Linguistic nationalism in nineteenth-century Hungary

Reconstructing a linguistic ideology*

Péter Maitz
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Linguistic nationalism was a decisive linguistic ideology all through the nineteenth century. Consequently, by its very nature, it determined thinking about language throughout the entire period, and thus, linguistic behavior, as well. Based on metalinguistic data, this paper attempts to reconstruct the form of existence of this linguistic ideology in Hungary in the period of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy (1867–1918). The author's aim is not to explore and contrast the various prominent and less prominent individual views of the period but rather to reconstruct and explain the general, collective system of ideas and values that underlies their apparent multiplicity and which is more or less constant throughout the period at hand. The paper hence wishes to contribute to a significant and neglected domain of historical sociolinguistics, the recognition of the history of linguistic awareness.

Keywords: language ideologies; linguistic nationalism; linguistic awareness; bilingualism; language contact; language conflict; political linguistics

1. Introduction

In recent years, in historical linguistics — as well as in other areas — increasing stress has been laid on studying social and pragmatic aspects of language and language use. The relevant branch of historical linguistics, mostly referred to in the literature as "historical sociopragmatics" or "socio-historical linguistics" (cf. Romaine 1982), in addition to examining the history of linguistic system and language use, pays special attention to the history of linguistic awareness (cf. Mattheier 1998). Getting a deeper knowledge of historically identifiable linguistic dispositions, attitudes and mentalities[1] linked to this domain, as well as systematically exploring the history of thinking about language, is among the important tasks of historical linguistics because all

Journal of Historical Pragmatics 9:1 (2008), **20–47**. DOI 10.1075/jhp.9.1.03mai
ISSN 1566–5852 / E-ISSN 1569–9854

these mental and cognitive factors have been proved to be in a causal relationship with linguistic behavior. In other words, knowledge about a particular language, along with the said dispositions, attitudes and mentalities, do, or at least may, determine linguistic behavior. Consequently, knowing these elements is also important, in fact often crucial, for the explanation of any language behavior known in history, thus for the exploration and understanding of the linguistic historical components called "history of language use", and "history of linguistic system" as well.

In German and Romance studies numerous important research results relevant to our subject have appeared in recent times (cf. Herman 1989, 2000; Scharloth 2005; etc.). However, I have no knowledge of any research ever specifically targeting the exploration of the history of Hungarian linguistic awareness.

This paper intends to contribute to the chapter on nineteenth-century Hungary of the history of linguistic awareness. Its topic is "linguistic nationalism",[2] which had a considerable influence on the direction of linguistic events throughout Europe in the century in question — and which is globally hegemonic all across the developed world today, too (cf. Blommaert and Verschueren 1998; Gal 2002: 199). The purpose of the study is to extract and define major features and constitutive elements of this linguistic ideology as experienced in nineteenth-century Hungary. To reach my goal, in the following pages I will analyse contemporary metalinguistic data reflecting contemporary thinking about language and conscious reflections on it. Deprived of individual and subjective elements, these metalinguistic manifestations will hopefully help to outline the collective ideological framework, in which thinking about language and linguistic reflections took place, determining the linguistic behavior of an individual by influencing his or her views on attitudes, and mentalities towards language and language use.

In Section 2 first I will say a few words about linguistic ideologies and their basic features in general. Subsequently, I will give a brief description of the historical background to nationalism, the ideology governing the period, and linguistic nationalism, the linguistic ideology that constitutes an inherent part of nationalism (Section 3). In the third step I will introduce the methods applied in the research, as well as the corpus providing a basis for the analyses (Section 4), followed by an attempt to demonstrate the ingredients of linguistic nationalism that determined linguistic events and thinking in nineteenth-century Hungary (Section 5).

2. Ideology — linguistic ideology

In the last one hundred years or so, an extensive body of literature has accumulated on the issue of ideologies studied by philosophy, anthropology, political science, (social) psychology, sociology, and the sociology of knowledge alike (cf. e.g.

Eagleton 1991; Gouldner 1976; Thompson 1984; and, for a survey of different conceptualizations see Blommaert 1997 and Woolard 1998). Although efforts have been made to delimit the concept, at present there is no single universally accepted framework for the consideration of ideologies; instead, we can observe different research traditions with a number of different emphases (cf. Woolard 1998: 3). For the purposes of this study two of the many discussed conceptualizations and aspects of ideologies seem to be relevant.

First of all — looked at from a mentalist perspective and interpreted broadly — ideology can be regarded as a — not necessarily consistent — system of certain socio-culturally based collective notions, ideas, and beliefs which imply moral and political stands reflecting the position on the political spectrum and the concomitant value system of the social group which has created and represents the ideology (cf. Silverstein 1979). It is important to see that in this sense ideology represents some sort of a collective framework in which thinking takes place in a given society or social group and, being culture- and age-specific itself, the thinking taking place within its framework and the resulting knowledge, whether it is naive or scientific, will also be society- and culture-specific, as well as subject to historical changes (cf. Barnes, Bloor and Henry 1996).

Secondly, — viewed from a functional-pragmatic perspective — the set of ideas and notions which make up the inherent structure of ideologies is the intellectual force behind, and a means of, the social action whose aim is to acquire, hold onto, or legitimize power, i.e., to create and maintain certain asymmetrical inter-group relations (cf. Bauman and Briggs 2002). In this sense, then, in Blommaert's words (1997: 3), ideology can be seen "as 'naturalized power', as power which no longer looks like power".

This general, structural (mentalist) and functional conceptualization leads to the following description of linguistic ideology: linguistic ideology is a general and collective set of shared beliefs, ideas and values which, by representing a particular kind of framework in which thinking about language takes place, basically defines the views on language (both linguistic structures and language use) prevailing in a specific age, culture and/or society and which is or may be used by the community representing it with a view to asserting its linguistic and other power interests against another community. A similar understanding of linguistic ideologies is reflected in Susan Gal's lines:

> LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGIES are the culturally specific notions which participants and observers bring to language, the ideas they have about what language is good for, what linguistic differences mean about the speakers who use them, why there are linguistic differences at all. […] these ideas are always positioned in some way, relate to politics, and are influenced by power. (Gal 2002: 197f; capitals in the original)

Starting from this definition and in keeping with the purpose of this study, in what follows I will make an attempt to describe the inherent structure of nineteenth-century Hungarian linguistic nationalism, namely, the system of linguistic notions, ideas, and beliefs related to nationalism which formed the linguistic dispositions, attitudes and mentalities of the society with a growing middle class of nineteenth-century Hungary, and the way it thought about language. But, at the same time, I also intend to show the socio-pragmatic environment of the ideology examined, i.e., the social and power relations, positions and intentions which underlay the ideology, and made linguistic nationalism as an ideology function in nineteenth-century Hungary. Before diving into our subject I find it necessary to touch briefly on the historical roots and basic features of nationalism as a prevailing political ideology of the age, as well as on its contact points with language. So the next section will be concerned with the emergence of linguistic nationalism and the circumstances of its birth.

3. Nationalism — linguistic nationalism

It is a well-known fact that for the roots of modern-time European nationalism one has to go back to the evolvement of modern civil societies and to the ideology of the enlightenment, which, after the French revolution, conquered the whole of Europe, that is, to the time of a shift taking place in the history of ideas and social history at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (at the latest) (cf. Nohlen 1996: 453f). What is crucial for us here is that — contrary to the feudal system of the preceding era — from this point on, belonging to a rank, stratum, religion, dynasty, state or region gradually ceased to define the social identity and social status of an individual (cf. Niederhauser 2000: 175; Gardt 1999: 90). This function was largely taken over by the nation and the national status of the individual. Thus for members of a national society the interests of the nation as against others outside of it began to gain priority over the interests of a rank, class or religion.[3] Understanding that the self-definition of nations — according mainly to Herder's philosophy — has particularly been linked with language from the beginning, and, therefore, national interests also include — not least of all — linguistic interests, we have reached the issue of linguistic nationalism, that is, the general, collective world view and set of thoughts and values which, connected with this newly developed social identity and nationalism as a political ideology, determined the ways in which the society of the age thought about language and individual languages.

