SCIENCE, TRANSLATION AND THE PUBLIC: THE HUNGARIAN RECEPTION OF DARWINISM, 1858-1875

Katalin Straner

A DISSERTATION

in

History

Presented to the Faculties of the Central European University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Budapest, Hungary
2012

Supervisor of Dissertation: Karl Hall

I hereby declare that this dissertation contains no materials accepted for any other degrees in any other institutions and no materials previously written and/or published by another person unless otherwise noted.

Abstract

This study draws attention to the role of translation in the early reception of Darwinism in Hungary. Understanding translation as a form of cultural encounter, it examines the reception of Darwinism in the context of the transforming public sphere from the early reception of evolutionary ideas in the 1850s until the publication of the Hungarian translation of *Origin of Species* in 1873. The involvement of the scientific community in informing and educating the public about the latest developments in the natural sciences is shown to be part of a patriotic agenda. By the late 1860s, the translation and adaptation of foreign scientific works became part of an emerging discourse of national progress fostered by the liberal political atmosphere following the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. When József Somody's translation of *Vestiges of Creation* was published in 1858, Hungarian scientific life was held back by the practical consequences of political repression. Jácint Rónay's attempts to transfer the latest developments in the natural sciences from London to Pest in the early 1860s were not only hindered by circumstances and distance, but the attention of the public and the scientific community alike was too much caught up in the events leading up to the Compromise and the institutional reorganization of scientific life. By the early 1870s, however, members of the Academy and the scientific societies were finally in a position to capitalize on the critical point when the consequences of the Compromise permitted a new, open engagement with the natural sciences and their social and political implications. As Darwinism gradually entered not only scientific but also public discourse, the Darwinian concepts of progress and development became part of the rhetorical apparatus of social and political reform agendas in late nineteenth century Hungary.

Acknowledgements

I do not think I could have managed to finish – or even start – this dissertation without a lot of help. First of all, I thank my supervisor, Karl Hall, for all the support and encouragement ever since I first mentioned a vague of idea of writing something on the reception of Darwinism in Hungary. The fact that this has resulted in a dissertation is in great part due to his constant feedback, advice and seemingly infinite patience. That his support often materialized through books and coffee was only icing on an already very nice cake.

During the years of research I have received much appreciated financial support from the Central European University in the form of a scholarship, research and conference grants, and finally, a dissertation write-up grant. My work would not have been possible without the institutional support provided by CEU and especially the History Department. I was also fortunate to receive a Marie Curie European Doctorate fellowship to University College London in 2008-2009.

Parts or earlier versions of this text were read by László Kontler, Susan Zimmermann and the participants of the doctoral seminar in February 2010. I am very grateful for their comments, and also for the suggestions I have received at conferences and workshops where I presented my research.

I especially thank Gábor Kármán, who has not only read most of what I have ever written on this subject, but was willing to listen and advise any time I wanted to talk about my research.

My thanks go to all who supported my work in various ways, including Guy Beiner, Janet Browne, Paolo Coccia, Thomas Glick, József Hudi, Axel Körner, Matthias Riedl, Daniel Schümann, Marsha Siefert, Szabolcs Somorjai, Emma Spary, Jan Surman, István Tóth-Barbalics, Balázs Trencsényi, Paul White, and many others, including the staff of the libraries and archives I visited. I especially thank Nadia Al-Bagdadi for her kind friendship, and for never complaining that her assistant wrote term papers in the office. Mónika Nagy was kind enough to share her working space with me in the last two years, and I am very grateful to her and to everyone at Pasts, Inc. Center for Historical Studies for the opportunity. I am also grateful to my brother Pali's anonymous colleague at the Institute of Chemistry at ELTE for the kind loan of a laptop in the last stage of writing.

I am grateful to all my friends, old and new, for being around and expressing an interest in my work. Éva Király and Ágnes Kakasi have been a constant source of support for well over a decade, even when I occasionally disappeared. The triumvirate of Jana Bacevic, Zsófia Lóránd and Maria Falina helped me survive the last year and were wonderful in general. This dissertation would not be the same without Markian Prokopovych – thank you for being "a wonderful listener" and occasional optimist, and also for the last-minute editing.

Finally, I am very grateful to have had the support of my family. Many thanks to Pali, Zsuzsi and Misi for their help, hospitality and making me company. My parents have tried to do everything in their power to support me even though I am not quite sure they ever understood why I wanted yet another degree, but I am all the more thankful. I hope they will like the result.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In his eulogy of Charles Darwin, who had been elected an honorary member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1872, Tivadar Margó told fellow members of the Academy that *Origin of Species* had been published in translation at the most appropriate time in Hungary, that is, after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867.[1] Margó, a respected professor of zoology at the University of Budapest who had been involved in the Hungarian publications of both *Origin of Species* and *Descent of Man*, reasoned that with the coincidence of two such critical cultural moments, the natural sciences could have an active role in recomposing and establishing the prospects for Hungarian social progress. While Margó's formulation might sound confused to a twenty-first century reader, it does capture an important development that lies at the heart of this dissertation. The Compromise was as much a landmark in modern Hungarian history as *Origin* was for modern science, and the 1850s and 1860s were significant for a number of developments not only in politics and culture, but also in science, especially in a sense of scientific theory and discovery related to fundamental nineteenth-century ideas of nation and progress.

What follows is a series of linked case studies of early evolutionary narratives published in the Hungarian language between 1858 and 1873, presented against the changing discourse of the historical period following the fall of the Hungarian Revolution and War of Independence in 1849, through the years of Neoabsolutism marked with political repression and censorship, leading up to the political consolidation of the mid-

[1] Tivadar Margó, *Emlékbeszéd Charles Robert Darwin, a M. T. Akadémia k. Tagja felett* [Obituary for Charles Robert Darwin, external member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences] (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1884), 47-49. All translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.

1870s that followed the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. Through the analysis of three main evolutionary texts, very different in character due to the historical circumstances and to the agendas of their creators, the focus of my attention is directed toward the early stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary: from the publication of *Vestiges of Creation* in 1858 to Jácint Rónay's work on *The Formation of Species* in the early 1860s, and ending with László Dapsy's translation of *Origin of Species* in 1873. The dissertation examines the reception of scientific ideas in the contextual space of the interaction of the scientific community and public life. Each text was published in a different stage of the early Hungarian reception of evolutionary thought, strongly interlinked with the political and social circumstances of the period, which permitted very different ranges of reception by the public. The case studies are linked not only by the evolutionary theme and the discourses of progress and development they each touched upon, but also by the evolution of the scientific discussions and the public discourse of Darwinism. As this dissertation aims to show, the scientific and popular reception of Darwinism was inextricably related by men of letters, public intellectuals acting as agents of translation, scientific discussion, and the public dissemination of Darwin's work in Hungary.

Through examination of different translation practices and examples of the cultural relocation process, my aim is to explore the process of transplantation of Darwinism to Hungarian soil. Through in-depth treatment of some the "great texts" of nineteenth-century evolutionary thinking, I will address the wider question of how the role and modes of translation, the agendas of the translator, the scientific community and other agents of reception, and the local context, such as the political and social circumstances, affected the dissemination of Darwinism in Hungary. By engaging with the relevance and consequences of this transplantation and the transformations of the

evolutionary discourse in the first fifteen years of Hungarian Darwinism, this work makes a contribution not only to the reevaluation of the role of Darwinism in the emergence of Hungarian national discourse of progress in the nineteenth century, but also to the recent efforts to reevaluate the nature of national receptions of Darwinism in an age when the interdisciplinary (re)interpretations of Darwinism have an increasing relevance to the study of history as well.

Contexts of Darwinism in the Nineteenth Century

The historical study of Darwinism and related forms of evolutionary thinking has become an increasingly diverse "industry" offering countless opportunities from a wide range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary endeavors.[2] In the more than two centuries since the publication of *Origin of Species*, not only has Darwin as a scientific and historical figure been constantly reevaluated, but the term "Darwinism" has gained newer and newer meanings and associated contexts. Since "Darwinism" is one of the central themes of this dissertation, it is important to briefly delineate in what conceptual sense the term will be approached throughout the text, even if it changes and acquires new meanings continuously during the fifteen years that the dissertation covers.

Today, Darwinism is a term that is used in a wide context, for an extensive range of concepts related to the theory of evolution and the transmutation of species; many of these ideas, however, have no direct link to Charles Darwin or his work, and thus the

[2] Peter C. Kjærgaard gives a good impression of this tendency in his 2010 article on what he calls the "Darwin Enterprise," his study being a criticism, reevaluation and organic part of the enterprise at the same time. Peter C. Kjærgaard, "The Darwin Enterprise: From Scientific Icon To Global Product," *History Of Science* 48, no. 1 (March 2010): 105-122.

meaning of the term "Darwinism" relies on the context in which it is used. Already in the nineteenth-century context, "Darwinism" az an expression came to be associated with an extensive array of (r)evolutionary ideas about science and society, the term itself was introduced by Thomas Henry Huxley in 1860, and throughout the rest of the nineteenth century, Darwinism in the narrow sense referred to the idea of evolution based on Darwin's idea of natural selection. The ideas had international influence – for instance, Ernst Haeckel is considered a central figure of German *Darwinismus*, although, just as in the case of Herbert Spencer's "social Darwinism," Haeckel's *Darwinismus* was based on an interpretation of, but not the actual theory of Charles Darwin. Thus the term Darwinism was used alike by opponents and proponents of Darwin's biological theory to mean whatever they wished it to mean in a larger context, and this tendency has continued to the present time.

This is especially relevant in the light of the fact that, in terms of modern evolutionary theory, Darwinism is often used in reference to nineteenth century ideas of evolution. While the focus of this dissertation is on the fifteen years following the publication of *Origin of Species*, and while the discussion around Darwin and *Origin* is a crucial concluding chapter, related works and ideas by his predecessors and contemporaries – and their influence on Darwin and Darwinism – in the period are also given their due. Thus, Darwinism in its earliest stage, in Hungary and in a wider context, is as much of an umbrella term, covering a wide range of ideas, approaches and disciplines, as it is today. The idea of natural selection according to Darwin was the scientific theory proposed by *Origin of Species* that served as an inspiration to a broad range of interpretations in the nineteenth century.

Upon its publication in 1859, *Origin of Species* arrived in a changing world. Victorian Britain was undergoing crucial intellectual and social transformations, and Darwin's book was a result, but to a much larger extent an agent and symbol of the transformations that changed how people understood themselves and the world around them. The "Darwinian revolution" provided a new explanation for life – or rather, it relied on ideas and themes already present, and by creating one comprehensive narrative in a critical moment, it initiated a discussion that intertwined the various intellectual, socio-political and religious concerns of a wide and diverse audience. Natural selection, Darwin's explanation of the origin of life and the idea that living organisms evolve gradually questioned the fundamental structures and beliefs of Victorian society, at a time when the nation was undergoing rapid industrial development and technological progress. Their world was changing, and when Darwin published his book, it became an intellectual hub that not only formulated the ideas according to which the world would transform, but did it in a way that it was accessible to everyone, with few social or disciplinary restrictions. *Origin of Species*, despite its author's much more modest ambitions, became part of the Darwinian revolution and of the story of how modernity came to be.[3]

In Hungary, as everywhere else, reactions to Darwinism brought into relief philosophical considerations and ignited political debates; speaking for or against Darwin and his theories became a political program in itself. Hungary, too, was undergoing

[3] On the Darwinian revolution, see Michael Ruse, *The Darwinian Revolution: Science Red in Tooth and Claw*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979). On evolutionary theory in Western thought, see, for instance, Greene, John C. *The Death of Adam: Evolution and its Impact on Western Thought*, revised edition, (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1996).

fundamental transformation at this time, even if that transformation differed significantly from what was going on in the British Isles. After the modernization efforts by select Hungarian aristocrats in the early nineteenth century, the intellectual breakthrough that the 1848 revolution brought to Central Europe, and the Darwinian revolution became part of the context of development that came to fundamentally question the old ways of historic Hungary, together with processes such as industrialization, urbanization, railway construction, and the internationalization of academic and cultural networks. Inquiry into the intellectual and social implications of the early reception of Darwinism thus also touch upon the question of the disparity between the levels of Western European and local Hungarian social and intellectual progress in the nineteenth century. A deeper engagement with the circumstances in which the early written narratives of Hungarian evolutionary thinking were created can also provide the background where Darwin's evolutionary theory became an attractive source to the nationalist discourse emerging towards the end of the nineteenth century.

From Scientific Translation to Public Reception

Origin was widely read and discussed in continental Europe and beyond before its translation to other languages even began; moreover, the delay in translation did not limit these discussions but rather enriched them. In many cases, just as *Origin* relied on earlier theories of evolution and discussions of geology or morphology that Darwin had studied and incorporated into his work, the translations of *Origin* were published for and read by audiences who had – to various extents – been aware of or familiar with not only these predecessor theories, but had their own debates and discussions in their own language

about them. Furthermore, they also had the time and occasion to discuss and debate *Origin* well before it appeared in translation in their own language.

The reception of Darwin's ideas as laid down in *Origin* is a complex and multi-layered process. Just as in Victorian Britain "the writing and controversial reception of […] *Origin* were never set apart in some cold esoteric world of science,"[4] so were the translations and the international reception of Darwinism not limited to a restricted audience. The way scientific ideas, such as the ones laid down by Darwin and other Victorian evolutionary thinkers, behaved in the Hungarian context of the second half of the nineteenth century in translation and transformation can shed light on new aspects of reception studies. In other words, can we identify what Gillian Beer has called "transformations that occur when ideas change creative context and encounter fresh readers" in the Hungarian context?[5]

In order to research the origins of Hungarian Darwinism, it is necessary to first determine the sources of Hungarian evolutionary thinking, which include the identification of the channels through which evolutionism entered Hungary from abroad. For the reception of a theory in a national context, which is quite different from its original setting, it is quite important to trace back the original form and location of the theory that enters the new context. As we will see, it makes a difference in the creation of the content and language of Hungarian Darwinism whether Darwin's original text was, for instance, received and (re)interpreted under the influence of previous readings of geology or, alternatively, through its translations and transformations to other languages and cultures. I argue that early Hungarian Darwinism was based on several sources, on

[4] Janet Browne, *Darwin's* Origin of Species, (London: Atlantic Books, 2006), iv.
[5] Gillian Beer, "Translation or Transformation? The Relations of Literature and Science," in *Open Fields. Science in Cultural Encounter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 173.

several interpretations of Darwinism; thus, its origins were as much in a transnational, transitory field above individual texts and national contexts, as was the case in Darwin's Britain or Haeckel's Germany. Since it is important to identify such mediators, channels of transmission and the extent of their influence during the process of translation and reception, this section will address some outstanding considerations of approaches to translation as a form of cultural transfer.

Darwin's theories had a wide influence not only in a geographical, but also a broad cultural sense, and they also gained new layers of meaning in new national contexts – *Darwinismus* in Germany, *darwinisme* in France, or *darwinizmus* in Hungary to name but a few – while in theory standing for the same original concept. By default they also included the associations that came with the new language and the new audiences. The act and the result of translation thus become a critical cultural product as much as the original book; translation is both a reason for, and a consequence of the transfer of ideas and the relocation of text and context in a way that is both geographical and symbolic.

Aspects of the transfer of scientific knowledge through translation have received increasing attention in recent scholarship. The benefit of the historical study of translation, or the study of translation in historical studies, is a perspective on the transferability of knowledge: in the relocation process, translation is a means of navigation in complex network of texts, contexts, cultures and languages. Translation has been identified as more than "an instance of inter-cultural communication," aiming to make a perceived Other intelligible in its very otherness. Instead, translation in history is a communicative act with predominantly intra-cultural purposes, "supporting domestic

agendas to which the translated text seems instrumental."[6] However, historians of science have also correctly suggested that science itself should be understood as a form of communication too, in order to create a more effective dialogue with history.[7] Thus, the circulation of knowledge becomes part of a framework for the understanding of scientific narratives, of which translation becomes an agent to facilitate the crossing of boundaries, not only through languages or nations, but also through disciplines. The process of bringing Darwin's work to other countries, in other languages, illuminates the difficulties of the transferability of scientific knowledge, and underlines that "making it understood there clearly involved much more than a mere mechanical substitution of [...] words" from one language to another.[8]

The geographical relocation of a text, its relation to its new audience (and indirectly, the relation of its author to the new audience despite linguistic barriers) can invest it with new meanings and attributions in its new context. Through translation, science ceases to be local, in not only geographical, national or linguistic, but also in disciplinary terms. The role of place and space in science, and the matter of importance of the locations and directions science can travel has been considered a useful connection to the study of translation in history;[9] even more so that the distance between an author and the readers of a book that includes not only connections with publishers, printers or

[6] László Kontler, "Translation and Comparison: Early Modern and Current Perspectives," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 3 (2007): 98.
[7] Secord, James. "Knowledge in Transit." *Isis* 2004, 95:654-672.
[8] Sander Gliboff, *H. G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism. A Study in Translation and Transformation*, (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2008), 4.
[9] See, for instance, Steven Shapin, "The place of knowledge: a methodological survey," *Science in Context* 4 (1991): 3-21; Jon Agar and Crosbie Smith (eds.), *Making Space for Science: Territorial Themes in the Shaping of Knowledge*, (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998); David Livingstone, *Putting Science in Its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

booksellers, but also translators.[10] One of these connections is through correspondence, the importance of which in reception studies has been shown by their use to introduce more agents of transmission. Hungarian correspondence with or about Darwin and his work illustrates the extent of the networks used to facilitate the circulation of scientific knowledge to a wider audience.[11]

The process of transmission through translation also brings attention to a more interdisciplinary concern with the ways scientific ideas are realized not only in the scientific community and in the minds of those who develop them in a laboratory environment, but also in their reception, or even transformation, by those who are outside of the less than precise boundaries of the scientific community. Translation is not merely a medium of transfer, but also a meeting point where the barriers of language and science and culture cross each other. Scientific ideas often circulate among intellectuals and the less educated only to find apparently "*in*appropriate audiences" which shows us what happens when the "*unforeseen* readers appropriate terms and texts" for reinterpretation.[12] In the case of Darwin's reception in Hungary, the implications of this argument go beyond the question of "audience response:" the translators were just as much members of Darwin's audience as the new readers reached through the work of these translators were.

As will become clear in the following chapters, the act of translation for some of the Hungarian agents of Darwin's work served the purposes of wider dissemination as

[10] Nicolaas A. Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science: The Example of the Vestiges," *British Journal for the History of Science* 33 (2000): 211.
[11] Paul White, "Correspondence as a Medium of Reception and Appropriation," in *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick, (London: Continuum, 2008), 55-65.
[12] Gillian Beer, *Open Fields. Science in Cultural Encounter*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 2. See also Beer, *Darwin's Plots. Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, (London: Routledge, 1983).

well, attempting to reach a heterogeneous audience by their work, approaching them through various channels including the scientific societies and the popular press. In trying to create a public image for Darwinism and connecting it to non-scientific intellectual and popular pursuits, the translators and the scientific community not only created an audience for Darwin's work (in their translation), but very early on established Darwin's work, especially *Origin*, as boundary-work.[13] As a result, not only the boundaries of Hungarian science, but also that of Hungarian scientific community were historically flexible, and continued to be redrawn in the nineteenth century.

"The translator invades, extracts, and brings home."[14] Claims applied to literary translation, such as George Steiner's, can prove helpful when applied to the cultural act of translation in the case of scientific text as well. The agency of the translator, as we will see, is a crucial element of the texts under investigation. As Nicolaas Rupke pointed out in his comparative analysis of the German and Dutch translations of *Vestiges of Creation*, scientific translations also become cultural products, and the texts can acquire altered, new meanings as the translators relocate the books and repossess the texts: cultural relocation is manifested not only in the new language and the place of publication, but also by the translators' interventions. New prefaces, footnotes, commentaries, illustrations, omissions – and the reader may find (in) the text a very different message than the author (or for that matter, the translator, the publisher, or other readers) had in

[13] On the concept of boundary-work in science, see Thomas F. Gieryn, "Boundary-work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Science, *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 6, (1983): 781-795. On boundary-work analysed within the framework of the rhetoric of "public science," Everett Mendelsohn, "The social construcion of scientific knowledge," in *The Social Production of Scientific Knowledge. Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook*, ed. E. Mendelsohn, P. Weingart, R. Whitley, Vol. 1, (Boston: D. Reidel, 1977) and Frank M. Turner, "Public Science in Britain, 1880-1919," *Isis* 71 (1980): 589-608.

[14] George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, 2nd edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 314.

mind. In the process of the transfer of concepts and ideas to locations further and further away from the source culture, the growing distance between the authors and their readers makes it possible for translators to play a crucial role: their location, circumstances, motivations and agendas leave their mark on the source text just as much as their commentaries, alterations and omissions do. There is a distance between authors and readers; the translators provide an important link between the two, and thus also have an important role in the nature of the scientific community and that of the public audience.[15]

It has been a recurring claim in the history of science that the discussion of textual translation has been to a large extent limited to questions of fidelity, instead of addressing "the receiving culture" as more than a passive recipient. However, the translatability of scientific knowledge also affects the political and cultural complexities of the target language and culture, the literal relocation – "*translocation*" – of the texts carrying over and creating new forms of language and knowledge, but also resulting in "overlapping authorships, and intertwined sources of sociocultural authority."[16] As Lawrence Venuti has shown, the flexible concepts of fidelity and authorship carry a great significance in translation, and as the case studies of this dissertation illustrate, the role of the translation also carries an implication of authorship, even if to a varying degree. Translation can be considered both as a form of authorship and a form of scholarship; the concept of authorship implies a freedom of the author, transferred to the translator, to select and arrange material in an order of priority, "rewritten according to specific values," while

[15] Rupke, "Translation Studies," 209-210.
[16] Marwa S. ElShakry, "Knowledge in Motion: The Cultural Politics of Modern Science Translations in Arabic," *Isis* 99 (2008): 703. On the role of textual aspects of translation in the development of science and language, see Scott L. Montgomery, *Science in Translation: Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time*, (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000).

scholarship relies on historical research and reinvents a text "for a specific cultural constituency that differs from the one for which it was originally intended."[17]

Venuti's approach to translation is based on literary examples, but they are well applicable to questions of translation in cases of Victorian scientific narratives such as *Vestiges* or *Origin,* especially in the tradition of treating the Victorian experience through engaging with scientific writing as and in a literary form.[18] Venuti's analysis of the role of the translator engages with another aspect of translation that is also connected to the concept of "fidelity": the "invisibility" of the translator and the value attributed to this in literary translation. As opposed to what he calls "domesticating" translation, Venuti draws attention to the nationalist movements where the agenda of translation was to develop a local language focused on cultural difference, where translation could enrich the target language, and with this practice of "foreignizing translation" could contribute to building a national culture favouring the elite.[19] Venuti's critique of the concept of "invisibility" when it comes to the translator and his work relates to the transitional role of the translator.[20] It is an especially helpful point of reference when the disciplinary language of the natural sciences, not to speak about the national language itself, was so much in transition as in nineteenth century Hungary, and when the translators of

[17] Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference,* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 43-44.

[18] The approach to the relationship of science and literature as one culture instead of the "two cultures" of C. P. Snow has become a well integrated track in the history of Science and Victorian Studies; apart from the fundamental work of Gillian Beer, see George Levine, *One Culture: Essays in Science and Literature,* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987). See also, George Levine, *Darwin and the Novelists: Patterns of Science in Victorian Fiction,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988). For collections of studies on literature and science on the nineteenth century, see John Christie and Sally Shuttleworth, eds., *Nature Transfigured: Science and Literature, 1700-1900,* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989) and Elinor Shaffer, ed., *The Third Culture: Literature and Science,* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998).

[19] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed., (London: Routledge, 2008), 83-98.

[20] Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility*, 1-34.

evolutionary narratives had so different approaches to building a body of national literature and through it a new model of national progress.

While the theme of this dissertation, in a very wide sense, is the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, the material under investigation presents a special circumstance in that the study of reception focuses on reception *in the Hungarian language*. The importance of the German language as a medium of communication cannot be underestimated when it comes to the analysis of the sources of the Darwin reception in Hungary; however, the formation of the scientific language was as closely linked to the acquisition of natural scientific knowledge as to national identity. The scientific community and their patriotic agenda, in which the popular dissemination of scientific ideas would lead to a better nation capable of catching up to the more developed ones, made a connection between scientific development and national interests.[21] Even if the location of the actors in making evolutionary narratives available to Hungarians ranged from London to the Hungarian capital and the countryside, their contribution was not only aimed at the formation of a new scientific discourse, but also to achieve this in the Hungarian language. It is important to keep in mind that the translators of foreign scientific works to Hungarian in the nineteenth century, moreover, were working with languages under transformation: together with science and the scientific community, languages were shifting, and in Hungary this process was complicated by the freedom reacquired by the scientific community and the public to use, and thus reformulate, the Hungarian language for academic and scientific purposes in the beginning of the 1860s.

[21] The link between the use of languages in science and nationhood is in the focus of, for instance, Ludmilla Jordanova, "Science and National Identity," in *Sciences et langues en Europe*, ed. Roger Chartier and Pietro Corsi, (Paris: Centre Alexandre Koyré, 1996).

Finally, it is important to contextualize the issue of the interaction – and to a significant extent, overlap – of the Hungarian scientific community and the agents of popular reception in the period under investigation. Due to the stilted nature of the development of scientific institution in the 1850s and 1860s resulting from the restrictions placed on the Academy of Sciences and institutions of higher education, the professionalization of the natural sciences took place parallel to and following the arrival of Darwin's work, which has resulted in claims that the Hungarian reception of Darwinism was mostly effected by non-professionals, i.e. not "naturalists."[22] Although the lines of demarcation were certainly more blurred than in contemporary Britain or Germany, the example of Darwin shows that there was a place for a tradition of men of science and their interest in natural history, while the cases presented in this dissertation will also show that there were a variety of agents of reception in Hungary with scientific training and background. Even though the claim that in 1850s Britain "[s]pecialist work was increasingly carried out behind laboratory doors, at field stations, and in technical journals, while cosmic evolutionary narratives were repeated and retold in mass-market books and magazines" cannot necessarily be applied to the Hungarian situation of the same time, the process was in place, only with a delay of a few decades.[23]

It has been claimed that the Hungarian reception of Darwinism suffered certain drawbacks and limitations in scope due to the fact that the Hungarian Darwinism debate involved only certain aspects of Darwin's work, mainly the possible ethical consequences

[22] Palló, "Scientific Nationalism," 104.
[23] James Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2000), 524.

of his teaching.[24] However, this interpretation of the Hungarian effect mechanisms is too narrow, and not only because the representatives of emerging disciplines such as zoology, botany, geology or anthropology were involved in the Hungarian reception and popularization of Darwinism. If Darwin's legacy, especially *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*, may be interpreted not only as a foundation stone of modern science, but also as a synthesis of scientific activity of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it also has to be taken into consideration that the impact of Darwinism was much more "subtle" than the traditional approaches would suggest.[25] This subtle impact calls for a correspondingly subtle treatment of the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, taking into account more aspects of Darwin's work and its effects on its Hungarian reception, including textual considerations and its influence on various disciplines and genres. The approach I have chosen in this dissertation, that is, an engagement with longer evolutionary narratives, or what one may call some of the fundamental texts of Victorian evolutionary thinking, offers not only to tell a story about how *Vestiges of Creation* or *Origin of Species* were translated and published in Hungarian for the first time. It will also address how translation, an intermediary tool of connection, mediation and re/formation, was part and not only consequence of the consolidation (and to some extent reconfiguration) of the scientific community, and their impact on the patriotic discourse of national progress of their time.

[24] Erzsébet Boldog Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus XIX. századi történetéből 1850-1875* [From the history of nineteenth century Hungarian philosophy and Darwinism, 1850-1875], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986), 93.

[25] See Peter J. Bowler, *Evolution. The History of an Idea*, revised edition, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 25.

The Reception of Darwinism – A Historiographical Overview

As it often happens when starting work on a new topic, at the beginning of this research I severely underestimated the scope of the available material, both in terms of primary sources and secondary literature. In the case of secondary literature, this is to a great extent due to the fact that back in 2006 it was impossible to even speculate about, not to mention realistically estimate, the number of books, articles and many other types of scholarly and more general publications that would be produced as a result of the Darwin Anniversary Year in 2009. New literature is still being published, and as far as scholarly publishing is concerned, the Darwin Industry is in full force. Thus, it would be an impossible exercise to even try to give a full, comprehensive overview of the history of Darwinism, or even of the history of the reception of Darwinism in an international context, since several projects are still in the process of completion or development. However, the new aspects of research have resulted in a growing body of literature on the reception of Darwinism that has not only reevaluated the fundamental approaches of classic work, but has offered inspiration at every stage of writing this text.

The writing of the history of science, similar to other branches of history writing, has undergone significant shifts in the last few decades, and these turns, be they linguistic, cultural, or urban, have resulted in a constant reevaluation of approaches to the reception of Darwin as well. The conceptual turns in writing the history of Darwinism have extended to research on Darwin's life as well, his biographers directing more attention towards his contacts with his audiences, increasingly including foreign contacts and translators. The biographies of Darwin by Adrian Desmond and James Moore, and especially Janet Browne's two-volume *Darwin* have given new impetus to research on

Darwin outside of the boundaries of the history of science.[26] Browne's short "biography" of *Origin of Species* is a great example of extending the research of Darwinism beyond traditional forms of writing cultural history, and shows that a short history of a long book intended for a non-scholarly audience can also serve as inspiration for a dissertation.[27]

The reception of Darwinism especially has been receiving renewed interest in the last decade or two and has undergone a significant reappraisal in the history of science and beyond. There is an important division in that the so called popular and scientific reception of Darwinism have been treated as separate branches, even within individual cases of national reception. An early point of reference and groundbreaking for the study of the reception of Darwin in the public sphere is the work of Alvar Ellegard on the reception of *Origin of Species* in the British periodical press between 1859 and 1872, which focuses on the "general reader," largely disregarding the interactions of the scientific elite and the publishing industry.[28] Despite a certain lack of engagement with Darwin's immediate precedents and contemporaries, Ellegard's methods and results have inspired new research on the public reception of Darwin's work and the complex interactions of science and the periodical press.[29] Although studies of the public reception of Darwin, especially in connection to periodical publications, have not matched the extent and depth of Victorian Studies research, the German context offers examples that

[26] Adrian Desmond and James R. Moore, *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist,* (New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1994); Janet Browne, *Charles Darwin: Voyaging,* (London: Pimlico, 2002). Janet Browne, *Charles Darwin: The Power of Place,* (London: Pimlico, 2003).
[27] Browne, "*Darwin's* Origin of Species."
[28] Alvar Ellegard, *Darwin and the General Reader: The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872,* reprint edition, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990). See also Alvar Ellegard, "Public Opinion and the Press: Reactions to Darwinism," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19, no. 3 (1958): 379-387.
[29] Geoffrey Cantor and Sally Shuttleworth, eds., *Science Serialized: Representation of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals,* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004); Allen Fyfe and Bernard Lightman, eds, *Science in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century Sites and Experiences,* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007); Bernard Lightman, ed., *Victorian Popularisers of Science: Designing Nature for New Audiences,* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

have proved useful in the contextualization of my research, especially the research of Eve-Marie Engels on Darwin's treatment in German periodicals (with a stress on scholarly publications), and the work of Andreas Daum on the popularization of science in nineteenth-century Germany.[30] Although there has been no comparable work about the Hungarian context, Géza Buzinkay surveyed the appearance of Darwinism in public thought through some Hungarian encyclopedic weeklies in the 1870s, and general histories of the Hungarian press address the dissemination of scientific thought and associated cultural and political agendas to some extent.[31]

One of the most important recent contributions to the new approach to reception studies in the cultural history of science was James Secord's work on *Vestiges of Creation*. Touching on diverse fields such as the cultural history of the book in science and science in the book, reassessing the role of authorship in reception, and reevaluating the attitudes of audiences, both professional and public, Secord's work aimed to show that *Vestiges* was more than a mere predecessor of Darwin; however, by raising attention to the role of the public in the reception of Victorian science, he also showed how British audiences have been to some extent prepared not only to the scientific impact of Darwin's work, but also to the controversy it caused.[32]

The increasing interest given to the international reception of Darwinism is greatly indebted to the work of Thomas Glick, whose *Comparative Reception of Darwinism,* first

[30] Eve-Marie Engels, "Darwin in der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Forschungsbericht," in *Evolutionsbiologie von Darwin bis heute,* eds. Rainer Brömer, Uwe Hossfeld and Nicolaas A. Rupke, (Berlin: Verlag Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2000). Andreas Daum, *Wissenschaftspopularisierung im 19. Jahrhundert: Bürgerliche Kultur, naturwissenschaftliche Bildung und die deutsche Öffentlichtkeit, 1848-1914,* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1998).

[31] Géza Buzinkay, "A darwinizmus és a magyar közgondolkodás az 1870-es években," *Orvosi Hetilap* 126, no.18 (2005): 1103-05. Domokos Kosáry and Béla G. Németh, *A magyar sajtó története* [The History of the Hungarian Press], 2 vols., (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985).

[32] Secord, *Victorian Sensation,* 2000.

published in 1974,[33] served as the starting point for many of the currently ongoing research projects on the reception of Darwinism internationally. Glick, whose body of work includes studies on the reception of Darwin in Spanish-speaking countries and by the Vatican,[34] co-edited with Eve-Marie Engels the so far most comprehensive collection of studies on the reception of Darwin in Europe.[35] Published just a year ahead of the Darwin Anniversary in 2009, *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe* contains research on so far unknown, at least in the English language, aspects of the reception of Darwinism in Europe, extending the geographical interest to Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Although the scope of the studies on these regions is limited (much of the Balkan region is not covered in the two volumes), and in some cases the regional boundaries are set in a rather arbitrary way (the two articles on the Hungarian reception are included in Volume 2 covering Southern and Southeast Europe, instead of together with the Czech lands and Poland in the section on Central Europe in Volume 1), the editors' intention to represent the complexity of the reception of Darwin in other languages and cultures is generally very successful.[36] The use of translation not only as a one-way process of communication, but attention to what they call the "cross-cultural

[33] Thomas F. Glick, ed., *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974).
[34] Thomas F. Glick, Miguel Angel Puig-Samper and Rosaura Ruiz, eds., *The Reception of Darwinism in the Iberian World*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 221, (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001); Mariano Artigas, Thomas F. Glick and Rafael A. Martínez, eds., *Negotiating Darwin: The Vatican Confronts Evolution, 1877-1902*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).
[35] Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick, eds., *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, 2 vols., (London: Continuum, 2008).
[36] Victoria Tatole's article on the reception of Darwin's theory in Romania also contains some references to "contributions to Darwinism […] published in Hungarian," many of these within the transactions of Hungarian scientific societies (such as *Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület* [Transylvanian Museum Society]) in Transylvania before 1914. See Victoria Tatole, "Notes on the Reception of Darwin's Theory in Romania," in *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 468.

influences and infections induced by translation" draws attention to the possible multiple roles and uses of translation in reception studies.[37]

The recent turns in history of science have also affected the reception of Darwinism in that national case studies have been enriched by theoretical and methodological considerations from other disciplinary branches such as linguistics, literature, philosophy and sociology. The works I have found useful as possible models for my own work in terms of structure and methodology have been those that addressed individual national cases from a variety of perspectives. Integrating the history of science with other aspects of history, these studies demonstrate that local circumstances are heavily implicated in the production of meaning, and through the infusion of a multiplicity of readings, scientific texts can demonstrate both the connections and the considerable distance between the author, the translator and the foreign reader.

As seen earlier, Nicolaas Rupke's study on the comparative aspects of the early translations of *Vestiges* has provided me with a model to rely on regarding the role of the translator and associated modes of authorship during the relocation of texts into changing contexts, and Marwa ElShakry's article "Knowledge in Motion" gave me perspective on the changing but interwoven nature of the scientific and the political language through the examination of the new terminology and vocabulary of the natural sciences. Daniel Todes's *Darwin without Malthus* has shown that the reception of Darwinism could take very different forms and limitations to only certain evolutionary tropes depending on the scientific culture of countries far away from Britain; it has also shown that the scientific

[37] Engels and Glick, "Editors' Introduction," *Reception of Charles Darwin*, 5-6.

reception of Darwinism, while very different in some contexts, can have a lasting influence on emerging political and social discourses.[38]

Throughout the dissertation, the intermediary role of the German language and scientific connections to German-speaking lands is a point of reference, especially when it comes to the German translations of evolutionary writings and their impact on the evolution of the Hungarian scientific language. Since German was also one of the languages of Hungarian politics, education, and middle-class culture in general in the nineteenth century, it was important to be able to rely on literature that could help me in the contextualization of the role of German and German-speaking natural science in connection with the cultural and literary aspects of the reception of Darwinism. Werner Michler's *Darwinismus und Literatur* has proved to be a rich background for establishing the contours of agents and audiences of Darwinism in the Austrian part of the Empire, and also served as a model for engaging with press sources and the role of public intellectuals.[39] Finally, Sander Gliboff's book on the *Origins of German Darwinism* has been an inspiration in terms of structure, approaches to translation in terms of the vocabulary and conceptual elements of Darwinism, and served as a model when it came to the reinterpretation of the standard treatment of the early translators of *Origin of Species* to Hungarian. His correction of the distorted image of early German Darwinism and the reevaluation of early text versions of *Origin* showed that nineteenth-century natural history and its public image were shaped by translation and the transitional narratives produced during the translation project.[40]

---

[38] Daniel Todes, *Darwin without Malthus. The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought,* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
[39] Werner Michler, *Darwinismus und Literatur: Naturwissentschaftliche und literarische Intelligenz in Österreich, 1859-1884,* (Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1999).
[40] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism.*

The overabundance of secondary literature on the Victorian and to a smaller extent the European context has been both a blessing and a curse, and so has the scarcity of literature on the Hungarian reception of Darwinism. The main characteristic of the prior literature on the subject of Darwinism in Hungary is that it is still rather limited, with very few studies focusing on the early Hungarian reception of Darwinism. Although references to the importance of Darwinian thought, especially in terms of positivism, do appear in studies of intellectual and literary history,[41] Hungarian Darwinism as a subject was, for a long time, a neglected subject. The first historiographical wave of interest, however small in stature, emerged in the 1950s, especially around the anniversary of 1959, and this resulted in shorter studies not only on the history of Hungarian Darwinists, but also attempts to process some of the early Darwinian literature of the nineteenth century.[42] A characteristic feature binding the works of István Boros or Endre Réti, who published widely on the history of biology around the *Origin* centenary, is that they placed their work in the discourse of the Soviet historiography of science.[43] Rajmund Rapaics, who started publishing short articles on the history of Darwinism in the 1930s, continued to do so with a heavy reliance on the work of Timiriazev and even Lysenko from the early 1950s.[44] Incidentally, the only short historical study on *Vestiges*, also by

[41] For instance, Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *A pozitivista történetszemlélet a magyar történetírásban* [The positivist view of history in Hungarian historiography], (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.) Miklós Szabó, *Az újkonzervativizmus és a jobboldali radikalizmus története* (*1867-1918*) [The history of neoconservatism and right-wing radicalism (1867-1918)], (Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2003).

[42] Anna Balás, Jenőné Orosz and Istvánné Vitéz, "A darwinizmus magyarországi irodalma" [The literature of Darwinism in Hungary], *Könyvtári Tájékoztató, Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum* 3 (1959): 60-89.

[43] István Boros, "A 100 esztendős darwinizmus magyarországi pályafutása" [The career of the hundred years old Hungarian Darwinism], *Élővilág* 4, no. 2 (1989): 3-7 and 20-25; Rajmund Rapaics, "A darwinizmus útja hazánkban" [The journey of Darwinism in our country], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 89, no. 2 (1959): 68-71; Endre Réti, "Darwinizmus és antidarwinizmus hazánkban" [Darwinism and antidarwinism in our country], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 89, no. 3 (1959): 100-104.

[44] Rajmund Rapaics, "Cuvier és Darwin tanai Magyarországon" [The theories of Cuvier and Darwin in Hungary], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 64 (1932): 425-428; Rajmund Rapaics, "A darwinizmus magyar úttörői" [The pioneers of Hungarian Darwinism], *Természet és technika* 3, no. 4 (1952): 196-204.

István Boros, was published at the hundredth anniversary of its publication, in 1958.[45] Despite the number of these articles, they give the impression that their purpose was much less scholarly research rather than the public dissemination of Darwinism in the framework of the political agendas of the 1950s.

The most comprehensive work to date on the Hungarian reception of Darwinism is the work of Erzsébet Ladányiné Boldog on the history of Hungarian philosophy and Darwinism from 1850 to 1875.[46] In this monograph, in which she examines the history of evolutionary theories and Darwinism in various contexts from the early 1850s to the end of the century, Ladányiné closely connects the development of philosophy and the natural sciences. While the body of sources used by the author is impressive and has been a point of reference for all subsequent work on the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, she seems to be chiefly concerned with placing her work in a context of Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism, which, given that the year of publication was 1986, gives it a rather anachronistic flavour.

In connection to the bicentennial activities around 2009, a number of smaller studies were published in scientific journals and most importantly in the collective volume edited by Engels and Glick. Yet a characteristic feature of these studies is that they rely too much on the available Hungarian secondary literature (predominantly Ladányiné) instead of the rich primary source material. Moreover, neither Sándor Soós on the scientific reception, nor Katalin Mund on the reception of Darwin in Hungarian society make too many connections to the recent theoretical and methodological concerns

[45] István Boros, "A fejlődéstörténeti irodalom egy feledésbe ment magyar emléke" [A forgotten memory of Hungarian evolutionary literature], *Élővilág* no. 2 (1957): 57-63.
[46] Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*.

and discussions in the history of science.[47] However, apart from the clear advantage of having placed the reception of Darwinism in an international context, especially Katalin Mund addresses trajectories of Darwinism so far neglected by Hungarian historians of science, particularly in terms of religious thought and the emergence of the study of sociology and anthropology in the nineteenth century.

This dissertation will engage with and reflect on the work of Mund and Soós throughout; another point of reference is a short article of Gábor Palló, which also relies to a large extent on earlier secondary sources. Some of his claims on the nature of the scientific community and his categorization of the scientific profession and its practitioners will be addressed especially in connection with the translation and dissemination of *Origin of Species*.[48] Charles Darwin's Hungarian connections are the focus of articles by Ábrahám Kovács on László Dapsy from the perspective of the connections of the Hungarian Calvinist and the Scottish Presbyterian church, which are especially useful for the consideration of the institutional role of Calvinism in the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, even if Kovács himself admits that more research would be needed to make the results more conclusive.[49]

[47] Katalin Mund, "The Reception of Darwin in Nineteenth-Century Society," in *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, 441-462. Sándor Soós, "The Scientific Reception of Darwin's Work in Nineteenth-Century Hungary," in *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, 431-440.

[48] Gábor Palló, "Darwin utazása Magyarországon," *Magyar Tudomány* 170, no. 6 (2009): 714-726.

[49] Ábrahám Kovács, "Darwin első kapcsolata Debrecennel. Egy debreceni szabadelvű protestáns diák, Dapsy László szerepe a brit természettudományi eredmények közvetítésében" [Darwin's first connection with Debrecen. The role of László Dapsy, a liberal Protestant student from Debrecen, in the dissemination of British scientific achievements], *Debreceni Szemle*, 2007, 3:10, 393-403. Despite the misleading title, Darwin himself had no connection to Debrecen, only to Dapsy who was educated in the Collegium. Kovács deals in more details with the role of Calvinist institutional connections and with the question of Protestant theology and Darwinism in "'Intellectual Treasures of Humankind': Religion, Society and László Dapsy's Translation of *On the Origin of Species*" in *Calvinism on the Peripheries: Religion and Civil Society in Europe*, ed. Kovács, Ábrahám, (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009).

Structure of the Dissertation

The first chapter serves a double purpose: on one hand, it surveys the reception of Darwinism and earlier nineteenth-century approaches to the evolution of life on earth in Hungary until the mid-1870s using primarily periodical press sources; on the other hand, it serves to provide historical and contextual background to the chronologically-ordered case studies of the following chapters. The focus of the presentation is on efforts to disseminate Darwin's theories in the public space, drawing attention to how, in the early years, the entanglement of the scholarly and the popular reception of Darwin was part of a patriotic agenda of certain members and institutions of the wider scientific community.

The second chapter gives an account of the translation and reception of *Vestiges of Creation* in Hungary. Although arguably less extraordinary than the waves its sensational original made in Britain, I argue that despite the relative silence surrounding it, József Somody's 1858 translation holds an important place in the Hungarian reception of Darwinism as an important and almost immediate precursor to the discussions that would start about Darwin's work in a year or two. More than a placeholder for *Origin of Species*, the existence of such a translation shows that Darwin's work did not appear in a vacuum, and moreover, it demonstrates that the import of scientific knowledge was not limited to the scientific elite, even though they had a crucial role in public dissemination.

The third chapter presents the work of Jácint Rónay, a transitional figure of Hungarian Darwinism whose body of work includes a variety of evolutionary texts influenced by the Victorian approach to the natural history of the world before and after *Origin of Species*. Rónay, who spent more that fifteen years in exile in London after 1849, could observe and participate in a wide range of scientific events and societies in London,

and his work reflects not only some of the content, but also the style of his literary and scholarly studies. Of his two longer evolutionary works analysed in the chapter, the first, *A tűzimádó bölcs és az ős-világok emlékei* [The fire-worshipping wise man and the remains of ancient worlds] is a variation of the romantic evolutionary epics popular in the 1850s following the fashion of *Vestiges of Creation*, and the second, *Fajkeletkezés* [The formation of species], is a work of undecided genre and originality, a transitional work that is at once the first translation, first adaptation, and first review of Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

The fourth chapter, through analysis of László Dapsy's translation of *Origin of Species*, the publication of which signaled the end of the first stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary, presents not only the first full translation of Darwin's work in Hungarian, but puts it into the context of the scientific community and their efforts to disseminate scientific thought through the publication of entire books on contemporary scientific thought considered crucial for Hungarian intellectual progress. Their efforts to reach an unexpectedly wide public were successful even though Dapsy, the initiator of the project, failed in the sense that his agenda to translate instead of produce original works was considered problematic by the scientific community and the public alike. Dapsy's *Origin* and his agenda is also treated in comparison to other contemporary translations of *Origin*, especially to the German ones that he himself consulted as well. The chapter will show that Dapsy, an influential figure of the public reception of Darwinism in the 1860s and early 1870s, failed to capitalize on the public interest in Darwin's work for his own purposes. Instead of introducing the Hungarian public to *Descent of Man* and the new discourse of Darwinism in the early 1870s, Dapsy's *Origin* became the conclusion to the first stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary.

Chapter 1
Evolution in Public Space: The Hungarian Scientific Community and the Dissemination of Darwinism in the Press

In their introduction to the volume *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature*, Gowan Dawson, Richard Noakes and Jonathan R. Toplan use the concept of the "magazine of nature" in contrast to the image of the book of nature to reflect on how general periodicals shaped the nineteenth-century public's understanding of scientific knowledge. They argue that the supposedly ephemeral nature of periodicals, contrary to the more timeless value attributed to books, paradoxically made books secondary to periodicals, not only because the latter gave a more complex picture of the dialog among the consumers of knowledge, but also because periodicals provided a wider sense of public awareness for books. The authors thus emphasize the significance of periodicals, scientific and non-scientific, in the public reception of scientific ideas.[50] In a dissertation about the reception of Darwinism in its first two decades in nineteenth-century Hungary, pairing the book of nature with the magazine of nature is a notion that will serve well as I consider the various reading publics of Darwin in the chapters that follow. In this chapter I set the scene in terms of early Hungarian audiences for evolutionary thought, while the following three chapters engage a series of books, each a translation and at the same time a transitional piece in a long process of knowledge transfer. Moreover, the translators of the three books that serve as the centerpieces for these chapters – the agents of relocation – worked in the context of the transformation of the natural sciences, the scientific profession, and the public sphere in

[50] Geoffrey Cantor, Gowan Dawson, Graeme Gooday, Richard Noakes, Sally Shuttleworth, and Jonathan R. Topham, *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Hungary, and the three years of their publication, 1858, 1864, and 1873, present contrasting approaches to writing (about) science, as well as very different communication strategies and general interest from the public.

This suggests we might apply another general claim of *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical*, namely, that "the lines of demarcation between men of science, men of letters, and scientific popularizers were far from clear, and were constantly renegotiated," and this, together with the "growth and diversification of periodical forms" affected the encounters of the public with ever newer forms of scientific knowledge.[51] While in a sense particular to Britain, the claim can suitably be applied to the Hungarian case as well, with some modifications due to differences in historical, political and social development. Most importantly, the main difference in terms of the development of the scientific profession and its institutions, but also of the periodical press, is that the decade of repression following the failed revolution of 1848/49 caused a break and subsequent stagnation in an already arrested development. For Western science, the 1850s and 1860s were a period of a series of major changes reflected and transformed in a continuously growing, vibrant and powerful public space; for Hungary, these years were a period of survival, and even with the rapid transformation of the public sphere following the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, catching up to the level of progress reached by Western Europe was a challenge more ideal than reasonable.

Periodicals played a crucial role in the reception and dissemination of scientific knowledge and the development of scientific thought. In Britain, Darwinism emerged as part of (and inspiration for) a controversial, new world view in an already diversely and widely developed periodical press, and the separation of specialist and general audience

[51] Cantor et al., *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical*, 3.

and the publications catering to them happened as a long-term, organic process.[52] The new generation of scientific professionals in the 1860s had a range of venues to publish their ideas and a wide readership to address from these various platforms, aimed at various segments of the population, and periodicals provided new forums for further thought and debate.[53] In Hungary, the 1860s were the time of radical political and social transformation following a period of repression and stagnation, and thus the emergence of a new kind of public sphere and periodical press, not to speak of the reception of new scientific ideas, happened at a different pace: much more suddenly, and much less as a continuous growth based on an existing infrastructure and community.

The transfer of knowledge is a process where the distance between original source and target is complex and flexible, and the process of relocation is an integral part of the process. As such, the interpreters of Darwinism in the Hungarian context, be they translators in the literal or the metaphorical sense, were as much a part of reception as the readers of their new texts were. This chapter presents the context of the early reception of Darwinism through the examination of the interactions of the scientific community and the periodical press in Hungary, both of which were undergoing a fundamental transformation in the 1860s and early 1870s. A loose network of scientists and intellectuals engaged with the natural sciences, their reasons and motivation ranging from scientific enthusiasm to a patriotic scientism based on competition and the quickly adopted discourse of struggle for life, was involved in all levels of the reception of Darwinism, from the discussions at the Academy of Sciences and the scientific societies

[52] Alvar Ellegard, in his study on *Darwin and the General Reader* has at his disposal an impressive range of periodicals, which in turn published a wide range of approaches on Darwinism to a diverse and numerous readership. In fact, due to the range of periodicals developed and available by the time Darwin published *Origin*, they could readily serve it to the "population at large." Ellegard, *Darwin and the General Reader*, 21.

[53] Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 351.

through scientific publications and general periodicals to popular publications aimed at the masses. While journalistic outlets also served as a tool for scientists in Britain to establish their reputation in the eye of the public,[54] the above mentioned lines of demarcation were much more blurred in Hungary, not only due to the delay in professionalization, but also because of the longer preservation of interdisciplinarity within the scientific community well into the 1870s. The early reception of Darwinism in Hungary was engineered by a network of people who belonged to overlapping scientific and public networks.

In what follows I will discuss the role of the Hungarian scientific community in the dissemination of evolutionary theory in the public sphere up to the publication of László Dapsy's translation of *Origin of Species* in 1873, which concluded the first stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary. I aim to show that this first stage of reception was a transitional period in many regards: due to the political changes following 1849, the country underwent a series of radical transformations that made the 1850s, 1860s and 1870s very different in character, which affected scientific life and publishing opportunities as much as any other aspect of life. This first chapter serves a twofold aim: first, to provide a backdrop to the popular reception of Darwinism in Hungary through examination of the changing nature of the scientific community and the periodical press in interaction; secondly, to place the three case studies of the following chapters into a context of interplay among various actors and agents of reception. Although the presentation of scientific societies, their members and publications, together with their links to academia, politics and a more general and popular audience will present a

[54] Both as members of the scientific community and as celebrities,; see Cantor et al., *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical*, 28.

complex picture, it is by no means my intention to provide a complete prosopographical analysis, but rather to illustrate the main themes of the dissertation by various examples from a rich and diverse body of Hungarian-language press.[55]

From there I move to the initial consideration of the three exemplary texts that form the core of this study. The proportion of sources and the number of publications and writers also gives an indication of the number of readers who had access to and interest in copies of József Somody's translation of *Vestiges of Creation* in 1858, Jácint Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* in the early 1860s, or the full complete translation of *Origin of Species* by Lászó Dapsy in 1873. These proportions will also be reflected in the length of the chapter sections dealing with the respective periods, which will show how much the political climate and the practical consequences of the repression after 1849, the changing circumstances of the early 1860s, and finally, the boom of the years following the Compromise affected scientific life and the reception of Darwinism in light of the changing political and social discourse.

Perspectives on Progress in the Natural Sciences before 1859

While the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, founded in 1825, had been the center of scientific life in Hungary and thus the formal repository of the natural sciences, with the formation of the Hungarian Society for Natural Science [*Magyar Természettudományi*

[55] Not discounting the rich contribution of German-language press read and also published in Hungary, the limitation of sources to those in the Hungarian language was due to the focus on translation to Hungarian. However, not only is it a given that German periodicals (published both in German and Austrian lands) were an important source of information for both the scientific community and the middle- and upper- class reading public, but German (and British or French) periodicals served both as sources and in many cases models for their Hungarian counterparts.

Társulat] in 1841, the landscape of Hungarian science began to diversify.[56] Motivated by the need for national and social progress, its founders, Ferenc Bene and Pál Bugát,[57] also organised the first meeting of the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science [*Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók Vándorgyűlése*] in the same year.[58] Based on the annual general meetings of German naturalists and medical practitioners,[59] the first meeting was held in Pest. There had been a movement at the academy since the mid-1840s to create a greater space for the natural sciences against the predominance of the social sciences, with an emphasis on the significance of the "prebiological sciences."[60] Within these efforts, the study of the laws of the development, or the theories of the gradual development of organic life and the species received attention, including, for instance, the work of Cuvier on comparative anatomy or studies on Lamarck's progressive work on the development of the nervous system. This also illustrates that Hungarian scholars of natural history were aware of different, sometimes opposing views of evolutionary thought (or in the case of Cuvier, who claimed that the history of the world was a series of catastrophes and geological revolutions, objections to the notion of

[56] On the history of the Society, see Endre Gombocz, *A Királyi Magyar Természettudomány Társulat története 1841-1941* [The history of the Royal Hungarian Society for Natural Science], (Budapest: Természettudományi Társulat, 1941).
[57] Pál Bugát, "Tudományosságunk előmozdítása ügyében indítvány," *Orvosi Tár* 2 (1840): 185-192 and 202-206.
[58] Since the language of the dissertation is English, the English translation of the name of the Association is based on its British equivalent (British Association for the Advancement of Science, also founded on the basis of the German model in 1831. For a history of the Association and the meetings, see Kornél Chyzer, *A magyar orvosok és természetvizsgálók vándorgyűlésének története 1840-től 1890-ig* [The history of the meeting of the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science], (Sátoraljaújhely: Zemplén, 1890). The documentation of the meetings between 1841 and 1912 are held at the Semmelweis Museum, Library and Archives Semmelweis Orvostörténeti Múzeum, Könyvtár és Levéltár (Budapest).
[59] *German Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte*, founded by Lorenz Oken, the leading figure of German Naturphilosophie, in 1822.
[60] On the relationship of the philosophical and the natural sciences, and the increasing efforts of the practicioners of the latter to create a space for themselves at the Academy of Sciences, see Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 25-34.

evolution), and these received some attention in the scientific publications of the late 1830s and the 1840s.

The scientific periodicals of the period prior to the political and social earthquake of the revolution of 1848/49 were aware of the changes of the scientific world view happening in Western Europe. A number of periodicals addressed questions of development (*fejlődés*), and while the materialist turn in natural philosophy would not take place until the 1850s, there was a sense of awareness that there were many aspects to the history of the universe and development of life on earth that needed explanation.[61] In a short article on the mammoth in 1838, the short-lived journal *Természet* [Nature] addressed the idea that the earth "must have had to undergo horrible changes several millennia ago."[62] Based on Cuvier's theory that elephants might be related to the mastodon genus or they might possibly be a subspecies of the extinct creatures, the article also draws to the attention of the reader that, just the previous year, several bones and nine pounds of heavy teeth of mammoth had been found in Vasvár county by Professor Dömény Paulovits of Szombathely.[63] Aside from the written evidence that the early nineteenth-century fascination with fossils and the interest in their excavation caught on in Hungary as well, the article is important because it shows an interest in communicating Cuvier's work on comparative zoology to the public,[64] and because it shows an awareness that there are many questions to be answered and many secrets hidden in nature.

[61] For scholars who translated or used works of Cuvier, Lamarck, Oken or Erasmus Darwin as points of reference in prior to 1848, see Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 32-37.

[62] *Természet*, a scientific journal aimed at the education of a wider public audience, was founded by Endre Kunoss. Altogether 52 issues were published between April and September 1838. Szinnyei, *Magyar írók*, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/

[63] "Szörnyü változásokon kellett földünknek évezredek előtt átmennie […]." "Mammut," *Természet* 1, no. 35 (31st July 1838): 138.

[64] The article is signed only by "S". However, it is worth noting that Péter Vajda, a friend of Kunoss and later the first secretary of the *Természettudományi Társulat*, an occasional contributor to *Természet*,

Another work of a different character published more than a decade later shows that the study of the earth and its life forms was not only a current issue for Hungarian scholarship, but also one that was being addressed through the lens of Western scholarship. Pál Almási Balogh's paper on "A glimpse onto the life of our earth" explores some phenomena of the life that "has gushed forth with such richness on the surface of earth."[65] Balogh's article, the published version of a lecture given at the Academy in 1847, is not only a synthesis of the accounts of contemporary scholars from Humboldt to Agassiz of their scientific expeditions and their conclusions on the phenomena of plant and animal life, but also a rare reference to Darwin's work prior to the publication of *Origin of Species*. Balogh makes several references to Darwin's voyage on the Beagle: one of the sources he mentions is the 1844 German translation of the Beagle diaries, and the other one is Darwin's work on coral reefs (this time, the reference is to the English title), which appeared in 1842.[66] Such an early reference to Darwin's work, and to the voyage of the Beagle, which culminated in geological observations that in their content and methodology would deeply inform Darwin's philosophy of nature, shows that at least some Hungarians were aware of the origins of the Darwinian revolution. Even if they had no way of knowing what the result would be, they found it not only interesting enough to read, but also to make it available to their colleagues and eventually the public.

---

translated the first volume of Cuvier's *Animal Kingdom* to Hungarian in 1841. Cf. Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 31.

[65] "És most vessünk egy pillantást a földünk felületén oly dúsgazdasággal elömlött életre." Pál Almási Balogh, "Egy pillantás földünk életére," *A Magyar Tudós Társaság Évkönyvei*, 8 (1844-47), (Buda: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1860), 77.

[66] Charles Darwin, *Naturwissenschaftliche Reisen*, translated by Ernst Dieffenbach, (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1844). Balogh makes references to Volume I, on Darwin's description of Brazil (78), snow on the Cordilleras in Paraguay, and the volcanic dust in Cape Verde (87). His other Darwin reference, to "On Coral Formations, in the Geological observations made during the Voyage of her Majesty's ship Beagle. London 1844-47" is probably based on *The structure and distribution of coral reefs. Being the first part of the geology of the voyage of the Beagle, under the command of Capt. Fitzroy, R.N. during the years 1832 to 1836*. London: Smith Elder and Co., 1842.

