ABSTRACT

The Growth of Magyar National Awareness
Under Francis I, 1792-1835

By Thomas Spira, Ph.D.
Department of History

Prior to the Age of Francis I, the idea of natio Hungarica was a class-centered concept held by the predominantly Magyar Hungarian nobility. Under the impact of Romantic and nationalistic ideas, Magyar national awareness grew during the reign of Francis I, as the Magyar nobility slowly changed its thinking and began to work toward Magyar national unity. The Magyars gradually created both a sophisticated language and a national literature, and made great strides toward solving long-standing religious problems. By the end of the period the idea for a national unity on the bases of ethnic origin and class equality had made significant progress among the Magyar upper classes. By 1836 the Magyars had achieved a greater national identity, but they were not able to solve the prevailing social conflicts and to remove the barriers to national unity.

SPIRA, Thomas

The Growth of Magyar National Awareness Under Francis 1

THE GROWTH OF MAGYAR NATIONAL AWARENESS UNDER FRANCIS I, 1792-1835

THOMAS SPIRA

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
in the Faculty of History,
McGill University

1969

PREFACE

The author wishes to thank his thesis director, Professor Milos Mladenovic, for his criticism, guidance and counsel. The author is indebted to the staffs of the New York Library, Main Branch, New York City; the Butler Library of Columbia University, New York; and the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. The author also wishes to thank the reference librarians at the University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware; and the Newark College of Engineering, Newark, New Jersey, for their help in locating books through the interlibrary loan system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Historical studies on Magyar society of the early nineteenth century have centered, broadly speaking, on the socioeconomic and political relations of the Habsburgs, the gentry[1] and jobbágyság.[2] These studies have treated gentry-jobbágy affairs, as well as the role, motives and influence of the Habsburg monarchy in Hungary. Other works have dealt with the cultural and linguistic aspects of Magyar and Hungarian society at that time. On the basis of this scholarship five different categories of historical interpretations have developed: Magyar contemporary accounts, Magyar and Austrian historiography before 1918, inter-bellum historiography, Marxian historiography and Western historiography.

Magyar contemporary observers, most of whom were from the upper classes, were benevolently paternalistic toward the jobbágyság and optimistic about the intentions of the gentry. Many of these writers were personally involved in the events they described and consequently their perspective was limited by their own interests. Only a few could properly evaluate the motives of their own class.

Ferenc Kölcsey, the noted author, poet and gentry deputy from Szatmár County, was a well-intentioned observer

during the Reform Era, or Vormärz, and was acquainted with most prominent personalities of his day. Nevertheless, he could not always evalute the true motives of his own class, which was fond of posing as the defender of the jobbágyság. Kölcsey was deceived, for example, by the activities of the gentry at the 1825-1827 Diet, which only coincidentally benefited the jobbágyság, and was surprised when the peasants retained their traditional trust in the Habsburg dynasty. Eventually, however, he recognized that members of his class were not as altruistic as he had hoped, especially when his own County had him recalled for his liberal views.[3] Lajos Kossuth, another political leader and observer during the Reform Period, underwent a similar change of thinking.[4]

Many Magyar contemporaries were openly hostile toward the Vienna Government and accused the Habsburgs of illegally meddling in Hungarian affairs to sow dissension between nobles and the jobbágyság. They believed that the Vienna Government deliberately supported the jobbágyság against their noble landlords in order to prevent the development of a broadly based Magyar national movement. For instance, according to Mihály Horváth, a Roman Catholic Bishop and liberally minded historian, the Vienna Government used various methods of economic harassment against the gentry to weaken them and destroy their wealth and morale.[5]

Other writers were more moderate in their appraisal

of the Habsburgs. János Mailáth, for example, a well-known historian of the era, ascribed the breach between the Magyar nobility and the Vienna Government to the unskillful policies of Francis I, not to the deliberate ill will of the regime as a whole. He showed how, in 1811 and again in 1816, the King blundered by forcing devaluation of the currency in Hungary without Diet consent, by refusing to return the Adriatic Littoral to Hungary and by staffing its administration with Austrian Germans. In Mailáth's view, a power struggle between Vienna and the Magyars was unavoidable under these circumstances. The King's policies had revived dormant fears among Magyars that their constitutional rights would be abolished and Hungary incorporated into the Empire.[6]

During the succeeding period, which includes the writing of Magyars and Austrians between 1867 and 1918, historiography became even more favourable to the gentry than the works of contemporary observers had been. By 1848 Magyar historians were deeply committed to the ideals of the Age of Reform and the men who had played a part in it. Consequently they exaggerated both the effectiveness and the scope of the gentry-led resistance to the Habsburgs' centralizing and disruptive policies. These scholars overemphasized the gentry's willingness to create a society where commoners, including the jobbágyság, would obtain equal rights. A legend had emerged, especially after the Revolution of 1848-1849, about the gentry's

alleged selfless patriotism and dedication to the Magyar national idea even at the cost of material sacrifice. The noted historian Béla Grünwald, for example, wrote that Magyar noblemen were unique: "A privileged class renounced its own immunities voluntarily, without external compulsion and without the participation and cooperation of democratic elements."[7]

Sándor Matlekovits, an economist and Member of the Hungarian Parliament, assumed a more moderate viewpoint. Matlekovits felt that Vienna had sincerely desired to promote culture and economic well-being in Hungary. But, in his view, the regime had been inept because it had prohibited freedom of press and assembly long after any need for such measures had passed. These unpopular regulations had prompted Magyars to question the sincerity of the Habsburgs. After 1825, according to Matlekovits, Magyars had seen evil even where good was intended and they had put their trust in Széchenyi's reform programme. The Habsburgs had opposed these moderate proposals and soon the gap between Magyars and the Vienna Government had become impossible to close.[8]

Some Austrian historians accepted the views of their Magyar colleagues on the divisive nature of Habsburg policy. J. H. Schwicker, for instance, documented what appeared to him to be organized efforts during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to settle Germans and Serbs in Hungary in the belief that this would weaken the

Magyars.[9] The Austrian historian Karl Hudeczek studied Vienna's economic policies and came to the conclusion that it had been deliberately designed to protect the producers in other parts of the Empire at the expense of the Magyar gentry.[10]

Besides the traditional emphasis on socioeconomic and political studies, some Magyar historians of this period began to examine various cultural aspects of the Age of Reform and the era preceding it in an attempt to find evidence of liberalism and conscious Magyarism among the upper classes. In this respect there was an interesting study by the Magyar historian Móric Kármán who investigated the gentry-controlled schools during this period and found evidence of a growing Magyar awareness among both the students and the teachers, most of whom had been of gentry origin but which had also included some persons of jobbágy extraction. In order to show the Habsburgs' interference in this aspect of gentry-jobbágy relations, Kármán indicated that the Vienna Government had made it difficult to obtain exit permits for study in Western European universities.[11] The noted historian Kolos Vaszáry edited a study of the 1825-1827 Diet based on minutes of some of the closed preliminary meetings in the Diet, the so-called regional sessions, and stated that as early as 1825 gentry Deputies had been prepared to discuss seriously the necessity for reform to benefit the lower classes.[12]

A few Magyar and Austrian writers were, however,

more favourable toward the Habsburgs. Though known more for his excellent work in eighteenth-century Hungarian history, the renowned Magyar historian Henrik Marczali also produced a general history of Hungary in which he tried to prove that the greatest obstacle to reform in the 1830's had been the prejudice of the Magyar nobility, not the policy of the Vienna Government.[13] Agreeing with Marczali were a number of Austrian historians, notably Adolf Beer, who, in a study based on Austrian archival sources, concluded that Austria had sought an equitable financial solution in Hungary during and after the Napoleonic Wars without hurting the nobility. In Beer's view, the Vienna Government had devalued Hungarian currency reluctantly, but justifiably, on the grounds that the nobility had failed to meet their financial obligations to the Empire in proportion to their numbers.[14]

In 1889 the Austrian historian Franz Krones published a study on Anton von Baldacci and his Denkschrift of 1816 in order to show that in the view of contemporaries the fiscal policies of Vienna had been not only justified but lenient. He stressed that the Magyar nobility and upper clergy had profited during the war, especially in grain, and hence could not have expected special consideration from the Habsburgs. On the contrary, according to Baldacci, the gentry, with their surpluses of grain and profit, had been duty bound to remedy the misery of the lower classes.[15]

The interpretation of the Vormärz in historiography remained essentially the same until after 1918. For some time even after the dissolution of the Dual Monarchy the inter-bellum generation of Magyar historians continued to emphasize the role of the gentry in the Reform Era and to criticize Habsburg policy. For example, one of the best known historians in this period, Gyula Szekfü, viewed the Magyar gentry as a progressive force whose enlightenment had been engendered by their education in foreign universities as well as by Rationalist Western thinkers. Szekfü maintained that as a result of these influences there had been a great deal of liberalism among the gentry by the 1830's, especially among the younger generation. Under the impact of enlightened ideas, progressive members of the gentry had assumed leadership of the Magyar national movement and had attempted to create a Magyar national state in which all Magyars would have been free and equal.[16] Kamill Sándorffy, a lesser-known historian of this period, went even further to say that the Magyar gentry by the 1830's had been prepared spiritually as well as culturally to introduce many reforms even without foreign influence.[17]

With the passing of time, as Austria's restraining hand was removed, many Magyar historians increased their criticism of Vienna Government policies of the early nineteenth century. Some of these writers accused the Habsburgs of having tried to prevent the Magyar gentry from achieving reform and national unity, while others sought

to make the Vienna Government the scapegoat for the gentry's failures. In this regard, the works of Kornél Táborí and Sándor Takáts emphasized the activities and abuses of the Austrian secret police in Hungary, while Gyula Miskolczy stressed what he believed had been anti-Magyar plots of a secret camarilla at the Court of Francis I.[18]

Later on, under the impact of secret archival material released by the new Austrian government, some of these inter-bellum historians began to modify the previous interpretation of Imperial policy. Gyula Szekfü, who had earlier studied the gentry and growth of liberal attitudes, edited a number of documents in 1926 dealing with various Austrian agencies that had influenced affairs in Hungary. By these documents it was shown that the Habsburg Government institutions had debated Hungarian issues with reasonable honesty and that Vienna's policy, although it conflicted with Magyar national aspirations, had been seldom illegal and, more often than not, had been the result of misinterpretations of conditions in Hungary and of Magyar sentiments.[19]

Subsequently, instead of blaming the Habsburgs for the failure of the Magyar movement, historians began to investigate the assets and shortcomings of the gentry by analyzing original documents. A particularly good reappraisal of gentry-jobbágy relations was offered during this period by István Szabó, who wrote that the gentry had not been motivated by altruism since they had systematically

exploited the jobbágyság by extending their own noble privileges and landholdings. Szabó pointed out that, although a new generation of liberal-minded nobles had appeared during the 1830's, opposition to social justice among the majority of aristocrats had continued throughout the entire decade. Szabó cited the example of Count István Széchenyi, whose publication Hitel (1830), propagating reforms, had been branded treasonous by many nobles. Some Counties had gone so far as to burn copies of the offending publication publicly.[20]

A new category of historical interpretation came into being when the Communists assumed power in Hungary. According to Erik Molnár, one of Hungary's most influential and authoritative Marxian historians, the entire history of Hungary had to be rewritten. Historians were to be enlisted ". . . in the task of educating the people in Socialist patriotism and international proletarianism."[21] The foremost task of the new historiography, in the view of Molnár and I. Barta, another well-known Marxian historian, was to rectify the attempts of the pre-Marxian era ". . . to discredit liberalism and the 1848-1849 Revolution and to show that liberalism led to the Revolution."[22]

The Marxian appraisal of the growth of liberalism in Hungary, together with an emphasis on socioeconomic research, resulted in a number of significant studies on the jobbágyság and economic conditions in the Vormärz. A further consequence of the interest in Hungarian reforms

was that some moderate Magyar reformers, like Count István Széchenyi, came to occupy a prominent place in Marxian publications.[23]

In 1948 Gyula Mérei, an economic historian already active in the pre-Marxian period, wrote a work which is still the most authoritative study on the subject of agricultural society in the Reform Era. Mérei explained that the gentry could no longer maintain their estates profitably in an age which was becoming increasingly more technological and therefore they had no alternative but to exploit the jobbágyság. When this approach failed they had to attempt other methods that would ensure their economic survival. The gentry had first tried to enter the world of commerce and, later on, they had gone into manufacturing. This had led many of them to modify their way of living and, according to Mérei, they had become an aristocratic, capitalistic bourgeoisie attempting to lead the Magyar national movement in order to gain the loyalty of a future army of wage labourers.[24]

At the same time István Szabó, who also began his career before the advent of Communism in Hungary, wrote a study which shed important light on the gradual development of the village judgeship, an intermediate social stratum between the jobbágyság and the nobility. Szabó showed that the village judge, originally elected by the peasantry, was being arbitrarily nominated during the Vormärz and hence no longer represented the interests of the jobbágyság.[25]

With a new generation of Marxian historians which emerged during the 1950's a number of well-documented studies appeared dealing with the jobbágyság. For example, in 1954 Imre Szántó published the results of his extensive research on the expropriation of jobbágy tenures on the trans-Danubian estates of Count Festetich,[26] one of the richest men in the Austrian Empire.[27] In the following year Lóránt Tilkovszky wrote the first comprehensive analysis on the peasant revolt, the so-called Cholera Uprising of 1831 in Northern Hungary.[28] Studies on various aspects of peasant life continued to appear during the 1960's.[29]

Another important task of Marxian historians was to investigate the relationship between the Magyars and the various nationalities under Habsburg rule. T. Tágvölgyi, one of the policy-making Marxist historians, accused Imperial scholars of either ignoring contacts between Magyars and non-Magyars entirely, or of holding the cultural level of these nationalities in contempt. The new historiography, according to Vágvölgyi, would expose these myths and prove that amicable relations existed between the Magyars and the other Hungarian nationalities.[30] This emphasis on the minority problems was consistent with the Marxian criticism and exposition of the former Magyar nationalist and chauvinist viewpoint. It became a task of high priority after the 1956 Counter-Revolution.[31]

Marxian literature on the non-Magyar nationalities has, however, been very sparse. The first monograph

dealing with a specific national group appeared only in 1959 when the prominent historian I. Zoltán Tóth presented a study on the question of Roumanian national development in Transylvania and Hungary. The treatment is very interesting because on occasion the author revealed his Magyar prejudices. For example, Tóth blamed the Serb Orthodox clergy, not the Magyars, for having persecuted Roumanians and for having obstructed the development of their culture and language. According to Tóth, Roumanians had only opposed the introduction of Serbo-Croatian into their school system, not Magyar or German.[32] A second study by Tóth on the same subject was published posthumously in 1966.[33]

Another well-known historian, Endre Arató, published a comprehensive two-volume study on the cultural and political evolution of Hungarian nationalities, but the work in most respects was merely an abridged synthesis of existing pre-Marxian literature. Arató oversimplified an important aspect of the nationality problem by declaring that the Germans in Hungary had constituted no menace to the development of the Magyars. The author credited the Germans with local patriotism, or at best with loyalty to the Natio Hungarica, but he neglected to mention their devotion to the Habsburg dynasty until well into the Age of Reform. Arató's Marxian orientation coloured his evaluation of the Magyar linguistic struggle. He equated the controversy between the linguistic innovators and their

opponents as "the struggle between the forces of progress and those of feudalism."[34] Arató contributed to a symposium on the same subject in 1964 but added nothing original to his previous work.[35]

The most ambitious, yet the least successful, undertaking in the area of nationality studies was a collection covering seven centuries, under the editorship of the noted historian G. Gábor Kemény. The purpose of the work, which allegedly took a team of historians ten years to complete, was to prove that significant instances of amicable relations existed between Magyars and non-Magyars. Unfortunately, the documents only serve to confirm the infrequency of such contacts, especially between 1830 and 1847, the period of greatest stress.[36]

In general, Marxian historians have viewed the Age of Reform, and the preceding period, as the stage for the dialectical struggle between the gentry and the small but powerful middle classes, the predominantly German merchants. However, these historians did not follow the traditional Marxian approach by trying to show that the bourgeoisie in Hungary took over the leadership from the Magyar nobility. Magyar Marxists demonstrated instead that the Germans willingly became Magyarized and infused the gentry with bourgeois qualities. Noblemen abandoned their class-centered Magyarism in order to bridge the gap between themselves and the commoners and they also acquired bourgeois economic interests.

In an important monograph published in 1951, Gyula Mérei examined the gradual amalgamation of interests of the two hostile classes, the Magyar gentry and the predominantly German, Habsburg-oriented, merchants.[37] In 1952, Emma Lederer wrote another important monograph which sought to explain why the landed gentry favoured commercial legislation on the eve of Reform. According to Lederer, many members of the gentry had become prosperous during the Napoleonic War and their wealth enabled them to pursue their own economic interests through politics. This policy brought them together with the bourgeoisie and just short of attaining a bourgeois society in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.[38] In the 1960's other historians have produced similar studies on economic and commercial problems during the Reform Era.[39]

Some contributions to the study of cultural history as well have been made in recent years by Magyar Marxian historians. One of the first to recognize the importance of the underlying cultural aspects of the Reform Era was Endre Arató. In a study which appeared in 1960 he wrote that during the Vormärz, and in the preceding years, the Magyar national struggle shifted from the political to the cultural arena. According to him, the French Revolution of 1789 had caused political unrest which swept all of Europe and aroused concern among the Magyar nobility and Vienna, both of whom were committed to the maintenance of the status quo. As a result, Arató claimed, both parties

agreed to a temporary political truce. Only with the Diet of 1825-1827, when the revolutionary danger was past, did the emphasis shift once more from the cultural to the political sphere.[40]

In the same year Sándor Bíró published a work in which he investigated the teaching of history before and during the Vormärz, basing his study on textbooks as well as on unpublished lecture notes which he found in archives throughout Hungary. The manuscripts turned out to be repositories of Magyar nationalist propaganda as well as liberal and Romanticist sentiments.[41] Bíró's monograph is of special importance to the present study because it offers valuable new source material and explains how national awareness could have developed among Magyars even before the Age of Reform. The importance of these sentiments has never been properly explained and no scholar thus far has drawn the proper conclusions from Bíró's documents.

Outside Hungary the Magyar Reform Movement has not attracted the attention it should. Only a small group of non-Magyar historians have concerned themselves with the problem. Prewar Imperial German historians generally agreed with their Magyar and Austrian colleagues who were critical of the Habsburgs. Anton Springer wrote, for example, that the Vienna Government had abandoned its unconstitutional practices in Hungary prior to the 1825-1827 Diet only because such methods had failed to destroy

the Magyar gentry. After 1825, according to Springer, the Habsburgs had adopted the technique of forcing the gentry to honour to the letter all the provisions of the existing laws that ran counter to their interests.[42]

The German scholar R. F. Kaindl agreed with Schwicker's analysis and especially pointed out the Habsburg policy of settling non-Magyars in Hungary. When the Habsburgs had temporarily lost certain German-inhabited districts to Napoleon, they had settled the refugees in Hungary. As a result Magyars had every reason to fear that Hungary would have become totally Germanized in the course of time.[43]

Victor Bibl, a postwar Austrian scholar, did not accept Kaindl's opinion without reserve. He suggested that the case against the Vienna Government was not as conclusive as certain Magyars, and even Austrians, believed. On the basis of primary sources in Austrian archives, Bibl concluded that conditions at the Court of Francis I had been too confused for the enforcement of a consistent anti-Magyar policy. In fact, the Austrian Government had been beset with power struggles and Magyar interests had generally been relegated to a secondary position. There were occasions when Francis I had wished to incorporate Hungary into the Empire, while at other times the King had been content to achieve his aims legally.[44]

Among more recent Western historians, Robert A. Kann is particularly important. Kann proposed that Magyar

nationalism rested on two foundations. One was political, based on the system of semi-independent Counties and their extensions, the Hungarian Diet. Both institutions, in Kann's view, had been sufficiently strong to challenge Habsburg encroachments. The other component of Magyar nationalism was economic and was predicated upon Széchenyi's commercial proposals, themselves based on English models.[45]

Hans Kohn, specializing in Nationalism, placed greater emphasis on the Romanticist influence of J. G. Herder than on either political or economic factors. However, Kohn also ascribed the temporary success of Magyar nationalists to the fact that Magyar leaders had demanded political reform from the Vienna Government whereas the other nationalities in the Empire had been content with cultural concessions.[46]

Oscár Jászi, an emigré Hungarian statesman, was very critical of the gentry's role. Jászi felt that the gentry's nationalistic crusade had been a sham. In his view the gentry, except for a small liberally minded faction, had been influenced only by economic, class and religious considerations but never by a national conception. Even the 1848-1849 Revolution had failed to imbue the gentry with a true spirit of social equality. The liberation of the jobbágyság had been carried out not by the gentry but by the Bach regime in Austria after the abortive Revolution.[47]

The English historian A. J. P. Taylor agreed with Jászi when he questioned the sincerity of the gentry. In Taylor's opinion the gentry had not really been interested in the jobbágyság: they had merely wished to assume control of the Magyar national movement for their own interest. Taylor also pointed out a very important fact about the changing nature of Magyarism in this period. In the eighteenth century "Hungarian" had meant an inhabitant of Hungary enjoying the privileges of a noble, whereas in the nineteenth century it had come to mean one of Magyar ethnic background. Taylor dated this change from 1825.[48]

More recently two German historians, F. Walter and H. Steinacker, have collaborated in a work concerning the nationality problem in the Hungarian Vormärz. The authors considered that the Magyar nobility had been a suspicious and backward group, determined to preserve the old order with its privileges at all costs. The Habsburgs, they believed, had tried to inaugurate reform in Hungary as far back as the eighteenth century, but each time they had encountered determined resistance from the nobles. Walter and Steinacker deprecated the Age of Reform by declaring that until 1848 Hungary had been an aristocratic nation in every sense of the word.[49]

When discussing the Magyar Reform Movement, as we have seen, most historians have concentrated on the relations between the gentry and the jobbágyság, and the struggle between the Magyar gentry and the Vienna Government.

Generally speaking, these accounts have been overly favourable to the gentry and critical of Habsburg policy. Recent trends, evident in both Magyar and non-Magyar, Marxian and non-Marxian writings, have modified the earlier interpretations. Modern, scholarly studies on language, economics, minorities and the underlying cultural aspects of the Reform Era have shown the importance of non-political factors in the Magyar national movement.

The existing literature does not, however, give a clear picture of the transition from a class-centered conception of Hungarian society to the idea of a more egalitarian and Magyar nation. The present study attempts to explain how and why the class-conscious nobility, especially the gentry and upper stratum of commoners, developed an awareness of the need to effect a universal Magyar national movement embracing all classes. The thesis will demonstrate that, although the gentry was not successful in creating a united, egalitarian Magyar nation by 1835, nevertheless certain changes in that direction were brought about by a combination of political and economic, as well as ethnic and cultural factors.

The study will attempt an objective historical synthesis to show that there were two simultaneous and conflicting trends in Magyar society. By the 1830's cultural and ideological forces tended to unify Magyars and forge a common bond of awareness among them, based on nationality instead of class. By the eve of Reform, Magyars had a

revitalized and sophisticated language and were rapidly developing a national literature. Roman Catholic and Protestant Magyars were on the verge of a religious reconciliation after centuries of sectarian strife. All these elements had sufficiently developed by 1835 to serve as strong unifying ties for a potential universal Magyar national movement.

Simultaneously, however, economic and political considerations tended to hinder the formation of a unified Magyar society and prevent the growth of Magyarism. Depression after the Napoleonic Wars affected all socio-economic groups, especially agricultural producers. Since the Magyar gentry derived their income almost exclusively from the land, their financial difficulty grew each year. The gentry could not afford to modernize their estates and they resorted to the exploitation of the jobbágyság. This policy enabled the Habsburgs to maintain dissension between the gentry and the jobbágyság by asserting their traditional position as the protectors of the rural masses against their gentry landlords. The gentry's economic difficulties deprived them of the opportunity to seek mass support among the jobbágyság and consequently endangered their political hegemony. In addition to the class attitude of the nobility and the Habsburgs' interests, the growth of Magyarism was also affected by the minorities which represented the greatest part of Hungary's population.

The period emphasized in the thesis, from 1825 to

1836, does not represent a turning point either in Hungarian or in Habsburg Imperial history. Its importance lies in the fact that during this time the most educated and most politically experienced class in Hungary, the landed gentry, was changing its social, political and economic thinking. Whereas the gentry at the beginning of the century was made up of various ethnic backgrounds and enjoyed class solidarity, by 1825 they separated and set themselves at the head of various national and occasionally militant minorities. This thesis examines the transition in national thinking which took place in the Magyar part of Hungarian society in the period prior to 1836. During this era the Magyar nobility developed a greater national awareness and modified its class-centered concept of Natio Hungarica in favour of a more equitable social order with emphasis on Magyarism.

This thesis depends on a wide variety of primary sources, including the reports and protocols of the Hungarian Diet, documents from the Secret Court and police archives in Vienna, proceedings of various Government Bureaus, as well as demographic and statistical collections. These sources are supplemented by numerous memoirs and diaries, plus more than thirty collections of speeches, works and correspondence of contemporary personalities. These include D. Berzsenyi, F. Deák, Aurél and József Dessewffy, E. Fényes, F. Kazinczy, Károly and Sándor Kisfaludy, F. Kölcsey, L. Kossuth, F. Pulszky,

I. Széchenyi, M. Wesselényi, and other contemporaries as well.

The periodical literature of the period has also yielded valuable material. This includes Felső Magyarországi Minerva, Orpheus, Tudományos Gyüjtemény and Vallási és Egyházi Tár. For additional first-hand impressions of Magyar society at that time a number of English, French and German travelers' accounts were important. Especially important were the writings of F. S. Beudant, R. Bright, C. B. Elliott, G. R. Gleig, G. Hiller, Count Hofmannseg, Wm. Hunter, J. G. Kohl, J. Paget, J. Pardoe, M. J. Quin and R. Townson. Occasionally secondary literature has also yielded important source material as, for instance, S. Bíró's work on the teaching of history in Hungary, which contains many valuable extracts from contemporary textbooks and manuscripts.

FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1]These were the untitled noblemen with moderate size estates. Geoffrey Drage aptly called them the "squirearchy." See G. Drage, Austria-Hungary (London, 1909), p. 265.

[2]Collective name for farmers who could rent tenures from noblemen, but who were not permitted to own land. The singular term is jobbágy.

[3]F. Kölcsey, Összes művei (Budapest, n.d.), pp. 1234, 1240-1241, 1279.

[4]See L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), especially his notes of 2 January 1833, 12 November 1835 and 9 February 1835, I, 110-111; III, 675; IV, 184.

[5]M. Horváth, Az ipar és kereskedés története Magyarországon a három utolsó század alatt (Buda, 1840), pp. 355-365. For similar opinions by a contemporary, see G. Berzeviczy, "A parasztok állapotáról és természetéről Magyarországon," Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest, 1902), Part II, p. 127.

[6]J. Mailáth, Geschichte des Östreichischen Kaiserstaates (Hamburg, 1850), V, 389-391.

[7]B. Grünwald, A régi Magyarország, 1711-1825 (3rd ed.; Budapest, 1910), p. iii.

[8]S. Matlekovits, Das Königreich Ungarn, Volkswirtschaftlich und statistisch dargestellt (Leipzig, 1900), I, vi.

[9]J. H. Schwicker, Geschichte der Österreichischen Militärgrenze (Vienna, 1883), pp. 182-186, passim.

[10]K. Hudeczek, Österreichische Handelspolitik im Vormärz (Vienna, 1918), pp. 80-85, passim.

[11]M. Kármán, Ungarische Bildungswesen. Geschichtlicher Rückblick bis zum Jahre 1848 (Budapest, 1915), pp. 45-48.

[12]K. Vaszáry, ed., Adatok az 1825-ki országgyülés történetéhez (Győr, 1883), pp. 39-42.

[13]H. Marczali, Magyarország történelme (Budapest, 1912), II, 613.

[14]A. Beer, Die Finanzen Österreichs im XIX. Jahrhundert (Prague, 1877), pp. 129-130.

[15]F. Kroneş, "Freiherr Anton von Baldacci über die inneren Zustände Österreichs," Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte, LXXIV (1889), 57, 60-61.

[16]Gy. Szekfü, Három nemzedék és ami utána következik (4th ed.; Budapest, 1935), p. 93.

[17]K. Sándorffy, Törvényalkotásunk hőskora. Az 1825-1848 évi reformkorszak törvényeinek története (Budapest, 1935), p. 24.

[18]K. Tábori, Titkos rendőrség és kamarilla (Budapest, 1921), pp. 14-15, 34-39; S. Takáts, Kémvilág Magyarországon (Budapest, n.d.), I, 5-7, 82-89, 93-95, 163-164; II, 72, 79-87; Gy. Miskolczy, A kamarilla a reformkorszakban (Budapest, 1930), pp. 12-13, 32-39, 54-57.

[19]Gy. Szekfü, Iratok a Magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1926), pp. 335-341, 366-367, 373-378, 399-401.

[20]I. Szabó, A Magyar parasztság története (Budapest, 1940), pp. 70-71.

[21]E. Molnár, "A Magyar történetírás fejlődése az elmúlt évtizedben," Századok, XCIV, No. 1 (1960), 45, 58 (hereafter cited as Molnár, Történetírás).

[22]I. Barta, "Entstehung des Gedankens der Interessenvereinigung in der Ungarischen bürgerlich-adligen Reformbewegung," Nouvelles études historiques, publiées à l'occasion du XIIe Congrès International des Sciences Historiques par la Commission Nationale des Historiens Hongrois, I (1965), 502. See also E. Molnár, "A Magyar történetírás tíz esztendeje," Századok, LXXXIX, No. 2 (1955), 183-184.

[23]Gy. Spira, "Széchenyi's Tragic Course," Nouvelles études, I (1965), 517-529; I. Barta, "Széchenyi és a Magyar polgári reformmozgalom kibontakozása," Történelmi Szemle, III, Nos. 2-3 (1960), 224-225; A M.T.A. Történettudományi Bizottsága és a M.T.A. Történettudományi Intézete, "Széchenyi István (Halálának századik évfordulójára)," Századok, XCIV, No. 1 (1960), 276-277; Molnár, Történetírás, p. 55.

[24]Gy. Mérei, Mezőgazdaság és agrártársadalom Magyarországon, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1948), pp. 55, 164-165, passim.

[25]I. Szabó, Tanulmányok a Magyar parasztság történetéből (Budapest, 1948), pp. 291-294, passim.

[26]I. Szántó, A parasztság kisajátása és mozgalmai a dunántúli Festetics-birtokon, 1711-1850 (Budapest, 1954), pp. 113-117, 124, 138-147, 170, 179-180.

[27]G. Hassels, Statistischer Abriss des Östreichischen Kaisertums nach seinen neuesten politischen Beziehungen (Nürnberg and Leipzig, 1807), pp. 8-81.

[28]L. Tilkovszky, Az 1831. évi parasztfelkelés (Budapest, 1955), passim. Tilkovszky relied on the excellent collection of contemporary documents by D. Rapant, Sedliacke povstanie na východnom Slovensku roku 1831 (2 vols.; Bratislava, 1953).

[29]J. Varga, Typen und Probleme des bäuerlichen Grundbesitzes in Ungarn, 1767-1849 (Budapest, 1965), pp. 109-142, passim.

[30]G. G. Kemény, ed., A szomszéd népekkel való kapcsolataink történetéből. Válogatás hét évszázad irásaiból (Budapest, 1962), pp. 3-6 (hereafter cited as Kemény, Szomszéd nép).

[31]Molnár, Történetirás, pp. 45-47, 53-54.

[32]I. Z. Tóth, Az Erdélyi és Magyarországi Román nemzeti mozgalom, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1959), pp. 99-100, 103-104 (hereafter cited as Tóth, Erdély). In fact the pre-Marxian historiography recognized that Roumanians were subjected to many influences, notably Latin, Turkish and Greek, in addition to Serb. See E. Horváth, Transylvania and the History of the Roumanians (Budapest, 1935), p. 63.

[33]I. Z. Tóth, Magyarok és Románok: történelmi tanulmányok (Budapest, 1966).

[34]E. Arató, A nemzetiségi kérdés története Magyarországon, 1790-1840 (Budapest, 1960), Vol. I; and E. Arató, A nemzetiségi kérdés története Magyarországon, 1840-1848 (Budapest, 1960), Vol. II (hereafter cited as Arató, Nemzetiség I.

[35]E. Arató, "A Magyar nacionalizmus kettős arculata a feudalizmusból a kapitalizmusba való átmenet és a polgári forradalom időszakában," A Magyar nacionalizmus kialakulása és története, ed. E. Andics (Budapest, 1964), pp. 79-82.

[36]Kemény, ed., Szomszéd nép, pp. 199-208.

[37]Gy. Mérei, Magyar iparfejlődés, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1951), pp. 164-165.

[38]E. Lederer, Az ipari kapitalizmus kezdetei Magyarországon (Budapest, 1952), p. 9.

[39]I. Bakács, A Magyar nagybirtokos családok hitelügyletei a XVII-XVIII. században (Budapest, 1965), passim; G. Eperjessy, Mezővárosi és falusi céhek az Alföldön és a Dunántúlon, 1686-1848 (Budapest, 1967), pp. 110-118, passim.

[40]Arató, Nemzetiség I, p. 172. Other works appearing at this time with a cultural theme are L. Deme, A XIX. század első felének harcai a nemzeti nyelvért. Nyelvünk a reformkorszakban (Budapest, 1966), passim; F. Hernády, Adattár a pécsi Magyar szinjátszás kezdeteihez (Budapest, 1960), pp. 1-3, passim.

[41]S. Bíró, Történelemtanításunk a XIX. század első felében, a korabeli tankönyvirodalom tükrében (Budapest, 1960), pp. 82-91, passim.

[42]A. Springer, Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809 (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 324, 360-361.

[43]R. F. Kaindl, Geschichte der Deutschen in Ungarn (Gotha, 1912), pp. 52-53.

[44]V. Bibl, Der Zerfall Österreichs (Vienna, 1922), I, 370.

[45]R. A. Kann, The Multinational Empire, Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918 (New York, 1950), I, 116.

[46]H. Kohn, The Habsburg Empire, 1804-1918 (New York, 1961), p. 26.

[47]O. Jászi, The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy (Chicago, 1964), pp. 298-299.

[48]A. J. P. Taylor, The Habsburg Monarchy, 1815-1918 (London, 1941), pp. 42-45. According to H. Marczali, "All noblemen, regardless of national tongue, were considered ipso facto Magyars." See H. Marczali, Ungarische Verfassungsrecht (Tübingen, 1911), p. 42.

[49]F. Walter and H. Steinacker, Die Nationalitätenfrage im alten Ungarn und die Südostpolitik Wiens (Munich, 1959), pp. 37, 40-41.

CHAPTER I

MAGYAR SOCIETY ON THE EVE OF THE AGE OF REFORM

Magyar society on the eve of the Reform Era was divided into mutually antagonistic groups. The main conflicts were social and economic, between privileged and non-privileged, landed and landless classes, but the society was further divided by language and culture, as well as by religion into Roman Catholic and Protestant faiths.[1] The social strife and disaffection among the various socio-economic and ethnic groups prevented the formation of a national unity in Hungary and was used by the Habsburgs to protect the interests of the Crown and to suppress any spirit of independence.[2]

The Magyar lower classes represented about 85% of a total population of about 4-1/2 million persons.[3] The nobility was far less numerous and counted approximately 500,000 members.[4] Neither the upper nor the lower classes constituted a uniform group. At the bottom of the social hierarchy stood the jobbágyság, or peasantry, which was further divided into renters, cottagers and leaseholders. The more privileged free-peasants, or parasztság, were much smaller than the jobbágyság but larger than both the

libertini, or peasant elite, and the honoratiori, persons from the lower classes not engaged in agriculture. The nobility was separated into armalists, landed gentry and magnates, who all felt that they enjoyed the same constitutional rights.[5]

The poorest elements in jobbágy society were the renters, who seldom owned homes and held no land tenures. They made a precarious living as agricultural labourers and servants. The cottagers enjoyed a higher mode of living since they generally owned their homes and a small surrounding land tenure on which they grew garden produce and raised small livestock. Leaseholders also owned a house with its plot but, in addition, they held fields which they farmed and meadows on which they raised cattle and horses.[6]

The paraszt enjoyed a better living than the jobbágy. The free-peasant lived in free areas of Hungary, such as certain cities, towns and specially privileged districts. These areas were free from gentry or County control and came under the jurisdiction of the Habsburgs. Such persons were free from jobbágy duties and paid neither land tax nor tithe.[7]

A small privileged group of peasants was selected by the landlords to be village judges, overseers and informers. These peasant functionaries, called libertini, were generally exempt from their normal obligations to the nobility and this set them apart as an elite in the jobbágyság.[8] Frequently these functionaries performed

military duty on behalf of their landlords. In return, they were not only freed from jobbágy duties but their special status was inheritable and transmitted through the male branch.[9]

Education also provided an opportunity for some of the peasants to better themselves. The most talented of the jobbágy and paraszt children had already been accepted into higher education under Joseph II and by the time of Francis I this practice had become commonplace. As a result, by the first decade of the nineteenth century two-thirds of the students in the gymnasiums were of non-noble origin. Most of these students studied trades, while others went into the ministry, which was the most certain road to advancement for a student from a humble station in life.[10] An ambitious and intelligent member of either the jobbágyság or the parasztság might even have an opportunity for a career in one of the secular professions. Honoratiori, as the educated, lower-class intelligentsia were called, numbered about 12,000 at the beginning of the nineteenth century.[11]

The libertini and honoratiori, however, were exceptions. The social and economic conditions of the peasantry as a whole were deteriorating. This was particularly true of the leaseholders whose numbers and leasehold size had been diminishing over the years.[12] Their poor condition resulted mainly from their legal and economic obligations to the gentry. These duties were defined by King

András II's Bulla Aurea (Golden Bull) of 1222,[13] by the Tripartitum of 1517, or Verbőczy's legal code,[14] and by the Urbarium, a decree issued by Maria Theresa in 1767. The Golden Bull and the Tripartitum imposed two important restrictions on the jobbágyság. They could not participate in government and they were not permitted to own land. The peasantry could hold or lease property but they could not sell, mortgage, pawn or alienate it in any manner. They only enjoyed rights to the plant and animal life on their leased holdings and were free to make physical improvements which then belonged to them.[15]

Some provisions of the Urbarium were even more burdensome. It was meant to improve the standard of living of the lower classes, but it was promulgated by Maria Theresa at a time when the Habsburgs needed the military support of the Magyar gentry and it left, to some extent, an opportunity for the gentry to use it for their own purposes.[16] According to the Urbarium the main obligations of the jobbágyság vis-à-vis their gentry landlords were the ninth-tax and the robot. The ninth-tax obligated the peasantry, after they had paid their tithe, to surrender to their lord one-ninth on the remainder of most types of agricultural produce and livestock. Even when the ninth-tax was properly observed by the gentry it was harmful to both the jobbágyság and the national economy. In regions where grain was the principal crop it had long become customary for the peasantry to deliver their

ninth-tax obligations in the form of straw. Straw was an indispensable fertilizer, however, and without it the land eventually deteriorated, leaving the soil exhausted.[17]

A second important obligation of the jobbágyság was the robot. This represented the amount of personal labour and drayage a peasant had to render his lord each year. Although the Urbarium stipulated that a jobbágy be paid for overtime robot, in fact he seldom was. As time passed the jobbágyság were forced to provide additional robot for their landlords and it eventually became their most burdensome obligation.[18]

In addition to these responsibilities the jobbágyság had to pay their lord one florin annually, the symbolic chimney money, for the privilege of being permitted to own a house on noble property. They were also compelled to use certain vital services, the so-called noble monopolies. Through these monopolies the landlords provided vital services and utilities, usually at high prices. A jobbágy was not permitted to move until he liquidated all his debts and in view of the extent of their obligations few of the peasantry could ever hope to rid themselves of their liabilities. The result was that a jobbágy became a virtual prisoner on his landlord's estate.[19]

In addition to his obligations to the landlords, the peasants had numerous other burdens. They bore the major share of the annual tax obligation.[20] The domestic tax, used to defray the expenses of County government, was

one such imposition and the war tax was another. The peasants also supported the clergy through the payment of tithe and were obliged to provide corvée for public projects which were determined by the County administrations. The jobbágyság also provided recruits for the armed forces, taxes for their upkeep, quarters for the troops, and provisions for military horses at officially designated low prices. They also had to give free transportation for military personnel, noblemen and government officials.[21]

Besides being oppressed by numerous obligations and burdens, a jobbágy was disadvantaged in legal matters because the landlords exercised nearly complete judicial control over him.[22] In small controversies, landlords or their representatives assumed personal judicial function and the jobbágy was without benefit of legal formalities. More serious cases, mostly concerning land allocation or personal services, were referred to the manorial court which consisted of a panel of five judges. If the landlord happened to be one of the litigants, he could neither participate on the manorial court himself nor could he have one of his personal representatives sit as proxy. He could, however, choose one judge and two other sworn persons with legal experience.[23] Under these circumstances the landlord commanded a majority in the manorial court. A wronged peasant might appeal to the County Sheriff or to the County court but his effort was generally in vain since the Sheriff was a nobleman and the courts were strongholds

of the gentry. As a last resort the jobbágy could petition the highest judicial body in Hungary, the Vice Regency, which was controlled by the Vienna Government. Over the years many peasants availed themselves of this prerogative[24] and grievances occasionally found redress in this manner.[25]

Besides partly protecting the jobbágyság on judicial matters, the Vienna Government sought to guarantee the peasants' solvency by including in the Urbarium a number of minor rights. These stipulated that a jobbágy could gather timber for building purposes, reeds for roofing, broken twigs and branches for firewood, and acorns for swine. Peasants were permitted to distill limited amounts of alcohol for home use, slaughter cattle on a small scale and trade in petty items such as candles, bacon and wax. By far the most essential privileges were the jobbágyság's clearing and grazing rights. The former made it possible for an enterprising jobbágy to clear virgin land without having to pay either rent or ninth-tax. The latter enabled him to supplement his meagre income by maintaining cattle, since the Urbarium permitted free grazing privileges on the village commons.[26]

Frequently these minor rights represented the difference between starvation and a viable mode of living. Unfortunately, the peasants never derived the full benefit from them because the Urbarium failed to effectively protect their interests.[27] For example, if natural disaster

destroyed a jobbágy's crops or epidemics decimated his livestock, he had only one year's grace in which to fulfill his obligations. Seldom was a jobbágy able to recoup his losses in a single year.[28] The gentry often persuaded an illiterate jobbágy to sign an agreement which left him with inferior pastures. Under various pretexts the gentry also frequently prevented the jobbágyság from using the common pastures and gradually landlords usurped the grazing grounds for their own use. Peasants were permitted to clear forest and waste lands, but when these areas were fit for grazing or agriculture the gentry all too frequently seized the improved lands for themselves.[29]

The peasants' difficult circumstances were made even worse by their own backward agricultural practices.[30] A contemporary English witness, William Hunter, observed that a Magyar peasant did his threshing by driving a team of horses back and forth over the wheat. This clumsy operation ruined the straw, bruised most of the grain and left many of the seeds in the husk.[31] Instead of storing their agricultural staples in granaries, Magyar peasants buried surpluses in underground pits. All too often rot spoiled their stores and they were deprived of essential food reserves in times of poor harvest.[32] In order to avoid starvation, the jobbágyság frequently consumed seeds reserved for next year's planting. Consequently, the gentry could compel them either to perform additional services or to pay high prices in exchange for seed and

vital food supplies.

The jobbágyság were not alone either in being dominated by the gentry or in their poverty. The armalists' standard of living was frequently no better than the peasants' and they accounted for nearly three-fifths of the Magyar noble classes.[33] Count Aurél Dessewffy, a contemporary political figure, reported that

> the armalists and the jobbágyság live side by side in the same village, the same lot, and often, so to speak, under one roof. Both are farmers and cattle raisers and hence their material interests are identical.[34]

Like the peasants, the armalists were frequently illiterate and poverty-stricken. According to Julia Pardoe, an English contemporary traveler, an armalist might own some forty or fifty head of cattle but have neither a coin in his pocket nor a buyer to purchase his herd. As a result the armalist was often reduced to bartering. He could not afford to send his cattle or grain to the lucrative Austrian market because the high tariff at the Austro-Hungarian border was payable in cash before the sale of his products.[35]

Despite their similarities with the peasants, armalists enjoyed certain privileges by virtue of their noble status. They had the right to attend both County assemblies and Diet sessions and they were exempt from all indirect taxation such as road tolls and corvée.[36] They could either acquire land, in which case they paid no direct taxation, or they could lease land, in which

case they might be required to pay direct land tax. Whether or not they paid property tax depended on local custom and the type of land leased.[37]

In spite of their privileges, the armalists' economic condition was deteriorating. They were obligated to provide the Vienna Government with personal military duty at their own expense and this drained their resources. As land grew scarce the armalists were increasingly forced to bargain for land normally leased to the jobbágyság and subsequently they were reduced to accepting contracts that resembled gentry-jobbágy agreements. On this land the armalists were required to pay property tax which they regarded as an unjust burden because they felt that such taxes were a non-noble obligation.

