

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>Mindenek 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 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

## Johann Ludwig Schedius's *Literarischer Anzeiger* and the Tradition of Critical Journalism in the Hungarian Kingdom around 1800\*

The German-written Hungarian journal, *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* was published between 1798 and 1799 as a supplement to *Neuer Kurier aus Ungarn von Kriegs- Staats- und Gelehrten Sachen* (i.e. *Pester Zeitung*). The editor of this short-lived periodical was Johann Ludwig Schedius (1768–1847). *Literarischer Anzeiger* is classified in Hungarian media history as a reproduction of German review journals.<sup>1</sup> The main question of history was formulated as follows by Karola Doromby, Johann Ludwig Schedius's first biographer: "ob eine kritisch-literarische Zeitschrift in der gegenwertigen Lage der Dinge für die wissenschaftliche Cultur unseres Vaterlandes Bedürfnis sey?"<sup>2</sup> In the anthology *Literatur und Kultur im Königreich Ungarn um 1800*, Schedius's preface to his journal was also highlighted because of its strong emphasis on criticism.<sup>3</sup> Evidently, earlier history had interpreted the preface and the articles of *Anzeiger* as an attempt to adopt the genre of critical review into Hungarian journalism. However, this interpretation contradicts the fact that a relatively low number of

\* The author is an associate professor at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest. Her research was supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary, Project No. 119577.

- 1 KÓKAY György, ed., *A magyar sajtó története. I. 1705–1848 [The History of the Hungarian Printed Media, I, 1705–1848]* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1979), 236–237.
- 2 DOROMBY Karola, *Schedius Lajos mint német–magyar kultúrközvetítő [Johann Ludwig Schedius as Mediator Between German and Hungarian Cultures]* (Budapest: Pfeifer, 1933), 47. The analysis of *Anzeiger*: *ibid.*, 47–50.
- 3 Johann Ludwig von SCHEDIUS, "Vorbericht zum Literarischen Anzeiger", in *Literatur und Kultur im Königreich Ungarn um 1800: Im Spiegel deutschsprachiger Prosatexte*, Hrsg. von András BALOGH und László TARNÓI, 20–24 (Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó, 2000).

critical reviews were published in the *Anzeiger*. In this paper I will attempt to resolve that contradiction, and to unfold the complex critical character of the *Anzeiger*.

Schedius<sup>4</sup> was one of the favourite students of the renowned German philosopher and classical philologist, Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812) at Georg August University in Göttingen.<sup>5</sup> Schedius came from a German-speaking Hungarian Lutheran family, and this background was advantageous to him in the political context of eighteenth-century Hungary. He was a professor of aesthetics at the university in Pest between 1792 and 1843, besides writing a monograph and many articles on aesthetics.<sup>6</sup> However, his identity as an aesthetician implied not only studying and teaching aesthetics. For him, aesthetics meant a harmonious and organised endeavour in support of the cultural sphere of human life. His various activities as an editor of journals,<sup>7</sup> a dramatic advisor to the first Hungarian theatre company,<sup>8</sup> a promoter of casinos and other societies,<sup>9</sup> an organiser of primary, secondary and higher education,<sup>10</sup> and a re-

- 4 Monographs on Schedius' life and works: DOROMBY, *Schedius Lajos...*; BALOGH Piroška, *Ars scientiae: Közelítések Schedius Lajos János tudományos pályájának dokumentumaihoz [Ars scientiae: Approaches to the Documents of Johann Ludwig Schedius's Scholarly Career]*, Csokonai könyvtár (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2007). About Schedius's role in the history of the Hungarian aesthetics see: Piroška BALOGH, "Aesthetics at the Royal University of Hungary (1774–1843)", in *Anthropologische Ästhetik in Mitteleuropa 1750–1850: Anthropological Aesthetics in Central Europe 1750–1850*, ed. Piroška BALOGH and Gergely FÓRIZS, Bochumer Quellen und Forschungen zum 18. Jahrhundert 9, 133–152 (Hannover: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2018).
- 5 On the connection between Schedius and Heyne see Piroška BALOGH, "Heyne és Schedius Lajos: A tudományos interakció modellje a göttingeni paradigmában" ["Heyne and Johann Ludwig Schedius: The Model of Scholarly Interaction in the Science Paradigm of Göttingen"], in *Göttingen dimenziói: A göttingeni egyetem szerepe a szaktudományok kialakulásában*, ed. GURKA Dezső, 127–140 (Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 2010).
- 6 Schedius' monograph: *Principia philocaliae seu doctrinae pulchri* (Pest: Hartleben Konrád, 1828); a collection of his writings on aesthetics: *Doctrina pulchri: Schedius Lajos János széptani írásai [Doctrina pulchri: Johann Ludwig Schedius's Essays on Aesthetics]*, ed. and transl. into Hungarian BALOGH Piroška, Csokonai könyvtár: források (Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, 2005).
- 7 Schedius published German-language journals in Pest to popularise aesthetics and criticism: *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1798–1799) and *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern, zur Beförderung der vaterländischen Geschichte, Erdkunde und Literatur* (1802–1804). See Andrea SEIDLER and Wolfram SEIDLER, *Das Zeitschriftenwesen im Donauraum zwischen 1740 und 1809: Kommentierte Bibliographie der deutsch und ungarischsprachigen Zeitschriften in Wien, Preßburg und Pest–Buda* (Wien: Böhlau, 1988), 220, 276.
- 8 See BALOGH, *Ars scientiae...*, 222–237.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 237–261.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 96–164.