Balogh, who was actively involved in obtaining the transactions of a number of Western scientific societies, including those of the Royal Society of London, published his work in smaller articles rather than in larger monographs.[67] Along with many of his contemporaries, he made it the scientific agenda of the 1830s and 1840s to catch up to Europe in terms of scientific (and social) progress, and this included reflections on development and progress in terms of the natural sciences as well. However, the revolution and war of independence of 1848/49 caused an interruption with a radically opposite effect, and in spite of the efforts of the scientific community in the 1850s, the reception of evolutionary theories, including those of Darwin, would lag behind.

Discussions of evolution, which were more or less restricted to the scientific community, ground to a halt after 1848, in stark contrast to the West, where the 1850s were a period when scientific knowledge was increasingly filtered into the public sphere. Both in Britain and Germany, the two countries with the strongest cultural influence on Hungary, learned and scientific societies, their meetings and publications, and even the more informal correspondence networks of naturalists and natural scientists were actively involved in the discussion and dissemination of new scientific ideas. Whereas the British and the German Associations had yearly meetings in various cities not even two decades earlier, the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science had no meetings between 1847 and 1863. Several scholars were forced into hiding or exile due to their participation in the events of the revolution, and even many of those who stayed and escaped imprisonment were displaced, having to spend the first few years of the 1850s in rural colleges.[68] The Hungarian language ceased to be the official language, to be

[67] See "Almási Balogh Pál," *Vasárnapi Újság*, 24 October 1858, 477-478.
[68] Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 36.

reinstated only in 1860,[69] which naturally affected not only the development of scientific life and language, but as a consequence of censure, scientific publishing as well. Both the Academy of Sciences and the *Természettudományi Társulat* experienced severe hindrances and breaks in their operation, with their first general meetings being held in the late 1850s following years of silence.[70]

This, however, did not mean a complete silence. Within the limited possibilities allowed in this decade of absolutism, there was a limited amount of discussion of the newer results of the natural sciences in the 1850s; however, even if the existence and quantity of these reports were impressive given the circumstances, they could not counteract the insurmountable advantage and development of the natural sciences in the West. Whereas the British public was informed about scientific controversies in the 1840s and 1850s, in a sense paving the way to immediate and wide reactions to *Origin of Species*, or German materialism was discussed to an extent not only in scientific circles but also in some public forums, even the fragments of these debates that had reached Hungary were mostly limited to a community of men of letters.

Even if many scientific publications were silenced together with the associations that used to publish them, and henceforth scientific studies had very few organs to be published in,[71] there were new ventures in the 1850s. In spite of the limitations to its operations, the Academy of Sciences published its transactions under the title *Magyar*

[69] The language of secondary education remained Hungarian, despite attempts to change it to German in the upper years of secondary schools after 1849. Tibor Frank, "Acts of Creation: The Eötvös Family and the Rise of Science Education in Hungary," in *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918,* ed. Mitchell Ash and Jan Surman, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012): 117.

[70] In general terms, associational life, be it scholarly or professional, was strongly discouraged by the Habsburg administration: "even those without any obvious political content, fearing that they might turn into hotbeds of nationalist aspirations." Mária Kovács, *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust,* (Washington, D.C. and Oxford: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Oxford University Press, 1994), 7.

[71] In ten years, *Természettudományi Társulat* published only two yearbooks, in 1858 and 1860. Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus,* 36.

Academiai Értesítő, and the platform of some of the most important scientific reports and discussions of the decade, *Új Magyar Múzeum* [New Hungarian Museum], not only significant as an early attempt to establish review culture in Hungary,[72] but also because of its reports on the latest developments in geology and other fields of natural science, was founded in 1850.[73] *Új Magyar Múzeum* was also a forum for a long-reaching debate about the meanings and tasks of the concept of science based on reactions in favor of and against German materialism and the question whether the natural sciences should be separated from natural philosophy. Károly Nendtvich, one of the main participants of the debate was not only one of the early proponents of scientific materialism in Hungary, but he also published articles on the theory of evolution, arguing for the theory of formation versus creation of the world. His efforts resulted in articles informing his readers of modern approaches to the natural sciences based on an interest in geology and biology in the West, predominantly Britain.[74]

In the centre of the debates about the teachings and possible consequences of materialism stood the work of the German materialist Carl Vogt, but also the writings of Jakob Moleschott and Ludwig Büchner. Their denial of the immortal spirit and the agenda to generalize the natural sciences separately from the idea of creation and the world view established around it was a frequent subject of a series of quite passionate debates in the 1850s. While the interest in Vogt was at least in part inspired by the

[72] Although the attempt is considered to be a failure in the sense that instead of following the contemporary Western model, focusing on modern views of scientific progress, offered by *Revue des Deux Mondes*, *Új Magyar Múzeum* reached back to a more archaic, encyclopedic genre. However, Kosáry and Németh also draw attention to the fact that the German *Deutches Museum*, founded a year after *Új Magyar Múzeum* in circumstances much more favourable than in Hungary, had only six hundred subscribers in 1857, when *Új Magyar Múzeum* had 289. Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó története* II. 1. 477-478.
[73] Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó története*, II. 1. 466-480.
[74] For instance, Károly Nendtvich's articles on "The future of the earth" (1850), "Geological letters" (1851), or "The study of the natural sciences" (1853), cf. Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó története*, II. 1. 477.

political persecution he had experienced in Germany due to his participation in the revolutionary events of 1848, the Hungarian public received information about the more dangerous aspects of his ideology as well, both within the walls of the Academy and in the daily *Magyar Sajtó* [Hungarian Press] between 1855 and 1857.[75] Vogt's later association with the Hungarian edition of *Vestiges of Creation* might have been partially rooted in the debate of József Pólya and Sámuel Brassai, conducted at the Academy in the late 1850s, in which they argued for and against materialism respectively.[76]

The publication of József Somody's translation of *Vestiges* coincided with an increased interest in the study of "progressive development" in the late 1850s,[77] exhibited by the work of József Dorner, Pólya, and Nendtvich in *Új Magyar Múzeum*. However, these debates would come to a rather abrupt halt at the end of the decade: the year 1858 was a smaller watershed moment in the sense that the Academy of Sciences could return to full operation, leading not only to the reestablishment and reorganization of scientific institutions, but also to a new framework for the scientific community where political changes would coincide with the transformation of the natural sciences by the publication of *Origin of Species*.

Considering the reception of evolutionary ideas prior to the arrival of Darwinism is important because a look at the literature shows that even if limited in scope and

[75] Cf. Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 60-62.
[76] József Pólya, "A szellemtani physiológiából – Az idegrendszer szellemi tevelléseinek alapjai" [From psychological physiology – The foundations of the mental activities of the nervous system], *Új Magyar Múzeum*, 1857, Vol. 2., 268-289 and 466-492. Brassai first responded in the daily *Pesti Napló*, but his more substantial response only appeared in 1859 under the title "A természettan szelleme és iránya" [The spirit and direction of natural science], *Budapest Szemle*, Vol. 7, 301-325. See also Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és Darwinizmus*, 61-62.
[77] Ladányiné claims that the Hungarian publication of *Vestiges* was a result of the interest in "progressive development;" however, as to be seen in the next chapter, this is unlikely not only because of the limited number of reactions to the Hungarian edition, but even more so because the lack of any indication that the translator had any connection with the group of scholars active on this field in the late 1850s. *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 60.

variety, there was an early reception that served as a frame of reference for later discussions. Even if this reception is restricted to a small circle of scholars who would be replaced by a younger generation at least in terms of swift reactions to the new tenets of Darwinism, it shows that, despite the asymmetry with the British or German reception, Darwin's ideas did not arrive in a vacuum and the evolutionary debate had a quite small-scale, but existing prior history.

The Beginnings of Hungarian Darwinism

From the examples above it is clear that the early Hungarian reaction to Darwinism, while certainly not of an earth-shattering force, was still quite far-reaching in light of the political circumstances restricting scientific life and academia in general. While members of the scientific community living within the borders of Hungary were limited both in terms of receiving information from abroad and in making this information public due to the extremely limited number of public forums available to them, the new theories of Darwinism started to permeate the public space parallel to the developments of the 1860s.

The first public reaction to *Origin of Species* in Hungary was the review of Ferenc Jánosi in *Budapesti Szemle* [Budapest Review].[78] This is a fact that has been mentioned in most if not all earlier studies about the Hungarian reception of Darwinism. Though Jánosi himself makes it clear in the introductory paragraph of his article, far fewer of these studies mention that Jánosi's article was written "according to the relevant article of a

[78] Ferenc Jánosi, "Új természetrajzi elmélet. Charles Darwin: On the origin of Species. A nemek eredete. London, Murray, 1859," *Budapesti Szemle* 10, no. 33/34 (1860): 383-397.

French review."[79] This circumstance has been given more or less no attention so far in previous scholarship, even though it would seem quite significant that the "first Hungarian review"[80] of *Origin of Species* was rather the first review in the Hungarian language, but based on a review written by someone else. A number of questions are raised at this point: first of all, who wrote it and where was it published, and second, how much Jánosi's review is based on it. Since few French reviews of *Origin* were published before the appearance of Jánosi's, it is not difficult to identify the source as the first known French review by Auguste Laugel,[81] "Nouvelle théorie d'historie naturelle," published in *Revue des Deux Mondes* earlier in 1860.[82]

As to the second question about how closely Jánosi's review was based on Laugel's, the answer is, quite closely. Not only the Hungarian title, which is a direct translation of the French, but the main text as well follows the original so closely that it could even be called an abridged and edited translation. Even the "few lines" that he offers to the reader in advance to be able "to judge whether [they] find our review worthy of their kind attention to follow until the end" (383-385) are directly based on the opening pages of Laugel's text (644-647). The text avoids taking a stance either for or against Darwin's more controversial ideas, and admits to some weaker points, such as the relationship of man to "monkeys." However, as a first communication to reach the readers of the Hungarian press, it is a well informed and comprehensive review.

[79] "[E]gy franczia szemle erre vonatkozó czikke után…" Jánosi, "Új természetrajzi elmélet," 383.
[80] While Ladányiné (*A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 94) acknowledges that Jánosi wrote the review after a French one, Sándor Soós ("The Scientific Reception," 341) and Katalin Mund ("The Reception of Darwinism," 441) do not mention this fact. In two articles published as recently as 2009 and 2012, Gábor Palló clearly considers Jánosi "the author of the review" ("Scientific Nationalism," 104), and no indication is given that this would be in the somewhat more flexible terms of authorship in the nineteenth century.
[81] Engels and Glick list Laugel's review as the first French one in their "Timeline: European Reception of Charles Darwin" in *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, xxix. On the same page, a few lines under Laugel, "Ferenc Jánosi reviews *OS* in *Budapesti Szemle*."
[82] Auguste Laugel, "Nouvelle théorie d'histoire naturelle: l'origine des espèces (On the Origin of Species, by Charles Darwin; London, John Murray, 1859)," *Revue des deux mondes* 26, no. 3 (1860): 644-671.

Since the way Jánosi's text was created was not an uncommon practice at the time, it would not be the last Hungarian text of Darwinism to be based on another one, and Jánosi states this clearly in the introduction, the most interesting feature of the review is Jánosi's introductory paragraph, in which he writes about the motivation to publish a review of *Origin* in *Budapesti Szemle*:

> "Few scientific works have attracted as much attention as the one whose title can be read above these lines. The loudest attack and the equally loud laudation that follows it constantly attest that what stands before us is a work of genius whose goal is fertilization, and directing the everyday process of ideas and thoughts into a new track. Under the unassuming title barely anyone would suspect the rich content worthy of public interest. The clear-sighted scholar who has researched one of the most interesting questions of the natural sciences has been assisted by lively imagination and the flow of free spirit to create a work that surprises both the philosopher and the scientist, and gives its due to practical consideration bent on profit. The public interest of Darwin's work is quite attested by the fact that all scientific publications have raced to make it known to their readers […].[83]

There are several things worth noting even in this short passage, but three are especially interesting in light of the general themes of the dissertation. The first is the question of the "unassuming title," *A nemek eredete* [The origin of genera], which is the first, and very rare use of this formulation, since *A fajok eredete* [The origin of species] became the standard very early on.[84] Secondly, Jánosi considers *Origin* to be a worthy and surprising read for both philosophers [*bölcsészek*] and (specialised) scientists [*szaktudósok*], although it is unclear if by the latter he means scientist in the Whewellian sense to distinguish the practitioners of the physical sciences from others. Yet Jánosi's distinction

[83] "Kevés tudományos mű keltett oly élénk figyelmet mint az, melynek czíme e sorok fölött olvasható. A legzajosabb megtámadás s az épen oly zajos elismerés, mely folyamatosan kíséri, tanúsítják is, hogy itt egy lángész műve áll előttünk, melynek hivatása a termékenyítés, s az eszmék és gondolatok mindennapi folyamát új mederbe indítani. Az igénytelen czím alatt alig sejtené valaki a gazdag, közérdekű tartalmat. A természettudományok egyik legérdekesebb kérdése után kutató éles látású tudóst eleven képzelődés s szabad szellem szárnyalása segíti, hogy oly művet alkosson, mely eszméi nagyszerűségével a bölcsészt s a szaktudóst egyaránt meglepi, s a haszonkereső gyakorlatnak is kijuttatja illetőségét." Jánosi, "Új természetrajzi elmélet," 383.

[84] Chapter 4 will discuss aspects of the title and the differences of its early translations in more detail.

implies awareness of both the increasing disciplinary boundaries and the significance of Darwin's book beyond the natural sciences. Thirdly, the first person plural can signify that Jánosi and the editors of *Budapesti Szemle* not only followed important foreign review journals and recognized the magnitude of Darwin's work based on their output, but aimed to follow their example in their *Budapest Review*.

Although Jánosi, a frequent contributor of *Budapesti Szemle*, published on a variety of subjects from economics to literary reviews, he also had a background in the natural sciences. His educational and professional background was similar to many of his contemporaries in that, after a comprehensive secondary and higher education, his career plans were derailed for decades after 1849, and this resulted in a diverse body of literary and journalistic publication that included a focus on scientific subjects.[85] His interest in biological evolution went back to the 1850s: in 1854, he published an article "On the changes of plants" ["A növények változásairól"] in the popular weekly magazine *Vasárnapi Újság* [Sunday News] in which he focuses on aspects of species formation as opposed to reasons for creation.[86] Shortly before the publication of the review of *Origin*, he published a study on "The degeneracy of the human genera [species]" [Az emberi nem elfajzása], a precursor to the later review in many ways, and a sign of his awareness (or that of the editorial board of *Budapesti Szemle*) that the question of development and generation were very timely concerns in scholarly research.[87]

[85] Ferenc Jánosi (1818-1879) studied theology and law in the Calvinist college of Nagyenyed and chemistry in Germany. Like many men of letters who had been forced into an extent of hiding due to Habsburg persecution, he taught chemistry, natural history and economics at the Calvinist secondary school in Nagykőrös until 1853, when he went to Pest, and until 1867, when he became a career bureaucrat in the Ministry for Justice, he wrote for a number of periodicals and occupied his free time with chemical experiments. "Ferencz Jánosi," in Szinnyei, *Magyar írók*, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/.
[86] 6 August 1854. Cf. Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és darwinizmus*, 95.
[87] Ferenc Jánosi, "Az emberi nem elfajzása," *Budapesti Szemle* 10, no. 31/32 (1860): 201-211.

Although Jánosi himself would not make a further contribution to the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, *Budapesti Szemle* would be one of the most important providers of space for discussions of evolutionary theories from the very beginnings of its existence. Founded in 1857, *Budapesti Szemle* strove to be a review following the model of *Revue des Deux Mondes* or the English *Athenaeum*. The goal of Antal Csengery, its founder, editor-in-chief and publisher until 1867, was to inform the public of recent achievements in science and other fields of culture abroad and at home. In the late 1850s and early 1860s, this agenda meant a reliance on the idea that the natural and social sciences were the means of human progress, and thus would lead to various applications of positivism in the human sciences. Due to the combination of these factors, *Budapesti Szemle* became an early repository of contributions to Hungarian Darwinism.[88]

The theory of evolution had been addressed in *Budapesti Szemle* prior to the appearance of Darwin's work. József Somody's translation of *Vestiges of Creation* was given an advance review in 1858, which also addressed the influence of Lyell's earlier work of geology.[89] In the very same issue, the geologist József Szabó published a review of the positivist philosopher Émile Littré's "Études d'histoire primitive. Y a-t-il eu des hommes sur la terre avant la derniére époque géologique?", published earlier in that year in *Review des Deux Mondes*.[90] Lyell's theory that the history of the world is a history of the small changes effected by natural forces was addressed several times by Szabó in *Budapesti Szemle* and elsewhere.[91] Based on Lyell's *Principles of Geology* and *Manual of*

[88] Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó*, II. 1. 477-501.
[89] Korizmics László, "A teremtés természettörténelmének nyomai. Vestiges of the natural history of creation," *Budapesti Szemle* 3, no. 9/10 (1858): 301-304.
[90] *Revue des Deux Mondes* 14 (1858): 5-32.
[91] József Szabó (1822-1894) was another of the young men who, with the typical Hungarian middle education in law and philosophy, ended up following his interest in the natural sciences. However, he managed to turn this into a successful academic career: in possession of a law degree and a diploma in

Elementary Geology, Szabó concluded in 1858 that "the present of the world is nothing else but the continuation of its past."[92] Szabó continued to address questions of man's place in geological research, and his paper "Man in geology" was delivered at the first meeting of the Hungarian Association for the History of Science to be held after more than a decade of inactivity in 1863, soon to be published in *Budapesti Szemle*.[93]

Antal Csengery was not only the person in charge at *Budapesti Szemle* in the 1860s, but also a central figure of the establishment of review culture in Hungary and an iconic figure of the scientific community, publishing and cultural production. He was active in the reorganisation the Academy of Sciences and other literary societies, an influential supporter of the agenda of the Deák party, and hence a journal editor of considerable power due to his connections.[94] With a group of public intellectuals, who included József Eötvös, Pál Gyulai and József Szabó, they effectively reorganised and consequently ruled over the Academy, or at least this was the impression of Jácint Rónay, whose return to Hungary was effectively delayed when they blocked his election as secretary of the Academy in 1864.[95]

Csengery was involved in editing and contributing other press publications in the 1850s and 1860s, and any author without a clear picture of his network, based heavily on

---

mineralogy, he taught mineralogy, chemistry and experimental physics at various colleges in Pest, until he was appointed to te Department of Geology at the University of Pest in 1862. He was member of the Academy of Sciences, Vice President of the *Természettudományi Társulat*, President of the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science, Vice President of the Geological Society, and edited many of the transactions of these societies and more. See "Szabó József," Szinnyei, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/.

[92] "[A] föld jelene nem egyéb, mint folytatása múltjának." József Szabó, "Geologiai alapnézetek: a folytonossági elmélet szellemében," *Budapesti Szemle*, 2, no. 4 (1858): 57-78.

[93] József Szabó, "Az ember a geológiában," *A Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók 1863. September 19-26. Pesten tartott IX. nagygyűlésének történeti vázlata és munkálatai*, ed. Szabó József, (Pest: 1864), 45-52; József Szabó, "Ember a geologiában," *Budapesti Szemle* 18, no. 59/60 (1863): 309-320.

[94] "Csengery Antal," Szinnyei, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm.

[95] For Gyula Schwarcz's report of the events and an account of Rónay's hurt feelings, see Jácint Rónay, *Napló-töredék. Hetven év reményei és csalódásai* [Diary-fragment. Hopes and disappointments of seventy years], 8 volumes, (Pozsony, 1884), 354-358.

political allegiances and to some extent personal sympathies, could run afoul of Csengery. For instance, Csengery probably had a quite decisive role in the misfortunes of Jácint Rónay, more of whose adventures will be told later. Rónay's participation in the early public dissemination of Darwin's work and evolutionary theory on the pages of various publications will show that even in possession of first-hand scientific news from London, the life of a foreign correspondent was hard to navigate on the swiftly changing map of the Hungarian press in the early 1860s.

Csengery's approach and the circle of his acquaintances was so diverse that *Budapesti Szemle* did not only publish positive reviews of Darwin's work, but also contained more critical pieces on Darwin and his circle, including T. H. Huxley. An early, critical voice that *Budapesti Szemle* gave space to was that of Sámuel Brassai in 1862. His "Éledés és életkezdet," published in 1862,[96] is an early, critical reading of Darwin, claiming that Darwin's idea of development, especially his new taxonomy of species and notion of constant development, not only threatened the accepted concept of species, but also the natural sciences as a whole.[97] Another critic, and also an influential member of the Academy of Sciences, was Ágost Greguss. His (rather critical) analysis of Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature* was published in *Budapesti Szemle* in 1863,[98] and was either an unintended catalyst to Jácint Rónay's decision to publish a collection of his writings on Darwin, Huxley and Lyell in 1864, or an indirect result of the enmities between the different political fractions that Csengery's circle and Rónay respectively belonged to.

[96] Sámuel Brassai, "Éledés és életkezdet" [Awakening and the beginning of life], *Budapesti Szemle* 16 (1862): 328-345.
[97] Brassai (1800-1897), a strong critic of materialism, considered the notion of constant development [*örökös fejlődés*] "one of the tenets of the school of thought denying life and the soul." See Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 95.
[98] Ágost Greguss, "Az ember helye a természetben" [Man's place in nature], *Budapesti Szemle* 18 (1863): 420-449.

However, it is also possible that – as supported by Greguss's later work – Greguss did not accept evolution according to Darwin or his bulldog.

According to Rónay's memoirs,

> "[F]irst József Szabó university professor and corresponding member of the Academy, read my manuscript in the "Geological Society"; then Ágost Greguss, also member of the Academy, at a meeting of the Academy; finally my manuscript was published in *Budapesti Szemle* – under the name of Greguss. And Antal Csengery, what did he do? According to my informer [Gyula Schwarcz], he was frightened of Huxley's work, and he did not dare to mention the name of the colleague who sent the manuscript. I do not know if this is so? But I do know that my manuscript could only be published under Greguss's name with [Csengery's] consent. [...] [E]veryone should reach the conclusion that Greguss wrote his paper based on the original text; but he published my manuscript, adding a few neither here nor there lines thought in German and written in Hungarian at the beginning and the end; maybe to calm his own and Csengery's sensitive conscience? This was all done to me without my consent by the respected patriots without even notifying me with a word. It is easy to treat like this the exile who has no rights or name in the country, and who will probably expire on foreign soil!"[99]

Not to place the blame solely on Csengery, based on his correspondence, Rónay did not seem to be aware, or at least did not acknowledge the deep enmity between Csengery and János Török. As he wrote in his memoirs, perhaps even with the purpose of relieving himself from any blame,

> "It is true that I do not know either the spirit, or the editor of this newspaper, but János Török wrote so nicely, describing so vividly the saint cause of the dying Hungarian [nation], the support of which is a patriotic duty, that I could not give an

[99] "Először Szabó József egyetemi tanár es m. akadémiai lev. tag, felolvasta kéziratomat a "Földtani-társulatban"; azután Greguss Ágost, szintén akad. tag, a M. T. Akadémia ülésén; végre megjelent kéziratom a "Budapesti Szemlében", Greguss Ágost neve alatt. És Csengery Antal, mit tett ő? Tudósítom azt mondja: hogy Huxley munkájától megijedt, s hogy nem merte az ismertető honfitárs nevét említeni. – Nem tudom, úgy van-e? de azt tudom, hogy kéziratom Greguss neve alatt, csak az ő beleegyezésével jelenhetett meg a Budapesti Szemlében. […] [M]indenkinek azt kelle következtetni: hogy Huxley művét, az eredeti szöveg után ismertete meg Greguss Ágost; pedig az én kéziratomat közölte, megtoldva néhány se ide se oda, németül gondolt, és magyarul írt bevezető és befejező sorral; tán hogy saját es Csengery által érzékeny lelkiismeretét megnyugtassa? És ezt mind tudtomon kívül, beleegyezésem nélkül követtek el rajtam azok a tisztelt hazafiak, anélkül hogy csak egy szóval is értesítettek volna. Könnyen bántak a száműzöttel, kinek a hazában se joga, de neve, s ki valószínűleg idegen földön fog elpusztulni!" Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, III. 274-75.

> absolute decline; […] I will occasionally write notes; however, not on politics, but on geology."[100]

Török, the controversial editor of editor of the daily *Magyar Sajtó* and *Kelet Népe* [People of the East], rivals of Csengery's ventures, the political daily *Pesti Napló* [Pest Diary] and *Budapesti Szemle* (even though *Kelet Népe* folded in 1856, before *Budapesti* Szemle would start) in the late 1850s.[101] Rónay was an occasional foreign correspondent for both of Török's ventures. Török was not with *Magyar Sajtó*, which had undergone a complete change of the editorial board and was edited by Mór Jókai in 1862,[102] when the serial version of Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* was published. Nevertheless, it was probably not Rónay's best strategic move to refer to this work with *Magyar Sajtó* to Csengery in one letter and then offer his extracts of Huxley's "Man's Place in Nature" for publication in *Pesti Napló* in the next, asking that if *Budapesti Szemle* were not to use the long article, Csengery send it to *Pesti Napló*, "or any other paper that could make use of it."[103]

From Rónay's side, the Greguss-Rónay affair seems like a straightforward story of academic plagiarism even according to the standards of the time: he sent a text, it was read without identifying him as its author, and was finally published under someone

[100] "Igaz, hogy nem ismerem a lapnak sem szellemét, sem szerkesztőjét; de Török János oly szépen írt, oly élénken ecsetelte a haldokló magyarság szent ügyét, melynek támogatása hazafiúi kötelesség, hogy nem adhattam egészen tagadó választ; (…) fogok alkalmilag a tárcza számára írni, de nem politikát, hanem földtani jegyzeteket." Török's letter was dated 26 July 1856. See Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, II. 346-347.

[101] János Török (1807-1874) was a successful newspaper editor in the 1850s, and while he was a controversial figure of Hungarian political journalism, his papers were quite popular. Although in the early 1850s he had been a faithful follower of István Széchenyi's concept of national progress, he founded *Magyar Sajtó* in Vienna (to avoid political persection and censorship in Hungary) in 1855, to be a gazette of "politics, economics, literature and the arts" (according to its title, "a politika, nemzetgazdászat, irodalom és művészet közlönye"). By the time he moved the newspaper to Pest in 1857, he had moved his program onto a more clerical/aristocratic/conservative platform, and he left the editorial position of *Magyar Sajtó* for *Pesti Napló* at the end of 1857. See V. Budsa Margit, *Magyar Sajtóbibliográfia 1850-1867*, (Budapest: Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, 1996), no. 303. On Török, his changing political journalism and *Magyar Sajtó* in the 1850s, see Kosáry and Németh, *Magyar sajtó*, II. 386-398.

[102] Jókai went on to found the newspaper *Hon* the next year, which also published a series by Rónay: "The antiquity of man" [Az ember régisége] based on Lyell's book, in 1863.

[103] Rónay to Csengery, 20 October 1862 and 22 April 1863. OSZK 1929/32, No. 1 and 2.

else's name with the addition of a few extra sentences. It is unclear whether Rónay had seen, or would ever see, the article that Greguss published in *Budapesti Szemle;* however, not only is Greguss's text of a very different nature and of a very different ideological background and agenda than Rónay's, there are only a few pages in the Greguss article based on what he acknowledges to be the manuscript of another, even if unnamed, Hungarian scholar. Nevertheless, the way it was played out in the public shows how much importance was attributed to being published in a respected periodical edited and read by public intellectuals and scholars alike.

Strictly speaking, like so many of the men of science debating Darwinism in the 1860s, Greguss was not a scientist, either.[104] However, he did study – and then abandon – medicine in Vienna and philosophy in Halle, which explains his approach to criticize the idea natural selection from both an anatomical and philosophical perspective. A frequent contributor of many periodicals in the 1850s and 1860s, ranging from the Academy Yearbooks through encyclopedic journals to the daily political press, he was an active member of the Academy and from 1870, a professor at the University of Pest.[105] As so many of his contemporaries reflecting on Darwinism, he was not a natural scientist, but by all means a scholar familiar with and well read in the natural sciences, and as such also part of the scientific reception of Darwinism and at the same time active in its dissemination to the public.

[104] Gábor Palló defines him as a "professor of aesthetics," which is, however, as much of a failed attempt to force Greguss, a scholar with an education and career in the multidisciplinary, humanistic traditions prevalent in nineteenth-century Hungary, into a disciplinary category as calling him "not a naturalist." Moreover, Greguss received his university position in 1870, several years after the events surrounding the "Man's Place in Nature" controversy and the publication of his criticism of Darwinism. Palló, "Scientific Nationalism," 104.

[105] Upon his return from the University of Halle, he took the position of the just deceased Péter Vajda in Szarvas. After a stint in the revolutionary army, his life followed the pattern of many contemporaries in that he spent a few years in hiding to finally start a literary and journalistic career in Pest in 1854. "Greguss Ágost," Szinnyei, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm.

Greguss's study on *Man's Place in Nature*, which actually bears the title "Man's Place in Nature", is a well-argued critical piece that belies Rónay's claim of plagiarism, and displays a familiarity with his sources and the subject matter. The first seven pages are a critical synthesis of the concept of evolution in the works of Lamarck, de Candolle, Lyell, Darwin and Huxley. He specifically addresses critics who attack Huxley for being an atheist and a materialist – based on his understanding of anatomy, likely gained during his years as a medical student – and provides an extensive summary of *Man's Place in Nature*. At this point it becomes painfully clear that, while Greguss had access to Rónay's text, he also read Huxley. On page 427, he states that he had used the "successful extract" [*sikerült kivonat*] made by a compatriot currently living in London; although Greguss does have Huxley's work as well, for the sake of simplicity he uses the extract for the first two parts, and only turns to the original when it comes to writing about the third part.[106] Greguss, whose style of writing was often admired by his contemporaries for its clarity, gives very concise extracts of Rónay's more rambling text, which resulted in an article that reads more "scientific", or at least "scholarly", than Rónay's more fanciful narrative. Greguss, however, unlike Rónay, who made no attempt to read his source critically, also goes on to present criticism of Huxley based on English and French articles published in *Athenaeum*, *Edinburgh Review*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and even the *American Journal of Science and Arts*. In his conclusion on the last pages, Greguss finally gives his reason, constantly alluded to within the text, for his main problem with Huxley: for Greguss, the

[106] Rónay had given a short summary of Huxley's work to Csengery earlier: the first chapter is about man-shaped monkeys [*emberalakú majmok* – in Huxley's original text, man-like apes], the second about the relation between man to the lower animals [*alantasabb állatok*], and the third describes the oldest skull fragments from Englis and Neanderthal (the original title was "On some fossil remains of man"). Rónay claims to "give the first two chapters faithfully," but chose to omit the third, as it "does not belong to the question stated." [A két első fejezetet, minden lényeges részében híven adom; a harmadikról nem szólok, mert nem tartozik a kitűzött kérdéshez.] Letter to Antal Csengery, 22 April 1863, OSZK 1929/32, No. 2.

spiritual nature of man can triumph over sensuality, whereas Huxley stops at sensual nature. And since human nature has this duality, Greguss cannot accept any theory that discounts this duality when it comes to the origin of man: even accepting Darwin's theory explaining the phenomena of plant and animal life, and Huxley's application of the system of evolution to the "zoology of man" [*az ember állattana*], the spiritual, godly origin of man cannot be ignored.

This line of thinking was developed further in Greguss's study on "The theory of progress,"[107] in which he framed the theory of eternal progress as a spiritual rather than material one. Inspired by Renan's "Les sciences de la nature et les sciences historiques," Greguss's introduction reflects on the idea of evolution [*kifejlés*] in contrast to epigenesis [*nemződés*] in Darwin's work (based on Lamarck). However, a quite interesting circumstance, to conclude the Greguss-Rónay affair as reflected in the periodical press, is that the footnote reference to Darwin's *Origin of Species* lists Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* as a version available in Hungarian.[108]

Fajkeletkezés, moreover, was positively reviewed in 1864, on the pages of *Budapesti Szemle*, by none other than Gyula Schwarcz,[109] Rónay's occasional visitor in London, and also the informant who so sympathetically reported to Rónay about the machinations of the Csengery-group at the Academy and the details of Rónay's

[107] Greguss, Ágost, "A haladás elvéről" [The theory of progress], *Magyar Akadémiai Értesítő* 4, no. 2, (1864): 269-294.
[108] Greguss, "A haladás elvéről," 275.
[109] Gyula Schwarcz (1839-1900; multiple spellings of the last name exist), university professor of ancient history, parliamentary representative and member of the academy, visited Rónay on a number of occasions in London. Schwarcz, who spent several years travelling across Europe, gave lectures at and was member of several Hungarian and foreign scientific societies, including the Ethnological Society of London, the Anthropological Society of London, and the Geological Society from the 1860s. He also published in geology not only in Hungarian, and his *On the Failure of Geological Attempts in Greece pior to the Epoch Alexander the Great* was published in London in two volumes in 1862 and 1865, with Rónay's (reluctant) assistance. See Szinnyei, "Schvarcz Gyula," http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/; Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, III. 354-55.

mistreatment in absentia.[110] The review, which generally praises Rónay's contribution to Hungarian literature that make it impossible to ignore his attempt to raise the attention of the Hungarian public to the works of Darwin, Huxley and Lyell, recommends the book on the basis that "in the West, reading it belongs as much to the higher fashion, not to say the spirit of the age, as table turning, spiritualism, [...], etc." The inclusive policy of the journal is further confirmed when the review ends with Schwarcz expressing his deepest hope that Rónay "would not put down his pen, but would use it to fight for the interests of the homeland, following the noble suggestions of his soul, and would not be discouraged by the unfortunage circumstances of the present time."[111] Ironically, despite this endorsement of *Budapesti Szemle*, Rónay would not make any more major contributions to Hungarian Darwinism, and apart from a few small news articles, his activity would more or less cease in the press. The same pattern can be applied to *Budapesti Szemle*, which would continue to operate for several decades, but more and more taking on the role of a literary review, with the role of the natural sciences increasingly diminishing. Although we will see that it would continue to publish studies and reviews addressing themes related to Darwin's work, its role of informing the educated middle class on latest developments of the natural sciences would be taken over by the newly active *Természettudományi Társulat* and its gazette, *Természettudományi Közlöny* [Natural Science Gazette], from 1869.

Apart from review journals and the daily press, encyclopedic magazines that had been emerging as a popular genre among the middle class reading public since the 1850s also started to react to scientific news. Although the most iconic illustrated encyclopedic

[110] Gyula Schwartz, "Fajkeletkezés. Az ember helye a természetben és régisége" [Origin of Species. Man's place in nature and its antiquity], *Budapesti Szemle* 20, no. 64/65 (1864): 282-285.
[111] Schwarcz, "Fajkeletkezés," 282 and 286.

weekly, *Vasárnapi Újság*, founded in 1854, would make the majority of its contribution to the mass dissemination of Darwinism after 1867, there were already articles reflecting on topics that could be of interest to readers with no scholarly bent. Ágost Greguss himself added his opinion "To the monkey-kinship debate [*A majom-atyafiság vitához*]," and the materialist Ferenc Mentovich, an acolyte of Karl Vogt, published an article, "On the vestiges of man in the distant past and his manifestations in the future" [*Az ember nyomai a messzemultban és kinézései a jövőben*] both in *Az Ország Tükre* [The Mirror of the Country] in 1864.[112] Although *Az Ország Tükre* was discontinued in 1865, its successor, *Magyarország és a Nagy Világ* [Hungary and the Great World] would continue to devote a number of articles to Western scientific achievements, Darwinism among them.[113]

As the decade progressed, especially after the changed circumstances following the Compromise, scientific societies and their publications would take over the dissemination of Darwinism to the educated middle class, and the urbanisation of the periodical press would lead to an increasing role of the encyclopedic genre in the mass popularisation of Darwinism. The widening scope of the dissemination of Darwinism to the public reflects the changed circumstances leading up to the Compromise, but the years to follow would prove to be a contextual shift for Darwinism as a concept and a transitional period for the scientific community in a swiftly transforming public sphere.

Darwinism in the Discourse of National Progress, 1867-1875

[112] Cf. Balás et al., "A darwinizmus magyarországi irodalma," 64.
[113] Rónay would also continue to contribute, albeit not only on matters of the relation of geological and social progress, to *Hazánk s a Külföld*, cf. Pál, "Rónay Jácint," 690.

This last section of the chapter will consider some aspects of the public reception of Darwinism between the Austro-Hungarian compromise and the mid-1870s. A transitional period between a long decade of repressions after 1849 and the establishment of a new political status quo, the eight years between 1867 and 1875 provided a fertile field for the development of the sciences and the reception of scientific ideas, even if this fertile field was also undergoing profound changes. With the reactivization of the Academy of Sciences and the scientific societies, the transformation of secondary and higher education, and the disciplinarization of the sciences, the texture of the scientific community also changed. Some men of science became scientists, and a new generation was being educated and trained according to changing professional and disciplinary standards. At the same time, the public sphere was also changing, the press becoming more diverse in character and a growing number of publications appearing on the market. However, the idea of progress advocated in this period was also in transition. Seen by the members of the scientific community active in the advocacy of making science (and Darwinism) known and popular to the public by contributing to various types and levels of the periodical press, and by many of the magazine publishers and editors who gave space to popularization of scientific ideas, as striving ahead following the ideal presented by more developed nations such as Britain, the idea of progress was increasingly seen as an evolutionary process with the aim of catching up as well.

Since this period of the reception of Darwin has been better covered by earlier scholarship in terms of the dissemination of Darwinism in Hungarian society through the periodical press, the following section will focus more on the agents of reception, the complex networks they acted in, and the nature of their contribution, rather than

identifying all instances when Darwin was mentioned in the press.[114] Even more so since by the 1870s, Darwinism had entered public discourse to an extent that Darwinian tropes such as *fejlődés* [evolution, development], *haladás* [progress] or *létérti harc* [struggle for existence], in a variety of forms depending on the translation preferences of the user, would be increasingly present in public discourse without Darwin or his colleagues mentioned. A frequently mentioned figure in the following will be László Dapsy, whose translation of *Origin* is the focus of Chapter 4. This is no accident in the sense that the intention of this chapter is to show that the early disseminators of Darwinism were involved in various layers of reception: maintaining connections within the scientific community, but also active in popularization through the popular encyclopedic weeklies and the daily periodical press. However, just as earlier, Dapsy will not be in the focus just yet, rather presented as part of a network of similarly minded people who were connected to – or members of – the Academy, active in *Természettudományi Társulat*, and published on a variety of subjects from politics through economics, to philosophy, literature, the arts, and also on the natural sciences in a variety of public forums.

As noted above, the Austro-Hungarian Compromise brought a transformation of scientific life. From the aspect of the reception of Darwinism, the most important of these was the *Természettudományi Társulat*, a scientific society that had a diverse membership and an even wider audience in the readers of their publications and the attendees of their popular lectures. Their gazette *Természettudományi Közlöny* aimed at popularizing

[114] Aside from the fact that this is not the aim of the dissertation, Ladányiné provides an impressive list of sources from the publications of scientific source, and Géza Buzinkay has surveyed the reception of Darwinism in the popular press, with a focus on the encyclopedic weeklies such as *Vasárnapi Újság* and *Magyarország és a Nagy Világ*. See Buzinkay, "A darwinizmus és a magyar közgondolkodás az 1870-es években." Katalin Mund, who to an extent appears to rely on the results of these two, provides a useful summary of the reception of Darwinism in Hungarian society, albeit with a focus more on the 1870s and 1880s.

science to the educated middle classes, putting the latest results and discoveries of natural science into the context of social science. It published texts that ranged from excerpts from Charles Darwin, Carl Vogt or John Stuart Mill, through longer studies by respected Hungarian scientists, be they based on original research or – a more general custom in the 1870s – reviews of foreign works, to the transactions of the Society. It also featured excerpts from foreign journals such as the *Popular Science Review*. Darwin's earliest Hungarian translators, László Dapsy, Tivadar Margó, Géza Entz and Aurél Török were regular contributors from the early years.[115]

The Society, in terms of its membership and its associations, had a major role in the dissemination of Darwinism from the early 1870s. This role was also very comprehensive in the sense that the Society, which had considered itself an important forum of the natural sciences, and had been striving to keep the standards of scientific contributions of its members on an increasingly level since the 1840s,[116] took on another agenda upon its revival in the 1860s. The first attempt to bring the Society into "greater bloom" resulted in a proposal suggesting that – instead of the earlier, infrequent yearbooks (only two were published between 1850 and 1860) – the regular publication of a gazette could put the Society in close contact not only with its membership, but also with the public. As a result of these discussions, a first issue was published in June 1860.[117] It was edited by József Szabó, who in the same year drew the attention of the Society to the increasing focus on the natural sciences at the Academy, warning that scholars working on these fields would take their research and publications to the relevant

[115] See Gombocz, *A királyi magyar természettudományi társulat*, 128-144. For the contextualisation of its place within journals specialised by field (e.g. *Századok*, the journal of the *Történelmi Társulat* [Historical Society]), see Kosáry and Németh, II. 2. 497-499.
[116] Gombocz, *A magyar természettudományi társulat*, 90-91.
[117] Gombocz, *A magyar természettudományi társulat*, 102-103.

departments of the Academy. Thus, Szabó suggested that the Society take a look at its original founding principles and modify its current agenda to refocus its activities to become "an organ of mathematics and the natural sciences that would present the gained results in a popular way, working on their dissemination, bringing them to life and making them well liked."[118] Szabó's suggestion makes it explicit that in Hungary, the task of the scientific society was not only an academic matter, but also to bring their scientific work closer to the general public. This also reflected Szabó's cooperation with Csengery's agenda at the Academy to make it the center for Hungarian scientific research. Szabó, who also had a central position at the Academy, had an interest in making the Society an forum of popularisation rather than cutting edge (at least in terms of the limited possibilities allowed on the European periphery) scientific research, but his ideas of a popular gazette and open public lectures were not yet realized at this point.[119]

A decade would pass between the proposal of Szabó, who, citing his commitments at the University, withdrew from the Society in 1860, until the new role of the Society would take its shape. After popular lectures began to take place from 1865, a gazette, *Természettudományi Közlöny*, was started after a significant rehaul of the Society and reformation its executive committee, which now included, among others, Károly Nendtvich, János Kriesch, László Dapsy, József Dorner, József Szabó, important figures already, or to be soon, in the reception and dissemination of Darwinism in Hungary.[120]

Due to the policy of its editor-in-chief, Kálmán Szily, as he outlined in his Introduction to the first issue, *Természettudományi Közlöny* became a forum to make the

[118] "[A] száraz nyomozás helyett a társulat lesz a mathematicai és természettudományoknak azon organuma, mely a nyert eredményeket népszerűen adja elő, elterjesztésükön, életbe léptetésükön s megkedveltetésükön dolgozik." Cf. Gombocz, *A magyar természettudományi társulat*, 103.
[119] Gombocz, *A magyar természettudományi társulat*, 104-105.
[120] For a full list of committee members, see Gombocz, *A magyar természettudományi társulat*, 120.

natural sciences not only popular, but well liked and enjoyed by a wider public. Vowing to put an end to an era when "[t]he Hungarian public does not like natural science" and "scientific works written in Hungarian cannot be sold," he intended to use the *Közlöny* to fill the void in Hungarian literature with a publication that would carry reading material that the public would not only learn from, but also enjoy. The aim of the gazette was twofold: to communicate the latest developments in the natural sciences to the growing membership of the Society and to "slowly inject" scientific knowledge in wider circles. Szily was joined by a group of editors, among them Dapsy (economic botany and zoology), Géza Entz (zoology), and Aurél Török (life science).[121]

Természettudományi Közlöny published a great number of articles on Darwinism from the very beginning, among them reviews and translations of Darwin's works, studies on the applications of Darwinism in Hungarian science and society, and also smaller news items about the reception of Darwin's work and associated debates abroad. In the following pages, a selection of these will be presented, centered around their authors, but also putting them into the context of the wider reception of Darwinism, since the activities of these people was far from limited to the Society.

According to Sándor Soós,[122] one of the major figures in the late 1860s and 1870s was the Vice-President of *Természettudományi Társulat* from the reorganisation in 1869, Tivadar Margó. Margó's contribution to Hungarian Darwinism cannot be emphasized enough: he had a formative role in both the scientific and popular reception of Darwinism in Hungary.[123] Margó's career was somewhat different from most of the

[121] Kálmán Szily, "Olvasóinkhoz" [To our readers], *Természettudományi Közlöny*, 1, no. 1 (1869): 1-4.
[122] Soós, "Scienfific reception," 431.
[123] This is recognised even by those voices who find that the early Hungarian reception of Darwinism was engineered by public intellectuals rather than practitioners of the natural sciences. See, for instance, Palló, "Scientific Nationalism," 104, and his "Darwin utazása Magyarországon," 714-715.

early disseminators of Darwinian thought active in the Society in that he had more scientific training: he studied medicine at the universities in Pest and Vienna, and held faculty positions in Graz, Kolozsvár and from 1863 at the University of Budapest.[124] Margó, known as the only Hungarian scientist to visit Darwin in his home,[125] had a lasting influence on Hungarian zoology and taxonomy, and some go as far as to state that he introduced the methodology of Darwinism into university lectures on zoology.[126] Margó, who served as a scientific consultant to Dapsy's translation of the Origin, was a member of the Academy and published widely on the biological and medical sciences. His contribution to the dissemination of Darwinism in Hungary is not limited to his assistance with Dapsy's translation of *Origin*. His *Darwin és az állatvilág* [Darwin and the animal world] was first read at *Természettudományi Társulat*, then published as a series in the *Közlöny*, and finally published in a separate, illustrated volume in 1869.[127] Margó also wrote Darwin's biography for Géza Entz and Aurál Török's translation of *Descent of Man*, and he delivered Darwin's eulogy at the Hungarian Academy (where the latter had been an honorary member since 1872).[128] As we will see later, so wide was Margó's reach that news of the popular lectures by the distinguished professor of zoology had even reached the mass readership of the illustrated weekly *Vasárnapi Újság*, through

[124] Géza Entz, *Emlékbeszéd Margó Tivadar rendes tagról,* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1898).
[125] See Entz, *Emlékbeszéd*, 16.
[126] See Bozidar Kovacek, "Who is Tivadar Margó?" *Archive of Oncology* 9, no. 1 (2001): 67-70. Kovacek also claims that Margó, the son of a Serbian Orthodox priest, indirectly influenced the work of the first Serbian Darwinist, Jovan Petrovic.
[127] The talks were held on 17th March and 7th April 1869, then published in the *Közlöny* in issues 5 and 6 in the same year (1 (1869): 193-207 and 241-266).
[128] *Emlékbeszád Charles Robert Darwin felett*. He also eulogised Louis Agassiz at the Academy a few years earlier, and the extract of this talk was also published in *Természettudományi Közlöny*, thus making the work of Agassiz, a close colleague and correspondent of Darwin, also a little better known to Hungarian audiences. "Agassiz Lajos emlékezete. Kivonat Margó Tivadar emlékbeszédéből. (Előadatott a m. tud. Akademia 1874. október 26-ikán tartott összes ülésén.)" [The memory of Agassiz Lajos. An Extract from the eulogy of Tivadar Margó. (Delivered at the plenary meeting of the Academy of Sciences, 26 October 1874], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 6 (1874): 410-425.

the report of none else that László Dapsy, who would be soon working together with Margó on the Hungarian translation of *Origin of Species*, published by the *Természettudományi Társulat*.

Természettudományi Közlöny was also among the first to publish news of Darwins's latest work in the early 1870s, and in some cases they were so swift that for instance, János Kriesch's review of *Descent of Man* and Dapsy's translation of its last chapter were published before the Society's edition of Dapsy's *Origin* appeared on the market.[129] Neither Dapsy, nor Kriesch, a professor of zoology at the Technical University of Budapest and a frequent contributor to *Természettudományi Közlöny* and other periodicals,[130] would continue to be involved in the future of *Descent of Man*. The future translators, Géza Entz and Aurél Török, both of them young men in the late 1860s, made contributions to the dissemination of Darwinism to a wider audience, not only through their membership of *Természettudományi Társulat*, where Entz was also member of the executive committee from 1869.[131] Entz, who studied zoology with Margó in Pest, and later followed Kriesch upon the latter's death at the Techincal University, was teaching at the University of Kolozsvár when he and Török translated *Descent*.[132] His article on

[129] Kriesch János, "Darwin legújabb művéről" [On Darwin's latest work], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 25 (1871): 330-340. Dapsy, László, "Darwin legújabb művének utolsó fejezete" [The last chapter of Darwin's latest work]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 26 (1871): 372-384.

[130] *Budapesti Szemle*, despite some gripes about typographical errors and some mistakes in terminology, published a very positive review to his natural history textbook for secondary schools. "Kriesch János: A természetrajz elemei," *Budapesti Szemle* 5, no. 9 (1874): 216-220.

[131] Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, (London: Murray, 1871). *Descent* was published in Hungarian in 1884 (*Az ember származasa és az ivari kiválás*). It was translated by Géza Entz, the first major figure of Hungarian hydrobiology and meteorology, and Aurél Török, who was the first-ever Hungarian professor of anthropology, and who also established craniology, that is, the study of skulls, in Hungary, which came to be a vehicle for the extremist forms of social Darwinism with the rise of nativism in fin-de-siècle Hungary. See Tibor Frank, "Anthropology and Politics: Craniology and Racism in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy," in *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making. Studies in Hungarian Connections to Britain and America 1848-1945*, (Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1999).

[132] See Dudich Endre, "Id. Entz Géza emlékezete születésének százéves évfordulója alkalmából. 1842-1942," *Állattani Közlemények* 39 (1942): 113-124.

Darwinism in the journal *Természet* [Nature], another popular science periodical, was published a year after Margó's *Általános állattan* [General zoology].[133] Török, who was more interested in the application of Darwinian thought to man, was also active in the Society and continued to publish on Darwinism and its themes such as the struggle for existence well into the late 1880s.[134] Török, still during his tenure at Kolozsvár in 1874, contacted Haeckel to successfully gain permission to translate *Anthropogenie*, "a true 'Bible' in the modern sense which should not be missing in any family circle."[135]

Also based in Kolozsvár was Lajos Felméri, whose example illustrated the importance of correspondence within the scholarly network, and who is yet another academic who contributed to the public dissemination of Darwinism even though he belonged to a discipline other than natural science. Felméri, whose work on pedagogy was widely appreciated in academic circles,[136] had "studied [Darwin's system] the first time in Jena, after having heard it from prof. Haeckel."[137] In his letter to Darwin in January 1873, not only did he inform Darwin that Felméri's review of *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* would soon appear in *Természettudományi Közlöny,*[138] but also that he would be giving lectures on the contact points of Darwinism and

[133] Entz, Géza, "Darwinismus," *Természet* 1 (1868): 18-22, 30-33, 39-43, 61-65. Tivadar Margó, *Általános állattan* [General zoology], Pest: Lampel, 1868.
[134] Rapaics Rajmund, Török Aurél ("M.B.T."). TTM 269/68/2 (3-5 p.)
[135] Aurél Török to Ernst Haeckel, 12 November 1874, EHH; Haeckel to Török, 16 November 1874, MTAKK Ms. 4093/237 (copy).
[136] His work on education was the basis of his election as corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, see MTA RAL 160/1883 and 278/1885.
[137] "I was then deep convinced, that it is impossible to speak on the connection of body and mind without accepting your principles of the origin of species. And as I became a professor in psychology in the year 1868, I was so much animated by the principles of the 'descendenz-theorie', that I was called by the surname: homo-Darwin!" Lajos Felméri to Charles Darwin, 3 January 1873, CUL DAR 164:116. Even though Felméri's letter reflects a clear influence of his studies with Haeckel, especially visible from the multiple use of "descendenz-theorie", Felméri's early career clearly shows how practicioners of various disciplines tried to apply the idea of evolution to their field.
[138] Lajos Felméri, "A nevetésről : Egy fejezet Darwin legújabb művéből," *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5, no. 45 (1873): 179-192.

psychology in Kolozsvár, where his "listeners receive always with great delight the principles of the 'descendenz-theorie.'" Felméry's study on *The Expression of Emotions* is not only important because it was published so soon after its original publication,[139] but because he extended his enthusiasm for applying it to his own field to applying it to his own people: in the letter, he also provided Darwin with further examples, expressing his disappointment that "our classical people, the Székelys (szekler), [...] a transition from the natural to the civilized state" were left out of Darwin's work. Not everyone in Kolozsvár was so taken with Darwin's work, though: *The Expression of Emotions* was reviewed a few years later in *Erdélyi Múzeum* [Transylvanian Museum], which had been publishing articles on Darwinism since the 1860s. Béla Dezső, the author of the review was "very sorry that here the Darwinian theory has been elevated to such a prestigious status that makes it almost impossible to doubt or apply criticism against it."[140] Dezső suggested that further research on the subject should be undertaken by those who are authorized by their profession.

To stay briefly with the periodical press outside of Budapest, they also made a significant contribution to spreading the word about Darwinism. In many cases, this meant the pedagogical press, which, due to the near monopoly of the churches in Hungarian education in the second part of the nineteenth century, was almost exclusively of a denominational character, the two most important being the Roman Catholic *Tanodai Lapok* [School Papers] and the *Protestáns Egyházi s Iskolai Szemle* [Protestant Church

[139] Felméri starts his letter thanking Darwin for having sent him the work. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* was published in 1872 (London: John Murray).
[140] Béla Dezső, "Az indulatok kifejeződése az embernél és állatoknál" [The expression of emotions in man and animals], *Erdélyi Múzeum* 5 (1878): 8-12. Dezső's review, however, is based in J. V. Carus's 1872 German translation.

and School Review].[141] However, many college towns had their own Protestant and/or Catholic educational review. *Sárospataki Füzetek* [Sárospatak Notebooks], for instance, was among the first in Hungary to publish a comprehensive paper on the development of the natural sciences (with references to Darwin's work) in relation to theology in 1868.[142] Intended to be a comprehensive scientific and scholarly periodical at its start in 1857, *Sárospataki Füzetek* was something of a disappointment, and in 1869, when the last issue was published, it was considered a decent, if not significant, forum on the history of Protestant church and educational history. The yearbook of the Székesfehérvár secondary school of the Cistercian order also published a long study on Darwin's theory with attention to psychology.[143] The respective authors, although positive towards the scientific merits of Darwin's theories, attempted to separate biological matters from the human spirit, which was a feature of even the most positive reviews coming from any denominational publication. Both studies cite English and German sources; however, the Catholic one also references Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* and Margó's *Darwin and the Animal World*, which shows that works aimed at an audience wider than the academic circles reached religious institutions as well.

While the religious reception of Darwinism in Hungary is not the focus of the dissertation,[144] it is worth a note here since primary and secondary education was to a

[141] Kosáry and Németh, *Magyar sajtó*, II.1.677.
[142] László Gonda's study will be discussed in greater detail in relation to the Hungarian reception of *Vestiges of Creation* in Chapter 2.
[143] B. L., "Nézetek Darwin elméletéről, különösen psychológiai szempontból" [Views on Darwin's theory, especially from a psychological point of view], *Értesítvény a Zircz-Cziszterci Rend Székesfehérvári Főgymnásiumáról az 1873/74 tanév végén,* Székesfehérvár, 1874.
[144] The religious and theological receptions of Darwinism in Hungary have not been comprehensively researched and thus are rather inconclusive, but the agreement is generally, and this is reflected in the existing literature, that Protestant publications had an interest in bringing theology and Darwinism together in conversation, since "shared origin does not contradict our spiritual being." See Kovács, "'Intellectual Treasures of Humankind,'" 85. Katalin Mund gives a brief account of the Hungarian religious debates on Darwinism, 445-457.

very large extent in the hands of the churches. The reception of Darwinism was thus in many respects influenced by the church; for instance, through their periodicals, which reflected a variety of approaches and reactions. These, however, ranged from positive to negative, and this was reflected by their publications. *Keresztény Magvető* [Christian Sower], a Unitarian publication (printed in the press of the Catholic lyceum in Kolozsvár), drew attention to the fact that in England, by the open and popular dissemination of the latest results of the natural sciences, including Darwinism, they managed to avoid the huge divide between scientists and the people, such as in Germany.[145] On the other hand, *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai figyelmező* [Hungarian Protestant church and school review] published a series on "Statements of respected scientists of our day against materialism, Darwinism and pantheism," in which, based on mostly German, but also a few British sources, Imre Révész addresses criticism against Darwin as well, with the final conclusion that the natural sciences would never surpass Christianity in moral culture.[146] It is however, worth nothing, that not only did *Protestáns Egyházi és Iskolai Lapok* publish an early review of the Hungarian *Vestiges* by the academic József Pólya in 1858, but it continued to inform its readership of the publication of Darwin's works as well: in 1861, it recommended Jánosi's review of *Origin* in *Budapesti Szemle,*[147] and gave news of the impending publication of Dapsy's

[145] Gergely Benczédi, "Különfélék. London, 1866" [Varia. London, 1866], *Keresztény Magvető* 3 (1867): 276-277.

[146] Imre Révész, "Tekintélyes tudósok nyilatkozatai korunkból a materializmus, darwinizmus és pantheizmus ellen" [Statements of respected scientists of our day against materialism, Darwinism and pantheism], *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai figyelmező* 3, no. 1-2 (1872): 22-34.

[147] E—y, "Mozgalom az angol egyház körében" [Movement in the English church], *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai lap*, 4, no. 46 (1861): 1496-1499. The author cites a foreign correspondent of the paper *Magyarország*, reporting from London. At this time, the editor of the paper was János Pompéry, a frequent contact of Jácint Rónay.

Origin as early as 1871,[148] when it was still in the planning stages, information which implies a certain level of contact.

The brief run of *Marosvásárhelyi Füzetek*, edited by Ferenc Mentovich (1819-1879), was a popularization of the sciences with an emphasis on materialism. Mentovich had published on the newer developments of evolution and its social applications since 1863,[149] and dedicated the second edition of his book *Új Világnézlet* [sic; New World View] to the *enfant terrible* of German natural science, the vulgar materialist Carl Vogt, who gave a series of lectures in Pest in 1869. In his dedication, he acknowledges Vogt's politeness when Vogt did not want to overstrain the sensibilities and weaknesses of his hosts' mind, and refrained from addressing some sensitive issues. However, Mentovich also points out the openness of the public that received Vogt in the Hungarian capital.[150] The dedication reflects that Mentovich, a resident of Marosvásárhely, could only rely on the reports of the press from Pest, which were diverse in enthusiasm, approach and politics.

The reception of Vogt's lectures in Pest also reflects how diverse branches of the press reported to their readers about Vogt, and how dependent the reception of scientific controversy was on social consciousness, professionalization, and political affiliation. *Természettudományi Közlöny* published detailed reports of the first, second and sixth

[148] "Különfélék" [Varia], *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai lap*, 14, no. 27 (1871) 855.

[149] Ferenc Mentovich, "Az ember nyomai a messzemultban és kinézései a jövőben" [The vestiges of man in the far past and his prospects in the future], *Az Ország Tükre* 1864, 30-31. Mentovich, Ferenc. *A természettan elemei* [Elements of natural history]. Marosvásárhely, 1865. Ferenc Mentovich, *Új világnézlet* [The new world view], (Marosvásárhely: 1870).

[150] Vogt visited a number of cities in Austria-Hungary, and his reception was far from welcoming everwhere. For instance, for Vienna and other cities in the Empire, see Michler, *Darwinismus und Literatur*, 39-41.

lectures,[151] generally positive in attitude, but with the remark that some of the lectures were too specialized to interest their audience.[152] The popular encyclopedic weekly *Vasárnapi Újság* devoted a two-part article, written by Dapsy,[153] whose article on the Vogt lectures is extremely positive, focusing on Vogt's ideas of the prehistory of the human race and the Asian origin of Europeans, but avoiding the issue of linking the human race to apes, a theory for which Vogt was notorious.[154] The political press was somewhat more diverse, depending on their political affiliation and the associated liberal or conservative value systems. *Hon* [Homeland], the newspaper of the liberal opposition,[155] published quite enthusiastic reviews of the lectures,[156] *Borsszem Jankó* [Tom Thumb], a satirical weekly, addressed Vogt's lectures in two consecutive issues, publishing a parody of the lecture on 12 December 1869, and a caricature of Vogt, complete with some zoo animals and the head of opposition leader Kálmán Tisza on December 19.[157]

The scandalous Vogt was not the only controversial scientist to reach the daily press and the popular weeklies, and awareness of Darwin reached more and more layers

---

[151] "Vogt előadásai Pesten (Tartattak az evang. gymnasium disztermében, 1869. decz. 13., 14., 18., 20., 22. és 23-án)" [Vogt's lectures in Pest (Held in the auditorium of the Lutheran secondary school], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 2, no. 10 (1870): 29-37; no. 11., 70-79; no. 13., 163-173.

