

The basis of the image today is numerical representation and renderable code instead of the analogic, indexical reference to reality. With new software and devices introduced by the day, with the more extensive elaboration of digital technologies, the moving image pushes new frontiers, immersing in the hybrid medial arena that is about to change the way we see and picture our on- and offline, or more accurately, "x-realities" (see Coleman 2011). The shift to code as the underlying basis of the image has consequences to all cultural aspects of our lives, just as much as the previous shifts of paradigms in terms of cultural interfaces (the traditions of the printed page and later of the cinema) influenced and changed the lives and perceptions of previous generations.

REFERENCE LIST

- Coleman, Beth. 2011. *Hello Avatar: Rise of the Networked Generation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Manovich, Lev. 2001. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Manovich, Lev. 2008. *Software Takes Command*. <http://lab.softwarestudies.com/2008/11/softbook.html> Kindle ebook.

"an overt, incestuous lecher, a plain agent of the devil!"

Thomas More's *Daemonizing of Luther in A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*¹
in: Költök, kének, detektívek, pirtós és fordítások – Írások Novák György tiszteletére/
Poets, spies, detectives, pieces of toast, and translations: Essay in honor of György Novák,
Szeged, JATEPress, 2012, 68–78. old.

KAROLI GÁSPAR UNIVERSITY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN HUNGARY

Elena Székely

"an overt, incestuous lecher,
a plain agent of the devil"
Thomas More's *Daemonizing of Luther*
in *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies*

"Both sprung from the same aspiring class: their fathers were city dwellers with high ambitions for their brilliant sons, ambitious they hoped to see fulfilled by putting those sons to the study of law. Luther gave up the law and, much against his father's wishes, entered the monastery. More was powerfully drawn to a clerical career but decided to marry, and acquiesced to his father's wishes and became a man of the law... In each of them burned an intensity that was often comic but could become fury at the slightest provocation, and each did battle for principle against an uncompromising and ruthless foe. Neither of them could believe that an opponent was honest or free of malice: each assumed that enemies were inspired by the most depraved wickedness."

The purpose of this paper is to investigate and evaluate the image of the German Reformer Martin Luther (1483–1546) in Book IV of *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* (1529, 1531, 1557), by the greatest English Humanist and Catholic martyr Saint Thomas More (1477–1535). We shall see that More was biased, even hysterical, with regard to the ideas of Luther and the Reformation, writing, as he was, in the aftermath of the bloodshed that had occurred during the German Peasants' Revolt (1525), for which he blamed entirely and exclusively Luther's heretical and subversive views.

I. THE BACKGROUND

Henry VIII's *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (1521) was probably inspired, if not written, by Thomas More. The king's work was a response to Martin Luther's

¹ Thomas More, *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*, Rendered into Modern English by Mary Gottshalk, Scepter Publisher, 2006, 394. (Henceforth: "G"). See also: Saint Thomas More, "A Dialogue Concerning Heresies", in: *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, 6, Parts I-II, Lawler, Thomas, McMarc'hadour, German/Marius, Richard C. (eds.), New Haven and London: Yale University Press. (henceforth: CWM 6); CWM 6, 346/13–14

¹ Richard Marius, *Thomas More, A Biography*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard UP, 1984, 264–5

De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae (1520). Luther's book was a powerful but provocative attack on the sacramental system of the medieval Catholic Church, in which Luther argued that the idea of the seven sacraments was the basis of the church's tyrannical control of its members. He found that baptism and the "sacrament of the altar" were only salvific as they were promised by Jesus. He also rejected the idea of transubstantiation, though, unlike his reformed followers, he never denied the "real presence" of the body and blood of Christ. The *Babylonica* immediately created friends and foes.