searcher and propagator of cultural geography in Hungary<sup>11</sup> indicate that not only did he teach aesthetics, but he also practiced it in everyday life. He was a corresponding member of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences,<sup>12</sup> a full member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and one of the leaders of the Hungarian Evangelical Lutheran Church.<sup>13</sup>

The most appreciated and famous journal edited by Schedius, was *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern* (1802–1804), which we can appreciate for the following reasons: the reviews of local journals<sup>14</sup> and the reports of the Polizeihofstelle show<sup>15</sup> that its volumes passed the borders of the Hungarian Kingdom and also the Habsburg Monarchy, reaching Göttingen and Paris. For example, reading the *Zeitschrift*, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was so inspired that he asked Schedius to send a report about Hungarian culture for Hegel's *Bamberger Zeitung*.<sup>16</sup> That notwithstanding, Hungarian media history has paid only slight attention to Schedius's first journalistic attempt, the *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern*. As György Kókay encapsulated:

Schedius edited a review journal in 1798. It was not published as an independent journal, but as a supplement of the *Neuer Kurier aus Ungarn von Kriegs- Staats- und Gelehrten Sachen* (or *Pester Zeitung*). In 1798 András Haliczky, who was the professor of German literature at the university, the colleague and friend of Johann Ludwig Schedius, took over the editorship of the *Neuer Kurier* started in 1788. Its

- 11 On Schedius' map see PÁSZTI László, "Schedius Lajos és Blaschnek Sámuel Magyarország-térképének kiadásváltozatai" ["Editions of Ludwig Schedius' and Sámuel Blaschnek's Map of the Hungarian Kingdom"], *Geodézia és Kartográfia* 5, Vol. 11 (2002): 12–17. On Schedius' project to give a cultural geography of the Hungarian Kingdom and on his connection with Carl Ritter, who was Humboldt's friend and colleague and the creator of a special theory of cultural geography, see BALOGH, *Ars scientiae...*, 354–361.
- 12 For the announcement of Schedius' membership at the Academy of Göttingen see *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1802, 1910.
- 13 Schedius was one of the authors of a new Lutheran educational system, the so-called *Systema rei scholasticae* in 1806. On the details see BALOGH, *Ars scientiae...*, 96–160.
- 14 See BALOGH, *Ars scientiae...*, 112–117.
- 15 For the letter of a French editor of journal to Schedius see Österreichisches Staatsarchiv / Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv (AT-OeStA/AVA), Inneres Polizeihofstelle, 1813:2951, Schreiben des Berony an Schedius.
- 16 For the letters of European journal editors to Schedius see Fritz VALJAVEC, "Briefe Deutscher Gelehrter und Schriftsteller an Ludwig Schedius", *Jahrbuch des Graf Klebelsberg Kuno Institut für ungarische Geschichtsforschung in Wien* (1933): 258–302, 276–291, 298–302; Klaus WIEWEG, "Az ön érdekes hazája: Hegel levele Schedius Lajoshoz" ["Your Interesting Homeland: Hegel's Letter to Ludwig Schedius"], transl. into Hungarian by Ferenc NYÍZSNYÁNSZKY, *Gond* 11 (1996): 109–113.

supplement appeared on 4 pages every week. Following the model of the German reporting journals, the public was informed about recently published books. The *Anzeiger* did not aim at giving an aesthetic analysis or a detailed review of them instead it popularized literature and science.<sup>17</sup>

When the place of the *Anzeiger* as reporting or review journal is put under scrutiny, two problems may emerge. The first of these is the question of its model, while the second one is about the concept of criticism.