[152] In a not to the third report, the author of the Hungarian extracts explained that while the Hungarian versions of the lectures were read at Society meetings, they came to the conclusion that because of the lack of print space and general interest, they should not publish all six articles. 163.

[153] László Dapsy, "Vogt Károly fölolvasásai az ember őstörténelméről" [Karl Vogt's readings on the prehistory of man], 19 December 1869, 704 and 26 December 1869, 716.

[154] Vogt was a proponent of polygenist evolution, rejected the monogenist beliefs of most Darwinists, and instead he believed that each race had evolved off different types of ape: "whites from the chimpanzee, blacks from the gorilla, and orientals from the orang-utan." (Browne, *Origin of Species*, 128.) "The gradual evolution of human being from ape-like progenitors and the relationship between man and animals" were rather controversial ideas at the centre of many reviews, debates and comments as early as 1860. See Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 9.

[155] The German language liberal newspapers, e.g. *Neuer Ferier Lloyd* was also very enthusiastic, as reflected in a short report. 21 December 1869.

[156] *Hon,* 11 and 16 December 1869.

[157] "Vogt tana" [Vogt's teaching, *Borsszem Jankó,* 19 December 1869, 106, and "Vogt Károly eléadásából" [From Karl Vogt's lecture], *Borsszem Jankó,* 26 December 1869, 494.

of society. The discussion of Darwin and his work also reached the political press by the early 1870s, and in some cases, the same members of the scientific community were the ones to publish their opinion and reports. An interesting case for this is the example of *Reform*, especially because the space given to articles on Darwinism is an indication of how intricate the map of dissemination and the role of those involved had become by the early 1870s.[158] Even though the editors of *Reform* were of the opinion that Hungarian patriotic feeling was at a low and Hungary was lagging behind in the "competition of the nations," they refused to accept the social application of the Darwinian idea of struggle for existence. Nonetheless, their agenda for social and cultural progress, expressed on 19 August 1871 is based on adaptation rather than struggle: "We have to be content with not falling behind the world [...], if we can adapt foreign results to our national spirit and the nature of our country."[159] This, to some extent, is similar to those to be later expressed by Dapsy on the subject of translation.

As Dapsy wrote to Darwin in 1873,

> "In the last winter session of the Hungarian parliament a very conspicioous [sic] member of it, Mr Paul Somsich on an occasion attacked your whole theory. Because he was in the last year president of the parliament, and now very influential member of the Right, I answered to him publicly in the "Reform": one of the largest Hungarian newspaper: very severely attacking him again for his groundless assertion, and he answered to me also publicly, recalling his former assertion, – and in all this it is the most interesting to me, that the public with many sign of sympathy have received me for your defence; – it is therefore not to be doubted that the Origin of Species shall exercise great influence here."[160]

[158] *Reform* was founded in 1869 by Jenő Rákosi, who had just left *Pesti Napló*. Relying on a group of young journalists, the influential editor intended *Reform* to serve "as one of the factors of practical progress," and while close to the governing Deák-party, they did not consider themselves a party newspaper. Thus, *Reform* strived at the complete anonymity of its contributors and thus to be able to present contradictory political agendas. These consideration extended to topic beyond politics, and articles on Darwinism by László Dapsy and Bernát Alexander appeared Kosáry and Németh, *Magyar sajtó*, II.2.141-144.
[159] Cf. Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó*, II.2.145.
[160] Dapsy to Darwin, 1 June 1873, CUL DAR 162:41.

Reform, whose editorial policy was to publish most of their material anonymously,[161] did contain at least one article in the spring of 1871 about Darwin, "whose scientific output has toughly confronted superstition and prejudices.[162] The overall effect of Dapsy's contribution cannot be estimated, but even his confrontational style did not dissuade Somssich from subscribing to the book series of the *Természettudományi Társulat* in which Dapsy's *Origin* would be soon published.

The most important difference that occurred in the public reception of Darwinism reflected by the press was that a new type of popular publication emerged after 1867, and unlike the political daily press, it had a specific agenda aiming at the dissemination of knowledge. Thus, at the same time when *Természettudományi Közlöny* started to address a wider audience than their membership by making their gazette more accessible and opened up their popular lectures to the public, an even wider segment of the middle and lower middle class was being vowed by the new genre of illustrated weekly journal.

Vasárnapi Újság, first published in 1854 by the Heckenast publishing company, was an unprecedented phenomenon of newspaper publishing in Hungary: the first Hungarian illustrated weekly magazine aimed at a wide reading public. While the original aim of the publisher was to create an informative publication for the widest possible readership, it soon became an encyclopedic journal, a family paper aimed at those members of the middle classes who had a deeper interest in the world around them than what an ordinary daily newspaper could offer.[163] The aim of the editors was to introduce all the many and varied branches of science as a whole in a way that was comprehensible

[161] Kosáry and Németh, *A magyar sajtó*, II.2.140-149.
[162] "Darwin Róbert Károly," *Reform*, 20 March 1871.
[163] Kosáry and Németh, A magyar sajtó, I.296. György Kókay; Géza Buzinkay and Gábor Murányi, A magyar sajtó története [The History of the Hungarian Press], (Budapest: Sajtóház Kiadó, 2001), 73.

and digestible for the widest possible audience, based on the examples provided by *Illustrated London News*, *Gartenlaube*, or *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung*, so far missing from the range of contemporary Hungarian press publications.[164]

By 1867, *Vasárnapi Újság* had become the most popular encyclopaedic weekly in Hungary. Aimed at a wide readership among the urban middle classes and an increasing focus on readership made up by Protestant lower nobility in the country, its articles addressed politics, culture, science, literature and the arts. *Vasárnapi Újság* was the first popular organ aimed at a mass audience in Hungary to publish extensively about the new developments of materialism, positivism and liberalism, and it was also the first among this type of magazines to publish articles about Darwinism as early as the mid-1860s.[165]

The case of *Vasárnapi Újság*, although certainly not unique, is a good illustration to how the early reception of Darwinism, be it in a narrow, "scholarly" sense or in a wider, "popular" discourse, was to a large extent engineered by the same group of people. The level of involvement of the scientific community in making science popular and easier to understand among the masses was in contrast with the situation in Victorian Britain, where the professionalization of science resulted in an earlier and wider divide between professional and popular science. The formation of stricter disciplines and subdisciplines within the sciences, and the parallel process of the professionalization of journalism caused British magazine and news editors to look for professional journalists instead of scientists. These journalists "could convey the broader significance of [scientific] discoveries," and had to have the "ability to present the huge mass of

[164] Dorottya Lipták, *Újságok és újságolvasók Ferenc József korában* [Newspapers and their readers in the age of Francis Joseph]. (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002), 53.
[165] Kosáry and Németh, II.1.213.

scientific fact in the form of compelling stories."[166] The same was true of the popularizers of Darwinism in Hungary, or at least to their best intentions; however, in many cases they were practitioners of the scientific profession or at least scholars of a certain status. The editors of popular encyclopedic journals and even political dailies recognized the need to publish material in the latest developments in science and technology because of the social applications and the interest they generated among their readership. On the other hand, however, the contribution of some members of the scientific community to popular encyclopedic weeklies such as *Vasárnapi Újság* meant using their position as respected scholars of their field to further the progress of the Hungarian nation and Hungarian culture by educating the mass readership of popular magazines.

There is a significant amount of overlap between the first academic discussants and translators of evolutionary thought and the first translators of Darwinism into the language of the middle classes. This group consisting – among others – of László Dapsy, Tivadar Margó, Gyula Schwarcz, Jenő Kvassay and Gyula Petrovits, was a loose network of young members of various scientific societies, many of them teaching medicine or natural science in secondary or university education. They were keen on publishing their work aimed not only in scientific publications, *Természettudományi Közlöny* or the more general *Budapesti Szemle*, but also in magazines such as *Vasárnapi Újság*, admittedly a venture with the aim of simultaneously entertaining and educating the masses. While it was not only the *Vasárnapi Újság* that published extensive and often rather good quality pieces on Darwin and his work, the combination of its wide and appreciative audience, relatively high scientific value and reader-friendly and transparent style made it a desirable vehicle for the supporters of Darwinism to seek new disciples. Their honest

[166] Kosáry and Németh, II.1.188.

enthusiasm about Darwinism and its possible positive effect on social progress in Hungary served as motivation to present it, in the shorter, simpler article format employed by encyclopedic journalism, as the most important scientific and intellectual breakthrough of the era. There were also many references made to Darwin in other articles on the social sciences, technology, anthropology or culture, since for reasons of simplicity and practical educational purposes, many intellectual and scientific ideas and developments of the era were linked back to Darwin's revolutionary discoveries.[167]

The most prolific Hungarian Darwinist publishing in the *Vasárnapi Újság* was again László Dapsy, whose three articles on Darwin were not the only ones he published in the *Vasárnapi Újság*: he wrote on a great number of topics in the areas of natural science and related philosophical treatises, including on the 1869 lectures by Vogt in Vienna and Budapest. The articles he wrote for the encyclopedic weekly, however, display a different tone from his more serious studies published in *Természettudományi Közlöny* or *Budapesti Szemle*, even if their agenda to effect national progress through the translation of foreign work into the national language remained the same despite the different narrative frame.

Dapsy, his translation, and his role in the Society will be the main subject of Chapter 4. However, it is important to discuss his role in the popularization of Darwinism in the context of the larger networks of the scientific community; while his life and career will also be treated in greater detail in Chapter 4, some points of reference, especially those connecting him to the others active in the Society and in disseminating Darwinism in a wider circle, are worth mentioning here in advance. Arguably the loudest voice, even if not the biggest name in making Darwin a household name in the nineteenth century, his

[167] Kosáry and Németh II.1.221.

main contribution was not scientific, but rather organizational, which culminated in his translation of *Origin*, which was his also his last major contribution, in a sense a conclusion, to the first stage of reception in the history of Hungarian Darwinism. Educated in Debrecen, "the Calvinist Rome", he encountered Darwinian thought while on an exchange program of the Scottish Presbyterian Church at New College, Edinburgh.[168] On his return to Pest, he taught in the Calvinist secondary school, published natural history coursebooks, and published on a variety of subjects from political economy to natural history, including biographies of Darwin and articles on Darwinism in popular and scientific journals. His crowning achievement was the foundation of a publishing house within *Természettudományi Társulat*, which aimed at publishing important scientific works by Western scholars. His translation of *Origin of Species,* published in two volumes in 1873 and 1874, was the second in a series that brought works by authors such as Darwin, Lyell or Huxley, and published over ninety such translations between 1871 and 1920. The series was very well received, and the first several volumes were given generally positive reviews in *Budapesti Szemle.*[169]

Dapsy wrote his first extensive article about Darwin in *Vasárnapi Újság*, in the form of a report on a public lecture given by Tivadar Margó.[170] In the article, Dapsy gave a positive review of the lecture, based on Margó's own recently published book on Darwin,[171] but his main agenda was to bring Darwin's theory and his main principles as

[168] Kovács, Ábrahám. "'Intellectual Treasures of Humankind': Religion, Society and László Dapsy's Translation of *On the Origin of Species*," in *Calvinism on the Peripheries: Religion and Civil Society in Europe*. ed. Ábrahám Kovács. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009. 78-89.
[169] The first, József Szabó's review of Gyula Petrovics's translation of Bernhard von Cotta's *Geologie der Gegenwart*, appeared in 1874. József Szabó, "A jelen geologiája, írta Bernhard von Cotta." *Budapesti Szemle* 5, no. 9 (1874): 220-222.
[170] László Dapsy, "Darwin és az állatvilág" [Darwin and the animal world], *Vasárnapi Újság*, 18 July 1869, 397.
[171] Tivadar Margó, *Darwin és az állatvilág*, (Pest: Aigner L., 1868).

close to the average reader of the journal as possible. In this sense, the article is both a review of Darwin's work tailored to a popular audience, but also a review of the work of the physician and university professor Margó, who, unlike Dapsy, was a respected member of the scientific community. Margó's book and lecture discussed the main principles of Darwinism that "had recently caused such a stir in the scientific world of the whole of Europe, and also in America." Before turning to the contents of the lecture Dapsy notes that the lecture hall was filled by representatives of every age group of the "more sophisticated class of society," including a few women, even if "deeper acquaintance with these doctrines is not suitable for them."[172] What is more interesting about the article is that it gave an opportunity to Dapsy to address some issues of contemporary public reception that would not have been as appropriate on the pages of a more scholarly publication. This reflected an awareness of the difference between audiences and the need for a different approach, but it also gave him greater liberty in assessing Darwin's significance for progress and development in society and culture.

The introduction to the lecture and to the article is non-confrontational, likely due to the desire to address as many readers as possible without the danger of losing those prone to conservative or religious criticism of Darwinism. However, the rather liberal ideology characteristic of the magazine until the late 1870s allowed Dapsy to express a positive opinion of Darwin's work, even if his subject, Margó himself had no intention to judge whether the theories, "supposed to be dangerous," were true or not. The reactions, however, indicated that "something [was] rotten in the state of Denmark." The article itself, and the conclusion especially, contains much less about Margó and his view on

[172] This reflection on the mental capacities of women is really not surprising considering even the views of Darwin and his contemporaries, but rather unfortunate in the sense that *Vasárnapi Újság*, like so many publication in this vein, was aimed at and read by the whole family.

Darwin and the animal world than commentary by Dapsy, giving the readers some general guidelines on how to assess the impact of Darwin on intellectual life and its practical implications. While Dapsy acknowledges the possible complications caused by the contradiction between creation and evolution, the reader might wonder how much his glossing over the problem was due to the forum and the audience of this article, or how much of this Margó had addressed in his lecture. In the end, however, he focuses on their practical applications in everyday life: even Darwin's ideological detractors admit the advantages to be gained from the practical side of Darwinism, as put to use in agriculture and selective breeding in agriculturally more advances countries such as Germany, Great Britain or France. Hungary was of course a mainly agricultural country, and it is understandable that this reference to the possibility of applying Darwinian theory in practice might have been attractive to readers for whom "practical" aspects of natural science carried more practical interest than natural philosophy."[173] Although it is true that Darwinian theory did not offer much more than a rationale to extend artificial breeding practices already known (as Dapsy was probably aware), the assertion at the end of the article is a sign of his resolve to defend Darwinism against likely censure from conservatives.

Dapsy's next article was a long feature on the title page, illustrated by an impressive woodcut portrait of Darwin. [174] Kicking off with a biographical sketch, the article places Darwin in the "scientific aristocracy," being not only the descendant of respected scientists, but also a wealthy squire. It remains a matter of conjecture whether

[173] This was a recurrent theme in early works recommending Darwin's work to a wider audience. Practical applications for agriculture to be found in *Origin* had not only been addressed by Gyula Schwarcz's 1864 review of Jácint Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* (in *Budapest Szemle*), but it would be one of Dapsy's arguments for the usefulness of Darwin's work in the Introduction of Dapsy's translation of *Origin*.
[174] László Dapsy, "Darwin Róbert Károly," *Vasárnapi Újság*, 26 March 1871, 153-53.

by this social and intellectual elevation Dapsy wished to establish respectability for Darwin's work by presenting him as a country squire in order to make evolution theory more acceptable in the eyes of some readers of the magazine. Dapsy also asserts the need for more proof to underline Darwin's claims, while also assuring the reader that certain basic principles of Darwin (like the evolution of species and the modifying effects of the environment) had been around long enough to have earned some measure of trust already.[175] Finally, Dapsy places Darwin among the greatest contemporary thinkers. Yet the main point is his declaration of intent to create an appropriate place for Darwin's ideas in Hungarian scientific and cultural discourse, which task would be considerably easier if a much wider audience were able to access them. This was not only a way to reinforce pieces of information that were already well known to the scientific community but not so evident to the mass readership of the popular magazine, but also a way to lay down the public foundations for Dapsy's most enduring project, the publishing society of the *Természettudományi Társulat*, which would not only publish his translation of *Origin of Species*, but also other foreign scientific works, and thus make these fundamentals accessible for the Hungarian public.

This agenda would also be prevalent in Dapsy's third article on Darwin in *Vasárnapi Újság*,[176] which used Darwin's fascinating account from his travels in the Tierra del Fuego about the filthy, uncivilized, inarticulately rattling natives "living on the lowest level of intellectual existence" in order to illustrate that the difference between the former and the Western world is in the differences in access to modern scientific

[175] The assertion toward the readers that Darwin himself had also admitted that some of his ideas were rooted in principles that had been widely accepted in earlier times, for instance in the era of the French Revolution (meaning, presumably, Lamarck), shows that Dapsy had a sensitivity towards how readers of different social and cultural backgrounds could be influenced by using arguments of different character.

[176] László Dapsy, "Az ember a fejlődés legalsó fokán" [Man on the lowest stage of evolution], *Vasárnapi Újság*, 24 September 1871, 486-87.

knowledge. Access to knowledge is the vehicle that leads to progress and the revival of the nation, and while this is not spelled out, the context of the article is clearly Dapsy's ongoing project of scientific translation.

Apart from Dapsy, other young members of the scientific elite were also active in creating a public awareness of Darwinism. Jenő Kvassay presented Darwin's latest works in a several articles in the early 1870s, many of them reflecting the interests of those active in *Természettudományi Társulat*.[177] Gyula Petrovits's article on "The evolution of man's intellectual and moral abilities" leads to far-reaching conclusions on civilization and civil society.[178] It is a review, "a sketch compressed in a cherry pip," of *The Descent of Man*, which was published in that very year in Britain. Petrovits also mentions that although the ideas expressed are "as elevated as we can expect from the studies and the pen of a Darwin," they do not "bear the stamp of definiteness [yet]." Petrovits also concentrates on the social aspects of the Darwinian theories, with special attention on their implications for Hungarian national progress. The points of the book he highlights are the development of intellectual talent; civil society and barbarism; the role and significance of mimicry; sympathy, friendship and moral development; loyalty, courage, obedience and self-sacrifice; the heroes of the fossil age; habits; and the self-esteem and vanity of our ancestors. Petrovits calls the readers' attention to the fact that the "intensification of civilization is circumscribed or hurried by many circumstances, and

[177] Jenő Kvassay, "A rovarok Darwin tanában" [Insects in Darwinian Theory], *Vasárnapi Újság*, 12 December 1872, 663; Jenő Kvassay, "Darwin legújabb munkája. A kedélyhangulatok kifejezése az embernél és az allatnál." [Darwin's latest work. The expression of emotional states in humans and animals], *Vasárnapi Újság*, Part 1, 9 March 1873, 115-17; Part 2, 16 March 1873, 130; Part 3, 23 March 1873, 142; Part 4, 8 June 1873, 154; Jenő Kvassay, "A létérti harc. (Darwin könyvéből.)" [The struggle for existence (From Darwin's Book.)], *Vasárnapi Újság*, Part 1, 28 September 1873, 465; Part 2, 5 October 1873, 478; Part 3, 12 October 1873, 487.

[178] Gyula Petrovits, "Az ember értelmi es erkölcsi képességeinek fejlődése. Darwin legújabb műveiből" [The evolution of man's intellectual and moral abilities. From the Darwin's latest works], *Vasárnapi Újság*, 4 June 1871, 291-92, 315-16.

progress is not a fixed rule." This is a reference to Walter Bagehot, who warned that while "[o]ur habitual instructors, our ordinary conversation, our inevitable and ineradicable prejudices tend to make us think that "Progress" is the normal fact in human society, […] history refutes this."[179] There is no evidence that they knew that Darwin himself approved of Bagehot's tenet that progress was "neither necessary nor normal" in human history,[180] but reference to Bagehot, who, four years later made a groundbreaking analysis of the natural and social sciences in *Physics in Politics*, is another proof that the editors and contributors at the *Vasárnapi Újság* were not necessarily amateur spokesmen of new-fangled ideas, but were interested in scientific ideas newly conceived in the West.[181] As a matter of fact, *The Descent of Man* echoes the sentiment that progress and the coming of the golden age of civilization and progress – as Petrovits set out to convince the reader – is not inevitable or usual in human societies.

By the 1870s, Darwinism reached a very different level of public awareness. Within ten years it had become a point of reference not only for scholars, but also for the wider public: Darwin's name and a certain vulgar interpretation of Darwinism were present in the satirical press, but also in literature. Literary references to Darwinism also appeared on a very wide scale: from the geological history of the earth in Mór Jókai's 1871 novel *Fekete gyémántok* [Black diamonds],[182] through a drama writing competition organized by the Academy of Sciences in the same year. The latter, a competition named

[179] Walter Bagehot, "The Use of Conflict." http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1873bagehot.html

[180] John C Greene, *Science, Ideology, and World View. Essays in the History of Evolutionary Ideas*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 109-112.

[181] The reference to Bagehot is not unique to Petrovits in the history of the Hungarian reception of Darwinism: Darwin suggests the study of Bagehot, who had considered "political economy or more strictly speaking, politics, in relation to primitive races of man" to Béla Földes-Weisz, a professor of economics in Budapest, who had approached him with a question about the study of political economy "under the light of the principle of evolution." Darwin to Földes-Weisz, 8 May 1874, CUL DAR 148:3.

[182] In the chapter "Ősapánk" [Our forefather]. Since Jókai's newspaper *Hon* covered Vogt's lectures in 1869, it is not unlikely that Jókai based his material on that, since he was not entirely comfortable witth Darwinism. See Veress Zoltán, *Jókai természettudománya*, (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1976), 20-24.

after Count József Teleki and judged by members of the Academy Ferenc Pulszky and Károly Szász, and actors Ede Paulay and Kálmán Szerdahelyi, included piece called *Szakáll* [Beard], a comedy with a double purpose: "to refute the Darwin-Vogt monkey-kinship theory," and to convert Hungarian women to become good Hungarian patriotic women instead of following foreign manners. The attempt was found wanting, since it was judged long and tiring, with bad iambic patterns and foreign-sounding language.[183]

This chapter has provided the initial background to an easier contextualization and understanding of the conditions in which the three translations of early evolutionary literature were received in Hungary. A selective sampling from a burgeoning genre, it has nonetheless shown that in the first stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary the boundaries between scientific and popular reception, the scientific community and the public, and scholarly publications and general press, were very fluid where they existed at all. Naturally these boundaries and groups underwent constant change and growth. Yet the development of scientific professionalization, the emergence of disciplinary and subdisciplinary fields within science, and the changing character of the press also reflect a changing approach to the dissemination of Darwinism.

The mid-1870s, however, brought an end to the first stage of the reception of Darwinism. When Darwin's theory of natural selection first entered the country, it was still subject to political repression that was reflected in the limited engagement with the social applications of early Darwinism. The creation of a new political system and adjustment to the changed circumstances following the compromise brought about a set of diverse reactions to Darwinism. But by the middle of the decade, with the

[183] "Tizenkettedik akadémiai ülés. Összes ülés. 1871. martius 20-kán" [12th plenary meeting of the Academy], *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Értesítője*, 6 (1871): 92.

disintegration of the Deák Party, and the coming to power of Kálmán Tisza and the Liberal Party in 1875, a new status quo was established, with new agendas. The gradual change in the form and content of Darwinism in the mid-1870s could perhaps best be interpreted within the Spencerian notion of the survival of the fittest, which first started to make waves in the public around this time. In another sense, this was a conflict between the aim of attaining European standards and the idea of autonomy within closed national boundaries – a battle whose outcome was still undecided.

Chapter 2
Evolution before Darwin:
The Hungarian Encounter with *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*

Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation, the work of an anonymous author, first published by prestigious medical publisher John Churchill in London in October 1844. Twelve years later, its Hungarian translation, *A teremtés természettörténetének nyomai*, the work of József Somody Pápa, left the printing press of the Calvinist college of his hometown Pápa, a small town in Western Hungary. A comprehensive tract based on the theory of transmutation, *Vestiges* "described not only the progress of the animal world from specks to living matter to men and women, but also the development of the astronomical universe and the mental life of mankind."[184] It immediately captured the attention of not only the scientific community, but what is more, electrified a significant portion of British society, and became one of the most influential – and notorious – books of the early Victorian era. As one of the first complete histories of the earth from its beginnings to the present according to an evolutionary principle, it has often been categorized as merely a predecessor of the *Origin of Species*; however, it has much importance and merit beyond that. This is also what James Secord argues in *The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*,[185] when he paints the portrait of Victorian London and the British countryside through the publication and reception history of *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*, a book that has been more or less forgotten beyond the nineteenth century, but had been a sensational and scandalous bestseller well before Darwin

[184] Browne, *Charles Darwin – Voyaging*, 457.
[185] Secord, *Victorian Sensation*.

completed and made the complex decision to publish *The Origin of Species* and lay down the basis for modern evolutionary thinking.

The claim that *Vestiges* failed to stir continental Europe and the rest of the world as it had enthralled and scandalized Victorian Britain is by no means an understatement. In Britain, and within the English-speaking world, *Vestiges* was undoubtedly a "publishing triumph"[186]; in Continental Europe, and the rest of the world, it mostly remained a neglected and forgotten record of natural history. It has been claimed that the book went so much unnoticed on the European mainland, that as much as it was a "reviewing success" in Britain, it neglected to draw reviews – whether positive or negative – on the Continent.[187] Nevertheless, a few translations were made in the nineteenth century, some of them before the publication of the *Origin of Species*, and Somody's Hungarian translation was one of the few. Though by no means did the Hungarian *Vestiges* become a bestseller, this chapter will show that it did not go unnoticed in Hungary.

In order to be able to meaningfully engage with the extent, nature and characteristics of the transfer of *Vestiges* to Hungary, it is not inconsequential to know its background and be familiar with its impact on the country where it was originally published and its scientific discourse, especially since unlike Darwin's work, *Vestiges* has not had a similar reputation in Hungary, even in spite of the availability of a Hungarian translation. Although *Vestiges* was more than a mere predecessor of *Origin*, the

[186] James Secord, "Introduction," in Robert Chambers, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation and Other Evolutionary Writings* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994), xxvi.
[187] Although Nicolaas Rupke notes in his article on the German and Dutch translations of Vestiges that the reviewing cultures of Britain and Continental Europe were vastly different. Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 211.

circumstances presented below made a profound impact on Darwin and the reception of his work as well.

Robert Chambers (1802-71), the mysterious author whose identity was not to be unveiled until 1884, fittingly on the title page of the twelfth edition of *Vestiges*, was a Scottish journalist and publisher, who – together with his brother William – wrote, edited and published *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* from 1832. Their venture, which capitalized on the surge of cheap publishing and a market of middle-class, non-specialist readers eager for regular, diverse and informative reading material, turned into a commercial success.[188] Robert Chambers's personal interest in science, especially geology and phrenology, coincided with the rapid increase of interest in popular science among the British public in the early nineteenth century, and he wrote many of the *Journal*'s articles on topics related to the natural sciences. Despite his rejection of Lamarck's theory of the transmutation of species, which he continued to distance himself from,[189] he gradually put together a narrative of a "law of development,"[190] a continuing process where species move forward on a preordained scale, the plan for which had been laid down by a barely present God, whom Chambers deliberately "remade […] in the

[188] The Chambers' published many other works besides the *Journal*, including what is considered the first history of English literature: Robert Chambers, *History of the English Language and Literature* (Edinburgh, 1835).

[189] Lamarckism, named after Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829) is based on the idea that characteristics acquired during the lifetime of an organism can be inherited, and these individual changes led to the adaptation of species. In Britain, Lamarck's ideas were considered highly controversial and connected to political radicalism, and they were discredited by the 1840s: for instance, in Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1830-33), which inspired Chambers to distance himself from the idea of Lamarckian species transmutation, as well. Although Darwin himself considered Lamarckism as a supplementary mechanism to natural selection in the development of species, the role of the individual endeavor in the generation of adaptation was abandoned by the second part of the nineteenth century. On Chambers, Vestiges and Lamarckism, see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 95-96, Browne, *Voyaging*, 458-459; on Lamarck and British approaches to transmutation, see Adrian Desmond, *The Politics of Evolution: Morphology, Medicine and Reform in Radical London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 42-54, 60-74.

[190] For more on Chambers, see James Secord, "Behind the Veil: Robert Chambers and the Genesis of the *Vestiges of Creation*," in *History, Humanity and Evolution: Essays for John C. Greene*, ed. James R. Moore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 165-194.

image of a benign Legislator."[191]

To understand why *Vestiges* became one of the biggest bestsellers of the nineteenth century, with twelve editions and more than a hundred thousand readers, selling more copies in the nineteenth century than the *Origin of Species*, several aspects need to be taken into account.[192] Scandalous and shocking, dangerous and titillating, *Vestiges* was not only read by members of the scientific elite and high society, but due to the rise of cheap book publishing, also by the middle and working classes.[193] Chambers's success was not only driven by unmotivated scientific curiosity or sheer desire for knowledge, but originated in the various educational and industrializing reform movements of his time. Despite his scientific interests, he was far less preoccupied with path-breaking research in evolutionary theory than making a splash and good profit in the publishing business. Also, as a publisher actively campaigning for the interests of the middle classes, Chambers wanted to show that nature and society were both governed by a law of inevitable progress. Chambers focused attention on progress rather than adaptation as the driving force of evolution, and proposed that species advance upwards on a preordained scale of development by gradually extending their period of individual development.[194]

Moreover, in the Great Britain of the early Victorian era, a book that argued – or could be construed as such – that God did not play an active role in the creation of natural and social hierarchies, threatened the existing social order in the eyes of the Anglican church and the conservative political leadership. Discussions of evolution had been

[191] Desmond, *The Politics of Evolution*, 7.
[192] Twelve editions were sold out between 1844 and 1884.
[193] It was even read regularly in the highest possible place of the realm: in 1845, Prince Albert, who had an interest in natural history and natural philosophy, read from *Vestiges* every afternoon to Queen Victoria, who found the narrative easy to relate to despite her lack of interest in scientific matters. See Secord, *Vestiges*, 168-169.
[194] Peter Bowler, *Biology and Social Thought: 1850-1914* (Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley, 1993), 11.

associated with political radicalism as early as the 1830s:[195] these debates on Lamarckism, transmutation and morphology, associated with scientific materialism, deism, or even atheism, however, did not reach what Chambers successfully conquered: the middle class. Although – or maybe because – *Vestiges* was publicly denounced by a number of respected, established scientists including Willam Whewell and Adam Sedgwick (both of whom, perhaps not surprisingly, later came to be opponents of Darwin's theory of evolution as well), members of the clergy and politicians on grounds that varied from scientific unfoundedness, shallowness and "the mystery of creation"[196], to the "misuse [of] all the careful and painstaking work of geologists and paleontologists in the preceding decades,"[197] it almost immediately became a phenomenal bestseller. In order to meet and counter attacks, irrespective of whether criticism came from scientific or religious convictions, Chambers published *Explanations: A Sequel to the Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* in 1845, roughly at the same time with the revised fifth edition of *Vestiges*.[198]

The theory of progressive transmutation, proposed by Chambers, was a successful attempt to make the radical ideas of transmutation more acceptable to a mostly middle-class public "used to thinking in terms of design by God," and to show that both nature and society were governed by the law of inevitable and gradual progress, which is derived from the timeless laws of Nature originating in a deistically conceived Creator.[199] In his narrative, the animate and the inanimate world are included in one great sweep of a

[195] On the role of Lamarckism in the radical politics of the 1830s, see Chapter 7 ("Engaging the Lamarckians") in Desmond, *The Politics of Evolution* , 276-334.
[196] William Whewell, *Indications of the Creator* (London, 1845), cf. Browne, *Voyaging*, 464.
[197] Martin J. S. Rudwick, *Worlds Before Adam: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Reform*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 548.
[198] Like *Vestiges*, *Explanations* was also published anonymously under the guise of "By the author of that work."
[199] Bowler, *Biology and Social Thought*, 11.

progressive, unitarian cosmology.[200]

It should not be omitted that apart from the progressive scientific theories outlined in Chambers' narrative, and the debates they had spawned, there was one more factor which contributed to the publishing success of *Vestiges* and its status as a "*cause célèbre*:"[201] the anonymity of its author. Chambers never relinquished his identity during his lifetime, not only because he was uncertain about the success of his venture and feared a backlash on his other literary and publishing endeavours: ultimately, he remained anonymous because he wanted to protect his family and reputation against the attacks he expected on account of the controversial topic of his book.[202] There were many guesses as to the identity of the author of *Vestiges*, suspects ranged from Walter Scott to Charles Lyell, from Charles Darwin to Prince Albert; William Whewell was not the only one to suspect that the author was a lady, which – these learned gentlemen thought – would have explained the scientific failings of the book;[203] and even Chambers was under suspicion, which he kept refuting. The question of anonymous authorship is quite significant in relation to the popular reception of *Vestiges* – not only because guessing the author was like a popular parlour game for awhile, but because it was also "a desperate search with consequences for social cohesion and religious faith."[204] The continued anonymity of the author made the reception of *Vestiges* relatively free from conjunctures of political, religious or gender associations, and thus the different readings of the text remained

[200] Klaus Stierstorfer, "Vestiges of English Literature: Robert Chambers," in *Unmapped Countries. Biological Visions in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture*, ed. Anne-Julia Zwierlein (London: Anthem Press, 2005), 37.
[201] Browne, *Voyaging*, 457; Rudwick, *Worlds Before Adam*, 548.
[202] On Chambers's motivation to remain anonymous, see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 370-371.
[203] "The mystery of creation," writes Whewell, " is not within the range of her legitimate territory; she says nothing but points upwards." Cf. Browne, *Voyaging*, 464. Harriet Martineau and Ada Lovelace were both considered as possible authors; see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 21, 183-184, 235, 461 and Secord, "Introduction" to *Vestiges*, xlii.
[204] Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 23.

open.[205]

Chambers managed to forge a linkage between progressive evolution and the relevance of the past to the present in a particularly unstable, but also highly productive period in British culture. Even if *Vestiges* is more than simply a predecessor of Darwin's published theory of evolution, and despite the possibility that Chambers was more interested in commercial success and appealing to a wide range of readers than rewriting science, his ideas created an environment which inspired both scientists and non-scientists to reconsider their stance on transformationism. Thus, he did in a sense pave the way for Darwin, who had been holding on to a carefully kept secret of being "the only man in Britain who possessed a fully worked out theory of transmutation." Despite the shock of not finding himself the only person to have had ideas about transmutation, Darwin decided to avoid the trap Chambers had fallen into: while *Vestiges* treated urgent themes reflecting on a specific moment of British culture and society and eagerly accepted even the most astonishingly unscientific sources as genuine, Darwin separated himself from the *Vestiges*' style of "popular progressive science"[206] and wrote as a scientist whose theories had also come to have serious implications outside of the realm of biology, which is the discipline the *Origin of Species* had revolutionarized in the first round. Chambers had ultimately failed to do so; nevertheless, his book reflects a specific moment in British cultural history and the history of science.

[205] For a comprehensive survey on authorship and anonymity, see Robert J. Griffin, "Anonymity and Authorship," *New Literary History* 30 (1999): 877-95. On the importance of anonymity and secrecy in the case of *Vestiges*, see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 364-400.
[206] Browne, *Voyaging* 457-465.

New Agendas and Contexts: *Vestiges* in Translation

The question is, can this specific moment reflected in the narrative of *Vestiges* be translated? Before engaging with the questions and possible answers inspired by the cultural relocation of *Vestiges* to Hungary, it is worth taking a look at its other translations and translators, and the cultural and political contexts of reception and interpretation. The types of translation agendas and methods exemplified by the various translators of *Vestiges* will also serve as points of reference for not only Somody's work, but for the cases presented in the following chapters as well.

The first known translation of *Vestiges* was published under the title *Spuren der Gottheit in der Entwickelungs- und Bildungsgeschichte der Schöpfung* in Stuttgart in 1846, in the translation of Adolf Friedrich Seubert, a member of the military who had risen to the rank of colonel, published on a variety of subjects, mostly military, and produced a number of translations from Lord Byron to *Vestiges*.[207] To the latter, he also added William Whewell's *Indications of the Creator* (1845), a refutation of *Vestiges* on the grounds of natural theology that Whewell had addressed to the general reader.[208] While Seubert wrote no preface or introduction, or added extra footnotes to his version of *Vestiges*, it is his addition of *Indications* that reveals that he in fact had an agenda. What is more, instead of contrasting the two texts by publishing them one after the other bound together in one volume, he entwined the two narratives into one integrated text where chapters of the two, in different typefaces, alternated, and ultimately merged into one final product: *Vestiges of Divinity*.[209] Thus, Seubert's "translation" would perhaps more

[207] Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 212-214.
[208] On Whewell and his early criticism of Vestiges, see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 227-229.
[209] Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 213-214.

appropriately be called an ”adaptation” where the translator used the text not to advocate the naturalistic origin of the species, but to support and verify divine design, and demonstrate divinely ordained laws in nature.

A year after Seubert published his *Vestiges*, his contemporary, but by no means ideological comrade, anti-monarchist and radical materialist Carl Vogt produced another translation; due to the events of 1848, the volume was only published after Vogt had fled from Giessen to Switzerland, in 1851.[210] Vogt's translation makes no allusion to Seubert or his German version of *Vestiges*; however, there are major differences between the two editions. Besides the illustrations,[211] footnotes and corrections, there are major ideological differences between the two texts, which are in all probability rooted in the differences between the translators themselves, both in terms of scientific convictions and political leanings. Although on first glance it might appear logical that Vogt, a professor of zoology and geology, and an active participant in the materialism debates of the 1850s, made *Vestiges* accessible in German because of his advocation of its evolutionary principles,[212] a closer look shows that this was not necessarily the case. According to Nicolaas Rupke, Vogt was an opponent of the theory of transmutation, but he speculates that Vogt might have liked *Vestiges* because of its ”subversive, anti-establishmentarian potential.”[213] On the other hand, Sander Gliboff argues that *Vestiges* was not taken seriously by German academics at the time of publication, and this is well illustrated by

[210] *Natürliche Geschichte der Schöpflung des Weltalls, der Erde und der auf ihr befindlichen Organismen* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg, 1851). There was second edition 1858. Rupke, “Translation Studies in the History of Science,” 217-20.
[211] The first illustrated British edition of *Vestiges* was published in 1853 (10th edition); however, as Vogt found illustrations necessary for the sake of better readability and reader comprehension, he took them from one of his own textbooks. See Rupke, “Translation Studies in the History of Science,” 217.
[212] See Milton Millhauser, *Just before Darwin: Robert Chambers and the Vestiges* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University, 1959), 145-146.
[213] Rupke, “Translation Studies in the History of Science,” 220.

the fact that even Vogt, its translator, "peppered [it] with enough sarcastic footnotes to dampen popular enthusiasm for it."[214] Nevertheless, Vogt's translation of *Vestiges* has been considered the one that came closest to the original, and Vogt himself received praise for his scientific translations even from those who did not approve of his personal reputation as a radical libertine and his professed enthusiasm for scientific materialism and atheism.[215] Both Rupke and Gliboff seem to agree, though, that *Vestiges* failed to create a major controversy when transplanted into the German context.

Even if there is a stark contrast between the aims and the results of the two German editions of *Vestiges*, it is clear that the novelty of its ideas on species transformation and evolutionary narrative were not exactly at the centre point of the translators' agendas. This is also true of the 1849 Dutch edition, which, somewhat surprisingly, presented *Vestiges* as putting forward a proof of divine order in nature in the context of reactionary, monarchist politics. The translator, who also produced an atlas of illustrations and later translated the *Sequel* as well, was Jan Hubert van den Broek, and like Seubert, he also had a career in the military; he published as well, albeit mostly on physics and chemistry, subjects which he also taught at the National Military Medical College in Utrecht.[216] Interestingly, he also published *Vestiges* together with a treatise disproving it, but with the stated intention to present both sides of the arguments laid

[214] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism*, 58-59.
[215] Darwin himself, who had quite high standards and requirements when it came to the translation of his works, considered – but ultimately refused, twice – Vogt's request to translate his works to German. See Martin Amrein and Kärin Nickelsen, "The Gentleman and the Rogue: The Collaboration between Charles Darwin and Carl Vogt," *Journal of the History of Biology* 41 (2008): 237–266.
[216] His translation of *Vestiges* was published under the title *Sporen van der natuurlijke geschiedenis der schepping, of schepping en voortgaande ontwikkeling van planten en dieren, onder den invloed en het beheer der natuurwetten* by J. G. Broese, in Utrecht, as were the subsequent editions in 1850, 1854 and 1866, and those of the Sequel in 1849 and 1851. See Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 214-217.

down in the books.[217] Nonetheless, as in the case of Seubert, van den Broek's career and literary and scientific pursuits imply political sympathies that were quite conservative, if not reactionary. There is also direct evidence for this: the preface to *Sporen* was written by Gerrit Jan Mulder, a professor of chemistry, a polemical character who led an active campaign for strong monarchy against parliamentary democracy. As Mulder expands in his preface, *Vestiges* could serve as an example of popular instruction of pure rather than applied science, and as the popularisation and spread of scientific learning was a central part of Mulder's career, he could think of *Vestiges* as a vehicle to deliver the Dutch people to a higher level of moral and material elevation, and encourage them to revere the divine Creator. Mulder does not even refer to transmutation, and places *Sporen* in the context of Calvinist theism when he objects to the notion of arbitrary intervention put forward in *Vestiges*. For him, *Vestiges* speaks to a large public, and is a useful tool to keep society stabilised under God and monarchy.[218]

The German and Dutch editions have been the only translations of *Vestiges* to gain a certain international recognition due to Nicolaas Rupke's article and references in Secord's work. The other translation known apart from the Hungarian one, which will be discussed at length in the following section, is a recently discovered Italian edition, of which very little is known. *Storia naturale della creazione* was published in a small village near Milan in 1860, in the translation of Majocchi Francesco, who also added

[217] Thomas Monk Mason, *Creation by the Immediate Agency of God, as Opposed to Creation by Natural Law; being a Refutation of the Work Entitled Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (1845). Mason argued that philosophy and the science were used to disparage the authority of the Bible, and the most compelling and enduring argument of his book was that the immortality of the soul could not be explained by natural laws. Cf. Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 215 and Secord, *Victorian Sensation*, 451-52.
[218] Rupke 215-217.

many notes and commentaries.[219] According to Marco Ferraguti, the edition, which has been confirmed by James Secord as based on the third, 1845 edition of *Vestiges*, is extremely rare, and apart from a few references, has not been discussed or commented upon in Italian publications.[220] Despite the current lack of information on this edition, it is important to note that in light of the concerns of the German and Dutch editions and those of their translators, an Italian translation is of special interest as it was published in a Catholic country, where the tradition of debates about natural theology and philosophy was much weaker and less significant than in the Netherlands, or especially Germany, alive with the tradition of pre-Darwinian debates on morphology and species transformation, which biologists and philosophers were actively discussing in the early 1850s.[221]

The Hungarian *Vestiges*

The main objective of this chapter is to present the case of the Hungarian translation and reception of the *Vestiges* and examine what happened to a highly – notoriously – successful book when it moved from its "native" country and culture to the Hungarian context of the 1850s, and why it seems to have left success and notoriety behind in Britain. We know from the several editions, explanations, responses, critiques and many other contemporary sources that the British editions of *Vestiges* (just like *Origin of Species* and other works connected to the debate on evolution) captivated the attention of both the scientific community and the general public, resulting in a new, dominant

[219] Francesco Majocchi, *Storia naturale della creazione* (Codogno, Milano: Tip. Cairo, 1860). See also: Paolo Coccia, "Darwin e l'evoluzionismo nel 2005 (Bibliografia)", L'Ateo (2006), no. 2, 12-13; *Pikaia – Il portale dell'evoluzione*: http://www.pikaia.eu/easyne2/LYT.aspx?Code=Pikaia&IDLYT=425&ST=SQL&SQL=ID_Documento=34
[220] Isodoro Bernuzzi, *La divina rivelazione e la geologia* (Parma: Pietro Fiaccadori, 1869), 20.
[221] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 47-60.

scientific discourse. When engaging with the history of the reception of Darwinism, looking into why and how the Darwinian (r)evolution (was) translated into Hungarian, we should take to into account the reception of pre-Darwinian works touching upon the subject of evolution and transmutation as well: it is no small feat in itself that Hungarian is one of the three languages to which *Vestiges* had been translated before 1859, the publication of *Origin of Species*: it was also the only book on evolution in the Hungarian language before the 1860s.[222] Even though the Hungarian *Vestiges* fits into the pattern drawn by Rupke, that is, it failed to attract much attention, its relocation to Hungary created a mental meeting point, placing Hungary on the map of the reception of species transformation, and established itself as a point of reference in the evolutionary narrative in Hungary.

Although the significance of the existence of a published Hungarian translation of *Vestiges* cannot be stressed enough, its theories and conclusions did not reach the Hungarian scientific public entirely out of the blue: it can also be interpreted as part of a movement to rethink and reorganize the form and content of scientific endeavours in the 1850s. The urge to bridge the gap between scientific progress in the West and the political and social consequences of the retributions following the 1848/49 revolution and war of independence resulted in an atmosphere where the acquisition and reception of new scientific results were also influenced by political and social motivations. Although many Hungarian naturalists were to an extent informed about discoveries and developments in the West, the weak and repressed nature of local research obstructed and delayed the reformation of scientific structures.

[222] Lamarck's idea of "the inheritance of acquired characteristics" did not receive significant attention in Hungary. Parts of *Philosophie zoologique* (1809) were translated to Hungarian for the first time only in 1914 by Viktor Haner.

The idea of evolution was also not entirely foreign: a number of Hungarian biologists were aware of the works of Lyell, Vogt or Ludwig Büchner, and had contacts and correspondence with colleagues outside of Hungary. The majority of these contacts and foreign sources of information in the 1850s came from the German context; even József Dorner, who was aware of the correspondence between Darwin and Asa Grey, had gained this information from German sources.[223] The Hungarian edition of *Vestiges* is not only an important milestone in the Hungarian reception and engagement with evolution because it signified an increasing interest in the theory of "progressive development" or because it was the first book on evolution in Hungarian; while both of the above reasons are substantial, the Hungarian publication of *Vestiges* also marks the year, 1858, when British achievements in the natural sciences start to have a more direct impact on Hungarian scientific life. Although the German connections would remain, the theory of evolution in many instances will by-pass the German lands, whose role as transmitters of new scientific ideas will be more limited in the 1860s and 1870s than before.

Although József Somody's translation is the first work published in a book form in Hungarian literature to give an account of evolution as a comprehensive, universal law of nature, it is relatively unknown in the history of Hungarian biology. Apart from a few bibliographies and encyclopedias,[224] it is rarely mentioned in modern accounts on the history of the Hungarian natural sciences.[225]

[223] Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 57-64.

[224] József Szinnyei, *Magyarország természettudományi és mathematikai könyvészete, 1472-1875* [Hungarian bibliography on the natural sciences and mathematics, 1472-1875] (Budapest: 1878); Géza Petrik, *Magyarország bibliographiája 1712-1860* [Hungarian bibliography 1712-1860] 4 vols. (Budapest 1888-1892).

[225] Its presence is limited to the article of István Boros, "A fejlődéstörténeti irodalom egy feledésbe ment magyar emléke" [A forgotten memory of Hungarian evolutionary literature], *Élővilág* no. 2 (1957): 57-63, and to a paragraph in Ladányiné's work on Hungarian philosophy and Darwinism (60).

The translator is perhaps even more obscure than his translation. József Somody (1825-1897), spent most of his life in Pápa.[226] After an education at the renowned Calvinist Collegium in Pápa,[227] with a break as an exchange student in the Lutheran lyceum in Sopron to learn German, which was common practice at the time, he passed a *laudabilis* bar examination in 1847, and planned to make a career as a lawyer. The events 1848 put these plans on hold for an unexpectedly long time, and in the end led to his contribution to the history of the Hungarian natural sciences. In the spring of 1848, he acted as commissioner for Veszprém county, then joined the newly formed Pápa militia in May where he and became a sergeant, and participated in the fights against Jelačić, in the Veszprém county national guards in September. Following the battle of Schwechat, he served as sub-lieutenant in the upper-Danubian troops, and entered the garrison of Komárom in January 1849. After participating in a number of battles in the Western Transdanubian region, he re-entered the garrison of Komárom in the rank of lieutenant, and this is where the end of the war found him. Due to the special circumstances of the capitulation of Komárom, he was free – after a two-month stint in military prison in Sopron and Pozsony (today Bratislava) – to return to his parents' home in Pápa. Practicing law, as he had planned before the war, was not an option due to his military record, and he was left to his own devices as to what to do with himself.

[226] His obituary in *Pápai Lapok* mentions that he was born in "an ancient noble family hailing from Antalfa by the lake Balaton"; his birth certificate, the documents of the town of Pápa and the ledgers of the Calvinist Church indicate that the family lived in the more affluent Alsóváros [Lower Town], where his father János had a hatmaking business. Biographical information, unless indicated otherwise, is based on the following sources: obituaries in *Dunántúli Protestáns Lap*, 21 February 1897, 130; *Dunántúli Protestáns Lap*, 28 February 1897, Gábor Bona, "Pápai diákok a '48-as honvédség tisztikarában (Életrajzi adattár)" [Students from Pápa among the 1848 officer corps (biographical database)], *Acta Papensia*: *A Pápai Református Gyűjtemények Közleményei* 9, no. 1-4 (2009): 363.

[227] See József Küblüs, ed., *A Pápai Református Kollégium diákjai, 1585-1861* [The Students of the Reformed College of Pápa, 1585-1861] (Pápa: Pápai Református Gyűjtemények, 2006), 250, 273, 285.

It seems that he decided that further study was his best option, especially the that of foreign languages. It is not clear how he financially supported during these years – his family was, presumably, comfortably well off – and not much is known about the two decades of his life that followed his withdrawal from law, and, it would seem, public affairs.[228] Nevertheless, not only did he study French, but also learned English well enough to translate *Vestiges* (presumably, as will be seen, with some assistance of his knowledge of German). After the Compromise in 1867, he became more visible again: returning to legal practice, he worked in the ministries of finance and transportation, and served as a legal counsel on the Board of Directors for the Hungarian Railways. After his retirement, which he took relatively early due to his poor health, he devoted himself to growing fruit and vegetables in Pápa, and was an active member of the Calvinist Church of the town, where he held the post of General Superintendent between 1888 and 1897.[229] His commitment to this community was confirmed when he left his worldly possessions and all his real estate – a house and a vineyard estimated to worth ten to twelve thousand forints – to the congregation, with a life-interest for his two sisters. After a lengthy illness, he died on February 20, 1897, and was buried two days later. Apart from his translation of *Vestiges*, he seems to have published nothing else, and there is no evidence of contact with other members of the scientific community. This isolation and the lack of contact

[228] According to some sources, Somody and Dezső Tarczy substituted professor of philosophy Károly Kerkápolyi for a term in the academic year 1865/66 when the latter became the parliamentary representative of Enying; however, I did not find his name in the documents these sources refer to. See Zsolt Trócsányi, ed., *A Pápai Kollégium története* [The History of Pápa College] (Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1981), 299. Trócsányi refers to Ernő Kis, *A Dunántúli Ev. Ref. Egyházkerület pápai főiskolájának története, 1531-1985* [The history of the College of the Transdanubian District of the Luth. Calv. Church at Pápa, 1531-1985] (Pápa: Református Főiskolai Nyomda, 1896), 285, who, in turn, refers to the yearly communications of the Pápa College at the end of the academic year 1865/66, which only contains the name of Tarczy as a substitute of Kerkápoly.

[229] Tóth, Endre: *A pápai református egyház története* [The history of the Calvinist congregation of Pápa] (Pápa: Református Főiskolai Nyomda, 1941), 269.

could have affected the public reception of his translation as well in light of the role the scientific community played in the public dissemination of the natural sciences.

Based on the tenth British edition of 1853,[230] *A teremtés természet-történelmének nyomai* was first published in 1858 in Pápa, in five hundred copies. It was printed during in the Printing House of the Calvinist Reformed Church, until 1 November.[231] Subscription price was four forints, whereas booksellers' price was 4.20. The volume came complete with 107 woodcut illustrations taken from the British edition; these had been selected for the original by physiologist William Benjamin Carpenter from his own textbooks on the request of John Churchill, the publisher. A second edition followed in 1861, printed in Pest by Károly Osterlamm: its title page announced it as "cheap edition," and it retailed for two forints only.[232] The second edition used the same font, the same typeset, the same illustrations (all 107), and same list of errata.

As the year of publication was 1858, and the author was still the well kept secret of Robert Chambers, his wife, and a few select others, the title page of the Hungarian edition only includes the Hungarian title, the name of the translator, the number of woodcut illustrations and year and place of publication. There is no trace of speculation as to the identity of the author in the translator's preface, or in any of the available Hungarian reviews. József Pólya, one of the reviewers, does refer to new terminology introduced by Charles Lyell in his comments on scientific vocabulary, but while it is not entirely clear

[230] Each edition of the *Vestiges* bore traces of editing and continuous revision. Thus, not only was the main text of the tenth edition significantly different from the first, containing "extensive additions and emendations" (see title page), the main text was also followed by an appendix entitled "Proofs, Authorities, Illustrations, Etc." Chambers, *Vestiges of Creation,* 1853. (In the following, *V1853*.)

[231] "A teremtés természettörténelmének nyomai. Vestiges of the natural history of creation. Angolból ford. Somody József. Sajtó alatt van Pápán," *Budapesti Szemle* 2, no. 3 (1858): 501-503.

[232] "[*O*]*lcsó kiadás*." The circumstances of the production of the second editions are unknown, including Somody's role or why Osterlamm, a printer-bookseller, decided to print and sell it.

from the wording of the review itself, Chambers did refer to Lyell by name in *Vestiges*.[233] A casual reader might have interpreted Pólya's comments as an indication as to the author's identity, but this mistake would have been fairly easy to correct by reading the book itself. To further the possible confusion on Lyell and *Vestiges*, one of the few pieces of information in József Szinnyei's 1891 database of Hungarian writers is the statement that Somody's work is the translation of *Charles Lyell*'s *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*,[234] which is quite a revealing (and somewhat embarrassing) mistake: not only because Lyell's famous work was called *Principles of Geology*, but because in 1891 it had already been known for seven years that Robert Chambers was the author. Nevertheless, despite these indirect and vague references that might have given way to speculation about the author's identity, from the little that is known about Somody, he did not express an interest or exerted himself to make conjunctures about the person who wrote the basis of his translation.

It is not known when and how Somody encountered *Vestiges* and why he decided to translate it. All we know is that after he had been forced by circumstances to withdraw from practicing law after the war, "he translated from the English, and published, illustrated with very nice pictures, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*."[235] The library of the Calvinist Collections of Pápa is in possession of the 1853 edition of *Vestiges*, and as the only inscription it has is Somody's name in handwriting on the title page, it is safe to presume that it was Somody's own copy, which probably became part of the library's holdings when Somody left his estate to the congregation. It also seems

[233] József Pólya, "Könyvismertetés: A teremtés, Természettörténelmének nyomai" [Book review: Vestiges of the natural history of creation], in *Protestáns Egyházi s Iskolai* 2, no. 28 (1859): 748.
[234] "Somody József," Szinnyei, *Magyar írók*.
[235] "Ekkor fordította magyarra angolból és igen szép képekkel illusztálva kiadta a Teremtés természet történelmét […]", see *Pápai Lapok* (1897): 4.

that he had access to the second edition of Carl Vogt's German translation,[236] which was made after the sixth British edition; however, the tenth edition, which, according to its title page, contained "extensive additions and emendations," adding a section on fossils in older rocks and an appendix containing responses to criticism and deleting the "Note Conclusory" of earlier editions, differed significantly from the sixth edition, not to speak about Vogt's eighty-three footnotes with "corrections, new information and expressions of disagreement."[237]

In its structure, Somody's translation closely follows the tenth edition. In his short, one-page preface to the Hungarian edition, he does not even attempt to introduce the subject, directions or the history of the work, as he "faithfully" translated the author's preface.[238] The only "truncation" he admits to is the omission of an unspecified number of "less interesting and inessential [foot]notes" and of the Appendix. The latter, despite its "undeniable interest", he did not consider essential, either, adding that it would have meant a great burden on the already substantial publication costs (at sixty pages, it made up almost one sixth of *Vestiges*).[239] He must have considered the illustrations important enough to include – either for reasons of easier readability (not unlike van den Broek and Vogt) or greater appeal to people who like their books illustrated – over Chambers's responses to criticism to approve of their presumably high cost.

The examination of the translation is interesting from two main aspects: on one hand, the possible agenda, or agendas, of the translator can be revealing, especially if we

[236] Pólya, "Könyvismertetés," 742.
[237] Rupke, "Translation Studies in the History of Science," 217.
[238] "Előszó", *A teremtés természettörténelme*, iv. (In the following, *T1858*.)
[239] "Csak azt kell megjegyeznem, hogy az olvasó e fordításban az eredetit annyiban megcsonkítva veendi, a mennyiben kevésbé érdekes és épen lényegtelen jegyzeteket hagytam ki, a *függeléket* pedig – bár annak érdekessége kétségbe vonhatatlan – mint szinte nem lényegest, mely által a különben is igen tetemes kiállítási költségek, jelentékenyen szaporodtak volna – egészen mellőztem." *T1858* iv.

consider the political situation in Hungary and Chambers's original revolutionary social and political ideals and agendas. On the other hand, as this practically the only extensive Hungarian example of pre-Darwinian evolutionary thought, the examination of scientific discourse and vocabulary can also prove useful.

As is often the case with such translations, it is the translator's introduction to the text which can give the most direct impressions on the translator's own agenda(s), if he had any. Somody's brief introduction is quite straightforward in its brevity. He first talks about his motivation: when he first became familiar with the *Vestiges*, he was so gripped by how unusually interesting the novelty of its theories, the consistency of its opinions and the versatility of its information were, that he felt immediately compelled to translate some crucial parts to share them with his friends. In the beginning, he had not felt confident to do a complete translation, partly because of his lack of specialist knowledge and the lack of appropriate Hungarian vocabulary, but with his friends' encouragement, he decided to face the seemingly impossible task. He does confess that he does not feel confident about having successfully solved all the challenges, and expects to have committed mistakes in the translation; he also admits to have taken the easy way out in some cases when he left in the original Greek and Latin terms when he was faced with difficulties during the process of translation. He justifies his potentially imperfect achievement not only with the exceptional difficulty of his task; as he writes, his aim with "this laborious enterprise was to serve our literature according to my talent – to carry a piece of stone, like a day-labourer, to the great building, built through the zeal of

centuries, to act as a memento of the intellectual development of our nation."[240] His tropes will be mirrored fifteen years later in László Dapsy's preface to his translation to *Origin of Species*.

Unlike the German and Dutch translators, he avoids voicing his opinions on the possible social or political opinions of the Chambers text. As far as we know, this was the only book which he translated, and he does mention how important he found it to make it accessible in Hungarian; as he writes in the preface, he felt compelled to translate it. He was not a scientist by training, and the recollections left behind in his obituaries do not indicate a special interest in natural history: it is not impossible to suppose that like Chambers himself, Somody might have been more interested in the role of science in society than science itself. His reluctance to voice any kind of opinion related to society or politics (except for his metaphor of the great building of Hungarian intellectual development) might be related to his fear of censure and renewed persecution – which also heavily affected the Hungarian scientific community – by the Habsburg administration.