Considering the magnitude of the influence of Herder's linguistic philosophy on contemporary philosophy and politics, let us choose it as our starting point.

One of the most frequently quoted and most influential ideas of the great thinker which says: every nation has a single quite distinct language, and in it dwell its entire world of tradition, history, religion and principles of life, its whole heart and soul, was reflected in the (linguistic) political practice of the age of nationalism by the emergence of the idea "one language — one nation" and the term "national language". What is more, in several European languages it became a part of the collective consciousness as a proverb, such as *Nyelvében él a nemzet!* 'A nation lives in its language!' in Hungarian (cf. Bartha 2000: 26). The reception of Herder's ideas in Hungary was especially well grounded by one particular sentence of the great philosopher of history, in which he envisioned the death of the Hungarian language. This sentence — in its original context — reads as follows:

> Das einzige Volk, das aus diesem Stamm [dem "finnischen Völkerstamm" — P.M.] sich unter die Eroberer gedrängt hat, sind die Ungern oder Madscharen. […] Da sind sie jetzt unter Slawen, Deutschen, Wlachen und andern Völkern der geringere Teil der Landeseinwohner, und *nach Jahrhunderten wird man vielleicht ihre Sprache kaum finden.*
> 'The only people who from this tribe [i.e. the "Finnish tribe" — P. M.] managed to get to the conquerors are the Hungarians or Magyars. […] They are now among Slavs, Germans, Vlachs and other peoples the minor part of their country's population and *in centuries to come even their language will probably be lost.*' (Herder 1989: 688; emphasis added)

As Susan Gal points out, Herder had little more to say about Hungarians (Gal 2001: 30). This sentence, i.e., his prophecy of language loss, however, made such an alarming noise that it is still reverberating even in our time, for instance in recent debates on Hungarian language cultivation (cf. Sándor 2003). Why this noise was so loud in nineteenth-century Hungary can actually be deduced from all that has already been said. Following Herder's logic, if

i. a monolithic national language is a constitutive feature of a nation and the force that holds it together,
ii. and this national language is heading for extinction,

the conclusion may be drawn that

iii. the vision of the loss of the language also anticipates the death of the nation.

The first premise of this conclusion shows the point where nation and language interlock inseparably, and the message the sentence carries is no less than the central thesis of linguistic nationalism. This is the thesis that raised the issues of language and language use among those on the central stage of political and public life of contemporary Hungary's national society, thus placing into the public limelight

an issue that, up to that time, i.e., until the mid eighteenth century, had not even existed. The concrete historical and social context also created "favorable" conditions for the spread and radicalization in Hungary of this Herderian notion and for the use of the national language as a tool serving the purposes of politics and power. Perhaps as the most important direct antecedent we must mention the linguistic centralizing and assimilating endeavors of the pre-1867 Hapsburg oppression, an example of which was Emperor Joseph II's attempt at making the German language general and compulsory in the entire empire including Hungary, too, as early as 1784. The (partial) attainment of Hungarian political autonomy in 1867, a change in the power relations, paved the way for the Hungarian language to become the symbol of national resistance and independence as well as one of its most important tools in the hand of Power by now representing Hungarian national interests.[4] In the middle of the nineteenth century this was complemented by the ever-increasing disappointment with liberal notions, as a result of which, as pointed out by Sándor (2003: 398), the entire country saw a strengthening of faith in a centralized power and respect for hierarchy. In the light of the foregoing it is quite understandable that from this point on the idea worded in (i) is reflected in numerous political and almost all linguistic political and purist arguments as one of the most influential toposes of national discourse, and from it various other characteristics of linguistic nationalism can also be derived. Suffice it to demonstrate its apparently strong presence in nineteenth-century Hungary with only two contemporary citations. The first one is from a public summons issued by the Language and Literature Department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in March 1878, later published in the journal *Magyar Nyelvőr*. In this writing entitled *A magyar közönséghez! Fölhívás egy nemzeti ügy támogatására* 'To the Hungarian Public! Call for support for a national cause', we can read the following among other things:

(1) A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia lelkes alapítóinak szándéka értelmében a tudományok mívelésén kívül különösen *anyanyelvünknek, nemzetünk e legdrágább kincsének* ápolását tartotta mindig és tartja szem előtt most is folytonosan. […] Anyanyelvünk őseinkről ránk maradt legdrágább örökségünk. *Nemzetképen addig élünk, míg e szent örökséget megőrizzük.* 'In accordance with the intention of its enthusiastic founders, besides practicing sciences, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences has always paid special attention to taking good care of our *mother tongue, this most precious asset of our nation.* […] Our native language is the most valuable treasure our ancestors left to us. *We can live as a nation only as long as we preserve it.*' (Pulszky and Gyulai 1878: 145ff; emphasis added)

The second citation, which also reflects the thesis of linguistic nationalism formed in (i), is from the writing by a former Prime Minister Baron Dezső Bánffy.[5] In this the author, as we will see, presses for the exclusive use of Hungarian last names, which he considers a linguistic means, displaying it as a national need:

(2) A magyar nemzeti társadalom meg kell hogy értse, hogy az idegen neveket viselőktől követelnie kell a magyar hangzású nevek felvételét, mint *egyik eszközét az egységes magyar nemzeti állam megalkotásának*.
'Hungary's national society must understand that it has to require of those having foreign last names to change them to Hungarian-sounding ones, for this is *one of the means of creating a monolithic Hungarian nation state*.'
(Baron Dezső Bánffy's article in *Budapesti Napló* on July 2, 1902. As quoted in Simonyi 1917: 203; emphasis added).

Before diving into the reconstruction and analysis of the elements of linguistic nationalism, which are largely deducible from the thesis of (i), I wish to give a brief description of the corpus that constitutes a basis for this study.

4. The corpus

In recent decades in both historiography and linguistic historiography it has become a common practice throughout Europe that periodization does not constrain the nineteenth century strictly to a period between the turns of the two centuries, but rather, considering the historic importance as well as the social and linguistic consequences of the French Revolution and World War I, identifies it with the period between these two events. Thus when historical social sciences discuss the nineteenth century, they in most cases mean this "long nineteenth century" of Europe. I, too, will follow this practice in my discussion.

The main body of the corpus compiled to serve the purposes of the analysis comprises texts from the last 50 years of the "long nineteenth century", that is the period between the Compromise between Austria and Hungary and World War I. Although in this way the empirical base of the analyses has been confined to the second half of the period indicated in the title of this article, I find it important to note that elements of linguistic nationalism detectable in the writings of these 50 years can be clearly identified in the first half of the nineteenth century as well, as linguistic nationalism was the governing linguistic ideology of the whole century. However, for reasons of space, I will demonstrate this with only a few sporadic examples. Again, the space limitations of this publication have generally made it impossible for me to present and interpret all the data of the corpus. So I wish to point out that the following data constitutes only a modest fragment of the body of

texts I actually processed; however, as for the information and messages they carry, they certainly represent the entire corpus.[6]

The corpus comprising the examples for demonstration purposes is made up of two major groups of sources.

a. The larger part includes texts that were produced as a result either of conscious and systematic linguistic reflections at a scientific level, or naive linguistic reflections of the literate middle class (*Bildungsbürgertum* in German). The main line of this group includes studies, pamphlets, comments and letters to the editor, which appeared in the journal *Magyar Nyelvőr*[7] between 1872 and 1918. This sizeable body of texts is supplemented by other sources linkable to the main line in terms of content and form, namely prefaces to popular scientific writings and academic theses dealing with Hungarian language.
b. The second part of the corpus draws on a source type that has a lot to offer, yet has so far remained unexploited by linguistic historiography in many respects: etiquette books and other guides that touch on, among other things, the issues of language and language use. These were published in Hungary in the period under scrutiny, and were mostly not, at least not detectably, merely translations from other languages. These sources have a lot to offer to linguistic history (as well) in that, by their very purposes, they may be the most creditable reflections of conscious normative opinions accompanying the use of language, to which contemporary society consciously adjusted its linguistic and communicational behavior. However, we have to note that, for diverse reasons, the whole picture of the linguistic and communicative standards and opinions relating to them cannot be drawn up relying only on these sources. This is in one part due to the fact that the publications in question dealt with only those preferred or rejected linguistic phenomena and norms that were found relevant and noteworthy by their authors with respect to social discourse. Secondly, the norms for linguistic behavior presented by these writings as appropriate or desirable are obviously not necessarily in line with the forms of behavior actually prevailing in the Hungarian society. We are informed about these actually existing forms of linguistic behavior mostly through descriptions of negative examples, phenomena that do not comply with the standards defined in these works. And thirdly, we also have to bear in mind that the authors of the works in question are all representatives of the literate middle class, thus linguistic forms described, preferred or rejected by them necessarily reflect the value system and linguistic standards of this middle class as the predominant social form of the era. The norm consciousness of the lower — or even higher — ranks, strata or classes can hardly be revealed through these sources.[8]

