

Media and Literature
in Multilingual Hungary
1770–1820

Edited by
ÁGNES DÓBÉK, GÁBOR MÉSZÁROS
and GÁBOR VADERNA

reciti
Budapest
2019

Reciti Conference Books · 3

Edited by
ZSUZSA TÖRÖK

Supported by the “Lendület” (“Momentum”) program
of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
“Literary Culture in Western Hungary, 1770–1820” Research Group



Proofreaders: Bernhard Heiller, Thomas Edward Hunter, Andrew C. Rouse



This book is licenced under the terms of the Creative Commons License Attribution–NonCommercial–ShareAlike 2.5 Hungary (CC BY-NC-SA 2.5 HU), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/hu/deed.en>).

Visit our website for free download: <http://reciti.hu>

HU ISSN 2630-953X
ISBN 978-615-5478-70-3

Published by Reciti,
Institute for Literary Studies of the Research Centre for the Humanities,
Hungarian Academy of Sciences
1118–Budapest, Ménesi út 11–13, Hungary
Publisher: Gábor Kecskeméti, Director of HAS RCH Institute for Literary
Studies
Graphic design, layout: Zsuzsa Szilágyi N.
Printing Press: Kódex Könyvgyártó Kft.

Contents

Gábor VADERNA Language, Media and Politics in the Hungarian Kingdom between 1770 and 1820	9
István FRIED Mehrsprachigkeit in den ersten Jahrzehnten der ungarischen Zeit- schriftenliteratur	17
Suzana COHA History of Journalism in the Croatian Lands from the Beginnings until the Croatian National Revival	41
Eva KOWALSKÁ Die erste slowakische Zeitung <i>Presspúrské nowiny</i> zwischen Journalis- mus und Patriotismus	55
Andrea SEIDLER Höfische Berichterstattung in der <i>Preßburger Zeitung</i> Reflexionen über die mediale Präsenz des Kaiserpaares Franz I. Stephan und Maria Theresias in den frühen Jahren des Periodikums	69
Réka LENGYEL The Newspaper as a Medium for Developing National Language, Literature, and Science Mátyás Rát and the <i>Magyar Hírmondó</i> between 1780 and 1782	87

Annamária BIRÓ Siebenbürgische Präsenz in der Presse Westungarns Die Korrespondenten Johann Seivert und József Benkő	101
Gábor VADERNA Möglichkeiten der Urbanität in der ungarischen Zeitschrift <i>Mindenes Gyűjtemény</i>	123
Rumen István CSÖRSZ The Literary Program of István Sándor and the Periodical <i>Sokféle</i> (1791–1808)	143
Olga GRANASZTÓI The Paper <i>Hazai Tudósítások</i> and the Beginnings of the Cult of Monuments Through the Lens of Ferenc Kazinczy's Articles (1806–1808)	155
Béla HEGEDÜS Literary History as an Argument for the Existence of Literature Miklós Révai's Call in <i>Magyar Hírmondó</i> and <i>Költeményes</i> <i>Magyar Gyűjtemény</i>	165
Margit KISS <i>Magyar Hírmondó</i> and Dictionary Proposals	181
András DÖBÖR Sándor Szacs vay's Underworld Dialogues as Political Publicisms in the 1789 Year of the Enlightenment-Era Newspaper <i>Magyar Kurír</i>	193
Piroska BALOGH Johann Ludwig Schedius's <i>Literärischer Anzeiger</i> and the Tradition of Critical Journalism in the Kingdom of Hungary around 1800	207
Norbert BÉRES „Roman und was besser ist, als Roman“ Über die Vertriebsstrategien des Romans	221

Katalin CZIBULA Der Beginn der Theaterkritik in der deutsch- und ungarischsprachigen Presse in Westungarn	233
Ágnes DÓBÉK Reports on European Publishing Culture in the Journals of Western Hungary	243
Zsófia BÁRÁNY Catholic and Protestant Union-Plans in the Kingdom of Hungary between 1817 and 1841 The Golden Age of “Public Opinion” and the Memory of the Reformation in Veszprém County	251
Index	269