Unlike so many of the Hungarians active in the translation and popularization of Darwinism in the 1860s, or the German and Dutch translators of *Vestiges*, Somody did not have a professional background in the natural sciences. Despite his doubts about the quality of his translation, expressed in the preface, his attitude was conscientious, and his text closely follows the original. He did not merge his translation with another text and did not add his opinion in the footnotes, but his translation is still not "fluent." He is quite "invisible" as a translator, but not enough: his text is Hungarian, but due to the presence

[240] "[E] fáradtságos vállalattal csak irodalmunknak volt czélom, tehetségemhez képest, szolgálatot tenni – egy darab követ vinni, mint köznapszámos, ama épülethez, melyen századok szorgalma dolgozik, hogy egykoron emléket hagyjon nemzetünk szellemi fejlődéséről." *T1858* iv.

of too many foreign words – mostly Latin, Greek and English – his text is not domesticated enough to be entirely natural.

He was also quite thorough in his research of species terminology; for someone with an education in law, putting a Hungarian term next to most of the Latin names under Carpenter's illustrations is no small feat in itself. Although *csőrönd* [Ornithorhynchus, platypus][241] and *gyógy festöncz* [Sepia officialis, cuttlefish][242] are very archaic sounding, and *rinya* [Scolopendra, centipede][243] and *kéjencz* [Cytherea concentrica, a Western Atlantic mollusc][244] sound somewhat ridiculous in present day Hungarian (they mean complaining in slang and lecher, respectively), these were the Hungarian terms still in use in the mid-nineteenth century, most of them originating in the language reform movement initiated by Ferenc Kazinczy in the 18th century. It seems, however, that Somody was content to use existing terminology and did not create any of his own, and thus failed to contribute to the evolution and further reform of the language of Hungarian biology.

Somody's solution to translating scientific terminology was to put the foreign term in parentheses right after the Hungarian word – depending on what Chambers used in the English texts, these could be Latin, Greek or English, and the dominant occurrence of this phenomenon is connected to names of species. See, for instance, the following paragraph:

> "Az utolsó emlős rend az, melyet *Linnae elsőrangúaknak* (Primates) nevez, magában foglalván mindazonáltal nem csak a majmokat és a félmajmokat (lemur) és a szárnykezűeket, vagy denevéreket, hanem a lajhárokat (Bradypodidae) is, miket Cuvier csupán bizonyos fogaik hiánya miatt másuvá helyezett. E rendnek sok hézagon keresztüli talapjai a csellék (Delphinidae), a czet törzs legutolsói és legkisebbje."[245]

[241] Illustration no. 107, *T1858* 189, *Ve1853* 239.
[242] Illustration no. 11, *T1858* 31, *V1853* 40.
[243] Illustration no. 90, *T1858* 153, *V1853* 194.
[244] Illustration no. 94, *T1858* 157, *V1853* 200.
[245] *T1858* 191.

And let us compare it with its original:

> "The last mammalian order is that which Linnaeus called *Primates*, comprehending, however, not only the monkeys and lemurs, and the Cheiroptera or bats, but the Sloths (*Bradypodidae*); which Cuvier, merely from their want of certain teeth, placed elsewhere. For this order there remains (with a long interval) a basis in the *Delphinidae*, the last and smallest of the cetacean tribes."[246]

Although the two sections contain approximately the same amount of "foreign words", Somody's text feels more cluttered, and this not because "primates" works both in English and Latin, but because in two short sentences he has three Latin and one English word inserted in the text, and instead of adding it in parentheses, he actually translates "Cheiroptera" to Hungarian. The above passage is fairly characteristic in terms of structure to the whole book.

It has been mentioned already that in the preface, Somody admits to having omitted a number of inconsequential footnotes in order to save space and thus money. On the whole, the missing footnotes generally refer either to minor questions and more detailed explanations of taxonomy, or serve to draw the reader's attention to newly discovered phenomena and evidence that forced Chambers to occasionally change minor details from earlier editions of *Vestiges*. For instance, the first sentence of the English quotation above is followed by a lengthy footnote on debates between a French and some British naturalists on the taxonomy of the sloth – this footnote is missing from the Hungarian edition. Just two sentences earlier in the English original, Chambers adds a footnote to inform the reader of a change about the position of the herbivorous cetes in the greater scheme of things (and in the book) compared to where they were assigned to in the fifth

[246] *V1853* 241-42.

edition.[247]

Chambers was not a scientist, and his text is replete with literary metaphors and references. For instance, he calls the geological strata "the leaves of the Stone Book" and he claims that it is geology that "chronicles" "the great natural transactions" and it is only after the "conclusion" of "the wondrous chapter of the earth's history which is told by geography" that the "creation of our own species" begins."[248] Somody – consciously or not – also uses literary metaphors: he unfolds "the romance of nature" ["természetbeli románczunk kifejtésében"][249] and "advance[s] to a new chapter in this marvellous history" ["uj szakaszhoz érünk e csodás történetben"][250]. These metaphors are part of the romantic imagery of the Victorian "evolutionary epic" characteristic of early Victorian science popularization. Not only did the novels of Sir Walter Scott, for instance, made an effect on Chambers' language of science, but as we will see in the next chapter, traces of this discourse also appeared especially in the early evolutionary writings of Jácint Rónay.[251]

A Hungarian Sensation? – The Reception of *Vestiges* in Hungary

It is a well established fact, known from the several editions, explanations, responses, critiques and many other contemporary sources that the British edition "caught the attention of thoughtful men"[252] (and women), and it caused a great stir indeed. But what happened in Hungary? To claim that the publication of *Teremtés* inspired heated

[247] *V1853* 241.
[248] Stierstorfer, "Vestiges of English Literature," 33, cf. *V1844* 57, 105, 144-45, 223-24, respectively.
[249] *V1858* 28, *T1858* 21
[250] *V1853* 43, *T1858* 33.
[251] Bernard Lightman, *Victorian Popularisers of Science*, 219-294.
[252] *The Examiner* (1844), cf. Secord 9.

debates at the meetings of learned societies, vicious attacks in the papers or heated conversations at society ladies' tea parties as had *Vestiges* in Britain would be a major overstatement. Although today it is not much more than a "forgotten memory of Hungarian evolutionary history,"[253] at least it did not go unnoticed in the press.

The first review of *Vestiges*, by László Korizmics, an influential member of the scientific community and one of the chief figures of the *Természettudományi Társulat* in the late 1850s, came out in *Budapesti Szemle* in 1858.[254] Korizmics's review is positive, and it is in line with the progressive ideals usually represented in the journal. He was aware that *Vestiges* had been published in several editions in Britain, and that the 1853 edition had been updated compared to earlier ones. The article gives a two-page outline of the book, and praises the anonymous author for his expertise in every branch of the natural sciences, as well as for the logical structure of the presentation of his material. Although the article draws attention to the assailability of some hypotheses of the book, the reviewer recommends it to the reader as attractive and edifying reading; matters of translation are not addressed in the review apart from basic information.

In a notice intended to a more general public, the illustrated weekly *Vasárnapi Újság* also alerted its readership to the availability of a new piece of scientific literature, "which has been planted in the otherwise bare field of our literature by József Somody, after English and German sources. […] Those who wish to learn and enjoy intellectual rapture will hurry to purchase this work."[255] The short announcement also contains information about the number and great quality of the woodcut illustrations, honouring

[253] Boros, "Fejlődéstörténeti irodalmunk," 57.
[254] Korizmics, "A teremtés természettörténelmének nyomai," 501-503.
[255] "Megjelent: „A teremtés természet-történelmének nyomai," czimü tudományos mű, mellyet angol és német kutfők után Somody József ültetett át irodalmunk, e téren kopár mezejére. A könyvben 107 csinos apró fametszet van, a kiállitás a pápai nyomdának dicséretére válik. Azok, kik tanulni s egyszersmind szellemi gyönyört élvezni szeretnek, e munkát sietni fognak megvenni." *Vasárnapi Újság*, 1 May 1859.

the work of the printers in Pápa. It does not specify, however, the exact source of the translation, and the wording is ambiguous enough so that the reader could come to the conclusion that Somody's work might be a compilation of German and English text fragments instead of a well-known book. Whoever wrote the notice, though, they were aware that the original existed both in English and German versions, but also that Somody had access to both.

The lengthiest and most comprehensive review can be tied to the name of József Pólya, a renowned physician and naturalist, who also had a background in scientific translation, and is considered an important reformer of Hungarian medical and scientific language.[256] In his 1859 review in *Protestáns Egyházi s Iskolai Lap* [Protestant Church and School Paper], Pólya considers *Vestiges* to be a comprehensive work on biology, containing scientific results available at that point, while acknowledging at the same time that the subject is a sensitive one due to the lack of scientific proof.[257] In his review, he is careful to state that *Vestiges* is acceptable and satisfying for both the theologian and the natural scientist: "wherever the natural scientist touches the tenets of the theologian, there is no sign of polemics."[258] Even his selections of lengthy paragraphs quoted from the first five chapters are balanced, as he decided to include a section on God's role in the movement of planets and spontaneous generation.[259]

Pólya found that the theories of *Vestiges* are identical to the theory of *ősnemzés* (abiogenesis); in the passages he quotes to demonstrate this, however, Chambers expounds on the theory of "spontaneous generation", what Somody translates as *nemzés*

[256] László Kiss, "Egy nyelvújító orvosdoktor: Pólya József (1802-1873)" [Language reformer and physician: József Pólya (1802-1873)], *Orvosi Hetilap* 143 (2002): 253-255.
[257] Pólya, "Könyvismertetés," 743.
[258] "[M]indenütt, hol a természettudós a theologus tanát érinti, semmi nyoma a polemiának." Pólya, "Könyvismertetés," 743.
[259] Pólya, "Könyvismertetés," 744 and 745, respectively.

nélküli származás [genesis/descent without generation]. Pólya explains that the theory had been formerly "in vogue"; as he puts it, "[s]cience is as much subjected to fashion as garments."[260] He warns the reader that the theory is more complex than it sounds, and he also implies that some of its conclusions are premature. Indeed, spontaneous generation was discredited by 1860.

Pólya, a committed reformer of the scientific language, also offers his opinion on the achievements of the translation itself. He agrees with Somody's opinion, expressed in the preface, that the Hungarian language was not adequate for scientific translation due to the lack of specialist vocabulary. He gives several reasons for this: first, unlike himself, Hungarian scientists do not pay attention to developing a scientific language before they start to work on a larger scientific project; second, they do not know each other's work well enough to make use of new words; three, they do not always translate Greek and Latin terms correctly; fourth, they like to boast about their negligence of language. Nonetheless, he allows that there is a positive side to the matter: there are new, "provincial" terms in every work that can be further used. He confesses to be fairly indulgent to all the above shortcomings, except when morphology and syntax are ignored in the generation of new words, and instead of adhering to Hungarian rules of word formation, Germanisms are given preference. Although he claims that his criticism does not apply to the author, as the reformation of the Hungarian scientific language will take time, his insistence that he merely intended his words as general suggestions for the future fall short when he criticizes Somody in the very next paragraph for the inappropriate translation of *eocene*, *miocene*, and *pliocene*, Lyell's terms for division of

[260] Pólya, "Könyvismertetés," 746.

the tertiary era.[261] He does not fail to realize that the more naturalists in Hungary, the better, and he is aware that both *Vestiges* and its Hungarian translation are important works, even if for different reasons; he concludes with an offer of a mental handshake to Somody in exchange for the pleasure that the reading of his translation caused.

Korizmics and Pólya were both members of the Academy, and were active members of the section for natural sciences; it is likely that they were not the only two members who were aware of the existence of and the theories described in *Vestiges*. While *Vestiges* became neither a bestseller, nor a reviewing success as in Britain, a few references to it do appear in the press and other literature apart from the reviews of Korizmics and Pólya, even if the references are rather indirect or the sources and allusions are rather confused at times, which can perhaps also be attributed to the contested authorship and the variety of channels through which the theories of the book entered the Hungarian context.

As in Western Europe, it is unavoidable that there would be reactions and approaches to the new theories of natural science from the fields of theology and religious philosophy. *Sárospataki Füzetek* [Sárospatak Notebooks], a journal that served as a forum of the Protestant church and education between 1857 and 1869, published, if not often, but fairly regularly, on the connections and reactions to religion to scientific matters. Such a piece was László Gonda's 1863 article on "The Development of the Natural Sciences with Reference to Theology" [A természettudományok fejlődése a theologiára vonatkozással],[262] in which Gonda, at the time the director of the *realgymnasium* in

[261] *V1853* 97 and *T1858* 77. Somody translates them as "idősb túlholt", "ujabb túlholt", and "túlélőveli". Pólya points out that these do not reflect the Greek origins of Lyell's terminology. 747-748.

[262] László Gonda, "A természettudományok fejlődése a theologiára vonatkozással" [The Development of the Natural Sciences with Reference to Theology], *Sárospataki füzetek* 7 (1868): 795-847.

Békés,[263] with the intention to show that not only "is the twin nature of the study of religion and natural science is a stated fact, but that in fact "[o]ur natural scientists clearly deserve thanks when they attempt to transfer their achievement in their field to the benefit of the study of theology; while the antipathy, while these [achievements] might be rejected from this part [i.e. theology], would prove directly that theological knowledge is in a childlike state that does know its own interest."

In his attempt to acquaint the readers with "an undeniably important scholarly movement, a recently started argument," that is, the newer results in the natural sciences, geology in particular, Gonda's article is based on two studies on Darwinism published in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* earlier in 1863: "Ein Beitrag zu richtiger Schätzung der sog. Entwicklungs- oder Transmutations-Hypothese, namentlich von theologischem Standpunkte aus" by Hermann Späth and "Noch ein Wort über die Darwin'sche Transmutationstheorie" by Christian Hermann Weiße.[264] In terms of this chapter and the Hungarian reception of *Vestiges*, the latter author and his treatment by Gonda is more interesting, since his reading of Weiße (a Protestant clergyman, just like Späth) lists *Vestiges* as a predecessor of Darwin among the works that accept and propagate Laplace's theory of epigenesis as a model for the creation and the evolution of the universe. In a footnote, Gonda especially singles out *Vestiges* from Darwin's predecessors as a work valued highly not only in its native England but also in the whole scholarly world. Moreover, he lists not only the two German translations (presumably listed by Weiße's original article, but he mentions both Hungarian editions of Somody's

[263] "Gonda László," Szinnyei, http://mek.niif.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm

[264] Gonda, "A természettudományok fejlődése," 795-796; Späth, H. "Ein Beitrag zu richtiger Schätzung der sog. Entwicklungs- oder Transmutations-Hypothese, namentlich von theologischem Standpunkte aus", in *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung für das Evangelische Deutschland*. Berlin 1863. No. 2 u.3.; Weiße, Chr. H. "Noch ein Wort über die Darwin'sche Transmutationstheorie", in *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*. 1863. No. 25f.

translation, which he finds "a commendable work that will grace our scientific literature."[265] Moreover, in his conclusions to the article based on the works of the two German theologians, Gonda tried to raise the interest of his readers by closing the article with passages from scientific works that he especially finds important for their treatment of science and religion, and to show that natural scientists "will not be burnt on stake for their brave flights […] since we do not live in an age that fossilized orthodoxy could eradicate books like "Systéme de la Nature,"[266] he himself also quotes a passage from the Hungarian edition of *Vestiges* to reassure the reader that "the pursuit of science is but the seeking of a deeper acquaintance with the Infinite."[267] The inclusion of this passage in Gonda's otherwise rather short conclusion, apart from showing that he did consult the Hungarian edition after adapting Weiße's original text (and he must have read at least the passage in question carefully, since his quotation does not contain the printing errors present in the original source), suggests that Gonda was not only impressed by *Vestiges* on a personal level, but he also found that he could recommend it to the – predominantly Protestant – readership of the journal. Closing his article, he advises his readers that "Protestant theological knowledge should never be embarrassed to come into closer contact, on any point, with the so called exact sciences."[268]

Part of the reason for the lack of mentions of *Vestiges* in mid- and late-nineteenth century British literature, be it scientific, literary or popular, might be related to the lack

[265] Gonda, "A természettudományok fejlődése," 829.
[266] Gonda, "A természettudományok fejlődése," 846.
[267] The whole quoted passage, from Chapter I on The Bodies of Space, their Arrangement and Formation, is as follows: "Let it then be understood – and this is for the reader's special attention – that when natural law is spoken of here, reference is only made to the *mode* in which the Divine Power is exercised. It is but another phrase for the *action* of the ever-present and sustaining God.Viewing Nature in this light, the pursuit of science is but the seeking of a deeper acquaintance with the Infinite. The endeavour to explain any events in her history, however grand or mysterious these may be, is only to sit like a child at a mother's knee, and fondly ask of the things which passed before we were born." (V1853, 9.)
[268] "Protestáns theologiai miveltség soha nem jöhet zavarba, akármely pontján közelebbi érülközésbe jönni az ugynevezett exact tudományokkal." Gonda, "A természettudományok fejlődése," 847.

of a visible and significant author and mistaken attribution to other scholars. In Hungary, even in the very limited nature of its reception, this was not a factor of interest. That József Szinnyei mentions it as the work of Charles Lyell in 1891 suggests that it did not reach a much wider audience: as the news of the *Vestiges*' revealed authorship could have reached Hungary in the time that had elapsed since 1884, it is a reasonable explanation of Szinnyei's ignorance that Somody's translation remained largely unknown on a popular level, despite the five hundred copies that must have been sold in order to make a second edition – a cheap edition, which was more accessible to a wider readership on account of its price – a profitable venture. It is possible that the second edition was not (only) published in 1861 due to the great public demand, as István Boros suggests, but because the emerging debates around the subject of Darwinism might have suggested an opportunity to try and make some profit. The lack of public debate and the relatively number of press reviews, as we can see from the cases discussed above, do not necessarily mean that the book itself was not read and considered on a more private level.[269]

The lack of significant, open public engagement with *Vestiges* – whether at the Academy, or among members of a general, non-specialist audience – is similar in the German, Dutch and Hungarian contexts, despite the differences in the circumstances of publication and the backgrounds and agendas of the translators. In the case of the Hungarian reception of *Vestiges*, to a much greater extent than in Germany and the Netherlands, timing is something that should be considered. In Britain, fifteen years passed between the publication of *Vestiges* and *Origin of Species*; while the same number of years passed between the publication of their respective translations to Hungarian, the

[269] Boros, "Fejlődéstörténeti irodalmunk," 62.

first Hungarian review of *Origin* came out in 1860, and it was followed by many others, as we will see in subsequent chapters. In Britain, the fifteen years allowed for a debate on Chambers' ideas and getting used to the idea of evolution, which meant that the Darwinian (r)evolution came to a more prepared audience and had a certain a continuity which made it more comfortable to the public to get used to the shock of it. Darwin knew that while advocating transformism was dangerous in the 1840s, the climate of opinion was changing, and transformism would be welcome by the 1850s by "those who believed that God governed the world by law rather than miracle."[270] On the other hand, the Darwin discussion started in Hungary very soon after Somody's translation appeared, which left little time to deal with Chambers and his descriptive explanation of the past based on divinely preordained laws. Hungarian scientists were also looking for a science of the future, and Darwin might have been more appealing from this point of view. Whereas *Vestiges* in Britain – despite its qualities that make it an important work on its own right – was a predecessor of Darwinism in the narrative of evolution, the same does not automatically apply in the Hungarian context; *A teremtés természettörténete* might have been an organic, integral part of the evolution of evolutionary thinking in Hungary, but it was not recognised as such, and that also matters.

Finally, the political changes of the 1860s, especially following the Compromise, made scientific discussions much easier to conduct: the discourse of the natural sciences were increasingly imbued with heavy references to social and cultural progress and development. Chambers came too early for that; on the other hand, in the words of Tivadar Margó, *Origin of Species* was published in translation in the most appropriate moment, after 1867, and thus in Hungarian social, cultural and political discourse,

[270] Bowler, *Biology and Social Thought,* 11.

Darwinism became an indicator of Hungarian progress in the late 1860s and early 1870s.[271] At the same time, Chambers, Somody and *Vestiges* remained at the same time a marker of scientific progress and an almost invisible piece of the Hungarian cultural history of science.

[271] Margó, *Emlékbeszéd*, 47-49.

Chapter 3
From London with Love: Jácint Rónay and the Beginnings of Hungarian Darwinism

In an interesting variation of the concept of cultural transfer, the earliest texts of Hungarian Darwinism, while published in Hungary, had their origins abroad – beyond the obvious aspect of the Englishness of the text itself and Britishness of Darwin and his circle. While this is not unique to the Hungarian case, since many early transcultural and transnational interpreters of Darwin were assisted by personal or scientific connections to international networks closer to the original source, it places Jácint Rónay among the early Central and Eastern European transmitters of Darwinism whose interests and circumstances were influenced by the revolutions of 1848, political machinations and often exile, even if his career took a very different trajectory from that of the Italian revolutionary intellectuals he sometimes socialized with in London, or of the notorious materialist Karl Vogt, whose work on "Darwinismus" was produced after he had fled from Giessen to Geneva in 1848. However, the advantage of being able to observe at first hand (and to some extent participate in) the scientific debates of the British capital in the 1850s and early 1860s and Rónay's consequent head start in being able to inform the Hungarian public about the latest developments in the natural sciences proved to be a disadvantage at the same time when it came to the subsequent reception of his work in Hungary. Rónay was bound to be disappointed once he realized that correspondence and occasional visits from acquaintances would not prevent him from remaining relatively isolated from the revitalization and organization – and occasional intrigues – of the Academy of Sciences and Hungarian scientific life in general.

What we may regard as the first text of Hungarian Darwinism, and hence who can be named as the first Hungarian Darwinist would, of course, depend on a number of factors. Chronologically, the matter is fairly straightforward. The first published Hungarian text on *Origin*, Ferenc Jánosi's review in *Budapesti Szemle*, clearly and admittedly based on Laugel's original text in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, was an adaptation based not only on his own interest in the subject matter but presumably also on a sense of urgency felt by Jánosi and the editors of the journal, who were eager to introduce such a crucial subject to the Hungarian public, even if they might not have imagined the impact Darwin's work would have on the world – in general and their own world in particular. However, the first substantial body of texts based directly on Darwin's theory in Hungarian, first published in serial form in the press and later issued as books, were written in London in the first few years of the 1860s by Jácint Rónay, a Benedictine monk who went into exile following the events of 1848/49, working as tutor, translator, and occasional jack-of-all-trades for the Hungarian émigré network. Jácint Rónay and his works on Darwinism, the thematic focus of this chapter, present a complex case not only because of the wide and rather thematically and stylistically colourful body of work Rónay produced, but also because of his changing agenda and approach when it came to natural science.

Rónay's role in the introduction and spread of Darwin's work and the evolutionary thought it inspired in Hungary has been documented, if often on a somewhat superficial level, in the secondary literature. The importance of his writings on Darwin was praised by some of his contemporaries, his biographers, and historians of science from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century: he has been called the first Hungarian Darwinist, the first Hungarian Darwinist thinker, the first translator of Darwin and the

first adaptor of Darwin into Hungarian. These descriptions each imply a very different approach, and they have also been coloured by the biographers' historical circumstances and their interpretations of Rónay's life and work according to their own agendas. Consequently, one of the aims of the chapter is to balance the narratives of the secondary literature with analysis of two types of primary sources Rónay left behind: his memoirs and correspondence on the one hand, and even more importantly, his published scientific works on the other.

The chapter consists of four main parts: following a biographical sketch to put the later narrative into context, it will identify the main events, contacts and influences during Rónay's life in London that affected his interest in and interpretation of natural history, especially geology and later anthropology, which in turn influenced his two longer evolutionary writings, the pre-Darwinian *A tűzimádó bölcs az ősvilágok emlékeiről* [The fire-worshipping wise man on the remains of ancient worlds; in the following: *Tűzimádó bölcs*][272] and the later *Fajkeletkezés; Az embernek helye a természetben és Régisége* [The origin of species; man's place in nature and his antiquity; in the following: *Fajkeletkezés*],[273] which was based on *Origin*. The third section, through analysis of the themes and tropes of *Tűzimádó bölcs*, will trace the early influences of natural history and geology on Rónay's scientific thought before Darwin, from his education though his early years in exile in London and the contacts he made there in the early 1850s. The third section will explicate the history and structure of *Fajkeletkezés*, the reason why Rónay acquired fame as the most important early transmitter of Darwinism to Hungary, and will

[272] Jácint Rónay, *A tűzimádó bölcs az ősvilágok emlékeiről* [The fire-worshipping wise man on the remains of ancient worlds], (Pest: Kilián György, 1860).
[273] Jácint Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés; Az embernek helye a természetben és Régisége* [The origin of species; man's place in nature and its antiquity], (Pest: Demjén és Sebes, 1864).

reflect not only on Rónay's understanding of Darwin theories, but also through the presentation of its reception by Hungarian academia, on the contrasting opinions on Rónay's work by his contemporaries, and how these differed among later historians of science. Finally, a fourth section, or rather an extended conclusion will address Rónay's work following his return to Hungary in 1866 as well as the disappearance of not only the concept, but also the word Darwinism from it as he refashioned himself from patriotic exile into a humble servant of the empire.

The Dubious Darwinist

János Jácint Rónay (1814-1889) was many things: Benedictine monk, natural scientist, author, revolutionary, exile, parliamentary representative, tutor to two of the children of Francis Joseph I, honorary bishop. He has also been represented as many other things, by biographers and scholars of various disciplines: phrenologist, student and pioneer of psychology, the first Hungarian Darwinist, translator, patriot; and by himself: un(der)appreciated patriot, ignored scholar, victim of Hungarian academia. All these aspects of Rónay's character are present in the numerous works on his life and work, which are based on and also reflect a biographical narrative that is both very detailed and blurred at the same time as a direct consequence of Rónay's own interference. The memoirs that he personally and very carefully edited himself from his diaries during his years of retirement, published privately in ten copies in 1884,[274] have served as the basis for the image that Rónay fashioned for himself: a gentle, scholarly, imaginative man

[274] Rónay, *Napló-Töredék*.

undervalued and overlooked by contemporaries and hindered by the circumstances of life and historical events, one who never complains, or at least not loudly or in public. The image he fashioned for himself at the end of his life, reconstructing himself into the retired cleric after a stint at the royal court, is of course in quite a contrast with the image of Rónay as presented by his writings, or even by some of his more discerning biographers. This dissertation does not aim at a reevaluation of Rónay's whole character or at decoding and reconstructing his biography, personality or oeuvre in general, only at identifying his role in the evolution of Hungarian Darwinism and evolutionary thought. The juxtaposition of his scholarly output and his thoughts reflected in his correspondence and memoirs will be thus restricted to the circumstances in which his writings on Darwinian and evolutionary thought were produced. Consequently, discussion of his Catholicism or politics will be framed within the evolution and eventual dissolution of his evolutionary narrative. In the end, the significance of Rónay's work lies not only in the fact that he produced the first substantial Hungarian text informing readers in detail about the contents and main idea of *Origin*, but also in that, however hard his memoirs (in the eight thick volumes of which the name Darwin is not mentioned once) tried to blur the traces of how much of an evolutionist (or Darwinist) he actually was, he is nonetheless still associated with, in fact is perhaps best known for, his role in making Darwin's work known to Hungarians.

János Leitzinger, later Rónay, was born on 13 May 1814 in Székesfehérvár.[275] Upon completing his primary and secondary education in his hometown and Esztergom,

[275] When otherwise not indicated, biographical data is based on the following works, which also, to certain extent, address or in some cases even focus on Rónay's scientific thought and approach to Darwinism: Ferenc Acsay, *Rónay János Jáczint élete* [The life of János Jáczint Rónay], (Győr: Győregyházmegyei Könyvsajtó, 1906); Irma Allodiatoris, "Rónay János Jácint," *Élővilág* 9, no. 5 (1964): 49-53; Romuáld Máthé, "Rónay Jácint," *Műhely* (Győr) 15, no. 3, (1993): 42-47; Lajos Pál, *Rónay Jácint*. (Budapest:

he entered the Benedictine order in Pannonhalma in 1831. After studies of philology in Győr and theology in Pannonhalma, he received a doctorate in 1841 taught philology in the Lyceum in Győr between 1841 and 1848, and it was during this time that he became interested in craniology and the study of characterology, on which subjects he actively published,[276] and which served as his entry into the scholarly community when he was elected as a corresponding member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Pest based on his work on experimental psychology.[277]

Like many of his contemporaries, his life took a radical turn in the spring of 1848. He became a member, and later the camp priest, of the Győr militia, was present at various military skirmishes, acted as a messenger to Kossuth, and in May 1849 he addressed an open letter to the clergy of Győr county, calling them to arms.[278] This last action was the main reason for going into hiding and ultimately into exile at the fall of the

---

Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976); Lajos Pál, "Rónay Jácint" *Századok* 105, no. 3-4 (1971): 670-695; Antal Pór, *Rónay Jácint pozsonyi prépost. Életrajzi vázlat,* (Pozsony-Budapest: Stampfel Károly kir. udvari és akad. könyvkereskedése, 1887); Antal Pór, *Emlékbeszéd Rónay János Jáczint rendes tagról,* (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1891). Is is not known when exactly changed his last name, but he is listed in Pannonhalma as Rónay in 1847 (Allodiatoris, 50).

[276] His studies on craniology, which he considered a branch of experimental psychology were published in the popular press in Győr as "Koponya- és arczisme" [A study of skull and face]; see Pál 1971, 676. On "national characterology", a proto-psychological subjects of sorts, he published a longer study: Jácint Rónay, *Jellemisme. Vagy az angol, franczia, magyar, német, olasz, orosz, spanyol nemzet nő, férfiú és életkorok jellemzése lélektani szempontból* [Characterology. Or the characterization of the women, men and ages of the English, French, Hungarian, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish nations from a psychological point of view], (Győr, 1847). For a critical reading of the latter, see György Hunyadi, "A nemzeti karakter talányos pszichológiája" [The curious psychology of national character]. In: György Hunyadi (ed.), *Nemzetkarakterológiák. Rónay Jáczint, Hugo Münsterberg, Kurt Lewin* [National characterologies: Jácint Rónay, Hugo Münsterberg, Kurt Lewin], (Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2001), 7-50.

[277] Jácint Rónay, *Mutatvány a tapasztalati lélektan köréből* [A presentation on experimental psychology]. Győr, 1846. His inaugural speech at the Academy was held in April 1848, "On the human brain and its influence on intellectual life" ("Az emberi agyról, s befolyásáról a szellemi életre"), but it did not receive more enthusiasm than the customary "Hurrah!" ["Éljen'"] from the assembly (see Rónay, *Naplótöredék* I. 67-68.). It was his last published scholarly work before he left Hungary in 1849, and neither did it contain significantly new thoughts compared to his earlier work, nor did he did not return to the subject later in life. See Pál 1971, 676.

[278] This is yet another instance when the contemporary accounts, even the sentiments expressed in his later correspondence with various exiled revolutionaries and his contacts in Hungary in the 1850s, are to some extent "tamed" in his later recollections, since in his edited memoirs he claims that he "accidentally drifted" ("véletlenül sodródott") into the events of the revolution. Rónay, *Napló-töredék* I. 61—65.

revolution; he left Hungary in 1850, and after being expelled from Breslau and Hamburg, he travelled – through Brussels – to London, where, despite some initial uncertainty,[279] he would spend the next sixteen years. It was in London in 1850 that he first learned English, and supported himself by translations and giving private lessons in Latin and Greek to children of middle class and a few aristocratic families. He also taught Hungarian to a few Brits fashionably sympathetic to the cause of the Hungarian revolution. He was, to some extent, also active in the affairs of the Hungarian community and was in correspondence with many friends and acquaintances based in other European and American cities, but following his growing disillusionment with Kossuth and various other machinations and perceived slights, he increasingly devoted himself to teaching, writing, and other scientific pursuits. As we will see later in more detail, this was the time when he renewed his interest in natural history and immersed himself in the study of geology, making the acquaintance of the works of Lyell, Murchison, and later Darwin and Huxley. He attended the meetings and became a member of various societies, and the 1860s he participated in a few meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

Although there was a window of opportunity for him to try and return to Hungary in 1860, he left Britain only in 1866, shortly before the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. He received a parliamentary mandate as the representative of Pér, and rejoined the Academy as an elected member and Secretary of the philosophical section; his inaugural speech was "On the Progress of Pre-Historic Man."[280] He did make some efforts to reintegrate himself into the scientific community not only at the Academy, but also

[279] In a letter to Bertalan Szemere dated 11 September 1852, he mentions that if he finds no suitable employment, he might emigrate to America. Jácint Rónay to Bertalan Szemere, OSZK 1927/5. No. 2.
[280] Jácint Rónay, *Az ősemberek haladása* [The progress of prehistoric men], (Pest: Eggenberger Ferenc, 1868).

through participation at the 1868 meeting of the Hungarian Association of Physicians and Naturalists, where he gave a paper on the topic of the "Ice Age."[281] He ultimately became disillusioned with the internal machinations of the membership, he felt underappreciated by his peers and he could never really integrate after his long absence, especially since he had barely started his scientific work before the revolution began. His last substantial scientific contribution, on "The progress of organic life and the extinction of species" was read at the Academy in 1871,[282] and is considered to be a regression compared to his earlier works: in the conclusion, he stresses the elusiveness of the "harmonious whole" of organic life on earth.[283] The reason for refraining from any, especially positive, commentary on evolutionism is most likely the new career direction that Rónay was considering at the time. He accepted an appointment as the tutor of Crown Prince Rudolf and later Princess Maria Valeria in Hungarian language and history, which also meant that he had to have clerical rank. Although it is unclear why he never received more than a honorary bishopric, his tacit rescinding, or rather conscious lack of commentary on his former scientific interests and output indicates that he felt it was inadvisable for a bishop, even if only a honorary one, to advocate evolutionary thought.[284] He retired from the

281 Jácint Rónay, "A jégkorszak" [The ice age], *A Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók Nagygyűlésének munkálatai*, 13 (1868): 66-75.

282 Jácint Rónay, "A szerves élet haladása s a fajok kihalása" [The progress of organic life and the extinction of the species], *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Évkönyve* 13 (1871).

283 "[A] szerves élet összehangzó egészet képez, mely a *valószínűtől a valóságig, s innét a megfoghatatlanságig* szövődik." (emphasis in original) Lajos Pál interprets this as a straighforward return to the acceptance or divine creation; however, since Rónay lists and summarizes many of even the most recent scientific results, even if without much of a comment, it is more likely that he was careful to avoid stating his opinion in either way.

284 There are a number of theories why Rónay ceased to comment on Darwinism. He never formally renounced the theories he formerly published so enthusiastically upon, but his memoirs, edited long after his works on Lyell, Darwin and Huxley were written and published, are much more careful with wording. However, it has been speculated, that he might have been able to receive an actual bishopric had he renounced his statements in his earlier scientific works (Pál 1971, 694); on the other hand, his Catholic biographer claimed that his scientific work had no bearing on his appointment as a bishop (Máthé 47, cf. Acsay). It has also been suggested that he was viewed with suspicion in Rome because of his connections with the members of the Italian revolutionary emigration while in London. (See Pál 1971, 694-95.) As to

court in 1883, and lived the remaining years of his life in Pozsony, where he edited and prepared for publication his diaries that he had kept for most of his adult life, and died in April 1889.

Rónay in London: A Naturalist and his Networks in Exile

Rónay's place in the Hungarian history of Darwinism is based on his authorship of the first comprehensive account of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, published under the title *Fajkeletkezés*[285] as a series of articles in *Magyar Sajtó* in 1862, and as part of a book in 1864. The evolution of Rónay's evolutionary thought, as it were, can be more comprehensively presented and understood through analysis of not just the text of *Fajkeletkezés* itself, but with the inclusion of the major evolutionary texts that preceded and followed it. Before detailed case studies of these two books, *A tűzimádó bölcs* and *Fajkeletkezés*, however, it is worth looking at the environment in which Rónay lived and worked, and the networks and contacts he established there and maintained with Hungary, since both volumes were direct results of his life and experiences in London in the 1850s and the first half of the 1860s.

Rónay lived in London between 1850 and 1866; he had been working on a manuscript on "the history of life" since 1853,[286] which he decided to abandon in 1855

Rónay himself, he cited the seventeen years of absence from church and country as a main reason. (*Napló-töredék* VI. 295.) Endre Réti has attributed the cessation of his scientific work as of 1871 due to his consecutive appointments to the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs and as Crown Prince Rudolf's tutor; see, for instance, Endre Réti, "Darwinisták és antidarwinisták Magyarországon," *Világosság* 7-8 (1962): 62.

[285] The most literal translation of the title would be "The formation of species."

[286] Rónay, *Napló-töredék* II. 123-127.

for the study of geology.[287] Rónay did not write about what inspired or motivated him to these pursuits, but the vibrant scientific life of London, some of which he had the opportunity to experience, left traceable influences in the texts. Besides the crucial influence of his British contacts and his participation in the activities of certain scientific societies, there are two other factors that influenced his scientific output while in London: one of these was his contacts with some members of the Hungarian scientific community in Pest through correspondence or through the visits some members paid to Rónay in London, and the other was his connection to the post-revolutionary emigrant network. Although his correspondence and his memoirs show frustration at not being appreciated enough by any of these three, sometimes overlapping networks, his contacts with them were crucial in getting some of his manuscripts published, and even in supplementing his income by sending articles for publication in various Hungarian papers, the series of articles in *Magyar Sajtó*, for instance, being among the earliest items on Darwin's work in the Hungarian popular press.

In light of his long membership of and at times active role in the Hungarian group of political exiles in London, and the role of London as one of its central hubs besides Brussels and Paris, it is perhaps fitting that Rónay's first tangible connections with the British scientific community were established through the Hungarian emigration network.[288] Bertalan Szemere,[289] one of Rónay's regular correspondents, asked him to

[287] Rónay, *Napló-töredék* II. 267.

[288] His memoirs and his correspondence both mirror his disillusionment with emigrant politics, especially due to his disagreement with Ferenc Kossuth's political schemes. On his position between the Kossuth group and their opposition, see his correspondence with Szemere (OSZK 1927/5.), or the relevant sections of Volume II of *Napló-töredék* (on the early 1850s). His correspondence and his memoirs contain many denials of interest in the machinations of various emigré groups, but these seem a bit too frequent to ring true.

[289] Until his return to Hungary in 1865, Szemere, who had served as Minister of the Interior in the Batthyány-government and as Prime Minister between 2 May and 11 August 1849, lived in exile in Paris

assist with obtaining financial support for the explorer László Magyar, who was at the time traveling in Central Africa.[290] Although Rónay's early letters to Szemere between September 1852 and March 1853 reflect his disappointment with the lack of enthusiasm displayed by the members of the scientific community he had approached in London, in regards to both the explorer and his own person,[291] in the end he did establish some important connections that came to form the basis of his interactions with some members of the British scientific community.

After being rejected by "some renowned members of the Parliament" who informed him that "the government did not support such enterprises", he turned to members of the Royal Geographical Society with the offer that he would be willing to present to them the whole expedition together with Szemere's document of recommendation, but as of 12 December 1852, his efforts were not met with success. Eventually, he did manage to create some interest, and while his hoped-for meeting with the famous Dr. Livingstone did not materialize at this time,[292] he succeeded in securing a private interview with R. I. Murchison, the President of the Geological Society.

---

and maintained a wide network of correspondence. Rónay, not only living in one of the major hubs of Hungarian emigration but being similarly wary of Kossuth and his activities, was a frequent contact.

[290] László Magyar (1818-64) was an explorer and cartographer known for his expeditions in Central Africa. Zsombor Nemerkényi's short, English language study, "László Magyar - a Hungarian explorer and map-maker of Southwest Africa," is available online at http://lazarus.elte.hu/hun/digkonyv/nemerkenyi/magyar5.htm, and a list of sources at http://lazarus.elte.hu/hun/digkonyv/nemerkenyi/magyar3.htm.

[291] In letter no. 3, dated 25 December 1852, he conveys his shock upon the realisation that membership in the Geographical Society and probably some others as well, is a matter of receiving a title in exchange for money, and the society exists only so that some members could occasionally read their papers and then see their names printed in the transactions of the society. (OSZK 1927/5.)

[292] Letter no. 5 to Szemere, dated 8 January 1853. Rónay eventually met Livingstone in 1857, first following Livingston's lecture at the Geographical Society on 12 December 1857, and a week later at a private soiree. On this occasions, not only did he urge Livingstone to try to find Magyar, but also offered to translate Livingstone's travel diary to Hungarian. In a footnote added later, he also tells how and why but the idea never came to fruition: for one thing, no publisher volunteered its resources, but in what Rónay also finds a significant counter-argument, he stopped the translation when he learned about the publication of a German translation: the renowned travel account would thus reach Hungary anyway. *Napló-töredék* II. on the meeting with Livingstone, see 385—389; on the German translation, 386.

Murchison, "the great master of the ancient Silurian formation and the discoverer of the Permian formations that he had researched with such great care in the Permian region of the former Poland," made a great impression on Rónay as a scholar very unlike his colleagues in Continental Europe: unlike those, he radiated contentment with his life and achievements, and Rónay found this a very British characteristic.[293]

An abstract of Magyar's letters in Rónay's translation, was read at a meeting of the Geographical Society in February 1853,[294] even if Rónay only learned about its positive reception after the fact from a newspaper, since the unidentified Secretary of the Society, who had promised him an invitation ticket to the meeting in question, must have apparently forgotten to keep his promise.[295] However, a longer version of extracts in Rónay's translation, followed by the not entirely positive comments of the renowned Dr. Cooley, who found Magyar's calculations incorrect and misleading, were published in the *Journal of the Geographical Society* in the following year.[296] Thanks to this enterprise, Rónay made the acquaintance of many Society members, and Rónay's emerging interest in geology, so clearly and enthusiastically declared as a new course of study in in 1855, follows closely his interactions with the Society.[297]

[293] "[A]z ős sziluri képletek nagy mestere s a permi képletek felfedezője, melyeket annyi gonddal tanulmányozott az egykori Lengyelország permi kerületében." *Napló-töredék* II. 134. It is also worth nothing how Murchison research on Russia becomes "the former Poland" for Rónay, who, as an exile of the Hungarian revolution, was a victim of Russian intervention, and socialised frequently with Polish émigrés in the early 1850s. See, e.g. *Napló-töredék* II. 85-86 and 162.

[294] According to the *Records of the Geographical Society*, the first paper read at Sixth Ordinary Meeting of February 14, 1853, chaired by the President, R. I. Murchison, was an "Abstract of Letters received from Mr. Ladislaus Magyar, dated April 20, 1851, Sah-Quilem, on the River Saszabi, in the Kingdom of Kalunda, in Central Africa, S. lat. 4° 41', and E. long. 23° 43', translated by Dr. H. Rónay." See also the "Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of London. Session 1852-53", *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 23, (1853): l-lvii and li.

[295] Letter no. 6 to Szemere, dated 3 March 1853.

[296] H. Rónay and W. D. Cooley, "Extracts from the Letters of an Hungarian Traveller in Central Africa," *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 24 (1854): 271-275.

[297] Rónay, *Napló-töredék* II. 267.

Action then followed enthusiasm, and despite the growing number of students and the less free time this resulted in, he started working on a text, "not theoretical, […] but visible to the eye, touchable by the hand, in [sic] the 'origins of life on earth.'"[298] Around the same time, on 26 July 1856, János Török, the editor of *Magyar Sajtó*, approached him through Mór Perczel, one of the most illustrious exiles post-1849, to become a regular correspondent for the paper, which Rónay accepted out of "patriotic duty" ("hazafias kötelességből"), but only to write "geological notes and not about politics" ("de nem politikát, hanem földtani jegyzeteket"). These planned articles were the start of what eventually became *Tűzimádó bölcs*, a strange, poetic narrative that was nonetheless based on the latest geological findings and theories available when the manuscript was completed in 1858, and which was already outdated upon its publication in 1860, just a year after Darwin published his thesis. The articles were ultimately left unpublished in *Magyar Sajtó*, since, at least according to Rónay, in 1856 Török was more interested in emigrant-gossip from London than pure science devoid of politics,[299] and by the time he expressed interest (and offered a honorarium of sixty forints per sheet) in publishing them in *Kelet Népe* (another of Török's ventures), Rónay decided that the text was perhaps substantial enough to deserve even a volume of its own.[300]

The manuscript of *Tűzimádó bölcs* was completed by early 1858.[301] Beyond the influence of Rónay's readings of British geological authors and his experiences during

[298] "[N]em elméletet; […] hanem szemmel látható, kézzel fogható dolgokat a 'Földi élet keletkezésében.'" Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, II. 345.
[299] Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, 347—48.
[300] Rónay, *Napló-töredék*, 367.
[301] This is supported on one hand by Szemere's somewhat critical assessment in a letter from Paris dated 12 February, and correspondence from Pest regarding an option for publication dated 22 February. Bertalan Szemere, *Levelek (1849-1862): száműzetésben* [Letters (1849-1862): in exile], (Pest: Ráth Mór, 1870), 84-86. See also, Rónay, *Napló-töredék* III. 9-11 and 101.

summer holidays on the Isle of Jersey,[302] Rónay's reluctant – according to his later framing of the matter in his memoirs, at least – assistance to Hungarian political machinations made it possible to publish it: another instance when his British and Hungarian networks, both scientific and political, unknowingly interacted in their support of his endeavors. Rónay assisted Béla Széchenyi with the arrangements for a bootleg edition of *Blick*, and as a gesture of gratitude, Széchenyi's father offered to read a manuscript of Rónay.[303] The gushing author only had one work that he found complete enough that he could even imagine publishing, should the "Greatest Hungarian" and a publisher in Pest both find it worthy of such honour. Count Béla also arranged for the publication of the work with the university publisher György Kilián, and twenty copies of *Tűzimádó bölcs* arrived for the proud author's London rooms on 26 September 1860.[304] The date of publication has caused some confusion, since some have mistakenly attributed to the book the influence of Darwin's *Origin*.[305] *Origin* did in fact, made a deep impression on Rónay, but only subsequently, when he decided to share Darwin's theses with the Hungarian public through *Magyar Sajtó*, which published a series of articles on the subject of "Fajkeletkezés" between 5 April and 26 October1862: "while others spoke

[302] A few members of the Hungarian emigration, including Count Sándor Teleki and the Perczels lived there. See Pál 1971, 694; on the first Jersey excursion in 1854, see *Napló-töredék* II. 214-56. Rónay later described the island, which "must have been created in a giant battle of the elements" ["E sziget, óriási elemharcz alatt keletkezhetett"] and the extraordinary influence of the ocean on its flora and fauna in a letter to Móric Majer, 22 September 1857, OSZK, 1954/57, no. 1.

[303] *Napló-töredék* III. 33-40 and 63-72.

[304] *Napló-töredék* III. 99-102.

[305] Acsay first implies the the foreshadowing of the acceptance of Darwin's standpoint, and then claims a direct influence of *Origin*, "which had been published just then" (176). See also Gabriel Adriányi, "Drei Naturwissenschaftler im ungarischen Klerus des 19. Jahrhunderts: Jácint Rónay OSB, Kabos Hegyfoki und Anyos Jedlik OSB," in *Theologie – Grund und Grenzen. Festgabe für Heimo Dolch zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres,* ed. Hans Wadenfels, (Paderborn, 1982): 553: "Rónay griff mit diesem Buch eine damals besonders in England viel diskutierte Frage nach Naturwissenschaft, die Evolution, auf; denn kurz zuvor war Charles Darwins Buch 'Origin of Species' veröffentlicht worden." *Tűzimádó bölcs* is also present on a list of the literature of Hungarian Darwinism compiled in 1959; however, the list contains other items not directly connected to Darwin's work, such as Hungarian reactions to Carl Vogt; see Balás et al, "A darwinizmus magyarországi irodalma," 64.

about the progress of the newest age, I returned to the far far past, and searched for the secrets of ancient times, the progress of life on earth and the origin of species."[306]

In August 1862, he was visited by Antal Csengery, editor-in-chief of *Budapesti Szemle*, who kindly informed his host that the anonymously published *Tűzimádó bölcs* was attributed by scientific circles in Hungary to Antal Csernátony.[307] In an attempt to "thaw the ice" a few months later, Rónay wrote a letter to Csengery, offering to produce a series of articles on Huxley's most recent work, *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*, to which he had early access due to his acquaintance with the author. In the letter, he also referred to gossip that Huxley had shown his work to Lyell as well, but "the old man" ["az öreg úr"] did not want to convert to the new camp. However, as Rónay reported, Lyell also had a book coming out the following month: "The geological evidences of the antiquity of man."[308] The three parts of the *Fajkeletkezés*-volume would be soon in place to edit, adapt and extract for Hungarian publication.

According to his promise he sent the "extract of Huxley's latest work [Huxley legújabb művének kivonatát] (Evidence as to man's place in nature)," under the title "Az ember helye a természetben" on 22nd April 1863, preferably to be published in *Budapesti Szemle* (of which Csengery was editor-in-chief), but the news that he interpreted as the

[306] "[M]íg mások a legújabb kor haladásáról szóltak, én visszatértem a messze messze múltba, s kerestem az ős idők titkait, a földi élet haladását, a fajok keletkezését." *Napló-Töredék* III. 214. The last, 26 October installment in *Magyar Sajtó* was published with the note that certain parts of the work were left out of publication, but may eventually appear; however, the work is complete in manuscript form and is only waiting for a publisher. See also, *Napló-töredék* III. 246.

[307] *Napló-töredék* III. 273. Csengery was not the only visitor who drew Rónay's attention to this circumstance.

[308] *Napló-töredék* III. 238. In his letter to Csengery on 20 October 1862, he mentions that while he is still working on the species-question (*faj-kérdés*), he had seen a few pages and some woodcuts (of human and monkey skeletons), and he thinks Huxley's work would be worth making known in Hungary. OSZK 1929/32, no. 1.

appropriation of his work by members of the scientific community left him deeply offended and left a lasting grudge against certain members of the Hungarian Academy.[309]

Since he wanted to secure his rights as author over a variety of anonymously published articles, Rónay decided to publish. He put together a volume from his articles based on *Origin* from *Magyar Sajtó*, his already completed sections of Huxley, and a series of articles based on Lyell's work published in *Hon* in 1863, and sent them to Pest. In 1864, a slim volume called *Fajkeletkezés: Az embernek helye a természetben és régisége* [The Origin of Species: Man's Place in Nature and His Antiquity] was published anonymously (which to some extent contradicts Rónay's attempt to assert his status as rightful author). He anxiously waited for reports if authorship would be questioned by the people who attributed his work earlier, but there was no reaction from the academic community,[310] and only one review in, ironically, *Budapesti Szemle* by Gyula Schwartz, a young friend and occasional visitor of Rónay's in London.[311]

Again, post-1849 resistance politics intersected with the publication and circulation of Rónay's scientific output, but this time with rather unfortunate results. One of the co-owners of the publishing company, Emil Sebes, was shot to death in March 1864 after a failed escape from the military hospital following his arrest after the exposure of the Almásy–Nedeczky plot,[312] as a result of which the Demjén–Sebes

[309] See Chapter 1.
[310] As he wrote in his memoirs, "I thought that the actions of the anonymous author [i.e. himself] would be met by opposition; but the scholarly world kept a wise silence." [Azt hittem, hogy a névtelen szerző eljárását tiltakozás erendi; de a tudós világ bölcsen hallgatott.] *Napló-töredék* III. 305.
[311] Schwartz, "Fajkeletkezés," 282-285.
[312] The "Almásy-Nedeczky plot" of 1863-64, nominally led by Pál Almásy, István Nedeczky and Lajos Beniczky, but connected to the wider relations of the secret organisations of the Hungarian political emigration, was a failed effort to achieve Hungarian independence according to the laws of 1848. See Lajos Lukács, *Magyar politikai emigráció 1849–1867* [Hungarian political emigration, 1849-1867], (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1984) and Chapters 3-4 of Katalin Farkas, *Magyar függetlenségi törekvések 1859-1867: a Csáky–Komáromy-féle szervezkedés* [Hungarian independence efforts 1859-1867: the Csáky-Komáromy plot], Doctoral dissertation, (Budapest: ELTE, 2006).

publishing business failed. As Rónay complains – yet again – in his memoirs, the printed copies of the books were bought by another bookseller, who printed a new title page to go on the old edition, this time including the author's name, whose anonymity was broken without even asking for his permission: "This is how they treat the exile!"[313]

By the early 1860s, despite his less than favorable impressions of his early interactions with the Royal Geographical Society in connection with László Magyar, Rónay managed to make enough connections to integrate to some extent into the British scientific community and its organized London circles. Since these circles informed and influenced his scientific output during his last years in London, some of which he published as articles in the Hungarian press, it is worth examining Rónay's contacts and the societies and organisations they belonged to, and the reports of his activities within these circles. Although his memoirs reflect very little of his experiences with the scientific societies in London – especially in comparison with the lengthy passages devoted to the many slights and indignities he suffered from the geographically much more distant Hungarian Academy of Sciences – and there is, in general, little evidence of active participation, records exist that show that Rónay was in contact with members of the British scientific community. Moreover, his sensitivity to actual and imagined slights nothwithstanding, his status as an outsider on the verges of the polite society of organised Victorian scientific life made it possible for him to keep his contacts on opposing sides of scientific politics and conflict likely because of the absolute lack of need or obligation to take sides. This can be well observed in his engagement with the Ethnological Society

[313] "Így bánnak a menekülttel!" Rónay reports of these events in *Napló-Töredék* under the date 7 March 1865, see III. 378. Copies of the book with the year 1864, whether or not with Rónay's name on the title page, contain the Demjén—Sebes company (Pest) as publishers and Wigand (Pozsony) as the printers. The second edition of 1867 was published by Mór Ráth in Pest.

and the Anthropological Society in the mid-1860s, during which period the two societies were in deep conflict.[314]

Since not only Darwinism, but the "science of man" were among the major issues of contention, it is not irrelevant to briefly look at the major points of this disciplinary power struggle that became a controversy of political and religious overtones, since Rónay was still at work on the three parts later to be published as *Fajkeletkezés* when the conflict started in the early 1860s, and he was present at the most significant attempt at peaceful resolution immediately before he left Britain in 1866. Consequently, a conflict over scientific orientation that started over contrasting approaches to and interpretations of ethnology and anthropology, but in the end also reflected on the politics of race and even the role of the scientific society in Victorian Britain, to a certain extent also influenced the Hungarian reception of the basic ideas – among them Darwinism – under debate.

The Ethnological Society of London, founded in 1843 with the agenda to pursue a more scientific study of "human origins" and the "natural history of man" by some members of the Aborigines Protection Society, retained the more liberal outlook and humanitarian inclinations of its predecessor. Ethnology, considered somewhat of a fringe science in the 1840s, acquired a measure of respectability in the 1850s: it was included in the section for Geology and Geography by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1851, and its membership overlapped with many other scientific societies and included, among others, Murchison, Huxley, Wallace and Lubbock by the 1860s. The

[314] On the origins, history and nature of the conflict, see, for instance, J. W. Burrow, "Evolution and Anthropology in the 1860's: The Anthropological Society of London. 1863-71," *Victorian Studies* 7, no. 2 (1863): 137-154; George Stocking Jr., "What's in a Name? The Origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute (1837-71)," *Man*, New Series, 3 (1971): 369-390; Ronald Rainger, "Race, Politics and Science: The Anthropological Society of London in the 1860s," *Victorian Studies* 22, no. 1 (1978): 51-70.

upsurge in membership in the early years, however, also created a source of tension, especially with the arrival of James Hunt, whose differing views of race from the more generally abolitionist and humanitarian traditions of the society, caused friction and eventually led him to found his own, competing organization, the Anthropological Society of London in 1853.[315] Hunt, whose approach to anthropology was based on "the science of man," was dissatisfied with the ethnology of the previous decades, which he considered to be pervaded by biblical speculation and religious overtones to result in a restrictive study of the "history of the science of races." Beyond the problem of the definitions of the science of ethnology versus anthropology, there was a stark difference in the two societies' approach to Darwinism: while the ethnologicals, among them many of the leading Darwinians such as Huxley and Galton were concerned with questions of "descent and origin," Hunt, whose interest was in a more narrowly physical anthropology, was explicitly anti-Darwinian.[316] Although the two societies overlapped in membership, the "anthropologicals" were seen as more marginal in the eyes of the "intellectual aristocracy" that constituted the core membership of the "ethnologicals;"[317] due to their more influential position and existing integration in the scientific community, the "ethnologicals" practically commandeered the subsection at the annual meetings of British Association for the Advancement of Science where papers on subjects of ethnology and anthropology were submitted to and discussed.[318] Although the British Association consistently withstood the attempts of the "anthropologicals" to create a place for themselves at their meeting in the first part of the 1860s, there was an exception,

[315] Stocking also suggests that while Hunt framed the reason for his departure "in terms of the differences over the nature of anthropology and its relation to ethnology," he might have been more interested in creating an organisation that he could dominate. 376.
[316] Stocking, "What's in a Name?" 375-380; Rainger, "Race, Politics and Science," 58-66.
[317] Stocking, "What's in a Name?" 381.
[318] Burrow, "Evolution and Anthropology," 145.

when through the influence of Huxley, under whose leadership the two societies would join in 1871, an anthropological subsection was organized under Wallace at the 1866 meeting held in Nottingham.[319]

Rónay was a member of both societies. Not only did he become a member of both societies very close in time, but during the time when the conflict of the two societies was the most acute. He was elected as fellow of the Anthropological Society on 2 May 1865,[320] and as a member of the Ethnological Society in the Autumn of the same year.[321] Moreover, he attended the above mentioned controversial 36th meeting of the British Association in Nottingham in August 1866.[322] As in the previous year, he was registered in the Section on Geography and Ethnology together with Murchison and Reddie, and not in the competing subsection with Hunt and Huxley. This time he was the only Hungarian participant to make a contribution:[323] his talk "On the Voguls"[324] was based on the research of the Hungarian traveler Antal Reguly. Rónay, who was listed among the "Officers and Committee" of the newly formed anthropological department together with Lubbock or Spencer,[325] does not mention any awareness of the long ongoing conflict and the (temporary) solution in the description of his experiences in Nottingham in his

[319] Rainger, "Race, Politics and Science," 67.
[320] *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 3 (1865): ccxvi.
[321] According to a letter to Viktor Szokoly dated 27 November 1865, he had been elected to be a member of the Ethnological Society, "which is not a really great thing here, but may be of use in the future, if there are nicer times to come" [Nehány nap előtt az Ethnological Society tagnak választott, ez nem valami nagy dolog itt, de tán hasznomra fordítható a jövőben, ha csakugyan szebb időkre virradánk.] OSZK 1912/36, No. 1. He was listed as a corresponding member among the new fellows of the Ethnological Society "elected since the anniversary of 1866" in 1867 in the "Report of the Council of the Ethnological Society of London, May 1867," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* 6 (1868): 2.
[322] Rónay, *Napló-Töredék*, IV. 129-138.
[323] In the previous year, at the Birmingham meeting, Ármin Vámbéry gave a paper "On the Origin of the Hungarians," on which Rónay commented. *Napló-töredék* IV. 34. Vámbéry was also affiliated with the Anthropological Society, where he gave a lecture in 1865, and of which he was the "local secretary" in Pest. See *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 2 (1865): iii, and 4 (1866): l.
[324] *Report of the Thirty-Sixth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; Held at Nottingham in August 1866*, (London: John Murray, 1867). Section list on page xiii, abstract on 115-116.
[325] "Report on the Anthropological Papers Read at the Nottingham Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1866," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 5 (1867): v.

memoirs.[326] This was the very last event he attended in Britain: on 16 September, less than three weeks after the conclusion of the Notthingham meeting, he left London to arrive at the Academy in Pest – after a short detour spent with his family and in Pannonhalma – on November 3.[327]

Rónay's apparent lack of interest in the societies' conflict seems rather disappointing at first sight. It should not be forgotten, however, that he was an outsider to the somewhat rigidly Victorian order of the British scientific structure that the Anthropological Society to some extent challenged – even if it went unnoticed by its Hungarian members, Rónay, Vámbéry and Gyula Schwarcz – and thus less sensitive to the undercurrents of conflict. He was also more concerned with the possibility of return to Hungary and the (re)integration in the scientific life of the Academy and other societies. Nevertheless, even if his scientific work after his return to Hungary has been considered less progressive and innovative by contemporaries and later scholarship, the themes he touched upon, on the progress and the science of man, bear the mark of his attendance at society meetings and his interactions with both prominent "ethnologicals" and "anthropologicals." As addressed in the conclusion of this chapter, Rónay's last written manifests of his engagement with the most progressive members of the British scientific community resulted in his most staid and non-confrontational work, but while his name dominated, or at least heavily influenced the Hungarian reactions to Darwinism in the early 1860s, a new, younger generation took over and created not only translations, but also a discussion in the public sphere that was based on a more scientifically informed

[326] Rónay, *Napló-Töredék*, IV. 129-138.
[327] Rónay, *Napló-Töredék*, IV. 146-167. He would soon attend the meeting of another scientific society, the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science [Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók Társasága]. Rónay attended the 12th meeting in in Rimaszombat (August 1867) and the 13th in Eger a year later. See Chyzer, *A magyar orvosok és természetvizsgálók*, xci.

