

## Seeing the Wood and the Trees

Károly Tagányi and His *Magyar Erdészeti Oklevéltár*

Festschriften are inherently personal documents. In that they celebrate one individual, they encourage closer reflection on other individuals. In commemorating one oeuvre, they point to the particularities of the works of others. Tibor has himself illuminated many such texts: I adduce for example his notable forensic examination of the memoirs and papers of the American diplomat, John F. Montgomery.

The focus in what follows is a text I encountered many years ago, gathering dust on the open shelves of a Budapest library. It seemed remarkable at the time; yet I never saw reference to it, either then or long afterwards (indeed, in the meantime I even forgot who it was by). Whereas Tibor has spent his career exploring Hungary's links to the USA and UK, often identifying mutual influences, especially in spheres of Anglo-Saxon prowess, my text is different. It derives from an area of study slow to take root in English-speaking countries: forest science, or *Forstwissenschaft*, in fact one of the most remarkable cultural exports from central Europe to the rest of the world. Not that my hero can count as one of its apostles: no single copy of his *chef d'oeuvre* has found its way to Britain.

The last item in Károly Tagányi's *Magyar Erdészeti Oklevéltár* (MEO<sup>1</sup>) records a meeting in 1866 at which the Ungarischer Forstverein was relaunched as the Magyar Erdészeti Egyesület, a culturally and linguistically Hungarian society grafted on to existing German stock. It had already founded a pioneering journal, the *Erdészeti Lapok*, which soon escaped from the shadow of its Austrian models.<sup>2</sup> At first its editors, Adolf Divald and Károly Wagner, operated in a semi-clandestine way (under rather obvious punning pseudonyms as Adolf Erdődi and Károly Mérei) from their professional base at Selmecbánya; but soon they, along with the society's long-serving secretary, Albert Bedő, could engage in a mission from Budapest to the whole of Dualist Hungary.

They sought to remedy the perceived neglect of the country's woodland, its primitive condition, low returns, nebulous ownership, and lack of effective management.<sup>3</sup> The forest law, *Erdőtörvény*, of 1879 was their work: it provided a framework for preservation and plantation, for planning and minute administrative controls, not least through a raft of penalties for delinquency ('erdőrendészeti áthágások').<sup>4</sup> Their inspiration was squarely the example of Germany, where forestry already had a century and a half of professional development and official direction behind it. From the first enunciation there of rational and sustainable principles by Hans Carl von Carlowitz in 1713, through the institution of training courses (most famously that established by Heinrich Cotta at Tharandt, near Dresden, in 1811), to the massive and lucrative state forestry programmes evolved in Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony and elsewhere, Germany had led the way.

Hungary's emulative activity in the field of silviculture ran *pari passu* with other aspects of her rapid material advance under Dualism. The country's enhanced status

was likewise conjoined to an explosion of patriotic sentiment and a craving for full international recognition. Hence the project for grandiose celebration of the Magyar Millennium in the year 1896. And foresters wanted to be part of that. Led by the indefatigable Bedő, the Magyar Erdészeti Egyesület decided to commission a millenary documentation of the evolution of Hungary's woodland.

\* \* \*

Their choice as compiler fell upon Károly Tagányi: not a forester, but a historian. Born in 1858 at Nyitra, of part-German burgher stock, Tagányi early stood out as a rising archivist: from 1879 he was one of those who under Gyula Pauler created the Országos Levéltár. Tagányi at first concentrated on medieval and technical materials, including seals, pedigrees, and heraldry. Meanwhile he read widely and, under the influence especially of Hippolyte Taine, began to take issue with what he saw as the conservative self-indulgence, sloppy standards and parochial vision of Hungary's existing historical establishment.<sup>5</sup>

In 1894, the very year he accepted Bedő's invitation, Tagányi joined together with a few like-minded colleagues to found a journal of economic, particularly agricultural, history, the *Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle*. This was a precocious venture by any standards: next to the almost simultaneous *Zeitschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* in Germany, apparently the first periodical of its kind anywhere. The subsequently prominent agronomist Alajos Paikert acted as co-editor (though Tagányi did most of the work). Others in the group were Sándor Takáts, later to be known as an anecdotal chronicler of popular culture; Ignác Acsády, pioneering expositor of the history of Hungary's peasants; and Ferenc Kováts, who took over the journal from Tagányi after 1900 for a few more years, and continued these approaches, albeit with diminishing resonance, through the inter-war period.<sup>6</sup>

