

Историческая русистика в XXI–м веке

Russian Studies in History in the 21st Century

Книги по русистике XLII.

Rusisztikai Könyvek XLII.

ИСТОРИЧЕСКАЯ РУСИСТИКА
В XXI-м ВЕКЕ

RUSSIAN STUDIES IN HISTORY
IN THE 21st CENTURY

*Материалы десятой международной научной конференции
будапештского Центра Русистики от 18–19 мая 2015 г.*

*Materials of the 10th International Conference
at the Centre for Russian Studies in Budapest, May 18–19, 2015*

Редакция • Edited by:

Gyula SZVÁK (Главный редактор / Chief Editor),
Szergej FILIPPOV, Zsuzsanna GYIMESI

© Gyula SZVÁK, editor, 2017

© Russica Pannonicana, Budapest, 2017

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ / CONTENTS

НАША РУСИСТКА. ПРИВЕТСТВЕННОЕ СЛОВО (ДЮЛА СВАК) / OUR RUSSIAN STUDIES. WELCOMING ADDRESS (GYULA SZVÁK)	9 11
---	---------

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ И МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ HISTORIOGRAPHY AND METHODOLOGY	13
---	----

EMMANUEL WAEGEMANS Изучение русской культуры и истории в Нидерландах (1985–2015 гг.)	15
--	----

И.И. ГЛЕБОВА О россиеведении в России	21
--	----

Я.А. ЛАЗАРЕВ Готова ли украинская историческая наука к диалогу? Размышления о роли национальной памяти в историческом сообществе	31
---	----

TAMÁS KRAUSZ Отождествима ли нацистская Германия с СССР? Или как переписывают историю Великой Отечественной войны представители мейнстрима Венгерской исторической науки	35
---	----

Е.И. САМАРЦЕВА Русское зарубежье XX века: актуальные вопросы истории и историографии	51
--	----

SZERGEJ FILIPPOV Возможности и ловушки цивилизационного подхода к российской истории	63
--	----

ДО XIX ВЕКА BEFORE THE 19th CENTURY	71
--	----

М.К. ЮРАСОВ К вопросу о времени появления первой волны печенегов в степях Восточной Европы	73
--	----

С.В. СОКОЛОВ	
На каком уровне развития находились восточные славяне до 862 г. с точки зрения Августа Людвига Шлёцера?	84
GÁBOR GYÓNI	
Кий, Аскольд и Дир: о ранней истории Киева	93
ANN KLEIMOLA	
Sea, Land, and Sky: the New Horizons of Afanasii of Kholmogory	105
MÁRTA FONT	
Даниил Галицкий и Ростислав Черниговский при дворе венгерских королей	112
М.С. ПЕТРОВА	
Об изучении «Русского ‘Доната’» и необходимости его интертекстуального прочтения	119
BEÁTA VARGA	
Оценка русско-украинских отношений с середины XVII до начала XVIII вв. в современной русской и украинской историографии	129
М.Ю. САВЕЛЬЕВА	
Феномен самозванчества и особенности народного восприятия верховной власти в России XVII–XVIII вв. (Тезисы)	140
Е.В. БОРОДИНА	
Социальная структура Кунгурского уезда в первой трети XVIII в.	147
ENDRE SASHALMI	
The Coronation Medal as a Vehicle of Legitimation: Iconographic Analysis of the Coronation Medals of Four Empresses, Catherine I (1724), Anne (1730), Elisabeth (1742) and Catherine II (1762)	157
М.А. КИСЕЛЕВ	
История понятий как метод изучения социальной стратификации российского общества XVIII в.	169
О.К. ЕРМАКОВА	
Контракты с иностранными специалистами в России в XVIII – первой половине XIX в.: эволюция формы и содержания	177

XIX-й ВЕК – НАЧАЛО XX ВЕКА
(ДО 1917 ГОДА)

19th CENTURY – BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURY
(UP TO 1917)

187

ERZSÉBET BODNÁR

Реагирование русской дипломатии на кризисные ситуации при решении шведского и восточного кризиса в 1801–1815 гг.