5. Elements of linguistic nationalism

Having armed ourselves with the theoretical, methodological, and historical background, we can now turn to the actual topic of my study, namely the description of the ideological principles and value system of linguistic nationalism. In my work I will strongly rely on the international literature on the subject, in particular the relevant research results of Andreas Gardt (Gardt 1999, 2000). Before starting the analysis I wish to point out that though the combination of the ideological value system to be described in the following pages characterizes linguistic nationalism, its particular elements may also be recognized as parts of other ideologies from before or after the discussed period. In addition, from the fact that linguistic nationalism has been part of the modern-time history of numerous European nations and languages, it emerges that most of the features to be described are far from being distinctively Hungarian phenomena, but are also parts of the linguistic nationalism of various other nations or "national linguistic communities" — in past and present (cf. e.g. Blommaert and Verschueren 1998).

5.1 Perfection of the national language

One of the most distinctive features of nineteenth-century linguistic nationalism is that national languages are glorified far beyond objectivity, and are often subjects of exalted admiration. National languages are often displayed as the most perfect of all both aesthetically and functionally.

Let me illustrate this phenomenon with an example from a monumental work published in 1888, introducing the Hapsburg Monarchy, more exactly from its volume dealing with Hungary. The relevant chapter, the author of which is Mór Jókai, one of the most popular writers of the age, is concerned with distinctive features of the Hungarian language:

(3) Egyedi természetét illetőleg *a magyar nyelv egyike a legszebb zengésű, legtökéletesebb szerkezetű és legvilágosabb szabatossággal szóló nyelveknek.* […] A beszédbeli viszonyok s vonatkozások kifejezésére ilyen és ennyi eszközzel rendelkezvén a magyar nyelv, természetes, hogy mondatszerkezetei s általában mindennemű *kifejezései oly tökéletes világosak és szabatosak*, hogy sem prózában, sem költői előadásban homály vagy kétértelműség nem eshetik benne, csak ha az író nem mestere e finom eszköznek. Ám hallgassátok meg a parlamenti szónokot és a költő művét vagy a falusi bírót és a népdalt, álljatok szóba a legfelsőbb körök emberével, vagy az alföldi puszták pásztorával: mindegyik esetben épen úgy gyönyörködhettek az észjárás ritka eredetiségű logikájában, mint *a kifejezések egyszerű*

világosságában, komoly méltóságában, festői színpompájában és szemléltető plasztikájában.
'In terms of its unique character, the Hungarian language is one of the languages characterized by the most beautiful cadency, the most perfect structures and clearest precision […]. With such and so many devices to express in-speech relations and connections, it is only natural that the sentence structures and generally all kinds of expressions of the Hungarian language should be so perfectly clear and accurate that no obscurity or ambiguity can occur in it either in prose or in poetic rendering unless the writer is master of this subtle device. But listen to the speaker in parliament or the poet's work, the village mayor and the folk song, or speak to people in the highest circles of society, or the shepherd of the puszta in the Great Plain: in each case you will enjoy both the rare ingenuity of the logic of the way of thinking and the simple clarity, solemn dignity, picturesque colourfulness, and illustrative plasticity of expression' (Jókai 1888: 280ff; emphasis added).

Similar views praising and highlighting the exceptional beauty and various other virtues of the Hungarian language had already been expressed far back in time, in the second half of the eighteenth century, for instance in Ferenc Kazinczy's speeches and writings,[9] though Kazinczy, among others, also stressed the urgent necessity to improve the national language, i.e., corpus planning:

(4) Ez valamennyi élő nyelvek közt — ha a buján kényes olaszt kiveszszük — az, mely kétségen kivül a legszebb, zengő és eredeti. Zrínyi és Gyöngyösi atyáink, példái lehetnek, némely fogyatkozás mellett is, milyen édességgel, milyen velősen, milyen pompás méltósággal ír a magyar.
'Out of all living languages — except for the exuberantly delicate Italian — obviously this is the most beautiful, vocal and original.' (Kazinczy's speech in Kassa on December 20, 1789; as quoted in Toldy 1859: 67). 'Zrínyi and Gyöngyösi, our great ancestors may exemplify, notwithstanding some deficiencies, the sweetness, richness and exquisite dignity of the Hungarian writing style.' (Kazinczy's letter to Gedeon Ráday on August 27, 1785; as quoted in Toldy 1859: 105)

In the case of linguistic nationalism, the distinctive feature in question can be explained mainly by the markedly positive attitudes deriving from the interpretation of the language as a national symbol, against a background of mostly emotional-affective factors. Since, on the one hand, the national language — according to the prevailing collective view — is a unifying force for the nation, thus in respect of the existence and survival of the nation, especially from the time Herder had put down his prophecy, represented an unconditioned value. This accounts for the distinctively positive attitudes of members of the Hungarian nation, or those

speaking Hungarian, towards the national language itself. On the other hand, one of the special functions of attitudes is in fact to drive and structure the individual's information-processing. In this sense an attitude is a global consideration, which organizes views on its subject in a consistent way. (Social Psychology refers to and describes this phenomenon as "cognitive consistency". Cf. e.g. Stroebe, Hewstone and Stephenson 1996: 231.) All this, in our case, adds up to the fact that distinctively positive attitudes of members of the Hungarian nation towards the national language trigger — with a view to maintaining cognitive consistency — exaggeratedly positive views on the national language, which boils down to appraisals similar to the one in the quotation.

5.2 Superiority of the national language

In the linguistic nationalism of the nineteenth century, the above-discussed glorification of a national language is strongly linked to, and therefore co-exists with, the view that a given national language, in our case Hungarian, is superior to others on the basis of certain considerations.

Let us exemplify this with a call for application for translators announced in Pest in 1825:

(5) Nints Nemzet a' Főld' kerekségén, mely a' Magyarnyelvet tisztaságára, hathatósságára, fellengősségére, kellemetes és kivánatos vóltára nézve követhesse. […] ezen eredeti Nyelv' fellengős szavait halandó nem követheti, mivel kivált Európába a' hasonló Eredeti nyelv ritka, vagy talán nints is. — Hát ha még azon ketseit vesszük melyek szabad gördülésénél, fülemile hangu zengésénél, a' szájba színméz gyanánt olvadósságánál fogva, a' Görög és Római Vers mértékre minden Nemzetek' nyelve felett leg alkalmatosabbá teszik, már ekkor éppen hasonlíthatatlan.
'There is no language in the world which could be compared in purity, efficiency, rhetoric and pleasantness to the Hungarian. […] no mortal man can reach the grandiloquence of this genuine language, for — mainly in Europe — this kind of language is rare, if any. — And if we mention its charm, which makes it sound like a song of a nightingale, taste like honey in the mouth, and makes it suitable for applying Greek and Roman metres far better than any other language, it is obvious that no other language can be compared to it.' (Mollay 1939/40: 3)

At this point we are only one step away from reaching another feature, which is in a causal relationship with the theory of superiority: contempt for other languages, often arguing for their inferiority and imperfectness in an aggressive tone. And, indeed, it is at this point that linguistic patriotism — characteristic of linguistic

views before linguistic nationalism, such as humanism or the baroque — turns into linguistic nationalism. While praising and admiring a national language for its beauty and perfection had also been a feature of linguistic patriotism characterizing earlier centuries (cf. Bárczi 1966: 207), the above-said features, in the disguise of diverse arguments, can be revealed to a significant extent only in linguistic nationalism.