Tagányi's research themes in the 1890s can be appreciated against this background. He became fascinated by the past worlds of ordinary people and by folklore (in later years he served as president of the Magyar Néprajzi Társaság). For our purposes two of his subjects at that time are especially relevant. One is the village community, the *faluközösség*, about which he wrote a notable article for the first volume of *Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle* (thus in the year he was also hired for MEO). Against a widespread contemporary presumption that the open-field system was a recent institution, the result of subdivision of plots or of Turkish depredation, Tagányi demonstrated its ancient origins, back into an age when tribal peoples were more important than land, and when broad social co-operation, involving local nobles too, was vital. As elsewhere in Europe – and Tagányi was acquainted with Seeböhm, Vinogradov, et al. – the pristine right of *prima occupatio* (*első foglалás*) gradually gave way to a system of common fields and regularly repartitioned strips. Particularly in remoter areas he could show that this had survived into his own day.<sup>7</sup>

A few years later, as his inaugural lecture on election to the Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Tagányi set out a similarly *longue-durée* analysis of Hungary's county administration. Here, in a reverse development, the institution of the *comitatus*, called into

being as an arm of royal authority, then undermined by aristocratic lawlessness, was transformed by the concerted activity of the lower nobility (*köznemesség*) into a stable instrument of local government and self-rule. And one of which, he concludes, Hungary can be proud: 'Európa legrégebb politikai intézménye a magyar vármegye.'<sup>8</sup>

\* \* \*

This, then, was the agenda that Tagányi brought – along with his prodigious appetite for work – to preparation of *MEO*. It duly appeared in time for the 1896 millennium: an astounding achievement in two years of what he himself describes as 'szakadatlanul folytatott kutatásaim.' There are three stout volumes, two and a half thousand pages, with extended introduction and exhaustive index. The sources, in Latin, German, and Hungarian, are mainly archival, ranging from the Országos Levéltár and the Nemzeti Múzeum to Viennese repositories and private ones, such as those of the Csáky, Kornis, and Károlyi families. Some are from printed collections, especially those of Hungarian mining legislation edited by Franz Anton Schmidt, and of municipal statutes by Sándor Kolosvári and Kelemen Óvári.

The fruit of Tagányi's labours may look dull and forbidding; but it's an early ecological treasury. What story did he tell through his *MEO*? Already in the earlier documents he finds plenty of evidence for his theories about communality. Royal forests, like royal lands as a whole, were gradually alienated, but some central control over them seems to have been retained. Much woodland came to be held by joint owners, in the form of the *compossessoratus* (*közbirtokosság*) of nobles or peasants (and often both together). These, and other kinds of woodland holding, were typically regulated by compacts: settlements within and between villages and families.<sup>9</sup> And they were very long-lived, notably in remoter parts of Transylvania.

Another long-lasting form of regulation which Tagányi must have enjoyed recording are the numerous examinations of witnesses (*tanúvallatások*), the most colourful of all his sources and the most Magyar in language. In these, local inhabitants testified to their own and others' customary rights in woodland. The inquisitions continued throughout the early modern period.<sup>10</sup> In one case, from 1733, called to arbitrate the common woods of Aranyosszék, 191 witnesses were summoned. Such later examples mainly come from Transylvania.<sup>11</sup> The *tanúvallatások* reveal rich evidence of usage, especially of course in cases where this was being challenged. Everywhere *MEO* attests to traditional management of woodlands, with apportionment (*nyílas osztás*) among local inhabitants, allowance being made for quality, distance, species, etc., and with much picturesque detail about pristine woodland husbandry over the long centuries of its ecological dominance. One instance among very many would be the countrywide valuation essayed in 1486 of various types of wood: *eresztvény* (i.e. *Niederwald* or coppice), *bárdos* (*Hochwald*), *makkos* (*Mittelwald*) and so forth; which can be compared with the relevant provisions in Werbőczy's *Tripartitum*.<sup>12</sup>