As the armalists' economic and social position worsened, relations between them and the jobbágyság became increasingly strained. The armalists resented the economic competition of the peasants, whom they considered to be socially inferior, and they began to exploit them by illegal means. M. J. Quin, a contemporary observer, recorded a conversation with an estate manager which revealed that armalists in many parts of the country were too proud to work and often lived by plunder. They would cut down and cart away wheat or corn belonging to a jobbágy who was afraid to resist for fear of bodily injury. A jobbágy had little chance for redress from such robberies because he could not testify against the armalist nobleman[38] in a

Hungarian court and resorting to a royal authority was dangerous for it might bring reprisals from the armalists.

The landless nobles were not only estranged from the peasants but from the gentry as well. Although the armalists resented the economic domination of their fellow nobles, the main source of antagonism toward the landed gentry was political. The impoverished armalists could no longer afford to attend protracted County assemblies or to take part in the political affairs of the County because most political positions offered little or no emolument. Consequently, the landed gentry gradually succeeded in excluding the armalists from County government and in gaining exclusive domination based on property ownership.[39]

The gentry numbered only 60,000 out of 136,000 noble families,[40] but they were the most influential noble group in Hungary.[41] They owned approximately one-fourth of all the land in Hungary and could lease soil to both nobles and non-nobles. They paid a certain sum to the Crown annually, known as the noble subsidy, but their noble status entitled them to personal tax exemption on their own holdings. They owed personal military service, at their own expense, to the Vienna Government, but this obligation was no longer being met by the early nineteenth century.[42] Although the gentry enjoyed many social and economic privileges, their principal source of power was political. Through their position in County government they controlled internal politics and Hungary's administrative life. The

country was divided into fifty-two Counties, each enjoying virtually sovereign rights. The landed gentry dominated the plenary County assemblies and nominated all the County officials.[43]

The gentry, through the Counties, judged the constitutionality of directives from the Vienna Government and were responsible for passing these directives to the executive branch of the County administration. They determined and apportioned all internal taxation, including the share which belonged to the Vienna Government. They even regulated meat prices for some royal free cities. County officials supervised the police as well as all other County employees and decided the quartering of military forces. County governments also had the important task of considering petitions of both commoners and noblemen.

The County Government also controlled the judiciary since it was responsible for naming County judges.[44] These judges were politically and economically secure since they enjoyed life tenure and hereditary landholdings. They became dependable and effective supporters of County interests. The Vienna Government might influence elective officials, who were without tenure, and it might occasionally influence the election or dismissal of an official, but judges generally resisted Royal persuasion and coercion.[45]

The power of County governments was such that when the Vienna Government promulgated a law or issued a decree which was not in the gentry's interests, the Counties could

neutralize these measures at the administrative level by refusing to put the new law into force.[46] In all, the gentry exerted so much authority through the County governments that, according to Baron József Eötvös, they might even uphold a County statute in the face of a Royal veto.[47]

Since each County government dispatched two elected representatives to the Diet, their influence even extended to the national level. The Deputies sent by the County could say anything they pleased, but they were compelled by law to adhere exactly to the instructions of their Counties, and they could be recalled.[48] This regulation was designed to prevent interference by the Vienna Government with the Deputies.[49] At the Diet, Deputies usually met in public plenary sessions. However, Deputies desired more privacy as well as protection from the informants of the Vienna Government and by the end of the eighteenth century they began to arrange meetings in closed regional assemblies prior to the plenary sessions. These assemblies consisted of four separate sections based on the geographic divisions of the country.

In spite of the gentry's privileged position, they were in serious economic difficulties on the eve of Reform and consequently their political power was threatened. Their situation was partly due to their own economic backwardness, since they had failed to modernize their estates and could no longer compete with more efficient producers elsewhere.[50] More important, however, were the effects of

the Habsburg Imperial economic policy. Since Hungary was excluded from the Austrian provincial customs union of 1775, Vienna could levy customs on Hungarian exports and imports.[51] Although the duties on Hungarian grain were normally high, the Government occasionally went so far as to prevent any exportation of Hungarian grain.[52]

The gentry's economic difficulties might have been less severe had Hungary's population been able to absorb the entire agricultural production of the nation. Unfortunately, the gentry had to export most of their agricultural staples either to Austria or outside the Empire. Since the King legally controlled Hungary's external commerce, the gentry became economically dependent on the Crown. Determined to make good their losses in the grain market, the gentry began to cultivate a number of other staples, notably tobacco and wool.[53] However, the Vienna Government protected Austrian producers by levying prohibitive export duties on these goods and the gentry producers were delivered into the hands of Austrian monopolies.[54]

Despite the gentry's economic dependence on the Vienna Government, their situation only became critical after the Napoleonic Wars. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the gentry tried to organize wholesale trading companies in order to sell their grain, tobacco and wool, without having to depend on Austrian middlemen.[55] They also attempted to establish small companies to manufacture such things as pottery, sugar and cloth.[56] The

nobles were not successful[57] because of their lack of business acumen, the absence of an effective Hungarian commercial code and communications system,[58] and the policies of the Vienna Government. Vienna had encouraged these ventures during the Napoleonic Wars because they believed that Hungary was beyond the reach of French armies. However, during the war and the postwar recession Vienna was forced to devalue the Hungarian currency[59] and this, as well as the deliberate withholding of raw materials, produced bankruptcy for many of the gentry.[60]

In order to protect their own position under difficult economic circumstances, the gentry increased their exploitation of the jobbágyság. Although they had accepted the Urbarium at the Diet of 1790-1791, it became standard practice for them to circumvent the law to the detriment of the jobbágyság. When the law was violated, as it frequently was, the peasants' condition became burdensome.[61] Richard Bright, an English observer in this period, was shocked to learn from a reliable and well-informed estate manager that a jobbágy was often compelled to perform robot duty at least double that of the lawful limit of one hundred and four days a year.[62] To make matters worse, the jobbágyság were forced to provide their robot at most inopportune times. Deputy Somsich pointed out for example that each day during the harvest season had the value of six ordinary days because a delay in harvesting the crop could result in spoilage. Somsich deemed it a miscarriage of

justice "to permit the jobbágy's entire prime time to be exploited by his landlord on such critical occasions." It was, as Somsich put it, "a grave loss both to the peasants and to the national well-being."[63]

The gentry also systematically cheated the jobbágyság on overtime robot. Legally a peasant was entitled to two florins per day for overtime labour and six or seven florins per day for additional use of his plow. Instead, as Deputy La Motte pointed out, he was frequently coerced into accepting only ten to twenty kreutzers per day for both services combined.[64] The gentry further exploited the jobbágyság through the abuse of noble monopolies such as flour milling by charging the peasants excessive fees for such essential services.[65]

More serious still was the gentry's systematic seizure of the jobbágyság's clearings and pastures.[66] These lands provided the gentry with the opportunity to introduce herds of sheep on a large scale, a potentially lucrative enterprise in view of the demand for wool.[67] To the jobbágyság, however, these infringements meant total financial ruin. They no longer had room for grazing their cattle and horses. Frequently they had to give up their livestock and hence they lost their sources of meat, butter, cheese and milk. Many a jobbágy finally had to surrender his landholdings and become a cottager, servant, agricultural labourer or vagrant.[68]

The gentry's circumvention of the Urbarium not only

alienated the peasants but it deprived the Vienna Government of tax revenue as well. If the jobbágy situation was to be improved on the basis of the Urbarium, it would be due to the efforts of the Habsburgs who, by virtue of their economic and political position, exercised considerable influence in Magyar society.

The Austrian Emperor possessed extensive economic, military and political power due to his position as King of Hungary. He owned the lucrative salt monopoly and all the mines in Hungary. He levied most taxes, which were paid almost exclusively by the jobbágyság, controlled external trade and determined the strength of Hungarian regiments. His administrative powers rested in two agencies, the Vice Regency and the Hungarian Chancellery.[69] Both of these agencies could redress grievances between members of the various classes. The administrative influence of the King was restricted, however, by the fact that he had to deal with fifty-two semi-independent County administrations. The King could issue executive decrees but the Counties often challenged these orders. Consequently the Vienna Government frequently had to dispatch royal commissioners and even armed troops in an attempt to force the Counties to comply.[70]

Besides his administrative role, the King had the sole authority to convoke the Diet. Although he was legally required to call the Diet into session every three years, the King often ignored his responsibility. He had

the privilege of determining legislative priorities and he often took advantage of this prerogative to force the Diet to consider legislation it would never contemplate by itself. The King also possessed a royal veto over the decisions of the Diet.[71]

The Royal Government exerted a strong influence in the Upper House, which in turn, wielded a veto over the Lower House. The Upper House was composed of Greek and Roman Catholic bishops and archbishops, Royal governors and County Lord Lieutenants, secular magnates and the so-called regalistae. The regalistae were named by the King for a limited time, whenever he wished to ensure a majority for the Government in the Upper House. However, this was seldom necessary because the King could usually depend on all the prelates and most of the magnates, who owed their position to the Habsburg monarchy. As well, the Upper House was presided over by the Palatine, or Vice Regent, traditionally a member of the Habsburg dynasty.[72]

The Habsburgs secured their political position soon after their accession to Hungary's throne when they endowed a select group of the Hungarian nobility with titles, large tracts of land and certain extraordinary privileges.[73] These magnates enjoyed the titles of Prince, Count, Baron, and eventually represented 168 families.[74] By the early nineteenth century the magnates' average land tenure amounted to some 100,000 acres per family. This represented an estate which was at least fifteen times greater

than the largest gentry holding.[75] The magnates were forbidden by law to mortgage their property and in the event of the extinction of a magnate line the property reverted to the Crown.

The special privileges of the magnates included the right of all males to sit in the Upper House for life, provided they had reached majority age. The magnates' titles also gave them the right to participate in the debates of the Lower House and they could even seek election to the Lower House without prejudicing their position in the Upper House.[76] Law IX of 1687 contained a further privilege for the magnates. It was passed in the difficult years following the Turkish occupation and was supported by the Habsburgs. It allowed magnates to renege on all debts as long as they were negotiated with non-nobles.[77]

In order to supervise their extensive tenures, magnates engaged estate managers and as a consequence they no longer had compelling reasons for residing permanently in Hungary.[78] The Habsburgs tempted the magnates with honours and important positions both at Court and in Imperial government. Some magnates left their estates in Hungary and became absentee landlords. They moved to Vienna, affected foreign customs and abandoned the Magyar language and culture in favour of German and French.[79] Some magnates outside Hungary lived on such a lavish scale that they were even criticized by their peers for the outflow of large sums of money. The Croatian economic expert, Baron Miklós

Skerlecz, for example, estimated that magnates living in Vienna alone accounted for an annual financial drain from Hungary of 860,000 florins.[80]

By the early nineteenth century the Habsburgs had succeeded, for the most part, in isolating the wealthiest and potentially the most powerful class in Magyar society. The magnates were indifferent to affairs in Hungary except for issues which affected their well-being. Even at the height of the Age of Reform relatively few of them attended sessions in the Upper House and hardly any participated in County government.[81] Count István Széchenyi observed that "magnates consider a rabbit or a fox more interesting than their fatherland. They seldom, if ever, attend County assemblies. . . . They think only of themselves."[82]

The effect of the isolation and apathy of the magnates was the creation of tension and conflict between the magnates and the jobbágyság. When the magnates became absentee landlords they left their estates in the hands of overseers whose oppressive practices alienated the peasantry. A contemporary estate manager remarked to the author Ferenc Kazinczy that he generally did whatever he pleased on his master's estate since the magnate only occasionally paid a visit to inspect the fields, at which time he would inquire about the harvest but never really look at anything.[83]

Relations between the magnates and the gentry were also strained, primarily for economic reasons. The Papal

Nuncio in Vienna, Ostini, observed that certain wealthy members of the gentry had advanced large loans to the magnates during the relatively prosperous time of the war years. Successive devaluations of the Hungarian currency during and after the war benefited the magnates because they were able to pay off their gentry creditors in virtually worthless paper currency and this ruined the gentry.[84] Ostini contended that the gentry had advanced too much money to the magnates and hence, they had ruined themselves. There is little evidence to support Ostini's view. In fact, the magnates had overextended their credits by contracting large loans, principally from Viennese bankers. When a prolonged depression in the 1820's left the magnates temporarily insolvent, they invoked Law IX of 1687 and refused to repay their non-noble creditors.[85] Foreign bankers were angered when authorities in Hungary refused to carry out foreclosures authorized by Austrian courts. At best, Hungarian courts would assign only a negligible portion of the debtors' annual incomes to the creditors. The result of the magnates' action was that international banking houses would no longer extend credit to any Hungarian nobleman, including the gentry.[86]

The gentry resented the fact that the magnates could legally repay their debts in devalued currency. The gentry could no longer contract loans from foreign bankers because of the irresponsibility of the magnates. The Habsburgs, by supporting the magnates' special right

to cancel their debts, had successfully created antagonism between the magnates and the gentry.[87]

The Habsburgs derived some benefit from the tension between the magnates and the gentry, and they were able to use the political conflict between the armalists and the gentry to even greater advantage. Through an executive order in 1819 Vienna decreed that the Counties had to permit the participation of poor armalist nobles in County government even though many of them no longer owned any land.[88] This resulted in the influx of a large number of armalists into County politics, which drew them closer to the regime, and at the same time weakened the gentry's base of political power. The gentry were in no position to accuse the Vienna Government of meddling because the decree conformed to the Tripartitum, which expressly stated that all noblemen were equals and had equal rights.[89]

The armalists began to make common cause with the Vienna Government in the wake of the decree. They soon represented a majority in many County assemblies and with threats of violence they succeeded for a time in creating obstructions and other difficulties for the gentry representatives.[90]

The Habsburgs not only took advantage of antagonisms between the various strata of the nobility, they also capitalized on the animosity between the jobbágyság and the nobles by demanding that the gentry comply with the terms of the Urbarium. The primary intention of the Vienna

Government in promulgating the Urbarium was to preserve its rightful share of the tax revenue. Vienna believed that the peasantry's minor rights would ensure their economic solvency and hence provide a steady source of income for the Crown. When Vienna insisted that the gentry adhere to the Urbarium, they not only insisted on their right to tax funds but also appeared to protect the peasants from excessive exploitation by the gentry. Consequently, the peasantry regarded the Urbarium as their permanent bulwark against gentry excesses and looked upon the Habsburgs as their protectors. They were drawn closer to the Vienna Government whenever royal commissioners, the Vice Regency or the Hungarian Chancellery redressed their grievances.

Besides the conflicts among the various Magyar classes, and in addition to their affairs with the Habsburgs, the non-Magyar minorities also affected the growth of Magyar national awareness. Hungary of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was composed of several nationalities, all culturally and ethnically distinct, among which no single group represented a clear majority of the population. Each of the various nationalities were in fact a minority both within Hungary and within the Habsburg Empire. Although Magyars were the largest single minority and the most affluent in Hungary, non-Magyars represented nearly 70% of Hungary's fourteen million population.[91]

At the beginning of the Reform Era the importance of the minorities, vis-à-vis the Magyars, was twofold.

Firstly, after a long period of relative tranquility, the leaders of the national minorities began to make demands than ran contrary to the Magyars' interests and that created tension between them. This tension continued, and even increased, during the Era of Reform and affected the growth of Magyar national awareness. Secondly, since some of the minorities possessed a privileged legal status in certain respects, the Habsburgs were presented with an opportunity to keep this tension and conflict between the Magyars and the minorities alive. By insisting on the minorities' rights in some cases and by encouraging their national aspirations in other instances, the Habsburgs could legally interfere in the affairs of Hungary to keep the society fragmented.

In this respect, the most important minorities in Hungary during the Vormärz were the Slovaks, Serbs, Roumanians, Slovenes and Germans. The Slovaks, numbering about 1,700,000,[92] lived in the unproductive northern highlands of Hungary, and constituted the largest non-Magyar minority. The clergy and nobility, either Magyar or Slovak, spoke Latin and for a long time held the vulgar Slovak of the lower classes in contempt. Having occupied the region in the tenth century, Magyars regarded the Slovaks as a conquered people. Magyar domination of the Slovaks was masked by the fact that both they and the Slovak nobility and clergy spoke the same language.[93]

Of all the minorities, the Serbs were the most

privileged. They numbered approximately 1,300,000[94] and inhabited the southern frontier region, known as the Militärgrenze,[95] which was formally administered by the Habsburgs since 1690. The Serbs enjoyed de facto autonomy under the leadership of their Orthodox priests and vojvode. The society was cohesive, since all Serbs were free men speaking the same language.[96]

The Roumanians numbered about 2-1/2 million persons, but they were more scattered and less politically and culturally uniform than the Serbs. Approximately one million lived in Transylvania, 150,000 on the Military Frontier, and a further 1,300,000 were spread throughout Hungary.[97]

Although the Croats, numbering one million, and the Slovenes, counting less than 50,000,[98] were fewer in number, they also enjoyed a privileged position. The Kingdom of Croatia and Slovenia was an associate Kingdom of Hungary and, while the Croats had their own Diet, they could send two additional, elected representatives to the Hungarian Diet. The Croatian Kingdom was socially and culturally fragmented since the lower classes spoke the language of the Serbs whereas the clergy and nobility used Latin as the official language.[99]

The 1,100,000 Germans were fewer than some of the other minorities but they occupied, for the most part, a unique and privileged position.[100] Approximately half of them lived in free cities which possessed royal charters

and were outside the jurisdiction of the gentry-dominated County governments. The financial affairs of the cities were controlled by the Royal Chamber (Hofkammer) but the cities were governed by their own elected magistrates and were corporate bodies enjoying de jure noble status. They sent representatives to the Hungarian Diet but they were unable to cooperate with the Magyar gentry Deputies who criticized them for their Habsburg sympathies and their use of the German tongue.[101] The fifty-three free cities, with a total population of 711,000,[102] were not only predominantly German and Habsburg controlled, but they dominated the commercial life of the country. In the words of a contemporary observer, "such was the power of German in all other walks of life as well that it was necessary for everyone to know it."[103]

Until the end of the eighteenth century there was little conflict between the Magyars and the other nationalities. Hungarian society was structured principally along divisions of class and religion, rather than nationality and language. Although the majority of Hungary's ruling classes were Magyar noblemen,[104] they identified with their non-Magyar fellow nobles rather than with their own classes.

By the 1790's, however, the situation was changing. At the Temesvár Congress in 1790 the Serbs produced their Supplex Libellus Valachorum, demanding an independent nation state within the framework of the Austrian Empire.[105] These demands caused some fear among the Magyar Deputies at

the 1790-1791 Diet who began to feel that the Serbs were trying to create a state within a state. For a short time Austria encouraged Serb aspirations and even established an Illyrian Chancellery in Vienna staffed with Serb sympathizers.[106]

The Roumanians were similarly encouraged by a report entitled lucru neamului (The Affairs of the Nation), prepared by two pro-Roumanian officials in Vienna.[107] The report suggested that the Roumanians become a privileged nation in Transylvania, and that they should have more representatives in the administration and Chancellery. The Transylvanian Diet rejected such ideas in 1791, but Magyars remained concerned about a possible Roumanian challenge to their authority.[108]

At the same time, Croats to the Diet resisted the introduction of Magyar as the official language in the Kingdom of Croatia and insisted that Latin remain as the official tongue. For political reasons the Croats were supported at this Diet by the Habsburgs.[109]

Whereas the Magyars' problems with the minorities were a comparatively recent development, religious schism in Hungary had been one of the oldest obstacles to Magyar unity. During the Turkish occupation most Magyar nobles and commoners became Protestants whereas Hungary's western frontier region, which remained in Christian hands during the Turkish era, retained its Roman Catholic character. When the two Hungaries were reunited at the end of the

seventeenth century, two major denominations emerged with the Protestants in the majority. However, the Roman Catholic Habsburgs' proselytizing efforts throughout the eighteenth century reduced the number of Protestants and by the nineteenth century they represented approximately one-third of Hungary's Magyar population.[110] The process of conversion, pursued at times with excessive vigor and cruelty by the Catholics, left relations between the two Christian groups strained to the extent that before the Age of Reform Catholic and Protestant Deputies in the Lower House would no longer sit at the same tables.[111]

The Catholic clergy, which numbered about 16,000, was divided into higher, middle and lower strata. Only the upper and middle Catholic clergy were permitted to go to the Diet as clerical representatives. All bishops and archbishops were considered as higher nobility, were automatically entitled to sit with the magnates in the Upper House, and could inherit family property. Abbots, provosts, canons and rectors were considered as middle nobility. They automatically sat in the Lower House but could not inherit family property in excess of 5,000 florins.[112] The higher and middle Catholic clergy supported Habsburg policies, and Vienna, through them, controlled a large part of the Hungarian lower classes.[113]

Protestant clergy could attend the Diet as well, but only if they were noblemen or residents of free cities and were elected as a Deputy to the Lower House. The

poorer, landless lower clergy of both denominations were denied political participation and on the eve of the Reform Era they had become estranged from the hierarchy.[114] Significantly, this mass of lower clergy provided the majority of teachers for Hungary's schools.

Since the administration of schools was a church function in Hungary, the Catholic-Protestant schism also affected education. In 1608 the Habsburgs, in an attempt to gain the support of influential Protestant noblemen, promulgated the Imperial Toleration Patent[115] whereby Protestants were granted relative educational autonomy. They could choose their language of instruction and they enjoyed some freedom in the choice of curricula. They were permitted to publish their own textbooks, but only with the approval of a Habsburg censor. The situation with Catholics was somewhat different. Through the Decrees of 1777 and 1806, the Ratio Educationis I and II, Vienna sought to standardize Catholic education by maintaining censorship over curricula and by making Latin the compulsory language of instruction. They were successful in controlling Roman Catholic schools, partly because the hierarchy supported Habsburg policies and partly because Catholicism was the official religion.[116]

The conflicts and stresses in Magyar society were aggravated by the economic crisis which culminated in the period immediately after the Napoleonic Wars. Agricultural producers were the hardest hit by the postwar depression

and this sharpened all the existing economic rivalries, the most crucial of which was the struggle between the jobbágyság and the gentry. The gentry had limited financial resources and could remain solvent only by exploiting the jobbágyság. The peasantry saw their only hope of survival in the Habsburgs who also used this economic distress to forestall progress toward Magyar unity by siding with the peasants against their gentry lords.

The Habsburgs, in their attempt to rule a multinational Empire, encouraged class divisions among Magyars and used the growing tension between Magyars and the minorities to their own advantage. They created a specially privileged magnate class and exploited the discords between the gentry and the armalists as well as between the gentry and the jobbágyság. The aim of the Vienna Government was to keep Magyar society fragmented and to isolate the gentry,[117] the only group capable, under the prevailing circumstances, of leading a national movement.

Despite the fragmentation of Magyar society on the eve of Reform, certain manifestations of increasing Magyar awareness appeared as early as the second half of the eighteenth century among some Catholic and Protestant educators.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

[1]H. Marczali, Ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte (Tübingen, 1910), p. 119; G. Eperjessy, Mezővárosi és falusi céhek az Alföldön és a Dunántúlon, 1686-1848 (Budapest, 1967), pp. 110-118.

[2]See especially the report of Alajos Hoffman, Privatbibliothek, 15 fasc., No. 6, concerning the policies of Leopold II, who wished to obstruct the Diet of 1790-1791, encourage Serb separatism and pit the Hungarian bourgeoisie against the Magyar nobility. Also see Kaunitz's remark to the effect that the Magyar nobility would have to be weakened. This was in response to a similar Staatsrat resolution (537:1791), both of which are cited in the Palatine's letter of 24 February 1791 (Sammelbuch 91). In 1790 Kaunitz also wrote, "I am convinced that now, more than ever before, the principle of divide et impera is essential." The documents are cited in E. Mályusz, ed., Sándor Lipót főherceg nádor iratai (Budapest, 1926), pp. 51-52.

[3]I. Lassú, Az austriai birodalomnak statisztikai, geographiai és históriai leírása (Buda, 1829), p. 61.

[4]Gy. Acsády, "Történeti statisztikai táblázatok," A történeti statisztika forrásai, ed. J. Kovácsics (Budapest, 1957), pp. 371-381; J. Eötvös, Die Reform in Ungarn (Leipzig, 1846), p. 2.

[5]According to Elek Fényes, the most respected authority from the Reform Era, the Magyar nobility understood "Constitution" to mean both the Bulla Aurea of 1222 and Part I, Article 9 of Verbőczy's Tripartitum. This meant that the nobleman was personally free and inviolable; he could be condemned only by trial. He was free from all taxation and military conscription, but he had to defend Hungary personally at his own expense. Finally, the Magyar noble only owed allegiance to his crowned King. See E. Fényes, Magyarország leírása (Pest, 1847), pp. 104-105, 123-124 (hereafter cited as Fényes, Leírás). The fundamental laws will be found in A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungaricae. Articuli Diaetales Annorum 1000-1526 (Leipzig, 1901), I, 65-69, 130-145 (hereafter cited as Kolosvári, Diaetales).

[6]Gy. Bernát, A Magyar jobbágyfelszabaditás eszmeáramlatai, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1930), pp. 21-25; I. Szabó, A Magyar parasztság története (Budapest, 1930), pp. 6-8; B. Pápa, "Magyarország népe a feudalizmus megerősödése és

bomlása idején (1711-1867)," in Magyarország történeti demográfiája, ed. J. Kovácsics (Budapest, 1963), p. 209; S. S. Pál, "Újabb adatok a paraszti földbirtoklás kérdéséhez a XIX. század első felében," Történelmi Szemle, IV, No. 2 (1961), 191.

[7]Vice Regency Document 141127:1784, cited in Gy. Kornis, A Magyar művelődés eszményei, 1777-1848 (Budapest, 1927), I, 65 (hereafter cited as Kornis, Művelődés).

[8]G. Berzeviczy, "A parasztnak állapotáról és természetéről Magyarországon," G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest, 1902), Part II, p. 150; I. Szabó, Tanulmányok a Magyar parasztság történetéből (Budapest, 1948), pp. 281-294; E. Iványi, "A földesúrakat kiszolgáló parasztok," in Tanulmányok a parasztság történetéhez Magyarországon, 1711-1790, ed. Gy. Spira (Budapest, 1952), p. 101.

[9]J. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), III, 215 (Editor's note) (hereafter cited as Kossuth, O.T.).

[10]Kornis, Művelődés, II, 518-521.

[11]Gy. Acsády, "Történeti statisztikai táblázatok," in A történeti statisztika forrásai, ed. J. Kovácsics (Budapest, 1957), p. 380, quoting Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie, III (1830), 4.Table (hereafter cited as Tafeln zur Statistik). According to Fényes, by 1846 there were about 20,000 honoratiori, not counting teachers. See Fényes, Leirás, p. 45.

[12]Fényes, Leirás, pp. 315-316; G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest 1902), Part II, p. 150; S. S. Pál, "Az agrárkérdés 1848 előtt," Társadalmi Szemle, III, No. 1 (1949), 9.

[13]Kolosvári, Diaetales, I, 130-145.

[14]A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Opus Tripartitum Stephani de Werbőcz (Leipzig, 1902), VI, passim (hereafter cited as Kolosvári, Tripartitum).

[15]Tripartitum, Law III, Kukuljević's speech in the Lower House, 30 August 1833, as quoted in Kossuth, O.T., II, 141-142. See Kolosvári, Tripartitum, VI, 407-411.

[16]S. Janšák, Slovensko v dobe Uhorského feudalizmu (Bratislava, 1932), p. 209.

[17]Somsich's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 22 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 88-89; J. Erdélyi, Nemzeti iparunk (Pest, 1846), pp. 136-137.

[18]A. Meszlényi, A jozefinizmus kora Magyarországon (1780-1846) (Budapest, 1934), p. 226.

[19]Bernát, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

[20]In 1807 the jobbágyság's share of the taxation for Austria was 4,000,000 florins. The remainder of 400,000 florins was made up by the royal free cities and the noble contributio, a voluntary annual subsidy to the Crown. G. Hassels, Statistischer Abriss des Österreichischen Kaisertums (Nürnberg and Leipzig, 1807), p. 85.

[21]Beöthy's speech at the Regional Session, 27 December 1832, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 38-39; Staatsrat Doc. Nos. 1822:1384 and 1827:7777, quoted in F. Eckhart, A Bécsi udvar gazdaságpolitikája Magyarországon, 1780-1815 (Budapest, 1958), pp. 419-426 (hereafter cited as Eckhart, Bécsi udvar); Bernát, op. cit., pp. 21-25.

[22]Count Károlyi's speech in the Upper House, 22 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 121. Tripartitum, Part III. See Kolosvári, Tripartitum, p. 31.

[23]Bernát, op. cit., p. 28.

[24]Gy. Mérei, Mezőgazdaság és agrártársadalom Magyarországon, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1948), pp. 24-25.

[25]Palóczy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 4 April 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 23; Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 680.

[26]Bernát, op. cit., pp. 21-25.

[27]"De oeconomia publico-politica," in G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest, 1902), Part II, p. 69.

[28]Erdélyi, op. cit., p. 134.

[29]Marczibányi's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 2 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 8; Bernát, op. cit., pp. 419-426; Mérei, op. cit., pp. 10-14; J. Varga, Typen und Probleme des bäuerlichen Grundbesitzes in Ungarn, 1767-1848 (Budapest, 1965), pp. 109-142, passim.

[30]I. W. E. von Maithstein, Ein Haupthinderniss des Fortschrittes in Ungarn (Vienna, 1842), pp. 4-5.

[31]Wm. Hunter, Travels through France, Turkey, and Hungary to Vienna in 1792 (London, 1803), II, 228; I. Berkeszi, ed., Gróf Hoffmansegg utazása Magyarországon 1793-94-ben (Budapest, 1887), p. 19.

[32]Hiller to Rev. Jutzler, letter of 21 September 1805, G. Hiller, Reise durch einen Theil von Sachsen, Böhmen, Österreich, und Ungarn (Kothen, 1808), pp. 303-304; see also D. Berzsenyi, A Magyarországi mezei szorgalom némely akadályairúl, ed. O. Merényi (Budapest, 1933), pp. 25-26 (work was written in 1833) (hereafter cited as Berzsenyi, Szorgalom).

[33]B. Hóman and Gy. Szekfü, eds., Magyar történet (Budapest, 1930-1934), VII, 64; D. Kosáry, Kossuth Lajos a reformkorszakban (Budapest, 1946), p. 31.

[34]A. Dessewffy, "Néhány nevezetessebb darab gróf Dessewffy Aurél-nek hátrahagyott eredeti Magyar munkáiból és országgyülési beszédeiből" (Pest, 1843), edited by Emil Dessewffy, who claimed that the collected excerpts were written in 1833, quoted in J. Ferenczy, ed., Gróf Dessewffy Aurél összes müvei (Budapest, 1887), pp. 162-163.

[35]J. Pardoe, City of the Magyar (London, 1840), I, 134-135; L. Höke, Magyarország újabbkori történelme 1815-től 1892-ig (Nagybecskerek, 1893), I, 33.

[36]Pardoe, op. cit.

[37]Höke, op. cit.

[38]M. J. Quin, A Steam Voyage down the Danube (London, 1836), I, 54-55. To be more accurate, a jobbágy had no legal right to initiate a law suit against anyone.

[39]Eötvös, op. cit., pp. 54-55; Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., p. 49.

[40]Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 63-64.

[41]A. L. Lowell, Governments and Parties in Continental Europe (Boston and New York, 1896), II, 127 (hereafter cited as Lowell, Governments).

[42]Nagy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 12 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 99-100;

Somsich's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 1 February 1833, in Kossúth, O.T., I, p. 143; Nagy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 696-697.

[43]I. Ereki, A Magyar helytartósági önkormányzat; vármegyék és községek (Budapest, 1908), I, 68; H. Marczali, Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht (Tübingen, 1911), p. 125; A. Timon, Magyar alkotmány és jogtörténet (Budapest, 1903), pp. 660-663; Eötvös, op. cit., pp. 18-19; P. Teleki, The Evolution of Hungary and Its Place in European History (New York, 1923), p. 69; Jansák, op. cit., p. 198.

[44]Eötvös, op. cit., pp. 18-19; J. Paget, Hungary and Transylvania (London, 1855), I, 314-316.

[45]Eötvös, op. cit., p. 19.

[46]Ibid., pp. 8-20; Paget, op. cit., pp. 312-316; A. Springer, Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden, 1809 (Leipzig, 1863), p. 324.

[47]Eötvös, op. cit., p. 19; J. Mailáth, a contemporary observer and historian, was of the same opinion. J. Mailáth, Geschichte des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates (Hamburg, 1850), V, 394.

[48]J. Orosz, Terra Incognita. Notizen über Ungarn in zwanglosen Heften (Leipzig, 1835), I, 276-277; Eötvös, op. cit., pp. 8-9; A. Kecskeméthy, Graf Stephan Széchenyis staatsmännische Laufbahn (Pest, 1866), pp. 22-23.

[49]A. de Gerando, Über den öffentlichen Geist in Ungarn seit dem Jahre 1790 (Leipzig, 1848), p. 65.

[50]Mérei, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

[51]Gy. Miskolczy, A kamarilla a reformkorszakban (Budapest, 1930), p. 30; K. Hudeczek, "Österreichische Handelspolitik in Vormärz, 1815-1848," Studien zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftskunde (1918), XI, 80-85.

[52]L. Lang, Hundert Jahre Zollpolitik (Vienna and Leipzig, 1906), pp. 169, 173-175. As Gy. Spira pointed out, this policy was neither anti-Magyar nor pro-German. It represented Austrian policy to benefit most of the Empire. Gy. Spira, "A Magyar negyvennyolc jobb megértését keresve," Kritika, V, No. 2 (1967), 14.

[53]Mérei, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

[54]M. Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der Geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848 (Leipzig, 1867), I, 29 (hereafter cited as Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre); Miskolczy, op. cit., p. 39; Eckhart, Bécsi udvar, pp. 7-10; Mr. Horváth, Az ipar és kereskedés története Magyarországon a három utolsó század alatt (Buda, 1840), p. 355; E. Győző, "Die absolute Monarchie der Habsburger als Hindernis der Ungarischen nationalen Entwicklung," Acta Historica, IV, Nos. 1-3 (1955), 98-100; Speeches by Nyitzky and Palotzy at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 11 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 95.

[55]Erdélyi, op. cit., p. 319.

[56]Ibid., pp. 164-166.

[57]M. Futó, A Magyar gyáripar története (Budapest, 1944), I, 144-163.

[58]I. Széchenyi, Javaslat a Magyar közlekedési ügy rendezéséről (Pozsony, 1848), pp. 9, 13-14; E. Wertheimer, "Erzherzog Reiners Reise durch Ungarn (1810)," Ungarische Revue, XIV, Nos. 1-2 (1894), 1; von Maithstein, op. cit., p. 6.

[59]Ostini's report to the Vatican, Arch. Segr. Vat. di Stato, 1824-1826, Dieta Ungarica del 1825, quoted in Meszlényi, op. cit., pp. 295-296.

[60]Mérei, op. cit., pp. 17-21.

[61]Document #1384 dated 1822 (Report of Austrian Staatsrat) showing gentry's circumvention of the Urbarium. See Eckhart, Bécsi udvar, pp. 419-426.

[62]Various speeches at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 20 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 122-124; R. Bright, Travels from Vienna through Lower Hungary in the Year 1814 (Edinburgh, 1818), p. 115.

[63]Somsich's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 30 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 127-128.

[64]La Motte's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 29 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 122.

[65]Say's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 12 April 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 306-308. Speeches by Szent Pály, Borsinczky and Kölcsey at the

Plenary Session in the Lower House, 17 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 72-73; Berzsenyi, Szorgalom, p. 19.

[66]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 March 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., pp. 281-282; Hungarian Chancellery, Doc. No. 1822:1384, 25 September 1822, is a report which documented the seizure of jobbágy pastures and other properties (see Eckhart, Bécsi udvar, pp. 419-426); Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 683; Gy. Spira, A Magyar forradalom 1848-49-ben (Budapest, 1959), pp. 8-9.

[67]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 March 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 306-308; I. Szántó, A parasztság kisajitása és mozgalmai a dunántúli Festetich birtokon, 1711-1850 (Budapest, 1954), pp. 114-117.

[68]Ferenc Deák's speech at the Regional Session of 1 August 1833, F. Deák, Deák Ferencz beszédei, 1829-1847, ed. M. Kónyi (Budapest, 1882), I, 25.

[69]Eötvös, op. cit., p. 10.

[70]György Zádor to Kazinczy, letter of 26 January 1824; F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz összes művei. Harmadik osztály. Levelezés, ed. J. Váczy (Budapest, 1909), XIX, 18-20 (hereafter cited as Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei).

[71]Orosz, op. cit., p. 269; E. Fényes, Ungarn im Vormärz (Leipzig, 1851), pp. 183-186.

[72]Gerando, op. cit., p. 63; Kossuth, O.T., IV, 184; Fényes, Leírás, pp. 115-117.

[73]Law I of 1608, quoted in Timon, op. cit., p. 529.

[74]Gerando, op. cit., p. 65. By 1840 their number had risen to 214. See Fényes, Leírás, p. 50.

[75]Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 79-80. The statistics give an average of 70,000 holds per family. One hold equals 1.43 acres.

[76]Eötvös, op. cit., p. 7.

[77]A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1657-1740 (Leipzig, 1902), IV, 341. In 1723 this law was extended to all noblemen (Law 50, paragraph 4, Kolosvári, op. cit., p. 613).

[78]Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 79-80.

[79]Bezerédy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 July 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 333; Lowell, Governments, p. 127.

[80]M. Skerlecz, Skerlecz Miklós báró művei, ed. P. Berényi (Budapest, 1914), pp. 113-114.

[81]Bezerédy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 July 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 333; Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., p. 4; Eötvös, op. cit., pp. 146-148.

[82]I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi vallomásai és tanitásai, eds. J. Fekete and J. Váradi (Budapest, 1943), p. 51; I. Széchenyi, Hunnia, ed. J. Török (Pest, 1858), pp. 11-12; also see J. Bajza to Toldy, letter of 28 September 1825, J. Bajza, Bajza József összegyüjtött munkái, ed. F. Badics (Budapest, 1901), VI, 148-151. According to Hegel, "the greats of Hungary consider the source of their freedom to be a rule of force." G. W. F. Hegel, G. W. F. Hegels Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte, ed. E. Gans (Berlin, 1831), IX, 445; E. Andics, "Der Widerstand der feudalen Kräfte in Ungarn," Acta Historica, IV, Nos. 1-3 (1955), 153-155.

[83]Kazinczy to J. Dessewffy, letter of 28 January 1824, in Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, pp. 23-26.

[84]Meszlényi, op. cit., pp. 297-298.

[85]Kölcsey's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 16 July 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 320-324.

[86]Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 79-80; Bernáth's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 12 October 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 300; Meszlényi, op. cit., pp. 297-298.

[87]B. Grünwald, Széchenyi magánhitelügyi koncepciójának szellemi és gazdasági előzményei a rendi Magyarországon, 1790-1848 (Pécs, 1927), pp. 40-41.

[88]Government decree of 16 February 1819, quoted in Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre, p. 23; Hóman and Szekfü, op. cit., p. 49; Höke, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

[89]Tripartitum, Law I, Paragraph 4, Section 1, quoted in Timon, op. cit., pp. 527-528; Kolosvári, Tripartitum, pp. 59-61.

[90]Hóman and Szekfű, op. cit., p. 49; D. Kosáry, A History of Hungary (Cleveland, 1941), p. 188.

[91]This figure includes the military frontier and Transylvania. The Magyar population of Hungary and Transylvania comprised slightly more than three-eighths of the population. See I. Lassú, Az Ausztriai birodalomnak statisztikai, geographiai és históriai leírása (Buda, 1829), pp. 13, 61. See also Tafeln zur Statistik, 4.Table.

[92]Fényes, Leírás, p. 25.

[93]J. Dubnicky, "A Szlovák nemzeti ébredés problémái," Századok, XCVII, No. 1 (1963), 175.

[94]Fényes, Leírás, p. 25.

[95]It has been difficult to determine the exact census of the Military Frontier owing to the continual fluctuation of the population. According to a demographic map prepared in 1773 there were 524,000 Croats and only 144,000 Serbs living in the region. See A. Petrov, ed., Narodopisná mapa Uherskovo. Poslo uredniho lexikonu osad z roku 1773 (Prague, 1924) (hereafter cited as Narodopisná mapa). It is more likely, however, that the Serbs predominated. E. Fényes committed a similar error in his census published in 1842, in which he overestimated the number of Croats by close to 1/2 million. See E. Fényes, Magyarország statisztikája (Pest, 1842), p. 57. Five years later Fényes rectified his error. See Fényes, Leírás, p. 25.

[96]R. W. Seton-Watson, The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans (London, 1917), p. 85; H. W. V. Temperley, History of Serbia (London, 1917), pp. 170-171.

[97]Fényes, Leírás, p. 25; Narodopisná mapa.

[98]Fényes, Leírás, p. 25.

[99]H. Wendel, Aus dem Südslavischen Risorgimento (Gotha, 1921), pp. 190-191, 195-196.

[100]Fényes, Leírás, p. 25.

[101]J. Orosz, Terra Incognita, Notizen über Ungarn (Leipzig, 1835), pp. 256-257.

[102]Fényes, Leírás, pp. 126-127.

[103]J. Csaplovics, Gemälde von Ungarn (Pest, 1829), I, 177, 220-221; Kornis, Művelődés, II, 511;

J. H. Schwicker, Die Deutschen in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen (Vienna and Teschen, 1881), pp. 184-185.

[104]According to E. Fényes, 86% of the nobility in Hungary were Magyars. See E. Fényes, Ungarn im Vormärz (Leipzig, 1851), p. 43.

[105]G. G. Kemény, A Magyar nemzetiségi kérdés története (Budapest, 1947), p. 12 (hereafter cited as Kemény, Nemzetiség); J. H. Schwicker, Politische Geschichte der Serben in Ungarn (Budapest, 1880), pp. 406-407.

[106]Kemény, Nemzetiség, p. 13; L. Szalay, A Magyarországi Szerb telepek jogviszonya az államhoz (Pest, 1841), pp. 110-111.

[107]N. Iorga, Geschichte der Rumänen und ihrer Kultur (Sibiu, 1929), pp. 271-305; Tóth, Erdély, pp. 99-100; B. Jancsó, A Román irredentista mozgalmak története (Budapest, 1920), pp. 17, 21-22. See especially Klein's and Sincai's Elemente linguae daco-romanae sive valachiae (Vienna, 1780), which sought to establish that Roumanians were the descendants of native settlers and Roman legionnaires. See N. Iorga, Geschichte des Rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildungen (Gotha, 1905), II, 228-229.

[108]R. W. Seton-Watson, A History of the Roumanians from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity (New York, 1963), pp. 189-190.

[109]Kemény, Nemzetiség, pp. 10-12; Gy. Miskolczy, A Horvát kérdés története és irományai a rendi állam korában (Budapest, 1928), I, 51.

[110]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 681.

[111]Gy. Farkas, A Magyar irodalom története (Budapest, 1934), pp. 142-143.

[112]Fényes, Leirás, pp. 124-125.

[113]In order to gain the confidence of the masses, for example, the Vienna Government even prescribed such obligatory topics for sermons as the need for smallpox vaccination and methods for growing potatoes. The Magyar hierarchy did not oppose this policy. See Hóman and Szekfű, op. cit., p. 23; A. Meszlényi, A jozefinizmus kora Magyarországon, 1780-1846 (Budapest, 1934), p. 215.

[114]Roman Catholic educators, notably the Piarists, deviated from the Habsburg-oriented curriculums, which were

supported by the hierarchy. The lower clergy taught progressive ideas in the Magyar tongue. For example, Georg Pray's compulsory history text in Latin, commissioned by the Vienna Government with the approval of the hierarchy, was never used. Instead, educators used Hányoki's Hármas Kis Tükör, which was the official Magyar Protestant textbook. See S. Bíró, Történelemtanításunk a XIX. század első felében (Budapest, 1960), pp. 34-35, 82-84, 81-108 (hereafter cited as Bíró, Történelemtanításunk).

[115]Also known as Law I of 1608, see C. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1608-1657 (Leipzig, 1902), III, 9.

[116]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 17-18.

[117]Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre, p. 5.

CHAPTER II

RELIGION AND EDUCATION

The religious schism in Hungary, evident before the Age of Reform, extended into education as well. Protestants and Roman Catholics managed their own schools and developed different attitudes towards learning. The Catholic hierarchy was strongly influenced by the Habsburgs and tended to urge devotion to the dynasty. This was more true for the higher clergy than it was for the lower clergy, especially in education. Protestants, for their part, mainly encouraged their students to be loyal to the prevailing social order.

