his SR work, his personal and professional correspondence, and drafts of his fiction and non-fiction from all the stages of his writing career.

In 1918, when it seemed that the album would be published soon, the Moscow journal *Evreiskii mir* ran an article on it by Abram Efros. The article is entitled 'Aladdin's Lamp' and Efros presents An-sky as a real-life Aladdin, one who takes 'old lamps for new' and then opens up the old lamps to release the genie of national cultural revival. Efros writes from the perspective of the assimilated Jewish intelligentsia, torn, as he writes, between the urge to become invisible, to fade completely into the Russian norm, and the opposing urge to celebrate Jewishness, in this case the naïve Jewish art that An-sky had collected. Efros knew well that by 1918 the general enthusiasm for folk art was waning among highbrow artists, even while the rediscovery of Russian folk art in the 1890s had given way to what he saw as an epidemic of lowbrow imitations and stylisations, with the golden cockerel and balalaika motifs of peasant embroidery and wooden architecture transferred mechanically onto second-rate paintings, buildings and elsewhere. Thus Efros warned Jews – especially Jewish artists – to avoid mechanical reproduction of the motifs in An-sky's finds but instead to seek out 'the *laws* governing Jewish line, color, plane and space' (p. 235). 'Folk art', Efros insisted, 'will become a vitalizing and miraculous source for us only when it is *creatively refashioned not imitatively adopted*' (p. 234).

Now a new generation of Jews in Russia and Ukraine, artists, scholars, and others, have taken up the task of creatively refashioning Jewish culture for a new era. This volume contributes thoughtfully to that effort. Taken together, the essays by Kantsedikas, Serheyeva and Efros provide an inspirational introduction to the 92 images themselves, presented in the final section of the book in clear, high-quality reproductions (although one of the Hebrew manuscripts is printed backwards). In the illustrations, birds and lions, unicorns and leviathans twirl and dance around the Hebrew letters. After 83 years, we should be grateful to see them at last.

GABRIELLA SAFRAN

Zionism in Hungary

Peter Haber, *Die Anfänge des Zionismus in Ungarn (1897–1904)*. Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2001

The literature on Zionism in Hungary is characterised by two conflicting trends, one portraying the Kingdom of Hungary as a particularly fertile breeding ground for the Zionist idea, the other portraying it as an utterly barren wasteland for Jewish nationalism in general. The first trend is exemplified by the Hungarian-born Israeli historian Zvi Zahavi, whose classic work 'From the Hatam Sofer to Herzl: A History of "Love of Zion" and the Beginnings of Zionism in Hungary, Transylvania, Slovakia, Carpathian-Rus, Northern Yugoslavia and Burgenland, 1799–1904' (Jerusalem: Hasifriya ha-ziyonit, 1972 (in Hebrew)) draws a straight line 'from the Hatam Sofer via Rabbi [Judah] Alkalay, Rabbi [Joseph] Natonek and the founders of Petah Tiqvah to the prophet of the State of Israel, Theodor Herzl'. Zahavi casts his net far and wide, taking in all inhabitants of historical Hungary – from the German-born rabbi of Pressburg/Pozsony (the Hatam Sofer) to the Croatian-born rabbi of Sarajevo (Judah Alkalay) – and identifying nearly all varieties of Palestino-centrism as ideological precursors to Zionism.[1] The second trend, which runs through much of Hungarian–Jewish historiography to this day, limits its scope to assimilated, Hungarian-speaking Jews and their (overwhelmingly rejectionist) attitudes towards *political* Zionism. It begins with an underlying assumption, which is usually expressed in the form of a paradox: although political Zionism's two central figures – Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau (né Sudfeld) – were both born in Hungary, the movement they founded never attracted a following there.

Peter Haber's *Die Anfänge des Zionismus in Ungarn (1897–1904)* challenges the validity of this paradox, arguing that political Zionism did, in fact, attract a considerable following in Hungary during its earliest stage – from the First Zionist Congress in Basel (1897) until Herzl's

untimely death seven years later. In the first of three chapters, Haber pieces together the early history of political Zionism in Hungary, based on Jewish periodicals, personal memoirs and private letters. His narrative is primarily a tale of two cities, Pressburg and Budapest, each representing a rival pole of Hungarian Zionism in this period. Pressburg, an Orthodox stronghold and home to Hungary's most famous *yeshiva*, reigned as the undisputed centre of Hungarian Zionism at the turn of the century. Here, Zionism found many adherents among the Orthodox population, including Samuel (Samu) Bettelheim, founder of Hungary's first Zionist society (Ahavath Cion) in 1897, and an estimated 120 *yeshiva* students who promptly joined the society's new ranks. This may explain why Rabbi Isaac Jacob Reines, the Lithuanian leader of the religious Zionist movement (Mizrachi), chose Pressburg for the First Mizrachi World Congress in 1904. In contrast to Orthodox Pressburg, Neolog Budapest proved much less hospitable to the fledgling Zionist movement. (The Neolog movement, which emerged in Hungary during the nineteenth century, promoted religious reforms within the bounds of *Halakha*.) There were a number of attempts to establish Zionist societies in Budapest, the first as early as 1899, but it was only in 1903, when a handful of Jewish students founded the Makkabea, that Zionism began to take root in the Hungarian capital.

What is perhaps most interesting about Hungarian Zionism at this stage is its attempt to reconcile aspirations for a Jewish national homeland with a fervent and deep-rooted Hungarian patriotism. As Herzl himself observed, 'In Hungary, one must forge a red-white-and-green Zionism' (the colours of the Hungarian flag). For Hungary's Zionists, this meant that the Jews in Hungary, though not constituting 'a separate political nationality with separate political tendencies', could still support the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine – to be settled, of course, by persecuted Jews from Eastern Europe. This vicarious Zionism was aimed, in large part, at 'protecting' Hungary from the influx of impoverished, Yiddish-speaking *Ostjuden* from Galicia, Romania and the Russian Empire. Indeed, one could argue that Hungarian Zionism was a form of anti-Jewish discrimination masquerading as Jewish solidarity.