\* \* \*

Attempts at official intervention in this self-regulatory silvan world commence in and around the Upper Hungarian mining towns<sup>13</sup> from the 16th century onwards; and these are tellingly the first German-language items in *MEO*. They reflect a growing awareness of the need to protect resources and plan for their balanced exploitation, and emanated from the governmental treasuries or chambers (*Kammern; kamarák*), Hungarian, Lower Austrian and Imperial, all of which long asserted some jurisdiction there. A ready supply of wood, above all as fuel, was crucial for these profitable operations. A weighty document of 1565 is the first Hungarian *Ordo silvarum*, an Austrian *Waldordnung* translated into Latin (though not by the man initially approached to do it, the famous humanist Johannes Sambucus, who reveals how forestry already possessed a technical vocabulary that was beyond him!).<sup>14</sup>

The countrywide implications of this were minimal as yet. Diet attention to environmental issues was perfunctory at best. Much destruction and dereliction of woodland took place, especially in areas laid waste by the Ottoman wars and ravaged by the supply demands of armies and frontier fortresses. In this setting there emerged the next phase recorded in *MEO*. It began in the Banat of Temesvár, once that territory had been recovered from the Turks,<sup>15</sup> and extended into a general state-directed campaign during the second half of the 18th century. Tighter, minuter regulation went with exhortation to improvement: fresh plantings, novel species, and trees to fix the shifting sand (*futóhomok*) of the Alföld.<sup>16</sup> Detailed advice of the Maria Theresan and Josephinist kind, and mainly in German, ranged from elaborate codes of conduct for *Waldmeister*, initially above all in mining areas,<sup>17</sup> to explanations of such things as why saws should be used rather than axes. The initiative culminated in exhaustive internal debates which led to a massive new *Waldordnung* or *Ordo silvarum*, issued for Hungary in 1769, and extended to Transylvania in 1781 after similar concerns had been raised there about ‘die Ursachen der Holzverminderung.’<sup>18</sup>

By the 1790s heightened anxiety about the state of woodlands was reflected in discussions of diet committees and the like, and some tinkering with peasant rights and policing.<sup>19</sup> The first fledgling projects for forestry education took shape.<sup>20</sup> In 1809 the authorities revamped the whole administration in Transylvania as well as Hungary, with four new woodland inspectorates (*Erdőfelügyelőségek*) headed by – and this is the language in which they still thought – *Forstoberinspektoren* (‘einige in der Forstwissenschaft bewanderte und mit ihrer Ausübung praktisch bekannte Männer’).<sup>21</sup> A proper *Forstinstitut* was founded as part of the mining academy at Selmechánya, with a professor ‘of the higher theoretical and practical-systematic forest sciences.’<sup>22</sup> Model state forests were cultivated, notably that at Hradek-Lykava (in Liptó county), for which a range of immensely detailed *Dienst-Instruktionen* appeared in 1811,<sup>23</sup> evidently the prototype for an even longer general directive to forestry employees on all crown, cameral and fiscal lands in the country, together with a tabulation of their extent in 1816–17. By that time everyone in the higher service grades needed professional qualifications.<sup>24</sup>

By contrast with the innovative decades around 1800, no major advances are recorded in *MEO* during the *Reformkor* – aside from a few inconclusive diet debates and

many more instructions for the growing workforce – and the national government of 1848 had no time to address the issues raised by forest management. The first phase of real transformation, from the 1850s on, provides Tagányi's coda. He records the neo-absolutist regime's ambitions for intervention and standardization, through the *Forstgesetz* extended to Hungary in 1857, with an accompanying programme of woodland mensuration and valuation across the empire.<sup>25</sup> And finally he records their antithesis: the equal and opposite reaction generated in that newly vibrant Hungarian intellectual climate by the 1860s that we have already encountered.

\* \* \*

What did *MEO* achieve in its own day? It had clearly been conceived as a prestige project, intended to enhance the profile of Hungary's silvicultural heritage at home and abroad. But who actually cared? Again we must turn to Germany for a comparative perspective.

