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The Hungarian proverb ‘A nyelvében él a nemzet’ (‘The nation lives in its language’) expresses the fact that the Hungarian language is the most prominent feature of modern Hungarian nationalism. Although this proverb has been documented only from the mid-nineteenth century, I will attempt to demonstrate in this chapter that the Hungarian language is one of the core features of early modern Hungarian nationhood as well. Native knowledge of the Hungarian language is a prerequisite for claiming Hungarian national and cultural identity. As a consequence, only native speakers of Hungarian are considered to be members of the Hungarian nation. Note that this presupposes an ethnie, an ethno-linguistic community in the sense of Anthony Smith. This also implies that the ethno-linguistic community is an antecedent to the development of the modern Hungarian nation. Hence, language is one of the most important roots of modern Hungarian nationalism. If this implication is correct, the question arises regarding how Hungarian nationalism should be analysed within the different theoretical paradigms available in the scholarly literature.

The scholarly literature on the origins of nationalism has been dominated by the modernist account elaborated in the work of Hobsbawm and Gellner. The central thesis of the modernist account, contrary to the traditionalist one, is that modern nationhood is an artificial by-product of the ‘Great Transformation’ produced by the French and the Industrial Revolutions. From this thesis the claim follows that modern nationhood has no premodern, historical antecedents whatsoever. To put it differently, the modernist school claims that there is a radical disjuncture between premodern, existing ethnicities and nation-state formation. However, the work of scholars like Anderson, Holton, May and Smith leaves open the possibility of a ‘third’ position that postulates a connection between modern nationhood and premodern ethnicity. Although Anderson's position on nation formation falls into the modernist school, there is a contradiction in his work. His notion of 'print capitalism' explains the spread of languages that is central to the forming of homogeneous speech communities and
'imagined communities' of the nations. This type of nation formation appears as early as the sixteenth century, as I will demonstrate below. The modernist paradigm hypothesises, however, that there is no connection between early forms of nationalism and the modern industrial states.6

The third position keeps many tenets of the modernist theory, such as the recent emergence of national identity, its constructed nature and the separation of political and ethnic nationalisms, but argues that the rise of nationalism due to modernity is shaped by premodern ethnic identities. Notice that the latter position presupposes a sense of continuity that does not preclude cultural and linguistic change and adaptation. Consequently, there are long-run continuities between older forms of cultural allegiance and identity, and contemporary forms of nationalism. Ethno-linguistic identity may be one such lineage that spans the two sides of the supposed ‘Great Transformation’.7 In this chapter, I will defend the third position by providing arguments for the claim that the most important feature of Hungarian ethno-symbolism, Hungarian language identity, is constructed. This claim maintains the insights of the modernist approach, but at the same time I will argue for continuity between the Hungarian ethno-linguistic core and modern Hungarian linguistic nationalism.

The Development of the Vernacular

The Hungarian language has developed into a standard language from an original vernacular following the pattern for the development of European vernaculars outlined in Peter Burke’s study Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe (2004). In the first period from the mid-fifteenth century, when the first books printed in European vernaculars appear, until the end of the seventeenth century, when the vernaculars started to function as official languages in several European countries, the vernacular is used alongside the official language of the state, Latin.8 During this period the domains of the vernacular are extended with the help of Bible translations, contributing to its standardisation. In the second period, the simultaneous use of the vernacular and the official Latin language leads to a variety of mixing and intermingling with Latin. In the third period, the vernacular sometimes competes with Latin and other vernaculars to become the language of power. In this stage purification takes place, separating the vernacular from its Latin elements. In the final stage, from the late eighteenth century onwards, the ‘nationalisation’ of the earlier vernaculars is put on the agenda in the framework of the unfolding nation-state.9 In this chapter,
I will demonstrate that the Hungarian language has been ‘nationalised’ in accordance with Burke’s pattern. Furthermore, I will demonstrate that publications in the Hungarian language that have a place in the Hungarian canon have been instrumental in forming the ethno-linguistic community. These publications form a vertical web – successively in time – by reference, co- and cross-reference. This turns out to be the case as well for authors who are part of the Hungarian canon and form a vertical network. These networks are based on similar concepts contributing to the transformation of the original vernacular into the nationalised, purified variety. Vertical webs and networks of publications and authors provide evidence for the continuity of the ethno-linguistic community and the modern nation, and do not support the thesis of a rupture between these entities, as the modernist account would predict.