Henry VIII championed himself to be its greatest foe, thus earning the title of *Defensor Fidei* (defender of the faith) from the pope. Luther read Henry's *Assertio* and replied in a rather harsh style in his *Contra Henricum Regem Angliae* (1522). In Marius's words: "[i]t is unlikely that any tract addressed to a king in Christian Europe had ever been as insulting, as vitriolic, as obscene as Luther's little book."²

Thomas More's own *Responsio ad Lutherum* which came out in 1523 under the pseudonym of William Ross, was the author's first vehement attack on Luther.³ In the next five years Luther's views were condemned in London, while at the same time William Tyndale's "Lutheran" translation of the New Testament was smuggled into England from the continent. To stop this spreading heresy, in March 1528 Cuthbert Tunstall (1474-1559), the Bishop of London, gave permission to More to read heretical books and commissioned him to refute those books by writing in the vernacular. The result was *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* which was published in June 1529 by More's brother-in-law John Rastell and republished in 1531 by Rastell's son, William Rastell.⁴

A Dialogue Concerning Heresies is a witty humanist masterpiece in the tradition of More's earlier *Utopia*. C. S. Lewis called it a "great Platonic dialogue, perhaps the best in English"⁵. However, there are critics such as G. R. Elton who speak about it as "diffuse, ill-organized, repetitive and dull - and endless"⁶ and even one of the editors of the Yale critical edition portrays it as a "polemical maze".⁷ More defines his subject, "heresy", in the *Dialogue* as follows:

² Marius, 280

³ "Responsio ad Lutherum" in *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*. Vol. 5. Ed. John M. Headley, Yale University, New Haven and London, 1969 (henceforth: CWM 5)

⁴ Cf. also the modern spelling editions: *The Dialogue Concerning Tyndale by Sir Thomas More, Reproduced in Black Letter Facsimile from the Collected Edition (1557) of More's English Works*. Ed. W. E. Campbell with A. W. Reed, London, Eyre and Sportswode limited, His Majesty's Printers, 1927 (henceforth: C); G. 18. In this paper I quote either one of the modern spelling editions or the Yale critical edition.

⁵ C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1954, 172

⁶ G. R. Elton, *The English Historical Review*, 89 (1974), 385.

⁷ CWM 6, 443.

Eliae Falsing

"And thereby I do clearly know it for a heresy... a detour (taken by any sector of those who have been baptized and bear the name of Christian) from the common faith and belief of the whole rest of the Church." (G 59)

For More, heresy is associated with what he calls "newfangliness,"⁸ which is his negative expression of innovation.

The *Dialogue* is a series of six conversations, taking place over four days, between Sir Thomas and a young university student. The "student", or the "Messenger", is frequently taken to be William Roper, More's son-in-law during his heretical phase. However, some critics say this "supposition is hardly credible".⁹ At the beginning of the *Dialogue*, this young *Messenger*, who had probably visited Luther's university (or a place like it), presents a "letter of credence" to More. The conversation takes place in More's home in Chelsea and it always begins in More's study at 7 a.m.

More, or the narrative "T", is an extremely good and tactful rhetorician, or, even manipulator. The Messenger is sometimes called "your friend" because the book is fictionally a long letter to a man in the North of England who has become worried about the young man's attraction to heresy. The young man is bright and intelligent and throughout the *Dialogue* More seems to enjoy how he can manipulate this receptive intellect. His art of Platonic dialogue and conversation is highly instructive; it is extremely witty and contains several "merry tales" as digressions in the style of Boccaccio and Chaucer.

The *Dialogue* has four books: the first two are related to images, shrines, the primacy of orality over textuality and other aspects of Catholic worship, and the last two books defend the church's right to try and punish those preachers who would uproot and overthrow the church.

Especially in the last book, More takes his role as freshly licenced heresy-hunter extremely seriously. If we are biased in favour of More, we may praise his genius for preventing a young, feeble intellect from lapsing into heresy; if we are biased against More, we may see his arguments as the triumph of an aggressive brainwashing.

In the following pages I will try to elucidate some features of the strategy of this "keen amateur inquisitor"¹⁰ by which he gradually subverts the messenger's mind.

⁸ CWM 6, 125/5; 191/31; 269/27; 338/35; 423/20.

⁹ Marius, 340.

¹⁰ D. V. N. Bagchi, "Tyndale, More, and the Anatomy of Heresy", *Reformation*, vol. 2, 1997, 261-81 (quotation p. 263)

II. MORE'S STRATEGY IN CONVINCING THE MESSENGER

1. Daemonizing and diabolizing Luther – Emotional, Evocative Images

At the very beginning More calls Luther "a foolish friar, ... an apostate... an overt incestuous lecher, a plain agent of the devil, and a manifest messenger of hell" (G 394). More knows he may sound too harsh in calling Luther by such odious names but he says this is the very language Luther uses in his writings. A key motif More seems to be hysterically harping on is Luther's "mad marriage" – a monk, breaking his vow, marrying a nun, breaking her vow – which was for More the most abhorrent and abominable scandal.