Magyar Hírmondó and Dictionary Proposals*

Everything is unfinished: Our lexicon is narrow, poor; our grammar is churning, incomplete; our style is tight, awkward.¹

It is not only Ferenc Kazinczy's oft-quoted famous sentence from 1793 which signals that our contemporary grammar and dictionary was poor and narrow, but as the dictionary plans of Miklós Révai, Ferenc Verseghy, Antal Böjthy, Pál Makó, József Teleki, Sámuel Gyarmathi and others were published, we can also see a demand for the rebirth of Hungarian dictionary writing in the news reports of contemporary periodicals (*Magyar Museum [Hungarian Museum]*, *Sokféle [Variety]*, *Magyar Hírmondó [Hungarian Herald]*, etc.). In my study I will provide an overview of the main steps in the series of changes that took place in the dictionary literature at the end of the eighteenth century, in the light of the contemporary press.

Expectations concerning Hungarian dictionaries had already started to change by the early part of the century.² The Latin-Hungarian root dictionary

* The author is a senior research fellow in the Institute for Literary Studies of the Research Centre for Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The research was supported by the Lendület (Momentum) Research Group 'Literature in Western Hungary, 1770–1820' financed by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

1 KAZINCZY Ferencz, *Levelezése [Correspondence]*, ed. VÁCZY János, Vol. II (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1891), 301.

2 GÁLDI László, *A magyar szótárírodalom a felvilágosodás korában és a reformkorban [Hungarian Dictionaries at the Age of Enlightenment]* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1957), 6–7.

of Cellarius, revised by Mátyás Bél (1719), testifies to this.³ A forward-thinking work compared to its precedents is the first revised version of Franz Wagner's *Phraseologia* by István Vargyas,⁴ in which we can find quotations from classics as well as snappy Hungarian-language interpretations; but we can also see signs of change in Mihály Adámi's Hungarian-German dictionary,⁵ which was prepared for Germans learning Hungarian. In the eighteenth century the Pápai Páriz *Dictionarium*,⁶ which had had several editions by that time, was increasingly less able to adjust to the expectations of the time. Liberating the Hungarian lexicon from the shackles of Latin language instruction and lexicography could not be delayed any longer, and with that updating the stock of Hungarian words covered by dictionaries was also added to the agenda. Moving beyond the preparation of multilingual dictionaries that primarily aided language learning through the demand for preparing general monolingual dictionaries and specialized dictionaries, thinking about and caring for the mother tongue became the centre of attention. These monolingual dictionaries, beyond processing the language of writers and poets, also aimed to process the different registers of living and technical languages, as well as those of professional and scientific language use. This changing process was fuelled and strengthened by similar European (French, German, Italian, etc.) ambitions existing at the same time. Along with proposals for academies, ideas for preparing national dictionaries also came to Hungary from other countries of Europe. For example, it was in the same year, 1793 when Ferenc Balassa proposed the Akademie der Nationalsprachen, planned for Buda, which also wished to edit a Hungarian dictionary to be prepared following the example of the Petersburg dictionary of the academy; when Ferenc Verseghy's *Proludium*⁷ appeared; when work began on the Portuguese academic dictionary; or when the exposition *Egy magyar szótárnak készítésére intéző vélemények* [*Opinions Concerning the Preparation of a Hungarian Dictionary*]⁸ by Pál Makó

3 CELLARIUS Christoporus, *Latinitatis probatae et exercitae Liber memorialis* (Nori[n]bergae: Sump-tibus Petri Conradi Monath, 1719).

4 VARGYAS István, *Phraseologia Wagneriana hungarico idiomate locupletata* (Tyrnaviae: Typis Acad. Soc. Jesu, 1750).

5 ADÁMI Mihály, *Ausführliche und neuerläuterte ungarische Sprachkunst* (Wien: Ged. B. J. J. Jahn, 1763).

6 PÁPAI PÁRIZ Ferenc and BOD Péter, *Dictionarium Latino–Hungaricum et Hungarico–Latino–Germanicum* (Szeben: Sárdi Typ, 1767) (The work was also published later: 1762, 1767, 1782, 1801).

