

**Contested Lieux de Mémoire in Central Europe:
The Case of Devín and Brasov**

by
Bálint Varga

2007

Submitted to
Central European University, Department of History
Budapest, Hungary

Supervisor: Balázs Trencsényi
Second reader: Maciej Janowski

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

This paper examines how the castle of Devín (Slovakia) and the city of Braşov (Romania) have been incorporated into the national canons of the neighboring nations (Magyars, Germans, Slovaks/Romanians). Both spots were used extensively throughout the last two centuries for various purposes, ranging from nation-building to ecclesiastical and communist aims.

The study of the changing nature of these sites gives an insight to local societies: it serves as an indicator showing the attitude to nation-building, assimilation, and so on.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to Eszter Bakó-Házy, Ionuț Biliuța, Béla Borsi-Kálmán, József Demmel, Balázs Kiss, Csaba Kiss Gy., Nenad Lajbensprenger, Danilo Sarenac, Katalin Sinkó and Gábor Sonkoly who provided valuable assistance during my research.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	1
Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction	3
Outline	4
Terminology	5
Sources.....	6
Secondary literature.....	7
2. Theoretical background.....	10
2.1 Lieu de mémoire.....	10
2.2 Monuments.....	13
3. The nationality question and the symbolic challenge of the millennium	19
The nationality question in Hungary	20
The Millennial idea.....	27
The Millennium: celebrations, events, achievements.....	33
4. Devín and Braşov: places of early national memory	39
Devín	39
The Hungarian Dévény: Porta Hungarica.....	43
The Slovak Devín: <i>haut lieu</i> of the nation.....	47
Braşov	50
The Cenk hill: tourist resort and symbolic place	55
5. Millennium in Dévény and in Brassó: elevated spirit, refusal and hectic afterlife	58
The afterlife of the millennial statues.....	76
Conclusion.....	84
Appendix: Name of locations in relevant languages.....	86
Bibliography	87
Primary sources	87
Secondary sources	90

1.Introduction

In 2007 in Tallinn removal of the statue of Soviet soldiers led to riots causing the death of one person and to a serious diplomatic crisis in the relations of the tiny EU-country and Russia. A year before in Hungary anti-governmental protestors attacked and damaged the monument dedicated to the Soviet army in downtown Budapest. In 2005 attempts at erecting a memorial to those Germans expelled from Central Europe after 1945 provoked a deep political crisis in German-Polish and German-Czech relations. Alike cases could be listed endlessly. What clear is that symbols have played an outstanding role and this has not changed even in our postmodern age. The use of symbols or rather places of memory (*lieu de mémoire*) are thus able to demonstrate conflict and contest between groups. Indeed, national conflicts can be investigated via such symbolic conflicts over *lieux de mémoire*. This study aims to research two contested *lieux* via which one can get an insight into a compressed history of Central European national rivalry.

The first *lieu* to be examined is the castle of Devín (Dévény in Hungarian, Theben in German) now in Slovakia. Devín has been a border settlement since the 10th century, therefore symbolizes the nation's borders in the Hungarian and Austrian (German) collective memory. However, Devín has played the most significant role in the Slovak national memory, because of its castle's ancient origins connected with the Great Moravian tradition. Devín, as a *lieu de mémoire*, will be investigated through its perception of the three involved nations in general and

particularly the local (Bratislava) population. The other location focused on in this study will be the city of Braşov and a hill above the city called Tâmpa. Braşov was chosen because of its similar population structure, i.e. beside Hungarians, the presence of the German minority and a third community (Romanians). This similar multiethnic sphere of the two cities will enable me to investigate the different local receptions to the dominant (Hungarian) nation-building in 1896, the heyday of Magyar nationalism.

Outline

In Chapter 2 the theoretical basis of the research will be laid down. The concept of *lieu de mémoire* will be investigated, and then its usability in Central Europe will be examined. This will be followed by the study of the theory of national monuments, since the focus of my research will be the Hungarian millennium monuments. Then I will introduce the most important sources and secondary literature.

The actual research will begin in Chapter 3 with the presentation of *fin-de-siècle* Hungary in terms of the question of nationalism and non-Magyar nationalities. Then the general description of the Hungarian millennium will be provided. Following these, in Chapter 4 Devín as *lieu de mémoire* of the Slovak and Magyar nation will be researched. Then the same kind of research will be run in the case of Brasov. Chapter 5 will provide a detailed analyses of the millennial festivities of 1896, which will be followed by introducing the afterlife of the millennial monuments.

Terminology

One confusing feature of Central Europe is the endless variety of geographical names in different languages. Multilingual spaces were called by all the inhabiting nations in their own languages, thus various names are connected to the image of national spaces. Therefore it is not possible to find neutral names. Throughout this study, names will be used flexible, i.e. choice of a name will depend on the actual context of the text. This policy might use some confusion, but since use of a fixed name would be anachronistic and ahistorical, this is the only solution. All the locations mentioned in this study are listed in the Appendix.

Another serious problem is the term describing ethnic minorities. Here again flexible terminology must be used, depending on the context. Thus, 'Hungarian nation' will be used when talking about the entire community of Hungarian citizens, while the term 'nationality' (*nemzetiség*) will mean a certain ethnic minority. The term 'minority' will be rather neglected, since the actual majority of Hungarian citizens were not ethnic Magyars at the end of the century.

A third issue is the difference between the terms 'Magyar' and 'Hungarian'. In the Hungarian language there is only one word for these two terms (*magyar*). The English usage tends to differentiate between Hungarian (concerning whole Hungary) and Magyar (ethnic term). The same differentiation can be found in Slovak (*uhorsky* vs. *madarsky*) and in some other languages of the region as well. This study tries to follow this

pattern, although sometimes it is very hard to decide which term to use when translating Hungarian texts.

Sources

A varied array of primary sources can be used to investigate of the problem. The most important source is a public lecture delivered by Kálmán Thaly at the Toldy Association of Pozsony (Pressburg in German, Prešporok in Slovak before 1919, Bratislava after 1919) on 15. March 1897.¹ In this lecture Thaly, the main initiator of the millennium monuments, explained the idea of the millennial columns and gave a detailed description of the circumstances of the planning and construction of them. Another relevant group of sources is the press, since all newspapers dealt in detail with the events of the millennium year. The following types of press will be used: national pro-governmental dailies (*Pesti Hírlap*, *Pesti Napló*), national dailies supporting the opposition (*Egyetértés*, *Magyar Állam*), a national weekly (*Vasárnapi Újság*), local Hungarian dailies (*Nyugatmagyarország*, *Brassói Lapok*), local non-Hungarian dailies (*Preßburger Zeitung*, *Preßburger Tagblatt*, *Kronstädter Zeitung*, *Kronstädter Tagblatt*, *Narodnie Noviny*). The third important type of source is travel guides. As mass tourism emerged exactly in the time when most of national monuments were erected, travel guides became important at an increasing rate. These guides made travelers familiar with their

¹ Kálmán Thaly, *Az ezredévi országos hét emlékoszlop története* (The history of the millennial seven national monuments) (Bratislava: Wigand F. K., 1898)

country; their perception of certain sites was accepted by the wide public as well.

As the events of the millennium raised wide public interest and participation, they were described and published by several authors. These written documents belong to the most interesting sources, as they provide evidence of the official (or semi-official) interpretation. The other side of the coin, namely the perception of the millennium from below can be examined by several memoirs written by members of local intelligentsia.

Secondary literature

Although the Hungarian millennium was extensively researched, the scholarship did not pay much attention to the events happened outside of Budapest. General interpretation of the millennium was provided by the historian András Gerő in a monograph², while the art historian Katalin Sinkó examined the millennium from an art history point of view.³ The nationality policy of the that-time prime minister Dezső Bánffy was investigated by Iván Bertényi Jr and László Szarka.⁴

The central monument of the millennium on the Heroes' Square was analyzed by András Gerő from historical point of view and by Katalin Sinkó

² András Gerő, *Imagined history. Chapters from Nineteenth- and Twentieth Century Hungarian Symbolic Politics* (Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 2006)

³ Katalin Sinkó, "Ezredévi ünnepeink és a történeti ikonográfia" (Our thousand-year festivities and historic iconography) *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* 1-2 (2000)
Katalin Sinkó, "Árpád kontra Szent István" (Árpád versus St. Stephen) *Janus* VI/1.

⁴ Iván Bertényi ifj, "Kérlelhetetlenül. Báró Bánffy Dezső nemzetiségi politikája" (Implacable. Baron Dezső Bánffy's policy on nationalities) *Pro Minoritate* Spring (2003)
László Szarka, *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés - magyar nemzetiségi politika, 1867-1918* (Slovak national development - Hungarian policy on nationalities 1867-1918) (Bratislava: Kalligram, 1995)

from the perspective of art history.⁵ The seven millennial monuments investigated in this study lack a proper research yet. Both Gerő and Sinkó refer to the case of the columns, however, Gerő pays only a very short remark to the seven monuments⁶, whereas the bit more detailed analyses of Sinkó used only the text of Thaly and the weekly *Vasárnapi Újság*, so she provides only basic information regarding these seven memorials.⁷ Besides Hungarian scholars, the Slovak historian L'ubomir Lipták investigated the fate of several monuments erected in the present-day Slovakia including the Dévény and Nyitra (Nitra in Slovak) millennial sculptures.⁸

The Devín monument is the only one from the seven which was extensively researched. The Slovak anthropologist Gabriela Kiliánová payed several excellent studies to Devín as *lieu de mémoire* of the Slovak, German and Hungarian nations.⁹ Her studies rely mainly on Slovak sources; this research aims to complete her results by investigating Hungarian and German material more in detail. The regional background, i.e. the social history of Slovaks was researched by Imre Polányi¹⁰, while the investigation

⁵ András Gerő, *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making. The Unfinished Experience* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995)

Katalin Sinkó, "A millenniumi emlékmű mint kultuszhely" (The millennial monument as a shrine) *Medvetánc* no. 2 (1987)

⁶ Gerő, *Képzelt történelem*, 211

⁷ Sinkó, *Ezredévi ünnepeink*, 12-14

⁸ L'ubomir Lipták, "Helycserék a piedesztálokon" (Change of place on pedestals), in *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000)

⁹ Gabriela Kiliánová, "Ein Grenzmythos: Die Burg Devín" (A border myth: The castle of Devín), in *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich*, ed. Beate Albert and Hannes Stekl (Wien: Wiener Vorlesungen - Konversatorien und Studien, 2003)

¹⁰ Imre Polányi, *A szlovák társadalom és polgári nemzeti mozgalom a századfordulón (1895-1905)* (The Slovak society and bourgeois national movement at the turn of the century) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987)

of Bratislava in the Dualist era was provided by Eleonora Babejova in her outstanding book *Fin-de-siècle Pressburg*.¹¹

Besides Devín the monument in Zemun received some attention. A Serb writer, Branko Najhold published a short non-professional booklet about the millennium column of Zemun, however, he did not use Hungarian sources, so it is hardly useful. A Hungarian journalist of Újvidék (Novi Sad in Serbian), Zoltán Kolapis held a lecture about the Zimony monument, nevertheless he failed to analyze sources in detail, too.¹²

A book presenting pictures from the old Brassó contains some photos and basic data of the millennial monument¹³ but I was not able to find any trace of a deeper study. While the story of the millennial monuments seems to be underresearched, the social history of the dualist Brassó is investigated in several works written by mainly German historians.¹⁴

¹¹ Eleonora Babejova, *Fin-de-siècle Pressburg: conflict and & coexistence in Bratislava 1897-1914* (Boulder: Eastern European Monographs, 2003)

¹² Zoltán Kolapis, "Százéves a zimonyi emlékmű" (The Zemun monument is hundred years old), in *A honfoglalás 1100 éve és a Vajdaság. Egy tudományos tanácskozás anyaga* (Novi Sad: Forum, 1997)

¹³ János Balázs and István Dobolyi, *A hajdani Brassó/Braşovul de odinioră* (The old Braşov) (Braşov: C2design, 2004)

¹⁴ Carl Göllner, ed., *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Jahren 1848-1918* (The Transylvanian Saxons between 1848 and 1918) (Vienna-Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1988)

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Lieu de mémoire

The concept of *lieu de mémoire* by Pierre Nora became one of the most widespread approaches of history, anthropology and other disciplines dealing with examination of collective memory.¹⁵ The French enterprise¹⁶ of Nora was followed by German, Austrian, Dutch, British and American projects.

Nora defines *lieu de mémoire* as a point where memory crystallizes and secretes itself. This concept is entirely new, since it acknowledges the break of memory and the emerging discontinuity between past and present. This new form of memory is needed because the old concept of history and nation were in a deep crisis. The real environment of memory (*milieux de mémoire*) ceased to exist; thus, a new sense of memory and history needed to emerge. Thus, the notion of '*modern régime d'historicité*' elaborated by François Hartog seems to be appropriate when describing the pre-Norian concept of memory.¹⁷ This 'modern' concept of history was based on the continuity of the past,

¹⁵ Pierre Nora, *Between Memory and History: Les Liux de Mémoire. Representations* Spring (1989)

¹⁶ Pierre Nora, ed., *Realms of Memory. Rethinking the French Past* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996-1998)

¹⁷ François Hartog, *Régimes d'historicité: présentisme et expériences du temps* (Regimes of historicism: presentisme and experiment of time) (Paris: Seuil, 2003)

indeed, the present itself became a sort of recycled, up-dated past, realized as the present through such welding and anchoring. ... Progress and decadence, the two great themes of historical intelligibility at least since modern times, both aptly express this cult of continuity, the confident assumption of knowing to whom and to what we owe our existence – whence the importance of the idea of "origins", an already profane version of the mythological narrative, but one that contributed to giving meaning and sense of the sacred to a society engaged in a nationwide process of secularization. The greater the origins, the more they magnified our greatness. Through the past we venerated above all ourselves.¹⁸

Nora claims that this kind of relation between past and present has been broken. Regarding France and the West in general, Nora is certainly right. But Central and Eastern European countries do not seem to fit into this concept; the description of the 'modern' idea of memory cited above tends to be compatible in this region even today. The entire brake of memory does not seem to have happened. Some change in historical consciousness has been started, of course, by the collapse of communism; however, the fall of socialist regimes encouraged the development of the 'modernist' national ideas as well, based on the same framework discussed above.¹⁹

Thus, whether the original concept of *lieu de mémoire* can be implemented while investigating Central European history and present, is highly debatable. It cannot be an accident that none of the historical workshops of the region have started a project similar to the original French version or to any Western European copies of it. Still, as phenomenon by Nora explained the need for *lieu de mémoire* (the emergence of personal memories, the increasing interest in the past, etc.)

¹⁸ Nora, 16

¹⁹ An apt example of this struggle can be found at Lucian Boia, *History and myth in Romanian consciousness* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001)

are flourishing in this region, too. That is the reason why I am convinced that the idea of *lieu de mémoire* can be used when investigating Central Europe – even if some limits are needed.

Beside the different social environment discussed above the other main problem of using *lieu de mémoire* in this region is the contesting nature of national narratives. The original work by Nora was not concerning the question of *lieux* which belong to more than one nation's collective memory. The cause of this disinterest can be seen in the effective execution of state-based nation-formations, i.e. that the French model of nation-building was so successful in most Western European countries that no nation of outside could claim territories (including places of memory). It is very remarkable that political borders west off the Rhine river have not changed significantly during the last two centuries (apart from Alsace and some marginal temporary changes during wars). East from the Rhine the situation is different: borders, states and therefore the intention of nation-formation changed from time to time, especially since 1918. This fluctuation of political regimes led to a contest of national spaces, therefore to a conflict in national places of memory. It is not rare that a certain location was incorporated into two, three or even more national canons. In my opinion, however, this contesting nature of Central and Eastern European *lieux* does not decrease the usability of the Noraean concept, indeed, it expands the possible ways of investigation.

2.2 Monuments

The second half of the 19th century was the heyday of national monuments. Alongside the emergence of the nation-state and the nationalist feelings, large numbers of several types of national monuments and buildings were erected throughout Europe. All of these works of art carried the idea of the nation. As Victor Hugo wrote in his *Notre-Dame de Paris*: "in the Middle Ages every building was a richly symbolic idea."²⁰ This concept did not change much during the centuries; the difference between Hugo's cathedral and the monuments investigated in this study is only the idea itself, i.e. idea of the nation-state instead of Catholicism. Thus, the monuments erected in the second half of the 19th century were perfectly able to carry their nationalist meaning, as Rudy Koshar puts it: "In the age of modern national state, every part of the memory landscape, every moment of the social heritage, could be a national idea."²¹

It is not an easy task to give a general definition of a national monument. Thomas Nipperdey claims that national monuments are what as treated as a national monument, since the variation of national monuments is almost endless. However, it is easier to define the goal of national monuments: their aim was to transform national identity into a visible and permanent symbol.²² According to Reinhard Alings, national monuments "should not necessarily be seen as a thing but rather as a

²⁰ Cited by Rudy Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces. Artifacts of German Memory, 1870-1990*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 18

²¹ Ibid, 18

²² Thomas Nipperdey, "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert" (National idea and national monument in Germany in the 19th century), *Historische Zeitschrift* 206, no. 3. (1968), 532-533

process, an attempt to create a generally comprehensible and durable national symbol."²³ From Biljana Menkovic's view, monuments are a means to visualize political power in the public space.²⁴ Winfried Speitkamp describes monuments as a sign of memory which transmit past to the present.²⁵ Although a generally accepted definition of monument does not exist, most scholars seem to use very analogous approaches. Thus, a national monument can be seen as an attempt of make the past alive within the framework of nation-building.

The statuomania of the second half of the 19th century can be seen as evidence of the new, democratic and national idea of society. The new politics – based on the ideas of the Enlightenment – was the popular sovereignty, the belief in popular unity. The pre-Enlightenment age's ideology was founded on religion and the absolute, from God originated power of the monarch; modernization broke this framework and put the sovereignty of people instead. This new ideology worked as a secular religion: as the object of worshipping changed from God and the monarch to the nation (the people itself), a new political style was to develop, including new types of cults, myths and representation. New, national myths and symbols emerged but to make these myths operative, several

²³ Alings is cited by Koshar, 30 (original: Alings: *Monument und Nation*. Berlin 1996, 38, 41)

²⁴ Biljana Menkovic, *Politische Gedenkkultur. Denkmäler – die Visualisierung politischer Macht im öffentlichen Raum* (Political memory culture. Monuments – the visualization of political power in public space) (Vienna: Braumüller, 1999), 1

²⁵ Winfried Speitkamp, "Denkmalsturz und Symbolkonflikt in der modernen Geschichte. Eine Einleitung" (Ruin of monuments and symbolic conflict in modern history. An introduction), in *Denkmalsturz. Zur Konfliktgeschichte politischer Symbolik*. ed. Winfried Speitkamp (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 6

concrete means were needed: festivals, ceremonies, monuments.²⁶ "Having once attributed a real existence to an idea, the minds want to see it alive and can affect this only by personalizing it. ... The mere presence of a visible image of things holy sufficed to establish their truth."²⁷

Monuments play an outstanding role in the formation of national narrative of history: they form mythic history and thematize the past in the public space. Monuments show how a society deals with its history, since via these works of art past can be simplified, thematized but even falsified. Monuments therefore serve not only as means of memory of the past but as a legitimation of the present by the past as well.²⁸ National monuments on the one hand create a new past while on the other they control, direct, disperse the past which were reflected in the historical monuments.²⁹ Thus, national monuments anchor national myths and symbols in the consciousness of people.³⁰

National monuments do not belong to the homogeneous space: they are sacred spots, as they show the essence of the nation like the church represents the whole world.³¹ National monuments overtook the role of the ancient or Middle Ages spots of pilgrimages. Since many of the newly erected national monuments were to be found at mystic, romantic or borderland locations, these generated national excursions, pilgrimages.