Luther's heresy is ultimately seen as an infection destroying the body of the church: "he is not besprinkled with a few spots, but with more than half venom is poisoned all the wine – which is in itself right rotten. And this is done on purpose and out of malice, not without an evil spirit accompanying his words in such a way that the contagion thereof is likely to infect a feeble soul, just as the stench of a plague sore infects a whole body." (G 395)¹¹

The 1557 edition has several marginal notes. In Chapter 17 we read: "*Luthers are the worst heretics that ever sprang in Christ's church*" (C 317).

In Chapter 6 More criticizes Luther's "inconsistent mind" and "diabolical intent" after he blasphemously burned the law of the church before the public of Wittenberg.

The mere existence of Luther and his followers is for More an apocalyptic sign. More believed that faith could help in recognizing that Luther was the offspring of the devil: "every man that any faith hath, and any manner knowledge of Christian belief, may well and surely perceive that Luther and all his offspring, with all those that favour and set forth his sect, be very limbs of the devil, and open enemies of the faith of Christ" (C 279).

2. Reminizing Luther's Heretical Views

In Chapter 2 More argues that no good fruit can spring from a friar who wedded a nun. Luther began his activity by castigating the use of indulgences and con-

¹¹ More's famous image of heresy as contagion is in *The Confutation* where he says his purpose was "to the intent that ye may more clearly perceive the malicious mind of these men, and that their pestilent books be both odious to God and deadly contagious to men, and so much the more perilous in that their false heresies wilfully walk forth under the the counterfeit usage of the true Christian faith. This is the cause and purpose of my present labour, whereby (God willing) I shall so pull off their gay painted visors, that every man listing to look thereon, shall plainly perceive and behold the bare ugly gargyle faces of their abominable heresy." "The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer", in: *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More & Parts I–III*. Schuster, Louis A., Marjorie C. Richard/Lusardi, James P./Schoeck, Richard, J. (eds.), New Haven and London: Yale University Press (Henceforth: *CWM* 8), 34/8–16, quoted by Bagchi, 267

tinned it by destroying the medieval sacramental system. For example, by denying that a priest was needed for the hearing of confession, this sacrament easily became a target for abuse. The student cynically remarks: "If I could in accordance with Luther's way make my confession to a beautiful woman, I would not hesitate to go to confession weekly" (G 398). More then goes on to itemize Luther's heretical views:

- He teaches that faith suffices to salvation.
- He saith that it is sacrilege to go about to please God.
- That no man can do good work.
- That no sin can damn any Christian man; but only lack of belief.
- He saith that faith "swallows" (G) all our sins.
- He teaches that no man hath free will.
- In matrimony, he saith plainly that it is no sacrament. (G 260). Item, if a man be not able to do his duty with his wife, he is bounden secretly without slander to provide another to do it for him.
- In the sacrament of the order. He saith that that priesthood and all holy orders be but a fayned (feigned) invention. Item that every Christian man and Christian woman is a priest. Item, that everyman may consecrate the body of Christ.
- He saith that the canon of the mass is false. Item that host in the mass is none oblation nor sacrifice. (G 260)
- He teacheth against scripture and all reason, that no Christian man is or can be bounden by any law made among men, nor is not bounden to observe or keep any.
- Item, he teacheth that there is no purgatory.
- Item, that all men's souls lie still and sleep till the day of doom.
- Item, that no man should pray to saints nor set by any holy relics nor pilgrimages, nor do any reverence to any images. (C 261)

3. Pointing out Inconsistencies in Luther

A convincing motif of More's arguments is that Luther's activity is full of inconsistencies. This results, he says, from Luther rejecting "reason" and letting his "passion" motivate his ideas. Passionate ideas are "seditious" (G 485) and easily make the mobs mad. More speaks about Luther's "arrogant diabolical pride cloaked under the pretext of good zeal and simpleness" (G 483), which is also typical of all "bad smelling" (G 479) heretics. More quotes St. Augustine that "pride is the very mother of all heresies" (G 477) and confirms that pride and not reason is the enemy of faith.

This pride-motivated passion lead Luther to inconsistencies: "then he fell from reasoning into ranting, and utterly denied what he had before affirmed" (G 411).

