

From “Great Realism” to Realism¹

Istvan Szerdahelyi

Hungarian Studies. Vol. 1. pp. 300-328. Translated by Iván Sellei.

I. How did Realism become “Great?”

1. The problem of “Great Realism”

Among the terms that Georg Lukács used in his aesthetic, the most controversial one has been “great realism.”

According to a commonly held view, the essence of Lukács’ conception of realism did not change between the 1930s and his death: “Eventful as Lukács’ external life was, his works show unbroken development from the early 1930s. He did not renounce any tenet, neither did he come up with remarkable new one.”² Yet sponsor of this view are divided into two groups. The members of the first group content that, for Lukács, the term “great realism” never functioned as a category, and that the adjective is unimportant. This view is expressed, for example, in monographs by Helga Gallas and István Hermann,³ which confine themselves to discussion of realism and do not mention the term “great realism.” In a similar manner, Miklós Lackó states that “in the early 1930s, Lukács plunged into Berlin literary polemics almost in full and complete possession of his conception of realism in art.”⁴ Hermann declared that

Lukács never used the concept “great realism” in that form. He did write of great realist writers, but the word *great* operated as an adjective. Once I asked him what he meant by greatrealism. He said he did not know, for, if such a concept existed, there should be little, middle, and intermediate realism as well.⁵

To be sure, the term “greatrealism” is written this way, that is, in one word, only by some of his pupils and—recently—translators, while Lukács

himself always wrote it in two words. Yet the controversial issue is not the term as it appears in written form, but the concept. And Lukács' above statement cannot be considered as the final word in the debate, as it is widely known that, although he did not use such terms as "little, middle, and intermediate realism," he did use such terms as "pedestrian," "superficial," and "limited" realism.

The members of the group contend that, for Lukács, the concept that really matters is not realism in general, but "great realism." Fritz J. Raddatz, for example, in his short monograph, characterizes as important the fact that, after 1933 in the Soviet Union, Lukács worked out the concept of "great realism," yet he does not state that Lukács transcended it. Instead, he points out that, in 1964, in an interview in which Lukács commented on the Prague literary polemics, "Lukács sticks to his earlier views stating that *great literature is realistic.*"⁶ The evolution of the theory of "great realism" is registered in the same manner in Johanna Rosenberg's chronology.⁷

According to the view held by a smaller number of theorists, Lukács' concept of realism changed with time. and the meaning of 'great realism' in Lukács' earlier writings is different from the later used 'realism' without an adjective. This camp is also divided on the issue of determining the date of the reinterpretation of the concept of realism. Tibor Hanák argues that the doctrine, conceived originally in 1933, was modified in the sixties in *Die Eigenart des Ästhetischen*.⁸ Nevertheless, as I pointed out in another work, the change took place much earlier, namely, in the late forties.⁹

Already in the early stage of my work on this paper, I was convinced by the careful reading of Lukács' works that conclusions made so far—including my own earlier attempts—lacked sound foundation owing to inadequacies of research. The main purpose of the present paper is to

elucidate the changes in the use of the term 'realism' and the diverse changes of conception expressed in them in the various stages of Lukács' intellectual development.¹⁰

2. The way that the Young Lukács used "Realism"

It will be recalled that, apart from other meanings of the term, 'realism', in the aesthetic sense, was originally used in the typology of styles.¹¹ In fact, this is still the only meaning that bourgeois literary scholarship accepts.¹² As far as its genesis is concerned, it was used to identify a literary and artistic trend of the nineteenth century which strove to depict phenomena of everyday life truly, realistically, in a way similar to immediate experiences, and without concealing the ugly aspects of reality. Yet, as soon as the name of the movement was generally accepted, its meaning was broadened to become a concept of typology, as all similar trends of style became associated with it. Realism as the name of a movement was not invented by writers themselves. Neither Stendhal nor Balzac claimed to be realists, and even Courbet declared in 1855 that the "label of realist" had been imposed on him and that no one claimed to have fully understood the meaning of this term.¹³ Edmond de Goncourt, in his preface to *Les Frères Zemganno* (1879), did not object to being called a 'realist', yet he described 'realism' as a "foolish word," a "fighting word".¹⁴ In fact, however, the works that he wrote in cooperation with his brother can be regarded as naturalistic. Originally, 'realism' and 'naturalism' were terms identical in meaning, and it took some time before naturalism (and verism) came to connote that sort of realism in which the author 'exaggerates', over-emphasizes the details of description (or, sometimes, finds pleasure in dwelling on 'loathsome' details).

The young Lukács adhered to this connotation of the term. Like other theorists, he interpreted realism as a 'naturalistic predilection', the 'sensuous' portrayal of 'everyday events of life', as a style.¹⁵ Writers whom he later referred to as 'great realists' were as yet of less importance to him; Balzac's name rarely appears in his writings. and he preferred Paul Ernst to Thomas Mann. In fact, in 1913, he referred to the latter as a representative of naturalism, a trend which, according to Lukács, was in ruin and had turned obsolete, owing to its "one-sided oppositional and negative character and inner emptiness."¹⁶ The theory of artistic reflection was alien to him. In his *Heidelberger Aesthetic*, he displays rigid formalism by declaring that 'a work of art can be defined as a complex of forms', and concludes that 'the work of art and reality lose any relation whatsoever from the point of view of the original aesthetic positing-and the one can be thought of by means of the elimination of the other'.¹⁷

The notion of 'typical'¹⁸ and (intensive) 'totality',¹⁹ two of the key terms of his later conception of reality. do, however, appear in his first major work. and especially the latter concept features repeatedly in his early writings,²⁰ perhaps under Rickert's influence.²¹ Yet let me point out that coincidences of this type must not in any way be used as an argument for the assumption that there is no clear demarcation line between Lukács' non-Marxist and Marxist conceptions.²²

3. In Exile in Vienna

Until most recently it was widely maintained in the secondary literature on Lukács that, between 1918 and 1930, he broke away from what had hitherto been the main line of his activity. and abandoned the study of aesthetic and literary problems.

New research proves that this assumption is a mere myth. which has its cause in Lukács' desire to let his papers on artistic and literary problems written during his exile in Vienna pass into oblivion because he regarded them either non-Marxist attempts or attempts that misinterpret Marxism.

To this category belong his writings on art dating from the period when *History and Class Consciousness* emerged. They have nothing in common with Marxism. However broadly we interpret the term. (True. the concept of totality, problematic as it was,²³ yet to which he attributed pivotal importance. later assumed decisive importance in his Marxist theory of art.) In his review article. "The Old Culture and the New Culture," he rephrased the history-of-ideas typology of *The Theory of the Novel* in a language comprising many Marxian terms.²⁴ His other acclaimed study, "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat," is even further away from any conception of realism because it rejects even the philosophical foundation of the former, namely, the theory of reflection,²⁵ and espouses Schiller's theory of play-instinct (*Spieltrieb*).²⁶ (Besides, he does so outside his aesthetic system of arguments. and his conclusion is, therefore, not adequately elaborated.)

As a matter of fact, in the 1920s, during his stay in Vienna, Lukács published numerous essays and articles that he did not include in his later omnibus volume and are, therefore, little known. Among the omitted pieces were some on literary history,²⁷ in particular. On Hungarian literature, which were originally published in *Uj Március* and *100%*.²⁸ It is very probable that, when these texts are located and carefully read. The appraisal of the development of Lukács' artistic and literary conceptions will be radically changed. For instance, in an article of 1922, in which he borrowed the slogans of *proletcult* and the attitude of the 'school of vulgar

sociology', he wrote as follows: "In the eyes of the proletariat. which is a class in the ascending stage of development (similar to the rising and revolutionary bourgeois class of the 18th century), art is a genuinely class art. a didactic art. the propagandist of its aim in the class struggle."²⁹ In an article of 1926, giving credit to Trotsky, he took another direction and criticized avant-garde tendencies of *proletcult* literature, describing a work by Y. Libedinsky as the high point of Soviet literature.³⁰ Gábor Révai. Who translated the article into Hungarian, is of the view that Lukács' reference to Trotsky is without significance, an act of courtesy. Yet the problem is more complicated. Libedinsky was a leading member of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), the most prominent group within the All-Union Association of Proletarian Writers (VAPP), which was operative as early as 1926³¹ (even though it was officially inaugurated only in 1928), and the chief ideologue of RAPP, L. Averbakh. was said to be a Trotskyist. Lukács certainly knew this, since in the year when his article was published. RAPP claimed a leading role both in Soviet literary life and international communist literary life. RAPP was the architect of the International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature (MBRL), formed in 1926. and its secretary-general was Béla Illés.³² For that very reason, the prominence of Libedinsky and the mention of Trotsky in Lukács' article is apparently not accidental. Neither was it by mere accident that, in one of his Hungarian-language articles. Lukács criticized Gorky.³³ It will be recalled that the relation of Gorky and RAPP was rather strained.³⁴

4. Lukács' First Moscow Period

In 1930 Lukács was expelled from Austria and moved to Moscow. where he became an associate of the Marx-Engels Institute. In view of

statements that he made on several occasions.³⁵ it is widely held that this year, when Lukács studied unpublished works of Marx and Engels and became acquainted with M. Lifschitz, was a turning point in his ideological development, and that, in the spirit of that radically new working conception, he returned to the study of aesthetics. (Let us mention at this point that, most recently, some researchers, having realized that this picture is in contradiction with the facts, have taken the stand that Lukács' aesthetic of the thirties is an organic continuation of the conception of *History and Class Consciousness*.³⁶ The scope of this paper does not allow us to discuss this problem, yet we challenge that interpretation.)

Lukács' writings from this era bear witness of quite another state of affairs. There is no proof that he was already familiar with Engels' theory of realism at that time; it is most probable that he had no knowledge of the then unpublished Harkness and Minna Kautsky letters.³⁷ (It is another popular fallacy that it was only at that time that research started on the aesthetic legacy of Marx and Engels,³⁸ It is true, however, that research entered a more intensive phase.) Lukács discussed a partial problem of the Lassalle correspondence, which he had already mentioned in the mid-twenties,³⁹ letters in which Marx, Engels, and Lassalle entered into a polemical debate on the latter's Sickingen drama.⁴⁰ Furthermore, Lukács published numerous writings in German-language periodicals of Moscow, first of all in the *Moskauer Rundschau*, where he published casual reviews on Soviet fiction and poetry.

'Realism' does not play a central role in these texts; its only emphatic use can be found in one place in the essay on Lassalle. There, Lukács argues that 'Vischer's moderate realism' was an empty aesthetic category, namely, 'reconciliation with the most deplorable aspects of the reality of

capitalism in Germany'. He continues: 'neither "conciliatory" realism, nor subjectivistic idealization can exonerate' capitalism's hostility to art. "The sole attitude that is adequate is revolutionary realism, which is [...] the poesy of the sound revolutionary exploration of the foundations of progress."⁴¹ In other words: realism is in itself a neutral concept for artistic value, and only its adjectival combinations can give us guidance concerning values. It is evident that the 'realism' in question was the realist style.

It is all the more understandable as, at that time. the concept of realism of Marxist theorists of art did not in any way differ from that of bourgeois theorists. There was no difference in either content or evaluation. Lukács was aware that Mehring, the most respected Marxist critic, considered realism and true-to-life portrayal in general as a dull imitation of nature.⁴² In the beginning, in fact, realism was in no way in favour in the Soviet Union. As noted by Lunacharsky in 1926:

among the artists. the realists were indifferent to the revolution in the immediate post-revolutionary period, in fact, some of them were hostile to its achievement. [...] Yet the revolution was given an enthusiastic reception by the 'leftist' artists, those belonging to the post-impressionist experiments.⁴³

Only by the mid-twenties was demand for realism stressed, The term still connoted a style, 'Heroic realism', proclaimed in 1922 by the Association of the Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AHRR), meant the registration of everyday life with the precision of reportage. In his platform of 'monumental realism' of 1926, A. Tolstoy demanded that "art should have the smell of flesh and should be more substantial than everyday life." In the 1928 platform of the peasant writers, it was spelled out that realism meant the "search for the simplicity of artistic style and the clarity of

language," a literature that is "genuinely created for the people at large, the workers and peasants,"⁴⁴ and so on.