Azar Gat convincingly argues for abandoning time limits for national identity formation. He even does not exclude going back to the ancient world to find ethnic antecedents to modern nations, questioning the claim that the establishment of early, coherent ethnic communities is dependent on a modern instrument like print. Although in this chapter the starting point of Hungarian ethno-linguistic community formation is the occurrence of print, it is my conviction that Gat’s arguments apply to the Hungarian case as well, as the following example illustrates.

Although Latin was the official language of the Hungarian kingdom in the late Middle Ages and the early modern period, other vernaculars, including Hungarian, were used as well. The early Hungarian vernacular spoken in the royal court in Buda in the late Middle Ages and early modern period and the language variety used by the Hungarian commoners was the same. This claim is well documented by the first librarian of the Hungarian Renaissance king, Matthias Corvinus (1443-90), the Italian humanist Marzio Galeotto (1427-90). We know from Galeotto’s writings on the deeds of Matthias Corvinus that the Hungarian king was plurilingual and spoke Latin, Hungarian, Slavic languages and German, but also that Hungarians, elites, like the court of the king and noblemen, as well as commoners, including the peasants, spoke the same variety of Hungarian. This implies the existence of a single and homogenous Hungarian ethno-linguistic community well before mass print became operative in Hungary around the mid-sixteenth century.

Before we start the discussion of the development of the Hungarian vernacular, two methodological notes are in order. Firstly, with respect to the Hungarian canon, I will heavily rely on the representative study of the Hungarian literary scholar Tibor Klaniczay. The selected authors and works
to be discussed are all integral parts of the Hungarian canon. Secondly, I will elaborate on the cases of the Hungarian canon in an analytic framework of Hungarian history that recognises the following three relevant turning points: 1526, 1711 and 1836. The year 1526 marks the end of the royal kingdom established by the first Christian king of Hungary, Saint Stephen, in 1000 AD. In the Battle of Mohács (1526), the Hungarian royal army was soundly defeated by the Ottomans, and, as a consequence, the Kingdom of Hungary was divided into three parts. The northwestern part of the country, which was considered the continuation of St. Stephen’s Hungary, became a Habsburg possession. The central parts of the old kingdom were occupied by the Turks. The royal city of Buda would be dominated for 150 years by the Turkish authority. The eastern parts of Hungary and Transylvania would develop over the course of the sixteenth century into the semi-independent principality of Transylvania under Ottoman domination. This Protestant principality became an important geopolitical actor in the religiously inspired conflicts in Europe. It will be spelled out in more detail below how these developments had repercussions for Hungarian culture and language. The second rupture is the definitive collapse of the Principality of Transylvania as an independent geopolitical actor in 1711, when the Rákóczy Uprising and War of Liberation failed to oust the Habsburgs from Hungary. After 1711, the Habsburgs took possession of the whole of Hungary and re-created St. Stephen’s kingdom. The year 1838 is a turning point as well in Hungarian history because in that year the Hungarian language received official status within the Hungarian parts of the Habsburg Empire, marking an important step in the modernisation of the Hungarian language and in the full recognition of the Hungarian language identity.

The Period before 1711

The Habsburg strategy to expand territorially via marriages, expressed in the proverb ‘Tu felix Austria et nubia’ (‘Be happy Austria and marry’), targeted Hungary as well. After the Battle of Mohács the Habsburg dynasty headed by Emperor Charles V took over the northwestern parts of the Hungarian kingdom. The last king of Hungary, Louis II from the Polish-Lithuanian house of Jagiellon who died in the Battle of Mohács, was married into the Habsburg family. Hence, one of the brothers of Louis’s wife, Mary queen consort of Hungary and Bohemia, the future emperor Ferdinand I, became king of Hungary after the collapse of the old Hungarian kingdom. The foreign occupation of the country by the Catholic Habsburgs and the
Muslim Ottomans made the teachings of the Reformation that were spreading quickly after Mohács attractive to many Hungarians, and Calvinism, in particular, became popular in the eastern parts of the former kingdom of St. Stephen and the semi-independent Principality of Transylvania. It is in this geopolitical context that the Hungarian vernacular received an important boost.