Darwinism. Before this happened, however, Rónay in one person provided a pre-Darwinian narrative on the progress or earth formation in *Tűzimádó Bölcs*, and then an immediate reaction not only to *Origin* but also to Darwin's contemporaries in *Fajkeletkezés*.

Romancing Geology: *The Fire-Worshipping Wise Man*

Developed over the course of several years, *Tűzimádó bölcs* is quite similar in terms of structure and content to other works on the development of life on earth written in various languages and countries across Europe at the time; however, it is quite different in style, even in comparison to Rónay's earlier and later writings. It essentially combines two narratives, and the combination is quite unusual: a narrative of the creation and development of the earth and its creatures, not unlike other similar works by Lyell or Chambers that Rónay had access to, is interwoven with the conversation of a Hungarian exile (presumably Rónay himself, or a more widely travelled version of himself, writing in first person singular) and a Persian philosopher (the titular wise man) in – of all places – Persia, where Rónay, whose only time ouside of the European continent were the almost two decades spent in Britain, had never been. The book is a very interesting phenomenon, not only because of the intertwining of seemingly incongruous narrative elements into one sequence. While on the one hand it is a rather fanciful story, on the other it is a summary, based on – but not a direct translation of – contemporary books on the history of (life on) earth.

It is one of the great ironies of Rónay's life that his work of several years was finally published in 1860, by which time even he was reading *Origin of Species* and

adapting it, in a shorter version, to Hungarian. In the end, *Tűzimádó bölcs*, not unlike József Somody's translation of *Vestiges*, failed to have the impact that it could have, due to poor timing and the distance of its author from the scientific community of Pest. Nonetheless, it set Rónay on the path to become one of the first Hungarians known for the dissemination and popularisation of Darwinism. The circumstances of Rónay's life in London, his contacts with British scientific societies and Hungarian political opposition, were outlined earlier; however, a more complex story unfolds when the development of his approach to natural history and geology is traced back with the help of his memoirs and his correspondence. What they add to the picture is a sense that the origins of Rónay's interest in the history of world formation and geology cannot be pieced together based only on the relevant sections of his memoirs even without the additional background of his Hungarian correspondence in the 1850s. Although the correspondence is crucial, since his letters mirror his circumstances without the hindsight of old age and the intentional obfuscation in the story he tells in his memoirs, the point of origin for *Tűzimádó bölcs* is as difficult to identify as its inspiration and sources.

According to his memoirs, he had been planning a longer work on "The history of life. The letters of a Hungarian priest in exile" in 1853.[328] The planned work, to be written in an epistolary form, was to be a collection of letters to an old friend in Hungary: the first letter, also quoted at length in Rónay's diary, expresses his fascination with geology, the "new branch of human knowledge: about the remains of perished worlds that testify to the gradual discovery of nature, the progress of organic life, and prove that a long series of millennia had to pass until the present nature could appear on the layered

[328] "Az élet története. Egy Magyar pap levelei a számkivetésben." See Rónay, *Napló-Töredék* II. 123.

vestiges, and as its last creature, the sapient man!"[329] Eventually, he abandoned this course of study, which reflected his mistrust of German metaphysics, and questioned where and when creation happened or started.[330] Even though he was already in the middle of the work in 1855, he had to stop in lack of time when he became more successful in his tutoring career. However, he did not entirely abandon the study of the history of the world, but now with a new course and an exclusive focus on geology.[331]

Although the approach of János Török from *Magyar Sajtó* did not result in publication, and *Tűzimádó bölcs* virtually disappears from Rónay's diaries until early 1858, the subject of his interest in geology and its manifestation in voluminous manuscript form comes up in his letters to Hungarian acquaintances in the late 1850s, and the subject of *Tűzimádó bölcs* is specifically addressed at various points. As he writes to Móric Majer in May 1858,[332] in spite of teaching from morning to evening to make sure there was bread on the table, his happiest moments were working on his manuscripts: even if he felt that he had lost his place in Hungarian scholarship, his "views on the development of the earth amount to six volumes; I am currently reworking them in the "fire-worshipping style"; and if not in Hungarian, I might publish them in English –

[329] "Az emberi ismeretek egy új ágazatáról, melynek híre csak akkor jutott el csendes magányunkba, – a Földtanról"; azon elpusztult világok emlékeiről, melyek a természet fokonkinti fejledezéséről, a szerves élet haladásáról tesznek tanúságot, s azt bizonyítják, hogy évezredek hosszú sorozatának kellett elvonulni, míg végre a réteg-romok színén feltűnt a jelen természet, s mint utolsó lény, a földi élet fejedelme, az értelmes ember!" Rónay, *Napló-Töredék* II. 124.

[330] He follows up the claim that metaphysics is no more than self-delusion and that Philosophy bought nothing else but "faithlessness and hopelessness" [hitetlenség és önámítás] with suggesting that the history of creation should be started where it is tangible, i.e. in nature, since "beyond its borders is the unapproachable and almighty Creator." ["Kezdjük a teremtés történelmét ott, hol lehető, hol megfogható, a természet körében; ennek határain túl, a megközelíthetetlen, a mindenható teremtő áll!"] *Napló-Töredék* II. 125-7.

[331] *Napló-Töredék* II. 276. As of 1853, the planned chapters were "Creator and creation" [Teremtő és teremtés], "The formation of the world" [Világalakulás], "The stages of the formation of the world" [A Földalakulás korszakai], "The natural ways of the created life on earth" [A keletkező földi élet természetes utai], "Man" [Az ember], "The human spirit" [Az emberi szellem]. *Napló-Töredék* II. 124.

[332] Móric Majer (1815–1904), natural historian and botanist, was a Cistercian priest and taught natural history in the Cistercian secondary schools in Székesfehérvár and Pécs in the 1850s. Szinnyei, http://mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/m/m14845.htm.

when? Heaven knows!"[333] A year later, he first reports to Mór Perczel that he had again taken up his abandoned work since a Hungarian magnate "offered to publish it,"[334] and a month later, on 1 August 1858, he was still busy "reworking" his text, since it was important to send it as soon as possible to Hungary, where Széchenyi (this time referred to by name) "offered to publish it."[335]

The emphatic assertion of Széchenyi's interest and the impending publication is somewhat in contrast with what is expressed in Rónay's correspondence with the actor Gábor Egressy. As he writes on 9 November 1859, "*Tűzimádó* will be finished in a few weeks, I don't know yet what I am going to do with it."[336] However, less than a year later he has the occasion to inform Egressy that "in a few days, a work of mine will be published by György Kilián." He laments about the usual subjects: that in the present excited times scientific works cannot expect much support, even if his work is in a somewhat poetic style; he wishes that he could have written it under other circumstances; he also mentions the several volumes of his manuscripts that he keeps working on despite his financial difficulties and his forgotten and ignored status in his country. However, among these statements there are others that are present in his other correspondence to a lesser extent and seem more unguarded than what his diaries would reflect later. He writes,

> "[T]ruth loses a lot if we only circle around it; but this is not my fault. My feelings, convictions I could not express in the homeland as they live in my heart, but I love my country more than myself and thus I found it better to do something than nothing. Among the forms of human knowledge, geology has the brightest future,

[333] "Földalakulási nézeteim már hat kötetet tesznek kéziratban; jelenleg átdolgozom "a tűzimádó" modorban; s ha magyarul nem, tán angol nyelven adandom ki, -- mikor? a jó ég tudja!" Jácint Rónay to Móric Majer, 29 May 1858, OSZK, 1954/57, no. 2.
[334] Jácint Rónay to Mór Perczel, 7 July 1859, OSZK, Fond 89/121, 864/135/1966, no. 14.
[335] Jácint Rónay to Mór Perczel, 7 July 1859, OSZK, Fond 89/121, 864/135/1966, no. 15.
[336] "A 'Tűzimádó' néhány hét mulva elkészül, még nem tudom mit fogok véle tenni." Jácint Rónay to Gábor Egressy, 9 November 1859, OSZK 1901/7, no. 1.

> and there is no doubt that it can have the greatest effect on the sober progress of mankind and on dispensing with the fantasies of the past."[337]

It is unclear what "truth" and "convictions" he felt he could still not express in Hungary, or why he felt that they were impossible to communicate even in his latest book, but his words seem to imply a connection between the progress of geological findings and Hungarian politics, the latter of which being a constant source of disappointment for an exile who felt constantly sidelined by those in power both at home and in emigration.

Even a cursory look at the full title, *A tűzimádó bölcs. Az ős-világok emlékeiről*, or "the fire-worshipping wise man on the remains of the ancient worlds" shows that the author had drawn from multiple influences and sources. There is, first of all, a somewhat mystical-sounding wise man who worships fire, thus evoking a pre-Christian imagery that must have been still at least culturally reconcilable with Rónay's Benedictine training and beliefs. On the other hand, there are the ancient, or pre-historic, worlds, not only one at that, but an implied succession of several; and there are their "remains": depending on the varied implications of the meaning, *emlékek* in this case could also be translated as "memories" or even "vestiges." Thus, already the images evoked by the title reflect the many influences that Rónay collected in Victorian London and before, and also the complex, one could even say confused, way in which they eventually converged in this book.

The book starts with a Latin epigraph,

---

[337] "Néhány nap mulva egy munkám fog megjelenni Kilian Györgynél 'A tűzimádó bölcs, az ős világok emlékeiről.' […] Az igazság sokat veszt, ha csak körül járjuk; de ez nem az én hibám. Érzelmeimet, meggyőződésemet a hazában nem adhatám úgy, miként szívemben élnek de a hazámat jobban szeretem, mint magamat azért jobbnak véltem valamit tenni, mint semmit. Az emberi ismeretek körében, legszebb jövője van a földtannak, s kétségtelenül legnagyobb hatása az emberiség józan haladására, a mult ábrándjainak szétoszlatására." Jácint Rónay to Gábor Egressy, 9 November 1859, OSZK 1901/7, no. 9.

> "Nec certum quis scire potest, quotus iste senescat
> Mundus adhuc quot erunt, quotve fuere prius."[338]

This is a question, or rather a statement of uncertainty: no one can know for certain how many times this world has grown old, how many more there will be, how many there were before. The source of the quotation is an elegy by Janus Pannonius (1434-1472), poet, diplomat and Bishop of Pécs, a significant figure of the Renaissance in the Kingdom of Hungary and of Humanist poetry in Europe. "De Inundatione", the 32nd of Pannonius' *Elegiae in Pannonia scripta*e, refers to a flood that probably occurred in the Autumn of 1468, framing it as an apocalyptic sign and a source of further problems, like a ruined harvest and consequent hunger.[339] Rónay's choice of the above two lines to precede his narrative on the creation and development of the earth and life on it was probably less rooted in apocalyptic thinking rather than in the awareness, stemming from his education in classical Graeco-Latin philology, that the history of evolutionary thought and its various forms went back to Greek philosophy and was also integrated into Christian thinking.[340]

The introductory lines of poetry are followed up by a poetic style and a rather peculiar narrative structure, both of which have been the subject of criticism, primarily from Bertalan Szemere, whose critical remarks are quoted at length in Rónay's memoirs.[341] While Szemere praises Rónay's language and its clarity and elocution, he is adamant that poetry is not a good form for the natural sciences, or at least not any more:

---

[338] Janus Pannonius, De Inundatione, Elegiae in Pannonia scriptae, No. 32. In Sándor Kovács, ed., *Janus Pannonius összes munkái. Iani Pannonii opera omnia* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987), 768.

[339] See Andrea Kiss. *Floods and Long-Term Water-Level Changes in Medieval Hungary*, Doctoral dissertation, (Budapest: Central European University, 2011), 91 and 170.

[340] It is likely that the choice of Janus Pannonius's poetry was based on the thematic link of the two lines of poetry in the epigraph about the changes of the earth(s), and not on a wish to connect Rónay's interest in the scientific interpretation of natural phenomena to Catholic faith and integration in church hierarchy and religious institutions through quoting Renaissance bishop not known for his pious nature.

[341] *Napló-töredék* III. 9-11. For the letters in full, see Szemere, *Levelek (1849-1862)*, 84-86.

"This [poetic form] was appropriate in the past, but not any longer. It should be either poetry or science, otherwise the reader will not know what is real and what is fancy, and especially the Hungarian reader would not know, which is an important consideration."[342] Szemere claims that Rónay could have filled a void for Hungarian readers and writers alike, since they need knowledge, but in the end, the book is "hard to read as poetry, but incoherent and fragmentary for science." He encourages the author to write science in a scientific form, since in possession of knowledge on the subject, he only needs to change the style, and he would possess the gratitude of the "homeland and the nation."[343]

Ferenc Acsay, Rónay's biographer attributes the stylistic failings to the poor circumstances in which the author lived and that due to his many commitments he could not pay as much attention to his language as earlier.[344] It is unclear whether this is an allusion to the fact that Hungarian was not Rónay's native language,[345] but since the style of his much earlier works were praised for their linguistic clarity, this is unlikely.[346] The criticism likely is directed towards the somewhat unlucky mixture of too many elements that reflect Rónay's preoccupations during the years in which he had conceived his work. First, his work was based on many sources, mixed with the melancholy of the exile, his

[342] "Ilyesmi hajdan helyén volt, most nincs többé. Vagy költemény legyen, vagy tudomány, különben az olvasó nem fogja tudni, mi a való, mi a képzelődés, kivált a magyar olvasó nem, mi fontos tekintet." Szemere, *Levelek*, 84-85.
[343] "Így költeménynek nehéz, tudománynak összefüggetlen és tördékes. [...] Ha még nem késő, írjon tudományt tudományos alakban, hiszen a tárgyat bírván, csak az alakot kell változtatni s hálára kötelezi a hazát s a nemzetet." Szemere, *Levelek*, 85-86.
[344] However, Acsay's underlying dissatisfaction with Rónay's evolutionary work, as will also be seen in his criticism of *Fajkeletkezés*, that it disregards the Bible too much. For instance, in the section about flood mythology, he provides various myths from all around the world, but he does not refer to the Genesis. Since according to Acsay, Genesis makes it clear that Moses in fact witnessed the formation of the world (or heard it from someone who had been there), and since the story is so precise in describing the process, it still had not been disproved by science. The lack of reference to the Biblical truth is made worse by the way *Tűzimádó bölcs* is structured, that is, every sentence is a separate paragraph, makes it too biblical in style. Acsay, *Rónay*, 92 and 177-178.
[345] See Allodiatoris, *Rónay*, 50.
[346] Pór, *Rónay* (1887), 7.

thoughts coming from the lips of a mythical Persian scholar. The displaced nature of the exile is underlined by the geographical uncertainty of the narrator: while he begins in a European sea port (which could also indicate that Rónay started – thinking – about the book as early as 1850), he suddenly finds himself "in the country of the mighty Cyrus, the unfortunate Darius, the great Sah-Abbas, in the land of fire worshippers, Iran" two pages later.[347] He sometimes also refers to his lonesome wonderings on the coast of the Caspian Sea.[348] In the introduction, he addresses a friend with whom he used to discuss the history of the world, which is a callback to his earlier planned epistolary work, since the addressee seems to be the same conversation partner from Pannonhalma, but warns him that what follows is a judgment-free communication of the words of the Eastern scholar: "Do not forget, however, the difference between East and West."[349] It is a question, however, what is East and what is West, and where Hungary is in-between, or on Rónay's mental map, at least.

There are several possible sources for Rónay's evolutionary narrative, especially since 1850s London was vibrant with such discussions following the publication of Robert Chambers' evolutionary bestseller *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. However, the origins or reasons for Rónay's decision to set it in a frame of ancient Persia (especially with a Hungarian – or even early Turanian – angle) are much less clear. Rónay's interest in ancient Persian culture, and his decision to link it in his text with both the story of the development of life on earth can probably be led back to interest in the Eastern origins of Hungarians. The idea of the Asian origins of Hungarians, also

[347] "A hatalmas Cyrus, a szerencsétlen Darius, a dicső Sah-Abbas országában, a tűzimádók honában, Iránban vagyok." Rónay, *Tűzimádó bölcs* 7. (In the following, *Tűzimádó*.)
[348] Acsay also points out that Rónay is so confused at this point that he does not realise who is speaking: the author of theoriginal souce that he based the text upon, the Persian scholar or Rónay himself. 94.
[349] *Tűzimádó* 6.

advocated by the Hungarian Ármin Vámbéry, who would come to enjoy quite a celebrity status in Britain in the 1860s, had been gaining popularity in Hungary.[350] Rónay is claimed to have been in contact with the famous orientalist Sir Henry Rawlinson,[351] who had been working on the deciphering of the cuneiform script since the late 1850s.[352] This marginal involvement in Rawlinson's work might have suggested the idea that controversial ideas about the development of the organic world had the potential to sound somewhat more harmless coming indirectly from a venerable Eastern scholar than someone who was not only a political refuge but also a Catholic monk.

Since the text is in first person singular, the conversational form with the Persian scholar could provide Rónay protection from both the political and the Catholic establishment, were it necessary; nonetheless, he refers to his exiled state from Hungary several times.[353] In the end, Rónay's first person narrator becomes a mouthpiece for the Eastern scholar, whose words of wisdom about "the gradual development of the earth"

[350] Vámbéry visited Rónay in London, and Rónay attended his lecture at the Geographical Society on 27th June 1864. In a comment after the lecture, Rawlinson, "the great master of cuneifoem script," had commended Vámbéry's work and at the same time recommended his own, soon to be published work. *Napló-töredék* III. 328-329.

[351] Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson (1810–1895), diplomat and Assyrologist, often referred to as the decipherer of cuneiform Akkadian and in name the author of *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, which in fact was manly based on the work of several other scholars. "Henry Creswicke Rawlinson," *ODNB*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23190?docPos=6. It was probably due to his relationship to Rawlinson that Rónay had also become a member of the Royal Asiatic Society. As of July 1875, he is on the membership list as "Dr. H Rónay, Secretary, Hungarian Academy, Pesth." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, New Series, 7, no. 2 (1875): 11.

[352] For more on Rónay's involvement, see Géza Komoróczy, "Az ókori Elő-Ázsia a pesti egyetemen: nemzeti célok vagy tudományos kutatás" [The Ancient Near East at the University of Pest: national goals or scientific research], *100 év után. Emlékkonferencia a Keleti Népek Ókori Története Tanszék alapításának 100. évfordulóján* [After 100 years. Anniversary conference to commemorate the founding of the Department of the Ancient History of Oriental Peoples], ed. Tamás Bács, Tamás Dezső and Zoltán Niederreiter, Series: Antiqua et Orientalia 1, (Budapest: ELTE-BTK Ókortudományi Intézet, 2011), 25-34.

[353] In an interesting geographical and conceptual turn, however, the Persian scholar also had been an exile, and had the occasion to learn about the temperament and language of the Hungarian people, which is the only Western nation to have retained its Eastern origins. (*Tűzimádó* 9). The Persian, however, "had left his country to be disappointed," even if he could learn from the greatest Western scholar, who later turns out to be Herschel. See *Tűzimádó* 19-24.

and the origins of life on it he interprets to the reader, without much of a commentary or criticism. [354]

The overall impression is that Rónay was trying to clothe his evolutionary narrative in romanticized garb. This literary romanticization of exile, scientific thought, and the history of various life forms and human existence on earth could rely as much on the German Romanticism informing much of the tradition that Rónay was educated in as the pervasion of this Romanticism among the readers and writers of early Victorian Britain. Rónay himself must have been aware the romantic vibes radiated by his text that could possibly throw off the scientifically minded reader, and explained his decision against future criticism back in 1856,

> "With the effort that it took to write this work, I confess, I could have written, on the basis of excellent English authors, a systematic "Geology", and with this I might have done more [for the conditions at home]; but I really did not know that among our hard conditions at home those working on science are allowed to say things, and only patriots were forced into silence. – This work did have another inner, psychological reason, my weakness: I liked to fancy, and my dreams felt so good even when surrounded by science; why would not I have enjoyed this little joy? My life is so joyless!"[355]

The English Romantic tradition, embodied so well by the persona and works of Sir Walter Scott, was an influence not only on Chambers, but the entire genre of "evolutionary epic." This approach also reflects the influence of the kind of science popularization that was characteristic to the British Victorian scene. The concept of the

[354] "földünk fokonkénti fejledezésére," *Tűzimádó* 41.
[355] "Azzal a fáradtsággal, melyet e munka igénybe vett, megvallom, írhattam volna, kitűnő angol szerzők nyomán, rendszeres "Földtant" s ezzel tán többet lendíthettem volna; de valóban nem tudtam, hogy nehéz hazai viszonyaink közt, a tudománnyal foglalkozónak szabad szólni, s csak a honpolgárnak kell elnémulni. -- Volt azonban e munkának belső, lélektani oka is, gyengeségem: szerettem kézetegni, az ábrándozés még a tudomány körében is jólesett; mért ne élveztem volna e kis örömöt? életem oly örömtelen!" *Napló-töredék* II. 347.

"evolutionary epic", mentioned earlier in connection with *Vestiges,*[356] can be applied here, too, not only in the sense that by adopting the conventions of a travel narrative Rónay might have felt that he could "domesticate what had been seen as a dangerous scientific theory."[357] This genre of evolutionary epic also provided him with the possibility to create "an evolutionary hero who would captivate the imagination of the readers,"[358] or at least would appear more adventurous, exciting and even exotic than a frustrated, penniless Hungarian cleric-scholar living the unglamourous, joyless life of exiles in an unappealing residential part of London.

Since the main interest of this research is the transfer of knowledge, or in this case the translation of evolutionary ideas to Hungarian and their dissemination and reception in Hungary, the content – and the origins and sources of the content – of the book, at least the parts relating to evolutionary thought, are the most important. Not only because they indicate Rónay's interest in and engagement with evolutionary thought before his encounter with Darwin and the works of other naturalists *Origin of Species* inspired or influenced, but because it gives an idea of what works of natural science Rónay read and heard about during his forays into the scientific community of 1850s London. However, it should also be noted that while *Tűzimádó bölcs* works as a summary of what Rónay had

[356] On the development of the genre, writers and characters of the "evolutionary epic", see Bernard Lightman, *Victorian Popularisers of Science,* 219-294.
[357] Secord, *Victorian Sensation,* 90.
[358] Lightman, *Victorian Popularisers of Science,* 221. Moreover, based on the examples of other such Victorian epics, Lightman also argues at this point that heroes are also engaged in an epic war, fighting, among others, "religious bigotry". While Rónay never makes such a claim, his assertion that he wanted to "hide the truth in a poetic mantle" due to the "nightmarish" conditions in the country, the approach is at least similar in method. See *Napló-Töredék* II. 345.

learned and found important of the results of British geological science, he also draws on his own earlier work,[359] thus combining his scientific output with that of his British peers.

The text draws on many sources, which, even if mostly unidentified,[360] range from already discounted scientific theories to mythology, the history of ancient Iran, to recent results in geology. The earlier mentioned fictional – for Rónay, at least – Caspian walks imply a familiarity with the work on Murchison on Silurian structures not only in the introduction,[361] but also in later chapters, and together with his references to the importance of the observation of geological processes and changes suggest that one of the major influences was Charles Lyell. Rónay dies not only draw on contemporaries, and while the explanation of the nebular hypothesis can suggest a reading of Chambers,[362] it also reflects that it had been a topic of discussion in the circles that Rónay was part of. In some cases, there is a certain amount of uncertainty about what to believe (or what there is good reason and proof to accept as a veritable scientific result): such as the inheritance of acquired characteristics, which is explained as a viable process that everybody sees and everybody knows when demonstrated on domesticated plants and animals. However, on

[359] The wise man illustrates the closeness of the Persian and Hungarian people not only through pointing out the similarities in their respective languages, but also that of their facial features, calling back to memory Rónay's early interest in craniology, which was an element of his early work on national characterology. *Tűzimádó* 7.

[360] A notable exception being Charles Agassiz, "a famous western scholar" not only mentioned by name, but also adding a reference to his work *On Lake Superior* (Boston 1850) in relation to the foetal development of mammals. *Tűzimádó* 138.

[361] See *Tűzimádó* 10. In the accompanying footnote, while the source is unnamed, Rónay explains how the Permian era received its name from its geographical origins in Russia, while the Silurian and Devonian formations were named after the similarly called regions in England, and this shows an awareness of Murchison's contributions to geology and the surrounding debates and scholarship. Murchison, who played a role in the establishment of the Devonian era, also established the Silurian system in 1839, with the publication of his research in *The Silurian System*. His work on the Permian system was first published in 1841, *On the Geological Structure of the Northern and Central Regions of Russia in Europe*. On how the Great Devonian Controversy rearranged the strata of not only geological knowedge but also the British scientific establishment, see Rudwick, Martin J. S., *The Great Devonian Controversy: The Shaping of Scientific Knowledge among Gentlemanly Specialists*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1985.

[362] Chambers advocated the Laplacian model of the origin and formation of the solar system, and his comparison of the roundness of planets to the roundness of dewdrops is adapted by Rónay in the section "Elemzavar" [The chaos of elements]. See *Tűzimádó* 15-16, and Chapter 1 of *Vestiges*.

the next page, it is a given that "some, perhaps questionable, data are unnecessary […] where nature proclaims the power of circumstances,"[363] since the process of world formation can be proven by the geological findings of the vestiges of earlier stages.

One should remember, though, that while Rónay had the occasion to attend scientific events and had some degree of professional and personal contact with Lyell, Murchison, and other Victorian gentlemen of science, Chambers had also drawn on their work in *Vestiges*; hence, their influence on Rónay could have been direct as well as indirect, *Vestiges* acting as a source but also as an intermediary, a transmitter of information. Moreover, even though Rónay had learned English quite well by the mid-1850s, *Vestiges* was a narrative that not only summarised scientific information for a popular audience, but also did so in a simpler and more accessible language.

Since *Tűzimádó bölcs* contains no references, footnotes or bibliography, the sources of the text can be tentatively identified through examination of the structure (including the comparison of the table of contents of *Vestiges* and the section heading of *Tűzimádó bölcs*) and arguments of the book, and also by looking at specific instances such as illustrations, place names or mentions of scientific phenomena. Ironically, while the structure of the book, illustrated by the similarities of section headings and their content, are quite similar, the closest parallels between the two can be found in the comparison of the illustrations, three quarters of which can be found in the 1853 edition of *Vestiges*;[364] together with the content, it can be argued that *Vestiges* could at least have served as an inspiration to Rónay.

[363] *Túzimádó* 175-176.

[364] The 1853 edition of *Vestiges*, which was the first to include illustrations, and to which Rónay could easily had access to, contained 107 pictures selected by William B. Carpenter who drew the material from his own illustrated textbooks, upon the request of the publisher. (Secord 2003, 150) Thus, almost half of the pictures in *Vestiges* are in *Tűzimádó*, in a number of cases in the exact same sequence, although it can be

The overall structure seems to follow the structure of *Vestiges of Creation* and similar works of that time.[365] Starting with the formation of the universe ("*Mindenség*" 14), through the solar system ("*Naprendszer*" 22), the text gives a detailed history of formation of the earth ("*Földkeletkezés*" 34) and its various geological formations from the Cambrian and Silurian ("*Cambri és Sziluri rétegek*" 53) through Devonian ("*Devoni képletek*" 61), Carbonigenous ("*Kő rengetegek*" 69, "*kő rengetegek*" 70), Permian Eras ("*Permi képletek*" 80), the Trias ("*Trias-képletek*" 87), the Cretaceous Era ("*Gréta-képletek*" 115), and Tertiary formations ("*Harmadrendű képletek*" 123). Superficial formations are the subject of last major section of the work ("*A nagy pusztulás / Emlékezet az új világból*" [The great decay / Memory from the new world]), which presents a certain deviation from the evolutionary structure of *Vestiges,* and not only because this is where Rónay ends his work instead of continuing further along the line.

James Secord calls *Vestiges* more than a book: it was "*seen* as a museum of creation."[366] In this sense, *Tűzimádó bölcs* is also a virtual museum of creation, on location in Iran, guided by an ageless Persian philosopher. The text, which had been already interspersed with philosophical comments from the wise man, ranging from the futility of applying Greek philosophy verbatim when attempting to explain the origins of life (52) to ruminations about the disappearance of the Aztecs (83), becomes dense with

---

said that the illustrations in *Tűzimádó* follow more or less the thematic order of those in *Vestiges*. It is unknown how Rónay chose or obtained the illustrations, although his memoirs refer to a letter from his publisher dated 12th August 1860, in which Kilián reports that only the illustrations are missing from the printed copies (they would be not within the text, but as an appendix at the end). *Napló-töredék* III. 102. However, Rónay mentions in connection to his later work on the extracts of Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature* that he made copies of some illustrations themselves, and "to make the cutting process easier, without proportion lines" [*hogy a metszést könnyítsem, arányvonalak nélkül*]. See letter to Antal Csengery, 22nd April 1863, OSZK 1929/32, No. 2. He presumably counted on the printing press to arrange the illustrations, and this could have been based on an earlier precedent and general practice.

[365] *Vestiges* being not only a popular bestseller, but in a sense also a non-professional reader-friendly summary of more academically oriented works.

[366] Secord, *Victorian Sensation,* 439.

references to the cultural history of religion in the last chapter, including a brief history of Buddhism (158-169) or a lesson on flood mythology on the American continent (161-162). These elements, which come from unidentified sources, seem like an attempt to reconcile the divine origins of life with the scientific discoveries of recent years: while mastodon fossils and the fossilized vestiges of extinct life forms could be explained away somehow, the remains of still existing creatures, and the ramifications of these when it comes to considering the evolution of animals and humans were less easy to justify. Thus, the last chapter, on tertiary formations and the vestiges of still existing life forms to be found in them, contain not only the latest available scientific findings, but also a source of uncertainty, and this is when the multiple narrators veer more into the history of the human spirit, morality and religion, and less into binding statements about geological findings.

In the end, *Tűzimádó bölcs*, both the book and Rónay's alterego, the Persian scholar, are the embodiment of the scientific knowledge that Rónay had collected by the end of the 1850s; however, they are also an expression of his ultimate uncertainty with what to do or think about the deeper implication of his knowledge. In the introduction to the section "The tomb of ancient words" (*Az ősvilágok síremléke*) on the Permian era, he writes, "Wondering through the dark empires of the ancient worlds, we reached the frontier of the primary formations, the Permian layers."[367] For him, these layers and grounds are dark indeed: the cutting edge of science, proven and revered by the British scientific elite that he had aspired to belong to, and which could have provided him with access and acceptance within the Hungarian scientific community, was also something

[367] "Az Ős világok setét birodalmain keresztül vándorolva, eljutánk az elsőrendű képletek határáig, a permi rétegekig." *Tűzimádó* 80.

that went deeply against his education and former life within the walls (literal and figurative) of Pannonhalma. This recalls the letter to his school friend that he had planned to publish as the first in a series of epistles about the history of life; the passage quoted earlier, an enthusiastic exclamation about the future of geology, continues thus, "We were shocked. How should we reconcile this with what we have learned? And if we accept this tenet, embraced by half the world, how should we make it open, how should we express our conviction?"[368] Katalin Mund suggests that "it was not only [Rónay's] political activity and the failure of the revolution that swept him far away from his mission but also the sprouting of the seeds of doubt once he got in touch with English scientific life during his exile," his mission being priesthood and religion, and this inspired the above quote.[369] I would argue that it was rather a reverse process: Rónay, who had always had an interest in science, well before the revolution and his exile, did register the enormity of the theories he had read and wrote about, but was held back to fully committing himself because of his committment to the church. In *Tűzimádó bölcs*, life forms are *created* by the forces of nature: for instance, by chemistry (*vegytan*, 39) or the meeting of elements (*elemtalálkozás*, 54). The *Creator* is only mentioned when the narrator is the Persian wise man, regarding his religion: "according to the faith of our fire/worshipper forebears, the creator god was followed by the destroyer,"[370] and "his mighty hand created a universe from the primordial elements."[371] As we will see, he went on to publish material of possibly more inflammatory nature, on Darwin and Huxley, and he only gave up on doing

[368] "Megdöbbentünk. Hogyan egyeztessük ezt meg azzal, a mit tanultunk? És ha elfogadjuk e tant, melyet már is a fél világ magáénak vall, hogyan nyilvánítsuk, hogyan adjunk meggyőződésünknek kifejezést?" *Napló-töredék* 124.
[369] Mund, "The Reception of Darwin," 445.
[370] "Tűzimádó őseink hite: hogy a teremtő istent, a romboló követé." 157.
[371] "Isten hatalmas keze az ősanyagból mindenséget teremtett." 158.

more when upon his return to Hungary he met with failure integrating into the scientific community, but was welcomed back to the institutional structure of the Catholic church.

Tűzimádó bölcs stops its story of the formation of the earth with geological formations, or as much as his headings and illustrations would indicate. On the last few pages, however, he draws attention to life and what can be learned about it from the vestiges of earlier eras: "the dead letters of the book of nature are replaced by new, living letters: they announce the present and prove the past."[372] He cannot seem to entirely avoid tying the progress of humans and their mental and spiritual development, a controversial subject that had also plagued the reception of *Vestiges*, but he touches upon the possible application of geological development in stages to the case of the progress of human civilization (176): "but life progresses, because it has to;" at the culmination of life is the sapient man. However, the book does not end here; in 1858, when the manuscript was completed, this is where evolutionary thinking stood before Darwin, but it is not a recapitulation of all that knowledge with a clear conclusion. Rónay seems to be aware of this when the wise man warns that there would be new theories: "the word may not have even left my lips when new facts might sound."[373] He promises to continue: it has been years since he noted down what he had learned from the wise man, but should there be fellow Hungarians interested, he promises to continue at some point with "the formation of plant and animal species, and the phenomena of spiritual life."[374] Although what ends the book is the image of the wise man and his sons kneeling down to pray, it is Rónay's

[372] "[A] természet könyvének holt betűit, élő betűk váltják fel, s hirdetik a jelent, s igazolva tanítják a múltat." 172. The book of nature, and its letters, are a powerful image, and another callback to Chambers' poetic imagery.
[373] "[T]án az ige még el sem hangzik ajkaimról, s már új tények szólandnak." 177.
[374] [S] hahogy lennének hazámfiai között, kik érdekkel olvasandják szakadozott jegyzeteimet, ígérem folytatásukat, melyek a növény és állat fajok keletkezését, s a lélekéletnek tüneményeit tárgyalandják." 180, n. 22.

awareness of the changing landscape of the scientific world view that dominates his conclusions. By the time the words were printed on paper, in 1860, though, new facts have already sounded, and this led to what became what can be called the first Hungarian translation of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* – or can it?

Adapting Darwin: *The Formation of the Species*

There is a certain lack of consensus among Rónay's biographers and within Hungarian Darwin research on what to consider *Fajkeletkezés*, Rónay's follow-up to *Tűzimádó bölcs,* a work which is, according to some, the first lengthier Hungarian treatise on *Origin of Species*, and the first Hungarian translation of *Origin* according to others.[375] However, even the stated opinions are not absolute and allow a margin of flexibility, and this allows for a reconsideration of Rónay's role in the Hungarian reception of

[375] Most recently, it was Gábor Palló who wrote that Rónay was the "first person to write a book on Darwinian evolution [in Hungary]," see his article "Scientific Nationalism: A Historical Approach to Nature in Late-Nineteenth-Century Hungary," in *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in Nineteenth-Century Central Europe*, eds. Mitchell Ash and Jan Surman, (London: Palgrave, 2012), 104. In an earlier article, he defines *Fajkeletkezés*, the volume, as "a book [not only] about Darwin," see Palló, "Darwin utazása Magyarországon," 714-716. The two recent studies by Katalin Mund and Sándor Soós do not take a stand, but Soós calls László Dapsy's 1873 translation of *Origin* the "first proper translation" (Soós, "Scientific Reception," 431) and Mund notes that Rónay published "a collection of Darwin's work" in 1864. (Mund, "The Reception of Darwin," 441) Two earlier scholars whose work on Darwinism in Hungary and on Rónay respectively have served as basis for even very recent articles, also lean towards the summary approach: according to the Ladányiné, Rónay "presented [*Origin*] to the Hungarian public based on notes from the original" (95), and Lajos Pál, calling *Fajkeletkezés* an "extract" [kivonat] in his 1971 article in *Századok*, claims that not only did Rónay not aspire to write an "original" work, he was satisfied with the role of simple communicator, which was not a much appreciated role in that era. (688) On the other hand, Rónay's biographers, both of them with Catholic leanings, make the case for an "abridged translation." Ferenc Acsay calls László Dapsy "Darwin's second Hungarian translator" and bemoans that neither Dapsy nor Tivadar Margó thought to acknowledge Rónay's translation, which, "even if only a lenghty review [*bőséges ismertetés*], can be well considered the translation of Darwin's first edition" since Rónay followed Darwin's text so closely that his text can be considered as a shortened translation (in which Rónay had inserted some things from other authors here and there). 180. The same approach is repeated by Romuáld Máthé, whose article heavily relies on Acsay's biography, when he calls *Fajkeletkezés* a "shortened translation" [*rövidített fordítás*], but he does not mention Dapsy at all. 45.

Darwinism: not only did he publish a his own romanticised evolutionary epic, not only was he among the first to popularise Darwin's thought in the Hungarian press (in the daily newspaper *Magyar Sajtó* in 1862), but these articles, and the book he compiled from them, could be considered the first Hungarian translation of *Origin of Species* – degree of completion and quality of scientific and language accuracy notwithstanding. The aim of this section, is to reconsider Rónay's role in the Hungarian reception of Darwinism: can he be considered a translator, in what context, and can *Fajkeletkezés* be considered a translation?

The title *Fajkeletkezés* can refer to two things. In its full title, *Fajkeletkezés; Az embernek helye a természetben és Régisége*, it is a collective volume. Published in book form in 1864, it contains three works of Rónay, all previously published in some form in Hungarian periodicals in the preceding few years, and they are based on fundamental works of Darwin, Huxley and Lyell, respectively. *Fajkeletkezés*, i.e. the first – and longest – of three parts of the book, is a detailed summary or an abridged translation containing some reflections by its author or translator. There are good arguments for both sides. Since it is not a full, verbatim, "faithful" translation, entire sections are missing and some are heavily edited and abridged, and it includes insertions from Rónay and a conclusion different from the original, it would be plausible to argue that by today's standards, this is not a "real" translation, or a translation at all. However, by the standards, or rather the lack of such standards and "good practices" in the nineteenth century, when the concept of translation was fluid and changing, even if changing towards the practices of today, it is not unreasonable to call *Fajkeletkezés* a translation.

There are three major case studies under examination in this dissertation, of scientific translation or the cultural transfer of evolutionary thought, from Britain to

Hungary, and they show the wide differences to translation in the nineteenth century: in approaches to the source and target material, the scientific language, and in the agendas of the translators as agents of contextual relocation. As we saw in the previous chapter, the early translations of *Vestiges of Creation* were very different in character, from the abridged, heavily edited and commented version of Carl Vogt to the almost painfully punctual text of József Somody. It has already been pointed out in the introduction to this chapter that there were certain similarities between the situations of Vogt and Rónay, both – albeit for different reasons – political exiles and in an uneasy relationship with the scientific establishment of their home countries. In the next chapter on László Dapsy's Darwin translation project, we will also see how Dapsy's text was one of many different translations into many European languages, many of which were neither classically "faithful", nor approved by Darwin. There is a wide berth of variations for (scientific) translation in the nineteenth century and a stronger sense of fluidity of authorship, and while *Fajkeletkezés* does not fit into the category that Somody's and Dapsy's belong to, it certainly fits in with Vogt's translation of *Vestiges*, in a sense that it is close to the German genre of *Bearbeitung* customary in the nineteenth century, or Clemence Royer's French or Bronn's German early translations of *Origin*.[376]

This would allow us to comfortably proceed with the analysis of both Rónay's translation of *Fajkeletkezés*, and the structure of the volume and the additional value and

[376] Another aspect of nineteenth-century conventions and accessibility as the result of less specialised practices is the serial form itself. For the first round of communication, Rónay chose a format that he thought could reach more readers and create more of an appetite for scientific knowledge. As such, his choice of publishing a translation based on traditions that were already transforming into something different and a very typical nineteenth-century format, *Fajkeletkezés* becomes even more of a transitional product even if Rónay had to come to the realisation of many of his contemporaries that the book form gave him better power over how to present his work. This was even true to Darwin, whose *Origin* "would not have appeared out of place in the higher reaches of the periodical press." Geoffrey Cantor and Sally Shuttleworth, eds., *Science Serialized*, 13.

layers of added meaning the other two studies Rónay had included provided. However, there is one more aspect, not to be ignored even considering the "relaxed" nineteenth-century attitude adopted by the earlier line of argument: we can consider Rónay a translator, but did he think of himself as one? The answer, based on what he wrote in his letters while working on *Fajkeletkezés*, what he printed on the title page, and what he published later in his memoirs, is a clear no. He refers to it as "my work" [*munkám*] or "my study" [*értekezésem*] both in his correspondence and in his memoirs, and the word "translation" does not come up at all.[377]

Another word that does not come up often – indeed, it appears really rarely – in *Fajkeletkezés* or Rónay's references to it, is the word "Darwin." It is conspicuously missing from correspondence and diaries, and appears as part of "references to Darwin's work" in the table of contents (once), in a lonely footnote (once, 4) and seven times (3, 139, 167, four times on 199) on the pages of book version of *Fajkeletkezés* (and once in *Az ember helye a természetben*, 244).[378] Unlike the case of the second part of the *Fajkeletkezés*-volume, based on Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature*, where he refers to having contacted Huxley for permission to use the original text (or in fact, the proofs of the yet unpublished English version) as basis to write the Hungarian articles, there is also no trace or archival evidence found to indicate that he had contacted, or ever considered contacting, Darwin for permission for a translation or "extracts."[379] Thus, while Darwin

[377] For instance, in letters to János Pompéry, on 21 December 1861 and 23 September 1862 (OSZK 1915/14, Nos. 6. and 7.) or in *Napló-töredék* III. 305.

[378] The four times on page 199 are actually references to Huxley's criticism of Darwin's work, which Rónay adopted as a conclusion instead of Darwin's own.

[379] Even though in late 1861, when he first refers to his plan of publishing the first installments of what a few months later became *Fajkeletkezés*-series (the first article appeared in *Magyar Sajtó* on 5 April, and the last one on 26 October 1862) in a letter to Pompéry (21 December 1861, OSZK 1915/14, no. 6.), Darwin might have been more predisposed to give permission than a few months later, after his disappointment

(or his work) is very much present in *Fajkeletkezés* in the form of ideas, arguments, examples and passages, his name is not so much.

This raises two questions in regards to Rónay's approach to authorship. First, in what role did he see himself? While he was willing to credit Darwin for his theories, and there is a footnote on page 4 with a full reference to the first edition of *Origin*, he refers to *Fajkeletkezés* in communication with others in Hungary as his own work, even if they were aware of its origins.[380] However, no one seems to dispute Rónay's merits in bringing Darwin's work, especially in such detail and volume, to the Hungarian public, to the readers of *Magyar Sajtó* as early as 1862, and to the book trade in 1864.

The second question is a psychologically more complex one: how come that Rónay, who was otherwise so sensitive to others respecting his authorship, which, following the Greguss-Huxley controversy at the Academy led to the publication of the entire *Fajkeletkezés*-volume, seems to have been willing to pass off Darwin's work as his own? Likely because he did consider it his own work, his own accomplishment and contribution to Hungarian scientific literature, even if it was based on Darwin's work. As to the close similarity between form and content, this was also part of the tradition of cultural transfer in the nineteenth century, and of the literary tradition that Rónay was part of.

In the end, my choice to treat *Fajkeletkezés* as a translation is based on reasons both nineteenth-century and modern: as we will see in the analysis to follow, there are too many similarities in form, content and text for it to be an "original work" based on or

---

with the French translation added to the experience of the German one, even if the work of a virtual unknown in a peripheral language had much less significance in his eyes.

[380] Gyula Schwarcz calls it the "Hungarianisation of Darwin" in the only substantive review of *Fajkeletkezés*. Schwartz, "Fajkeletkezés," 284.

inspired by someone else, and these similarities in some cases even merit the label "faithful" translation. Its inclusion as a primary text in position and volume underlines that in comparison to the other two texts by Huxley and Lyell in the volume, which are also based on, but only summarised, rather than anywhere translated, important texts of evolutionary thought by Darwin's contemporaries, colleagues, supporters and critics at the same time, *Fajkeletkezés* is a translation, even if abridged, edited, at times changed, and very much unauthorised.

In contrast to the background, creative process and narrative features of *Tűzimádó bölcs*, the case of *Fajkeletkezés*, both as a stand-alone text and as a collective volume, shows that times had changed with the arrival of Darwin, and Rónay was sensitive to the significance of the event that was the publication of *Origin* and the waves surrounding it. He had experienced it not only in real time, but also *in situ*, and his reaction was relatively swift in comparison to the many years he had mulled over the manuscript of *Tűzimádó bölcs*, at least. However, considering the two years and a half that passed between the first edition of *Origin* in November 1859 and April 1862, when Rónay's first *Fajkeletkezés*-article appeared in *Magyar Sajtó*, Rónay's reaction suddenly does not seem *that* swift, even if it is one of the first in Hungary.[381] Since his correspondence and (to an extent) his memoirs indicate some stages in his progress of adapting *Origin* into the manuscript of *Fajkeletkezés*, it becomes clear that it was not his reaction, but the mailing and publishing arrangements resulted in a delay in the access of the Hungarian public to a series of more substantial articles on Darwin's work.

[381] Ferenc Jánosi's review, published in Autumn 1860 had been technically the first, and has been considered so ever since. This feat cannot really be disputed, not even on the grounds that his review was entirely based on someone else's, especially in favour of Rónay, whose contribution was not only different in character (i.e. it was not really a review), but was also based on the work of other people, even if he gave them at least nominal credit.

Rónay received the printed copies of *Tűzimádó bölcs* on 16 September 1860,[382] and as he wrote to Gábor Egressy five days later, he had started working on his studies on geology again.[383] Although he had to interrupt his scientific studies for months,[384] he reported to János Pompéry that "his work called *Fajkeletkezés*" might be ready for publication in a short while, although he was still uncertain where. "His friend Urházy,"[385] an editor at *Magyar Sajtó*, had promised to negotiate with someone, although it might be better to publish it in a weekly or monthly paper.[386] In the end, *Magyar Sajtó* started to publish the articles, while Rónay continued to work on the series, even if he occasionally complained of interruptions. He felt that the interruptions make the work lose its value, but this fear inspires the idea, expressed to János Pompéry on 23 September 1862, that the articles could be published in a collective volume at some later point.[387] The last article to appear in *Magyar Sajtó* on 26 October 1862, contained the following note: "We have made known the main lines of the newer system of the formation of the

[382] *Napló-töredék* III. 101.
[383] Letter to Gábor Egressy, 21 September 1860. OSZKK Levelestár, 1905/7, No. 10. A few months before, on 3rd April, Rónay had complained that he had very little time to write due to the difficulties in earning his bread that chase him around the streets of London. Letter No. 4.
[384] Letter to Egressy, 1 August 1861, OSZK 1905/7, No. 14.
[385] Lajos Urházy (1823-1873), lawyer and journalist, had participated in the revolution, and was the editor of the section on international affairs at *Magyar Sajtó* between 1858-1862. See Szinnyei, www.mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/u/u28840.htm.
[386] Letter to Pompéry, 21 December 1861, OSZK 1915/14, No. 6. At the time of writing, Pompéry was the editor-in-chief of the paper *Magyarország*, which he had founded himself, so this can also be interpreted as Rónay's way to put out more sensors as to who would be willing to publish his work soon. Rónay had been forwarded both papers from Hungary in the early 1860s, and he put them to the use to the emigrant community, sending one or more to Jersey, where some families were residing. See letter to Mór Perczel, 12 June 1862, OSZK Fond 89/121, 846/135/1966, in which Rónay apologises for sending *Magyarország* instead of *Magyar Sajtó* for the time being, since he needs the copies to continue "his articles on *Fajkeletkezés*."
[387] On 28 August, he expresses his worry to Egressy that the latest articles, sent to *Magyar Sajtó* several weeks ago to continue "the perhaps long forgotten" installments, might not have arrived, and his attempts to contribute to Hungarian literature will be lost – since his work and its publication suffers from interruptions, it might go to waste without a trace, even if he would like to serve his country among difficult circumstances. A few weeks later, on 19 September, he reports again that his articles in *Magyar Sajtó* have appeared again. OSZK 1901/7, No. 14 and 16. His similar complaints to Pompéry a few days later have a slightly different shade, since they are not only about the lost value caused by the interruptions, but stress that had not planned to publish the articles in the daily press – alas, one of his friends could make at least this possible, and now he is obliged to complete the project. 23 September 1862, OSZK 1915/14, No. 7.

species, and have perhaps availed ourselves longer than necessary of the columns of *Magyar Sajtó*; hence the explanation of animal instinct and the difficulties rolled in front of us by the fossil world will be discussed at another time. The complete work is ready; the manuscript is only waiting for a publisher."[388]

The idea of a full edition also appears, ironically, in a letter to Antal Csengery in which Rónay first offered to make Huxley's upcoming *Man's Place in Nature* available to the Hungarian public.[389] It is rather ironic, since the affair around Rónay's "extract" of Huxley's work, sent to Csengery six months later,[390] would be the trigger that caused Rónay to decide to publish a collection of *Fajkeletkezés, Az ember helye a természetben* (based on Huxley) and [*Az ember*] *Régisége* (a very short text based on Lyell's *The Antiquity of Man*) together in one volume. Rónay sent the final manuscript "of [his] work, which discusses the three most famous questions to have been raised in recent times […] under the title The formation of species, man's place in nature and its antiquity" to Pest on 11 June 1863,[391] after a period of offended contemplation, to the publishing company Demjén and Sebes, and on 25 December the publishers let him know that his book had left the press.[392]

Since Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* is the first Hungarian version of *Origin of Species* and as such an important source for the study of the first stage of the reception of Darwinism in Hungary, the analysis of the text will be based on the book version. Moreover, using a text that was published together with Rónay's "extracts" of Huxley and

[388] *Napló-töredék* III. 246.
[389] 20 October 1962, OSZK 1929/32, No. 1.
[390] 22 April 1863, OSZK, 1929/32, No. 2.
[391] "Munkám […] az elmúlt időben felmerült három legnevezetesebb kérdést tárgyalja, […] ily czím alatt: Fajkeletkezés, az embernek helye a természetben és régisége." Letter to Mór Perczel, 12 June 1863, OSZK Fond 89/121, 864/135/1966, No. 33.
[392] *Napló-töredék* III. 305.

Lyell frames Darwin not only in terms of the – sometimes critical – opinions of his contemporaries, but also reflects on Rónay's understanding of the scientific debates over evolution and natural selection. While the inclusion of Lyell is mostly an afterthought and an act of preventative defiance – to make sure Rónay would really be the first this time, even his name is not put on the cover –, we will see that Rónay did take Huxley seriously when he decided not only to follow *Origin* by *Man's Place in Nature*, but replace some of Darwin's text by Huxley's more radical criticism of it at the end. *Fajkeletkezés* thus became not only the first Hungarian version of *Origin*, but a companion to the first wave of controversial Darwin-translations in that it had been interwoven by its interpreter with other thoughts and text – however, unlike Bronn or Royer, these interventions were not his own, but borrowed.

The source of Rónay's text is the first edition of *Origin of Species*, which can be identified in a number of ways. The most explicit reference to this is on the first page of Rónay's introduction to *Fajkeletkezés*: "The newest system was given by Darwin, with such a scientific preparation that no one has ever attempted to solve this question. Our present task is to make this system known in its main principles."[393] The footnote attached states that the source for this is Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*, published in 1859. Since the second edition was published in 1860, it is safe to assume even from this that Rónay used the first edition. There is, however, another way to prove this, which at the same time also suggests that Rónay took and translated entire passages from Darwin. There are a few specific instances where the 1859 version differs from subsequent ones, although we only have to consider the first three editions (1859, 1860 and 1861) in the

[393] A legújabb rendszert Darwin adá, oly tudományos készülettel, minővel e kérdés megfejtéséhez még nem fogott senki. Jelen feladatunk e rendszert főelveiben megismertetni. Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés* 3-4.

case of the source identification of *Fajkeletkezés*, since only these preceded its completion and publication. One of these is that the story of the whale-bear in full is peculiar to the first edition:[394]

> "In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely open mouth, thus catching, like a whale, insects in the water. Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant, and if better adapted competitors did not already exist in the country, I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale."[395]

In subsequent editions, the story is truncated, and the theory of the possible evolution of the monstrous whale-bear creature is omitted:

> "In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with widely open mouth, thus catching, almost like a whale, insects in the water."[396]

Rónay's Hungarian version is an interesting case of "partial" translation: since it contains the idea of the bear becoming more whale-ish, it is clearly based on the first edition; moreover, some sentences and clauses are translated from it verbatim:

> "Az éjszakamerikai barna medve, szájtátva órákig úszik a vízben, s bálnaként nyeldeli a vízi férgeket. Ha a férgek elegendő tápot nyújtanának, s ha az említett esetben nem volnának előnyösebb féregevő állatok, mért ne alakíthatná a választás e medvefajt mindinkább növekedő szájú szörnyné?"[397]

However, some connectors are left out, most notably that this is an extreme case, which makes Rónay's text appear in a more radical – or more naive – light, accepting the theoretical process of evolution more readily. It is also worth noting that "natural selection" is shortened to "selection" [*választás*], but it is clear that the source of the

[394] Although R. B. Freeman draws attention to the fact that the story is also in full form in the 1860 America edition as well, it is more than unlikely that Rónay would have used that as a source. See R. B. Freeman, *The Works of Charles Darwin: An Annotated Bibliographical Handlist*, 2nd ed, (Dawson: Folkstone, 1977): http://darwin-online.org.uk/EditorialIntroductions/Freeman_OntheOriginofSpecies.html.
[395] Darwin, *Origin* (1859) 184.
[396] Darwin, *Origin* (1860), 184.
[397] Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés*, 96.

Hungarian version is the first edition of *Origin*, which shows that Rónay was following scientific news in London enough for his attention to *Origin* fairly soon after its publication.

The examination of the structure of the text is the next point that can be indicative of how closely Rónay followed his source. While a parallel, or at least similar table of contents would not necessarily mean that *Fajkeletkezés* is a translation rather than an "extract" of *Origin*, there are a number of matches too close to be ignored. Before the brief analysis of the two tables of contents, it is worth giving a general description of *Fajkeletkezés*. It is approximately two hundred pages in length (*Origin* is more than double of this in volume, but this is also due to the different printing and editing outline).[398] Apart from the main body based on *Origin*, Rónay's text contains a three-page introduction in the beginning (3-5) and a four-page conclusion (199-202), the latter of which is based on Huxley's *On our knowledge of the Causes of the Phenomena of Organic Nature.*[399] *Fajkeletkezés* contains thirteen chapters (the first edition of *Origin* has fourteen), and Rónay's chapters follow Darwin's closely, one could say chapter by chapter, if not for Rónay's intervention in dividing Darwin's Chapter I (Variation under Domestication) and Chapter IV (Natural Selection) into two chapters each, and merging Darwin's Chapters X, XI and XII (On the Succession of Organic Beings; Geographical Distribution parts 1 and 2) into a penultimate and Chapters XIII and IV (Mutual Affinities of Organic Beings; Recapitulation and Conclusion) into a last chapter. Darwin's last chapter, moreover, is heavily edited by Rónay also in the sense that the extension of the

[398] "Az embernek helye a természetben" follows "Fajkeletkezés" on pages 205-245, and "Az embernek régisége" from 249 to 280.

[399] Rónay's note indicates an edition from 1862, which can refer to the six lectures Huxley delivered at the Geological Museum on *Origin*. The lectures were published in book form in 1863, under the title *On our knowledge of the Causes of the Phenomena of Organic Nature. Being six lectures to working men, delivered at the Museum of Practical Geology*, (London: Robert Hardwicke, 1863).

adoption of the theory of natural selection to man is largely omitted, and replaced with Huxley's criticism.

The chapters in the two books can be matched especially easily because Rónay's titles are clearly (if creatively) translated from Darwin's titles, e.g. "A házi válfajok változatai" (Chapter I: Variation under Domestication), "Életutáni törekvés" (Chapter III: Struggle for existence), or "Természetes választás" (Chapter IV: Natural Selection). Rónay's decision to give more volume to the first part of Darwin's text, shown by breaking chapters into two in the first half while merging several into one towards the end, can mean two things. One is that his enthusiasm or energy had diminished to a certain extent while producing the Hungarian versions, which can be a consequence of serial publication and the irregularity of publication that he sometimes complained about. The other option, which anyone of a more serious scholarly interest would prefer, is that he found the early chapters, in which Darwin laid down the fundamental concepts of his theory, including natural selection and the struggle for life, more important to be communicated to the Hungarian reading public in detail rather than the more specimen-oriented chapters towards the end. This latter hypothesis would certainly diminish Rónay's aspirations to be considered as a serious scholar by his contemporaries, but since he was more often ignored than not, and since Rónay did not have a habit to try to apply the theory of evolution to social progress in Hungary or elsewhere, it is with a certain disappointment that one concludes that the structural disproportion is more likely due to Rónay's energy levels and his wish to finish sooner rather than later while writing a serial publication for a newspaper.

The choice of the title is one of the most interesting features of both the text and the publication: while not easy to convey, *Fajkeletkezés* can best be translated to *The*

formation of species. A circumstance worth noting is that Rónay, unlike later translators, did not use the full title: instead of *On the Origin of Species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*, Rónay's title, while a translation, is as abridged as the rest of his text.

His formulation recalls the first German translation, *Die Entstehung der Arten*, which places more emphasis on the process of development, rather than a stress on the origin of the process, which is the implication of László Dapsy's choice for the title of his 1873 translation, *A fajok eredete*, which has remained the title used until the present day. The connection to the German translation in Rónay's case, however, is tenuous. Although it is a totally feasible possibility that he could have had access to Bronn's translation that had been published in 1860, and given that Rónay's first language was German (he learned Hungarian in his childhood),[400] the idea he could have been influenced by the German title is not unreasonable. However, given that he had started working on the text in 1860, and living in London he had easy access not only to the text but to an atmosphere and scholarly network that could have made it easier to understand the text and digest its meaning, it is more likely that he based his Hungarian text on Darwin's original and the medium of the German language, which often played an important role in the transfer of Darwinian knowledge to Hungary, did not affect the text of *Fajkeletkezés*.

Rónay's language received criticism from contemporaries and later scholars both, whether they considered him a translator or something else notwithstanding. In his 1864 review in *Budapesti Szemle*, Gyula Schwartz acknowledges Rónay's "pretty extracts" that

[400] Allodiatoris, "Rónay," 49.

he had produced instead of a "full translation;"[401] however, he takes Rónay to task for not having produced a full translation, even if his "lengthy extract is still a welcome phenomenon in our more serious literature."[402] This is also emphasized by Schwarcz's awareness of the peculiarities of the already existing German and French translations: the German cannot be ignored if only for Bronn's introduction, but in an interesting move, he implicitly compares Rónay's product to the model provided by "the French miss" who Frenchified Darwin's work:

> "a woman was not afraid [to translate Darwin's work], since she knew well that not only those can break a path for such an intellectual product who can express it from point to point in its most sophisticated details in the language of their homeland, but even those who can produce an incomplete outline, in a more lasting form than in the daily press, making it available to the public in a few thousand copies."[403]

At the same time, he also calls Rónay's work "*Darwin magyarítása*" [the Hungarianisation of Darwin], so in the end it is left somewhat open again whether Rónay's text is a translation or not.