The change was due to political causes. In his above-mentioned article, Lunacharsky describes the turn in clear terms:

Light was subsequently shed on two issues. First, the broad public that came of age during the revolution expected art to possess a characteristic, convincing, and clear-cut social content. While 'leftist' artists were essentially formalists. Being preoccupied with colourful and playful stylization, they lost touch with the language of real things and became unintelligible for the public. Secondly, realist artists started to develop a positive attitude toward the revolution. The change of orientation was becoming increasingly intense year by year, and ultimately resulted in the establishment of a massive group, which, no doubt, has scored some success.⁴⁵

It is remarkable that Lunacharsky adds: "The struggle is still going on..." If he had had the authority to modify the turn of events, the struggle would not have been decided with the elimination of any of the trends. As late as 1931, he took a stand in favour of "two main trends of proletarian literature," where 'realistic technique' was but one of the two. He stuck to the stance that "it is clear that the proletariat needs another technique as well, stylization, whose constituents are caricature, hyperbole. And deformation."⁴⁶

As I have already hinted, at that time, RAPP strove to detain the rank of officially representing the party literature in the spirit (i.e., under the aegis) of the *proletcult* movement, which played a contradictory yet not entirely negative role in the history of Soviet literature.⁴⁷ The leaders of RAPP were Averbakh, Fadeyev, and Libedinsky who, at the first all-union congress of RAPP in 1928, elaborated the platform of the organization.

They espoused the slogans "toward realism," and "let us learn from the classics,"⁴⁸ yet had some reservations. Fadeyev declared that proletarian art must not confine itself to following "naive realism," that is, the pattern of "the great realists of the past," as it has to portray "the birth of the new in the old," a task that old realism was incapable of realizing.⁴⁹ For that reason, the principal method that the leaders of RAPP prescribed for proletarian art was not realism, but dialectical materialism,⁵⁰ and the task that they most often preferred was the attainment of a 'vividness' of portrayal, by which they meant a stress on the description of the characters' internal features.

The chief opponents to RAPP's official line were the avant-garde documentary literature represented by LEF and New (*Novy*) LEF and a 'leftist' opposition within RAPP (which, in 1930, rallied behind the short-lived *Litfront*). The representatives of the latter disowned a realistic style and laid stress on psychologism and literary reportage. They had much in common with LEF.⁵¹ However, embracing Averbakh's slogan of "either an ally or an enemy," the journals associated with V APP and RAPP made repeated onslaughts against "fellow-traveling" writers, as, for instance, Ehrenburg.⁵²

The articles that Lukács wrote in 193~31 clearly have much in common with the line of RAPP. In two of his articles published in *Moskauer Rundschau*, he attacked Ilya Ehrenburg. In fact, in the second he charged that Ehrenburg was a writer of sentimentalist kitsch, whose world view was servile.⁵³ Lukács wrote a disapproving review of the second volume of Sholokhov's *And Quiet Flows the Don*, stating that 'vividness' was missing from its portrayal.⁵⁴ In a review of A. Karavayeva's novel, *Die Fabrik im Walde*, Lukács echoed the tenet on the need of the description of the "new that is born in the old."⁵⁵ In his article, "Neuer Inhalt und alte Form," he

called for the observance of the stylistic conventions of realism because, as he put it, standards in bourgeois literature had sunk since Tolstoy, and this literature was becoming nothing more than an empty playing with forms. He attempted to support his argument by using a then well known tenet of 'vulgar sociology'.⁵⁶ It is an old axiom of aesthetics that the style is the man- et man is the product of his class status.⁵⁷ The tenet, the style is the class, belongs to N. Yefimov, an advocate of 'vulgar sociology'.⁵⁸

No one should be surprised at the conclusion that, in the beginning, Lukács' Marxist aesthetic conception was shaped in the spirit of 'rappist' doctrines. It is almost self-evident that Lukács, who had just settled in Moscow, where he was almost unknown, oriented himself to the trend that was respected the most and accepted as the official line of the time. Besides, not all of RAPP's conceptions were mistaken; and among its mistaken theories its anti-avant-gardism coincided with Lukács' personal opinion to such a degree that he stuck to it even after the fall of RAPP. That the sectarian views of Averbakh were far from alien to him is illustrated best not by his reviews in *Moskauer Rundschau*, but by his article on the draft platform (1931) of the Hungarian proletarian writers living in Moscow.⁵⁹ Lukács offered a left-wing criticism of that ultra-leftist draft platform which we have bad memories of. Lukács starts out from the assertion that in Hungary, the whole bourgeois literature after the Compromise of 1867 was apologetic: it was the literature of the 'Prussian course' of the bourgeoisie. "[Mór] Jókai's humour serves the aim of glossing over the repugnant aspects of the peculiar development of capitalism in Hungary."⁶⁰ The life work of Kalman Mészáros carried on this 'glossing over'; Bródy is a mere apologist, while Lajos Kassák is a social fascist, and Dezső Szabó an expressionist fascist. In conclusion, Lukács calls on the framers of

the platform to declare that: "There is no classic writer in the Hungarian literature after '67 whom proletarian writers could learn from."⁶¹

Yet even that period produced some results that are worthy of Lukács the thinker. In his review on Johannes R. Becher—for the first time in his Marxist period—he points out the role of totality in an aesthetic context,⁶² and that argument is genuinely Lukácsian. It can be concluded that his writings reflect a strong influence, rather than the uncritical adoption, of 'rappism'.

5. The Berlin Mission

In the summer of 1931, Lukács went to Berlin to consolidate the official line of RAPP, and worked there until March, 1933. In 1928, the aforementioned International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature organized a German writers' association, the *Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller* (BPRS—Association of Proletarian Revolutionary Writers), which issued a monthly journal, *Die Linkskurve*, between August 1929, and December 1932. There were two opposing groups within the BPRS and *Die Linkskurve*. The one (led by J. R. Becher and including Andor Gabor) stood for RAPP's official line, while the other, 'leftist' wing associated itself with the views of LEF. In summer, 1931, the 'leftist' wing gained the upper hand in the BPRS and the editorial board of *Die Linkskurve*. Against that background, Lukács arrived in Berlin as the emissary of the Moscow centre (which after 1930 went under the title of International Union of Revolutionary Writers). As Lukács was sent from Moscow, he was considered the only authority in questions of theory.⁶³ He attacked the views of the 'left wing' in sharply polemical articles.⁶⁴

His arguments continued to adhere to rappid doctrines. He called for

“the application of dialectics,”⁶⁵ instead of the method used by the “great realist writers of the revolutionary era of the bourgeoisie,” which he—in the manner of Fadeyev—described as “naive.”⁶⁶ At the same time, he justified their usage of “psychological” portrayal, which, he stated, emerged from a “not-yet-apologetical soil,”⁶⁷ unlike the reportage novel, which is an anti-dialectical form. and unlike all new forms in general. which “in reality [...] cut off from the great stream of revolutionary development and tradition, feed on the ideological products of the bourgeoisie's decay” that appeared in the wake of the “subjectivistic transformation of realism.”⁶⁸ Lukács described Averbakh, the leader of RAPP, as an outstanding critic,⁶⁹ and lashed out at his opponents, Ehrenburg, whose outlook he described as “sceptically corroded, intellectualist, and anti-revolutionary,” and the “leftist” Tretyakov.⁷⁰ Accordingly, Lukács' assessments are fundamentally erroneous. The reportage novel and documentary literature are genres in their own right today. as they were in 1931; but his fellow debaters were even more mistaken.⁷¹

More important yet for the purpose of this paper is the fact that these polemical articles contain thoughts anticipating the conception of realism of later years. At that time, Lukács certainly knew—and quoted—Engels' observations on realism and the “triumph of realism,” although he attempted to use them to justify his erroneous views.⁷² Still he defined the requirements of “typical” and “intensive totality” (true, written as they were in the heat of the polemic against documentary literature. His definitions were not without weaknesses),⁷³ and, finally, he offered an ingenious analysis of the category of partisanship (*Parteilichkeit*) in art.⁷⁴

These facts once again prove that Lukács' views of the time were not confined to advocacy of the 'rappist' line, for he transcended it on points of

considerable importance. Furthermore, there is no evidence that he had direct ties with RAPP apart from those mediated by the International Union of Revolutionary Writers and BPRS.⁷⁵

6. Realism as a style: non-realist great art

In the same period, Lukács wrote an essay that had nothing to do with the fruitless controversy over documentary literature and the factional strife within the BPRS. And which was, therefore, free of the 'rappist' weaknesses: "Zur Frage der Satire"⁷⁶ was an article of unique importance for the evolution of his conception of realism. Its main points are summed up as follows: it is a characteristic feature of every literature that it presents the key phenomena of the reality that it wishes to portray in a sensuous form of phenomena in such a way that, by evoking the whole complex of the interplay of causes and consequences, the work of art reflects the picture of social totality.⁷⁷

Further analysis shows that the peculiarity of satirical representation, which relies on the fantastic, is that "accidence, possibility and necessity, appearance and essence, are linked in satire in a way that is different from reality."⁷⁸ However, diversion from the real appearance--essence connections does not mean the termination of the 'effect of reality'. the criterion of truth. Instead, it means that satire,

as it excludes the realistic mediations, creates a world picture whose evidence depends, formally, on the sensuous strength of the evoked conflict, and, in content, on the *correctness* of the connection of categories, in other words, on whether the accident represented, the social situation portrayed in a satirical way, is indeed truthful and correct in terms of its content in its representation. What satire creates is an impression of reality, the impression of a mirror-image of reality; yet what provokes this

impression is, in its structure. Qualitatively different from the reality that it reflects. The qualitative difference exists even if the satirist adheres to the empirical reality both in the details and the make-up of its work. [...] In satire, no combination of elements of reality, even if they be represented realistically, corresponds to the structure of reality: their linkage is beyond both what is possible in ordinary life (which is attained by almost all great realist writers), and the typical. [...] It is this departure from reality, which is, however, a correct reproduction of the *essence* of reality. This uninterrupted shuttle between real and unreal, that gives rise to the impression of the grotesque and fantastic. Obviously, it does so *only* in the case if this 'unreality' does not express less than the substance of reality. In the opposite case, the fantastic degenerates into an empty and worthless juggling with elements of reality, hurled one upon the other arbitrarily and without design.⁷⁹

In sum: the method of the 'great realists' is just one of the possible types of 'great literature'. The 'great realist writers' retain the appearance-essence relationships of immediate reality, and their representation is typical, in the sense of adherence to the average,⁸⁰ and realistic. Other, non-realistic, modes of expression, like that of the grotesque and fantastic satire can be of equal value.

7. Realism as method rather than style

I have good reason to suppose that it would have been very beneficial for the development of Lukács' aesthetic—and Marxist aesthetic in general—if Lukács had carried on that approach to full elaboration. Yet historical conditions would not have allowed him to do that.

While he stayed in Berlin, decisive changes took place in the Soviet Union. In its resolution of April 23, 1932, "On the Reorganization of Literary and Artistic Organizations," the party disbanded all proletarian literary and

arts organizations, in order to replace them with uniform artistic associations. Most important among the developments was the dissolution of RA PP itself; in fact, the official explanation claimed that the resolution had been necessitated chiefly by RAPP's sectarian intolerance.⁸¹ In the BPRS, which—through the mediation of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers was dependent on RAPP, the latter news created general uncertainty. Lukács remained the only representative of the old line in *Die Linkskurve*, until the journal ceased publication in the absence of material support (it had been sponsored by the above-mentioned international union).⁸²

For over half a year Lukács stood for a line in the BPRS that had been transcended and, in a similar manner, his conception of realism spelled out in connection with satire became outdated. The dissolution of RAPP was not identical with a full break with 'rappist' doctrines. On the contrary, attachment to the realistic style of the 19th century was elevated to official status, while mounting pressure was put on LEF, the Litfront. And Meyerhold's school, that is, opponents of RAPP.⁸³ In but a few years, "a legion of primitive writings," written in the spirit of a realistic style, "was published in periodicals that had for long rejected works by *avant-gardists* because they fell victim to the cult of personality or were banished to Siberia."⁸⁴

Lukács states that Stalin's sole aim in the measures against RAPP was to force the Trotskyist Averbakh out of literary life (his fate after 1932 is unknown). True, he followed I. M. Gronsky's proposal and gave the new communist art the name "socialist realist" instead of "dialectical materialist," championed by RAPP.⁸⁵ As far as style is concerned, his move strengthened, rather than weakened, the justification of the 'rappist'

conception of tradition. Fadeyev, who had once acted as an official exponent of the platform of RAPP, was now busy declaring that the cornerstone of the “ever more steady and triumphant” progress of Soviet literature was the “new revolutionary artistic method, that of socialist realism,” “the vanguard style of the era.”⁸⁶

The rivalry between the 'realist' and 'stylizing' lines, 'the two fundamental lines of proletarian literature', was, then, settled, even though Lunacharsky—in his above-mentioned statement—had said only a year before that it could not be decided. 'Socialist realism' proved to be the stronger of the two, in which stress was laid not on 'socialist'—as the stylizing-deformative trend was also socialist—but on 'realism', the realist style.