Inspired by the Reformation, writers, translators and printers like Gáspár Heltai (1510-74), Gáspár Károlyi (1529-91) and Albert Szenczi Molnár (1574-1634) started to publish in Hungarian. Gáspár Heltai was a member of the Transylvanian Saxon minority in Transylvania and had learned Hungarian at later age due to the Reformation. He became a Protestant minister and established the first print shop in Kolozsvár (now Cluj-Napoca in Romania), the most important town of Transylvania. In addition to his translations of religious and historical texts from Latin into Hungarian, he published collections of fables in Hungarian. The latter were inspired by the European humanists. Gáspár Károlyi was a Hungarian Calvinist pastor who translated the complete Bible into Hungarian. The first Hungarian Bible translation was completed in a small village in his native Transylvania, Viszoly, and hence it is referred to as the Bible of Viszoly (1590). Szenczi Molnár was a Calvinist pastor as well who worked as a translator and religious writer. He was present at the translation and printing of the Viszoly Bible. Like Heltai and Károlyi he visited the Wittenberg Academy to complete his theological studies. During his stay in German Protestant principalities he wrote a Hungarian grammar in Latin, ‘Nova grammatica Ungarica’, which was published in Hanau in 1610. The numerous conversions of Hungarians to Protestant denominations during the early period of the Reformation were partly neutralised by the Counter-Reformation led by the Habsburgs. Instrumental in this effort was Péter Pázmány (1570-1637), a Hungarian Jesuit who became Archbishop of Hungary. Pázmány was active as a theologian, pulpit orator and author involved in religious polemics against the early Protestant writers such as Heltai, Károlyi and Szenczi Molnár. His Catholic apologetics contributed to the standardisation and the creation of the Hungarian literary language. The Counter-Reformation also formed an important inspiration for the resistance against Ottoman pressures on the territory of the former Hungarian kingdom.

The main pockets of resistance against the attacks of the Turks were the isolated border castles. Soldier-poets like Bálint Balassi (1554-94) defended border castles against the Turks, and they wrote about the heroic deeds in the resistance against Turkish attacks. Balassi also wrote poems about everyday life and love stories unfolding against the backdrop of the border
castles’ struggles. Such works formed the foundation of modern Hungarian lyric and erotic poetry. Balassi’s most famous poem ‘Egy katonaének’ (‘Knights’ song’) from 1589 is a tribute to the life in the border castles as its first sentence makes clear: ‘Knights, what finer worth is there than what the borderlands can show?’\(^8\) Most of the border castles’ soldier-poets not only wrote poems about the battles against the Turks but chronicled them in music. Sebestyén Tinódi (1510-66) nicknamed ‘Lantos’, the lute player, was a notable example.\(^9\)

One of the most important fighters against the Turks was Count Miklós Zrínyi (1620-64), a descendant from a Croatian-Hungarian noble family. He not only fought against the Turks as the highest political and military leader of the Croatian part of the Habsburg Empire, but also employed literary works to urge his countrymen to take up arms against the Turks. Zrínyi drew from the poetry of Balassi and Sebestyén Tinódi. Count Zrínyi wrote the first Baroque epic poems in Hungarian, which recount the heroic deeds of his forefathers in the struggle against the Turks. Furthermore, he wrote a patriotic pamphlet about the ousting of the Turkish occupiers, ‘A török áfium ellen való orvosság’ (1661) (‘An antidote to the Turkish poison’) which played an important role in the formation of Hungarian nationalism then and later.\(^20\)