Hungarian Zionism began to falter, according to Haber, because it lacked a country-wide organisation, a charismatic leader and an official newspaper. It also came up against sharp criticism from *Egyenlőség* (Equality), Hungary's leading Jewish newspaper and 'the most important organ of assimilated Budapest Jewry'. In chapter two of his book, Haber examines Jewish anti-Zionism in Hungary through the prism of *Egyenlőség*, focusing in particular on Miksa Szabolcsi, its editor-in-chief. A self-proclaimed Hungarian of Jewish faith, Szabolcsi perceived Jewish assimilation in Hungary to be a completed – and irreversible – process (which had reached its culmination in 1895, when Judaism was officially placed on equal terms with Hungary's other established religions). For Szabolcsi, the establishment of a Jewish state – and the *de facto* recognition of a Jewish nationality – was irreconcilable with Hungarian patriotism; hence, any form of political Zionism was anathema. Nonetheless, he did support the settlement of *Ostjuden* in Ottoman Palestine – primarily to keep these undesirables from crossing into Hungary. In this respect, as Haber points out, Zionism's proponents and opponents in Hungary were of one mind.

In chapter three, Haber argues that, despite their different positions on Jewish statehood, Hungary's Zionists and anti-Zionists actually shared a common discourse, characterised by fervent Hungarian patriotism and unwavering belief in the 'assimilation contract'. After a lengthy and somewhat superfluous discussion of collective memory and cultural capital, Haber concludes that Zionism's opponents and proponents alike enjoyed the fruits of emancipation and viewed Hungary as their 'New Canaan'. Indeed, while Zionism is usually seen as a response to failed or deferred emancipation, it emerged in Hungary at a time of unprecedented social and economic mobility. To the extent that Hungarian Zionism was a response to crisis, it was the crisis of the *Ostjuden*, not the crisis of Hungarian Jewry.

Haber's book is an important contribution to the history of early Zionism in Hungary, but, like most scholarship on Hungarian Jewry, it places undue emphasis on assimilated, Hungarian-

speaking Jewry, particularly in Budapest. Although Haber notes that none of the Makkabea's founders came from Budapest and that the majority of Hungary's 2,000 *shekel*-payers in 1903 came from northwest Hungary (today's western Slovakia), he does not explore the significance of this geographic distribution. Is it a mere coincidence that Zionism made deeper inroads in northwest Hungary, where Slovak nationalists excoriated Jews as agents of magyarisation? Is it not significant that János Rónai, Hungary's first Zionist publicist, came from Transylvania, where Jews were similarly caught between competing national movements?

Haber's focus on the Jews of Budapest (particularly in chapters two and three) elides the regional complexity of Hungarian Jewry. As Michael Silber and Jacob Katz have demonstrated, Hungarian Jewry was divided into three distinct cultural–religious regions in the nineteenth century: (1) northwestern Hungary (known as Oberland), where an adherence to Orthodoxy was coupled with a relative openness to secular culture; (2) northeastern Hungary (known as Unterland), where proximity to Galicia, economic backwardness and the influence of Hasidism contributed to the religious zealotry of large segments of the Jewish population; and (3) central Hungary (and Transylvania), where the Jewish population was highly heterogenous (with a marked Neolog influence).[2] Unfortunately, Haber views Hungarian Jewry primarily through the prism of Budapest – the largest Jewish population, though not necessarily the most representative one. In his future scholarship, I hope Haber will include northeastern Hungary, the breeding ground of radical, religious anti-Zionism.

A seemingly pedantic, geographical problem with Haber's book is an occasional lack of awareness of Hungary's borders. Apparently misled by the names of two Moravian towns, he places Ungarisch-Brod (Uherský Brod) and Ungarisch-Hradisch (Uherské Hradiště) within the historical boundaries of Hungary.

MICHAEL MILLER

NOTES

1 Prior to 1919, when Bratislava acquired its current name, this city in NW Hungary was called Pozsony (Hungarian) or Pressburg (German). In this review, I use the name Pressburg, since it is more widespread in Jewish historiography.

2 Jacob Katz, *A House Divided: Orthodoxy and Schism in Nineteenth-Century Central European Jewry*, translated by Ziporah Brody (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1988); Michael Silber, 'The Emergence of Ultra-Orthodoxy: the Invention of a Tradition', in Jack Wertheimer (ed.), *The Uses of Tradition* (New York, Jerusalem: JTS, 1992), 23–84.

A definitive study

Gennady Estraikh and Mikhail Krutikov (eds.), *The Shtetl: Image and Reality. Papers of the Second Mendel Friedman International Conference on Yiddish*. Studies in Yiddish 2. Oxford: Legenda/European Humanities Research Centre, 2000. viii + 184pp. ISBN 1-900755-41-6

Putting together a really good volume of conference papers is a challenge. The result has to have focus and be centred on a clearly defined topic. Each article should not only say something new but, preferably, break new ground altogether. In a good collection there is a balance among the papers in terms of scope and method. There is a simple way to identify poor conference volumes: when one says 'Oh, there are two articles in there that I should xerox' – then the volume contains some relevant material, but not very much. *The Shtetl: Image and Reality* is one of the rare collections of conference papers about which one can say 'They got it right – this is one I should buy – and order for the library so my students can get hold of it.' Almost every article is on target, the articles are generally very innovative, and for anyone interested in the shtetl, Jewish life in Eastern Europe, modernisation of Jewish society and similar topics, this book is highly recommended reading.