Because-as Lukács put it at that time—that was “Stalin's slogan,”⁸⁷ there could be no open opposition; yet it was possible to reinterpret it in such a way as to assure the persistence of modern values of art. That is believed to have been what Lunacharsky had in mind when, in 1933, he wrote-breaking with his own earlier terminology—that 'our realism is extremely dynamic, and allows scope for elements that are beyond the formal boundaries of realism if the term is taken in the strict sense.' Therefore, Realism “has the right to create gigantic characters that never exist in reality and embody collective forces.”⁸⁸ To bring home the reinterpretation, Lunacharsky challenged Fadeyev's definition—which had general currency—which stated that socialist realism was 'method and style'. As Lunacharsky put it:

The term 'style' does not have a clearcut and generally accepted meaning either in general European literature on the history of art or in ours. Yet I firmly oppose the use of the term 'socialist

realism' in the sense of style. Socialist realism is a whole trend that will become dominant in a certain period. [...] major trends that cover decades, sometimes centuries and considerable groups have given rise to distinct styles in themselves. [...] Of all trends, socialist realism supposes and demands the diversity of styles. In fact. The diversity of styles logically follows from it.⁸⁹

A thorough analysis of the facts will easily show that such reinterpretation of realism dates back to an earlier period. Mayakovsky rallied representatives of the Soviet avant-garde to the camp of LEF with the tenet of 'tendentious realism', while Tairov used the term 'concrete realism' for a theatrical style that radically broke with conventions and which, in his words, could "of all styles claim to be the *genuine style of our age*,"⁹⁰ Yet these occasional instances of play on words cannot be regarded as terms, and neither was it a genuine definition when Andre Breton and Paul Eluard wrote in their "*Notes sur la poésie*" (1929) that "*La poésie est une pipe*."⁹¹

That we are compelled to admit that Lunacharsky's reinterpretation fell into oblivion should in no wise be taken as belittling the absolutely positive and progressive character of his intention regarding cultural policy. In vain did he define it as a method. For at least two decades thereafter, socialist realism was discussed within the confines of realist style in the Soviet Union (and, after 1948, in the various people's democracies). Neither has the public at large accepted the new meaning of realism: even today, writer and reader associate it with a moderately naturalistic style. Ambiguity has arisen about the connotation of the term in the scholarly literature. Western Marxists and communist writers—who were allowed to do so—welcomed the opportunity to accord the label 'realist' to the romanticist Hugo, the symbolist Rimbaud, and the futurist Mayakovsky.

They defined Bruegel's fantastic visions as realistic. and used the term 'new realist' to characterize the entire avant-garde ranging from impressionism to cubism.⁹² Soviet theorists, however, contended—as Simonov remembers— that 'in artistic creation the method of socialist realism determines style itself and it is practically style itself.' In this way, “they paid lip service to diversity and strove to shape all works after the same pattern.”⁹³ Neither were Western Marxists united in their usage of the term. since many of them, including Caudwell,⁹⁴ stuck to the traditional meaning of the term.

It can. therefore. be concluded that the reinterpretation did not serve artistic practice, and, in fact, sowed confusion over the pivotal concept of Marxist aesthetic. As Laxness wrote in 1954,

the usage of the concept of realism with any adjective is apparently nothing but *contrudictio in adiecto*. The very fact that it is possible to speak of several types of realism instead of the sole, genuine, Realistic realism, proves that realism is an obscure notion,⁹⁵

Sholokhov recalls that Fadeyev. when asked what socialist realism was, answered in a more simple way: “he said: 'The devil knows what it is'.”⁹⁶

II. The Non-Existent conception of “Great Realism”

1. ‘Petty’ and ‘Great Realism’

When, after the fascist takeover in 1933, Lukács had to leave Germany and return—via Czechoslovakia—to the Soviet Union, he was not able to

further unfold his theory based on the principle of the duality of 'great realism' and 'non-realist great art'. For it had been decided in the Soviet Union that, in this or that sense, only 'realistic' art may claim the title 'great'. He lost no time in revising his theory, and elaborated the concept of 'great realism'.

Numerous analysts ascribe the emergence of this conception to political considerations. Many hold that fear dictated Lukács' alignment with Stalin's position,⁹⁷ or claim that he worked under disguise,⁹⁸ or that he was waging a partisan-style war against Stalinism.⁹⁹ Others qualify his 'great realism' as the art theoretical manifestation of the political program put forward in the "Blum Theses".¹⁰⁰ The latter assumption seems to other observers, including myself, to lack any foundation,¹⁰¹ as the Stalin-Lukács relationship, too must have been much more complex than that. István Hermann's statement about the 1930s appears to carry the most conviction when he states that, at that time, Lukács' trust in Stalin was still dictated by inner conviction.¹⁰² It should be recalled that since his juvenile years, Lukács had professed the principle that "the Catholic should be papist."¹⁰³ and that only after *Literaturny Kritik* had to cease publication, did there emerge a widening gap between his private opinions and loyal public statements.¹⁰⁴

Upon returning to Moscow. Lukács was able to work under more favourable conditions. He became a staff member of *Literaturny Kritik*. Which was launched in June 1933. He was given the opportunity to publish articles in Russian and thereby to enter Soviet cultural life. In the circle of German writers living in exile in Moscow (which included Andor Gabor and Gyula Hay) he was a respected personality,¹⁰⁵ while his opponents abroad went so far as to consider him to be the helmsman of a powerful clique.¹⁰⁶

Stalin authorized P. F. Yudin to found and edit *Literaturny Kritik* in order to challenge (the disbanded) RAPP, pave the way for the formation of the unified Soviet Writers' Association, bring Plekhanovian orthodoxy and "vulgar sociology" under criticism. And help to give rise to a new Marxist aesthetic.¹⁰⁷ Lifschitz and Lukács were included in the staff in order to promote the latter goal. Lukács did not participate in the onslaught on RAPP; he made his debut as a contributor by publishing an anti-expressionist 'revelation'.

It was a decisive change in his conception of realism that he gave up the opinion admitting the existence of non-realistic great art, one that altered the realistic appearance—essence relationship of reality. He found fault with expressionism for failing to "preserve the general structure of immediate reality."¹⁰⁸ (In addition, he alleged that expressionism was heading toward fascism, and called it a trend that belonged to the fascist traditions of art¹⁰⁹—but that is beyond the province of this paper.) Lukács writes approvingly of the "realist writers"¹¹⁰ and the "great realists"¹¹¹ (mentioning Zola), yet it is not immediately clear what he means by these terms. Only one thing is certain: he backed every "passionate protest" against "experimentation with form."¹¹²

Lukács' essay on Vischer (1934) is, as a whole, important, and the fruit of profound studies. but even though the notion of realism is now considerably more elaborate, it is, nevertheless, built on a grave terminological contradiction. On the one hand, Lukács describes realism as the "true-to-life reproduction of social reality"¹¹³ that is, qualifies it as a style. In the same manner, he adds that realism may be "of small faith," "cowardly," "miserably moderate," and "shy of a genuine criticism of society"; as such. The tradition of "theorists and writers who became

infamous in fascist times."¹¹⁴ On the other hand, the term is also used in quite another sense: to designate art that represents genuine, that is, social reality. When Lukács writes that, in dismissing Sue as "false," Marx reproaches him for the "absence of realism,"¹¹⁵ Lukács has artistic truth, rather than a style, in mind. Only in that sense can he declare that there was a "realistic late period of romanticism."¹¹⁶ By using the terms "true realism that offers a criticism of society," "sham realism," and "pseudo-realism"¹¹⁷ within the same paper, Lukács suggests that the realist style is especially well disposed to reflect reality in a truthful and critical way because it is 'genuine' and realizes all its potentials only in the case that 'it has a critical attitude to society.' The idea—whether true or not—builds a link between the two meanings of the word. Lukács, on the pattern of Lunacharsky, transforms realism into a concept of methodology, yet also retains its original meaning, that is, a term of style typology, and he strives to connect the two.

Writings of subsequent years repeat these ideas. On the one hand, he writes that deviation from realism is a question of form, as realism may be "vulgar,"¹¹⁸ "servile, empirical," or "petty and photographic."¹¹⁹ On the other hand, he extends the concept of realism, which he conceives in the sense of 'great literature', to a growing number of non-realistic trends of style: the classicism of Goethe and Schiller,¹²⁰ the symbolism of Baudelaire,¹²¹ and, in one place, even to the poetry of Holderlin.¹²²

Lukács' writings are marked by this dual meaning of realism down to 1948; what is more, the distance between the two meanings is now small, now large. The scope of this paper does not allow me to offer a year-by-year account of these changes, which are devoid of an organizing principle or developmental trend. At one of the two extremes, Lukács is ready to admit

as realistic even 'extravagantly' grotesque and fantastic representation, provided that he finds the content true to reality. In this sense, in the fantastic novellas.

It is the very depth of Balzac's realism that removes his and so completely beyond the photographic reproduction of 'average reality'. For the great concentration of the content lends the picture, even without the addition of any romantic ingredients, a sombre, gruesome, and fantastic quality.¹²³

Lukács wrote in 1940 that this position should be interpreted as follows:

Balzac used the romantic element, the grotesque, the fantastic, the bizarre, the ugly, the ironically or sententiously exaggerated only in order to show up essential human and social relationships. All this was for Balzac merely a means, if a roundabout one, to the creation of a realism which, while absorbing the new aspects of life, would yet preserve the qualities of the older great literature.¹²⁴

His essays on Keller (1939) reflects the same view,¹²⁵ and he gave the clearest elaboration to this theory in 1945, in his introduction to the first Hungarian edition of Marx's and Engels' writings on literature. In that work he concludes the discussion of typical representation and the unity of essence and appearance with the following thought:

wayward poetic imagination and the fantastic representation of phenomena are fully compatible with the Marxist conception of reality. It is not accidental that Max acknowledged some of Balzac's fantastic novellas and E. T. A. Hoffmann's works [...] Marxian aesthetic, which does not consider as realistic the most naturalistic representation of the world if it fails to express the essential organizing forces of life, accepts it as obvious that

fantastic novellas by Hoffmann and Balzac constitute summits of realist literature because, with the very assistance of fantastic representation, those essential moments are expressed in them. The concept of realism for Marxian aesthetic is the realism of essence expressed in a sensuous artistic form. This constitutes a dialectical application of the theory of reflection in the realm of aesthetics. And it is not accidental that it is the very concept of type where this feature of Marxian aesthetic receives the clearest expression.¹²⁶

2. Non-realistic 'Great Art' that exists after all

It has to be mentioned at this point that, as is well known, a 'Marxian conception of realism' has never existed, while no connection whatsoever can be established between Engels' remarks on realism and fantastic representation, as they are historically associated with the realistic style.¹²⁷ Yet the conception described above is just one of Lukács' doctrines of realism. For, concurrent with it, we can find another one, which was connected to style typology. As early as 1934, in Lukács' study on Heine. The 1932 conception of reality, which states that realism is merely one of the possible stylistic embodiments of 'great art', re-emerges. In that article, Lukács juxtaposes Heine with Balzac.

Heine wird, zusammen mit Balzac, der letzte grosse Dichter des westeuropäischen Bürgertums von Weltbedeutung, weil er, ebenso wie dieser, eine besondere Form gefunden hat, in der die Widersprüche sich lebendig bewegen können. [...] Stilistisch freilich zündet Balzac und Heine, die einander persönlich und künstlerisch verehrt haben, die denkbar grössten Gegensätze.¹²⁸

The fact expressed in the latter statement is entirely irrelevant here. The French social situation 'allowed Balzac to represent the real

contradictions with such immediately realistic means', while the German social situation demanded another style, a form that was 'lyrical, ironic, fantastic, and extremely subjective'. According to him, "at that time, that was the only possible *German form* of the sublimest poetic expression of the social contradictions."¹²⁹

Yet not only difference in social situation can allow the emergence of a non-realistic style of equal value with the realist one. As Lukács put it in his essay, "Parteidichtung," of 1945, varying degrees of consciousness may also permit this. In that article, one possible type of literary creation is that belonging to the writer who 'raises political issues unconsciously, often against his will and intention'. The other type is the 'great realist' who strives for 'giving a broad, profound. And comprehensive picture of the development of social life'. The third type is the 'political poet proper, the party poet'. He wants 'directly to influence the turn of events'. Such an activity demands the highest degree of consciousness, since in that case, 'the poet's outlook, subjective thoughts, and emotions not only give shape to the object, but are themselves the expressed and represented object.'¹³⁰

Those who are well versed in Lukács' conceptions of genre theory can recognize that, at this point, the differences in style are attached to differences in genre. A year later, Lukács said in clearer terms that non-realistic representation has an affinity to poetry, and the realistic to the major forms of epic and drama.¹³¹

To sum up, Lukács had no distinct conception of 'great realism'. Until 1948 he used the term 'realism' in two senses: (1) to designate 'great art'; and (2) as a term of style typology. Apart from that, 'great realism' had only the connotation of 'very great art' (value orientation) or 'great art of the realistic style' (type of style). We might as well criticize Lukács inconsistency

in the usage of these terms, but there is no justification for developing particular theories around it.