In the 19th century Germany's woodlands became envisioned as a collective national entity. Under the influence of popular romantic enthusiasts like Ernst Moritz Arndt and especially Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, 'der deutsche Wald' acquired something close to patriotic cult status among significant segments of the population. Had it not yielded crucial cultural values and material benefits, and protected against foreign invaders through the ages? The pride was shared by specialists in forest science themselves. Woodland is 'a significant part of our national honour': thus Carl Fraas, compiler of a compendium of German expertise in the subject which appeared in 1865.<sup>26</sup> At the same time, in counterpoint to this professional enthusiasm, often for regimented coniferous plantations, there developed a movement for conservation of traditional woods, as part of a wider emphasis on *Naturschutz*.<sup>27</sup> Altogether perceptions of a distinctive German natural landscape were associated with liberal-bourgeois individualism at least as much as with radical state-centred nationalism.<sup>28</sup>

This German model clearly had not just been a foreign encumbrance, but an inspiration to the likes of Divald and Wagner. '[E]gyedül a német nemzet az [...] akire e tekintetben támaszkodhatunk...' <sup>29</sup> And these pioneers detected in the ideals of its forestry a way to raise Hungarian culture too.<sup>30</sup> As political Dualism took shape, they saw the chance to emancipate their country from its unregarded position on the periphery of Germanic forestry, the *démarche* recorded in loving detail at the end of *MEO*.<sup>31</sup> In 1884 Tagányi's historian-archivist colleague Elek Jakab composed a passionate appeal for Hungary's woods as a national treasure, both economically and spiritually, actually citing Fraas and the German patriotic prototype, even as he sought emancipation from it.<sup>32</sup>

But was there such a 'silvan discourse' in Hungary? *MEO*, including its long analytical introduction, is strikingly sober and objective. Tagányi chronicles time-honoured customs equally with progressive reforms; the standpoint a Magyar one, but always restrainedly so. He would later defend Gyula Szekfű against his chauvinist detractors in the *Számüzött Rákóczi* affair.<sup>33</sup> Tagányi's compilation correspondingly lacked popular resonance, like the rest of the 'economic-history' agenda. Even if the launch of the *Mag-*

yar *Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle* was the product of another millennial initiative, it proved a premature growth in the intellectual climate of Dualism.

Native forests do not appear to have played any special role in the contemporary Hungarian imagination, except perhaps as part of conservative-romantic perceptions of Transylvania. Early nature protection in Hungary, led by Ottó Herman and István Csernel, focused on ornithology. Contrast equivalent activities in Germany, with their central place for woods and trees as 'natural monuments' (*Naturdenkmäler*).<sup>34</sup> There may be a parallel with the Polish lands, where the historiography of woodlands was initiated in the 1860s (by Aleksander Połujański's two volumes on *Leśnictwo polskie*), but where forests also provided a medium, material and cultural, for German assaults on 'polnische Wirtschaft,' i.e. the incompetence of the native Slavs.<sup>35</sup> In a way Hungary might also be compared to Great Britain, where forestry was likewise a German import, introduced by such experts as (Sir) Dietrich Brandis and Wilhelm/William Schlich who had pursued careers in India.<sup>36</sup> In mainland Britain too, woodlands made little mark. They occupied a comparatively small area anyway. After Trianon, that would also be true for Hungary.

\* \* \*

What of *MEO* in the comparative perspective of *our* own day? Its impact has remained slight. Only Hungarian forest science has drawn on it.<sup>37</sup> It is (so far as I am aware) almost entirely unknown abroad, even though Latin and German are the languages of the bulk of its material. Yet, in virtual terms at least, *MEO* can bear silent witness to the relevant international debates. These have – predictably – once more been focused on the German experience; and the single most important of them can very profitably be followed on Tagányi's pages.

