

Csilla Markója

UNDER THE WINGS OF THE TURUL

ANNA ZÁDOR AND ANTAL HEKLER¹

For the 80th birthday of Géza Galavics

A scholar of classicism with a rank in international academia, Anna Zádor recalled the events of the Holocaust in Budapest as follows: “We had to move out of our flat; it was assigned to an illustrious couple and we, together with another four families, were put up in their flat with a room for each family. Both me and my husband thought we’d ride it out somehow, it didn’t occur to either of us to hide or do anything: we both had aging parents and felt it was our duty to protect them. It’s hard to decide now what we ought to have done; one thing is sure: something different, because, though our parents survived, my husband and my younger brother perished, and neither my mother nor my mother-in-law could get over the loss of their beloved sons. I was driven off from the “star-marked” house in Személynök street in early November. It was not one of the murderous processions, we were not immediately taken to the Danube to be shot into the river, but five minutes earlier there was such a group and many of my dear acquaintances had been shot into the Danube. We, aged twenty to seventy, were driven in a slow procession toward the brick factory, and then on along the Vienna road to Hegyeshalom. All along we got nothing to eat but a dish of soup on and off, we could not wash, already at Piliscsaba our backpacks were taken away under the pretext of help and all our things were put in a truck – we never saw them again. A degree of deprivation and destitution followed, which is beyond imagination. We usually spent the night a pigsty strewn with straw and every morning I found someone dead by my side: one of the elderly who could not bear it longer. It’s fantastic that I didn’t fall ill during the march. That’s how we reached Hegyeshalom. I don’t know which way we would have gone on; I had some friends, young women, in the group, none of them returned. I was rescued by a friend of mine miraculously and brought back to Pest. I was hiding with Catholic friends until the outbreak of

¹ This text is based on a lecture, what was read at the conference “Hungarian art historians in the Holocaust” staged jointly by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Art History department of ELTE. It was revised by István Bardoly and Árpád Tímár. The *turul* is a legendary bird of Hungarian myths of origin, an alloy of a falcon, eagle and the mythic griffon. The Turul Association was one of the most important youth organizations of university students in Hungary in the Horthy era between 1919 and 1945. It was characterized by right-wing radicalism, Christian-national ideology, militarism, revisionism of the Trianon treaty and anti-Semitism, and efforts to reduce the weight of the Jewry.

the siege.”² Anna Zádor’s typical story of a death march then took a lucky turn. The friend who rescued her risking his life later recalled: “In the evening of 14 November 1944 Félix Zádor, no longer alive now, visited me in my flat and told me that his daughter Anna Zádor had been driven off as one of the persecuted by the Hungarian Nazis and later they’d take her to the west. [...] under circumstances unknown to me, Zoltán Topán acquired a military pass for me. Having it on me, I dressed into uniform on the 19th, got into my car and set out for the western frontier of the country. [...] In Hegyeshalom Anna Zádor and the group were taken to a manorial shed. Seeing it, I left my car close by and went in to Anna Zádor telling her I’d come for her, she should come with me. Then I left the mentioned building and Anna Zádor followed me through the fence. As she managed to escape, we got into the car and I drove her to Budapest. [...] Afterwards Anna Zádor stayed with various female acquaintances in Budapest with the help of the passes I had acquired and she managed to survive in this way.”³ That is how Miklós Szabó, the later counsel for Lajos Fülep, ended his recollection. Szabó’s heroism was rewarded with several years at the Gulag, as somebody had given him away to the Russians with the charge that he had worn the armband of the Arrow Cross party. Anna Zádor’s younger brother György disappeared during his forced labour service in January 1943. Her husband Ede Schütz Harkányi was deported by the Hungarian Nazis in June 1944, and presumably perished in Bergen-Belsen.