What are the most conspicuous inconsistencies in Luther's activity? Once he said of the Bohemian Hussites that they were heretic, another time he denied that they were. "Luther, who had previously appealed to the next general council, utterly denies the authority of all general councils and regards them as of no account" (G 411). "[H]e did once promise to abide by the judgement of the University of Paris, and thereupon were held public debates... But when his opinions were afterward, in Paris, condemned, then he refused to abide by their judgement and reverted to his old expedient of ranting." (G 412). First he said that though purgatory could not be proved by scripture, "yet it was to be firmly believed by all Christians" (G 415) but later he entirely rejected purgatory and began to teach the idea of "soul-sleep", namely that the souls of the departed sleep until judgement day.¹²

He also changed his views of religious vows: in *The Babylonian Captivity* he taught that the vows of human beings to God should be kept, but soon after he said that "no vow can bind anyone". More quickly finds the explanation for Luther's inconsistency: he "changed to the second out of a lecherous lust toward the nun that he intended to marry" (G 416).

4. Slandering Luther's Actions

Slander is verbal defamation, in which someone tells one or more persons an untruth about another which will harm the reputation of the person defamed. In More's treatment of Luther in Book IV of the *Dialogue* there are at least three episodes which definitely illustrate how slander works.

Slander 1. The occasion why Luther fell into heresy

More tells the Messenger that "there was an indulgence service held in Saxony, for which service, in accord with the custom there, Luther was the preacher; and he preached to the people, encouraging them to participate in it, and supporting its legitimacy, all that he possibly could, not without great advantage to himself. Then, soon after, it so happened that the giving of the service, with the advantage thereof, was taken from him and assigned to someone else. For anger over which he fell into such a fury that forthwith he began to write against all grantings of indulgences." (G 410)

The editors of the Yale critical editions remark: "This slander, probably from one of More's German correspondents, is not repeated in his later polemical work."¹³

¹² Cf. Gergely Juhász, *Translating Resurrection: An Early Sixteenth-Century Exegetical Debate in Antwerp between the Protestant Bible Translators William Tyndale and George Joye in Its Historical and Theological Context*. A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor's Degree in Theology. Leuven, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Faculteit Godgeleerdheid, 2008.

¹³ CWM 6/2 707.

Slander 2. The "foolish friar's insane vainglory"

More recalls an episode that he had already mentioned in his *Responsio ad Lutherum* (CWT 5, 46-49). In Chapter 4 of the *Dialogue* More again refers to a book that Luther wrote about his activity at the Diet of Worms in which Luther wrote in the third person singular about himself. His text, More argues, was interrupted by a brief intrusion of Luther's first person singular narrative in which, venting his fury, he forgot himself and called the emperor, with gross informality, just "Charles" and called himself "in big capital letters and solemn titles - The Man of God Luther" (G 413).

The Yale critical edition provides the explanation: "The words are not, as More gives them, 'The man of God Luther', but only 'DICTOD. MARTINI LUTHERI coram Caesare Carolo...' The discrepancy may mean that More had seen a copy of the work in possession of someone else, had made incomplete notes on it, and erred when he tried to recall the titles Luther had given himself in the capital letters that mark the beginning of the speech."¹⁴

Slander 3. The Sack of Rome

For More, the ultimate proof of Luther's abominable and dangerously seductive heresy was the German Peasant's Revolt in 1525. Violence escalated and More believed that the sect of Luther was responsible for the mischief not only in Germany but also in Lombardy and Rome. The most notorious case is the sack of Rome.

Charles, Duke of Bourbon, the Imperial commander-in-chief, led an army of mercenary soldiers into Rome on May 6, 1527. When Bourbon was killed, the soldiers, like beasts, sacked the city; they raped wives in the sight of their husbands, daughters in front of their fathers and even slaughtered innocent children. Richard Marius in Appendix C to the Yale critical edition wrote: "More believed that the common soldiers of the army were German mercenaries; Lutherans acting in the violent way he always expected followers of Luther to act... Such is More's account and his moral is plain: Lutheranism destroys the natural feelings of humanity that people should have for one another."¹⁵ Marius was drawing on the historian G. R. Elton, who pointed out that "many of the troops were Catholic Spaniards and that More's belief that the sack was motivated by Lutheranism cannot be sustained."¹⁶

More remained a captive of his own image of Luther and Lutheranism as being seditious and violent. For him this was all the consequence of heresy. He never checked his sources which he probably acquired through diplomatic channels. It is interesting, Marius concludes, that this episode is not mentioned in his later

¹⁴ CWM 6, 710, cf.