While Count Zrínyi and the Catholics in Habsburg Hungary fought against the Turks, the princes of Transylvania who had adopted the Calvinist faith collaborated with the Ottomans in order to counterbalance the Habsburgs. The Transylvanian princes considered Transylvania as the legal continuation of the old Hungarian kingdom. The language of administration in Transylvania became Hungarian, and Hungarian rulers such as Gabriel Bethlen (1580-1629), who sided in the Thirty Years’ War with the Protestant forces, succeeded in setting up a stable Hungarian state administration. Bethlen also managed to improve the educational system and established the Bethlen College in Nagyenyed (now Aiud in Romania). This college served as an institute for higher education of Transylvanian Calvinists who were not allowed to enroll at the universities supervised by the Catholic Habsburgs in Royal Hungary. Transylvania was not able to erect its own university, however. Hence, after the Thirty Years’ War Hungarian Protestant students who had first visited the German universities were, from the mid-seventeenth century onwards, forced to travel to Western Europe, where they were welcomed at universities in Protestant countries like the Netherlands, Britain and Switzerland. In fact, these universities became destinations for Protestant students from the eastern parts of the former Hungarian kingdom.\(^21\) The numerous cultural encounters between
peregrinating Hungarian students and the Western European universities led to an enormous upswing in the use and status of the Hungarian language in culture, theology and sciences. One of the first Transylvanian-Hungarian students in the Netherlands who made important scientific progress in Hungarian was János Apáczai Csere (1625-59).

Apáczai was the first Hungarian scholar in the modern sense. He was the leading Hungarian Protestant scholar and writer of the seventeenth century. He studied at several Dutch universities and was a follower of the French philosopher René Descartes (1596-1650), one of the most influential early Enlightenment thinkers. Apáczai became famous for the first textbook in Hungarian called ‘The Hungarian Encyclopedia’ (‘Magyar Encyclopaedia’) based on the philosophy of Descartes and focusing on the idea that ‘a nation cannot become happy if it cannot get access to sciences in its own mother tongue but only through foreign languages’. The book was completed in 1653 and published in Utrecht in 1655. The typographer and printer Miklós Kis Misztótfalusi (1650-1702), who learned the art of typography and printing in the well-known Amsterdam Bleau Printing Company, became famous for his outstanding print-related achievements.

Kis translated and printed the ‘Golden’ Bible of Amsterdam (1683), a Hungarian-language edition of the complete Bible, in fact a refinement of Károlyi’s Viszoly Bible with an ornamented cover, hence ‘Golden’. For his
translations he relied on the work of early Protestant translators such as Heltai, Károly and Szenczi Molnár.

Relations between the Hungarian Protestants and the house of Habsburg reached a low when the Austrian Emperor Leopold I (1640-1705) decisively rolled back the Turkish forces from Central Europe, took up with new energy the Counter-Reformation and sold 41 Hungarian Protestant ministers as galley slaves to Naples. These Hungarian Protestants were sold as galley slaves because they refused to convert to Catholicism at their trial in the Hungarian capital of Preßburg (in Hungarian Pozsony, now Bratislava in Slovakia). The case of the Protestant Hungarians led to a sharp reaction in the Dutch Republic, at that time one of the most powerful European sea powers, which had accepted freedom of religion and supported the Protestant case. The sovereign Prince of Orange, Stadholder William III of Orange, ordered his admiral Michiel de Ruyter (1607-76) to free the Hungarian Protestant ministers from the Neapolitan galley. De Ruyter succeeded in doing so on 11 February 1676.26 One of the surviving galley slaves was the theologian Ferenc Fóris Otrokocsi (1648-1718) who managed to get to the Netherlands and visited several Dutch universities as a peregrinating student. He defended a dissertation on early Hungarian history and language at the University of Franeker in 1693.27