Schwarcz does have, however, a few comments on the translation of certain terms, and on the style in general: the large number of typos are attributed to the physical distance between author and printer, but more importantly, technical terms and expressions should be more consistent. However, the only example Schwarcz mentions is the overabundance of English terms, even where Hungarian ones would work as well: for instance, instead of "baboon", "pávián" would be better understood by Hungarian

[401] "Rónay nem fordította le a munkát egész terjedelemben; hanem az egyes fejezetekből csinos kivonatokat készített." Schwarcz, "Fajkeletkezés," 282.
[402] "Rónay helyebben cselekedett volna ugyan, nézetem szerént, ha az egészet úgy amint van, minden kihagyás nélkül lefordítja: de jelen terjedelmes vázlata is még mindig örvendetes jelenség komolyabb irodalmunkban." Schwarcz, "Fajkeletkezés," 284.
[403] "Hisz francziára Darwin művét egy kisasszony fordította le legközelebb: nem rettent vissza belekapni egy nő, mert jól tudta, hogy ily szellemi terményeknek útat idegen földön nem csak az tör, ki azt tökéletesen képes hazája irodalmának legfinomabb részleteiben pontról pontra visszaadni, ha nem már az is, ki hiányos vázlatban, a napi sajtóénál valamivel maradandóbb közegben több ezer példányban bocsátja a közönség elé." Schwarcz, "Fajkeletkezés," 283.

readers.[404]

Later scholars have also made a few comments on Rónay's style, which they judged to be influenced by his exposure to foreign languages: Allodiatoris claims that not only did he create several philological terms, but also used idiosyncratic grammatical constructions,[405] while Rónay's biographer Ferenc Acsay gives specific criticism on the style of *Fajkeletkezés*. While he finds the "translation" to be exact and follow Darwin's text closely (even if Rónay inserted the occasional comment borrowed from another author), his style here is "even less original than in *Tűzimádó bölcs*: the influence of the English language is often visible, especially with the use of passive form and in more complex sentence structures. But all in all it is a rather precise [*szabatos*] translation, and at most places it gives back the original in a natural way, so that the Dapsy translation eight years later is not superior in any way, rather it is at some places more cumbersome [*nehézkes*]." This is not the only time for Acsay to express his frustration with Dapsy, but his criticism about Rónay's style is adequate, although one could argue with the implication that the style of *Tűzimádó bölcs* was not original, since that is its more original feature. [406] The originality of *Fajkeletkezés*, however, is definitely not in its style, which is a rather awkward construction of complicated sentences following Darwin's original text, with the additional sense, well illustrated by the paragraph about the bear-whale monster, that some of the more complex ideas were not translated exactly because

[404] Schwarcz, "Fajkeletkezés," 285. What Schwarcz does not mention, that the incriminated use of "baboon", together with "orang", "lemur" or "chimpanzee", occurs not in *Fajkeletkezés*, but in the extract of Huxley's *Man's Place in Nature*. Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés*, 225-231.
[405] Allodiatoris, "Rónay," 51.
[406] This frustration seems to be based on the uneasiness of Catholic Acsay towards Calvinist Dapsy's enthusiasm towards Darwinism: earlier, Acsay complains that despite the truth to the claim that Darwin has provided a lot of new information about the animal worls, and thus made a great service to natural history, he did not discover any great truth that would merit the claim of its "second Hungarian translator" that is is "the second Bible of humanity." Acsay, "Rónay," 180.

of their complexity, although it is impossible to know whether this was for the benefit of the readers or the translator. The most original feature of *Fajkeletkezés* is that such an early Hungarian version of *Origin* exists.

Remote as Rónay had been from the discussions that had already started about Darwinism among the scientific community and consequently in the public sphere, his text played a role in informing many of his readers about new scientific concepts that would soon take hold in public discourse. Since the scientific language was also in a process of evolution, it is worth briefly looking at Rónay's choice of terminology. He has been claimed to have created new Hungarian terminology in his earlier works on psychology and especially in craniology,[407] so it would stand to reason that he would use Hungarian terminology instead of foreign. Contrary to what Schwarcz's criticism would suggest, foreign terms are not overabundant; even many Latin terms that should have been familiar to a reader with secondary education, were translated to Hungarian. The world "evolution" is naturally missing from the text, since even Darwin did not use it in the first edition, but often used terms such as "domesticate/domestication" is "*honosít/ás*" in all cases, and "variation" is "*változat*"; the Latin "*domesticatio*" or "*variatio*" do not appear in the text at all. "Hybridism" is "*keresztezés*", "sterility" is "*terméketlenség*", and in an even less conventional choice, since these terms have been commonly used in scientific language, "morphology" is "*idomegység*", and embryo is "*méhmagzat*" – the Latin terms, commonly used in the Hungarian scientific language of the nineteenth century do not appear, which is especially impressive for someone who received a Latin-oriented Catholic education.

[407] Allodiatoris, "Rónay," 51.

The use of the word "*változat*" also draws attention to how Rónay's practice of "adapting" the text results in something different, but in appearance rather similar to Darwin's original. The word stands in not only for variation, but also variability: see, for instance, Chapter III: *Változatok a természetben* [orig. Variation under Nature] or Chapter VII: *A változatok törvényei* [orig. Laws of Variation] versus Chapter I: *A változatok okai* [orig. Causes of Variability]. Moreover, the occasional use of "*változás*" [change] complicates the text further. However, as the following example from Chapter V illustrates, "*változat*" generally refers to the result of variation, and "*változás*" to the process:

> "A választás változatokat feltételez; minél több változás tűnik fel valamely fajnak egyedeiben, minél hasznosabbak, tehát minél könnyebben örökölhetők, annál nagyobb sikerrel működik a természetes választás. A változatok ritkaságát sokszor pótolja az egyedek sokasága; e körülmény általában előnyül szolgál a választásnak nem csak azért, mert a működési tér nagyobb, hanem mivel az egyedek sokasága bizonyítja, hogy a faj kedvező körülmények közt él."[408]

A look at Darwin's original text shows that Rónay's "extracts" at times ended up more complicated, but his repeated mentions of natural selection, even when they are not actually present in Darwin's text, seem to indicate that he was aware of the importance of the concept.

> "A large amount of inheritable and diversified variability is favourable, but I believe mere individual differences suffice for the work. A large number of individuals, by giving a better chance for the appearance within any given period of profitable variations, will compensate for a lesser amount of variability in each individual, and is, I believe, an extremely important element of success."[409]

Moreover, the passage is a good example of the transitional nature of Rónay's text between translation and something else (irrespective of whether it is more or less than translation), since it shows that Rónay's liberal attitude to interfering with the text while

[408] Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés*, 51.
[409] Darwin, *Origin of Species* (1859), 102.

still rather closely following the original. Although the order of the two sentences is switched up and the Hungarian text is not exactly a close translation of the English, the source can be clearly identified.

The most important phrases are the ones covering the concepts and new vocabulary that Darwin's work introduced or redefined, most importantly, selection (natural and sexual), struggle for existence, or descent. "Selection" becomes "*választás*" – "*természetes*" for natural and "*nemi*" for sexual – a variation of the "*kiválás*" and "*kiválasztás*" to be used in Hungarian literature in the nineteenth century.[410] Struggle for life is either used as "*életutáni törekvés*" or "*küzdelem*", and descent, introduced in Rónay's Chapter 8, is also translated as "*fajkeletkezés*", which implies an understanding of descent as the formation of the species. As we will see later, Rónay's choice of vocabulary of Darwinism was not to take root and thus reads rather as a linguistic curiosity than a scientific text.

Fajkeletkezés is hard to classify; it would perhaps be best defined as a transitional genre between abridged translation and extract of a longer, complex work for the edification of the public: Rónay informs the public more than he translates Darwin's work. The many sentences and passages, especially in the first half of the text pull the scale towards translation, which feels more and more truncated and paraphrased into something shorter and simpler towards the end. The conclusion, however, is something else: instead of using Darwin's own conclusion, Rónay, who was not averse to inserting his own notes (which were either based on his own thoughts of those of others),[411] inserts

[410] The next chapter on László Dapsy's 1873 translation will provide a more detailed contextualisation of the usage of Darwinian evolutionary vocabulary.

[411] For instance, a footnote on page 70, a reference to a talk by Owen at the Royal Society in 1862, attempts to answer a conundrum posed by Darwin about the extinction of certain forms of prehistoric birds when discussing natural selections.

a four-page reflection on *Origin* by Huxley. This conclusion is perhaps the most controversial in the whole text, since it shows that Rónay, a man trained for priesthood and who would return to his order in a few years and die as a retired bishop, accepts – or at least unthinkingly parrots – an opinion that instead of Darwin's conciliatory tone and repeated mentions of the Creator and his presence behind life on earth, argues for something very different. In Rónay's conclusion – despite his faithful translations of creation, or rather the result of having been created, throughout the text – the Creator, so central in Darwin's world view, is missing. Instead, he goes ahead and asks a question that would take Darwin twelve years to address in *Descent*. Even if his question was based on the work of Darwin's radical and controversial bulldog and, like most of Rónay's work, it contains no original thought, it was brave coming from a man of his training, in the precarious position of someone who had still not given up on the idea of returning to a country where radical ideas, especially applied to society, were not encouraged: can natural selection be applied to man, and the separate races of mankind ("*az embernem külön fajai*")?[412] However, Rónay backtracks in the last paragraph, stating that since there are no animals that approach man step by step on the scale of development, it is vain to attempt to place man in the system of natural selection.

The final question is, thus, not if natural selection can be applied to man, but where man could be placed in the natural system, and what exactly his relation is to animals. Rónay, having completed the first Hungarian version of one of the most influential and controversial works of the nineteenth century, chose not to take it forward, but to play it safe. This ultimate uncertainty parallels the transitory nature and indefinable

[412] The overlap between the usage of species, genus and race, with an often inconsistent use of "*faj*", "*nem*" and "*fajta*" was a recurrent feature in the nineteenth century, which will also be addressed in the next chapter in the discussion of the formation of evolutionary vocabulary.

genre of *Fajkeletkezés*, Rónay's "own work" that was entirely based on the thoughts of some of the most famous natural scientists of the nineteenth century.

Rónay's choice to publish a book of an abridged translation of *Origin* shows that Rónay was aware that the scientific life of London as the 1850s progressed and turned into 1860s, especially in terms of popularisation and publishing success. This was not solely about, or not even centered exclusively around *Origin*,[413] even if he made no attempt to downplay its obvious importance. He might have been out-of-context in terms of Hungarian scientific life and out-of-touch with its insiders, but he had insight, even if he was not particularly insightful, on what was happening in London. However, his last scientific text of any significance, on *The Progress of Prehistoric Man*, the published version of his membership talk at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,[414] is more of a coda than a conclusion to his contribution to Hungarian Darwinism. Instead of a reflection on his experience with the latest debates on the disciplinary development anthropology, his paper is a regression to an even more bland recapitulation of the research of others, as inoffensive and non-controversial as possible.

As we saw earlier, Rónay had become increasingly involved in the Ethnological Society and then the Anthropological Society, attending their events and obtaining membership of both, in the years before he returned to Hungary in 1866, shortly before the Compromise. After his return in Hungary he did not only try to integrate himself into the formal circles of the Hungarian scientific community, but he again became active in the popularization of newer results in geology. The former was a quite impressive

[413] Not only *Vestiges*, but more than six books by science popularisers on the British scientific publishing scene sold more copies than *Origin* in the second half of the nineteenth century. See Lightman, *Victorian Popularisers of Science*, 32-34.
[414] Jácint Rónay, *Az ősemberek haladása,* (Pest: Eggenberger, 1868), 3. The talk was originally read at the Academy on 25th November and 9th December 1867.

failure,[415] but the latter brought some modest success. This time, however, he did not have to do it in English or long-distance on the pages of a magazine,[416] but could do it in person: on the recommendation of József Eötvös, he gave lectures on geology in the school of Mrs. Vachott, and also in the home of Dr. Endre Kovács-Sebestyén, where he spoke about the "history of the development of the earth" ("*a földalakulás történelme*") to family, friends and acquaintances, mostly young.[417]

Despite his relative success with the practical side with the popularization of newer research in geology, his last work on geology is again an unimaginative recapitulation of old and new results of his old and new interests, namely geology and anthropology, in which he introduces paleo-anthropology, the combination of the two.[418] Based on the work of writers from Homer to Lubbock, the journals of Darwin to Lyell's *Antiquity of Man*, and informed by both the *Transactions of the Ethnological Society* and the *Anthropological Review*,[419] Rónay's last work on geology is the possibly most inoffensive recapitulation of what could be some of the most controversial ideas of recent times, had Rónay not avoided them completely. A history of the prehistoric man in Europe from the Paleolithic to the Iron Age on 46 pages, Rónay's paper argues for the necessity of the establishment of the discipline of paleo-anthropology, and the most significant statement of the paper comes in the conclusion. Showing that despite the more

[415] While he received a lukewarm welcome at the Academy and was even elected as secretary to some of the sections, he had been deeply disappointed at the election process and especially the political machinations in the background. This has only reinforced the impressions left by the treatment received in connection with the Csengery-Greguss affair of 1863, which was confirmed when Csengery and others questioned the validity of Rónay's election as member of the Academy. In the end, the series of disappointments and a feeling of abandonment led to his withdrawal from the Academy. See *Napló-töredék* 167-195.

[416] In 1858, he gave weekly readings about "the history of the world" [*világ-történet*] to an audience of English ladies in London, which he at the time hoped to lead to better things than "the boring instruction of children." Jácint Rónay to Móric Majer, 29 May 1858, OSZK 1954/57, no. 2.

[417] Pór, *Rónay*, 50.

[418] Rónay, *Az ősemberek haladása* 3.

[419] Rónay's – admittely incomplete – list of sources can be found on page 4 of *Az ősemberek haladása*.

than a decade that had passed since Rónay started to work on *Tűzimádó bölcs*, his overly careful approach to scientific paradigm change had not changed, he states: "We do not found an entire system on a singular base; but certain pieces if information, even if it is hard to admit, can shake the system."[420]

His system had ultimately remained unshaken: in his last scientific lecture, at the meeting of the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science, in the Catholic town of Eger presided over by a bishop who did not want to hear controversial subjects like Darwinism addressed in his city,[421] Rónay gave the impression of a "priest who could reconcile geology with the Bible, [conquering] everyone with his warm lecture on the cold Ice Age."[422] This statement redefined Rónay's public persona almost as much as his memoirs present him as a victim of Hungarian academia, someone whose scientific contribution was never properly acknowledged. He reinforced this by taming down the extent of his activities in the revolution of 1848/49 or choosing not to mention Darwin in his autobiography.

While he had never tried to take the scientist out of the priest, in the end he could not take the priest out of the scientist. Rónay was the first to introduce Darwin's theory in detail, based on his own reading of the original text to the Hungarian public, which makes him a transitional agent of reception. He ultimately made a choice not to take a stand; choosing some of the freedoms available to the editor versus the limitations forced on the

[420] Egyes alapokra nem alapítunk rendszert, de egyes adatok, ha nehezünkre esik is kimondani, megingatják a rendszert.

[421] Béla Bartalkovics, the patron of the meeting who presided over much of the proceedings, did not encourage the discussion of Darwinism. Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 139. A few years later, according to the book's dedication, Bartalkovics sponsored the Hungarian translation of Sidney Herbert Laing's *Darwinism Refuted*, which was published by the Saint Stephen Society in 1871. Sidney Herbert Laing, *Az ember származása: A megczáfolt Darwinizmus c. Tanulmány alapján*, transl. Manó Michalek, (Pest: Szent István Társulat, 1872).

[422] "[P]ap, … ki tudta összeegyeztetni a geologiát a bibliával: Rónay Jácint, [ki] mindenkit egyaránt meghódított a hideg jégkorszakról szóló meleg előadásával." Chyzer, *A magyar orvosok és természetvizsgálók*, 87.

translator, he chose a comfortable, transitional middle way between a critical reflection and a full translation. His name is inevitably bound to the Hungarian reception of Darwinism, but *Fajkeletkezés*, one of the most important contributions to the early Hungarian reception of Darwinism, while the first substantial review of Darwinism, is not the very first review, and while in many senses the earliest translation of *Origin of Species*, it is not the first full, and as such "proper" translation.

Chapter 4
The *Origin* of Hungarian Darwinism: Translation, the Scientific Community and the Public

In any discussion about the early reception of Darwinism in a national context, *The Origin of Species* inevitably holds a central role, as the cultural moment when – even if not for Darwin himself – it all began, in a sense. The previous two chapters illustrated different approaches to translation and adaptation in terms of cultural relocation and transfer; this one addresses many of those approaches and more, since László Dapsy's 1873 translation of *Origin of Species*, just as Darwin's original had been in so many cultures, is at the same time result and consequence of the public – be it academic or "popular" – engagement with Darwinism 1860s Hungary, and also the beginning of a new era.

We have seen on previous cases that even the earliest reactions to Darwinism as a phenomenon includes a wide range of concepts and ideas that have no relation to Darwin's work – even *Vestiges of Creation* or Rónay's *Tűzimádó bölcs* are often placed under the broader umbrella of Darwinism. The idea of continued progress of life and human and social development became a catalyst for a qualitatively new approach to evolutionary thought and a serious reconsideration and reconfiguration or earlier theories of transmutation or transformism, as the word and concept of "evolution" was not included in the vocabulary used by Lamarck and others whose work preceded Darwin's. Even if the term "Darwinism" was created by Huxley, even if it was filled by (re)interpreted and (re)appropriated content and associations by everyone who ever had an opinion (or not), it was Darwin – the person and his work – who laid down the ideas,

and it was in *Origin* that he did so, if not for the first time, but at the critical moment in history.

It took fourteen years for *Origin* to be published in Hungarian: *A fajok eredete* [full title: *A fajok eredete a természeti kiválás útján, vagyis az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása a létérti küzdelemben*] was published in two volumes (in late 1873 and early 1874, respectively) by the publishing company of the Royal Hungarian Society for Natural Science in Budapest, in the translation of László Dapsy, with Tivadar Margó in the role of scientific advisor. While no less intellectually exciting, *Origin* was by no means as fresh or groundbreaking in 1873 as it had been in 1859. In fact, Darwin's promise to throw light "on the origin of man and his history,"[423] as promised at the end of *Origin* had already been fulfilled in *Descent of Man*, published in 1871 and available in Hungary by the time László Dapsy's translation of *Origin* finally left the press. However, translation is an integral part of the reception process, notwithstanding the distance in time and space, and the Hungarian publication of *Origin* in 1873, and the events that led up to it, was nonetheless a critical moment, even if on a different – smaller, local, national – scale that created a new space for the transformation of how Hungarians' understanding of the world and themselves changed.

This chapter will relate the history of the translation and the events that led to the publication of *Origin* in Hungarian. Following a brief introduction into the history of the translation of *Origin* into various European languages prior to 1873 to provide a comparative background of the various themes, patterns, local concerns and difficulties of the translation process and the translators themselves, the chapter will focus on two main

[423] *OS* 428. [The abbreviation *OS* refers to the 1872 English edition, whereas *FE* to the 1873/74 Hungarian translation throughout the chapter.]

angles of the translation. The story of how Dapsy translated and arranged the publication of the book will relate how Dapsy encountered *Origin* and why he decided to translate it, but will also engage with wider questions. How did his project to translate one book by Darwin impact the scientific community? What was the role of the scientific societies in the establishment of scientific publishing and the dissemination of scientific works in Hungary, and to what extent did they get involved? A comparative analysis of the translation will then reflect on questions of the development of the Hungarian scientific language in terms of terminology and vocabulary, and whether and how they had a wider impact on language and culture in late 19th century Hungary in general. The relocation of the narrative as a cultural product into a new linguistic and cultural context also raises questions of the aims and intentions of the translator. How much did his reading of *Origin* – and what version of *Origin* – impact his own text, and what role did his possible aims and agendas came to play in the interpretation and reappropriation of the narrative discourse: for instance, how did Dapsy's patriotic framing of his aims and agendas affect the translation and its role in the nature of progress he claimed to have envisioned for the Hungarian nation.

Encounters with *Origin*: Early Translations in Continental Europe

Since this chapter will present how the Hungarian translation of the book came to exist, it is useful to briefly look at other, earlier foreign editions of *Origin*, predecessors of the Hungarian edition: not necessarily as direct sources of influence, but as points of reference in the identification of parallel or contrasting patterns that can be discovered

during the processes of translation. Before the chapter would turn its attention to its main focus, the translation of *Origin* to Hungarian, it will give a brief account of how the book was translated to other languages. As the temporal focus of the dissertation is on the "early" reception of Darwinism in Hungary, the following sketches will deal with translations of *Origin* published prior to 1873, when the Hungarian edition was published. In their introduction to the collective volume *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe,* Thomas Glick and Eve-Marie Engels draw the reader's attention to "*cross-cultural influences of inflections* induced by translations" when it comes to the influence of German translations of *Origin* in several countries.[424] Even when there is no traceable or discernible influence of the work of one translator on another, examining the various cultural and political contexts of reception and patterns of interpretation, however distant and unrelated they might seem, can provide additional layers of insight.

As we have seen in the case of *Vestiges* earlier, even bestseller status in Britain does not necessarily guarantee publishing success abroad. Unlike the meager continental impact of *Vestiges, Origin* caused quite a stir from the earliest point; more than just a specific point in the cultural history of British science, with the publication of *Origin*, Darwin created a critical moment and one of the most influential books ever written – and ever translated. During his lifetime, *Origin* was published in eleven different languages, some of them in more than one edition:[425] the first foreign translation was the German (1860), followed by Dutch (1860), French (1862), Italian (1864), Russian (1864), Swedish (1869), Danish (1872), Hungarian (1873), Spanish (1877) and Serbian (1878). Partial translations were also made available, for instance in Polish in 1873 (with a full

[424] Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, I. 4.
[425] Browne, *Darwin's Origin of Species*, x. For the dates of the various translations and editions, see the timeline in Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, I. xxvi-lxxii.

translation in 1884, two years after Darwin's death). Some of these cases, such as the reception of Darwin and Darwinism in Germany, France and Russia, have been researched and published widely on well before the surge of national reception studies connected to the Darwin anniversary year in 2009.[426] Thomas Glick's *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism* (1974), followed by the geographically far wider reaching *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe* (co-edited with Eve-Marie Engels, 2008) have provided many national case studies in and also reaching beyond Europe, although with some understandable gaps.[427] While it is impossible to cover the translation and reception of *Origin* in a comprehensive and detailed manner here, the following paragraphs will offer brief historical sketches and highlight the most important patterns and problems encountered.

Not only because it was the first foreign edition,[428] but also in terms of "cross-cultural influences and inflections," the most important translation from a Hungarian – or East Central European – comparative perspective is the German one, which had become a fertile ground for the reinterpretation of Darwin's original manifest by the late 1860s. Darwin's work attracted the interest of German scholars working on aspects of adaptation, selection, transmutation or variation in botany and zoology quite early on. The

[426] Such earlier studies include the work of Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas Junker on Germany: see, for instance, Junker's "Zur Rezeption der Darwinschen Theorien bei deutschen Botanikern (1859–1880)," in *Die Rezeption von Evolutionstheorien im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Eve-Marie Engels, (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985), 147-81. On France, Yvette Conry's *L'Introduction du Darwinisme en France au XIXe siècle* (Paris: Vrin, 1974) is a definitive early work. On Russia, earlier work includes James Allen Rogers, "The Reception of Darwin's Origin of Species by Russian Scientists," *Isis* 64 (1973): 484-50); "Charles Darwin and Russian Scientists," *Russian Review* 13, no. 4 (1960): 371-38; and "Russian Opposition to Darwinism in the Nineteenth Century," *Isis* 65 (1974): 487-505). Alexander Vucinich's *Darwin in Russian Thought* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988) gives a good general introduction. *The Darwinian Heritage*, edited by David Kohn (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), includes studies on "Darwinism in Germany, France and Italy" by Pietro Corsi and Paul Weindling (683–730), and on "Darwin and Russian Evolutionary Biology" by Francesco M. Scudo and Michele Acanfona (731-52).
[427] Glick, *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*. Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*.
[428] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism*, 4.

paleontologist H. G. Bronn, who had been also working in the 1840s and 1850s on a new model to approach the science and history of life,[429] published the first edition of the German translation of *Origin* quite promptly in 1860,[430] based on the second edition, under the title *Über die Entstehung der Arten im Thier- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Züchtung, oder, Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn*. A second edition, based on the third English edition, followed in 1863,[431] and if the extended title page would not make it clear, it is so from the well-researched literature on the subject that Bronn had his own opinions about Darwin's book and the theories laid out in it, and he did not hesitate to make his opinion public.[432] Darwin himself had become invested in the German translation of his works,[433] and his comments and involvement resulted in a third edition significantly revised by Victor Carus in 1867, based on the English fourth.[434] Based on Bronn's text, *Die Entstehung der Arten im Thier- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Zuchtwahl, oder Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn*, revised by Victor Carus and overseen

[429] See Sander Gliboff, "H. G. Bronn and the History of Nature", in *Journal of the History of Biology*, 40, no. 2 (2007): 259-294.

[430] Darwin, C. R. 1860. *Über die Entstehung der Arten im Thier- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Züchtung, oder, Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn*. Nach der zweiten Auflage mit einer geschichtlichen Vorrede und andern Zusätzen des Verfassers für diese deutsche Aufgabe. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Dr. H. G. Bronn. Stuttgart: Schweizerbart.

[431] Darwin, C. R. 1863. *Über die Entstehung der Arten im Thier- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Züchtung, oder, Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn*. Nach der dritten Englische Auflage und mit neueren Zusätzen des Verfassers für diese deutsche Aufgabe. Zweite verbesserte und sehr vermehrte Auflage. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von H. G. Bronn. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagshandlung und Druckerei.

[432] Gliboff argues that Bronn was much less critical, and much more favourable, than Darwin thought from reading the hard German of Bronn's first edition. See Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 5-6.

[433] For instance, he had been reluctant to give authorisation to Carl Vogt to translate both *Variation* and *Descent*, even though he found him a competent translator. Vogt, an ardent Darwinist, became involved in the preparation of Colonel Moulinié's French translation of *Origin* in 1868 and of *Descent* in 1872. See Amrein and Nickelsen, "The Gentleman and the Rogue."

[434] Darwin, C. R. 1867. Die Entstehung der Arten im Thier- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Zuchtwahl, oder Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt von H. G. Bronn. Nach der vierten englischen sehr vermehrten Ausgabe durchgesehen und berichtigt von J. Victor Carus. Dritte Auflage. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagshandlung und Druckerei.

by Darwin, illustrates not only the degree of Darwin's willingness to become involved in the process of translation when he considered the status of the translator or the scientific life of the country important enough, but also the complexity to which Darwin's ideas, including natural selection, the central concept introduced in *Origin* were received and debated in Germany.

Darwinismus, due to the attention paid to the expectations of Darwinism and the contributions of Ernst Haeckel or Karl Ernst von Baer (who, in turn had an important role in the Russian reception of Darwinism), to various approaches to transmutation and evolutionary theory, influenced not only Darwin, but also the Hungarian language of Darwinism during the early period when his works were unavailable in Hungarian, and in a country where German was the language not only of academia, but also of the middle class, unlike the much less widely read English. While Jácint Rónay's contribution to the early reception of Darwin is valuable because of its timeliness and because it was geographically and culturally rooted in Britain because that is where Rónay lived and worked in the 1850s and 1860s, for his contemporaries stuck in Hungary where the use of German language was not only a cultural, but also a political conjuncture. Many members of the Hungarian scientific community read about Darwinism, and *Origin* specifically, in German, as visible from sources from the 1860s,[435] and even László Dapsy, the Hungarian translator, claimed to have consulted the German version during the process of

[435] Ákos Kánitz, "A növény-species fejlődésének történetéről, különös tekintettel Magyarhonra," in *A Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók 1863. September 19-26. Pesten tartott IX. nagygyűlésének történeti vázlata és munkálatai*, ed. József Szabó, (Pest: Emich Gusztáv, 1864), 298-303. Kánitz makes reference to the 1863 German translation of the 1862 English edition of *Origin* while providing the English title as well. However, Kánitz text was informed of some of the criticism addressed at the German translation, which he makes a reference to in his article. Another work that refers to the works of Agassiz and Darwin with their English titles (*Essay on Classification* and *Origin* respectively, see page 833), László Gonda's "A természettudományok fejlődése a theologiára vonatkozással."

translation.[436] Had Darwin had an idea how much Bronn's text would make Darwinism "local" not only in Germany, but how much he would contribute as a medium of transfer to the spread of Darwin's thought across Eastern, Central and Southern Europe, where German was one of the common languages of communication between the three empires, he might not have underestimated Bronn as much.

Unlike the German lands, where Darwin, despite the difficulties finding a translator that he was satisfied with, his work was well received and discussed by the scientific community in general, in France, his difficulties finding a translator were aggravated by the lack of response and in many cases unwillingness to accept his ideas.[437] Following some complications in finding a translator, Clémence Royer undertook the task *De l'origine des espèces ou des lois du progrès chez les êtres organisés,* with the translator's preface and notes of explanation was published in 1862.[438] Royer, who was more interested in the application of Darwin's work to society, and whose preface contained vehement arguments against religion and strongly related Darwin's work to Lamarck's,[439] produced a revised second edition on the request and with the increased involvement of Darwin himself to correct some of Royer's scientific terminology, which, for instance, resulted in the now common usage of "sélection naturelle" instead of

[436] László Dapsy to the Vice President [of the Academy of Sciences], Budapest, 21 February 1875, MTA RAL 1211/1875.
[437] Since Yvette Conry's *L'Introduction du Darwinisme en France.* many studies have dealt with the early French non-response to Darwinism by French scientists (not unlike the criticism against Saint-Hilaire and Lamarck); see also Joy Harvey, "Darwin in a French Dress: Translating, Publishing and Supporting Darwin in Nineteenth-Century France", in Engels and Glick *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 354-374. Despite the lack of early significant lack of reactions, Darwin was read in France even before the translations were published; one of the first (balanced) reviews by Auguste Laugel in *Revue des Deux Mondes* later served as the basis of the first published Hungarian review (Laugel 1860; Jánosi 1860).
[438] Darwin, Charles, *De l'origine des espèces ou des lois du progrès chez les êtres organisés*, translated and with preface and notes by Clémence-Auguste Royer, (Paris: Guillaumin et Cie, 1862).
[439] On Royer and her translation, see also Browne, *The Power of Place*, 142-3; and Joy Harvey, *Almost a Man of Genius: Clémence Royer, feminism and nineteenth-century science*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997), 62-101.

Royer's original choice of "élection naturelle."[440] After a third edition in 1870, in which Royer did not include the changes Darwin had made in the new edition but included a preface that Darwin did not approve of, he started looking for a new translator, and on the suggestion of Carl Vogt, the translator of *Variation under Domestication* and (later) *Descent*, Jean Jacques Moulinié produced a new edition in 1873, completed upon his death by Edmund Barbier. Just as in the case of the German translations after Carus took over from Bronn, Darwin asked the second translator to keep some of the terminology used by the first, to retain continuity.[441]

Apart from these two interculturally influential, at the time widely read and very well documented cases, the 1860 Dutch or the 1872 Danish cases are well researched enough to provide some parallel angles or contrasts for the examination of the role of the translator, modes or publication, or popularity. The Dutch translation of T. C. Winkler,[442] published in serialized form, did not gain popularity and – not unlike the 1849 Dutch translation of *Vestiges* – did not become commercially successful. Engagement with Darwin stayed rather low until the interest created by the public statements in the 1868-69 lectures of radical atheist scientist Carl Vogt (and, incidentally the highly critical German translator of *Vestiges*) the social implications of *Descent* started a wider debate on Darwinism in the 1870s and 1880s, centered around questions of society and ethics rather than the earlier discussions which were mostly concerned with the religious implications

[440] Darwin, C. R. 1866. L'origine des espèces par sélection naturelle ou des lois de transformation des êtres organisés. Traduit en Français avec l'autorisation de l'auteur par Clémence Royer avec une préface et des notes du traducteur. Deuxième édition augmentée d'après des notes de l'auteur. Paris: Victor Masson et fils; Guillaumin et Cie.
[441] Harvey, "Darwin in a French Dress," 361; Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 143.
[442] Darwin, C. R. 1860. Het ontstaan der soorten van dieren en planten door middel van de natuurkeus, of het bewaard blijven van bevoorregte rassen in de strijd des levens. With a preface and an epilogue by the translator Tiberius Cornelius Winkler. 1st ed. Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman, 2 vols.

of selection.[443] In Italy, where early discussions of Darwinism have often been claimed to be slow and little responsive, the translators of the 1864 edition of *Origin* made the conscious decision not to interfere with the text, unlike Royer, whose translation was known by Italian readers of Darwin. Giovanni Canestrini and Leonardo Salimbeni refrained entirely from adding their opinions – "untimely additions" to Darwin's text in a conscious show of neutrality, although they did warn their readers against Royer's translation. Ultimately, while Darwinism and evolution – although as in many other cultures, the two were often considered very distinctly – were discussed on a scientific level, the ideas did not immediately provoke a wide, public response and awareness.[444]

On the other hand, Darwin is claimed to have been a household name in Denmark by the time *Descent* was published in Danish in 1875,[445] even before J. P. Jacobsen's translation of *Origin* in 1872.[446] The Danish case is interesting as a point of comparison with the Hungarian case because of the many parallels and contrasts: both were countries on the European periphery, with an increasingly patriotic national language project but still deeply imbedded German-language culture produce translations of *Origin* with one year difference; the participants of the early, but vigorous academic discussions of Darwin's theories are also involved in the popularization of Darwinism to wider ranges of society; however, these academic circles also had a closer connection with Darwin

[443] See Bart Leeuwenburgh and Janneke van der Heide, "Darwin on Dutch Soil: The Early Reception of his Ideas in the Netherlands", in Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 175-187.
[444] On the Italian translation and translators of *Origin*, see Giuliano Pancaldi, *Darwin in Italy: Science across Cultural Frontiers*, transl. Ruey Brodine Morelli, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 77-88.
[445] On the reception of Darwin in Denmark, see Peter C. Kjærgaard, Niels Henrik Gregersen and Hans Henrik Hjermitslev, "Darwinizing the Danes, 1859–1909", in Engels and Glick, *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 146-155. Stine Grumsen's preface to the online edition at the Darwin Online project is a useful introduction to Jacobsen's translation of *Origin*: http://darwin-online.org.uk/EditorialIntroductions/Grumsen_DanishOrigin.html.
[446] Darwin, Charles, *Om Arternes Oprindelse ved Kvalitetsvalg eller ved de heldigst stillede Formers Sejr i Kampen for Tilværelsen*, transl. J. P. Jacobsen, (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1872).

himself, even if not to the extent of their German or French colleagues. Finally, Jacobsen, also an important figure of Danish literature who, unlike László Dapsy, translated both *Origin* and *Descent* to Danish, had a clear agenda of using Darwin's work for the propagation of his own agendas of "freedom of thought" and to end religious dogmatism. It is also important to note that the early introduction of *Descent* into the national discourse of Darwin marks a widening of the national character of the understanding of Darwinism as social Darwinism, which took place in Hungary a decade later, after *Descent* had been published in 1883.[447]

In Eastern Europe, the influence of the German language is again critical, though in different ways. The Russian translation of Sergei A. Rachinsky is among the earliest translations of *Origin*, and unlike a number of other translators, Rachinsky, a professor of botany in Moscow who started working on the translation in 1862, did not include any of his comments on the text and the theories laid down in it.[448] A completely new translation by Timiryazev was published towards the end of the century. Both in Russia and partitioned Poland, where *Origin* and *Descent* were both partially translated in 1873 to be published in a complete form years later,[449] the scientists involved in the early discussions of Darwinism and the translation of Darwin's work read *Origin* in German, had been

[447] Darwin's *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex,* (London: Murray, 1871) was published in Hungarian under the title *Az ember származasa és az ivari kiválás* in 1884. One of its translators, Aurél Török, was one of the founding figures of Hungarian of anthropology and had a major role in the establishment of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Budapest. Török was also interested in the study of craniology, which came to be a vehicle for the extremist forms of social Darwinism with the rise of nativism in fin-de-siècle Hungary. See Tibor Frank, "Anthropology and Politics: Craniology and Racism in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy," in *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making. Studies in Hungarian Connections to Britain and America 1848-1945,* (Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1999).
[448] Rogers, "The Reception of Darwin's Origin," 485.
[449] Daniel Schümann, "Struggle for or against Participation? How Darwinism came to Poland in the 1860s and early 1870s," in *The Reception of Charles Darwin*, 247 (note 4) and 250 (note 8).

much immersed in the natural historical thought of German biologists, and many of the Russians were in correspondence with Darwin himself.[450]

From the above examples it seems a reasonable conclusion, as confirmed by many scholars of Darwin that Darwin was interested and involved in the preparation of foreign editions, which often involved close cooperation, to those languages where he had scientific contacts, and thus could control.[451] However, it is doubtful whether Darwin indeed had close – or any kind of – contact with all the translators and the circles of scholars, naturalists and intellectuals involved in the dissemination of his work and theories, even if he thought that "the success of a work abroad is the best test of its enduring value."[452] One of the characteristics of the case of the Hungarian translation of *Origin* is that any contact Darwin had with the translator and the Hungarian scientific community was marginal and rather superficial, not extending beyond the customary request on behalf of the translator, who was already in the process of securing a publisher. The chapter will examine how factors like language, cultural influence or status could affect the extent of Darwin's interest and involvement in a Hungarian translation, and whether and how the presumed status of Dapsy within the scientific community on a national or international level, and the position of Hungary on the scientific, cultural and political map of Europe motivated the production of a Hungarian *Origin*.

[450] On the reception of Darwin in Russia, apart from the more general works listed earlier, Daniel Todes's *Darwin without Malthus* by has redefined the research of Russian Darwinism by the reexamination of Darwin's metaphor of the struggle for existence without the application of Malthusianism. See also Todes, "Darwin's Malthusian Metaphor and Russian Evolutionary Thought, 1859-1917," *Isis* 78 (1987): 537-551.
[451] Browne, *The Origin of Species,* x and 105.
[452] Darwin, *Autobiography*, in *Autobiographies: Charles Darwin, Thomas Henry Huxley*, ed. Gavin de Beer, (London; New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), 84.

Origin in Hungarian: A Story of Scientific Publishing

The case of the Hungarian translation of *Origin* shows some interesting superficial parallels to that of *Vestiges*, but upon closer inspection, it becomes unsurprisingly clear that the fifteen years that passed between 1858, the year of the first Hungarian edition of *Vestiges*, and 1873, the year of publication of Volume I of *Origin* brought many changes in Hungarian politics and society, which had great effect on the structures of scientific thought and community, and which, in turn, created completely different approaches and reactions to the translation and reception of scientific works in general and Darwinism in particular. The relocation of scientific thought to a different context became a characteristically different process due to the changed political, cultural and social environment in post-1867 Hungary, where the ideas of progress, development or evolution could be freely discussed, in contrast to the rather subversive applications of the new results of geology with regards to the formation of the earth the evolution of plant, animal and human life to a society under oppression and in passive resistance to it.

Origin of Species was translated to more languages, and it also surpassed the success and controversy generated by *Vestiges* within a few years of its publication. It is an interesting coincidence that both *Vestiges* and *Origin* took close to fifteen years to be fully translated and published in Hungarian, but this parallel also serves to highlight major differences in the circumstances and environments in which the ideas advocated by their authors were received, debated and occasionally reappropriated in various ways in the Hungarian context.

The fifteen years that had passed between 1858 and 1873 are also critical in terms of the intensity of reception and debate. This can be attributed to the fact that due to the

changes in the political system, the freedom of interaction and mobility within the academic community and their increased interaction with the actors of the wider cultural and political scene made it possible react to and discuss Darwinism on various forums from the early 1860s. The role of Jácint Rónay as an "interim translator" in summarizing and adapting Darwin and his contemporaries, making their ideas available in Hungarian – even if in a condensed and abridged form – cannot be stressed enough in creating a very different, more informed, prepared and receptive environment for the first full edition of *Origin*. In that sense, the fifteen years that passed between the first English and the Hungarian edition yielded a soil that was, at least in extensive patches, very fertile for the growth of Hungarian Darwinism.

One of the major differences between the reception of *Vestiges* in its home environment and in translation was that while in Britain it created an identifiable division between the debates within the academic community and the reactions in the popular press and the public space, in translation, and in Hungarian translation in particular, *Vestiges* remained a subject of scholarly reference, even though some of the ideas were filtered into the public mind, even if they were more often than not attributed to Carl Vogt or remained even more vaguely connected to the original source. *Origin*, just as heavily debated and subjected to vigorous criticism, even though considered more "seriously" scientific, had a similar model of scientific and popular reception, where reviewers and their intended audience, positive or negative, calmly appraising or passionate, could be more or less clearly identified, despite some overlap. Many members of the Academy of Sciences and the *Természettudományi Társulat*, the memberships and activities of which often overlapped, were also active in the popular dissemination of Darwinism, publishing articles in various weekly illustrated journals of varying readership and political

affiliation, such as *Vasárnapi Újság, Magyarország és a Nagy Világ*, or *Ország-Világ*. This is also well exemplified in the two people, László Dapsy and Tivadar Margó, who created the Hungarian text of *Origin* and made sure that the text was up to current scientific standards. While they came from different environments and had differing qualifications, what they had in common was that both, and especially Margó, were established and acknowledged members of the academic community. Consequently, they also had a crucial and determining role in creating and shaping the public image of Darwinism and its implications for Hungarian society, its future progress and envisioned developments according to the newly adapted systems of materialist and positivist thought and the patriotic project.

Ever since the beginning of the 1860s, a new generation of young public intellectuals had been pushing a liberal patriotic agenda placing Darwinism, in the forefront of intellectual discussions in Hungary. For these figures, Darwinism also served as an embodiment of British-style political and economic development based on the work of, among others, John Stuart Mill. This combination of liberalist, materialist, positivist, and evolutionist ideas contributed to the emerging political culture of the decade following the Compromise, which then underwent a shift into a more conservative, nationalist discourse parallel to the publication of *Descent of Man* (1871 in English and 1883/4 in Hungarian). The second stage of response to it took place in the form of an increased discussion and reliance on the ideologies of social and racial Darwinism in Hungary after the conservative turn following the 1875 elections. However, the liberal reading of Darwinism enjoyed a very successful decade between the mid-1860s and 1870s, and the key person in making Darwin a household name and making not only the full text of *Origin of Species*, but also a great number of contemporary English works

available in Hungarian, was László Dapsy, only thirty years old when *Origin* was published.

Born on 28 February 1843 in Miskolc to a family of the lower nobility, he received his secondary education in Miskolc until 1861, when he left – the felt his schooling "narrow in scope" ("szűkköri") – to continue his studies in the Calvinist Collegium in Debrecen.[453] He attended lectures on theology, philosophy and law, but he did not want to become a clergyman and "due to the political circumstances of the time" ("az akkori politikai viszonyok miatt") did not pass the law examinations either. However, he did receive the scholarship of the Scottish Presbyterian Church to Edinburgh, Edinburgh, where he spent the winter semester of 1866 "at the Free College and the University."[454] This is where he claimed to have first encountered and become a lifelong disciple of Darwinism and British capitalist economic ideas.[455] His example also shows that liberal Protestantism and its institutional structure in many cases played an important role in the spread of progressive ideas in the natural sciences, politics or economics in Hungary in the 19th century. Upon his return to Hungary he taught for a short while in Debrecen and then became a teacher of natural history in the Calvinist secondary school in Pest. His interest in the sciences was demonstrated when he

[453] László Dapsy to József Szinnyei, 15 January 1877. MTA MS 773/335. Szinnyei was the editor of a biographical encyclopedia of Hungarian writers, and upon his request, Dapsy sent him information that was later extended for the entry in the published work. Further biographical information can be found in the history of the Dapsy family written by Dapsy's son, see Vilmos László Dapsy, *A dapsay Dapsy-család története* [The history of the family Dapsy of Dapsa], (Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1931).

[454] "[...] Scothonba, Edinburgbe menten, hol a téli semester alatt részint a Free College, részint a University természettudományi előadásait hallgatva [...]" László Dapsy to József Szinnyei, 15 January 1877, MS 773/335.

[455] According to Ábrahám Kovács, it cannot be ascertained whether the encounter took place within the walls of the college or in other fields of social or academic life, although it is suggested that it was probably the latter. See, for instance, his "Dapsy László szerepe a darwinizmus terjesztésében és annak teológiai fogadtatása" [The Role of László Dapsy in the dissemination of Darwinism and its theological reception], *Confessio* 50, no. 3 (2007): 151–155.

published a study on the effects of soil degradation in Britain and Hungary,[456] and a secondary school textbook in natural history.[457] He was also a prolific translator, his translations from English apart from *Origin,* for which he is best remembered for, included David Page's *Introductory Textbook to Geology,* John Stuart Mill's *Elements of National Economy*, and Alpheus Todd's *On Parliamentary Government in England*.[458] In the 1870s and 1880s he wrote for various newspapers and journals on subjects ranging from the natural sciences to economics, and from 1880 to his death on 29 May 1890 he was publisher and editor-in-chief of *Magyar Föld*, a review of economics.

Even before he started his project to make Darwin's work available in Hungarian, Dapsy had been actively working to make Darwin and his ideas known in Hungary. Through his articles, published both in the scientific and popular press, he consistently presented Darwinism as a possible model for the type of progressive society that Hungary should attempt to achieve.

At a superficial glance, the story of how Dapsy came to translate *Origin* starts with Dapsy's wish to translate the newly published *Descent of Man* in 1871. Following the conventions for translators wishing to translate a book, Dapsy contacted Darwin about translating *Descent*. It was customary for the translator to secure a publisher as well, and around the same time, he proposed to the *Természettudományi Társulat* to establish a publishing house "to translate and publish important foreign scientific works to

[456] László Dapsy, *A talajkimerülés befolyása az államok életére. Különös tekintettel Magyarország jövőjére.* [The influence of soil degradation on the life of states. With special attention to the future of Hungary], (Pest, 1869).
[457] László Dapsy, *Általános természetrajz. Középiskolák és magántanulók számára* [General natural history. For secondary schools and private students]. Pest, 1869.
[458] *A geologia alapvonalai. Page Dávid művenek 9. kiadása nyomán,* (Pest: Eggenberger, 1873); J. S. Mill, *A nemzetgazdaságtan alapelvei s ezek némelyikének a társadalmi bölcsészetre való alkalmazása*. (Pest, 1875); Alpheus Todd, *A parliamenti kormányrendszer Angliában és annak eredete, kifejlődése és gyakorlati alkalmazása*, (Pest, 1876-77).

Hungarian."[459] However, from the wording it is not clear what work he wanted to translate, and from the context the casual observer has no reason to assume that it was specifically Darwin's work that he himself wanted to translate within this proposed project. While the establishment of such a venture can be considered at least as great an achievement as becoming the first Hungarian translator of Darwin, even in hindsight, he does not explain what his agenda was when he undertook both projects and successfully convinced the membership of the *Természettudományi Társulat* to commit to and invest in his proposal.

It is also unclear whether Dapsy's role went beyond initiating the venture, serving on a committee and contributing with the translation of one work. The policies of choosing the books to be translated, the authors, subjects and translators chosen, while not directly in scope of this study (considering especially that the publishing company was active until 1945), are indicative of scientific interest on behalf of scientific tastemakers and various layers of audiences in the changing atmosphere of the 1870s and 1880s. The subscription numbers: copies, readers, prices, and also conditions, did have a major influence on the reception of Darwin not only in terms of translation (quality and quantity), but also dissemination, popularization, audience and readership. The story of Dapsy's initiative and its reception, moreover, illustrates in vivid colour how Dapsy and his contemporaries approached science, scientific culture, scientific language, and also progress and development in not only scientific life, but also generally in politics, culture and society in Hungary.

Moreover, even if we consider that Dapsy had published various articles on Darwin in various, scientific and popular publications throughout the second half of the

[459] Dapsy, "Introduction," iv.

1860s, and that he had some practice in the translation of works in the social and natural sciences from English to Hungarian, the sources available do not make it clear why he settled on Darwin; and even if he became enthralled with Darwinism, why did he not attempt to translate it earlier after his return from Scotland. He must have been aware that apart from Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés*, there was nothing that could be considered a lengthier, systematic account or other Hungarian edition of *Origin*.

With this in mind, it is even more curious that he wanted to translate *Descent*, which had come out less than five months before he wrote to Darwin. Not only must he have obtained the book quite quickly, but as it will become clear from the timeline that can be established from Dapsy's correspondence with Darwin and from the minutes and reports of *Természettudományi Társulat*, he must have been working on the translation of *Descent* at the time of approaching *Természettudományi Társulat* and Darwin. He seems to have abandoned *Descent* in order to translate *Origin*, presumably never to complete, since he was still alive when Géza Entz and Aurél Török published *Descent* in the same series that Dapsy was instrumental in bringing to existence.[460]

Dapsy's original inquiry to Darwin, dated 12 June 1871, asks for Darwin's authorization to translate the recently published *Descent of Man*, but at the same time, not unlike a few other contemporary translators, he puts Darwin's ideas into a context where they can be applied to society, or at least political culture.

> "Dear Sir!
> Being convinced of the good effect of your heighly precious inquiries for the whole society: as Professor of natural history, since many years I have done my best to spread your doctrines between my countrymen. I published already besides many articles on this matter, in the last March your biography, and portrait in our Vasárnapi Ujság. Now reading the Descent of Man, I am very pleasantly touched to

[460] Charles Darwin, Az *ember származása*, 2 vols., transl. Aurél Török and Géza Entz. Budapest: Természettudományi Társulat Kiadóvállalata, 1884.

> see the fulfilling of my whish, that at length you have applied your doctrines for the man.I am sorry to say that as yet, here such tendencies are received with a good deal of aversion, but I believe that by-and-by they will accept it, and it would be a great advancement for our political life too. I beg therefore for your Kindeness to authorize me to the translation of the "Descent of Man"; for hungarian language; and to assure you that if in any matter I can to serve you, I am to your disposition.With my highest respect I remain Sir!
> Your obedient servant
> Ladislaus Dapsy"[461]

Darwin's response to this letter is not known, but can generally be presumed that he graciously agreed.

On 5 July, that is, less than a month after writing the letter, Dapsy proposed at a caucus meeting of the TTT to publish "renowned foreign works" (*külföldi jelesebb művek*) in Hungarian, and promised to present a detailed proposal at the next meeting.[462] His commitment to the project of translating Darwin, and *Descent* in particular is even more emphasized when we consider that he had been clearly working on the translation. In the July issue of *Természettudományi Közlöny*, the gazette monthly published by the Society, he published his own translation of the last chapter of *Descent*,[463] which had also been reviewed in the *Közlöny* a month earlier.[464]

He did indeed submit a detailed proposal that he presented at the caucus meeting on 4 November 1871.[465] In the document he proposed that the Society establish a subdivision (*alosztály*) that publishes foreign works of natural science in the Hungarian language. In the text, Dapsy argued that such a venture was in the interest of Hungary, and it was the patriotic duty of the Society to facilitate this, since there was no other scientific society in Hungary that was better equipped and could be more supportive of

[461] [sic]. Dapsy to Darwin, 12 June 1872, CUL DAR 162: 40.
[462] *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 29 (1872):40.
[463] Dapsy, "Darwin legújabb művének utolsó fejezete," 372-84.
[464] Kriesch, "Darwin legújabb művéről," 330-40.
[465] "I. indítvány" [Initiative I.], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 28 (1871): 465-459.

such a project. The natural sciences, as the proposal continued, are the most expensive among the sciences of the day, and experimentation is often the privilege of rich states. The results of these sciences, however, are needed by all, because the sciences raise the abilities of its citizens to a significant extent. "There is no clearer source of real freedom, sober morality and honesty than the natural sciences. They are the stable support of the calm progress of the state." Since there is no other body in the country that could take this duty upon itself (and he believes that they could sell at least as many copies of a scientific work as a private printer or bookseller could), and as the Society had adopted establishing and maintaining contacts with abroad in its founding statement, there is no other, more fitting place to host such a publishing house. The question is only if they have the means. He acknowledged that there have been doubts whether Hungary contains 6-700 people who would purchase the works of famous naturalists, but then he also claims that out of the 3,500 members of the Society, it is impossible not to reach such a number. He cited the example of the medical publishing company, which had been operating successfully and profitably for a number of years.[466] He proposed a subscription system among the members of the Society. The books would not be able to be bought separately or independently of the subscription system. He estimated that in a 3-year cycle they would be able to publish 5-6 volumes, the starting capital for which would be provided by the Society, eventually to be returned from the profits made.

The proposal was accepted a committee was formed, the members of which included Dapsy himself, Loránd Eötvös, and Darwinists Gyula Petrovits and János

[466] "I. indítvány" [Initiative I.], 456-459.

Kriesch.[467] At the next meeting of 6 January 1872, it was decided that the proposal document should be read in public again, this time at the general meeting on 17 January, where it was decided that the Society should go ahead with the venture and circulate the proposal and the subscription sheets starting with March.[468] By April, there were 896 subscribers,[469] who would first receive Bernhard von Cotta's *Geologie der Gegenwart*,[470] to be followed by the first volume of Dapsy's translation of *Origin* in 1872, and then the second volume in early 1873.[471] Although the minutes of the *Természettudományi Társulat* published in *Természettudományi Közlöny* and its supplements do not give a reason why Gyula Petrovics's translation of Cotta came to precede Dapsy's translation, or how and why it was decided that Dapsy would translate *Origin*, it is presumable that the translation of such a long and complex text took more time than expected, especially since it became the collaboration of two people when Dapsy was assigned Tivadar Margó to assist him with the translation.

Subscription numbers rose quite steadily: there were 1064 subscribers altogether on 6 November, when it was decided that the Cotta volume could go to the printers, and it

[467] For a full list of members of the initial committee (Kálmán Balogh, László Dapsy, Loránd Eötvös, Ignác Hirschler, József Krenner, János Kriesch, Gyula Petrovics, Kálmán Szily, Miklós Szontágh and Vince Wartha), but also the later history, membership and activities of the publishing company, see Katalin Kapronczay, "A Királyi Magyar Természettudományi Társulat Könyvkiadó Vállalatának története" [The history of the book publishing company of the Royal Hungarian Society for Natural Science], *Természet Világa* 142, no. 5 (2011): 205-207. See also, Mihály Beck, "Tudományos mozgalmak: Nyolcvan év hazai természettudományi művelődéstörténete" [Scientific movements: Eighty years of the cultural history of the Hungarian natural sciences], *Természet Világa* 129, no. 12 (1998): 531–534, which includes a short history of the *Természettudományi Társulat*.

[468] "XXVIII. Válaszmányi ülés" [28th electoral meeting], *Természettudományi Közlöny*, 3, no. 30 (1872): 80.

[469] *Természettudományi Közlöny*, supplement to the May issue of Volume 4 (1872).

[470] Originally published in 1865.

[471] Since Dapsy's original did not contain was a list of works Dapsy had in mind for the venture to publish, it is impossible to know when he decided to translate *Origin* instead of *Descent*. As the committee's decisions are available as late as the beginning of 1872, it is not impossible that they made the decision as a group, and it was only Dapsy who presented himself to Darwin as someone who had just changed his mind. Since his translation of a chapter from *Descent* was published in *Természettudományi Közlöny* in 1873, he might have had plans, never to be fulfilled, to publish both within a short stretch of time.

was announced that the full translation of Darwin could be expected by January 1873.[472] In January 1873, there were 1105 subscribers, and optimistic members of the TTT were wondering whether the planned 1500 copies per edition would suffice; on the downside, it was also announced that the translation and revision of *Origin* was going slower than expected, "which is not a problem, as long as the translation is faithful and Hungarian," according to the secretary at the general meeting of 15 January.[473] It was also communicated to the society, and through the gazette to the general public, that scientific publishing was creating a financial profit.[474] Based on the extensive minutes and reports of the Society, one can have a good idea of the numbers, and thanks to the preserved (and published) subscription sheets, of the people (and institutions) of the subscribers. It should, however, be kept in mind that the individuals and institutions (including municipal and school libraries) who signed up, did not subscribe to individual books, but according to the founding principles of the publishing society, to the whole series. Thus it is rather impossible to judge how many subscribed due to their interest in a book specifically (or how many happened to read it). News about the general progress of scientific publishing and that of the translation of *Origin* went back to back throughout 1873: further delays were announced in April, according to which Cotta would only be published in June 1873 (both the translator and the printers were blamed), and *Origin* Vol. I would be ready in July (no reason was given).[475]

This is the point where we might notice a relatively minor, at least in terms of the general outcome, but nonetheless interesting detail: Dapsy seems not to have notified

[472] "XXXV. Választmányi ülés" [35th electoral meeting], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 4 (1872): 471.
[473] "XL. Közgyűlés" 40th general meeting], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5 (1873): 79.
[474] In the first year of 1872, this was 3753 Forints out of the total Society budget expenses of 24,678 Forints (expenses being 904 out of a Society total of 14,566). *Természettudományi Közlöny* 4 (1873): 115.
[475] *Természettudományi Közlöny*, Supplement to the May 1873 issue.

Darwin of the change of plans of what was being translated while all the translation and printing work was in progress. He did, in fact, write to him more or less after the fact, on 1 June 1873:

> "As I had the honour to mention you that I intend to translate the Descent of Man, the natural philosophical society accepted my proposal: to translate the most conspecious [sic] foreign authors on the Hungarian language, and for the first instance the society received after my own motion to publish first of all The Origin of Species, and only after that the Descent of Man, and I was committed with the translation, and the first volume of it shall be published in August, and the second part, from the Chapter VIII at the end of the year. It is very elegantly printed, and we shall have the honour to present to you one copy of it when quite ready. We should to publish your portrait too on the head of the translation, therefore we should be much obliged to have some information where to get some authentic electrotype copies? If you could be so kind to direct your publisher to let me know the terms how to get them, but very speedily, we should order them."[476]

Darwin, according to his answer, was very glad that the translation has progressed, and would be pleased to receive a copy, although he cannot provide an electrotype – he did, however, offer to send a photograph, "if he hears of Dapsy's desire to have one."[477] There is no response from Dapsy in the Darwin correspondence archives, and the correspondence stops here.

What is interesting albeit telling of national and scientific status but also of Darwin's limitations is the almost utter lack of interest in Darwin's response. A great number of Darwin's letters to prospective and actual translators of his work reflect deep concern with the quality of translation, and he is known to have had rather deep conflicts with some of them. His lukewarm reaction to Dapsy's communications seem to indicate

[476] [sic]. László Dapsy to Charles Darwin, 1 June 1873. Correspondence. CUL DAR 162: 41. The wording of this part of the letter could even make the impression that Dapsy's main reason for writing was to obtain a picture of Darwin for the volume, and the rest is just polite chitchat, even if the communication of the presence if the public debate is more interesting for the historian of reception. For the discussion of the public reception of Darwin, including the role of the scientific community in the dissemination of Darwinism in the public sphere through the press, see Chapter 1.

[477] Charles Darwin to László Dapsy, 9 June 1873, CUL DAR 96: 155.

that Darwin might not have attributed great importance or influence to the Hungarian translation of his work, be it *Origin* or *Descent*; the same applies to the translator, who was not on the level of peer status such as Bronn, for instance. Finally, it is also clear that while Darwin could have exert some control over translations and translators to languages that he had a certain command of, Hungarian was not a language he could speak, and Hungary was not a country that could have a significant influence in dissemination or "enduring value" on an international scale.