It was not only the anti-Jewish laws that influenced the fate of Anna Zádor and her family. Hungarians were in the vanguard of discrimination, segregation, for instance, with the Numerus Clauses Act being introduced at a very early date, in 1920. This legalized discrimination – which hypocritically avoided using the word Jewish at that time – put a stamp on the career of Anna Zádor of Jewish origin from the very beginning: she could only get into university with some back-stair support. In 1922 she was miraculously admitted to the faculty of humanities of Pázmány Péter university, to the department of Professor Antal Hekler⁴ as his only Jewish student.⁵ We learn about all this from Mamma herself as her students called

² „Mert én egy ilyen fantáziátlan alak vagyok...” [Because I am so unimaginative] Cecília Szabó in conversation with Anna Zádor. *Beszélő*, 10 March 1994. Cited: György Sümegei: „Soha nem lehet tudni, mi a jó, és mi az, ami segíti az embert egy nagyon nehéz helyzetben” [You never know what’s right and what helps you in a very difficult situation]. Anna Zádor in November 1944 – on the basis of documents. *Zádor Anna* II. Ed. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly. *Enigma*, 15. 2008. no. 55. 9-10.

³ Historical Archives of the State Security Services, 3. 1. 9. V-110209/4-a. 323, cited: Sümegei 2008. op.cit. 5.

⁴ Gosztonyi Ferenc: A „Pasteiner-tanszék” vége. Az 1917-1918-as tanszéki pályázat története és iratai [The end of the “Pasteiner department”. The history and documents of the application for the department chair in 1917-1918]. *Művészettörténeti Értesítő*, 63. 2014. 67-93.

⁵ Cf.: Tóth Károly: Péter András a budapesti egyetemen [András Péter at Budapest University]. *Ars Hungarica*, 33. 2005. 461-471. The other student of Jewish origin, József Biró, was also in Gerevich’s course. He was probably admitted on account of the merits in tradition preservation of his father

her, because Anna Zádor found it important to speak about the atrocities her generation had suffered.⁶ However, despite her seeming communicativeness, in these tape-recorded recollections one can hardly hear about her relationship with Antal Hekler, an internationally registered archaeologist of the Roman province, later head of department and academician. An art historian bumping against the blind spots of memory must resort to other sources if she would like to know more about Anna Zádor's years of studies and career start spent under the wings of Antal Hekler, the *primus magister* of the Turul Association.

The Numerus Clausus Act was introduced upon university pressure during the “white terror”, and exactly for this reason they hurried to outperform the set quotas. What is more, throughout the entire Horthy era they fought with increasing impatience for tightening the quotas. The violent actions, atrocities, pogrom-like demonstrations of right-wing students' organizations and fraternities were meant to put pressure on the political forces which wished to slacken (and nominally⁷ did ease) the legal regulations in 1928 upon the request, e.g., of the League of Nations.⁸ That means that the university atrocities accompanying the introduction of numerus clausus were not restricted to the period of “white terror” following the defeat of the Hungarian Republic of Soviets using “red terror”. The Hungarian career of the other brother of Anna Zádor, Henrik, fell victim to the third wave of university violence: he was so severely maltreated at the Faculty of Economics that he left the country. The right-wing students' organizations, whose leaders were university professors and often filled leading public or political positions, were a decisive force in the life of the universities. As archaeologist of classical antiquity József Révey, later a colleague of Anna Zádor, wrote in an article: “the numerus clausus poured oil on the fire of uncurbed anti-Semitism. Jewish students were beaten one after the other out of the university, the youth was overcome by the fever of organizing under certain slogans which imbued the whole of society during my course. Fraternal societies, Attila, Turán, Csaba, flat caps, identity checks, *Ébredők* [Awakening], Budaörs, Goldberger case - are all phenomena of disintegration. [...] It is profoundly sad that there were professors, race biologists and others, who verified with scholarly theories or personal participation the false and perverted ideas of the confused youth, and heated the cauldron of hatred with effective incentives or cowardly retreat.”⁹ Several such

Márk Biró, principal of the Jewish school in Nagyvárad.

⁶ In her declining years several interviews were made with her published in four separate books of the periodical *Enigma. Zádor Anna* I-IV. Szerk. Markója Csilla, Bardoly István. *Enigma*, 15. 2008. no. 54. 1-170, no. 55. 1-179, no. 57. 1-142, *Enigma*, 16. 2009. no. 58. 1-142.

⁷ Extenuation was really only nominal, as the admission committees consisted of the right-wing professors who had gone out of their way for the numerus clausus: it was within their jurisdiction to decide who to admit and why.

⁸ Ladányi Andor: A numerus clausustól a numerus nullusig [From numerus clausus to numerus nullus]. *Múlt és Jövő*, 16, 2005, 1. 57.