III. The conception of "Great Realism" that exists after all

Yet the preceding conclusion will be found rash if we take a closer look at the peculiarities of Lukács' conception of realism. This is all the more advisable as it cannot be accidental that so many scholars insist on speaking of a conception of 'great realism', instead of a simple 'realism'.

1. Avant-garde as Anti-Realism

One such peculiarity is the way in which Lukács interprets the historical development of realism as conceived of in the sense of 'great realism'. As his historical analyses are incomplete in the sense that some periods are overlooked, it is unclear whether or not he had a comprehensive idea about the actual nature of that development at the time and, if he had, what was it like. It is certain, however, that the list of "valuable" realists begins with Homer, as Lukács declared that the "great realists," Scott, Balzac, and Tolstoy "(*mutatis mutandis*) created their works according to the same principle that is pointed out in Homer by Lessing."¹³² Shakespeare and Cervantes are almost stock members of the list of 'great realists'. and the heyday of that literature is put in the 18-19th centuries with Balzac's life work as the high point. Yet 'the evolution of bourgeois society after 1848 destroyed the subjective conditions that made a great realism possible' as the genuinely ingenious writers 'repudiated with hatred and loathing the way of life and development of their own class'; "For the proletarian class struggle and its implications were beyond their

understanding, they remained mere spectators of the social process," This alienation gives rise to naturalism, a "new type of realism," in which the writer "turns into a specialist of literary expression, a virtuoso, an 'armchair scientist' preoccupied with the superficial traits of reality that meet the eye."¹³³

In this way, "the social evolution which forced the most sincere, upright and gifted bourgeois writers into the position of observers, at the same time inevitably drove them to fill the place of the missing essentials with literary substitutes."¹³⁴

Great realism, therefore, perishes in the era of decay. And besides the overtly apologetic anti-realism and pseudo-realism of the literature promoted by the reactionary bourgeoisie, we have a long chain of tendencies that try in a very 'radical' and 'avant-garde' fashion to liquidate the very foundations of realism. Whatever may be the intentions behind the representatives of these tendencies, objectively they only help the bourgeoisie in its struggle against genuine realism. This objective social function is shared by the entire literature of the decadent epoch, from naturalism through to surrealism.¹³⁵

In this decadent period, access to the peaks of genuine art is given only to those bourgeois writers who 'transcend ideologically the literary forms and methods of creation that emerged in the era of imperialism or have since undergone a transformation'. The transcendence is in effect a return, a revival of the "grand old legacy of realism."¹³⁶ The same return can lend greatness to socialist realism, which is "immediately and vitally bound up with the great traditions of bourgeois realism," even if it elevates the latter to a higher, "qualitatively different level."¹³⁷

Let us point out that Lukács here both criticizes the content of the

works conceived in the isms and rejects as alien to art the innovations of form and technique introduced by the isms. As he puts it: 'unless young Soviet writers are forbidden to apply this technique. they will adopt the ideological elements of which it is a vehicle.'¹³⁸ The avant-gardist

literary styles arose on the basis of capitalist decadence out of an ideology that has lost the will and ability to grasp the social totality in its movement and reproduce it in a true-to-life fashion. All the forms of expression that subsequently arise are surrogates which essentially remain simply on the surface of things. [Only] the ideological encirclement of capitalism has the effect that forms of expression of bourgeois decadence are taken over into the literature of socialism.¹³⁹

The opinion of less well-meaning critics of Lukács—alleging that “everything and the opposite of it all can be found in him”—appears to be somewhat corroborated by the fact that now and then Lukács recanted this extremely dogmatic tenet. In 1938 he wrote of symbolism that it was a trend artistically at a lower level, which was still “further from grasping reality.”¹⁴⁰ A year later he unexpectedly wrote that “there are symbolists of various types”, that symbolism may be of a revolutionary character, and that, in Ady's poetry, “the strength of lyric symbolism is the most important constituent.”¹⁴¹ Lukács discovered in the works of his friend, Becher, that the stream-of-consciousness technique, introduced by Joyce, may be realistic (in the sense of value),¹⁴² while he admitted that, in the works of Tibor Déry, who was so near to him, Proustian psychology and avant-gardist technique of time can fulfil a realistic function, which is “diametrically opposed” to its original purpose.¹⁴³ These are, however, self-contradictions set aside solely for writers whom he liked most. That his genuine opinion of the time was that avant-gardism as such was worthless.

was made crystal clear in 1938-39 in the famous expressionism debate, the Brecht-Lukács debate. A comprehensive discussion of the debate—which provoked a wide variety of comment¹⁴⁴—would go far beyond the room allowed here. Suffice it to remark that, although I clearly side with Brecht in the evaluation of the avant-garde, Lukács' aesthetic gave a more exact and profound picture of art than Brecht's. In other words:

we should not seek an understanding of Lukács on the basis of his polemic with the avant-gardist movements. but should rather consider that. despite his occasional misconception and undervaluation of *avant-garde* endeavours. Lukács succeeded in exploring such a specificity of artistic representation. such a system of the theory of reflection that schools otherwise more sensitive to modern initiatives were not able to achieve.¹⁴⁵

The truth of this statement is emphasized by the fact that, by that time Lukács had become aware, in theory. that: "Only vulgar sociology, which views its sole task as the discovery of so-called 'social equivalents' for individual writers or styles, believes that with the identification of social origin every question is answered and resolved."¹⁴⁶

2. Social determinants of "Great Art" of a non-realist style

When Lukács rejected the techniques of the isms of the avant-garde, he set narrow confines to 'great art' of a non-realistic style. He carried the limitation further when he attached its validity to certain social conditions. It has been mentioned above that. In his essay on Keller, Lukács assigned fantastic representation (when conceived of in the sense of 'great art') to the sphere of realism. Yet it was for him an exception to the rule. An exception determined by a certain sort of social backwardness:

Dass Deutschland dennoch hinter der Zeit zurückgeblieben ist, drückt sich in der spezifischen Fonngebung der Literatur aus; darin, dass ihr Realismus das Leben der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft in Deutschland nicht direkt im Sinne des französisch-englischen Realismus dieser Zeit gestalten kann; darin, dass besondere Formen des—monumentalen, phantastischen usw.—Realismus gefunden werden müssen, um diese konkrete. Allgemeinheit der zeitgenössischen Probleme des Humanismus in eine dichterisch-sinnfällige Form zu gießen. [...] Je mehr sich jedoch die deutschen Verhältnisse entwickeln, desto unhaltbarer wird dieser Stil, desto mehr entstehen auflösende Tendenzen in der Richtung auf einen Realismus im westeuropäischen Sinne. Je mehr die objektiven Bedingungen einer bürgerlich-demokratischen Revolution in Deutschland herangereift sind, desto stärker werden diese Bestrebungen.¹⁴⁷

Consequently, the normal way of the evolution of 'great art' is attached to the realistic style, to the West European English-French realism, while 'monumental and fantastic forms' are adequate only in an exceptional social situation. Once that is over, the evolution of art must return to the normal road, that of realism, taken in the sense of style typology.

The fact that by the aforementioned 'West European realism' Lukács meant realistic style can be easily proven by an essay on Heine, also mentioned above, where—as I have pointed out—realism connoted a style. There, the relevant point is put as follows:

Heine is looking for a poetry that expresses the profoundest contradictions of the era on the highest level of learning of the era. In France and England, the development of real events of social life allow—for a Balzac or, at a lower level, a Dickens—the directly realistic representation of the real contradictions. The 'anachronism' of conditions in Germany [...] at the time rules out the emergence of great German realism. [...] As Heine intended

to give an artistic criticism of conditions in Germany on the highest international level of the time, that is, genuinely on a general contemporary level and not in the German anachronistic spirit, he could not find on German soil a plot for a realistic representation of conditions in Germany, a plot that could have been valuable and realistically perceptible.¹⁴⁸

That is why he opted for a “lyric-ironic, fantastic-ironic, extremely subjective” form.

Lukács apparently formulated this argument under the influence of vulgar sociology, but limitations of space do not permit us to prove this contention systematically here. In fact, Lukács' other writings could be used to refute this argument. He pointed out elsewhere¹⁴⁹ that Balzac, too wrote works that are realist, though fantastic, rather than realistic in style. even though no social condition compelled him to do so. The relevant conclusion that we can draw from all this is that, at that time, Lukács considered the works of styles other than realistic as exceptional, rather than as natural manifestations of art.

3. “Triumph of Realism:” triumph of realistic style

On the other hand, Lukács attributed extraordinary advantages to works written in realistic style. The conception has earned fame and created controversy with the label 'triumph of realism'. In a latent form, the debate had been going on since the mid-1930s, and it centred on the relationship of the writer's political views and artistic method. One group, which included Lukács, contended that, provided a writer applies the realistic method of representation, he may produce great art even if his views are retrograde and conservative. Members of the first group were called '*voprekists*' (the Russian word for 'notwithstanding'), and in the

second half of the 1930s they rallied behind *Literaturny Kritik* under the name of 'new trend'. or simply 'trend' ('*novoye techeniye*', or 'techeniye'). Members of the second group, referred to as '*Blagodaryists*' (deriving from the Russian word for "owing to the fact that"), attached greater importance to the political views than to the literary method, and they were supported by *Literaturnaya Gazeta* and Fadeyev's authority. An open confrontation occurred in 1939, when the *blagodaryists* sharply criticized a collection of essays by Lukács, *K istorii realizma* (1939), published in Moscow, and the representatives of the 'new trend', above all, Lifschitz. The polemic ended with their victory. owing to Fadeyev's personal connections with men of influence. A party resolution of 1940 on literary criticism ordered *Literaturny Kritik* cease publication (the last issue was its No. 11-12, 1940), on the ground that it had lost touch with the literary establishment and living literature. The defeat dealt a heavy blow to Lukács' position: "I found myself practically barred from publication in the Russian literary press," Lukács recalls, "not by the letter, but the consequence of the resolution. After that I could publish literary treatises only in the German-language *Internationale Literatur* and the Hungarian-language *Uj Hang*."¹⁵⁰ In the early 1940s he was even arrested, and it was due only to the intervention of Rákosi and Dimitrov that he was soon released.¹⁵¹ These problems re-emerged in numerous consultations after his return to Hungary.¹⁵²

The idea which has as its point of departure an observation of Engels, who states that writers may create outstanding works of art despite retrograde political and social views is, in itself, an irrefutable truth. As Lukács emphasized, "it is a radical break with the vulgar conception of literature and art that deduced the value of poetic works mechanically from the writer's political views, his so-called class psychology."¹⁵³ In that sense it

was a break with Plekhanov's orthodoxy and constituted a criticism of RAPP's one-time sectarian line and subsequent cultural policy that continued in the same spirit because the tenet gave a green light even to those living authors who failed to fall precisely into line with the political dictates of the Stalinist era. It was not by chance that an active role in the crusade against *Literaturny Kritik* was played by 'rappists' who had been given senior posts even after the dissolution of their organization: Fadeyev, who was transferred to the board of the writers' association from RAPP's board, and Ermilov, who had started his career as a secretary of RAPP.

Let us add, however, that Lukács was actually lax in some of his wordings. Instead of speaking of retrograde political views, which could be corrected by other progressive elements of a world view, he declared that "there are cases in which a politically and socially reactionary world outlook fails to prevent the development of a real masterpiece of realism."¹⁵⁴ In this statement he is wrong because, were it true, the 'triumph of realism' would not have any basis in the process of creation.