It is worthwhile to take a glance at a writing, which appeared in *Magyar Nyelvőr* in 1872 (Volf 1872). According to the following passage, the author, György Volf (member of the editorial staff of the journal) deduces the superiority of the Hungarian language — and simultaneously the subordination and imperfectness of Latin (!) and German as compared to Hungarian — from the alleged intranslatability of the great works of Hungarian poetry and the unique difficulties involved in translating from Hungarian:

(6) Hát a latin nyelv, hát a német nyelv nem szegény a mienkhez képest? Fordítsuk csak latinra, németre Aranyt vagy Petőfit, s meglátjuk, hogy minden második szavuknál megakadunk.
'Is Latin, or German, for that matter, not poor as compared with our language? One just has to make an attempt to translate Arany or Petőfi[10] into Latin or German, and one will balk at every second word of theirs.' (Volf 1872: 343)

However, much more explicit forms of negative attitudes than this "mildly" contemptuous view can also be detected against other national languages and their users, especially against the German language and the Germans and Austrians. Behind these attitudes lies, besides xenophobia, which is an inherent part of nationalism, primarily one of the strong biases of contemporary Hungarian nationalism likely to have originated from the fall of the war of independence in 1848/49 (cf. Glatz 1974: 255). Indeed, the Austrians showed total incomprehension of the Hungarian national movement even after their bloody victory in 1849, which refuelled Hungarian nationalism with animosity against Austrians and Germans from the second half of the nineteenth century. The same applies to linguistic nationalism: the same way as the Hapsburg oppression threatened the existence and survival of the Hungarian nation, their language also endangered Hungarian as the language of the nation. According to the principle of cognitive consistency, it is this global perception and strong negative attitude that eventually (though not exclusively, see 5.5), results in often aggressive opinions reflecting contempt for the German language and stressing its inferiority.

This is demonstrated by a statement in a contemporary and repeatedly published etiquette code:

(7) Nézzük ezzel szemben a német nyelvet, mennyire meglátszik rajta, hogy részben a tudósok katedráin, részben a kaszárnyákban fejlődött ki. *Unalmas, száraz, nehézkes, szintelen, elvesznek benne a gondolatok* s erővel teljes csak akkor tud lenni, mikor — parancsol. S ha van némelyik költőjükben és esztétikusukban némi báj és finomság, az bizonyára francia hatásra termett.
'Let us take a look now at the German language, how it reflects the fact that it was mainly developed by scholars and soldiers. It is *boring, dry, dull, colorless, alien to thoughts*, and can be powerful only when giving orders. And if one finds some charm and refinement in some of their poets or aesthetes, it is certainly a result of some French influence.' (Gonda 1920: 162f; emphasis added.)

The supposed superiority and the allegedly exceptional richness of our own national language also provide arguments for purist views pertaining to linguistic nationalism (too), in particular the rejection of borrowing and using words of foreign origin. Since, according to numerous contemporary sources, our national language is so rich that it can express everything with its native elements, borrowing and using elements of foreign origin in the Hungarian language is entirely unnecessary, and is, consequently, to be avoided. This notion is reflected by the following passage from another contemporary etiquette guide:

(8) Mindenekelőtt iparkodjunk a nyelvtan szabályai szerint beszélni. Hiuságból sokan a franczia, angol s német nyelv ismeretével kérkednek, s a magyar nyelvet elhanyagolják. Művelt magyar embernek nagy szégyenére válik, ha anyanyelvén rosszul s hibásan beszél. […] Idegen szavakat ritkán használjunk. *A mi nyelvünk oly gazdag, hogy az idegen szavak használatát mellőzhetjük.*
'To begin with, let us try to follow grammar rules in our speaking. Out of vanity, many people show off their French, English, or German knowledge, while neglecting their own mother tongue. Using their own native language badly and incorrectly is a disgrace to educated Hungarians. […] We should try and avoid using loanwords. *Our language is so rich that we are not in need of them.*' (Forgó 1917: 36; emphasis added)

Another argument, more about prestige, pops up from time to time against the use of foreign elements. It claims that by borrowing foreign elements speakers of a national language acknowledge — even if implicitly — the poorness of their own language, thus its subordination to another one (cf. Schmitt 1996: 873). This opinion points out that the (over)use of foreign elements may imply the poorness of a given national language, therefore obviously is to be avoided, especially because our national language is not just far from being poor but, in fact, is exceptionally

rich, and therefore superior to others. This view is illustrated by the following passage from an etiquette guide published in 1867:

(9) Elkerülendők az idegen, vagy használatba csak nem rég jött szavak, melyek könnyen értelmi zavart okozhatnak. […] Instálom, protestálok opponálok [sic!], kriminális stb. oly általán használt szavak, melyek a köznépre is átmentek, és a mennyire helytelenek a müvelt társaságokban, annyira hitelrontók […] az idegenek előtt, kik az ilyetén szavak gyakori használatából *a nyelv szegénységére, s az irodalom pangására következtetnek.*
'Foreign or newly introduced words are to be avoided, as they can easily cause confusion in the meaning. […] *Instálom* "solicit", *protestálok* "protest", *opponálok* "oppose", *kriminális* "criminal", and other similar words have become so common that they are even used by common people. Besides their frequent use being improper in literate circles, they are discreditable […] in the eyes of foreigners, *suggesting that our language is poor and our literature stagnant.*' (Rádl 1867: 16f; emphasis added)

5.3 The national language as a self-existent formation independent of its speakers

Sometimes explicitly, sometimes indirectly, but in contemporary arguments with respect to language and language use shaped by linguistic nationalism it is easy to detect the notion that a national language is an entity, independent, in a sense, of people, history, and society, with a distinct, ancient nature (spirit, disposition, character, etc.). According to this view this distinct nature is based on ancient and *inherent laws* pertaining exclusively to the given language, in our case, Hungarian, and these laws must be honored by the users of the language. Following this line of reasoning the national language should be used with appropriate respect for these assumed laws in mind, otherwise the original and unique feature (spirit, disposition, character, etc.) of the language, as well as the resulting purity, will be lost, and the language will deform and degenerate. This view paves the way for the launch and broadening of a purist program which, like the entire era, is language-centered (ultimately nation-centered), and which — of course, not necessarily explicitly — is based on the idea that one of the greatest threats to the national language is constituted by its users themselves; therefore it should be practically protected from them by teaching the users about its laws. (The most significant forum of this language cultivation movement was the journal *Magyar Nyelvőr*, whose purpose was for the major part to serve the goals of the movement.)

The above-outlined views on language can be detected, for example, in the preface to a scholarly thesis on German elements in the Hungarian language, published in 1880:

(10) *Minden nyelvnek*, mindaddig mig ép, *meg van azon természeti ösztöne*, magától minden idegent eltávolitani és azt, ha mégis betolakodik, kiküszöbölni, vagy legalább honi elemekkel kiegyenliteni. Igenis *elveszti a nyelv eredeti jellegét* akkor, ha az átvett szóval nem saját, hanem az idegen nyelvérzéke, sajátsága szerint él.
'*Any language*, as long as it is intact, *has a natural instinct* to protect itself from any foreign elements, to keep them away and, if they do intrude, to edge them out or balance their influence with native elements. *A language will lose its original character* if it uses loanwords according to their original nature, instead of using them in accordance with characteristics of the borrowing language.' (Vizoly 1880: 13f; emphasis added)

The first sentence of the paragraph illustrates the discussed contemporary view that language behaves as an entity independent of its users: as long as it is intact, that is, not corrupted by either external sources or its users; it is able to defend itself from any influences against its nature with the help of its own nature and natural instinct. This view perceives language as a formation or structure, which, in a certain sense, cannot be influenced by its users.