²⁶ George L. Mosse, *The Nationalization of the Masses. Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 1-9

²⁷ Huizinga is cited by Mosse, 6

²⁸ Menkovic, 3

²⁹ Koshar, 29

³⁰ Mosse, 8

³¹ For the concept of sacred space see Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959)

A monument always demonstrates the current order – or at least the order which the maker of the monument wants (believes) to be. As the monuments of the Middle Ages represented the power of God and his earthly representative, the monarch, so did the monuments of the modern age the new political order: namely, the nation, run by the bourgeoisie. A political monument presupposes consensus among the members of the community. As this consensus is frequently lacking, political monuments tend to be antidemocratic: they offer only one interpretation of the past, which may not be shared by part of the community.³² Thus, a monument demonstrates and justifies hierarchy, order and rule of a certain group of society. Being a liberal, modernist and bourgeois age, the 19th century of course promoted the rule of the middle classes. The monuments erected in this age therefore demonstrated the bourgeois interest and taste.³³ Thus, monuments can be seen as a form of civic activity. Furthermore, usually the construction and then maintenance of monuments was financially supported by civic societies, groups, clubs and individuals as well.³⁴ Donations to national goals became important civic, middle class virtues.

The 'occupation' of national monuments by the middle class meant also that certain groups were excluded from these monuments. The non-state building elements of the society were not able to demonstrate their interpretation on the past and present in monuments. In the central part of

³² Menkovic, 1

³³ Charlotte Tacke, *Denkmal im sozialen Raum. Nationale Symbole in Deutschland und Frankreich in 19. Jahrhundert* (Monument in social space. National symbols in Germany and France in the 19th century) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 19-20, Hartmut Boockmann, *Denkmäler und ihre Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbewußstein* (Monuments and their meaning to historical consiousness). Offprint from Hauser, O. (ed.) *Geschichte und Geschichtsbewußstein* (Göttingen – Zürich: 1981), 238

³⁴ Boockmann, 237, Koshar, 34-35, 42

Europe societies tended to be extremely complex and different than their Western counterparts, in terms of national and ethnic minorities. Even in Germany significant groups of people were excluded (or not given the same value) from the process of nation-building (including monuments): non-Germans (Poles), Catholics, socialist workers and women.³⁵ East of Germany, the amount of 'suspicious' ethnic minorities significantly increased, so national monuments tended to express an ideal but in the reality never existing, unified nation. As one will see in the detailed study on the Hungarian millennium, the level of exclusion could be quite high. Nevertheless, non-state constituting elements might have appeared on national monuments as well, just not by their own will, but as a 'proxy representation', arranged by the ruling strata of the society.

As many monuments were built outside of cities they were hard to access. Since the net of public transport covered the economically less important locations relatively late, for a long time many of these monuments were accessible only by individual transport. This obviously meant that only well-off people were able to perform the 'national pilgrimage' to these monuments.

This reflected the presumption that a relatively small public was capable of shaping national memory, a presumption consistent with the impulse of the liberal movement in Germany to speak for the *Volk* as a whole but in fact to cater to the outlook and values of the educated middle strata.³⁶

³⁵ Koshar, 24

³⁶ Ibid, 34

However, even the middle class was not as enthusiastic in the nation-building project as the picture would show at first glance. Research dealing with German national memory indicates that even the most important monuments were attracting a quite low number of people up to the very early 20th century when the data climbed higher.³⁷

³⁷ Kirsten Belgum, Displaying the Nation: A View of Nineteenth-Century Monuments through a Popular Magazine. *Central European History* no. 4. (1993), 458

3. The nationality question and the symbolic challenge of the millennium

The nationality question emerged as one of the most important problems of dualist Hungary. It developed into a crisis whose intensity The intensity of the problem increased year by year up to WWI.³⁸ However, the symbolic level of national conflict culminated in the year of the millennium. The millennial festivities explicitly challenged the non-Magyar communities, since the national and local celebrations forced everyone to confess their identity. Non-Magyar people (or at least the elite) had to choose between two possible ways regarding their attitude to the state-building nation: either assimilation or keeping their national, cultural identity. As we will see later, the various communities reacted in different ways: some groups chose and manifested assimilation option, others sharply rejected it and some were split into two camps.

Although this paper does not seek to investigate the question of nationalities *per se*, a short introduction to this problem and to the millennium is needed to achieve a deeper understanding of the research project.

³⁸ Even without comprehensive research it is clear that the level of controversy steadily increased. One needs only to read the press: while on an average week in 1896 an average daily published approximately 2 or 3 articles concerning the question of non-Magyars, in 1913 one can find some material about the issue almost every day.

The nationality question in Hungary

Hungary used to be one of the most heterogeneous countries in Europe in terms of ethnicity (which means the diversity of confessions, too). In 1850 Magyars constituted only 37% of the entire population of the Kingdom of Hungary (43% without Croatia and the military frontier territories). In the peripheries non-Magyars were in absolute majority: in Transylvania 60% of the population declared themselves Romanian, in Western Upper Hungary (today West and middle Slovakia) inhabitants were entirely Slovak, while in other 8 counties they outnumbered Magyars.³⁹ The Temesköz (Banat) region (now divided between Serbia and Romania) was populated by four major ethnic groups (Romanians, Germans, Serbs, Magyars), none of them which exceeded the overall ratio of 40%.

During the entire 19th century a slow, but continuous Magyarization took place. Whereas the ratio of Magyars was of about one third at the beginning of the century, in 1910 Magyars amounted to an absolute majority, while the ratio of all other ethnic groups declined. The reason for this decrease was assimilation to Magyars, lower level of economic development in the peripheries, higher number of immigration from the periphery to America and lower fertility rates among certain nationalities. The following Table 1 shows these changes clearly.

³⁹ András Gergely ed, *Magyarország története a 19. században* (History of Hungary in the 19th century) (Budapest: Osiris, 2003), 82-83

Table 1. Ratio of nationalities in Hungary (without Croatia and Rijeka)

	1850	1880	1910
Magyars	41.5	46.7	54.5
Germans	11.6	13.6	10.4
Slovaks	15.0	11.9	10.7
Romanians	19.3	17.5	16.1
Ruthenians	3.9	2.6	2.5
Croatians	5.1 (together with Serbs)	4.6 (together with Serbs)	1.1
Serbs	no data	no data	3

Taken from László Katus, "A népesedés és a társadalmi szerkezet változásai" (Changes in demography and social structure). In: Magyarország története. Ed, Péter Hanák. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987. Vol 6/2. 1149.

One arrives at an even more striking number by investigating the ethnic composition of townspeople. The ratio of Magyars in towns increased from 64% in 1880 to 77% in 1910, as the process of assimilation was the most effective and rapid in urban environment.

Due to the modern schooling system, the difference in terms of culture was decreasing during the age of dualism. However, the cultural development of certain ethnic groups depended significantly on the church. Thus, nations belonging to Orthodox and Greek Catholic churches tended to be less culturally articulate, as the following data show:

Table 2. Level of literacy in 1910 (in percentage)

Germans	Magyars	Slovaks	Croatians	Serbs	Romanians	Rusins
71	67	58	47	40	28	22

Taken from: András Gergely ed, *Magyarország története a 19. században* (History of Hungary in the 19th century), 415.

Although the authorities did not measure the wealth of nationalities separately, it is clear that Magyars and Germans tended to be better-off than the other ethnic groups. Geographical location (Magyars and Germans

lived on the plains), social status (high ratio of Germans and Magyars among townspeople, German merchants in towns, Magyar nobleman in the countryside) and Jewish assimilation made Magyars and Germans the leading nations of Hungary in economic, social and cultural terms.

Even if in the economic and cultural spheres non-Magyars had a certain chance to develop, their chance of attaining political influence was minimal. In the old (pre-1848) Hungary politics had been run by the nobility. Although after 1848 every male citizen, who paid a certain amount of tax, had the right to participate in politics, mostly descendants of the noble families had the chance to partake in political life. Even if some politicians of non-noble origin managed to embark on a political career, they had to assimilate to the old elite in terms of language, mentality and behavior. This meant that the political class of dualist Hungary was almost entirely Magyar. The passivity of non-Magyar parties further diminished the chance of the emergence of a potential non-Magyar political elite.

The status of nationalities during the age of dualism was regulated by the Law of Nationalities of 1868.⁴⁰ According to the law, in Hungary there existed only one nation: the Hungarian. Every citizen of the country was a member of this political nation. However, the law acknowledged the right of nationalities to maintain a certain level of cultural autonomy, in order to maintain and develop their languages and culture. The law guaranteed everyone the right of using their mother tongue in the local administration.

⁴⁰ <http://www.1000ev.hu/index.php?a=3¶m=5366> (accessed 18 May 2007)

The nationalities tended to reject co-operation with the government's official policy at an increasing rate. At the time of promulgation of the 1868 act they were highly suspicious of the genuineness of the rights guaranteed by the law; later, when the government tended to ignore the law, the nationalities would have been still satisfied with a course which honored the promises of 1868. The most important aim of the non-Magyars was to be accepted as separate nations (*nemzet*), i.e. to establish nationality-based legal bodies (corporations). This aspiration was rejected by the Hungarian government, as they saw in this demand the first step towards the secession of the entire Hungarian periphery. The liberal Hungarian elite was convinced about the necessity of centralization as one of the main means of modernization, therefore any idea of federalism was brushed aside.⁴¹

Since governmental politics was not an option for non-Magyar ethnic groups, they had to find alternative ways of cultivating their national cultures. Thus, all nationalities established their cultural associations which tried to develop their national culture, contributing among other things to schooling, press, publishing of literature in their languages. These major societies were the Matica Slovenská (Slovak), Matica Srpska (Serb), Astra (Romanian) and St. Basil Association (Rusin). With the exception of the Matica Slovenská, which was prohibited by the government in 1875, these central cultural associations were allowed to work, thus they contributed to the non-Magyar nation-building processes significantly. The

⁴¹ See for instance the reaction on the congress of nationalities by prime minister Dezső Bánffy in August 1895. Gábor G. Kemény, ed., *Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez Magyarországon a dualizmus korában* (Documents of the nationality question in Hungary during the dualist era) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1952-1985), Vol. II. 383.

major conduits of maintaining the national culture were the autonomous Orthodox, Romanian Greek Catholic and Lutheran churches which provided beside ecclesiastical services elementary and high school education, too. In addition to the above, an important role was played by economic associations and banks which aimed to finance schools, publications, as well as church activities. In the case of Transylvanian Germans, who did not have such comprehensive cultural associations as the Romanians, these financial societies emerged as the most important element of Saxon nation-building.⁴² Social and economic cooperatives served as communication channels between the national elites and masses: by providing participation for those who did not have the right to vote at general elections, these associations functioned as an important public sphere.⁴³

In the political sphere, ethnically based parties were formed to articulate the interests of the non-Magyar population. Traditionally, Serbs had the best organized political movement. However, the Serb National Liberal Party steadily lost from its influence and in 1887 split into two streams: radicals and liberals, which formed their own parties. The (Transylvanian) Romanian National Party (Partidul Național Român) was established in 1869 and merged with the Romanian movements of Hungary in 1881. Slovak national aspiration were represented by the Slovak National Party (Slovenská Národná Strana), founded in 1871. The Saxon

⁴² Gábor Egry, "*Erdély gazdasági meghódítása – Az erdélyi százok jövőképe a 20. század elején*" (The economic conquer of Transylvania. The concept on future of Transylvanian Saxons at the beginning of the 20th century), in *A Kárpát-medence népeinek együttélése a 19-20. században*, ed. Gábor Egry and István Feitl (Budapest: Napvilág, 2005), 415

⁴³ Attila Hunyadi. "Economic nationalism in Transylvania," *Regio* (English version) 2004, 175

People's Party (Sächsische Volkspartei), established in 1876, has to be treated differently from the abovementioned movements, since it tended to support the Hungarian government.⁴⁴

However, the nationality-based parties were not able to find their way. If they were loyal to the liberal government (like German and Serb politicians in the first decades of the dualist regime), they could not achieve any additional nationality-based rights, since liberal, modernist, progressive Hungarian politicians were not inclined to set up any kind of 'feudal institutions', such as nationality-based corporations. The radical stream, however, could not attain results, either, as they could not enter the liberal government. There was no exit from this trap, therefore the political elite of the nationalities chose the means of passivity during almost the entire dualist age.

The tactics of nationality parties were naturally the disadvantages of their general political environment. Due to the property qualifications of the franchise, the number of non-Magyars with voting rights was disproportionately small, since nationalities (except for Germans) tended to be poorer than Magyars. Furthermore, county administration, run by almost entirely Magyars, used various tricks to prevent good results by non-Magyar candidates. Indeed, government manipulation was so successful that non-Magyar territories tended to vote for the governing Liberal Party, while purely Magyar areas often supported the opposition Independence Party. Realizing these unfortunate conditions, the Slovak

⁴⁴ Friedrich Gottas, "Die Deutsche in Ungarn" (The Germans in Hungary), in *Die Habsburgermonarchie*, ed. Peter Urbanitsch and Adam Wandruszka (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980), III/1 388

National Party boycotted elections up to 1896. This tactic, however, outraged many Slovak contemporaries, since it deprived Slovaks of any possible political influence and weakened the position of the party even among Slovaks.⁴⁵ By the end of the 19th century the old-school Slovak national movement found itself on the down-grade, but the new, mass-politics of the Hlasist movement was not formed yet. As a result, at the Hungarian millennium Slovak national movement was in an impotent condition. Realizing that the policy of passivity did not bring results, nationality parties decided to change their policy and partake at the elections from the early 1900's. The first result of this change was achieved during the political crisis of 1905 and 1906: at the 1906 elections 7 Slovak, 2 Serb and 16 Romanian politicians were elected to the Parliament.

The most significant event concerning nationality movements in the early 1890's was without doubt the *Memorandum*-trial. In 1892, Romanian intellectuals sent a petition directly to Francis Joseph, in which they asked the Emperor to sever Transylvania from Hungary, to give equal political representations to non-Magyar nations (thus federalize Hungary) and to establish whole cultural autonomy of non-Magyar churches and the education systems. Although Francis Joseph chose not to receive the paper (he sent it to the Budapest government), the *Memorandum* outraged the Hungarian public. A lawsuit was instituted against the main contributors of the *Memorandum* and two years later 14 members of the *Memorandum*-movement were sentenced to imprisonment.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Szarka, 80-86

⁴⁶ Gerald Volkmer, *Die Siebenbürgische Frage 1878-1890. Der Einfluss der rumänischen Nationalbewegung auf die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich-Ungarn und*

The most important, co-coordinated, political action of the nationalities took place in 1895 in Budapest, where around 800 Slovak, Romanian and Serbian representatives held a congress of nationalities. The conference rejected the 'Magyar national idea of state' (*magyar nemzeti állameszme*) but at the same time declared their interest in preserving the integrity of the country while maintaining its ethnic heterogeneity. The conference proposed to change borders of counties and electoral districts according to language barriers, introduction of universal suffrage, higher level of educational and church autonomy and the appointment of a minister for nationality issues.⁴⁷ The government refused to negotiate about the recommendations of the conference, indeed, legal action was taken against the participants of the congress.⁴⁸ The that-time prime minister, Baron Dezső Bánffy implemented the toughest policies against the non-Magyar movements; he was convinced that any allowance to the nationality movements would harm Hungary significantly.⁴⁹

The Millennial idea

The first ideas of celebrating the 1000th year anniversary of the settlement of Magyar tribes in Hungary emerged in the 1880's.

Rumänien (The Transylvanian question. Influence of Romanian national movement on the diplomatic relations of Austria-Hungary and Romania) (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004), 231-239.

⁴⁷ *Az 1895. évi budapesti nemzetiségi kongresszus elfogadott határozati javaslata* (Proposal accepted by the nationality conference in Budapest, 1895) Kemény, II. 379-381.

⁴⁸ Governmental documents concerning these legal actions can be found in Kemény, II. 384-390. It is remarkable that both the Romanian Greek Catholic and Orthodox churches cooperated with the government to discourage their priests to partake in such actions.

⁴⁹ Bertényi, 73-82

The Millennial celebration was not just an occasion for revelry: it was an historic opportunity for the Hungarian government to construct an integrated national and historical ideology depicting the *de facto* imperfect state as *de jure* a whole, inspiring a sense of continuity, of permanent and unshakable stability, while at the same time presenting the status quo as inevitable.⁵⁰

So the millennium had to be celebrated, propagating the achievements of the liberal government. This interpretation was of course attacked by the opposition: editorial of the Independence Party daily *Egyetértés* stated the hope that Hungary would gain independence in the second millennia of its existing⁵¹, while the emerging, conservative Catholic People's Party accused the government to endanger the country by its anticlerical policy.⁵² Nevertheless, due to the aggressive policy of the Bánffy-government and to the elevated spirit of the celebrations, party conflicts remained in shadow up to autumn 1896, when most of the festivities were already over.

During the early preparations the government had to tackle a the difficult question of assigning an actual historical date to the arrival and settlement of the in the Carpathian Basin. A special committee of distinguished scholars of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was set up for this purpose; but they could only identify a 12 year during which the conquest may have taken place. This result did not satisfy the decision-makers so politicians decided the date of the millennium. They identified the year 895 as the date, thus the millennium feasts would be held in 1895. Yet, the politicians started their job too late as ideas kept surfacing

⁵⁰ Gerő, *Modern Hungarian Society*, 204

⁵¹ *Egyetértés*, 1 January 1896. The article was written by Ferenc Kossuth, son of Lajos Kossuth.