7 VERSEGHY Ferenc, *Proludium in institutiones linguae hungaricae*, (Pest: Typis et expensis Trattnerianis, 1793)

8 MAKÓ Pál, "Egy magyar szótárnak készítésére intéző vélemények" ["Opinions Concerning the Preparation of a Hungarian Dictionary"], *Magyar Hirmondó* 1 (1793): 539.

was published in the *Toldalék [Appendix]* of *Magyar Hírmondó*, which later also influenced the dictionary concept of Ferenc Kresznerics.⁹

At the time György Bessenyei's academy proposal was developed in 1781, and also possibly not independent of it, book dealers Johann Michael Weingand and Georg Köpff from Pest announced a call for subscription in *Magyar Hírmondó* for a Latin-Hungarian-German dictionary, which they attached to some issues of the 1781 *Magyar Hírmondó*.¹⁰ The author of the above-mentioned report, possibly linked to Bessenyei according to László Gáldi, besides describing the structure of the planned dictionary also reports that the entire Hungarian scientific community is looking forward to the publication of the new Hungarian dictionary. From the plan that can be deduced from the call it is clear that at this time they planned for the Latin material to be more extensive and for its entry structure to be more sophisticated in comparison to the Hungarian and German parts. After the description of the grammatical apparatus of the German headwords, however, it is also clear from the section on the Hungarian material that according to the changed needs of the time, beside interpreting the words according to their meanings, the author voted for language reform by adding new words.

the last part is the Hungarian Glossary. Such a compilation in our nation's people's own language has not as yet been made. In this, on the one hand, every word has its different meanings, explanations and linguistic characteristics listed, but it also has many thousands of new words, which for some part have not yet been recorded in Hungarian glossaries.¹¹

At the time of the subscription, in 1781, as editor of *Magyar Hírmondó* Mátyás Rát mentions a Hungarian, German, and Latin Dictionary (Lexicon), i.e. a Glossary. He is also looking forward to the part that incorporates the Hungarian lexicon in the dictionary, although this report was probably not yet referring to his own planned work. "What the Dictionary should be like, we will see later. I hope that the Hungarian in it will always be clearly expressed!"¹²

Our contemporary publicists' interest in a Hungarian dictionary catering for new, changed demands is also obvious as it was they who would have most needed

9 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom...*, 7–11.

10 National Széchényi Library, Hírlaptár [Media and Press Collection], nr. 31.409/1

11 National Széchényi Library, Hírlaptár, nr. 31.409/4

12 RÁT Mátyás, "Tudománybéli dolgok" ["Scientific Matters"], *Magyar Hírmondó* 2 (1781): 245.

a philological-linguistic tool which they could have used when creating their texts, to help them with the linguistic difficulties of wording the current, daily news material. Even the *zotár* [*szótár*] equivalent of a dictionarium or lexicon, already part of the dictionary in 1767, was unearthed by Rát in the 1781 year of *Magyar Hírmondó* from the Péter Bod revision of dictionary of Ferenc Pápai Páriz, at the suggestion of József Benkő. We also have to add that according to contemporary thinking, the concepts of the encyclopaedia and the dictionary constituted a united whole – certainly so for Rát.¹³ “I did not invent the Dictionary myself, but my lord József Benkő reminded me that Pápai Páriz had named the Lexicon in Hungarian in this way: because his *Zótár* surely means Dictionary.”¹⁴ There are few traces of Rát’s ideas concerning his own planned multilingual dictionary, we can learn the most from his report published in Hungarian, Latin, and German, about which the *Magyar Músa* [*Hungarian Muse*] in Vienna also reported in Hungarian in 1787.¹⁵ From this it appears that Rát rejected Johann Christoph Gottsched’s and Friedrich von Adelung’s ideas, i.e. the rigid limitations disregarding the historical development of the words of a language and the spoken vernacular, as did Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Rát followed quite modern principles in his neologisms, also supported by Kazinczy, but Gedeon Ráday opposed him by representing Adelung’s purism.¹⁶ His plan did not gain the necessary support for several reasons. With his proposed dictionary his main aim was, as we will later also see with Sámuel Decsy, to aid the language learning of those who speak different languages due to linguistic diversity in the Hungarian Kingdom. However, for learning a foreign language he thought it indispensable to develop the mother tongue. To this end, he thought it important to explain the meaning of unusual words and idioms, to determine the root and etymology of words, to list irregular forms, and he also talked about the differences between speech and written language. As regards their function, he was already distinguishing between multilingual dictionaries that supported language learning and monolingual dictionaries prepared for native speakers. In this report he also refers to the news report he had written in German, which goes beyond being a translation of the Hungarian text. The implications of this German version were later analysed by the media histo-