189

В.Л. ПАВЛОВ

Концепт справедливости в философских и социально-политических взглядах декабристов.

198

Л.Г. ЧАПАЕВА

Идеология и язык в русской культурно-языковой ситуации 30–40-х гг. XIX в.

207

А.С. ПАЛКИН

Отражение европейского влияния в русской дореволюционной духовной периодике в 1860-е – 1917 гг.: на примере журнала «Христианское чтение».

215

SZABOLCS SUHAJDA

Образ России в венгерских газетах (1841–1844 гг.)

222

ZSÓFIA MÉSZÁROS

Развитие концепции женской эмансипации в творчестве Дмитрия Писарева

231

Д.О. СЕРОВ

Образовательный ценз для судебного ведомства России (1860 – 1868 гг.)

240

GÁBOR KECSKEMÉTI

The Historical Roots of Liberal Russophobia in Hungary

248

SZILVIA NAGY

Причины участия русских женщин в революционном движении в России в свете новейшей историографии

256

GYÖRGY BEBESI

Забытый дипломат: Сергей Юльевич Витте (1849–1915)

261

Е.В. АЛЕКСЕЕВА

Европейские технологии в России XIX – начала XX в.: проникновение, адаптация, общественная реакция

269

ZSUZSANNA GYIMESI

Взаимосвязи естественнонаучного, гуманитарного и художественного мировосприятий на рубеже XIX–XX веков и его современные аналоги

279

ALEXANDRA MEDZIBRODSZKY Alexander Bogdanov and the Sociology of Knowledge	287
--	-----

XX-й ВЕК – НАЧАЛО XXI ВЕКА
(ДО НАШИХ ДНЕЙ)

20th CENTURY – BEGINNING OF THE 21st CENTURY (UP TO NOW)	295
---	-----

М.А. БЕЗНИН, Т.М. ДИМОНИ Социализм и государственный капитализм: перепутья русистики в оценках советской истории	297
--	-----

М.В. КОВАЛЕВ Венгерские историки и русская академическая эмиграция: к постановке проблемы	308
---	-----

О.В. ПАТУШНЯК Казачье зарубежье в 1920 г. – начале XXI в.	316
--	-----

BRIGIT FARLEY The Fog of War: the Fate of a Russian Army Contingent in France During the Great War, 1916–1918	324
---	-----

ÁKOS FÓRIS The Soviet Prisoners of War and the Hungarian Royal Army 1941–1943	334
---	-----

В.Л. МАРТЫНЕНКО Немецкое население Украины и оккупационный режим (1941–1944 гг.)	342
--	-----

Ю.А. РУСИНА Феномен инакомыслия в практиках советской индивидуализации в высшей школе 1940-х – 1950-х годов	350
---	-----

Е.Т. АРТЕМОВ Организация работы и мотивация труда в советском атомном проекте	353
---	-----

А.В. ГОЛУБЕВ Мир в зеркале советской политической карикатуры	369
---	-----

В.С. ЖУКОВА Трансформация повседневной жизни северной деревни 1906–1970-х гг. (по материалам дневников и воспоминаний сельских жителей)	379
--	-----

АВТОРЫ / AUTHORS	386
------------------	-----

RUSZISZTIKAI KÖNYVEK	389
----------------------	-----

ÁKOS FÓRIS

The Soviet Prisoners of War and the Hungarian Royal Army 1941–1943

During the Second World War the Axis powers captured about 5.7 million Soviet prisoners. More than 3 million of them died due to the inhuman treatment. In my presentation I examine the POW's policy of Hungary between 1941 and 1943.

The Hungarian POW's policy wasn't uniform during the Second World War. Although the Hungarian state ratified the Geneva Convention on the Prisoners of War in 1936,¹ and the Soviet Union declared the acknowledgement of this convention by means of Red Cross after the outbreak of world war,² Hungary has failed to comply with the rules of the convention. One part of the Hungarian units got most of their Soviet prisoners of war from the Germans. On the other hand, the Hungarian units committed war crimes also.