⁵² *Magyar Állam*, 1 January 1896

on Hungary should celebrate her 1000 years of existence. The consequence was that the organizers ran out of time and the millennium show had to be delayed by and be staged finally in 1896.⁵³

Besides the unclear date of the settlement, another serious issue was the very subject-matter of the celebrations: what exactly should Hungary celebrate? Traditionally St. Stephen was considered to be the founder of Hungary, but in 1896 only Árpád, leader of invading Magyar tribes was to be celebrated.⁵⁴ Hence, these two figures represented a deep cultural-political divide line within Hungarian society. According to Katalin Sinkó, Árpád and Stephen personify the following division: the cult of Árpád symbolized the domination of ethnic Magyars who defeated the indigenous population of the Carpathian Basin, therefore the "right of the sword" legitimates their rule. Árpád represents the tribal type of lordship, i.e. the will of nation creates the king. His paganism is a further symbol-sign of holding on to the old Magyar traditions which are rooted in the East. The Árpád-concept represents a monolingual, ethnically homogeneous nation. Moreover, Árpád can be seen as a symbol of national independence, a leader who resisted Western attempts to incorporate Hungary into a larger entity.

The other tradition found its symbol in St. Stephen. Thus, Stephen typified adherence to the West, universal-Catholic values, heterogeneous and imperial (meaning the multi-ethnic Hungary). Furthermore, the royal legitimation of Stephen indicates the heavenly origin of his power, which goes beyond the nation.

⁵³ Thaly, 4-6

⁵⁴ Sinkó, *Ezredévi* 2

Thus, the Eastern Hungarian (Transylvanian), Protestant, anti-Habsburg tradition, carried by mainly middle-strata nobility, can be identified with the figure of Árpád, while the Catholic, mainly Western Hungarian, pro-Habsburg, rather aristocratic stream can be connected with the cult of Stephen. Sinkó argues that the Independence party preferred Árpád to Stephen, while the governing Liberal Party stood by Stephen.⁵⁵ In this sense is the debate in Parliament about the official, national day of Hungary significant. The Liberal Party proposed 20th August, day of Stephen, since the figure of the holy king expressed the idea of the nation (*nemzet-eszme*). The opposition rejected this concept because the day of any saint could not be celebrated by Protestants. Therefore the Independence Party suggested 15 March, day of the anti-Habsburg revolution of 1848 to be elevated to the status of national day.⁵⁶

The two streams clashed and confused each other during the millennium. Some illustrations represented Árpád and the Protestant or anti-Habsburg (mainly Transylvanian) leaders of the country, such as István Bocskay, Gábor Bethlen, Ferenc Rákóczi or Lajos Kossuth, but omitting Stephen or any Habsburg ruler. Other pictures showed Árpád and Stephen at the same time, further representations stressed the link between these two and Francis Joseph, calling the reigning monarch a "second Árpád."⁵⁷

Since the "rivalry" between Árpád and Stephen was won rather by the former, for non-Magyars the idea of millennium was hard to accept. To

⁵⁵ Sinkó, *Árpád kontra*, 50-51

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 48 f.

⁵⁷ *Ibid* 49 and appendix 18-19

resolve the conflict, the government tried to stress the anniversary of the existence of the state, which belonged to all its citizens. Thus, the liberal character of Hungary was stressed, liberalism brought by the Magyar tribes and manifested in the first, 'constitutional', assembly which was held according to the legend at 896 in Puszteszer. Independence party leaders, on the other hand, attributed more importance to the figure of Árpád and the occupation of the Carpathian Basin.⁵⁸

While St. Stephen was to some extent acceptable to non-Magyars, the figure of Árpád and the entire aforementioned connotation around him was absolutely imponderable for the nationalities. It cannot surprise anyone that the non-Magyar population was not really enthusiastic about the millennial idea. With the meager exception of the ethnographic parts of the Millennial Exhibition, there was no attempt to incorporate the non-Magyars into the millennium. This exclusion, however, seems to be logical: what link could be established between descendants⁵⁹ of Svatopluk and Árpád, when celebrating the latter?⁶⁰ Thus, the newspaper of the Slovak national movement *Národné Noviny* stressed that the settlement led by Árpád had been a national disaster for Slovaks:

A millennium ago Asian nomads arrived here [to the Great Moravian Empire] and ruined the flourishing Christian culture and church, but the Lutheran bishop ordered celebration on 10

⁵⁸ Sinkó, *Ezredévi 2*

⁵⁹ The extent to which the Magyars and Slovaks were descendants of the 9th century Magyar and Slav population, is of course subject to serious doubt. The terms are used metaphorically.

⁶⁰ Tom Barcsay, "The 1896 Millennial Festivities in Hungary: An Exercise in Patriotic and Dynastic Propaganda", in Karin Friedrich ed, *Festive Culture in Germany and Europe from the sixteenth to the twentieth century* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellon Press, 2000), 193
The exclusion of non-state constituting groups or the political opposition is, by no means exceptional, rather typical. Nipperdey, 530

May in churches and schools. This is the way how they want to educate Slovak children who do not speak Hungarian into Magyar janissaries. ... No one shall demand of us that we celebrate the fall and destruction of Great Moravian Empire together with the Magyar race in this year.⁶¹

Furthermore, the article claimed that Slovak children shall be taught for Slovak history instead of Hungarian and the Great Moravian Empire shall be celebrated instead of the Magyar settlement. The newspaper of the anti-Magyar Germans of Kronstadt *Kronstädter Zeitung* emphasized that their ancestors had not come with Árpád, but conquered and ruled their territory independent from Magyars, therefore there was nothing to celebrate at the millennium.⁶²

However, the non-Magyar nations did not protest seriously against the millennium. Some individual events such as burning the Hungarian flag, refusal to participate in festivities, failure to light the decoration lights in a house, did take place happened but the general pattern was silent acceptance of the millennial idea and festivities. Indeed, as the vice-governor of Szepes (in German Zips, in Slovak Spiš) County proudly reported to the Ministry of Interior: the millennium provided an occasion to revel in Hungarian songs and patriotic speeches, delivered in many purely German or Slovak villages.⁶³ The main form of the resistance against millennium was passivity: scarce participation by minority groups at the millennial school festivals, church celebrations, official receptions at town

⁶¹ The article of *Narodnie Noviny* on 8 April 1896 is cited by Polányi, 116

⁶² *Pesti Hírlap*, 18 September 1896

⁶³ Joachim von Puttkammer, *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn. Slowaken, Rumänen und Siebenbürger Sachsen in der Auseinandersetzung mit der ungarischen Staatsidee 1867-1914* (Everyday schooling and national integration in Hungary. Slovaks, Romanians and Transylvanian Saxons in the conflict with the Hungarian idea of state) (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2003), 406

halls or county halls was typical. However, the level of passivity shows an uneven pattern: is tendentious: Romanians tended to ignore these events most conspicuously, while the Serbs, Germans and Slovaks seemed able to cooperate more.⁶⁴

The Millennium: celebrations, events, achievements

What links the locations examined in this study is their role played during the Hungarian Millennium celebrations. In the course of a fair number of staged events and inaugurations (such as the National Exhibition in the Budapest City Park, the building of the underground railway under Andrásy Avenue, etc.) numerous millennial monuments were erected throughout Hungary. The central sculpture group was installed in Heroes' Square at the end of Andrásy Avenue, yet, it did not bear any special meaning for the nationalities of Hungary. A more pointedly Magyar-centered project involved the construction of seven statues representing the conquering Magyar tribes, which were erected at seven particular locations in Hungary. The idea of these sculptures originated from Kálmán Thaly, a historian and politician, one of the best known exponents of Hungarian nationalism in the second half of the 19th century. Thaly is one of the most characteristic representatives of the aforementioned independist, Protestant, ethnic-nationalist school. His achievements are typical of this stream: Thaly as a historian contributed to

⁶⁴ Puttkammer, 408-411

the Rákóczi-cult, he himself discovered and documented military-folk songs from Rákóczi's age, moreover, he forged some poems to instill the enthusiasm for the Rákóczi period. For decades, Thaly served as an Independent Party MP for Debrecen, the capital of Hungarian Protestantism and famous for its anti-Habsburg traditions.⁶⁵

Thaly feared that the plans for the millennial celebrations may fall short of long term expectations. He wished to erect a lasting monument such as those had been built in Western Europe: the Germania monument in Niederwald, the Walhalla in Regensburg and the Superga in Turin. Thaly argued that such monuments constructed in elevated locations such as high hills can significantly enhance contribute national feeling. Although Thaly was representative of the opposition Independence Party, his initiative to erect the seven statues was accepted by the government at once. The number of the monuments was no matter for dispute, as it had to represent the seven glorious Magyar tribes led by Árpád. Choosing the exact places was more difficult. The monuments had to symbolize the idea of the Hungarian state (*magyar állameszme*), therefore four gateways to the country were chosen to represent Hungary both towards foreigners entering the country and to the local non-Magyar population; two monuments were placed inside purely Magyar-populated areas, whereas the seventh one was erected in an area with clear Slovak majority.

The first column was received by the town of Munkács (Mukacheve, now in Ukraine), because Magyar tribes are said to have entered the Carpathian Basin there and travelers arriving by train from Lemberg (Lviv)

⁶⁵ Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Thaly Kálmán és történetírása* (Kálmán Thaly and his history-writing) (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1961)

catch sight of this column as one of the first visible impressions as they enter the country. The Munkács column also served as a message to the local Rusin population: they should be as faithful to the Hungarian homeland as they had been before – argued Thaly.⁶⁶

The second column was set up in Zimony (Zemun in Serbian, Semlin in German, now part of Belgrade). The reasons for that location were that the monument could be seen from the Serbian capital itself and that the great Hungarian warlord János Hunyadi is said to have died in Zimony Castle. The Zimony column was a message to Serbs and Croats within Hungary and to the Serbs of Serbia: 'only to the Sava river, but not further!' – as Thaly wrote.⁶⁷

The third column was erected in Dévény (Devín in Slovak, Theben in German) to show the idea of Hungary to travelers entering Hungary by boat on the Danube and thus marked the Hungarian-Austrian border. Furthermore, Dévény was said to be the headquarter of Svatopluk, conquered by Magyars. As such, it symbolized the Magyar hegemony, too.⁶⁸

The fourth monument was placed in Brassó (Braşov in Romanian, Kronstadt in German), on the Cenk Hill (Tâmpa in Romanian, Zinne in German) to demonstrate the local Saxons and Romanians Hungarian domination and to hearten Szeklers that they were not forgotten by the motherland. Romanians entering from Wallachia would face this symbol of Hungarian predominance as well, since the Cenk Hill millennial column was perfectly visible from the Bucharest-Brassó railway line. The main

⁶⁶ Thaly, 11

⁶⁷ Ibid

⁶⁸ Ibid

reason why this location was chosen was the presence of all three nationalities inhabiting Transylvania and not Brassó's historical importance for Hungarian history. Neither Cenk Hill nor Brassó itself played major historical roles, indeed: the city was dominated by German citizens and served as a major cultural center of Saxons and Transylvanian Romanians, but not for Magyars.

The Slovaks living in Upper Hungary deserved their own monument as well: it was unveiled on Zobor Hill at the town of Nyitra (Nitra, Slovakia). Thaly decided to put a monument on that hill only to show the local Slovaks the superiority of the Hungarian state and nation. Thaly cited an old Hungarian chronicle, *Gesta Hungarorum* by Anonymus to allocate historical importance to the hill: according to Anonymus the Slav chieftain Zobor was killed by the Magyars on the hill which was named after him. Apart from this unproven legend, Zobor Hill itself did not play any historical role, and was not even near any of gateways to the country.

Two monuments were placed on purely Magyar-inhabited territory: one in Pusztaszer (believed to be the spot of the first Hungarian assembly) and Pannonhalma (the first important abbey in Hungary founded by Stephen). Both represented the idea of the 1000 year old Hungarian state and nation.⁶⁹

As we can see, most of the chosen locations played a significant role in the history of the settlement of the Magyars in the Carpathian Basin. In other words, in most cases these millennial statues can be seen as

⁶⁹ Ibid

invented *lieu de mémoire*, aiming to create a national myth around the settlement.

The seven millennial monuments were built in the governing artistic style of the age, that is historicism. Historicism sought ideals which were found in history, especially in heroes of the past. This past is used to legitimize present, therefore the historicist art is a means of propaganda, avoiding conflicts of the present and showing the ideal past.⁷⁰ The Hungarian millennial festivities followed these patterns. Heroes of the past appeared as legitimizing force of the present: mainly Árpád, but all kind of historic figures were represented (Stephen, Mathias Corvinus, Maria Theresia, etc.)

Because of lack of time the seven monuments were not put out to tender. Instead, an architect, called Gyula Berczik, a civil service counselor was granted the task of designing the columns. Berczik was an average architect of the time working for the government.⁷¹ He was not an artist *per se* but more a well-trained craftsman, thus the artistic value of monuments turned out to be quite low. Most of the figures standing on the columns were moulded by Gyula Jankovits, a well-known historicist sculptor of his time. The Dévény and Brassó monuments were built almost identical in identical forms: the standing figures of the warrior of Árpád were of the same design, the only differences to be found between the columns that supported them.

⁷⁰ Nagy, Ildikó. A műfajok hierarchiája a historizmus szobrászatában (Hierarchy of genres in the historicist sculpture), In: Zádor Anna (ed.) *A historizmus művészete Magyarországon. Művészettörténeti tanulmányok.* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Művészettörténeti Kutató Intézet, 1993), 111

⁷¹ *Vasárnapi Újság*, 20 September 1896

The erection of the millennial monuments entirely fits into contemporary European patterns. For Hungarians, Germany served as a traditional model on all kind of political actions, including symbolic legitimation. The idea of millennial monuments was shaped by its German counterpart, the difference, however, is significant: while in Germany mostly local associations, students and representatives of the civil society were the initiators and sponsors, in Hungary the whole action was arranged by the government. This difference is a clear mark of the weakness of the Hungarian civil society.

4. Devín and Braşov: places of early national memory

Devín

The village Devín has been an unimportant settlement next to Pressburg at the junction of Danube and Morava (March) rivers. What gave Dévény some significance was its special location between Austria and Hungary. As the Morava river was the Hungarian-Austrian border, Dévény served as a border point to Austria from the 10th century up to 1918. After reshaping the borders in Central Europe in 1918-1920, Devín became a border point between Austria and Czechoslovakia. The Munich Treaty gave Devín to Germany, so Devín became part of the German Third Reich until 1945, when it returned to Czechoslovakia. Since 1993 Devín has been part of Slovakia.⁷²

Although being an unimportant village in modern times, Devín played significant role in the Middle Ages which was then later reflected by the romantic nationalism movements in the 19th and 20th century. Devín has been continuously habited by man since the Neolithic Age. The first identifiable settlers of the spot were Celts, who were later followed by Romans, who established a fortress there. Archeological evidence proves that in the 4th century AD the place was used by early Christians. The relevant history of Devín, however, started with Great Moravians. Although Great Moravians did not produce much written material, the archeological

⁷² Kiliánová, *Lieux de mémoire*, 155

excavations clearly showed that the Devín fortress was one of the most important centers of the Great Moravian Empire. The heyday of Devín was probably during the reign of Rastislav (846-870). Despite of the lack of written evidence, it is highly possibly that the church fathers Cyril and Methodius visited Devín, probably many times. At the end of 9th century the Great Moravian Empire fell apart and Magyar tribes could easily conquer the territory of present-day Slovakia, including Devín. Subchapter The Slovak Devín will present how the flowering of Devín as both imperial, cultural and church centre and then the harsh decline of the spot influenced 19th century Slovak nation-builders, who sought for their historic traces of their national identity and found it in Devín.

The history of Devín between the 10th and 18th centuries is totally irrelevant, since this period of time was not used by any later nation-building attempts. The castle and the village shared the average faith of the other Upper Hungarian regions. The castle to be seen nowadays was built in the 13th century which was then under siege by Austrian and taken by Czech armies during the hectic 13th and 14th centuries. After the consolidation of Hungary it was reconquered by Hungary again. Since 1650 the castle belonged to the Pálffy counts. Due to the Hungarian-Habsburg federation the castle lost its military significance and was not developed further by the Pálffys. It fell into decay already during the 18th century.⁷³ The main destruction of the fortress, however, happened in 1809 when

⁷³ A beautiful example of the partly ruined castle is the picture *The ruins of Theben at Morava river* by the Italian baroque master Bernardo Bellotto (1720 – 1780). The picture was painted between 1758 and 1761. It is to see in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

French troops destroyed the castle. Since then Devín has remained ruined, providing a picturesque, romantic landscape to Danube travelers.

Before turning our attention to Dévény as a *lieu de mémoire*, however, the social environment of Pressburg shall be examined. Dévény as place of memory was obviously used first of all by Pressburgians, not by peasants of Dévény village.

At the end of the 19th century, Pressburg was one of the main bourgeois cities of Hungary. The middle-class of the city had long roots and emerged as one of the main centers of embourgeoisement in Hungary. Data concerning the city life clearly demonstrates the democratic-bourgeois character of the city: during the second half of the 19th century number of civic associations increased by 11 times and at the end of the century several German and Hungarian newspapers were published.⁷⁴

Pressburg had been inhabited by Germans since the Middle Ages. According to the 1850 census, 70% of inhabitants of Pressburg were Germans, 13% Jews, 10% Slovaks and only 6% Magyars.⁷⁵ In 1880 Germans still amounted to majority by 65.6%, but the ratio of Magyars increased to 15.7%, equal to number of Slovaks. Magyarization of the city was rapid: the last census organized by Hungary in 1910 found almost 41% Magyars and only 43.2% Germans, while ratio of Slovak population did not vary significantly (13.4%).⁷⁶ Pressburg had a long Jewish history as well, since Israelites constituted 11.1% of the population of the city in

⁷⁴ Mária Rózsa, "Pozsony a német nyelvű helyi sajtóban (1850-1920)" (Bratislava in the German local press, 1850-1920), in *Fejezetek Pozsony történetéből magyar és szlovák szemmel*, ed. Gábor Czoch (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2005)

⁷⁵ Babejová, 25

⁷⁶ Babejová, 56

1900.⁷⁷ Jews were the main engine of assimilation, since by modernizing their religious habits they usually changed their language from German (Yiddish) to Hungarian. Thus, ratio of Jews speaking Magyar increased from 13.7% in 1880 to 51.4% in 1910.⁷⁸

Pressburg traditionally served as a main German bourgeois centre, both in terms of economy (modern factories) and culture. Pressburgian German middle-class had a strong local identity, which was cultivated by several ways, for instance the first successful political daily of Hungary, *Preßburger Zeitung*, was published here since 1764.⁷⁹ The closeness of Vienna opened the way of importing Western material and intellectual goods.

Besides of the local patriotism, Pressburgian German *Bürgers* had a strong commitment to Hungary as well, feeling themselves *Hungarus*, i.e. member of the traditional (feudal) nation. This identity was expressed during the revolution of 1848, when German citizens wholeheartedly supported the Hungarian freedom fight. Thus, it is not surprising that the next generation was so easily willing to start the assimilation process into Magyars. The main carrier of the Pressburg German bourgeois mentality, *Preßburger Zeitung*, declared several times its Hungarian identity and commitment, which was acknowledged by the Hungarian public: for

⁷⁷ Woldieter Bihl, "Die Juden" (The Jews) in *Die Habsburgermonarchie*, ed. Peter Urbanitsch and Adam Wandruszka (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980), III/2 886

⁷⁸ Babejova, 57

⁷⁹ Gottas, 386

instance, the influential *Vasárnapi Újság* called *Preßburger Zeitung* an 'honest Magyar-minded daily.'⁸⁰

Although before the middle of the 19th century hardly any Magyars lived in Pressburg, the city had a Hungarian character, as Parliament hold its meetings there. Thus, especially since the Reform Age (beginning in 1825), the center of Hungarian political life was Pozsony which attracted many Hungarian noblemen to the city. The achievements of the reformists influenced Pressburg citizens as well and Pressburg Germans became proud as partaker in the reform age and the revolution.