The Period between 1711 and 1838

The failure of the Hungarian Uprising and War of Liberation against the Habsburgs led by the Hungarian nobleman and prince of Transylvania, Francis II Rákóczy (1676-1735), in 1711 forms a clear rupture in Hungarian history. After 1711, the Habsburgs controlled all the former territories of Royal Hungary and also reintegrated Transylvania into their empire. After the defeat of the Rákóczy Uprising, Prince Rákóczy and his inner circle were forced to flee to Turkey where they received asylum. The refugees were denied permission to return to Hungary by the Habsburgs. Rákóczy’s chamberlain and private secretary Kelemen Mikes (1690-1761) accompanied the prince of Transylvania to Turkey. In Turkish exile, Mikes wrote 207 fictive letters to a lady in Transylvania. With his ‘Letters from Turkey’ Mikes laid the foundations for Hungarian literary prose. This epistolary genre was in fashion at that time.28

The second part of the eighteenth century was dominated by Empress and Queen Maria Theresa (1717-80) and her son, Emperor and King Joseph II (1741-90). Relations between the Hungarian estates and the house of
Habsburg improved when the Hungarian estates supported the house of Habsburg in the Austrian Succession War (1740-48) fought to decide whether Maria Theresa had the right to rule the realms of the house of Habsburg as a woman. The Hungarian estates swore ‘vitam et sanguinem’ to their Queen Maria Theresa in the Diet in 1741. It was under the reign of Maria Theresa that the Hungarian Enlightenment set in. Peregrination to Calvinist Netherlands was not appreciated by the Habsburgs, but they ceased fighting it.

Péter Bod (1712-69), the Calvinist minister, who had during his peregrination to the Netherlands studied at the University of Leiden and after his return to Transylvania worked as a pastor at the court of Countess Kata Bethlen, wrote the first Hungarian literary history, ‘Hungarian Athenas’, in 1766. In this work, Bod cited more than 500 Hungarian authors, including most of the authors discussed earlier in this chapter.39 Bod’s ‘Hungarian Athenas’ became one of the most important sources for future Hungarian literary research. Another influential peregrinating student was the theologian, linguist, poet and Orientalist György Kalmár (1726-82) who also visited the University of Leiden in the Netherlands. Kalmár was deeply involved in the study of universal and perfect languages and other linguistics projects in which he relied on the work of earlier Hungarian peregrinating students like Otrokocsi.30 These studies led him to discover the ‘radix’ (root) in Hungarian.31 The full blossoming of the Hungarian Enlightenment did, however, not take place in Hungary but in Vienna, first during the reign of Queen Maria Theresa (1740-80). Instrumental herein was the society of Hungarian Noble Body Guards that she founded in 1760.

The driving force behind this society was a Hungarian nobleman, the officer György Bessenyei (1747-81) who admired Voltaire and the French encyclopedists. Bessenyei followed in the footsteps of the French writers and started to publish in 1772.32 His works included Classical tragedies, the history of the Hungarian nation, and philosophical prose and poetry. However, Bessenyei’s most influential publications are his programmatic pamphlets with ideas and proposals in the domain of cultural politics, including ‘Hungarianness’ (‘Magyarság’, 1778), ‘The Hungarian Spectator’ (‘A magyar néző’, 1779) and ‘Pious intention towards a Hungarian society’ (‘Egy magyar társaság iránt való jámbor szándék’, 1790).33 From these works it appears that Bessenyei adopted a view similar to that expressed by Apáczai: sciences are the key to a nation’s happiness and sciences can be accessed only in one’s mother tongue. Hence, Bessenyei became an advocate of the thesis that modernisation can be achieved only through ethno-linguistic nationalism.34 These ideas were in full accordance with the literature of the Enlightenment. In practice, this meant that sciences should be transferred
to the members of the nation via their native Hungarian language. However, at the end of the eighteenth century the Hungarian language had the status of a vernacular only and was not fit for the cultivation of sciences yet. Thus arose the idea to make the Hungarian language ‘perfect’ in order to be able to fulfill this task. In this process, a ‘pious society’ of writers and thinkers should take the lead in establishing a Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Both of Bessenyei’s ideas, the renewal of the Hungarian language and the establishment of a Hungarian Academy of Sciences, would resonate soon. The movement to renew the Hungarian language in order to make possible the social mobilisation of the Hungarian nation would be further accelerated by the centralising efforts of Joseph II. The son of Maria Theresa was a proponent of enlightened absolutism and favoured modernising the Habsburg Empire from above. His Germanisation policies to introduce German as the language of state administration in the territories of the Hungarian parts of the Habsburg Empire as well was received with fierce resistance among the Hungarian nobility.35 The emerging nationalist movement fuelled by French Enlightenment ideas led Joseph II to withdraw his language reforms in Hungary shortly before his death. This was an important victory for the movement to renew the Hungarian language led by the writer and translator Ferenc Kazinczy (1759-1831).