For the subject of this paper, the relevant conclusion is that Lukács attached the occurrence of the 'triumph of realism' to classicist-realistic conventions of style. He denied even Zola's naturalism, let alone fantastic or avant-gardist forms. The chance of producing the "triumph of realism."¹⁵⁵

4. Great form of realistic style as the Ally of Democracy

It was on this bias that Lukács based a cultural political conception. Which—erroneously—stated that there is an affinity between democracy and 19th-century great forms of realistic style. (An archetype of this conception is his theory of the novel of 1935, in which he described the realist novel, written on the pattern of epic, as the leading genre of

socialism.)¹⁵⁶ Above we quoted a 1946 essay of Lukács',¹⁵⁷ in which he clearly separated 'the great poetic representatives of the *citoyen* principle', who are "lyricists in the first place," and whose "lyric pathos permeates their representation," from the "great realists," the authors of great forms in the realistic style. Upon offering a detailed discussion of the advantages of 'great realism' conceived of in this sense, the article concludes that "in their works and representation, the great realists are always allies of democracy, whether consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, provided they are genuinely great realists."¹⁵⁸ Lukács emphasizes that this opportunity is not given to the lyric poets and other authors who do not create great forms of realistic style. I have said 'emphasizes', as he makes it a point here to define what he really means by 'great realism'-which he otherwise used with so many connotations. "Let us eliminate any misunderstanding, what we are speaking of here is the specifically modern realism of the 19th century (Balzac, Dickens, and Tolstoy)." Hungarian literature "has not undergone" this "period of great realism in the French and Russian manner" because, though we had "inspired genuine popular realism (*János vitéz* [John, the Hero], *Toldi*)" and "prose that emerged from anecdotic narration," "a style that is genuinely epic in its fresh rustic details which, however, is incapable of a novel-type epic synthesis (*Jókai*)."¹⁵⁹ For that very reason, Lukács argues, in the development of Hungarian literature after 1945, the leading role must be played by the great forms of 19th century realistic style, which are willy-nilly attached to democracy. "May the democratic renewal of the Hungarian people be accompanied by a renewal of Hungarian literature: the advent of a period of great realism, which our literature, colourful as it was, has so far missed."¹⁶⁰ Let us add in this context that his prepossession for great forms of the epic and drama was manifest not only in the political sphere. In the period of the advocacy

of the conception of 'great realism' as well. he gave uncertain answers to the question whether the lyric and small epic forms possess the asset of intensive totality. True, in 1934 he wrote that "the briefest song is as much an intensive totality as the most powerful epic,"¹⁶¹ in *The Historical Novel* of 1936-37, he wrote of the small epic forms that they fail to comprise this asset,¹⁶² and in his study on the Ady of 1939 he denied poetry the capability of reflecting intensive totality.¹⁶³ Only in an article on the Becher of 1951 does the idea re-emerge—in a cautious wording—that in poetry, too the 'universality of content' is an important asset, and that even a single poem may be a "mirror to our era."¹⁶⁴ On the other hand, *Die Eigenart des Ästhetischen*, extends the principle of intensive totality to the whole of art.

5. Essence of the conception of "Great Realism"

The essence of the conception of 'great realism' is. therefore, that. under normal conditions of evolution, art is attached to representation in a realistic style. and that it can significantly depart from this style only under relatively backward social conditions. In a capitalist development after 1848, and from naturalism onward, all such attempts at renewing form are above artless and ideologically detrimental because democratic and socialist development can be promoted solely by the observance of the tradition created by the realistic style of the 19th century and especially its great forms.

Critics (Marxist and non-Marxist, domestic and foreign) are absolutely justified—from the scientific point of view—in declaring that this conception of Lukács' suffers from a retrograde sociological schematism that is isolated from reality,¹⁶⁵ and that it expresses the conservatism of a 'neoclassicist' taste,¹⁶⁶ and that it offers an idealized image of the 19th

century.¹⁶⁷ Even Brecht's anger is understandable: during the debate on expressionism he wrote that Lukács was a "Murxist" rather than a Marxist ("Murks" is the German word for "bungle," so the meaning of the pun is 'bungler').¹⁶⁸ However, to tell the full truth, it has to be added that, despite its negative aspects, the conception of 'great realism' was an important stride forward in the development of the Marxist theory of art, since Lukács elaborated in the same writings the theory of the most fundamental categories of artistic reflection, including typical, anthropocentric, and intensive totality, partisanship, and populism (the latter in its specifically Hungarian sense); he also elaborated epochal formulas for the study of the relationship of fictitiousness and truth, content and form, and many other such issues.

Provided that we analyse his conception not from a scientific point of view, but from that of cultural policy, it has to be pointed out that its real characteristics can be assessed only against its historical background. 'Great realism' meant the defence of classic cultural tradition and a demand for a relatively higher standard in the face of the powerful forces of the *proletcultist*-sectarian destruction of values and servile schematism. Viewed in this context, it has more than a few historical merits.

IV. Realism without adjectives

1. Realism is not a Style—there is no Realist Style

The year 1948 marks a turning point—at least on a theoretical level—for, in the preface to his collection of essays, *A realizmus problémái* [The Problems of Realism], Lukács (as if forgetting his previous writings in which

he declared that realism belongs to the realm of style typology)¹⁶⁹ says in case

realism is treated merely as one of the constantly changing styles. the fundamental aesthetic question is ignored. and so are the relationship of art to objective reality and. along with that. the objective criterion of the critical attitude to art. the result is subjectivism. arbitrary decision. lack of principles. and eclecticism.¹⁷⁰

Lukács defines realism as a “fundamental aesthetic question,” which runs as follows: “is it the purpose of artistic activity to approach objective reality with art's special means of reflection and representation, to be truthful where the basic features are concerned?”¹⁷¹ If we interpret the category in this manner, “our judgment is not limited by attachment to, or rejection of, any styles. Only in that sole case are we able to dissociate ourselves from false dogmatism, which attempts to define the dominant stylistic trends of the present (let alone, the future):”¹⁷² The tenet, “socialist realism is not a dogma on style, but rather a literary reflection of fast-developing socialist life”¹⁷³ was smuggled even into his self-criticism of 1949. He stressed the same point in his study on Pushkin of the same period: there may be “decisive” changes within realism, for “realism is not a style but the social basis of every truly great literature.”¹⁷⁴ He often repeated this thought from the 1950s down to his death: “there is a fundamental truth at stake here: realism is not one style among others, it is the basis of literature: all styles (even those seemingly most opposed to realism) originate in it or are significantly related to it,”¹⁷⁵ and it is nonsensical to conceive of a “stylistic realism.”¹⁷⁶

2. Specious and true contradictions

Far from giving prominence to this turn, Lukács was busy, so to say, 'concealing' it from the professional public. The essays in *A realizmus problémái* all reflect the conception of 'great realism', and in the preface Lukács is content to point out that there are no stylistic limits to realism, while failing to remind the reader that the collection should be understood keeping in view this modified conception. Similar negligence provoked false impressions of collections of his essays abroad,¹⁷⁷ so much so that left-wing critics could arrive at the conclusion that his writings should not be taken seriously.¹⁷⁸

However rigorously he reiterated that realistic style does not exist and never did, he failed to advocate this stance consistently where terminology was concerned. He could have found himself without any term to designate the style that in common parlance is referred to as realist. In a 1955 essay on Mann, he had no alternative but to confront realistic and fantastic representation, even though the two categories differ only stylistically.¹⁷⁹ He concludes his analysis of Mann's fantastic style by saying: "this style is deeply realistic for all the apparently unrealistic ingredients which we have described."¹⁸⁰ Again, 'apparent' realism connotes a style.

Lukács' works after 1948 show contradictions of content as well as terminology. Throughout his life, he stuck to his (clearly anachronistic) aversion to the montage technique, which he struggled to keep outside the boundaries of realism.¹⁸¹ In a similar manner, he would refer to the avant-garde as an anti-realist tendency on the grounds of its alleged philosophical idealism¹⁸² and solipsist character, which reflected empty transcendence and its affinity to allegoric decorativeness.¹⁸³ Lukács went as far as to declare that the avant-gardists 'subordinated the aesthetic

conduct to religion and the religious need'.¹⁸⁴ (N. B.: at that time, on the revaluation of an earlier opinion, he conceded that the means of form worked out by the avant-garde may promote the development of 'traditional realism'.)¹⁸⁵ His conservative hostility is hardly compatible with the above-quoted tenet of the 'conception of realism without adjective' that states: "our judgment is not limited by attachment to or rejection of any styles."

3. Evaluation of the Conception of Realism

I am, however, of the view that the blame for mistakes of this type should be put on Lukács, the literary critic and literary historian, and not on his conception of realism. Although Lukács was attached to Thomas Mann with—to use the apt expression of Deutscher!¹⁸⁶—an 'intellectual love', although he overestimated Balzac's importance (writers who deserved to no small extent Brecht's criticism from the other extreme as well),¹⁸⁷ and although these yardsticks distorted his system of measurement, his theoretical and abstract statements retain their validity. As a young man, Lukács was aware that, as he put it: "I am not a critic. I am not endowed with the faculty to determine the unquestionable and subtle quality of individual works."¹⁸⁸ His friend, Arnold Hauser, put it in the following—pertinent—way: "when he described someone as an important writer or poet, his judgment was almost always wrong"—while "'Lukács is of enormous importance as a philosopher of art and aesthete."¹⁸⁹

The truth of Lukács' conception is not refuted by the-fully justifiable-criticism that was put forward in the Hungarian debate on realism by theorists who proved the actual existence of realism as a trend of style.¹⁹⁰ It does not follow from their argument that Lukács' concept of realism is

unhistorical and reflects the 'inadequate generality' of a transcendental typology,¹⁹¹ that it relapses from Lenin to Aristotle,¹⁹² and that it is "shoreless" like Garaudy's conception.¹⁹³ Artistic reflection may have categories which can change in the stream of history, yet, as regards their most general and essential characteristics, they preserve their validity.

Whether reflection is the sole social function of art or whether it offers us some more, remain an open question.¹⁹⁴ Advocates of the latter view often arrive at the (little convincing) conclusion that Lukács' conception of realism retreats to the pre-Marxian mechanistic materialist theory of reflection,¹⁹⁵ and that, unlike Brecht's views, even its Marxist character can be doubted.¹⁹⁶ Yet even analyses that are fairer—and consider the debates that Lukács carried out as debates among Marxists¹⁹⁷—often state that Lukács' conception of realism overlooks the changes in the functions of art, for socialist art assumes new social assignments and more directly joins political agitation and class struggle, as its purpose is both the transformation of the people-through its cathartic effect-and the social set-up.¹⁹⁸

I myself find the latter thought entirely problematic, as I cannot conceive how art can directly influence changes in the social system, except through a cathartic effect exerted on individuals. At the same time, I share the view of numerous Hungarian theorists,¹⁹⁹ in that the sort of art that offers the values of realistic reflection and is called 'autonomous art' in Hungary, cannot be identified with art as a whole. At variance with Lukács' opinion I accept the need for 'agitative art' that is more directly attached to the political functions.

This is by no means to say that the functions of 'art as a whole' change in the course of historical development and that socialist art as a whole is

marked by an increased role of the agitative function. Since the emergence of the distinct forms of social consciousness, 'agitative art' and 'autonomous art' have coexisted (along with other sorts of art). Historical changes can only result—from the functional point of view—in shifts in the importance of the one or the other.

During the proletarian revolutions and the antifascist struggle—as in all similar historical phases—the importance of the forms of 'agitative art', naturally, grew, which was rightly recognized by representatives of LEF, the Litfront, and other similar 'leftist' trends. They were, however, mistaken in the theory that this development must bring about a change in the function of 'art as a whole'. They overestimated the temporary importance of agitative genres. Lukács was right in defending 'autonomous art' against them, yet he too identified this sort of art with 'art as a whole'. And his conception of reality does not apply only to 'autonomous art', of which he elaborated an ambitious and profound Marxist theory. This is an achievement in itself, in fact, a milestone in the history of aesthetics.