Slovaks of Pressburg did not play an important role in the life of the city. They constituted only one sixth-seventh of the city's population and indeed, majority of Slovaks living in Prešporok were peasants. Slovak middle-class as such did not exist in Prešporok; it is not an accident that the first Slovak newspaper was launched only in 1906 and indeed, it was a social-democrat daily for workers.⁸¹ Slovaks lived mainly in the worker's districts in the outskirts of the city, closed to factories where around half of them were employed.

The Hungarian Dévény: Porta Hungarica

Although Dévény lost its military significance by the 16th century and the village itself was unimportant, since the middle of the 18th century

⁸⁰ Rózsa, 424-425

⁸¹ Monika Glettler, "The Slovaks in Budapest and Bratislava, 1850-1914," in *Ethnic Identity in Urban Europe. Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940*, ed. Max Engman (Hants: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1992), 313

Dévény became known as the border point between Hungary and Austria. The Morava Field (Dürnkрут) in Lower Austria ends right at Dévény which at the same time marks the beginning of the Little Carpathians. The sharp change of the landscape gives Dévény a remarkable character; thus, it was called *Porta Hungarica*, or Hungarian Gate.

Since the beginning of 19th century opportunities of traveling increased, especially when introducing steam engine boats on the Danube in 1830. This caused a boom of travel guides, descriptions of certain regions and all kind of materials connected to traveling. Beside the Landeskunde-type accounts, these travel guides influenced the public significantly: they provided cultural, social, historic information on the locations. The main target of these books was of course the emerging middle class, i.e. noblemen and bourgeoisie who on the one hand could afford themselves to travel, on the other had to move within the Empire to fulfill their job (merchants, high-positioned clerks, etc.)

As due to the steam engine boats people going from Hungary to Vienna (or further to Western Europe) tended to take the Danube route, all travelers faced the visible castle of Dévény. Thus, Dévény became known by the Hungarian middle-class public. Dévény was mentioned by almost all travel guides telling its remarkable location, the history of the castle and the romantic legends connected to it. As early as 1831 a travel guide describing Upper Hungary mentions the castle of Dévény as a spot "found by so many describers".⁸² A German description of the Danube introduces

⁸² "In geringer Ferne sah man die mächtigen Ruinen von Theben, welche schon so viele Beschreiber befunden haben." Adalbert Joseph Krickel, *Wanderung von Wien über Pressburg und Tyrnau in die Bergstädte Schemnitz, Kremnitz und Neusohl, und von da in*

Dévény as a beautiful, sometimes important spot, inhabited by Moravians in the 9th century.⁸³ A detailed German travel guide on Pressburg and its surrounding claims that all the people love the beautiful and blond Danube and it provides a long description on the origin of the word 'Devín' and on the history of the castle itself.⁸⁴ Another guidebook published in Zürich describing the route between Vienna and Budapest calls Dévény a beautiful spot and tells a well-known legend on the love of the Moravian princess and Magyar tribe-leader during the siege of the castle.⁸⁵

The then well-known writer, amateur historian and ethnologist Arnold Ipolyi published a series of articles in the most influential bourgeois weekly *Vasárnap* *Újság* in 1859-1860 describing the Lower Carpathians. Ipolyi, of course, paid deep attention to Devín. The author emphasized mostly the border function of the location, mentioning its beautiful landscape as well. What is most interesting in his writing that he rejected the idea of Slavic origin of the castle. Ipolyi claimed that the fortress of Rastislav was in Moravia near to Velehrad. He refuted the Roman habitation, too. In Ipolyi's view the first proven settlers of Devín were the

die Turoß und das Waagthal (Wanderings from Vienna through Trnava to the hill towns Banska Štavica, Kremnica, Banska Bystrica and from there to Turoc and to the valley of Vah) (Vienna: M. Ehr Adolph, 1831), 15

⁸³ A. J. Gross-Hoffinger, *Die Donau vom Ursprung bis in das schwarze Meer. Ein Handbuch für Donaureisende von Ulm, Linz, Wien, Pesth, Galatz über das schwarze Meer nach Constantinopel* (The Danube from source to the Black Sea. A handbook to travellers on the Danube of Ulm, Linz, Wien, [Buda]Pest, Galaţ through the Black Sea to Constantinople) (Wroclaw: Verlag von Eduard Trewendt, 1846), 198-199.

⁸⁴ Alexander F. Haksch, *Illustrierter (sic) Führer durch Pressburg und seine Umgebungen* (Illustrated guide through Bratislava and surrounding) (Vienna-Bratislava: Commissions-Verlag von C. Stampel, 1884), 80-82

⁸⁵ A. Imendörffer, W. Gerlai and J. Sziklay, *Nach und durch Ungarn. Von Wien nach Budapest* (To and through Hungary. From Vienna to Budapest) (Zürich: Orell Füssli & Co., n .d.), 8-9, 36-37

Hungarians in the 13th century.⁸⁶ This concept can be seen as typical: if the Slavic origin of Devín was mentioned by non-Slovak authors, it was usually rejected.

Dévény became so well-known that even foreign travelers did not omit to visit it, either. The English traveler John Paget, while visiting Hungary in 1835, made a trip from Pozsony to Dévény. He liked the beautiful castle very much and recorded in his travel description some romantic myth concerning Dévény as well.⁸⁷ However, he did not even mention any Slavic origins, although he provides information on non-Magyar population often. Paget received information from local Hungarian nobles; thus, it would mean that Paget's friends were not aware of the Moravian history of the place. The Russian prince Anatol Nikolayevich Demidov visited and climbed the ruins of the castle, too. He was unable to get any information on the history of the place, either, as he could not communicate with locals (probably Slovak) peasant in German.⁸⁸ The famous Danish writer Hans Christian Andersen held Dévény "probably the most beautiful ruin of castle along the Danube, ...as if fell down directly from heaven."⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Arnold Ipolyi, *Fehér-hegységi útiképek* (Travel pictures from the White Mountains) (Bratislava: Madách-Posonium, 2004), 94-99

This book is a collection of the original articles but it does not contain date of publication. Since the exact date of the articles is irrelevant, I decided to use the book form.

⁸⁷ John Paget, *Hungary and Transylvania; with Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political and Economical* (New York: Arno Press – The New York Times, 1971), I. 17-21

⁸⁸ Lajos Tardy, (ed). *Orosz és ukrán utazók a régi Magyarországon* (Russian and Ukrainian travelers in old Hungary) (Budapest: Gondolat, 1988), 196-198

The original work of Demidov was published in Paris in 1854 under the title *Voyage dans la Russie méridionale et la Crimée par la Hongrie, la Valachie et la Moldavie*. According to the excerpts concerning Devín, Demidov did not try to communicate with locals in Russian. This might mean that he himself did not speak Russian. Demidov was born and later on died in Florence; he spent most of his life in Western Europe.

⁸⁹Hans Christian Andersen. *Mesék és történetek felnőtteknek* (Fairy tales and stories for adults) (Budapest: Polar, 2005), 135-136

To summarize, in the Hungarian national consciousness Dévény did not play a significant role. It was seen as an emblematic border point (*Porta Hungarica*) towards Austria, but nothing more.⁹⁰ However, its name and location were well-known, as travelers taking boat passed by it on the way to Vienna. At the same time, Dévény was seen as the symbol of gateway to the West. A later, but still valid example of this border-perception can be found in the first important work of the famous Hungarian poet Endre Ady when calling for modernization of Hungarian poetry: "May I break in at Dévény/ with new songs of new times?"⁹¹

The Slovak Devín: *haut lieu* of the nation

Whereas Devín played a marginal role in the Hungarian self-consciousness, and a totally unimportant one in the Austrian (German) case, it gained high significance in the Slovak national memory. Role of Devín began by the emergence of the cult of Cyril and Methodius and the discovery of the Great Moravian tradition, beginning in the 17th but getting more importance in the 18th century. Due to the attempts of counter-reformation, the Hungarian Catholic church sought for own saints. In consequence, the cult of Cyril and Methodius was officially acknowledged,

⁹⁰ Kilianova, *Lieux de mémoire*, 155

⁹¹ Original: 'Szabad-e betörnöm Dévénynél / Új időknek új dalaival?' Endre Ady: *Góg és Magóg fia vagyok én*. Endre Ady, *Összes versei* (Oeuvre) (Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1965), I. 7

and since 1777 14 March became the day of worshipping of these saints within the whole Habsburg Empire.⁹²

Even without archaeological excavations it was clear that Devín used to be an old and important settlement in the Middle Ages, hosting Great Moravian kings and thus probably Cyril and Methodius, too. Proof of that significance, of course, was the castle which guarded the Danube. Hence, as early as the end of 18th century an enlightened clerical historian, Stefan Salagius (István Szalágyi in Hungarian) mentions in his work *De statu ecclesiae Pannoninae* (On the state of Pannonian Church, published between 1777-1786) Devín as the capital of Svatopluk, "the most famous king of our Slovaks".⁹³

The picturesque view of Devín grabbed the mind of Romantic nation-awakeners. Thus, Devín was incorporated into Ján Kollár's *Slávy dcera* (The daughter of goddess Slava) written in 1832. Kollár's poem can be seen as the first attempt to create the Slovak national poetry and 'rise the Slovak nation' (although Kollár wrote in Czech, emphasizing the Panslav brotherhood). In Part III Devín appears among the future national symbols of Slovaks (Danube, Krivan peak, Lomnic hill, etc.) and it is clearly connected to Rastislav, the Great Moravian past.⁹⁴

The first event concerning Slovak nation-building happened in 1836, when

on Sunday, April 24, 1836 (St. George's day) Slovak students arranged on L'udovit Stúr instigation "a trip to the ruins of the

⁹² Kiliánová, *Ein Grenzmythos* 56

⁹³ Kilianova, *Lieux de mémoire* 156

⁹⁴ "Ne, to Děvín čumí skalnatý / nešťastného sídlo Rostislava!" Ján Kollár, *Dielo*, ed. Cyril Kraus. (Bratislava: Slovensky Tatran, 2001), 179

old castle of the fathers." That climb of Devín had a ceremonial and festive character. At first participants sang a song, which was followed by Stúr's speech on the historical importance of Devín. After another hymn and declamation of selected poems, L'udovit Stúr proposed that the participants choose a "motto of life" and add to their Christian names new Slavic names. Eager approval continued with awarding the names by L'udovit Stúr, it was a kind of national baptism.⁹⁵

By this act, Devín became a major Slovak *lieu de mémoire*, whereas remained of minor importance in the Hungarian context. Stúr's performance clearly copied Christian ceremonies: the national walk resembles on pilgrimage to a shrine, the festivity there played the role of a holy mass, while re-baptism does not need to be explained any more. Thus, Devín was seen as a holy place, both in national and in ecclesiastical meanings: on the one hand, Cyrill and Methodius were thought to live there and to start their baptizing work among Slavs from the castle. On the other hand, the glorious Great Moravian kings were believed to settle in Devín. The combination of these two (rather invented) traditions gave the basis of Slovak nation-building idea. Thus, Devín emerged as a compressed, all-embracing cradle of Slovak national history.

Alongside the strengthening of Hungarian-Magyar nationalism, the Great Moravian tradition gained anti-Hungarian connotation at an increasing rate, representing Slavic brotherhood and repression of Slovaks by Magyars. Beginning with the sixties, the cult of Cyril and Methodius became an important way to express Slovak national feelings. However, the main festivals of the Cyril and Methodius anniversaries between the 1860's and 1890's were not taken place in Devín but rather in Banská Bystrica

⁹⁵ Kilianova, *Lieux de mémoire*, 157

(Besztercebánya), Nitra (Nyitra) and Velehrad (in Moravia). According to Gabriela Kiliánová, an expert of Slovak nation-building, "the oblivion of Devín can be seen in connection with the decline of Bratislava's importance in terms of the whole Hungary"⁹⁶ to the benefit of Budapest. In addition, the emergence of middle Upper Hungary (especially the town Turčiansky Sv. Martin/Turócszentmárton) as the center of Slovak national movement was due to the development of the Slovak literary language, which was decided to be based on the central Slovak dialect. Thus, from the 1860's, Turčiansky Sv. Martin became the leading center of Slovak national movement, overshadowing the much larger Prešporok.⁹⁷

Braşov

The city of Brassó (in Hungarian) or Braşov (in Romanian) or Kronstadt (in German) has been an important, well-off trading settlement in the Southeastern corner of Transylvania. Since the 13th century it had been inhabited by Germans (called here Saxons) who gained important privileges from the Hungarian kings and later from the princes of Transylvania. The Saxon community of Southern Transylvania had the right to govern itself and became an independent, feudal 'nation' within Transylvania. However, since the 17th century Romanian peasants and workers, and later Hungarian state employees, middle-class citizens and

⁹⁶ Kiliánová, *Lieu de mémoire* 159

⁹⁷ Zsolt Vesztróczy, "Pozsony, mint a reformkori szlovák politikai élet központja" (Bratislava, as the center of the Slovak political life in the Reform Age), in: *Fejezetek Pozsony történetéből magyar és szlovák szemmel*, ed. Gábor Czoch (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2005), 160

workers began to move into the Saxon territories (called Königsboden) and by the turn of the 20th century Saxons found themselves in minority. According to a 1890 census population of the Brassó itself was divided into three more or less equal groups: Germans (30,8%, 9478 people), Magyars (34,0%, 10441 people) and Romanians (31,7%, 9758 people).⁹⁸ Despite of their weak position in term of numbers, Germans were able to preserve their political, social and economic leading role: mayor of the city emerged always from Saxons and language of administration was German, too.

Most important political goal of the German community of South Transylvania was to keep their right of home-rule, guaranteed first in the 13th century and confirmed several times later. The Habsburg government usually acknowledged the autonomy of the Saxons, thus Transylvanian Germans tended to support the Viennese policies. This meant that Germans had to balance between the central Habsburg government of Vienna and the Transylvanian administration, which was dominated by Hungarian noblemen. This delicate situation led to several conflicts and so to the most important one in 1848. Just after the start of the revolution majority of German and Romanian population of Kronstadt supported the changes, since the dissolution of feudalism encouraged economic progress, whose benefitors were cities and bourgeoisie. But as Hungary and Transylvania became united, Germans started to feel their autonomy endangered and by the autumn 1848 they clearly turned against the revolution. Besides, the beginning War of Independence was unacceptable for Saxons, who preferred the Habsburgs to the Pest government. Constitution, German

⁹⁸ Nyárády, R. Károly. *Erdély népesevéstörténete* (Demographich history of Transylvania), ed. Árpád E. Varga (Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Levéltára, 2003), 418

national feeling, loyalty to the Emperor – these were the major ideas which led Saxon politicians, according to Stephan Ludwig Roth, an influential leader of Kronstadt.⁹⁹ Majority of Transylvanian Germans favored thus the forces of the Emperor. However, some Kronstadtian German and Romanian liberals and radicals supported the revolution and War of Independence up to the fall. Liberal delegates of Kronstadt took part at the 14 April meeting of the Hungarian Parliament where the Habsburgs were deposited.¹⁰⁰

After 1867, German bourgeoisie tended to accept the achievements of dualism. Although the Saxon University (the autonomous body of Saxons) was soon dissolved and replaced by county system and thus German autonomy ceased to exist, the liberal German citizens supported the governing Liberal Party. In 1890 the *Sachsensstag* (Saxon Parliament) accepted *Das sächsische Volksprogramm* (The Saxon people's program) which acknowledged the idea of Hungarian state (*magyar állameszme*) but did not give up the demand on the separate German nation of Transylvania.¹⁰¹ However, the increasing Magyarization divided Transylvanian Germans into two parts just at the beginning of the 1890's. Opposing the loyal policy of the older German political elite, a new generation of politicians stepped on the stage by founding the "Green" German party and collaborating with the other minority parties.¹⁰² As

⁹⁹ Ambrus Miskolczy, *Erdély a forradalomban és szabadságharcban (1848-1849)* (Transylvania during the revolution and War of Independence, 1848-1849) In *Erdély története*, ed. Béla Köpeczi (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1986), III. 1398-1399
In May 1849 Roth – as a traitor – was sentenced to death and executed by the Hungarian authorities.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid III. 1414, 1420.

¹⁰¹ Kemény, I. 785-788

¹⁰² Konrad Gündisch, *Siebenbürgen und die siebenbürger Sachsen* (Transylvania and the Transylvanian Saxons) (Munich: Langen Müller, 1998), 160-161

Alfred Meschendorfer, a Kronstadtian German writer put in his novel *Die Stadt im Osten*:

The green movement started. Couple of young people founded that our politics became halfhearted. ... The most desolate agitation began from house to house, from family to family, in all associations and corporations, the most fatal civil war began in the entire history of Saxon people. Greens were called dreamer, fool, herostratic but by the others savior in the last hour. Blacks were labeled either castrate, stallion of cradle, traitor of the people, or true friend of the Saxon nation. ... The enemy must have been annihilated by all means. ...A Green bought only at the Green bakery and let make shoes only at the Green shoemaker; a Black had only Black employees and would have been never buried by a Green priest.¹⁰³

As later will be presented, the German community was highly challenged by the millennium and the two parties gave different answers.

