

The possibilities of language choice: an 1808 application for the introduction of Hungarian in a multilingual country

ALINKA AJKAY

Abstract

At the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, Hungary was characterised by ethnic diversity. Nevertheless, for a long time there was no sign of this causing any particular tension. The language of everyday life was characterised by pragmatism, and the language of public life, education and science was uniformly Latin. Joseph II's language decree of 1784 (which made German the official language instead of Latin) started the process that would culminate in the language decree of 1844, which made Hungarian the official language. In the first decade of the 19th century, there was a revival of the language issue, with the publication of a series of documents on the language. At the Diet of 1807, there were such heated debates about the language that the Viennese court and the secret police thought it would be a good idea to hold a competition to see whether Hungarian was suitable for official use in Hungary. 21 contributions were received for this competition. Almost half of the applicants were from Upper Hungary, all of them Protestants, most of them pastors. They were the founders of one of the earliest scientific-literary societies, Solennia, in 1808. The works of the society's members were published every year in the journal Solennia, which was published in four languages (Latin, Hungarian, German, Slovak).

Keywords: 18th-19th century literature; language; multilingualism; Upper-Hungarian literature; scientific society; Joseph II's language decree

Subject-Affiliation in New CEEOL: Language and Literature – Studies of Literature
Hungarian Literature

DOI: 10.36007/eruedu.2024.1.071-083

Hungary in the 18th century was characterised by a high degree of ethnic and linguistic paucity, with only about 40% of the total population having Hungarian as their mother tongue. Despite this, for a long time there was no particular evidence that the lingual division caused tensions. The authors wrote, preached and taught in two or three languages, and abroad they called themselves *Hungarus* (Hungarians) regardless of their mother tongue. The use of language in everyday life was characterised by pragmatism; only in public life and in education and the sciences was there a single, universally accepted language, the Latin. It was not the mother tongue of any of the nationalities, so its prominent use meant that no son of any nation could feel marginalised. This relatively peaceful (lingual) situation was disrupted by Joseph II's language decree (which made German official in Hun-

gary) in 1784. The fierce protest against the decree was not only triggered by the disappearance of Latin, but mainly by the fact that the role of the hitherto neutral language would be taken over by a minority, and not even the language of the largest minority. The events of the first decade of the 19th century, which have been relatively little studied, were very important and indispensable preconditions for the later achievements of the reform era. There was a revival in both political and literary life, and on the language issue the two cannot be separated, since language is as much a political issue as a literary one. One of the important results of the political movement of the Order, of the Hungarian aristocracy, which developed after the death of Joseph II, was that it introduced the defence of the Hungarian language into political life and public discourse. It is around this time that we can observe a process in which we can no longer speak of a *natio Hungarica*, i.e. a nobility of Hungary (which may be Croatian, Hungarian, Slovakian, etc.), but instead of a *Hungarian* nobility with a lingual consciousness. By this time, the Hungarian language was no longer merely a suitable means of oral or written communication, but had gradually become one of the most important expressions of national identity. From the first decade of the 19th century, the language issue gradually became a significant factor in the politics of the nobility, who sought to recognise the Hungarian language as a state language in the country.

The Hungarian Diet of 1807, which Archduke Joseph, the Prince Regent, described as one of the most important of all the Diets since the reign of the Habsburgs, was watched with great interest by the nations of Europe (Wertheimer 1896). Its importance was due to the fact that the decisions taken at the Diet were crucial for putting the monarchy's finances in order and strengthening its military defence. It was at this Diet that the Hungarian language issue was fought over more than ever before, which can also be explained by the fierce mood of the Diet, since the issue itself was actually discussed surprisingly little. In fact, in the Diet from April to December, the Members of the Diet met ninety-five times, and the Hungarian language was discussed in only six sessions. In addition, the ruler rejected all the bills on the language issue, so there was virtually no progress on the matter. Yet its importance is undisputed, and is best illustrated by the fact that the Vienna secret police and the government circles announced their tender on the Hungarian language after the language discussions of this Diet. Contributions were invited to answer the question whether it was possible to make the Hungarian language official in Hungary. In March 1808, the Viennese government, on behalf of the publisher Cotta of Tübingen, advertised a competition in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*. The deadline for submissions was the end of July, and 21 contributions were received in German, Latin and German, anonymously and with a sign. The Viennese government circles hoped that the competition would not only raise public awareness, but also bring other important benefits. On the one hand, they could assume that some of the entries would demonstrate the inadequacy of the Hungarian language, and on the other hand, they could hope that the writings, which were in fact political in nature but disguised as academic or literary, would expose the writers themselves and thus lead to the possible formation of rebel organisations. The court was disappointed in this expectation, however, as some of the received contributions

considered Hungarian suitable for use as an administrative and state language. Among them, Ferenc Kazinczy's work stood out, in which he clearly demonstrated that Hungarian language and literature, given its development, would be suitable for use as the state language of the country. His work was not even allowed to be published in its entirety until 85 years after Kazinczy's death (Kazinczy, 1916).