- 1 ILLÉS, László; JÓZSEF, Farkas; SZABOLCSI, Miklós; SZERDAHELYI, István (eds.). *Hungarian Studies on Georg Lukács*. Vol. 1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1993, pp. 300-328. Translated by Iván Sella. Transcribed by V. S. Conttren, April 2022.
- 2 Wemer Millenzwei: "Gesichtspunkte zur Entwicklung der literaturtheoretischen Position Georg Lukács," in *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, hrsg. von W. Mittenzwei (Leipzig: 1975), p. 95.
- 3 See Helga Galias: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller* (Neuwied—Berlin: 1971); István Hermann: *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, übers. Von E. Kiss (Budapest: 1978).
- 4 Miklós Lackó: "Politika, kultúra, realizmus: Lukács Georg a 100% időszakában" [Politics, culture, and realism: Georg Lukács in the period of 100%], *új frás* (1978), no. 2, p. 86.
- 5 Edit Erki: "Hermann Istvánnál" [With István Hermann], *Elet és Irodalom* (February 22, 1975), p. 7.
- 6 Fritz J. Raddatz: *Georg Lukács in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: 1972), pp. 91, 129, 131.
- 7 See Johanna Rosenberg: "Das Leben Georg Lukács," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*.
- 8 See Tibor Hanák: *A filozófus Lukács* [Lukács, the Philosopher] (Paris: 1972), pp. 60-62, 105-9.
- 9 See István Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története 1945-1975* [The History of Hungarian Aesthetics 1945-1975] (Budapest: 1976), pp. 93-94.
- 10 László Sziklai, the head, and Katalin Lakos, then associate of the Georg Lukács Archives and Library (LAL., which belongs to the Institute of Philosophy of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), helped me a great deal in my researches, for which I hereby express my thanks.
- 11 See Rudolf Eisler: *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe* (Berlin: 1904), Bd. II, pp. 215-17. Note that it is not the classical rhetorical meaning of the style that I refer to (cf. Heinrich Lausberg: *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (München: 1960). Bd. II, pp. 817-18, but rather the way it is interpreted by Wellek and Warren: "Stylistic analysis seems most profitable to literary study when it can establish some unifying principle, some general aesthetic aim pervasive of a whole work" (René Wellek and Austin Warren: *Theory of Literature* [London: 1956], p. 182).
- 12 See, e.g., Gero von Wilpert: *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur* (Stuttgart: 1964), pp. 557-60; *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry*, ed. by A. Preminger (Princeton: 1972), p. 685.
- 13 Fernand Desnoyers: "On Realism." in *Documents of Modern Literary Realism*, ed. by G. J. Becker (Princeton: 1973). pp. 87-88.
- 14 Edmond de Goncourt: *Les frères Zembanno* (Madrid and Paris: 1879). p. ix.
- 15 See Georg Lukács. "Der Dramatiker des neuen Ungarns: Balázs Béla: Misztériumok." *Pester Lloyd* (March 2, 1913).
- 16 Georg Lukács: "Válasz a L'Effort libre körkérdésére" [Response to a questionnaire of L'Effort libre], in his *Ifjúkori művek 1902-1918* [Early Works 1902-1918] (Budapest: 1977), p. 588. (He wrote the German original in March, 1913).

- 17 Georg Lukács: *Heidelberger Ästhetik 1916-1918* (Darmstadt—Neuwied: 1974), p. 12 (It was written between 1912 and 1918).
- 18 Georg Lukács: *A modern dráma fejlődésének története* [The history of the development of modern drama] (Budapest: 1978), p. 30. (It was written in 1906-1907, and first published in 1911).
- 19 *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
- 20 Georg Lukács: "Royal Highness," in his *Essays on Thomas Mann*, trans. By S. Mitchell (New York: 1965), p. 135—first published as "Thomas Mann új regénye" [Thomas Mann's new novel], *Nyugat* (1909) No. 21; his lecture on painting, believed to be written in 1913, was "Über die Kategorie der Malerei"—first published in *Acta Historiae Artium* (1973) no. 1-2.
- 21 Since intensive totality is one of the most important original ideas in Lukács' aesthetic, its genesis is of interest. Tibor Hanák contends that it appeared first under Hegel's influence in *The Theory of the Novel* (cf. his *A filozófus Lukács*, p. 153). According to Helga Gallas (*Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*, p. 153), it originated in *History and Class Consciousness*, while István Hermann states that it emerged in the early thirties, under the influence of the new edition of Rickert's work (cf. his *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, p. 192). It is highly probably that Rickert exerted an influence on Lukács, yet Lukács referred to an earlier edition of the work as early as 1915. Another factor is believed to have been Simmel's view that only art can give a unified form to a fragmented world (cf. Georg Simmel: *Über soziale Differenzierung* [Leipzig: 1890].)
- 22 As far as Hungarian critical literature is concerned, the view is not given systematic elaboration and exists only in the form of scattered remarks. The view is challenged in Hermann's monograph. Among foreign critics, continuity is stated in a remarkable yet controversial essay: Alberto Asor-Rosa: "Ill Giovane Lukács teoretico dell'arte borghese." *Contropiano* (1968), pp. 58, ff. It is challenged by Ursula Apitzsch: *Gesellschaftstheorie und Ästhetik dei Georg Lukács dis 1933* (Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt: 1977).
- 23 See István Hermann: *A szocialista kultúra problémái* [The Problems of Socialist Culture] (Budapest: 1970), pp. 367-408; Hermann: *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, pp. 125-156. In the latter, Hermann gives a detailed account of the recent responses to Lukács' conception. Some of the works not included in his survey are: Federico Riu, *Historia y totalidad: el concepto de reificación en Lukács* (Caracas: 1968); Apitzsch: *Gesellschaftstheorie und Ästhetik hei Georg Lukács his 1933*; Marija Hevesi: "Baloldaliság" a filozófiában ["Leftsim" in Philosophy] (Budapest: 1979).
- 24 Georg Lukács: "The Old Culture and the New Culture," *Telos* (Spring, 1970)—first published as "Régi kultúra és új kultúra" [The old culture and the new culture], *Internationale* (June 15, 1919).
- 25 See Georg Lukács: "Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat," in his *History and Class Consciousness*, trans. by R. Livingstone (London: 1971)—first published as "Die Verdinglichung und das Bewusstsein des Proletariats," in his *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* (Berlin: 1923).
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 138.
- 27 See Rpsenberg: "Das Leben Georg Lukács," in *op. cit.*, pp. 404-6.
- 28 See Lackó: "Politika, kultúra realizmus: Lukács Georg a 100% időszakában," in *op. cit.*

- 29 Georg Lukács: "Marxismus und Literaturgeschichte," *Die Rote Fahne* (1922) no. 445.
- 30 Georg Lukács: "L'art pour l'art und proletarische Dichtung," *Die Tat* (June, 1926).
- 31 See L. Svetsova: "Proletár írószervezetek 1920-1930" [Proletarian writers' associations 1920-1930], *Helikon* (1966) no. 1-2, p. 9.
- 32 See O. V. Yegorov: "A Forradalmi Írók Nemzetközi Szövetsége 1930-1935" [The International Union of Revolutionary Writers 1930-1935], in "*Jöjj el. Szabadság!*" ["Freedom, Come!"], ed. by M. Szabolcsi and L. Illés (Budapest: 1967), pp. 227, ff; László Illés: "Kísérletek a proletáriróadalom megalapozására" [Attempts at laying the foundations of proletarian literature], *Új Írás* (1972), no. 10.
- 33 See Lackó: "Politika, kultúra, realizmus: Lukács Georg a 100% időszakában," in *op. cit.*, p. 93.
- 34 See Illés: "Kísérletek a proletáriróadalom megalapozására," in *op. cit.*, p. 96; János Maczala *Estétika és forradalom* [Aesthetics and Revolution] (Budapest: 1970), p. 262.
- 35 See Georg Lukács: "Preface to the New Edition (1967)" in *History and Class Consciousness* p. XXXVI, Georg Lukács "Előszó" [Preface], in his *Utam Marxhoz* [My Road to Marx] (Budapest: 1971), vol. 1, p.25—the manuscript was written in October, 1969.
- 36 See Henri Arvon: *Georges Lukács ou le front populaire en littérature* (Paris: 1968). pp. 68-73; U. Apitzsch: *Gesellschaftstheorie und Ästhetik bei Georg Lukács his 1933*, pp. 145-46.
- 37 See Georg Lukács: "Előszó" [Preface], in his *Marx és Engels irodalomelmélete* [The Literary Theory of Marx and Engels] (Budapest: 1949), p. 5.
- 38 See Maczala: *Estétika és forradalom*, pp. 293-94.
- 39 See Georg Lukács: "The New Edition of Lassalle's Letters," in his *Political Writings 1919-1929*. trans. by M. McColgan (London: 1972)—first published as "Die Neue Ausgabe von Lassalles Oriefen," *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung* (1925) Vol. XI.
- 40 Originally written for a Soviet literary encyclopedia, the treatise was published in instalments by *Der Rote Aufbau* of Moscow in 1931, under the title "Kritik der Literaturtheorie Lassalles"—better known is its later publication as "Die Sickingendebatte zwischen Marx-Engels und Lassalle," *Internationale Literatur* (1933) No. 2.
- 41 Georg Lukács: "Die Sickingendebatte zwischen Marx-Engels und Lassalle," in his *Probleme der Ästhetik* (Neuwied-Berlin: 1969), pp. 490-91.
- 42 See Georg Lukács: "Franz Mehring," in *ibid.*, p. 390—written in 1933, the essay was meant to be an introduction to a collection of Mehring's literary writings (Moscow and Leningrad: 1934).
- 43 A. Lunacharsky: "Vistavka revolutsionnogo iskusstva zapada," in *Ob iskussive* (Moscow: 1982) p. 342.
- 44 See Béla Köpeczi (ed.): *A szocialista realizmus* [Socialist realism] 2 vols. (Budapest: 1970) I, pp. 335-36. 369; II, pp. 36--37.
- 45 A. V. Lunacharsky: "Vistavka revolutsionnogo iskusstva zapada," in *Ob iskussivo*, p. 342.
- 46 See A. V. Lunacharsky: "O novikh pesakh i osnovnikh liniakh proletarskogo iskusstva," in *Sobranie sochinenie*, 9 vols. (Moscow: 1964) II. p. 471.

- 47 See László Illés: *Józanág és szenvedély* [Reason and emotion] (Budapest: 1966), pp. 19-32, 127-31; Mácza: *Esztétika és forradalom*, pp. 248-62; V. V. Gorbunov: *Lenin és a Proletkult* [Lenin and the *proletkult*] (Budapest: 1976).
- 48 L. Svetsova: "Proletár írószervezetek 1920-1930," in *op. cit.*, p. 12.
- 49 A. A. Fadeyev: "Doloy Shillera!," *Na literaturnom postu* (1929) No. 21-22, p. 4.
- 50 See "Kulturnaya revolutsia I sovremennaya literature Rezolutsia I. Vsezoyuznovo syezda proletarskih pisatelei po dokladu tovarisa A verbakha," *Na literaturnom postu* (1928) no. 13-14, pp. 4, 8; Y. N. Libedinsky: "Hudozhestvennaya platforma RAPPa" *ibid.*, (1928) no. 19, p. 9; Aleksandr A. Fadeyev: "A proletárirodalom országútján" [On the road of proletarian literature], in Köpeczi (ed.): *A szocialista realizmus*, vol. II—first published in Russian in *Okryahr* (1928) no. 11.
- 51 See Svetsova: "Proletár írószervezetek 1920-1930," in *op. cit.*, pp. 10-11, 14-15; "A Lef" [The Lef], *Helikon* (1966) no. 1-2; Mácza: *Esztétika és forradalom*, pp. 263-68, 306-8.
- 52 Svetsova: "Proletár írószervezetek 1920-1930," in *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 11.
- 53 See Georg Lukács: "Die heiligsten Gueter," *Moskauer Rundschau* (1931) No. 45.
- 54 See L. Georg: "Michail Scholochow," *Moskauer Rundschau* (1930) No. 41.
- 55 See Georg Lukács: "Die Fabrik im Wulde," *Moskauer Rundschau* (1931) No. 6.
- 56 See Mácza: *Esztétika és forradalom*, pp. 225-26.
- 57 See Georg Lukács: "Neuer Inhalt und alte Form," *Moskauer Rundschau* (1930) No. 2.
- 58 See László Sziklai: *Történelmi lecke haladóknak* [A Lesson of History for Advanced Students] (Budapest: 1977), p. 239.
- 59 See Georg Lukács: "A régebbi magyar irodalomhoz való viszonyunk" [Our relation to the Hungarian literature of old]. *Sarló és Kalapács* (1931) No. 9.
- 60 *Ibid.*, p. 56
- 61 *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- 62 See Georg Lukács: "Das Hohelied vom Fünffjahrplan," *Moskauer Rundschau* (1931) no. 55.
- 63 See Simone Barck: "Wir wurden mündig ersi in deiner Lehre ...: Der Einfluss Georg Lukács' auf die Literaturkonzeption von Johannes R. Becker," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, p. 251.
- 64 The most important works that discuss the activity of the BPRS and Lukács' activity therein are Werner T. Angress: "Pegasus and Insurrection: *Die Linksturve* and its Heritage," *Central european History* (1968) no. 1; Gallas: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*; Ingeborg Münz-Koenen: "Auf dem Wege zu einer marxistischen Literaturtheorie: Die Debatte proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller mit Georg Lukács," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 105, ff. Gallas' monograph sheds light on many facts. For a survey of the relevant German-Hungarian relations, see László Illés: "A magyar és német szocialista irodalom kapcsolatai" [The relations between Hungarian and German socialist literature], in his *Józanág és szenvedély*.
- 65 Georg Lukács: "Willi Bredels Romane," *Die Linkskurve* (1931) no. 11.
- 66 Georg Lukács: "Reportage or Portrayal?," in his *Essays on Realism*, trans. by D. Fembach

(London: 1980), p. 240—first published as “Reportage oder Gestaltung?,” *Die Linkskurve* (1932) Nos. 7. 8.