Two significant developments took place in religion during the Age of Reform which aided the progress of Magyarism and reflected the growing Magyar national awareness. First, in the Diet the Catholic and Protestant secular Deputies came to an understanding, based on Magyarism, and began to offer resistance to the hierarchy and its support of Vienna's policies. Secondly, within the Catholic Church the hierarchy was becoming less influential in the Diet and the lower clergy, through education, was having a greater impact than before. Francis I disliked clergy who interfered in politics and he refused to utilize their

influence in the Diet. As a result, in the view of a contemporary observer, "within thirty years of his reign the clergy in the Diet was virtually powerless."[1]

At the same time, younger members of the clergy, particularly those of non-noble origin, turned to education as a means of advancement. Education had been the preserve of the noble classes, but by the beginning of the nineteenth century this was no longer true. By then there were 9,300 lower clergy teaching in elementary schools and another 900 in the higher schools.[2]

Teaching and the priesthood were virtually synonymous in the Catholic Church, but in Protestant schools, which were attended by most of the gentry, the churches took great care to select talented students, regardless of class, for secular teachers. These pedagogues were dispersed in Hungary's village and small town elementary schools where they were considered honoratiori. If a student showed exceptional promise, he was sent abroad to such centers as Jena, Göttingen and Utrecht.[3] When these scholars returned they invariably filled highly respected professorial chairs in higher education and as a consequence the lower classes, through their clerical and teaching positions, began to have an impact on the education and thought of the nobility.[4] It was primarily through the foreign-trained scholars that the nobles became exposed to the ideas of Romanticism, liberalism and nationalism, then popular in Western Europe.

The Habsburgs, at the beginning of the Reform Era, were disturbed by these developments in education and by the influx of Western European ideas. The French Revolution of 1789 prompted Vienna to promulgate Law IV of 1790-1791 which forbade graduate students to visit foreign universities unless they obtained a special Government permit.[5] In this way the Habsburgs were able to restrict the travel of students to the West, but they were not able to stop it entirely. Even more important for the growth of Magyar national awareness was the fact that the ideas of Romanticism and nationalism had already penetrated to the lower levels of the education system.

As early as the middle of the eighteenth century there were signs that even Catholic teachers, generally regarded as supporters of the Habsburgs, were teaching in Magyar and encouraging Magyar patriotism among their pupils.[6] Evidence of this is clearly available in the form of the textbooks of that period. In this respect, one of the most important books was Franz Wagner's Universae Phraseologia Latinae Corpus, which first appeared in Trnava in 1750. Although the book was written, published and used by Jesuits, it was designed to arouse patriotic feelings in Magyar children. The text of the work was composed in Latin but it contained parallel translations in German, Slovak and Magyar. The German and Slovak translations were literal, but the Magyar versions invariably contained patriotic messages.

For example, the Latin phrase "Decrevi me Philosophiae dare" was translated verbatim into German and Slovak. In Magyar, however, the passage was changed to read "I am determined--it is my intention--to learn the wisdom of the world, to dedicate my life to science, and oh, some day in the glorious Magyar tongue." The expression "Urbem strenue defendit" became, in the Magyar translation, "Valiantly did Miklós Zrinyi defend the city."[7] Magyar sentences were for the most part extended, unlike the laconic German and Slovak translations, and were specifically designed to provide opportunities for Magyar children to exercise their mother tongue.

Wagner's text was reprinted in 1760 and was in steady use until the early nineteenth century, particularly among jobbágy children. The work is important for it shows that some of the Catholic Magyar intelligentsia were not only interested in educating the lower classes but instructed their pupils in the Magyar Romantic spirit as well.

I. L. Hányoki's Hármas Kis Tükör (Triple Small Mirrors) was also used extensively in Magyar schools. It was first printed in 1771 and by 1849 over a hundred printings appeared. The text was designed only as an introductory work for Protestant village schools, but was so well received that within a few years it was adopted in Protestant and Catholic middle schools.[8]

The author used question and answer passages, brief

verses and clever catch words to characterize great men in Hungarian history and to appeal to the patriotism of his young readers. Pupils were asked the provocative question "To which nation do you belong?" The correct reply was "I belong to the Magyar nation." They were taught a fifteenth-century saying "Extra Hungariam non est vita; si est vita, non est ita."[9] This was a reminder to the children that once before, during the reign of Matthias Corvinus, Hungary had attained a high degree of culture, political influence and national self-esteem.

Hányoki carefully selected historical episodes which showed that Hungary produced valiant heroes who defied Habsburg tyranny. For example, he discussed the Bocskai uprising by writing: "Aware that his suit with the Emperor was hopeless, Bocskai decided to safeguard his own cause by resorting to arms."[10] When Hányoki discussed the subsequent peace treaty he revealed the cause of the uprising: "The Emperor concluded an agreement with Bocskai, agreeing that the Protestant faith henceforth shall be free.[11] Alert students recognized that Bocskai had launched his uprising because the Habsburgs had oppressed the Protestant faith. The author declared that Rákóczi's revolt "created quite a tumult" and suggested that "both Emperors Leopold and Joseph endeavoured to pacify the insurgents with gracious promises."[12] Every Magyar child of Hányoki's time knew what "pacification through gracious promises" really meant.

Hányoki was the first Hungarian author to mention the condition of the jobbágy in a critical sense. He concluded the account of the 1514 peasant uprising by writing: "For their rebellion the nobles put the peasants under a great yoke under which they are still groaning."[13]

The importance of Hármas Kis Tükör lies in the fact that at a time when Latin was almost the exclusive language of instruction, particularly in Catholic schools, Hányoki's book was the only school text written in Magyar. Many years before the reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics, Roman Catholic schools, even some convents, adopted this Protestant text, indicating that some Catholic educators put Magyarism ahead of religion. The effect of Hányoki's text was that by the time Magyar pupils completed their studies they were aware that Hungary was ruled by foreigners whose interests opposed their own. They were taught that only Habsburg treachery kept Hungary from becoming a great and rich nation once again. Many of Hungary's future leaders, such as the author Ferenc Kazinczy and the statesman Lajos Kossuth, spoke with enthusiasm and affection about the unforgettable influence the book had on them.[14]

In schools of higher learning the Vienna Government's censorship was more severe than in the lower form schools and consequently most Magyar professors found books and the official curricula inadequate, especially in history. As a result professors began to teach history

from their unpublished lecture notes. Many of them taught the ideas of Romanticism and influenced their pupils among whom many were of noble origin.

One such educator was the Göttingen alumnus József Láczai Szabó, who taught history at the Protestant gymnasium at Sárospatak from 1807 until 1828. His manuscript Magyar Ország Históriája, written in 1804, criticized the Habsburgs for their religious persecution of Hungary's Protestants and for their suppression of rebels like Bocskai and Rákóczi.

By examples from Swedish history Szabó showed how in other nations noblemen respected the peasants and gained their loyalty. Szabó's aristocratic pupils learned that there were ways of dealing with peasants other than through coercion and trickery. He quoted the Danish King Frederick V who, in his dying words, advised his son:

> You can become a great and illustrious monarch only if you consider carefully, before you issue any order, whether you would wish to obey such a command from your King if you were a serf.[15]

Another professor, Ézsaiás Budai, influenced young noblemen through his teaching at the Reformed Collegium in Debrecen between 1793 and 1841. Budai wrote a three-volume work, Magyar Ország Históriája, which became an official text in Protestant schools. However, he did not use these books in his lectures because he had been forced to omit or alter certain historical events in order to avoid censorship and these changes conflicted with his personal

convictions. He chose instead to lecture from his notes. Budai criticized overtaxation of poor Magyar commoners by the Vienna Government, the Jesuits' excesses against Magyar Protestants, and the meddling of the Austrian Court in the affairs of Hungary's nobility.[16]

In 1803 Budai became the first to write a world history in the Magyar tongue. It was written at the insistence of the Rector, Lajos Domokos, because professors at the Collegium had been lecturing in Magyar since 1798 without a guiding text.[17] Budai's criticism of the Habsburgs' role in Hungary only appeared indirectly since he wished to avoid censorship. Nevertheless, in a passage purportedly inspired by the Bible, but in fact prompted by the ideals of the Enlightenment, Budai declared that all men were of common origin and equals regardless of race, colour or nationality. Rulers who exploited natives under the guise of self-proclaimed superiority were to be despised.[18] This was a thinly veiled reference to Austria's domination of Hungary.

József Csengery, professor of history at the Reformed Collegium at Sárospatak from 1824 until 1850, was the most prominent among those who helped to promote disaffection with the Austrian regime. He skillfully applied the lessons of world history to Austro-Hungarian affairs. In his manuscript Europa politikai megtekintése 1825-be, Csengery wrote that the people were no longer content with privileges issuing from the largesse of sovereigns: they

desired freedom based on human rights and dignity. He considered England the only European nation where the dignity of man was vouchsafed and indirectly chastised the Magyar nobility by condemning the French aristocracy. According to Csengery, France had lost her honour, and the esteem of Europe, because of her aristocracy. He even attacked the Austrian Government, saying that Austria was the true home of despotism, and the only merit of her Government was its desire to make despotism tolerable.[19]

Many Roman Catholic teachers in higher education, especially the Piarists, defied the Vienna Government and the Ratio by teaching most subjects, including history, in the Magyar tongue. So effective were these Catholic schools in transmitting Magyarism that in the opinion of Kossuth, who attended a Piarist gymnasium,[20] the Revolution of 1848 would have never come about without their inspiration.[21]

To counteract the teaching of Magyarism in Roman Catholic history courses, the Vienna Government introduced in 1801 a compulsory official history of Hungary written in Latin.[22] The three-volume text, prepared by the pro-Habsburg Court clergyman Georg Pray, was designed for use in Hungary's Catholic middle schools. However, it was completely beyond the comprehension of the thirteen to eighteen year old students, many of whom knew only Magyar. The book presented a one-sided picture of the Habsburg rule in Hungary and ignored such episodes as the

persecution of Protestants. Despite its official sponsorship, or perhaps because of it, the text was never used in any Catholic schools. Much to the displeasure of the Habsburgs, Catholic professors continued to dictate their own lecture notes, mostly in Magyar and in the Magyar spirit.[23]

The Vienna Government took great pains to arrest the spread of this practice in Catholic schools. In 1813 a Piarist gymnasium was accused by the Government of teaching Magyar in defiance of the ban, and a similar charge was made against the Piarist gymnasium at Szeged in the early 1830's.[24] In 1833 Chancellor Reviczky was angered by a report that the Lyceum at Szeged was giving its public final oral examinations in the Magyar tongue. A further inquiry revealed that the Lyceum and its adjunct, the gymnasium, also taught many subjects in Magyar. The director of the school was reprimanded and ordered to comply with the Ratio.[25]

The teaching of Magyar patriotic ideas in the Magyar tongue continued, however, and became an important feature of the pre-Reform era. Commoners and nobles were equally exposed to these influences because noble children, except for the most well-to-do, attended village schools along with peasant children. Even higher schools catered to a large percentage of commoners. This practice contributed to the gradual breaking down of barriers among the classes and promoted the acceptance into society of the educated non-noble honoratiori.[26]

The weak point of Hungary's educational system lay in the absence or poor quality of school facilities in the underprivileged rural districts.[27] Many villages had no schools at all and in others the teaching personnel were incompetent.[28] In 1806 Count László Teleki, one of the earliest proponents of universal education in the Magyar spirit, related the poor quality of rural education to the choice of village teachers, who were selected from the lowest segments of society. According to Teleki, these pedagogues did not teach peasant children useful knowledge. They wasted their precious time by having to memorize Latin phrases at the expense of their native Magyar tongue.

Educational facilities for the urban lower classes were also poor, according to Teleki. Teachers were so incompetent that they frequently needed instruction themselves, and the occasional good teacher was not sufficiently rewarded. In the smaller towns future artisans and petty shopkeepers were taught knowledge with little practical value. Besides Latin, they studied such subjects as Roman and Greek geography and antiquities. Students destined for occupation in shops or trades wasted four or five years in such schools.[29]

Although many nobles, having been exposed to Romanticist and liberal educational influences, were aware of the shortcomings in their educational system, the demand for reform came predominantly from the public outside the Diet. An anonymous writer in Felső Magyarországi Minerva

for example, declared that

> Latin should be taught only to those who wish to embark on careers in the ministry or law; those who have no such inclination should study their respective career topics only in the Magyar tongue.[30]

In a similar article in Tudományos Gyüjtemény another author added that most students left school after three or four years to enter trade and Latin was completely useless to them.[31]

The question of Latin in the schools became the concern of a large group of influential Deputies at the Diet of 1825-1827. One representative of this group said:

> Our children learn only Latin and when they leave school after eight years they hardly know anything. If Magyar was taught in our schools then pupils would learn every other discipline with far greater ease. Poorer children especially, whose parents cannot afford to keep them in school for too long, would have a better opportunity to learn more practical subjects.[32]

By the time of the 1825-1827 Diet the Magyar intelligentsia had become concerned about substituting Magyar for Latin in the schools for the lower classes and this common objective tended to submerge ill feelings between Catholics and Protestants.[33] Secular leaders of both faiths recognized that Magyarism would fail to grow if they did not reconcile their differences. They had to unite in order to combat the educational policies of the Habsburgs, which compelled Catholics to teach only in Latin.

Deputies were also aware that the success of Magyar education in the villages particularly depended on the cooperation of Catholic and Protestant lower clergymen and

their assistants. These educators could communicate meaningfully with the peasantry and introduce them to the Magyar tongue in the village schools. According to Deputy Bartal, the question was not only the elimination of Latin from the curriculum. In his view it was equally important to introduce non-Magyar peasant children to the Magyar tongue. Bartal believed that in this way new generations of jobbágy children, both Magyar and non-Magyar, would grow up being proficient in the Magyar tongue instead of Latin.

The question of minority influences in Hungary stimulated interest among the Deputies and the subject was discussed at length in the Diet, with great emphasis on the activities of the clergy in the educational realm. According to Deputy Horváth, many localities in Békés and Fejér Counties had become Magyarized owing to the activities of the Magyar clergy. Deputy Frimm said that in Erlau County the Magyar tongue had made such strides since 1790 that only two non-Magyar priests could be found in the entire diocese.

Other Deputies were less enthusiastic about the progress of Magyar. Deputy Bartal observed that it might be true that the nation had made great advances in Magyar since 1790 but this was not true in all regions. Pozsony County was inundated with clergy from Austria who did not know the Magyar tongue and hence the Magyar character of the entire area was in danger. Deputy Németszeghy believed

that such an influx of foreign clergy would not be possible if Magyar landlords insisted on engaging only Magyar priests for their jobbágy villages. Unfortunately, many Magyar nobles were too indifferent on the language question, and this was a menace for Magyarism. Baron Dessewffy wished to stop the entry of non-Magyar priests into Hungary and proposed a bill that would forbid the ordination of priests in Hungary who did not know the Magyar language.[34]

Catholic clergymen in the Lower House opposed the public discussion of religious issues, especially when Catholic secular Deputies sided openly with the Protestants by introducing two proposals on their behalf. One bill proposed by the Catholic laymen would have lifted the restriction on Protestant students traveling to foreign universities. At the time these students were forced to obtain special permits from the Vienna Government despite the fact that there was no legal restriction on their travel abroad.[35] Another proposed law would have permitted Catholic pupils to be taught by qualified Protestant instructors, a practice which was forbidden.

Clerical representatives in the Lower House maintained that the Diet had forfeited its jurisdiction over these topics because Law IV of 1790-1791 granted Supremae Inspectionis to the King over all religious and educational issues affecting Protestants.[36] Catholic lay members pointed out that they considered this to be treason by their clergy, for under the Constitution education was,

and always had been, within the jurisdiction of the Diet, not of the King. They declared that the Monarch's restriction of educational opportunities for Protestants was not only discrimination but also a prima facie violation of the Constitution.[37]

Catholic lay deputies also defended the Protestants against the charge made by the Roman Catholic Provost of Pozsony:

> If Roman Catholics are taught by Protestants the former might become influenced by Naturalism, a doctrine which is a menace both to the Protestants and the entire nation. A person should only be taught by a member of his own religion.[38]

Catholic laymen rejected the Provost's allegation that Protestant teachers would spread dangerous ideas in Hungary. They contended that if fathers had the duty of educating children in their own faith then it was unthinkable that a Catholic father would deliberately hire a Protestant teacher for the purpose of having his child proselytized or seduced into Naturalism. They argued that a father would consider engaging a Protestant tutor only when he failed to find a suitable Catholic instructor. What sort of justice was it, the Catholic laymen asked, that permitted Catholics to teach Protestants but prohibited Protestants from teaching Catholics? In effect, they argued that the ban represented an infringement on the rights of Catholic fathers.[39]

A Deputy from Bereg County, one of the least developed regions in Hungary, viewed the prohibition as a

serious curtailment of educational opportunities for Catholic children. The Deputy declared that there were many localities in Bereg without Catholic schools and it would be a denial of the constitutional rights of Roman Catholic parents if they were forbidden to send their children to Protestant schools.[40] These debates indicated the concern of lay Deputies for the educational welfare of lower class children who suffered most from the prohibition.

Clerical representatives were adamantly opposed to any concession to the Protestants. They pointed out that the ban on Protestant studies abroad was wise because Protestants would absorb dangerous and revolutionary doctrines in Western Europe and upon their return they would spread these ideas. Roman Catholic lay deputies countered by pointing out that not all foreign institutions taught dangerous ideas. Why, they inquired, should Protestant youth be excluded from visiting foreign universities where dangerous ideas were not present?[41]

The two issues concerning the Protestants reached the conservatively minded Upper House which decided to maintain the laws of 1790-1791 in their original form.[42] The same issues were revived during the 1830 Diet but after a brief discussion they were remanded to a Committee for further study.[43] Although no laws had been passed dealing with educational reform at the 1825-1827 and 1830 Diets, Magyar upper class society had become increasingly secularized as a result of the reconciliation of the Protestant

and Catholic laymen.

Public concern continued to center on education, as may be seen from an article which appeared in Tudományos Gyüjtemény in 1832. The anonymous author criticized the Magyar upper classes for neglecting the education of Magyar peasants. In his view pedagogues concerned themselves only with the upper classes while the needs of the peasant children were ignored. The writer maintained that this oversight was a grave error because the peasants were not only the most numerous but also the most useful members of society. How can the nation be happy without satisfying their needs? asked the author.[44] His views concerning village teachers were strikingly similar to those expressed some thirty years earlier by the progressive, Count Teleki:

> Our choice of village school teachers is most unfortunate. These teachers come from the ranks of the somewhat more able and richer village children who demonstrate some talent such as playing an instrument or especially those who can sing or who are servile in helping the school master in menial tasks. They become teachers casually, without any formal training, often after only some two or three years of teacher apprenticeship in some other village.[45]

The education question also emerged as an important issue at the Diet of 1832-1836. In the Lower House the progressively minded Deputy Say charged that Hungary still did not possess a single trade school and he blamed this condition on the contempt in which lower middle class citizens were held by the Magyar nobility. In Say's view the result was that Magyar artisans emigrated to neighbouring nations where they found both prosperity and respect.[46]

Deputy Beöthy declared that it was time for the nation to educate the jobbágyság so that they might learn how to manage their property and discharge their civic duties as future citizens.[47]

As late as 1833 some of Hungary's more remote Counties lacked school facilities even for the children of armalists. At the Lower House Deputy Asztalos described the plight of nearly 30,000 armalists in Máramaros, a relatively backward county:

> With the exception of a few towns the entire County has only one school. The five towns in the County contain one Protestant school each, but Catholics are not permitted to attend them. For this reason the great part of the armalists remain in ignorance and they do not even know how to write.[48]

Deputy Asztalos' remark on education was in fact also a religious complaint, since the issues of religion and education were inseparable because of clerical control. By the time of the 1832-1836 Diet the secularization of Magyar upper class society had sharpened the conflict between the secular and clerical forces in the Diet. Secular Deputies of both faiths stood united against the Roman Catholic clerical hierarchy. Kölcsey, who was in regular attendance at the Diet, observed:

> What a change! When the Peace of Lintz and the Vienna Compact had to be gained with blood who would have prophesized then, that in the 1833 Diet the sons of Luther and Calvin would watch in silence while the correligionists of Pázmány vied with one another to speak up on their behalf?[49]

Two weeks later Kölcsey reported that Protestants watched in silence at the Plenary Sessions as Catholic clerical and

lay deputies debated with one another. According to Kölcsey the laymen made numerous enlightened declarations and vied with one another in expressing views that would engender the rapprochement of the two Christian sects.[50]

By that time the Roman Catholic hierarchy had completely split with their laity on most issues and were particularly incensed by the Magyarization efforts of the Catholic laymen. The question concerning the use of Magyar in Diet rescripts and laws came to a vote in the Upper House and the prelates decided against the measure unanimously.[51] To make matters worse, Bishop Alagovits made some insulting remarks concerning the Lower House and called the liberal magnates István Széchenyi and Miklós Wesselényi traitors to Roman Catholicism.[52]

Against this inauspicious background debates on the religious issue continued in the Lower House the following day, 21 February 1833. Deputies Majthényi and Répás spoke up strongly against the prevailing statute,[53] which compelled prospective Protestant converts to undergo a six-week period of religious instruction in Catholic dogma and practice. Before a candidate could conclude the formalities of his conversion he had to prove to his clerical instructor's satisfaction that he understood Catholic dogma and that he still wished to leave the Church. Répás considered the law invalid because he regarded the Protestants' Toleration Patent of 1608 as the cornerstone of religious policy in Hungary. Deputy Borsinczky maintained

that six weeks of instruction was neither necessary nor useful nor practical and Deputy Beöthy charged that in his own County he personally knew of instances when the six-week instruction period was stretched out from twenty to thirty years. Tagen, the Canon of Nagyvárad (Grosswardein), denied Beöthy's allegations and proceeded to heap insults on the Deputy. Tagen was berated from all sides and the meeting had to be adjourned because of the disorder. Tagen was censured for misconduct and temporarily suspended from the Diet.[54]

Tagen's conduct was not fully representative of clerical behaviour, however, because the same day one of his colleagues adopted a more conciliatory policy, admitting clerical abuse of the law. In a relatively temperate speech, Canon Mayer of Fehérvár recognized that Protestants had certain rights, but maintained that Roman Catholics possessed even more ancient privileges. He admitted that frequently the law in question was abused and prospective converts suffered unjustified extensions and delays.[55]

On 22 February 1833, the Lower House attempted to amend Law 13 so that

> there should be total freedom of conversion from one religion to another but with full publicity and dignity and with resort to the civil authorities. They would appoint a mixed commission to question the candidate and if they were satisfied he would be permitted to convert at once.[56]

The following day at the Regional Session Deputies discussed the charge that Protestants frequently enticed

Roman Catholics to abandon their religion. Deputy Comáromy considered it an insult that Roman Catholics were forbidden to attend Protestant religious services whereas no law forbade them to attend Jewish synagogues or the theatre, or worse still, taverns, where their morals would be exposed to far greater perils than in a Protestant church. Deputy La Motte, an arch-conservative in all other matters, agreed with Comáromy. The Lower House voted to abolish this provision of Law 13. Three days later the Lower House decided to abolish a further provision of the same law, one which forbade Roman Catholic children to attend Protestant schools.

On 9 March 1833 the Upper House met to consider the religious proposals of the Lower House. The Prelates unanimously opposed the measures but the magnates split into two distinct groups, the conservative majority wishing to remand the issues to Committee and the liberal minority favouring the immediate acceptance of the Lower House proposals.

Baron Szepessy, Bishop of Pécs, represented the clerical position and opposed any change on the grounds that

> the proposals contradicted our very lucid present laws and the purpose of the current Diet. Also, they conflicted with "parliamentary praxis" and with the present discussions in the Diet.[57]

The Chief Treasurer of Hungary, a spokesman for the conservative magnates, essentially agreed with the hierarchy.

He did not feel that new laws were called for because the alleged violations involved only individual grievances which should be subject to court decisions. Nevertheless, the Treasurer advocated the establishment of a mixed commission to investigate the matter further. Count Széchenyi, speaking on behalf of the liberal magnates, demanded that the Upper House ratify the Lower House proposals in their original form without debate and dispatch them to the King for speedy enactment.[58]

Only twenty-three magnates voted in favour of Széchenyi's proposal. The Prelates, despite their undoubted moral prestige and influence among the magnates, were equally unable to sway the Upper House. The Upper House reached a compromise by establishing a Mixed Commission to examine the Lower House proposals and to recommend alternate solutions wherever necessary.[59] The decision to establish a Mixed Commission might have been a significant step in the direction of reconciliation. The conservative magnates wanted to reassure Protestants and their Roman Catholic supporters in the Lower House by including Protestants on the Commission. The Commission emerged with its findings in the unusually brief time of seventeen days in order to prevent charges that the Upper House was merely intent on delaying the issue.

On 26 March 1833 the Commission announced its findings and, while many of its decisions were disappointing, they nonetheless offered the Protestants certain

limited concessions. The Commission ruled, for example, that foundlings should be brought up as Christians, not necessarily as Roman Catholics and that illegitimate children should adopt their mother's religion. The Commission rejected allegations that Protestants enticed Roman Catholics from the path of their religion and they also refused two of the proposed laws which the Lower House considered crucial. The question concerning Roman Catholic attendance at Protestant schools was denied further consideration because the Commission considered it an educational not a religious issue. The proposal to abolish the mandatory six-week Roman Catholic instruction period for prospective Protestant converts was also not accepted.

The Lower House, however, was committed to the enactment of the two important proposals and during the next three months the two Chambers exchanged seven messages in rapid succession, each exchange more bitter than the last.[60] Despite the Palatine's plea for compromise by June 1833 there was no progress. The Lower House insisted that the Upper House accept their proposals in toto. With equal determination the magnates adhered to the decision of the Mixed Commission. After the third rejection by the Lower House only five magnates voted in favour of the Lower House resolution. By 12 July 1833 the Upper House even repudiated the findings of their own Mixed Commission and declared the original laws of 1790-1791 to be legal and valid.[61]

The struggle between the secular and clerical Deputies centered mainly on religious and educational issues, but the underlying theme of these controversies was the Magyar tongue. While the Roman Catholic higher clergy consistently opposed the introduction of Magyar in Hungary this was not true of the lower Catholic clergy and the various teaching Orders. For many decades prior to the reconciliation between Catholic and Protestant laymen, Catholic clergy taught Magyar children patriotic ideas in the Magyar language. This was the first common bond between the two religious denominations and from these modest beginnings in the eighteenth century cooperation between them gradually grew until a reconciliation between lay deputies was effected in the 1830's.

Despite some progress in educational reform during the pre-Reform era, Hungary's school facilities for the lower classes, and even for the armalists, were for the most part primitive. Magyar leaders recognized that the success of Magyarization depended on a sound educational system for all classes and the Diet as well as the press began to advocate the improvement of educational opportunities, in the Magyar tongue, for the peasants and the urban lower classes.

Many of the progressive Magyar educators were trained outside Hungary and played an important role both in the Magyarization of education and in the slowly emerging reform movement. Most of these scholars were of the

gentry but many were laymen from the lower classes who had no vested interest in preserving the old order. Social inequity increasingly became a target for these liberal professors. For several decades before the Age of Reform these pedagogues taught in the Magyar tongue and acquainted Magyar noblemen with Western European intellectual thought, especially Romanticism, liberalism and nationalism. Among the gentry, Western ideas were fused with their Magyar-oriented patriotic upbringing in the lower and middle schools and this enabled some noblemen to become the leaders of Magyar reconciliation based on equality. This trend in Magyar upper class society was one of the most significant developments in Hungary during the first third of the nineteenth century.

The rapprochement between Roman Catholics and Protestants was one aspect of the trend toward the secularization of Magyar society which weakened the hold of the Vienna Government and the pro-Habsburg Magyar Church hierarchy on Magyar Roman Catholic laymen. However, in their eagerness for immediate reform in favour of Protestants, Magyar Catholic laymen antagonized the conservative magnates and their own hierarchy, especially during the Diet of 1832-1836. The alienation between the hierarchy and the secular gentry had important repercussions. It strengthened the bond between the Protestant and Catholic gentry, who recognized that the upper clergy opposed their interests. The hierarchy wanted to maintain Latin

in Hungary whereas the gentry were determined to abolish Latin altogether and introduce Magyar as the exclusive tongue in Hungary.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER II

[1]J. Mailáth, Geschichte des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates (Hamburg, 1850), V, 391.

[2]E. Fényes, Magyarország leírása (Pest, 1847), p. 45.

[3]In many cases individual Protestants, particularly Germans, sent their sons abroad. Upon their return, some of these honoratiori became Magyarized. See J. Horváth, Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1956), p. 111.

[4]S. Bíró, Történelemtanításunk a XIX. század első felében, a korabeli tankönyvirodalom tükrében (Budapest, 1960), pp. 26-27, 32-33 (hereafter cited as Bíró, Történelemtanításunk).

[5]M. Kármán, Ungarische Bildungswesen. Geschichtlicher Rückblick bis zum Jahre 1848 (Budapest, 1915), pp. 45-46. See A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1740-1830 (Leipzig, 1902), V, 169-179.

[6]János Horváth, Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1956), pp. 106-110.

[7]F. Wagner, Universae Phraseologiae Latinae Corpus (Tyrnau, 1750), quoted in M. Kármán, Ungarische Buildungswesen, Geschichtlicher Rückblick zum Jahre 1848 (Budapest, 1915), pp. 47-48.

[8]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 81-108.

[9]I. L. Hányoki, Hármas Kis Tükör (3rd ed.; n.p., 1773), quoted in Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 102-103.

[10]Ibid., p. 107.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid.

[13]I. L. Hányoki, Hármas Kis Tükör, ed. L. Vajtha (n.p., n.d.), see Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, p. 108.

[14]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 257-258.

[15]J. L. Szabó, Magyar Ország Históriája (Sárospatak, 1804), see Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, p. 136.

[16]E. Budai, Magyar Ország Históriája (Debreczen, 1805-1812), see Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, p. 154.

[17]J. H. Schwicker, Die Ungarische Gymnasien. Geschichte, System, Statistik (Budapest, 1881), p. 49.

[18]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 62-64.

[19]J. Csengery, Europa politikai megtekintése 1825-be (Sárospatak, 1825), see Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 159-160.

[20]J. Bajza, Bajza József összegyüjtött munkái, ed. F. Badics (3rd ed.; Budapest, 1901), I, 7.

[21]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, p. 261.

[22]Georg Pray, Historia regum Hungariae (The History of the Kingdom of Hungary) (3 vols.; Buda, 1801).

[23]Bíró, Történelemtanításunk, pp. 82-84.

[24]Ibid., p. 261.

[25]Hungarian Chancellery Archive, Doc. No. 1833: 12058, 28 September 1833, found in Gy. Szekfü, Iratok a Magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1926), pp. 412-413.

[26]In 1780, at one of the gymnasia in Pest, which represented a fair cross section for the entire nation, 39% of the students were nobles, 43% from the middle classes and 18% from jobbágy and peasant families. See J. Kósa, Pest és Buda elmagyarosodása 1848-ig (Budapest, 1937), p. 61.

[27]P. E. Turnbull, Austria (London, 1840), II, 141-143.

[28]According to I. W. E. von Maithstein, Ein Haupthinderniss des Vortschrittes in Ungarn (Vienna, 1842), p. 8, an estimated 1,500,000 children were entirely without schools.

[29]L. Teleki, A Magyar nyelv elé mozditásáról (Pest, 1806), p. 128.

[30]D. M. per K. M. (anon.), "A Magyar nyelvről," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, II, No. 6 (1826), 735.

[31]J. A. Horváth, "Az iskolai nevelésről Magyar Országban," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, XIII, No. 2 (1829), 31.

[32]Speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Jegyző Könyve, 1825-1827 (Pozsony, 1825-1827), I, 620 (hereafter cited as Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve).

[33]M. Bucsay, Geschichte des Protestantismus in Ungarn (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 155.

[34]M. Pongrácz, secret report on the Regional Session in the Lower House, 20 January 1826, Hungarica Collection of Francis I's private library, bundle 64, see Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 341-347; various debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 11 February 1826; 13 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, I, 598-599, 606, 609-610.

[35]See A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1740-1830, Law 26, Paragraph 5 of 1790, (Leipzig, 1902), V, 173-174.

[36]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 27 February 1826, see Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, II, 67-69; see Kolosvári, op. cit.

[37]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 27 February 1826, see Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, II, 69-82.

[38]Speech of Catholic Provost of Pozsony at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 27 February 1826, ibid., pp. 75-76.

[39]Various speeches by Deputies from Trencsén, Bars, Heves, Veszprém and Szabolcs Counties at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 27 February 1826, ibid., pp. 79-80.

[40]Speech by Deputy from Bereg County at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 8 March 1826, ibid., p. 191.

[41]Speeches by various clerical and lay Deputies at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 27 February 1826, ibid., pp. 67-69.

[42]Resolution in the Upper House, 8 March 1826, ibid., p. 174.

[43]Resolution in the Upper House, 23 November 1830, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1830 (Pozsony, 1830), I, 306-307; II, 557.

[44]G-es (anon.), "Rövid észrevételek a falusi mívelésről," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, XVI, No. 2 (1832), 92; also see D. Berzsenyi, A Magyarországi mezei szorgalom némely akadályairúl, ed. O. Merényi (Budapest, 1933), p. 23 (work was written in 1833).

[45]G-es (anon.), op. cit., p. 96. These views were similar to those found in the secular-oriented periodical literature of the Roman Catholics. For example: P. Kozmár, "Felszólitás a falusi gyerekek iskoláztatásukra," Egyházi Tár, V (1834), 49-62; Izidor Guzmics's editorial comments on the schooling of working children, ibid., p. 62; J. Nagy, "A jó lelkipásztornak képe," ibid., VII (1836), 80-87; V. K. (anon.), "A lelkipásztor az uralkodó korszellemnek arányában," Vallási és Egyházi Tár, I (1832), 88-105.

[46]Say's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 4 April 1834, L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), III, 47-50 (hereafter cited as Kossuth, O.T.).

[47]Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 53.

[48]Asztalos' speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 August 1833, Kossuth, O.T., II, 10-11.

[49]Kölcsey's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 4 February 1833, F. Kölcsey, Összes munkái (Budapest, 1940), pp. 1284-1285.

[50]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 20 February 1833, ibid., p. 1286.

[51]Debates in the Upper House, 21 January 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 107-110; Debates in the Plenary Session of the Lower House, 16 October 1834, ibid., III, 603-604.

[52]Bishop Alagovits' speech in the Upper House, 20 February 1833, ibid., I, 174.

[53]Law XIII, Section 26 of 1790.

[54]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 21 February 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 196-201.

[55]Speech by Canon of Fehérvár at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 21 February 1833, ibid., p. 197.

[56]Resolution in the Plenary Session of the Lower House, 21 February 1833, ibid., p. 201.

[57]Speech of Baron Szepesy, Bishop of Pécs, in the Upper House, 9 March 1833, ibid., p. 221.

[58]Speech by Count Széchenyi and the Chief Treasurer in the Upper House, 9 March 1833, ibid., pp. 223-225.

[59]Resolution in the Upper House, 26 March 1833, ibid., pp. 254-255.

[60]Notes from the Upper House, May 15-July 17, and notes from the Lower House, May 21-July 13, 1833, ibid., pp. 382-555.

[61]Upper House Resolution, 17 July 1833, ibid., p. 564.

CHAPTER III

THE STRUGGLE FOR MAGYAR AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

Before the reign of Joseph II the Magyar nobility did not strive for either the elimination or absorption of the non-Magyar minorities. Magyar nobles accounted for 90% of the Hungarian nobility and they controlled most of the wealth and virtually all the political power in Hungary.[1] Though aware of being Magyars, noblemen had more in common with their non-Magyar fellow nobles than with Magyar commoners.[2] The nobles did not resist the Habsburgs' traditional policy to weld the Empire into a uniform administrative unit. However, under Joseph II, when this policy took the form of introducing German as the dominant language, the Magyars reacted. The new interest which they then developed in the fate of the Magyar tongue was due to a number of circumstances.

The combination of attempted Germanization, non-Magyar cultural revival, and influx of foreign settlers during and after the Napoleonic Wars caused Magyars to become concerned about their position in Hungarian society and influenced them to change their attitude in favour of their own language.[3] By that time they felt that in order to maintain control of the Hungarian state they had

to take into consideration both the Magyar and non-Magyar lower classes and to attempt the Magyarization and assimilation of all minorities. The adoption of the Magyar language and the elimination of Latin were regarded by the Magyar gentry as the first step toward these ends.

Under the influence of Piarist and Jesuit teachers, instruction in the Magyar language had already reached a highly developed stage during the late eighteenth century.[4] Even in predominantly German regions children were being taught the Magyar language as a compulsory subject.[5] One of the earliest defenders of this policy of forced Magyarization, Count Teleki, expressed the view in 1806 that Magyars occupied Hungary by right of conquest and hence they could demand that the descendants of the vanquished accept the culture and language of the Magyars:

> Hungary has suffered many foreign invasions and subsequent diminution of the Magyar population and this has necessitated the influx of foreigners into Hungary on a large scale. However, this does not mean that the Magyars are willing to renounce their leading position of original conquerors.[6]

In Teleki's view both the indigenous and immigrant non-Magyars should learn, from the beginning, the Magyar language. This would ensure their assimilation with the Magyar nation. In his opinion, it would be harmful if the foreign nationalities in Hungary failed to learn the language, and even more serious if they hindered its development.[7] The increased number of non-Magyar arrivals prompted Teleki to justify his aggressive assimilationist

policies on the grounds that if a person immigrated he should adopt the language and customs of his new homeland as a matter of course. In Teleki's view Magyar was the principal tongue in Hungary and hence all public affairs ought to be conducted in Magyar. He even demanded that Slovene and Croat Deputies in the Diet be compelled to learn Magyar eventually and that Croatia itself should become Magyarized. This was to be accomplished not by force but "through friendly persuasion and patience."[8]

Teleki had no intentions of permitting these older inhabitants to retain their own language and culture. He merely wished to proceed with more caution than with the recent arrivals and said that "through proper preparations, slowly, without controversy, these peoples should also be introduced to the Magyar tongue."[9]

Teleki especially feared that the non-Magyar nobility might become a disruptive element in Hungary and obstruct the development of Magyarism. He ascribed the unwillingness of some nobles to learn Magyar to the fact that they

> live among the Slovaks, Croats, Roumanians and Serbs and their prolonged stay among them has accustomed this nobility to their speech more than to ours. Nevertheless, we in Hungary can tolerate only a Magyar nobility. Since noblemen who live among the Slovaks and others are attracted by Magyar privileges and freedom, I believe it proper that the Magyar tongue should attract them as well.[10]

Teleki's concern for the fate of the Magyar tongue was echoed the following year by Sándor Kisfaludy, a

well-known author, who warned his Magyar compatriots: "Whatever nation has no language of its own can have no patriotism and no home; indeed, it can be fortunate if it is not devoured by some other nation."[11]

However, as long as the non-Magyar nobility and intelligentsia favoured Latin instead of their own native languages, Magyars were not alarmed. They assumed that it would be relatively easy to convince the Slavic nobility to change their allegiance from one alien tongue, Latin, to another, Magyar. Once the leaders accepted Magyar the masses would presumably follow their example.[12]

As early as the 1780's, however, there were signs, particularly among the Serbs, Croats and Slovaks, that the minorities were developing their own languages. It was during this time that Dositej Obradović, a renowned Serb scholar, pedagogue and poet, introduced a Serb literary language which was intended to replace the archaic Church Slavonic. In 1784 Obradović, in his Sovieti zdravago razuma (Counsels of Common Sense), went so far as to appeal for unity on the basis of language of all South Slavs, regardless of religion and nationality.[13] This had an effect on the Croats as well, when the intelligentsia, under the influence of Ljudevit Gaj's Illyrism, a cultural and linguistic movement, began to discard Latin in favour of Serbo-Croatian.[14]

At the same time a Roman Catholic Slovak priest, Juraj Papanek, was writing nationalistic literature which

advocated the use of Slovak,[15] and Pozsony was becoming a Slovak cultural center where linguistic controversies were creating an interest among intellectuals. In 1801 Professor Juraj Palkovič and Anton Bernolák, a Slovak philologist, established rival literary societies.[16] The Slovak intelligentsia rapidly abandoned Latin and offered increasing resistance to the Magyar language. The Slovak cultural and linguistic revival was, in fact, so successful in the early decades of the nineteenth century that many Magyar and German communities in Slovakia responded by becoming Slovakized.[17]

As the Slavic leaders began to abandon Latin and put themselves at the head of popular national movements, the relative complacency of Magyars yielded to alarm. In 1817, when Juraj Palkovič started in Pozsony the Slovak weekly Tydennik, aneb Čysarske Kralowske Národny Nowiny (Weekly, or Imperial Royal National Journal) the title of the publication aroused indignation among Magyars

> . . . because it implied the existence of a Slovak nation whereas all nationalities in Hungary, which our brave ancestors had occupied amid torrents of blood, belong to the Magyar Nation. Hence the concept of a Slovak Nation in Hungary is either a scandalous dream or a mocking insult.[18]

Magyars did not object to the publication of Slovak newspapers

> . . . as long as they recommended to their readers that they obtain the services of Magyar priests and school masters in their villages so that their children might learn Magyar and become Magyar patriots and useful citizens. But if the editor's design was to foster Slovak literature in our homeland then he was a person who

> wished to transform the Magyar Nation into a Slovak Nation.[19]

Non-Magyars were urged to consider it their patriotic duty to become Magyars.[20] In response to many protests Palkovič changed the offending title in subsequent issues by removing the word "National."