Yet it is Kazinczy's work that has reached one of the most important public forums of the time, the Diet, in the shortest time. In December 1811, József Dessewffy mentioned it in one of his speeches as one of the first examples of a contemporary author's work being cited in a political forum. However, it was not subsequently praised in any official or other public forum, nor was it mentioned for a very long time. There are several possible reasons for this silence: first of all, the fact that it did not appear in print, only a part of this contribution, a literary history, and the entire text itself sank into the Vienna archives unfinished; and secondly, perhaps, that the attention of Kazinczy and his contemporaries soon turned in another direction, the debate about the language reform began, which - temporarily - pushed everything else out of the centre of interest. The elevation of the Hungarian language to the level of a European language meant, first and foremost, the renewal, supplementation and expansion of its vocabulary, i.e. the creation of new words to express all the concepts and ideas that emerged as a result of the social, economic and cultural developments of the time.

We do not know much about the contributions submitted by the deadline of late July 1808, as the competition was not announced, and the contributions were lost in the archives of the Vienna secret police, most of which - including the entries - were destroyed in the early twentieth century. Entries had to be submitted in German or Latin, with an indication. It is therefore very difficult to find a reference to these, as we have no title at all, and the only list of authors is that of Gusztáv Heinrich from 1916 (Kazinczy 1916, 25–28). Nevertheless, it is worth investigating further, as it is possible to find unknown connections, even by browsing the list of applicants. Heinrich - who had seen the documents in one piece before the archives fire - published the German-language opinion of one of the judges, Jernej Kopitar, on the entries in an *appendix* after the text of Kazinczy's contribution (Kazinczy 1916, 178–194). Along with his own basic data, this is our main clue as to the identity of the candidates and the content of the entries. Some of the entrants are multilingual, and for some it is difficult to tell what their mother tongue is, typical of the multilingual *Hungarus*. Twenty-one entries were received, in alphabetical order of authors:

Amilkár Barrakóczy - All we know about Gusztáv Heinrich is that he sent his entry from Keszthely. According to Kopitar, he is a cleric, perhaps a Catholic priest, and the tone of his entry is rather sarcastic. Barrakóczy Amilkár is most likely a pseudonym, perhaps a Hungarian distortion of the name of the Punic general Hamilkar Barkasz. For example, a letter of Berzsényi (to Ferenc Kazinczy, Nikla, 5 January 1811): "The district from the Danube, so called, was mainly inhabited by German peoples, with whom the Hungarians, being strangers from Hamilcar, never mixed, so I do not know of a single village where they live mixed" (Berzsényi 2014, 174). He was ready with his writing in 1805, he mentions the dispute between András

Cházár and János Fejes. On the topic and the *Hungaruses* of the 19th century (Miskolczy, 2009, 12).

Samu Bredeczky - Bredeczky Sámuel (1772-1812) Lutheran pastor, teacher, writer. His schools were Késmárk (Kežmarok), Csetnek (Štítňik), Sopron, Jena. At the time of the competition he was Lutheran pastor in Lemberg (Lviv). In addition to his ecclesiastical and teaching duties, he was also a scholar, his works on geography and topography were published in German.

Gábor Döbrentei - (1785-1851) Lutheran poet, writer. He was educated in Pápa, Sopron, Wittenberg, Leipzig. Lajos Gyulai's tutor in Oláhándrásfalva (Săcel).

Johannes von Eigel - Heinrich says that he is a senior citizen and that he sent his application from Pécs. Kopitar writes only one line about him, which tells us which language he recommends, and that his entry is only half an arc. No other information could be found out about him. Not to be confused with John Engel's Baptist (Miskolczy, 2009, 9).

János Fejes - (Johannes Fejes; 1764-1826) Lutheran court judge, lawyer. His schools were Osgyán (Ožďany), Késmárk (Kežmarok); Pozsony (Bratislava), Bécs (Wien), Göttingen. His works were published in four languages (Latin, Hungarian, German, Slovak)

János Genersich - (Johannes Genersich; 1761-1825) Lutheran historian, ecclesiastical lawyer, theologian, teacher. His schools were Késmárk (Kežmarok), Debrecen, Felsősjó (Vyšná Slaná), Pozsony (Bratislava), Jena. Teacher at Késmárk. He was sent to the Reformed College in Debrecen to learn Hungarian and to Felsősjó to learn Slovakian. His historical works and youth novels were published in German. Kopitar says that in his essay, he takes the anti-Hungarian arguments from Fejes' pamphlet (Fejes 1807).