A similar perception can be seen in another article of the already cited György Volf, published in *Magyar Nyelvőr*:

(11) Igaz, hogy nyelvünk meglehetősen megtisztúlt az idegen szavaktól, de már most ki szabadítja meg szegényt eredetieinktől, *melyek nem az ő*, nem is földi, hanem valami holdbeli nyelv hasonlatosságára és *törvényeire vannak alkotva* és így idegenebbek maguknál az idegeneknél is?
'Though it has been cleared of foreign words, who will ever clear our poor language of the native words which were *not created in harmony with its own laws*, not even in harmony with any of the earthly languages, but rather with some kind of a Lunar language, and are thus more alien to us than any foreign element?' (Volf 1872a: 394; emphasis added)

These lines display the writer's deep concern about the distinct nature and character of the national language. Volf, as we can see, calls for cleaning the "poor language" of elements that have been forced upon it by its users, mainly by reformers of the language, ignoring its internal laws. We will see even more vivid examples of this feature in the next section, which is concerned with yet another distinctive feature of linguistic nationalism.

5.4 Language — people — culture — nation — country — character — race

The fourth constitutive element of nineteenth-century Hungarian linguistic nationalism is a vague linking of linguistic, ethnic, cultural, political, often moral,

psychological, even anthropological categories and features, a confused blending of these areas, often appearing hidden behind controversial arguments. As a result, the national language becomes equated with one and only one folk/culture/country/character/race. And this, in a final step, leads to the identification of an alleged national linguistic character with an alleged national character.

This phenomenon is revealed in another passage from the above study by György Volf, published in the first volume of *Magyar Nyelvőr*:

(12) […] vannak szavak, melyekben bizonyos viszonyok, *a nemzet gondolkozása módja* vagy valamely sajátos nézete, sőt sokszor egy darab története nyilvánúl. Az ilyenekhez vonzódunk, az ilyenekhez nemzeti érzelem csatol, az ilyenek kedvesen esnek hallásunknak. Ezek *a nyelv szellemében képezett és összetett szavak*. És vannak ismét olyanok, melyek *a nemzeti gondolkozásmóddal, a sajátságos eredeti szemlélődéssel és igy a nyelv szellemével s minden törvényével* ellenkeznek, sőt mindazt lábbal tiporják. '[…] there are words in which certain relations and *attitudes of the nation*, or even a piece of its history are revealed. We are attracted to them, our national emotions attach us to them, and they sound like music to our ears. These *words* were *coined and created in harmony with the spirit of the language.* And there are those that are against *our attitudes and views, thus are against the spirit of the language,* and therefore trample all these in the dust.' (Volf 1872a: 399; emphasis added)

The writing explains to us that the nation and the character of the national language strongly and inseparably stand together. The author makes a distinction between words that reflect certain national features such as national mentality and distinctive views of things, and which are thus in harmony with a supposed spirit of the national language, and words that conflict with national features, therefore with the spirit of the national language, too. Such linking of characters of the nation and its language can be deduced from the core thesis of linguistic nationalism shown in Section 3. Since, on the one hand, insofar as the nation is organized and kept together by its national language, i.e. the nation lives in its language, and, on the other hand, this language has its own distinct features and character, the conclusion can be drawn that this unique character of the language exerts a decisive influence on the national character as well, thus making the two inseparable.

In the following quotation two new categories appear in addition to nation and language: Hungarian race and Hungarian character.

(13) A végett, hogy mennél tisztább öntudattal s igazi tősgyökeres magyarsággal beszélhessünk s írhassunk, kénytelenek leszünk fajunk "jobbik eszét újra éleszedni s használatra fogni." — Értelem és kedély, ítélet és ízlés újra vissza igyekszik a természetesebb alapra, s kibontakozván a korcsosító kábulatból,

> ismét fölkeresi az üdébb élet elemeit. A tőről sarjadó igazi magyar nyelvvel talán még érvényesíthető, vagy legalább némileg fölélesztheto ama valódi magyar jellem is, melynek majdnem fogytára jutottunk már.
> 'To be able to speak and write a true-born Hungarian language with a clear mind, we will have to draw on "the better senses of our race" and make it work again. — Reason and temper, judgment and taste seek to return to provide a more natural ground, and unfolding from a degenerating daze, it revisits elements of a more vivid life. With a true-born Hungarian language we may be able to implement, or at least revive to a certain extent, a true-born Hungarian character as well, which we seem to be running out of.' (Árpádfi 1872: 38)

Although what we see here is an obviously diffuse and rather confused reasoning, the main features of this notion are clearly visible: the author believes that to reach and sustain true-born pure Hungarian speech, a revival of ethnic features (i.e. better senses of the race) is needed. This notion of pure Hungarian speech is significant because with its help a true and original Hungarian character is hoped to be revived.

In respect of the connection between race, nation, and language, much clearer and more radical views are reflected in the following statement by Jenő Rákosi (of German extraction!), one of the prominent intellectuals in contemporary Budapest:

(14) […] a faji jelleget ember és nemzet a nyelvétől kapja […] a magyar fajt a magyar nyelv termeli nagyban és kicsinyben egyaránt […] mindent a világon, minden egyéb, ha még oly fontos érdeket is, a nyelv érdekének kell alája rendelnünk.
'[…] a nation and its people have their ethnic features through the language […] The Hungarian racial character is produced by the Hungarian language […] we have to subordinate everything, even the interests of the highest importance, to those of the language.' (as quoted in Pukánszky 2000/1940: 84f)

5.5 Endangerment of the national language by other languages

I have already touched upon the view pertaining to and governing the era that the national language has an independent and distinct nature/character/disposition (cf. 5.3). This idea paves the way for the apprehension, which serves as a ground for all purist movements, namely that other languages and external linguistic influences seriously endanger the national language. Thus, regarding the national language, all kinds of structural inter- and transferences occurring through

encounters with other languages may be harmful, for, and as far as, they are not in line with the nature/character/disposition of the adopting — i.e. the Hungarian — language; rather, they conform to the loaning language. From this it follows that, because these linguistic interferences are sources of serious threat to the national language, the sheer presence of other languages in Hungary is also dangerous, therefore undesirable. Furthermore, assuming that, as we have seen in Section 5.4, in linguistic nationalism language, culture, nation and ethnic character get jumbled, these languages — and their users — endanger not only Hungarian as the national language, but the Hungarian nation, the national culture, the Hungarian ethnicity, and the origins and purity of all these as well.

In the light of this it should come as no surprise that relevant contemporary documents stigmatize other languages and language varieties, especially those in contact with Hungarian. In these writings one encounters desperate calls for help and outbursts against other languages often in a contemptuous and aggressive tone, which — in the name of national interests and/or Herder's prophecy — call for the protection of the national language from the harmful (abusive, destructive) influences of other languages. Among these dangerous languages special attention is given to Latin, and even more to German (cf. Benkő 1992: 91). The reason for this is in part the fact that in earlier centuries these languages edged Hungarian off the standard-oriented domains of communication; in fact, for a long time they had not even allowed it in there. In addition, following this line of argumentation, their continuous and exposed presence had resulted in a bulk of borrowing in subsystems of the national language, thus seriously harming not only the use of the national language but its ancient nature/character/disposition as well. Beyond this argument, as discussed above (cf. 5.2), German, as the language of Vienna and Hapsburg absolutism, had become a major symbol of the threat of an external oppression.