Although Palkovič gave in to his critics, the incident caused many angry reactions among the Magyar public. The influential periodical, Tudományos Gyüjtemény, editorially referred to the conquered peoples of Pannonia--a veiled reference to the Slovaks--as "Cowardly."[21] In the same publication, M. V. Vitkovics objected to the use of any language except Magyar in Hungary. "Only by using its own language exclusively, by everyone, can a nation become great," he declared.[22] In 1820, I. Boros, another contributor to Tudományos Gyüjtemény, asked:

> What harm is there for anyone if in our country not only Magyars but also Slovaks, Croats, Germans, Jews and Gypsies, also speak only Magyar? They should Magyarize.[23]

The author went on to praise the Protestant Reverend A. R. Záhányi in Esperest, a Croatian locality, where within six years of his ministry about half of the population became Magyarized.[24]

No sooner did this controversy settle down than another furor arose in 1821 when the Slovak author Jan Kollár wrote an article in Überlieferungen zur Geschichte, a periodical edited by Zschokke, in Aarau, Switzerland. Bitter about his own persecution and intimidation by

Magyars for his pro-Slovak views,[25] Kollár in his article condemned Magyars for their forcible Magyarization methods. According to Kollár, in many Slovak villages children were compelled by beatings and other punishments to learn Magyar. He accused Magyars of deliberately planting Magyar teachers and clergymen in Slovak communities to this end. Kollár concluded his article by declaring that the Magyars had no right to impose their undeveloped language on the Slovaks, whose language by now was far superior to the Magyars'.[26]

The response from the Magyar reading public was once again immediate and condemnatory. I. Vedres declared in Tudományos Gyüjtemény that the Magyar nation's superiority to all foreigners in Hungary was an established fact. From the very beginning, he claimed, the Magyars had demonstrated the stateliness and noble spirit which enabled them to subdue all other nationalities.[27] In the same publication, Antal Sztrókay maintained that "Our national [Magyar] tongue is our greatest treasure."[28] In 1822, the influential Baron Alajos Mednyánszky, a Magyarized Slovak magnate, declared that

> German and Slovak children must be taught Magyar at once in our schools instead of Latin. What difference does it make to them? They know neither language to begin with. Within ten years they should all study Magyar, all the way up to teachers' training institute.[29]

M. V. Vitkovics, another Magyarized Slovak, warned Magyars:

> The time beckons! Without our national tongue our Nation cannot arise. Let us not neglect it, therefore, otherwise tomorrow funeral orations will be held over the Magyar tongue and Nation.[30]

By the mid-1820's the growing national consciousness of Hungary's non-Magyar minorities had provoked the outnumbered Magyars to be even more aggressive. A Transylvanian Magyar official, Miklós Cserey, expressed the view that

> the expansion of the Magyar people and their strengthening should be our Nation's key interest. . . . Under these circumstances only National Energy can help as well as National Spirit and these can spring only out of the Magyar Nation. . . . If the Magyar Nation should die--and it shall die if it fails to grow--another nation will arise which is now under our feet--the Slovaks. . . . This is why it is imperative for us to proliferate and fortify our Magyar nationality and to assimilate all Slovaks, Serbs and Roumanians who live among us.[31]

His apprehension was echoed by an anonymous contributor to the periodical Felső Magyarországi Minerva in 1826, who asked:

> What progress has Croatia made in the Magyar language? How many villages have become Slovakized! How many towns are inundated with Germans, Serbs and Roumanians and their customs! . . . At least 75% [sic!] of the nation desires the exclusive adoption of Magyar. What does the minority expect of the majority? Should it renounce its national tongue which has given its name to our soil and to our nation?[32]

In the same year Deputies from Pozsony and Veszprém Counties pointed out that the Magyars were surrounded on all sides by peoples who spoke different tongues and unless Magyars defended their own language the non-Magyars would sooner or later suppress it.[33] Deputy Majthényi complained that in his County a number of Magyar villages had been

transformed into Slovak communities. Deputy Sztojka told his colleagues: "Just go to church next Sunday at eight in the morning, the service for school children, and you will hear God worshipped in German. It is scandalous." Deputy Nyiky stated that in the City of Pest magistrates even refused to accept petitions in the Magyar language. Deputy Vay confirmed Nyiky's allegation and declared that despite the fact that he was a citizen of Pest his own petition in Magyar was turned down.[34]

The status of the Magyar tongue deeply concerned the well-known Deputy Pål Nagy who felt that it was unfair to demand that Croats become Magyars. Nagy believed that each member of a nationality should remain as he was at birth. Nevertheless, he could not understand why the Croats should cling stubbornly to Latin, their official tongue, when they could easily learn Magyar, the language of the nation which had given them their laws and Constitution. Nagy spoke more harshly about the Slovaks than other non-Magyars because he considered that Slovak territory was an integral part of Hungary:

> The Slovaks consider themselves Magyars, not Slovaks, yet they insist on conversing in a sort of Slovak-Latin-German. Why do they deem it an honour to use Slovak or Julius Caesar's dead tongue instead of the language of the land whose members they profess to be?[35]

Magyars believed that the minorities represented a real danger and this impression brought about demands, both in the Diet and in the press, for the employment of

Hungary's educational facilities as a means to arrest the spread of all non-Magyar tongues. A Deputy from the Slovak County of Túróc proposed that all peasant children in the village schools be taught only in the Magyar tongue. He felt that this would provide the students with sufficient practice so that in two or three generations Magyar would be commonly used all over the nation.[36] In a letter to Kazinczy in 1826 Cserey expressed himself similarly by saying that the only way to absorb the numerous non-Magyars would be to establish lower form schools in Slovak villages. Cserey feared that if Slovaks did not become Magyarized then quite naturally Magyars would become Slovakized.[37] At the same time a writer in Felsö Magyarországi Minerva urged all non-Magyars to learn the language of the Magyars, since they lived on Magyar land and under Magyar Laws.[38]

Some Magyars proceeded with more caution on the language question. In the Diet of 1825-1827, for example, the Deputy from Liptó, a Slovak County, questioned the wisdom of forcing non-Magyars to learn the Magyar language. He pointed out that the poor people of the Slovak highlands were staunch Slovaks who had no desire to learn Magyar and it would be disastrous to force the language upon them.[39]

Such and similar situations among the minorities made Magyar Deputies doubt the possibility of imposing the Magyar language. Although they favoured Magyar language education in the lower schools in principle, many of them had serious misgivings about the propriety, if not the

expediency, of such a plan in the Slavic areas of the nation.[40]

Magyars were thus confronted with the alternative whether non-Magyars should receive their education in their own tongue or whether they should have Magyar forced upon them. Neither choice was satisfactory from the standpoint of the Magyars. If non-Magyars were permitted to cultivate their own national tongue, eventually they would overwhelm the Magyars by sheer weight of numbers. If, on the other hand, the minorities were compelled to adopt Magyar in the schools they would become resentful and this would prove equally disastrous.[41]

At best, Magyarization through education seemed to be a slow and uncertain process and Magyar legislators sought alternate means by which they would create a Magyarized society. As early as the Diet of 1790-1791 Magyar Deputies had sought to replace Latin with Magyar as the official language, and these efforts continued in nearly every subsequent Diet. The attempts to replace Latin met with partial success at the Diet of 1790-1791 when, through Law XVI of 1790-1791, the Vienna Government allowed the Diet diary to be printed in both Latin and Magyar.[42] This initial gain was followed by another, Law VII of 1792, which stipulated that after 1792 officials in the Vice Regency had to be conversant in Magyar and respond in Magyar if so addressed.[43]

In 1805 Law IV granted the Diet the right to

dispatch rescripts to the Vienna Government in parallel Latin and Magyar texts. The Vice Regency and the Hungarian Chancellery had to respond in the Magyar language to rescripts from Magyar authorities and County courts, which could conduct their proceedings in Magyar if they chose.[44] Subsequent wartime Diets were urged by several County assemblies to demand official recognition of the Magyar tongue.[45] The Vienna Government rejected all further requests as inappropriate in times of war, but the King pledged his Government to reconsider the issue after victory had been won. Despite the gentry's failure to win official recognition of their language, most Counties began to write their protocols and to correspond with each other in Magyar. Most of this transformation from Latin to Magyar occurred about 1806,[46] according to a contemporary observer who inspected a number of County archives.

Following the war non-Magyars became determined to abolish Latin in favour of their own national tongue. Magyar leaders were convinced that under the circumstances the minorities should be forced to learn Magyar. This attitude prevailed as Deputies at the first postwar Diet in 1826-1827 made a concerted effort to make Magyar the official language throughout Hungary.

Soon after the opening of the Diet the Lower House demanded, as a first step, the publication of all subsequent laws in parallel Latin and Magyar texts,[47] a stratagem designed to raise Magyar to the same level as Latin.

Nearly four months elapsed before a royal rescript granted this permission and even then the concession was meaningless because the King insisted that the Latin text must be the original version and must always remain so. The King correctly feared that the Diet would next demand to incorporate laws written in Magyar into the corpus juris. After protracted negotiations the Diet still insisted that Magyar be elevated to the same status as Latin but the King threatened to withdraw the concession entirely.[48] On 6 October 1826 the Diet replied by threatening that a nation which could not read its laws could not obey them either, but the Diet assured the King that his support of their national tongue would strengthen Magyar loyalty to Austria.[49]

The King delayed his reply by referring the question to the Staatskonferenz. The Austrian Cabinet claimed it was senseless to abandon a practice of many centuries and stated that Magyarization was contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. In Vienna's view, a country with a polyglot population should have its laws published only in one learned tongue, one which was not subject to change. Finally, in the view of the Staatskonferenz, the Diet's request was unreasonable because having two "original" official tongues was absurd and illogical.[50]

After numerous meetings the Staatskoferenz came to the conclusion that it would be best to send an evasive reply to the Diet. Vienna believed that the Lower House sought to abolish Latin and a showdown between the Diet

and the Government should be delayed. The King agreed with this plan and on 2 November 1826 he dispatched a rescript to the Diet, ruling that Latin was to remain the only language in which laws could be published during the current Diet.[51] After 12 August 1827, however, unofficial Magyar translations of the laws would be also authorized.[52]

Although the Diet was united on this issue as on no other,[53] it failed to achieve the first important step in the recognition of Magyar, since Vienna refused to raise Magyar to the same official level as Latin. However, the Magyars decided to take matters into their own hands the following year. On 30 June 1827, the Lower House, without asking for authorization from the King, had the original Latin text of their Preferential Grievances Concerning the Magyar Language translated into Magyar[54] and this version was circulated throughout Hungary. The King at once dispatched a secret message to his brother, the Palatine,[55] asking him to investigate what had prompted the Lower House to adopt this course of action. The King was convinced that the Lower House wished to spread the erroneous news among lower class Magyars that the Vienna Government had refused the Diet's petition of the Grievances.

The Palatine's report both reassured and disturbed the King. The Palatine reported that Lower House Deputies had informed him months earlier they intended to translate their Petition into Magyar but he had prevailed upon them to postpone the publication date. The Palatine assured the

King that the Lower House had every legal right to translate a petition into Magyar and that it had done so repeatedly since 1807. The Palatine also assured the King that the Lower House had no intentions of stirring up the Magyar lower classes against the Royal Government. But the King was warned that most Lower House members were fully committed to the future publication of all official documents in Magyar.[56]

On the advice of Metternich and the Staatskonferenz, the King decided not to make an issue of the matter and tried to avoid further controversy with a resolution which only requested the Palatine to advise the Diet that "it was forbidden to print Diet sessions separately."[57]

The Vienna Government's reluctance to permit the introduction of Magyar as the official tongue in Hungary was understandable. It wished to implement a Magyar policy which was standard practice throughout the Empire. No single ethnic group was to be aggrandized at the expense of others. Further, the Habsburgs equally feared the psychological impact of all ethnic tongues because they fostered national consciousness and contention among the various peoples. Latin was a dead tongue and hence the possession of all groups, not the exclusive property of any single nationality. Since Latin lacked the emotional impact of any of the languages spoken in the Empire, its use was considered by the Habsburgs as a proper safeguard against national sentiments, Magyar sentiments included.

By not insisting on the Germanization of Hungary, after the death of Joseph II, and by advocating Latin instead of German, the Habsburgs attracted support on this issue from certain Magyars who otherwise were not favourable to Vienna. This support continued well into the 1830's.[58] Magyars in academic circles, presumably of the older, noble generation, considered that all scientific and legal data belonged to the intellectual elite. They feared the intellectual isolation of Hungary, should domestic scholarly publications adopt Magyar. Many Magyars believed that internal administration and justice would suffer if Latin was abolished. Some Magyars even claimed that there was disorder in many districts already because local officials used whatever language suited them in the absence of definitive instructions from the Counties and from the Vienna Government. Conservative secular magnates and Churchmen considered the pro-Magyar movement immature and irresponsible. In their view its leaders were men in quest of notoriety and self-gain and its sincere advocates were weak-headed dreamers.[59]

In the first two decades of the nineteenth century the Magyar intelligentsia had little confidence in the ability of the Magyar language to develop. Széchenyi, for instance, considered the decade between 1805 and 1815 an uncertain era with respect to the Magyar tongue since frequently two steps were taken backward for every step forward.[60] A similar appraisal was given by Ferenc Pulszky,

when he wrote:

> Under Francis I there was a stillness of death in the progress of Magyar and only events after 1823 aroused Hungary from her sleep; but by then most of the leaders knew no Magyar.[61]

In one of his speeches in the Lower House in 1834 Pál Nagy reviewed the changing attitude of his countrymen towards the Magyar language by saying that

> when in 1807 I declared that Latin must be abolished as our official tongue there was an old gentleman who said to me: "Non loquatur talia stulta." Once more in 1825 I said the same thing, namely, that soon we shall abolish Latin, but even then there were several esteemed gentlemen left who did not agree with me.[62]

However, by the late 1820's Magyar awareness had intensified in response to the rapidly growing nationalistic sentiments of the non-Magyars. Magyars sought to counteract this trend among the minorities by increasing their Magyarization effortsamong them.

This changed attitude among Magyars can even be seen in the progressive and liberally minded Széchenyi, who wrote to Count Károly Eszterházy in 1828:

> I heard with eager interest that you are Magyarizing your Szeredines [Eszterházy's Slovak village] and that your wife takes part in these efforts. She will gain great blessings for these deeds even in this life.[63]

As relations between Magyars and non-Magyars deteriorated in the early 1830's, an anonymous contributor to the Tudományos Gyüjtemény demanded that

> everyone should learn Magyar and honour it; both common sense and survival demand it. Whoever defies this rule ought to be permitted to live with his foreign tongue, since our laws guarantee such freedom, but he should be left only in the lowest, animal-like state. He should be denied all offices and even the common joys of

> living, until he makes himself a worthy Magyar, not only in word, but also in deed.[64]

Non-Magyars were quick to respond to such attitudes of the Magyars. On the eve of the 1832-1836 Diet the Slovak publicist Jan Kollár, using a pseudonym, wrote Sollen wir Magyaren werden?, a polemical anti-Magyar pamphlet. Kollar agreed that Slovaks should study the Magyar language for practical reasons, but he argued that at home and in cultural affairs the Slovaks should be permitted to nurture their own language without outside influence.[65]

Kollár's writing evoked an angry reaction in the Diet of 1832-1836 when the Deputy Hertelendy demanded that the author be identified and punished. Cooler heads prevailed, however, and Hertelendy's proposal was rejected on the grounds that any attempt to impose censorship on a publication in Hungary, no matter how objectionable it might be, was unwise at a time when the Diet was seeking freedom of the press from the Vienna Government.[66]

Hertelendy's reaction was completely out of proportion to the alleged insult contained in the pamphlet which was, in fact, far milder and more conciliatory than another article written by Kollár in 1821. However, the Deputy's outburst was symptomatic of the growing fears of Magyars that the minorities might seize the cultural initiative.

In many respects the Magyars' concern was justified. By 1827, for example, the Slovaks had not only freed

themselves of Czech linguistic influences but one of their philologists, Anton Bernolák, had compiled an efficient Slovak dictionary, predating the first Magyar dictionary by a few years. Bratislava and Turčiansky Sväty Martin were thriving cultural centers as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century[67] and by the 1820's there were many Slovak students' literary associations scattered throughout gymnasia in Slovakia. Magyar leaders, particularly in the purely Magyar sections of the Plains, were deeply concerned because many Magyar noblemen were helping to establish and maintain these associations and frequently they were becoming de-Magyarized in the process. The pan-Slavic publication Gistrenka, for example, boasted numerous influential Magyar noble supporters. Under these conditions there can be no doubt that Magyarization could make little or no headway in Slovakia.[68]

Magyars encountered difficulties with other minorities as well. Croatian philologists had improved the Croatian language and there were demands in the Croatian Diet for resisting Magyar and for the adoption of Croatian as the official language instead of Latin. When the Diet of 1825-1827 met, Magyar-Croatian linguistic animosities were in the open. In the course of the 1830's the Croatian lingual-cultural movement became political with the appearance of Ljudevit Gaj, the advocate of Illyrism, which called for the unification of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.[69]

The Serbs were also making great strides culturally. The first Serb gymnasium in Karlova in the eighteenth century was augmented in 1810 by another high school in Novy Sad. In 1813 the first Serb theatre was established by the writer Joachim Vujić and in 1824 a Serb cultural association, the Matica Srpska, was founded in Pest. Two years later this association began to publish a periodical called Letopis.[70]

In view of the mounting success of the non-Magyars there was a growing response among Magyars to reject the cultural efforts of other ethnic groups. The Magyars were mindful of the political demands of some of these nationalities in the 1790's and feared that they might be successfully repeated. As a result, by the 1830's the Magyars' spirit of compromise disappeared entirely and this seriously jeopardized the success of Magyarization efforts among the minorities, who themselves became increasingly committed to their own cultural and political development.[71]

The reaction of the non-Magyar nationalities was considered a serious development by Magyar leaders. For example, Count Aurél Dessewffy acknowledged the Croatian and Slovak resistance to Magyarization and urged caution on the part of Magyars:

> Not only are they protected by law from encroachments upon their national traditions but it is also quite obvious that they do not desire the Magyar language; hence it is not possible to force it upon them.[72]

Similarly, Széchenyi's attitude on the issue of Magyarization was moderate. He urged Magyars

> to leave everyone strictly in the exercise of his own religion, language, custom and national peculiarity and not to offend non-Magyars, because they, too, have their pride and they, too, feel that their language and culture have a role to play in European civilization.[73]

It is evident, however, that the Magyar nobility never really gave up their plans to Magyarize Hungary's minorities. In 1833 Széchenyi proposed that,

> as of 1 January 1835, all laws, judgments, orders, appeals, contracts, agreements, accounts, etc., should be valid only in the Magyar tongue for them to be legally binding in our nation.[74]

He was mistakenly convinced that the adoption of such laws would force non-Magyars to learn the official language out of sheer necessity. Presumably, once they spoke Magyar their eventual conversion would be assured.

Meanwhile, between the Diets of 1825-1827 and 1832-1836 the political struggle between Vienna and the Magyars intensified. The advocates of Magyar maintained pressure on the regime through the Counties and even achieved certain gains at the Diet of 1830.[75] The Counties harassed the Vienna Government with resolutions in an organized and coordinated manner[76] by demanding that official publication of all laws in Magyar be permitted throughout Hungary on the basis of Law VII of 1792 and Law IV of 1805. The Vienna Government rejected most of these demands but the issue remained unsolved and the elevation of Magyar to official status became one of the major issues at the

Diet of 1832-1836.

Events prior to the Diet of 1832-1836 contributed to the deteriorating relations between Magyars and non-Magyars. When a cholera epidemic broke out late in 1831, the gentry were forced to treat the water in order to control the disease. Roumanian, Slovak and Ruthene jobbágy interpreted this as a deliberate attempt by Magyar landlords to poison them and appropriate their land tenures. The non-Magyar peasants murdered hundreds of Magyar nobles and the bitter feeling produced by this episode was reflected the following winter in the gentry's attitude at the Diet.[77]

When Deputies debated whether laws ought to be published in every language spoken within a given area, feelings on the question ran high. Deputy Pécsy, for example, stated:

> Our laws need not be published in Rusznyák (Ruthene) and Oláh (Roumanian) because, as the Deputies from Bars and Bihar Counties are well aware knowing their own Counties, their inhabitants differ little from cattle and for them it is not necessary to translate our laws.[78]

Deputy Balogh rebuked Pécsy by declaring, "I shall never compare Tót (Slovak), Rátz (Serb) and Hottentot, in other words, anyone who is a human being, with cattle."[79]

In view of the insecurity engendered by the uprising of the non-Magyar peasants, as well as by the steady growth of the self-awareness of these inhabitants, the

number of gentry Deputies at the Diet who wished to introduce Magyar as the official tongue without further delay had grown appreciably since the previous Diets. Deputies were no longer content merely to raise Magyar to associate status with Latin. By this time they wished to eliminate Latin entirely.[80] Aware of the resistance such a plan would encounter from the regime the Deputies nonetheless planned to proceed with caution and attain their aim gradually during the Diet sessions. The Vienna Government's plan was once again to delay the question and the Habsburgs decided to use the Upper House to obstruct the demands of the Lower legislative body. As soon as the Diet convened, the Lower House dispatched an appeal to the Upper House drafted by Kölcsey.[81] The magnates were asked to approve a Lower House resolution in favour of having all the laws published only in Magyar. The Upper House rejected the appeal in spite of strong pleas by Széchenyi, Wesselényi, György Károlyi and Mihály Eszterházy, the leading progressive magnates.[82] Claiming that the request by the Lower House was not in accord with current statutes and that it was as yet an unattainable goal, the magnates referred the matter to "systematic study."[83] Presumably the magnates wanted to achieve the same end result as the Lower House since their own deliberations now took place in Magyar instead of the customary Latin. However, they did not wish to jeopardize the possibility of passing this law through premature and impetuous action.[84]

The Lower House refused to let the matter rest. In his reply to the Upper House Kölcsey reminded the magnates that the Magyar language was essential for the preservation of the Magyar nation:

> A people can be uprooted and they can still remain a nation elsewhere, as examplified by our own original ancestors in the Hungarian Plain; but once its language is dead a nation is destroyed.[85]

Kölcsey urged the magnates to reconsider their position but the Upper House wished to remove the issue from the list of grievances slated for speedy action and relegate it to normal business.[86] His third and final appeal to the Upper House was very strongly worded: "National independence is inextricably linked with our national tongue. Every other issue must yield before this one is solved."[87] The magnates ceased their opposition,[88] showing that where the Magyar tongue was concerned they no longer permitted themselves to be influenced by their clerical colleagues or by the Vienna Government.

Encouraged by this development, on 30 March 1833 Kölcsey drafted an appeal to the King in the spirit of his third message to the Upper House.[89] The King transmitted the rescript to the Hungarian Chancellery which made its recommendations on 30 April 1833. The Chancellery announced that, since Magyar was being used <u>de facto</u> in many areas of Hungary, laws ought to be published both in Latin and Magyar. However, the Latin version should remain the official text.[90]

This proposal came before the joint session of the Staatskonferenz and the Staatsrat.[91] The diversity of opinions among the members reflect the lack of unity which prevailed on this important topic in the highest circles of the Austrian Government. One of the officials, Georg Mailath, declared, for example:

> On the basis of the present laws I cannot concur with the opinions of the Chancellery; yet it is true that Latin may no longer be maintained in Hungary because hardly anyone there speaks it any longer and the entire country is already using unofficial Magyar translations of the Latin text without the benefit of the Government's sanction.[92]

Mailath recommended therefore that Latin be used as the official text but that the Magyar versions also be published under royal sanction. Another Conference member, Norbert Purkhart, was of the opinion that

> it would be best for the entire Monarchy to use only Latin; it would prevent once and for all the rivalries among our peoples. Is the use of Magyar practical and convenient for the Government? No! Magyar might have attained a high level of development but many people in Hungary and most people in the Associated States do not speak Magyar. It would be contradictory, in addition, to have Latin as the original tongue with Magyar on a par with it.[93]

Reviczky, the Hungarian Chancellor, was opposed to Purkhart's conclusions and felt that it would be circumventing the laws not to permit the publication of statutes in Magyar. Reviczky reasoned that in all other provinces the laws appeared both in German and in the native tongue of the region. The Hungarian Diet was already preparing proposals in two languages, Magyar and Latin, with Magyar titles preceding the Latin. Reviczky's only qualification

was that the right to publish laws in Magyar should not be retroactive but be restricted only to legislation promulgated in the course of the current Diet and thereafter.[94]

In one of his few pronouncements on the question of Hungary, Metternich summed up not only his own view but the Government's ultimate position:

> If the Magyar language has languished for centuries it is due to the fact that Magyars had always constituted a minority in Hungary. Had Magyars been in the majority there would have been no need to revive their language through artificial means and all their laws would have been written originally in Magyar.[95]

Metternich went on to explain that if laws were published only in Magyar, two-thirds of Hungary's population would no longer understand them. Metternich accused advocates of Magyar of trying to arouse the Magyar masses and of using the Magyarization drive as a means of harming the Empire.[96]

In view of the fact that the Vienna Government was divided on this issue, on 13 September 1833 Reviczky wrote to Metternich and proposed that it might be best to delay a reply to the Diet in the hope that the Deputies would get immersed in other matters.[97] The subject of delaying tactics became a matter of protracted three-way discussions among Reviczky, Metternich and the King.[98] Essentially all three agreed that a policy of delay would be best.

Reviczky's thought on this issue is interesting because it reveals the determination of the Vienna Government and its officials not to yield on this issue to the

Diet. Reviczky felt that Deputies in the Lower House would not be grateful for a royal rescript which vouchsafed only limited status for the Magyar language because most Deputies insisted on official status. A rescript now would only stimulate resentment and augment demands because legislators, in Reviczky's view, considered the issue of Magyar paramount to any other legislation. At the moment the Urbarium was on the agenda of the Diet and Reviczky feared that irate Deputies would retaliate by abandoning the Urbarium. Consequently, Reviczky advised the King to wait for a short period. When the time was ripe he would propose the introduction of the royal rescript in the Diet. Metternich and the King agreed to this plan and they permitted the matter to lapse for more than a year.[99]

Meanwhile, the Lower House had become impatient. Between 23 November 1833 and 28 May 1834 the Lower and Upper Houses debated the propriety of exerting pressure on the King for a response. The Magnates at first sought to restrain the Lower House from committing what they feared would be tantamount to lèse majesté. However, they finally relented and agreed to sponsor an urgent though respectful appeal to the King. Finally on 5 October 1835 the King responded with a rescript in the spirit of earlier messages which the Lower House found unsatisfactory.[100]

The Vienna Government overestimated the patience of the Deputies in the Lower House. As a result the regime was confronted with a list of demands from the Diet which

amounted to a virtual declaration of independence from Austria, even in its modified Upper House version. On 8 July 1835 the Factfinding Committee of the Lower House demanded that Magyar become the exclusive official tongue in Hungary. This would mean that all matters pertaining to the legislative, judicial and executive branches of government would be conducted only in Magyar. Even the royal family would be compelled to learn the Magyar language. Separate Magyar army corps, led by native born Magyar officers, were to be established under Magyar colours. Magyar was to become the exclusive language of instruction in Hungary's schools and within ten years every citizen would be obligated to know Magyar. All religious services, including Roman Catholic Mass, were to be celebrated only in Magyar. Ample manifestations of external symbols of a Magyar nature were also demanded. These included the display of the Magyar coat of arms on banknotes, vessels and public buildings. Finally, the Committee demanded that "those who were not conversant in the Magyar tongue should not obtain royal deeds of gift in Hungary or patents of nobility."[101] Most of these claims were denied by the Vienna Government[102] but they gave the impression to the Habsburgs that Magyar leaders were intent on gaining independence for Hungary. This further increased the determination of the regime to resist additional Magyarization of Hungary.

Although the Magyars' struggle to elevate their national tongue first, to official and, later, to exclusive

status was not successful, it nevertheless had important implications and repercussions. The introduction of Magyar as Hungary's official language might have been a step towards achieving a uniform Magyar-speaking society. The gentry could have attracted the Magyar lower classes and extended their own political and cultural influence throughout the non-Magyar regions of Hungary. Unfortunately, they became overly aggressive in their language policy and caused a reaction whereby the minorities increasingly refused to be absorbed by the Magyar community.[103] In fact, the Magyars' policy served to strengthen the cultural revival among the minorities themselves.[104]

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER III

[1]M. Wesselényi, Szózat a Magyar és szláv nemzetiség ügyében (Leipzig, 1843), pp. 69-70.

[2]H. Marczali, Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht (Tübingen, 1911), p. 42; I. Acsády, A Magyar jobbágyság története (Budapest, 1908), p. 426.

[3]According to H. E. Balázsi, "A reformkori nacionalizmus XVIII. századi gyökrei," Történelmi Szemle, III, Nos. 2-3 (1960), 319-322, a few influential members of the gentry were concerned with Magyar language and culture at least since the Seven Year War.

[4]J. Horváth, Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1956), pp. 106-110.

[5]J. H. Schwicker, Die Deutschen in Ungarn (Vienna, 1881), pp. 184-185.

[6]L. Teleki, A Magyar nyelv elé mozditásáról (Pest, 1806), pp. 229-231 (hereafter cited as Teleki, A Magyar nyelv).

[7]Ibid., p. 109.

[8]Ibid., pp. 171-176. Also see Teleki's earlier anonymous publication, in which he praised Count Festetich for Magyarizing his Croatian villages in the Muraköz region. The Count had established Magyar schools at his own expense and also exerted his influence with County Government to have only Magyar notaries hired. See G.T.D., Egynéhány hazai utazások leírása Tót és Horváth országoknak rövid esmértetésével egygyütt (Vienna, 1796), pp. 214-215.

[9]Teleki, A Magyar nyelv, p. 171.

[10]Ibid., pp. 232-233.

[11]S. Kisfaludy, Kisfaludy Sándor minden munkái, ed. D. Angyal (4th ed.; Budapest, 1892), I, 8. Also see Széchenyi's concern about the same issue. I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi vallomásai és tanitásai, eds. J. Fekete and J. Váradi; quoting Széchenyi's diary entry of September 1820, Gy. Viszota, ed., Széchenyi István naplói (Budapest, 1937), II, 156.

[12]D. Berzsenyi, the noted author believed this to be true as late as 1833. See D. Berzsenyi, A Magyarországi

mezei szorgalom némely akadályairúl, ed. O. Merényi (Budapest, 1933), pp. 30-32.

[13]G. G. Kemény, A Magyar nemzetiségi kérdés története. A Nemzetiségi kérdés a törvények és tervezetek tükrében (Budapest, 1947), p. 12; J. H. Schwicker, Politische Geschichte der Serben in Ungarn (Budapest, 1880), pp. 406-407.

[14]E. Arató, A nemzetiségi kérdés Magyarországon, 1790-1840 (Budapest, 1960), I, 85 (hereafter cited as Arató, Nemzetiség I; Gy. Miskolczy, A Horvát kérdés története és irományai a rendi állam korában (Budapest, 1927), I, 173-203.

[15]J. Papanek, Historia gentis slavae (Pécs, 1780), pp. 296-325, 355.

[16]Arató, Nemzetiség I, 95-96.

[17]J. Csaplovics, Gemälde von Ungarn (Pest, 1829), I, 219; J. Rohrer, Versuch über die Deutschen Bewohner der Österreichischen Monarchie (Vienna, 1804), I, 244.

[18]E. P. N. P. (anon.), "Eszrevételek a Pozsonyi Tót Újság kissebbitö Homlokirása ellen," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 12 (1817), 117-124.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., p. 124.

[21]Tudományos Gyüjtemény , I, No. 2 (1817), 89.

[22]M. V. Vitkovics, "Hazafiúi elmélkedés," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 12 (1817), 12.

[23]I. Boros, "Hazafi gondolatok a Magyar nyelv ügyében," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, IV, No. 6 (1820), 93.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Arató, Nemzetiség I, 229-231.

[26]Ibid.

[27]I. Vedres, "A Magyar nemzeti lélekről egy két szó," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, VI, No. 11 (1822), 65.

[28]A. Sztrókay, "A nemzeti nyelv elömozditásáról," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, V, No. 5 (1821), 72.

[29]A. Mednyánszky, "Hazafiúi gondolatok a Magyar nyelv kiterjesztése dolgában," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, VI, No. 1 (1822), 34.

[30]M. V. Vitkovics, "A Magyar könyvek terjesztéséről," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, V, No. 9 (1821), 47.

[31]Cserey to Kazinczy, letter of 10 June 1825. F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz összes művei. Harmadik osztály. Levelezés, ed. J. Váczy (Budapest, 1909), XIX, 351-353 (hereafter cited as Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei).

[32]D. M. (anon.), "A Magyar nyelvrül," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, II (June, 1826), 736.

[33]Speeches by Deputies from Pozsony and Veszprém Counties at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 28 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Jegyző Könyve, 1825-1827 (Pozsony, 1825-1827), II, 88-89 (hereafter cited as Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve).

[34]M. Pongrácz, secret report on the Regional Session of the Lower House, 28 January 1826, Hungarica Collection of Francis I's private library, bundle 64, see Szekfü, Iratok a Magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1926), pp. 341-347.

[35]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, n.d., quoted in Gy. Kornis, "Az 1825-ik évi országgyülés és a Magyar közoktatásügy," Magyar Pedagógia, XXXIV (1925), 81-95.

[36]Speech by Deputy from Túrócz County at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, I, 612-614.

[37]Cserey's letter to Kazinczy, 29 December 1825, Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, pp. 498-499.

[38]D. M. (anon.), "A Magyar nyelvrül," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, II (June, 1826), 736.

[39]Speech by Deputy from Liptó County at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, I, 612-614.

[40]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 14 February 1826, ibid., pp. 653-659.

[41]Speech by Deputy from Liptó County at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 February 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, I, 612-614.

[42]A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1740-1830 (Leipzig, 1902), V, 163.

[43]Ibid., p. 245.

[44]Ibid., pp. 325-326.

[45]Numerous Counties appealed to the Diet between 1802 and 1806. For details, see D. Rapant, Ilegálna Maďarizácia, 1790-1840, Turčiansky Sväty Martin, 1947, pp. 55-90; also see Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai 1807, p. 426, and Irásai 1811, pp. 127, 155.

[46]J. G. Kohl, Reise in Ungarn (Leipzig, 1842), pp. 73-74.

[47]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 22 December 1825, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyzö Könyve, I, 262-268.

[48]King's rescript to the Lower House, 9 September 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1825-1827 (Pozsony, 1825-1827), II, 689-690 (hereafter cited as Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai).

[49]Lower House rescript to the King, 6 October 1826, ibid., p. 730.

[50]Staatskonferenz, Doc. No. 1826:358; Hungarian Chancellery, Doc. Nos. 13,399 and 13,969, 18 October 1826 (see Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 338-340).

[51]King's rescript to the Lower House, 7 November 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, pp. 741-742.

[52]King's clarification of his rescript of 7 November 1826 to the Lower House, 18 August 1827, ibid., III, 1739.

[53]Bajza to Toldy, letter of 15 December 1825. See J. Bajza, Bajza József összegyüjtött munkái, ed. F. Badics (Budapest, 1901), VI, 157-160.

[54]For Latin text, see entry of 26 April 1826, Magyar Országgüles, Irásai, I, 383-427; for Magyar text, see entry of 30 June 1827, ibid., III, 1510 et seq.

[55]Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 348-349.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Staatskonferenz, Doc. No. 1827:142, quoted in Szekfü, op. cit., p. 349.

[58]These observations were made in 1833 (see A. Dessewffy, Gróf Aurél Dessewffy összes müvei, ed. J. Ferenczy [Budapest, 1887], pp. 296-297) (hereafter cited as Dessewffy, Dessewffy Müvei).

[59]Ibid., p. 297.

[60]These observations were made in 1835 (see I. Széchenyi, Töredékek gróf Széchenyi István fenmaradt kézirataiból. Első kötet. Hunnia, ed. J. Török [Pest, 1858], p. 42) (hereafter cited as Széchenyi, Hunnia).

[61]F. Pulszky, Életem és korom, ed. G. Tolnai (Budapest, 1958), pp. 37-40.

[62]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 26 July 1834, L. Kossuth, Orszaggyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), III, 371-372 (hereafter cited as Kossuth, O.T.).

[63]Széchenyi, letter to Eszterházy, 26 October 1828 (see I. Széchenyi, Gróf Széchenyi István levelei, Vol. II of I. Széchenyi, Gróf Széchenyi István összes munkái, eds. B. Majláth and A. Zichy [Budapest, 1890-1894], p. 102).

[64]Endre K-ss (anon.), "Nemzeti játékszin Honi fölemelkedésünk segéde," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, XII (1831), 19.

[65]The pamphlet was ascribed to Kollár at that time, but more recent scholarship has found that the article might have been written by Samuel Hoič, another Slovak author, and it was commissioned by the Croatian political figure and leading South Slav nationalist, Count Janko Draskovič. See J. V. Ormis, Bibliografia Jána Kollára (Bratislava, 1954), pp. 230-231; I. Esih, "Tko je autor politicki brošure: Sollen wir Magyaren werden?," Slov. pohl. Lit., ed. J. V. Ormis (Sarajevo, 1933), pp. 127-128; J. Misianik, "Poznámka k Hoičovej knihe Sollen wir Magyaren werden?," Sbornik Matice Slov., XX (1942), 279-280; J. V. Ormis, Slovnik slovenských pseudonymov (Turčiansky Sväty Martin, 1944), p. 112; Gy. Miskolczy, A Horvát kérdés története és irományai a rendi állam korában (Budapest, 1927), I, 168; H. Steinacker, "Österreich-Ungarn und Osteuropa," Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVIII (1923), 38.

[66]Debates at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 30 January 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 139.

[67]Arató, Nemzetiség I, 95-96.

[68]Gy. Farkas, Der ungarische Vormärz (Berlin, 1943), pp. 49-50.

[69]Arató, Nemzetiség I, 83-85, 217-221.

[70]Ibid., pp. 92-93.

[71]Farkas, op. cit.

[72]Dessewffy, Dessewffy Művei, p. 298.

[73]Széchenyi, Hunnia, pp. 52-55.

[74]I. Széchenyi, Stadium (Leipzig, 1833), pp. 32-34.

[75]Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1830 (Pozsony, 1830), II, 595-596.

[76]The demands of Vas and Bars Counties were the most publicized but similar to those of Esztergom County (see Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 373-378, 399-401). I. Barta, "Széchenyi és a Magyar polgári reformmozgalom kibontakozása," Történelmi Szemle, III, Nos. 2-3 (1960), 233. Széchenyi hoped that the uprising might bring noblemen to their senses and impel them toward reform. Also see Széchenyi to Wesselenyi, letter of 26 August 1831, in I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi István válogatott irásai, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1959), pp. 158-161.

[77]For the most detailed account of the uprising, see L. Tilkovszky, Az 1831. évi parasztfelkelés (Budapest, 1955), passim; also see Széchenyi's letter to M. Wesselényi, 26 August 1831, quoted in I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi István válogatott irásai, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1959), pp. 158-161; Kazinczy's letter to I. Guzmics, 16 July 1831 and 8 August 1831, quoted in F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz és Guzmics Izidor közti levelezés 1822-1831-ig, ed. E. Gulyás (Budapest, 1873), pp. 272-273, 276-278.

[78]Pécsy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 30 January 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 139.

[79]Balogh's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 30 January 1833, ibid., p. 139.

[80]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 19 December 1832, and at the Regional Session, 23 December 1832, Kossuth, O.T., I, 13.

[81]Kölcsey's appeal to the Upper House, 10 January 1833, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai,

1832-1836 (Pozsony, 1832-1836), I, 10-11 (hereafter cited as Irásai, 1832-1836).

[82]Kossuth's notation, 21 January 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 112.

[83]Debates in the Upper House, 21 January 1833, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Jegyzö Könyve, 1832-1836 (Pozsony, 1832-1836), I, 107-110, Resolution by the Upper House, 26 January 1833, Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 36-37.

[84]Kossuth's notation, 21 January 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 108.

[85]Kölcsey's reply to the Upper House, 22 February 1833, Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 61-64; F. Kölcsey, Országgyülési naplója, 1832-1833 (Pest, 1848), p. 124.

[86]Resolution by the Upper House, 29th Session (n.d.), Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 93-94.

[87]Kölcsey's third and final appeal to Upper House, 35th Session (n.d.), ibid., I, 111-113.

[88]Resolution by Magnates, 20 February 1833, Kossuth, O.T., I, 174.

[89]Kölcsey's draft to the King, 30 May 1833, Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 148-150, 156-157.

[90]Hungarian Chancellery, Doc. No. 1833:4587 (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 408).

[91]Staatskonferenz, Doc. No. 1833:623; and Staatsrat, Doc. No. 1833:2141 (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 408).

[92]Georg Mailath's statement (see Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 409-410).

[93]Norbert Purkhart's statement (see Szekfü, op. cit., pp. 410-411).

[94]Reviczky's statement (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 411).

[95]Metternich's statement (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 411).

[96]Ibid.

[97]Staatskonferenz, Doc. No. 1833:990 (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 411).

[98]Hungarian Chancellery, Archives, Doc. Nos. 1835: 1707, 1834:1379, and Staatsrat, Doc. No. 1834:1172 (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 412).

[99]Staatskonferenz, Doc. No. 1834:1172 (see Szekfü, op. cit., p. 412).

[100]King's rescript to the Lower House, 5 October 1835, Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, III, 9-11.

[101]Recommendation of Committee, 23 December 1835, ibid., VI, 116-117. Proposed law by the Lower House, 16 March 1836, ibid., VII, 44-52.

[102]King's response to proposed law by the Lower House, 16 March 1836, rescript of 29 April 1836, Kossuth, O.T., V, 668-669. For the King's opinions on the proposed laws which he failed to accept, see Magyar Országgyülés, Irásai, 1832-1836, VII, 44.

[103]Wesselényi, op. cit., pp. 9, 15-16 and 62-63.

[104]M. Zsilinszky, "Széchenyi nemzetiségi politikája," eds. J. Gaál et al., Széchenyi eszmevilága (Budapest, 1914), II, 85-86.

CHAPTER IV

NATIONAL AWARENESS IN LITERATURE AND CULTURE

The Magyars' struggle for their national tongue had a negative result in the sense that it provoked a reaction from the minorities. In another respect, however, the emphasis on official Magyar had a positive result because it stimulated development of Magyar language and literature. When the gentry first began their Magyarization endeavours in the latter part of the eighteenth century, even they had to admit that Magyar was not sufficiently developed to supplant Latin. By this time, however, Romantic thought already had penetrated deeply into the intellectual life of the country. The ideas of Herder and others were propagated by some of the educated upper class who had traveled to Western Europe and, even more significantly, by growing numbers of educated lower-class honoratiori.

These Magyars accepted the idea of Romanticism that the unsophisticated rural masses with their folklore formed the foundation of a national culture. They agreed with the Romanticist suggestion that the intelligentsia should become interested in its own ancestral language as preserved by common folk.[1] Herder had cautioned the Magyars

that the neglect of their national language and culture would result in their extinction.[2] As a goal which the intellectuals should strive for, Romanticism promised the organic nation state, formed on the bonds of a commonly shared language.[3]

When the magnates and the landed gentry agreed in the Diet that their language was one of the most important means toward forming a united Magyar nation, the idea of Magyarism had already made great strides, especially among the literati. Dilettante writers from the noble classes had been joined by honoratiori, authors from the lower classes, who were few in number but who had considerable influence in Magyar literature.[4] They had a new viewpoint, one which was divorced from the class-conscious standards of the nobility. Even in the gymnasia future honoratiori could influence the nobility by being active in literary societies. Although the associations were relatively small and predominantly aristocratic, they were nevertheless influential and their acceptance of lower class students was significant.[5]

Under the influence of Romanticism and a widening social base of the literati, the movement for raising the Magyar language as a means of expression of Magyar literary and cultural advancement came slowly into being.[6] The Magyars' interest in their language encouraged the revival of an indigenous literature based on Magyar traditions, history and folk motifs. Both major denominations, but

especially the Protestants, taught Magyar in the lower schools and kept the language alive through hymnody, psalmody and school drama.[7] However, the various literary movements which appeared were at first under the impact of foreign literature, notably French and Latin.[8] Only during the eighteenth century did Magyar writers gradually free themselves from such influences and begin to create an indigenous literary movement. This slowly developing effort to return to the traditional Magyar historical and cultural themes became known as the National School.

The forefather of this literary trend, István Gyöngyösi (1620-1704), wrote in the seventeenth century but his literature was so popular in the eighteenth century that his epic, Keményiad (1693), went through five printings by 1772.[9] More important, in the pre-reform era, were the writings of András Dugonics (1740-1818), a Magyarized Slav whose early works The Fall of Troy and Tales of Ulysses (1780) were based on Virgil and Homer.[10] Although themselves under a strong classical influence, Dugonics' works were written in the traditional Magyar style and influenced other writers of the National School to take up Magyar themes.[11]

Dugonics especially influenced Baron József Gvadányi (1725-1801), a Magyarized Italian. Like many proselytes, Gvadányi was extremely chauvinistic,[12] assailing Magyar noble society for its foreign-inspired pretentiousness and praising the simplicity of the honest,

rustic Magyar. In his satirical rhymed novel, Egy falusi notáriusnak budai utazásából (From the Travels of a Village Notary to Buda), Gvadányi portrayed the reactions of an imaginary village notary who, on his first visit to Buda, found himself confronted by a young Magyar noble dressed in exaggerated Western-style clothes. The words which Gvadányi put in the mouth of the notary were presumably indicative of anti-foreign sentiments among Magyars who were uncontaminated by alien exposure. Gvadányi's notary declared that

> Every nation the world over concedes
> That Magyar dress is the best.
> If one is a Magyar and fails to wear it, there
> Can be only one explanation: such a
> Magyar must have taken leave of his senses.[13]

Gvadányi tried to influence the deputies at the 1790-1791 Diet to adopt legislation which would promote Magyarism at the expense of foreign customs. His Istenmezei palócból (from the Palóc of Istenmeze) intended to sway the law-makers:

> Let him be cursed with legal suits
> Who does not wear the garb of our kind,
> Let all his chattels be cursed.
> Such a man ought to hoe potatoes in the land of
> the Swabians.
>
> Your second law ought to be the Magyar tongue.
> Believe me, without it naught shall succeed.
> Whatever anyone may do with an alien tongue
> If he fails to do it also in his mother tongue, it is
> A shame and a scandal.
>
> Finally, this law too shall be enacted,
> Whosoever shall go asoldiering in our nation
> Should take service in our nation's own regiment.
> To enlist foreigners in it ought to be a disgrace.

These three points are our true grievances.
Whoever fails to give his leave in these matters
Should be struck by lightning from heaven,
Forever and ever, Amen.[14]

Ferenc Darvas, an influential member of the Vice Regency Council, offered similar advice to the Diet of 1790-1791 through his Hazafiúi Intés (Patriotic Admonition). Darvas believed that

If you put both nobles and peasants on a better footing,
Whom evil circumstances have flooded with much trouble and many burdens,
You may then praise the sun upon its descent.
Therefore we must have our Diet first.

Darvas concluded his last stanza with the admonition to his fellow nobles: "You must embrace all your Magyar blood brothers equally."[15]

In spite of these precursors, at the beginning of the nineteenth century the majority of the clerical hierarchy and the higher nobility were contemptuous of the simple Magyar speech of the lower classes. The privileged classes used the Magyar language primarily for communicating with their social inferiors.[16] The attempt to develop a uniform Magyar-speaking society was complicated by the fact that even the upper stratum lacked unity in culture and language. Latin and German were the only common languages. As far as the masses were concerned, they were divided into several ethnic groups and possessed their own languages and their own culture based on folklore.