Kristóf Heisser - Heinrich has an Anonymous candidate in his list. I came across his name in a letter written by István Horváth to Pál Szemere in December 1811. "You will remember that a German answer to the question of the Reward, for which the answers had to be sent to the bookkeeper Cotta in Tübingen, was printed last year, or even a few years before in Pozsony. Being here, I was not amused to learn its author as a great friend of our language. To many of my questions, Landes, a book-keeper here, who is my servant because of my many purchases, and who printed the book, confessed that it was made by Heisser Kristóf in Transylvania for the Protestant schools in the Korona, and showed me the letter he wrote to him about the book. - Who shall be this untutored Teacher? I do not know!" (National Széchényi Library Budapest, Manuscript Archives, Correspondence, István Horvát to Pál Szemere, 17-22 December 1811, 43-44.) I write it in Hungarian because that is how Horvát wrote it. The little we know about him comes from Horváth, for example that he was a teacher in the Protestant schools in Transylvania. According to Kopitar, he was a native German speaker, which is also clear from his application.

Mátyás Holko - (Matej Holko; 1757-1832) Lutheran pastor. His schools were Dobsina (Dobšiná), Osgyán (Ožďany), Lőcse (Levoča), Wittenberg. Kopitar particularly recommends him for the prize, considering his Latinity wonderful. He argues in favour of Latin, even though he is a native Hungarian ("das Ungrische ist meine

Muttersprache” Kazinczy 1916, 192). His writing some twenty years later reveals that Hungarian is (no longer) his primary language.

Ferenc Kazinczy - (1759-1831) Calvinist, Abaúj county. Jernej Kopitar identifies only two of the works he considers to be by Kazinczy. (“Wenn wir uns nicht sehr irren, so ist der Dichter Kazinczy der Verfasser”. Kazinczy 1916, 183.)

Nik. von Kerchelich - Nikola Krčelić, from a Catholic family in Zagreb, nothing more is known about him. Kopitar also writes only one sentence about his work, that he is against the Hungarian, good, but too synoptic.

János Legéndy - Heinrich says that he is a Piarist from Trencsén (Trenčín). Kopitar is also very terse, saying that Legéndy is arguing for Hungarian, but he is not fit for purpose, and therefore his contribution is not competitive.

János József Maisch - Johann Josef Maisch Heinrich is known to have been the surgeon of Wimbsbach. Kopitar says he is unworthy because he did not grasp the issue. He specifically says of the epilogue that it is benign nonsense. (“Der Epilog ist gutmüthig dumm . Kazinczy 1916, 189.)

György Nagy - György János Nagy (1735-1812) Lutheran pastor. His schools were Sopron and Jena. Lived in Harka and Sopron, taught Hungarian to native Germans and German to native Hungarians. This is the second time that Kopitar names the author, saying that Rector Nagy wanted to earn good money as a Hungarian or German language teacher. His opinion of the contribution is that it is beyond criticism. (“Rector Nagy möchte sich gerne schönes Geld verdienen, sei es als ungrischer oder als deutscher Sprachmeister. [...] Unter aller Kritik.” Kazinczy 1916, 192.)

von Neustädter - Heinrich says that he is a court accountant, a bailiff of the counties of Nógrád and Trencsén, but he has not been identified. The Neustädter family had a branch in the Highlands (and was also Transylvanian Saxon), there are records of them in Pozsony (Bratislava), Eperjes (Prešov), Nagyszombat (Trnava), a similar German-speaking Lutheran family as the majority of the applicants. One branch of the family was ennobled in 1756, perhaps indicated by the *von* before the surname (Tóth 2018, 11).

Valter von Philipps - All we know about him is that he was an Austrian mayor from Bonyhád. Unfortunately, no other information about him could be found.

András Plachy - (Ondrej Plachý; 1755-1810), Lutheran pastor. His schools were in Nemesvarbók (Zemiansky Vrbovok), Rimaszombat (Rimavská Sobota), Pozsony (Bratislava), Leipzig. His works in Latin and Slovak survive. Kopitar notes his preference for Latin. He speaks with a strong Slavic consciousness, saying that there is not a single corner of Hungary without Slavs. He also refers to Herder’s prediction that in a few tens of generations the Hungarians would die out.

János Pollagh Ker. - Heinrich says that he was in Pest at the time of the application, unfortunately we don’t know anything else about him.

Roth - Johann Theodor Roth (1759-1841) Protestant Bavarian town councillor and lawyer. Gustav Heinrich says that he was the president of the Protestant Consortium of Ulm. He held various public offices until his retirement in 1825. Kopitar quotes most from his work, summarising it. Roth proposes the Hungarian language as a complete outsider, Kopitar considers him the most deserving to win the prize.

József Schihulizsky - I could not find anyone with the name Heinrich mentioned, but József Schihulizsky does exist, at the time of writing he was a tax office auditor of Csertész (Čertišné) in Zemplén county. In the *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* Volume XII, 1817, among the new books, there is a mention of a book on beekeeping (*A méheknek kettős köpükben leendő könnyű, új és hasznos tartásokról, mely szerint a méhek könnyen szaporíthatnak és kis fáradsággal felette nagy hasznot béhajthatnak*, Kassa, 1817. *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* 1817, 137). Unfortunately, we cannot say for sure that he is the same as the author of the application. Kopitar does not say much about the contribution, believing him to be a Catholic priest, and all we learn is that he argues for the retention of Latin.