Media history claims that Schedius's journal follows the *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*. However, the titles, column structure and the editorial plans of the two diverge significantly. Only the column of *Vermischte Nachrichten* resembles the most popular column of the German journal, *Intelligenzblatt*. It is important to mention here that Schedius and the editors of *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* were almost certainly associated. In the 1790s, Schedius published some articles about Hungarian plays and other literary pieces in the German journal.<sup>18</sup> In the *Anzeiger* he often referred to the news and information published in the *Literatur-Zeitung*. And vice versa: the *Literatur-Zeitung* published a long and detailed review about the *Anzeiger* in 1800, when the Hungarian journal had already ceased publication.<sup>19</sup> In that very positive review the *Anzeiger* was appreciated as the only medium of Hungarian cultural news relating to Jena („wozu auch Siebenbürgen, Croatien und Slavonien gerechnet werden“).<sup>20</sup> The connection between the two editors proved to be a durable one, as the *Literatur-Zeitung* also reviewed Schedius's next journal, the *Zeitschrift*.<sup>21</sup> In spite of the editorial connection (of which Hungarian media history was ignorant), the lack of structural resemblances incites us to search for other models.

Column headers similar to those in Schedius's *Anzeiger* can be found in the *Historisch-literarisch-bibliographisches Magazin*, edited by Johann Georg Meusel (1743–1820) in Zürich between 1788 and 1794. However, there is no sign of any

17 *A magyar sajtó...*, 236.

18 Johann Ludwig SCHEDIUS, “Ungrische Literatur. Einleitung die künftig zu liefernden Uebersichten”, *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 21 (1798): 162–174; Johann Ludwig SCHEDIUS, “Ungrische Literatur. Zweyte Uebersicht. Literatur der dramatischen Dichtkunst”, *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 140 (1798): 1233–1240.

19 “Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungarn. Jg. 1. 1. halbes Jahr. Pest: Trattner 1798”, *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 205 (1800): 158–160.

20 *Ibid.*, 158.

21 *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* No. 160 (1802): 499–503; No. 71 (1803): 561–565; No. 170 (1803): 614–627; No. 214 (1804): 153–160; No. 215 (1804): 161–164.

contact between the editors; and Schedius never referred to Meusel's journal.<sup>22</sup> This being the case, the most plausible hypothesis is that the main inspiring ancestor of Schedius's *Anzeiger* was the *Allgemeine litterarische Anzeiger oder Annalen der gesamten Litteratur für die geschwinde Bekanntmachung verschiedener Nachrichten aus dem Gebiete der Gelehrsamkeit und Kunst*, published in Leipzig between 1796 and 1800, and edited by Johann Christian Friedrich Roch (1770–1843). The structure and the headings of columns in the two journals correlate almost entirely. Their main title is clearly very similar: *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern – Allgemeine litterarische Anzeiger oder Annalen der gesamten Litteratur für die geschwinde Bekanntmachung verschiedener Nachrichten aus dem Gebiete der Gelehrsamkeit und Kunst*. Roch's journal, as was explicitly stated on numerous occasions within its pages, aimed at reviewing not only those books recently published, but the whole complexity of local cultural life.<sup>23</sup> The plan of Schedius's *Anzeiger* was something similar: to unfold and to reveal the cultural complexity of "Ungern" (i.e. the Hungarian Kingdom). In addition, the successor to the *Anzeiger* in Leipzig, the *Leipziger Literatur Zeitung* referred to Schedius's cultural undertakings (to his next journal, the *Zeitschrift*; to his reform plans on the higher education) 22 times between 1804 and 1827.<sup>24</sup> Close academic connections can be assumed to lie in the background. Probably, Schedius and the classical philologist Johann Christian Gottlieb Ernesti (1707–1781), professor of Leipzig University were in contact with each other;<sup>25</sup> or possibly, to mention another key figure, Wilhelm Traugott Krug (1770–1842), who became the professor of Leipzig University in 1809, referred to Schedius's works in his monographs and lexicons, and vice versa Schedius cited Krug's books too.<sup>26</sup>

22 About Meusel's journal see Christel HESS, *Presse und Publizistik in der Kurpfalz in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main–Bern–New York–Paris: Peter Lang, 1987), 154–155.

23 About the *Allgemeine litterarische Anzeiger* see Peter UFER, *Leipziger Presse 1789 bis 1815: Eine Studie zu Entwicklungstendenzen und Kommunikationsbedingungen des Zeitungs- und Zeitschriftenwesens zwischen Französischer Revolution und den Befreiungskriegen* (Münster–Hamburg–London: LIT, 1999), 118–119, 283–284.

24 *Leipziger Literatur Zeitung* (1807): 2506–2509; (1809): 502; (1809): 507; (1809): 940–941; (1809): 1246; (1809): 1932; (1810): 327–328; (1810): 2001–2002; (1812): 802; (1812): 2059; (1814): 2003; (1815): 1652; (1817): 1018–1019; (1822): 2306; (1827): 689–690; *Intelligenzblatt der Leipziger Literatur Zeitung* (1804): 646; (1805): 53; (1805): 116; (1805): 199; (1809): 368; (1809): 575; (1810): 203.

25 Friedrich August ECKSTEIN, "Ernesti, Johann Christian Gottlieb", *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 6 (1877): 242–243; <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116556811.html#adbcontent>, downloaded: 09.03.2019.