⁹ Révay József: Három esztendő [Three years]. *Független Szemle*, 2, 1922, 1. 8-9.

fraternities are known, of which the Turul Association was already clamouring for the tightening of numerus clausus quota as early as in October 1920. In 1932 there were atrocities at Szeged University and the Faculty of Humanities in Budapest, then the Turul members of Debrecen submitted a memorandum to the rector with the demand that the already reduced number of Jewish students should not be allowed to wear the gown at the doctoral inauguration, should not receive aid or scholarship, and should only be allowed to sit in the rear benches in the auditoria. The waves of terror rose highest in 1937, the Turul Association requesting *numerus nullus*, and the disturbances in the Trefort garden were paired with “vandalism” as the police reported. This went on until 1941, when the chieftain of Turul ordered the wearing of differentiating badges introduced immediately in the Technical University, which MP Antal Incze commented with the following words in the Lower House: “The students of the technical university had extremely finely wrought, tasteful Jewish badges made at their own costs and called upon the Jewish students to pin these pretty badges on for practical reasons – for the possibility of easy discrimination.”¹⁰

Anna Zádor’s recollections actually draw up the outlines of the history of the Hungarian department of art history from the beginnings to World War II. At the turn of the century Pasteiner put a stamp on the character of the department, while in the interwar years the rivalry of the departments of Hekler and Gerevich was decisive on the training of art historians. Anna Zádor described her professor, a leader of the Turul Association, as follows: “Suddenly, someone was needed to head the department, so this man, Antal Hekler was put there, who had to learn – literally – the history of art, he had never exercised it, except to the extent an archaeologist needed. He had to learn the history of Hungarian art, because quite understandably, and in my opinion, quite rightly, after Trianon a very powerful support for what was Hungarian, Hungarian art and Hungarian literature earned very strong support. Until then, in Pasteiner’s period, much less attention was given to Hungarian art.¹¹ And now, since earlier scholars were engrossed in the middle ages in the first place, now they plunged into baroque and renaissance with full force. Hekler had an odd habit: he seemingly did not look at us; two or three people were sitting around a large table in a room, with poor lighting, poor heating, poor cleanliness, with a small library like mine now, in stiff silence, nobody was allowed to smoke but the professor – he smoked day and night, that was one cause for his death at 58,¹² and he rushed with quick steps to get a book. [...] In summer 1924, at the beginning of the year, Esztergom achieved that a Christian archaeology department was founded

¹⁰ Ladányi 2005. op. cit. 70.

¹¹ On the idea historical background, see: Gosztonyi Ferenc: A „helyes” művészettörténeti álláspont kérdése Pasteiner Gyula írásaiban [The „right” position of art history in Gyula Pasteiner’s writings]. *Ars Hungarica*, 27. 1999. 309–351.; Gosztonyi Ferenc: A Pasteiner-tanítványok [The Pasteiner disciples]. *Ars Hungarica*, 38, 2012, 1. 11–71.

¹² Hekler died on 3 March 1940; speeches were said by Béla Brandstein, Elek Petovics, Andor Pigler and Dénes Radocsay.

and they had Tibor Gerevich¹³ appointed to the chair. Now, these two could not suffer each other, they were of diagonally different disposition, Gerevich was honed in Latin culture and hated the Germans, Hekler was brought up on German culture, he didn't hate the Italians but had no affinities for them. But that wasn't the main problem. The greatest trouble was that Hekler had graduated abroad and Gerevich was a graduate of the *Eötvös Collegium*. It had such enormous value and prestige at that time that this company - Gerevich, Kodály, Szekfű, János Horváth, Zoltán Gombocz belonged here - carried the faculty of the humanities on their back, Hekler falling through the sieve as if he had never existed. He had no weight, no influence in the teeth of the enormous coherence and self-awareness of these great minds, and Gerevich from Italy also joined them. The extremely embarrassing antagonism of the two "neighbours" was immediately kindled and smouldered throughout the period, but in the summer of '26 the Gerevich department organized a study trip to Italy, to which they invited me, too. It was an awesome thing, as I was the only Hekler student who had not transfer to Gerevich, András Péter earned his doctoral degree there, so did Genthon, and I don't know who else. I was stubborn and loyal."¹⁴