The key issue of recent decades has been the so-called *Holznot*, or 'wood shortage,' debate. Against the backdrop of central Europe's *Waldsterben* crisis of the 1980s, historians have asked whether, roughly two centuries earlier, between 1750 and 1850, there was another dangerous scarcity.<sup>38</sup> They addressed the received hypothesis that the inefficiency and ignorance of a silvan *ancien régime* had, in an era of explosive demographic and economic change, held back the proper and sustainable exploitation of wood resources. There is now widespread agreement among researchers that the problems were often exaggerated and instrumentalised by vested interests. Whereas temporary local shortages certainly occurred, it suited various parties to have a pretext for higher prices, exclusion of outsiders, assertion and demarcation of exclusive rights of ownership, and specialized management.

In the process of studying this topic, much has been learned about both sides of the contraposition. On the one hand we have the old world of woods, with its customary rights and permissions, its close interplay with peasant agriculture and local trades.<sup>39</sup> It was characterized by selective clearance (typically *Plenterbetrieb*) and natural regeneration, all invested with deep folkloric significance. On the other hand stood the enlightened, rational, systematic, and 'sustainable' (*nachhaltig*) regime of clear-felling and

plantation (typically *Schlagbetrieb*).<sup>40</sup> In legal and occupational terms this was the contrast between the *dominium utile* of tenants (typically peasants), for whom access to woodland formed an indispensable part of their husbandry and household economy, and the *dominium directum* of proprietors (typically princes and other nobles), who utilized increasingly professional methods of management.<sup>41</sup> The sharpest clashes of all came after 1800 in parts of Bavaria, where the expanding and profit-oriented state with its ideals of *Hochwald* restricted supplies and infringed entrenched claims, leading to huge levels of woodland crime (*Waldfrevel*).<sup>42</sup> But there is a clear example much closer to Hungary in the Beskid uplands of Teschen in Silesia, where semi-nomadic local herdsmen, the *salašníci*, were evicted from the forests by a reformist Habsburg administration.<sup>43</sup>

Hungary's pristine woodcraft is documented in *MEO* in many ways, beginning with the testimony from medieval charters and beatings of parish bounds (*határjárások*). The rights of estovers (*faízás*) and pannage (*makkoltatás*) were exercised within regimes where wood-pasture coexisted – uneasily – with coppice, and both of these with the dictates of seigneurial hunting.<sup>44</sup> The evidence supports comparison with ancestral woodmanship of a west-European kind, which the country's subsequent debt to German approaches has long obscured.<sup>45</sup> The lineaments of this socio-economic structure are still apparent in the provisions of the 1767 Urbarium: peasants are entitled to wood products for their own use, though only their lord can trade in them.<sup>46</sup>

Systematic regulation began in the mining towns, from the 1560s onward: attempts to limit damage to the raw materials of local industry from goats and sheep and other kinds of detriment. But there was no sustained policy to protect timber or to guard against shortage.<sup>47</sup> We find something similar in Germany's Harz Mountains at that time, where likewise the extensive forests had to serve the needs of the mines.<sup>48</sup> Hungarian landowners began to recognize the worsening state of their woodlands. In two documents from the 1630s, relating to the Rákóczi and Nádasdy estates, one begins 'látván az mi rákóczi és morvai erdőnknek nagy pusztulását'; the other 'mivel minden erdeink elpusztultanak, szorgalmatos gondja légyen az erdükre...'<sup>49</sup>

Regulation found its classic 18th-century form in Maria Theresa's *Ordo silvarum* of 1769, which commends the 'strength and utility that derive from perpetual conservation of woods in a good and flourishing state, as against the damage of their ruin and desolation if felled indiscriminately.'<sup>50</sup> The message was conveyed more tersely in a diet article of 1791: 'De sylvarum devastatione praecavenda.'<sup>51</sup> Since Tagányi's time the tight management in 18th-century Debrecen has been highlighted, as the town, prompted by its royal officials, sought to use its unusually large area of woodland as a sustainable resource.<sup>52</sup> A lengthy 1800 'Instruction,' with its concern for 'gleichmässige eintheilung der holzbestände' and its 'sorge für die zukunfft' provided for a thorough survey and stock-taking of state forestry holdings throughout the country in the same spirit.<sup>53</sup>