26 On the connection between Krug and Schedius see BALOGH, *Aesthetics...*, 150–151.

The second problem that emerged when analysing the *Anzeiger* was to define the meaning of its “criticism”. Schedius emphasises in the preface of the journal that the *Anzeiger* will be a critical-literary (kritisch-literarische) journal, and its criticism covers three dimensions.<sup>27</sup> The first of these is the virtual dimension of the Empire of Knowledge (“das Reich des Wissens”). With regard to that, criticism is the best instrument to extend the virtual territory of the Empire of Knowledge. Criticism marks the way leading to Verity (“die Aufnahme der Wahrheit”). The second dimension is national cultural expansion (“Reichthum oder Mangel einer Nation an gelehrten Produkten”). Here, the criticism is a method of self-recognition, a method by which one can easily determine at what stage of universal cultural evolution the national culture stands. This method of criticism is an appropriate way to appoint what is to be done to raise national culture. Ultimately, criticism forms the past for the future. By means of criticism, an encyclopaedic repository or an archive of knowledge (“ein Archiv der Gelehrsamkeit für die Nachwelt”) can be built. It will determine the historical conscience of posterity, and it will create a national cultural narrative. The third dimension is about the artists’ or writers’ virtual community. In that community, criticism becomes the main instrument of self-recognition as well as self-education. Criticism unfolds the errors and virtues of every cultural product, which could be a novel, a botanical collection, a theatre or an educational institute. However, criticism not only qualifies these products, but formulates for them the norms of Truth, Goodness and Beauty (“Darstellung dessen, was sein Werk Wahres, Gutes und Schönes enthält”). At the end of his preface, Schedius reveals the most important forerunners of his journal: *Jenaische Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, *Novi Ecclesiastico-Scholastici Annales Evangelicorum August. et Helvet. Confessionis in Austriaca Monarchia*, *Merkur von Ungern* and *Oesterreichische Merkur*. However, this does not mean that those journals served as models of criticism for him. It is more likely that Schedius considered them not as models, but rather as earlier journals which had written about Hungarian national culture accidentally, without any criticism.

Schedius’s project on criticism was inspired by a contemporary theory by Friedrich Nicolai (1733–1811), who in his essays and in the preface to the journal *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* emphasised the importance of criticism for the virtual community of knowledge (“Gelehrtenrepublik”).<sup>28</sup> As he

27 SCHEDIUS, *Vorbericht...*, 20–24.

28 Friedrich NICOLAI, “Vorbericht”, *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* (1765). For its context see: M. Van Der LAAN, “Nicolai’s Concept of the Review Journal”, in *The Eighteenth Century German Book Review*, ed. Herbert ROWLAND and Karl J. FINK, 95–112 (Heidelberg: Winter Verlag, 1995).

claims, critical journals play a central role in the Republic of Letters.<sup>29</sup> As well as Schedius, Nicolai emphasized the impartiality of criticism: reviews should not qualify the authors themselves. An appropriate review exhibits the place of the reviewed cultural product in the cultural evolution moving towards the Truth (“Wahrheit”). However, Nicolai is not interested in the national aspects of culture, neither does he want to change or refine cultural narratives. Concerning the national culture, Schedius probably followed Christoph Martin Wieland’s (1733–1813) *Theutscher Merkur*.<sup>30</sup> It is worth noting that Kantian anthropology stands behind Wieland’s concept on nation.<sup>31</sup> This anthropological paradigm was decisive in the cultural life of Göttingen during the 1780s and ’90s. It can be investigated in the ‘debate of scientific racism’. Johann Friedrich Blumenbach’s (1752–1840) racial theory and his concept of ‘vis formativus’ or ‘Bildungstrieb’ (an inborn force within any organism that drove it to create, to maintain and to repair its form) activated the traditional approach to universal and linear development.<sup>32</sup> When Wieland used “Teutsch” instead of “Deutsch”, he expressed that his journal aimed to shape a new cultural identity, one which could not be defined between political or linguistic frames. The virtual community covered by the epithet “Teutsch” is not a stable aggregation (like Carl von Linné’s category of classes), but an altering organism determined by its own special evolution and formed by a dynamic adaptation (like Blumenbach’s races). The “Teutsch” is critically separated from the so-called French or English type of identity based on the unity of language, race and politics: “Die deutsche Nation ist eigentlich nicht eine Nation, sondern ein Aggregat von vielen Nationen, so wie die alten Griechen [...]. Umgang mit Menschen von allen Ständen, von allen Ländern, von allen Denkartern.”<sup>33</sup>

29 Dirk van MIERT, “What was the Republic of Letters? A brief introduction to a long history (1417–2008)”, *Groniek*, 204/205 (2016): 269–287.