"Stubborn loyalty" is the only faint reflection on the straining contradiction that must have been felt between the journalistic activity of the Turulist professor and Anna Zádor's university experiences. The breaking in of the proto-Nazi "awakeners" - as if it were a symbolic date - she narrated again and again as an epitome of her experiences, similarly to the memory of the dignified act of one of the two Jewish professors of the university at that time, Lipót Fejér, partly fed by his abstraction of mind: "It was a grave story, that these people broke into the university despite the autonomy, and the warden, this excellent old man, failed to sweep them out. One day when I was just entering the university these guys had just rolled down a man on the few steps before the landing where the big staircase started, and he was lying there with a bleeding nose. I had never seen such a thing, I was terribly frightened, and ran to warden's booth to call the old caretaker who was a perfectly effective, saintly person, and this stalwart old man helped me set the man on his feet. He was Endre Csatai, and our great friendship until his death dated from that moment. [...] For weeks I sat through the seminars with trembling knees and a lump in my throat, working like that, waiting to see when such a thing would happen again. It was truly horrible. [...] Most of our departments were on the first floor, there were some downstairs, too; the one I mean was the department of mathematics led by Lipót Fejér, the most abstract person on earth, he wouldn't walk alone in the street, he could not mount stairs [...] He was a person who had

¹³ Though he had been teaching as a private docent from 1911, Gerevich was only appointed university professor in 1924. However, he mostly stayed in Rome on commission to restart the Hungarian Historical Institute in Rome, and actually only took his chair in 1926.

¹⁴ „Ez a bécsi kör nekem nagyon sokat adott” [This Viennese circle gave me a lot] (interview by Anna Mojzer, András Zwickl). *Zádor Anna II*. 2008. op. cit. 52.

no idea what life was outside, for his only interest was mathematics. These awakers usually broke into a ground-floor section, that's how the turmoil usually started [...] so they broke into the room where a lot of young men were sitting, and there was a small old Jew who was writing something on the blackboard. And he turned round in response to the noise and saw these strangers clad in some sort of uniform and said: But gentlemen, we are concerned with mathematics here. This gave them such a shock that they turned and left.”¹⁵

Anna Zádor writes about “awakers”, but no matter whether they belonged to the Society of Awakening Hungarians or to the Turul Association sporting the turul-badge adorned cap, Hekler was one of the professors who had an active share in organizing the right-wing fraternities from the beginning. There is a speech of his from 1924 delivered upon the consecration of a flag of the Turul Association in which he was extolling the readiness of the youth to live and die for Great Hungary.¹⁶ On 1 November 1924 he opened the festive assembly of the Turul Association delegates' camp. In this address he referred to Fichte and Széchenyi when urging the youth for an ethic renaissance “in the teeth of all sorts of anti-national trends, literary, theatrical and journalistic destructiveness” which is associated with the group “that ushered this nation into the maelstrom with the devilish assistance of organized destruction.”¹⁷ Hekler wrote short articles in *Napkelet* [East], *Szózat* [Appeal], *Turul Naptár* [Turul calendar], *Nemzeti Újság* [National Paper], *Testnevelés* [Physical education] and *Új Magyarország* [New Hungarians] about the dire practice of undermining authority, the need for physical training, the glorious entry of Horthy into the consecrated land of Kassa, the restoration of women's dignity and the return of Pozsony (the piquancy of the matter is that after an upswing from the turn of the century, women suffered discrimination again during the numerus clausus period). In 1941–1942 members of the Turul Association provided lists of the names and addresses of Jewish colleagues for the military replacement centres, based on which the first forced labour companies to be sent to the eastern front were recruited. Hekler did not only provide ideological ammunition for the Turul Association. In 1926 he called for opening an account with the Postal Savings Bank to raise a National Fund, and appealing “to the imperative of the love of our race and to the national conscience” he called on all to donate to the benefit of the Hungarian youth on the pages of *Nemzeti Újság*.¹⁸ In the knowledge of all this, it appears surprising that all what Anna Zádor had to remark about Hekler's world view

¹⁵ Ibid., 47–49.

¹⁶ Hekler Antal: Beszéd a Turul-Szövetség zászlószentelésén, 1924. november 16-án [Speech delivered at the flag consecration of the Turul Association, 16 Nov. 1924]. In: Hekler Antal: *Magyar kulturpolitika 1919 és 1939 között*. Budapest, 1942. 9.