Firstly, I distinguish three territories of the POW's policy of Hungary: the politics of the Ministry of Defence, the treatment of the Hungarian occupation forces and the practice of the fighting troops, especially the Hungarian Royal 2nd Army, which was the greatest Hungarian formation in the Eastern Front in the examined period.

Secondly, I examine the issue of prisoners of war in the level of ordinary soldiers and the behaviour of prisoners of war from resistance to collaboration.

In the days following the German attack against Soviet Union, the members of the 21st – so-called prisoners of war – department had already dealt with the issue of Soviet prisoners of war.³ The Hungarian authorities wanted to make arrangements for the Soviet units who had surrendered to the Hungarian frontier-guards in the Sub Carpathian border. Three days after the outbreak of war, the Hungarian authorities had already determined the place of camps.⁴ On 26 June the first Soviet deserters appeared in the Hungarian border.⁵

After the Hungarian entry into the war, thousands of Soviet prisoners of war were captured by the units of the Carpathian Group and the Rapid Corps at the first week of the campaign.⁶ At that time they wanted to handle the masses of prisoners so that, similar to the Germans⁷, they released the Ukrainians against certificate.⁸

At the start of the war against the Soviet Union, the German and Hungarian high commanders agreed that the Hungarians had to hand over the caught soldiers to Germans in the Eastern Front. The Hungarian political and military leadership didn't agree with this decision, because it was damaging for Hungary's international position.⁹

Although the Soviet prisoners of war were not in Hungarian captivity according to the law, the Soviet prisoners arrived at the territory of Hungary several times. Firstly, the Soviet prisoners of war were brought to Hungary by the Hungarian units returning from the Eastern front. Secondly, many Soviet prisoners of war escaped from Ostmark to Hungary due to the forced labour. Some of them escaped during the transportation of Soviet prisoners of war.¹⁰

One of the most important functions of the rear areas was the guarding of the Soviet prisoners of war in 1941. During the Operation Barbarossa the Axis armies took over 2.8 million prisoners. In Ukraine, where the Hungarian units fought in the summer and autumn of 1941, the invaders captured around 770 thousand soldiers in the Uman and Kiev pocket.

According to the 4th order of the Hungarian Occupation Group, the Hungarian troops were responsible for the guarding of the prisoner-of-war camps in the area of Occupation Group. The commanders of the Hungarian units had to contact with the regional commander of Dulag and Stalag. Seven prisoner-of-war camps (Stammlager – Stalag) and two transit camps (Durchgangslager – Dulag)¹¹ officiated here in 1941–1942.¹²

In the Hungarian-controlled camps the prisoners got the quarter of the German ration – approx. 950 calories – by the German model.¹³ According to a Hungarian soldier, Alajos Salamon's diary the prisoners were treated horribly in these camps. Masses of prisoners of war died on account of hunger and epidemics like typhus and gastro-enteritis. According to the Soviet reports, the Hungarian units took part in the death of 24000 Soviet prisoners of war only in Chernigov region.¹⁴

When the Hungarian units were regrouped in February 1942, they transferred the control of camps to the German local authorities, but afterwards they participated in the escorting of the prisoners.¹⁵ For example, the several troops from the 108th Light Division took part in collecting and guarding of Soviet prisoners in the region of Alekseyewka, Tatarowka and Gomolsha in May 1942.¹⁶

Three institutions were responsible for handling the prisoners of war in the 2nd Hungarian Army. The rear battalions and prisoner of war collecting units collected, guarded and waited on the Soviet prisoners. The function of the department 1.b was the interrogation of prisoners of war. The Hungarian military surgeons helped for the prisons in the German camps.