By that time *Holznot* had become a recurrent rationale for the introduction of tighter controls, as in the cameral woods of Arad in 1812, 'weil auch schon die meisten waldungen dem Untergang nahe gekommen sind.'<sup>54</sup> By 1836, as the reform movement

began to assert itself, a diet resolution gave more weight to peasant rights in woodlands, but only 'az erdei rend sérelme nélkül'; while a subsequent enactment on rural policing implies a rise in the incidence of related criminality.<sup>55</sup> Similar concerns inform contemporary codes for the good order of woods in Transylvanian Saxony.<sup>56</sup> Much more could be adduced from *MEO* to illustrate this archetypal central-European environmental debate.

\* \* \*

It might be thought, from all the foregoing, that the achievement of *MEO* has been to allow us, across Hungary's history, to see the wood for the trees. However I should add, finally, that it frequently shows the trees themselves too. Individual trees, identified by species, first appear as medieval boundary markers, with beech and oak predominating. Later we find particular species being planted, or at least ordained. The first of these was willow, which Mihály Teleki already advocated in 1683: 'Mivel a fa igen szűk ebben a helyben, szükséges fűzfákat szaporítani...'<sup>57</sup> By the mid-18th century willow-planting came to be widely urged by the authorities: across the Alföld, indeed in all wet places, said the Lieutenancy Council; twelve a year by each noble and peasant in Moson county.<sup>58</sup> But we also meet with advice about a whole range of species, as in an instruction of 1743 for 'unterschiedliche pflanzung und setzung des holzes in Banat'; and there is much on the same lines in Maria Theresa's 1769 decree.<sup>59</sup> Elsewhere we learn how to plant elms from seed, for example, and encounter the first experiments with acacia and sugar-maple.<sup>60</sup>

This, then, was the diverse world of trees, separate and collective, familiar to Tagányi's commoners and lower nobles. It remained, through most of the *MEO*, a world of woodcraft, rather than forest science, though of course the single word *erdő* in Hungarian elides the difference, which was anyway never clear-cut. We might think that Tagányi preferred traditional woodlands, with all their collectivist connotations; yet without forestry there would have been no Magyar Erdészeti Egyesület, no *MEO*. It is surely time for a more measured and informed view of both; and, with rising environmental and ecological awareness, perhaps Tagányi's compilatory masterpiece may at last come to be better appreciated.

## Endnotes

- 1 I have used the digital version prepared by the Klimo Library in Pécs: <<http://kt.lib.pte.hu/cgi-bin/kt.cgi?konyvtar/kt05012101>>.
- 2 The complete run of *Erdészeti* [originally *Erdőszeti*] *Lapok* from 1862 at <[http://www.oee.hu/digitalis\\_archivum\\_erdeszetilapok](http://www.oee.hu/digitalis_archivum_erdeszetilapok)>.
- 3 Several articles on these lines by 'Erdődi' and 'Mérei' in *Erdőszeti Lapok*, 1 (1862).
- 4 1879:xxxii tc. at <<https://1000ev.hu/index.php?a=3&param=5861>>.
- 5 Károly Tagányi, 'Styl és történelem (Jegyzetek az ötvösműkiállításról),' *Századok* 18 (1884), 493–503; cf. Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *A pozitivisták történetelmélet a magyar tör-*