Wilhelm Armand Schmidt - Wilhelm Armand Schmidt is a doctor from Késmárk (Kežmarok). The Lutheran family was a major donator to the library in Késmárk.

András Thorwächter - (Andreas Thorwächter; 1760 d.-1815) Schools: Nagyszeben (Sibiu), Marosvásárhely (Târgu Mures), Jena. According to Heinrich Kopitar wrote that he was a Lutheran pastor in Nagyapold (Apoldu de Sus). He writes his essay because the subject is of interest to the Transylvanian people.

Of the twenty-one applicants, five submitted their contribution in Latin (Barrakóczy, Holko, Plachy, Schihulizsky, Thorwächter), while the other sixteen submitted their entries in German. In response to the question asked, Hungarian was recommended: a) unconditionally by 5 (Döbrenței, Kazinczy, Legéndy, Nagy, Roth); b) conditionally (in addition to German and Latin) by 4 (Eigel, Genersich, Maisch, Thorwächter). Heisser (unnamed), Kerchelich (alternatively to Latin), Maisch, Philipps, Pollagh, Torwächter, so 5 or 4; for Latin, Barrakóczy, Bredeczky, Fejes, Kerchelich (possibly to German), Neustädter, Plachy, Schihulizsky, Schmidt, 8 or 9 in all. These are the persons of Gustav Heinrich, who omitted Mátyás Holko from the list.

Religious divisions may be an important consideration for applicants. Of the twenty-one participants, we do not know the exact religion of six (Eigel, Maisch, Pollagh, Schihulizsky, von Philipps, von Neustädter). Only three Catholics can be identified (Barrakóczy, Legéndy, Kerchelich), the remaining twelve are Protestants, most of them Lutheran (Bredeczky, Döbrenței, Fejes, Genersich, Holko, Nagy, Plachy, Schmidt, Torwächter - ev.; Heisser, Kazinczy, Roth - Calvinist or unidentified protestant).

Of the twenty-one participants in the Tübingen competition, five came from Transdanubia (Barrakóczy, Eigel, Nagy, Philipps, Pollagh), three from Transylvania (Döbrenței, Heisser, Thorwächter) and four from outside Hungary (Bredeczky, Kerchelich, Maisch, Roth). It is striking that almost half of the applicants - nine of them - came from the Highland counties of present-day Slovakia. Two were from the counties of Gömör and Kis-Hont (Mátyás Holko and János Fejes), two from the county of Szepes (János Genersich and Wilhelm Schmidt Armand), three from Trencsén (János Legéndy, András Plachy and von Neustädter), and two from Zemplén (Ferenc Kazinczy and József Schihulizsky). Almost all were Lutherans, and presumably knew each other.

Two of them, Mátyás Holko and János Fejes, were also closely related to each other. I use the Hungarian form of their names, although they all wrote in several

languages and their names can be found in literature in several forms (e.g. Matej Holko, Johannes Fejes). The elder of the two, Holko (9 February 1757 - 20 July 1832), became a Lutheran pastor in Alsó-Székálnok (Nižný Skálnik) and later in Rimabánya (Rimavská Baňa). János Fejes (2 July 1764 - 16 March 1826), after studying law, became a lay helper of the Lutheran Church and a supervisor of the Kis-Hont parish, in addition to his county office. His father, the renowned jurist György Fejes, was born in Székálnok. It was on the initiative of the two of them that one of the earliest literary and scientific societies was founded in 1808, the year of the Tübingen competition. The society was founded to establish the Kis-Hont library, which was founded in September of that year in Székálnok. On 13 September each year, the members of the society met and read their works to each other, which were then published in print the following year. The publication had the same title as the society: *Solennia memoriae anniversariae bibliothecae Kis-Hontanae evangelicorum A. c. publice in Alsó Székálnok*. The booklets, averaging six volumes (roughly 90-120 pages), were published annually with the works of the members in four languages (Latin, Hungarian, German, Slovak). Of these, Latin is the most commonly used language, and Hungarian the least used. The society was composed mostly of Lutheran pastors from the area, with the addition of lay helpers. We have no exact data about the membership, apart from the two founders (who wrote in Latin, Hungarian and Slovak) we can only list the authors of the yearbook:

János Chalupka: teacher of the Lutheran Lyceum in Késmárk (Kežmarok), Lutheran pastor of Breznóbánya (Brezno) - in Latin, Hungarian, German and Slovak;

András Czener: vice-deacon of Kis-Hont, Lutheran pastor and librarian of Székálnok (Nižný Skálnik) - in Latin and Slovak;

János Fizel: Teacher at the Lutheran high school in Tiszolc (Tisovec) - in Slovak;