Kazinczy is unanimously seen as the most indefatigable agent of the Hungarian language renewal.36 In his efforts he relied on an extremely broad network of Hungarian scholars with which he corresponded extensively on the renewal of the Hungarian language. He referred in his correspondence to the work of earlier Hungarian linguists, such as the peregrinating students Otrokocsi and Kalmár.37 The language renewal movement revived the Hungarian language by purifying the Hungarian vocabulary and coining ‘pure’ Hungarian words to replace the European lexical heritage from Latin, Greek, French and especially German. This led to heated public discussion. The first Hungarian grammar written by a group of professors from Debrecen and published in Vienna in 1795, known as the ‘Debrecen Hungarian Grammar’ (‘A debreceni magyar grammatika’), formulated a prescriptive rule for the renewal and purification of the Hungarian language. According to the Debrecen Hungarian Grammar, these processes should be restricted to the system of the language, i.e. new words should consist of roots and suffixes only of Hungarian stock. Language renewal was also supported by two outstanding scientists, the Transylvanian polymaths Farkas Bolyai (1775-1856), who was professor of mathematics at the Calvinist College in Marosvásárhely (now Tîrgu Mureş in Romania), and his son János Bolyai (1802-60), who served in the Austro-Hungarian army and is the founder
of non-Euclidean geometry. The motivation behind the Bolyais’ decision to participate in language renewal was similar to that inspiring Apáczai and Bessenyei, i.e. sciences make a nation happy, but sciences can be accessed only in one’s mother tongue.\textsuperscript{38} Hence, the Bolyais undertook efforts to extend the lexical domain of Hungarian and coined a number of new Hungarian words in the sciences. In addition to the support it received from those favouring the Enlightenment, Hungarian language renewal later gained importance among the proponents of Romantic nationalism, such as the Hungarian poet, literary critic, orator and politician Ferenc Kölcsey (1790-1838), who had been a collaborator of Kazinczy.\textsuperscript{39} His poem ‘Himnusz’ (‘Hymn’) (1823), evoking the glory of Hungary’s past, became Hungary’s national anthem.

Bessenyei’s other idea, the establishment of a Hungarian Academy of Sciences, received support from members of the high-ranking aristocracy, such as Count József Teleki (1790-1855). Teleki, a jurist and governor of Transylvania between 1842 and 1848, was an ardent supporter of making the Hungarian language ‘perfect and pure’.\textsuperscript{40} The decisive push for the establishment of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was given by the great initiator of social and political reforms in Hungary, Count István Széchenyi. Széchenyi argued in the Diet in 1825 for the establishment of a Hungarian Academy of Sciences. For this purpose, he made available his annual salary as an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army. Finally, in 1830 the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was established, and Count Teleki became its first president. In 1844, the board of the Academy decided to have compiled a ‘great’ dictionary covering the entire lexicon of the Hungarian language and satisfying one of the programmatic points put forward by Bessenyei.\textsuperscript{41} Two members of the Academy, Gergely Czuczor (1800-66) and János Fogarasi (1801-78), were entrusted with the task. Czuczor was a monk of the Benedictine Order and wrote Romantic nationalist poetry, while Fogarasi worked as a judge on the High Court of Appeal. By that time modernist nationalist claims were in full swing in the Hungarian part of the Habsburg Empire.\textsuperscript{42}