13 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom*, 10–11.

14 RÁT Máttyás, “Egyéb hazánkbéli dolgok” [“Other Matters in Our Land”], *Magyar Hírmondó* 2 (1781): 326.

15 KÓKAY György, “Rát Máttyás röpirata II. József ellen, a magyar nyelv érdekében” [“Pamphlet Against Joseph II and in the Interest of the Hungarian Language by Máttyás Rát”], *Magyar Könyvszemle* 82 (1966): 305–316.

16 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom*, 8, 33.

rian György Kókay:¹⁷ Rát sent the report to August Schlözer in Göttingen, who published it in year 1778 of the periodical *Stats-Anzeigen*, under the title *Ueber die Ausrottung der Ungarischen Sprache*. The German version can essentially be interpreted as a pamphlet condemning the Germanization efforts of Joseph II, under the guise of a report on dictionary publication. Its reception abroad and his influence on Johann Gottfried Herder is quite substantial, but in order to keep within the confines of our topic I will rather provide a few words about its Hungarian relevance. Kazinczy and János Batsányi highly appreciated the significance of Rát's pamphlet: Batsányi refers to him in the 1787 issue of *Magyar Musa* in his paper *A fordításról* [*About Translation*], when he describes the difficulties of translating different languages, and elsewhere.

This does not oppose the opinion of Mr Mátyás Rát about the German language at all, who considers that one to be the most difficult of all the languages he knows; [...] – see his German Report on the German-Hungarian-Latin Dictionary, from which you can also judge the nature of the work that needs to be prepared.¹⁸

The report also reached György Aranka. The main aim of the Transylvanian Society for the Cultivation of the Hungarian Language, language cultivation, was based on preparing a Hungarian grammar and a dictionary, and they were hoping to get the dictionary from Rát. “As far as the dictionary is concerned, in this matter let Mátyás RÁT be found so that what he has written he should share with the Society.”¹⁹ Although Rát could not carry out his plan, his pamphlet disguised as the *Report* on the dictionary had met with a lively response both in Hungary and abroad. Kókay summarizes its significance like this:

RÁT, with his pamphlet making a statement against eradicating the Hungarian language, preceded *Magyar Museum, Mindenés Gyűjtemény* [*Miscellaneous Collection*], and the work of [Sándor] BÁRÓCZI, DECSY, and ARANKA. He preceded them and also prepared the way for them, as by launching *Magyar Hírmondó* he also gave great impetus to the development of our linguistic and literary movements. From the point of view of his own life, however, this small work became a tragic milestone.²⁰

17 KÓKAY György, “Rát Mátyás röpirata”, 305–316.

18 BATSÁNYI János, “A fordításról” [“On Translation”], *Magyar Músa* (1787), downloaded: March 1, 2019, http://deba.unideb.hu/deba/magyar_museum/index.php?xf=mm_1_1_5_o.

19 JANCSÓ Elemér, *Az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság iratai* [*Documents of the Transylvanian Society of Neology*] (Bukarest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1955), 168.

