukács, *Magyar függetlenségi és alkotmányos mozgalmak, 1849-1867* [Hungarian independence and constitutional movements] (Budapest: Muvelt Nep, 1955), 35.

[33]. Országos Levéltár (OL) [National Archive], D129, *Staathatleriei Abtheilung* (SA) Kaschau, 1859 csomó (cs.) 4, #132, 112 (7 May 1859); D129, kk, cs. 3, 1859; #39, 195-7; D129 cs. 4, 1859, #11.

[34]. OL, SA Kaschau, D129, cs. 4, 1859, #132, 143 (31 May 1859).

[35]. OL, SA Kaschau, D129, cs. 4, 1859, #124, 60 (23 Feb 1859).

[36]. OL, SA Kaschau, D129, cs. 4, 1859, #158, 449 (24 November 1859).

[37]. OL, SA Kaschau, D129, cs. 4, 1859, #132, 112 (7 May 1859).

[38]. Binal, 226.

[39]. 21 June 1851; Binal, 227.

[40]. *Pester Zeitung,* 20 August 1851.

[41]. Adlerstein, 16.

[42]. Binal, 243. After his Hungarian theater evening, Franz Joseph did attend a ball held in the German theater attended by the bureaucracy and the German and Jewish middle class.

[43]. Gyulai, 126.

[44]. Gyulai, 131.

[45]. Gyulai, 126.

[46]. Gyulai, 127.

[47]. In contrast, the Viennese only performed two Hungarian plays in 100 years, one by Therese Artner (1772-1829) in 1821 and another by Jókai in 1885. Otto Rub, *Das Burgtheater: Statischer Rückblick* (Vienna: Paul Knepler, 1913), 304.

[48]. "Gazdag nő" [The rich woman], *Hölgyfutár* (21 December 1849).

[49]. Garay died on 5 November 1853 and was buried in the Kerepesi cemetery. In 1908 his remains were placed in a more decorative grave. József Ferenczy, *Garay János életrajza* [Biography of János Garay] (Budapest, 1883); János Jeney, *Garay János* [János Garay] (Budapest, 1932).

[50]. *Hölgyfutár* (6 February 1850).

[51]. In the same year as the Martón Lendvay statue, one was also etched for the playwright József Katona. The Katona statue was widely understood to be the patriotic response to the regime's erecting a statue for General Hentzi. All three statues would be removed. See Rédey, 268. On the role of the Kisfaludy society in this resurgence of political culture, see Lajos Kéky, *A Százéves Kisfaludy Társaság, 1836-1936* [The 100-year-old Kisfaludy Society] (Budapest: Franklin, 1936).

[52]. In the Horthy period, which was fascinated with the ceremonial nationalism of the Dual Monarchy, there was talk of taking the Lendvay statue out of storage and returning it to some square in Pest. Today the Lendvay statue decorates a shaded bench in the fortress tourist zone in Buda.

[53]. OL, SA Kaschau, D129, cs. 4, 1859, #11, 697 (27 January 1860).

[54]. For a portrait of theater life in an ethnically mixed area, see Alojz Ujes, "Das Publikum der wandernden Schauspieltruppen in der Vojvodina im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Das Theater und sein Publikum*, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, no. 327 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), 206-17.

[55]. János Reizner, *Szeged Története* [History of Szeged] (Szeged: Szeged szab. királyváros közönsége, 1897), 229. In June 1859, three poets, Gyula Sárosy, Imre Vahot, and Kálmán Lisznyai, accompanied by the then very popular band, Bunkó, came to Szeged for one of their "poetry and music evenings." It has been estimated that in 1860 there were some 400 Hungarian actors traveling around the country. See Kindermann, 411.

[56]. *Pester Lloyd*, 13 August 1865, 17 August 1865; *Pesti Napló*, 22 August 1865; Tamás Nádor, *Liszt Ferenc életének krónikája* [A chronology of Ferenc Liszt's life] (Budapest: Zeneműkiadó, 1977), 250.

[57]. On Liszt, see Imre Keszi, *Pest-Buda* (Budapest: *Zeneműkiadó*, 1973), 35-38; Tibor Frank, "Liszt, Brahms, Mahler: Music in Late Nineteenth Century Budapest," in *Hungary and European Civilization*, ed. György Ránki, Indiana University Studies on Hungary, vol. 3 (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1989), 343-359. On Liszt's subsequent

career, see Dezső Legány, *Liszt Ferenc magyarországon, 1869-1873* [Ferenc Liszt in Hungary, 1869-1873] (Budapest: *Zeneműkiadó*, 1976).

[58]. Rub, 304.

[59]. Ujes, 208.

[60]. Ujes, 213.

[61]. *Neue Politische Volksblatt* (*NPV*), 11 September 1880.

[62]. Schödl, 363.

[63]. Ferenc Glatz, "Das Deutschtum in Ungarn im Zeitalter der industriellen Entwicklung," in Hambuch, 74.

[64]. *NPV*, 16 September 1880.

[65]. *NPV*, 21 September 1880.

[66]. *Hon*, 24 October 1880; *NPV*, 24 October 1880.

[67]. *NPV*, 10 and 11 December 1880.

[68]. *NPV*, 1 May 1882.

[69]. Adolf Silberstein, "Jubiläum des ungarischen Nationaltheaters (1837-1887)," *Im Strome der Zeit*, vol. 3 (Budapest: I. Wiener, 1895), 3-4.

[70]. Silberstein, 1-27. See also A. Ötvös, "Die ungarische Schauspielkunst," in Ambrus Neményi, *Das moderne Ungarn* (Berlin: A. Hofmann, 1883), 178-93.

[71]. Silberstein, 2.

[72]. Binal, 422.

[73]. Wolfgang Mommsen, "Österreich-Ungarn aus der Sicht des Deutschen Kaiserreichs," in *Der Autoritäre Nationalstaat. Verfassung, Gesellschaft und Kultur im Deutschen Kaisserreich* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1990), 225

ALICE FREIFELD is an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Florida in Gainesville. She received a PhD in history from the University of California at Berkeley in 1992. She has two articles forthcoming in 1998: "Marketing Industrialism and Dualism in Liberal Hungary: Expositions, 1842-1896," in the *Austrian Studies Yearbook*; and "Nietzscheanism and Anti-Nietzscheanism in Eastern Europe," in **East Europe Reads Nietzsche**, ed. Peter Bergmann, Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, and Alice Freifeld (Boulder, CO: East European Quarterly). She is currently completing a manuscript entitled "Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848-1914."