The following letter to the editor published in the first volume of *Magyar Nyelvőr* highlights this imminent threat posed by foreign languages, in this case German:

(15) Nem tudom honnan veszik, ha cselédemtől, kit alig néhány hónapja hoztunk föl az ország legtősgyökeresebb magyar vidékéről, a Kis-Kunságból, azt kérdezem: "hideg van-e künn?" azt feleli rá "igen!" S ha kis lányomtól, ki itthonn magyar szónál egyebet sem hall, azt kérdezem: "megtanúltad-e már a leczkédet?" azt feleli: "igen!". Dehogy nem tudom honnan veszik? A pesti levegőből veszik, mely saturálva van a germanismusokkal. […] Az ember már saját házában, saját családja körében sem lehet biztos a germanismus invasiójától. Végre a saját maga fülében s nyelvérzékében sem bízik. Én már ott vagyok, hogy nem bízom; s lehet, hogy a cselédemnek és a kis lányomnak

van igaza a magok "igen"-jével, mely nekem oly hegyesen hangzik s úgy *sérti a fülemet*, mert mindig *a német "ja"-t vélem benne hallani*. Kérem, *ne engedjék a magyar gyermek beszédét* sem e részben, sem általában *elnémetesedni*; legyenek rajta, hogy *ne veszítse el ép s igazi nyelvérzékét* […]. 'I do not know where it comes from, but when I ask my servant whom I acquired from Kiskunság, the most traditional countryside in Hungary, a couple of months ago: *megtanúltad-e már a leczkédet?* "Is it cold outside?", she answers *igen*! "yes". And when I ask my little daughter, who at home hears nothing but Hungarian words: *megtanúltad-e már a leczkédet?* "Have you finished with your homework?", she answers *igen*!. But where does it come from? Oh yes, I certainly know where it comes from. It comes from the air of Pest, which is saturated with Germanisms […] One cannot feel safe even in one's very home from the invasion of Germanisms. In the end one loses trust in one's own ears and linguistic instinct. I have already reached this point. And perhaps my servant and my daughter are right in using this *igen*, which sounds so sharp to me, and *hurts my ears*, because *it much reminds me of German ja* "yes". I ask you *not to allow our children's speech*, either in parts, or as a whole, *to become Germanized.* Please see to it that *their intact and original language instinct is not lost* […]' (Szász 1872: 80ff; emphasis added)

The author goes as far as to discover German influence in the use of the Hungarian response particle *igen*,[11] which he perceives as harmful to the purity of the way Hungarian children speak the language. The invasion of the German language and of Germanisms, according to the author's metaphor, carries a danger from which one cannot be safe even at home, and which already threatens the clean and pure language instinct of the children. In the last sentence of the quotation he calls for help, probably to the editors of the journal *Magyar Nyelvőr*, to stand up against this danger and protect the children's (yet) intact language instinct from Germanisms.

The following argument from the article by György Volf, already quoted in (11) and (12), and the underlying value judgment are also informative:

(16) Míg azelőtt a magyar szellem az idegen szavakat naív fogékonysággal sajátította el és férfias alkotó erővel alakította át, mostanában lelketlen utánzás kapott lábra. Ez nem lehet más mint a németek majmolása, mert az egész világon csak ők teszik, hogy az idegen szavakat lehetőleg változatlanúl veszik föl nyelvükbe, sőt a már elfogadottakat és megváltozottakat idegen alakjukra és kiejtésükre visszaerőszakolják.
'While a long time ago the Hungarian spirit acquired foreign words with naive sensitivity, just to alter them with manly creativity, by now soulless miming has gained ground. The source of this cannot be anything else but the German language, as only Germans adopt foreign words without any

alteration, and they force back into their original shape and pronunciation even those already accepted and altered.' (Volf 1872a: 394f)

In these lines, as we can see, Germans and their language and linguistic behavior are unambiguously presented as negative examples which are to be rejected. The author's negative attitudes are most apparently displayed by the noun "miming" with its obviously negative connotations. The quoted passage also implies that the effects of the German language and its use has forced a soulless imitation of a bad linguistic behavior pattern upon the Hungarian people, and therefore deprived it from a manly feature of it, namely its former manly creative power. Again, in the background of the rejection of this linguistic behavioral pattern one is likely to find the reasoning of linguistic nationalism: By using loanwords with their original pronunciation and morphology, which lies at the heart of the linguistic practice in question, Germans neglect the interests of their own national language, thus endangering its purity.

5.6 National language instinct

After all, according to the collective contemporary apprehension, the most reliable tool in the protection of the national language against the danger from other languages remains its speakers' uncompromising, intact language instinct. This pure, sound language instinct is again presented as an inherent, quasi-immanent talent of the speakers, similarly to the way the ancient nature of the national language is perceived. However, this analogy is also accompanied by the analogy of the dangers: like the national language, language instinct is also exposed to the danger of foreign linguistic influence, thus is endangered by the sheer presence of foreign elements in everyday language use (which again provides arguments for the contemporary purist movement). This reasoning is exemplified by the last sentence of the quotation in (15), and also by the following citation from writing by György Volf in which he whips "degenerated" and "freakish" words created by the language reform:

(17) A nyelv sajátságai mind a nemzet millióinak benső élete mélyében gyökeredzenek. E tulajdonok közül a legkisebbnek elenyészését vagy elváltozását is megérzi minden nemzet, ha nemzeti öntudata és *ép nyelvérzéke van*. […] Ha már azon egyesek […] a nyelvet nem saját módjai szerint tulajdon erőiből és eszközeivel fejlesztik: *összeütközésbe jőnek a nemzeti nyelvérzékkel*, a fejlődés helyes irányával, szándéktalanul is rontanak s a nyelvnek nemcsak elfajulását, de valóban bekövetkezhető halálát is előkészítik.

> 'Features of the language are deeply rooted in the inner lives of millions of the nation. A nation will sense the loss or deformation of the smallest of these properties as long as it has a national consciousness and an *intact language instinct*. […] Those […] who do not improve the language in accordance with its own rules and using its own means, thus *coming into conflict with the national language instinct*, do harm even without bad intentions, and pave the way not only for the depravation, but the actual death of the language as well.' (Volf 1874: 60; emphasis added)

These lines reflect the author's concern about Herder's prophecy coming true, in the sense that development of the language occurs against the national language instinct. Nevertheless, all this also suggests that it is not only the borrowing of elements created by foreign rules that endangers intact language instinct, but structures made of native components as well, as long as they neglect the laws of the national language, thus trying to develop the national language in a way that, according to the wording of the quotation, is against its own nature.

Nevertheless, according to contemporary views, it was children's language instinct that was most exposed to the danger posed by foreign languages because, though intact and clean by its very nature, it is undeveloped, and therefore subject to harmful effects of early bilingualism. According to this view, bilingual primary linguistic socialization was considered harmful, thus to be rejected, not only by contemporary linguistic pedagogy, but by public opinion as well, which was under the influence of the former.[12] This view is reflected in the following citation:

(18) De határozottan károsnak és szükségtelennek tartjuk azt az elterjedt szokást, hogy a még magyarul beszélni alig tudó gyermeket azonnal német bonn kezére bízzuk s ezáltal fejletlen nyelvérzékét megrontjuk, anyanyelvének rejtettebb sajátságai iránt minden időre fogékonytalanná tesszük. […] egy azonban bizonyos: ez a kétnyelvűség is eggyik kiváltó oka a nyelvérzék minden irányban észlelhető gyöngülésének s az irodalmi nyelv hanyatlásának.
'But we find it a definitely harmful and unnecessary custom that children who have hardly learned to speak are looked after by German private tutors, which corrupts their undeveloped language instinct and deprives them of the sensitivity to the more subtle features of their mother tongue for ever. […] however, one thing is certain: this bilingualism is among the factors that are responsible for the visible weakening of language instinct and the decay of literary Hungarian.' (Albert 1894: 246)

Finally, we have to mention a view which also appeared in contemporary writings, namely that the above discussed intact and sound, thus uncompromising language instinct could mostly be found among "common people" or "simple people". Thus

if it was to be checked whether a given linguistic structure was in line with the laws (nature, spirit etc.) of the national language, the most reliable reference point was the vernacular, i.e., the language instinct, of village people. In the background of this view lay the assumption that the language instinct of native Hungarian literate town-dwellers had been corrupted by intense relations with other languages, especially with Latin and German, individual and regional multilingualism, and a sort of linguistic cosmopolitanism. In contrast, the language instinct of common people living in rural areas, owing to their isolation, was not exposed to this harmful influence and remained intact. One can often come across the view that literate town-dwellers, for instance journalists and — in particular — language reformers, did more harm to the Hungarian language than foreign language influences.