Although Romanians tended not to take leading role in the administration of the Braşov, contrary to other Transylvanian towns, the Romanian bourgeoisie of Braşov was highly developed. Romanian (Orthodox) merchants accumulated high fortunes by linking the commerce of the Habsburg Monarchy and the Balkans. Since the first half of the 19th century, they took the leading role of Levantine trade from Saxon and Greek businessmen. The heyday of the Romanian commerce was the 1830's and 1840's; during this time the leading tax-payers of the city were

¹⁰³ "Die „grüne“ Bewegung hatte begonnen. Ein Paar junge Leute fanden, daß unsere Politik viel zu lau betrieben wurde. ...Es begann die wüteste Agitation von Haus zu Haus, Famile zu Familie, in allen Vereinen und Körperschaften, es begann der unheilvollste Bruderkrieg in der ganzen sächsischen Geschichte. „Grüner“ hieß bei den einen: Phantast, Narr, Herostrat, bei den anderen: Retter in der zwölften Stunde. Einen „Schwarzen“ deutete man entweder als Kastraten, Krippenhengst, Volksverräter aber als getreuen Eckart der sächsischen Volkes. ...Der Feind mußte mit allen Mitteln vernichtet wurden. ...Ein Grüner kaufte nur bei dem grünen Bäcker und ließ sich nur von einem grünen Schuster Schuhe machen, ein Swarzer hielt nur schwarte Angestellte und hätte sich um die Welt von keinem grünen Stadtprediger begraben lassen."
Meschendorfer, 106-107

Romanians and they possessed the highest part of the city's commercial capital. The wealth of the Braşov bourgeoisie enabled the support of high culture. Thus, Braşov served traditionally as the center of Orthodox culture: it hosted a Romanian publishing house, high school and the first Romanian daily *Gazeta Transylvaniei*. Major figures of Romanian nation-building lived and worked in Braşov, such as George Bariţ, founder of the modern Romanian press. However, in the 1850's by the emergence of modern capitalism decline of traditional transit trade began. The peripheral location of the city turned out to be a serious disadvantage up to the construction of train lines connecting Transylvania with Hungary. However, railway connection to Kolozsvár (Cluj) and Budapest was constructed too late (in 1873) to save the already declined Romanian bourgeoisie. In spite of this decline, the tradition of self-conscious cultivation of Romanian culture and nation-building remained and influenced the events of the millennium, too.¹⁰⁴ Despite of the economic decadence, the Romanian bourgeoisie of Braşov was still seen by the contemporaries as the leading core of Romanian modernization, national progress and embourgeoisement.¹⁰⁵ The Romanian population – as in other towns as well – was united in the declining of Magyarization, although there were permanent quarrels about the exact means of this opposition.

¹⁰⁴ Ambrus Miskolczy, *A brassói román levantei kereskedőpolgárság kelet-nyugati közvetítő szerepe (1780-1860)* (The East-West transit role of the Braşovian Romanian Levantine merchant bourgeoisie, 1780-1860) (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987), 43-174

¹⁰⁵ Barna Ábrahám, *Az erdélyi románság polgárosodása a 19. század második felében* (The process of embourgeoisement among Romanians of Transylvania in the 2nd half of the 19th century) (Miercuera Ciuc: Pro Print, 2004), 133

The Romanians were seen as the less willing non-Magyar ethnicity to assimilate.¹⁰⁶

Although by the end of century German community was the weakest in numbers, Kronstadt was considered to be a Saxon city. According to a newspaper article, Romanians behave as if they were non-existent, Magyars as if they were strangers in the city, because they let everything to Germans. The city is led by Saxons, says the article, but they feel above their head the sword of Damocles of the Hungarian state.¹⁰⁷ The author of the article turned out to be right: ratio of Magyars rose up to 43,4% in 1910, while Germans constituted only 26,2%, Romanians 28,7% in the same year.¹⁰⁸

The Cenk hill: tourist resort and symbolic place

Although Cenk Hill (Zinne in German, Tâmpa in Romanian) did not bear a nation-wide importance in collective memory, it was a significant location in the local perception. The hill has been a popular resting-place for Kronstadt bourgeoisie and belonged to the highlights of the city. A travel guide from 1890 advised visitors to make an excursion to Zinne to enjoy the beautiful panorama,¹⁰⁹ while another one claims that "no one leaves

¹⁰⁶ *Pesti Hírlap*, 18 October 1896

¹⁰⁷ *Pesti Hírlap*, 16 October 1896

¹⁰⁸ Nyárády, 418

¹⁰⁹ Edward Mysz, *Touren-Weiser für Ausflüge in die Berge und Gebirge der Umgebung von Kronstadt* (Tour advisor for excursions in the hills surrounding Braşov) (Braşov: Verlag von Adolf Albrecht, 1890), 16-17

Kronstadt without climbing the Zinne Hill."¹¹⁰ In order to promote modern tourism, in 1872 a stone terrace was built to attract more visitors¹¹¹ and later convenient pavement was build to the top of the hill. On the Zinne a small restaurant served the tired tourists.¹¹²

Visitors to the city tended to follow the enthusiastic advice of travel guides. The young Hungarian lawyer Gedeon Tanárky, when arriving to Brassó in 1840, climbed the Cenk hill at first, and hardly could return to the city, as he enjoyed the panorama so much.¹¹³ Another traveler, the archeologist and botanist Sámuel Fenichel stopped at Brassó in 1888 while aiming to get from Nagyenyed (Aiud) to Bucharest. Fenichel was astonished from the view as well, claiming that he had never seen such beautiful landscape before.¹¹⁴

The hill was extensively used for purposes beyond tourism as well. Up to 1712 a cross stood on the Zinne which was replaced by a chapel, founded by Johann Draudt, a Catholic senator of the city. The hill became known as Kapellenberg (Chapel Hill) as well.¹¹⁵ The chapel, however, was heavily damaged by a thunderbolt in 1737.¹¹⁶ The political usage of the hill began after the fall of the Hungarian freedom fight in 1848-1849, when a

¹¹⁰ "Kein Reisender verlässt Kronstadt, ohne die Zinne erstiegen zu haben." Josef W. Filtsch, *Die Stadt Kronstadt und deren Umgebung. Ein Führer für Einheimische und Fremde* (The city Braşov and its surrounding. A guide for locals and strangers) (Vienna: Verlag von Carl Graeser, 1886), 47

¹¹¹ *Führer für Kronstadt und Umgebung* (Guide to Braşov and surrounding) (Braşov: Johann Gott & Sohn Heinrich, 1874), 49

¹¹² Lajos Méhely, *Brassóvármegyei turista-kalauz* (Tourist guide for Braşov county) (Cluj: Erdélyrészi Kárpát-Egyesület, 1895), 22

¹¹³ Árpád Losonczy Tóth and Sámuel Izsák, ed, *Magyar utazók a Duna-tájon. Tanárky Gedeon és Fenichel Sámuel útleírásai* (Hungarian travellers in the Danube region. The travel descriptions of Gedeon Tanárky and Sámuel Fenichel) (Budapest: Lucidus, 2006), 87-88, 160-161

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 183-184

¹¹⁵ Friedrich Phillipi, *Aus Kronstadt's Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (From Braşov's past and present) (Braşov, 1874), 8

¹¹⁶ Filtsch, 48-49

pyramid was set up on the Zinne, decorated with a lion which defeated the rebellious dragon. The inscription of the monument said: '*Austria cum Russia unita – Rebellio devicta*' (The united Austria and Russia bet down the rebellion). This monument celebrating the victory of Russian-Austrian army over Hungary was sponsored by the city council, since Transylvanian Saxons tended to oppose the Hungarian freedom fight.¹¹⁷ Magyars were, of course, outraged by this monument. Kálmán Thaly himself saw this statue in 1860 but he did not go close to the hated monument.¹¹⁸ However, in 1861 a thunderbolt destroyed the statue and the Kronstadt German citizens did not fix it any more.

¹¹⁷ Gündisch, 133-136

¹¹⁸ Thaly, 39

5. Millennium in Dévény and in Brassó: elevated spirit, refusal and hectic afterlife

As already mentioned, both Dévény and Brassó were chosen as places to erect millennium monuments. The unveiling ceremony at both locations happened on the same day, that is 18 October 1896. These festivities belonged to the last ones in the country, so they did not receive as high attention as the previous unveiling ceremonies. The forthcoming elections overshadowed the happenings as well. Still, both festivities were reported by the newspapers in details.

Dévény was chosen to manifest the existence of the border between Hungary and Austria. The monument itself stood in the court of the castle ruins. Following the intentions of Thaly, a 21 meter high column was erected, on which a Magyar warrior from the age of Árpád stood, leaning his left hand on a shield bearing the Hungarian coats of arms and having a sword in his let down right hand. The coats of arms had to remind travelers entering Hungary from Vienna by boat that they came into an "independent country", while the let down sword represented that conquer of the country was finished in Dévény and Hungarians did not want to go further. The statue was not designed as a provocative and aggressive one (unlike the Jelačić sculpture in Zagreb, argued Thaly) but as a reminder that Hungary was willing to defend its independence in case of an Austrian aggression.¹¹⁹

The unveiling ceremony was like the previous ones: local politicians, MPs, bishops, generals of the common army, mayor of Pozsony and all

¹¹⁹ Thaly, 19-21

important men of the city were taking part. After a ceremonial Catholic mass, minister of royal court Baron Samu Jósika delivered the main speech at the column in Dévény, which was followed by an elegant reception in Pozsony.¹²⁰

The leading national daily, the modern, moderate and liberal *Pesti Hírlap* reported that "the hero of settlement (*honfoglalás*), while letting down his sword in one hand, holding the shield of Hungarian coats of arms in the other, looks calmly throughout the country which has been conquered for ever."¹²¹ The liberal-nationalist, semi-official governmental daily *Pesti Napló* delivered a long article on the day of the unveiling ceremony. The unknown author of the article claimed that the monument was a memorial to the power of the Hungarian state. The statue explained the neighbors of Hungary the failure of their endeavors concerning their jealousy and envy while proving the victorious idea of Hungarian nation and state. Therefore the statue was a signal to both of the neighboring states as to Hungary herself. The monument should remind every Hungarian of working always in favor of Hungary.¹²² *Egyetértés*, the leading daily of the opposition reported on the event in a high spirit too, calling the Dévény and Brassó monuments as of having great national mission among non-Magyars.¹²³ The editorial of the local Hungarian daily *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó* hoped that the Dévény monument would be

¹²⁰ Kőváry, 151-155

¹²¹ "A honfoglaló hős kardját leeresztve a másik kezében a magyar címeres pajzsot tartva nyugodtan tekint az országra, melyet örökre elfoglalt."
Pesti Hírlap, 17 October 1896

¹²² *Pesti Napló*, 18 October 1896

¹²³ *Egyetértés*, 19 October 1896

an altar to the heroes of the settlement (*honfoglalás*).¹²⁴ The traditional newspaper of the German bourgeoisie, *Preßburger Zeitung*, was proud that Pressburg partly hosted the celebrations and thus the city could contribute to the millennial festivities. The detailed report on the unveiling ceremony accounted the patriotic speeches delivered in Dévény.¹²⁵ The speeches of the participants were reported by the Christian-Social *Preßburger Tagblatt*, too.¹²⁶

Interestingly, the Hungarian perception of Devín was not influenced by the Slovak inhabitants of the area. The statue at the ruins of the Devín castle was a message only to Austria. During the unveiling feast Slovaks and the pre-Hungarian history of the castle were rather neglected, only one speaker, a local lawyer of minor importance, Gyula Zsigárdy, mentioned the former habitants of the castle. But his speech reminds one rather of a romantic fairy tale, not a 'realistic' political speech. Zsigárdy was telling a story invented probably by himself about the Moravian king who committed suicide with his daughter when seeing that the Magyars would take the castle. According to Zsigárdy's story, the Magyar chieftain was looking for the body of the daughter but found her dead, and became very sad, since he fell in love with her. After seeing that Magyars would win the battle over Dévény, the Moravians surrendered. The Magyars let them to go, but they rather offered their services to Hungarians. Since then they have been

¹²⁴ *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó*, 18 October 1896

¹²⁵ *Preßburger Zeitung*, 19 October 1896

¹²⁶ *Preßburger Tagblatt*, 19 October 1896

living there, being faithful to Magyars.¹²⁷ This romantic fairy tale was the only reference made during the unveiling ceremony to the Slavs or to the prehistory of the castle. The speech of Zsigárdy was published only by *Egyetértés*¹²⁸ and the local Hungarian daily, *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó*.¹²⁹ Either the leading national governmental dailies and the local German newspapers, nor the detailed collection of the millennial events published by László Kóváry mentioned it in their reports on the festivity. If this uninterest was caused by the rather low level of the speech or by the minor rank of the speaker himself, is now hard to decide.

National newspapers included neither the Slav history of the place, nor the local Slovaks into their reports. The local Hungarian daily *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó* was the only medium which did not omit the issue, however, it claimed that the Great Moravian fortress Devín was identical with Velehrad in Moravia, therefore Devín in Hungary had nothing to do with the glorious Slav past.¹³⁰ This concept corresponds to the aforesaid idea of Arnold Ipolyi on the refusal of Moravian roots of the castle.

The Dévény monument was seen by the contemporaries as a clear sign to Austria, but nothing more. The Slovaks of Upper Hungary received their 'own' monument at the Zobor Hill near to Nyitra to remind them of the current political situation. It seems to be that the local Germans accepted this perception of the Dévény monument, too. The Pressburg Germans

¹²⁷ Gyula Zsigárdy, *Beszéd, melyet Zsigárdy Gyula a dévényi millenárius szobor leleplezésénél mondott* (Speech delivered by Gyula Zsigárdy at the unveiling ceremony of the Devín millennium monument) (Galanta: Első Galánthai Könyvnyomda, 1896) Interestingly, Zsigárdy published his speech not only in Hungarian, but in Slovak, too: Julius Zsigárdy, *Reč, ktorú držal Julius Zsigárdy pri odhalení tisícročného pomníka devínského* (Trnava: Tlačou Žigmunda Wintera, 1896)

¹²⁸ *Egyetértés*, 19 October 1896

¹²⁹ *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó*, 19 October 1896

¹³⁰ *Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó*, 18 October 1896

welcomed the millennium in a modest way, but there is no sign of clear refusal.¹³¹

On the same day, that is 18 October 1896 the Brassó millennial monument was unveiled at the other corner of the country. Kálmán Thaly chose exactly the same place for the millennial memorial where the former Austrian one stood.¹³² The Cenk monument was of the same design as the Dévény one, showing the Hungarian coats of arms to Romanians and at the same time manifesting the Hungarian ability of self-defense.

Leading Hungarian politicians, representatives of Szeklers, local Magyar and German politicians, generals of the army and university professors took part at the unveiling festival. Beside some speeches delivered by Magyars (county governor Mihály Maurer, Minister of the Interior Dezső Perczel) the most patriotic address was provided by Friderich Müller, German Lutheran bishop of Hermannstadt (Nagyszeben in Hungarian, Sibiu in Romanian). Although Müller had some conflict with the Hungarian government when criticizing the Magyarizing decisions of the millennial conference on education, at this moment he forgot about his reservations and went beyond all other patriotic speeches. He was talking in German, arguing that Germans participated at the ceremony by their own will. According to Müller, the Cenk monument showed foreigners that the territory of Hungary began there. He was worrying about those who did not want to partake in the ceremony. Mayor Karl Jacobi promised in the name of the city that the monument would be saved, since it symbolized

¹³¹ *Preßburger Zeitung* 1 January 1896, 18 October 1896

¹³² Thaly, 39

'our beloved country'. The speeches were followed by a reception and several high-spirit events in the town (illumination, concerts, etc.)¹³³

The editorial of the local Hungarian daily *Brassói Lapok* expressed all the enthusiasm felt by Magyars:

Let this monument be our hope, the column of our trust. Like the biblical pillar of fire shall it lead us to the yet unreached land of promise, which this country will be changed into when all its people, without regard on differences of language or religion, with one heart, with one spirit, with true brother love will prostrate themselves at the holy altar of patriotism. You are such an altar, dignified column. Steadily stand, rule this beautiful land, preach the power and glory of the millennium old Hungarian state. And even if time will weather you, which ruins your stone bottom for innumerable millennia or if thunderbolt of the furious heaven falls you or if father-killer hands attack you in a disgusting way: the idea which you are representing, is irrefutable and will live in our hearts firmly and will assure for our glorious nation the blessed homeland and this beautiful land for the next millennia.¹³⁴

The German newspaper *Kronstädter Tageblatt* encouraged Saxons to accept the millennial idea but at the same time not to give up their peculiarities:

Therefore we have the idea that love of fatherland or the entire state is and must remain the moral inevitable for the Saxon people, unless we want to sign our death sentence. However, this

¹³³ Kőváry, 146-151

¹³⁴ "Legyen ez emlékmű a mi reménységünk, a mi bizodalunk oszlopa. Mint a bibliai lángoszlop vezessen minket az ígéretnék még el nem ért földjére, melylyé akkor váland ez ország, ha minden népe: nyelv- és valláskülönbség nélkül egy szívvel (sic), egy lélekkel, igaz testvéri szeretettel borul le a hazafiság szent oltára előtt. Ilyen oltár vagy te, magasztos oszlop! Állj rendületlenül, uralkodjál e gyönyörű vidéken, hirdesd az ezeréves magyar állam erejét és dicsőségét! És ha szétmállaszt is az idő, mely megszámlálhatatlan évezredek óta morzsolja sziklatalapzatodat, vagy ha ledönt a haragos ég sujtó villáma, avagy ha lerombolnának förtelmes merénynyel apagyilkos kezek ...: az az eszme, a mit te hirdetsz, megdönthetetlenül és s rendületlenül élni fog sziveinkben és biztosítani fogja dicső nemzetünk számára az áldott hazát és e gyönyörűsége vidéket újabb évezredekre." *Brassói Lapok*, 20 October 1896

love of fatherland cannot mean that we Magyarize name of our fathers or forget language of our mothers. ... As we would like to be truthful citizens of the Hungarian state, we shall be prepared to stay and fall with the Hungarian state. We are full with this consciousness, but we will not come to the point in the forecoming second millennium to must have be nationalized in the interest of the Hungarian state.¹³⁵

However, the Hungarian government wanted to do exactly that nationalization which the author of this article thought to be avoidable. Therefore it is not surprising that despite of all the approval by Magyars, in Brassó part of local population heavily protested against the idea of the millennial column. This protest made Brassó unique in this sense, since at the other locations locals accepted the erection of columns (or at least did not protest against it).

The Green Saxons did not want to let the territory of the Zinne hill to the state, but they found themselves in minority to the Black party. Thaly reminded Kronstadt Germans that Hungary had been guaranteed their autonomy, respected their culture and language. He even warned them that Germans and Hungarians must unite against Romanians, since Romanians might assimilate the entire population of Transylvania.¹³⁶ Although Thaly thought that his speech convinced local Saxons, the Green party followers did not accept his argumentation. A meeting of the city

¹³⁵ "Darum sind wir der Meinung, daß die Liebe zum Vaterlande oder zum Staatsganzen auch für das Sachsenvolk eine sittliche Notwendigkeit ist und bleiben muß, wenn wir nicht selber unser Todesurteil unterschreiben wollen. Diese Vaterlandsliebe kann allerdings für uns nicht darin bestehen, daß wir den Namen unserer Väter „magyarisieren“ oder die Sprache unserer Mutter zu vergessen trachten. ... Denn wollen wir wahrhafte Bürger des ungarischen Staates sein, so müssen wir bereit sein, mit dem ungarischen Staate zu *stehen* und zu *fallen*. Sind wir aber von solchen Bewußstein erfüllt, so wird auch im ausbrechenden 2. Jahrtausend die Zeit noch nicht kommen, wo wir Sachsen im Interesse des ungarischen Staates entnationalisiert werden müßten."