Three circumstances contributed to the fact that the Magyar ruling classes experienced a change in favour

of the Magyar tongue. Firstly, they feared that the Magyar lower classes would emulate the excesses of the French Revolution of 1789. Secondly, after the Napoleonic War, with the Magyar nobility no longer needed, the temporary tacit truce with the Habsburgs came to an end[17] and the Vienna Government resumed its policy of protecting the jobbágyság against the landlords. Thirdly, non-Magyar leaders in Hungary abandoned Latin in favour of their own national tongues, assumed leadership of the lower classes and threatened to disrupt the territorial integrity of the Hungarian state by demanding political and cultural autonomy. As a result, Magyar noblemen feared that both the Magyar and the non-Magyar jobbágyság would be turned against them by outside forces.[18] It was realized both in the Diet as well as in the Magyar leading classes outside the Diet that Magyars had to become united and the upper classes as a whole had to change their scornful attitude toward the Magyar jobbágyság. If Magyar unity was to become a reality, however, the Magyar tongue had to adopt the idioms and vocabulary of the Magyar peasant. At the same time the Magyar tongue had to become more expressive and had to develop both a systematic grammar and a viable vocabulary. Only a revitalized and enriched Magyar tongue common to all could foster an effective national culture capable of leveling class barriers.

An attempt to promote interest in the Magyar tongue among upper-class contemporaries began in 1801 when Ferenc

Kazinczy, released from Austrian jail, launched a philological and literary movement known as the trans-Tibiscan or Neologue school.[19] Kazinczy's programme was complex and sometimes contradictory. He advocated basic changes in the language and proposed to accomplish them by translating foreign words literally, by coining new words with foreign roots and by arbitrarily inventing new Magyar words.

Kazinczy, however, was an upper-class conservative who desired no changes in favour of the lower classes. He and his Neologue followers were influenced by Romanticism, but they held the peasantry in contempt and belittled their influence on the Magyar tongue. They had no desire to create a language that would serve as a link between the Magyar upper and lower classes. One observer noticed that Kazinczy looked down on poets who wrote as if they were writing for coachmen.[20] This appraisal is supported by Kazinczy's correspondence with his colleagues. In 1823 Kazinczy wrote to Izidor Guzmics, a friend and supporter, that

> if Magyar were not a multifarious tongue, such compositions as my Boufflers could not be understood. Still so many Magyars reproach me for wishing to maintain Magyar as a multi-faceted tongue.[21]

Guzmics' views were even more revealing of the Neologues' attitude. "What does the Új Szellem desire? Do its adherents wish to pronounce as pure Magyar the kitchen Magyar of the servant? If so, we go backward, not forward."[22]

Another letter, written by Kazinczy three years

later to one of his followers, showed that the Neologues were no longer united in their determination to exclude folk idiom from the Magyar tongue. Kazinczy disagreed with Gábor Döbrentei, one of his close associates, because

> to Döbrentei the countenance is a Magyar countenance graced with moustaches[23] whereas Kazinczy is willing to accept countenances with or without moustaches as long as the Magyar spirit shines forth. Döbrentei wishes to render our language uni-coloured whereas Kazinczy desires a multi-coloured language (Charaktersprache). Döbrentei will not tolerate anything which has a foreign odour though the odour may be pleasing. Kazinczy is prepared to accept everything foreign if it is beautiful and if it retains its beauty in translation because a writer has no greater law than that his writing be beautiful.[24]

A few years later Kazinczy modified his social attitudes as the result of a meeting with the well-known author Sándor Kisfaludy.[25] Kazinczy also relented somewhat from his extreme Neologue viewpoint on the urging of members of his Circle.[26] Despite his more moderate attitude, however, the changes within Kazinczy's Circle proved to be far too rapid for him.[27] By subjecting Magyar to foreign influences at the expense of native Magyar idioms, he even came into conflict with influential friends, who were by then believers in the Romanticist ideal, with its emphasis on nationalistic consciousness, exaggerated patriotism and commitment to the indigenous national past.[28] As early as 1815 Ferenc Kölcsey, a faithful follower of Kazinczy since 1808,[29] expressed the view that

> the path to Magyar is now broken in, but not by Kazinczy . . . , but by the entire nation from long

> ago and this will be the true road because our language is inclined in this direction. To remove it from this path will be impossible.[30]

Count József Dessewffy, scion of an ancient Magyar family, was yet another friend who could not accept Kazinczy's foreign orientation. In one of his letters to Kazinczy, Dessewffy wrote about his own Magyar education and environment, stating:

> I had a Magyar nurse and ever since infancy I had been surrounded with Magyar families. . . . My nation's tongue was my first tongue. At the age of twelve [in 1786] I spoke not a word of German as yet.[31]

Kölcsey's and Dessewffy's opposition to Kazinczy was a step forward in the development of the Magyar tongue along indigenous lines. Kölcsey later became a celebrated author and Lower House Deputy and he exerted great influence among the gentry in matters pertaining to the Magyar tongue. In the early 1830's he also became acquainted with the liberal magnates, Miklós Wesselényi and György Károlyi. In 1831 the three collaborated in drawing up Szatmár County's liberal instructions for its representatives to the 1832-1836 Diet. Once at the Diet as representative of Szatmár County, Kölcsey was introduced by Wesselényi to most renowned and important aristocrats in the Upper House.[32] Similarly, Dessewffy, a well-known political writer, founded the influential literary and political periodical Felső Magyarországi Minerva in 1825 and in 1811 became a leading figure in the Upper House where he influenced the magnates with his Magyar-oriented ideas.

Both Kölcsey and Dessewffy subsequently lent prestige to a rival faction which arose almost immediately after Kazinczy resumed his literary activities in 1801. These opponents, who were called trans-Danubians or Orthologues, tried to eliminate all alien influences, both contemporary and classical, from the Magyar language and they attempted to introduce words and idioms from folk usage. The Orthologue philologist Pál Beregszászi criticized Kazinczy's method of arbitrarily coining Magyar words and urged the creation of words solely on the basis of etymology. In a philological study[33] József Siposi even went so far as to declare that all innovations were unnecessary and he was supported by András Thaisz in an article that appeared in Tudományos Gyüjtemeny.[34] Keszthelyi Kör, a periodical published by the influential Baron György Festetics, also reacted unfavourably to Kazinczy's Neologism, as did most of the older generation.[35] A reviewer of Kazinczy's nine-volume translation of foreign classics[36] accused the author of breaking his own linguistic rules and of writing in a way that was incomprehensible.[37]

Most of the older literati were also opposed to Kazinczy. For example, a poet of the National School, Dániel Berzsenyi, strongly attacked the invasion of foreign styles into Magyar in his poem Magyarokhoz (To Magyars), written in 1807:

> The Magyar, in days of old so strong, is now decaying.
> Can you not see that Árpád's blood is degenerating?
> What is the Magyar now? An ugly sybaritic shell.

> He has torn off his shining national emblem.
> Grown weary of his forebears' heroic garb
> And speech, he has settled for the alien's ugly style.
> He is trampling his nation's guiding spirit.[38]

In the same year, Sándor Kisfaludy published the second edition of his extremely successful Himfy Szerelmei (Himfy's Loves).[39] In the Introduction of this edition Kisfaludy announced a new programme: the liberation from all traditional literary shackles and devotion to patriotic ideals. The Introduction occasioned the break between Kisfaludy and Kazinczy and represented the first unconscious step among Magyars towards the patriotic appeal of the German Romanticists.[40] The effectiveness of Kisfaludy's literary declaration of war was intensified by the unprecedented popularity of the first edition of Himfy Szerelmei, published in 1801. The esthetic yet folkish quality of the work endeared it to the reading public in Hungary to the extent that many Magyars carried the book around and read it aloud. The fame, especially of Keserelgő Szerelem (Mournful Love), extended beyond Hungary's borders and it was translated into many languages. Even the Royal family boasted a copy.[41]

The Neologue-Orthologue controversy intensified between 1805 and 1824 in satirical tracts written by both sides and stimulated public interest. In a letter to Kazinczy, János Szabó, one of his followers, pointed out that

> there is hardly anyone among the reading public who is not involved personally in the struggle between

> Neologues and Orthologues. Even those who are neutral follow the events with the keenest of interest.[42]

Orthologue writers had a greater appeal and they steadily gained ground against the Neologues. As Pál Szemere, a former follower of Kazinczy, remarked, "It is best to gain the reading public's permission before we innovate. . . . A writer can succeed only if he goes along with the majority of the reading public."[43] Orthologues gradually persuaded most Magyars that the correct path for the Magyar language lay with the speech of the Magyar peasants. In Kölcsey's words, "The true national spirit can arise only from within the bosom of the Nation."[44] These arguments particularly influenced noblemen from those regions where Magyars were a minority surrounded by Slavs and Roumanians. These nobles feared that the traditional Magyar tongue would soon be obliterated and once lost it could never be recovered. One such nobleman, the Magyarized Slovak Baron, Frigyes Podmaniczky, recognized the importance of the Magyar peasant for the preservation of Magyar speech when he wrote:

> As a result of my experiences among the gentry I became convinced that it was not the nobles, as it was customarily said, but the common people, who kept our [Magyar] national tongue alive for our present generation.[45]

As the Magyar intelligentsia began to pay attention to its own national tongue, interest in foreign works languished, even when they were translated into Magyar. This changed attitude came very suddenly. In 1814, Kazinczy had no problem finding a publisher for his nine-volume work;

but in 1816, when Kazinczy announced his intentions to publish additional translations of foreign classics, his plans came to naught because public opinion by then had changed in favour of Magyar literature.[46]

By this time the Orthologues' impact had also been felt in Magyar intellectual circles. For example, they had a great influence on the linguistic policies of the Marczibányi Foundation, established in 1815 for the purpose of investigating questions relating to the Magyar tongue. Two years later administrators of the Foundation announced prizes for solving a series of questions concerning the Magyar tongue:

1. What are dialects from the grammatical point of view? In this sense, do there exist Magyar dialects? If so, what are they, how do they differ, and how could their use enrich the Magyar literary medium?

2. What scientific methods might and should be employed to enrich the Magyar tongue with new words and idioms in order to aid sundry sciences and trades?

3. What would be the best approach toward compiling a Magyar dictionary? Should old Magyar words, provincial words, colloquialisms, and the various dialects be used in such a dictionary? What would be the briefest and most expeditious method?

4. How could Magyar orthography be established, based on correct philosophical principles, as opposed to contradictory usages and arbitrary opinions?[47]

It was a strong indication of Orthologue influence that three of the questions acknowledged the need for investigating the idiom of the peasant classes. The reference to

'contradictory usages and arbitrary opinions' was a direct accusation of the Neologues' unscientific methods.

The Orthologue literary movement found legislative support in the person of István Széchenyi. Through his influence and personal financial aid, he led a movement which established the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at the Diet of 1825-1827.[48] Although most of the nobles were not Orthologues, this literary movement became so influential that its aims were partially incorporated into the programme of the Academy. For example, the Academy pledged "to cultivate the national tongue, to revive neglected but relevant words and expressions, to gather various proverbs in different areas and compare them."[49] However, in an effort to be impartial and promote peace between the rival linguistic factions, the Academy also promised

> to create new words wherever necessary and to remind members not to neglect the translation of ancient Greek and Latin as well as more recent Italian, French, English and German works because the Magyar tongue can benefit by examples from these foreign languages.[50]

As the contest between the Neologue and Orthologue movements continued outside the Diet, the well-known philologist Pál Magda published an article in Felső Magyarországi Minerva which threw his support behind the Orthologues. The article stressed especially that

> pure Magyar may be found only among those who live far away from Hungary's borders and away from foreign enclaves. Hence the Magyar tongue should draw, as much as possible, on this source for its standards. According to page 18 in the Debreczeni Grammatica "there is nothing more certain than thus far the common people are endowed with the knowledge of pure

> Magyar and especially those who are least exposed to non-Magyar nationalities." Hence, here resides the root of our true Magyar tongue.[51]

By 1830, when Széchenyi took a stand in Hitel (Credit) in favour of the Orthologues, their victory was complete. The author Berzsenyi acknowledged Széchenyi's support by writing:

> You have done a great turn for our language when you declared yourself in favour of the Danubian dialect, especially since the Kazinczy group has ostracized me because of it.[52]

What began as an attempt to emphasize the use of the folk language elements soon grew into a conviction that the new Magyar should even become the predominant written language in Hungary. Magyar authors were particularly anxious to see that the Magyar language replace German. Csokonai, for example, wrote shortly before his death in 1805:

> It may be true that among European nations we are among the last, but German, too, was what Frederick the Great called "a rough, Gothic language" before Gellert. Yet even in its present state Magyar is a more beautiful and useful language than the well-cultivated German. What could it become if we did some work on it![53]

It was for these reasons that some of the literati, such as Kölcsey, complained about the Neologues' excessive Germanism.[54] József Bajza went so far as to write a letter to his literary colleague Kazinczy in which he said:

> For the sake of our future we have to declare that it is unpatriotic for a Magyar writer to compose in German. What a victory if we can save even one talent for our nation from such error![55]

Károly Kisfaludy was initially less opposed to the

German language. In fact, as late as 1818 he recognized that Magyars using German could play a special role: "Magyars who write in German should earn the gratitude and pride of Magyars for helping foreigners to become acquainted with our Magyar works."[56] Even Kisfaludy turned against German, however, and when the author Zerffy appealed to him in 1820 to collaborate in the projected Vaterländerischer Almanach, Kisfaludy declined. He refused to write in German, which he knew fluently, and asked, "Are we not Magyars? Is Hungary not our fatherland? How can our literature be other than Magyar?"[57]

The alienation between the German-writing authors, both Magyar and non-Magyar, and the younger generation of Magyar and Magyarized literati came to a head in 1831 with the so-called Pyrker Affair. János László Pyrker was a Germanized Magyar who became a Roman Catholic bishop in Hungary and wrote exclusively in German. In 1821 he published a biblical epic[58] which was translated into many languages. When the work appeared in Magyar in 1830 it provoked a storm of indignation. Mihály Vörösmarty declared that Magyars did not need a man like Pyrker, who knew neither fatherland nor God because he was divided in his beliefs and heart.[59] The affair created a gulf between Magyars and the German literati, who became passively resistant to further Magyarization.[60]

While some Magyars were on the offensive against Germans, various other literati took the more positive

approach of trying to create a popular medium for spreading the written word. An example of such attempts was the founding of a literary journal, Erdélyi Muzeum, by the author Döbrentei in 1814. The periodical was published in Pest, and although it only lasted until 1818, it disseminated Romanticist ideas and exerted a great influence on the growing circle of Magyar writers.[61]

Three years later a group of literati led by József Bajza, Károly Kisfaludy and Mihály Vörösmarty founded a literary society, which drew its name from the literary almanach Aurora, which they started. The Aurora Circle and the Orthologues had the same aims, particularly where the Magyar language was concerned. All these authors were deeply imbued with Romanticism[62] and wished to spread a knowledge and appreciation of the neglected Magyar past, to reconcile the upper and lower classes, and to demonstrate that the peasants were decent, honest and respectable. The Circle was very successful, partly because its members had political connections with influential liberally minded magnates like Széchenyi[63] and partly because Orthologues had absorbed many of the features of Neologism. By synthesizing the more sophisticated and esthetic Neologue methodology with the folk-oriented patriotism of the Orthologues, the Aurora Circle was able to reach a far wider reading public than Kazinczy.[64]

The success of the Aurora Circle was partly due to the fact that its membership was virtually a Hungarian

melting pot. This was significant for the growth of Magyar awareness, because it cut across barriers of class, religion and region. The circle included a number of recently Magyarized literati, such as the German-Hungarian Schedel-Toldy, as well as Helmeczy, Szenvey, Stettner, Tretter, and the Roumanian Paziazi. The Circle also included the Roman Catholic magnates János Mailáth and Alajos Mednyánszky, whose loyalty to the Habsburg cause was wavering. Protestants were represented by A. Fáy and the former Neologues Szemere and Kölcsey, who acted as intermediaries between the two rival groups. Finally, Roman Catholic priests of jobbágy origin, such as Endre Horváth and Gergely Czuczor, also joined the group.[65] By the late 1820's there were about one hundred literati living in Pest[66] and most of them were Magyars. This is remarkable considering that only a decade earlier there were scarcely one thousand persons living in Pest whose mother tongue was Magyar.[67] The rapid change may be attributed to the fact that by the late 1820's, according to a contemporary observer, the nobility in Pest had stopped using Latin and German and now conversed only in Magyar.[68]

Inspired by the National School and reinforced by the linguistic contributions of the Orthologues, the Aurora Circle extended its activities over a wide range. During the 1820's one member of the Circle, András Fáy, wrote Eredeti meséi és aphorizmái (Original Tales and Aphorisms) as a collection of fables satirizing Magyar life. One of

these fables, The Stork's Travels, was in fact a condemnation of the magnates for their neglect of the lower classes and of Hungary. In one passage containing a conversation between a pigeon and a stork, the pigeon asked:

> How is it that you storks see the world, roam over water, land, hill and dale, experience good and bad, have wide access to science and to possibilities of having your standards improved; yet spring after spring, without change, you build your nest simply, I might say, roughly; you eat snakes and frogs, your clattering has not changed to a more refined singing or whistling. I could overlook all this, if I could only see that you have brought some learning, good inventions or customs to your fellow birds at home. But nothing! Absolutely nothing!

The stork replied:

> I am surprised that you even mention the word "home" to the migrant stork. He is a guest everywhere, he comes and goes, seeking not fatherland, knowledge, customs, but simply summer and spring. He nests and is a glutton wherever possible and what else can an eternal traveler and glutton achieve?[69]

In the same work Fáy expressed his impatience with the slow progress of the national language: "My Magyars! How many have sung for you: 'The dawn is breaking.' But God! How difficult it is for the dawn to break!"[70]

Sándor Kisfaludy, another member of the Circle, became particularly well known for his collection of stories from the national past. One of them, Dobozy Mihály és Hitvese (Michael Dobozy and Spouse), was written in 1822, when it seemed to some contemporaries that Magyar was in obvious decline. In it Kisfaludy described a nobleman named Dobozy who had survived the battle of Mohács only to find himself attacked by the Turks on the doorstep of his

home. By dramatizing the heroic resistance of Dobozy and his Magyar companions, Kisfaludy sought to encourage similar strength and solidarity among Magyars in their own struggle.[71]

Sándor Kisfaludy's brother Károly also commemorated the battle of Mohács, which he called "our national grandeur's great cemetery." In his Mohács, written in 1824, Kisfaludy spurned the possibility of defeat by exclaiming, "Magyar lives, Buda still stands!"[72] This was a call to arms against the Habsburg menace to Magyarism.

His Budai harcjáték (War Play in Buda), written in 1828, reflected the growing animosities between Magyars and other nationalities. He chose as his locale the Court of Matthias Corvinus in order to remind Magyars of their past grandeur. The story described a tilting match between Holubár, an unbeaten Czech champion, and the Magyar knight Kinizsi, in which Kinizsi won after a titanic battle.[73] There was more to this poem than mere chauvinism. By casting the apparently invincible Czech knight in the role of Goliath and the Magyar challenger in that of David, Kisfaludy encouraged the popular contemporary sentiment that the Magyars might win in their struggle against Austria.

In the same year another member of the Aurora Circle, Mihály Vörösmarty, composed a historical ode about the Turkish wars of the seventeenth century in which he emphasized the heroism of the Magyars even in defeat. His

poem Zrinyi concluded with the encouraging question "With all these great examples, should not the Magyars become great once again?[74] Between 1822 and 1835 Vörösmarty wrote a series of poems dramatizing Magyar historical events in order to enlighten Magyars by means of their history,[75] including even their distant past. Many schools, especially those of the Catholics under close Vienna Government surveillance, could not give historical interpretations which encouraged Magyar patriotic sentiments.

The Aurora Circle was successful in its efforts to romanticize the Magyar peasant. Stylized folk poems and songs suggested that peasants possessed qualities of charm, sensitivity, morality and bravery. Kölcsey began to delve into this genre almost immediately after his break with Kazinczy. His first published work of this type, Bú kél velem (Woe Is Unto Me), dates from 1821. It was followed in rapid succession by Csolnakon (In a Boat) (1822), Zápor (Shower) (1823), Esti dal (Evening Song) (1824) and Hervadsz (Thou Wiltest) (1825).[76] By 1826 Kölcsey was so inspired by peasant motifs that he declared:

> In my opinion, the original spark of the authentic national poetry may be found only in the songs of the peasants. They are important for two reasons: they either sing about past history or about their instantaneous personal feelings.[77]

Károly Kisfaludy was also noted for his rustic characterizations and for the simplicity of his plots. He composed more than thirty folk songs between 1828 and 1830

which portrayed peasants as honest, loyal and patriotic citizens. One of his poems, Rákósi szántó a török alatt (Field of Rakos under the Turk), criticized Magyar noblemen for neglecting their national tongue. A Magyar peasant under Turkish rule lamented:

> Many folk come from Pest and Buda
> who hardly know our language any more
> Oh! In a day or so the Magyar word
> Shall be as scarce as a white raven.[78]

The most effective creator of poetry which glamourized peasant life was Gergely Czuczor, a poet of jobbágy origin who wrote a series of folk songs between 1833 and 1835. Czuczor's compositions were effective because his characters possessed charm, depth, personality and a sense of moral responsibility. In Nincs mentség (There Is No Excuse) a lovelorn peasant girl sought solace in nature while Kis leány (Little Girl) introduced the reader to the intimate and delicate thoughts of a young maiden in love. Első Szerelem (First Love) described the pangs of a girl's first disappointing love affair. In Eprésző leány (Berry-picking Girl) a simple peasant girl, confronted with a moral problem, made a difficult decision in a reasoned manner, based on sound ethical principles:[79] Czuczor hoped that his aristocratic readers would recognize in his rustic characters the basic qualities which unite members of all social classes.

It is difficult to measure the impact of this literature on the aristocratic reading public. There was some

indication that upper-class Magyars were beginning to appreciate the art forms of the lower classes. Czuczor apparently detected a change of attitude because in 1836 he wrote:

> Conceit born of class origin is beginning to dim
> The lords are becoming humane to their jobbágy
> Their former despotism of power no longer strikes and
> The curse of selfishness is being uprooted.[80]

There was further evidence that folk themes were gaining acceptance in Magyar upper class society. In 1828 Czuczor had written a long folk poem which extolled the beauty and grace of the Magyar peasant dance[81] and which caught the attention of his Romanticist contemporaries. In 1830 Berzsenyi addressed identical letters to Széchenyi and Wesselényi on the subject of Magyar music and dancing:

> I see a great deal in Magyar music and Magyar dancing because I believe these to have been the esthetic culture of our Nation in the past, to the extent that among our forbears dancing was not mere fun but a veritable esthetic gymnastics.[82]

Another important medium of expression which lent itself to the propagation of national sentiments was the stage. In the 1770's Bessenyei had produced the first two plays based on Magyar national heroes, Hunyadi László and Attila és Buda. However, with the exception of Károly Kisfaludy's drama Zach Klára,[83] which appeared in 1812, and Magyar versions of several German plays,[84] the Magyar theatre remained stagnant until after the Napoleonic Wars. At that time, along with the growing interest in the Magyar tongue, there developed an appreciation for Magyar theatre.

Members of the Aurora Circle concentrated a good deal of their effort on writing for the stage, and much of the revival can be attributed to them. Károly Kisfaludy wrote a number of historical dramas between 1818 and 1820.[85] A Tatárok Magyarországon was one such work with a strong patriotic appeal and it caused a sensation in Pest in 1819 when it was first presented.[86] There were patriotic outbursts in the theatre and the Vienna Government was alarmed. Consequently, in 1820 the censor forbade the presentation of two other Kisfaludy plays, Zach Klára and Salamon Király, on the grounds that they might provoke "too many painful memories" in the audience.[87]

Stibor Vajda was another Kisfaludy composition which is of particular interest because it dealt with the cruel treatment of the jobbágyság by Stibor, a nobleman of Polish extraction. The play was designed to arouse Magyar audiences. The evil nobleman Stibor was able to oppress Magyar peasants only because the King arbitrarily dispossessed the incumbent Magyar nobleman and installed Stibor in his place. Two of Stibor's oppressed jobbágy revealed that the deposed Magyar noble had been a model of virtue and had treated his jobbágy with humane consideration. At the close of the play Stibor succumbs to heavenly retribution but not before Kisfaludy provided the peasants in his play with the opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty, patience and sense of responsibility.[88] With Kemény Simon, a historical drama set during the time of

János Hunyadi (1441), Kisfaludy also dramatized the peasant's role in national life.[89]

József Katona, a honoratior of middle class origin, also appealed to the patriotic zeal of his countrymen in 1819 with his historical drama Bánk bán.[90] Bánk, the governor of Hungary in 1213, was appalled by the neglect and misery of the jobbágyság and he plotted to overthrow András II, the constitutional monarch. The allegory was not lost on the censor, who still recalled the tumultuous scenes during and after the performances of Kisfaludy's A Tatárok several weeks earlier. Consequently, the play was banned without explanation and only its printing was permitted. Bánk bán was not performed on the stage until 1833, when it appeared in the provincial Magyar town of Kassa. The public in Pest had the opportunity to see the play only in 1839 when it was a great success.[91]

Nearly all these plays shared certain common characteristics. Each play was designed to engender feelings of patriotism, since the plots generally stressed the heroic struggles of numerically weak Magyars against strong and cruel invaders. The plays also emphasized the injustice and indifference of Hungary's foreign kings in contrast to the generosity and kindness of Magyar monarchs. Perhaps their most important message was the appeal for national unity among all Magyars, based on the idea that the Magyar peasant also possessed virtues which made him a worthy member of the Magyar nation.

In spite of the undoubted high literary quality of these plays, in Buda and Pest Magyar theatre was not very successful because both cities were predominantly German in the opening decades of the nineteenth century. In his letter written in Pest at the end of 1824, Miklós Cserey painted a gloomy picture:

> Our Magyar theatre is dying. It is not that the plays are not going on or that they are worse than before. The theatre needed 12,000 florins but it was nowhere to be had. How will the theatre company get the funds? Where will the patriots obtain so much money in a moneyless nation? There are hardly ten magnates who are able to raise enough money to satisfy their own accustomed needs.[92]

According to the Austrian secret police, however, a Magyar theatrical company performed in Pest for a month during 1827 and its performances were enthusiastically received. According to the police report, the German director of the theatre had made false statements about the Magyar troupe, by claiming that when the Magyars performed the theatre was nearly empty. Using this as a pretext he gave notice to the company, but on the last day a deputation of some thirty patriotic Magyar law students appeared in his office armed with staves and clubs and threatened to close the theatre permanently if the Magyar company was not permitted to perform throughout the winter season. Thoroughly intimidated, the director agreed.[93]

The activities of the newly established Academy of Sciences were beneficial to the Magyar theatre as well. At

the time of its establishment the Academy adopted as one of its aims "to see that the theatre, one of the best means of popularizing Magyar, should not remain neglected."[94]

Despite this moral support, the Magyar theatre encountered difficulties. When the 1832-1836 Diet proposed a permanent home for the National Theatre, the project nearly failed for lack of funds and interest of the gentry. After many difficulties Prince Grassalkovics donated a plot, and the theatre was built. Even so, attendance was poor during Magyar drama performances even in the 1830's and to remedy the situation the management had to arrange musical performances once or twice weekly. The alternative would have meant bankruptcy.[95]

It would be inaccurate to judge the progress of Magyar theatre solely on the developments in Buda and Pest because there were fifteen itinerant provincial companies which thrived.[96] Between 1818 and 1835, for example, five different companies appeared at the provincial center of Pécs and performed nearly one hundred Magyar plays, ranging from musical comedies to historical dramas. These were so popular that patrons had to be turned away at the box office.[97] One of these companies, performing at Székesfehérvár, was formed in 1818 in response to public demand and was funded entirely through public subscription.[98]

By the mid-1830's a significant change had occurred in the area of Magyar language and literature. In the 1820's only a few literati were involved in the Magyar

cultural movement and public interest was just beginning. By the 1830's, however, Magyar national awareness was growing and, as it evolved, the influence of foreign literature gave way to more widespread use of Magyar. John Paget, an English traveler who visited Hungary in 1836, reported:

> Magyar authorship has become fashionable. Among men it is now the medium of conversation; at public dinners, toasts and speeches in German would not be listened to; and at Pest, whatever else may be the case in Vienna, Magyar gentlemen are now ashamed to be ignorant of the Magyar language.[99]

The growing popularity of the Magyar language was also evident in Magyar public affairs. During the 1832-1836 Diet, Lajos Kossuth, who kept the minutes of the meetings, tried to replace Latinized expressions in the language with more purely Magyar expressions.[100] At the same Diet session Pál Nagy noticed the change that had taken place among the Deputies. He remarked that over the previous ten years many Deputies had already forgotten their Latin and he wondered if, in another ten years, the priests might even forget it.[101] Nagy's observations on the use of Latin were supported by his contemporary, Julia Pardoe, when she observed:

> There were certain individuals in the Chamber who rendered their speeches ornate by classical allusions and quotations; which however produced no effect save ennui and impatience, as the patriotic Magyars are anxious to rid themselves altogether of the dead language in their debates.[102]

Despite the heated controversies of three decades between the Orthologues and Neologues, perhaps even because of it, Magyars had developed their national tongue and

created a Magyar literature. Unfortunately for the Magyar revival, the Slavs and the Roumanians were so alienated by then that they refused to have anything to do with either the improved Magyar tongue or the new literary achievements. Magyar writers had gone too far in ridiculing the minorities and encouraging only the development of Magyar literature and culture.[103]

Only a few years earlier in Slovakia there had been considerable friendly relations, and even cooperation, between Magyar and Slovak literary groups. Slovak reading circles were frequently encouraged and founded by Magyar noblemen and clergymen. There was a great deal of cultural interchange between the Slovaks and Magyars. Student participation on the gymnasium level in these cultural activities was of everyday occurrence.

These peaceful relations ceased as a reaction set in among both Magyars and Slovaks. Magyars in the Diet, in administration and in the Magyar periodical press grew chauvinistic, and Magyar writers and the public soon began to reject all non-Magyar cultural endeavours. As the Slovaks' linguistic and literary sophistication began to match the Magyars', they began to resent the attempt of the Magyars to force Magyar language and culture upon them. The Slovak literati began to utilize their own language to win the Slovak masses and to create peace between Roman Catholics and Protestants.[104]

The result of these animosities was that Slovak and

Magyar cultural cooperation began to diminish by the 1820's and by the 1830's the two literati became hostile toward one another.[105] The Slovaks rejected Magyar literature[106] whereas the Magyars intensified their Magyarizing efforts among the Slovaks. The 1830's can be regarded as the watershed in Magyar and non-Magyar literary relations. After 1831, Magyars who wrote in any foreign language, especially Slovak and German, were considered traitors. Non-Magyar writers who refused to assimilate were no longer accorded respect or courtesy.[107] By 1835 the estrangement was complete.

The growing awareness on the part of Magyars in their language, literature and history was partly the result of linguistic controversies which had developed at the beginning of the century. The Neologues contributed to the Magyar tongue by adding certain new words and phrases which enriched the language.[108] Neologues, many of whom were conservative socially, successfully stimulated the upper classes with patriotism. Their use of classical patriotic literature encouraged similar attitudes among the Magyars. Kölcsey indicated the relationship between classicism and patriotism when he wrote:

> In school we were taught Roman and Greek history and there you have the seeds of patriotism. This seed began to sprout first with respect to the love of the national tongue: the idea of both go together indissolubly.[109]

During the Reform Era the Neologues' influence was gradually surpassed by the Orthologues' and, as national

awareness grew, patriotic literature began to emphasize Magyar folklore and folk traditions. The young literati, many of whom were educated in the West, began to erode class barriers as they popularized the image of the patriotic and worthy lower classes. When formal literary organizations and periodicals appeared, the movement extended to all classes, and literary developments reached a new phase.

The closed circle of the gentry literati which existed at the beginning of the century had been gradually enriched through the influx of non-noble elements, the honoratiori.[110] This expanded group of intellectuals transmitted the ideas of Romanticism and nationalism through various literary media and popularized the Magyar language. Their desire to entertain, however, was surpassed by their desire to instruct during the course of the Reform Era. Almost without exception Magyar writers turned their attention to political, social and economic problems and they thereby became the most important voices of the growing Magyar national awareness.[111]

The success of Magyarism in language and literature heightened the suspicions of Vienna and by the 1830's they made overt moves, through intensified censorship and other means, to prevent the spread of reform writings. The combined hostility of the non-Magyars and the Government only made the Magyar nobility more receptive to the emotional and patriotic exhortations of the Magyar writers propagating reforms.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER IV

[1]J. B. Halstead, ed., Romanticism (New York, 1969), pp. 31-32.

[2]J. G. Herder, Ideen zur Philosophischen Geschichte der Menschheit (Karlsruhe, 1820-1829), IV, 19.

[3]G. W. F. Hegel, Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, oder Nationrecht und Staatswissentschaft im Grundrisse, ed. E. Gans (Berlin, 1833), VIII, 312-313. For a general discussion on this subject, see H. S. Reiss, The Political Thought of the German Romantics, 1793-1815 (Oxford, 1955).

[4]J. Csaplovics, Gemälde von Ungarn (Pest, 1829), p. 180.

[5]G. Bodolay, Irodalmi diáktársaságok 1785-1848 (Budapest, 1963), p. 109. See also Gy. Farkas, A "Fiatal Magyarország" kora (Budapest, 1932), pp. 122-123, and his A Magyar romantika (Budapest, 1930), pp. 97-98.

[6]H. E. Balázsi, "A reformkori nacionalizmus XVIII. század gyökerei," Történelmi Szemle, III, Nos. 2-3 (1960), 319-322.

[7]G. Hegedüs and J. Kónya, A Magyar dráma útja (Budapest, 1964), pp. 17-20 (hereafter cited as Hegedüs, Dráma); B. Menczer, A Commentary on Magyar Literature (Castrop-Rauxel, 1956), p. 19.

[8]Gy. Szekfü, Der Staat Ungarn (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1918), p. 146.

[9]L. Bóka and P. Pándi, eds., A Magyar irodalom története 1849-ig (Budapest, 1957), p. 140 (hereafter cited as Bóka, Irodalom).

[10]J. H. Schwicker, Geschichte der Ungarischen Literatur (London, 1906), pp. 257-260.

[11]Bóka, Irodalom, pp. 225-226.

[12]A. Yolland, "The National Spirit in Hungarian Literature," The Cambridge Modern History (New York, 1909), XI, 422.

[13]J. Gvadányi, Egy falusi notáriusnak budai utazásából, ed. J. Sebestény (Budapest, n.d.), p. 37.

[14]J. Gvadányi, "Istenmezei Palócból," quoted in Zs. Beöthy, ed., A Magyar nemzeti irodalom történeti ismertetése (11th ed.; Budapest, 1909), I, 310 (hereafter cited as Beöthy).

[15]F. Darvas, "Hazafiúi Intés," Orpheus, II (May-August, 1790), pp. 3-4 (Orpheus was published by F. Kazinczy under the pseudonym Vincze Széphalmi).

[16]B. F. Podmaniczky, Naplótöredékek, 1824-1886 (Budapest, 1887), pp. 27-28.

[17]J. Szauder, Kölcsey Ferencz (Budapest, 1955), p. 7.

[18]J. Szauder, A romantika útján. Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1961), p. 13.

[19]Interest in Magyar languished during the eighteenth century, and before the nineteenth century Albert Szenczi Molnár's Magyar Grammatica (1610), revised in 1682 by the Jesuit philologist Pál Beregszászi, was the last important grammatical study.

[20]For a typical comment by Kazinczy on the role of literature and the lower classes, see "Wieland Adelung ellen: Mi a tiszta Németség? (Wielands Werke, Suppl. VI. Band)--Tükörül azoknak kik nyelvrontást emlegetnek's ezt kérdezettik: Mi a tiszta Magyarság?--'s intésül a' szere felett merészeknek," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, I, No. 7 (1825), 269-286.

[21]Kazinczy to Guzmics, letter of 4 November 1823, F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz és Guzmics Izidor közti levelezése, ed. E. Gulyás (Budapest, 1873), p. 28.

[22]Guzmics to Kazinczy, letter of 19 October 1824, ibid., p. 69.

[23]At that time moustaches were considered to be typically Magyar and hence they were often worn as a sign of defiance against foreigners and their styles.

[24]Kazinczy to Pál Szemere, letter of 3 October 1827, F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz összes művei. Harmadik osztály. Levelezés, ed. J. Váczy (Budapest, 1909), XX, 368-369 (hereafter cited as Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei).

[25]Gy. Farkas, A Magyar irodalom története (Budapest, 1934), pp. 145-146.

[26]Kölcsey to Kazinczy, letter of 11 June 1817, Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, XV, 233; János Szabó to Kazinczy,

letter of 27 February 1820, ibid., XVIII, 95-96; also see Gy. Farkas, Die Entwicklung der ungarischen Literatur (Berlin, 1934), p. 128. See also A. Vidovics, A Magyar neologia rostálgottalása (Pest, 1826), pp. 24-25.

[27]Gy. Kovács, "A klasszicizmus árnyékában s a romantika előtt," Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, LXIX, No. 6 (1961), 688.

[28]Hegedűs, Dráma, p. 44.

[29]J. Révai, Literarische Studien (Berlin, 1956), p. 9.

[30]Kölcsey to Döbrentei, letter of 3 May 1815, F. Kölcsey, Osszes Müvei (Budapest, n.d.), p. 1462. Most authorities agree that the final break between Kölcsey and Kazinczy occurred sometime in 1817. I. Fenyő, Kisfaludy Sándor (Budapest, 1961), pp. 334-335; J. Horváth, Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1956), p. 164.

[31]Kazinczy to J. Dessewffy, exact date of letter unknown, quoted in J. Dessewffy, Dessewffy József gróf irodalmi hagyományai, ed. G. Kazinczy (Budapest, 1864), II, 92; and in M. C. Beleznay, A Felső Magyarországi Minerva, 1825-1836 (Eger, n.d.), p. 5. For similar opinions, see J. Dessewffy, "Előszó az avúlni kezdő és a nagyon újitgatás irás-módról a Magyar nyelvben," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, I, No. 1 (1825), iii-xii; and J. Dessewffy, "A Magyar Ihlet," ibid., p. 29.

[32]J. Horváth, Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1956), p. 170.

[33]József Siposi, Ó és Új Magyar (Pest, 1816).

[34]A. Thaisz, "A Neologizmusokról, avagy szabad-e a' Magyarban új szókat tsinálni és mennyire?" Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 12 (1817), 14-33.

[35]Berzsenyi to Szemere, letter of 1 January 1811, D. Berzsenyi, Berzsenyi Dániel ismeretlen és kiadatlan levelei, ed. O. Merényi (Budapest, 1938), p. 22 (hereafter cited as Berzsenyi, Levelei); Beöthy, op. cit., pp. 124-125.

[36]F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz Munkáji. Szép Literatura (9 vols.; Pest, 1814-1816).

[37]N. (anon.), "Book Review," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 6 (1817), 106, 108, 114-115.

[38]D. Berzsenyi, "Magyarokhoz," quoted in Beöthy, op. cit., pp. 335-336.

[39]S. Kisfaludy, Kisfaludy Sándor minden munkái, ed. D. Angyal (4th ed.; Budapest, 1882), I. Himfy Szerelmei consists of two parts, "Keserelgő Szerelem" (pp. 10-165) and "A boldog szerelem" (pp. 166-319).

[40]I. Fenyő, Kisfaludy Sándor (Budapest, 1961), pp. 188-189.

[41]E. Császári, Kisfaludy Sándor (Budapest, 1910), pp. 88-89.

[42]J. Szabó to Kazinczy, letter of 27 February 1820, Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, XVII, 95.

[43]P. Szemere, Szemere Pál munkái, ed. J. Szvorényi, (Budapest, 1890), Part II, p. 199.

[44]F. Kölcsey, "Nemzeti Hagyományok" (1826), F. Kölcsey, Kölcsey Ferencz minden munkái (3rd rev. ed.; Budapest, 1886-1887), III, 39.

[45]Podmaniczky, op. cit., p. 28.

[46]K. Csahihen, Pest-Buda irodalmi élete, 1780-1830 (Budapest, 1934), II, 61-62.

[47]Ferdinand J. Miller, "Announcement of the National Museum," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, II, No. 1 (1818), 108-109.

[48]Law IX, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésenek Irásai, 1825-1827 (Pozsony, 1825-1827), III, 1713. For Széchenyi's formal acceptance of the financial responsibility, see Széchenyi to Tudós Társaság, letter of 19 March 1826, quoted in I. Széchenyi, Adatok gróf Széchenyi István kora történetéhez, 1808-1860, ed. L. Bártfai Szabó (Budapest, 1943), I, 56-57. For Széchenyi's attitude, see his diary entry (exact date unknown), quoted in I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi vallomásai és tanitásai, Széchenyi-Anthologia, ed. J. Fekete and J. Váradi (Budapest, 1943), p. 53. For the reaction of Széchenyi's contemporaries in Hungary, see Bajza to Kazinczy, letter of 7 April 1826, Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, pp. 5-6; J. Bajza to F. Toldy, letter of 4 November 1825, quoted in J. Bajza, Bajza József összegyüjtött munkái, ed. F. Badics (Budapest, 1901), pp. 154-157.

[49]Zs. J. Ferenczy, Magyar irodalom és tudományosság története (Pest, 1854), pp. 193-194.

[50]Ibid., pp. 194-195.

[51]Pál Magda, "Értekezés a Magyar nyelvben teendő újitások barátai és ellenségei közt levő perpatvarkodásról," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, I, No. 5 (1825),

184. The Debreczeni Grammatica, first published in 1795, became the standard reference book for the Orthologues.

[52]Berzsenyi to Széchenyi, letter of 1830 (exact date unknown), Berzsenyi, Berzsenyi levelei, pp. 84-85.

[53]M. V. Csokonai, "A Magyar nyelv felélédése," M. V. Csokonai, Csokonai Vitéz Mihály összes művei, eds. I. Harsányi and J. Gulyás (Sárospatak, 1922), II, Part 2, 577-580.

[54]F. Kölcsey, K. F. minden munkái (3rd rev. ed.; Budapest, 1886-1887), X, 46.

[55]Bajza to Kazinczy, letter (exact date unknown) to Kazinczy, Kazinczy Művei, XII, 486. For detailed discussion of non-Magyar and Magyarized authors, see J. Horváth, "Kisfaludy Károly íróbarátai," J. Horváth, Kisfaludy Károly és íróbarátai (Budapest, 1955), pp. 98-118.

[56]Vida Füredi (pseud. K. Kisfaludy), "A recensiókról," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, II, No. 6 (1818), 22-23.

[57]Kisfaludy to Zerffy, letter of 1820, quoted in Gy. Farkas, A Magyar romantika (Budapest, 1930), pp. 210-211.

[58]J. L. Pyrker, Perlen der heiligen Vorzeit (Buda, 1821).

[59]J. Horváth, "Kisfaludy Károly íróbarátai," in J. Horváth, Kisfaludy Károly és íróbarátai (Budapest, 1955), pp. 115-119.

[60]Schwicker, Deutschen, p. 185.

[61]J. Szauder, "A Magyar romantika kezdeteiről," Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, LXV, No. 6 (1961), 668.

[62]J. Szauder, "A Magyar romantika kezdeteiről," Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, LXV, No. 6 (1961), 663-664.

[63]K. Horváth, "Széchenyi és a Magyar romantika," ibid., p. 15.

[64]Horváth, "Kisfaludy Károly," in Horváth, Kisfaludy Károly és íróbarátai, p. 28; I. Fenyő, Kisfaludy Sándor (Budapest, 1961), p. 338; Gy. Farkas, A "Fiatal Magyarorszag" kora (Budapest, 1932), pp. 8-9.

[65]Gy. Farkas, A Magyar romantika (Budapest, 1930), pp. 97-98.

[66]J. Csaplovics, Gemälde von Ungarn (Pest, 1829), I, 180.

[67]Gy. Farkas, Die Entwicklung der ungarischen Literatur (Berlin, 1934), p. 136.

[68]Csaplovics, op. cit., p. 177. See also F. Sartori, Historisch-ethnographische Übersicht der wissentschaftlichen Cultur, Geistesthätigkeit und Literatur des Österrichischen Kaiserthums nach seinen mannigfaltigen Sprachen und deren Bildungsstufen (Vienna, 1830), pp. 104-105.

[69]Beöthy, op. cit., II, 153.

[70]A. Fáy, Eredeti meséi és aphorizmái (Vienna, 1820), p. 19.

[71]S. Kisfaludy, Kisfaludy Sándor minden munkái, ed. H. Gustav (Budapest, 1905), II, 206-218.

[72]K. Kisfaludy, Kisfaludy Károly minden munkái, ed. F. Schedel (4th ed.; Pest, 1843), I, 97-100 (hereafter cited as K. Kisfaludy, Minden munkái).

[73]Ibid., pp. 154-158.