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that the claim of the modernist school that the modern Hungarian linguistic nation is totally disconnected from earlier antecedents on the other side of the Great Transformation is on the wrong track. I have shown that the premodern Hungarian ethno-linguistic
communities are clearly related to modern language nationalism. This continuity is expressed in the proverb ‘The nation lives in its language’. It is clear that those publications and authors that form part of the Hungarian canon discussed above refer, co-refer and cross-refer to each other. The continuous development of the historical-cultural nation implies that an ethno-linguistic speech community precedes the legal political nation. An analytical framework with relevant turning points helps us to see how the authors and Hungarian-language publications of the Reformation provoked responses by the Counter-Reformation. The Hungarian language and speech community were shaped by the Hungarian Peregrination, an early form of globalisation, and cultural encounters driven by the Reformation. Literary publications emanating from the struggles against Turkish rule and Habsburg absolutism are linked with early and late Enlightenment literature. The different kinds of references, co- and cross-references are too subtle and too interwoven to maintain the claim of a rupture around the Great Transformation, as the modernist school presupposes. Not only the web of interconnected canonical literary works but also the vertical networks of canonical authors over time demonstrate that the different stages of the ethnic speech community and the modern language nations are connected.

Note that there is a strong link between the scholars Apáczai, Bessenyei and the Bolyais, whose main motivation to renew the Hungarian language and to spread it among the Hungarian commoners is similar. They argue that the well-being of the Hungarian nation can be achieved only when the sciences can be accessed via the mother tongue. So, in their view, the domain of the Hungarian vernacular must be extended to the sciences as well. Notice that these scholars form a vertical network for they never met during their lives. From this and other continuous vertical networks and webs the conclusion follows that modern development in the Hungarian case can be understood only if ethno-linguistic antecedents are integrated into the paradigm. Because these ties between linguistic antecedents and modernity are much stronger than in the case of Smith’s *ethnie*, the Hungarian case justifies taking these premodern antecedents as a form of early modern nationhood.

The claim of continuity between the modern nation and its historical antecedents does not imply that insights of the modernist paradigm should be entirely abandoned. Hungarian also fits the pattern outlined by Burke, who sets up a development pattern for European vernaculars. The essential characteristic of this pattern is linguistic continuity, although Burke accepts the modernist claim that the French Revolution replaced an old regime both in government and language. The new governments were becoming increasingly concerned with the everyday language of ordinary people. However,
Burke admits that changes were not absolute, as I have argued in this chapter. According to him, changes in the linguistic regimes and the idea of the nation were becoming visible before the Great Transformation.\textsuperscript{44} Hence, in these cases the changes could not be caused by the Great Transformation itself.

This chapter provides empirical evidence that this hypothesis is correct. In the first stages, the Hungarian vernacular is used alongside official Latin, and its domains are extended, leading to an initial standardisation. Later on there is mixing with Latin, and competing with German for status as the official language of Hungary. In the final stage, language renewal purifies the language and puts its nationalisation on the agenda. Burke observes that at the beginning of European language development Bible translations formed one of the principal means by which printers aided the process of linguistic standardisation.\textsuperscript{45}

As discussed above, in Hungary an early pioneer in this effort was Gáspár Heltai, who relied on the heritage of Bible translations of earlier centuries that he printed in Hungarian. In this way, Heltai contributed to the standardisation of the Hungarian language. A revealing reference for Hungarian-Latin code-switching and -mixing are Bessenyei’s comments in ‘The Hungarian Spectator’. Bessenyei exaggerates when he complains about the dominant use of Latin over Hungarian in written language: ‘if we compare the written Hungarian words with the written Latin words, in our country for one Hungarian word there are 100,000 Latin words ...’.\textsuperscript{46} However, this quote from Bessenyei indicates that on the eve of the purification of the Hungarian vernacular the written language was a kind of Hungarian-Latin hybrid variety. The key words in the textual discourse during the purification process, i.e. the elimination of Latin words and to a lesser extent German ones, include ‘tökélesítés’ (‘perfection’) and ‘pallerozás’ (‘cleaning, smoothing, refining, polishing’). Ironically the root of the latter Hungarian word is a loan word from Latin, i.e. the verb ‘polire’ meaning ‘smooth, polish; refine’. In sum, the purification of the Hungarian language resulted in domain extensions that were in fact a way of modernisation, and standardisation.\textsuperscript{47}
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