30 John A. MCCARTHY, “Reviewing Nation: The Book Review and the Concept of Nation”, in *The Eighteenth Century German Book Review*, ed. Herbert ROWLAND and Karl J. FINK, 151–167 (Heidelberg: Winter Verlag, 1995).

31 Karl J. FINK, “Kant’s Concept of telos: Reviews Shaping Anthropology”, in *The Eighteenth Century German Book Review*, ed. Herbert ROWLAND and Karl J. FINK, 169–181 (Heidelberg: Winter Verlag, 1995).

32 Luigi MARINO, *Praeceptores Germaniae. Göttingen 1770–1820* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995), 90–110; GURKA Dezső, “A rassz fogalma körüli vita mint a göttingai tradíció és a kanti filozófia kapcsolódási pontja” [“The Debate About the Race as the Connection Between the Göttingen Tradition and Kant’s Philosophy”], *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 47 (2003): 461–478.

33 Christoph Martin WIELAND, *Werke*, Hrsg. von Fritz MARTINI und Hans Werner SEIFFERT, Bd. 3 (München: Hanser Verlag, 1967), 267.

In my opinion, it was Wieland's journal that served as Schedius's model when the latter aimed to critically determine a new identity called "Ungern" instead of the traditional spelling of "Ungarn". Both of his journals, the *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* and the *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern*, include "Ungern" in their title. As Schedius wrote in his *Einleitung* of *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern*: "Ungern nehme ich hier im ausgedehntesten Sinne dieser Benennung, nach welcher auch Siebenbürgen, Croatien, Slavonien und Dalmatien dahin gehören."<sup>34</sup> The geographical definition makes it clear that Schedius's "Ungern" cannot be interpreted as a design of Habsburg imperial patriotism.<sup>35</sup> The next sentence of his *Einleitung*<sup>36</sup> outlines a plan for a wider community of Danubian peoples.<sup>37</sup> That agenda was decisive for Schedius's former journal and for the *Anzeiger* too. From the 18th issue to the 23rd issue of the year 1799 a tractate was published anonymously in sequels under the title *Geschichte von Serwien*,<sup>38</sup> which is commonly considered in media history to be the discovery of Serbian history.<sup>39</sup> Supposedly its writer was either Károly [Carolus] Koppi (1744–1801) or Márton György [Martin Georg] Kovachich (1744–1821). However, it seems to be highly consistent with Johann Christian Engel's (1770–1814) Serbian history.<sup>40</sup> (Engel was Schedius's friend from Georg August University.) In addition, Schedius published his own dispute with Johann Schauff (1757–1827) about the usage of the name "Ungern": *Soll man Hungarn, Ungarn oder Ungern schreiben?* (Schedius) – *Ueber den ersten Artikel der ersten Stückes des literarischen Anzeigers*

34 Johann Ludwig SCHEDIUS, "Einleitung", *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern* (1802): 5–15, 13.

35 Harm KLUETING, "Bürokratischer Patriotismus: Aspekte des Patriotentums im thesesianisch-josephinischen Österreich", in *Patriotismus*, Hrsg. von Günter BIRTSCH, 37–52 (Hamburg: Meiner, 1991).

36 „Auch Aufsätze über die in Osten und Süden an uns zunächst angränzenden Länder, von denen der europäische Gelehrte wieder nur meist durch uns genaue Nachrichten erhalten kann, z.B. über Bosnien, Servien, die Walachey, Moldau, u.s.f. gehören in den Umfang dieser Blätter". SCHEDIUS, *Einleitung...*, 13.

37 One of the "Danubian peoples" concepts: Samuel J. WILSON, "Lost Opportunities: Lajos Kossuth, the Balkan Nationalities and the Danubian Confederation", *Hungarian Studies* 8 (1993): 171–194.

38 "Geschichte von Serwien", *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 18, 80–82; No. 19, 83–86; No. 20, 87–89; No. 21, 91–92; No. 22, 95–97; No. 23, 99–100.

39 FRIED István, "Szerbia fölfedezése a magyar felvilágosult történetírásban" ["The Discovery of Serbia in Hungarian Enlightened Historiography"], *A Hungarológiai Intézet Tudományos Közleményei* 3 (1970): 21–30.

40 Johann Christian ENGEL, *Geschichte des ungarischen Reichs und seiner Nebenländer*, Bd. III, *Geschichte von Serwien und Bosnien, nebst einer Fortsetzung der Denkmäler ungarischer Geschichte und der historischen Literatur der ungarischen Nebenländer* (Halle: Gebauer, 1801).



zu Pest 1799 (Schauff) – Antwort (Schedius).<sup>41</sup> Their dispute proves that the term “Ungern” serves as a generic term which includes many ethnicities. “Ungern” as “Vaterland” could not be localized by means of ethnic terms; the way of its localization can be found in the cultural criticism: “Betrachtet man kritisch-literarische Anzeigen oder Recensionen aus diesem Gesichtspunkten, so kann es unter uns wohl weder dem eigentlichen Gelehrten, noch dem kultivierten Manne überhaupt, der sein Vaterland liebt, und es nicht einzig und allein durch das Tragen der Nationalkleidung zu verherrlichen geneigt ist”.<sup>42</sup> Obviously, the community of “Ungern” is a dynamic organism which is determined by its own evolution. As in his other papers, Schedius explicated that the organism is based on the mutual, equal, and internal connection of its parts, and, after all, constitutes a nation.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, in Schedius’s theory the nation as an organism is based on the mutual, equal and internal connection of its parts – an organism can contain different ethnicities.