20 KÓKAY, “Rát Mátyás röpirata...”, 312.

As István Síkos summarizes the significance of this tragic milestone in *Hazai és Külföldi Tudósítások* [*Domestic and Foreign Intelligence*] in 1810, in his obituary about Rát: his *Report* on the Hungarian-German-Latin dictionary “interesting and insulting some, did not attain its goal, since the preoccupation with insignificant things and the lawsuit was greater than enthusiasm concerning the main issue.”²¹

Although the planned multilingual dictionaries also carry signs of forward-thinking changes in their treatment of the Hungarian linguistic material, the next significant milestone is the *Magyar Museum*, published in Košice [Kassa] in 1788, which in its foreword is the first to sketch the need for a complete Hungarian dictionary. It formulates an intent to normalize, introduces the idea of linguistic standardization, deems the Pápai Páriz dictionary inadequate, and aims to curb the proliferation of foreign words and the excesses of neologistic word coinages and thus shows the way in this process.

BUT before all else it would be necessary that the Society should develop such a *Language-book* in which we could find all Hungarian words and their use; so that the clarity of the Language could be judged by it. There are many Hungarian words around anywhere in our Country which already cannot be understood in the neighbouring Counties; and which we often cannot use in writing only because they are either unknown or at least unclear in meaning. How many countless words do we have that cannot be found in Páriz-Pápai? – From the lack of such a common Language-Book it follows that in our writings we either pile up many foreign words, or if we want to express our thoughts entirely in Hungarian, we create new words, and we deface the easy, natural flow of our language with the many *-delem -dalom -vány -mány* endings, and many such unsightly long words.²²

Almost at the same time, Demeter Görög and Sámuel Kerekes were editing the 25 September, 1789 issue of the periodical *Hadi és Más Nevezetes Történetek* [*Military and Other Famous Stories*], in which the editors published a call for enriching the sciences in the national language and encourage the creation of a grammar and a dictionary:

what a *Hungarian Grammar* to be prepared thoroughly would be more like, than a rich *Dictionary* [...], through which we could prepare our Language, just like the

21 SÍKOS István, “Tudósítás” [“Report”], *Hazai és Külföldi Tudósítások* (1810): October 3, October 5.

22 “Bé-vezetés” [“Introduction”], *Magyar Museum* (1788): 1.

Russian language was prepared from the time of Emperor Peter I, as a language which can be used appropriately not only to speak but also to write and teach.²³

Although they also include a methodological compass for the planned grammar, little is said about the dictionary. We do learn that they refer to the Petersburg dictionary as an example to follow, and this is important because contemporary Hungarian dictionary planners were of quite diverse opinion concerning the linguistic material to be covered by the dictionary. The Petersburg dictionary incorporated contemporary conversational language to an influential extent,²⁴ which in the case of Görög and his associates can be interpreted as clearly taking one side. Incidentally, Sámuel Gyarmathi and József Teleki also referred to the Petersburg academic dictionary in their proposals.

In 1792, Dávid Baróti Szabó announced a subscription in *Magyar Museum* for his own dictionary, in which again the need for a perfect, new Hungarian dictionary appears.²⁵ Baróti Szabó himself also started to collect rare words on the verge of extinction, with the appropriate explanations. He encourages the countrywide collection of words, which would lower the rate of adoption of foreign words and the creation of new words. The dictionary created in this way would make the work of writers easier; on the other hand, it would also help readers interpret texts written in Hungarian. The message of Verseggy's proposal also ties in with this, and through Verseggy Kresznerics's idea that contemporary works were inadequate due to their linguistic quality, and he only recommended their inclusion in dictionaries within certain limits.²⁶

Two things are setting back the enrichment of our mother tongue the most for those of other nationalities who would happily wish to learn it. The first: that we do not have a well-prepared Hungarian Grammar. The second: that we lack a perfect Dictionary. About the Dictionary what else can we say but that Pápai Páriz is not sufficient (which its everyday use also makes us profess). If all the words were to be collected and published, how thankful the whole Nation would be! what abundance our mother tongue would gain! what ease both writers would experience in preparing their works and Readers in understanding them! Then none of us would need to borrow from other Nations, or to fabricate words to our own liking for

23 *Hadi és Más Nevezetes Történetek* (1789): September 25, 284.

24 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom*, XV.