Miklós Földváry: bailiff - in Hungarian;

György Gál: Lutheran pastor in Rahó (Rahiv) - in Latin;

Mátyás Haluschka: Lutheran pastor in Rimakokova (Kokava nad Rimavicou) - in Latin and Slovak;

János Hoznek: Teacher at the Lutheran high school in Osgyán (Ožďany) - in Latin;

Mihály Kolbenheyer: archdeacon in Kis-Hont, Lutheran pastor of Nyustya (Hnúšťa) - in Latin, Hungarian and German;

Sámuel Kollár: Lutheran pastor of Cserencsény (Čerenčany) - in Latin;

János Kortsek: Lutheran pastor of Nyustya (Hnúšťa) - in Latin and Slovak;

Krmann János: Lutheran pastor of Kraszkó (Kraskovo) - in Latin and Slovak;

Péter Kubinyi: bailiff, royal councillor - in Latin;

János Laurentzy (Laurency): Lutheran pastor and librarian of Székálnok (Nižný Skálnik) - in Latin and German;

István Lipták: Lutheran pastor of Pongyelok (Hrnčiarška Ves) - in Latin;

Antal Mocsáry: chief slave judge of Nógrád - in Hungarian;

István Pekár: deacon of Kis-Hont, Lutheran pastor of Rimakokova (Kokava nad Rimavicou) - in Latin and Hungarian;

Péter Pál Schramko: Lutheran pastor of Klenóc (Klenovec) - in Latin and German;
 Mátyás Gáspár Schulek: Lutheran pastor of Tiszolc (Tisovec) - in German and Slovak;
 Mihály Steigel (Staygel): Lutheran pastor of Rimabrezo (Rimavské Brezovo) - in Latin and Slovak;
 Mihály Szabó: Lutheran pastor and librarian of Szkálnok (Nižný Skálnik) - in Latin;
 János Szepessy: Teacher at the Lutheran high school in Tiszolc (Tisovec) - in Latin and Slovak;
 Dániel Valentinyi: Lutheran pastor in Rahó (Rahiv) - in Hungarian;
 János Valentinyi: Lutheran pastor in Szirák - in Hungarian.

The society was also in contact with such important persons as the historian László Bartholomaeides, András Cházár, the historian László Bartholomaeides, and the writer of the history of literature and the writer of the history of literature Pál Wallaszky. Seventeen of the twenty-three people listed are pastors.

Not all of the works presented at the annual celebrations were printed, but it is also possible that the very long works were not read out, but only printed. Therefore, at the end of the volumes, in addition to the table of contents, there is usually a list of the other works read but not printed (*Praeterea Lectorem*). The first issue was already trilingual (Latin, Hungarian and Slovak), and this multilingualism was present in the Society's publications throughout the period up to 1842. Latin was the language most often chosen or used, because it was the language of science and could be used to express things clearly and precisely, and because it was the *lingua Franca* understood by all members of the Society, who had different mother tongues. Hungarian and Germanic were the languages least frequently used. The choice of Hungarian is mainly personal, used by some members. The earliest is István Pekár, who also wrote in the first volume, and after that we can meet his Hungarian-language works in the 1920s. The work of Antal Mocsáry is also early, and he wrote exclusively in Hungarian at the turn of the decade and the twenties. Miklós Földvály's works also appeared in the 1920s, and he also wrote only in Hungarian. A little later, Mihály Kolbenheyer, who worked in three languages, and János Chalupka, who is the most versatile in the use of languages, wrote in all four. Finally, in time, we must mention the Valentinyi, who wrote in Hungarian. The lingual change of the early 1840s is already noticeable in the writings of Dániel Valentinyi, and *Solennia* is also becoming more consciously Hungarian, with the last issue of 1842 already containing three works in Hungarian, and the index of unpublished but read-over works is also in Hungarian. The language choices of the earlier period show that Hungarian is the language of choice of the less learned minds, the few lay members who use it exclusively, while the majority of the clerically educated are multilingual.

The work of the society was reported in two journals of national importance: the *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* in 1826 and the *Felső magyar-országai Minerva* in 1829. In the fourth issue of the tenth year of the *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*, a long review appeared in the *Hazai Literaturá* section, immediately after Dániel Berzsenyi's treatise on verse forms, on the occasion of the *Solennia* issue that had