Kronstädter Tageblatt, 17 October 1896

¹³⁶ Thaly, 40-41

council in September concerning the question and the costs of the unveiling ceremony developed into a huge scandal, as the Green Saxons did not want to cover the increased expenses of the festivity. As the *Kronstädter Zeitung* argued:

The city could use its money wiser than financing a project which challenges and insults Saxons of the city. ... The further sprawl of chauvinism cannot be supported. Erection of the Árpád-monument in Kronstadt is a nonsense, a historic lie, an intended insult of the ruling German element in Burzenland.¹³⁷

Moreover, they were arguing that Hungarian millennium for them was not to be celebrated, as their ancestors had settled in Kronstadt later than 896, without the assistance of Magyars. As a further matter, they were claiming that the Hungarian government depressed Germans in Transylvania. Finally, they discouraged Germans to partake in "the orgy of Magyar chauvinism." The view of the Green party was shared by several followers of the Black party as well, however, Blacks did not want to confront with the Budapest government and accepted the existence of the millennial column.¹³⁸

As a result, pupils of German high schools did not participate in the ceremony, many Germans decorated their houses with Saxon flags on the day of the festivity and German civil associations had serious quarrels

¹³⁷ "Die Stadt kann doch ihr Geld wahrlich besser brauchen, als zur Förderung eines Unternehmens, das eine Herausforderung und Beleidigung des Sachsentumes dieser Stadt ist. ... Das Weiterwuchern des Chauvinismus können wir nicht unterstützen. Die Errichtung dieses Arpaddenkmals in Kronstadt ist ein Nonsens, eine historische Lüge, eine beabsichtigte Beleidigung des herrschenden deutschen Elements in Burzenland." *Kronstädter Zeitung*, 15 September 1896

¹³⁸ *Pesti Hírlap* 18, 19 September 1896
Pesti Napló 18, 19 September 1896

about the participation.¹³⁹ The already cited novel of Alfred Meschendörfer clearly shows that Germans did not feel the monument as theirs: "The lords in Budapest plan for their millennial festivity to erect an Árpád-monument on the Zinne above the city – »in our city!«"¹⁴⁰

Romanians were even more rejecting. According to the newspapers, Romanians did not take part in the unveiling ceremony at all and they did not decorate their houses with flags, either. Indeed, Romanians were having an Orthodox church feast in the town just during the unveiling festival on Cenk Hill, using the colors of the Romanian flag. This resistance, of course, shocked Hungarian public opinion. Even the moderate *Pesti Hírlap* condemned to the behavior of the Romanians, at the same time praising Transylvanian Armenians for their patriotic attitude.¹⁴¹ The refusal of the millennium was not only expressed in words but by acts as well. Two months before the unveiling ceremony, during the night unknown persons damaged the statue, which was kept inside a mill in the town. The damage itself was not serious, still the act shocked Hungarian media, which was worrying about the future faith of the statue.¹⁴²

A local Romanian, Andrei Popovici introduced the shock of the millennial monument on the opening page of his pamphlet published in 1923, five years after the occupation of Transylvania:

¹³⁹ *Pesti Hírlap*, 17 September 1896, 15 October 1896

¹⁴⁰ "Die Herren Magyaren in Budapest planen zu ihrer Tausendjahrfeier auf die Zinne über die Stadt ein Árpád-Denkmal zu pflanzen – „in unserer Stadt!"" Meschendörfer, 170-171

¹⁴¹ *Pesti Hírlap*, 20 October 1896

¹⁴² *Pesti Hírlap*, 9 August 1896

The face of Braşov changed during only one day, became Magyar, from a peaceful German-Romanian town became a Magyar nest, above which on the top of the Tâmpa the most Mongol figure stood, who never even entered Braşov, a Magyar idol, a Magyar stone symbol.¹⁴³

Popovici's leaflet wanted to demonstrate how advantageous was Romanian rule for Saxons. He accused Magyars of being barbarian, Asiatic, primitive people who always sought deprivation of Saxons and Romanians. Although this clearly chauvinistic-racist work shall not be taken seriously, it clearly shows what a high importance was ascribed to the millennial monument by local non-Magyars (and by Magyars as well, just in the other way).

As it was presented, serious difference emerged in the reception of the same kind of monument between Pozsony and Brassó. The Romanians and the Slovaks were refusing the idea of the Hungarian millennium, the Pressburg Germans accepted it, while the Kronstadt Germans were split into two camps. Thus, the local reception of the millennial monuments tells a lot about the attitude of the local non-Magyar population to the attempts of the Hungarian-Magyar nation-building.

In order to be able to analyze and compare the reception of the millennial columns by non-Magyars, the other five monuments shall be investigated short, too. The region of Pannonhalma and Pusztaszer was

¹⁴³ "Peste noapte Braşovul şi-a schimbat fizionomia, a devenit unguresc şi dintr'o localitate pacinică germano-românească a devenit un cuib unguresc, peste care s'a înălţat sus, pe vârful „Tâmpel", cea mai mongolă figură, care nicicând nu a călcat prin Braşov, „Arpad" în idol unguresc şi simbol de piatră ungurescă."

Andrei Popovici, *Braşovul. Românii şi Şaşii* (Braşov. Romanians and Saxons) (Braşov: Editura Ziarului Carpații, 1923), 1

Popovici is right at the point that Árpád had never been to Braşov. This fact was acknowledged by some contemporary Hungarian scientists as well. János Karácsony, for example, argued in a lecture delivered in 1896, that the Brassó region was conquered as late as 1211. See: János Karácsony, *A honfoglalás és Erdély* (The settlement and Transylvania) (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1896)

Why Popovici calls Braşov a peaceful German-Romanian town, however, is a secret to me.

inhabited purely by Magyar population, therefore they do not need special attention from the point of view of this study. The more do the other three memorials. The Zobor obelisk was a message to Slovaks of Upper Hungary. National newspapers did not report about any Slovak action concerning the Zobor monument, thus, it seems that Slovak national movement was not able to protest against it. The case of Munkács memorial is even clearer: local Rusins cooperated with Hungarian authorities at the organization of the festivities and declared their willingness to assimilate into Magyar nation.¹⁴⁴ The Budapest press 'rewarded' 'patriotic Rusins' by several editorials praising their devotion to Hungary and Magyars and called for economic development of the region in change. It is a significant feature that representatives of the Ukrainian Democratic Party in Lemberg protested against the millennium and Magyarization of Hungarian Rusins, but the Rusins in Hungary entirely accepted the policies of Budapest.¹⁴⁵ The highest conflict was provoked by the Zimony monument. Zimony is in Szerém (Srijem in Croatian, Srem in Serbian, Syrmien in German) County, which belonged to the autonomous Croatia within Hungary. A part of Croatian public protested against the Zemun tower, since they held it as a 'desacralization of the holy land of Croatia.' They rejected to participate in the unveiling ceremony and committed some minor actions like flag-burnings and street demonstrations.¹⁴⁶ The pro-Hungarian stream,

¹⁴⁴ Paul Robert Magocsi, "Rusyn Organizations, Political Parties, and Interest Groups, 1848-1914" in *Of the Making of Nationalities There is No End* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), I. 122-123

¹⁴⁵ Protest from Lemberg: *Pesti Napló*, 19 July 1896, 21 July 1896
On the 'patriotic behaviour' of Hungarian Rusins: *Pesti Napló*, 19 July 1896, 20 July 1896, 21 July 1896, 22 July 1896; *Pesti Hírlap*, 21 July 1896, 23 July 1896

¹⁴⁶ *Pesti Hírlap*, 24 April 1896; *Pesti Napló*, 11 September 1896

however, was willing to cooperate and thus stressed that the place of the monument symbolized the brotherhood between the two nations.¹⁴⁷ Serbian public, both in Hungary and in Serbia, refused the millennium. Serbs of Hungary mostly rejected to participate in the millennial events, although some Serbian communities took part in the festivities 'very patriotically.'¹⁴⁸ The Serbs of Serbia were entirely outraged by the millennium: in Belgrade student rioted and burned Hungarian flags, which led to public scandal in Budapest, too.¹⁴⁹

Thus the millennium emerged as a significant challenge to all ethnic groups in Hungary. The millennial idea was accepted by Rusins and most Germans (and indeed, by Jews, too) while it was rejected by almost the entire Romanian community. Slovaks and Serbs tended to refuse the millennial idea, too, although some of them seemed to be ready to cooperate. This pattern absolutely corresponds to the general willingness of assimilation: Germans, Jews Magyarized traditionally easy and rapidly; the Rusin elite decided to Magyarize entirely. Slovaks stood on the third rank in the assimilation project, while Romanians and Serbs were almost intact of the effects of Magyarization.

Beyond this general pattern, the exact case of Pozsony and Brassó deserves attention, too. In the case of Pressburg the relative lack of Slovak population in the region might be a cause of Hungarian uninterest

¹⁴⁷ *Pesti Napló*, 21 September 1896; *Pesti Hírlap*, 21 September 1896

¹⁴⁸ On refusal of Hungarian Serbs: *Pesti Hírlap*, 26 March 1896, 24 May 1896; *Pesti Napló* 15 September 1896

On cooperation see for instance the festivity of Temesvár (Temeschwar/Timișoara/Temišvar), *Pesti Napló*, 12 May 1896

¹⁴⁹ The exact reason for the riots was that among Hungarian historic flags the flag of medieval Serbia was showed at the millennial parade on 9 May 1896, since in the 15th century Hungarian kings dominated Serbia, too. Serbs perceived this as an attack towards independent Serbia. See: *Pesti Hírlap*, 21 April 1896, 4 May 1896, 7 May 1896

concerning the unveiling ceremony. But how could the Magyar politicians forget the German citizens of Pressburg? Not even a word was addressed to the German population, whereas in the other cases the speakers of the ceremony and the newspapers dealt a lot with the non-Magyar ethnic groups, either condemning them to being potential traitors of the motherland, or praising their 'patriotic attitude'. Considering the fact that Kronstadt Saxons were heavily protesting against the millennial monument in their town, at the first look it is quite surprising that German citizens of Pressburg accepted the idea of millennium.

While an increasing number of Kronstadt Saxons were protesting against Magyar domination, the German citizens of Pressburg seem to accept Hungarian control on national level. Taking into account the closeness of ethnic German territories and the flourishing economic, social, educational and cultural ties between Pressburg and Vienna, it is quite surprising that the German '*Bürgers*' of Pressburg were willing to accept the goals of the Hungarian nation-building and even to assimilate in the long run.¹⁵⁰ According to my assumption, to find the main difference one has to go back into the Middle Ages. The South Transylvanian Saxons received high level autonomy from Hungarian kings and later from Transylvanian princes. The right of home rule was not denied up to the 1870's. This autonomy resulted in a widespread patriotic feeling among Transylvanian Saxons. This early-modern patriotic feeling was converted into a modern, national one in the 1880's and 1890's. At the end of the century it became clear to everybody that the modernizing Hungarian state

¹⁵⁰ Babejova, 50

can no longer tolerate such an early-modern phenomenon like Saxon patriotism and Hungarus-consciousness at the same time. The Saxons had to choose between the two possible nationalisms: German or Magyar. This pressure to change was not as serious in the case of the Pressburg Germans. Due to the lack of regional autonomy, the Pressburgian patriotism was rather linked to the city itself. Therefore the shift to accept modern nationalism was not as sharp as in the case of the Transylvanian Saxons. It cannot be an accident that the Green German party did not achieve any success in Pressburg. Indeed, apart from the Southern Transylvanian Saxons, generally the Germans were the most willing to assimilate into the Hungarian nation. The later someone's ancestors arrived into Hungary, the easier s/he tended to accept Hungarian nationalism.¹⁵¹ And alike, the higher level of autonomy a certain community enjoyed during the Middle Ages and the early modern, the harder it proved to be to find the way into a modern nation.

Another factor caused difference between attitude of Pozsony and Brassó population to millennium was the geographical structure of the ethnic groups. Pressburg used to be an almost pure German settlement up to the middle of the 19th century. The mass immigration to Pressburg began after the abolishing of traditional bourgeois privileges, which meant that immigrants moving into the city were allowed to live according to there preferences. Thus, German, Magyar and Slovak population lived mixed,

¹⁵¹ Several convincing examples can be found at Béla Borsi-Kálmán, *Öt nemzedék és ami előtte következik ... : A temesvári levente-pőr 1919-1920* (Five generations and what come before. The Timișoara criminal case of the 'Levente-guys', 1919-1920) (Budapest: Noran, 2006)

which promoted a higher level of integration.¹⁵² On the contrary, Kronstadt was inhabited by German *Bürgers* living in the middle part of the city and Romanian and Greek inhabitants lacking bourgeois rights, inhabiting outskirts.¹⁵³ Magyars, moving into the city from the middle of the 19th century, tended to prefer a third part of Brassó. This pattern of ethnic division remained up to early 20th century. Thus, ethnic groups were more or less divided from each other which weakened the chance of assimilation.

The war on *lieux* begins: 1896-1918

The local (i. e. Pozsony) Hungarians started to use the monument in the Dévény castle already the day followed the unveiling ceremony. 19 October 1896 1200 high school students made an excursion to Dévény.¹⁵⁴ This excursion reminds one of the journey of students of L'udovit Stúr 60 years before. The monument became part of Hungarian national canon: German travel guides¹⁵⁵, Magyar textbooks for schoolchildren¹⁵⁶ mention it in a positive connotation. A popularizing scientific booklet on Pressburg county opens with the description of the Dévény monument, thus:

¹⁵² Babejová, 272-278

¹⁵³ Miskolczy, *A brassói román*, 52-68

¹⁵⁴ *Pesti Napló*, 20 October 1896

¹⁵⁵ *Illustrierte Führer durch Pozsony (Pressburg) und Umgebung. Mit 52 Abbildungen, Stadtplan, Karten der Umgebung und des Komitates Pozsony in Farbendruck* (Illustrated guide through Bratislava and surrounding. With 52 pictures, map of the city and the surrounding county Bratislava in colored print) (Bratislava: Sigmund Steiners Buchhandlung, n.d.), 125-126.

¹⁵⁶ János Györffy and Arnold Zelliger, *Földrajzi előismeretek. Pozsony vármegye és Pozsony város rövid földrajza* (Geographical preliminary knowledge. A short geography of Bratislava county and Bratislava city) (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1913), 32

The traveler coming by boat from Vienna reaches the Hungarian border at Dévény. One cannot imagine a more elevating view than the steep and great rock at the border which as a prohibition sign made by God's hand draws the traveler's attention that here begins the empire of St. Stephen, whose border shall be respected.¹⁵⁷

This view can be seen as typical. Thus, the whole process is a kind of 'invented *lieu de mémoire*', to unite the well-known concepts of Nora and Eric Hobsbawm. The Dévény monument aimed to exclude Slovaks from the spot, emphasizing the Magyar past and forgetting the Moravian one. For potential assimilationists, the monument served as a reference point where they could identify themselves with the Magyar nation (without a regard, whether they were of Slovak, German or Jewish origin). Up to 1918 this concept seemed to work, since the Dévény monument was not contested by the local non-Magyar population, certainly for the aforementioned reasons: Germans did not want to question the Magyar rule by an attack of the monument, while Slovaks rather preferred the middle region as the focal point of their nation-building.

Not surprisingly, the case of Brassó was significantly different. Of course, Magyars were enthusiastic on the monuments, too. Local Magyars used the monument in the same way as in Pozsony: national marches were organized, national songs and patriotic poems were performed at the

¹⁵⁷ "A Bécs felől hajón érkező utas Dévénynél éri el a magyar határt. Lélekemelőbb látványt elképzelni sem lehet, mint a határszélen azt a meredek és hatalmas sziklát, amely mint istenkéz alkotta tilalomjel figyelmezteti az utast, hogy itt Szent István birodalma kezdődik, amelynek határát tisztelet illeti."

Gyula Déri, *Pozsony és Pozsony vármegye* (Bratislava and Bratislava county) (Uránia Magyar Tudományos Egyesület. Népszerű tudományos felolvasások 67. Bp., Hornyánszky Viktor nyomdája, 1909), 1

statue.¹⁵⁸ The Cenk monument became involved into several kinds of publications, too. A popularizing, semi-scholarly booklet concerning the Brassó region introduces the monument on Cenk Hill that the figure shows the thousand year old glory of Magyar nation to strangers.¹⁵⁹ The well-known writer and fairy tale collector Elek Benedek was astonished by the panorama and the Magyar figure when climbing Cenk Hill:

The eye and spirit cannot have enough from the view. Who desires to leave to another country from here? And who would dare take a fancy to this sweet, by blood sacred territory, since here stands Árpád¹⁶⁰, the monument to the homeland-taker Árpád. The heroic figure of the homeland-taker stands on the top of a great column and it seems to me that he not only conquered this land but keeps guard over it, too. ... I feel my heart to swell and I begin to recite *Szózat* spontaneous: Of your homeland ...¹⁶¹

Romanians (and to a less extent, Germans as well) did not share the same feelings, they were rather outraged by the monument. A German travel guide from 1898 claims the monument was unhistorical, since neither did this territory belong to Hungary for a millennium, nor was the

¹⁵⁸ For instance on the tenth anniversary of the unveiling of the monument. *Brassói Lapok*, 18 October 1906

¹⁵⁹ Lajos Kolumbán, *A Barcaság és népe* (The Braşov region and its people) (Budapest: Lampel (Wodianer F. és Fiai), n. d.), 18

¹⁶⁰ It is remarkable that in both the case of Dévény and Brassó locals hold the figure standing on the statue Árpád, although in the reality it represented a warrior of Árpád's time. Alike, locals of Zimony has claimed that the monument was dedicated to János Hunyadi (Janko Sibinanin), who is said to have died there. The monument, of course, had nothing to do with Hunyadi.

¹⁶¹ "A szem s a lélek nem tud betelni a gyönyörűséggel. Ki kíváncznék innen idegen országba? S ki merne szemet vetni e drága, vérszentelte földre, mikor ihol, itt áll Árpád, a honszerző Árpád szobra! Hatalmas oszlop tetején áll a honszerző daliás alakja s úgy tetszik nekem, hogy nemcsak megszerezte e szép földet, hanem örökös is felette ... Dagadni érzem keblemet s önkéntelen kezdem szavalni a szózatot: Hazádnak ..."