To demonstrate the views just mentioned, and to wind up, let us see a quotation from Gábor Szarvas, editor of *Magyar Nyelvőr*:

(19) Tudnivaló, hogy a nyelvszellemnek hamisítatlan nyilatkozása leginkább a népnyelvben van megőrizve; […] A nyelv tiszta eredetiségét népünknek azon részénél tartotta s tartja meg leginkább, mely többé-kevésbé elszigetelve magának élt s a más ajkúakkal s a magyar civilizált osztályokkal mennél ritkább érintkezésben állott.
'It is a well-known fact that the spirit of the language in its purest form has been preserved mostly in the common language, […] The language has been able to keep its pure originality mostly in communities living a more or less isolated life with rare contacts with higher and educated classes of the Hungarian society.' (Szarvas 1872: 53f)

6. Closing remarks

Through the above-discussed analyses I made an attempt to reconstruct the basic components and main forms of linguistic nationalism in nineteenth-century Hungary. Rather than describing and juxtaposing the various different prominent and less prominent individual contemporary views, it was my aim to reconstruct the general and collective, more or less constant system of ideas and values that underlay that superficial diversity. In this reconstruction a fairly abstract and complex system of views has unfolded. However, one has to bear in mind that this abstract ideological and value system considerably affected the everyday linguistic practice of the communities to which it pertained, and which it had to confront. A number of contemporary linguistic events (the practice of language cultivation, the language shift among linguistic minorities in Hungary, the change of the use and function of languages and varieties in Hungary, the changes that took place in the

structures of these languages and varieties, etc.) can be explained in the light of this linguistic ideology. For my part, I have recently made an attempt to demonstrate and describe the significant influence Hungarian linguistic nationalism had on the language shift of traditionally German-speaking middle classes (cf. Maitz 2005; Maitz and Molnár 2004; Maitz 2007). However, I think that a detailed analysis of the causality between the discussed linguistic ideology and the linguistic behavior of the various social and speech communities, as well as recognition of the decisive influence linguistic ideologies may have on linguistic behavior is still among the tasks to be tackled by linguistic historiography and (historical) sociolinguistics.

Notes

* This paper gives an account of the initial results of a more comprehensive body of research, which aims to explore Hungarian aspects of linguistic nationalism. The work received financial help from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and I owe many thanks to Jenő Kiss (Budapest), Andreas H. Jucker (Zurich) and the two anonymous reviewers of my paper for their critical remarks and valuable advice, and to Klára Sándor (Szeged) for her support. I am really grateful to them.

1. In this paper I will use these concepts deliberately in a pre-explicative sense, which, of course, does not mean that I will use them undefined.

2. Due to the fact that linguistic nationalism is a linguistic ideology affecting numerous nations in Europe and determining the history of their languages in modern times and even today, it should be among the most important chapters of a study still to be written about the "linguistic history of Europe" with a comparative approach, a subject increasingly being studied and highlighted by scholars dealing with the history of language. For the outlooks, limits, and conceptions of European linguistic historiography, see Mattheier (1995, 1999), Munske (1995), Reichmann (2002).

3. According to Karl W. Deutsch's universal definition, nationalism gives high priority to the interests of the nation, their representation and practice in the face of foreigners (cf. Deutsch 1972: 26).

4. At this point a remark is in order: power did not and could not use the national language as a tool of power in every case. For that matter, the official language policy of the era under consideration was far too liberal to be directly traced back to the inherent value system of linguistic nationalism, the prominent linguistic ideology of the period. Hungary's Ethnicities and Public Elementary Schools Act passed in 1868, regulating the language rights of the country's ethnicities was, in fact, one of the most liberal regulations of its kind in contemporary Europe (for the texts of the Acts see Maitz 2005: 201ff.). This, however, can by no means be regarded as a contradiction since it is only in rare cases, primarily with dictatorial forms of government, that Power can afford the luxury of totally subordinating its political and judiciary practice to its own ideology, disregarding any other external factors, such as diplomatic ones.

5. Baron Dezső Bánffy was prime minister of Hungary between 1895 and 1899. His radical views on ethnic politics largely accounted for the deepening of the crisis of the Austro-Hungarian dualistic settlement in Hungary at the turn of the century.

6. More on relevant data and detailed analyses in Maitz (2005), Maitz and Molnár (2004).

7. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 'Guardian of the Hungarian Language' was launched by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1872 with the specific purpose of language cultivation. The journal targeted a wide audience seeking to involve the literate middle class in the discussion and solution of actual problems and broader issues of language and language use. As a result, it was among the most popular journals of its time.

8. This is especially hard to trace because these social formations differ from the (literate) middle class in the lack of conscious reflections on art, language, and literature (cf. Koselleck 1990: 41), while this reflection is exactly what could give a clue to the understanding of their standards.

9. Ferenc Kazinczy (1759–1831) was the leading figure of a movement called "language reform" which lasted from the end of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century that, clubbing together contemporary Hungarian writers, grammarians, and lexicographers, aimed to standardize the Hungarian language by working out and codifying linguistic standards. For the history of the movement within the context of Hungarian linguistic standardization processes see Benkő (1992).

10. Sándor Petőfi and János Arany were prominent figures of nineteenth-century Hungarian literature.

11. The word does not originate from German, and we do not know of any provenly German influence regarding its function in the citation (cf. Benkő 1993). Another part of the writing reveals that, according to the author the proper, that is "truly Hungarian", approving answer to a yes-no question containing a preverb is the preverb itself: *Megtanúltad-e már a leczkédet?* 'Have you finished with your homework?' — *Meg*. 'I have.'

12. Of course, this view is not an exclusively Hungarian phenomenon, as it is at least as predominant in contemporary German literature, for instance. See e.g. entry *Muttersprache* in: Schmid (ed.). (1875).

Sources

Albert, János. 1894. A magyar nyelv jelene és jövője I. Hol a hiba? *Magyar Nyelvőr* 23, 241–247.
Árpádfi Géza. 1872. A népnyelv s néphagyományok gyűjtésének ügye. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 1, 38–41.
Forgó, Jenő. 1917. *Társalgás és udvarlás könyve*. 4., bővített kiadás. Budapest: Magyar Könyvkiadó.
Gonda, Béla. 1920. *Jó modor — jó társaság*. 2. kiadás. Budapest: A szerző saját kiadása.
Herder, Johann Gottfried. 1989. *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*. Ed. by Martin Bollacher. Frankfurt/Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag (=Johann Gottfried Herder: Werke in zehn Bänden. Ed. by Martin Bollacher et al., vol. 6).

Jókai Mór. 1888. A magyar nyelv sajátságai. In: Az Osztrák-Magyar Monarchia irásban és képben. Magyarország I. kötete. Rudolf trónörökös főherczeg Ő császári és királyi Fensége kezdeményezéséből és közreműködésével. Budapest: A Magyar Királyi Államnyomda kiadása, 283–290.

Mollay, Károly. 1939/40. *Bors Sámuel magyar nyelvpályázata 1825-ben. Adalék a magyar népnyelvi kutatás történetéhez.* Különnyomat a salgótarjáni m. kir. állami gimnázium és kereskedelmi középiskola 1939–40. évi Évkönyvéből.

Pulszky, Ferencz, and Pál Gyulai. 1878. A magyar közönséghez! Fölhívás egy nemzeti ügy támogatására. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 7, 145–148.

R[ádl], Ö[dön]. 1867. *Illemtan a tanuló ifjuság számára*. Nagyvárad: Hügel Ottó.

Schmid, K. A. (ed.). 1875. *Enzyklopädie des gesamten Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens*. Gotha: Besser.

Szász, Károly. 1872. *„Igen!"*. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 1, 80–82.

Simonyi, Zsigmond. 1917. Magyar név. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 46, 201–205.

Szarvas, Gábor. 1872. Felszólítás. Gyűjtsük a néphagyományokat! *Magyar Nyelvőr* 1, 53–54.

Toldy, Ferenc. 1859. *Kazinczy és kora*. Pest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Vizoly, Zakariás. 1880. *Germán elemek a magyarban*. Déva: Hirsch Adolf.

Volf, György. 1872. Idegen csemeték. Fattyú hajtások: Hamis. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 1, 342–343.

Volf, György. 1872a. Az idegen szavak és a purizmus. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 1, 393–401.

Volf, György. 1874. A nyelvújítás nyelvrontás. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 3, 54–65.