[74]M. Vörösmarty, Vörösmarty Mihály összes költői művei, ed. Z. Endrei (Budapest, 1907), pp. 2-3.

[75]Ibid., pp. 3-144.

[76]F. Kölcsey, Kölcsey Ferencz minden munkái (3rd rev. ed.; Budapest, 1886-1887), I, 75-76, 78-79, 89-90, 97-99, 108.

[77]F. Kölcsey, "Nemzeti Hagyományok" (1826), ibid., III, 37.

[78]Kisfaludy, Minden munkái, pp. 169-170. Also see "Puszta csárda" (1829) and "Pásztorlány dala" (1831), written by Vörösmarty, op. cit., pp. 18-20.

[79]G. Czuczor, Czuczor Gergely költői munkái, ed. I. Zsoltványi (Budapest, 1903), pp. 122-124, 128-130.

[80]G. Czuczor, "Korunk olcsárlóihoz" (1836), ibid., pp. 77-78.

[81]G. Czuczor, "Magyar Táncz," ibid., pp. 178-181.

[82]Berzsenyi to Széchenyi and Wesselényi, identical letters of 25 February 1830, Berzsenyi, Berzsenyi levelei,

pp. 80-83. Similarly, see G. Rothkrepf, "A Magyar muzsika története," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, XII, No. 2 (1828), 57-65.

[83]Kisfaludy, Minden munkái, pp. 315-379.

[84]Hegedüs, Dráma, pp. 46-48.

[85]K. Kisfaludy, Ilka, vagy Fejérvár bevétele (1819), Stibor Vajda (1820), Minden munkái, II, 3-81, 86-221; Széchi Mária, vagy Murányvár ostroma (1820) and Kemény Simon (1820), ibid., II, 3-56, 89-158.

[86]A. B. Yolland, "The National Spirit in Hungarian Literature," The Cambridge Modern History (New York, 1909), XI, 422-423.

[87]F. Szinnyei, Kisfaludy Károly (Budapest, 1927), pp. 12-13.

[88]Kisfaludy, Minden munkái, II, 3-81.

[89]Ibid., II, 89-158.

[90]J. Katona, Bánk bán (Budapest, 1959).

[91]P. Gyulai, Katona József és Bánk bánja (Budapest, 1883), pp. 3, 156-161; Hegedüs, Dráma, pp. 29-31.

[92]Cserey to Kazinczy, letter of 1824, Kazinczy, Kazinczy müvei, XIX, 267-268.

[93]Secret Police report of 19 December 1827, quoted in S. Takáts, Kémvilág Magyarországon (Budapest, 1920), pp. 163-164.

[94]Ferenczy, op. cit., p. 194.

[95]Ibid., II, 5-6. Also see I. Széchenyi, Magyar játékszinrül (Pest, 1832), p. 5.

[96]M. Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der Geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848 (Leipzig, 1867), I, 61.

[97]F. Hernándy, Adattár a pécsi Magyar szinjátszás kezdeteihez (Budapest, 1960), pp. 1-3.

[98]"Notice by the Director," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, II, No. 11 (1818), 129-130.

[99]J. Paget, Hungary and Transylvania (Philadelphia, 1850), I, 129.

[100]L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), Vols. I-V, passim.

[101]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 26 July 1834, in L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), III, 371-372.

[102]J. Pardoe, City of the Magyar (London, 1840), I, 243.

[103]I. Fenyö, Az Aurora. Egy irodalmi zsebkönyv életrajza (Budapest, 1955), p. 10; J. Bajza, Magyar klasszikusok. Bajza József válogatott müvei, eds. L. Bóka et al. (Budapest, 1959), p. 29; Hegedüs, Dráma, p. 44.

[104]Th. J. G. Löcher, Die nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slovaken und Tschechen in ihrem geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848 (Haarlem, 1931), p. 190.

[105]L. Gogolák, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Slowakischen Volkes (Munich, 1963), p. 254.

[106]J. H. Schwicker, Die Deutschen in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen (Vienna and Teschen, 1881), p. 185) (hereafter cited as Schwicker, Deutschen).

[107]Bóka, Magyar klasszikusok, p. 19; B. Pukánszky, A Magyarországi Német irodalom története (Budapest, 1926), pp. 453-454.

[108]Kazinczy's opponents frequently complimented him for his contributions to the Magyar language. See Vörösmarty to Kazinczy, letter of 18 February 1824, Kazinczy, Kazinczy müvei, XIX, 44-45; G. Zádor to Kazinczy, letter of 30 July 1824, ibid., p. 169.

[109]F. Kölcsey, Minden munkái (Budapest, 1886-1887), IX, 410.

[110]Gy. Farkas, A Magyar romantika (Budapest, 1930), pp. 97-98. See also his A "Fiatal Magyarország" kora (Budapest, 1932), pp. 122-123.

[111]G. Ballagi, A politikai irodalom Magyarországon 1825-ig (Budapest, 1888), pp. 809-810; Gy. Farkas, A "Fiatal Magyarország" kora (Budapest, 1932), pp. 10, 164.

CHAPTER V

ATTEMPTED RECONCILIATION, 1825-1836

By the time of the 1832-1836 Diet, Magyar national awareness in the upper classes had grown to the extent that most of the nobility recognized the necessity for reform. To protect themselves from the encroachments of Vienna and to maintain their position in the face of awakening non-Magyar minorities, the gentry as a whole favoured Magyarization in public life, by making Magyar the official language. They also hoped, through the schools, to promote the general Magyarization of all classes.

Before the idea of a Magyarized society could become a reality, however, the gentry in the Diet had to remove the barriers which kept Magyars socially, economically and politically divided. This required, firstly, that the nobility in the Diet, acting as a class, recognize the need for general reforms. Secondly, it required that the nobles accept the difficult task of modifying some of their own privileges and discarding some others in favour of the lower classes.

When one approaches the Diets of the Vormärz with this in mind, it is possible to distinguish three general types of nobility, according to the position they adopted

on the substantive issues. Liberal Deputies not only recognized the need for reform, but were partly willing to modify their own class privileges to see that reform was achieved. Moderate Deputies were aware of the need for basic changes in favour of the lower classes, but were reluctant, in most cases, to give up their own special privileges. Conservative Deputies discounted the convictions of Liberals and Moderates, insisted on the status quo in most cases, and in other instances even demanded that their ancient rights be reaffirmed.

By that time the economic and political literature of the literati had replaced literary works in importance. These works gave noblemen certain rational alternatives to the precarious economic condition which affected them and the peasants, and provided an incentive to reorganize their economic institutions and to reconsider their self-centered class attitudes.[1]

As early as the pre-Reform Diet of 1790-1791, a number of Deputies had indicated that solving the jobbágyság question was a prerequisite to the solution of Hungary's economic problems. Nevertheless, the sole achievement was Law XXXV of 1790 which merely reaffirmed the peasants' right to move.[2] The Diets immediately following 1791 were mostly concerned with the Napoleonic Wars and with safeguarding gentry privileges, and no further steps were taken to relieve the peasants' plight through legislation.

Outside the legislative chambers, however, certain

members of the Magyar upper classes began to consider various means to reduce the distressing burdens on the peasants. Some writers examined agricultural practices and their effects on the well-being of the jobbágy.[3] In 1804 for example, the economist Nagyváthy studied the robot, and concluded that it was a wasteful practice. He claimed that it would be far better for both parties to commute the robot at a just rate through individual bargaining.[4] Fourteen years later another authority on economic matters, Professor G. K. Rumy of the Georgicon Agricultural Institute, advanced a more detailed solution for the robot along similar lines.[5]

Other Magyars of the upper class attempted to help starving peasants through systematic famine relief. The periodical Tudományos Gyüjtemény, for instance, published an article advocating the establishment of a public relief organization. Membership would be optional for landowners but mandatory for the jobbágyság. County officials would staff the agency, collect grain supplies from participants in times of abundance and distribute proportional shares among them in times of poor harvest. The jobbágyság would have to provide menial labour free of charge but the County administrators would receive recompense for their services from the assets of the relief agency.[6] Although such proposals were well-intentioned, they were paternalistic, impractical, and had no chance of success. They indicated however that the Magyar upper classes were beginning

to be more sensitive to the needs of the peasantry.[7]

Among noblemen the realization grew that the peasants' backwardness was due to lack of incentive, not necessarily to laziness or stupidity, as many of the gentry believed.[8] When peasants were permitted to engage in open competition, they were frequently successful. John Paget, a contemporary English observer, reported in 1836 that many of the jobbágy living in the region between Buda-Pest and the Austrian border competed with the Government, providing good stagecoach service at a lower rate.[9]

The nobility's growing awareness of the need for reconsidering the position of the peasantry could be seen from an article by the Reverend Sámuel Terhes, which appeared in Felsö Magyorországi Minerva. He advocated a unique thesis, stating that only historical vicissitudes had forced so many Magyars to the low social level of the conquered non-Magyars. Terhes believed that all Magyars should be noblemen and hence superior to all non-Magyars.[10] He was the first prominent Magyar to suggest that all Magyars by virtue of having been the original conquerors of Hungary ought to be social equals. His views, however, were not widely accepted by his Magyar contemporaries, many of whom were still contemptuous of the jobbágyság.[11]

In spite of some awareness of the need for improving the growing plight of the jobbágy, there were few tangible results at the Diet of 1825-1827. Ferenc Kölcsey claimed that the gentry had tried to remedy the peasants'

situation at the Diet in order to regain their confidence[12] but his claim was not entirely factual. A few Deputies at the Diet went so far as to suggest in general terms that the jobbágyság's condition ought to be improved.[13] The majority, however, objected strongly when a small group of legislators suggested specific proposals for remedying their plight.

The Lower House rejected, for example, the suggestion that if a peasant lost his lot only another jobbágy should be permitted to take his place. One of the Deputies insisted that the proposal was unconstitutional because according to the Tripartitum (Law I, Article 9) noblemen could offer their property to anyone and, under certain circumstances, he may prefer to lease such lots to other nobles. Many Deputies were prompted by the prevailing land shortages to agree with their colleague.[14]

The gentry legislators also ignored jobbágy reform partly because they were concerned with two other problems.[15] One of the issues was whether the Diet or the Vienna Government had the right to regulate taxation and recruiting. The laws were not entirely clear and both Government and Diet wished to extend their authority at the expense of the other. It was coincidental, but important for future reconciliation, that in these two test cases the gentry seemed to champion the cause of the jobbágyság.

The gentry-controlled Counties, without Diet

consent, had reluctantly provided the Vienna Government with recruits during the Napoleonic Wars. Citing this precedent the King attempted to remove recruiting completely from the jurisdiction of Hungarian authorities. When the King demanded 35,000 troops from the Counties after the war, they objected and reminded the Crown that since the national emergency was over only the Diet could allocate additional troops. This made it seem as if County administrations were protecting the lower classes from being recruited illegally by the regime, particularly when most Counties resisted commissioners, armed troops and royal displeasure.[16] The Diet of 1825-1827 took over from the Counties the unresolved conflict with the Vienna Government and seemed to represent the interests of the jobbágyság.

The Vienna Government also sought to circumvent the powers of the Diet concerning taxation. According to the law, only the Diet could levy new taxes but during the war the Habsburgs extracted funds from the protesting Counties. In 1820 the Vienna Government tried to collect a sum equal to the largest wartime tax of 1812 through a Cabinet decree. Both the Counties and the Diet of 1825-1827 resisted,[17] and once again conveyed the impression that they were trying to thwart the regime's illegal demands on Hungary's main taxpayers, the peasants.[18]

Both issues were resolved in favour of the gentry when the King promised to respect the Diet's control over

both recruitment and taxation. The peasants benefited because the gentry also succeeded in gaining for them a new tax survey as well as a remission in the tax and recruiting levies.[19] These gains, however, were merely a by-product of the gentry's determination to retain control of the affairs of Hungary and over as many of its inhabitants as possible.

Progress toward reconciliation between the upper and lower classes came only from some of the influential magnates, among whom Count István Széchenyi was the most prominent.[20] He had a genuine concern for the welfare of his jobbágyság, as indicated in a letter in which he stated that he always favoured his jobbágyság's interest at the expense of his own. Széchenyi conceded, however, that reconciling peasantry and landlords was a difficult task because

> a peasant refuses to abandon old customs. . . . On the other hand in our nation it is difficult for a landlord to prosper without injuring his jobbágy's interests.[21]

Széchenyi's concern for his peasants was further demonstrated by his instructions to one of his estate managers:

> Improve my estates but never do so to the detriment of my subjects, because that would be inflicting a wrong. . . . It is my duty, however, to derive the greatest possible profit from my estates. See to it, therefore, that you satisfy the demands of both parties.[22]

A few years later Széchenyi ordered another estate manager to conclude a contract with his peasants, dividing his pastures in such a way that they were the

beneficiaries.[23] Such a contract was unprecedented and of the utmost importance since pasture allocation was one of the main reasons for discontent among the jobbágyság. Széchenyi hoped to set an example and convince both magnates and gentry that decent treatment of the jobbágyság was the only way to gain their confidence, respect and support. It was the prerequisite, he believed, for the unification of Hungary on the basis of Magyarism.

In his work Hitel (Credit) in 1830, Széchenyi sought to convince Magyar noblemen that economic reform was necessary in order to remedy their own depressed economic condition. Széchenyi warned that continued mistreatment of the jobbágyság was not only a national disgrace but that it would lead to disaster for the aristocracy.[24] Partly hoping to forestall the possibility of future revolution, Széchenyi recommended an economic programme based upon the establishment of credit facilities in Hungary. Széchenyi claimed:

> Credit is the cornerstone of my plan because without credit even the most talented nationality must be destroyed. . . . Let us eliminate avaticitas, or the right of noblemen to redeem their properties at the original sale price even after thirty years, because such a practice prevents buying and selling of real estate. The right of inheriting a noble property upon extinction of the line by the Crown, or fiscalitas, must be also abolished because only then will it be possible for everyone, including commoners, to become creditors to noblemen with full assurance of security for their investments.[25]

Széchenyi also advocated the creation of a National Bank in order to solve the problems of credit and high

interest rates.[26]

Establishment of credit was only the first step in Széchenyi's reform programme which advocated equality before the laws for everyone, regardless of class. Since a law representing only one faction of a nation was bound to be unsuccessful, he felt there should be legal representation for all classes and the nobility must pay their share of the exchequer and of Diet expenses. Before national unity embracing all classes could be effected, the Diet had to assume control over waterways as well as other national arteries and even the equitable and proportional allocation of internal toll payments had to pass under its jurisdiction. In order to encourage industry, he proposed that all monopolies and guilds would have to be abolished.[27]

Széchenyi urged the creation of commercial courts in Hungary in order to avoid the interference of Austrian courts in Hungarian business affairs. He further advocated the extension of property ownership rights to all citizens.[28]

While Széchenyi sought to reconcile the peasantry and nobility on the basis of economic reform, Count Aurél Dessewffy tried to achieve the same end through political reform. In Dessewffy's view, <u>armalists</u> and <u>jobbágyság</u> did not require separate representation:

> The two parties must be amalgamated and have one common election so that those who now commonly share the County and Diet expenses should also share the election

> in common. The legal difference between the two, namely, that armalists perform their military duty voluntarily whereas the jobbágyság are recruited, can be solved without difficulty.29

Dessewffy recognized that the peasants were not sufficiently educated to assume these political responsibilities immediately:

> The peasant is ignorant and there are only two possible remedies. For the future he must be made more educated. For the present we must hitch him to the same wagon with more knowledgeable people instead of leaving him to his own devices because if we do his ignorance will only grow and remain unbridled.30

Presumably, Dessewffy meant to salvage the pride of the armalists by implying that they were to be responsible for representing the peasantry at the Diet sessions. Dessewffy may have been aware of the fact that some Counties, such as Pest, Bihar and Borsod, had given some libertini and honoratiori the right to vote and to hold County office, even though no such permissive laws had been promulgated.31

In 1831 Aurél's father, József Dessewffy, went even farther toward representation of the lower classes when he wrote in Taglalat (Analysis) that one jobbágy representative from each County should appear in person at County assemblies.32 Until this was achieved, however, he felt that the gentry must assume the responsibility of representing the lower classes:

> The landed gentry in Hungary and the landless armalist nobility together represent the electorate. Although at the moment only members of the landed nobility actually sit in the Diet they nevertheless must represent the armalists, whose interests with the jobbágyság are virtually one.33

These plans, designed for creating amicable relations among the classes, were one indication that Magyars had become concerned with national unity. However, unity was impossible as long as certain noble prerogatives like taxation and property ownership separated society into two sharply divided segments. Freedom from paying taxes and ownership of property were viewed by the nobles as their exclusive constitutional rights, and these issues stood at the core of relations between the upper and lower classes. The nobility justifiably feared that if they accepted taxation, and if non-nobles owned property, then the main distinctions between nobles and non-nobles would disappear.[34]

For hundreds of years Hungarian noblemen had enjoyed total tax exemption, and until 1831 nobody challenged that right. In that year Széchenyi advanced what was then a radical idea among the nobility when he suggested that nobles assume part of the nation's tax burden. In his Világ (Light) he was, however, pessimistic about the chances of such a law either in the existing society or in the near future. In his view the nobility was not yet ready to accept taxation. Although there was much talk in private about tax concessions to the peasants, he felt that nothing was likely to occur in this area for some time.[35]

Széchenyi was perhaps too pessimistic, because the more conservative József Dessewffy in the same year

conceded the need for limited noble taxation:

> I believe that every nobleman, every landowner, would benefit if he paid road toll. . . . Such a plan should be worked out in our Diet. Everyone should pay for the building and maintenance of these roads . . . and they should be established and kept in repair by joint stock companies.[36]

Even liberally-minded Deputies, however, were reluctant to create a new non-aristocratic landowning class in Hungary. In Széchenyi's view, commoners were entitled to property ownership along with noblemen, but he considered that non-noble property owners should pay a yearly tax equal to one-twelfth the value of the property.[37]

Széchenyi's friend and collaborator, Miklós Wesselényi, expressed somewhat similar views, only in a very ambiguous way. He suggested that peasants should provide either cash or produce, or perform certain services for their lords. He claimed this was legal because the nobility, as a class, owned Hungary, and could make contracts as they saw fit. He recognized that the prevailing gentry-jobbágy regulations were illegal and contrary to the provisions of the existing laws. But he insisted that the lessor-lessee relationship between lord and peasant did not legally diminish the civil rights of the jobbágyság.[38]

Through circuitous reasoning, Wesselényi also arrived at the principle of "free soil," which meant that both nobles and peasants should own land. He was aware that noble status included sole ownership of the land, and by this he understood that "free and unfettered use of

land" was the basis of ownership. In his view, however, this was just an illusion for the nobles were landowners in name only. They were not permitted to evict their tenants, to charge excessive rent, or to do anything that would run contrary to the law. He concluded that, under the circumstances, nobles might as well permit peasants to acquire the land de jure since they already possessed it de facto.[39]

The position of a Moderate, Aurél Dessewffy, was more indicative of gentry attitudes on the soil issue. According to Dessewffy, redemption was both useful and just, provided noble proprietors obtained full compensation. After selling a portion of their property, owners should be able to continue their enterprises profitably on the remainder of their land. Any redemption plan which did not conform to this formula was legalized robbery and constituted a danger to the national economy. Dessewffy was convinced that the robot was such an essential portion of the landowner's rightful profit that noblemen would be the losers if jobbágy were permitted to purchase the land. Paid labour could never compensate the landowners for such a loss.[40]

By the time of the 1832-1836 Diet the reform ideas of Széchenyi, Wesselényi and the Dessewffys began to have an impact on many noblemen. Their political writing had such influence that even the Vienna Government took notice of it. After the opening of the Diet the Habsburgs would

no longer permit the publication of polemical literature by influential men such as Wesselényi and Széchenyi for fear that it would arouse the Deputies. Stadium, a book which Széchenyi planned to publish in time for the first session of the Diet, encountered so many difficulties with the censor that it finally appeared in Leipzig only in 1833. Similarly, Wesselényi had to go to Bucharest to avoid censorship of his Balitéletekről (On Misjudgments), which also appeared in 1833.

Even without Balitéletekről and Stadium, the Vienna Government has cause for alarm. The gentry favoured the economic aspects of Széchenyi's reform and they wished to incorporate as many as possible of his recommendations into Hungary's corpus juris.

Despite the fact that Széchenyi also advocated remedying the condition of the jobbágyság, most of the gentry still hesitated to reform the Urbarium, which they had turned to their own advantage. They abused the robot and encroached on the privileges and tenures of the jobbágyság. Due to their financial distress, most of the gentry depended on gains from these violations. They had to recapture the loyalties of the peasants, yet they could scarcely attain their objective without granting them certain meaningful concessions. By this time all but the most conservative were willing to depart to some extent from the rigid standards of the aristocratic system of Hungary but few of the gentry wished to compromise their

own economic advantages.[41] They planned to consider economic legislation first, believing with some justification that this reform would help their own class and the jobbágyság as well.[42]

By their hesitancy to work for immediate jobbágyság reforms, the gentry played into the hands of the Vienna Government, which insisted that reform must commence with legislation to remedy the abuses arising from the Urbarium. In the first few weeks of the Diet the gentry attempted in vain to get the King to reconsider the order of business. Finally Széchenyi intervened and convinced the Lower House that it was pursuing a course which would alienate the peasantry further. He persuaded the gentry to place the Urbarium on the agenda.[43]

The gentry recognized that the Government had outmaneuvered them. Lajos Kossuth explained in 1832 that

> the Government's strategy to place the Urbarium first on the agenda was clever because it put the Diet in a slippery position. Any inadvertent misstep by the Diet now could easily cause public opinion to join with the Vienna Government against it. How can a Diet accomplish anything if it has to battle public opinion?[44]

By forcing the gentry to consider legislation opposed to their own interests, the Habsburgs had an excellent opportunity to confirm their image as protectors of the peasants. Because of this dilemma many Deputies who seemed to support the cause of jobbágyság reform, especially at the public Plenary Sessions, were not sincere. To prevent adverse publicity, Deputies decided to confer privately

in Regional Sessions before facing the public and to limit, as far as practicable, controversial argument.[45] They concluded gentlemen's agreements not to reveal anti-jobbágy sentiments at the public sessions because such comments would cause unrest among the peasants.

Some Deputies, however, were not satisfied. Deputy Novák, for example, realized that

> there can be no talk of tranquility in Hungary until nine millions of our fellow inhabitants are admitted to citizenship. Now is the time! Let us open up the gates![46]

Deputy Somsich urged the Lower House to

> bind the interests of the commoners to those of our own. . . . Every nation's power is grounded principally in its commoners, the most useful of whom are the peasants. The tiller of the soil is the strongest pillar of our freedoms.[47]

Kölcsey felt that the peasants looked upon the gentry as their enemies and regarded the Habsburgs as their benefactors because Vienna had rectified so many abuses of the Urbarium.[48] Another Liberal Deputy, Ferenc Deák, warned his colleagues that "if we promote any laws that are unjust the peasants will become totally alienated from us and seek redress of their grievances from Vienna as a matter of course."[49] Despite these warnings, a significant minority of gentry Deputies insisted on the existing practices and refused to rectify the abuses of the Urbarium.

There were significant differences between Liberals and Conservatives in both Houses with respect to the Urbarium. The Liberal Deputy Novák, for example, attacked

the robot and declared that "the Christian religion has eradicated idolatry and so will the moderating influence of civilization do away with this last vestige of oppression."[50] Deputy Gyertyánffy reminded his colleagues that for some time in Bánát County the jobbágyság had been permitted by the gentry to redeem their robot in cash. These transactions were so successful that he urged the adoption of similar measures throughout the nation.[51]

Conservatives conceded that voluntary agreements between the jobbágyság and landlords were not forbidden by law but, they claimed, if a law was promulgated in the spirit of Gyertyánffy's suggestion, then redemption of the robot would become compulsory for everyone. This would be unjust because conditions differed from place to place and uniform redemption tables for each and every community could not be created without violating the principle of equity. Conservatives also stressed that in many regions labour was scarce and without the robot many landlords would be unable to harvest their crops.[52]

Most Conservatives also defended the ninth-tax on legal grounds but admitted the law led to discontent, disputes and loss of time.[53] Moderate Deputies in the Upper House approached the question of the ninth-tax cautiously. Hungary's Chief Justice declared, for instance, that although noblemen were legally entitled to the ninth-tax the obligations of the jobbágyság had to become more tolerable. Their duties, in his opinion, were so onerous

that they destroyed the peasants' initiative to work. Nearly all Upper House members agreed that, even at its best, the ninth-tax was such a rigid obligation that it must alienate peasants from their landlords.[54]

Liberals were even more critical of the ninth-tax. Deputy Bencsik urged his colleagues to solicit the peasants' affection by permitting them to redeem their ninth-tax in cash. Deputy Borsinczky even warned that if the gentry disregarded Bencsik's advice they might fare like the French aristocrats who refused to renounce their privileges until it was too late.[55]

With some minor exceptions both moderates and Liberals shared the view that the jobbágyság must be guaranteed unobstructed freedom of movement throughout the nation. The Treasurer-General complained in the Upper House that landlords frequently failed to respect their agreements with their jobbágy. For example, a landlord would permit a peasant to terminate his tenure contract, and then prevent his departure. This was a misdemeanour punishable with a fine of 200 florins, but the fine went to the gentry-controlled County treasury, and the jobbágy was not indemnified. Liberals argued that landlords should be criminally prosecuted and the fine given to the injured jobbágy as compensation.[56]

In the Lower House Pál Nagy expressed dissatisfaction that certain jobbágy were merely permitted to move and he demanded more humanitarian attitudes toward them. In

his view,

> this is truly a meagre concession. . . . It is not enough for a man to be able to go on his way and not be beaten up. He must also make a living and have wood so that he will not freeze in the winter.[57]

The attention of liberals was also focused on the judicial practices which discriminated against the peasantry. Ferenc Deák pointed out that a jobbágy frequently appeared as litigant before a court of law in which the accused acted as his own judge. Deák was concerned because it was common practice that a jobbágy was condemned even without a hearing. Frequently he was not guilty of violating the law and all too often the landlord contrived a grievance against him.[58] Nagy agreed with Deák that with few exceptions manorial courts perpetrated such infamies that even fifteen higher courts could not rectify the injustice.[59] Deputy Andrássy feared that the jobbágyság would not tolerate such treatment much longer. He was aware of the dangers confronting the gentry and saw a strengthened nation only in terms of elevating the jobbágyság. Andrássy denied the allegation by Conservatives that by extending equal justice to the peasants the gentry's privileged position would be imperiled. In his view, a unified people would be more able to defend the homeland against both internal and external perils than would a few hundred thousand noblemen caught between two fires,[60] the peasants and the Vienna Government.

Conservatives opposed the Liberals on the judicial

issue and refused to remove the jobbágyság or their property from the jurisdiction of the nobility. They were convinced that the loss of such control would lead to the abolition of the nobility's constitutional rights.[61] Conservatives insisted that Hungarian law, according to which no person may be disturbed without due process, was not meant for commoners. To include them in any such guarantee, they feared, would irreparably damage the spirit of the fundamental laws.[62]

The equitable distribution of pastures was a further difficult problem confronting the gentry, because they had purchased herds of sheep which required more land than was available. A general compromise solution, according to the liberal Deputy Kölcsey, was virtually impossible because of regional and other differences.[63] Deputy Nagy considered sheep raising the chief cause of the jobbágy's ruin since landlords, in order to make room for their sheep, encroached on their peasants' pastures. With his pastures gone, a jobbágy could no longer maintain cattle, and the loss of one ox could ruin him for as many as ten years. Under these circumstances he had every right to participate in the final decision regarding the separation of pastures.[64]

The conservative Deputies Dubraviczky and Csapó maintained that the separation of grazing grounds between the peasants and landlords was not necessarily an evil because such divisions often benefited the jobbágyság.

Deputy Marczibányi opposed any change whatever in the status quo and maintained that any alteration in the law would undermine the privileged status of the gentry.[65]

On the issue of separation Deputies arrived at a preliminary agreement, whereby both the jobbágyság and landlords would be lawfully bound by a separation agreement.[66] Kölcsey, however, protested, for this was meaningless because "all landlords have to do is to 'persuade' their peasants how to vote."[67]

Kölcsey's objections brought about another proposal. Pastures would be divided between the jobbágyság and landlords on the basis of "equity" for both parties. Where pastures were scarce or where separation was impracticable, pastures could either remain as before, or new gentry-jobbágy agreements could be reached on the basis of "equity." This proposal was also meaningless, as Pál Nagy pointed out, because landlords would never agree to have their own advantageous situation changed.[68]

The last proposed law was never ratified by the King, yet in most regions the gentry adopted it as the standard for dealing with divisions of pastures. The jobbágyság hoped that at least illegal land seizures would end. In fact, landlords were able to deprive them of their good pastures in exchange for sandy useless tracts because standards of exchange between good and poor pastures were only vaguely defined. Although one provision of the law specified that exchanges could not take place without the

consent of the majority of the jobbágyság, this stipulation had little value. As Kölcsey indicated, landlords coerced their peasants and deprived them of their remaining good pastures. To the gentry these exchanges were of crucial importance. Formerly most of their lots had been scattered and this made sheep raising on a large scale unprofitable. Despite the fact that the proposed law never received royal sanction, it was implemented in practice by the gentry, who arbitrarily reapportioned pastures in their own favour.[69] It was a clear indication that, when their economic interests were involved, the gentry were not willing to legislate in favour of the jobbágyság.

The allocation of clearings had similar implications for both the gentry and the peasants. The liberal Deputy Ferenc Deák opposed a proposal which would have permitted bilateral agreements between a jobbágy and his landlord. Deák feared that the law would make the jobbágy dependent on the good will of the gentry and he tried to convince his colleagues that many of the poorer jobbágyság depended for their survival on these clearings. An ambiguous law would render thousands of them homeless and make them vagabonds. This represented a great danger, for people attached to the soil always defend law and order no matter how poor they are, but individuals who are evicted from their land, Deák warned, devote their energies to the destruction of the system which had mistreated them.[70] Count Fekete expressed a similar view in the

Upper House by saying:

> The fate of thousands of jobbágy hinges on this decision. It would be unworthy of foresighted lawmakers to bring about economic insecurity among the jobbágyság and engender lack of confidence in the legislators. At least until now the Vienna Government, as arbitrary as it might have been, has generally intervened and prevented the jobbágyság from starving. However, once we promulgate a law the Government's benevolent interference will cease.[71]

Despite the awareness of the need for land reform, clearings were potential grazing grounds and many of the gentry had no intentions of sharing them with the jobbágyság. A group of Conservative Deputies succeeded in passing a bill in the Lower House which would have permitted landlords to seize a large portion of the jobbágyság's clearings. Only a royal veto saved them. The King issued a strongly worded rescript which confirmed the principle of inviolability for nearly all jobbágy clearings, whether authorized by their landlords or not. The gentry had to accept the Crown's censure and eventually a law which they considered economically harmful to them.[72] The incident showed once again that, regardless of their avowed sentiments, most of the gentry were still not prepared to sacrifice immediate economic gain for the sake of the peasantry.

Few issues in Hungary at that time provoked as much controversy as the Liberals' proposal which would have allowed the peasants to commute their obligations to money payments. Conservatives criticized the measure on both legal and practical grounds. Deputy Rohonczy objected

because in his view the law would give the peasantry de facto property rights and thus a new Estate would be created. Deputy Szlucha declared that the law would transform the jobbágyság into a landowning class whereas the Constitution only permitted noblemen to own property. The Deputy feared that this measure would destroy the economic basis of both landlords and peasantry. Gentry landowners would go bankrupt because contributions from the peasants would cease. The jobbágyság, in turn, would be ruined because their commutation payments would be so excessive that they would be unable to pay their taxes.[73]

Although the Liberals proposed the bill of commutation, they did so not because they wanted to help the peasantry but to show that the King was not their real protector.[74] Liberals were convinced that the King would have to veto the bill because he did not approve of any radical change. However, the hesitation of the gentry enabled the Vienna Government to score a legislative victory. The King was confident of the support of the peasantry and felt that Liberals wielded little influence with them. Besides, the gentry had committed a blunder earlier by passing another bill in the Lower House, according to which ownership of the land was vested only in the landlord and all the soil cultivated by the jobbágyság was the landlord's property.[75] The King pointed out the contradiction and vetoed the second bill.

The gentry's clumsiness, if not incompetence,

allowed the King to turn the issue into a jurisdictional struggle. In his rescript to the Lower House the King pointed out that the problem of land allocation was so complex that it could no longer remain within the jurisdiction of the Diet.[76] After a formal protest the Lower House yielded to the King and abandoned the bill on commutation.[77] The Vienna Government then forced the Lower House to accept an alternate law which authorized the Habsburgs to intervene in jobbágy-gentry relations more than ever before. The new law stipulated that landlords were not permitted to conclude individual agreements with their peasants until the Vienna Government had scrutinized the contract for possible violations and subterfuges on the part of the gentry.[78] This enabled the Vienna Government to appear again as the protector of the jobbágyság.

Because the majority lacked sincere interest, as Count Andrássy pointed out in the Lower House,[79] the Diet of 1832-1836 failed to promulgate legislation which would substantially aid the jobbágyság. A few legal steps, however, relieved the worst abuses in judicial matters. The gentry could no longer exercise personal judicial control and only lawfully appointed judges could preside in litigation involving a jobbágy. He could no longer be arrested without a formal hearing, nor could he be punished without first having been sentenced by a court. It was even more important that the jobbágyság obtained the right to initiate lawsuits on their own behalf, without the landlord's

permission. Impartial commissions were also established in order to settle minor issues between peasants and landlords.[80]

The jobbágyság's economic gains were minor. They won a small concession by having some of their ninth-tax abolished and their right to keep store reaffirmed.[81] One law, although it concerned the armalists, brought indirect benefit to them. Under the new law armalists were required to pay tax on fields, inner plots and pastures, if this land was legally jobbágy tenure. When armalists occupied this type of land they also had to pay the domestic and war taxes.[82] This law not only assured the jobbágyság a fairer tax distribution, but it also indicated that the armalists' noble privileges were beginning to be limited in certain respects.

Except for these relatively small measures, most of which were originated in the Diet by Liberals, the gentry made no substantial move to gain the confidence of the jobbágyság. However, during the Diet discussions a group of noblemen showed for the first time an awareness of the need to improve the condition of the jobbágyság and to create an atmosphere for further reconciliation.

The problem of relations between the gentry and the merchants, the second important class of commoners, was essentially different. The predominantly German merchant class controlled most of Hungary's commerce and without their help and support the gentry had no hope of

successfully entering trade and manufacturing. They would have to remain agricultural producers at the mercy of the Vienna Government and Austrian monopolies. The gentry recognized the merchants' importance, both for their own economic well-being and for national interests. A movement toward accommodation grew steadily throughout the Reform Period.[83]

The first attempt to establish contact and to solicit the support of the merchants took place at the Diet of 1790-1791 when the Commercial Factfinding Committee approached them for their opinions on commercial conditions in Hungary. In order to remedy what it considered a crisis in Hungary's economy, the Committee suggested that the Vienna Government abolish all tariffs both for the nobility and the merchants. Only a few Deputies supported the Committee's suggestions, and the proposals were not adopted.[84]

The gentry's attitude improved at the Diet of 1802 and the Merchant Corporations of Pozsony, Pest, Buda and Györ were permitted to submit their own suggestions for remedying the commercial crisis.[85] By this time many Deputies were sympathetic to the merchants' grievances. This feeling increased after the Napoleonic Wars, when many German merchants became Magyarized.[86] As postwar recession set in, it became clear to the gentry that their interests and the merchants' were closely linked. The merchants were the gentry's chief creditors and the principal purchasers

of gentry produce.[87] This became a compelling reason for initiating mutually beneficial commercial legislation.

By the time of the 1832-1836 Diet, the main obstacle to rapprochement between the gentry and merchants was the lingering suspicion, on the part of some Magyars, regarding the intentions of the merchants. Deputy Borsinczky, for example, looked upon the merchants with disdain and accused them, and their municipal authorities, of systematically abusing and extending their monopolies to the detriment of the rest of the nation.[88] Liberal Deputies were willing, however, to come to the merchants' defense. Deputy Say, for instance, recognized that noblemen still looked upon tradesmen with contempt and denigrated their valuable contributions to the nation. He warned the gentry that unless Hungary provided laws for the protection of merchants, there would be no trade and commerce in Hungary even if the Austrian Government suddenly abolished its colonial policies.[89] He criticized the gentry for not permitting municipal judges to exercise control over town-dwelling noblemen, and said this was just another sign of gentry contempt for the common classes.[90]

Deputy Kölcsey was equally critical of the gentry's attitude toward the merchants, especially since they provided Hungary with valuable revenue:

> Too many speakers in the Diet talk about the taxpayer with contempt and what is even worse they are applauded by the noble audience. Is this patriotism? Shall we cordon ourselves off forever? Shall we look down from great heights dominated by caste forever? Shall there

> never arise in our souls the desire to destroy these walls and instead of separation seek strength in unity?[91]

One of the most liberal magnates, Széchenyi, was aware that the gentry's prejudices could not be eliminated overnight. But, in an effort to reach an understanding, he offered a plan that would benefit both the gentry and the commercial class. He proposed to replace the temporary pontoon bridge which linked Buda-Pest, with a more permanent steel bridge. He suggested that all members of society, including nobles, pay a toll for the use of the new structure.[92]

Unlike the pontoon bridge, the steel structure could be crossed in any type of weather. This would benefit everyone, by making travel easier, but it would especially benefit the merchants who would no longer suffer loss of trade because of inclement weather, and they would benefit from fairer competition. Under the prevailing circumstances noblemen and their produce could cross the pontoon toll-free, while merchants paid toll both on themselves and their wares.[93]

Széchenyi had opened the possibility for important reform, but by suggesting that everyone pay a toll he also stimulated debate on a controversial question. Most nobles still considered tolls just another form of taxation. Széchenyi himself reported one typical reaction to his scheme:

> Only recently a very enlightened gentleman in all other respects declared to me: "I would rather wait three

> days in Pest or get to Buda by rowboat while chopping ice, than to pay a toll on a bridge, be it of the shiniest steel."[94]

In an attempt to resolve the taxation issue, Széchenyi and the Liberal György Andrássy published a pamphlet which proposed three possibilities for financing the venture. One suggestion was that the expense of the bridge should be assumed by the entire population which would then be able to use the bridge free of charge. The second suggestion was that the nobility would pay the entire cost of the bridge which would be used toll-free by everyone. The third, and most feasible plan, would be the creation of a joint-stock company to which everyone would pay toll. Such a scheme would not conflict with the nobles' view of their constitutional rights, according to Andrássy and Széchenyi, provided the Diet promulgated suitable legislation.[95] The Bridge Commission eventually accepted this latter proposal and presented its recommendation to the Diet in June 1833.

Some of the Conservatives refused to even discuss the issue. Deputy La Motte, one of the most conservative members in the Lower House, felt that the decision to make noblemen pay a bridge toll conflicted with Law VIII of 1741 which stated that taxation of the nobility in any form was not a subject for deliberation in the Diet.[96] Very few Deputies agreed with La Motte's interpretation of their privileges. Deputy Pfanschmidt's position on the taxation issue was more representative of the attitude of the Diet:

> My County does not interpret noble privilege to mean

> that noblemen should never pay for anything. What the privilege means is that neither the Vienna Government nor any other outsider may inflict a burden on the nobility and that it may bear only burdens which are decided upon and freely accepted by its own representatives.[97]

On 13 January 1835, the Lower House introduced a resolution which called for everyone to pay the bridge toll and the Counties voted thirty-six in favour, ten against, with seven abstentions.[98] The more conservative Upper House accepted the bill a few days later, but with the important modification that the law should not be construed as a precedent for universal payment of tolls by noblemen.

The commercial class was encouraged by the gentry's partial modification of its tax privileges, but other developments at the 1832-1836 Diet aided this feeling as well. The Diet initiated debates on the establishment of a Hungarian National Bank and promulgated a law designed to facilitate railroad building in Hungary. Commercial Courts of Arbitration were established in order to facilitate business transactions, and laws were enacted to correct the worst abuses involving credit. The new regulations made it more difficult for debtors to delay paying a debt. In a final important step, the Diet proposed to consider the establishment of schools which would benefit the merchant classes.[99]

The gains of the merchant class could not be called extensive, but in comparison with the gains of the other

commoners, they can be considered meaningful. The legislative steps of the gentry, and the new attitudes which accounted for them, reflected a social class in the process of change. As the gentry gradually accepted more progressive ideas, conflict emerged between their developing liberalism and their economic interests. The economic circumstances only served to aggravate the dilemma. A sizeable minority favoured agricultural reform and various schemes for improving the conditions of the lower classes but only so long as these innovations did not compromise their own position.[100] The majority rejected any concessions and in the early nineteenth century this divisive issue prevented any meaningful Magyar reconciliation.

The gentry were unable, by themselves, to rally the various Magyar social classes and eventually a small group of influential magnates provided the catalyst for reconciliation. Széchenyi's Hitel, the work chiefly responsible for reform, appeared only two years before the Diet of 1832-1836 and few of the Deputies had either the time or the opportunity to comprehend it fully. They were frequently confused and divided among themselves. The Habsburgs used their division and indecision to force the nobles to consider reform of the Urbarium.

Despite these drawbacks, the atmosphere for an understanding among Magyars was improving. Some of the most progressive magnates had begun to reconcile the gentry, the armalists and the jobbágyság; a few modest

measures introduced at the 1832-1836 Diet inaugurated a new phase in the gentry's relationship with commoners. Commercial legislation gave hope for better relations between the merchants and the nobility, and the partial renunciation of tax privileges by the nobility was the first step in the erosion of class barriers.

The legislative achievements of the 1832-1836 Diet were not, however, nearly sufficient by themselves to pave the way for Magyar unity. One of the nobles at the Diet in 1833 explained why.

> I, and the public in general, have cast off many of our old, archaic notions and our souls have become more receptive to the ideas of modern progress. . . . It was difficult, however, to cast off the aristocratic notions which clung to me in spite of myself.101

The following year another noble at the Diet indicated that the times in which he lived

> already bore the stamp of the New Age because there were ample numbers of individuals in whom the new ideas had struck a spark. Yet the nation was fooled by the dazzling speeches and the mighty concepts; few, however, noticed that the speakers were not so numerous.102

In fact, by 1836 some nobles held even more strongly than before to the principles embodied in the fundamental laws, and they refused to relinquish their class privileges in favour of a more egalitarian social order. The interference of the Vienna Government, together with the economic self-interest and class consciousness of the nobility, prevented the formation of a meaningful Magyar unity.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER V

[1]J. Szauder, A romantika útján. Tanulmányok (Budapest, 1961), p. 13.

[2]Gy. Bernát, A Magyar jobbágyfelszabaditás eszmeáramlatai, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1930), pp. 31-33. See A. Kolosvári and C. Óvári, eds., Corpus Juris Hungaricae: Articuli Diaetales annorum 1740-1830 (Leipzig, 1902), V, 183-184.

[3]P. Menyhárd Pásztory, "A napról napra kevesedő pénz miatt miként segithet magán a Magyar mezei gazda; és miképp készüljön annak jövendő beli nagyobb szükére," Tudományos Gyüjtemeny, III, No. 1 (1819), 53; I. Meszlényi, "A Magyar nemesek közbirtoka eránt való javallások," ibid., I, No. 6 (1817), 85; M. (anon.), "A juh tenyészetröl," ibid., I, No. 12 (1817), 34-76.

[4]Nagyváthy, Instructio, at (n.p., n.d.), p. 25 (see I. Szántó, A parasztság kisajitása és mozgalmai a dunántúli Festetich birtokon, 1711-1850 [Budapest, 1954], p. 146).

[5]K. G. Rumy, "A gazdaságbeli erőnek használásáról és igazgatásáról," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, II, No. 7 (1818), 78-79.

[6]P. Bárán, "Magyar Országon az éhség meg-akadályoztatására tzélzó gondolatok," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 8 (1817), 43-46.

[7]See Gy. Forgó's article "Rendkivüli való szükség idején," Tudományos Gyüjtemény, I, No. 10 (1817), which advocated the introduction of a variety of new types of staples to forestall famine among the poor jobbágyság (pp. 41-57); also see I. Acsády, A Magyar jobbágyság története (Budapest, 1908), p. 433.

[8]Hiller to Rev. Jutzler, letter of 21 September 1805; G. Hiller, Reise durch einen Theil von Sachsen, Böhmen, Österreich und Ungarn (Kothen, 1808), p. 303.

[9]J. Paget, Hungary and Transylvania (Philadelphia, 1850), I, 33-34.

[10]S. Terhes, "Hazafiúi szó idegen nyelvü Lakós Társaimhoz," Felső Magyarországi Minerva, III (September, 1827), 1363-1366.