Elek Benedek, *Szent Anna tavától a Cenk-tetőig* (From the St. Anne Lake to the Tâmpa Hill) (Budapest: Franklin, n. d.), 62

Szózat (Appeal) is a national hymn, written by Mihály Vörösmarty.

region encultured by Magyars.¹⁶² Another German travel guide to Transylvania stresses the German character of the city, emphasizing the roles of German civil associations. The millennial monument is mentioned in a short, neutral sentence.¹⁶³

The monument was object of various attacks. In 1901 an unknown person shoot on it, damaging the hat of the statue.¹⁶⁴ In 1913 the monument was damaged by a bomb attack.¹⁶⁵ The monument did not collapse but the bottom became heavily damaged. Magyars of the city were outraged: editorial of *Brassói Lapok* on the next day after the attack claimed that the monument symbolized the nation and the Hungarian state, therefore the attack was a direct challenge to entire Hungary.¹⁶⁶ On the following day pupils of Roman Catholic (i.e. Magyar) elementary and high schools marched to the monument, where a priest prayed, which was followed by recitation of several patriotic poems.¹⁶⁷ By this act the

¹⁶² Joseph Schuller, *Kronstadt. Neuer illustrierter Führer durch die Stadt und ihrer Umgebung* (Braşov. New illustrated guide through the city and surrounding) (Braşov: Heinrich Zeidner, 1898), 92

¹⁶³ Emil Sigerus, *Siebenbürgen. Ein Handbuch für Reisende* (Transylvania. A guide for traveler) (Sibiu: Verlag von W. Krafft, 1903), 155

¹⁶⁴ Bogdan Florin Popovici, Muntele Tampa si simbolurile sale (The Tâmpa Hill and Its Symbols) *Magazin istoric* June 2001 (accessed from www.itcnet.ro/history on 24/05/2007), without page numbers

¹⁶⁵ The Hungarian press blamed for the attack immediately Romanians. (*Brassói Lapok*, October 1 1913) Later it turned out that a certain a Romanian wrestler-boxer from Tulcea (Kingdom of Romania), Cotofan Eliad was responsible for damaging the monument. However, the main role was played by a certain Ilie Catarau, who committed several alike actions in Hungary (for instance in Debrecen). Origin of Catarue is unclear: he claimed to be a Bessarabian, ethnic Romanian student who was persecuted by Russian authorities. *Gazeta Transylvaniei* reported that Catarau had come from Bulgaria and his original name used to be Katarov. *Gazeta* also claimed that Catarau was a Russian spy, indeed, he was a member of the terrorist group Chamber of Archangel Mihail and Gabriel of Kiev. See: Popovici, *Muntele*

Catarau, instigated Eliad to bomb the Braşov monument. (*Brassói Lapok*, 7 March 1914) He certainly had some relations with Romania, but up to this point I was not able to discover the exact nature of this connection. Nevertheless, the local reactions on the attack are much more interesting for the sake of the research than the details of the event.

¹⁶⁶ *Brassói Lapok*, 30 September 1913

¹⁶⁷ *Brassói Lapok*, 3 October 1913

monument became again sacred, since the attack ruined not only the statue itself, but its function as a shrine as well. However, the recanonization of the monument could not prevent the statue: couple of months after the attack a huge storm fell it down and ruined totally. The reaction of Brassó citizens was tendentious, as the following report of the *Brassói Lapok* says:

The monument was visited by curious people during morning and its view provoked different reactions in the visitors, depending on their nationality. Many of them stood there awed by learning the terrible view of ruining, some others could not hide their malicious joy.¹⁶⁸

This article thus acknowledges that despite all efforts, the monument remained only a Magyar symbol, therefore it was not able to fulfill its task.

The afterlife of the millennial statues

Brassó was conquered by Romanian troops for one and half months, in 1916. The Romanian military declared Braşov as part of the Romanian Kingdom forever, liberating their Romanian brothers from "Magyar serfdom." Romanian population was eager to accept the new rule and cooperate with the new power. The new Romanian city administration immediately started to nationalize the city, thus scripts were allowed only

¹⁶⁸ "A szobrot egész délelőtt tömegesen keresték fel a kíváncsiak és annak látása a megtekintőkben, nemzetiségük szerint, vegyes érzelmeket keltett. Többen megilletődve állottak meg a pusztulás e képének láttára, mások nem voltak képesek kárörömüket elrejtteni."
Brassói Lapok, 31 December 1913

in Romanian.¹⁶⁹ According to *Gazeta Transylvaniei*, which emerged as the semi-official daily of the Romanian administration, Romanian soldiers destroyed the bottom of the monument on Tâmpa Hill.¹⁷⁰ After conquering the city for ever, Romanians never erected a new monument on Tâmpa Hill. However, in the fifties, when Braşov was named Oraşul Stalin (Stalin City), pine trees were planted on Tâmpa in a pattern to form the letters of Stalin. So people when looking at the hill from the city center, could read the name of the wise leader of internationalist proletariat. After the death of Stalin, Braşov regained its name, and the pine trees were cut out but some of them are to see even now.¹⁷¹ Now a huge Romanian flag is on the top of the Tâmpa just couple of meters away from the late Hungarian millennium monument.

The faith of Devín was similar to Braşov. Czech troops marched in Pozsony on the first day of 1919. Since then the city, which received its new name Bratislava in 1919, has been part of Czechoslovakia and then of Slovakia. As majority of Bratislava was not Slovak but German and Hungarian, the new capital city was seen as a 'foreign-hearted', cosmopolite city. The nationalization of Bratislava began immediately, which included the change of the city's national space from Magyar to (Czecho)Slovak one.¹⁷² Besides changing street names and setting up new institution, monuments connected with Magyar past were also destroyed. This

¹⁶⁹ Tibolt Schmidt, *Brassó az oláh megszállás idején* (Braşov during the Romanian occupation) (Braşov: Brassói Lapok, 1917), 28-35, 85-88

¹⁷⁰ Popovici, *Muntele*

¹⁷¹ Balázs, 50

¹⁷² L'ubomir Lipták, "Bratislava ald Hauptstadt der Slovakei" (Bratislava as capital of Slovakia) in *Heroen, Mythen, Identitän. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich ed Hannes Stekl and Elena Mannová* (Vienna: Wiener Vorlesungen, 2003), 135-154

destruction wave did not even avoid the statue of Queen Maria Theresa, which used to be the symbol of the city. Despite of the fact that under the reign of Maria Theresa Pressburg flourished, and the Queen herself helped the city a lot, the new authorities did not let her statue remain. The figure of a Hungarian ruler, even if Maria Theresa was an Austrian Habsburg, could not be accepted by the new power. The destruction of this statue was the clearest sign of the Czechoslovak policy: while building a totally new state, trying to get rid of any sign of the past.¹⁷³

If the statue of Queen Maria Theresia could be seen as a 'neutral' one, the millennial monument in Devín had no excuse. It was clearly a Magyar, national memorial representing the 'old', prewar Hungarian state and its borders. The millennial column was an obvious manifestation of Hungarian territorial claim to Czechoslovakia. Devín called the place of "manifestation of the Hun lies."¹⁷⁴ Therefore the Devín monument did not have any chance to survive the change of regime: during the night of 11 January 1921 soldiers of a Czech legion went to Devín, built a scaffold and destroyed the monument by iron bars.¹⁷⁵

The destruction of the Devín Millennium monument caused a huge public scandal among Hungarians living both in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary. The scandal was just strengthened by the fact that the Czech soldiers remained unknown, as the Czechoslovak authorities were not

¹⁷³ Ferenc Olay, "A magyar emlékművek és a magyar művészet sorsa az elszakított területeken" (Faith of Hungarian memorials and Hungarian art in the detached territories), *Budapesti Szemle* no. 628 (1930)

¹⁷⁴ Kílianová, *Ein Grenzmythos*, 66

¹⁷⁵ Miklós Markó, "Magyarország elszakított országrészei műemlékeinek és szobrainak pusztulása" (Destruction of monuments and sculptures of detached parts of Hungary) *Ország-Világ*, 26 February 1922, 99

searching for the delinquents. Marcell Jankovics, the then well-known writer, who lived in Pozsony/Bratislava for decades, was outraged by the destruction of the millennial monument, interpreting in his memoirs the figure of Árpád as the symbol of the West, which was attacked by the barbar Czechs.¹⁷⁶

The Hungarian community in Czechoslovakia bowed to the loss of the Devín monument. In many other cases the Hungarian minority did not accept the destruction of statues, or any kind of Magyar cultural heritage. The loss of Magyar interest in the Dévény millennial monument clearly demonstrates that the attempt of inventing *lieu de mémoire* failed. Two decades proved to be not sufficient to make the trace of Dévény in Magyar hearts and minds. The lack of ethnic Magyar population in Dévény just strengthened the process of forgetting. The new emblematic point between Austria and Hungary became Sopron (Ödenburg), the town which voted in favor of Hungary in the popular vote in 1921.

The destruction of the monuments following WWI was by no means exception, indeed, it fit entirely into (Western) European patterns. Like in the case of Devín and Braşov, French authorities immediately demolished the German statues of Alsace and Lorraine, replacing them by French national monuments, thus (re)nationalize the (re)conquered space.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁶ Marcell Jankovics, *Húsz esztendő Pozsonyban* (Twenty years in Bratislava) (Budapest: Méry Ratio, 2000), 98-99

¹⁷⁷ Annette Maas, "Zeitenwende in Elsaß-Lothringen. Denkmalstürze und Umdeutung der nationalen Erinnerungslandschaft in Metz (November 1918-1922) " (Change of times in Alsace-Lorraine. Destruction of monument and reinterpretation of national space of memory in Metz, November 1918-1922), in *Denkmalsturz. Zur Konfliktgeschichte politischer Symbolik*. ed. Winfried Speitkamp. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

While Magyars forgot Dévény, (Czecho)Slovak authorities wanted to turn it into an *haut lieu* of the Czechslovak nation, therefore Devín was extensively used in the interwar period. At first in July 1927, a procession organized by the Catholic church and laic Slovak groups was held to celebrate the 1100th anniversary of the birth of Cyril. Members of this march decided to repeat this event every two years. In 1936 Slovak students made a memorial excursion to Devín to remember on the same kind of event 100 years ago by L'udovit Štúr and his followers. This action was followed by a meeting of the nationalist gymnastic society Sokol in the same year. Besides, Slovak archaeologists made extensive excavations in the region, claiming that Devín had been the first Slavic settlement in the region. This perception of Devín became widely accepted by the Slovak public,¹⁷⁸ and even some non-Slovak authors emphasized it as well.¹⁷⁹

The process of Slovak nationalization of Devín broke off by the Munich agreement in 1938. As we have seen before, Theben did not play any role in the German nation-building before 1938. However, the German perception changed during the period Theben belonged to (1938-1945). In 1939 a 'borderland meeting' (Grenzlandtreffe) took place there, collecting representatives of German minorities living in the neighboring countries (Hungary, Slovakia, Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia), as well Germans of the Reich. In this very Eastern point they had to represent the unity of German nation.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Kilianova, *Ein Grenzmythos*, 66-68

¹⁷⁹ See for example Emil Portisch, *Geschichte der Stadt Bratislava-Pressburg* (History of city Bratislava-Pressburg) (Bratislava: Commissionsverlag S. Steiner, 1933), Vol. I 17-18.

¹⁸⁰ Kilinova, *Lieux de mémoire*, 160

In 1945 Devín turned back to Czechoslovakia. As the after-war years were the age of increasing friendship with the Soviet Union, Devín was turned into a pan-Slavic *lieu de mémoire*. Couple of weeks after the end of the war in Europe the first Panslavic day was held in Devín, on the day of Cyril and Methodius. The festival was carried out in the name of the 'eternal antifascist coalition of Slavonic nations.' The booklet introducing this event starts with the pictures of Eduard Beneš and Stalin which are followed by reports among other things on the Slavic war against Germans, the Cyril and Methodius tradition among Slavs. The detailed description of the event emphasized the brotherhood among Slav nations.¹⁸¹ Just after the war this perception based on Slavic antifascist merits meant exclusion of Germans and Hungarians, indeed, not only in symbolic sphere: during the following months German population of Czechoslovakia was entirely expelled to Germany, while Magyars were partly made leave to Hungary.

However, the renewed importance of Devín did not last for a while. Since the early 1950's no more festivals were held in Devín. As Devín was situated on the border, it was detached from the country by wire fence and watchtowers. Moreover, the cult of Cyril and Methodius was pushed into background because of the increasing anti-clericalism of the regime. Devín regained some importance during the 1960's when some open feasts were held there again, like the Festival of Czech-Slovak friendship or the Festival of Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship. Some minor event happened in the

¹⁸¹ Rudolf Mrlian, ed., *Slováci v slovenskom svete. (Všeslovanský deň na Devíne)* (Slovaks in the Slovak world. All-Slovak day in Devín) (Bratislava: Vydalo Všeslovanské Sdruženie v Bratislave, 1945)

castle organized by the Bratislava City Museum as well (for instance exhibitions commemorating Great Moravia).¹⁸²

Since the fall of the communism, Devín's importance has grown. In 1989 a group of Slovaks protested in Devín against communism by taking a boat to Hainburg in the Austrian side of the Danube, accompanied by several thousands of Bratislava citizens. This action gave Devín a new meaning, since it symbolized the fall down of the Iron Curtain and thus marking freedom. Since then, Devín has been a popular recreation place, appeared constantly in TV spots and a bank is called after it. Although the current Cyril and Methodius celebrations took place rather in Nitra, Devín "has gradually become a *lieu de mémoire*, which was »occupied« by the Slovak nation."¹⁸³ Descriptions in the Devín castle refer to the place as "our castle", "site of our history."

Nyitra and Munkács also became parts of Czechoslovakia. Like in Devín, the millennial monuments were destroyed in 1921, soon after the takeover of Czechoslovak state. Neither of the spots were used for national purposes by Czechoslovakia. Local Magyars, however, did not forget these places: students of Nitra University have celebrations on the Zobor hill on 15 March, day of the 1848 revolution, while the Munkács fortress serves as an *haut lieu* for the Hungarians living in present-day Ukraine. According to a travel guide published in 1940, Hungarian authorities wanted to reerect the millennial monuments in reconquered Munkács, but lack of time prevented from this action.

¹⁸² Kilianova, *Lieux de mémoire*, 161

¹⁸³ Ibid 162

While the story of Nitra and Mukacheve monuments can be seen as rather typical, the Zemun tower had a unique faith. After 1896 it was used as watch-tower of the local brigade. During WWI Serbian artillery bombed the tower, since they hold the bird on the top of the monuments an Austrian eagle. (In the reality it was a *turul*, symbolic totem of old Magyars). The monuments became damaged but did not collapse. In 1918 the *turul* and the Hungarian scripts were damaged but it was not demolished.¹⁸⁴ On the contrary with their Czechoslovak counterparts, the Yugoslav authorities did not demolish the monument, indeed:

The millennial monument in Zemun shall be considered as our victory trophy from the war. There is no single people which destroys its trophies but keeps it for future generations, builds museums and uses them as part of its own monuments (for instance Siegesäule in Berlin). Thus this monument shall not be destroyed, nor rearranged but maintained. Direction considers that this place should be used as a commemoration on the war.¹⁸⁵

Although governmental care was ordered, authorities did not find the way how to utilize the tower. Since then the tower was used for various functions, such as museum, café, a painter's workshop. However, none of these solutions were sufficient. Right now the tower is empty, locked, the Zemun council plans to restore again and find some cultural function to it.

¹⁸⁴ Kolapis, 355

¹⁸⁵ "Milenijski spomenik u Zemunu imade se smarati našom pobjedničkom trofejom svjetskog rata. Nijedan narod ne uništava svoje trofeje, nego ih čuva za poznija pkoljenja, diže im muzeje i upotrebljava ih kao dijelove svojih spomenika (na pr. t.z.v Siegesäule u Berlinu je pun francuskih topovskih cijevi iz godine 1871). Po tom se taj spomenik ne bi imao ni rušiti ni preudesiti nego održati. Gradjevna oštećenja na njemu bi se imala ukloniti." (12 April 1921)
Archive of Serbia and Montenegro, fond 66, folio 627.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to demonstrate the story of two *lieux de mémoire*: how they were used by various political regimes and by different nations. The two axis of investigation (political and national) allowed me to introduce a compressed history of Central Europe in the last two centuries: the story of Devín and Braşov bear all major problems of the region, such as national conflict, hectic political regimes, extensive need for symbolic legitimation.

Furthermore, comparison of significant events can reveal delicate differences in the social structure of various social and ethnic groups. This paper tried to argue that symbolic politics was able to show sensitively the attitude and mentality of the covered societies. Via reception of important monuments one can measure the views of a certain community on nation-building, assimilation, local patriotism and historical consciousness, thus on modernization and embourgeoisement, keywords of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

In the case of Devín and Braşov the millennial monument entirely fit into this pattern. The actual weakness of the Slovak national movement can be shown by the impotent protest against the millennial idea, while the rapidly Magyarizing Pressburg Germans accepted the Dévény memorial. In the case of Brassó the symbolic challenge of the millennium led to increasing tension between the two streams of local Germans, representing the two possible, nevertheless antagonistic answers given to the demands of Magyarization. The same challenge, which divided Germans so deeply,

united Romanians against the Magyar nationalization. Ordinarily, the Romanian national movement was developing and potential at the end of the century. The millennium shows Magyar perception of the nationality question, too: Hungarian media reacted mainly to the actions of Romanians and tended to omit the Slovaks, as if they were non-existing.

Furthermore, the local reception of the millennial monuments indicates the social-historical background of the two cities. Pressburg, although having an almost pure German population up to the middle of the 19th century, was traditionally a Hungarus-city. The pre-national Hungarian identity was easily transformed into a modern, national Magyar consciousness. On contrary with Pressburg, the autonomy of the Saxon citizens led Transylvanian Germans into another direction, insisting on their traditional, feudal concept of nation. The millennium revealed the demand how to transform this early modern phenomenon into modern nation-building. At the same time, the well-off and high-cultured Romanian bourgeoisie served as a powerful engine of the Romanian nation-building project, thus resisting on Magyarizing attempts.

The Hungarian Millennium columns can be seen therefore as indicator of the willingness of the local population to assimilate into the modern Magyar nation, level

Appendix: Name of locations in relevant languages

Towns are listed according to their Hungarian names.

In present-day Romania			
<i>Hungarian</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>Romanian</i>	<i>Serbian</i>
Brassó	Kronstadt	Braşov	
Cenk	Zinne	Tâmpa	
Kolozsvár	Klaußenburg	Cluj	
Nagyenyed	Straßburg am Mieresch	Aiud	
Nagyszeben	Hermannstadt	Sibiu	
Temesvár	Temeschwar	Timișoara	Temišvar
In present-day Slovakia			
<i>Hungarian</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>Slovak</i>	
Besztercebánya	Neusohl	Banská Bystrica	
Dévény	Theben	Devín	
Nyitra	Neutra	Nitra	
Pozsony	Pressburg	Prešporok (before 1919) Bratislava (after 1919)	
Szepes	Zips	Spiš	
Turócszentmárton	Turz-Sankt Martin	Turčiansky Svätý Martin	
In present-day Serbia			
<i>Hungarian</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>Serb</i>	<i>Croatian</i>
Szerém*	Syrmien	Срем (Srem)	Srijem
Újvidék		Нови Сад (Novi Sad)	
Zimony	Semlin	Земун (Zemun)	Zemun
In present-day Ukraine			
<i>Hungarian</i>	<i>German</i>	<i>Ukrainian</i>	
	Lemberg	Львів (Lviv)	
Munkács	Munkatsch	Мукачеве (Mukacheve)	

* Divided between Serbia and Croatia

Bibliography

Primary sources

Archive

Archive of Serbia and Montenegro

Press

Brassói Lapok
Egyetértés
Kronstädter Tagblatt
Kronstädter Zeitung
Magyar Állam
Narodnie Noviny
Nyugatmagyarországi Híradó
Pesti Hírlap
Pesti Napló
Preßburger Tagblatt
Preßburger Zeitung
Vasárnapi Újság

Internet

Laws of Hungary: www.1000ev.hu

Articles and books

Ady, Endre. *Összes versei* (Oeuvre). Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1965.