In applying their project of criticism, both the *Anzeiger* and the *Zeitschrift* used a special structure of columns. There is a recognizable parallelism between the dimensions of criticism (that were unravelled in the preface to the *Anzeiger*) and the column structure of the journals. The first dimension of criticism, namely extending the virtual territory of the Empire of Knowledge, was represented in the column *Vermischte Nachrichten* by quantitative methods. The column *Vermischte Nachrichten* explicates the imperial statistics of the Republic of Letters through the method of Johann Christoph Gatterer or Márton Schwartner.<sup>44</sup> This column collects a high number of news items about cultural and educational institutes or undertakings. For instance, many short reviews can be read here about Sámuel Tessedik’s educational reform, which aimed at improving the peasantry.<sup>45</sup> Nevertheless, the dominant type of news is the one which

41 *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 1, 1–2; No. 14, 64–65.

42 SCHEDIUS, *Vorbericht*..., 22.

43 On Schedius’s organic concept on nation see Piroška BALOGH, “Anthropological Aspects of Johann Ludwig Schedius’s Aesthetics”, in *Changes in the Image of Man from the Enlightenment to the Age of Romanticism*, ed. Dezső GURKA, 220–231 (Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó, 2018).

44 BODNÁR-KIRÁLY Tibor, “Államleírás és a »statisztika elmélete« a 18–19. század fordulóján” [“Theory of State Descriptions and Statistics at the Turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries”], *Századok* 151 (2017): 971–986.

45 SZENICZEY Vilma, *Tessedik Sámuel közgazdasági törekvései s a szarvasi gyakorlati gazdasági iskola* [*Samuel Tessedik’s Economic Endeavors and the Practical Economic School in Szarvas*] (Budapest: Athenaeum, 1918).; News about Tessedik in the *Anzeiger*: “Das Uebersicht der praktisch-ökonomischen Vorlesungen, welche zu Szarvas im ersten Vierteljahre, vom 16ten März 1799. bis den 23ten Junius d. J. gehalten warden”, *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 3, 11–12;

describes Hungarian geology and botany (for example Pál Kitaibel's botanical enterprise).<sup>46</sup> The column *Vermischte Nachrichten* obviously follows the tradition of "Intelligenzblätter".<sup>47</sup> That tradition was mainly based on the regularized journalistic discourse of "Polizeiwissenschaft", the political and economic science of describing and organising empires. Schedius's next journal, *Zeitschrift*, referred to that tradition explicitly: its column *Intelligenzblatt* was an extended and detailed continuation of *Vermischte Nachrichten* of the *Anzeiger*. Therefore, these columns proved that not only does journalistic criticism aim to inform, but it can organize and control the Republic of Letters too.

The second dimension of criticism aspired to relate a national cultural narrative and establish its archive. The column *Kurze Aufsätze* of the *Anzeiger* and the column *Abhandlungen und kürzere Aufsätze* of the *Zeitschrift* collected examples and events of national cultural narrative. These articles are written about the history of nature (geological, geographical, botanical narratives), about the history of literature, and about history itself. They were formed as synthetic studies from a special historical point of view: they tried to comprehend the extensive narratives about the past.

The third critical dimension was installed to regulate new cultural products by implicating the norms of Truth, Goodness and Beauty. Its territory was the column of book reviews – in the *Anzeiger* under the heading *Rezensionen* and in the *Zeitschrift* under the heading *Bücheranzeigen*. Hungarian media history has concentrated only upon the topic and the language of reviewed books. However, Schedius's reviews are interesting not only because of their topic, but of their critical method and their rhetoric as well. Their critical method and rhetoric divide three types of reviews.

The first type of reviews aims at confirming the cultural direction the reviewed book represents. Let us see an example of Schedius's reviews. A review was published in the *Anzeiger* under the title *Unterricht für eine junge Person, die in die Welt tritt. Aus dem französischen in das Deutsche übersetzt von dem*

---

No. 4, 15–16.; More about Tessedik's institution: *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 12, *Anhang*; No. 17, 76–78; No. 21, 92–93; No. 22, 97–98.; No. 30, 130; No. 31, 133–134; No. 32, 138; No. 33, 141–142.