In summer 1942, the Hungarian units took thousands of the Soviet soldiers prisoners. In August – September, 4 prisoner of war camps existed in the area of the 2nd Hungarian Army.¹⁷ According to the files of Lieutenant Károly Lázár's trial¹⁸ the Hungarians did not give sufficient treatment and the prisoners had to bear atrocities as well.

Colonel-general Gusztáv Jány, the commander of the 2nd Army said after the war, that the Hungarians handed the Soviet prisoners of war over to the Germans after the interrogation.¹⁹ Although, this practice regulated by an agreement between the Hungarians and the Germans, the prisons remained under Hungarian supervision.

The work of POW's played an important role in the rear area of the 2nd Army. The Hungarian units suffered from labour shortage, therefore they used the workforce of the prisoners of war and the local population. According to a Hungarian officer, the workforce of the poorly clothed prisoners was not great, but it was greater than the workforce of the Jewish labour servicemen.²⁰ The prisoners had to work, so they were integrated into labour units widely behind the front.²¹ During the forced labour, appropriate supply wasn't provided for the workers, therefore, the defensive works often constructed in the inhuman circumstances.

The Hungarian prisoner officer of Heeresgruppe B asked, that approx. 100 tons food was allocated to some 50-60 thousand prisoners of war. The Germans rejected this request with reference to the difficulty of transport, therefore, they didn't allow the food supply trains.²²

The local commanders didn't get any help from the high commands, therefore, they had to solve the treatment by themselves. Some Hungarian commanders tried to supply the prisoners with help of the local population. Cannibalism turned up among Soviet prisoners in another unit. It was an extra problem for Hungarian soldiers that they often could provide the prisoners of war with food from the expense of the local population.²³

In the end of September 1942, the 18th order of head quartermaster ordered more humane treatment with Soviet prisoners.²⁴ Although the sufficient provision was ordered for prisoners, these orders contained some limitations, and were disregarded.

The hygiene situation of the Soviet soldiers was a general problem for Hungarian troops. The POWs – captured after heavy fighting – were in bad

condition,²⁵ what worsened by the deficient treatment. Although the 2nd Army took the measures – e.g. it ordered supply of prisoners with delousing powder²⁶ –, they couldn't stop the epidemic. Therefore the local population regarded the groups of prisoners as a potential threat to the public health. Several interesting situations developed in the camps. For example, a Jewish doctor treated the prisoners of the camp, because he was not allowed to treat Hungarian soldiers as a result of anti-Semitic politics.²⁷

At the beginning of 1943 more than 4000 Soviets soldiers were in captivity in the territories of the IV. and VII. Corps.²⁸ According to Lieutenant general Marcell Stomm, the commander of III. Corps, his units didn't hand the prisoners over to the Germans.²⁹

After the Soviet advance, the provision of the prisoners collapsed, causing the death of many prisoners of war. The camps were destroyed and the prisons were driven to the rear area. One of the orders of the 7th infantry regiment required that the Jewish labour servicemen and prisoners of war, who were "reluctant" to march, should to be shot to death.³⁰

The Hungarian soldiers had different attitudes toward the Soviet POW's. Most soldiers felt pity for the ragged prisoners of war. Despite of the German prohibition, the Hungarians gave food or scraps of food to the prisoners. Other soldiers spoke about the prisoners stonily and sardonically.

Very important question is whether the Hungarian soldiers considered the Soviet soldiers as comrade. Anti-bolshevik propaganda described the Soviet soldiers as an inhuman, and barbarous foe. The cruel treatment toward the prisoners was influenced by the atrocities against the Hungarian soldiers and the rumours about being a prisoner of war at the Soviet side. For example, a Hungarian soldier, László Pap wrote in his diary: "*In Darnizza 40-45 men are buried daily in the prisoner of war camp. (...) Stalin – supposedly – declared, that prisoners of war didn't exist. There is life-and-death struggle between Christianity and bolshevism.*"³¹