Andersen, Hans Christian. *Mesék és történetek felnőtteknek* (Fairy tales and stories for adults). Budapest: Polar, 2005.

Benedek, Elek. *Szent Anna tavától a Cenk-tetőig* (From the St Anne lake to the Tãmpa hill). Budapest: Franklin, n. d.

Déri, Gyula: *Pozsony és Pozsony vármegye* (Bratislava and Bratislava county). *Uránia Magyar Tudományos Egyesület. Népszerű tudományos felolvasások* 67. Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor nyomdája, 1909.

Filtsch, Josef W. *Die Stadt Kronstadt und deren Umgebung. Ein Führer für Einheimische und Fremde* (The city Braşov and its surrounding. A guide for locals and strangers). Vienna: Verlag von Carl Graeser, 1886.

Führer für Kronstadt und Umgebung (A guide to Braşov and surrounding). Braşov: Johann Gott & Sohn Heinrich, 1874.

- Gross-Hoffinger, A. J. *Die Donau vom Ursprung bis in das schwarze Meer. Ein Handbuch für Donaureisende von Ulm, Linz, Wien, Pesth, Galatz über das schwarze Meer nach Constantinopel* (The Danube from source to the Black Sea. A handbook to travellers on the Danube of Ulm, Linz, Wien, [Buda]Pest, Galat through the Black Sea to Constantinople). Wroclaw: Verlag von Eduard Trewendt, 1846.
- Győrffy, János – Zelliger, Arnold. *Földrajzi előismeretek. Pozsony vármegye és Pozsony város rövid földrajza* (Geographical preliminary knowledge. A short geography of Bratislava county and Bratislava city). Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1913.
- Haksch, Alexander F. *Illustrierter (sic) Führer durch Pressburg und seine Umgebungen* (Illustrated guide through Bratislava and surrounding). Vienna – Bratislava: Commissions-Verlag von C. Stampel, 1884.
- Illustrierte Führer durch Pozsony (Pressburg) und Umgebung. Mit 52 Abbildungen, Stadtplan, Karten der Umgebung und des Komitates Pozsony in Farbendruck* (Illustrated guide through Bratislava and surrounding. With 52 pictures, map of the city and the surrounding county Bratislava in colored print). Bratislava: Sigmund Steiners Buchhandlung. n.d.
- Imendörffer, A. – Gerlai, W. – Sziklay, J. *Nach und durch Ungarn. Von Wien nach Budapest* (To and through Hungary. From Vienna to Budapest). Zürich: Orell Füssli & Co., n. d.
- Ipolyi Arnold. *Fehér-hegységi útiképek* (Travel pictures from the White Mountains). Bratislava: Madách-Posonium, 2004.
- Jankovics, Marcell. *Húsz esztendő Pozsonyban* (Twenty years in Bratislava). Budapest: Méry Ratio, 2000.
- Karácsony, János. *A honfoglalás és Erdély* (The settlement and Transylvania). Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 1896.
- Kemény, G. Gábor, ed. *Iratok a nemzetiségi kérdés történetéhez Magyarországon a dualizmus korában* (Documents of the nationality question in Hungary during the dualist era). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1952-1985. I-VI.
- Kőváry, László. *A Millenium lefolyásának története és a millenárius emlékkalkotások* (The history of the millennium and the millennial memorials). Budapest: Athenäum. 1897.
- Krickel, Adalbert Josphe. *Wanderung von Wien über Pressburg und Tyrnau in die Bergstädte Schemnitz, Kremnitz und Neusohl, und von da in die Turoß und das Waagthal* (Wanderings from Vienna through Trnava to

the hill towns Banská Štavnica, Kremnica, Banská Bystrica and from there to Turoc and to the valley of Vah). Vienna: M. Ehr Adolph, 1831.

Kollár, Ján: *Dielo*, ed. Cyril Kraus. Bratislava: Slovensky Tatran, 2001.

Losonczy Tóth, Árpád – Izsák, Sámuel (eds). *Magyar utazók a Duna-tájon. Tanárky Gedeon és Fenichel Sámuel útleírásai* (Hungarian travellers in the Danube region. The travel descriptions of Gedeon Tanárky and Sámuel Fenichel). Budapest: Lucidus, 2006.

Miklós Markó, "Magyarország elszakított országrészei műemlékeinek és szobrainak pusztulása" (Destruction of monuments and sculptures of detached parts of Hungary) *Ország-Világ*, 26 February 1922

Méhely, Lajos. *Brassóvármegyei turista-kalauz* (Tourist guide for Braşov county). Cluj: Erdélyrészi Kárpát-Egyesület, 1895.

Meschendorfer, Adolf: *Die Stadt im Osten* (The city in the East). Munich: Albert Langen, 1934.

Mrlan, Rudolf ed. *Slováci v slovenskom svete. (Všeslovanský deň na Devíne)* (Slovaks in the Slovak world. All-Slovak day in Devín) Bratislava: Vydalo Všeslovanské Sdruženie v Bratislave, 1945.

Mysz, Edward. *Touren-Weiser für Ausflüge in die Berge und Gebirge der Umgebung von Kronstadt* (Tour advisor for excursions in the hills surrounding Braşov). Braşov: Verlag von Adolf Albrecht, 1890.

Paget, John. *Hungary and Transylvania; with Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political and Economical*. Vol I-II. New York: Arno Press – The New York Times, 1971.

Pernold, Adolf Emmanuel. *Magyarország' Távcso-földképe. Első Osztály magában foglalván Pozsonyt a' környékeivel* (Hungary's telescope picture. First class, Bratislava and surrounding included). Vienna: by the author, 1839.

Phillipi, Friedrich. *Aus Kronstadt's Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (From Braşov's past and present). Kronstadt, 1874.

Popovici, Andrei. *Braşovul. Români şi Şaşi* (Braşov. Romanians and Saxons). Braşov: Editura Ziaruli Carpaţilor, 1923.

Portisch, Emil. *Geschichte der Stadt Bratislava-Pressburg* (History of city Bratislava-Pressburg) Bratislava: Commissionsverlag S. Steiner, 1933.

- Schmidt, Tibolt. *Brassó az oláh megszállás idején* (Braşov during the Romanian occupation) Braşov: Brassói Lapok, 1917.
- Schuller, Joseph. *Kronstadt. Neuer illustrierter Führer durch die Stadt und ihrer Umgebung.* (Braşov. New illustrated guide through the city and surrounding). Braşov: Heinrich Zeidner, 1898.
- Sigerus, Emil. *Siebenbürgen. Ein Handbuch für Reisende* (Transylvania. A guide for traveler). Sibiu: Verlag von W. Krafft, 1903.
- Tardy, Lajos (ed). *Orosz és ukrán utazók a régi Magyarországon* (Russian and Ukrainian travellers in old Hungary). Budapest: Gondolat, 1988.
- Thaly Kálmán: *Az ezredévi országos hét emlékoszlop története* (The history of the millennial seven national monuments). Bratislava: Wigand F. K., 1898.
- Zsigárdy, Gyula. *Beszéd, melyet Zsigárdy Gyula a devényi millenáris szobor leleplezésénél mondott* (Speech delivered by Gyula Zsigárdy at the unveiling ceremony of the Devín millennium monument). Galanta: Első Galánthai Könyvnyomda, 1896.
- Zsigárdy, Julius. *Reč, ktorú držal Julius Zsigárdy pri odhalení tisícročného pomníka devínského* (Speech delivered by Julius Zsigárdy at the unveiling ceremony of the Devín millennium monument). Trnava: Tlačou Žigmunda Wintera, 1896.

Secondary sources

- Ábrahám, Barna. *Az erdélyi románság polgárosodása a 19. század második felében* (The process of embourgeoisment among Romanians of Transylvania in the 2nd half of the 19th century). Miercuera Ciuc: Pro Print, 2004.
- Babejova, Eleonora. *Fin-de-siècle Pressburg: conflict and & coexistence in Bratislava 1897-1914.* Boulder: Eastern European Monographs, 2003.
- Balázs, János and Dobolyi, István. *A hajdani Brassó/Braşovul de odinioară* (The old Braşov). Braşov: C2design, 2004.
- Tom Barcsay. "The 1896 Millennial Festivities in Hungary: An Exercise in Patriotic and Dynastic Propaganda", in Karin Friedrich ed. *Festive Culture in Germany and Europe from the sixteenth to the twentieth century.* Lewiston: The Edwin Mellon Press, 2000.

- Belgum, Kirsten: Displaying the Nation: A View of Nineteenth-Century Monuments through a Popular Magazine. *Central European History* no. 4. (1993): 457-474.
- Bertényi, Iván Jr. Kérlelhetetlenül. Báró Bánffy Dezső nemzetiségi politikája (Implacable. Baron Dezső Bánffy's policy on nationalities). *Pro Minoritate* Spring (2003): 69-104.
- Boia, Lucian. *History and myth in Romanian consciousness*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2001.
- Boockmann, Hartmut. Denkmäler und ihre Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbewußstein (Monuments and their meaning to historical consiousness). Offprint from O. Hauser, ed. *Geschichte und Geschichtsbewußstein*. Göttingen – Zürich: 1981.
- Borsi-Kálmán, Béla. *Öt nemzedék és ami előtte következik... : a temesvári Levente-pör 1919-1920* (Five generations and what comes before. The Timișoara criminal case of the 'Levente-guys' 1919-1920). Budapest, Noran, 2006.
- Egry, Gábor. "Erdély gazdasági meghódítása – Az erdélyi szászok jövőképe a 20. század elején" (The economic conquere of Transylvania. The concept on future of Transylvanian Saxons at the beginnig of the 20th century), In *A Kárpát-medence népeinek együttélése a 19-20. században*, ed. Gábor Egry and István Feitl. Budapest: Napvilág, 2005.
- Eliade, Mircea: *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959.
- Gergely András, ed. *Magyarország története a 19. században* (History of Hungary in the 19th century). Budapest: Osiris, 2003
- Gerő, András. *Imagined history. Chapters from Nineteenth- and Twentieth Century Hungarian Symbolic Politics*. Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 2006.
- _____. *Modern Hungarian Society in the Making. The Unfinished Experience*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995.
- Glettler, Monika. "The Slovaks in Budapest and Bratislava, 1850-1914," in *Ethnic Identity in Urban Europe. Comparative Studies on Governments and Non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940*, ed. Max Engman. Hants: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1992.
- Gottas, Friedrich. "Die Deutsche in Ungarn" (The Germans in Hungary). In: *Die Habsburgermonarchie*, ed. Peter Urbanitsch and Adam

Wandruszka. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980.

Göllner, Carl (ed.) *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in den Jahren 1848-1918*. Vienna-Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1988. [The Saxons of Transylvania in the years 1848-1918]

Gündisch, Konrad. *Siebenbürgen und die siebenbürger Sachsen* (Transylvania and the Transylvanian Saxons). Munich: Langen Müller, 1998.

Hartog, François. *Régimes d'historicité : présentisme et expériences du temps* (Regime of historicism: presentism and experiment of time). Paris: Seuil, 2003.

Hunyadi, Attila. "Economic nationalism in Transylvania," *Regio* (English version) 2004: 172-193.

Katus, László. "A népesedés és a társadalmi szerkezet változásai" (Change of demographical and social structure). in *Magyarország története* Ed Hanák, Péter. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987. Vol 6/2

Kiliánová, Gabriela. "Ein Grenzmythos: Die Burg Devín" (A border myth: The castle of Devín). In: *Heroen, Mythen, Identitäten. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich*. ed. Hannes Stekl and Elena Mannová. Vienna: Wiener Vorlesungen - Konversatorien und Studien, 2003.

_____. Lieux de mémoire and collective identities in Central Europe. The case of Devín/Theben/Dévény castle. *Human Affairs. A Postdisciplinary Journal for Humanities & Social Sciences* no. 12 (2002): 153-165.

Koshar, Rudy. *From Monuments to Traces. Artifacts of German Memory, 1870-1990*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Kolapis, Zoltán. "Százéves a zimonyi emlékmű" (The Zemun monument is hundred years old). In: *A honfoglalás 1100 éve és a Vajdaság. Egy tudományos tanácskozás anyaga*. Novi Sad: Forum, 1997.

Kutschera, Rolf. "Kronstadt während der Regierungszeit der Habsburger (1688-1918)" (Braşov during the reign of Habsburgs 1688-1918). In: *Kronstadt. Eine siebenbürgische Stadtgeschichte*, ed. Harald Roth. Munich: Universitas, 1999.

Lerner, Adam J. "The Nineteenth-Century Monument and the Embodiment of National Time," In *Reimagining the Nation*, ed. Marjorie Ringrose and Adam J. Lerner. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1993. 176-196.

Lipták, L'ubomir. "Bratislava ald Hauptstadt der Slowakei" (Bratislava as capital of Slovakia) in *Heroen, Mythen, Identitän. Die Slowakei und Österreich im Vergleich* ed Hannes Stekl and Elena Mannová. Vienna: Wiener Vorlesungen, 2003.

_____. "Helycserék a piedesztálokon" (Change of place on pedestals). In: *Száz évnél hosszabb évszázad*. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2000.

Maas, Anette. "Zeitenwende in Elsaß-Lothringen. Denkmalstürze und Umdeutung der nationalen Erinnerungslandschaft in Metz (November 1918-1922)" (Change of times in Alsace-Lorraine. Destruction of monument and reinterpretation of national space of memory in Metz, November 1918-1922). in *Denkmalsturz. Zur Konfliktgeschichte politischer Symbolik*. ed. Winfried Speitkamp. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

Magocsi, Paul Robert. "Rusyn Organizations, Political Parties, and Interest Groups, 1848-1914" in *Of the Making of Nationalities There is No End*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Menkovic, Biljana. *Politische Gedenkkultur. Denkmäler – die Visualisierung politischer Macht im öffentlichen Raum* (Political memory culture. Monuments – the visulization of political power in public space). Vienna: Braumüller, 1999.

Miskolczy, Ambrus. *A brassói román levantei kereskedőpolgárság kelet-nyugati közvetítő szerepe (1780-1860)* (The East-West transit role of the Braşovian Romanian Levantine merchant bourgeoisie, 1780-1860). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987.

_____. "Erdély a forradalomban és szabadságharcban (1848-1849)" (Transylvania during the revolution and War of Independence, 1848-1849), In: *Erdély története*, ed. Béla Köpeczi. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1986.

Mosse, George L. *The Nationalization of the Masses. Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Nagy, Ildikó. "A műfajok hierarchiája a historizmus szobrászatában" (Hierarchy of genres in the sculpture of historism), In *A historizmus művészete Magyarországon. Művészettörténeti tanulmányok*, ed. Anna Zádor. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Művészettörténeti Kutató Intézet, 1993.

Nipperdey, Thomas. "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert" (National idea and national monument in Germany in the 19th century), *Historische Zeitschrift* 206, no. 3. (1968): 529-585.

Nora, Pierre (ed.) *Realms of Memory. Rethinking the French Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996-1998.

Nora, Pierre. *Between Memory and History: Les Liux de Mémoire. Representations* Spring (1989): 7-24.

Nyárády, R. Károly. *Erdély népesedéstörténete* (Demographical history of Transylvania), ed. E. Árpád Varga. Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Levéltára, 2003.

Olay, Ferenc. "A magyar emlékművek és a magyar művészet sorsa az elszakított területeken" (Faith of Hungarian memorials and Hungarian art in the detached territories), *Budapesti Szemle* no. 628 (1930): 348-385.

Popovici, Bogdan Florin. *Muntele Tampa si simbolurile sale* (The Tâmpa Hill and Its Symbols) *Magazin istoric* June 2001 (accessed from www.itcnet.ro/history on 24/05/2007)

Polányi, Imre. *A szlovák társadalom és polgári nemzeti mozgalom a századfordulón (1895-1905)* (The Slovak society and the bourgeois national movement at the turn of century). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1987.

Puttkammer, Joachim von. *Schulalltag und nationale Integration in Ungarn. Slowaken, Rumänen und Siebenbürger Sachsen in der Auseinandersetzung mit der ungarischen Staatsidee 1867-1914* (Everyday schooling and national integration in Hungary. Slovaks, Romanians and Transylvanian Saxons in the conflict with the Hungarian idea of state, 1867-1914). Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2003.

Rózsa, Mária. "Pozsony a német nyelvű helyi sajtóban (1850-1920)" (Bratislava in the German local press, 1850-1920), in *Fejezetek Pozsony történetéből magyar és szlovák szemmel*, ed. Gábor Czoch. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2005.

R. Várkonyi, Ágnes. *Thaly Kálmán és történetírása* (Kálmán Thaly and his history-writing). Budapest: Akadémiai, 1961.

Sinkó, Katalin. "Árpád kontra Szent István" (Árpád versus St. Stephen), *Janus* VI/1: 42-52.

_____. "Ezredévi ünnepeink és a történeti ikonográfia" (Our thousand-year festivities and historic iconography), *Művészettörténeti Értesítő* no. 1-2. (2000): 1-19.

_____. "A millenniumi emlékmű mint kultuszhely" (The millennium monument as a shrine), *Medvetánc* no. 2. (1987): 29-50.

Speitkamp, Winfried. "Denkmalsturz und Symbolkonflikt in der modernen Geschichte. Eine Einleitung" (Ruin of monuments and symbolic conflict in modern history. An introduction), in *Denkmalsturz. Zur Konfliktgeschichte politischer Symbolik*. ed. Winfried Speitkamp, 5-21. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

Szarka, László. *Szlovák nemzeti fejlődés - magyar nemzetiségi politika, 1867-1918*. (Slovak national development – Hungarian policy on nationalities 1867-1918) Bratislava: Kalligram, 1995.

Tacke, Charlotte. *Denkmal im sozialen Raum. Nationale Symbole in Deutschland und Frankreich in 19. Jahrhundert*. (Monument in social space. National symbols in Germany and France in the 19th century) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Vesztróczy, Zsolt. "Pozsony, mint a reformkori szlovák politikai élet központja" (Bratislava, as the center of the Slovak political life in the Reform Age), In *Fejezetek Pozsony történetéből magyar és szlovák szemmel*, ed. Gábor Czoch. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2005.

Volkmer, Gerald. *Die Siebenbürgische Frage 1878-1890. Der Einfluss der rumänischen Nationalbewegung auf die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich-Ungarn und Rumänien*. (The Transylvanian question. Influence of Romanian national movement on the diplomatic relations of Austria-Hungary and Romania). Cologne: Böhlau, 2004.

Woldieter Bihl, Die Juden (The Jews). In: *Die Habsburgermonarchie*, ed. Peter Urbanitsch and Adam Wandruszka. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980.