46 V. MOLNÁR Attila, *Kitaibel: egy magyar tudós élete [Kitaibel: the Life of a Hungarian Scientist]*, (Debrecen: DE TTK, 2015).; News about Kitaibel and his writings in the *Anzeiger: Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 1, 2–3; No. 7–8, 25–31; No. 11, 42; No. 12–13, 45–61; No. 23, 101; No. 24, 105.

47 Werner GREILING, "Intelligenzblätter in Thüringen", in Werner GREILING, *Presse und Öffentlichkeit in Thüringen: Mediale Verdichtung und kommunikative Vernetzung im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, 191–264 (Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau, 2003).



*Fräulein Celestina von Dwornikowich. Pest, Trattner, 1796.*<sup>48</sup> The structure of the review is the following: A) bibliographical data of the book; B) describing the philological background of the book (here: title of French original, method of translating); C) describing the cultural context of the book (here: the importance of that translation in the process of women's education); D) observations on the topic and the method of the book (here: problems of translation); E) enumeration of related books. Two strategies ensure the cohesion of the review, on the one hand, the frequent repetition of contextual keywords (here: "Frauenzimmer", "Damen", "Weiblichkeit", "Nachahmerin", "Uebersetzerin") in each structural unit, while on the other hand, personal rhetoric. The text is constructed by descriptive columns, which are interrupted by notes written in first person singular, sometimes in first person plural. These notes represent the independent reviewer's expectations and observations. Formulated by a representative of the educated and accomplished community of "Ungern", these reviews express encouraging confirmations and modest suggestions.

The second type of reviews does not confirm – on the contrary, it admonishes the authors. Another of Schedius's reviews helps us to see the characteristics of a critical review. It is about László [Ladislaus] Bielek's book *Maiiores Hungarorum. Pars I, Pest, 1799.*<sup>49</sup> Its structure is (with the abbreviations I used above): A) bibliographical data of the book; [B] the philological background is omitted]; C) the cultural context of the book is the most emphasised point: the reviewer enumerates the most decisive books on the reviewed book's topic, and prescribes the most desirable direction of research (here: the research of the Hungarian prehistory); D) observations on the topic and the method of the book are the most critical part of the review: the reviewer calls in question the scientific authenticity of the book for two reasons – on the one hand, the author did not use the scientific critical methods during the examination of sources; on the other hand, the author's main questions are significantly different from the adequate direction of research; E) the final column enumerates related books: the reviewer lists further recommended reading-matter. Thus, the critical review uses the cultural context not as a confirmative background, but as the basis of comparison. Nevertheless, the final column does not express a negative judgement. It represents the list of related books as proposals for the future direction of the author's research. Its rhetorical strategy ignores radical judgements, and reminds us of a polite, sometimes ironic conversation. The reviewer often apos-

48 *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 9, 33–34.

49 *Literarischer Anzeiger für Ungern* (1799): No. 2, 5–7.

trophizes the author very courteously, and his critical notes are formulated as attentive proposals or questions. It is worth mentioning that this type of review often gives a highly detailed description of the content of the book. When the reviewer exhibits the main themes of a book, he wants to involve the reader in the critical exploration. Sometimes the reviewer leaves the task of drawing (negative) conclusions to the reader. That type of review must have been strange for the Hungarian public at that time. That is the reason why Schedius's critical review about Sándor Kisfaludy's tragedy on János Hunyady<sup>50</sup> was interpreted by Ferenc Kazinczy (1757–1831) as an “immoral adulation.”<sup>51</sup>

Examples of the third type of review appear in large numbers in the *Rezen-sionen* column *Zeitschrift*. This type exhibits the reviewed book almost impartially, and invites the reader to confer, to confront and to judge the reviewed books. These reviews are often formulated in pairs; for instance, the two reviews about the two pamphlets<sup>52</sup> representing the two faces of the Hungarian Kant debate.<sup>53</sup> They involve sections A), C), and D), without sections B) and E). Consequently, not only do the reviews exhibit neglect to provide open judgements, but also suggestions and guidelines. Their rhetoric tries to give the impression of objectivity. Subjective grammatical forms and other references of the reviewer's opinion are avoided. However, these reviews operate with very sophistic and refined methods to channel the reader's opinion, among them cross-references within the paired reviews, editorial footnotes and ironical reflections (e.g. the review of an anonymous book is maliciously anonymous as well). Friedrich

50 Johann Ludwig SCHEDIUS, “Hunyady János. Históriai Dráma. írta Kisfaludi Kisfaludy Sándor. Budán, Kir. Magy. Universitas betűivel, 1816” “[János Hunyady. Historical Drama Written by Sándor Kisfaludy, Published in Buda, Royal University, in 1816]”, *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* No. 1 (1817): 103–107.