The so-called military necessity regulations determined the treatment of the Soviet prisoners of war. In the Eastern Front martial law was often disregarded due to achieve military aims. For instance, a battalion commander had got order to shoot Soviet casualties, because the wounded Soviet soldiers rifled the Hungarian soldiers previously.³² On 13th February 1943 Captain László Hárs, the commander of 23/II Battalion had reported, that 300 Soviet POW were shot by his order. Captain Hárs justified his cruel order on the grounds that his unit did not have enough strength to escort the prisoners while his battalion took part in heavy battle.³³

Unfortunately, we have only sporadic information in the sources about the prisoners who collaborated with the Hungarians and Germans. The Ger-

mans wanted to recruit Ukrainians in Hungary from the group Polish internees by the help of a former tsarist officer in 1942.³⁴ The prisoners of war were used as an auxiliary force – e.g. coachman, driver – in understrength units.³⁵ The auxiliary police companies were set up from Soviet prisoners of war due to the rear area security by the 2nd Army since October 1942.³⁶ The extremist example of collaboration is a Soviet deserter, Sergei Vavilov, who served voluntarily as a soldier of the 47th infantry regiment. He was a soldier in the combats of 2nd Hungarian Army in 1942–1943.³⁷ The Hungarians tried to persuade the enemy by propaganda, but according to the reconnaissance of the 2nd Army “*the Russian crew was afraid of bad and miserable supplying as prisoners of war.*”³⁸

From the start of the war, many prisoners of war escaped due to the bad treatment and weak guarding. Suggested by the OKW's instruction, the Command of Hungarian Occupation Group ordered that the left forearm of the prisoners of war must be marked with cross due to the escapes.³⁹

The orders of the Hungarian occupation forces punished the negligence of the guards⁴⁰ and the illegal use of weapons.⁴¹ The Hungarian soldiers on several occasions wanted to use brutal instruments. In one occasion, the guards of a camp wanted to decimate the prisoners after 18 escapes.⁴² In March 1942 a company of 50/I battalion took 30 hostages in Gaysin, because somebody conspired among the prisoners.⁴³

The greatest escape of Soviet prisoners of war happened between 12. and 15. October 1942, when 1150 Soviet soldiers escaped during railway transport between Nikolajewka and Ostrogoshsk.⁴⁴ The partisans helped to escape the prisoners of war. E. g. in October 1943 a partisan troop attacked a prisoner group. In this incident, they captured a Hungarian soldier.⁴⁵

In December 1942 the Hungarian commanders wanted to transport the Soviet prisoners further from the frontline, because the prisoners of war rebelled in the territory of the Italian 8th Army.⁴⁶ The POW's, who worked at the mine clearance command, made time bomb.⁴⁷

* * *

All things considered, in the activity of the Hungarian POW's policy, we could differentiate 3 parts.

The 21st department of Ministry of Defence wanted pursue independent policy related to Soviet prisoners, but the Prisoner of War Department couldn't implement it.

The Hungarian Occupation Forces had an auxiliary role in the German POW's policy. These Hungarian units had no POW's policy because their

activity served the realization of German orders only. Therefore they participated in the destruction of Soviet prisoners of war.

The policy of the 2nd Army was ambivalent and pertinent. Despite of the fact, that these Hungarian troops had to transfer their POW's to the Germans, the Hungarian commanders kept the thousands of prisoners back in the rear area of the 2nd Army. The most important factor of the POW's policy was the work of prisoners. The treatment of prisoners depended on more ad hoc aspect, e.g. the mentality of the local Hungarian commanders, the amount of the supply, and the operational situation.

Notes

¹ Act XXX of 1936.

² HL Mikrofilmtár / Microfilm archives (hereafter – MF) B / 241 277 / 2217 / 1988 microfiche – VKF (Vezérkari Főnökség / the Chiefs of Staff of the Supreme Command) 1941–1.oszt/6046/el, 17th August 1941.

³ HL Honvédelmi Minisztérium / Ministry of Defence I. 31 (hereafter – HM) Eln. 21. oszt. 43213 / 1941.