¹⁷ Hekler Antal: Megnyitó-beszéd a Turul-Szövetség követtáborának díszközgyűlésén [Opening address at the festive assembly of the deputies of the Turul Association, 16 Nov. 1924]. Ibid., 10–11.

¹⁸ Hekler Antal: Segítetek! Nemzeti Alap a magyar ifjúság megszervezésére [Help! National Fund to assist the organization of the Hungarian youth] *Nemzeti Újság*, 5 Dec. 1926. Ibid., 20–21.

is this: “Now, Hekler was a classical archaeologist and he was absolutely disinterested in politics. Most probably, he had a conservative outlook, and if the poor man had lived longer, his German schooling and German contact would certainly have drifted him to the side of the Germans, but the poor man unfortunately died in '41, so it did not happen.”¹⁹ The statement that Hekler was not interested in politics, that he had no political influence – he of all people who, as a relative of minister of religion and public education Kunó Klebelsberg²⁰ was also his close friend – is a gross exaggeration. And it is impossible that Anna Zádor knew nothing of Hekler’s political activity, she must have read his writings, if not in the press, then at least in the small book edited by Gizella Erdélyi on behalf of the Hekler disciples in 1942, a collection of Hekler’s cultural political writings. Hekler’s anti-Semitism is perpetuated by several articles: he wrote about “Hungarian-speaking strangers who intruded upon us” in *Napkelet*,²¹ and he was a supporter of Hitler’s politics: “without fear and trembling, with the happy and grateful joy of the redeemed we are watching the world forming constructive work of the two geniuses of action, Hitler and Mussolini, and are fully aware that someone building on difficult ground must not shrink back from necessary explosions.”²² Paradoxically, it was the appealing facets of the personality in harmony with his morality²³, his gentlemanlike attitude and conservative views that exerted the greatest influence on his students, and this influence was not only formal or temporal, as their step immediately after his death to publish his writings proves. The first volume containing aphorisms with the title *Gondolatok* [Thoughts] in 1941 drew not only on his journalistic but also on his scholarly writings. This collection of meditations abounding in high-flown phrases and only applying the method of the history of ideas from the angle of ideology was prefaced by his good friend Elek Petrovics. Unlike Zádor, Petrovics already touched on the anomaly in Hekler’s activity in 1941, trying to find excuses for the teacher and man in these words: “He was not an ascetic of scholarship, he did not belong to the contemplative type of scholars [...] he was deeply interested in life, the wide world, he was preoccupied with political issues. The most visible signs were his participation in guiding the movements of the youth and his press utterances. Judging this kind of activity always implies subjective emotions, political sympathies and antipathies, and I would not like to stray onto that ground, but I feel obliged to declare that what Hekler was more passionate about than art and profession was the rise of our country, of complete, integral Hungary. It was the central idea that

¹⁹ „Magyarország alapjában véve konzervatív.” [Hungary is basically conservative]. In conversation with Anna Zádor (interview by Árpád Tímár). *Zádor Anna II.* 2008. op. cit. 77.

²⁰ The mother of Kunó Klebelsberg’s wife was born Márta Hekler.

²¹ Under the pseudonym György Magyar: *Mindent vissza!* [Give back everything!] (1938) Hekler 1942. op. cit. 49.

²² Hekler Antal: A diktatúrákról [On dictatorships]. *Új Magyarság*, 6 May 1939. 2. Ibid., 54.

²³ He wished to see it with reference to the „Hungarian ethical and cultural superiority” in everyone who „is not suffering from a pathological lack of will-power.”

explains his behaviour and many of his moves, and it calls for acceptance by even those who would only agree with him on the goal but not on the methods.”²⁴ Anna Zádor’s statement that Hekler was an “introverted person with inhibitions” is confuted not only by Hekler’s journalistic work but also by the program his scholarly works outline. These views received a name and a program in archaeology in Hekler’s opening presidential address to the assembly of the Archaeological Society with the title *Neo-nationalism in Hungarian archaeology*. Another program integrated in this sphere of thought brought about an upswing in Hungarian art history, most favourably, in baroque research supported by Klebelsberg and already urged by the Pasteiner disciples. Anna Zádor’s investigations of classicism also obviously fit into the trend around the dividing line between two periods – the artistic precedents in baroque architecture on one side of the line where Catholicism lent research – willy-nilly – some legitimistic hue, while on its other side, in the Horthy era, research relied heavily on the tradition of national classicism.