67 Lukács: *Essays on Realism*, pp. 46--47.

68 Georg Lukács: “A Virtue of Necessity,” in *ibid.*, pp. 69-70—first published as “Aus der Not eine Tugend,” *Die Linkskurve* (1932) no. 11-12.

69 See Georg Lukács: “Gegen die Spontaneitätstheorie in der Literatur,” *Die Linkskurve* (1932) no. 4.

70 Lukács: *Essays on Realism*, pp. 55, 61.

71 A detailed description of the debate would be beyond the scope of this paper. All I wish to point out is that the monograph of Helga Gallas—which is, besides, a remarkable achievement—makes a stronger criticism of Lukács than his opponents because it has an erroneous interpretation of the relationship of art and politics (cf. Her *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*, pp. 168-169). The study by Ingeborg Münz-Koenen contends in an unconvincing way that Lukács' conception of the time witnessed an idealistic interpretation of Marxism (cf. her “Auf dem Wege zu einer marxistischen Literaturtheorie: Die Debatte proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller mit Georg Lukács”, in *op. cit.*, pp. 138-143). Münz-Koenen concentrates her criticism on Lukács' most progressive ideas and fails to note that a second-rate socialist novel like Ottwalt's brings more harm rather than good to the movement (cf. *ibid.*, p. 151.)

72 See Lukács: *Essays on Realism*, pp. 52-53. At this point Lukács ignores the fact that a reportage novel can also be typical and that it is mistaken to blame the novel for failing to represent the “whole of the process,” as that is extensive rather than intensive totality.

73 See *ibid.*, pp. 50-55.

74 See Georg Lukács: “«Tendency» or Partisanship?,” in *ibid.*,—first published as “Tendenz oder Parteilichkeit?,” *Die Linkskurve* (1932), no. 6.

75 A statement of Lukács', in which he declared that he had always opposed RAPP (and Trotsky) should be seen in his context, though it is not acceptable; see his “Postscriptum 1957 zu *Mein Weg zu Marx*,” in *Marxismus und Stalinismus* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: 1970).

76 Georg Lukács: “Zur Frage der Satire,” *International Literatur* (1932) no. 4-5.

77 Georg Lukács: “Zur Frage der Satire,” in *Probleme des Realismus* (Neuwied: 1971) vol. I, pp. 89-90.

78 *Ibid.*, p. 95.

79 *Ibid.*, p. 95-97.

80 In an earlier passage Lukács lists as synonyms the words: “realistic, average and typical.” See *ibid.* p. 93.

81 See Gallas: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*, p. 65; Gorbunov: *Lenin és a Proletkult*, pp. 265-267.

82 See Gallas: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer Schriftsteller*, p. 67-71.

83 See *ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

- 84 László Illés: "Újabb viták az avantgadról" [Recent debates on the avant-garde], *Kritika* (1964) no. 4, p. 18; further, see Gunnar Gunnarson: *Georg Lukács* (Stockholm: 1969), pp. 191-192.
- 85 Béla Kopaczi: "A szocialista realizmus" [Socialist realism], in Kopeczi (ed.): *A szocialista realizmus*, vol. I, pp. 26-27. For Gronsky's speech advocating socialist realism, see *Russkaya sovjetskaya literaturnaya kritika*, ed. By P. F. Yushin (Moscow: 1981), p. 150.
- 86 Aleksandr Fadejev: "O sotsialisticheskom realizme," in *Za tritsat let* (Moscow: 1957), p. 89.
- 87 Georg Lukács: "Friederich Engels als Literaturtheoretiker und Literaturkritiker," in his *Probleme der Ästhetik*, p. 534—first published in Russian in *Literaturny kritik* (1935) no. 8. (This part was omitted from the 1972 Hungarian translation.)
- 88 A. V. Lunarcharsky: "Sotsialistichesky realizm" in *Sobranie sochinenie*, VIII, p. 495.
- 89 *Ibid.*, pp. 518-519.
- 90 For Mayakovsky and Tairove see P. F. Yushin (ed.): *Russkaya sovetskaya literaturna kritika (1917-1934)*, (Moscow: 1981), p. 145 and p. 150.
- 91 André Breton and Paul Eluard: "Notes sur la poésie," *La révolution surréaliste* (December 15, 1929), no. 12,
- 92 See Louis Aragon: "Le retour à la réalité," in *Pour un réalism socialiste* (Paris: 1935); J. Lurçat, et al.: *La querelle du réalisme* (Paris: 1936), pp. 15-90.
- 93 Y. Simonov: "O sovetskoy hudozhestvennij proze," in *Vtoroi vsesoyuzni siezd sovetskih pisatelei* (Moscow: 1956), p. 89.
- 94 See Christopher Caudwell: *Romand and Realism* (Princeton: 1970).
- 95 See Béla Kopeczi (ed.): *A szocialista realizmus II*, p. 382.
- 96 *Ibid.*, p. 347.
- 97 See George Lichteim: *Georg Lukács* (New York: 1970), p. 78.
- 98 See Gunnarson: *Georg Lukács*, p. 193.
- 99 See Jules Dévérité: *Der Fall LukácsL Georg Lukács und der Stalinismus* (Cologne: 1952).
- 100 See István Hermann: "Lukács Georg fejlődése A regény elméletétől a realizmus elméletéig" [Georg Lukács' development from *The Theory of the Novel* to the theory of realism], in Illés and Szabolcsi (eds): "Jöjj el. Szabadság," pp. 437-38; W. Mittenzwei: "Gesichtspunkte" in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 34-43, 69; Mittenzwei: "Der Streit zwischen nichtaristotelischer und aristotelischer Kunstauffassung: Die Brecht-Lukács-Debatte," in *ibid.*, pp. 165-70; Rosenberg: "Das Leben Georg Lukács," in *op. cit.*, p. 409.
- 101 See Kurt Batt, "Erlebnis des Umbruchs und harmonische Gestalt: Der Dialog zwischen Anna Seghers und Georg Lukács," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse Mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 209-10.
- 102 See Hermann: *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, pp. 209-11.
- 103 Arnold Hauser: *Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács* (München: 1978), p. 54.
- 104 See Lukács: "Preface to the New Edition (1967)" in *History and Class Consciousness*, p. XXXVIII.

- 105 See Mittenzwei: "Gesichtspunkte," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 68-69.
- 106 See Batt: "Erlebnis des Umbruchs und harmonische Gestalt," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 205-206. This view seems to be just as far-fetched as its opposite, which alleges that, throughout the thirties, Lukács remained a little-known advocate of French-Russian relations (cf. Lichtheim: *Georg Lukács*, p. 78).
- 107 For information on Plekhanov's orthodoxy, see Sziklai: *Történelmi lecke haladóknak*, pp. 119-96. Until recently, the critical evaluation of the "school of vulgar sociology" had been one-sidedly negative, yet new research has come forward with a more differentiated assessment: cf. Lajos Nyiró: "Kutatási irányok a 20-as évek szovjet irodalomtudományában" [Trends of research in the literary scholarship of the Soviet Union in the 1920s], *Helikon* (1978) no. 1-2.
- 108 Georg Lukács: "Expressionism: Its Significance and Decline," in his *Essays on Realism*, p. 105.
- 109 See *ibid.*, pp. 87, 110-13.
- 110 *Ibid.*, p. 105.
- 111 Lukács: *Probleme der Ästhetik*, pp. 397-412.
- 112 *Ibid.*, p. 396.
- 113 Georg Lukács: "Karl Marx und Friedrich Theodor Vischer," in his *Probleme der Ästhetik*, p. 238—first published in *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo* (1934) no. 15.
- 114 *Ibid.*, pp. 273, 280, 301.
- 115 *Ibid.*, p. 244.
- 116 *Ibid.*, p. 273.
- 117 *Ibid.*, p. 243.
- 118 Georg Lukács: "The Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe," in his *Goethe and his Age*, trans. by R. Anchor (London: 1968), p. 95—written in 1934, the essay was first published as "Shiller i Gyote v yikh perepiske," in *Gyote i Shiller, perepiska* (Moscow and Leningrad: 1937).
- 119 Lukács: *Goethe and his Age*, pp. 79, 89.
- 120 *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89, 96-97, 100.
- 121 See Georg Lukács: "Zur Ästhetik Schillers," in his *Probleme der Ästhetik*, p. 93—first published as "Shiller kak estetika," in F. Shiller: *Stati po estetike* (Moscow and Leningrad: 1935).
- 122 See Georg Lukács: "Hölderlin's *Hyperion*," in his *Goethe and His Age*—first published as "Hölderlins *Hyperion*," *Internationale Literatur* (1935), no. 6.
- 123 Georg Lukács: "Balzac: *Lost Illusions*," in his *Studies in European Realism*, trans. by E. Bone (New York: 1964), p. 60—written in 1934, it was first published as "Balzac: *Utrachennye ilyuzii*," in O. Balzac: *Utrachennye ilyuzii* (Moscow and Leningrad: 1936).
- 124 Georg Lukács: "The Zola Century," in his *Studies in European Realism*, p. 94—first published as "A százéves Zola," *Új Hang* (1940) no. 5-6.

- 125 See Georg Lukács: "Gottfried Keller," in his *Deutsche Literatur in zwei Jahrhunderten* (Neuwied—Berlin: 1964), pp. 338-339, 365-366—first published in *Internationale Literatur* (1939) nos. 6, 7.
- 126 Georg Lukács: "Bevezetés" [Introduction], in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: *Művészet—irodalom* [Art and Literature] (Budapest: 1946), p. 20.
- 127 See Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története*, pp. 81-82.
- 128 Georg Lukács: "Heinrich Heine als nationaler Dichter," in his *Deutsche Literatur in zwei Jahrhunderten*, pp. 316-317—the first version appeared as "Genrikh Geyne," in G. Geyne: *Germaniya* (Moscow: 1934)—the final form is "Heinrich Heine als nationaler Dichter," *Internationale Literatur* (1937) nos. 9, 10.
- 129 Lukács: "Heinrich Heine als nationaler Dichter," in his *Deutsche Literatur in zwei Jahrhunderten*, p. 318.
- 130 See Georg Lukács: "Parteidichtung III," in his *Schriften zur Ideologie und Politik* (Neuwied—Berlin: 1967)—written in 1945, the article was first published as "Pártköltészet" [Partisan poetry], in his *Irodalom és demokrácia* [Literature and Democracy] (Budapest: 1947).
- 131 See Georg Lukács: "Irodalom és demokrácia" [Literature and democracy], in his *Irodalom és demokrácia*. The Manuscript of the study dates back to 1946.
- 132 Georg Lukács: "Erzählen oder berschreiben?," in his *Schickalswende* (Berlin: 1948), p. 154.
- 133 Georg Lukács: "Tolstoy and the Development of Realism," in his *Studies in European Realism*, pp. 141-43—written in 1935, it was first published as "Leo Tolstoi und die Entwicklung des Realismus," *Internationale Literatur* (1938) nos. 10-11.
- 134 *Ibid.*, p. 142.
- 135 Georg Lukács: "Marx and the Problem of Ideological Decay," in his *Essays on Realism*, p. 166—the manuscript of the study dates back to 1938, and it was first published as "Marx und das Problem des ideologischen Ferfalls," *Internatinoale Literatur* (1939) no. 7—in 1939 it was published in Hungarian by *Új Hang* in instalments.
- 136 Georg Lukács: "Friedrich Engels als Literaturtheoretiker," in his *Probleme der Ästhetik*, pp. 534-34.
- 137 Lukács: "Tolstoy and the Development of Realism," in his *Studies in European Realism*, p. 203.
- 138 Georg Lukács: "Kunst und objektive Wahrheit," in his *Probleme des Realismus*, Bd. I, p. 647 (a 1968 Hungarian edition of the essay fails to include this part)—written in 1934, the original title was "K probleme obyektivnoy khudozhestyennyoy formy," *Literaturny Kritik* (1935) no. 9.
- 139 Georg Lukács: "Tribune or Bureaucrat?," in his *Essays on Realism*, p. 232—the manuscript dates back to 1939, and was originally published as "Volkstribun oder Bürokrat," *Internationale Literatur* (1940) nos. 1-3.
- 140 Georg Lukács: "Marx and the Problem of Ideological Decay," in *op. cit.*, p. 162.
- 141 Georg Lukács: "Ady, a magyar tragédia nagy énekese" [Ady, the great singer of Hungarian tragedy], in his *Magyar irodalom—magyar kultúra* [Hungarian literature—

Hungarian Culture] (Budapest: 1970), pp. 171-72—first published as *Adi politikai költészete* [Ady's political poetry]. *Korunk* (1939) no. 10. Révai's apt statement, "this symbolism is realism," appears to have its origin in that statement of Lukács' (cf. József Révai: *Irodalmi tanulmányok* [Literary Studies] [Budapest: 1960], p. 206).