⁴ HL Personali (hereafter – Pers.) 305. box VII. 86. (Colonel Zoltán vitéz Baló's documents) Documents about Soviet prisoners of war – HM 114.sz. – M.21 / 1941. Establishment of Russian prisoners of war camps. The Hungarian authorities could house more than 14000 Soviet prisoners in 35 locations in the territories of eight Hungarian corps.

⁵ Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár Országos Levéltár / National Archives of Hungary (hereafter – MNL OL) K 64 90. csomó/document bundle (hereafter – cs.) 24. tétel / items (hereafter – t.) 422 / 1941. res pol. No. 4.daily situation report of VKF, 26th June 1941.

⁶ E.g. until 10th July the Hungarians captured 25000 Soviet prisoners of war.

⁷ It should be attempted to release Ukrainian prisoners of war to their home areas following a brief examination, provided that these areas have already been occupied by the German Armed Forces // In: *Martin Dean*. Collaboration in the Holocaust: Crimes of the Local Police in Belorussia and Ukraine, 1941–44. New York, 2000. P. 185; Between 25 June 1941 and middle of November 1941 277762 Ukrainian prisoners of war were released by the Germans // In: *Szabó Péter-Számvéber Norbert*. A keleti hadszíntér és Magyarország 1941–1943. Nagykovács: Püedlo Kiadó, 2002. P. 132.

⁸ MNL OL K 64 90. cs. 24. t. 422 / 1941. res pol. No 18. daily situation report of VKF, 10th July 1941.

⁹ HL Pers. 345. box VII. 260. Kálmán Kéri: Soviet prisoners of war and forced laborers in Hungary (1941–1945).

¹⁰ The writing of the activity of IX. Department of the Ministry of Interior and 21st departed of the Ministry of Defence needs further research.

¹¹ Stalag 358. (Zhytomyr) – its sub-camp: Stalag 358 N (Berdichev); Stalag 329.(Smerinka) – its sub-camps: Stalag 329 (Vinnytsia); Stalag 329 / Z (Gaysin); Stalag 335. (Pruskorov); Stalag 349 (Uman); Dulag 182. (Nowo Ukrainka); Dulag 182. (Uman).

¹² HL. II. 1458. 1. box, The 4th order of Hungarian Occupation Group, 24th October 1941.

¹³ *Ungváry, Krisztián*. Megsemmisítő háború: a keleti front és magyarok által elkövetett háborús bűncselekmények // In: *Belügyi Szemle 2* (2005). P. 16.; HL VII. 233. Tanulmánygyűjtemény / Collection of studies (hereafter – TGY) 3213. Alajos Salamon's diary, 5th November 1941.

¹⁴ A magyar megszálló csapatok a Szovjetunióban. Levéltári dokumentumok (1941–1947) / Edited by Krausz Tamás, Varga Éva Mária. Budapest, L'Harmattan, 2013. P. 34.

¹⁵ HL MF B / 246 277 / 2494 / 1988 microfiche – VKF 1942–1. oszt 4458 / eln. Redeployment of West Occupation Group 28th February 1942.

¹⁶ MNL OL K 64 95. cs. 24. t. 14 / 1942. res pol. No 259. and No. 261 daily situation report of VKF, 1st and 3rd June 1943.

¹⁷ In the area of IV. Corps: 102nd temporary camps (Ostrogohsk); In the area of VII. Corps: 103rd temporary camps (Tatarino); In the area of III. Corps: 105th temporary camps (Stariy Oskol); 107th temporary camps (Kursk then Chernjanka) In: HL II. 1453. 15. box Logistical arm. 28th June – 31st August 1942.

¹⁸ Budapest Főváros Levéltára / Budapest City Archives (hereafter BFL) XXV.4.a 452 / 1957.

¹⁹ BFL XXV.1.a. 2613/1947 V – 117091 / B 427. (Gusztáv Jány's interrogation protocol. Budapest, 2nd June 1947.)