In 1932 the Hungarian Academy of Science called a competition with the title *Neoclassical architecture in Hungary*. Though they took part in the competition separately, Anna Zádor and Jenő Rados won the possibility to co-author the book in 1934. Among the explanations there are practical considerations such as the delicate balance between Hekler behind Zádor and Gerevich supporting Rados. In 1938 both of them were included in the jury evaluating the manuscript. Although they found a thousand objectionable points starting with the title, through the lack of due cooperation between the two authors – Hekler sarcastically remarked that Zádor “had better remain in the realm of facts, for wherever she rises into the regions of the history of ideas and art theory, the motor often misfires,”²⁵ all were in favour of continuing the work. The book is really disproportionate: Zádor’s 300 pages is somewhat inorganically followed by Rados’ typology on less than a third of this volume. Rados, in turn, hurried to have his section printed as a separate work under his name.²⁶ His attempts to become independent climaxed in a letter which Zádor deeply resented. Zádor only hinted at the reason expressed in the letter saying that Rados, who had married a non-Jewish woman, feared that collaboration with her would jeopardize the future of his family.²⁷ Elsewhere she commented: Rados “would have liked to be an Arya aristocrat, whereas he was actually a half-blooded bourgeois.”²⁸ His worry was not at all unjustified. A one-time student of Gerevich, László Balás-Piry denounced the authors on the pages of *Ország*

²⁴ Hekler Antal: *Gondolatok*. Petrovics Elek emléksoraival [Thoughts. With Elek Petrovics’ recollection]. Budapest, 1941. 15

²⁵ Jelentés Budapest székesfőváros művészettörténeti jutalmáról [Report on the art historical reward of the capital city of Budapest]. *Akadémiai Értesítő*, 48. 1938. 63–68.

²⁶ Rados Jenő: *A magyar klasszicizmus építészete feladatainak tükrében. Tipológia* [Hungarian classical architecture as reflected in its tasks. Typology]. Budapest, 1943. offprint.

²⁷ Zádor Anna II. 2008. op. cit. 69.

²⁸ „A sportolás nagyobb szerepet játszott, mint ma.” Beszélgetés Zádor Annával [Physical exercise

[Country] in 1943 with the following words: “Without detailed commentary or criticism, let me register that upon commission from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences two Jews, Anna Zádor and Jenő Rados have written a synthesis with the title *Classicist architecture in Hungary*, in spite of the fact that – as they admit – the material collected on the age of classicism is still of mixed value. [...] This notwithstanding, the Academy did not only support the pseudo-scientific work of two careerist Jewish authors, but they were even assigned the art historical prizes of the municipality of Budapest.”²⁹

The complexity of the historical and personal situation only sketchily outlined by the listed facts, and in this situation the intricacy of the Zádor-Hekler relationship, which is impossible to interpret (nor should it be interpreted) from a moral angle, can perhaps be made most tangible by an episode registered by István Vas. The Hungarian poet Zoltán Zelk found shelter for a few days in 1944 in the home of the noted Hungarian writer and editor of the periodical *A Tanú* [The witness], László Németh, Laci. That was where the wife of the great Hungarian writer Gyula Illyés, Flóra visited him, “bringing him cigarettes. She found him sitting on the floor, surrounded by issues of *A Tanú*, which he took off the lowermost shelf of the bookcase. Flóra asked if he liked what he had read: “Well,” Zoltán said, “Laci does have a little share in having to hide me here.”³⁰

Translated by Judit Pokoly

played a greater role than today. Conversation with Anna Zdor]. (Interview by Anna Mojzer, András Zwickl). *Zádor Anna III*. Szerk. Markója Csilla, Bardoly István. *Enigma*, 15. 2008. no. 57. 95.

²⁹ Balás-Piry László: Minden bővebb megjegyzés és kritika nélkül közöljük... [Without detailed commentary or criticism, let me register...] *Az Ország*, 24 July 1943. 14. – and the protest: A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia [The Hungarian Academy of Sciences]. *A Magyar Zsidók Lapja*, 12 August 1943. 2.

³⁰ Vas István: *Miért vijjog a saskeselyű?* [Why is the vulture screaming?] Budapest, 1981. II.: 426-427.