just appeared as a result of the 1825 celebrations. The author, Pál Edvi Illés, also a Lutheran pastor, is highly complimentary of the Society's work and scholarly spirit, and merely criticises that it would be good if more studies in Hungarian appeared in it (Edvi, 1826). *Felső Magyar-országi Minerva* is a little terser, but much more critical, and makes the same criticisms, only much more emphatically. In this case, too, the basis for the report is a currently published volume, the 1828 celebration. The author of the article is no less a person than Ágoston Kubinyi, a friend of Kazinczy and the Pest circle, a member of the Academy, the future director of the National Museum, and an active member of numerous foundations and scientific societies. The article appears in the fourth book of the fifth volume of the journal. Kubinyi reports that he did not read this publication as a novelty, he was already familiar with the previous ones and was pleased to find that "the Lutheran Pastors of our neighbouring Lutheran Church not only do what they are bound to do, but also, by promoting the sciences and by useful institutes, they stir up scientific fires and even stimulate them in the inhabitants of my dear Hungarian homeland" (Edvi 1826). Then, in the next almost one page, as if stepping back in time three or four decades, we are reminded of the lingual debates of the late 18th century, and the arguments and difficulties that have been made many times before are brought up again. In particular, how much progress has been made in science since the time of Emperor Joseph, how many scientific books and periodicals have been published (and he lists them), yet we are not able to make the same progress in science as the English or the French, because it is still fashionable for our nation to waste time learning many foreign languages. His final conclusion is that if they took all this to heart, they would find subscribers not just for six times as much work as they do now, but for up to four times as much (Kubinyi 1829).

The two founding authors of *Solennia* are known to have entered the Tübingen competition. Tracing the texts of the contributions is not an easy task, but in the case of János Fejes we can assume that he most probably submitted the work he had published in Pest a year earlier (Fejes 1807). Kazinczy also discusses it in his own entry.

We do not know much about Mátyás Holko's application, but Heinrich's edition reveals that he submitted his work in Latin. However, we can still get some idea of his thoughts on the language issue, as many of his writings have appeared in *Solennia*. His speech of 13 September 1826 to the youth of Hungary on the learning of the Hungarian language: *Oratio ad Juventutem Hungaram de Studio Lingvae Hungaricae cum Studio Lingvae Latinae, ejusque Classicorum Autorum conjugendo; propulsandoque contemtu et odio Concivium diversas Lingvas loquentium, utpote ad provehendam culturam Lingvae Hungaricae summe necessariis remediis* is the somewhat lengthy title, which is almost a summary of the contents (Holko 1826). It recommends the study of Hungarian in conjunction with the study of Latin, listing the classical authors. Furthermore, in this speech Holko shows how to ward off the contempt and hatred of fellow citizens who speak different languages, and what are the remedies necessary for the progress of the cultivation of Hungarian. Holko sensed - and this must have been the occasion for his speech - that by 1825-26 real changes had finally begun to take place in the

field of language (one need only recall István Széchenyi's offer in November 1825 to set up a scientific society to standardise language), and that the reform era was having an impact in all areas. He begins by saying that in recent years the love of the Hungarian language has flourished in the country, especially where it had been neglected and suppressed by German, because those who were the masters of the others wanted to appear German not only in their language but also in their dress. (A pluribus jam inde Annis evigilavit in Patria nostra amor Lingvae Hungaricae, maximeque incensi sunt animi gentis Hungaricae studio ejus tum, ubi maxime neglecta, et per Lingvam Germanicam quasi oppressa prostrataque jacuisset. Ubi paene exulabat ex aulis, circulis, et ore, nobilissimorum Civium Hungariae. Dum jam prope omnes, qui aliis praestabant, non solum lingua, sed veste quoque Germani videri volebant. 111 p.) It is possible that he could be referring to István Széchenyi himself (and the young aristocrats who followed him), since it was the magnates who had neglected their mother tongue, yet now the descendants of one of the most important families made a very serious offer of support for the cultivation of the Hungarian language through the academy.

Holko continued his speech by discussing the Joseph period, analysing its results in a new and surprising light. As an ardent Josephinist, he even interpreted the language decree of 1784 as a positive decision to promote the Hungarian language - however strange this may sound. According to Holko, Joseph II also succeeded, against his will and contrary intentions, in getting the Hungarians back into Hungarian clothes, and in reviving the Hungarian language in the courts after it had been banned. For it often happens that people only discover their possessions when they have lost them. (Josephus autem II-dus fuit Vir ille mirabilis, qui prouti alia multa eximia inopinataque praestitit, sic Hungaros quoque, licet invitus et contrarium intendens, veste Hungarica induit, et Lingvam Hungaricam e Foris Judicariis proscribendo, in vitam revocavit. Prouti namque fieri solet, ut bona sua homines tum solummodo ubi amittunt recte cognoscere aestimareque incipiant. 111-112 p.) So Joseph considered the protest against the compulsory German language to be a merit, because in this way he - indirectly - supported the development of the Hungarian language. Holko then pointed out that indeed, from that time onwards, the Hungarians had been pulling out all the stops and were tireless in this work, and we are already witnessing the fruits and progress of the Hungarian language. Most recently, at the Diet in Pozsony, selected members of our country also took up the national language: in schools, churches, on the lips of fellow citizens, and finally, by founding the Academy, they put the crown on it. (Ab hoc inde tempore, in hac excolenda perficienda promovendaque, omnem moverunt lapidem, unde indefessi hujus studii, eximios sane fructus et progressus Lingvae Hungaricae cum voluptate cernimus. Nuper autem lectissimi Patriae nostrae Viri, Posonii Comitibus agentes, Lingvam quoque Nationis suae cura sua amplexi, saluberrimis Statutis, et generosa Liberalitate provehere, in Scholas, Tempora, et ora omnium Concivium suorum inducere, simulque Academia Scientiarum Hungarica coronare, decreverunt. 112 p.) Here he made it clear that this speech was also the result of the first Reform Parliament of 1825. This concludes the introductory section, and Holko turns to the substance of what he had to say.