- 142 See Georg Lukács: "Johannes R. Bechers *Abschied*," *Internationale Literatur* (1941) no. 5.
- 143 Georg Lukács: "Levél Németh Andorhoz Déry Tibor regényéről" [A letter to Andor Németh about Tibor Déry's novel], in his *Magyar irodalom—magyar kultúra*, p. 522. The article was written in January, 1948.
- 144 A few important contributions: Jargen Rahle: "Gefährten am Kreuzweg: Anna Seghers und ihr Disput mit Georg Lukács," in his *Literatur und Revolution* (Cologne-Berlin: 1960); László Illés: "Régi viták az avantgardról!" (Old debates on the avant-garde), *Kritika* (1963) No. 2; István Hermann: "Tények és összefüggések" (Facts and interrelations), *Kritika* (1964) No. 2; László Illés: "Újabb viták az avantgardról"; Klaus Völker: "Brecht und Lukács," *Kurshuch* (1966) No. 7; Mittenzwei: "Die Brecht-Lukács-Debatte," *Sinn und Form* (1967) No. I; Klaus L. Berghahn: "Volkstümlichkeit und Realismus: Nochmals zur Brecht-Lukács-Debatte," *Jahrbuch für deutsche Gegenwartsliteratur* (Frankfurt a. M.: 1973); Hermann: *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, pp. 218-225; Mittenzwei: "Der Streit zwischen nichtaristotelischer und aristotelischer Kunstauffassung: Die Brecht-Lukács Debatte," in *op. cit.*, pp. 153 ff.; Batt: "Erlebnis des Umbruchs und Harmonische Gestalt: der Dialog zwischen Anna Seghers und Georg Lukács," in *op. cit.*; Hans-Jürgen Schmitt: *Die Expressionismus-Debatte* (Frankfurt a. M.: 1976); Tamás Ungvári: *Brecht színházi forradalma* [Brecht's Theatrical Revolution] (Budapest: 1978).
- 145 Ungvári: *Brecht színházi forradalma*, p. 140.
- 146 Georg Lukács: "Erzählen oder beschreiben?," in his *Schicksalwende*, p. 129.
- 147 Georg Lukács: "Gottfried Keller," in his *Deutsche Literatur in zwei Jahrhunderten*, p. 337.
- 148 Georg Lukács: "Gottfried Keller," in his *Deutsche Literatur in zwei Jahrhunderten*, p. 337.
- 149 See Lukács: "Balzac: *Lost Illusions*" in *op. cit.*; "The Zola Century," in *op. cit.*
- 150 Georg Lukács: "Előszó" [Preface], in his *Művészet és társadalom* [Art and Society] (Budapest: 1968), p. 12. It was written in 1967.
- 151 For a more elaborate account of the debate over *Literaturny Kritik*, see István Hermann: *Die Gedankenwelt von Georg Lukács*, pp. 204-28; Barck: "Wir wurden mündig erst in deiner Lehre ...: Der Einfluss Georg Lukács' auf die Literaturkonzeption von Johannes R. Becher," in *op. cit.*, pp. 275-76; Sziklai: *Történelmi lecke haladóknak*, pp. 246-59, 302-21.
- 152 See Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története*, pp. 82-86, 101-102.
- 153 Georg Lukács: "Einführung in die ästhetischen Schriften, von Marx und Engels," in *Schriften zur Literatursoziologie* (Berlin-Neuwied: 1961), pp. 237-38.
- 154 Lukács: "Marx and the Problem of Ideological Decay," in *op. cit.*, p. 139; Georg Lukács: "Régi és új legendák ellen" [Against legends old and new], in his *Magyar irodalom—magyar kultúra*, p. 411. The Article was written in 1947.
- 155 Lukács: "Balzac: *Lost Illusions*" in *op. cit.*, pp. 89-91.
- 156 See Sziklai: *Történelmi lecke haladóknak*, pp. 292-4 An available collection of the texts referred to is Georg Lukács: *Écrits de Moscow*, trans. By C. Prévost (Paris: 1974).

- 157 Lukács: "Irodalom és demokrácia," in *op. cit.*
- 158 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 159 *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- 160 *Ibid.*, p. 68.
- 161 Georg Lukács: "Art and Objective Truth," in his *Writer and Critic and Other Essays*, trans. by A. Kahn (London: 1970), p. 38.
- 162 See Georg Lukács: *The Historical Novel* (London: 1969), pp. 103-4—first published as "Istoricheski roman," *Literaturny Kirit* (1937) nos. 7, 9 and *ibid.* (1938) nos. 1, 3, 8, 12.
- 163 See Lukács: *Magyar irodalom—magyar kultúra*, p. 174.
- 164 Georg Lukács, "Politische Parteilichkeit und dichterische Vollendung," *Der Rote Aufbau* (1951) no. 5, p. 402.
- 165 See Ervin Gyertyán: "Életpraxis és elvontság" [Life praxis and abstraction], in his *Párbeszéd sokszemközs* [Dialogue with Many Participants] (Budapest: 1973), pp. 292 ff.
- 166 See "Ernst Bloch und Georg Lukács im Gespräch mit Iring Fetscher, Johannes B. Metz und Jürgen Moltmann," *Neues Forum* (November-December, 1967).
- 167 See Brack: "Wir wurden mündig erst in deiner Lehre ...: Der Einfluss Georg Lukács' auf die Literaturkonzeption von Johannes R. Becker," in *op. cit.*, pp. 273-74; Tibor Hanák: *Az elmaradt reneszánsz* [Renaissance Cancelled] (Munich: 1979), p. 364.
- 168 Bertolt Brecht: *Arbeitsjournal: 1938-1942* (Frankfurt a. M.: 1973), p. 39.
- 169 The turnabout affected the interpretation of both realism and style as such. Until then, Lukács referred to style as a synonym of artistic method, which is a 'decisive artistic problem' of an era (cf. Georg Lukács: "Tolstoi und die Probleme des Realismus," in his *Der russische Realismus in der Weltliteratur*) [Berlin: 1952, p. 182]. Here, differences can be attributed to the different interpretations of the typical. Therefore, questions of style had in Lukács a direct connection with questions of artistic truth (cf. Lukács: "Zur Ästhetik Schillers," in *op. cit.* pp. 96-7. In the reinterpretation described here, style is conceived of as an element of 'artistic technique', independent of aspects of content and world view (cf. Leo Kofler: *Zur Theorie der modernen Literatur* [Neuwied-Berlin: 1962], p. 170; Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története*, pp. 97-102). It is a puzzling coincidence that in 1936 Lukács—who confronted in a pejorative sense the 'modern realists' with the 'classics of realism'—attributed the weaknesses in terms of content and method of the former to their 'literary technique' (cf. Georg Lukács: "Die intellektuelle Physiognomie der künstlerischen Gestalten," in his *Kunst und objektive Wahrheit* [Leipzig: 1977], p. 194), which, however, can be considered as a mistake in the usage of terms.
- 170 Georg Lukács: "Előszó" [Preface], in his *A realizmus problémái* [Problems of Realism] (Budapest: 1948), p. 11.
- 171 *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- 172 *Ibid.*, p. 11-2.
- 173 Georg Lukács: "Bírálat és önbírálat" [Criticism and self-criticism], in *Társadalmi Szemle* (1949) no. 8-9, p. 591.
- 174 Georg Lukács: "Pushkin's Place in World Literature," in his *Writer and Critic and Other*

Essays, p. 231. The essay was written in 1949.

- 175 Georg Lukács: "Franz Kafka or Thomas Mann?," in his *Realism in Our Times*, trans. by J. and N. Mander (New York: 1964), p. 48—first published as "franz Kafka oder Thomans Mann?," in his *wider den missverstandenen Realismus* (Hamburg: 1958).
- 176 See Georg Lukács: "Előszó" [Preface], in his *Világirodalom* [World Literature], vol. I, pp. 7-8. The preface was written in November 1968.
- 177 See Georg Lukács: *Wider den missverstandenen Realismus*, and his *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* (London: 1936).
- 178 See Hans Magnus Enzensberger: "Die Aporien der Avantgarde," *Merkur* (may, 1962); Harold Rosenberg: "The Third Dimension of Georg Lukács," *Dissent* (Autumn, 1964).
- 179 See Georg Lukács, "The Playful Style," in his *Essays on Thomas Mann*, p. 108.
- 180 *Ibid.*, p. 114.
- 181 See Georg Lukács: *Die Eigenart des ästhetischen* (n. p.: 1963), bd. I, pp. 723, 831-35.
- 182 See *ibid.*, bd. I, p. 574.
- 183 See *ibid.*, bd. II, p. 772-75
- 184 *Ibid.*, bd. II, p. 826.
- 185 *Ibid.*, bd. II, p. 773.
- 186 See Isaac Deutscher: "Georg Lukács and 'Critical Realism'," *The Listener* (November 3, 1966).
- 187 See Mittenzwei: "Der Streit nichtaristotelischer und aristotelischer Kunstauffassung: Die Brecht-Lukács-Debatte," in *op. cit.*, pp. 177-81.
- 188 Georg Lukács: "Kiknek nem kell és miéri Balázs Béla költészete?" [Who want none of Béla Balázs' poetry and why?], in his *Magyar irodalom—magyar kultúra*, p. 136—first published as the preface to his *Balázs Béla és akiknek nem kell* [Béla Balázs and Those Who Want None of Him] (Gyoma: 1918).
- 189 Hauser: *Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács*, p. 56.
- 190 See Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története*, pp. 216-21.
- 191 Gallas: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie*, p. 173.
- 192 See Peter Demetz: "Georg Lukács auf dem Wege zu Aristoteles," *Merkur* (June, 1965).
- 193 Hanák: *A filozófus Lukács*, pp. 106-7.
- 194 See András Horn: *Kunst und Freiheit* (Den Haag, 1969), p. 47.
- 195 See Wilhelm Girnus: "Von der unterfleckten Empfängnis des Ästhetischen: Betrachtungen zur Ästhetik von Georg Lukács," *Sinn und Form* (1967) no. 1, p. 175; Erwin Pracht: "Sozialistischer Realismus und Leninische Abbildtheorie," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* (1971) no. 6, p. 759.
- 196 See Völker: "Brecht und Lukács," in *op. cit.*, p. 80.
- 197 See Werner Mittenzwei: "Vorbermerkungen," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, p. 6.
- 198 See Gallas: *Marxistische Literaturtheorie: Kontroversen im Bund proletarisch-revolutionärer*

Schriftsteller, pp. 168-70; Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 50-4, 77, 81, 92-3, 98; Mittenzwei: "Der Streit zwischen nichtaristotelischer und aristotelischer Kunstauffassung: Die Brecht-Lukács-Debatte," in *op. cit.*, pp. 192-203; Gudrun Klatt: "Korrespondenz und Widerspruch: Einige Aspekte der politisch-ästhetischen und literaturtheoretischen Auffassungen von Friedrich Wolf und Georg Lukács," in Mittenzwei (ed.): *Dialog und Kontroverse mit Georg Lukács*, pp. 310-57.

199 See Szerdahelyi: *A magyar esztétika története*, pp. 481-82.