25 *Ibid.*, 9.

26 *Ibid.*, 379–409.

ourselves; but we would see ourselves rich enough through the heritage that we inherited from our old fathers, which had almost been buried due to carelessness. This could also include those many words which Hungarian craftsmen etc. usually call the tools of their trade. Merely these names alone that are unknown to others could be so useful to begin with!²⁷

One year later, in 1793, Pál Makó published his piece under the title *Egy magyar szótárnak készítésére intéző vélemények [Opinions Concerning the Preparation of a Hungarian Dictionary]* in *Magyar Hírmondó*.²⁸ He takes up Révai's concept: the goal is to present as wide a circle of lexical items as possible, rather than selection and regulation.²⁹ He aims to present as much as possible of the lexicon by reviving old words, adding dialectal words and neologisms, instead of the principle of selection and normative regulation. Makó makes it clear that the dictionary plays a central role in cultivating the language and points out that a dictionary is related to all areas of life. In his proposal he is thinking in terms of a complete dictionary, without which scientific work and poetic expression is empty, shallow, and wording is obscure and weak. Albert Szenci Molnár and Ferenc Pápai Páriz had started this work, but Makó also points out the weaknesses of his predecessors: many basic words are missing, and the dialect vocabulary of those living in various parts of the country also needs to be processed. He would also add the work of contemporary and earlier literary writers (e.g. the works of Péter Pázmány, György Káldi, István Gyöngyösi, Péter Beniczky, Ferenc Faludi, Dávid Baróti Szabó). He also recommends vernacular and dialectal forms, words of trade, and phraseological expressions (the last of which is considered to have been innovative). In order to extend the vocabulary, he recommends the development of Hungarian-style derivatives, and he follows rigid, consistent and rationalistic principles in the use of affixes. He would include archaic words in moderation, he would showcase synonyms, he does not reject forms coming from foreign languages, he cautions moderation in adding new words, and he is more accepting towards scientific terminology. He distinguishes among suffixes based on the action and the result of the action, e.g. *tojás, tojomány* (Révai mentions in a letter the same forms as examples when taking issue with the nomen actionis, actum differentiation), and Makó is also consistent in establishing a

27 BARÓTI Szabó Dávid, "Tudósítás és kérés" ["Report and Request"], *Magyar Museum* (1791): 6. quarter, downloaded: March 1, 2019, http://deba.unideb.hu/deba/magyar_museum/mellekletek.php?f=borito_6.

28 MAKÓ, "Egy magyar szótárnak készítésére intéző vélemények", 539.

29 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótáriródalom...*, 124–129.

relationship between sound and meaning. Similarly to Bessenyei and Verseggy, he would entrust work on the dictionary to a working group. He designates Pest as its centre, and he would tie the task to the Hungarian Society of Pest. His importance is undoubted in that he plans a monolingual dictionary which already takes living language as its basis, recognizing the changed needs of the time. In its preparation he is thinking in terms of collective work, which had already appeared with Verseggy, and he would place this work in Pest. He plans a root dictionary, the implementation of which will be the task of Ferenc Kresznerics.

From the research of Péter Tóth, who analyzed volumes VI and VII of *Analecta Philologica*, it appears that between 1804 and 1808 Kresznerics familiarized himself with several grammatical works, among them *A' Magyar Nyelv elé mozdításáról buzgó esdeklései G. Teleki Lászlónak* [*Count László Teleki's Fervent Entreaty for the Promotion of the Hungarian Language*];³⁰ but he also made a copy of the work of József Fábchich, *Kengyel futó, avagy Magyar Kálepinus példája* [*Running Footman, or the Example of the Hungarian Calepino*].³¹ In 1806, Kresznerics also took notes in Vienna of Pál Makó's dictionary proposal that had been published in the above-mentioned 1793 *Magyar Hírmondó*.³² This work may also have been an important milestone in his later dictionary-making activities. We know that he put together glossaries from János Apáczai Csere's encyclopedia, from the works of Péter Pázmány, András Dugonics, Mihály Csokonai Vitéz and Ferenc Verseggy. Since dictionary-making exceeds one person's capacity, the majority of contemporary dictionary proposals unfortunately remain unfinished. Kresznerics was lucky, for he lived to see the first edition of his dictionary in 1831.