References

Barnes, Barry, David Bloor and John Henry. 1996. *Scientific Knowledge: A Sociological Analysis.* London: Athlone Press.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles S. Briggs. 2002. *Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bárczi, Géza. 1966. *A magyar nyelv életrajza*. 2nd ed. Budapest: Gondolat (German edition: Bárczi, Géza 2001. *Geschichte der ungarischen Sprache.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen).

Bartha, Csilla. 2000. A kétnyelvűség fogalma: tudománytörténeti vázlat. In: Anna Borbély (ed.). *Nyelvek és kultúrák érintkezése a Kárpát-medencében*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézetének Élőnyelvi Osztálya, 25–35.

Benkő, Loránd. 1992. Sprachliche Standardisierungsprozesse im Ungarischen. In: Ulrich Ammon, Klaus J. Mattheier and Peter H. Nelde (eds.). *Sociolinguistica. Internationales Jahrbuch für Europäische Soziolinguistik.* Vol. 6. *Nationalsprachenentstehung in Osteuropa.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 84–99.

Benkő, Loránd (ed.). 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Blommaert, Jan. 1997. Introduction: Language and politics, language politics and political linguistics. In: Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcaen (eds.). *Political Linguistics.* (Belgian Journal of Linguistics 11). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–10.

Blommaert, Jan, and Jef Verschueren. 1998. The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. In: Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 189–210.

Deutsch, Karl W. 1972. *Nationenbildung — Nationalstaat — Integration.* Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag.

Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction.* London: Verso.

Gal, Susan. 2001. Linguistic theories and national images in nineteenth-century Hungary. In: Susan Gal and Kathryn A. Woolard (eds.). *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority.* Manchester: St. Jerome, 30–45.

Gal, Susan. 2002. Language ideologies and linguistic diversity: Where culture meets power. In: László Keresztes and Sándor Maticsák (eds.). *A magyar nyelv idegenben.* Debrecen/Jyväskylä, 197–204.

Gardt, Andreas. 1999. Sprachpatriotismus und Sprachnationalismus. Versuch einer historisch-systematischen Bestimmung am Beispiel des Deutschen. In: Andreas Gardt, Ulrike Haß-Zumkehr and Thorsten Roelcke (eds.). *Sprachgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 89–113.

Gardt, Andreas. 2000. Sprachnationalismus zwischen 1850 und 1945. In: Andreas Gardt (ed.). *Nation und Sprache. Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 247–271.

Gardt, Andreas, Klaus J. Mattheier and Oskar Reichmann (eds.). 1995. *Sprachgeschichte des Neuhochdeutschen. Gegenstände, Methoden, Theorien.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Glatz, Ferenc. 1974. Polgári fejlődés és nacionalizmus Magyarországon a XIX. században. *Történelmi szemle* 17.4, 248–260.

Gouldner, Alvin Ward. 1976. *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, Grammar, and Future of Ideology*. New York: Seabury Press.

Herman, József. 1989. Conscience linguistique et diachronie. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguitique de Paris* 84.1, 1–19.

Herman, József. 2000. Nyelvi tudat, nyelvi változás, nyelvi politika. A mai romanisztika műhelyéből. *Magyar Tudomány* 2000/4, 385–396.

Koselleck, Reinhart. 1990. Einleitung — Zur anthropologischen und semantischen Struktur der Bildung. In: Reinhart Koselleck (ed.). *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*. Teil II. *Bildungsgüter und Bildungswissen*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 11–46.

Maitz, Péter. 2005. *Sozialpsychologie des Sprachverhaltens. Der deutsch-ungarische Sprachkonflikt in der Habsburgermonarchie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Maitz, Péter. 2007. The death of standard German in nineteenth-century Budapest. A case study on the role of linguistic ideologies in language shift. In: Stephan Elspaß, Nils Langer, Joachim Scharloth and Wim Vandenbussche (eds.). *Germanic Language Histories 'from Below' (1700 to 2000).* Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 405–421.

Maitz, Péter, and Anna Molnár. 2004. Zur Rolle sprachlicher Ideologien beim Sprachwechsel. Am Beispiel der deutschen Sprachgemeinschaft Ungarns im sprachnationalistischen 19. Jahrhundert. In: Dániel Czicza, Ildikó Hegedűs, Péter Kappel, and Attila Németh (eds.). *Wertigkeiten, Geschichten und Kontraste. Festschrift für Péter Bassola zum 60. Geburtstag.* Szeged: Grimm, 293–310.

Mattheier, Klaus J. 1995. Sprachgeschichte des Deutschen: Desiderate und Perspektiven. In: Andreas Gardt, Klaus J. Mattheier and Oskar Reichmann (eds.). *Sprachgeschichte des Neuhochdeutschen. Gegenstände, Methoden, Theorien.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1–18.

Mattheier, Klaus J. 1998. Kommunikationsgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Überlegungen zum Forschungsstand und zu Perspektiven der Forschungsentwicklung. In: Dieter Cherubim, Siegfried Grosse and Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.). *Sprache und bürgerliche Nation. Beiträge zur*

deutschen und europäischen Sprachgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1–45.
Mattheier, Klaus J. 1999. Historische Soziolinguistik: Ein Forschungsansatz für eine künftige europäische Sprachgeschichte. In: Helga Bister-Broosen (ed.). *Beiträge zur historischen Stadtsprachenforschung.* Wien: Edition Praesens, 223–234.
Munske, Horst Haider. 1995. Ist eine europäische Sprachgeschichtsschreibung möglich? In: Andreas Gardt, Klaus J. Mattheier and Oskar Reichmann (eds.). *Sprachgeschichte des Neuhochdeutschen. Gegenstände, Methoden, Theorien.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 399–412.
Niederhauser, Emil. 2000. A magyarországi asszimiláció problémái. Utószó Pukánszky Béla könyvének új kiadásához. In: Béla Pukánszky 2000/1940, 174–189.
Nohlen, Dieter (ed.). 1996. *Wörterbuch Staat und Politik.* Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung.
Pukánszky, Béla. 2000/1940. *Német polgárság magyar földön.* Budapest: Lucidus.
Reichmann, Oskar. 2002. Nationale und europäische Sprachgeschichtsschreibung. In: Dieter Cherubin [sic!], Karlheinz Jakob and Angelika Linke (eds.). *Neue deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Mentalitäts-, kultur- und sozialgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 25–42.
Romaine, Suzanne. 1982. *Socio-historical Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sándor, Klára. 2003. Nyelvtervezés, nyelvpolitika, nyelvművelés. In: Ferenc Kiefer (ed.). *A magyar nyelv könyve.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 381–409.
Scharloth, Joachim. 2005. *Sprachnormen und Mentalitäten. Sprachbewusstseinsgeschichte in Deutschland im Zeitraum von 1766 und 1785*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Schieffelin, Bambi B., Kathryn A. Woolard and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.). 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Schmitt, Christian. 1996. Sprachpflege und Sprachreinigung. In: Hans Goebl, Peter H. Nelde, Zdenek Starý and Wolfgang Wölck (eds.). *Contact Linguistics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Vol. 1. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 871–880.
Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language Structure and linguistic ideology. In: Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.). *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society, 193–247.
Stroebe, Wolfgang, Miles Hewstone and Geoffrey M. Stephenson. (eds.). 1996. *Sozialpsychologie*. 3rd ed. Berlin etc.: Springer.
Thompson, John B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology.* Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In: Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity, (eds.). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–47.

Author's address

University of Debrecen
Institute of German Studies
Egyetem tér 1
H-4032 Debrecen
Hungary

mensaje30@hotmail.com

About the author

Péter Maitz pursued German and Polish Studies in Debrecen and Heidelberg and is currently assistant professor at the Institute of German Studies at the University of Debrecen in Hungary. He holds a PhD in German Linguistics from the same University. His research interests are in sociolinguistics, historical linguistics with a special focus on historical sociolinguistics, contact linguistics and dialectology. He has recently carried out research into language maintenance and language shift of the German community of Hungary and has published the monograph *Sozialpsychologie des Sprachverhaltens. Der deutsch-ungarische Sprachkonflikt in der Habsburgermonarchie* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005).