²⁰ HL II. 1453. 20. box, Support service of III. Corps. 1st September 1942 – 1st February 1942.

²¹ The prisoner of war is currently valuable and indispensable labour force // In: HL II. 1453. 15. box, 18th order of head quartermaster. 28th September 1942.

²² HL II. 1453. 6. box, 2nd H. Army, app. No. 306 – Résumé of Colonel-general Gyula vitéz Kovács' conversations, 1st August 1942.

²³ Colonel Béla Vécsey, commander of 35. inf. reg. wrote in detail about this problems. See: HL TGY 2658 Béla Vécsey's diary, notes of June-August 1942.

²⁴ HL II. 1453. 15. box, 18th order of head quartermaster. 28th September 1942.

²⁵ According to one of Hungarian non-commissioned officers the caught Soviet soldiers suffered from shell-shock and they “trembled like meet jelly” In: HL II. 1453. 31. box, NCO Miklós vitéz Nemeskéri-Kiss's diary 28th June 1942.

²⁶ HL II. 1453. 15. box, 17th order of head quartermaster.

²⁷ HL II. 1453. 28. box, Military surgeon of 19th Light Division, János Birich dr.'s diary, 28th November, 1st December 1942.

²⁸ HL II. 1453 22. box. Description of the combat by the chief of general staff of 7th Light Division, 12th – 19th January 1943; 24. box – IV. Corps War diary, app. No. 515 – Report, 12th January 1943; 28. box, Prospectus from the logistical situation of VII. Corps until 31st December 1942.

²⁹ *Stomm, Marcel*. Emlékiratok. Budapest: M. Hírlap Kv., 1990. P. 144.

³⁰ HL II. 1453 22. box 7th inf. reg. War Diary, app. No. 4. – Measure for withdrawal of regiment.

³¹ HL TGY 4100 László Pap's diary, 9th December 1941.

³² *Ibid.*, 13th May 1942.

³³ *Szabó, Péter*. Don-kanyar: a Magyar Királyi 2. Honvéd Hadsereg története, 1942–1943. Budapest: Corvina, 2001. P. 211.

³⁴ HL HM Eln. 21. oszt. 6809 / 1942; 17450 / 1942.

³⁵ HL II. 1453 15. box, 15th order of head quartermaster, 10th September 1942.

³⁶ *Szakály, Sándor*. A magyar tábori csendőrség. Budapest: Zrínyi Kiadó, 1990. P. 56.

³⁷ HL HM Eln. 21. oszt. 33202 / 1943.

³⁸ HL II. 1453 8. box – 2nd H. Army, app. No. 1577. – Summary of enemy situation (15.XI. – 12.XII.1942).

³⁹ HL II. 1458. 1. box, The 15th order of Hungarian Occupation Group, 9th February 1942.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, The 14th order of Hungarian Occupation Group, 12th January 1942.

⁴¹ HL II. 1519. 425 / 105. Classified order of adjutant of the 105th Light Division, 16th June 1942.

⁴² HL TGY 3213. *Op. cit.*, 14th November 1941.

⁴³ BFL VII. 5. e. 7555 / 1950. 162. – Ignác Szabo's interrogation report, Budapest, 23th December 1949.

⁴⁴ HL II. 1453 7. box, 2nd H. Army War diary, app. No. 1160. – Capturing of the escaped Russian prisoners, 19th October 1942.

⁴⁵ MNL OL K 64 98. cs. 24. t. No. 7. weekly situation report of VKF, 11th October 1943.

⁴⁶ HL II. 1453 8. box, 2nd H. Army War diary, app. No. 401. – Verbal instructions, 24th December 1942.

⁴⁷ HL II. 1453 28. box, 19th Light Division War diary, app. No. 357. – 33. / 19.k.ho.I.a.43.II.19. Report from espionage and intelligence activity of the enemy, 16th December 1942 – 15th January 1943.