51 Ferenc Kazinczy's Letter to József Szentgyörgyi, 19. April 1817.; and to János Kis, 6. May 1817.; KAZINCZY Ferenc, *Levelezése [Ferenc Kazinczy's Correspondence]*, ed. János VÁCZY, Vol. XV (Budapest: MTA, 1905), 166, 175.

52 The two reviewed pamphlets are: [BUDAI Ferenc], *A' Kánt szerént való Filozofiának rostálgatása Levelekben. Magyarra fordítva és jegyzésekkel megbővítve [Letters About Kant's Philosophy]* (Pozsony: Weber, 1801); SÁRVÁRI Pál, *Moralis Philosophia, mellyben az erköltsi tselekdeteknek a józan okosság szerént való Főregulája vagy Principiuma kikeresődik, és annak az Isten lételevel, a lélek halhatatlanságával, és a vallással való szoros egybe-köttetése elő-adódik [Philosophy about the Rational Principle of Moral Acts, and its Connection with the God's Existence, and the Immortality of the Soul, and the Religion]* (Pest, Trattner, 1802). The pair of reviews: *Zeitschrift von und für Ungern* (1802): 217–218, 219–221.

53 Béla MESTER, “Utilitarian Political Discourse and the Background of the Kantian Ethics in the 19th-Century History of the Hungarian Political Ideas: What Can Be Sacrificed?” in *Sacrifice: From Origins of Culture to Contemporary Life Challenges*, ed. Robert PETKOVŠEK, Bojan ŽALEC, 165–172 (Berlin, Münster, Wien, Zürich, London: LIT Verlag, 2018).

Nicolai's above-mentioned theory on criticism, which emphasises the reviewer's impartiality ("Unpartheylichkeit") and the reader's activity, can be found in the background of such exhibiting reviews.

Upon exploring the models of Schedius's reviews, one may examine the reviewing strategy used in the *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*.<sup>54</sup> As I have already stated, Schedius wrote many reviews for that journal, and so he would have been familiar with the expectations of the *Literatur-Zeitung*. There is a parallel characteristic between the reviews of the *Literatur-Zeitung* and the reviews of Schedius's journals: namely, the contextual approach. As we have seen, outlining the cultural and philological context was a constant part of Schedius's reviewing strategy. However, the types of reviews published in the Jena journal ("normative Rezensionen", "offene Rezensionen", "Enzyklopädische Rezensionen", "Programmatische Rezensionen")<sup>55</sup> are not equivalent with the types were used by Schedius. Besides that fact, as I suppose, there is another reviewing strategy which might have impressed Schedius. He had been one of Heyne's favourite students, and Heyne wrote many reviews for *Göttingische Gelehrten Anzeigen*, among them ones about Schedius's journals.<sup>56</sup> However, media and literary history have not as yet examined Heyne's reviewing methods.

Finally, our investigation concludes that Schedius's journals established a special agenda of cultural criticism, one aimed at creating a nation's virtual community, "Ungern". However, that community was not only determined by its language. It was considered a dynamic organism defined by a complexity of geographical, historical and cultural characteristics. For that purpose, Schedius concentrated on three dimensions of cultural criticism, and elaborated some methods for controlling this complexity. One of his methods was to write complex and developing reviews about cultural products, especially about books. Schedius's reviewing strategy provided a model and also a norm as to how to modulate a polite conversation about cultural facts, and how to embark upon cultural discourses.

54 Andreas WISTOFF, *Die Deutsche Romantik in der öffentlichen Literaturkritik. Die Rezensionen zur Romantik in der „Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung“ und der „Jenaischen Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung“ 1795–1812*, (Bonn und Berlin: Bouvier, 1992), 274–277.

55 *Ibid.*, 275–277.

56 Christian Gottlob Heyne's three reviews about Schedius's: *Zeitschrift: Göttingische Gelehrten Anzeigen* (1803): 127–128; (1803): 2044–2047; (1804): 2054–2056. On the importance of *Göttingische Gelehrten Anzeigen* see: Joachim RINGLEBEN, "Über die Anfänge der Göttingischen Gelehrten Anzeigen", in *Die Wissenschaften in der Akademie: Vorträge beim Jubiläumskolloquium der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen im Juni 2000*, Hrsg. von Rudolf SMEND und Hans-Heinrich VOIGT, 345–356 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2002).

As for the influence of Schedius's reviewing strategy and the effect of his journalistic program on criticism, the Hungarian media history has many questions to answer. It is only natural that Schedius's journals occupied a position of extreme importance, both for the Hungarian and the international public. It is therefore plausible to suppose that his reviewing strategy also impressed his readers, that is, the Hungarian reviewers who wrote in Hungarian journals in the Hungarian language. It is crucial that Hungarian media history links the criticism of German journals to the critical methods of the Hungarian ones. If this is achieved, then Schedius's program on criticism will at last take its rightful place in Hungarian cultural history.