Speaking to the Hungarian youth, he pointed out that they could hope for the coming of a golden age by learning the language. But in the meantime, those who advocated the learning of the Hungarian language had committed a double sin: firstly, they had neglected Latin, and secondly, they had neglected the other nations of our country and their languages. Many people believe that it is enough to know Hungarian and then they have an open path to any office. But not so! Other languages must be learned, especially Latin, so that the language has elegance, weight, brilliance and beauty. (His auspiciis Tu Juventus Hungara, accedente Tuo quoque amore et studio recte excolendae perpoliendaeque Lingvae Tuae vernaculae, aurea illius tempora sperare videreque poteris. Interim penes omnem hanc contentionem, amorem, studiumque, quo inflammati sunt animi Hungarorum erga Lingvam suam, multos duplici ratione peccare, et nimio, ne dicam praecipiti, eam promovendi studio, communem illius amorem, atque culturam impedire animadverto, nempe; Hos penes culturam Lingvae Hungaricae, negligendo studio Lingvae Latinae: Illos despiciendo, aversando, et contemnendo alias Nationes Patriae nostrae, eorumque Lingvam. [...] Qui ad consequendam doctrinam, nomen, atque gloriam sufficere sibi putant cognitionem solius Lingvae Hungaricae, et si hac fari possint, sibi jam apertum esse aditum ad quaevis munia et honores in Patria sua. Sed nolite credere O Juvenes! [...] per studium aliarum Lingvarum, inprimis autem Lingvae Latinae, debitam elegantiam, gravitatem, nitorem, et pulchritudinem consequatur. 112-113 p.) In the rest of his speech, Holko praised Latin, trying to point out its usefulness. At one point, for example, he quoted Wieland, who said that he had learned German from Cicero. Young Hungarians should follow this well-trodden path in developing their own language and virtues. The English also got as far as they did because they had a classical education, and the Hungarians would not have got as far as they did if they had not been helped by other languages. If they neglect Latin, they will not understand the laws of 700 years. (Wieland admiranti cuidam stili sui elegantiam, respondit: "Se ex Cicerone didicisse Germanice scribere, ipse autem Cicero didicit a Graecit." [...] Et Vos igitur, si in cultura Lingvae et Sermonis Vestri feliciter versari et progredi cupitis, hanc tritam regiamque viam ingredi oportet. [...] Dum *Fridericus Thiers* ex quodam Anglo quaesivisset: Vbinam quaerendum sit principium, seu fundamentum tanti progressus Reipublicae Anglicanae, hic extemplo reposuit: "*In nostra classica educatione*" h. e. in nostro a teneris antiquorum classicorum Autorum studio. [...] Adhaec scitote: *Magyaros* necdum suam lingvam ad tantum gradum perfectionis evexisse, ut sine adminiculo et subsidio aliarum lingvarum, in cultura ingeniorum et scientiarum feliciter progredi possint. Neglecta porro Lingva Latina, non intelligent patrias per septem secula latas Leges, et rerum partiarum Scriptores. 115-117 p.) Holko took his foreign examples - Wieland and the English statesmen - from the German philologist-teacher Friedrich Thiersch's *Über gelehrte Schulen, mit besonderer Rucksicht auf Bayern*, published in 1826. Alongside the developed European nations, the reference to Latin as the language of law-making was already an established *topos* in the history of language.

In the rest of his speech, Holko mainly pointed out that it is now common to despise and hate other peoples and their languages, and that this has become