Dapsy's *Origin of Species*

During the decade and half that passed between the original publication of *Origin* and that of its first full Hungarian translation by Dapsy, Darwinism had been discussed in Hungary and in a variety of forums. A number of factors and circumstances influenced the transfer of ideas and the translation in terms of language as well. One of the most fundamental factors is the role of the translator, as they are the creators of a new text through their decision to what extent to adhere to an old text – Dapsy, in the role of the translator of the *Origin* transplants an existing text and existing ideas into a new context, but he has options and choices in doing so which may fundamentally impact both narratives: both in the source and the target texts. What is important for Dapsy as a translator becomes indirectly important to the new readers, and the consequences of his personal preferences and agendas, do affect the text. Moreover, as a natural progression of events, it is unpredictable how much the reader, and then, in a sense, the public realm would be affected, but in order to be able to estimate this aspect of the reception process, the examination of the translation is a crucial step to take.

Dapsy's Introduction to his translation gives invaluable insight into his agendas and self-awareness as a translator.[478] In less than eight pages, he covers a number of themes and questions regarding his approach to translation that he feels necessary to explain to the reader; in a wider sense, the Introduction is also his manifesto not only about his approach to translation, but also about the importance of Darwinism for a progressive trajectory of the Hungarian nation. As such, the text is a crucial source in itself, and before the chapter would turn to a deeper analysis of the translation, I find it important to summaries the points Dapsy touches upon. Not only can they provide a structural basis for various points of analysis, but they also offer a general overview of the approach that shaped the creation of the text and context of the Hungarian *Origin*.

In covering the points he finds most important as a translator, Dapsy starts off from making a universal claim about the importance of translation to gradually narrow down towards some particular issues with the practicalities of translation. His Introduction is made up by three distinct parts: the first on the role of translation in science, and by direct association in national development in comparison with the more developed nations (v-vi); the second on the significance of Darwin's ideas for science and society (vi-x); and the third on matters on language, where he does not only addresses questions of scientific terminology and vocabulary, but also puts his translation in the context of other, contemporary ones (x-xii). As a fourth segment, a short introduction by the "revisor" of the translation, Tivadar Margó, responsible for the "fidelity" of Dapsy's translation, concludes the preface to the Hungarian edition (xii-xiii).

[478] Dapsy, "Előszó 'A fajok eredete' magyar kiadásához" [Introduction to the Hungarian edition of *The Origin of Species*], v-xiii.

In the first part of his text (v-vi), Dapsy rationalizes his initiative of 4 November 1871, in which he suggested the establishment of a publishing company to the Natural Science Society. He claims that should anyone look only briefly at the situation in Europe, they should be easily convinced that it would be a useless waste of power and time to spend the nation's precious capital on (trying to) produce original works. As he argues, the majority of efforts to achieve such a thing would lead only to the nurturing of national hubris due the lack of real ability even in fields where foreign nations have long overtaken Hungary. Instead, the only reasonable route to take – in the present circumstances and for a long while to follow – is to translate the most illustrious fundamental works from abroad, and through this process to create a Hungarian literature available and affordable to speakers of Hungarian: "These are the ways and methods through which a young state can push its way up among those more progressed."[479] He concludes this section by reiterating and extending his idea of the necessity of the establishment of publishing companies to serve every discipline, like the one for the natural sciences that have been started with the very volume in the readers' hands.

The second, somewhat longer section addresses the importance of the subject of the book and his conviction that Darwin's present work is fundamental: "a significant intellectual weapon, a work of great importance."[480] His argument is broken into three subsections. First, he justifies the decision to publish *Origin* despite the worries of the Society – based on market research, they doubtfully allowed themselves to hope that they might be able to sell six hundred copies – and the difficulties of the translation of such a "peculiar" [*sajátságos*] work. His argument that *Origin* is such a fundamental work that it

[479] "Egy fiatal államnak csak ily utakon és módokon lehet a már előrehaladottabbak közé felvergődni." *FE* vi.
[480] "[j]elentékeny szellemi fegyver, egy nagy fontosságú mű." *FE vi*.

"became the second Bible of mankind"[481] is based on both quantitative and qualitative arguments. As far as numbers go, the claim that apart from – again – the Bible there had been no other book that attracted more attention is supported by the number of authors, studies and articles dealing with and reacting to Darwinism.[482] The conclusion Dapsy draws from the numbers is that Darwin's theories create deep interest in the thinking members of various social classes and that not only the natural scientist, the botanist and the zoologist, but also scholars of ethics, theology, philology, sociology and law are affected by them.

Second, he stresses that the laws of nature and organism (*természeti* and *szervezeti törvények*) laid down by Darwin apply to the whole of society and every one of its members: the law of development (*a fejlődés törvénye*) and the just laws of nature will even affect the grandchildren of the makers of constitutions as much as the grandchildren of the poor who are presently unaware of their virtues.[483] The research and identification of these laws is the objective of Darwin's work, who acknowledges himself that he could be wrong at some points; however, he makes it possible for certain theories to develop, even though they are not clearly identified, but instead are hidden under an aggregation of facts, making it difficult for the unpracticed eye to discover them.

[481] "az emberiségnek mintegy második bibliáj[a]", *FE* vii.

[482] Based on J. W. Spengler's *Die Darwinische Theorie. Verzeichniss* (1872), the numbers given by Dapsy include over 150 authors and almost 300 major works ("nagyobb önálló munkálat") in English (42/58), German (48/195), French (40/52), Italian (18/21), Dutch (8/9) and Scandinavian languages (3/3), and over 300 minor works ("kisebb értekezés") only in English and German (187 and 224 respectively). Despite the presumable German bias (versus English in particular) of Spengler's tally, Dapsy does make a point regarding the impact *Origin* made in other languages. *FE* vii.

[483] Dapsy's footnote after this point (*FE* viii.) lists Galton's *Hereditary Genius*. Galton's work, published 1869, was built on the caveat that "natural ability" could be inherited biologically, i.e. greatness had a genetic element. Dapsy's initial interest in translating *Descent* and some of the points he later makes in the Introduction also point to his interest in the application and extension of the ideas of *Origin* to humans and human society, but the connection he makes with Galton here is not express in his earlier or later work.

This is where the third thematic subsection is introduced, in which Dapsy contrasts his interest in interpreting Darwin's thought with the good practices of translation: tied down by "every European translation practice, and the initial agreements we have made," [484] he could not take the freedom to italicize the instances marking a major law in the text, for instance on pages 89, 117, 136 and 246, which would have made it much easier for the reader to use the book as a basis for further thought.[485] However, Dapsy hopes that "in spite of the otherwise dry and seemingly uninteresting detailing of facts, when the reader becomes accustomed to reading with patience and attention, they will also find themselves comfortable with the writer's logic."[486] While Dapsy's intent not to interfere with the original text does him credit, the reference to the contemporary good practices of translation is rather puzzling in light of the peculiarities of the German and the French editions of *Origin*, which both Dapsy and Margó, as we will have seen, were aware of. As a closing remark on this thematic subsection, Dapsy expresses his regret that his circumstances do not allow the fulfillment of an old wish, that is, to apply some Darwinian tenets spread through *Origin* to human society, as he is convinced that "should anyone do this, they would make a great service especially at us,

[484] "[A]z összes európai fordítói szokás, részint ennek alapján saját előleges elvi megállapodásaink által kötve lévén […]" *FE* ix.

[485] Page 89 is in Chapter III on the Struggle for Existence; it concludes the section on "The Geometrical Ratio of Increase" with the statement that every single organic being has to experience struggle at some point of its life, and turns to the "Nature of the Checks to Increase." Page 117, in Chapter IV on Natural Selection; or the Survival of the Fittest, contains a paragraph explaining the principle of the survival of the fittest by variation of a beneficial nature. Page 135, also in Chapter IV, ends the previous section by reconfirming the essential nature of the survival of the fittest and introduces extinction by natural selection. Page 246, in Chapter VI addressing the Difficulties of the Theory, provides final conclusions at the start of the section summary on "the Law of Unity of Type and of the Conditions of Existence embraced by the Theory of Natural Selection" and reinforcing the idea that natural selection is a very slow process. Unfortunately, even if would go against the convention of non-intervention on behalf of the translator that Dapsy is intent on following, Dapsy does not specify which statements of Darwin he would mark as fundamentally crucial.

[486] "[A] különben sokszor száraz és érdektelennek látszó tény-részletezés kissé türelmes és figyelmes olvasásához szokván, már az első fejezeteknél be fogja találni magát az olvasó szerző észjárásába." *FE* ix.

where according to the natural course of things so many and so dangerous social prejudices are preventing the free development of the human spirit, to the detriment of healthy, sensible progress and the prosperity of the state."[487]

In the third part of the Introduction (x-xii), Dapsy addresses some matters pertaining to the quality of translation and explains some of the difficulties they faced. Despite his best efforts to live up to the trust put into him by the supporters of the publishing project, he feels that he could not fully live up to the expectations, and hence he feels necessary to provide information regarding some peculiarities of the translation. What he needs to make clear above all is that "in the very complicated practical question regarding the institution of the reviewer [*revisor*] established for the purpose of achieving an as perfect as possible reliability of this translation, that is, of the Hungarian text, an agreement has been made to the effect that the translator is responsible for the language of the translation, and the revisor for its fidelity."[488] In the following he addresses a few outstanding questions of language, or rather language and style, as *nyelvezet* implies a sense of both.

"Most readers will probably notice the complicated and foreign character of the language."[489] Indeed, these are the two main issues that he addresses, arguing in the first point that the original, characteristic style of the work did not make it possible – even if he wished to do so – to employ a lighter style more in line with the *genius* of the

[487] "Meg vagyok róla győződve, hogy ha valaki tenné ezt, igen jó szolgálatot tenne vele épen nálunk, hol különben a dolgok természetes folyama szerint annyiféle és oly veszélyes társadalmi előítéletek akadályozzák az emberi szellem szabad fejlődését, az egészséges, józan haladás és állami felvirágzás ügyének nagy kárára." *FE* ix.

[488] Így mindenek előtt meg kell említenem, miszerint a jelen fordítás vagyis a magyar szöveg mennél tökéletesebb megbizhatóságának elérése végett létesített revisori intézményt illetőleg, e műre nézve abban történt e gyakorlatilag igen complicált kérdésben a megállapodás, hogy a fordító a fordítás nyelvezetéért, a revisor pedig annak hűségeért vállal felelősséget." *FE* ix.

[489] "Az előbbire nézve bizonnyal a legtöbb olvasó előtt fel fog tűnni a nyelvezetnek egyfelől nehézkessége, másrészt idenegszerűsége." *FE* x.

Hungarian language. As to the abundance of words of Greek and Latin origin in the original and as a consequence in the Hungarian text, he admits himself that he could have replaced them in most cases with "words of pure Hungarian origin" ["*tisztán magyar eredetű szavak*"], but he chose to use a combination of both types.

> "[O]n one hand, it will be to our great advantage if the termini of Greek and Latin origin accepted in the languages of the European learned nations will be domesticated in the Hungarian language as well; on the other, it benefits our theoretically narrow language to have two or three words of different origin and character to express the same thought. This is also, by the adaptation of foreign words, how the English language has extended to its present richness – and this is not to the damage of this nation, either."[490]

It is rather interesting how it is entirely missing from this argument that words of Latin origin were not merely familiar, but commonly used in Hungary well into the late-nineteenth century, especially in academia, and not limited to the study of law. Nonetheless, every (male) person with an average secondary education had a command of Latin (and German).

It is also at this point that Dapsy explains the division of roles and the nature of cooperation throughout the process of translation with Tivadar Margó, who was commissioned by the publication committee to assist Dapsy in the translation: his tasks and contribution included corrections regarding the fidelity of the translation ["*a fordítás hűségére vonatkozó helyreigazítás[ok]*"], advice in the choice of scientific terminology ["*a tudományos műszók megválasztása*"] and "practical implementation" ["*gyakorlati kivitel*"].

[490] "[E]gyfelől jövőben nagy könnyebbségünkre lesz, ha a magyar nyelvben is meghonosúlnak az európai mívelt népek nyelvében elfogadott görög és latin eredetű műkifejezések; másfelől úgyis szűk eszmekörű nyelvünknek előnyére válik, ha ugyanazon gondolat kifejezésére két vagy három, külön eredetűm s más-más hangzású szavaink is lesznek. Így, az idegen szavak felvétele által terjedt az angol nyelv is mai óriás bőségére, – s e nemzet semmiként nem vallja ennek kárát." *FE* x-xi.

At the end, Dapsy places his translation in the context of the European translation process of *Origin* by giving a brief history of contemporary translations he is aware of, although it is unclear what his source was and how many of the editions he had seen or had access to. He gives a brief history of the English editions and a sense of his awareness of at least some of the changes that the text had undergone since the first edition. He mentions by name the fourth French edition translated by "Colonel Moulinié" [1873] based on the fourth [1866] and fifth [1869] English editions, and the fourth and fifth [forthcoming] German editions by "Professor C. Carus" [sic]. He also mentions three American editions, the Italian, Dutch, three Russian, and the Swedish translations. As the Introduction is dated 30 July 1873, this demonstrates a quite up-to-date grasp on the state of affairs, and Dapsy's felt need to give such a timeline indicates a sense of belonging in a European current.

Dapsy's Introduction is followed by a shorter one by Tivadar Margó (xii-xiii). From reading Dapsy's Introduction only, this could appear a clean case of a methodical translator whose main agenda – apart from the elevation of Hungarian culture or the nation onto a higher level of societal progress – was seemingly to closely follow the original text and the ideas conveyed in it, there is one more layer that complicates the examination of Dapsy's role as a translator, which can, to an extent, provide an explanation for the delays plaguing the publication of *Origin* in Hungarian. From the start of the translation project, Dapsy was assigned a "*lektor*", that is, a reviewer. Tivadar Margó had been involved in the popularisation of Darwinism since the mid-1860s, but unlike Dapsy, he was a respected member of the scientific community. Professor of zoology and anatomy at the university and member of the Academy of Sciences at the time of the translation, we have seen earlier that Margó's scientific output included

scientific articles in both zoology and comparative anatomy, but also works intended for a more general audience. He is the only Hungarian scientist Darwin is known to have received in his home (in 1875),[491] which indicates at least a sense of collegial equality on Darwin's part, but Margó does not allude to his role in the translation of *Origin* in the story of his visit. Overall, it is impossible to say how deep his involvement in the translation project was, although his later work on zoological classification suggests an influence in the choice of scientific terminology used in the Hungarian text.[492] There is also a seeming lack of documented consultation or debate between Dapsy and Margó, which is perhaps also due to the lack of interest in Darwin's part in the Hungarian translation, unlike the relationship between Bronn and Darwin that had started with Bronn's review of *Origin* in 1859 and lasted until 1862, in an frequent exchange of communication and miscommunication.[493]

Margó's short preface is compact and somewhat vague at the same time: it stresses the important and complex nature of the translation work, but he does not go into specifics as to what his role exactly entailed. He begins with the acknowledgement that the theories and views presented in Darwin's book has been known to the learned public from a few studies and shorter articles in Hungarian, some of which were his own contributions; being aware of its importance, he is happy to assist in the "control" ["*ellenőrzés*"] of the translation despite his busy professorial schedule. "Those who know

[491] Margó gives a brief account of his visit, during which Darwin showed him his laboratory and graciously accepted Margó's present of a work of his. See Géza Entz, *Emlékbeszéd Margó Tivadar t. tagról*, (Budapest, 1898).
[492] E.g. *Az állatország rendszeres osztályozása a főbb csoportok rövid jellegzéseivel. Az összehasonlító boncztan és fejlődéstan alapján* [The systematic classification of the animal country, with the characterisation of the main groups. Based on comparative anatomy and the theory of evolution], (Budapest, 1883); *Az állatország rendszeres osztályozása különös tekintettel az ujabb állattani rendszerekre* [The systematic classification of the animal country, with special attention to newer systems of zoology], (Budapest, 1884).
[493] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 13.

the precise and at the same time extensive, often quite circuitous style and original direction," he writes, can imagine all the difficulties faced by the translators and the reviewer.[494] To make sure that this edition was as successful in terms of style and content as much as other translations, such as the French and the German, he and the translator had to meticulously compare the translation with the original on all points, recovering the lacks and correcting the erroneous and unclear parts. Despite the possible small mistakes, he concludes, as they happen in any work, he hopes that the dexterity of the translator and his own painstaking meticulousness has by and large fulfilled their target, and he is rewarded by the knowledge that he made a contribution to the advancement of Hungarian science and learning through the dissemination of Darwin's great ideas.[495]

Both statements reflect that while Margó did provide "assistance" (Dapsy) by "controlling", and they worked together so that the final text would be faithful to the original in style and content, the final result is Dapsy's work that Margó contributed to with an unspecified quantity and quality of help. His contribution, which seems to have extended to scientific terminology (that Margó was by profession more of an expert at), but also to style and fidelity of the Hungarian text to the original, was important for the final shape in which the new book presented the original ideas in Darwin's original work. Thus, while Margó's role should not be forgotten or underestimated, in the following Dapsy will be considered as the (primary) translator, and the choices made in the text, be it terminology, vocabulary, language or style, will be interpreted as his. Moreover, it is

[494] "Ki az angol természettudósok, kivált Darwin szabatos és egyszersmind terjedelmes, gyakran igen körülményes előadási módját s eredeti irályát ismeri, könnyen elképzelheti magának mindazon nehézségeket, melyekkel a feladat megoldásánál mind a fordítónak, mind az ellenőrzőnek megküzdeni kellett." *FE* xii-xiii.

[495] "[R]ám nézve bő jutalmul szolgál az a tudat, hogy szerencsés valék közreműködésem által hazai tudományunk és művelődésünk előmozdításához, s Darwin e jeles munkájában foglalt irányadó új eszmék terjesztéséhez csekély erővel hozzájárulni." *FE* xiii.

impossible to measure or estimate the extent of Margó's contribution; since it was Dapsy whose name is given on the title page as a translator and who wrote a long text about his perceived role as a translator, the responsibility for the final product ultimately fell on him.

In fact, he was called out on this responsibility, as his statements about translation did not go without attracting criticism at the time: not because of the choices he made in the use of scientific terminology and vocabulary, but because of his wider agenda of translation as a more viable alternative than original production in the creation of a national scientific culture on par with that of the more developed nations. How contested this idea was becomes clear from the fact that following a strongly worded review in one of the German-language (!) dailies soon after the publication of the first volume of *Fajok eredete* in 1873, Kálmán Szily, the President of *Természettudományi Társulat*, felt it necessarly to distance the Society from Dapsy's opinions and made this clear by publishing his reaction in *Természettudományi Közlöny*. After making it clear that only Dapsy is responsible for his statements, the communique first quotes the offending paragraph in which Dapsy claimed that it is a waste of time to try to produce original scientific output and Hungary should rather translate others' work than create its own. Szily personally assured the readers that Dapsy's statements did not reflect the views of the Society or the book publishing committee, and such views and opinions had never ever come up in discussion at the meeting of the Society.[496] It was also stressed that Dapsy stated his own private opinions in his Introduction to *Origin*, and as such he is the

[496] Given that Dapsy published his next translation (of J. S. Mill) somewhere else and judging from the transactions of the Society in the second part of the 1870s, the review might have caused a severing of the relationship.

only one responsible.[497] Following the statement, *Természettudományi Közlöny* published a lengthy quotation from Dux's review, with the comment that they found his opinions interesting – repeating again that they do not accept responsibility for the translators' [sic] statements in the introductions to the translations they publish.[498]

The incriminating review was published in the evening edition of the *Ungarischer Lloyd* on 20 September 1873. Adolf Dux, a journalist with an interest in Darwinism,[499] voiced strong criticism of some of Dapsy's statements on the role of translation in national progress. Although Dux acknowledged the importance of translation, which he presented as a rather common practice in developed societies like England, France or Germany as another method to improve themselves in addition to creating their own, original, monumental works. However, he added that if a nation did not produce original works, then it was wasting its time: and it is better to start small than not start at all. He found it especially ironic that a preface to Darwin's work, which is of the highest literary value, dared to claim that people should not exercise their minds by writing original material. In the rapid progress of the scientific revolution, a nation that tries to keep up in the scientific race of nations only with translation will soon have to cede defeat. He welcomed and applauded the establishment of the publishing company and the work of the Society to make the translations of great works available to the public, but he urged the readers not to settle for translation alone. From the publicity the Society gave him on

[497] Kálmán Szily, "Darwin magyar kiadásának előszavához" [To the Introduction of Darwin's Hungarian edition], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5 (1873): 412-3.
[498] "[*A] fordítások előszavában az illetők által mondottakért sem a társulat választmánya, sem könyvkiadó bizottsága kezességet nem vállalt magára.*" (Italicised in the original, Szily, "Darwin magyar kiadásának előszavához," 412.)
[499] He became a full member of the Kisfaludy-társaság, a prestigious literary society with his study on Darwinism and aesthetics in 1871, and he contacted Ernst Haeckel about the discussions on Darwin and Haeckel in the "Kisfaludy Geschellschaft" in the following year. Adolf Dux to Ernst Haeckel, Pest 27 October 1872, EHH.

the pages of its own Gazette, it seems that at least some agreed, although this does not diminish the long-term results of Dapsy's original initiative.

The Text and its "Cross-Cultural" Contexts

Dapsy's translation was based on the sixth edition of *Origin*, published in early 1872;[500] thus, Dapsy's Hungarian text, like his earlier translated last chapter of *Descent*, used a very recently published source text. The sixth edition is often considered "the definitive edition." It was extensively revised, it contained a new Chapter VII to argue against the views of Roman Catholic biologist St George Mivart and it was aimed at a wider public (also by being a cheaper edition to encourage sales). This edition was the first one to use the title of *The origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life* instead of *On the Origin*, etc. The edition is also significant because it is where the word "evolution" appears for the first time in the text of *Origin* within Darwin's body of work (although it was already used in the first edition of *Descent* a few months earlier).[501]

Dapsy could rely not only on the text of *Origin* that served as the direct source of his translation, but possibly also on other foreign translations, of which Bronn's German version was available and certainly perused by a number of Hungarian readers since its publication in 1860. Dapsy and Margó had certainly encountered the German version of *Origin*, and of the two at least Dapsy must have consulted it prior to and in the process of

[500] *The Origin of Species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*, Sixth edition, with additions and corrections, (London, John Murray, 1872).
[501] Spencer's term "the survival of the fittest" is used for the first time in the fifth edition.

translating *Origin* as a precedent and likely as not only a basis of comparison, but also as a helpful tool.[502]

Before turning to a closer reading of Dapsy's text, there are two aspects to consider. The first is the influence of German culture not only on the development of Hungarian scientific language, but also in a wider context of the public sphere. Apart from already available translations of other languages, and the influence of these on the emerging scientific terminology and evolutionary vocabulary, reviews, published reactions and references to Darwinism in the scholarly and popular press employed a range of terms for the ideas and concepts proposed by Darwin in *Origin*, which in turn also often relied on the intermediary power of the German language. Thus, Dapsy's contribution, instead of creating the Hungarian language of Darwinism, rather served to select and affirm a future standard. However, even then it should be acknowledged that these choices were heavily dependent on his personal agendas, and were not necessarily permanent, or even long term contributions to the Hungarian language of science that was in the process of being created and standardized in the second half of the nineteenth century.

While the differences between the German texts translated by Bronn (1860 and a second edition in 1862-63) and the 1867 version by Bronn and Carus are significant in themselves, in terms of the potential influence of the German text on Dapsy and his translation these are rather small details compared to the larger interpretative issues present in the philological and general linguistic values of the text. Although Dapsy's

[502] Dapsy did make a reference to having consulted German translations of such, more complicated, works such as John Stuart Mill and Darwin, when he approached the Academy to support his project of translating Alpheus Todd's *On Parliamentary Government in England*. László Dapsy to the Vice-President of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, 21 February 1875, MTA RAL 1211/1875.

translation, for all accounts and purposes, is based on the sixth British edition of *Origin*, another – perhaps more intermediary – level of comparison to the German versions of the 1860s comes naturally for Hungarians.[503] This conjunctural reconstruction leads to the more general reasons for the role of the German editions in the process of Dapsy's work, on one hand the importance of the German cultural influence in nineteenth century Hungary, a consequence of which was the impact of German on the Hungarian language which, despite the various cultural and political agendas of a number of agents and parties of diverging interests, was in the process of gaining a character of its own after centuries of heavy influence of Latin and an increasing interference of German from the late eighteenth century.

The second aspect, another more general concern highlighted by the case of Bronn (and possibly Carus) is that of the role of the translator. The differences between Dapsy and Bronn – in scientific or social background, their place in academic hierarchy, or the significance of their national scientific community on the European or global map – are clearly mirrored in their translations. Bronn was a natural scientist trained and active in the rich traditions of German *Naturgeschichte*. As a geologist and paleontologist he had developed his own theories concerning nature and selection, which specifically affected his translation of *Origin* on both textual and conceptual levels, either as "Veränderungen und Reinigungen," or as what could be construed as deliberate "mistranslations." The case of Bronn illustrates the possibilities open for a translator to reflect not only upon his social and cultural field, but even to purposefully interfere with the source material by

[503] Dapsy claimed to have consulted an unspecified German translation. Be it Bronn's or Carus's, it could have had an effect on Dapsy, especially if we consider that despite his familiarity with the English language, due to his social class and the education he received, his German must have been much better, thus he could have used the German text for clarification.

influencing the readers' understanding of Darwin. What is also important is that Bronn was an equal, and in many senses a rival and critic of Darwin, who in turn was very much aware of this, and became very much involved in the German translations of his work. Dapsy, who was somewhat of a freelance intellectual with an interest in the social sciences positioned closer to the margins of the academic community, had no bone to pick with Darwin about the scientific theories expressed in *Origin*, neither did he have an ambition as a translator to enter the text to a level where it would express his own, potentially diverging, views on the original narrative. His translation thus remains quite "faithful" to the source text, with very minimal additional comments of his own, although it does show traces of influence that Dapsy's reading of the German translation might have effected.

Beyond creating a new text from the source material, be it "faithful" or not, the task of the translator is also to address and attract an audience. In the case of Dapsy, and in fact this is characteristic of translated texts, part of the audience was new to Darwin's ideas, and a smaller part was aware them and had read (of) them in other languages and/or in the Hungarian press. However, Dapsy and Margó are also part of Darwin's audience, just as all the other translators of *Origin* were, although it is questionable to what extent they were the kind of audience Darwin envisioned and wrote to. Already in the beginning of his Introduction to *Origin*, Darwin establishes his position as a naturalist with field experience,[504] and in the course of his narrative, it quickly becomes clear that he is a very consciously British one. He is a British gentleman-naturalist, whose interests and language, together with the examples he uses, speak to people with similar interests: British country gentlemen who have an interest in the natural sciences, collect specimens

[504] "When on board H.M.S. 'Beagle,' as naturalist […]", *OS* 1872, p. 1.

and attend lectures at scientific societies. The examples he uses, "a comparatively unsystematic assortment of crop plants, sheep, hunting dogs, and fancy pigeons […] were calculated to be familiar to British gentlemen, who might have bred some of them as a hobby or for use on their country estates, and they were crucial in the first chapter of *Origin* for introducing basic concepts of variation, heredity and artificial selection."[505] The age in which Darwin developed his theory of natural selection, and even the twenty years that passed between the voyage of the Beagle and the first edition of *Origin* marked the professionalization of science in Britain, and while he found an audience in professionalized academia as well, the original, intended readers for his books were mostly men like himself.

Hungary of the 1860s had no comparable tradition of country gentlemen-naturalists,[506] neither did it contain many gentlemen of a comfortably British lifestyle interested in breeding pigeons or observing the habits of orchids, as Darwin and his social class were wont to do. There was a network similar to that of the British gentlemen scientists in Hungary, with some naturalists in the countryside even in correspondence with scholars abroad and hence aware of many recent developments in science,[507] and their contribution to Hungarian botany and zoology was not insignificant. Their numbers had been also boosted by the withdrawal of many into passive resistance from public service or Budapest to the countryside after 1849, and some of these devoted themselves

[505] Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 87.

[506] Natural history manifested in collecting did exist, although as Ladányiné observes in relation to botany, it was an "accessory of the private life of a small number of intellectuals," 31.

[507] Such a figure was József Dorner, originally an apothecary, who later worked as a teacher in the small provincial town of Szarvas, and was not only aware of the work of Darwin and Asa Gray from the early 1850s, but corresponded with various German scientists about his own research on the development of cells. Including Darwin's work prior to 1859, interestingly based on information from German contacts and sources. In the 1860s and 1870s, due to the development of urban centers in the countryside, more and more naturalists and natural philosophers, including Ferenc Mentovich in Marosvásárhely, Lajos Felméri in Kolozsvár, corresponded with each other, with colleagues in the capital and with some abroad. See also Ladányiné, *A magyar filozófia és darwinizmus,* 57-64.

to intellectual pursuits, such as in the case of the translator of *Vestiges*. However, they were not the audience Darwin wrote for (and to which group he belonged himself), and neither were Dapsy and Margó, who were members of the professionalised urban middle class and academia, respectively. Thus, they were not Darwin's intended ideal audience, which in turn influences the role of the translator who transplants the original ideas in the original text to his language, not only in a linguistic, but also socio-cultural sense. This might have even influenced some of Dapsy's choices in translating certain terms and concepts that had no equivalent in Hungarian, including even his choices to identify or define through the translation of certain terms and the concepts embedded in them the members of the scientific profession, including himself.

The New Text and the Hungarian Language of Evolution

Aside from challenges imposed by the relocation of the narrative into a new linguistic, social and cultural context, there was one more factor that influenced the end result as much as the translator and the new audience did. A defining consequence of the time that had passed between 1859 and 1872, when Dapsy began his translation of *Origin*, was the choice of which edition of the source text to use. The choice of the new, 1872 edition as the basis of translation not only indicates that Dapsy – and other members of the intellectual elite or the middle class – had access to a book so recently published in Britain, but more importantly, makes the first Hungarian edition a "definitive edition" in more than one sense.

The title of the book is naturally a defining characteristic of the reception of the work, and it had a history well before Dapsy's choice of phrasing: "*A fajok eredete*",

which has remained the accepted Hungarian title, the continuity of which has been maintained in the several translations that followed Dapsy's to this day. There is an interesting case of development both in the terminology of evolution used merely in the title of the book, or perhaps an uncertainty in the possible profound consequences of defining a concept through its name, but it can be safely said that the options presented to the reading public did in a sense reflect the agendas and backgrounds of their creators. Ferenc Jánosi, whose 1860 review in *Budapesti Szemle*, entitled "*Új természetrajzi elmélet. A nemek eredete*" [A new theory of natural history. The origin of genera], was the first known mention of *Origin* in the Hungarian press, based his review on August Laugel's review in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, "Nouvelle théorie d'histoire naturelle: l'origine des espèces". The French transmitter, however, does not provide an adequate explanation for Jánosi's misuse of basic terms of biological classification: he consistently uses the term *nem* [genus] instead of *faj* [species], also in conjunction with *eredet* [origin] both in the title and in the text itself.[508] His use of taxonomy becomes even more complex – even if we allow that genus and species as wide groups were rather more loosely interpreted in the 19th century than today – when in some places he does not make a clear distinction between *faj* and *fajta* [breed] either, which might cause inaccurate understanding when it comes to the discussion of Darwin's arguments on cross-breeding illustrated with the various breeds [*fajta*] of dogs.[509] This, however, might be attributed to

[508] Sándor Soós, in his study of the scientific reception of Darwinism in Hungary, also translates Jánosi's *nemek* as genera. See Soós, "The Scientific Reception of Darwin's Work," 431. For other uses of genera instead of species in the text, see, for instance, "az emberi nem eredetéről" [on the origin of the human genus] or "ugyanazon forrásból a legkülönbözőbb nemek eredhetnek" [the most differing genera can originate in the same source], both in Jánosi, "Új természetrajzi elmélet," 395.

[509] "[A]z állatok nemei fajtákra ágaznak" [the genera of the animals branch into breeds], Jánosi, 385; "a fajták (rásza, varietas)" [the breeds (race, varietas)], Jánosi, 386.

the uncertain boundaries of classification, which were perhaps set, or in any case approached, in a more flexible manner in the nineteenth century.

The question of the title, the role it played in familiarizing audiences with the book and the theory, and more importantly, coining one of the most important phrases related to Darwinism in Hungarian (together with the Hungarian versions of "natural selection", or in fact the usage questions of Hungarian versus Latin that can be illustrated by the term "evolution"), played out in a more varied way in the translation and use of "origin" rather than that of "species", as Jánosi seems to be rather an exception than a trendsetter in mistranslation. Interestingly, his use of "*eredet*" for "origin" came to be the version that has been in use up to the present day, despite a few other versions introduced in the 1860s, the most influential of which being Jácint Rónay's "*Fajkeletkezés*", which received some exposure in the press and at the Academy. Rónay's choice of translation to "*keletkezés*" [formation] conveys a stronger sense of the process of developing, not unlike Bronn's choice of "Entstehung" (*Die Entstehung der Arten*), which places more emphasis on "arising out of preexisting components" rather than Carus's later suggestion, "Ursprung", which not only implies something bursting forth, but even "suggests an origin *de novo*."[510] Nonetheless, the "deficiencies" attributed to the Bronn translation,[511]

[510] See Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 143. The similar distinction between the contextual difference of *keletkezés* vs. *eredet* offers an interesting contrast to the German case, where under the influence of Darwin, who wanted to maintain continuity between the subsequent editions, asked Carus to keep *Entstehung* in the title, although Gliboff suggests that seeing how Darwin "did not want to explain ultimate origins" anyway, *Entstehung* might have suited his purposes better.

[511] See, e.g. Kánitz, "A növény-species fejlődédének történetéről,", *munkálatai*, where no only does Kánitz explain the importance of the term "*faj (Species)*" in the first paragraph (p. 298), but in the footnote attached, he refers to the 1863 German translation of the 1862 British edition of *Origin* (the third edition came out in 1861, while the fourth in 1866), taking care to mention that he gave the English title as well because the German translation is "not exactly faithful and could possibly be translated to our language in a more practical way" ("Az angol czímet azért írtam ide, mert német fordítása nem egészen hű, és talán honi nyelvünkön czélszerűbben fordíthatjuk."), pp. 298-99. Gliboff argues that despite the acknowledged "interpretative and linguistic problems," the bad reputation of the Bronn translation is largely undeserved. (*The Origins of German Darwinism,* 123)

apart from the eventual circulation numbers and press mentions of Dapsy's final, definitive version of the title, might have had a determining role in the eventually enduring mainstream usage of *A fajok eredete*, even though Dapsy was not the first to use the phrase, which had already been – to some extent – used through the 1860s.[512]

In fact, the title of any book has an often inordinately determining role in the reception of a whole book, even, or one could say especially, in the case of *Origin*, where most of the "popular", "non-academic", or "non-scientist" audience might not be able to recite the full title of the book beyond *The Origin of Species*, or *A fajok eredete* in Hungary. This is especially ironic given how the title – the full title: *The Origin of Species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life* / *A fajok eredete a természeti kiválás útján, vagyis az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása a létérti küzdelemben* – contains so much of the fundamental vocabulary of Darwinism and evolutionary thought, and how some of the choices of translation in the title itself have influenced the way people, not only readers, talk and think about it.

The question of the varied, and eventually accepted usage of the title phrase also draws attention to the value of translation when it comes to the creation and variation of scientific terminology, which has a distinct, but rather limited value, the wider issue of vocabulary, in terms of its role as a narrative element. Darwin's text, and the sixth edition in particular, presents the translator and the reader with some key phrasal terms, and through the examination of their internal consistency, or the lack of it, in the translation, it is possible investigate whether or how much Dapsy's own personal preferences and agendas as translator influence the text. Since fidelity is an aspect that Dapsy, in the role

[512] Although Dapsy's contibution to the spread of this element of vocabulary cannot be underestimated in light of his use of it in his articles in encyclopedic and scientific journals years before the publication of his translation.

of translator, is very conscious and programmatic about, the comparison of the translation and use of a few selected terms illustrates how the Hungarian text connects to the narrative, and how the original source text and the translation interact.

A comparison and analysis of Dapsy's choice of vocabulary and composition style also provides answers to questions of what is important for Dapsy as a translator, and what the consequences of his choices as a translator are. As he states in the Introduction, some choices forced him to work against his own personal preferences to achieve textual fidelity and still benefit the development of the Hungarian scientific language. Some of the answers are rather narrow in a sense, but they do lead into more general concerns about how the translator's agendas – and self-prescribed or externally enforced limitations – affect the text, and, as a natural progress of events, the reader, and then, in a sense, the public sphere. Some of these questions are also explicitly addressed by Dapsy in his Introduction to his translation.[513]

Such a question about the conflict of personal preference and perceived responsibility as translator comes up when he decides to use sets of Greek-Latin and Hungarian vocabulary for scientific termini. The conscious variation and parallel usage of Graeco-Latin terms and their Hungarian equivalent is characteristic of Dapsy's entire text. Dapsy's approach to translation was later confirmed through other translation projects. In his Introduction to his translation of John Stuart Mill's *Elements of National Economy*, where he only states that the principles he applied during the process of translation were the same as the ones he followed when he translated *Origin*.[514] In a letter to the Academy, in which he addressed some questions raised during his translation of *On Parliamentary*

[513] Dapsy, "Introduction," *FE* v-xii.
[514] John Stuart Mill, *A nemzetgazdaságtan alapelvei, s ezek némelyikének a társadalom-bölcsészetre való alkalmazása*, (Budapest, Légrády testvérek, 1874), vii.

Government in England by Alpheus Todd (originally published in 1867) based on his experiences while translating *Origin*.[515]

> "[I]n the present case I would like to adhere to the same principles that I elaborated upon in my translator's preface to Darwin's work [i.e. *Origin*]; on one hand, these relate to keeping the original terminology of Greek and Latin origin, and on the other hand to following, as much as possible, the original writing style of the author when it comes to theoretically crucial statements. Although this method might cause the language of the translated text to become cumbersome [*nehézkes*], but long practice and especially the experience and comparison (e.g. with German translations) gained during the translation of more difficult works – such as the works of Darwin and Stuart Mill that I have translated – have convinced me that, especially in those cases where the style of the original author is already cumbersome because of the condensing of thoughts, more important interests can fall victim to the attempt of making the language of the translation more pleasant."[516]

Essentially, he reaffirms the two principles already set down in the Introduction to *Origin*: a varied choice of vocabulary of various linguistic origin, and creating a text whose structure and content mirror that of the original as closely as possible. Essentially, his domestication of Darwin is self-conscious and deliberate: he does not express an opinion, neither by modification nor by addition. Even if he had liked not to, he adhered to the unspecified code of translators' conduct alluded to in the Introduction.

The principle of vocabulary of mixed origin could well be illustrated by several words; however, an especially fitting one to be used as an example here is "evolution": it is not only immediately associated with Darwinism and *Origin*, but was also used for the

[515] Todd, *On Parliamentary Government in England*.

[516] "[Mint e mutatványban látható, é]n a jelen esetben is ugyanazon elveket kívánnám érvényesíteni, melyeket a Darwin műve elé bocsátott fordítói előszóban kifejtettem; s melyek egyfelől az új magyar műszavak alkotása helyett az eredeti latin és görögös eredetű műkifejezések megtartása, másfelől pedig az elvi fontosságú tételeknél a lehetőségig a szerző irmodorának a követésére vonatkoznak. Habár talán ez eljárás némileg a fordítmány nyelvezetének nehézkességét vonja is maga után, de hosszas gyakorlat, és épen az oly nehezebb művek fordítása alkalmával – minők Darwin és Mill Stuart általam fordított művei voltak, -- szerzett tapasztalat és összehasonlítgatás (t.i. a német fordításokkal) affelől győztek meg, hogy kivált azon esetben, hol már az eredeti írónak stylja is nehézkes a gondolatok összetömörítése miatt: könnyen fontosabb érdekek ennek áldozatúl a fordítás nyelvezetének kellemesebbé tételére törekvés közben." MTA RAL 1211/1875.

first time in the sixth edition that Dapsy's translation was based on.[517] While Dapsy consistently calls evolutionists "evolutionista" in the Hungarian text,[518] his translation of the concept is more varied than that of the persons involved in accepting and spreading it. While in certain cases he just uses the Latin term, "evolutio"[519], he also uses terms that would explain the phenomenon with a Hungarian word. In some cases, he simply substitutes "evolution" with a Hungarian term, for instance, when "[e]very one who believes in slow and gradual evolution" (201) becomes "[m]indaz a ki a lassú és fokozatos fejlődést hiszi" (299), and "a strong disbeliever in evolution" (215) is, in Hungarian, "igen erős ellensége *a fejlődés elméletének*" (Vol. II. 17, emphasis mine: "the theory of evolution/development). In other instances, he expands the Hungarian translation of the term into an explanation of the concept: "[j]elenleg csaknem minden természettudós elösmeri valamely alakban *az evolutio vagyis előhaladás elvét*" (298, emphasis mine), where the original wording, "[a]t the present day almost all naturalists admit evolution under some form" changes into "evolution, that is, the theory of progress."[520] As a final coup, "evolution through natural selection" (282), perhaps the most important phrase in the entire book, ends up as a somewhat unlikely victim of both principles: for some reason unwilling to use the Latin terms, but still insistent to give a close translation of the principle, the Hungarian version is close to incomprehensible in its complexity: "természeti kiválás útján lassú átalakulás által történõ leszármaztatás"[521]

[517] Even though the word "evolution" had appeared in the first edition of *Descent of Man* published a few months earlier in 1871.
[518] E.g. *FE* I. 282 or 298.
[519] *FE* I. 298; II. 325.
[520] Greguss, in his article on Huxley's *Man's Place of Nature,* also uses "haladás", or "a haladás elmélete", thus substituting evolution with progress, see "A haladás elmélete," 275-77.
[521] "*Leszármaztatás*", used here instead of "*leszármazás*" (the usual Hungarian word for "Darwinian" "descent") is more active in the sense that it implies more agency in initiating or starting descent as a process.

(Vol. II. 118; descent happening through slow transformation by way of natural selection).

Natural selection, another definitive term of Darwinism as presented in *Origin*, as seen above and also – crucially – in the title, is consistently used as "*természeti kiválás*" in Dapsy's text, although "*selectio*" does appear instead of selection in some instances, and in some cases Dapsy even makes a finer differentiation between the theory of selection versus the process of selection, such as in Chapter I: "Man's power of selection" (5) – *"Az ember kiválasztási képesség[ér]e"* (I. 21). There is a wider historical spectrum regarding the use and development of the Hungarian term, some variations for which we have seen earlier, for instance *természetes kiválasztás* (natural selection, Jánosi 386-37, 391) or *természetes választás* (natural choice, Rónay 1864, Ch. III and V), and which is currently accepted as "természetes kiválasztódás,"[522] which carries more of an implication of a result of a process rather than the activity of the process itself.

The consistency of the usage of "*kiválás*" for selection applies to the text also in a wider sense. Apart from natural selection, which is one of the most influential concepts introduced by the book, Darwin also presents two other versions for the process of selection: sexual and artificial. Sexual selection, which is addressed at a number of times throughout the text, is consistently translated in its Hungarian mirror version, "*ivari kiválás*" (e.g. I. 25), while the term artificial selection becomes "*mesterséges kiválogatás*" (I. 85). In fact, while "*kiválás*" and "*kiválogatás*" share the same root and essentially follow Darwin's system in which the three are different "versions of the same process,"

[522] Used in Hungarian translation of György Kampis in the 2000 edition.

"*kiválogatás*" implies a more conscious act of selecting the more desired – or simply, the better – from a pool of candidates.[523]

More or less the same principles of double (Latin and Hungarian) apply to other important biological terms as in the case of selection. Domestication, for instance, is among the more straightforward cases: "*domesticatio*" (e.g. I. 21) and "*háziasítás*"; in its adjective form especially, domestic is easily and naturally used as "*házi*" (e.g. domestic varieties/pigeons/productions (5) – "*házi válfajok/galambok/állataink*" (21). At first sight, the same principle seems to apply to variation ("*variatio*" and "*(át)változás*"); however, it soon becomes apparent that "*variatio*" is much less present throughout the text than "*(át)változás*" (e.g. "*átváltozás*": 61, "*változás*": 176, 252), and in some cases "*változat*", which, in turn, is sometimes the counterpart of variety (e.g. *OS* 125 vs. *FE* 192).[524] Thus, variation, which in Darwin's English texts stands for both the process and the result of change, comes to be denoted in various terms in Hungarian, occasionally further complicated by the overlap with variability, which, albeit generally translated as "*változékonyság*," can also mean "*változat*."

As we have seen so far, the Hungarian translation had to tackle various disparities and lack of existing, widely accepted and used scientific vocabulary, whereas there are also instances when the conceptual richness of one English term cannot be mirrored with a similar, corresponding one in Hungarian. This was, of course, an issue all the translators had to face; however, while in the case of another translator, such as the opinionated

[523] Again, though it is impossible to judge whether Dapsy's decisions were affected by his reading of the German translation (and exactly which of those), this is an interesting callback to the conflicting choices of Bronn and Carus to use *Züchtung* and *Zuchtwahl* respectively. Bronn's preferred usage was *Züchtung, natürliche Züchtung, Auswahl zur Züchtung*, especially because he felt that the presence of *–wahl* implied too much of a choice (and that of a *Wähler* with the agency to choose. Despite his fundamental concerns and ultimate rejection of the neologism *Zuchtwahl*, it became the enduring and still commonly used term after Carus decided to switch to it in later editions. See Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 137-8.
[524] Rónay, in *Fajkeletkezés* (1864), uses "*változat*" for "variability" as well; see Chapter 2.

scientist Bronn, this would lead the reader to the conclusion that the translator expressed a disagreement with Darwin by inserting his own version that does not necessarily correspond with the English term, in the case of Dapsy, who seems to have followed the policy of "when in doubt, find the term with the closest possible meaning," there is a sense of uncertainty, even after consulting the German medium. Such a case is, to return to the title of the book, the translation of the phrase "preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life," which, in Hungarian, comes as "*az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása."* Again, Dapsy seems to have chosen a less process oriented term as the original for "preservation", where "*fennmaradás"* is a result, or state of affairs, rather than the process that preservation implies, but since it suggests little agency, it fits within the context of his choice of "*eredet*" for "origin".

A more unusual choice is "*előnyös*" for "favoured": while the word root is the same, "*előnyös*" is rather corresponding to "favourable". Interestingly, perhaps the most verbatim Hungarian translation for "favoured" could be "*kiváltságos*", or perhaps "*kiválasztott*", which both share the same root with "*választ-*": select. Consulting the German title for a possible reason or influence is not necessarily helpful, although Bronn's choice of "*Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen,*" that is, "preservation of the perfected races," later to be changed to "*begünstigten*" (favoured) by Carus, does lead to another potential conceptual influence of the German texts on Dapsy. "*Vervollkommnung*", used by Bronn both for perfection and improvement (though not in all cases),[525] might have influenced Dapsy's many choices to translate "improved" not as "*javult*" (I. 55) or "*nemesbítés/nemesült*" (I. 51 and 58), but as "*tökéletes*" (perfect, I. 19), "*tökélyesbül*" (I. 53), "*tökéletes-ít/eni/ebbé/edik*" (perfects/to perfect/more

[525] See Gliboff, *The Origins of German Darwinism,* 138-139.

perfect/perfected, I. 55, 57-8, 106 and 128). On the other hand, Dapsy also translates "converted and perfected into two distinct species" (136) as "*két külön fajjá csoportosul és fejlődik*" (groups and develops into, 208); this, just like the "*megváltozni és tökéletesedni*" (changed and perfected) used for "modified and perfected"; or "*fejlődés és átalakulás*" (development and transformation, *FE* I. 6) for "development and modification" (*OS* xvi) shows not only the impossibility to find a perfectly consistent single match for each word and the concepts behind it in two different languages, but also the occasional overlap and possible confusion of some of the basic concepts of *Origin*: variation/change/modification or improvement/perfection/development.

The last phrase of the title, and one of the most enduring one in the intellectual history of science and its influence on political thought, is the phrase "struggle for life" or "struggle for existence". Translated by Rónay as a milder and more literal "*Életutáni törekvés*" ("striving for life" Ch. III, IV) in the early 1860s, it becomes a tougher "*létérti küzdelem*" (e.g. in the title) or "*létérti harc*" (Chapter III, e.g. 82) in Dapsy's version. He could have possibly been influenced by the German *Kampf um's Daseyn*, not only in the reference to warfare, but in the use of "*lét*", which combines the sense of existence and being. However, even if the German concept influenced the specific use of the Hungarian term in this case, the implication of the German influence in this case is a much more general one that encompasses both the development of the Hungarian science in the nineteenth century, which, despite claims and intentions to the contrary, often relied heavily on the awareness of the conceptual richness of the German language.[526]

It has been established earlier that Dapsy, who through his translation and his efforts to have it published did make an impact on scientific language and the community,

[526] See, for instance, Frank, "Acts of Creation."

was not a member of the academic establishment to the extent that Margó was: university professor and member of the Academy. It is thus interesting to look at the usage of terms used to designate the members of the scientific community in the text itself, especially as keeping in mind the differing processes of the professionalization of the sciences in Britain and Hungary, they can be telling not only of the translator's (translators') sense of self and self-identification in academic hierarchy and even social structure, but also how they imagine and define these communities and their members.

A product of the British naturalist tradition,[527] writing for a familiar audience of colleagues, and not primarily to the professional scientific elite of academic institutions, Darwin exclusively refers to himself and his colleagues when he writes about the work of "the naturalist" in *Origin*; in fact, the word "scientist" is entirely missing from the text. The distinction between an existing, even if murkier divide between the more non-professional was also present in Hungary, and it is reflected by the difference of the terms used in the three most defining Hungarian texts on/of *Origin*: Ferenc Jánosi's 1860 review in *Budapesti Szemle*, Rónay's *Fajkeletkezés* and in Dapsy's translation. Jánosi, whose usage of "*természetbúvár*" (384, 387, 390) likely stems from Laugel's "*le naturaliste*," had a background and interests rather similar to Dapsy's.[528] Rónay and Dapsy, apart from one exception of "*természetbúvár*" in Rónay's Chapter XII,[529] use "*tudós*" or "*természettudós*." It is unclear whether the use of the more "professional

[527] The term "scientist," coined by Willian Whewell, was in a sense created out of concern about the disintegration and "endless subdivision" of the sciences. See Bernard Lightman, "Science and the Public," in *Wrestling with Nature: From Omens to Science*, eds. Peter Harrison, Ronald L. Numbers, and Michael H. Shank, (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 337.

[528] Like Dapsy, he also produced a textbook of natural history: *Föld- és természetrajz* népiskolák számára (Pest: Népiskolák könyvtára, 1852. Later editions in 1854, 1862, 1868, 1876), and among other authors, he also translated John Stuart Mill: *A képviseleti kormány*. Pest, 1866.

[529] Rónay, *Fajkeletkezés*, 164. Rónay also introduces the vocation "régiségbúvár" [used twice, pages 251 and 254], this "researcher of antiquities" being the person who "studies the periods of human progress that gradually approach the oldest vestiges of history" ["tanulmányozza az emberi haladásnak azon korszakait, melyek fokonkint megközelítik a történelemnek legrégibb emlékeit"] (251).

sounding" term denotes their awareness of a growing distinction between professional and non-professional practitioners of science who were part of their intended audience. However, they were as much of an audience as transmitters of Darwinism, and as such, it seems that they felt more "*tudós*" than "*búvár*."[530]

There seems to be a similar contextual differentiation between natural history and natural science. Dapsy describes himself as a "Professor of natural history," and indeed, the name of the secondary school subject that he (and Jánosi, almost two decades earlier) taught was "*természetrajz"*. In this case, the translation of *Origin* faithfully follows the original text, substituting "*természetrajz"* for "natural history" throughout the text and "*természettudomány*" for "natural science" (although the latter term appears only once: *OS* 266 and *FE* II. 93). It seems that disciplinary questions were better defined, or at least not as much of a question of status and hierarchy within the scientific community.

There is a much narrower matter of the terminology of "professionalization," or rather specialization that reflects the difference between the community and tradition of naturalists in Britain and the difficulty to translate or express if in other languages or cultures, which recalls Bronn's difficulties with adapting Darwin's examples based on the hobbies and interests of British gentlemen in the country. This can be well illustrated on the example of "pigeon fanciers," who are frequently featured on the pages of *Origin*. More hobbyists that professional breeders, "fanciers" nonetheless had an active network in Britain, breeding fancy pigeons (or, for instance, rabbits), and their observations were an important source for the hypotheses, analysis and conclusions in Darwin's work.[531]

[530] Another difference implied by the terms "*természettudós*" and "*természetbúvár*" is that while the use of "*tudós*" suggests the possession of knowledge, "*búvár*" only signifies the road to knowledge, i.e. the process of research. In this sense, the translation of "naturalist" as "*tudós*" implies an elevation of rank.

[531] On Darwin and the breeders and fanciers of pigeons, see James A. Secord, "Nature's Fancy: Charles Darwin and the Breeding of Pigeons," *Isis* 72, no. 2 (1981): 162-186, and his "Darwin and the Breeders: A

Instead of making a distinction between fanciers of pigeons (and – in some cases – rabbits, ducks, poultry, dogs or horses) and breeders, Dapsy puts them all under the label "*tenyésztő*" (breeder) or once "*műtenyésztő*" (specialist breeder, 188) with the exception of the one lonely case of a "*galambkedvelő*" (57). It is hard to say whether Dapsy was aware of the pigeon clubs mushrooming across British land, but this case shows the difficulty of transplanting not only a word, but also the concept behind to a soil where it is rather alien: not even in terms of an interest in breeding as an interest and not a profession, but the long history and intrinsic understanding of the British club culture behind it.[532]

Another crucial term, which gained a wider concern and public influence in the sense that it infiltrated the public sphere and the increasingly nationalist political discourse of the coming decades was Spencer's "the survival of the fittest." Used for the first time in the fifth edition, appearing in the heading of Chapter IV,[533] it is also present in various forms in Dapsy's translation of the sixth edition: the above chapter heading, "Natural Selection; or the Survival of the Fittest" is translated as "*A természeti kiválás, vagyis a legalkalmasabbak felmaradása,*" a fairly literal translation (also on page 167), as is the only cosmetically differing "*a Herbert Spencer által gyakran használt kifejezés, 'a legképesebbek fennmaradása'"* (p. 83, orig. "the expression often used by Mr. Herbert Spencer of the Survival of the Fittest", p. 49; also p. 160 and 254).

Social History" in *The Darwinian Heritage*, 519–42.

[532] Naturally there is a distinction to be made here: while pigeon fancying and associated clubs were foreign to Hungarian culture (despite the use of pigeons as means of communication), horse breeding was a different matter. István Széchenyi addressed the necessity of catching up to the British model of horse breeding as early as 1828, and the breeding of horses and dogs to be used for hunting was a frequent hobby and passion for the nobility. Nonetheless, they breeded and not fancied them. István Széchenyi, *Lovakrul*, (Pest: Petrózai Trattner J. M. És Károlyi Istvánnál, 1828).

[533] See Freeman.

Although Dapsy chose not to comment on the wider implications of the ideas laid down in *Origin* to human society as he saw them, his choices to translate much of the vocabulary to be used following the publication of his translation had a role in setting the verbalization of these concepts as default usage in the long run. One more example is the use of the conceptual pair of "progress" and "development", together with "progressive development", which had been part of the evolutionary vocabulary well before Darwin. "*Haladó fejlődés*" had already been Somody's choice in *Vestiges* as it had been Dapsy's in Chapter 7 (e.g. OS 176 and FE 263) as well. However, in Darwin's historical sketch at the beginning of *Origin* about the predecessors that influenced the development of his theories, the "progressive development" of Lamarck is translated as "*fokozatos fejlődés*" [gradual development] (OS xiv and FE I. 3), which implies less of a sense of continuity between Lamarck and Darwin than what the latter might have been wanted to maintain. In the title of the very same historical sketch, the conceptual distinction between the values of progress and development becomes further shaded when "An Historical Sketch of the *Progress* of Opinion on the Origin of Species, Previously to the Publication of the First Edition of this Work" becomes "A fajok eredetéről e mű első kiadásának megjelenése előtt uralkodott nézetek *fejlődés*ének történelmi vázlata" (emphasis mine).

The few footnotes that Dapsy added to the text stress once more his fidelity and the neutrality implied – and even highlighted – by it: they contain translations of English, German and French book titles and quotations that Dapsy left in the body of the text, providing their Hungarian translation in footnotes.[534] While this does not make the text

[534] Without even attempting to give a complete list, the following examples from the "Historical Sketch" at the beginning of the book can give an idea of the amount of West European words and quotes in the text. *Vestiges of Creation* is left in English in the main text and with no Hungarian title given in a footnote. (*OS* xvi, *FE* 6). This in spite of the fact that there were two Hungarian editions in 1858 and 1861, which indicates a lack of awareness of its existence on behalf of Dapsy and Margó. Interestingly, Lyell's

more integrally Hungarian sounding, and the many English references in the main text are distracting for the modern reader, we should keep it in mind that this was rather standard practice in the nineteenth century, as also illustrated by the novels of Mór Jókai, whose long German, French and English passages in assigned mandatory readings are giving much trouble for schoolchildren to this day. A rare exception to this rule is when Darwin writes about a lecture by Huxley in the Royal Institution in June 1859 on the "Persistent Types of Animal Life:" instead giving the title, Dapsy incorporates it as the topic of the talk in Hungarian and provides the English title in a footnote.[535] Interestingly, the three quotes chosen by Darwin for the back of the frontispiece by Whewell, Butler and Bacon are translated, but the titles of the works they were taken (*Bridgewater Treatise, Analogy of revealed Religion* and *Advancement of Learning*) for are not. The most direct intervention linking Darwin's theory to Hungary is a footnote in Chapter III on the struggle for existence, in which Dapsy provides the local example of the overpopulation of the rabbits of Mágócs and the pox that finally solved the problem by decimating them:

> "When a species, owing to highly favourable circumstances, increases inordinately in numbers in a small tract, epidemics – at least, this seems generally to occur with our game animals – often ensue; [this is the point where Dapsy inserts the asterisk for the footnote][536] and here we have a limiting check independent of the struggle for life. But even some of these so-called epidemics appear to be due to parasitic worms, which have from some cause, possibly in part through facility of diffusion

---

Principles of Geology, which was much better known to both translators (even if they were not aware of the speculation that pointed to Lyell as the author of *Vestiges*), was also left in English in the main text with no translation given. (*FE* II. 93). However, there are translations from French in the footnotes with the original quotations left in the main text: From Saint Hilaire (*OS* xix, *FE* 9); Naudin a "distinguished botanist" [*híres* (famous) *botanikus*] (*OS* xix-xx, *FE* 10-11); and Lecoq, a "well-known French botanist" [*az eléggé ismeretes* (the quite known) *franczia botanicus*] (*OS* xx, *FE* 12). Among others, an English quotation from Herschel is left in the main body of the text with a Hungarian translation in footnote (*OS* xxi, *FE* 12), or the title of Dr. Freke's circular [röpiratka (little pamphlet)] "On the Origin of Species by means of Organic affinity" with its translation, "*A fajok eredete a szervezeti rokonság utján*" in footnote (*OS* xix, *FE* 10).

[535] "1859. juniusában Prof. Huxley "az állati élet állandó typusairól"*) tartott a Royal Institutionban egy felolvasást" (*OS* xxi, *FE* 13).

[536] "E tétel igazolására szolgál azon eset is, hogy a mágócsi uradalom roppant elszaporodott nyúlai között, a múlt évben, a himlő-járvány pusztított; – habár itt is meg kell jegyeznünk, hogy a valódi himlő könnyen összetéveszthető más bőrbetegségekkel, melyek a nyúlféléknél bőratkák következtében származnak."

> amongst the crowded animals, been disproportionally favoured: and here comes in a sort of struggle between the parasite and its prey."