¹⁵ CWM 6, 773-4.

¹⁶ CWM 6, 774.

polemical work. This might be a proof that he began to doubt that Lutherans were responsible for all these atrocities. Thus the story remains just a slander in the arsenal of More's critique of Luther.

5. Scandalizing Luther's Teaching on Destiny

Among the doctrines most scandalous for More was Luther's idea of predestination and his rejection of free will. We should remember that Erasmus had challenged Luther on humanist philosophical grounds: how can human beings be held responsible and judged on the Day of Doom if they do not have free will? Luther vehemently responded to Erasmus in his 1525 *De servo arbitrio*, which was the theologian's devastating attack on the humanist's "theology of observation" which suggested that God could be observed from a neutral corner. For Luther, God could not be understood from the point of view of a speculative observer because God is both hidden and revealed. It is a mystery why God "hardened the heart of the Pharaoh" (Exodus 7, 13) but it is definitely a sign that God acts even through our evil actions. The human will is never entirely free for Luther: either God rides it, or Satan rides it. God works for our salvation, Satan for our damnation. God, however, can use Satan's riding for his own purposes, sometimes he goes as far as wearing the mask of Satan. Only faith in Christ can help us to recognize the difference. God, and not man, is the ultimate author of history.

Luther's radical theocentric theology has always been a scandal for anthropocentric humanist theologies, whether Catholic or evangelical. For the latter group the human being is active, he decides whether to choose salvation or damnation. For Luther the human being is necessarily passive, he is being acted upon. Another hateful doctrine for More was Luther's idea of predestination and his rejection of free will. More deals with Luther's most scandalous teaching in Chapters 10 and 12. Chapter 10 is entitled: *The author inveigheth against this detestable article of this ungracious sect, whereby they take away the liberty of man's freewill, and ascribe all things to destiny*. He says that "[they] wretchedly lay all the weight and blame of our sin to the necessity and constraint of God's ordinance, affirming that we do no sin of ourselves, by any power of our own will, but by the compulsion and handiwork of God." (G 427)

More is logically asking that if God were to be blamed for all our wickedness and if our goodness were not to count towards our salvation, why is there so much exhortation in the Holy Scripture to do good works?

Due to More's emphasis on the scandalous nature of the doctrine of predestination Luther's name came to be associated with destiny in England, a view that is echoed even in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.¹⁷

¹⁷ Richard Marquis, "Fare and Providence: Hamlet's take on Martin Luther", *WICK, The Harvard Divinity School Student Journal of Literature and Religion*, Vol. 11.1.1997, 37-50.

III. CONCLUSION - MORE'S IMAGE OF THE CHURCH

More's cosmic anxiety and fear of the seductive, heretical views of Luther is deeply rooted in his passionate and devoted concern for the church as the body of Christ where the Holy Spirit is working. He believed that against the "barking of heretics" we should hear and listen to "God's undoubted truth, taught to his church by his Holy Spirit and confirmed by such a multitude of miracles, by so much blood of holy martyrs, by the virtuous conduct of so many blessed confessors, by the purity and cleanness of so many chaste widows and undefiled virgins, by the wholesome doctrine of so many holy theologians, and finally by the unanimous accord and agreement of all Christian people these fifteen hundred years." (G 394)

More uses this image of the church (martyrs, confessors, virgins, doctors) several times, and this tableau evokes the famous painting of the "Adoration of the Lamb" (1432) by Hubert and Jan van Eyck. Jan van Eyck (c1385-1441) was the first significant representative of the Flemish school. We may wonder whether More could have seen this painting on one of his diplomatic missions to Flanders.¹⁸ For More "[t]he church is like a living person; it receives its cohesion from that living soul, the Holy Spirit, the agent of unanimity in the household of the faith."¹⁹

More taught that heretics could, or even should be burned. Luther's shameful opinions condemn themselves and his sect will be cut off from the body as a withering branch would be cut from a tree.