[11]G. Berzeviczy, "De oeconomica publico-politica" (place and date uncertain), dedicated to Francis I, quoted in G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest, 1902), Part II, p. 26 (hereafter cited as Berzeviczy, Művei).

[12]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834 (see L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta [Budapest, 1948-1961], III, 679-680) (hereafter cited as Kossuth, O.T.).

[13]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 27 September 1825, and Kajdaczy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House (see K. Vaszáry, ed., Adatok az 1825-ki országgyülés történetéhez [Győr, 1883]).

[14]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 24 July 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Jegyző Könyve, 1825-1827 (Pozsony, 1825-1827), III, 199-203 (hereafter cited as Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve).

[15]Borsód County, a fairly liberal-minded County, in its forty-two instructions to its Diet representatives in 1825, failed to mention even one grievance relating to the jobbágyság. B. Záhony, Borsódmegye országgyülési utasitása a reformkorban (Miskolc, 1929), pp. 7-8; E. Horváth, Modern Hungary, 1660-1920 (Budapest, 1922), pp. 55-56.

[16]See Gy. Zádor's letter to Kazinczy, 26 January 1824, in F. Kazinczy, Kazinczy Ferencz összes művei, ed. J. Váczy (Budapest, 1909), XIX, 3-5 (hereafter cited as Kazinczy művei); M. Horváth, Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848 (Leipzig, 1867), I, 417-420.

[17]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 30 December 1825, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, pp. 298-299, 300-301; Debates, 27 December 1826, ibid., III, 575-673; A. Springer, Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden, 1809 (Leipzig, 1863), I, 323-325.

[18]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 18 March, 5 May, 17 May, 19 May 1826, Magyar Országgyülés, Jegyző Könyve, II, 241, 345, 375, 425; Debates, 19 August, 19 September 1826, ibid., III, 341-358, 428-432.

[19]Law IV and Law VII (see Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1825-1827 [Pozsony, 1825-1827], III, 1706, 1740-1741).

[20]I. Barta, "Entstehung des Gedankens der Interessenvereinigung in der Ungarischen bürgerlich-adligen Reformbewegung," Nouvelles études historiques, I (1965), 511.

[21]Széchenyi to P. Somsich, letter of 4 September 1827 (see I. Széchenyi, Adatok gróf Széchenyi István és kora történetéhez, 1808-1860, ed. L. Bártfai Szabó [Budapest, 1943], I, 71-72) (hereafter cited as Széchenyi, Adatok); G. Berzeviczy, "A parasztnak állapotáról és természetéről Magyarországon," in G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál (Budapest, 1902), Part II, p. 147.

[22]Széchenyi, Adatok, pp. 71-72 (Széchenyi reproduced his instructions for Somsich's benefit).

[23]Széchenyi to J. Liebenberg, letter of 8 November 1828 (see I. Széchenyi, Széchenyi István válogatott írásai, ed. I. Barta [Budapest, 1959], pp. 64-66) (hereafter cited as Széchenyi, Széchenyi írásai).

[24]Széchenyi, Hitel (Pest, 1830), p. 246; also see Széchenyi's letter to M. Wesselényi, 8 November 1831, quoted in Széchenyi, Széchenyi írásai, pp. 162-164.

[25]Széchenyi, Stadium (Leipzig, 1833), pp. 32-34.

[26]Széchenyi, Hitel (Pest, 1830), pp. 145-148.

[27]Széchenyi, Stadium, pp. 32-34.

[28]Ibid., pp. 29-32. Also see F. Deák, Deák Ferencz emlékezete. Gondolatok, 1833-1873 (Budapest, 1889), pp. 3-4 (1833).

[29]A. Dessewffy, "Néhány nevezetesseb darab gróf Dessewffy Aurélnak Hátrahagyott eredeti Magyar munkáiból és országgyülési beszédeiből" (Pest, 1843), ed. by Emil Dessewffy, who claimed that the collected excerpts were written in 1833, in A. Dessewffy, Gróf Dessewffy Aurél összes művei, ed. J. Ferenczy (Budapest, 1887), pp. 162-163 (hereafter cited as A. Dessewffy, Dessewffy művei).

[30]Ibid., p. 163; J. Dessewffy, Taglalat (Pest, 1831), pp. 238-239.

[31]A. Kecskeméthy, Graf Stephan Széchenyis staatsmännische Laufbahn (Pest, 1866), p. 24; Gy. Kornis, A Magyar művelödés eszményei, 1777-1848 (Budapest, 1927), II, 521-522.

[32]Also see D. Berzsenyi, A Magyarországi mezei szorgalom némely akadályairúl, ed. O. Merényi (Budapest, 1933), p. 56. In it Berzsenyi suggested in 1833 that a public fund be shared by armalists and jobbágyság in time of need.

[33]Dessewffy, Taglalat, p. 239.

[34]Treasurer General's speech in the Upper House, 12 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 165.

[35]Széchenyi, Világ (Pest, 1831), pp. 120-121.

[36]Dessewffy, Taglalat, pp. 140-141.

[37]Széchenyi, Stadium, pp. 32-34.

[38]M. Wesselényi, Balitéletekröl (Bucharest, 1833), pp. 215-217.

[39]Ibid., p. 238. Also see Csepcsányi's arguments in a similar vein at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 December 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., IV, 31.

[40]Dessewffy, Dessewffy művei, p. 4.

[41]Csapó's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 8 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 33.

[42]For declarations in favour of jobbágyság reform in the Diet, see Majer's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 28 December 1832, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 40-42; Pázmándy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 27 December 1832, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 38-39; Nyitzky's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 11 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 95; Palóczy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 11 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 95; Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 12 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 99-100; Balogh's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 13 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 55; Madocsányi's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 17 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 74-75; Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 17 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 73; Borsinczky's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 153-154; Balogh's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 November 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 398; Prónay's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 December 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., IV, 25-26. For similar opinions by contemporaries, see G. Berzeviczy, "A parasztnak állapotáról és természetéről Magyarországon," in

G. Berzeviczy, Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei, ed. J. Gaál, Budapest, 1902, Part II, pp. 146-147; also see F. Deák, Deák Ferencz emlékezete. Gondolatok, 1833-1873 (Budapest, 1889), p. 16 (1834); E. O. S. (anon.), Hungary and Its Revolutions from the Earliest Period to the Nineteenth Century (London, 1854), pp. 191-192. For more recent literature on the topic, see I. Barta, "Entstehung des Gedankens der Interessenvereinigung in der Ungarischen bürgerlich-adligen Reformbewegung," Nouvelles études historiques, I (1965), 492; Gy. Spira, "Széchenyi tragikus útja," Történelmi Szemle, VII, Nos. 3-4 (1964), 586.

[43]Széchenyi's speech in the Upper House, 22 January 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 115.

[44]Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[45]Deputy Bencsik's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 12 April 1833, ibid., pp. 308-309; F. Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 31 January 1833, F. Kölcsey, Összes művei (Budapest, n.d.), p. 1279.

[46]Regional Session in the Lower House, 27 April 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 338.

[47]Ibid., p. 339.

[48]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 679-680.

[49]Deák's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 1 August 1833, in F. Deák, Deák Ferencz beszédei, 1829-1873, ed. M. Kónyi (Budapest, 1882) (hereafter cited as Deák, Deák beszédei).

[50]Novák's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 29 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 120.

[51]Gyertyánffy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 29 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 121; Bük's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 29 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 121.

[52]Debates at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 29 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 122; La Motte's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 30 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 128.

[53]Nyiczky's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 22 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 89.

[54]Speech by Hungary's Chief Justice in the Upper House, 17 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 241.

[55]Borsinczky's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 22 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 89-91. Also see Somsich's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 16 April 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 311; Somsich, Rohonczy and Aczél, speeches at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 22 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 88-89; speeches by Borsiczky and Bencsik, pp. 90-91.

[56]Speech by Hungary's Treasurer-General in the Upper House, 12 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 140.

[57]Nagy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 12 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 50-51.

[58]Deák's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 15 June 1833; Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 140; Berzeviczy, Művei, p. 69.

[59]Nagy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 12 October 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 302; also see speeches by Palóczy, Szent Horváth and Bernáth at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 12 October 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 301-302.

[60]Andrássy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 15 October 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 305. For a similar opinion, see Bezerédy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 160-161.

[61]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 17 June 1833, Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 16-17.

[62]Debates at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 3 December 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 99-100.

[63]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 15 March 1833, Kölcsey, op. cit., p. 1322.

[64]Nagy's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 March 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 281-282.

[65]Debates at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 15 March 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 291.

[66]Kossuth, O.T., I, 284.

[67]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 7 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 28.

[68]Nagy referred to Law III, Article 9, Kossuth, O.T., IV, 20; Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1832-1836 (Pozsony, 1832-1836) (hereafter quoted as Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 513).

[69]For the best account how peasants were cheated, see Staatsrat, Doc. No. 1822:1384, 25 September 1822, quoted in F. Eckhart, A bécsi udvar gazdaságpolitikája Magyarországon, 1780-1815 (Budapest, 1958), pp. 419-426. For the best monograph, see I. Szántó, A parasztság kisajitása és mozgalmai a dunántúli Festetics birotokon, 1711-1850 (Budapest, 1954), pp. 116-117, passim.

[70]Deák's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 1 August 1833, Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 23-25. For a similar opinion, see Bezerédy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 161.

[71]Count Fekete's speech in the Upper House, 16 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 210-211.

[72]King's Law V, Article 2 of 4 September 1833 introduced in the Lower House, 10 September 1834, Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 85-87.

[73]Szlucha's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 157; Debates in the Upper House, 13 September 1833, ibid., p. 186.

[74]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 153-161.

[75]Irásai, 1832-1836, I, 518.

[76]King's rescript to the Lower House, 10 November 1834, Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 93-94.

[77]Debates at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 10 November 1834, Deák, Deák beszédei, I, 93-99.

[78]Law VIII, Article 2 (see Irásai, 1832-1836, VI, 48).

[79]Count Andrássy's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 7 August 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 31.

[80]Irásai, 1832-1836, VI, 48.

[81]Law III, Paragraph 7, Point 1, ibid., VI, 47, 309-311.

[82]Law II, Articles 1-12, ibid., VI, 311-316.

[83]J. Varga, "A nemzeti nyelv szerepe a polgári fejlődésben Magyarországon," Történelmi Szemle, IV, No. 3 (1961), 296.

[84]Gy Mérei, Magyar iparfejlődés, 1790-1848 (Budapest, 1951), pp. 5-6.

[85]Magyar Országgyülés, Magyar Országgyülésének Naponként-Való Jegyzései, 1802 (Pozsony, 1802). Latin text, see pp. 57-73; German text, see pp. 74-155.

[86]J. Kósa, Pest és Buda elmagyarosodása 1848-ig (Budapest, 1937), pp. 40-42 and 59-61.

[87]Mérei, op. cit., p. 164.

[88]Borsinczky's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 3 September 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., II, 147.

[89]Say's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 12 April 1833, in Kossuth, O.T., I, 306-308.

[90]Say's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 4 April 1834, in Kossuth, O.T., III, 47-50.

[91]Kölcsey's speech at the Plenary Session in the Lower House, 11 January 1833, Kölcsey, op. cit., p. 1241.

[92]J. Bagyó, Gróf Széchenyi István közlekedésügyi reformja és tevékenysége (Budapest, 1913), pp. 84-85.

[93]The Diet made every effort to please the Merchant Corporations of Buda and Pest by heeding many of their suggestions (see Irásai, 1832-1836, VI, 1-110). (Please note that this is a supplement inserted between pp. 64 and 65 of the volume.)

[94]Széchenyi, Világ, p. 121.

[95]Gy. Andrássy and I. Széchenyi, "Gróf Andrássy György és Széchenyi Istvánnak a budapesti hidasegyesülethez irányzott jelentése külföldröl visszatérttükor" (Pest, 1833), pp. 9-11 (see Széchenyi, Széchenyi irásai, pp. 176-182).

[96]La Motte's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 13 January 1835, in Kossuth, O.T., IV, 119.

[97]Pfanschmidt's speech at the Regional Session in the Lower House, 13 January 1835, in Kossuth, O.T., IV, 119.

[98]Regional Session in the Lower House, 13 January 1835, in Kossuth, O.T., IV, 116.

[99]Provisions of these laws (see Irásai, 1832-1836, VI, 42-44 and 52-53). A commercial school, with 1,200 students, was established in Pest under the direction of J. E. Bibanco the following year (1837). A fővárosi Szabó Edvin Könyvtár évkönyve, 1955 (Budapest, 1957), V, 83.

[100]B. Grünwald, Széchenyi magánhitelügyi koncepciójának szellemi és gazdasági előzményei és következményei a rendi Magyarországon, 1790-1848 (Pécs, 1927), p. 103; D. Kosáry, Magyarország története (Budapest, 1943), p. 187; G. R. Gleig, Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary Visited in 1837 (London, 1839), II, 35-37.

[101]J. Madarász, Emlékirataim, 1831-1881 (Budapest, 1883), pp. 20, 22.

[102]F. Pulszky, Pulszky Ferencz kisebb dolgozatai, ed. A. Lábán (Budapest, 1914), p. 184.

CONCLUSION

Before the Reform Era the Hungarian nobility, most of whom were Magyars, held a class-centered concept of the natio Hungarica. Within Magyar society there was no significant awareness of ethnic national unity. The society was fragmented and most of the landless persons, who had been relegated to the level of jobbágy, were exploited by their landlords. The noble classes themselves lacked social uniformity. The largest number of the nobility were impoverished and could no longer maintain their property. These armalists, or landless nobles, were isolated from the landed gentry and eventually lost the exercise of their political privileges. The landed nobility, through economic and political power, dominated the country. They were alienated from the specially privileged magnate class, which had been created by the Habsburgs soon after they ascended the Hungarian throne. The lower classes were divided into a bottom stratum which lived exclusively on agriculture, and a smaller group which earned its living in various ways, mostly through certain special occupations.

The two main non-Magyar factors were the non-Magyar minorities and the Habsburgs. Before the Reform Era Magyars enjoyed peaceful relations with the minority nationaliities.

The self-centered nobility of all ethnic groups considered themselves the natio Hungarica. They spoke Latin and together dominated the lower classes. The Habsburgs, in order to maintain their hold on Hungary and to rule the country with its many diverse national groups, adopted a policy of playing one minority against the other. Further, the Habsburgs encouraged class divisions among the Magyars themselves in order to forestall the development of an ethnic national movement.

The Habsburgs took advantage of the discord between the lower nobility, the gentry and armalists, by insisting that County Governments respect the armalists' right to participate in political affairs. Vienna also maintained tension between the nobility and the jobbágy by frequently investigating and rectifying peasants' complaints against their landlords through the Vice Regency and the Chancellery. This was obvious during the depression which set in after the Napoleonic Wars and which aggravated the existing social conflicts. As the gentry's economic circumstances worsened, they increased their exploitation of the peasants and this further alienated the two classes.

By this time various non-Magyar minorities were making political and cultural demands, and the Habsburgs used this to fragment Hungarian society by supporting such groups as the Serbs and Croats, against the Magyars. Following the wars the Habsburgs also settled numerous non-Magyar refugees on Hungarian soil and this, the Magyars

felt, further upset Hungary's ethnic balance to their detriment.

By then, however, developments were already taking place in the society which led a number of Magyar noblemen to promote Magyar unity, but only after a small group of influential, patriotic magnates seized the initiative. The efforts of the nobility were stimulated by cultural trends in education.

As early as the eighteenth century the clerically-controlled education system had been reforming from within. Catholic education was formally under Austrian control and Catholic clergymen were expected to support the Habsburgs' policies, but many Catholic educators were imbued with Romanticist ideas by then and they defied Vienna by teaching Magyar patriotism in the native tongue. This tendency continued throughout the period, especially under the influence of the Protestants who enjoyed more educational freedom than the Catholics, and who frequently received a liberal education abroad.

As society became more secularized in the nineteenth century, the traditional hostility between the two groups diminished, particularly among the lower clergy and the lay leaders, and their efforts merged on behalf of reforms. The reconciliation was greatly aided by the growing number of educated commoners who opposed religious division and the prevailing social injustices. Under the impact of these honoratiori noble society became more

receptive to change.

The trend toward religious reconciliation, which began in education, was evident when Protestant and Catholic secular Deputies came to an understanding in the Diet and began to collaborate on social and political issues. They opposed both the Catholic hierarchy and the Vienna Government by demanding the introduction of Magyar into all phases of national life. Accommodation between the traditionally hostile religious factions provided an atmosphere for a general Magyar reconciliation, stimulated rapprochement among dissident social groups, and began slowly to erode class attitudes.

Under the influence of both Protestant and Catholic teachers the Magyar upper classes were exposed to new ideas from the West. Romanticism, which glorified peasant life and stressed the importance of national unity based on language and ethnic factors, influenced the class-conscious gentry in favour of national unity embracing all classes. Gradually the nobles recognized the need for improved and expanded education, and by the Reform Era they were not only planning reform in education, they were actively defying Vienna by promoting Magyarism in the schools.

As the ideas of national identity and social solidarity grew, Magyarism came into conflict with the cultural and political aspirations of the minorities. Magyars were forced to choose between permitting the non-Magyars to

pursue their national ambitions, or stifling them through compulsory assimilation. Magyars were conscious of the fact that they were a minority in Hungary and, out of fear of absorption by the non-Magyars, they adopted the more aggressive attitude. At first Magyars considered that the key to control of the minorities was education in the Magyar language. However, it soon became clear that non-Magyars would defy forcible Magyarization. Consequently, Magyars adopted the more indirect approach of trying to persuade Vienna to permit the substitution of Magyar for Latin as the official language, for they believed that such a measure would force non-Magyars to adopt the tongue for practical reasons and sooner or later they would adopt it as a matter of course.

The plan to supplant Latin with Magyar had serious consequences. It aroused the Vienna Government's suspicions that the Magyars planned eventually to secede, while non-Magyars reacted to Magyarization the same way the Magyars had earlier responded to the Habsburgs' Germanizing efforts.

As the Magyars were trying to elevate their tongue to official status, they were also reviving their language and literature. Under the impact of an expanding group of literati and the ideas of Romanticism, they had made great strides by 1836 in popularizing nationalistic literature based largely on peasant folklore and traditions. This gave nobles and peasants a common ground and established

the basis for an understanding between them. However, the reform writings also provoked added resistance from Vienna and the minorities. The Habsburgs opposed the emphasis on Magyar national themes and heroes. Non-Magyars reacted to the chauvinism of Magyar literature and refused to become assimilated. By the 1830's they were developing their own language, literature and culture, and the impact of new economic and political ideas over a relatively brief period created new problems and divisions. By 1836 both Magyar and non-Magyar leaders had assumed the leadership of more or less militant national movements.

Under opposition from the minorities and Vienna, the Magyar upper classes became more receptive to ideas of class reconciliation which were being emphasized by the literati. In the 1830's, when the emphasis in reform literature shifted from prose and poetry to political and economic writings, the gentry slowly took up economic and social questions and attempted to promote class reconciliation through legislation. A gradual progress is evident from the Diet of 1790-1791 to the Diet ending in 1836, both in terms of the issues discussed as well as the legislation enacted.

Although legislation was modest, a greater Magyar social unity slowly began to emerge in the 1830's. Whereas earlier Magyars were splintered socially, politically and economically, this had been decreased by the integration of armalists into political life. At first the gentry resented

and feared the intrusion of large numbers of semi-literate armalists, but they soon recognized that their support was essential for national unity. Some magnates slowly reintegrated into Magyar society and began to show an interest in problems of national interest as they became more involved in cultural and political affairs. The peasants, although not affected politically by 1836, gained a few legal rights as a first step toward emancipation. The merchant classes, who already possessed certain privileges, were mainly concerned with economic reform, and the 1832-1836 Diet for the first time initiated legislation on their behalf. This was an important measure by the nobility who, until then, had been hostile and contemptuous toward the commercial class.

The Magyar gentry advocated reforms to benefit the peasants as well, but they failed to put their promises into action, and the greatest unresolved issue by 1836 was gentry-jobbágy relations. The inability of the gentry to reconcile the mass of peasants did not necessarily represent hypocrisy; the nobles' economic circumstances frequently prevented them from matching their ideals with meaningful concessions.

Despite the growth of national awareness and the recognition of the need for social, economic and political reforms, their reluctance to proceed with thorough reform was still a restricting factor. By 1836 many of the gentry had accepted enlightened ideas in principle, but their

legislative achievements still reflected more economic self-interest than a desire to create a more egalitarian society. With the jobbágy's loyalties still in doubt, 1836 cannot be considered the year of reconciliation between the upper and lower classes. What set 1836 apart from 1790, and even 1825, was in the realm of ideology.

The Marxian historian István Barta wrote that in 1790 the gentry had adopted the idea that Rousseau's social contract was meant only for their benefit, but by 1836 a growing number believed the entire population was entitled to the benefits of society.[1] More accurately, they had accepted the idea that all Magyars, regardless of class, were entitled to social equality, but this idea was accepted in principle only. By the 1830's the gentry had accepted the armalists and merchants, but they did not take any decisive steps toward making the peasants equal members of what they considered was the Magyar nation. The gentry was fully aware of the need for Magyar national unity, but in the transitional period 1825-1836 this had not been achieved in practice.

---

[1]L. Kossuth, Országgyülési Tudósitások, ed. I. Barta (Budapest, 1948-1961), IV, 70 (Editor's footnote).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCE SOURCES

Acsády, Gy. "Történeti statisztikai táblázatok" [Historical Statistical Tables]. Magyarország történelmi demográfiája. Magyarország népessége a honfoglalástól 1949-ig [Hungary's Historical Demography. Hungary's Population from the Occupation of the Homeland until 1949]. Edited by J. Kovácsics. Budapest, 1963.

American Historical Association. The American Historical Guide to Historical Literature. New York, 1961.

Anon. Tafeln zur Statistik der Österreichischen Monarchie. Vienna, 1830.

Bartoniek, E. Magyar történeti forráskiadványok [Magyar Historical Sources]. Budapest, 1930.

Bokor, G. Geschichte und Organisation der amtlichen Statistik in Ungarn. Budapest, 1896.

Ereky, I. A magyar helyhatósági önkormányzat. Vármegyék és községek [Hungarian Municipal Self-government. Counties and Parishes]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1908.

Fényes, E. Magyarország leírása [Description of Hungary]. Pest, 1847.

Fényes, E. Magyarországnak 's a hozzá kapcsolt tartományoknak mostani állapotja statisztikai és geographiai tekintetben [The Present Statistical and Geographic Position of Hungary and Its Attached Provinces]. 6 vols. Pest, 1836-1840.

Fényes, E. Magyarország statisztikája. Pest, 1842.

Fényes, E. Ungarn im Vormärz, nach Grundkräften, Verfassung, Verwaltung und Kultur. Leipzig, 1851.

Ferdinandy, G. von. Staats- und Verwaltungsrecht des Königreichs Ungarn und seiner Nebenländer. Hannover, 1909.

Fogarasi, J. A magyarhoni alkotmány fő ágazatai régibb és újabb időben [The Main Articles of Hungary's Constitution in Old and Modern Times]. Pest, 1861.

Gragger, R. Bibliographia Hungaricae I. Historia. Verzeichniss der 1861-1921 erschienenen Ungarn betreffenden Schriften in nichtungarischer Sprache. Dritte Reihe. Berlin and Leipzig, 1923.

Hassels, G. Statistischer Abriss des Österreichischen Kaisertums nach seinen neuesten politischen Beziehungen. Nürnberg, 1807.

Hóman, B. Történetírás és forráskritika [The Writing of History and Source Critique]. Budapest, 1938.

Kálnoki, A., and G. Torzsay-Biber. Legal Sources and Bibliography of Hungary. New York, 1956.

Kertész, J. Bibliographie der Habsburg Literatur, 1218-1934. Budapest, 1934.

Kolosvári, A., and C. Óvári, eds. Corpus Juris Hungarici. Articuli Diaetales annorum 1000-1526, Vol. I; annorum 1526-1608, Vol. II; annorum 1608-1657, Vol. III; annorum 1657-1740, Vol. IV; annorum 1740-1830, Vol. V; Opus Tripartitum Stephani de Werbőcz, Vol. VI. Leipzig, 1901-1902.

Kosáry, D. Bevezetés a magyar történelem forrásaiba és irodalmába [Introduction to the Sources and Literature of Hungarian History]. 3 vols. Budapest, 1951-1958.

Kovácsics, J., ed. A történeti statisztika forrásai [Sources of Historical Statistics]. Budapest, 1957.

Lassú, I. Az austriai birodalomnak statistikai, geographiai, es históriai leirása [The Statistical, Geographic and Historical Description of the Austrian Empire]. Buda, 1829.

Marczali, H. A magyar történet kútfőinek kézikönyve [Handbook of the Sources of Hungarian History]. Budapest, 1901.

Marczali, H. Ungarische Verfassungsgeschichte. Tübingen, 1910.

Marczali, H. Ungarisches Verfassungsrecht. Tübingen, 1911.

Ormis, J. V. Bibliográfia Jána Kollára. Bratislava, 1954.

Ormis, J. V. Slovník slovenských pseudonymov [Dictionary of Slovak Pseudonyms]. Turčiansky Sväty Martin, 1944.

Pápa, B. "Magyarország népe a feudalizmus megerösödése és bomlása idején (1711-1867)" [The People of Hungary during the Period of Feudal Growth and Decline (1711-1767)]. Magyarország történeti demográfiája. Magyarország népessége a honfoglalástól 1949-ig [Hungary's Historical Demography. Hungary's Population from the Occupation of the Homeland until 1949]. Edited by J. Kovácsics. Budapest, 1963.

Petrov, A. Národopisná mapa Uherskovo. Podlo uredniho lexikonu osad z roku 1773 [Demographic Map of Hungary. According to the Official Lexicon in the Year 1773]. Prague, 1924.

Smith, J. T. Parallels between the Constitution and Constitutional History of England and Hungary. London, 1849.

Tezla, A. An Introductory Bibliography to the Study of Hungarian Literature. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Timon, A. Magyar alkotmány és jogtörténet tekintettel a nyugati államok jogfejlödésére [History of Magyar Constitution and Justice, with Regard to the Development of Justice in the Western States]. 2nd ed. Budapest, 1903.

Tóth, I. Z. Magyar történeti bibliográfia, 1825-1867. I. Kötet. Általános rész [Magyar Historical Bibliography, 1825-1867. First Volume. General Part]. Budapest, 1950.

Uhlirz, K. Handbuch der Geschichte Österreich-Ungarns. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Graz, 1963.

Ulbrich, F. Das Österreichische Staatsrecht. Tübingen, 1909.

Ulbrich, F. Das Staatsrecht der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Freiburg, 1884.

Wiles, R. McKeen. Scholarly Reporting in the Humanities. 3rd ed. Toronto, 1965.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Documents and Collections

Bajza, J. Bajza József összegyüjtött munkái [Collected Works of Joseph Bajza]. Edited by F. Badics. 6 vols. 3rd ed. Budapest, 1901.

Bajza, J. Magyar klasszikusok. Bajza József válogatott művei [Magyar Classics. Joseph Bajza's Selected Works]. Edited by L. Bóka et al. Budapest, 1959.

Berzeviczy, G. Berzeviczy Gergely élete és művei [The Life and Works of Gregory Berzeviczy]. Edited by J. Gaál. Budapest, 1902.

Berzsenyi, D. Berzsenyi Dániel ismeretlen és kiadatlan levelei [The Unknown and Unpublished Letters of Daniel Berzsenyi]. Edited by O. Merényi. Budapest, 1938.

Berzsenyi, D. Berzsenyi Dániel összes művei. Költelem és folyóbeszéd [Complete Works of Daniel Berzsenyi. Poetry and Prose]. Edited by G. Döbrentei. 2 vols. 3rd ed. Buda, 1842.

Berzsenyi, D. A magyarországi mezei szorgalom némely akadályairúl [Concerning Certain Obstructions with Respect to Hungary's Agricultural Industriousness]. Edited by O. Merényi. Budapest, 1933.

Bibl, V., ed. Metternich in neuer Beleuchtung. Sein geheimer Briefwechsel mit dem bayerischen Staatsminister Wrede nach unveröffentlichen Dokumenten aus den Archiven in Wien und München. Vienna, 1928.

Csokonai, V. M. Csokonai Vitéz Mihály összes művei [Complete Works of Vitéz Michael Csokonai]. Edited by I. Harsányi and J. Gulyás. 2 vols. Sárospatak, 1922.

Czuczor, G. Czuczor Gergely költői munkái [Gregory Czuczor's Poetical Works]. Edited by I. Zoltvány. Budapest, 1903.

Deák, F. Deák Ferencz beszédei, 1829-1847 [The Speeches of Francis Deak, 1829-1847]. Edited by M. Kónyi. 2 vols. Budapest, 1882.

Deák, F. Deák Ferencz emlékezete. Gondolatok, 1833-1873 [Francis Deak's Remembrances. Thoughts, 1833-1873]. Budapest, 1889.

Dessewffy, A. Gróf Dessewffy Aurél összes művei [Complete Works of Count Aurél Dessewffy]. Edited by J. Ferenczy. Budapest, 1887.

Dessewffy, J. Gróf Dessewffy József bizodalmas levelezése Kazinczy Ferenczczel, 1793-1831 [The Confidential Correspondence of Count Joseph Dessewffy with Francis Kazinczy, 1793-1831]. Edited by G. Kazinczy. 3 vols. Pest, 1864.

Dessewffy, J. Dessewffy József gróf irodalmi hagyományai [Literary Bequests of Count Joseph Dessewffy]. Edited by G. Kazinczy. 2 vols. Budapest, n.d.

Dessewffy, J. "A 'Hitel' cimü munka taglalatja" [Analysis of Hitel]. Kassa, 1831.

Fay, A. Eredeti mesei és aphorizmái [Original Tales and Aphorisms]. Vienna, 1820.

Gvadányi, J. Egy falusi notáriusnak budai utazása [The Travel of a Village Notary to Buda]. Edited by J. Sebestény. 2nd ed. Budapest, n.d.

Gyulay, L. Gróf Gyulay Lajos Naplótöredékeiből (1815-1834) [From the Diary Fragments of Count Louis Gyulai (1815-1834)]. Edited by G. Kuun. Budapest, 1874.

Katona, J. Bánk bán. Budapest, 1959.

Kazinczy, F. Kazinczy Ferencz levelezése Kisfaludy Károlyval és ennek körével [Francis Kazinczy's Correspondence with Charles Kisfaludy and his Circle]. Edited by G. Kazinczy. Budapest, 1860.

Kazinczy, F. Kazinczy Ferencz és Guzmich Izidor közti levelezés 1822-1831-ig. A pannonhalmi könyvtár kéziratgyüjteményében levő eredeti levelek után [Correspondence between Francis Kazinczy and Izidor Guzmics from 1822 to 1831. From the Original Letters of the Manuscript Collection of the Pannonhalma Library]. Edited by E. Gulyás. 2nd ed. Budapest, 1873.

Kazinczy, F. Kazinczy Ferencz összes müvei [Complete Works of Francis Kazinczy]. Edited by J. Váczy. 23 vols. Budapest, 1909.

Kisfaludy, K. Kisfaludy Károly minden munkái [Complete Works of Charles Kisfaludy]. Edited by F. Schedel. 6 vols. 4th ed. Pest, 1843.

Kisfaludy, S. Kisfaludy Sándor minden munkái [Alexander Kisfaludy's Complete Works]. Edited by D. Angyal. 8 vols. 4th ed. Budapest, 1892-1893.

Kisfaludy, S. Kisfaludy Sándor munkái [The Works of Alexander Kisfaludy]. Edited by G. Heinrich. 2 vols. Budapest, 1905.

Kölcsey, F. Kölcsey Ferencz minden munkái [Francis Kölcsey's Complete Works]. 10 vols. 3rd rev. ed. Budapest, 1886-1887.

Kölcsey, F. Ferencz Kölcsey országgyülési naplója és Wesselényi védelme [Francis Kölcsey's Diet Diary and his Defense of Wesselényi]. Budapest, 1886.

Kölcsey, F. Kölcsey Ferencz összes művei [Complete Works of Francis Kölcsey]. Budapest, n.d. (Franklin Társulat).

Kölcsey, F. Kölcsey Ferencz összes művei [Francis Kölcsey's Complete Works]. 3 vols. Budapest, 1960.

Kölcsey, F. Kölcsey Ferencz naplója, 1832-1833 [Francis Kölcsey's Diary, 1832-1833]. Pest, 1848.

Kossuth, L. Kossuth Lajos iratai [The Writings of Louis Kossuth]. Edited by F. Kossuth and I. Helfy. 13 vols. Budapest, 1880-1911.

Kossuth, L. Országgyülési Tudósitások [Diet Reports]. Edited by I. Barta. 5 vols. Budapest, 1948-1961.

Madarász, J. Emlékirataim, 1831-1881 [My Memoirs, 1831-1881]. Budapest, 1883.

Magyar Országgyülés. Magyar Országgyülésének Irásai, 1790-1836 [The Writings of the Hungarian Diet, 1790-1836]. 24 vols. Pozsony, 1790-1836.

Magyar Országgyülés. Magyar Országgyülésének Jegyző Könyve, 1790-1836 [The Protocol of the Hungarian Diet, 1790-1836]. 17 vols. Pozsony, 1790-1836.

Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. A Magyar Tudós Társaság évkönyvei, 1831-1836 [The Year Books of the Hungarian Scientific Academy, 1831-1836]. 6 vols. Pest, 1833-1838.

Podmaniczky, F. Naplótöredékek, 1824-1886 [Diary Fragments, 1824-1886]. 4 vols. Budapest, 1887.

Pulszky, F. Életem és korom [My Life and Times]. Edited by G. Tolnai. 4 vols. Budapest, 1958.

Pulszky, F. Pulszky Ferencz kisebb dolgozatai [Francis Pulszky's Minor Works]. Edited by A. Lábán. Budapest, 1914.

Skerlecz, M. Skerlecz Miklós báró művei [The Works of Baron Nicholas Skerlecz]. Edited and translated by P. Berényi. Budapest, 1914.

Széchenyi, I. Adatok gróf Széchenyi István és kora történetéhez, 1808-1860 [Facts about Count Stephen Széchenyi and the History of his Age, 1808-1860]. Edited by L. Bártfai Szabó. 2 vols. Budapest, 1943.

Széchenyi, I. Gróf Széchenyi István összes munkái [Complete Works of Count Stephen Széchenyi]. Edited by B. Iványi-Grünwald, Z. Ferenczy, Gy. Viszota, and A. Károlyi. 15 vols. Budapest, 1921-1939.

Széchenyi, I. Gróf Széchenyi István összes munkái [Count Stephen Széchenyi's Complete Works]. Edited by B. Majláth and A. Zichy. 8 vols. Budapest, 1890-1894.

Széchenyi, I. Gróf Széchenyi István és hátrahagyott iratai [Count Stephen Széchenyi and his Literary Legacy]. Edited by M. Lónyai. 2nd ed. Budapest, 1875.

Széchenyi, I. Javaslat a magyar közlekedési ügy rendezéséről [Concerning the Regulation of Hungary's Transportation]. Pozsony, 1848.

Széchenyi, I. Magyar játékszinrül [About the Magyar Stage]. Pest, 1832.

Széchenyi, I. Stadium. Leipzig, 1833.

Széchenyi, I. Széchenyi István válogatott irásai [Stephen Széchenyi's Selected Writings]. Edited by I. Barta. Budapest, 1959.

Széchenyi, I. Széchenyi vallomásai és tanitásai. Széchenyi Anthologia [Széchenyi's Professions and Teachings. Széchenyi Anthology]. Edited by J. Fekete and J. Váradi. 2nd ed. Budapest, 1943.

Széchenyi, I. Töredékek gróf Széchenyi István fenmaradt kézirataiból. Hunnia [Fragments from Existing Manuscripts of Count Stephen Széchenyi. Hunnia]. Edited by J. Török. Pest, 1858.

Széchenyi, I. Világ, vagy is felvilágositó töredékek némi hiba 's előitélet eligazitására [Light, or Enlightening Fragments for the Rectification of Sundry Faults and Prejudices]. Pest, 1831.

Szekfü, Gy., ed. Iratok a magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez, 1790-1848 [Documents on the History of the Magyar Official Language, 1790-1848]. Budapest, 1926.

Szemere, P. Szemere Pál munkái [Paul Szemere's Works]. Edited by J. Szvorényi. Budapest, 1890.

Teleki, L. A magyar nyelv elé mozditásáról buzgó érdeklései [Zealous Efforts on Behalf of the Magyar Language]. Pest, 1806.

Vörös, I. Fáradi Vörös Ignácz visszaemlékezései az 1778-1822 évekről [Ignacz Fáradi Vörös' Reminiscences of the Years 1778-1822]. Budapest, 1927.

Vörösmarty, M. Vörösmarty Mihály összes költői művei [Michael Vörösmarty's Complete Poetical Works]. Edited by Z. Endrei. Budapest, 1907.

Vörösmarty, M. Vörösmarty összes művei [Vörösmarty's Complete Works]. Edited by P. Gyulay. 8 vols. Budapest, 1884-1885.

Vörösmarty, M. Vörösmarty Mihály összes művei [Michael Vörösmarty's Complete Works]. Edited by K. Horváth and D. Tóth. 18 vols. Budapest, 1960-1967.

Wesselényi, M. Balitéletekről [On Misjudgments]. Bucharest, 1833.

Wesselényi, M. Szózat a magyar és szláv nemzetiség ügyében [Declaration on Behalf of the Magyar and Slav Nationalities]. Leipzig, 1843.

Travellers' Accounts

Batthányi, V. Reise durch einen Theil Ungarns, Siebenbürgen, der Waldau und Buccovina im Jahr 1805. Pest, 1811.

Batthányi, V. Über das Ungrische Küstenland. In Briefen. Pest, 1805.

Berkeszi, I. Gróf Hofmannseg utazása magyarországon 1793-1794-ben [Count Hofmannseg's Travels in Hungary in 1793-1794]. Budapest, 1887.

Beudant, F. S. Travels in Hungary in 1818. London, 1823.

Bright, I. Travels from Vienna through Lower Hungary, with Some Remarks on the State of Vienna during the Congress, in the Year 1814. Edinburgh, 1818.

Elliott, C. B. Travels in the Three Great Empires of Austria, Russia, and Turkey. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1839.

Gleig, G. R. Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary Visited in 1837. 3 vols. London, 1839.

Hiller, G. Reise durch einen Theil von Sachsen, Böhmen, Österreich und Ungarn. Köthen, 1808.

Hunter, Wm. Travels through France, Turkey, and Hungary to Vienna, in 1792. To which are Added Several Tours in Hungary, in 1799 and 1800. In a Series of Letters to his Sister in England. 2 vols. 3rd ed. London, 1803.

Kohl, J. G. Reise in Ungarn. Dresden and Leipzig, 1842.

Paget, J. Hungary and Transylvania, with Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political and Economical. 2 vols. London, 1855.

Paget, J. Hungary and Transylvania, with Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political and Economical. 2 vols. New London Edition. Philadelphia, 1850.

Pardoe, J. The City of the Magyar, or Hungary and her Institutions, 1839-1840. 3 vols. London, 1840.

Quin, M. J. A Steam Voyage Down the Danube. 2 vols. 3rd ed. London, 1836.

Szék, D. Teleki von. Reisen durch Ungarn. 8 vols. Pest, 1805.

G. T. D. (pseud. L. Teleki). Egynéhány hazai utazások le-irása tót és horváth országoknak rövid ismertetésével egygyütt [Several Domestic Travels and a brief Description of Slovakia and Croatia]. Vienna, 1796.

Townson, R. Travels in Hungary, with a Short Account of Vienna in the Year 1793. London, 1797.

Walsh, R. Narrative of a Journey from Constantinople to England. London, 1828.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Secondary Works Containing Manuscript Material

Bagyó, J. Gróf Széchenyi Istvánnak közlekedésügyi reformja és tevékenysége [Count Stephen Széchenyi's Transportation Reforms and Activities]. Budapest, 1913.

Beöthy, Zs., ed. A magyar irodalom történeti ismertetése [Historical Review of Magyar Literature]. 2 vols. 11th ed. Budapest, 1909.

Bernát, Gy. A magyar jobbágyfelszabadítás eszmeáramlatai, 1790-1848 [The Ideological Trends of the Jobbágy Liberation, 1790-1848]. Budapest, 1930.

Bíró, S. Történelemtanításunk a XIX. század első felében a korabeli tankönyvirodalom tükrében [Our History Teaching in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century Reflected in the Contemporary Textbook Literature]. Budapest, 1960.

Domanovsky, S., ed. József Nádor élete és írásai [The Life and Writings of the Palatine Joseph]. 4 vols. Budapest, 1925-1944.

Eckhart, F. A bécsi udvar gazdaságpolitikája Magyarországon, 1780-1815 [The Commercial Policy of the Viennese Court in Hungary, 1780-1815]. Budapest, 1958.

Eötvös, J. Die Reform in Ungarn. Leipzig, 1846.

Erdélyi, J. Nemzeti iparunk [Our National Industry]. 2nd ed. Pest, 1846.

Ferenczy, Zs. J. Magyar irodalom és tudományosság története [The History of Literature and Science]. Pest, 1854.

Halstead, J. B., ed. Romanticism. New York, 1969.

Kármán, M. Ungarische Bildungswesen, Geschichtlicher Rückblick bis zum Jahre 1848. Budapest, 1915.

Kemény, G. G. A magyar nemzetiségi kérdés története. A nemzetiségi kérdés a törvények és tervezetek tükrében [History of the Magyar Nationality Question. The Nationality Question Reflected in Laws and Plans]. Budapest, 1947.

Kemény, G. G., ed. A szomszéd népekkel való kapcsolataink történetéből. Válogatás hét évszázad irásaiból [From the History of the Connections with our Neighbouring Peoples. Selections from the Writings of Seven Centuries]. Budapest, 1962.

Mályusz, E., ed. Sándor Lipót főherceg nádor iratai [The Writings of the Palatine Archduke Alexander Leopold]. Budapest, 1926.

Matlekovits, S. Das Königreich Ungarn, Volkswirtschaftlich und statistisch dargestellt. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1900.

Meszlényi, A. A jozefinizmus kora Magyarországon (1780-1846) [The Age of Joseph in Hungary (1780-1846)]. Budapest, 1934.

Miskolczy, Gy. A kamarilla a reformkorszakban [The Camarilla during the Age of Reform]. Budapest, 1930.

Rapant, D. Ilegálná Maďarizácia, 1790-1840 [Illegal Magyarization, 1790-1848]. Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1947.

Rapant, D. Sedliacke povstanie na východnom Slovensku roku 1831 [Peasant Uprising in Northern Slovakia in the Year 1831]. 2 vols. Bratislava, 1953.

Rohrer, J. Versuch über die Deutschen Bewöhner der Österreichischen Monarchie. 2 vols. Vienna, 1804.

Sándorffy, K. Törvényalkotásunk hőskora, az 1825-1848. évi reformkorszak törvényeinek története [The Heroic Age of Our Lawmaking. The History of the Laws during the Reform Era of 1825-1848]. Budapest, 1935.

Sartori, F. Historisch-ethnographische Übersicht der wissenschaftlichen Cultur, Geistesthätigkeit und Literatur des Österreichischen Kaiserthums nach seinen mannigfaltigen Sprachen und deren Bildungsstufen. Vienna, 1830.

Szántó, I. A parasztság kisajátitása és mozgalmai a dunántúli Festetics birtokon, 1711-1850 [The Expropriation and Movements of the Peasants on the Trans-Danubian Festetics Estate, 1711-1850]. Budapest, 1954.

Tábori, K. Titkosrendőrség és kamarilla. Aktàk - Adatok a bécsi titkos udvari és rendőrségi levéltárból [Secret Police and the Camarilla. Documents and Facts from the Secret Court and Police Archives in Vienna]. Budapest, 1921.

Takáts, S. Kémvilág Magyarországon [The World of Spies in Hungary]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1920.

Varga, J. Typen und Probleme des Bäuerlichen Grundbesitzes in Ungarn, 1767-1849. Budapest, 1965.

Záhony, B. Borsodmegye országgyülési utasitása a reformkorban [Diet Instructions of Borsod County during the Age of Reform]. Miskolcz, 1929.

General Works

Acsády, I. A magyar jobbágyság története [History of the Magyar Peasantry]. 1st ed. and 2nd ed. Budapest, 1908 and 1944.

Andics, E., ed. A magyar nacionalizmus kialakulása és története [The Development and History of Magyar Nationalism]. Budapest, 1964.

Arató, E. A nemzetiségi kérdés története Magyarországon, 1790-1848 [The Question of Nationalities in Hungary, 1790-1848]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1960.

Bakács, I. A magyar nagybirtokos családok hitelügyletei a XVII-XVIII. században [Credit Transactions of the Magyar Great Landowning Families in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries]. Budapest, 1965.

Ballagi, G. A politikai irodalom Magyarországon 1825-ig [The Political Literature in Hungary until 1825]. Budapest, 1888.