Not only does Dapsy illustrate the universal point of the struggle for life and Darwin's example for it with a local Hungarian example no doubt relevant (or at least more so than fancying pigeons) for the Hungarian country gentleman and any person interested in the dangers awaiting game animals, but he even extends Darwin's argument to the footnote when he mentions that rabbits are especially susceptible to the parasites mentioned in the main text.[537]

Terminology, vocabulary and their contextual background, do not stand alone, but amalgamate into a text. Darwin's texts, and *Origin* especially, have been applauded for their literary richness, imagistic character, aesthetic sensibility and approachable language. Directed towards the wide public, his seminal works went astray from biological jargon, using various tropes to express the ideas and convince his readers. Widely using rhetoric, yet distinguishing his texts from literary writing, Darwin's text remained both precise and imprecise allowing the public to appropriate his terms to a variety of meanings, and for the terms to be story-generating themselves.[538] How is this stylishness and literary complexity reflected in Dapsy's text, if that is possible? Due to Dapsy's consciousness of preserving the style of Darwin's text as much as structure and content, his sentences reflect a nineteenth-century way of expressing complex thoughts in a complex language, and due to his strong wish to remain faithful to Darwin's text, the poetics are also reflected in a quite straightforward mirror. As a conclusion, let us reflect on Darwin's conclusion to his work, the poetics of which, thanks to Dapsy, being freely available to the Hungarian reader of the nineteenth century, who might have missed out

[537] *OS* 55, *FE* 92.
[538] Beer, *Darwin's Plots.*

on Dapsy's opinions to orient or influence, but had access to a text that could have been the exact mirror of the English one:

> "Igen érdekes egy sűrűn benőtt partvonalat szemlélni, mely számos többféle növénnyel, s bokrokon énekelő madarakkal, köröskörül röpködő különböző rovarokkal, és az iszapos földben turkáló férgekkel van népesítve, – és elgondolni, hogy ezen annyi művészettel szerkesztett alakok, melyek annyira különbözők egymástól, és oly bonyolult összefüggésben vannak egymással, mind a körültünk ma is működő törvények által hozattak létre. […] Van valami fönség ezen nézetben, mely szerint az élet, a maga különböző erőivel együtt, eredetileg csak egynehány, vagy talán csak egy alakba leheltetett a teremtő által; – és míg ezen bolygónk a nehézség megállapított törvénye szerint kering, egy ilyen egyszerű kezdetből a legszebb és legcsodálatosabb alakok végtelen száma fejlődött és fejlődik jelenleg is."[539]

Ironically, in the end, the translator's insistence on a "faithful" translation resulted in a Hungarian text that closely follows not only Darwin's words, but also his poetics, the physical law of gravity seamlessly coexisting both with worms crawling through the earth and the endless number of beautifully evolving forms. Dapsy's interpretation of the concept of fidelity resulted in a perhaps unexpectedly poetic text, at times almost as unintentionally lyrical as the language of evolution that Darwin had created.

From the end result, it seems that Dapsy's program was not to make Darwin text his own and form it to his own liking according to his scientific social agendas, but to follow it as faithfully as possible. Although Dapsy and Margó showed great care in producing a scientifically correct Hungarian *Origin*, their ambitions regarding their own role as a translator did not extend to reflecting their opinion of the text or Darwin's claims. Whether this was a matter of perceived scientific competence or personal preference, it is

[539] "It is interesting to contemplate a tangled bank, clothed with many plants of many kinds, with birds singing on the bushes, with various insects flitting about, and with worms crawling through the damp earth, and to reflect that these elaborately constructed forms, so different from each other, and dependent upon each other in so complex a manner, have all been produced by laws acting around us. […] There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved." (*OS* 439, *FE* II. 332-3)

telling that not even Margó, a respected member of the scientific community, did not seem to have an ambition to engage with Darwin's thought within the narrative he helped to create. By putting priority on fidelity in the process and result of the translation, the work of Dapsy and Margó also reflects that the scientific community and the public was satisfied to debate Darwinism outside of the actual text of *Origin*, which they left to stay Darwin's own as much as they could.

Dapsy's translation was reviewed in *Budapesti Szemle* almost immediately after it left the press, placing Darwin's work, now available in Hungarian in full, in the context of the Hungarian reception.[540] After a short summary of the significance of Darwin's work on a general level, the review points out that thanks to the *Természettudományi Társulat*, Darwin's work is finally fully available to the Hungarian public who had access to it so far only through a few articles. The review starts in a rather positive manner: the translation is judged to be "fairly successful" [*eléggé sikerült*]; even if a bit too cumbersome at places, it should be noted that Dapsy and Margó strove at achieving "fidelity" in order not to sacrifice the original, characteristic language of the original work. The review here admittedly relies on the content and even language of Dapsy's justification about the stylistic choices laid down in the Introduction of the translation, and this is reflected in the use of Dapsy's "*nehézkes*" [cumbersome]. Moreover, Dapsy and Margó's choice in closely following the original style is approved, both in terms of avoiding too much "purism" and the creation of too many new Hungarian technical terms instead of the perfectly appropriate Latin and Greek ones. As the reviewer exclaims,

[540] "Charles Darwin, A fajok eredete a természeti kiválás útján, vagyis az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása a létérti küzdelemben," *Budapesti Szemle* 6, no. 12 (1874): 424-426.

"Would all our authors of natural science follow this principle!"[541] Thus, the review is clearly positive about the translation and about the significance of Darwin's work: "So we have a Hungarian Darwin, that we have reason to be proud of, and which can bravely stand next to the translations to other languages."[542]

However, as a an unexpected blow after all the praise, the last two paragraphs draw attention to the "only dark point: the introduction of the translator," being in full agreement with the opinions expressed by Adolf Dux in *Ungarischer Lloyd* in the previous year. The review finds it especially disappointing Dapsy's agenda to translate foreign works instead of wasting precious capital on creating originals.

> "Darwin's translation did not need such a sad justification; it would have kept its full worth and value in the eyes of the Hungarian public even without this. We should really despair over the future of Hungarian science if our scientists were motivated by such ideas and such views would spread among our wider public. We are honestly sorry that the society for natural science, even if they cannot be held responsible for the individual opinions of certain colleagues, did not block the printing of these thoughtless lines. We are doubly sorry that they had to deface Darwin's work."[543]

The review thus addresses the scientific community and wider public as well, and this is especially significant since it gives a direction as to the future of Hungarian science. This is a signal as well that the first stage of the reception of Darwinism is over: it is not enough to translate, since Hungarian science should be prepared to overtake foreign achievements instead of just catching up; translation is important, but increasing value

[541] "Bár minden természettudományi írónk ez elvet követné!" 425.
[542] "Van tehát magyar Darwinunk is, melyre méltán büszkék lehetünk, és mely bátran megállhat a más nyelveken megjelent fordítások mellett." 425.
[543] "Darwin fordításának ily szomorú indoklásra valóban nem volt szüksége: megtartotta volna az a magyar közönség előtt teljes becsét és értékét e nélkül is. Igazán kétségbe kellene esnünk a magyar tudományosság jövőjén, ha ily elvek vezéreénk hazai tudósainkat s ily nézetek terjednének el nagy közönségünk zömében is. Őszintén sajnáljuk, hogy a természettudományi társulat, hona egyes munkásainak magán nézeteiért felelőssé nem tehető, ama meggondolatlan sorok kinyomatását meg nem akadályozta. Kétszeresen is sajnáljuk, hogy azok épen egy Darwin munkájának élén díszetenkednek." 426.

should be placed on original scientific works, and this is something that not only the scientific community, but the general public should be aware of as well.

After this indeed very faint and ambivalent praise, it is perhaps not that surprising that Dapsy more or less disappeared from the Society; he turned his attention to matters of political economy, and his only other work of translation of Alpheus Todd's work on British parliamentarism was published somewhere else. It must have been especially disappointing that after not one, but two not reviews in *Budapesti Szemle* that were far from complementary,[544] the review journal followed up the disparaging lines about his translating agenda – even if his work of translation itself was approved of – with a glowing review of Sándor Magyar's translation of Huxley's work that was also part of the Society's book series,[545] which meant that their criticism of the agenda of its founder, the book series received the endorsement of the prestigious review.

The book series continued successfully for decades. A more immediate consequence was announced at the 21 January 21 1875 general meeting of the Society, where the president, Károly Than announced that not only did the first cycle of books make a financial profit, but it also created a moral one: the often used phrase "scientific works do not create interest in this country" is no more than an empty phrase.[546] The venture also attracted the attention and gained the respect of the scientific community, the daily press and most importantly from the Society's viewpoint, that of the Academy of Sciences, who offered their support in the form of 5000 forints per year, which meant

[544] Dapsy's part-translation, part-adaptation of David Page's *Introductory Textbook of Geology* was doomed to be more or less a failure in terms of scientific content and style as well, "especially from Dapsy, who has exhibited such a commendable enthusiasm in the dissemination of scientific knowledge in our country." St. F, "A geologia alapvonalai. Irta Dávid Page 'Introductory Textbook of Geology' mívének kilenczedik kiadása alapján Dapsy László," *Budapesti Szemle* 3, no. 5 (1874): 224.
[545] Hőgyes, Endre, "Előadások az elemi élettan köréből," *Budapesti Szemle* 6, no. 12 (1874): 426-429.
[546] "[A] tudományos munkáknak nálunk nincs jelentősége." Károly Than, "Elnöki megnyitóbeszéd" [Opening speech of the President], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 6, no. 54 (1874) 6:(54): 81.

they could reduce subscription costs.[547] The interest of the Academy in the dissemination of current, progressive scientific works and theories was not only displayed by this financial contribution, but also in more symbolic gestures: starting with the 1860s, they elected a number of foreign scientists as external members,[548] among them Darwin, sending him a diploma confirming his membership on 10 June 1872.[549]

Thus, in the end Dapsy's desire to translate *Origin*, whether from his professed scientific patriotism, or from a more selfish consideration of his own career, did result, even if not directly or intentionally, in the start of scientific publishing in Hungary, and possibly in a wider readership than if he had published a book with a private bookseller. With this he had also contributed to the agenda of *Természettudományi Társulat* to create a more public platform for scientific discussion and a possible conversation between the scientific community and the general public, which, they felt, had been far from interested and committed enough to a more widespread involvement with the sciences: "[w]e are slowly, invisibly occupying the space, and the public will slowly, invisibly get to like the natural sciences," claimed Than, closing a general meeting the President of *Természettudományi Társulat* in 1875, at which he had announced the Academy's financial contribution to the efforts publishing company,[550] which is a fitting conclusion of Dapsy's project, as far as the physical production of the book as an object is considered.

[547] Kapronczay, "Könyvkiadó vállalat," 206.
[548] Darwin was elected with 17 votes against 4. Ladányiné, *A filozófia és a darwinizmus*, 138.
[549] Menyhért Lónyay to Charles Darwin, 11 June 1872. CUL DAR 96: 154v.
[550] Than's words were a reference to a speech he made five years earlier, although the second time he used them in an optimistic manner. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 7: no. 66 (1875): 81. Cf. Kapronczay, "Könyvkiadó vállalat," 206.

Conclusion

In 1875 János Pap, the author of a Hungarian secondary school textbook on zoology, decided to include a chapter on Darwin's theory. At the time, Pap was teaching natural history in the secondary school of the Piarist Order in Pest, and was an ordained priest himself. He had also studied natural history, first in Kolozsvár, and later in Pest, which included attending the lectures of Tivadar Margó at the University of Pest.[551] That references to Darwinism would reach the level of secondary education by 1875, and in a textbook intended for the students of a prestigious Catholic institution, is no small feat in itself, and indicates a level of public awareness that extended far beyond the scientific community. Sixteen years after the publication of Darwin's *Origin*, when the work had been available in Hungarian translation for a year, we may safely assert that natural selection according to Darwin had become public knowledge. Even if reactions to it were diverse, the Hungarian Darwinists whose contributions we have considered here show that the scientific production leading up to the construction of an "official", authorized translation was an important part of reception. Although they were not immediate participants in the literal translation of *Origin*, they were part of the intellectual translation of Darwin's theories that led to a transformation of the scientific and social space of knowledge.

This transformation came at a transitional period in Hungarian history and was by no means limited to scientific domains. My decision to direct my attention to these transitional texts was motivated by an interest in discovering whether "forgotten

[551] János Pap, *Az állatok természetrajza a középtanodák felsőbb osztályai számára,* (Pest: Zilahy S., 1875). On Pap, see "Pap János," Szinnyei, *Magyar írók*, mek.oszk.hu/03600/03630/html/p/p18964.htm

memories" of the Hungarian history of science such as *Vestiges of Creation* or the romantic fancies and scientific adaptations lying in the mostly neglected curiosity cabinet of Jácint Rónay's literary legacy could be considered more than stepping stones to the making of a Hungarian *Origin of Species*. The answer to this initial question leads back to the status of the original versions of *Vestiges* and *Origin*, and the years of their appearance, 1844 and 1859, which are considered critical points in the history of science, while the publication of *Origin* is one of the foundation points of modernity as we think about it today.

1858, the year when József Somody's translation appeared, was not only shortly before the publication of *Origin*, the news of which would reach Hungary in a few short years, but also during a period when Hungarian scientific life was held back by the practical consequences of political repression. Jácint Rónay was in a tenuous position where he could experience the critical points on location in Britain, but his attempts to transfer them were delayed by circumstances and distance; moreover, his target's attention was too much caught up in the events leading up to the Compromise and in the seemingly more urgent, practical matters of the institutional reorganization of scientific life. László Dapsy, Tivadar Margó and others at the Academy of Sciences and at the *Természettudományi Társulat* were, finally, in a position to capitalize on the critical point when the consequences of the Compromise made possible a new, open engagement with the natural sciences and their social and political implications. Catching up with the West, however, also meant directing their attention to the latest developments. Had Dapsy been able to fulfill his original wish to translate *Descent* in 1872, his translation might have been the basis of the new discourse of Darwinism; as such, his translation of *Origin* served as a means of setting much of an already established vocabulary of evolution and

concluding the first stage of the Hungarian reception of Darwinism. As for being a critical point in Hungarian history, there were many competing candidates for the year 1873, including the newly formed city of Budapest, and the attention of the public was directed to flashier events that the publication of a two-volume book on evolution.

Apart from timing, there was also the matter of location, not only geographically, but also in terms of the placement of the translators within the networks and institutions of scientific life and the availability of tools to reach the public. *Vestiges* might not have existed in Hungarian had Somody not been forced to withdraw to Pápa after the revolution, but this isolation was part of the reason why his work of translation, which appears to have served as a pastime for an out-of-work lawyer, never reached an audience that the success of its original might have predicted, despite the endorsement of prominent members of the scientific community. Rónay, who had a wide network of correspondents even though he was separated from the Continent by the English Channel, could not enforce his interests by proxy in Pest, and remained on the far verges of the scientific community in London as well. Dapsy, on the other hand, made the most of his spatial advantages: not only did he benefit from his stay in Britain, but he managed to turn it into connections and publication in Pest. That his literary efforts were not as successful as his activities in scientific organization was another matter. Despite the restrictions forced on them by time and space, all three made a contribution to the translation of evolutionary theory, and the references to their work in contemporary sources justify the re-evaluation of their significance for the history of Hungarian Darwinism.

The significance of these works is not merely in their existence, even if their potential influence was so much hindered by political circumstance and associated

personal difficulties. Through setting the case studies against the presentation of a diverse group of translators, naturalists, scientists and science popularizers, this dissertation shows how the Darwinian revolution affected Hungary and how the language of evolution became part of not only scientific but also public discourse. Through the new meanings attributed to words and concepts such as progress, development or evolution, the vocabulary of the emerging modern language of the natural sciences became inextricably connected to the new culture of politics, especially following the Compromise in 1867. The act of translation thus functions as a multi-directional process between languages and cultures. It is an instance of inter-cultural communication where evolution or development becomes *fejlődés* in Hungarian evolutionary literature. However, in the intra-cultural act of communication, the biological terms and the concepts they denote also enter the social discourse of the public. In this sense, the role of the translator is not limited to his agenda and its execution, but extends far beyond the determination of the textual element. Thus, progress and development, two of the key concepts of the agenda of political and cultural tastemakers of the years following the compromise, were imbued with new, Darwinian implications that would continue to transform them well into the approaching new century.

As Robert Young wrote about Victorian Britain, in "the heart of its science we find a culture's values."[552] In the case of Hungary, we not only find the values of Hungarian culture in its emerging scientific language, but we also find the politics of the nation, both of which underwent a series of transformations in the decades after 1849. The urge to bridge the gap between scientific progress in the West and the political and

[552] Robert Young, *Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in Victorian Culture,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 125.

social consequences of the retributions following the 1848/49 revolution and war of independence resulted in an atmosphere where the acquisition and reception of new scientific results were also influenced by political and social motivations. Many Hungarian naturalists were to an extent informed about discoveries and developments in the West, but the weak and repressed nature of local research obstructed and delayed the reformation of scientific structures. Although the significance of the existence of a published Hungarian translation of *Origin* cannot be stressed enough, its theories and conclusions did not reach the Hungarian scientific public entirely out of the blue: it can also be interpreted as part of a movement to rethink and reorganize the form and content of scientific endeavours starting with the late 1850s.

The decade following the Compromise witnessed a deep transformation of Hungarian society: political consolidation, urbanization, industrialization, and new frameworks for education, academia, and scientific research. When Dapsy's translation of *Origin* came off the printing press in 1873, the future translators of *Descent of Man*, Géza Entz and Aurél Török, were professors of the natural sciences in Kolozsvár. Their example shows the diversity of the circle of men of science involved in the dissemination of Darwinism. Approximately the same age as Dapsy, Entz and Török were part of a new generation of professional scientists, and their translation of *Descent* would arrive in a different social and political environment, when the relevance of evolutionary theory to society would be discussed, not so much in terms of liberal ideas of progress, but under the Spencerian influence of survival of the fittest. The direction of the political consolidation of Hungary after the compromise, and the status quo set by the formation of Kálmán Tisza's conservative government would provide fertile ground for the reinterpretation of Darwinism according to the racial ideas attributed to *Descent* due to

Darwin's interest in Francis Galton's idea of eugenics, even if neither actually advocated eugenic policies.

In the early 1870s, however, the transitional state of Darwinism, translation practices and the scientific community was moving towards a more established, albeit complex network of sometimes differing agendas. Although "scientific community" is often an intuitive term taken for granted today, in the nineteenth century context it was not. Dapsy and the scientists he convinced, cajoled or enabled to participate in his institutionalized translation project did not take this for granted at all. For them, the scientific community was an explicit tool to facilitate translation (and later the creation of original work), and through translation to promote national science and advance national progress. At the same time, translation also served as a tool to strengthen the scientific community itself. Translation was not only part of an agenda, but also an active part of building a scientific community that was also a part of a new nation-building endeavour. As cultural relocation of text and context, translation was an integral part of cultural transfer and the processes of reception of evolutionary theory according to Darwin and others in a new environment. This study, through examples of how text as discourse and book as a physical object were produced, presented points of reference for the examination of how and why texts of different message and character become part of the reception of evolutionary theory and a public discourse of science and progress in nineteenth century Hungary. The last point of reference, the publication of a Hungarian *Origin*, is an end and a beginning at the same time. The first, transitional stage of the reception of Darwinism that reached its conclusion with the publication of a widely accepted, physical copy of Darwin's essential text was over. Dapsy's translation, inspired by liberal ideals of progress, increasingly became part of the conservative discourse of

Hungarian politics, reinterpreted and appropriated according to the nationalist agendas emerging in Hungarian society.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Unpublished primary sources from manuscript collections

Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Kézirattár, Budapest [MTA]
- Dapsy, László – Ms. 773/335
- Török, Aurél – Ms. 4093/237

Régi Akadémiai Levéltár, Budapest [MTA RAL]
- Dapsy, László – 1211/1875
- Felméri, Lajos – 160/1883; 278/1885

Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, Levelestár, Budapest [OSZK]
The Correspondence of Jácint Rónay
- Csengery, Antal – 1929/32
- Egressy, Gábor – 1901/7
- Majer, Móric – 1954/57
- Perczel, Mór – Fond 89/121, 864/135/1966
- Pompéry, János – 1915/14
- Szemere, Bertalan – 1927/5
- Szokoly, Viktor – 1912/36

Természettudományi Múzeum Tudománytörténeti Gyűjtemény, Budapest [TTM]
- Rapaics, Rajmund. Török Aurél ("M.B.T."), 269/68/2

Ernst-Haeckel-Haus, Jena [EHH]
The Correspondence of Ernst Haeckel
- Dux, Adolf.
- Török, Aurél.

Cambridge University Library, Darwin Archives [CUL DAR]
The Correspondence of Charles Darwin
- Dapsy, László
  - 162: 40
  - 162:41
  - 96: 155
- Felméri, Lajos
  - 164:116
- Földes-Weisz, Béla
  - 148:3
- Menyhért Lónyay
  - 96: 154v.

Periodicals

"Agassiz Lajos emlékezete. Kivonat Margó Tivadar emlékbeszédéből. (Előadatott a m. tud. Akademia 1874. október 26-ikán tartott összes ülésén.)" [The memory of Agassiz Lajos. An Extract from the eulogy of Tivadar Margó. (Delivered at the plenary meeting of the Academy of Sciences, 26th October 1874]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 6 (1874): 410-425.

"Almási Balogh Pál." *Vasárnapi Újság*, 24 October 1858, 477-478.

"Charles Darwin. A fajok eredete a természeti kiválás útján, vagyis az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása a létérti küzdelemben" [Charles Darwin. The origin of species]. *Budapesti Szemle* 6, no. 12 (1874): 424-426.

"Darwin Róbert Károly." *Reform*. 20th March 1871.

"I. indítvány" [Initiative I]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 28 (December 1871): 465-9.

"Kriesch János: A természetrajz elemei" [The elements of natural history]. *Budapesti Szemle* 5, no. 9 (1874): 216-220.

"Különfélék" [Varia]. *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai lap*. 14, no. 27 (1871): 855.

"Mammut." *Természet* 1, no. 36 (31st July 1838): 138-139.

"May 2nd, 1865." *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 3 (1865): ccxvi.

"Members." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. New Series 7, no. 2 (1875).

"Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of London. Session 1852-53." *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 23 (1853): l-lvii.

"Report of the Council of the Ethnological Society of London, May 1867." *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* 6 (1868): 2.

"Report on the Anthropological Papers Read at the Nottingham Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1866." *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 5 (1867): v.

"Somody József." *Dunántúli Protestáns Lap*, 21 February 1897, 130.

"Somody József." *Dunántúli Protestáns Lap*, 28 February 1897, 146.

"Tizenkettedik akadémiai ülés. Összes ülés. 1871. martius 20-kán" [12th plenary meeting of the Academy]. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Értesítője* 6 (1871): 92.

"Vogt előadásai Pesten (Tartattak az evang. gymnasium disztermében, 1869. decz. 13., 14., 18., 20., 22. és 23-án)" [Vogt's lectures in Pest (Held in the auditorium of the Lutheran secondary school]. Part 1. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 2, no. 10 (1870):2. 29-37.

"Vogt előadásai Pesten (Tartattak az evang. gymnasium disztermében, 1869. decz. 13., 14., 18., 20., 22. és 23-án)" [Vogt's lectures in Pest (Held in the auditorium of the Lutheran secondary school]. Part 2. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 2, no. 11, (1870): 70-79.

"Vogt előadásai Pesten (Tartattak az evang. gymnasium disztermében, 1869. decz. 13., 14., 18., 20., 22. és 23-án)" [Vogt's lectures in Pest (Held in the auditorium of the Lutheran secondary school] Part 3. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 2, no. 13, (1870): 163-173.

"Vogt Károly eléadásából" [From Karl Vogt's lecture]. *Borsszem Jankó*, 26th December 1869, 494.

"Vogt tana" [Vogt's teaching]. *Borsszem Jankó*. 19th December 1869, 106.

"XL. Közgyűlés" [General meeting XL]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5 (1873): 79.

"XXVIII. Választmányi ülés" [Electoral meeting XXVIII]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 30 (1872): 80.

"XXXV. Választmányi ülés" [Electoral meeting XXXV], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 4 (1872):471.

B. L. "Nézetek Darwin elméletéről, különösen psychológiai szempontból" [Views on Darwin's theory, especially from a psychological point of view]. *Értesítvény a Zircz-Cziszterci Rend Székesfehérvári Főgymnásiumáról az 1873/74 tanév végén.* Székesfehérvár, 1874.

Balogh, Pál Almási. "Egy pillantás földünk életére" [A look at the life of our earth]. *A Magyar Tudós Társaság Évkönyvei*. 8 (1844-47). Buda: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1860. 76-93.

Benczédi, Gergely. "Különfélék. London, 1866" [Varia]. *Keresztény Magvető* 3 (1867): 276-277.

Brassai, Sámuel. "A természettan szelleme és iránya" [The spirit and direction of natural science]. *Budapest Szemle* 7, no. 22/23 (1859), 301-324.

Brassai, Sámuel. "Éledés és életkezdet" [Awakening and the beginning of life]. *Budapesti Szemle* 16 (1862): 328-345.

Bugát, Pál "Tudományosságunk előmozdítása ügyében indítvány" [An initiative to move forward our science]. *Orvosi Tár* 2 (1840): 185-192 and 202-206.

Dapsy, László. "Darwin és az állatvilág" [Darwin and the animal world]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 18 July 1869, 397.

Dapsy, László. "Darwin Róbert Károly." *Vasárnapi Újság*, 26 March 1871, 153-53.

Dapsy, László. "Darwin legújabb művének utolsó fejezete" [The last chapter of Darwin's latest work]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 26 (1871): 372-384.

Dapsy, László. "Az ember a fejlődés legalsó fokán" [Man on the lowest stage of evolution]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 24 September 1871, 486-87.

Dapsy, László. *A talajkimerülés befolyása az államok életére. Különös tekintettel Magyarország jövőjére* [The influence of soil degradation on the life of states. With special attention to the future of Hungary]. Pest, 1869.

Dapsy, László. "Vogt Károly fölolvasásai az ember őstörténelméről" [Karl Vogt's readings on the prehistory of man]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 19th December 1869, 704.

Dapsy, László. "Vogt Károly fölolvasásai az ember őstörténelméről" [Karl Vogt's readings on the prehistory of man]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 26th December 1869, 716.
Darwin, Charles. *Autobiography*. In *Autobiographies: Charles Darwin, Thomas Henry Huxley*, ed. by Gavin de Beer. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Dezső, Béla. "Az indulatok kifejeződése az embernél és állatoknál" [The expression of emotions in man and animals]. *Erdélyi Múzeum* 5 (1878): 8-12.

E—y. "Mozgalom az angol egyház körében" [Movement in the English church]. *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai lap.* 4, no. 46 (1861): 1496-1499.

Entz, Géza. "Darwinismus." *Természet* 1 (1868): 18-22, 30-33, 39-43, 61-65.

Felméri, Lajos. "A nevetésről: Egy fejezet Darwin legújabb művéből." *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5, no. 45 (1873): 179-192.

Gonda, László. "A természettudományok fejlődése a theologiára vonatkozással" [The development of the natural sciences with reference to theology]. *Sárospataki Füzetek* 7 (1868): 795-847.

Greguss, Ágost. "Az ember helye a természetben" [Man's place in nature]. *Budapesti Szemle* 18 (1863): 420-449.

Greguss, Ágost. "A haladás elvéről" [The theory of progress]. *Magyar Akadémiai Értesítő* 4, no. 2 (1864): 269-294.

Hőgyes, Endre. "Előadások az elemi élettan köréből." *Budapesti Szemle* 6, no. 12 (1874): 426-429.

Jánosi, Ferenc. "Az emberi nem elfajzása." *Budapesti Szemle* 10, no. 31/32 (1860): 201-211.

Jánosi, Ferenc. "Új természetrajzi elmélet. Charles Darwin: On the origin of Species. A nemek eredete. London, Murray, 1859" [A new theory of natural history. Charles Darwin: On the Origin of Species]. *Budapesti Szemle* 10, no. 33/34 (1860): 383-397.

Kánitz, Ákos. "A növény-species fejlődésének történetéről, különös tekintettel Magyarhonra" [On the history of the development of the plant-species, with a special attention to Hungary]. In *A Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók 1863. September 19-26. Pesten tartott IX. nagygyűlésének történeti vázlata és munkálatai* [Proceedings of the ninth meeting of the Hungarian Association for the History of Science, held in Pest, 19-26 September 1863], ed. by József Szabó. Pest: Emich Gusztáv, 1864. 298-303.

Korizmics, László. "A teremtés természettörténelmének nyomai. Vestiges of the natural history of creation." *Budapesti Szemle* 3, no. 9/10 (1858): 301-304.

Kriesch, János. "Darwin legújabb művéről" [On Darwin's latest work]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 3, no. 25 (1871): 330-40.

Kvassay, Jenő, "Darwin legújabb munkája. A kedélyhangulatok kifejezése az embernél és az állatnál" [Darwin's latest work. The expression of emotions in humans and animals]. *Vasárnapi Újság,* 9th March 1873, 115-17; 16th March 1873, 130; 23rd March 1873, 142; Part 8th June 1873,154.

Kvassay, Jenő. "A létérti harc. (Darwin könyvéből.)" [The struggle for existence (From Darwin's Book.)]. *Vasárnapi Újság* 28th September 1873, 465; 5th October 1873, 478; 12th October 1873, 487.

Kvassay, Jenő. "A rovarok Darwin tanában" [Insects in Darwin's Theory]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 12th December 1872, 663.

Laugel, Auguste. "Nouvelle théorie d'histoire naturelle: l'origine des espèces" (On the Origin of Species, by Charles Darwin; London, John Murray, 1859). *Revue des deux mondes* 26, no. 3 (1860): 644-671.

Mentovich, Ferenc. "Az ember nyomai a messzemultban és kinézései a jövőben" [The vestiges of man in the far past and his prospects in the future]. *Az Ország Tükre* 1864, 30-31.

Petrovits, Gyula. "Az ember értelmi es erkölcsi képességeinek fejlődése. Darwin legújabb műveiből" [The evolution of man's intellectual and moral abilities. From the Darwin's latest works]. *Vasárnapi Újság*, 4th June 1871, 291-92 and 315-16.

Pólya, József. "A szellemtani physiológiából – Az idegrendszer szellemi tevelléseinek alapjai" [From the physiology of psychology]. *Új Magyar Múzeum* 2 (1857): 268-289 and 466-492.

Pólya, József. "Könyvismertetés: A teremtés természettörténelmének nyomai" [Book review: The vestiges of the natural history of creation]. *Protestáns Egyházi s Iskolai Lap* 2, no. 28 (1859): 748.

Révész, Imre. "Tekintélyes tudósok nyilatkozatai korunkból a materializmus, darwinizmus és pantheizmus ellen." [Statements of respected scientists of our day against materialism, Darwinism and pantheism]. *Magyar protestáns egyházi és iskolai figyelmező* 3, no. 1-2 (1872): 22-34.

Rónay, H. and W. D. Cooley. "Extracts from the Letters of an Hungarian Traveller in Central Africa." *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 24 (1854): 271-275.

Rónay, Jácint. "Az ember régisége" [The antiquity of man]. *Hon*, 1863. 150-159.

Rónay, Jácint. "A jégkorszak" [The ice age]. *A magyar orvosok és természetvizsgálók nagygyűlésének munkálatai* 13 (1868): 66-75.

Rónay, Jácint. "A szerves élet haladása s a fajok kihalása" [The progress of organic life and the extinction of the species]. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Évkönyve* 13 (1871): 66-75.

Schwartz, Gyula. "Fajkeletkezés. Az ember helye a természetben és régisége" [Origin of Species. Man's place in nature and its antiquity]. *Budapesti Szemle* 20, no. 64/65 (1864): 282-285.

St. F. "A geologia alapvonalai" [Basic geology]. *Budapesti Szemle* 3, no. 5 (1873): 220-224.

Szabó, József. "Ember a geologiában" [Man in geology]. *Budapesti Szemle* 18, No. 59/60 (1863): 309-320.

Szabó, József. "Az ember a geológiában" [Man in geology]. In *A Magyar Orvosok és Természetvizsgálók 1863. September 19-26. Pesten tartott IX. nagygyülésének történeti vázlata és munkálatai*. Pest: 1864. 45-52.

Szabó, József "Geologiai alapnézetek: a folytonossági elmélet szellemében" [Fundamental views of geology: in the spirit of the theory of continuity]. *Budapesti Szemle* 2, no. 4 (1858): 57-78.

Szabó, József. "A jelen geologiája" [The geology of the present]. *Budapesti Szemle* 5, no. 9 (1874): 220-222.

Szily, Kálmán. "Darwin magyar kiadásának előszavához" [To the Introduction of Darwin's Hungarian edition]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 5 (1873): 412-3.

Szily, Kálmán. "Olvasóinkhoz" [To our readers], *Természettudományi Közlöny* 1, no. 1 (1869): 1-4.

Than, Károly. "Elnöki megnyitóbeszéd" [Opening speech of the President]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 6, no. 54 (1874):80-83.

Books

Chambers, Robert. *A teremtés természet-történelmének nyomai.* [Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation]. Pápa: Pápai Református Főiskolai Nyomda, 1858.

Chambers, Robert. *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.* London: John Churchill, 1853. Tenth edition.

Dapsy, László. *A geologia alapvonalai. Page Dávid művenek 9. kiadása nyomán.* [Basic geology. After the ninth edition of David Page's work]. Pest: Eggenberger, 1873.

Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. London: Murray, 1871.

Darwin, Charles. Az *ember származása* [The descent of man]. 2 volumes. Translated by Aurél Török and Géza Entz. Budapest: Természettudományi Társulat Kiadóvállalata, 1884.

Darwin, Charles. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals.* London: John Murray, 1872.

Darwin, Charles. *A fajok eredete a természeti kiválás útján, vagyis az előnyös válfajok fennmaradása a létérti küzdelemben* [The origin of species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life]. Translated by László Dapsy, with the assistance of Tivadar Margó. Pest: Magyar Királyi Természettudományi Társulat Kiadóvállalata, 1873-74.

Darwin, Charles. *Naturwissenschaftliche Reisen.* Translated by Ernst Dieffenbach. Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1844.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by means of natural selection, or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life*. Sixth edition, with additions and corrections. London, John Murray, 1872.

Darwin, Charles. *The structure and distribution of coral reefs. Being the first part of the geology of the voyage of the Beagle, under the command of Capt. Fitzroy, R.N. during the years 1832 to 1836*. London: Smith Elder and Co., 1842.
Entz, Géza. "Darwinismus." *Természet* 1 (1868): 18-22, 30-33, 39-43, 61-65.

Huxley, Thomas H. *On our knowledge of the Causes of the Phenomena of Organic Nature. Being six lectures to working men, delivered at the Museum of Practical Geology*. London: Robert Hardwicke, 1863.

Laing, Sidney Herbert. *Az ember származása: A megczáfolt Darwinizmus c. Tanulmány alapján* [The descent of man: based on the study Darwinism Refuted]. Transl. Manó Michalek. Pest: Szent István Társulat, 1872.

Margó, Tivadar. *Általános állattan* [General zoology]. Pest: Lampel, 1868.

Margó, Tivadar. *Darwin és az állatvilág* [Darwin and the animal world]. Pest: Aigner L., 1868.

Mentovich, Ferenc. *A természettan elemei* [Elements of natural history]. Marosvásárhely, 1865.

Mentovich, Ferenc. *Az uj világnézlet* [The new world view]. Marosvásárhely: 1870.

Pap, János. *Az állatok természetrajza a középtanodák felsőbb osztályai számára.* Pest: Zilahy S., 1875.

Rónay, Jácint. *Fajkeletkezés; Az embernek helye a természetben és Régisége* [The origin of species; man's place in nature and its antiquity]. Pest: Demjén és Sebes, 1864

Rónay, Jácint. *Jellemisme. Vagy az angol, franczia, magyar, német, olasz, orosz, spanyol nemzet nő, férfiú és életkorok jellemzése lélektani szempontból* [Characterology. Or the characterization of the women, men and ages of the English, French, Hungarian, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish nations from a psychological point of view]. Győr, 1847.

Rónay, Jácint *Mutatvány a tapasztalati lélektan köréből* [A Study on experimental psychology]. Győr, 1846.

Rónay, Jácint. *Napló-töredék. Hetven év reményei és csalódásai* [Diary-fragment. Hopes and disappointments of seventy years]. 8 volumes. Pozsony, 1884.

Rónay, Jácint. *Az ősemberek haladása* [The progress of prehistoric men]. Akadémiai székfoglaló értekezés. Series: Értekezések a Bölcsészeti Tudományok köréből. Vol. 1. Pest: Eggenberger Ferenc, 1868.

Rónay, Jácint. *A tűzimádó bölcs az ősvilágok emlékeiről* [The fire-worshipping wise man on the remains of ancient worlds]. Pest: Kilián György, 1860.

Other

Hudi, József, ed. *Források Pápa város történetéből* [Sources from the history of the town of Pápa]. A Pápai Református Gyűjtemények kiadványai, Forrásközlések 2 [Publications of the Calvinist Collections of Pápa, Source editions 2]. Pápa: Pápai Református Gyűjtemények, 2001.

Margó, Tivadar. *Emlékbeszéd Charles Robert Darwin, a M. T. Akadémia k. Tagja felett*. [Obituary for Charles Robert Darwin, external member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1884.

Report of the Thirty-Sixth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; Held at Nottingham in August 1866. London: John Murray, 1867.

Szemere, Bertalan. *Levelek (1849-1862): száműzetésben* [Letters (1849-1862): in exile]. Pest: Ráth Mór, 1870.

Secondary Sources

A pápai református egyház története [The history of the Calvinist congregation of Pápa]. Pápa: Református Főiskolai Nyomda, 1941.

Acsay, Ferenc. *Rónay János Jáczint élete* [The life of János Jáczint Rónay]. Győr: Győregyházmegyei Könyvsajtó, 1906.

Adriányi, Gabriel. "Drei Naturwissenschaftler im ungarischen Klerus des 19. Jahrhunderts: Jácint Rónay OSB, Kabos Hegyfoki und Anyos Jedlik OSB." In *Theologie – Grund und Grenzen. Festgabe für Heimo Dolch zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres*, ed. Hans Wadenfels. Paderborn, 1982. 547–563.

Agar, Jon and Crosbie Smith, eds. *Making Space for Science: Territorial Themes in the Shaping of Knowledge*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1998.

Allodiatoris, Irma. "Rónay János Jácint." *Élővilág* 9, no. 5 (1964): 49-53.

Amrein, Martin and Kärin Nickelsen. "The Gentleman and the Rogue: The Collaboration between Charles Darwin and Carl Vogt." *Journal of the History of Biology* 41 (2008): 237–266.

Artigas, Mariano, Thomas F. Glick and Rafael A. Martínez, eds. *Negotiating Darwin: The Vatical Confronts Evolution, 1877-1902*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Balás, Anna, Jenőné Orosz and Istvánné Vitéz. "A darwinizmus magyarországi irodalma" [The literature of Darwinism in Hungary]. *Könyvtári Tájékoztató, Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum* 3 (1959): 60-89.

Beck, Mihály "Tudományos mozgalmak: Nyolcvan év hazai természettudományi művelődéstörténete" [Scientific movements: Eighty years of the cultural history of the Hungarian natural sciences]. *Természet Világa* 129, no. 12 (1998):531–534.

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots. Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1983.

Beer, Gillian. *Open Fields. Science in Cultural Encounter*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.

Beer, Gillian. "Translation or Transformation? The Relations of Literature and Science." In *Open Fields. Science in Cultural Encounter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 173-195.

Bona, Gábor. "Pápai diákok a '48-as honvédség tisztikarában (Életrajzi adattár)" [Students from Pápa among the 1848 officer corps (biographical database)]. *Acta Papensia*: *A Pápai Református Gyűjtemények Közleményei* 9, no. 1-4 (2009): 363.

Boros, István. "A 100 esztendős darwinizmus magyarországi pályafutása" [The career of the hundred years old Hungarian Darwinism]. *Élővilág* 4, no.2 (1959): 3-7 and 20-25.

Boros István. "A fejlődéstörténeti irodalom egy feledésbe ment magyar emléke" [A forgotten memory of Hungarian evolutionary literature]. *Élővilág* no. 2 (1957): 57-63.

Bowler, Peter J. *Biology and Social Thought: 1850-1914*. Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley, 1993.

Bowler, Peter J. *Evolution. The History of an Idea*. Revised edition. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Browne, Janet. *Charles Darwin: The Power of Place*. London: Pimlico, 2003.

Browne, Janet. *Charles Darwin: Voyaging*. London: Pimlico, 2002.

Browne Janet, *Darwin's* Origin of Species. London: Atlantic Books, 2006.

Burrow, J. W. "Evolution and Anthropology in the 1860's: The Anthropological Society of London. 1863-71." *Victorian Studies* 7, no. 2 (1863): 137-154.

Buzinkay, Géza, "A darwinizmus és a magyar közgondolkodás az 1870-es években" [Darwinism and the Hungarian public thought in the 1870s]. *Orvosi Hetilap* 126, no. 18 (1985): 1103-05.

Cantor, Geoffrey, Gowan Dawson, Graeme Gooday Richard Noakes, Sally Shuttleworth, and Jonathan R. Topham. *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Cantor, Geoffrey and Sally Shuttleworth, eds. *Science Serialized: Representation of the Sciences in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.

Christie, John and Sally Shuttleworth, eds. *Nature Transfigured: Science and Literature, 1700-1900*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Chyzer Kornél. *A magyar orvosok és természetvizsgálók vándorgyűlésének története 1840-től 1890-ig* [The history of the meeting of the Hungarian Association for the Advancement of Science]. Sátoraljaújhely: Zemplén, 1890.

Coccia, Paolo. "Darwin e l'evoluzionismo nel 2005 (Bibliografia)" [Darwin and evolutionism until 2005]. *L'Ateo* no. 2 (2006), 12-13.

Conry, Yvette. *L'Introduction du Darwinisme en France au XIXe siècle.* Paris: Vrin, 1974.

Corsi, Pietro and Paul Weindling. "Darwinism in Germany, France and Italy" in *The Darwinian Heritage*, ed. by David Kohn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. 683–730.

Dapsy, Vilmos László. *A dapsay Dapsy-család története* [The history of the family Dapsy of Dapsa]. Budapest: Egyetemi Nyomda, 1931.

Daum, Andreas. *Wissenschaftspopularisierung im 19. Jahrhundert: Bürgerliche Kultur, naturwissenschaftliche Bildung und die deutsche Öffentlichtkeit, 1848-1914*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1998.

Desmond, Adrian and James R. Moore. *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist*. New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1994.

Desmond, Adrian. *The Politics of Evolution: Morphology, Medicine and Reform in Radical London*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Dudich Endre. "Id. Entz Géza emlékezete születésének százéves évfordulója alkalmából. 1842-1942." [On the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Géza Entz, Senior]. *Állattani Közlemények* 39 (1942): 113-124.

Ellegard, Alvar. *Darwin and the General Reader: The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872*. Revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Ellegard, Alvar, "Public Opinion and the Press: Reactions to Darwinism." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19, no. 3 (1958): 379-387.

ElShakry, Marwa S. "Knowledge in Motion: The Cultural Politics of Modern Science Translations in Arabic." *Isis* 99 (2008): 701-730.

Engels, Eve-Marie. "Darwin in der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Forschungsbericht." *Evolutionsbiologie von Darwin bis heute*, ed. by Rainer Brömer, Uwe Hossfeld and Nicolaas A. Rupke. Berlin: Verlag Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2000.

Engels Eve-Marie and Thomas Glick, eds. *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*. 2 volumes. London: Continuum, 2008.

Entz, Géza. *Emlékbeszéd Margó Tivadar rendes tagról* [Memorial speech about Tivadar Margó]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1898.

Farkas, Katalin. *Magyar függetlenségi törekvések 1859-1867: a Csáky–Komáromy-féle szervezkedés* [Hungarian independence efforts 1859-1867: the Csáky-Komáromy plot]. Doctoral dissertation. Budapest: ELTE, 2006.

Frank, Tibor. "Acts of Creation: The Eötvös Family and the Rise of Science Education in Hungary." In *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918*, ed. by Mitchell Ash and Jan Surman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 113-137.

Frank, Tibor. "Anthropology and Politics: Craniology and Racism in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy." In *Ethnicity, Propaganda, Myth-Making. Studies in Hungarian Connections to Britain and America 1848-1945*. Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1999.

Freeman, R. B. *The Works of Charles Darwin: An Annotated Bibliographical Handlist*. 2nd ed. Dawson: Folkstone, 1977. http://darwin-online.org.uk/EditorialIntroductions/Freeman_OntheOriginofSpecies.html.

Fyfe, Allen and Bernard Lightman, eds. *Science in the Marketplace: Nineteenth-Century Sites and Experiences*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Gliboff, Sander. "H. G. Bronn and the History of Nature." *Journal of the History of Biology* 40, no. 2 (2007): 259-294.

Gliboff, Sander. *H. G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism. A Study in Translation and Transformation*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 2008.

Glick, Thomas, ed. *The Comparative Reception of Darwinism*. 2nd ed. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Glick, Thomas F., Miguel Angel Puig-Samper and Rosaura Ruiz, eds. *The Reception of Darwinism in the Iberian World.* Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 221. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.

Gombocz Endre: *A Királyi Magyar Természettudomány Társulat története 1841-1941* [The history of the Royal Hungarian Society for Natural Science]. Budapest: Természettudományi Társulat, 1941.

Greene, John C. *The Death of Adam: Evolution and its Impact on Western Thought*. Revised edition. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1996.

Greene, John C. *Science, Ideology, and World View. Essays in the History of Evolutionary Ideas.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Griffin, Robert J. "Anonymity and Authorship." *New Literary History* 30 (1999): 877-95.

Gieryn, Thomas F. "Boundary-work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Science. *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 6, 1983: 781-795.

Harvey, Joy. *Almost a Man of Genius: Clémence Royer, feminism and nineteenth-century science*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Harvey, Joy. *Almost a Man of Genius: Clémence Royer, feminism and nineteenth-century science*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997.

Harvey, Joy. "Darwin in a French Dress: Translating, Publishing and Supporting Darwin in Nineteenth-Century France." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas Glick. 2 volumes. London: Continuum, 2008. 354-374.

Hunyadi, György. "A nemzeti karakter talányos pszichológiája" [The curious psychology of national character]. In *Nemzetkarakterológiák. Rónay Jáczint, Hugo Münsterberg, Kurt Lewin* [National characterologies: Jácint Rónay, Hugo Münsterberg, Kurt Lewin], ed. by György Hunyadi. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, 2001. 7-50.

Jordanova, Ludmilla. "Science and National Identity." In *Sciences et langues en Europe,* ed. by Roger Chartier and Pietro Corsi. Paris: Centre Alexandre Koyré, 1996.

Junker Thomas. "Zur Rezeption der Darwinschen Theorien bei deutschen Botanikern (1859–1880)." In *Die Rezeption von Evolutionstheorien im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels). Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985. 147-81.

Kampis, György. "Bevezető tanulmány" [Introduction]. In *A fajok eredete* [The origin of species] by *Charles Darwin.* Budapest: TypoteX, 2000.

Kapronczay, Katalin. "A Királyi Magyar Természettudományi Társulat Könyvkiadó Vállalatának története" [The history of the publishing company of the Royal Hungarian

Society for Natural Science]. *Természet Világa: Természettudományi Közlöny* 142, no. 5 (2011): 205-207.

Kis, Ernő. *A Dunántúli Ev. Ref. Egyházkerület pápai főiskolájának története, 1531-1985* [The history of the College of the Transdanubian District of the Luth. Calv. Church at Pápa, 1531-1985]. Pápa: Református Főiskolai Nyomda, 1896.

Kiss, Andrea. *Floods and Long-Term Water-Level Changes in Medieval Hungary*. Doctoral dissertation. Budapest: Central European University, 2011.

Kiss, László. "Egy nyelvújító orvosdoktor: Pólya József (1802-1873)" [Language reformer and physician: József Pólya (1802-1873)]. *Orvosi Hetilap* 143 (2002): 253-255.

Kjærgaard, Peter C. "The Darwin Enterprise: From Scientific Icon To Global Product." *History Of Science* 48, no. 1 (2010): 105-122.

Kjærgaard, Peter C. Niels Henrik Gregersen and Hans Henrik Hjermitslev. "Darwinizing the Danes, 1859–1909." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas Glick. 2 volumes. London: Continuum, 2008. 146-155.

Kókay, György, Géza Buzinkay and Gábor Murányi. *A magyar sajtó története* [The History of the Hungarian Press]. Budapest: Sajtóház Kiadó, 2001.

Komoróczy, Géza. "Az ókori Elő-Ázsia a pesti egyetemen: nemzeti célok vagy tudományos kutatás" [The Ancient Near East at the University of Pest: national goals or scientific research]. In *100 év után. Emlékkonferencia a Keleti Népek Ókori Története Tanszék alapításának 100. évfordulóján* [After 100 years. Anniversary conference to commemorate the founding of the Department of the Ancient History of Oriental Peoples], ed. by Tamás Bács, Tamás Dezső and Zoltán Niederreiter. Series: Antiqua et Orientalia 1. Budapest: ELTE-BTK Ókortudományi Intézet, 2011. 25-34.

Kontler, László. "Translation and Comparison: Early Modern and Current Perspectives," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 3 (2007): 71-102.

Kosáry, Domokos and Béla G. Németh. *A magyar sajtó története*. [The History of the Hungarian Press.] 2 volumes. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985.

Kovacek Bozidar. "Who is Tivadar Margó?" *Archive of Oncology* 9, no. 1 (2001): 67-70.

Kovács, Ábrahám. "Dapsy László szerepe a darwinizmus terjesztésében és annak teológiai fogadtatása" [The Role of László Dapsy in the dissemination of Darwinism and its theological reception]. *Confessio* 50, no. 3 (2007):151–155.

Kovács, Ábrahám. "Darwin első kapcsolata Debrecennel. Egy debreceni szabadelvű protestáns diák, Dapsy László szerepe a brit természettudományi eredmények közvetítésében" [Darwin's first connection with Debrecen. The role of László Dapsy, a

liberal Protestant student from Debrecen, in the dissemination of British scientific achievements]. *Debreceni Szemle* 3, no. 10 (2007): 393-403.

Kovács, Ábrahám. "'Intellectual Treasures of Humankind': Religion, Society and László Dapsy's Translation of *On the Origin of Species.*" In *Calvinism on the Peripheries: Religion and Civil Society in Europe*. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2009. 78-89.

Kovács, Mária. *Liberal Professions and Illiberal Politics: Hungary from the Habsburgs to the Holocaust*. Washington, D.C. and Oxford: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Oxford University Press, 1994.

Kovács, Sándor, ed. *Janus Pannonius összes munkái. Iani Pannonii opera omnia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987.

Küblüs, József, ed. *A Pápai Református Kollégium diákjai, 1585-1861* [The Students of the Reformed College of Pápa, 1585-1861]. Pápa: Pápai Református Gyűjtemények, 2006.

Ladányiné, Erzsébet Boldog. *A magyar filozófia és a darwinizmus XIX. századi történetéből 1850-1875* [From the history of nineteenth century Hungarian philosophy and Darwinism, 1850-1875]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1986.

Leeuwenburgh, Bart and Janneke van der Heide. "Darwin on Dutch Soil: The Early Reception of his Ideas in the Netherlands." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 175-187.

Levine, George. *Darwin and the Novelists: Patterns of Science in Victorian Fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Levine, George. *One Culture: Essays in Science and Literature*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Lightman, Bernard. "Science and the Public." In *Wrestling with Nature: From Omens to Science*, ed. by Peter Harrison, Ronald L. Numbers, and Michael H. Shank. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011. 337-375.

Lightman, Bernard, ed. *Victorian Popularisers of Science: Designing Nature for New Audiences*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Lipták, Dorottya. *Újságok és újságolvasók Ferenc József korában* [Newspapers and their readers in the age of Francis Joseph]. Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2002.

Livingstone, David. *Putting Science in Its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lukács, Lajos. *Magyar politikai emigráció 1849–1867* [Hungarian political emigration, 1849-1867]. Budapest: Athenaeum, 1984.

Máthé, Romuáld. "Rónay Jácint." *Műhely* (Győr) 15, no. 3 (1993): 42-47.

Mendelsohn, Everett. "The social construcion of scientific knowledge." In *The Social Production of Scientific Knowledge. Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook*. Ed by E. Mendelsohn, P. Weingart, R. Whitley. Vol. 1. Boston: D. Reidel, 1977.

Michler, Werner. *Darwinismus und Literatur: Naturwissentschaftliche und literarische Intelligenz in Österreich, 1859-1884*. Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1999.

Millhauser, Milton. *Just before Darwin: Robert Chambers and the Vestiges*. (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University, 1959.

Montgomery, Scott L. *Science in Translation: Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Mund, Katalin. "The Reception of Darwin in Nineteenth-Century Society." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 441-462.

Nemerkényi, Zsombor. "László Magyar – a Hungarian explorer and map-maker of Southwest Africa." http://lazarus.elte.hu/hun/digkonyv/nemerkenyi/magyar5.htm.

Pál, Lajos. "Rónay Jácint." *Századok* 105, no. 3-4 (1971): 670-695.

Pál, Lajos. *Rónay Jácint*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.

Palló, Gábor. "Darwin utazása Magyarországon" [Darwin's journey in Hungary]. *Magyar Tudomány* 170, no. 6 (2009): 714-726.

Palló, Gábor. "Scientific Nationalism: A Historical Approach to Nature in Late Nineteenth-Century Hungary." In *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918*, ed. by Mitchell Ash and Jan Surman. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 102-112.

Pancaldi, Giuliano. *Darwin in Italy: Science across Cultural Frontiers*. Translated by Ruey Brodine Morelli. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Peter J. Bowler. *Evolution. The History of an Idea*, Revised Edition, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Petrik, Géza. *Magyarország bibliographiája 1712-1860* [Hungarian bibliography 1712-1860]. 4 volumes. Budapest: 1888-1892.

Pikaia – Il portale dell'evoluzione

http://www.pikaia.eu/easyne2/LYT.aspx?Code=Pikaia&IDLYT=425&ST=SQL&SQL=ID_Documento=34.

Pór, Antal. *Emlékbeszéd Rónay János Jáczint rendes tagról* [Memorial speech about János Jácint Rónay]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1891.

Pór, Antal. *Rónay Jácint pozsonyi prépost. Életrajzi vázlat* [Jácint Rónay, Prelate of Pozsony. Biographical Sketch]. Pozsony-Budapest: Stampfel Károly, 1887.

Rainger, Ronald. "Race, Politics and Science: The Anthropological Society of London in the 1860s." *Victorian Studies* 22, no. 1 (1978): 51-70.

Rapaics, Rajmund. "Cuvier és Darwin tanai Magyarországon" [The theories of Cuvier and Darwin in Hungary]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 64 (1932): 425-428.

Rapaics, Rajmund. "A darwinizmus magyar úttörői" [The pioneers of Hungarian Darwinism]. *Természet és technika* 3, no. 4 (1952): 196-204.

Réti, Endre. "Darwinisták és antidarwinisták Magyarországon" [Darwinists and Anti-Darwinists in Hungary]. *Világosság* no. 7-8, (1962): 62.

Réti, Endre. "A darwinizmus útja hazánkban" [The journey of Darwinism in our country]. *Természettudományi Közlöny,* 89, no. 2 (1959): 68-71.

Réti, Endre, "Darwinizmus és antidarwinizmus hazánkban" [Darwinism and antidarwinism in our country]. *Természettudományi Közlöny* 89, no. 3 (1959): 100-104.

Rogers, James Allen. "Charles Darwin and Russian Scientists." *Russian Review* 13, no. 4 (1960): 371-38.

Rogers James Allen. "The Reception of Darwin's Origin of Species by Russian Scientists." *Isis* 64 (1973): 484-50.

Rogers James Allen. "Russian Opposition to Darwinism in the Nineteenth Century." *Isis* 65 (1974): 487-505.

Rudwick, M. J. S. *Worlds Before Adam: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Rudwick, Martin J. S. *The Great Devonian Controversy: The Shaping of Scientific Knowledge among Gentlemanly Specialists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Rupke, Nicolaas. "Translation Studies in the History of Science: The Example of the Vestiges." *British Journal for the History of Science* 33 (2000): 209-222.

Ruse, Michael. *The Darwinian Revolution: Science Red in Tooth and Claw*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Schümann, Daniel. "Struggle for or against Participation? How Darwinism came to Poland in the 1860s and early 1870s." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 244-258.

Scudo, Francesco M. and Michele Acanfona. "Darwin and Russian Evolutionary Biology." In *The Darwinian Heritage*, ed. by David Kohn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. 731-52.

Secord, James. "Behind the Veil: Robert Chambers and the Genesis of the *Vestiges of Creation*." in *History, Humanity and Evolution: Essays for John C. Greene*, ed. by James R. Moore. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 165-194.

Secord, James A. "Darwin and the Breeders: A Social History." In *The Darwinian Heritage*, ed. by David Kohn. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. 519–42.

Secord, James A. "Introduction," to *Robert Chambers, Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation and Other Evolutionary Writings.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1994.

Secord, James A. "Knowledge in Transit." *Isis* 95 (2004):654-672.

Secord, James A. "Nature's Fancy: Charles Darwin and the Breeding of Pigeons." *Isis* 72, no. 2 (1981):162-186.

Secord, James A. *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception and Secret Authorship of* Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2000.

Shaffer, Elinor, ed. *The Third Culture: Literature and Science.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998.

Shapin, Steven. "The place of knowledge: a methodological survey." *Science in Context* 4 (1991): 3-21.

Soós, Sándor. "The Scientific Reception of Darwin's Work in Nineteenth-Century Hungary." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 431-440.

Steiner, George. After *Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Stierstorfer, Klaus. "Vestiges of English Literature: Robert Chambers." In *Unmapped Countries. Biological Visions in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture*, ed. by Anne-Julia Zwierlein. London: Anthem Press, 2005.

Stocking, George Jr. "What's in a Name? The Origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute (1837-71)." *Man*, New Series, 3 (6 September 1971): 369-390.

Szabó, Miklós. *Az újkonzervativizmus és a jobboldali radikalizmus története* (*1867-1918*) [The history of neoconservatism and right-wing radicalism (1867-1918)]. Budapest: Új Mandátum, 2003.

Széchenyi, István. *Lovakrul* [On horses]. Pest: Petrózai Trattner J. M. És Károlyi Istvánnál, 1828.

Szinnyei, József *Magyarország természettudományi és mathematikai könyvészete, 1472-1875* [Hungarian bibliography on the natural sciences and mathematics, 1472-1875] (Budapest: 1878).

Tatole, Victoria. "Notes on the Reception of Darwin's Theory in Romania." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 463-479.

Todes, Daniel. "Darwin's Malthusian Metaphor and Russian Evolutionary Thought, 1859-1917." *Isis* 78 (1987): 537-551.

Todes, Daniel. *Darwin without Malthus. The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Trócsányi, Zsolt, ed. *A Pápai Kollégium története* [The History of Pápa College]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1981.

Turner, Frank M. "Public Science in Britain, 1880-1919." *Isis* 71 (1980): 589-608.

V. Budsa Margit, *Magyar Sajtóbibliográfia 1850-1867*. Manusript. Budapest: Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár, 1996. no. 303. www.mek.oszk.hu/03500/03546/03546.htm.

Várkonyi, Ágnes R. *A pozitivista történetszemlélet a magyar történetírásban* [The positivist view of history in Hungarian historiography]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Venuti Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.

Veress, Zoltán. *Jókai természettudománya* [Jókai's natural science]. Bukarest: Kriterion, 1976.

Vucinich Alexander. *Darwin in Russian Thought*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

White, Paul. "Correspondence as a Medium of Reception and Appropriation." In *The Reception of Charles Darwin in Europe*, ed. by Eve-Marie Engels and Thomas F. Glick. London: Continuum, 2008. 55-65.

Young, Robert. *Darwin's Metaphor. Nature's Place in Victorian Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 125.

Databases

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography [ODNB]. http://www.oxforddnb.com

Szinnyei, József. *Magyar írók élete és munkája*. Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor, 1891. [Szinnyei]. http://mek.niif.hu/03600/03630/html/index.htm