A recent dissertation has elucidated the uniqueness of More's understanding of the church: "His sense of the church, especially in the *Dialogue Concerning Heresies* and in the *Confutation of Tynedale's Answer*, as the 'Common Corps [body] of Christendom' is surprisingly organic, anticipating many of the later positions of Vatican II... His emphasis, also developed in the *Confutation*, on the role of the Holy Spirit in guiding the consensus of the faith of the Church down through the ages again seems very unusual in the early Sixteenth Century, either among Protestants or Catholics, and also fits in with his own very organic understanding, as a lay theologian, of the nature of the Church."²⁰

In conclusion we may say that More's daemonizing of Luther should be understood against the background of his ecclesiology. In view of this grandiose ecclesiology we may, if not accept, at least understand his perspective: his anxious concern for the body of Christ. Neither can we blame him for lacking our mo-

¹⁸ For details see: Peter Schmidt, *The Adoration of the Lamb*, Leuven, Davidsfonds, 1995.

¹⁹ Germain P. Marc'hadour and Thomas M. C. Lawler, "Scripture in the *Dialogue*" in, CWM 6, 499

²⁰ Romuald Ian Lakowski, *Sir Thomas More and the Art of Dialogue*, Ph.D. Diss. U. of British Columbia, all, 1993, <http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/femls/work/chapters/heresy1.htm>, 24.

dem sense of scholarship and forgetting about primary sources and thus frequently relying on rumours. No wonder that this attitude ended up in slander.

However, we may notice that More who rightly criticized Luther for abandoning reason in favour of passion, fell into the same trap. He did let himself be guided by his intense passions and thus he himself became the epitome of what he criticized about Luther. Richard Marius was entirely right when he noticed that "[i]n each of them burned an intensity that was often comic but could become fury at the slightest provocation, and each did battle for principle against an uncompromising and ruthless foe. Neither of them could believe that an opponent was honest or free of malice; each assumed that enemies were inspired by the most depraved wickedness."²¹

Ghant Tibor
DEBRECENI EGYETEM

Dualizmuskori Amerika-kép, utazási irodalom és paródia

BEVEZETÉS

Bécs és Washington diplomáciai kapcsolataiban az 1870-es évektől a magyarok egyre nagyobb szerepet játszottak. 1878-ban Budapesten megnyitották az első magyarországi amerikai konzulátust, melyet 1904-ben főkonzulátusi rangra emeltek. Mivel Magyarországnak a Kiegyezés értelmében nem lehetett önálló külpolitikája, viszont nagyszámú kivándorló költözött a Magyar Királyságból Amerikába, a Monarchia clevelandi és New York-i főkonzulátusának vezetésében egyre több magyar diplomata szolgált. A két kultúra közti kapcsolatokban kiemelkedően fontos szerepet játszottak a személyes kapcsolatok is, elsősorban Theodore Roosevelt elnök és Gróf Apponyi Albert barátsága.¹

Amerikai-magyar viszonylatban a legfőbb kapcsolódási pont a tengerentúli migráció volt: az amerikai "új bevándorlás" időszakában a Magyar Királyság területéről mintegy másfél millió ember vándorolt ki Amerikába. A magyar származású kivándorlók többsége azonban nem akart végleg kielepülni; erre mutat a viszonylag magas, 30% feletti visszavándorlási arány. A Monarchiából áttelepült (zömében paraszti származású) kivándorlók elsősorban az acél- és bányáiparban helyezkedtek el, s néhány kivételtől eltekintve (pl. Pulitzer József, Braun Márkus, Konta Sándor) kísérletet sem tettek arra, hogy beilleszkedjenek az amerikai társadalomba. Ehelyett megpróbáltak úgy élni, hogy a lehető legtöbb pénzt tudják megtraktarítani és hazaküldeni. Ezt mindkét kultúra megérezte, és a maga módján reagált is rá. A magyar elit megkongatta a vészharangot (a nemzet veszteségére hivatkozva), az amerikaiakat pedig az foglalkoztatta, hogy honnan jönnek ezek a különös, tudatosan nyelvi és fizikai izolációban élő (az amerikai asszimilációs törekvéseket elutasító) emberek. Budapest komoly erőfeszítéseket tett a kivándorlás korlátozására és a magyar identitású migránsok visszacsalogtatására, Washington pedig tényfeltáró missziókat küldött a Kárpát-medencébe. A

¹ A jelen tanulmány elkészítését a Habsburg Történeli Intézet 006/104/2005 sz. pályázata, valamint a TAMOP 4.2.1/B-09/1/KONV-2010-0007 és TAMOP 4.2.2/B-10/1-2010-0024 kutatási programja (az Új Széchenyi Terv keretében) tette lehetővé.