In 1833, István Horvát published a review in *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* [*Scientific Collection*] of the finished dictionary of Kresznerics, *Egy tekéletes magyar Szótár legnagyobb héánya a' magyar Literatúrának!* [*A Perfect Hungarian Dictionary is the Biggest Deficiency in Hungarian Literature!*], in which he also names as its predecessors the work of the above-mentioned Rát, Makó, as well as György Kalmár, József Márton and József Teleki.³³ Horvát reviews and evaluates

30 TELEKI László, *A' Magyar Nyelv elé mozdításáról buzgó esdeklései* [*Count László Teleki's Fervent Beggling Toward the Promotion of the Hungarian Language*] (Pest: Trattner, 1806).

31 TÓTH Péter, "Kresznerics Ferenc (1766–1832)", in *Szombathelyi Tudós Tanárok*, ed. KÖBÖLKUTI Katalin, 39–75 (Szombathely: Berzsenyi Dániel Megyei Könyvtár – Szombathely Megyei Jogú Város Önkormányzata, 1998), 55.

32 MAKÓ, "Egy magyar szótárnak készítésére intéző vélemények", 539.

33 HORVÁT István, "Könyvvizsgálat" ["Book Review"], *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* No. 5 (1833): 110–119.

the contemporary ambitions to write dictionaries, and he also places the Kresznerics dictionary in this context and process. In his analysis of the domestic situation he particularly emphasizes the influential role *Magyar Hírmondó* played in the flow of dictionary ambitions, but he regrets that beyond the competition answers clarifying theoretical questions there were no competitions for collecting old written materials. His review can also be interpreted as a programmatic text, from which his own concept concerning the complete Hungarian dictionary can also be deduced. He emphasizes two basic functions for the dictionary. The first is the role that shows connections: through the data of the dictionary it is for example possible to define the nature and rules of the language, and to acquaint oneself with the historical processes of a language from the etymology of words. The second function is in connection with the norm-generating role of the dictionary. He clearly argues in favour of the regulation of language against the excesses of neologists and others. On the road towards the planned complete dictionary he considers the work of Kresznerics an important step. He emphasizes its values and sheds light on its shortcomings from this point of view. Horvát acknowledges that Kresznerics has completed an enormous piece of the work on his own, but he also adds that the preparation of the complete dictionary will not be the work of one person. He appreciates that in his sources Kresznerics went back to the time of charters, because it was indispensable that one uncovered the historical nature of language. At the same time, Horvát also emphasizes the role of philological reliability regarding the source material, as well as the avoidance of the use of copies. Unfortunately, due to his death Kresznerics could not share the sources of all his historical materials, and the publisher did not do so either. Horvát believes that when processing textual sources the complete dictionary should rely on an even larger, more comprehensive corpus. Although he acknowledges the advantages of the root dictionary regarding word family creations, he still sees the future in what we consider etymology today, which sheds light on the actual foreign language sources of the words. The Kresznerics type of dictionary does not touch upon the comparison of the Hungarian language with foreign words to uncover Greek, Latin, German origins. Horvát recommends Adelung's dictionary as an example in this respect. He touches upon the level of elaboration of the entries' grammatical apparatus: since Kresznerics often disregarded analogies and made many mistakes regarding endings, he believes he did not reach Révai's level and also barely touched upon syntax. At the same time, in phraseology his collection of proverbs constitutes such an added value that Horvát would print it on its own as well. Here we can refer back to the proposal of Makó, who was a pioneer in incorporating phraseology

in his dictionary. Although Kresznerics includes the words of contemporary authors (Ferenc Faludi, Kelemen Mikes, etc.), he is cautious in terms of adding new words. Horvát considers Kresznerics, who keeps innovations within reasonable limits, as an example to follow for the makers of the complete dictionary. “But beside all this, the merits of Kresznerics are great, many, and eternal.”³⁴