Beer, Adolf. Die Finanzen Österreichs im XIX. Jahrhundert. Prague, 1877.

Beer, Adolf. Die Österreichische Handelspolitik im neunzehnten Jahrhundert. Vienna, 1891.

Bibl, V. Der Zerfall Österreichs. 2 vols. Vienna, 1922.

Bodolay, G. Irodalmi diáktársaságok, 1785-1848 [Literary Student Associations, 1785-1848]. Budapest, 1963.

Bóka, L., and Pándi, P., eds. A magyar irodalom története 1849-ig [History of Magyar Literature until 1849]. Budapest, 1957.

Bucsay, M. Geschichte des Protestantismus in Ungarn. Stuttgart, 1959.

Budapest. A fővárosi Szabó Edvin könyvtár évkönyve, 1955 [Yearbook of the Edvin Szabó Library in the Capital, 1955]. Vol. V. Budapest, 1957.

Csahihen, K. Pest-Buda irodalmi élete, 1780-1830 [The Literary Life of Pest-Buda, 1780-1830]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1934.

Csaplovics, J. Gemälde von Ungarn. 2 vols. Pest, 1829.

Császári, E. Kisfaludy Sándor. Budapest, 1910.

Deme, L. A XIX. század első felének harcai a nemzeti nyelvért. Nyelvünk a reformkorszakban [Struggles during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century for our National Tongue. Our Language in the Reform Era]. Budapest, 1955.

Drage, G. Austria-Hungary. London, 1909.

Eperjessy, G. Mezővárosi és falusi céhek az Alföldön és a Dunántúlon (1686-1848) [Guilds in Agricultural Towns and Villages in the Great Plain and in the Trans-Danubian Region]. Budapest, 1967.

Farkas, Gy. Die Entwicklung der Ungarischen Literatur. Berlin, 1934.

Farkas, Gy. A "Fiatal Magyarország" kora [The Age of "Young Hungary"]. Budapest, 1932.

Farkas, Gy. A magyar irodalom története [History of Magyar Literature]. Budapest, 1934.

Farkas, Gy. A magyar romantika (Fejezet a magyar irodalmi fejlődés történetéből) [Magyar Romanticism (a Chapter from the Development of Magyar Literature)]. Budapest, 1930.

Farkas, Gy. Der Ungarische Vormärz. Petőfis Zeitalter. Berlin, 1943.

Fenyő, I. Az Aurora. Egy irodalmi zsebkönyv életrajza [Aurora. The Biography of a Literary Pocket Book]. Budapest, 1955.

Fenyő, I. Kisfaludy Sándor. Budapest, 1961.

Futó, M. A magyar gyáripar története [The History of Hungary's Manufacturing]. Budapest, 1944.

Gerando, A. de. Über den öffentlichen Geist in Ungarn seit dem Jahre 1790. Leipzig, 1848.

Gogolák, L. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Slowakischen Volkes. Munich, 1963.

Grünwald, B. A régi Magyarország, 1711-1825 [The Old Hungary, 1711-1825]. 3rd ed. Budapest, 1910.

Grünwald, B. Széchenyi magánhitelügyi koncepciójának szellemi és gazdasági előzményei és következményei a rendi Magyarországon, 1790-1848 [The Ideological and Economic Premises and Consequences of Széchenyi's Conceptions on Credit in Aristocratic Hungary, 1790-1848]. Pécs, 1927.

Gyulai, P. Katona József és Bánk bánja [Joseph Katona and his Bánk Bán]. Budapest, 1883.

Harris, R. W. Romanticism and the Social Order, 1780-1830. London, 1969.

Hegedűs, G., and J. Kónya. A magyar Dráma útja [The Road of Magyar Drama]. Budapest, 1964.

Hegel, G. W. F. G. W. F. Hegel's Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, oder Nationrecht und Staatswissentschaft im Grundrisse. Edited by E. Gans. Berlin, 1833.

Hegel, G. W. F. G. W. F. Hegel's Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte. Edited by E. Gans. Berlin, 1837.

Herder, J. G. "Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit," Vol. IV of J. G. Herder, J. G. von Herders sämmtliche Werke. Edited by Bureau der Deutschen Classiken. 44 vols. Carlsruhe, 1820-1829.

Hernády, F. Adattár a pécsi magyar szinjátszás kezdeteihez [Data Concerning the Beginnings of Magyar Theatre in Pécs]. Budapest, 1960.

Höke, L. Magyarország újabbkori történelme 1815-től 1892-ig [Hungary's More Recent History from 1815 until 1892]. 2 vols. Nagybecskerek, 1893.

Hóman, B., and Gy. Szekfü, eds. Magyar történet [History of Hungary]. 8 vols. Budapest, 1930-1934.

Horváth, E. Modern Hungary, 1660-1920. Budapest, 1922.

Horváth, János. Kisfaludy Károly és íróbarátai [K. K. and his Literary Friends]. Budapest, 1955.

Horváth, János. Tanulmányok [Studies]. Budapest, 1956.

Horváth, J. Transylvania and the History of the Rumanians; a Reply to Professor R. W. Seton-Watson. Budapest, 1935.

Horváth, M. Fünfundzwanzig Jahre aus der Geschichte Ungarns von 1823-1848. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1867.

Horváth, M. Az ipar és kereskedés története Magyarországon a három utolsó század alatt [The History of Industry and Commerce in Hungary during the Last Three Centuries]. Buda, 1840.

Iorga, N. Geschichte der Rumänen und ihrer Kultur. Sibiu, 1929.

Iorga, N. Geschichte des Rumänischen Volkes im Rahmen seiner Staatsbildungen. 2 vols. Gotha, 1905.

Iványi, E. "A földesúrokat kiszolgáló parasztok" [About Peasants who Served their Landlords]. Tanulmányok a parasztság történetéhez [Studies about the History of the Peasantry in Hungary]. Edited by Gy. Spira. Budapest, 1952.

Jancsó, B. A román irredentista mozgalmak története [History of the Roumanian Irredentist Movement]. Budapest, 1920.

Janšak, S. Slovensko v dobe Uherského feudalizmu [Slovakia in the Age of Hungarian Feudalism]. Bratislava, 1932.

Jászi, O. The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. 3rd ed. Chicago, 1964.

Kaindl, R. G. Geschichte der Deutschen in Ungarn. Gotha, 1912.

Kann, R. A. The Multinational Empire, Nationalism and National Reform in the Habsburg Empire, 1848-1918. 2 vols. New York, 1950.

Kecskeméthy, A. Graf Stephan Széchenyis Staatsmännische Laufbahn, seine letzten Lebensjahre in der Döblinger Irrenanstalt und sein Tod. Pest, 1866.

Kohn, H. The Habsburg Empire, 1804-1918. Princeton, 1961.

Kornis, Gy. A magyar müvelödés eszményei, 1777-1848 [The Ideals of Magyar Culture, 1777-1848]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1927.

Kósa, J. Pest és Buda elmagyarosodása 1848-ig [The Magyarization Process of Pest and Buda until 1848]. Budapest, 1937.

Kosáry, D. A History of Hungary. Cleveland, 1941.

Kosáry, D. Kossuth Lajos a reformkorban [Louis Kossuth during the Age of Reform]. Budapest, 1946.

Kosáry, D. Magyarország története [History of Hungary]. Budapest, 1943.

Lang, L. Hundert Jahre Zollpolitik. Vienna and Leipzig, 1906.

Lederer, E. Az ipari kapitalizmus kezdetei Magyarországon [The Origins of Industrial Capitalism in Hungary]. Budapest, 1952.

Lowell, A. L. Governments and Parties in Continental Europe. 2 vols. Boston and New York, 1896.

Mailáth, J. Geschichte des Östreichischen Kaiserstaates. 5 vols. Hamburg, 1850.

Maithstein, I. W. E. von. Ein Haupthinderniss des Fortschrittes in Ungarn. Vienna, 1842.

Marczali, H. Magyarország történelme [Hungary's History]. Budapest, 1912.

Menczer, B. A Commentary on Magyar Literature. Castrop-Rauxel, 1956.

Mérei, Gy. Magyar iparfejlődés, 1790-1848 [The Development of Commerce in Hungary, 1790-1848]. Budapest, 1951.

Mérei, Gy. Mezőgazdaság és agrártársadalom Magyarországon, 1790-1848 [Agriculture and Agrarian Society in Hungary, 1790-1848]. Budapest, 1948.

Miskolczy, Gy. A horvát kérdés története és irományai a rendi állam korában [The Croatian Question, Its History and Writings in the Age of Aristocracy]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1927-1928.

Orosz, J., ed. Terra Incognita. Notizen über Ungarn in zwanglosen Heften. Leipzig, 1835.

Pukánszky, B. A magyarországi német irodalom története (a legrégibb időktől 1848-ig) [History of German Literature in Hungary (from the Oldest Times to 1848)]. Budapest, 1926.

Révai, J. Literarische Studien. Berlin, 1956.

Schwicker, J. H. Die Deutschen in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen. Vienna, 1881.

Schwicker, J. H. Geschichte der Österreichischen Militärgrenze. Wien and Teschen, 1883.

Schwicker, J. H. Geschichte der Ungarischen Literatur. London, 1906.

Schwicker, J. H. Politische Geschichte der Serben in Ungarn. Budapest, 1880.

Schwicker, J. H. Die Ungarische Gymnasien. Geschichte, System, Statistik. Budapest, 1881.

Seton-Watson, R. W. German, Slav, and Magyar. A Study in the Origins of the Great War. London, 1916.

Seton-Watson, R. W. A History of the Roumanians, from Roman Times to the Completion of Unity. Reprint of 1934 ed. N.p., Archon Books, 1963.

Seton-Watson, R. W. The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans. London, 1917.

Spira, Gy. A magyar forradalom 1848-49-ben [The Magyar Revolution in 1848-1849]. Budapest, 1959.

Spira, Gy., ed. Tanulmányok a parasztság történetéhez Magyarországon, 1711-1790 [Studies about the History of the Peasantry in Hungary, 1711-1790]. Budapest, 1952.

Springer, A. Geschichte Österreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden 1809. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1863.

Szabó, I. A magyar parasztság története [History of the Magyar Peasantry]. Budapest, 1940.

Szabó, I. Tanulmányok a magyar parasztság történetéből [Studies from the History of the Magyar Peasantry]. Budapest, 1948.

Szalay, L. A magyarországi szerb telepek jogviszonya az államhoz [The Legal Relationship of Serb Settlements to the State]. Pest, 1841.

Szauder, J. Kölcsey Ferenc. Budapest, 1955.

Szauder, J. A romantika útján. Tanulmányok [On the Way to Romanticism. Studies]. Budapest, 1961.

Szekfü, Gy. Három nemzedék és ami utána következik [Three Generations and what Follows Thereafter]. 4th ed. Budapest, 1935.

Szekfü, Gy. Der Staat Ungarn: eine Geschichtsstudie. Stuttgart, 1918.

Szinnyei, F. Kisfaludy Károly. Budapest, 1927.

Taylor, A. J. P. The Habsburg Monarchy, 1815-1918, A History of the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary. London, 1941.

Teleki, P. The Evolution of Hungary and Its Place in European History. New York, 1923.

Temperley, H. W. V. History of Serbia. London, 1917.

Tilkovszky, L. Az 1831. évi parasztfelkelés [The Peasant Uprising of 1831]. Budapest, 1955.

Tóth, I. Z. Az erdélyi és magyarországi román nemzeti mozgalom, 1790-1848 [The Roumanian National Movement in Transylvania and Hungary, 1790-1848]. Budapest, 1959.

Tóth, I. Z. Magyarok és románok. Történelmi tanulmányok [Magyars and Roumanians. Historical Studies]. Budapest, 1966.

Turnbull, P. E. Austria. 2 vols. London, 1840.

Vaszáry, K. Adatok az 1825-ki országgyülés történetéhez [Facts about the History of the 1825 Diet]. Győr [Raab], 1883.

Vidovics, A. A magyar neológia rostalgottalása [Critique of Magyar Neologism]. Pest, 1826.

Walter, F., and H. Steinacker. Die Nationalitätenfrage im alten Ungarn und die Südostpolitik Wiens. Munich, 1959.

Wendel, H. Aus dem Südslawischen Risorgimento. Gotha, 1921.

Wendel, H. Der Kampf der Südslawen um Freiheit und Einheit. Frankfurt a.M., 1925.

Yolland, A. B. "The National Spirit in Hungarian Literature (1686-1900)." Cambridge Modern History. Vol. XI. Cambridge, 1909.

Zsilinszky, M. "Széchenyi nemzetiségi politikája" [Széchenyi's National Politics]. Széchenyi eszmevilága [Széchenyi's World of Ideas]. Edited by J. Gaál. Vol. II. Budapest, 1914.

Works Consulted But Not Cited

Acsády, I. A magyar birodalom története a kútfők alapján a müvelt közönség számára [History of the Kingdom of Hungary Based on Sources, for the Cultivated Public]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1904.

Acsády, J. "Magyarország történelme." Az ezredéves magyar állam és népe [The Millenary Magyar State and Its People]. Edited by J. Jékelfalussy. Budapest, 1896.

Áldor, I. A haza bölcse. Emlékkönyv [The Sage of our Nation. Memorial Book]. Budapest, 1876.

Angyal, D. Kölcsey Ferenc. Budapest, 1927.

E. O. S. (anon.). Hungary and Its Revolutions from the Earliest Period to the Nineteenth Century. London, 1854.

Apáthy, I. "Széchenyi István és a nemzeti sajátságok az emberi továbbfejlödés szempontjából" [Stephen Széchenyi and National Peculiarities from the Point of View of Human Progress]. Széchenyi eszmevilága. Edited by J. Gaál. Vol. II. Budapest, 1914.

Arató, E. "Die verschiedenen Formen der nationalen Unterdrückung in Osteuropa und die Madjarisierung in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts." Studien zur Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Edited by V. Sándor and P. Hanák. Budapest, 1961.

Balányi, Gy. Geschichte Ungarns. Budapest, 1930.

Balásházy, J. Az 1831-dik esztendöi felsö magyarországi zendüléseknek történeti leírása [Historical Description of the Rebellions of the Year 1831 in Upper Hungary]. Pest, 1832.

Balla, A. Magyarország története [History of Hungary]. Budapest, 1942.

Bárány, G. "The Emergence of Széchenyi and Hungarian Reform until 1841." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Colorado, 1960.

Bárány, G. Stephen Széchenyi and the Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791-1841. Princeton, 1961.

Baráth, T. Magyar történet. 2nd ed. Cluj, 1941.

Barta, I. A Fiatal Kossuth [The Young Kossuth]. Budapest, 1966.

Beleznay, M. C. M. A Felsö-Magyarországi Minerva, 1825-1836. Eger, n.d.

Benda, K. A magyar jakobinusok iratai [Writings of the Magyar Jacobins]. 3 vols. Budapest, 1952-1957.

Benedek, E. A magyar nép multja és jelene [The Past and Present of the Magyar People]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1898.

Beöthy, A. A magyar államiság fejlödése, küzdelmei [The Development and Struggles of the Magyar Statehood]. 3 vols. Budapest, n.d.

Beöthy, Zs. "A magyar szellemi élet fejlődése." Az ezredéves magyar állam és népe. Edited by J. Jekelfalussy. Budapest, 1896.

Berend, I., and E. Molnár, eds. Magyarország története [History of Hungary]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1964.

Bibl, V. Österreich 1806-1938. Zürich, 1939.

Bocsor, I. Magyarország történelme, különös tekintettel a jogfejlődésre [History of Hungary, with Special Emphasis on Development of Law]. 7 vols. Pápa, 1861-1869.

Bonkáló, S. A szlávok. A szláv népek és a szláv kérdés ismertetése [The Slavs. The Slav Peoples and a Review of the Slav Question]. Budapest, 1915.

Bovill, W. B. F. Hungary and the Hungarians. London, 1908.

Brandis, C. Österreich und das Abendland in der Wende des XIX. Jahrhunderts. Innsbruck, 1953.

Brisits, F. "A XIX-ik század első fele" [The First Half of the Nineteenth Century]. A magyar irodalom története. Edited by Zs. Alszeghy. Budapest, 1939.

Corvinus [pseud. for Sir Travers Twiss]. Hungary: Its Constitution and Catastrophe. London, 1850.

Csighy, S. A szabadságharc előtti kor pedagógiai törekvései [The Pedagogical Efforts of the Period before the War of Liberation]. Budapest, 1936.

Csuday, E. Die Geschichte der Ungarn. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Berlin, 1899.

Dezsényi, B., and Gy. Némes. A magyar sajtó 250 éve [Two Hundred Fifty Years of the Magyar Press]. Budapest, 1954.

Domanovszky, S. Magyar művelődéstörténet [Magyar Cultural History]. 5 vols. Budapest, n.d.

Eckhart, F. A Short History of the Hungarian People. London, 1931.

Eszláry, Charles. Histoire des Institutions publiques Hongroises. Vol. I and Vol. II. Paris, 1959 and 1963.

Falk, M. Széchenyi István gróf és kora [Count Stephen Széchenyi and his Age]. Pest, 1868.

Farkas, Gy. Ungarns Geschichte und Kultur in Dokumenten. Wiesbaden, 1955.

Felbermann, L. Hungary and Its People. London, 1892.

Gaál, J. Gróf Széchenyi István nemzeti politikája és jövönk [The National Policy of Count Stephen Széchenyi and our Future]. Budapest, 1903.

Geissler, G. Von Metternich bis Sarajevo. Das Leben Kaiser Franz Josephs. Berlin, 1939.

Gelléri, M. The Millennial Realm of Hungary: Its Past and Present. Budapest, 1896.

Godkin, E. L. The History of Hungary. London, 1853.

Grünwald, B. Az új Magyarország. Gróf Széchenyi István [The New Hungary. Count Stephen Széchenyi]. Budapest, 1890.

Haas, A. G. Metternich, Reorganization and Nationality, 1813-1818. A Story of Foresight and Frustration in the Rebuilding of the Austrian Empire. Wiesbaden, 1963.

Hegedüs, G. Magyar romantika. Budapest, 1947.

Hofhauser, M. A kereskedőtestületek mozgalma a magyar kereskedelem fellendítése érdekében a XVIII. század végén és a XIX. század elején [The Movement of the Merchant Corporations at the End of the Eighteenth and the Beginning of the Nineteenth Centuries on Behalf of the Revival of Hungary's Commerce]. Budapest, 1930.

Horváth, István. Magyarország gyökeres régi nemzetségeiről [About the Roots of Hungary's Old Nationalities]. Pest, 1820.

Horváth, János. Kisfaludy Károly. Budapest, 1936.

Horváth, János. Kisfaludy Károly évtizede [Charles Kisfaludy's Decade]. Budapest, 1936.

Horváth, Jenő. Magyarország és a nemzetiségi kérdés, 1815-1920. Történelmi tanulmány [Hungary and the Nationality Question, 1815-1920. Historical Study]. Budapest, 1920.

Iorga, N. A History of Rumania. Land, People, Civilization. London, 1925.

Kann, R. A. The Habsburg Empire, A Study in Integration and Disintegration. New York, 1957.

Kassai, G. Magyar történelmi sorsfordulók és a nemzetiségi kérdés [Magyar Historical Landmarks and the Nationality Question]. Budapest, 1959.

Katona, L., and F. Szinnei. Geschichte der Ungarischen Literatur. Leipzig, 1911.

Kay, D. Austria-Hungary. London, 1880.

Király, B. Hungary in the Late Eighteenth Century. New York, 1969.

Király, B. K. "1790; Society in Royal Hungary." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1966.

Knatchbull-Hugessen, C. M. The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation. 2 vols. London, 1908.

Kohn, H. The Idea of Nationalism. New York, 1961.

Kohn, H. Pan-Slavism. New York, 1960.

Kornis, Gy. Széchenyi és a magyar költészet [Széchenyi and Magyar Poetry]. Budapest, 1941.

Kósa, J. A magyar nacionalizmus kialakulása [The Formation of Magyar Nationalism]. Budapest, 1937.

Krones, F. Geschichte der Neuzeit Österreichs vom achzehnten Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart. Berlin, 1879.

Lederer, E. A magyar társadalom kialakulása a honfoglalástól 1918-ig [The Development of Magyar Society, from the Occupation of the Homeland until 1918]. Népszava könyvkiadó, Budapest, n.d.

Leger, Louis. Histoire le l'Austriche-Hongrie depuis les origines jusqu'en 1918. New Edition. Paris, 1920.

Lingelbach, Wm. E. Austria-Hungary, Based on the Work of Paul Louis Leger, Collège de France. New York, 1916.

Lipthay, S. Gróf Széchenyi István műszaki alkotásai [Count Stephen Széchenyi's Technological Achievements]. Budapest, 1896.

Löcher, Th. J. G. Die Nationale Differenzierung und Integrierung der Slowaken und Tschechen in ihrem geschichtlichen Verlauf bis 1848. Haarlem, 1931.

Lukinich, I. A History of Hungary in Biographical Sketches. Budapest, 1937.

Macartney, C. A. Hungary. A Short History. Chicago, 1962.

Macartney, C. A. "The Austrian Monarchy, 1792-1847." The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. IX. New York, 1965.

Marczali, H. Az 1790-1-diki országgyülés [The 1790-1 Diet]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1907.

Marczali, H. A legújabb kor története, 1825-1880 [History of the Most Recent Times, 1825-1880]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1892.

Marczali, H. Magyarország története: III Károlytól a bécsi Congressusig, 1711-1815 [History of Hungary: From Charles III to the Congress of Vienna, 1711-1815]. Budapest, 1898.

Marczali, H. Magyarország története a szatmári békétől a bécsi Congressusig, 1711-1815 [The History of Hungary from the Peace of Szatmár to the Congress of Vienna, 1711-1815]. Budapest, n.d.

Marczali, H. "Übersicht der Geschichte Ungarns." Ungarn. Land und Volk, Geschichte, Staatsrecht, Verwaltung und Rechtspflege, Landwirtschaft, Industrie und Handel, Schulwesen, Wissentschaftliche Leben, Literatur, Bildende Künste. Edited by A. Berzeviczy. Budapest, 1918.

Masaryk, T. G. A nemzetiségi kérdés [The Nationality Question]. Edited by F. Szerényi. Bratislava, 1935.

Merényi, O. Berzsenyi Dániel. Budapest, 1966.

Miskolczy, Gy. A magyar nép történelme a mohácsi vésztől az első világháborúig [History of the Magyar People from the Disaster at Mohács to the First World War]. Rome, 1956.

Miskolczy, Gy. Ungarn in der Habsburg-Monarchie. Vienna, 1959.

Pais, D., ed. Nyelvünk a reformkorban [Our Language in the Age of Reform]. Budapest, 1940.

Pintér, J. A magyar irodalom történetének kézikönyve [Handbook of Magyar History of Literature]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1921.

Pukánszky, B. Német polgárság magyar földön [German Bourgeoisie on Magyar Soil]. Budapest, n.d.

Reich, E. Hungarian Literature, A Historical and Critical Survey. Boston, 1898.

Révai, J. Marxizmus, népiesség és magyarság [Marxism, Populism and Magyarism]. Budapest, 1948.

Riedl, F. A History of Hungarian Literature. London, 1906.

Ruzsás, L. A baranyai parasztság élete és küzdelme a nagybirtokkal, 1711-1848 [The Life and Struggle of the Baranya Peasantry against the Large Estates, 1711-1848]. Budapest, 1964.

Sándor, V., ed. Studien zur Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Budapest, 1961.

Sarlós, M. Széchenyi és a feudális jogrend átalakulása [Széchenyi and the Transformation of Feudal Law]. Budapest, 1960.

Schlözer, A. L. von. Allgemeine nordische Geschichte aus der neuesten und besten nordischen Schriftstellern und nach eigenen Untersuchungen beschrieben und als eine Geographische und Historische Einleitung zur richtigen Kenntniss aller Skandinawischer, Finnischen, Slawischen, Lettischen und Sibirischen Völker, besonders in alten und mittleren Zeiten. Halle, 1771.

Schütte, U. Ungarn und der Ungarische Unabhängigkeitskrieg. Dresden, 1850.

Schuy, G. Bacsányi János és I. Napoleon 1809-ki proclamációja a magyarokhoz [The Proclamation of John Bacsanyi and Napoleon I to the Magyars in 1809]. Budapest, 1914.

Seton-Watson, R. W. A History of the Czechs and Slovaks. London, New York, Melbourne, 1943.

Seton-Watson, R. W. The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy. London, 1911.

Silagi, D. Der grösste Ungar. Graf Stephan Széchenyi. Vienna, Munich, 1967.

Sinor, D. History of Hungary. New York, 1959.

Spohr, L. Die geistigen Grundlagen des Nationalismus in Ungarn. Berlin, 1936.

Srbik, R. Metternich der Staatsmann und der Mensch. 2 vols. Munich, 1925.

Steinacker, H., ed. Austro-Hungarica. Ausgewählte Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Geschichte Ungarns und der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. Munich, 1963.

Štur, L. Starý i nový vek Slováku [Old and New Age of the Slovaks]. Edited by J. Jirašek. Bratislava, 1935.

Szekfü, Gy., ed. A mai Széchenyi [Széchenyi Today]. Budapest, 1935.

Szekfü, Gy. Mi a magyar? [What is the Magyar?]. Budapest, 1939.

Szilágyi, S., ed. A magyar nemzet története [History of the Magyar Nation]. 10 vols. Budapest, 1898.

Török, P. Magyarország története [History of Hungary]. Budapest, 1942.

Tóth, D. Vörösmarty Mihály. Budapest, 1957.

Vámbéry, A. The Story of Hungary. New York, 1891.

Vargha, B. Berzsenyi Dániel. Budapest, 1959.

Viszota, Gy. A Széchenyi lánchíd története [History of the Széchenyi Chain Bridge]. Budapest, 1935.

von Löher, F. Die Magyaren und andere Ungarn. Leipzig, 1874.

Wachsmuth, W. Geschichte des Illyrismus, oder des Südslawischen Antagonismus gegen die Magyaren. Leipzig, 1849.

Waldapfel, J. 50 év Pest-Buda irodalmi életéből [Fifty Years from the Literary Life of Pest-Buda]. Budapest, 1935.

Wertheimer, E. Ausztria és Magyarország a tizenkilenczedik század első tizedében. Kiadatlan források alapján [Austria and Hungary in the First Decade of the Nineteenth Century. Based on Unpublished Sources]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1890-1892.

Yolland, A. B. Hungary. London, 1917.

Zarek, O. The History of Hungary. London, 1939.

Zichy, A. Gróf Széchenyi István életrajza [Biography of Count Stephen Széchenyi]. 2 vols. Budapest, 1896-1897.

Articles and Periodicals

1790-1840

D. M., per K. M. (anon.). "A magyar nyelvrűl" [Concerning the Magyar Tongue], Felső Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. XI, No. 6 (1826).

E. P. N. P. (anon.). "Észrevételek a pozsonyi tót újság kissebbitő homlokirása ellen" [Observations Against the Deprecating Headline of the Pozsony Slovak Newspaper], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 12 (1817).

G-es (anon.). "Rövid észrevételek a falusi mivelésről" [Brief Observations Concerning Village Education], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. XVI, No. 2 (1832).

Endre k-ss (anon.). "Nemzeti játékszin honi fölemelkedésünk segéde" [The National Stage as a Means to the Elevation of our Nation]. Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. XV (1831).

M. (anon.). "A juh tenyészetről" [Concerning Sheep Culture], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 12 (1817).

N. (anon.). Book Review of F. Kazinczy's Kazinczy Ferencz Munkáji. Szép Literatura. 9 vols. Pest, 1814-1816. Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 6 (1817).

V. K. (anon.). "A lelki pásztor az uralkodó korszellemnek arányában" [The Pastor in Relationship to the Prevailing Spirit of the Times], Vallási és Egyházi Tár, Vol. I, No. 1 (1832).

Balla, K. "A nemzeti tánczról [Concerning the National Dance], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. VII, No. 7 (1823).

Bárán, P. "Magyar Országon az éhség meg-akadályoztatására tzélozó gondolatok" [Thoughts Concerning the Prevention of Famine in Hungary], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 8 (1817).

Beregszászy, P. "A nemzeti nyelvünk tanulásának szüksége voltáról" [Concerning the Need to Study our National Tongue], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. II, No. 4 (1818).

Boros, I. "Hazafi gondolatok a magyar nyelv ügyében" [Patriotic Thoughts Concerning the Magyar Tongue], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. IV, No. 6 (1820).

Darvas, F. "Hazafiúi Intés" [Patriotic Admonition], Orpheus, Vol. II (1790).

Dessewffy, J. "Elöszó az avulni kezdö és a nagyon újítgató irás-módról a magyar nyelvben" [Foreword Concerning the Method of the Writing of the Magyar Tongue which is too Radical and which is Beginning to be Out of Style], Felsö Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. I, No. 1 (1825).

Dessewffy, J. "A magyar ihlet" [The Magyar Inspiration], Felsö Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. I, No. 1 (1825).

Erczey, D. "Javallás (Projectum) a magyar nyelv bövítésére nézve" [Proposal Concerning the Improvement of the Magyar Language], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. III, No. 8 (1819).

Forgó, Gy. "Rendkivül való szükség idején, a' közönségesen szokásbanlevö gabona fajokon kivül, miböl készithetni meg kenyeret hazánkban, 's mit találhatni meg, a' mivel ollyankor táplálhassa magát a szegénység?" [In Case of Extreme Need, Besides the Cereal Staples in Normal Use, What May be Used in Our Nation for Making Bread, and What to do so that the Poor People May Feed Themselves? Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 10 (1817).

Horváth, J. A. "Az iskolai nevelésröl Magyarországban" [Concerning School Education in Hungary], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. XIII, No. 2 (1829).

Kazinczy, F. Book Review of J. Siposi, Ó és Új Magyar. Pest, 1816. Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 12 (1817).

Kazinczy, F. "Wieland Adelung ellen: Mi a tiszta németség (Wielands Werke, Suppl. VI. Band)--Tükörül azoknak kik nyelvrontást emlegetnek, 's ezt kérdezzetik: Mi a tiszta magyarság?--'s intésül a' szere felett merészeknek" [Against Wieland's Adelung: What is Pure German (Wielands Works, Suppl. Vol. VI)--Reflection for Those Who Repeatedly Mention the Ruin of Our Language, Who Ask: What is Pure Magyar?--And Admonition to Such Impudents], Felsö Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. I, No. 7 (1825).

Kis, J. "Hogy kell a magyar olvasó publicomot nevelni?" [How to Educate the Magyar Reading Public?], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. II, No. 8 (1818).

Vida Füredi (pseud. K. Kisfaludy). "A Recensiókról" [Concerning Criticisms], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. II, No. 6 (1818).

Kozmár, P. "Felszólitás a falusi gyermekek iskoláztatásukra" [Plea on Behalf of the Education of Village Children], Egyházi Tár, Vol. V (1834).

Magda, P. "Értekezés a magyar nyelvben teendő újítások barátai és ellenségei közt levő perpatvarkodásról" [Report on the Feud between the Opponents and Friends of Innovation in the Magyar Tongue], Felső Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. I, No. 5 (1825).

Mednyánszky, A. "Hazafiúi gondolatok a magyar nyelv kiterjesztése dolgában" [Patriotic Thoughts on Behalf of the Furthering of the Magyar Tongue], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. VI, No. 1 (1822).

Menyhárd, P. Pásztory. "A napról napra kevesedő pénz miatt miként segíthet magán a magyar mezei gazda; és miképp készüljön annak jövendőbeli nagyobb szükére?" [How Can the Magyar Agriculturalist Help Himself in View of the Shortage of Money; and How Should he Prepare Himself for Greater Future Wants?], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. III, No. 1 (1819).

Meszlényi, I. "A magyar nemesek közbirtoka eránt való javallások" [Proposals Concerning the Estates of Magyar Nobles], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 6 (1817).

Nagy, J. "A jó lelkipásztornak képe" [The Picture of a Good Pastor], Egyházi Tár, Vol. VII (1836).

Rothkrepf, G. "A magyar muzsika története" [The History of Magyar Music], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. XII, No. 2 (1828).

Rumy, K. G. "A gazdaságbeli erőnek használásáról és igazgatásáról. Kiváltképpen Thaer és Traulmann szerint" [Concerning the Use of Agricultural Methods and their Management. Especially According to Thaer and Traulmann], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. II, No. 7 (1818).

Z. (K. G. Rumy). "A Mondolatnak 's rá való Feleletnek megitélésére" [The Judgment of Mondolat and Felelet], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 6 (1817).

Sztrókay, A. "A nemzeti nyelv előmozditásáról" [About the Furthering of the National Tongue], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. V, No. 2 (1821).

Terhes, S. "Hazafiúi szó idegen nyelvü lakós társaimhoz" [Patriotic Word to my Fellow Citizens with Foreign Tongues], Felső Magyarországi Minerva, Vol. III, No. 9 (1827).

Thaisz, A. "A Neologizmusról, avagy szabad-e a' magyarban új szókat tsinálni és mannyire?" [Concerning Neologism,

or, is it Permissible in Magyar to Create New Words, and if so, to What Extent?], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 12 (1817).

Vedres, I. "A magyar nemzeti lélekről egy két szó" [One or two Words about the Magyar National Spirit], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. VI, No. 11 (1822).

Vitkovics, M. V. "Hazafiúi elmélkedés" [Patriotic Thoughts], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. I, No. 12 (1817).

Vitkovics, M. V. "A magyar könyvek terjesztésérül" [About the Spreading of Magyar Books], Tudományos Gyüjtemény, Vol. V, No. 9 (1821).

1841-Present

Alszeghy, Zs. "Adalék a protestáns iskoladrámák XVIII. századik történetéhez," Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LXXI (1967).

Andics, E. "Der Widerstand der feudalen Kräften in Ungarn," Acta Historica, Vol. IV, Nos. 1-3 (1955).

Arató, E. "A magyar nemesség és az osztrák udvar nemzetiségi politikája a szabadságharc elött" [The Magyar Nobility and the Nationality Policy of the Austrian Court before the War of Liberation], Századok, Vol. LXXXIX, No. 2 (1955).

Balázsi, H. E. "A reformkori nacionalizmus XVIII. századi gyökerei" [The Eighteenth Century Roots of Nationalism in the Reform Era], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. III, Nos. 2-3 (1960).

Bárány, G. "The Awakening of Magyar Nationalism before 1848," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. II (1966).

Bárány, G. "The Széchenyi Problem," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol. XX, No. 3 (1960).

Barta, I. "Entstehung des Gedankens der Interresenvereinigung in der Ungarischen bürgerlich-adligen Reformbewegung," Nouvelles études historiques, publiées a l'occasion XIIe Congrès International des sciences Historiques par la Commission des Historiens Hongrois I. Budapest, 1965.

Barta, I. "Felsöbüki Nagy Pál és a bécsi kormány" [Felsöbüki Paul Nagy and the Vienna Government], Századok, Vol. XCVII, No. 4 (1963).

Barta, I. "A magyar polgári reformmozgalom kezdeti szakaszának problémái" [The Problems of the Initial Stage of the Magyar Bourgeois Reform Movement], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. VI, Nos. 3-4 (1963).

Barta, I. "A magyar reformkor és 1848-49 nacionalizmusának néhány vonása" [The Magyar Reform Era and Several Features of the Nationalism of 1848-49], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. III, Nos. 2-3 (1960).

Barta, I. "The Opening of Kölcsey's Political Career," Századok, Vol. XCIII, No. 1 (1959).

Barta, I. "István Széchenyi," Acta Historica Revue de l'academie des sciences de Hongrie, Vol. VII, Nos. 1-2 (1960).

Barta, I. "Széchenyi és a magyar polgári reformmozgalom kibontakozása" [Széchenyi and the Evolution of the Magyar Bourgeois Reform Movement], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. III, Nos. 2-3 (1960).

Benczédi, L. "A haza és nemzetfogalom alakulása a késői feudalizmus korszakában" [The Development of the Concept of Fatherland and Nation in the Era of Later Feudalism], Századok, Vol. CI, No. 6 (1967).

Beneš, V. L. "The Slovaks in the Habsburg Empire: A Struggle for Existence," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Berczik, A. "Ferenc Toldy, Begründer der wissentschaftlichen Ungarischen Literaturgeschichte," Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Vol. IV (1961).

Borsodi, S. "Modern Hungarian Historiography," Journal of Modern History, Vol. 24 (1952).

Cushing, G. F. "The Birth of National Literature in Hungary," Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. 38 (1960).

Djordjević, D. "The Serbs as an Integrating and Disintegrating Factor," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Domanovszky, S. "Széchenyi," Századok, Vol. LXXV (1941).

Dubnicky, J. "A szlovák nemzeti ébredés problémái" [The Problems of the Slovak National Awakening], Századok, Vol. XCVII, No. 1 (1963).

Ember, Gy. "Die absolute Monarchie der Habsburger als Hindernis der Ungarischen nationalen Entwicklung," Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Vol. IV, Nos. 1-3 (1955) (Etudes des delegues hongrois au Xe Congres International des Sciences Historique, Rome, 4-11 Sept. 1955).

Eperjessy, G. "A mezővárosi és falusi céhek kialakulása és bomlása az Alföldön és a Dunántúlon" [The Development and Decline of Guilds in Agricultural Towns and Villages on the Great Plain and in the Transdanubian Region], Századok, Vol. XCVII, No. 5 (1963).

Halotík, Ľ. "The Slovaks: An Integrating or Disintegrating Force?" Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Hantsch, H. "Pan-Slavism, Austro-Slavism, Neo-Slavism: The All-Slav Congresses and the Nationality Problem of Austria-Hungary," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. I (1965).

Haraszti, E. H. "Contemporary Hungarian Reaction to the Anti-Corn Law Movement," Acta Historica, VIII, Nos. 3-4 (1961).

Horváth, K. "Széchenyi és a magyar romantika" [Széchenyi and Magyar Romanticism], Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LXV, No. 1 (1961).

Hudeczek, K. "Österreichische Handelspolitik im Vormärz 1815-1848," Studien zur Sozial-, Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungsgeschichte, Vol. XI (1918).

Iványi, B. G. "From Feudalism to Capitalism: The Economic Background to Széchenyi's Reform in Hungary," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol. XX, No. 3 (1960).

Jellavich, Ch. "The Austrian Problem in the Habsburg Empire in the Nineteenth Century," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Király, B. K. "Peasant Movements in Hungary in 1790," Südost-Forschungen, Vol. XXVI (1967).

Kohn, H. "Reflections on Austrian History," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. I (1965).

Kornis, Gy. "Az 1825-27-ik évi országgyülés és a magyar közoktatásügy" [The 1825-27 Diet and Magyar Public Education], Magyar Pedagógia, Vol. XXXIV (1925).

Kovács, Gy. "A klasszicizmus árnyékában s a romantika előtt" [In the Shadow of Classicism and before

Romanticism], Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LXIX, No. 6 (1965).

Krizman, B. "The Croatians in the Habsburg Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Krones, F. "Freiherr Anton von Baldacci über die inneren Zustände Österreichs. Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1816," Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte, Vol. LXXIV (1889).

Kunszery, Gy. "Das Bild des Ungartums in der Deutschen Romantik," Acta Litteraria Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Vol. VI, Nos. 3-4 (1964).

Lékai, L. J. "Historiography in Hungary, 1790-1848," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol. XIV, No. 1 (1954).

A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Bizottsága és a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történettudományi Intézete, "Széchenyi István--Halálának századik évfordulójára" [Stephen Széchenyi--on the 100th Anniversary of his Death], Századok, Vol. XCIV, No. 1 (1960).

Mályus, E. Császár. "Polgári-forradalmi eszmék és az első magyar szintársulat műsora" [Bourgeois-revolutionary Ideals and the Programme of the First Magyar Theatrical Company], Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LX, No. 2 (1956).

Mérei, Gy. "A magyar céhrendszer 1848 előtt" [The Magyar Guild System befcre 1848], Századok, Vol. LXXXII (1948).

Mérei, Gy. "Mezőgazdasági árútermelés és a parasztság helyzete Magyarországon a feudalizmus válságának elmélyülése idején" [Agricultural Production and the Position of the Peasantry in Hungary during the Time of the Deepening Feudal Crisis], Századok, Vol. XC (1956).

Meszlényi, A. "A magyar katolikus hierarchia reform-törekvései a reformkorszakban" [The Reform Strivings of the Magyar Catholic Hierarchy during the Reform Era], Vigilia, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4 (1968).

Molnár, E. "A magyar történetírás fejlődése az elmúlt évtizedben" [The Development of Magyar History Writing in the Past Decade], Századok, Vol. XCIV, No. 1 (1960).

Molnár, E. "A magyar történetírás tíz esztendeje" [Ten Years of Magyar History Writing], Századok, Vol. LXXXIX, No. 2 (1955).

Murko, M. "Hundert Jahre der'Slavischen Wechselseitigkeit' Ján Kollárs," Slavische Rundschau, Vol. IX (1937).

Otetea, A. "The Roumanians and the Disintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Pál, S. S. "Az agrárkérdés 1848 előtt" [The Agrarian Question before 1848], Társadalmi Szemle, Vol. III, No. 1 (1948).

Sándor, P. "Újabb adatok a paraszti földbirtoklás kérdéséhez a XIX. század első felében" [New Facts Concerning Peasant Land Tenure Problems during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1961).

Seton-Watson, R. W. "Era of Reform in Hungary," American Slavonic Review, Vol. XXI (November 1943).

Seton-Watson, R. W. "Metternich and Internal Austrian Policy," Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. XVII (1939).

Spira, Gy. "Egy pillantás a Hitel írójának hitelviszonyaira" [A Glimpse into the Credit Relationships of the Author of Hitel], Társadalmi Szemle, Vol. VI, Nos. 3-4 (1951).

Spira, Gy. "A magyar negyvennyolc jobb megértését keresve" [Looking for a Better Understanding of 1848], Kritika, Vol. V, No. 2 (1967).

Spira, Gy. "Széchenyi's Tragic Course," Nouvelles études .... Budapest, 1965.

Spira, Gy. "Széchenyi tragikus útja" [Széchenyi's Tragic Course], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. VII, Nos. 3-4 (1964).

Sugar, P. F. "The Influence of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution in Eighteenth-Century Hungary," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol. XVII, No. 4 (1958).

Sugar, P. F. "The Nature of the Non-Germanic Societies under Habsburg Rule," Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. XXII (1944).

Szauder, J. "A magyar romantika kezdeteiről" [About the Beginnings of Magyar Romanticism], Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LXV, No. 6 (1961).

Szűcs, J. "A magyar szellemtörténet nemzet-koncepciójának tipológiájához" [Concerning the Typology of the Nation-Concept of Magyar Intellectual History], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. IX, Nos. 3-4 (1966).

Teleki, P. "Die weltpolitische und weltwirtschaftliche Lage Ungarns im Vergangenheit und Gegenwart," Zeitschrift für Geopolitik, Vol. III, No. 6 (1926).

Tóth, D. "Irodalmi kritikánk néhány kérdése" [A Few Questions Concerning our Literary Criticism], Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, Vol. LXII (1958).

Tóth, I. Z. "A soknemzetiségü állam néhány kérdéséről az 1848 előtti Magyarországon" [Several Questions Concerning the Multinational State in pre-1848 Hungary], M.T.A. Társadalmi-Történeti Tudományok Osztályának Közleményei, Vol. VII, No. 4 (1956).

Ungár, L. "A magyar nemesi birtok eladósodása 1848 előtt" [The Encumbered Noble Estates before 1848], Századok, Vol. LXIX, No. 1 (1935).

Ungár, L. "A polgári osztály kialakulásáról" [About the Development of the Bourgeoisie], Századok, Vol. LXXVI (1942).

Varga, J. "A nemzeti nyelv szerepe a polgári fejlődésben Magyarországon" [The Role of the National Tongue in the Development of the Bourgeoisie], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. IV, No. 3 (1961).

Varga, J. "A telektulajdon a feudalizmus utolsó századaiban" [The Ownership of Land in the Last Centuries of Feudalism], Történelmi Szemle, Vol. VII, No. 2 (1964).

Vučinich, W. S. "The Serbs in Austria-Hungary," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).

Wagner, F. S. "Széchenyi and the Nationality Problem in the Habsburg Empire," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol. XX, No. 3 (1960).

Wertheimer, E. "Erzherzog Reiners Reise durch Ungarn (1810), Nach dessen ungedrucktem Tagebuch," Ungarische Revue, Vol. XIV, Nos. 1-2 (1894).

Wertheimer, E. "József Nádor eszméi Magyarország és Austria regenerálásáról 1810-ben" [The Palatine

Joseph's Ideas Concerning the Regeneration of Hungary and Austria in 1810], Budapesti Szemle, Vol. XXVI, No. 52 (1881).

Zwitter, F. "The Slovenes and the Habsburg Monarchy," Austrian History Yearbook, Vol. III (1967).