²¹ A részleteket ld. Ghant Tibor: "Roosevelt, Apponyi és a Habsburg Monarchia" *Századok* CXXXII/6 (1997): 1386–1401. o.



Költők,
kémek,
detektívek,
pirítós és fordítások
– Írások

Nováik György tiszteletére

Poets,
spies,
detectives,
pieces of toast,
and translations:
Essays in honor of *György Novák*

Tartalomjegyzék/Contents

Szerkesztette/Edited by
Vajda Zoltán

Tervezte/Design by
Szőnyi Erelka

A kiadvány
a Szegeedi Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Karának
és Amerikanisztika Tanszékének
a támogatásával jelent meg.

ISBN 978-963-315-084-9

Előszó/Preface 9

Iren Annus
Maintaining Faith: Sacrifice and Mission 13

Balázs Mihály
Thomas Morus és a magyarok 23

Erzsébet Barát
Bone Marrow on Toast: Pleasures in/of the 'Wild East' 29

Réka M. Cristian
From Graffiti to Olympia: Jean-Michel Basquiat's Bodyscapes 33

Charmian Dexter
"Eye for an Eye" The Armchair Detective, January 1997 43

Zoltán Dragon
The Image Does Not Exist: Unknown Territories of Digital Cinema 63

Tibor Fabiny
"an overt, incestuous lecher, a plain agent of the devil" Thomas More's
Daemonizing of Luther in *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies* 69

Glant Tibor
Dualizmuskori Amerika-kép, utazási irodalom és paródia 79

Karsai László
1988–2012: 24 év, 20 konferencia, 10 tanulmány-fordítás. Barátom és
fordítóm Novák György 99

Edward Kelly
Contradictions in Irish Foreign Policy, 1956–1974 101

Minden jog fenntartva.

Jelen könyvet, illetve annak részeit tilos reprodukálni,
adatgyűjtő rendszerben tárolni,
bármilyen formában vagy eszközzel
– elektronikus, mechanikus, fényképeseti úton –
vagy más módon közölni a kiadó engedélye nélkül.

Kenesei István	
A szegeedi Angol Tanszék a hetvenes években	119
Attila Kiss	
Herder, National Identity, and the Hungarian Cult of Shakespeare	127
Kocsis Mihály	
Ezra	135
Kovács, Ágnes Zsófia	
"Pym, you bastard, where are you?" Intertextuality in John Le Carré's <i>A Perfect Spy</i>	139
Kökény Andrea	
Hajónapló: Csillagidő 8929	157
Lévai Csaba	
"Egy olyan feketé fellelként tekintettem a rabszolgaság intézményére, mint amely ötven esztendője ott lebeg az ország felett" (G. Washington, J. Adams és J. Madison felfogása a rabszolgaságról)	171
Sándor Martsa	
Soldiers Wearing Zero Uniforms <i>or</i> Why Conversion is not Zero-Derivation	191
Molnár Judit	
Ami a fordításokból kimaradt	203
Ötvös Péter	
puer maturior annis (Vergilius)	209
Róbert Péter	
The representations of the Bayeux tapestry in the nineteenth-century British press	213
Miklós Péti	
The Modernists on Milton—Yet Once More	227
+ Jack Roberts	
Some Thoughts on Fliccraft, Hard-Boiled Detective Fiction, and the American Work Ethic	237

Bálint Rozsnyai	
Propter utilitatem eorum qui lecturi sunt (Cotton Mather, <i>Magnalia Christi Americana</i> epigraph) or the ultimate captivity of <i>The Algerine Captive</i>	247
Ágnes Surányi	
In Honour of Novák György	259
Zoltán Vajda	
Selfish Barbarians – Affectionate Americans: Thomas Jefferson, Indian Women, and the Power of Civilization	261

Költők,
kémek,
detektívek,
pirítós és fordítások

— Írások

Novák György tiszteletére



Poets,
spies,
detectives,
pieces of toast,
and translations:

Essays in honor of *György Novák*



www.press.u-szeged.hu



9 789633 150849