ingrained in the minds of not a few. But there is no one who does not defend the Hungarian language and is a good citizen of his country. However, in Hungary there are different peoples who speak different languages and are subject to the same laws. (Ad illiberale illud, turpe, noxium, detestandumque odium et contemptum diversarum adinvicem Nationum atque Lingvarum, quod non paucorum animos insedit. Amare, fovere, colere Hungaram Nationem, Lingvam suam vernaculam, quis verus Patriae nostrae Civis non probet, non laudet? [...] Et cum Hungaria sinu suo diversas Nationes, diversis Lingvis loquentes, complectatur, quae omnes iisdem Legibus, Juribus atque praerogativis gaudent, nulla harum aliam contemnere, odio prosequi, vel plane illi dominari velle, deberet. 117-118 p.) Holko went on to speak at length, presumably drawing on his own experience or emotions, about the need not to despise and look down on our fellow countrymen who speak other languages. In addition to the name and concept of *Hungarus*, which was still a living concept at the time, he also uses a new term, *Hungarismus*, which Mátyás Holko uses in the sense of 'Hungarianism'. (Haec sint arma Vestra, his solummodo sensim homines ingenuos et liberos ad Hungarismum compellere potestis et debetis. 118 p.) He also asks why it would be good if everyone spoke Hungarian. Is the Hungarian language being harmed by all the people who speak Hungarian in a broken way? I wish the members of the parliament would also take care to eradicate this disease, this hatred, from the state. Then he cites the well-tryed ancient example: the Romans did not force anyone to learn their language. (Et quid quaeso! proficeretis, etiamsi statim omnes ore Hungarico loqui deberent, aut possent? Quid per id dignitati vel culturae Lingvae Vestrae accederet? Nonne haec multitudo Hungarice balbutiens Lingvam Vestram contaminaret et deturparet? [...] Utinam! Superi Patribus Patriae, nunc Posonii ad salutem publicam Regni Hungariae procurandam stalliendamque congregatis, hanc mentem largirentur, ut id quoque negotii sibi datum esse putarent, quo hujus morbi vis, Odii puta Nationum et Lingvarum, plane e visceribus Reipublicae extrahatur, radicitusque evellatur. Nobilissima illa gens Romana, quae tot diversissimas Nationes ac Lingvas imperio suo cominebat, earumque bene meritos viros Jure Civitatis donabat, nunquam tamen ad usum Lingvae suae adigebat, hi enim visa et cognita ejus majestate atque venustate, hanc ipsi ultro amplectebantur. 118-119 p.) Interesting thing is that in this passage he consistently uses the term *Lingva Vestra* for Hungarian, *your language*, thus confirming that he was a native of another language, probably not able to speak Hungarian, or only a little, at least not to write in that language.

Finally, he ended his speech with a very beautiful, rhetorical call for the youth to follow the example of the old Hungarians, because the true *Hungarus*, whatever nation he belongs to, whatever language he speaks, is worthy of his ancestors in spirit, strength and patriotism. (Qui animo, studiis, virtute, amore Patriae, semet distingvit; simplicitate morum, abstinencia, abominatione omnis mollitiei atque luxus, fortitudine et constantia, majores suos imitatur, hic mihi solus verus Hungarus est, ad quamcunque is demum Nationem spectet, et quacunque Lingva loquatur. 120 p.)

It is therefore clear from all of this that, in the absence of the Tübingen competition participants and the available contributions, the other writings and the inves-

tigation of the texts submitted could have many more yields. In the present case, we can assume that the call for proposals may have provided an opportunity for the establishment of a long-standing scholarly society. At the same time, one of the applicants, whose submission is lost or lying dormant, may still be able to share his thoughts on the Hungarian language, which are remarkable even if they may have been modified later by the reform era, thanks to *Solennia*.

Literature

Berzsenyi Dániel (2014): *Levelezése*. ed. Gergely Főríz. Berzsenyi Dániel összes munkái 2. Budapest: Editio Princeps.

Edvi Illés Pál (1826): A kis-honti ev. gyülekezet könyvtáráról. *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*. X. évf. 1826/4, 100-104.

Fejes, Johannes (1807): *De lingua, adminiculis et perfectione ejus in genere, et de lingua hungarica in specie COMMENTATIO historico-politica placidae Hungarorum ruminatiōi dicata, dum Linguam Hung. Publicam reddere contendunt*. Pest: Josephi Eggenberger bibliopolae.

Holko, Matthias (1826): *Oratio ad Juventutem Hungaram*. Solennia XVIII. Memoriae Anniversariae Bibliothecae Kis-Hontanae Publicae Senioratus Evangelici A. C. the 13th Septemb. Alsó-Székánokini celebrate. Pestini: Typis Nobilis Matthiae Trattner de Petrőza. 1826, 109-120.

Kazinczy Ferenc (1916): *Tübingai pályaműve a magyar nyelvről 1808*. pub. Heinrich Gusztáv. Régi magyar könyvtár 37. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

Kubinyi Ágoston (1829): Hazai Literatura. *Felső-magyarországi Minerva*. V. évf. 1829/5, 952-954.

Miskolczi Ambrus (2009): A »hungarus alternativa«: példák és ellenpéldák (Fejes Jánostól Rumi Károly Györgyig). *Regio*. XX. évf. 2009/2, 3-45.

Tóth Árpád (2018): Az evangélikus polgárság részvétele a korai magyarországi egyesületekben: Közéleti ambíciók, társadalmi hálózatok, csoportstratégiák. *Korall*. 19. 2018/74, 5-27.

Tudományos Gyűjtemény (1817): [n. d.] *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*. I. évf. 1817/12.

Wertheimer Ede (1896): Az 1807-diki magyar országgyűlés. *Századok*. XXX. évf. 1896/4, 293-309; 1896/5, 394-412.