The clear guidance of contemporary dictionary initiatives to cultivate and regulate the Hungarian language, which is clear from the declarations that are partly independent from each other, can be seen as a common goal even if the road towards that goal was seen to be taking different paths. Kresznerics has an everlasting role in that after proposals and concepts were published one after the other without being carried out, he represents a step forward in that he actually completed his dictionary. The Ferenc Verseghy, Ödön Simai, Sámuel Gyarmathi era made a significant step forward in the period’s dictionary literature through the new need for establishing a clean Hungarian vernacular.³⁵ Kresznerics took much inspiration from Verseghy’s system, the terminological matches also testifying to that. That he did not include the vocabulary of contemporary Hungarian literature with even greater accuracy might also be the result of Verseghy’s influence, see *Felelet [Answer]*.³⁶ Révai, following his historical approach, dove into the language of old times, but he also included the results of language reform within reason. His approach was influenced by Herder (language is not of divine origin but the free play of sound-producing organs), and by Adelung (through recognizing the connection between archaic language and vernacular: specifically through numbers, the importance of the vigesimal system survived in the numerals, which was also discovered by Kresznerics, citing Adelung, and in the case of specific word forms he also bases the historical explanations on this).³⁷ His dictionary contains 80,000 words, which is an enormous achievement for his time. His word families are far richer than those of the late nineteenth-century *Nyelvtörténeti Szótár [A Historical Dictionary of Hungarian]* by Gábor Szarvas and Zsigmond Simonyi, where the headword and example materials should have been transferred.³⁸ It is Kresznerics’s innovation that he lists verbs in the third person singular, in contrast with Simai’s first person singular, and he plays a major part in curbing the authority of Pápai Páriz. His data of

34 *Ibid.*, 119.

35 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom...*, 379–409.

36 VERSEGHY Ferenc, *A Filozófiának Talpigazságára épített Felelet [Answer Built on the Principles of Philosophy]* (Buda: A Királyi Magyar Universitásnak Betűivel, 1818).

37 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótárírodalom...*, 385.

38 *Ibid.*, 408.

living language are especially valuable: for instance, he adds the meaning of *füles bagoly* [*long-eared owl*] based on a seventeenth-century nomenclature, but the entry is also completed with a unique interpretation that developed during the time of Joseph II, meaning 'a person who is eavesdropping'. Later dictionaries of dialect also did not include such spoken vernacular expressions, mainly from Transdanubia, as *könyökös mester* [*elbowing master*] 'one who does not sing, does not have an organ, and sings with his elbow on the pew' or *gombolyító kecske* [*balling goat*] 'a three-legged chair on which they ball a yarn'.³⁹ As Gáldi sums up:

Hungarian linguistics is forever indebted to György Zádor and his friends by their making this very rich, although somewhat difficult-to-handle data repository accessible, which we have to access so frequently, since it has not been made redundant by CzF⁴⁰ or NySZ⁴¹ either.⁴²

Following Makó's 1793 proposal in *Magyar Hírmondó*, the Kresznerics dictionary reflects and realizes the need to revive old words, to incorporate vernacular and dialectal forms, to include the language of literary texts, and at the same time to limit new forms and rationalise the use of suffixes. It is no longer a question what role the contemporary press played in the eighteenth-century development of dictionaries, but in uncovering the still hidden values of this period, and especially a more thorough examination of the role of Ferenc Kresznerics. In this area the research group 'Literature in Western Hungary, 1770–1820' will have a great deal more work to do in the coming years.

39 Ibid., 404–406.

40 *A magyar nyelv szótára* [*Dictionary of the Hungarian Language*], ed. CZUCZOR Gergely and FOGARASI János (Pest: Emich, 1862–1874).

41 *Magyar Nyelvtörténeti Szótár* [*Diachronic Dictionary of the Hungarian Language*], ed. SZARVAS Gábor and SIMONYI Zsigmond (Budapest: Hornyánszky V., 1890–1893).

42 GÁLDI, *A magyar szótáriróadalom...*, 408.