- ténetírásban (2 vols., Budapest, 1973), i.165–168 (who otherwise mentions Tagányi only *en passant*).
- 6 Edit Izsépy, 'A Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle történetéhez,' *Századok* 103 (1969), 1077–1103; Szabina Bognár, 'Tagányi Károly a Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle élén,' *Ethnographia* 124 (2013), 273–296. Brief treatment in Steven B Vardy, *Modern Hungarian Historiography* (Boulder, Colo/New York, 1976), 37, 40f; Péter Gunst, *A magyar történetírás története* (Debrecen, 1995), 157, 164, 168.
  - 7 Károly Tagányi, 'A földközösség története Magyarországon,' *Magyar Gazdaságtörténelmi Szemle* 1 (1894), 199–238.
  - 8 Károly Tagányi, 'Megyei önkormányzatunk keletkezése,' *Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből* 18.6 (Budapest, 1899), 399–413.
  - 9 Examples: *MEO*, i, nos. 252–254, 256, 266.
  - 10 Examples: *MEO*, i, nos. 160, 168, 186, 205, 251, 290, 292, 305. They had Latin introductions and were occasionally all in Latin (e.g. i, nos. 169, 213).
  - 11 *MEO*, i, no. 362, cf. 365; ii, nos. 154, 232; iii, no. 9 (the last one, from Vizakna, 1810).
  - 12 *MEO*, i, nos. 97, 105–106.
  - 13 Selmechánya, Besztercebánya, Körmöcbánya, etc. These were at that time mainly part of Lower Hungary (as viewed from Austria); the terminology of 'Felvidék' arose later, but I use it here to avoid confusion.
  - 14 *MEO*, i, nos. 140–141, 143.
  - 15 See *MEO*, i, nos. 340ff. *passim*; then esp. ii, nos. 20, 60, 62–64, 76, 83 (a chronicle).
  - 16 *MEO*, ii, nos. 207–208, 302–303, 306.
  - 17 Examples: *MEO*, ii, no. 16, for Zalatna; no. 20, for the Banat; nos. 165–167, for Nagybánya; nos. 169–170, for Kapnik; nos. 173ff., for Selmechánya.
  - 18 For Hungary: *MEO*, ii, nos. 105–113 (preparations), 116, 119ff., esp. 139 (impact). For Transylvania: ii, nos. 151, 168.
  - 19 *MEO*, ii, nos. 193ff., 212–213.
  - 20 *MEO*, ii, nos. 104, 225, 238–239, 275, 281–282, 284, 301, 304; iii, nos. 13, 25, 33.
  - 21 *MEO*, iii, no. 7.
  - 22 *MEO*, iii, no. 1.
  - 23 *MEO*, iii, nos. 16–19; cf. no. 53 for Sóvár later.
  - 24 *MEO*, iii, nos. 38, 42–44.
  - 25 *MEO*, iii, nos. 80, 82. Seeing the Wood and the Trees 129
  - 26 '... ein erheblicher Teil unserer Nationalehre': C. Fraas, *Geschichte der Landbau- und Forstwissenschaft seit dem 16. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 1865), 483–668, at 484.
  - 27 See, in general, Alfred Barthelmess, *Wald: Umwelt des Menschen. Dokumente zu einer Problemgeschichte von Naturschutz, Landschaftspflege und Humanökologie* (Munich, 1972); Hansjörg Küster, *Geschichte des Waldes, von der Urzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich, 1998).
  - 28 Jeffrey K. Wilson, *The German Forest: Nature, Identity and the Contestation of a National Symbol, 1871–1914* (Toronto, 2012).

- 29 *Erdőszeti Lapok* 1 (1862), 19.
- 30 'A magyart első sorban nemzetiségének szellemi fensőbbsege biztosíthatja a végbukás ellen; ismereteink fejlesztése minden irányban – ez fennmaradásunk talpköve; e nélkül – fényesen vagy észrevétlenül – de sírba dülünk'; *Erdőszeti Lapok* 1 (1862), 353.
- 31 *MEO*, iii, no. 92.
- 32 Elek Jakab, 'Erdőink hajdan és ma,' *Erdészeti Lapok* 23 (1884), 599–609, 676–685.
- 33 Ágnes R. Várkonyi, *Thaly Kálmán és történetírása* (Budapest, 1961), 320f.
- 34 Friedemann Schmoll, *Erinnerung an die Natur: Die Geschichte des Naturschutzes im deutsch Kaiserreich* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004), esp. 93ff.
- 35 Józef Babicz et al (ed.), *Studia z dziejów ochrony przyrody w Polsce* (Wrocław etc., 1985); Wilson, *The German Forest*, 132–174.
- 36 See, for the larger picture, S. Ravi Rajan, *Modernizing Nature: Forestry and Imperial Eco-development, 1800–1950* (Oxford, 2006).
- 37 Cf. Bognár, 'Tagányi Károly,' 285f.; [Martha] Kolossváry (ed.), *Az erdőgazdálkodás története Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1975). The approving mentions in Gunst, *A magyar történetírás*, 168 ('szakszerű és szakmailag megbízható'), and Péter Szabó, *Woodland and Forest in Medieval Hungary* (Oxford, 2005), 21, seem exceptional among Hungarian historians.
- 38 Key texts: Joachim Radkau, 'Holzverknappung und Krisenbewußtsein im 18. Jahrhundert,' *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1983), 513–543; Radkau, 'Zur angeblichen Energiekrise des 18. Jahrhunderts. Revisionistische Betrachtungen zur "Holznot",' *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 73 (1986), 1–37. Surveys in Frank Uekötter, *Umweltgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2007), 51ff.; Bernd-Stefan Grewe, *Der versperrte Wald. Ressourcenmangel in der bayrischen Pfalz, 1814–70* (Cologne, 2004), 34ff.
- 39 Much material in Friedrich Mager, *Der Wald in Altpreußen als Wirtschaftsraum* (2 vols., Cologne, 1960); Elisabeth Weinberger, *Waldnutzung und Waldgewerbe in Altbayern im 18. und beginnenden 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2001).
- 40 Joachim Allmann, *Der Wald in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine Mentalitäts- und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung am Beispiel des Pfälzer Raumes, 1500–1800* (Berlin, 1989). Richard Hölzl, *Umkämpfte Wälder: Die Geschichte einer ökologischen Reform in Deutschland, 1760–1860* (Frankfurt, 2010).
- 41 Stefan von Below and Stefan Breit, *Wald, von der Gottesgabe zum Privateigentum: Gerichtliche Konflikte zwischen Landesherren und Untertanen um den Wald in der frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 1998); Christoph Ernst, *Den Wald entwickeln: Ein Politik- und Konfliktfeld in Hunsrück und Eifel im 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 2000).
- 42 Grewe, esp. 194–220; Hölzl, 267–414.
- 43 Blanka Pitronová, *Těšínské Beskydy na sklonku feudalismu: Salašnictví a lesní hospodářství v Těšínských Beskydách na přelomu 18. a 19. století* (Brno, 1968), esp. 91–135.
- 44 Cf. Pál Csőre, *A magyar erdőgazdálkodás története: középkor* (Budapest, 1980).

- 45 Szabó, *Woodland and Forest*.
- 46 *MEO*, ii, no. 99.
- 47 Eszter Magyar, *A feudalizmus kori erdőgazdálkodás az alsó-magyarországi bányavárosokban, 1255–1747* (Budapest, 1983).
- 48 On which see Peter-Michael Steinsiek, *Nachhaltigkeit auf Zeit. Waldschutz im Westharz vor 1800* (Münster, 1999).
- 49 *MEO*, i, nos. 231, 242.
- 50 *MEO*, ii, no. 116: 'Materna cura et tenerrima [...] sollicitudo benignum animum nostrum advertit, quanti sit momenti atque utilitatis perpetua nemorum in bono, florentique statu conservatio, nociva e contra si promiscue caedantur, horum ruina et desolatio. Quapropter indispensabilem esse comperimus boni ordinis in succisione et usu silvarum hoc etiam in regno quamprimum introducendi necessitatem...' (p. 297).
- 51 *MEO*, ii, no. 219.
- 52 Dénes Penyigey, *Debrecen erdőgazdálkodása a XVIII. században és a XIX. század első felében* (Budapest, 1980).
- 53 *MEO*, ii, nos. 253–255.
- 54 *MEO*, iii, no. 27.
- 55 *MEO*, iii, no. 57 (1836: vi.4); no. 62 (1840: ix, 'A mezei rendőrségről').
- 56 *MEO*, iii, nos. 68–69.
- 57 *MEO*, i, no. 316.
- 58 *MEO*, ii, nos. 47–48, 164 (Moson); nos. 49–50, cf. 163–164 (Alföld); no. 28, cf. 46 (Moson).
- 59 *MEO*, ii, no. 1 (Banat); no. 116 (Maria Theresa).
- 60 *MEO*, ii, no. 94; iii, nos. 11, 14.

